

# Unit-I : Ācārāṅga

- 0.0 Introduction
  - 1.1.1 Aṅgapravīṣṭa and Aṅgabāhya
  - 1.1.2 Aṅga-literature
  - 1.1.3 The prathama (first) Aṅga
  - 1.1.4 Meaning of ācāra
  - 1.1.5 Main Division
  - 1.1.6 Sub-division
  - 1.1.7 The Extent of Volume and the Present Version
  - 1.1.8 Subject Matter
  - 1.1.9 Philosophical dimensions of ācārāṅga
  - 1.1.10 Main themes of the ācārāṅga
  - 1.1.11 Faith and Independent Thinking
  - 1.1.12 Touchstone
  - 1.1.13 The Authorship and the Period of Compilation of the ācārāṅga
  - 1.1.14 Composition Style
  - 1.1.15 Commentary Literary Composition
  - 1.1.16 Importance of the ācārāṅga
  - 1.1.17 Relevance of Ācārāṅga
- 1.2.1 Character of soul
- 1.2.2 Nature of the soul
- 1.2.3 Knowledge and knower is soul
- 1.2.4 Consequence of self-realization
- 1.2.5 Rebirth
- 1.2.6 One's own power of recollection
- 1.2.7 Exposition by the Jina
- 1.2.8 Hearsay
- 1.3.0 Influx of Karma
  - 1.3.1 Stoppage of Karma
- 1.4.0 Doctrine of six classes of souls
  - 1.4.1 Earth bodied beings
  - 1.4.2 Water-bodied beings
  - 1.4.3 Fire-bodied beings
  - 1.4.4 Plant-Bodied beings
  - 1.4.5 Mobile beings
    - 1.4.5.1 Creatures born of womb
    - 1.4.5.2 Spontaneous
    - 1.4.5.3 Body
    - 1.4.5.4 Hide
  - 1.4.6 Air-bodied being
- 1.5. Critical Study
- 1.6 Nature of Non-violence
  - 1.6.1 Basis of non-violence
  - 1.6.2 Secret-realizer of Non-injury
- 1.7 Knowledge of non-violence is to know all doctrine
  - 1.7.1 Obstruction of non-violence
- 1.8 Conclusion

## 0.0 Introduction-

Āgamas are the most ancient works in Jaina-literature. We find two versions of Āgamas in samavāyāṅga—Dvādaśāṅga (Gaṇipīṭaka) and caturdaśapūrva. In the Nandī Sūtra we get two divisions of Āgamas—(i) Aṅgapravīṣṭa and (ii) Aṅgabāhya.

### 1.1.1 Aṅgapravīṣṭa and Aṅgabāhya

All references about the course of studies for the Jain monks and nuns, which are found in Āgama-literature, are related to the eleven *Aṅgās* and fourteen *Pūrvās*.

In *Samavāyāṅga* and *Anuyogadvāra* we do not find any mention or a separate section for *Aṅgapravīṣṭa* and *Aṅgabāhya*. We find mention about that for the first time in the *Nandī* (Tenth century after *Vīra-nirvāṇa*). By the time the *Nandī* was written, the Āgama literature had been divided into three sections—(i) *Pūrvā* (ii) *Aṅgapravīṣṭa* (iii) *Aṅgabāhya*.

*Aṅgabāhya* is the creation of later *sthaviras*. Many *Aṅgabāhya* works were written prior to the *Nandī* and their authorship can be attributed to *Caturdaśapūrva* or *daśapūrva sthaviras* and therefore, they have been in the Āgama category. That was the reason that Āgama literature was divided into two sections viz. (a) *Aṅgapravīṣṭa* (b) *Aṅgabāhya*. This bifurcation seems to have been made post-*Anuyogadvāra* (sixth century after *Vīra-nirvāṇa*). Today only the latter two are available to us, while the former is not tracable.

#### Aṅgapravīṣṭa and Aṅgabāhya

We have no evidence on record to accept that categories as *Aṅgapravīṣṭa* and *Aṅgabāhya* came into existence at that time. After Lord Mahāvīra passed away when other Ācāryas composed some works, it is quite possible that the issue was debated whether the works could be included in the category of Āgamas and whether they can be regarded as authoritative. It appears that after a great debate and circumspection, it was decided that the works composed by *caturdaśapūrva* and *daśapūrva* may be categorized as Āgamas. Although they were not considered authority in themselves, yet as they were in consonance with principles laid down in the *Dvādasāṅgī* they were considered as the Āgama literature and simultaneously categorized as distinct from *Aṅgapravīṣṭa* due to their being *prataṁ prāmānya āgama*. This way the *Aṅgabāhya* category was conceived in the Āgama literature.

Jinabhadra *Ṛṣamāśramaṇa* has presented three tests for categorization of *Aṅgapravīṣṭa*.

- (i) Those, which are composed by the *Gaṇadhara*s.
- (ii) What is propounded by a *Tīrthāṅkara* in response to a *Gaṇadhara* question.
- (iii) Which is related to the eternal truth.

The works other than those fulfilling the above criteria and those, which are the works of *sthaviras* are supposed to be *Aṅgabāhya*.

The other attribute of *Aṅgabāhya* is that it is an extempore discourse of *Tīrthāṅkara*, the content of which is not eternal but temporal.

The main criterion distinguishing between the *Aṅgabāhya* and *Aṅgapravīṣṭa* is the difference in their authorship or speakers.

The Āgama which is pronounced by Lord Mahāvīra and has been compiled by a *Gaṇadhara* is regarded as the main limbs of the personified *Śrutapuruṣa* and is called *Aṅgapravīṣṭa*.

According to the *Sarvārthasiddhi*, there are three kinds of preachers: (i) *Tīrthāṅkara*, (ii) *Śrutakevalī* i.e. (*Caturdaśapūrvī*), (iii) *Ārātīya* i.e. later *Ācārya*. The works of *Ārātīya Ācāryas* have been termed as *Aṅgabāhya*.

Ācārya Akalaṅka has said that Āgamas composed by the later *ācāryas* are only reflections of the principles propounded in original *Aṅgas* literature. *Aṅgabāhya* literature is like the subsidiary limbs of personified *Śrutapuruṣa*.

## 1.1.2 Aṅga-literature

The word *Aṅga* has been used in all the three main streams of Indian philosophy. In the *Vaidika* and *Bauddha* literature, the main treatises are “*Veda*” and “*Piṭaka*”. The word *Aṅga* is not associated with them. In the Jaina literature, the main works are categorized as “*Gaṇipīṭaka*” which has been associated with the *Aṅga*, e.g. *Gaṇipīṭaka* has 12 *Aṅgas* (*Gaṇipīṭaka*).

The 12 *Āgamas* compiled in the *Dvādasāṅgi* are known as *Aṅga-literature*. The Jain *Aṅga Āgama* is divided into 12 parts—(i) *ācāra* (ii) *sūtrakṛta* (iii) *sthāna* (iv) *samavāya* (v) *bhagavatī* (vi) *jñātādharmakathā* (vii) *upāsakadaśā* (viii) *antakṛtadaśā* (ix) *anuttaropapātika* (x) *praśnavyākaraṇa* (xi) *vipāka* (xii) *drṣṭivāda*.

The personification of “*Śruta-puruṣa*” is also there in Jaina literature. *Ācāra* and 12 *Āgamas* are the limbs of “*Śruta-puruṣa*”. The adjective *Dvādasāṅgi*, therefore, qualifies both “*Gaṇipīṭaka*” and “*Śrutapuruṣa*”.

### 1.1.3 The prathama (first) Aṅga

The *Ācārāṅga* occupies first place in *Dvādasāṅgi*. There are two opinions according to one school, it is the first from the point of view of the order of the theme, but considering its period of compilation, it is the twelfth. The other school of thought considers it at first place on both the counts. *Acārya* *Malayagiri* and *Abhayadeva Sūri* have referred to the contention of both the schools. These views were prevalent in their times. *Aṅgas* were extracted from *Pūrvas* and as such the view of the former school appears to be justified.

According to the *Niryuktikāra*, the *ācārāṅga* enjoys the first place because the *Tīrthāṅkara* first propounded the guidelines for *ācārāṅga* and then dealt with other *Āgamas*. The *Gaṇadhara* also treated them in the same order. The *Niryuktikāra* has said, the *Ācārāṅga* is to be regarded as first and foremost among *Aṅgas*.

This argument has some limitation. But if we see the point made by the *Niryuktikāra* i.e. first of all the *ācārāṅga* was extracted and compiled out of the *Pūrvas* and then the other *Aṅgas* like “*Sūtrakṛtāṅga*” we overcome the limitation at least in intrinsic sense.

In the *Samavāyāṅga*, two *Śruta-skandhas* (parts) have been attributed to the *Ācārāṅga*, which is also called *Brahmacaryādhyayana*. In the *Samavāyāṅga* *Niryukti* mentions it as consisting of nine *Brahmacaryādhyayanas*. The second part of the *ācārāṅga* is *āyārācūlā*. This proves that the description of *Dvādasāṅgi* as found in the *Samavāyāṅga* is a composition which dates back to *āyārācūlā*. The *ācārāṅga* did not have any division prior to this. This happened only after *ācārācūlā* was composed by *Bhadrabāhu*. The *Niryuktikāra* has given 10 synonyms of the *ācārāṅga*. They are *āyāra*, *ācāra*, *āgāla*, *āsāsa*, *āyārisa*, *Aṅga*, *āinna*, *ājāi* and *āmokkha*.

### 1.1.4 Meaning of ācāra

In Jaina Tradition, the term *ācāra* has been used in very wide sense. *ācāra* has been described in different aspects : (i) *Jñānācāra* (ii) *Darśanācāra* (iii) *Cārītrācāra* (iv) *Tapācāra* (v) *Vīryācāra*.

In this *āgama*, All the five *ācāras* have been dealt with.

### 1.1.5 Main Division

There are nine chapters in the *ācārāṅga*. But there is some difference in the names as well as in the order of these nine chapters as given in the *Samvāyāṅga* and the *ācārāṅga* *Niryukti*.

<i>Samavāyāṅga</i>	<i>ācārāṅga Niryukti</i>
<i>Satthapariṇṇā</i>	<i>Satthapariṇṇā</i>
<i>Logavijaya</i>	<i>Logavijaya</i>
<i>Śōsaṇijja</i>	<i>Śōsaṇijja</i>
<i>Sammatta</i>	<i>Sammatta</i>
<i>āyvammtī</i>	<i>Logasāra</i>
<i>Dhuta</i>	<i>Dhuta</i>
<i>Vimokāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mahāpariṇṇā</i>
<i>Uvahāṇasuya</i>	<i>Vimokkha</i>
<i>Mahāpariṇṇā</i>	<i>Uvahāṇasuya</i>

There is difference in the nomenclature as well as the order. The original name of the 5<sup>th</sup> chapter is "Logasre". *Vantī* however is its name only because it is the first word. In the *Anuyogadvara* it is mentioned as an instance. The *Niryuktikāra* also considers "ācanti" as the name due to the *Logasāra* as a subsidiary name.

On the basis of above discussions, we can conclude that the text of the *ācārāṅga* has, no doubt, been abridged to a certain extent, but not all together lost. The reason for this is that when the *ācārāṅga dhāras* were no more and the monks that became prey to forgetfulness, in the absence of the tradition of recitation, the text became extinct. But according to Acharya Śilāṅkasūri (8<sup>th</sup> century), the text of *ācārāṅga* was available in his time and as such it was not totally lost. The Śvetāmbara ācāryas believed that the mahāparijñā—the seventh chapter of *Ācārāṅga*, has been lost. This happened between the 1st century and the 8th century A.D.

### 1.1.6 Sub-division

In the *samavāyāṅga*, it has been said that the *ācārāṅga* has 85 subdivisions. This is the sum total of both the *śruta-skandhas*. The *uddeśana*-time of a chapter is one unit. Similarly, the *uddeśana*-time of a *uddeśaka* is also one unit. *Uddeśaka* is a section of the chapter. The number of sections in each chapter is as follows :

Chapter	Section	Chapter	Section
1	7	6	5
2	6	7	7
3	4	8	8
4	4	9	4
5	6		

### 1.1.7 The Extent of Volume and the Present Version

According to the *Niryukti*, there are 18000 *padas* (verses) in the *ācārāṅga*. But this number includes *padas* in both *śruta-skandhas*. According to the *Samavāyāṅga* and the *Nandī*, however, this number corresponds to only the first part of the *ācārāṅga*, as mentioned by the *Niryuktikāra*.

*Abhayadeva Suri* has also mentioned the same number. But today we do not find 18000 *padas*. This number of *padas* is only of the nine *Brahmacār yādhyāyanas* of *ācāra*. According to the tradition, it is believed that this number was there in the period, when the *ācārāṅga* was composed, but with the passage of time, some portion of the text was lost.

### 1.1.8 Subject Matter

The *ācārāṅga* has been described in details in *Samavāyāṅga* and the *Nandī*. According to them, the main studies of the *ācārāṅga* are "ācāra gocara" i.e. code of conduct, *vinaya* (humility), *vaināyika* (fruition of humility), *sthāna* (difference postures), *gamana* (traveling), *cankramaṇa* (movements), *bhojana-mātra* (Quantity of food intake), *svādhyāya* (spiritual studies), *bhāsā samiti* (principles of speech), *gupti* (restraint of mind, speech and body), *śayyā* (place of stay), *upādhi* (belongings) etc. The *ācārāṅga* recommends purity of all these aspects. *Ācārya Umasvāti* has briefly dealt with the subject matter of the nine chapters of the *ācārāṅga*. They are.

1. *Saṁjīvanikāya yatanā* self-restraint in respect of the six kinds of living beings.
2. Abandoning of ego over worldly things.
3. Conquest over trials and tribulations of life.
4. Unshakable perception about righteousness.
5. Detachment towards worldly affairs.
6. The process to decay or destroy the karmas.
7. Service towards elders.
8. Penance and austerities.
9. Renunciation of attachment to sexual objects.

The *Niryuktikāra* mentions about following themes that were the subject of studies of *navabrahmacarya*.

The are :

- (i) Abandonment of violence towards living beings.
- (ii) Conquest over passions.
- (iii) Equanimity about happiness and suffering.
- (iv) Right perception.
- (v) Abandonment of matters that are hindrance to salvation and acceptance of right knowledge/ perception/character.
- (vi) Feeling of detachment.
- (vii) Ability to endure sufferings.
- (viii) Practice to attain Nirvana.
- (ix) Practice of code of conduct practiced by Lord *Mahāvīra*.

According to *Ācārya Akalanika*, the comprehensive theme of the *ācārāṅga* is the code of conduct of an ascetic, and according to *Aparājita Suri*, it deals with the practice of three gems- right perception, right knowledge and right conduct.

### 1.1.9 Philosophical dimensions of *ācārāṅga*

The *ācārāṅga* is a very important *āgama* considering its philosophical value. *Acharya Siddhasena* has enumerated six eternal truths contained in the *Jaina* philosophy.

They are:

- (i) Soul exists.
- (ii) It is eternal.
- (iii) It is the subject of action (it is the doer.)
- (iv) It reaps its fruits.
- (v) There is *nirvāṇa*: emancipation.
- (vi) There is path to attain emancipation.

All the six truths mentioned above have been dealt with in great details in the *ācārāṅga*, and, therefore, it is considered to be the foundation on which the *Jaina* philosophy has been raised. The first truth is—Soul exists. The *ācārāṅga* begins with the explanation of this very truth. There is also the mention of immortality of soul together with this, “O man! Thou art thy own friend”. You yourself the maker of thorn. These sentences are pointing towards the soul’s exertion. There is the reference to “co-feeling”. This is showing the reaction undergoing the fruition of the action. The *nirvāṇa* said to be “*uniquely supreme*”. As all adjuncts cease there, there is nothing more supreme than it. At various places, there is explanation of right view, right knowledge and right conduct as the means to attain *nirvāṇa*.

### 1.1.10 Main themes of the *ācārāṅga* :

1. The soul exists.
2. The matter also exists.
3. The soul and the matter have eternal relationships.
4. The soul, bound by matter, re-incarnates.
5. The soul also transmigrates.
6. There is cause for transmigration.
7. There are various genera.
8. There is suffering.
9. Suffering has a cause.
10. Prevention of suffering is possible.
11. There is a path for cessation of suffering.
12. There is plurality among the souls.

Souls are infinite in number. However, each soul has its own independent individuality, meaning thereby that each soul has its own independent existence. Neither is there any supreme entity like “God”, of which they are parts, nor are they the manifestations of ‘*Brahma*’. “Pleasure and pains are self-inflicted”—this dictum clearly proclaims the independence of the soul.

In the dictums below, the unity of soul is proclaimed :

“The one who, according to you, should be killed or hurt is none other than yourself.”

“He, who knows all, knows one. And one, who knows one, knows all.”

Now the question arises : If single soul manifests itself into various forms, how can the souls have plurality? How can we resolve the paradox? Yes, we can resolve this problem by adopting the methodology of approaches (*nayas*). In this context, we can apply “composite view-point” (*samgraha naya*) as also practical view-point (*vyavahara naya*).

Each and every substance has a universal attribute (*sāmānya dharma*), which is the subject of composite view-point. Likewise, it has also some special attributes (*viśeṣa dharma*), which is the subject of “practical view-point”.

Each substance has its own universality as well as individuality. There is unity brought about by universality, which is the subject matter of “composite view-point”. Along with that we can also accept their plurality, which is the subject matter of “practical view-point”. There is no basic contradiction between unity and plurality. Both are relative. The existence of a substance is inherent in itself irrespective of unity or plurality. Unity and plurality are quantitative expressions, which are relative. In the process of synthesis, the unity becomes prominent and plurality is diluted; on the other hand, in the process of dissection, plurality becomes prominent.

In its worldly sense, the soul is defined as *prāṇa*, *biṭāta*, *jīva*, *sattva* etc. According to etymological view-point (*samabhīrudha naya*), all these terms connote different meanings, yet on the basis of substantial point of view, there is no difference. So the Lord has said, “Soul is neither high nor low.”

The soul has its own independent existence and, therefore, has its own independent role. It is not inspired by any God. The Lord also said, “Oh wise man! Therefore you act.” Any action fructifies only when it is endowed with the potential for either (i) to go in bondage or (ii) to gain emancipation.

The author of the scripture has said, “Bondage and emancipation : both are your own creations.” The soul will have no role whatsoever if any other entity different than the *ātman* (the soul), was the subject of the bondage or the emancipation, as is the case of “*prakṛti*” in the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. The essence of the teachings of the *ācārāṅga* is that a worldly soul is not without attachment. Hence, it is always bound by karma. Therefore, the karmic body always accompanies it. In this process of associating itself with karma, it takes divergent physical forms. The same *ātman* when it comprehends equanimity, its karmic body decays and ultimately it ceases to be. The soul releases itself from the bondage and becomes free. It has been said, “Soul is free from attachment.” It has neither any body nor rotation for birth and death. The emancipated soul has these attributes. However the worldly soul has attachments and is subject to death and birth.

Soul is sentient, matter is non-sentient. Soul is formless; matter has a form, because it (the matter) has color, taste, smell and touch. The existence of matter is not subjective. It is as objectively real as the soul.

Soul and matter are inter-connected. This relationship is not substantial but modal. Whether we know the matter or not, it has its own existence. This existence is natural, and not necessarily related to our knowledge. Another question arises, “If sentient and non-sentient are the two contradictory entities, then how can they co-exist?” We resolve this question by saying that the substances are neither absolutely opposed to each other nor absolutely similar. All are relative.

Existence is the generic attribute of all the substances. There is no opposition between sentient and non-sentient so far as their existence is concerned. Consciousness is the characteristic i.e. special attribute of the soul: the sentient, whereas colour, taste, smell and touch are the characteristics of matter.

As such, if sentient and non-sentient are separate, it is only because of their characteristics. But they are similar on the basis of their generic attributes. We should therefore not take an absolutist view about them, as there is always room for duality. According to the transcendental viewpoint, there is unity between them.

Let us clearly understand the nature of unity and duality (*bheda* and *abheda*). In this context, the relationship between “*prakṛti* and *puruṣa*”, as projected in the *Saṅkhya* philosophy is relevant. Also relevant to our study is the difference between the reality of “*Brahma*” and illusion (*māyā*) of the physical world, as we see in the Vedānta philosophy.

Both the transcendental and the empirical viewpoints are relative expressions and cannot be different in all circumstances. According to the former, an absolute integration of soul and body cannot be accepted. But as per the latter viewpoint, absolute diversity of the soul and the body is not possible. This non-absolutistic approach also enables us to differentiate between *adhyāsa* (appearance), and *vyavahāra* (empirical experience).

Question arises : Can we accept the existence of soul only? How can we negate the existence of matter which can be seen, perceived and is established on the basis of valid knowledge? The matter is not an illusion created by mere mental perception. In that case, how can one say that soul is something different from a mere illusion? If we do not acknowledge a certain act, then how do we identify its doer? We recognize substances through perception. If this perception is not real, how does one vouch for one’s own existence? The existence of consciousness and matter (the non-sentient entity) is thus independent. None is the product of the other. As has been said in the *Sthānāṅga Sūtra* (10.1), “It had never been, nor can be, nor would be that the consciousness becomes a non-conscious matter or vice versa”. This is the Universal Law. (Universal Axiom)

Matter, with its independent existence, interacts with *ātman* (soul), which, in turn gets tainted with the impressions of the matter through the process of attachment. The spider gets trapped in the web that it weaves; it happens so because of its own ignorance.

Another Question : If *ātman* (soul) is omniscient and it is without any stigma; then how can it be bound or attached? How can this view be corroborated with the view of the *ācārāṅga*, which says, “The soul is in bondage”.

On this issue our contention is that according to the Jaina philosophy, no soul is free from attachment in its original form. It never approves that non-attachable can be attached. Then it is only the attachable, which can aspire for freedom through a special process.

This raises another question: if we accept that attachment is eternal, then how is that terminable. That is so in the sense that it is a flowing relationship between matter and soul. Therefore, when this flow is interrupted, the soul is able to free itself.

“*Parīṣā*” i.e. learning is the understanding or the knowledge as also the process to gain freedom from that. The “*ācārāṅga*” suggests the process in order to achieve that objective. The *ācārāṅga* deals with both souls, which are in the bondage and also those, that are emancipated. The soul, which breaks out from the cycle of births and deaths becomes free from all bondages.

The Lord has said, “A wise monk, who is well versed with the study of the “*āgamas*” transcends the cyclic path of birth and deaths.”

Beginning with the phrase: “All sounds recoil thence”, and ending with the phrase: “It is neither sound, nor color, nor smell, nor taste, nor touch”, the *Para* deals with the state of the emancipated soul.

A soul under bondage has to undergo many births, it has to suffer many trials and tribulations and continues to rotate in the cycle of births and deaths due to lack of vigilance on its part.

All the worldly souls are bound by karma and as such they go on doing karma incessantly and experience the fruits thereof. The soul has been interconnected with karma from time immemorial and these interconnection results in the cycle of births and deaths. According to the transcendental view-point (*Niścaya naya*), this does not match with the nature of the soul. However, viewed from the spiritual point of view, the suffering has no

relationship with the nature of the soul. In this context, the *āgama* says, “Suffering is to be avoided; happiness is to be sought for. This is the main theme of the ethics of conduct.”

- The vicious circle of suffering is as follows:
- He who sees anger sees pride.
- He who sees pride sees deceit.
- He who sees deceit sees greed.
- He who sees greed sees love.
- He who sees love sees hatred.
- He who sees hatred sees delusion.
- He who sees delusion sees conception in the womb.
- He who sees conception sees birth.
- He who sees birth sees death.
- He who sees death sees hell.
- He who sees hell sees animal life.
- He who sees animal life sees sufferings.

The wise monk should, therefore, avoid anger, pride, deceit, greed, love, hatred, delusion, conception, birth, death, hell, animal life and suffering.

Suffering is caused by passions. If the seed of passions is crushed, suffering gets eradicated altogether. So, one should try to inhibit the passions i.e. beginning with anger and ending with greed. When those passions decay, the attributes of equanimity take their place. The virtue of equanimity is the heart of the *ācārāṅga*. All other norms of ethics thrive on this attribute.

Equanimity is two fold: (i) dependent upon self and (ii) dependent upon others. Equanimity, which is achieved by the subjugation of love and hatred resulting into experience of equanimity in both favorable or in favorable circumstances, is a self-dependent equanimity. All the living beings seek happiness, none desires suffering, hence, and no living being should be killed or hurt. This equanimity belongs to the second category and hence it is not self-dependent. For said, “One should extinguish passions”, and for the second kind of equanimity, “One should desist from killing the living beings”. If one imbibes these two kinds of equanimites into his conduct, surely he has understood the *ācārāṅga*.

The root cause of violence is “*karma*”. The term *karma* has two meanings: First, it means activity and the second; it means “material aggregates attracted by the activities which bind the soul”. One should not indulge in sinful activities (*karma*), this aphorism suggests that *karma* is of two types—(i) meritorious and (ii) sinful. In this respect, the Lord has proclaimed that the principle of comprehension and renunciation is *parijñā*.

Right perception, discrimination, and *parijñā* are synonyms. *Parijñā* means doing or not doing any activity, unless it is tested and screened through one’s own conscience. Involvement in good action or refraining from bad actions can be put to test through the norms of *parijñā*. A person involved in violence is bereft of the wisdom of comprehension (*parijñā*). His *parijñā* becomes perfect who is not involved in violence. One who is not capable of using proper discretion among realities and non-realities slips into *aparijñā*. A person, who does not comprehend and renounce the *karma*, rotates in the circle of death and birth. One who comprehends the *karma* puts an end to this circle. A person who acts with due comprehension is not tainted with any acts of violence. Thus, it becomes clear that the activity guided by the power of comprehension is meritorious and the actions guided by non-comprehension are sins.

Karmic matter, which binds the soul is explained in the *ācārāṅga*. It is said; the adjunct (*upadhī*) is produced by *karma*. Quite opposite to this is said, “there is no designation for the soul-freed from the *karma*. This soul has committed many-many deeds of sins in the past on account of its non-comprehensive attitude or due to negligence. Such deeds lead to bondage and then the soul tries to be free from bondage using proper comprehension.



It is said, Understanding the true nature of the karma in this manner, one should not indulge in violence. He should control his senses and should not allow them to go astray. The wise person desisting from any kind of violence eliminates all possibilities of evil deeds.

### **Consciousness of Happiness and Sorrow**

All living beings aspire to have long life, relish happiness and hate sufferings. Psychologically speaking it is a natural tendency among all living beings. That is the natural justification of non-violence.

- The Lord has said, “See and ponder over the karma and its fruits. Also reflect on the process of its cessation.”
- Comprehending the misery of the world, one should avoid its cause—i.e. passion.
- Deeply reflect and ponder over how dear is happiness to all beings and so is the suffering unpleasant, dreadful and painful to all beings.

The spiritual aspect of happiness and suffering is that all the living beings love happiness and as such, they should not be deprived of it. They hate suffering and so one should not inflict pain on them.

It is quite natural that all of us want to know what suffering is. On this, the Lord has said, Karmic bondage is suffering. This makes the soul rotate in the whirlpool of sufferings. So, he has cautioned against that and has advised us to clearly distinguish between the sprout and the root in relation to suffering. All the sufferings sprout out from passions.

Violence is also considered to be a cause of suffering. So the wise men have advised, Use your *parijñā* i.e. knowledge and renunciation for the annihilation of suffering. For this, one needs to shake up his karmic body.

### **The ways and Means for the Annihilation of Karma-body :**

1. **Vigilance :** The destruction of karma is possible by practicing vigilance.  
A resolute aspirant should not become non-vigilant even for a single moment.
2. **Perceiving the self is a must.**
3. **Contemplation over solitude :** I am alone; I have nobody belonging to me, nor do I belong to anybody; “I am on my own.”
4. **Contemplation over lack of refuge :** Pondering over the lack of refuge, Oh man! Think! None of your relatives shall be able to protect you or offer you a shelter, nor can you protect them or offer them a shelter.
5. **Contemplation on fragility :** The body is nourished by food and it is emaciated by hardships. Look! This body is fragile. It was so in the past and it will remain so in future. It is subject to decay; it is unstable, transient, non-eternal, subject to growth and decay, subject to changes.
6. **Perception of body :** Vigilant indeed is he who is always conscious of the present state of his existence.
7. **Perceiving the structure of the world :** The wide awake man perceives the structure of the world. He knows the lower, the upper and the middle regions.
8. **Development of intrinsic perception :** The seer should use the articles in a manner different from that of the common people.  
He alone remains steadfast on his own path, who looks at the world quite differently.
9. **Development of an antidote :** One should guard himself against greed by means of non-greed.
10. **Abandonment of worldly actions :** He who abandons the worldly activities knows and sees the truth.
11. **Contemplation of loathsome nature of body :** The external of body is like the internal and the internal is like the external. Inside, one sees the internal apertures of putrid body with the cardinal humors secretions oozing.

12. Perception of the soul : One who perceives the pure nature of the soul practices the pure discipline. One who practices the pure discipline perceives the pure nature of soul.
13. Observation of fear : The person finding violence as the cause of fear should discern from evil.
14. Perception of salvation : A person, uprooting attachment and hatred by absolute self-restraint and austerities achieves the mission of the self.
15. Perception of the supreme good : One who is conversant with the three sciences, knows the supreme good.
16. Self-engrossment : As fire consumes the worn out wood, in exactly the same way, an ascetic engrossed in meditation and unaffected by passions shakes, thinks and desiccates the karmic body.
17. Contemplation of the limitation of the life-span : One should contemplate that life-span is limited.
18. Perception of vibration : You look, this Universe incessantly vibrates on all sides.
19. Power of comprehension : The act done due to inclination towards violence or the resolve to harm should be brought to an end by the power of comprehension.
20. Self-restraint or conquest over the senses : Oh man! Restrain thyself. Thus thou will get thyself freed from sufferings.
21. Perception of equanimity : The person with the outlook of equanimity is saved from vices.

All souls are equal. This is the central theme of ethics and on this basis does and don'ts are delineated. Just as in the matter of non-violence it is said: Knowing the equality of all beings one should desist from the weapon of violence.

#### 1.1.11 Faith and Independent Thinking

The *ācārāṅga* is the ocean of faith. *saddhīṅāṇe mehvāṅā, āṅāṇe mamagam dhammam* and many other expressions of similar nature reflect faith in total devotion to *one's own* venerable. The *ācārāṅga* does not rule out freedom of the devotee to dedicate his faith on any object for realization of truth. The *ācārāṅga* prescribes three means : *Sahasammatti* (ii) *Paravyākaraṇa* (iii) *Śrīnānuśruta*.

The first is—*svasmṛti* to realize truth through one's own search. *Maimam pāsa* this dictum facilitates freedom of thoughts. The *Vṛttikāra* has paraphrased it on "It is not only for me to say. You can also see it." Thus, the *ācārāṅga* has very subtly synthesized independence of approach and faith, which is the proper way to seek truth. Either of them is not sufficient enough to work alone for realization of truth.

#### 1.1.12 Touchstone

The *ācārāṅga*, being the oldest *sūtra*, is like a touchstone for the later *sūtras*. The *ācāra* i.e. code of conduct prescribed by it is the foundation for all further development. It is the nearest to what Lord *Mahāvīra* persuade in his own life. The later versions have tried to develop the basic ideas given in the *ācārāṅga*. *ācārācūlā* is an example of this process of development and evolution of basic tenets prescribed in the *ācārāṅga*, although we find a few new concepts here and there. It seems that the later *ācāryas*, when they established the doctrine like *utsarga* i.e. universal rules of conduct and *apavāda* i.e. special rules of conduct and amendment in the universal rules, they certified certain rules of conduct in their various attempts. *ācārācūlā* is the first such attempt.

#### 1.1.13 The Authorship and the Period of Compilation of the *ācārāṅga*

The Jain tradition believes the *ācārāṅga* has been composed by *Gaṇadhara Sudharmā Svāmi*, when Lord *Mahāvīra* established his *tīrtha* i.e. religious order. Historically, and also from the linguistic point of view, it is evident that the *ācārāṅga Sūtra* is the oldest among the *āgama* literature, and also in style of presentation of the doctrine. Dr. Hermann Jacobi has compared it with the style adopted in the sacred books of *brāhmiṇika sūtras*. According to him, the syntax of *brāhmaṇa sūtras* are inter-related, but it is not so in the *ācārāṅga* has accommodates quotations from prominent religious treatises of that time. He has based his view on poetic stanzas, which intercept prose in between. These verses can be compared with the verses of *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, the *Uttarādhyāyana* and the *Daśavaikālika*.

It seems Dr. Jacob's view is not without any substance. *Dvādasāṅgi* and *Daśavaikālika* both are congregated from the *Pūrvas*, and, therefore, there is a strong possibility that the contents of same wordings have the same sources.

The non-relativity of sentences in the *ācārāṅga* can, to some extent, be understood, as what we have today as the *ācārāṅga* is a fragmented piece of the original. The other reason could be the difference in the styles that used to be adopted by the earlier *ācāryas* in the commentaries on the original texts.

#### 1.1.14 Composition Style

So far as the *sūtras* are concerned, four styles of composition have been recognized by the *sūtras* are concerned, four styles of composition have been recognized by the *sūtrakṛtāṅga cūrṇi*.

(i) Prose (ii) Poetry (iii) Story (iv) Lyrical in the *daśavaikālika cūrṇi*, it has been categorized as "*caurṇa*" as pointed out by Haribhadra. While commenting on *caurṇa-pada* of *Niryukti*, the *Niryuktikāra* has interpreted it as *arthabahula* (having multiple shades), *mahārha* (deep meaning), *hetu* (with definite cause), *niṣpāta* (preposition), *upsarga* (grammatical suffix), *bahupāda* (many-verses). According to him, the verse, which does not have any "*pāda*" is prose, but that one, which has many *pādas* along with prose is called "*caurṇa*". The *ācārāṅga* is full of many *pādas* and is, therefore, a composition of "*caurṇa*" style. The *ācārāṅga* consists of a good number of poetic verses along with prose, as Dr. Schubring has pointed out in the text edited by him. He has compiled the poetic verses separately. Up to the seventh *uddeśakas* of the eight chapter of the *ācārāṅga*, the narration is in "*caurṇa*" style, the eighth *uddeśakas* and the 9<sup>th</sup> chapter are all in poetry. In the *ācārācūlā*, it is predominantly prose style up to the fifteenth chapter, with poetic verses used intermittently. The sixteenth chapter is all poetic.

#### 1.1.15 Commentary Literary Composition

From the available commentaries on the *ācārāṅga*, the *Niryukti* is the oldest. Its author is Bhadrabahu II (5-6<sup>th</sup> century of Vikrama). The second oldest is the *Cūrṇi*. The former is in verse while the latter is prose. Although it has not yet been proved historically, yet Jinadasa Mahattara is considered to be author of the *Cūrṇi*, the author, while explaining the word *dravya-aṅga* through the method of *nikṣepa* (critical analysis), gives as an example the word *cauramgijja* (which is the third chapter of the *Uttarādhyayana*).

On the basis of this allusion, there is a possibility that the author of the *Uttarādhyayana Cūrṇi* could be the same person as the author of the *ācārāṅga cūrṇi* could be "*Gopalika Mahattaraśiṣya*", as recorded in the *Uttarādhyayana Cūrṇi*.

Third commentary on the *ācārāṅga* is "*Tīkā*" which is most exhaustive among all the commentaries. While the *Niryukti* is very compact and least voluminous, it is the most valuable one due to its historical closeness to Lord Mahāvīra's times and it indicates the direction to be persuaded for the study of the *ācārāṅga*.

The "*Cūrṇī*", although less voluminous, is also considered to be very valuable due to its depth and clarity of expression. The author of the "*Tīkā*" is *Śīlāṅka Suri*, with pen-name *Tattvaditya*. He complete this *Tīkā* in the 8<sup>th</sup> century in *Gambhuta* (Gujrata). Besides "*Tīkā*" other commentaries are as follows :

*Dīpikā, Avacūrī, Bālāvabodhatal, Padyānuvāda* and *Vārtika*.

*Ācārāṅga Bhāṣya* has a very important place in commentaries. Its uniqueness is that this *Bhāṣya* does not limit itself to the derivations of meaning contained in the *Cūrṇi Vṛtti*, but explores new meaning in certain words, phrases and *sūtras*, which is the result of author's deep contemplative mind.

#### 1.1.16 Importance of the *ācārāṅga*

The *ācārāṅga* gives the guidelines for *ācāra* i.e. conduct. It has, therefore, been recognized as the quintessence of all the "*Aṅgas*". The *Niryuktikāra* has himself raised this issue and answered that the *ācārāṅga* is the soul of all the "*Aṅgas*".

It also suggests the path for emancipation, which is the most crucial part of the study. We get the knowledge of the *śramaṇa* religion from this study and the knowledge of the *ācārāṅga* is therefore, recognized as the first "*gaṇi-sthāna*" the first consideration of an *ācārya*. It is the basic *āgama* that deals with the conduct of an ascetic.

Therefore, it is studied first. Without reading the nine *Brahmacharyādhyānas* (of *ācārāṅga*), if any monk reads the super *āgamas* i.e. the successive *āgamas*, he has to expiate for it.

The tradition held that *Dharmānuṃyoga* (explanation of righteousness), *Gaṇitānuṃyoga*, (mathematical explanation) and *Dravyānuṃyoga* (metaphysical explanation) and *Dravyānuṃyoga* (metaphysical) should be studied only after the *ācārāṅga* has been studied. A newly initiated ascetic was to be introduced first to *Śāstra-parijñā* (comprehension and abandonment of weapons of injury): the first chapter of the *ācārāṅga*. The other *Āngas* like *Śūtrakṛta* could be studied only after the *ācārāṅga* has been understood.

### 1.1.17 Relevance of *Ācārāṅga*

People often ask about the relevance of *Ācārāṅga* in modern times. The answer is very simple. If the principles of equality, non-violence and non-possessiveness are relevant today, why not Jainism which so eminently stood for them. If the former were denied any relevance, the latter would have no change to occupy the altar of relevance. The religion preached by *Mahāvīra* was purely spiritual, with self-knowledge as the starting point and self-realization as the final end.

As an upholder of dualism of self and not self, Jainism propounded non-absolutism. Knowledge of the self is not complete without the knowledge of the not self, nor is the latter achieved without the former. The knowledge of both in their completeness is therefore a vital necessity.

The first chapter of *ācārāṅga* facilitates the understanding of different states of soul, induced by karma, which are very important from the standpoint of environmentalism. The principle of equality and comparison of the weal and woe of others with those of oneself are powerful remedies for the pollution of environment. The denial of the exit stance of the six classes of beings, the five immobile (earth-bodied, etc) and the mobile (two-sensed, etc.) ones, will be tantamount to the denial of the existence of the self, said *Mahāvīra*. One cannot safeguard one's own existence by obliterating the existence of others. One cannot be aware of one's own existence by denying the existence of other.

Violence itself is a sort of non-awareness, or the result of the latter. This awareness is developed by comparing the weal and woe of others with those of oneself. This is why *Mahāvīra* preached the principle of comparison of self with others.

The principle of non-violence cannot be adequately comprehended without knowing the ways and means to violence. This is the reason for an elaborate description of possessiveness and non-possessiveness in the scripture under study.

The principal cause of violence is possessiveness. Modern economics encourages violence by prescribing attachment to wealth. *Mahāvīra* on the contrary preached non-attachment to property. Attachment dominated enterprises are opined as the foundation of social development. Acceptance of this partial opinion as a complete truth has resulted in the spread of violence and terrorism. Detachment dominated activities also can provide base for social welfare. Requisitioned for social welfare, this latter base gives rise to a new angle of vision. Whereas the exclusively attachment dominated attitude promotes competition and violence, the exclusively detachment dominated attitude falls short of fulfilling the social needs. The society therefore can be efficiently governed by what is the means between the two extreme attitudes for fostering balanced harmony and peace and avoiding the devastation cause by violence.

*Mahāvīra* gave the philosophy of non-acquisition, which was not based on the needs of growing population. He propounded the philosophy of non-acquisition and restraining one's will keeping in view the human psyche and the results of accumulation of wealth. *Mahāvīra* was not opposed to meeting the primary needs of the rapidly growing population, but his opposition was to the ideology of unrestrained ambition. The scripture under study proclaims the effects of ambitious mentality of modern society.

The seeker of happiness indulges in acquisition of wealth. In search of happiness he repeats indulgence, Deluded by suffering produced by himself, he gets bewildered on attaining suffering in place of happiness. He seeks pleasure but gets sufferings.

Modern society has largely succeeded in eliminating death by starvation, but accumulation of wealth by a handful of people has compelled a large majority to live in poverty. Excessively rich people also have their own problem in that they have to pass their time in perpetual mental tension, fear and terror. Humanity has not yet Succeeded in finding a way of life that could satisfy the primary needs of all and simultaneously mitigate the inhuman cruelty, a by-product of excessive acquisition of wealth. It will perhaps never be feasible to find out the ways without delimiting personal ownership. Availability of goods is limited. Consumer's demands are unlimited and their desires are vaster still. We have no arithmetic that can induce balance. This is why *Mahāvīra*, keeping the truth in view, proclaimed that what is most dreadful is that man has focused his attention exclusively on acquisition of the problem of violence is of tying up the sense of mineness with things. The truth however is that things do not belong to anybody. The attempt at denying this truth breeds violence.

Declared *Mahāvīra* : do not rest satisfied with striking only at foliage and flowers of violence but also strike hard at the very root of it. Violence varies proportionately with the sense of mineness. The deeper the sense of mineness, the intense the outburst of violence. This *sūtra* is super-commentary on the concept of scholars as the message of non-violence. This view has originated from the subject matter of the first chapter, which details abandonment of the weapons of violence. The subsequent chapters, however, deal with the doctrine of possessiveness and non-possessiveness, which have been relegated to a secondary position by those scholars. Our initial attention goes exclusively to the foliage, flowers and fruits ignoring the root. An issue cannot be finally decided without going to the very root of it. We wish to solve the problem of violence by concentrating on the pursuit on non-violence. But this is only approach that focuses exclusively on outside surface. The approach that focuses on the root is quite different, which is embodied in the dictum: solve the problem of possessiveness, the problem of violence will be then automatically find its own solution. The effect cannot be got rid of so long as the cause is in function. Violence is an effect, possessiveness is its cause. It was only in order to bring home this truth that *Mahāvīra* again and again declared know the truth. The supreme truth is: the souls are conscious entities, things are not conscious. The essence of souls is consciousness, not materiality. This philosophy of the *ācārāṅga* gave a new turn to the science of ethics and advanced thought in the direction of peace, announcing be a seer. Look at every event and bring about a change in your attitude to sensual objects. Do not enjoy objects like the person who does not seek truth. But bring about a radical change in your life-style. The value of the realization of this truth is in no way inferior to the realization of the self.

### 1.2.1 Character of soul

The person endowed with the memory of the past life is convinced of his own existence in the past. Such person has been directly referred to in the *Sūtra* (1.4)—the person who transmigrates from the cardinal and intermediate directions and sub directions is identical with myself.

The *Cūrṇi* has defined *ātman* with reference to the aforesaid phrase. The query is made, “Although there is *ātman*, its defining characteristics have not been indicated.” To this query, the preceptor answers thus : “experience of “I”ness in the body, which is not the “I” in the judgments “I am doing”, “It is done by me”, “I shall do this”, defines the character of the soul identified as “I”.

### 1.2.2 Nature of the soul

*soṃve sarā ṇiyaṭṭamti.*

All sound recoil thence.

*takkā jattḥa ṇa vijjai.*

There speculation has no room.

*mai tattha ṇa gāhiyā.*

Nor does the mind penetrate there.

*oe appatitṭhāṇassa kheyaṇṇe.*

The liberated soul is solitary, supportless and the pure knower.

*se ṇa dīḥe, ṇa hasse, ṇa vaṭṭe, ṇa tamse, ṇa cauraṇse, ṇa parimamdale.*

It is neither long, nor small, nor round, not triangular, nor quadrangular, nor circular.

*na kiṅke, na ṇīle, na lohīe, na hālidde, na sukkille.*

It is neither black, nor blue, nor red, nor yellow, nor white.

*na subbhigamḍhe, na durabhigamḍhe.*

It is neither of good smell nor of bad smell.

*na tütte, na kaḍue, na kasāe, na ambīle, na mahure.*

It is neither bitter, nor pungent, nor astringent, nor acid, nor sweet.

*na kakkhade, na maue, na garue, na lahue, na ste, na unthe, na ṇiddhe, na lakkhe.*

It is neither rough, nor soft; neither heavy, nor light; neither cold, nor hot; neither wet nor dry.

*na kāū.*

It does not possess a physique.

*na ruhe.*

It is without rebirth.

*na samge.*

It is without contamination (attachment).

*na itthī, na purise, na annahā.*

It is neither female, nor male, nor neuter.

*pariṇṇe sanne.*

It knows and perceives.

*uvamā na vijjāe.*

It is beyond any analogy.

*arūvī sattā.*

It is formless existence.

*apayassa payam ṇatthi.*

It transcends all expressions. There is no word to express it.

*se na sadde, na rūve, na gamḍhe, na rase, na phāse, iccetāva—tti bemi.*

It is neither colour, nor smell, nor taste, nor touch. It is that much—Touch do I say. [5/123-140]

The present *āgama* begins with the doctrine of soul. The transmigrating soul assumes many varieties of bodies and migrates to various births. Such soul is designated as worldly.

According to the substantial standpoint which is related to the state of soul associated with karma, the soul, on account of his embodied state, is knowable by logic, comprehensible by empirical knowledge and is endowed with the qualities of matter, it is subject to re-birth and it belongs to the sex such as male, female, etc. and in some sense is also possessed of form.

According to the substantial standpoint, which is related to the state of soul dissociated from karma, the soul, with respect to its innate state of soul hood, is designated as emancipated or liberated from the destructive karma as well as non-destructive karma. It is without a form, because it is bereft of the body. Consequently, it is not susceptible to description through words, logic and empirical knowledge. It is devoid of the qualities of matter and three kinds of sex. It is in its state of knower. In the present *Sūtra* (123-140) the nature of the soul which is free from association with karma and bereft of body has been propounded.

The *sūtras* of the *Upaniṣadas*, that describe soul have similarity to these *Sūtras*. The *ṛṣatriyas* were the forerunners among the upholders of the science of self. They had the authority of propounding the doctrine of the self. This could be proved on the evidence of the *Upaniṣadas*. This mere similarity cannot be a sufficient proof of the *Upaniṣadas* influence on the *ācārāṅga sūtra*, as claimed by some scholars. Such claim, therefore, needs re-consideration.

Now the unknowable or the ineffable aspect of the soul is explained—the soul is without any form and is the subtlest principle and therefore it cannot be expressed in words. In the *cūrṇi* (p. 199), the sound is replaced by the word doctrine—all doctrines cease to exist in respect of the soul.

In the *Upaniṣadas* the bliss of *Brahman* is described as follows :

“Words do not reach there, but recoil together with the mind. The person who knows the bliss of Brahman has no fear from any quarter.”

“Logic” means investigation. The soul cannot be perceived directly through investigation. It is not amenable to the logic, because of its being a formless and the most subtle principle.

The soul is not knowable by the empirical perception. A formless principle is not the object of words, logic or intellect, as it is explained in the *Uttarādhyaṇa Sūtra* (14. 19).

The Soul is one and alone, that is, independent. The Sanskrit word “*Oja*” in the *Sūtra* according to its scriptural connotation, means solitary and alone. Being different from the body, it exists alone. There is not second (to it). It is support less and the knower. Souls are infinite in number. However, each soul has its own independent individuality, meaning thereby that each soul has its own independent existence. Neither is there any supreme entity like “God”, of which they are parts, nor are they the manifestations of “Brahma”. “Pleasure and pains are self-inflicted”—this dictum clearly proclaims the independence of the soul.

The soul has its own independent existence and, therefore, has its own independent role. It is not inspired by any God. The Lord also said, “Oh wise man! Therefore you act.” Any action fructifies only when it is endowed with the potential for either (i) to go in bondage or (ii) to gain emancipation.

The soul is not long i.e., all pervasive (as some philosophers believe). It is not small i.e., being of the size of the thumb (as some thinkers assert). It is not of any shape such as the circular and the like.

It is not possessed of any colour viz., black and the like.

It is not possessed of any smell.

It is not possessed of any taste.

It is not possessed of any touch.

In the aforesaid five *Sūtras* (127 to 131), the soul has been propounded by negative designations. The shapes, the qualities of color etc. mentioned in these *Sūtra* are existent in the material substance. In the sensible world, we perceive the world as possessed of three dimensions. The souls are beyond all dimensions, and therefore, in order to propound its difference from the material substance, the negative designation has been used. It is proved from this that what is possessed of shape and the like is a substance possessed of form. All these do not exist in the soul and therefore it is formless.

The liberated souls are not embodied with any kind of body. Neither any soul incarnate from the merge into it, as some philosophers believe.

It is not subject to birth like a seed burnt by fire. On account of its burnt out karma-seed, their sprout of transmigration does not grow.

It is free from attachment. The soul, which has even a slight remnant of attachment, is subject to transmigration. The liberated soul, on according of its being completely free from attachment is not born again.

The sex belongs to the body. The genital emotion is due to the conduct-deluding karma. The soul in its pure state is without any body and bereft of all karma. So it is beyond all genital modes. It is neither female nor male nor neuter. It is beyond sex—physical and emotional. In the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, the state of the soul with and without gender have been described as follows :

“The soul is neither female, nor male, nor neuter. It is identified with male, female and neuter in accord with his body.”

It knows from all ways and from all sides, and therefore, it is all knowing. The ordinary person knows

only partially through his sense organs, but the soul without any veil knows completely. It perceives rightly, and therefore, it is designated as one who perceives rightly.

Consciousness is the defining characteristics of the soul. Liberated or not, it can never be devoid of consciousness. In the philosophy (unlike *Nyāya Vaiśeṣika* and *Sāṃkhya*) the soul has knowledge and its function even in the innate state of liberation.

The soul alone is all knowing and all perceiving. No other entity is all knowing and all perceiving. And therefore, there is no simile applicable to the soul or the soul is not comparable to anything that is worldly.

Existence means is-ness. There is existence of the soul, but it is formless and therefore its existence is directly known only by omniscience. Those who are possessed of only sensuous knowledge do not directly know the soul.

The soul cannot be expressed by any word. There is no word that signifies the soul. Unlike the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy, which asserts that *Om* stands for the liberated soul, the emancipated soul has no designation. In the *Cūrṇī* the word “*pada*” is explained as footprint. For instance, the serpent has no feet, circular or round-like. The word, “*pada*” is of the nature of sound. The soul is neither sound, nor color, nor smell, nor taste, nor touch.

### 1.2.3 Knowledge and knower is soul

The soul is a substance; and knowledge is its quality. To the query whether the quality is different or non-different from the substance, the *Sūtra* says the soul is that which knows. The implication is that the soul is not bereft of knowledge. The implication of the statement, that which knows is the soul is that knowledge is not possible without the soul. Says the *Cūrṇī*—“there cannot be any soul which is devoid of the knowledge and cognition”. Fire is never devoid of heat that is the heat is not different from the fire. Therefore, when fire is spoken of, heat is implicitly spoken of. Similarly the assertion of the soul is tantamount to the assertion of cognition: the assertion of cognition is tantamount to the assertion of the soul.

### 1.2.4 Consequence of self-realization

In the absence of self-realization, equality cannot materialize in practical life. The who has realized the self does not strive for anything else. He exerts only for the realization of the self. One who perceives his pure self as essentially free from all dirt of karma is liberated from karma. The person who rivets his attention on pure consciousness does necessarily revel in it and not in anything else that causes karmic bondage, nor in sensual objects and passions by cutting down attachment and aversion by means of self-restraint and penance, the monk perceives his pure self free of karma.

The person who has realized the unimpeachable self does not commend evil karma. It is said in *sūtra* : “*aṇomadamsī ṇisanne pācēḷuṃ kammehim*”. “*Impeachable*” means low or mean. “*Unimpeachable*” means excellent or great. The person who gives up the mean objects and perceives the great, i.e., the self has not inclination to evil deeds, nor is the puffed up by them. Self-perceiver comes to know that the unique state is pure consciousness. It is eternal and substantial, being ever beneficial. There is nothing else more valuable than it. All the sensual objects, being impermanent, are devoid of any essence. The sensual objects such as sound, color, etc., are like the “*kimpāka*” fruit, which is charming but poisonous.

Self-perceiver monk pursuing the unique end does not kill any creature, nor get it killed by other, nor does he approve of such killer.

### 1.2.5 Rebirth

This question of life before and life hereafter is of supreme importance not only for those who believe in the existence of the soul, but also for all living beings endowed with reason. To ignore this question is to deny the truth about birth and death. In the absence of such query the birth of philosophy itself would be impossible. Is it possible to disentangle the soul from the body? If it is not possible, the issue of birth and rebirth will be only imaginary and unreal. Only if it were possible to disentangle the soul from the body, it would be feasible to comprehend that the body and the soul are not identical entities.



This is expressed in the *sūtra* “I have the soul that is subject to birth or I have none that is so.” All people have no intuition as to “what I was in the past or what I shall be in the future after departing from here.” We find two investigating *sūtras* in this context: “what I was in the past”—this is concerned with the future life.

Is such intuition possible? To this query, Lord *Mahāvīra* says that it is possible to have intuition of the past life as well as the future birth. There are three sources that prove such possibility: one’s own power of recollection; exposition by the *Jina* having the power of direct knowledge; and hearsay, i.e., heard from some one who had learnt about it from one who commanded direct knowledge.

### 1.2.6 One’s own power of recollection

This is the first source. Some children in their childhood get the memory of the past life spontaneously. With modern psychologists many events of spontaneous memory of past occurrences are found registered. In Jaina literature also, there are records of such incidents.

In the *Suśruta Saṃhitā*, it is pointed out that the persons with their mind, cultivated in the past life by the study of spiritual lore, are capable of the memory of the past life.

### 1.2.7 Exposition by the Jina

This is the second source. The exposition is ascribed to the supreme authority namely that *Jina*. This is confirmed in the *Niryukti* (commentary) where it is said that there is no higher authority than *Jina*, who had expounded the doctrine of transmigration.

In this connection, *Meghākumāra*’s memory of previous life deserves mention. In the commentaries, the example of *Gautama Svāmī* is also mentioned. Lord *Mahāvīra* was asked by *Gautama Svāmī*, “O Lord! How is it that omniscience is not arising in me?”

The Lord explained, “O Gautama! This is so because you have deep attachment to me.”

Then the Lord mentioned that there was mutual relation between them in many past lives. In this connection, the Lord said, “You had been attached to me for a long time. You had been acquainted with me for a long time.”

On hearing this explanation of the Lord, *Gautama Svāmī* came to possess the knowledge (memory) of the specific detection from which he came to the present state of existence, and the like.

### 1.2.8 Hearsay

This is the third source. It is not direct revelation by the *Jina*, but it is something heard as propounded by a person with his power of extrasensory perception. Such hearing is conducive to intuitive knowledge in the listener. In ancient commentaries, such source was indicative of all people, through concentrated investigation.

The memory of the past life arises on account of some specific event, or without such event. The memory that arises simply on account of the elimination-cum-subsidence of the relevant karmic veils is without the occurrence of any specific event. Sometimes, on the other hand, such memory takes place due to the presentation of some external event.

The memory of the past life is a variety of empirical knowledge. Maximally, one can recollect nine rational lives by means of this memory. According to the *ācārāṅga* commentary, however, the possessor of the power of recollection can remember any number of past lives, not only nine.

### 1.3.0 Influx of Karma

I did it, I got it done, and I shall be the approver of the doer.

The person with the memory of the past has a deep experience of the causal chain of action, the karmic bondages and the resultant transmigration in different directions and sub directions. This has found vent in this *sūtra*.

The action is three fold: was done by the agent himself, or was got done, or shall be approved of by him. This threefold action becomes nine fold when combined with the three periods of times—past, present and

future. From the present *sūtra* all these nine types of action can be derived. The first, second and ninth types are explicitly mentioned here. Others can be formulated as follows:

- (i) I had approved of what was done.
- (ii) I am doing myself.
- (iii) I am getting it done.
- (iv) I am approving of what is being done.
- (v) I shall do myself.
- (vi) I shall get it done.

Due to action there is the inflow of karmic particles, and therefore, the action is called inflow. In fact, this inflow is the cause of the transmigration in various direction.

What is influx is efflux, what is efflux is influx; what is non-influx is non-efflux, what is non-efflux is non-influx—The aspirant, comprehending this paradigm, should realize the world of living being in accordance with the discrete commandment of the Jina and should not indulge in what leads to influx.

The mode of the self that attracts karma is the cause of influx, and the mode that is responsible for the dissociation of the karma is the cause of efflux. The opposite of influx is non-influx.

### 1.3.1 Stoppage of Karma

Comprehension is twofold; theoretical knowledge and practical application. The implication is that the activities are first of all to be known and then abandoned. Here a significant problem crops up. “Is it possible to do away with karma”? The maintenance of the body and substance of life are controlled by karma. How can a person live without karma? The meaning of the abandonment of karma is not the abandonment of all karma, but only of karma, which nourishes non-restraint. “The evil deeds are unworthy of being done”, it is clearly maintained that only evil actions are to be avoided.

The statements about the comprehension and abandonment of karma are virtually the statements about the purity of karma. Even the seer other than the *Jinas*, who were possessed of special knowledge.

The memory of the past life is inborn in some souls, while in other it is acquired faculty due to some auxiliary causes, which are: the special subsidence of deluding karma; purity of perception (purity of aura); the process of speculation, elimination (of doubt), investigation, intensive search.

The special subsidence of deluding karma is illustrated in *Namipavvajjā* in the *Uttarādhyayana*. There it is said that Nami remembered the past life on account of the subsidence of deluding karma.

On account of his purity of perception, *Mrgāputra* got the memory of his past life simply at the sight of a monk. Here the cause is mentioned to be the subsidence of the deluding karma and purification of the perceptive faculty simultaneously. Similarly, *Harikēśabala* also had the memory of past life while engrossed in reflection. In the introduction to the chapter on *Cītrasambhūti* also, there is mention of the memory of the past life. Both the sons of *Bhṛgupurohita*, simply at the sight of a monk, acquired the memory of their past life, and also recollected their practice of penance and self-restraint.

Realizing that the faith in religion and desire for liberation are easily nourished by the memory of the past life, Lord *Mahāvīra* led many people recollect their past life. When *Meghakumāra* was in the point of reverting to the householder’s life, the Lord reminded him of the third life in the past, which produced in him the memory of his past rational lives due to beneficial psychical processes, auspicious perception with aura gradually purified. This was the result of speculation, elimination, investigation and intensive search due to the elimination-cum-subsidence of relevant karmic veils. The memory of the past life arose in *Sudarśana Śreṣṭhi* too in the same manner.

The third auxiliary cause consisting of speculation, elimination, investigation and intensive search is illustrated by the memory that occurred to *Meghakumāra* as soon as he heard the name of *Meruprabha* elephant. There started “speculation” in his mind about that elephant. As a result, there was some agitation in his mind to

know the elephant. Thereafter the process of elimination started with the query—“Had I been an elephant in the past?” In the process of ratiocination, he entered the state of “investigation”. In other words, he entered the area of past experience in order to search out the event in his past life. While reflecting on the past, he embarked upon the state of “intensive research”. Even as a cow reaches the grazing posture visited earlier, while engaged in search of fodder, *Meghakumāra* gained the memory of his elephant-life by investigating makes use of worldly things, and such use is nothing other than karma. It is, therefore, said that the seer makes use of worldly things in a different manner and for a different purpose. For instance, the ordinary man uses things or enjoys them in a worldly way without any self-restraint. But a man of self-restraint does not do so. He makes use of those things with proper restraint, and an act done with proper restraint, and an act done with proper self-restraint is virtually not karma. Hence, there will be no bondage of karma.

#### 1.4.0 Doctrine of six classes of souls

Lord *Mahāvīra* propounded the doctrine of six classes of souls, namely, earth-bodied, water-bodied, fire-bodied, air-bodied and plant-bodied, and the mobile creatures. In the present section the comprehension of the nature of violence to the earth-bodied beings is explained. In the *Upaniṣads* there are discussions, about the existence of soul, but the doctrine of six classes of living beings is an absolutely original contribution of the Jainas. There is mention of mobile being and also plant life in non-Jain literature, but the exposition of other types of living beings such as, immobile like the earth-bodied, etc. and the scientific classification of beings based on the number of senses is exclusively a contribution of the Jainas.

##### 1.4.1 Earth bodied beings

*tattha tattha puḍho pāsa, āturā paritāveṃti.*

Look, with different intentions and purposes, passionate people are indulging in acts of violence.

*saṃti pāṇā puḍho siyā.*

There are being inhabiting individual bodies.

*lajjamāṇā puḍho pāsa.*

Look at self-restrained people, ashamed of their violent activities.

*aṇagārā motti ege pavayamāṇā.*

*jamiṇaṃ virūvarūvehiṃ satthehiṃ puḍhavi-kamma-samāraṃbheṇaṃ puḍhavi-satthaṃ samāraṃbhemāṇe aṇṇe vaṇeḡarūve pāṇe vihimsati.*

Some people style themselves homeless mendicants, though indulging in violent actions to earth-bodied beings with various weapons, which involve destruction of various other classes of beings.

*tattha khalu bhagavayā pariṇṇā paveiyā.*

On this subject, the Lord has propounded the principle of comprehension and abandonment.

*imassa ceva jīviyassa, parivaṃdaṇa-māṇaṇa-pūyaṇāe, jāī-maraṇa-moyaṇāe, dukkhaḡaḡighāyaheṃ.*

Longing for survival, praise, reverence and adoration; life and death, emancipation, and elimination of physical and mental suffering.

*se sayameva puḍhavi-satthaṃ samāraṃbhai, aṇṇehiṃ vā puḍhavisatthaṃ samāraṃbhāveī, aṇṇe vā puḍhavi-satthaṃ samāraṃbhaṃte samaṇujāṇai.*

He himself indulges in killing the earth-bodied beings or instigates others to do so, or approves of such killing by others.

*taṃ se ahiyāe, taṃ se abohīe.*

Such violence is for his harm, is for his non-enlightenment.

*se taṃ sambujjhamāṇe āyāṇīyaṃ samuṭṭhāe.*

The ascetic comprehends the result of violence and applies himself to the practice of self-restraint.

*soccā khalu bhagavao aṇaḡārāṇaṃ vā aṃti e hamegesim ṇātaṃ bhavati—esa khalu gaṃthe, esa khalu mohe, esa khalu māre, esa khalu ṇarae.*

Hearing from the *Jina* or other ascetics, some people come to know : such violence is indeed a knot, is delusion, is death, is hell.

*iccatthaṃ gaḡhie loe.*

Nevertheless, the people entrapped in pursuit of pleasure (indulge in violence to earth-bodied beings).

*jaṃiṇaṃ virūvaṇīvehiṃ satthehiṃ puḡhavi-kamma-samāraṃbheṇaṃ puḡhavi-satthaṃ samāraṃbhemāṇe aṇṇe vaṇegarūve pāṇe vihiṃsai*

They indulge in violent actions to earth-bodied beings with various weapons, which involve destruction of various other classes of beings.

*se bemi—appega aṃdhamabbhe, appege aṃdhamacche.*

Thus I say; some body pierces or cuts the blind (earth-bodied beings that have the feeling of intense pain like that of the human beings born blind, deaf, dumb, lame and deficient in other limbs).

*appege pāyamabbhe, appege pāyamacche, appege gupphamabbhe, appege gupphamacche, appege jaṃghamabbhe, appege, jaṃghamacche, appege jāṇumabbhe, appege jāṇumacche, appege ūrumabbhe, appege ūrumacche, appege kaḡimabbhe, appege kaḡimacche, appege ṇābhimabbhe, appege ṇābhimacche, appege uyaramabbhe, appege uyaramacche, appege pāsamabbhe, appege pāsamacche, appege piṭṭhamabbhe, appege piṭṭhamacche, appege uramabbhe, appege uramacche, appege hiyaṃamabbhe, appege hiyaṃamacche, appege thaṇamabbhe, appege thaṇamacche, appege khaṃdhamabbhe, appege khaṃdhamacche, appege bāhumabbhe, appege bāhumacche, appege kaṭṭhamabbhe, appege kaṭṭhamacche, appege aṃgulimabbhe, appege aṃgulimacche, appege ṇahamabbhe, appege ṇahamacche, appege gīvamabbhe, appege gīvamacche, appege haṇuyamabbhe, appege haṇuyamacche, appege hoṭṭhamabbhe, appege hoṭṭhamacche, appege daṃtamabbhe, appege daṃtamacche, appege jibbhamabbhe, appege jibbhamacche, appege tālumabbhe, appege tālumacche, appege galaṃmabbhe, appege galaṃmacche, appege gaṃḡamabbhe, appege gaṃḡamacche, appege kaṇṇamabbhe, appege kaṇṇamacche, appege ṇāsamabbhe, appege ṇāsamacche, appege acchimabbhe, appege acchimacche, appege bhamuhamabbhe, appege bhamuhamacche, appege ṇidālamabbhe, appege ṇidālamacche, appege sīsamabbhe, appege sīsamacche.*

Some people pierce and cut foot, ankle, leg, knee, thigh, waist, belly, stomach, flank, back, bosom, heart, breast, shoulder, arm, hand, finger, nail, neck, chin, lip, tooth, tongue, palate, throat, temple, ear, nose, eye, brow, forehead and head.

*appege sampamārae, appege uddavae.*

Sometimes a person is beaten to a state of unconsciousness and sometimes tortured to death.

*ettha satthaṃ samāraṃbhamāṇassa iccete āraṃbhā aparīṇātā bhavaṃti*

The person thus indulging in acts of violence does neither comprehend nor abandon them.

*ettha satthaṃ asaṃāraṃbhamāṇassa iccete āraṃbhā pariṇātā bhavaṃti*

The person not indulging in acts of violence is capable of comprehending and abandoning them.

*taṃ pariṇāya mehāvī neva sayaṃ puḡhavi-satthaṃ samāraṃbhejjā. nevaṇṇehiṃ puḡhavi-satthaṃ samāraṃbhāvejjā, nevaṇṇe puḡhavi-satthaṃ samāraṃbhamite samaṇujāṇejjā.*

Comprehending this, an intelligent ascetic should not indulge in violence to earth-bodied beings, nor should he instigate others to do so, nor should he approve of such violence committed by others.

*jassete puḡhavi-kamma-samāraṃbhā pariṇātā bhavaṃti, se hu muṇī pariṇāta-kamme—tti bemi*

The ascetic who comprehends and abandons these acts of violence to the earth-bodied beings is

indeed an ascetic who has fully comprehended and abandoned all acts of violence.

*se bemi—se jahāvi anagāre ujjukade, ṇiyāgapadivaṇṇe, amāyaṃ kuvvamāṇe viyāhie.*

Likewise also, the ascetic (desisting from violent action to the water-bodied beings) is straightforward, treader on the path to liberation, not a deceitful concealer of his power of self-restraint. Thus do I say.

*jāe saddhāe ṇikkhamto, tameva aṇupāliyā, vijahittu visottiyam.*

He (the ascetic) should follow immaculately the same faith with which he renounced the world, not flowing in the stream of mental fickleness (about the reality of water-bodied beings).

*paṇayā vīrā mahāvīhim.*

The heroes are dedicated to the great path of liberation.

As the consciousness in the earth-bodied entities is unmanifest, they are not easily identifiable as living beings, like the creatures in whom consciousness is manifest. Lord *Mahāvīra* did not propound mere consciousness in the earth, but he disclosed many other facts about them as listed below :

(i) Respiration—Earth bodied beings can inhale and exhale from all the six directions, if there is no obstruction in any one of them. But in case there is obstruction, they can do so from only three, four or five sides according to circumstances.

(ii) Senses (*Karaṇas*)—In earth-bodied beings there are two types of senses (*karaṇas*) “corporeal means of action and karmic means of action”.

A sense is an instrument through which actions are done or feelings and cognitions are produced. The “sense” is sometimes identified with the body; sometimes with karma; sometimes with the sensual organs; sometimes with psychic centers responsible for extra-sensory perception, sometimes with the centers of different sensations.

(iii) Sensation—They enjoy sensations through senses that are auspicious or inauspicious and not without any sense.

(iv) Volume of the body—The earth-bodied organisms have very subtle bodies.

(v) Visibility—The bodies of one, two or more such beings are not visible but we are able to see only a big lump of innumerable such beings huddled together.

(vi) Enjoyment—They have no sexual desire, but they have tactile enjoyment of sex.

(vii)-(xvi)—Inflow, Ageing and grief, Frenzy, Instinct etc.—The frenzy is of two kinds. Both types are possible in them. When the goblin and the like sprinkle them with inauspicious particles, it is a case of frenzy due to being possessed by a goblin. When such frenzy occurs due to the maturation of deluding karma, it is called frenzy due to the rise of delusion. There are ten instincts. All the ten instincts are in earth-bodied beings.

In the earth-bodied beings there is only a tacit and undeveloped mind. The knowledge of the one-sensed beings is the least manifest like that in a person, who is mad, fainted or poisoned. They hanker after food every moment without break. Even as in a plant there is fine viscosity just so there is very subtle viscosity in the earth-bodied organism the passion of anger, pride, etc., are also there in the earth-bodied beings, but they are too subtle to be perceived sensory perception alone. There are four psychic colourings in the earth-bodied beings: black, blue, gray and fiery.

For the knowledge of subtle entities, extra-sensory perception is the only way. But the ancient authors have advanced some arguments to prove their existence. There is the sign of consciousness, such as replication, in the earth-bodied objects like the growth of a homogeneous slab in the rock, just as in the sprouts of the flesh of hemorrhoid.

In his *Pañcāstikāya*, *ācārya kundakunda* has advanced the following arguments in order to prove the animate character of one-sensed beings; even as the animate character of the substances in an egg or in an embryo or in a person in coma is accepted, though there is no perceptible intelligent activities in them, exactly so

the animate character of one-sensed being is to be admitted. The earth-bodied beings can neither hear, nor see, nor smell, nor move. How can then we believe that they have pleasurable or painful sensation?

The lord explained the problem through three examples. The first example—Just as the dumb cannot articulate his pain however intense, when cut or tortured, likewise the one-sensed being like the earth-bodied organism feels pain though it is incapable of articulating it on account of his being bereft of any other sense-organ to express it.

The second example—As in the case of man, endowed with all the sense-organs and with fully manifest consciousness, there arises inexpressible extreme pain, when simultaneously are pierced or cut all his aforesaid thirty-two organs, e.g., foot, ankle, etc., exactly so there arise similar extreme pain in the earth-bodied beings too.

The third example—Just as when a person is led into a state of unconsciousness, and while dying also; exactly so the earth-bodied beings experience pain on account of their consciousness being dim due to the rise of extremely drowsy slumber.

#### 1.4.2 Water-bodied beings

*logaṃ ca āṇāe abhisameccā akutobhayaṃ.*

Properly understanding the nature of the world (of water-bodied beings) according to the commandment of the *jina*, one should make that world completely fear-free

*se bemi—neva sayaṃ logaṃ abbhāikkhejjā, neva attānaṃ abbhāikkhejjā. je loyaṃ abbhāikkhai, se attānaṃ abbhāikkhai. je attānaṃ abbhāikkhai, se loyaṃ abbhāikkhai.*

One should neither deny the world (of water-bodied beings), nor should one deny oneself. One who denies the world (of water-bodied beings), denies himself, and one who denies himself denies the world (of water-bodied beings). Thus do I say.

*lajjamāṇā puḍho pāsa.*

Look at various self-restrained monks ashamed of their violent activities.

*aṇagārā motti ege pavayamāṇā.*

Some people style themselves as homeless mendicants.

*jamaṇaṃ virūvarūvehiṃ satthehiṃ udaya-kamma-samāraṃbheṇaṃ udaya-satthaṃ samāraṃbhamāṇe aṇṇe vaṇegarūve pāṇe vihiṃsati.*

But they indulge in violent actions to water-bodied beings with various weapons which involve destruction of various other classes of living beings.

*tattha khalu bhagavayā pariṇṇā paveditā.*

On this subject, the Lord has propounded the principle of comprehension and abandonment.

*imassa ceva jīviyassa, parivaṃdaṇa-māṇaṇa-pūyaṇāe, jāṭ-maraṇa-moyaṇāe, dukkhaṇaḍighāyaheṃ.*

Longing for survival, praise, reverence and adoration; life and death, emancipation; and elimination of physical and mental suffering.

*se sayameva udaya-satthaṃ samāraṃbhati, aṇṇehiṃ vā udaya-satthaṃ samāraṃbhāveti, aṇṇe vā udaya-satthaṃ samāraṃbhamāṇe samaṇujāṇati.*

He himself indulges in killing the water-bodied beings or instigates others to do so or approves of such killings by others.

*taṃ se abhiyāe, taṃse abohīe.*

Such violence is for his harm, is for his non-enlightenment.

*se taṃ sambujjhamāṇe, āyāṇīyaṃ samuṭṭhāe.*

He (the ascetic) comprehends the result of violence and applies himself to the practice of self-restraint.

*soccā khalu bhagavaṃ aṇaḅārāṇaṃ vā aṃti ihaṃeḅeṣiṃ ṇāyaṃ bhavati—esa khalu gaṃthe, esa khalu mohe, esa khalu māre, esa khalu narae.*

Hearing from the *Jina* or other ascetics, some people come to know : such violence is indeed a knot, is delusion, is death, is hell.

*iccatthaṃ gaḅhie loe.*

Nevertheless, people entrapped in pursuit of pleasure (indulge in violence to water-bodied beings).

*jaṃiṇaṃ virūvarūvehiṃ satthehiṃ udaya-kamma-samāraṃbheṇaṃ udaya-satthaṃ amāraṃbhamāṇe aṇṇe vaṇeḅarūve pāṇe vihiṃsati.*

They indulge in violent actions to water-bodied beings with various weapons, which involve destruction of various other classes of living beings.

*se bemi—appeḅe aṃdhamabbhe, appeḅe aṃdhamacche.*

Thus I say—somebody pierces or cuts the blind (water-bodied beings that have the feeling of intense pain like that of the human beings born blind, deaf, dumb, lame and deficient in other limbs).

*appeḅe pāyamabhe, appeḅe pāyamacche.*

Some people pierce and cut foot, ankle, leg etc. (see *Sūtra* 29 for all the thirty-two limbs of the body).

*appeḅe saṃpamārae, appeḅe uddavae.*

Sometimes a person is beaten to a state of unconsciousness and sometimes tortured to death.

*se bemi—saṃti pāṇā udaya-nissiyā jīvā aṇeḅā.*

There are many aquatic beings living in water. Thus do I say.

*appeḅe pāyamabhe, appeḅe pāyamacche.*

Some people pierce and cut foot, ankle, leg etc. (see *Sūtra* 29 for all the thirty-two limbs of the body).

*appeḅe saṃpamārae, appeḅe uddavae.*

Sometimes a person is beaten to a state of unconsciousness and sometimes tortured to death.

*se bemi—saṃti pāṇā udaya-nissiyā jīvā aṇeḅā.*

There are many aquatic beings living in water. Thus do I say.

*ihaṃ ca khalu bho! aṇaḅārāṇaṃ udaya-jīvā viyāhiyā.*

In this ascetic discipline, O men, water itself has been propounded as a living being.

*satthaṃ cettha aṇuvī pāsā.*

Minutely visualize the weapon of injury to water-bodied beings.

*puḅho satthaṃ paveiyam.*

That there are varieties of weapons has been propounded (by the Lord).

*adhuvā adiṇṇāadāṇam.*

Or, it (viz. the use of live water) is a case of accepting what has not been offered (stealing).

*kappaṃe pakkaiṇe pāum, aduvā vibhūsāe.*

Some (heretics) asserted : water was allowed to them, water was allowed to them to drink, also to beautify their body.

*puḅho satthehiṃ viuttamti.*

They kill water-bodied beings by various weapons.

*etthavi tesiṃ ṇo ṇikaraṇāe.*

Even then they cannot absolve themselves (of the responsibility).

*ettha sattham samāraṃbhamāṇassa iccette āraṃbhā aparīṇṇāyā bhavaṃti.*

The person thus indulging in acts of violence does neither comprehend, nor abandon them.

*ettha sattham asamāraṃsamāṇassa iccette āraṃbhā parīṇṇāyā bhavaṃti.*

The person not indulging in acts of violence is capable of comprehending and abandoning them.

*taṃ parīṇṇāya mehāvī neva sayam udaya-sattham samāraṃbhejjā, nevannehiṃ udaya-sattham samāraṃbhāvejjā, udaya-sattham samāraṃ-bhaṃtevi aṇṇe ṇa samuṇajāṇejjā.*

Comprehending this, an intelligent ascetic should not indulge in violence to the water-bodied beings, nor should he instigate others to do so, nor should he approve of such violence committed by others.

*jassete udaya-sattha-samāraṃbhā parīṇṇāyā bhavaṃti, se hu muṇī parīṇṇāta-kamma—tti bemi.*

The ascetic who comprehends and abandons these acts of violence to the water-bodied beings is indeed an ascetic who has fully comprehended and abandoned all acts of violence.

In those days no other thinker did accept water as a sentient entity. There was of course the opinion that there are living beings in water. This *Sūtra* clarifies the issue. In the Jaina scripture, water itself is propounded a living substance.

There are water-bodied beings that are too subtle to be perceptible to the naked eyes. The *Sūtra* advises us to know them in comparison to ourselves. Their denial would involve the denial of oneself.

Even though it is very difficult to understand the nature of water-bodied beings, because it is said that they neither hear, nor see, nor smell, nor taste, nor are they found to feel pleasure and pain; there is no throb of life in them, no respiration. Why should they be considered as possessed of souls? The reply to this query is provided by the *Ācārāṅga Nirṇukti*. Just as the body of the elephant embryo at the time of conception, and the watery egg are both sentient liquids, exactly so the water-bodied beings are sentient. This can be soliloquized as follows:

Thesis : water-bodied beings are sentient.

Reason : Because they are liquid, and not injured by any weapon.

Concomitance : Whatever is liquid and not injured by any weapon is necessarily sentient. Example: (1) Like the embryo (*kalala*) that is the material cause of the body of the elephant. (2) Like the liquid in the egg that has not developed the organs and where the limbs and the like have not grown.

As in the case of earth-bodies in the *Sūtra* 28 above, one should elaborate the concept of water-bodied beings under the sixteen items beginning with respiration and ending in psychological colouring.

Although some heretical sects like the *Ājīvikas* and others, did not believe in the existence of the water-bodied beings, they had imposed certain restrictions for using water. The *Ājīvikas* and the *Śaivas* agreed that they could use water only to drink and not for any other purpose.

The Buddhists used water to drink and also to bathe.

### 1.4.3 Fire-bodied beings

*se bemi—neva sayam logam abbhāikkhejjā, neva attāṇam abbhāi-kkhejjā. je logam abbhāikkhai, se attāṇam abbhāikkhai. je attāṇam abbhāikkhai, se logam abbhāikkhai.*

One should neither deny the world (of fire-bodied beings), nor should one deny oneself. One who denies the world (of fire-bodied beings), denies himself and one who denies himself, denies the world (of fire-bodied beings). Thus do I say.

*je dīhaloga-satthassa kheyaṇṇe, se asatthassa kheyaṇṇe. je asatthassa kheyaṇṇe, se dīhaloga-satthassa kheyaṇṇe.*

One who knows the weapon of (injury to) the world of long-bodied beings (plants), knows the nature of



non-weapon (self-restraint). One who knows the non-weapon, knows the weapon of (injury to) the world of long-bodied beings.

By cutting down their veils of knowledge of intuition, the heroes, who are always self-restrained, self-controlled and wakeful have realized the reality of the fire-bodied beings.

*je pammatte guṇaṭṭhie, se hu daṃḍe pavvuccati*

One who is non-vigilant and covetous of sensual objects is called an instrument of violence.

*taṃ pariṇṇāya mehāvī iyāṇiṃ ṇo jamaḥaṃ puvvamaḁāṣī pamāeṇaṃ.*

Comprehending this, the wise resolves : Henceforth I will not indulge in any violent actions which I used to do in the past out of non-vigilance.

*lajjamāṇā puḁho pāsa.*

Look at various self-restrained monks ashamed of their violent activities.

*aṇaḁārā motti ege pavayamāṇā.*

Some people style themselves as homeless mendicants.

*jamiṇaṃ virūvarūvehiṃ satthehiṃ aḁaṇi-kamma-samāraṃbheṇaṃ aḁaṇi-satthaṃ samāraṃbhamāṇe, aṇṇe vaṇeḁarūve pāṇe vihiṃsati*

But they indulge in violent actions to fire-bodied beings with various weapons, which involve destruction of other classes of living beings.

*tattha khalu bhagavayā pariṇṇā paveiyā.*

On this subject the Lord has propounded the principle of comprehension and abandonment.

*imassa ceva jīviyassa, parivaṃḁaṇ-māṇaṇa-pūvaṇāe, jāī-maraṇa-moyaṇāe, dukkhaḁaḁighāyaheṃ.*

Longing for survival/ praise, reverence and adoration; life and death, emancipation; and elimination of physical and mental suffering.

*se sayameva aḁaṇi-satthaṃ samāraṃbhāi, aṇṇehiṃ vā aḁaṇi-satthaṃ samāraṃbhāvei, aṇṇe vā aḁaṇisatthaṃ samāraṃbhamāṇe samaṇujāṇa.*

He himself indulges in killing the fire-bodied beings or instigates others to do so or he approves of such killings by others.

*taṃ se ahiyāe, taṃ se aboḁhe.*

Such violence is for his harm, is for his non-enlightenment.

*se taṃ sambujjhamāṇe, āyāṇīyaṃ samuṭṭhāe.*

He (the ascetic) comprehends the result of violence and applies himself to the practice of self-restraint.

*socā khalu bhagavao aṇaḁārāṇaṃ vā aṃṭie ihamegehiṃ nayaṃ bhavati—esa khalu gaṃṭhe, esa khalu mohe, esa khalu māre, esa khalu ṇarae.*

Hearing from the Jina or other ascetics, some people come to know such violence is indeed a knot, is delusion, is death, is hell.

*icchatthaṃ gaḁhie, loe.*

Nevertheless, the people entrapped in pursuit of pleasure (indulge in violence to fire-bodied beings).

*jamiṇaṃ virūvarūvehiṃ satthehiṃ aḁaṇi-kamma-samāraṃbheṇaṃ aḁaṇi-satthaṃ samāraṃbhamāṇe aṇṇe va ṇeḁarūve pāṇe vihiṃsati*

They indulge in violent actions to fire-bodied beings with various weapons, which involve destruction of various other classes of beings.

*se bemi—appege aṃḁhamabbhe, appege aṃḁhamacche.*

Thus do I say : somebody pierces or cuts the blind (fire-bodied beings which have the feeling of intense pain like that of the human beings born blind, deaf, dumb, lame and deficient in other limbs)

*appege pāyamabbhe, appege pāyamacche.*

Some people pierce and cut foot, ankle etc.

*appege sampamārae, appege uddavae.*

Sometimes a person is beaten to a state of unconsciousness and sometimes tortured to death.

*se bemi—samtipāṇā puḍhavi-ṇissiyā, taṇa-ṇissiyā, patta-ṇissiyā, kaṭṭhaṇissiyā, gomaya-ṇissiyā, kayavara-ṇissiyā, samti sampātīmā pāṇā, āhacca sampayamti ya. aṅṅim ca khalu puṭhā, ege samghāyāmāvajjamti. je tattha samghāyāmāvajjamti, te tattha pariyāvajjamti. je tattha pariyāvajjamti, te tattha uddāyamti*

Thus do I say : There are living beings inhabiting earth, grass, leaf, wood, cowdung and garbage. There are insects, which fly into fire impetuously; some of them shrivel when touched by fire, faint and eventually die.

*ettha sattham samārambhamāṇassa iccette ārambhā aparīṇṇāyā bhavamti.*

The person thus indulging in acts of violence does neither comprehend, nor abandon them.

*ettha sattham asamārambhamāṇassa iccette ārambhā parīṇṇāyā bhavamti.*

The person, not indulging in acts of violence, is capable of comprehending and abandoning them.

*taṃ parīṇṇāya mehāvī neva sayam aṅṅi-sattham samārambhejjā, nevaṇṇehim aṅṅi-sattham samārambhāvejjā, aṅṅi-sattham samārambhamāṇe aṅṅe na samavajjānejjā.*

Comprehending this, an intelligent ascetic should not indulge in violence to fire-bodied beings, nor should he instigate others to do so, nor should he approve of such violence committed by others.

*jassete aṅṅi-kamma-samārambhā parīṇṇāyā bhavamti, se hu mūṇī parīṇṇāya-kamme.—tti bemi.*

The ascetic who comprehends and abandons these acts of violence to the fire-bodied beings is indeed an ascetic who has fully comprehended and abandoned all acts of violence.

*Je logam abbhāikkhai, se attāṇam abbhāikkhai, je attāṇam abbhāikkhai, se logam abbhāikkhai.*

One who denies the world (of fire-bodied beings), denies himself and one who denies himself, denies the world (of fire-bodied beings).

Although the fire-bodied beings are not visible on account of their being very subtle, even then the *Niryukti* has adduced some arguments in order to prove their existence.

Even as the corporeal mass of the glow-worm shines as light in the night, exactly so the lighting power in the fire is inferred as originating from a particular transformation in the fire-bodied beings. Even as the heat of fever is not separate from the fevered, exactly so on account of its heat (temperature), fire is also inferred as a variety of living being.

In the *Vṛiti* also, the following argument is given in favour of fire as a sentient entity. Fire grows on the supply of fuel, and diminishes and extinguishes in the absence of it.

#### 1.4.4 Plant-Bodied beings

*lajjamāṇā puḍho pāsa.*

Look at various self-restrained people ashamed of their violent activities.

*aṅṅārā motti ege pavayamāṇā.*

Some people style themselves as homeless mendicants.

*jamiṇam virūvarūveim satthehim vaṇassai-kamma-samāram bhemaṃ vaṇassai-sattham samārambhamāṇe aṅṅe vaṇegarūve pāṇe vihim satī.*

But they indulge in violent actions to the plant-world with various weapons, which involve destruction of various other classes of beings.

*tattha khalu bhagavayā pariṇṇā paveditā.*

On this subject the Lord has propounded the principle of comprehension and abandonment.

*immassa ceva jīviyassa, parivaṇḍaṇa-māṇaṇa-pūyaṇāe, jāṭi-maraṇa-moyaṇāe, dukkhaḍḍhāyaheum.*

Longing for survival; praise, reverence and adoration; life and death, emancipation, and elimination of physical and mental suffering.

*se sayameva vaṇassai-sattham samārambhāi, añṇehim vā vaṇassai-sattham samārambhāvei, añṇe vā vaṇassai-sattham samārambhamāṇe samaṇujānai.*

He himself indulges in killing the plant-world, or instigates others to do so, or he approves of such killings by others.

*taṃ se ahiyāe, taṃ se abehīe.*

Such violence is for his harm, is for his non-enlightenment.

*se taṃ sambujjhamāṇe, āyāṇīyaṃ samuṭṭhāe.*

He (the ascetic) comprehends the result of violence and applies himself to the practice of self-restraint.

*soccā bhagavao aṇagārāṇam vā aṇṭie ihemegeṣiṃ nayaṃ bhavati—esa khalu gaṇṭhe, esa khalu mohe, esa khalu māre, esa khalu ṇirae.*

Hearing from the *Jina* or other ascetics, some people come to know : such violence is indeed a knot, is delusion, is death, is hell.

*iccettham gaḍḍhie loe.*

Nevertheless, the people entrapped in pursuit of pleasure (indulge in violence to the plant-world).

*jamiṇam virūvehiṃ satthehiṃ vaṇassai-kamma samārambheṇam vaṇassai-sattham samārambhemāṇe añṇe vaṇegarūve pāṇe vihiṃsati.*

They indulge in violent actions to the plant-world with various weapons which involve destruction of various others classes of beings.

*se bemi—appege aṇḍhamabbhe, appege aṇḍhamacche.*

Thus I say : somebody pierces and cuts the blind (plant-world which has the feeling of intense pain like that of the human beings, born blind, deaf, dumb, lame and deficient in other limbs).

*appege pāyamabbhe, appege pāyamacche.*

Some people pierce and cut foot, ankle, etc.

*appage sampamārae, appage uddavae.*

Sometimes a person is beaten to a state of unconsciousness and sometimes tortured to death.

*se bemi—imampi jāidhammayam, eyampi jāidhammayam, imampi buddhidhammayam, eyampi buddhidhammayam, imampi cīttamaṇṭayam, eyampi cīttamaṇṭayam, imampi chīnnaṃ milāti, eyampi chīnnaṃ milāti imampi āhāragam, eyampi āhāragam, imampi aṇiccayam, eyampi aṇiccayam, imampi asāsayam, imampi caṇāvacaīyam, eyampi caṇāvacaīyam, imampi vipariṇāmadhammayam, eyampi vipariṇāmadhammayam.*

Thus I say :

This (human body) is subject to birth, so too the plant body.

This (human body) is subject to growth, so too the plant body.

This (human body) is endowed with consciousness, so too the plant body.

This (human body) withers, so too the plant body.

This (human body) needs nutrition, so too the plant body.

This (human body) is impermanent, so too the plant body.

This (human body) is non-eternal, so too the plant body.

This (human body) is subject to metabolism, so too the plant body.

This (human body) is subject to change, so too the plant body.

*ettha sattham samārambhamāṇassa iccete ārambhā aparīṇṇāyā bhavaṃti.*

The person thus indulging in acts of violence does neither comprehend, nor abandon them.

*ettha sattham samārambhamāṇassa iccete ārambhā parīṇṇāyā bhavaṃti.*

The person not indulging in acts of violence is capable of comprehending and abandoning them.

*ta parīṇṇāya mehāvī neva sayam vaṇassai-sattham samārambhejjā, nevaṇnehim vaṇassai-sattham samārambhāvejjā, nevaṇṇe vaṇassai-sattham samārambhate samaṇujāṇejjā.*

Comprehending this, an intelligent ascetic should not indulge in violence to the plant-world, nor should he instigate others to do so, nor should he approve of such violence committed by others.

*jassete vaṇassai-sattha-samārambhā parīṇṇāyā bhavaṃti, se hu muṇī parīṇṇāya-kamme. —tti bemi.*

The ascetic who comprehends and abandons these acts of violence to the plant-world is indeed an ascetic who has fully comprehended and abandoned all acts of violence. Thus do I say.

Among the immobile being, the plant-bodie beings have manifest consciousness. In the earth-bodie beings and the like, the consciousness is not as manifest as in the plant. This is why the former has not been likened to the human body. The comparison of the human body with plant body is possible in all respects. The characteristics of birth, growth, nutrition, metabolism, death, disease, the states of childhood, adulthood and the like and consciousness and the like are the most obvious items of description.

- (i) As the human body is subject to birth, so the plant-body exhibits signs of birth.
- (ii) As the human body grow up, so does the plant-body.
- (iii) As the human body is endowed with consciousness and is possessed of the power of cognition, so is the plant-body. The plants like emblica, officinalis, cassiadora etc. exhibit slumber and waking.
- (iv) As the limbs of human body, when severed, gradually decay and die, so the branches, flowers, leaves, etc. of the tree, when torn, wither up. The aura around the leaves that are severed from the main body fades away and on complete fading, it dies.
- (v) As the human body draws nutrition, so the plant body draws mineral, water etc. The digestion in both cases depends on sunlight.
- (vi) As the human body is impermanent, that is subject to growth and decay, so is the plant-body.
- (vii) As the human body is non-eternal, i.e., subject to death, so is the plant-body.
- (viii) As there is formation and disintegration of billions of cells every moment in the human body, there is formation of cells every moment in the human body, there is formation of cells and their disintegration in the plant-body too.
- (ix) As the human body is subject to change, so is the plant-body. Change comprises the stages beginning from fertilization and the like and the post-natal stages of childhood etc., or arising of some ailments or acquisition of special luster, strength, etc., through special medicine (elixir), oil etc.

The *Cūrṇi* mentions the different modification like dream, longing during pregnancy, diseases etc. that are to be understood here. The *Vṛtti* does not mention anything about dreams in the plants. As regards longing during pregnancy it is mentioned that flowers and fruits from when the longing is fulfilled. The bumper growth

of crops is remarkable in modern times on account of the supply of fertilizers and the like to satisfy their longings. Further research is necessary on the subject of dream and longings in plant life.

#### 1.4.5 Mobile beings :

*se bemi—samtime tasā pāṇā, tam jahā—amdayā poyayā jarāyā rasayā samseyayā samcchimā ubbhiyā ovavāiyā.*

Thus I Say :

There are mobile beings such as those born :

- (1) Out of eggs
- (2) Out of foetus (born complete)
- (3) Out of foetus with amnion (or the chorion, an enveloping membrane)
- (4) Out of fluids
- (5) Out of sweat
- (6) By coagulation
- (7) By sprouting from the earth
- (8) Spontaneously

*esa samṣāretti pavuccati*

*maṇḍassa aviyāno.*

The world of mobile beings is known as the world of motion even to the dullard and the ignorant person.

*ñijjhāittā padilehittā patteyam pariṇivvāṇam.*

*savvesim pāṇāṇam savvesim bhūyāṇam savvesim jīvāṇam savessim sattāṇam assāyam aparivvāṇam mahabbhayaṃ dukkhaṃ tti bemi*

Deeply reflecting and observing that happiness is dear to all (and so) to all mobile beings, immobile beings, souls and living substances, unhappiness is unpleasant, dreadful and painful. thus I say,

*tasamti pāṇā padisodisāsu ya.*

The mobile beings, being frightened, wander in all directions, cardinal and intermediate, overwhelmed by distress.

*tattha-tattha puḍho pāsa, āurā paritāveṃti*

Look, passionate people, at different places, are torturing the mobile creatures.

*samti pāṇā puḍho siva.*

The mobile beings inhabit individual bodies.

*lajjamāṇā puḍho pāsa.*

Look at various self-restrained people ashamed of their violent activities.

*aṇagārā motti ege pavayamāṇā.*

Some people style themselves as homeless mendicants.

*jaṃṇam virūvarūvehiṃ satthehiṃ tasakāya-samārambheṇam tasakāya-sattham samārambhamāṇe aṇṇe vaṇegarūve pāṇe vihimsati*

They indulge in violent actions to the mobile beings with various weapons, which involve destruction of various other classes beings.

*tattha khalu bhagavayā pariṇṇā paveiyā.*

On this subject the Lord has propounded the principle of comprehension and abandonment.

*imassa ceva jīviyassa, parivamdaṇa-māṇaṇa-pūyāṇāe, dukkhaḥaḍighāyaheum.*

Longing for survival; praise, reverence and adoration; life and death, emancipation; and elimination of physical and mental suffering.

*se sayameva tasakāya-sattham samārambhati, aññehiṃ vā tasakāya-sattham samārambhāveī, aññe vā tasakāya-sattham samārambhamaññe samañujānai.*

He himself indulges in killing the mobile beings or instigates others to do so or approves of such killings by others.

*taṃ se ahiyāe, taṃ se abohīe.*

Such violence is for his harm, is for his non-enlightenment.

*se taṃ sambujjhamāññe āyāññiyam samuṭṭhāe.*

He (the ascetic) comprehends the result of violence and applies himself to the practice of self-restraint.

*soccā bhagavao aṇagārāṇam vā amtiē ihamegesimñāyam bhavai—esa khalu gaṃthe, ese khalu mohe, ese khalu māre, esa khalu ṇarae.*

Hearing from the *Jina* or other ascetics, some people come to know : such violence is indeed a *knot*, is delusion, is death, is hell.

*iccattham gaḍhie loe.*

Nevertheless, the people entrapped in pursuit of pleasure (indulge in violence to mobile beings).

*jamiṇam virūvarūvehiṃ satthehiṃ satthehiṃ tasakāya-samārambhenaṃ tasakāya-sattham samārambhamaññe aññe vaṇegarūve pāññe vihiṃsati.*

They indulge in violent actions to mobile beings with various weapons, which involve destruction of various other classes of beings.

*se bemi—appege amḍhamabbhe, appege amḍhamacche.*

Thus I say : somebody pierces and cuts the mobile beings, some among whom are deficient in other limbs (but have the feeling of intense pain like that of the human beings born blind, deaf, dumb, lame).

*appege pāyamabbhe, appege pāyamacche.*

Some people pierce and cut foot, ankle etc.

*appege sampamārae, appege vaddavae.*

Sometimes a person is beaten to a state of unconsciousness and sometimes tortured to death.

*se bemi—appege accāe vahaṃti, appege ajiṇāe vahaṃti, appege mamsāe vahaṃti, appege soṇiyāe vahaṃti, appege hiyayāe vahaṃti, appege pittāe vahaṃti, appege vasāe vahaṃti, appege picchāe vahaṃti, appege picchāe vahaṃti, appege bālāe vahaṃti, appege siṃgāe vahaṃti, appege visāññāe vahaṃti, appege daṃtāe vahaṃti, appege dāḍhāe vahaṃti, appege nahāe vahaṃti, appege ṇhāruṇoe vahaṃti, appege aṭṭhīe vahaṃti, appege aṭṭhīmimjāe vahaṃti, appege aṭṭhāe vahaṃti, appege aṇaṭṭhāe vahaṃti, appege hiṃsimsu meti vā vahaṃti, appege hiṃsamti metti vā vahaṃti, appege hiṃsissamti metti vā vahaṃti.*

Thus I say :

Some people kill (mobile beings) for obtaining their body, while others do so for their hide, flesh, blood, heart, bile, fat, feathers, tail, hair, horn, tusk, tooth, jaw, nail, sinew, bone and marrow. Some people kill with a purpose and some without any. Some people kill for vendetta, reflecting that they committed violence to him (or his kith and kin) in the past. Some people kill for they are doing at present or are likely to do violence to him (or his kith and kin) in future.

*ettha sattham samārambhamaññassa iccete ārambhā aparinñāya bhavaṃti.*

The person thus indulging in acts of violence does neither comprehend nor abandon them.

*ettha sattham asamārambhamaññassa iccete ārambhā pariññāya bhavaṃti.*

The person not indulging in acts of violence is capable of comprehending and abandoning them.

*taṃ pariṇṇāya mekhāvī neva sayam tassakāya-satthaṃ samāraṃbhejjā, nevaṇṇehiṃ tassakāya-satthaṃ samāraṃbhāvejjā, nevaṇṇe tassakāya-satthaṃ samāraṃbhate samaṇujāṇejjā.*

Comprehending this, an intelligent ascetic should not indulge in violence to mobile beings, nor should he instigate others to do so, nor should he approve of such violence committed by others.

*jassete tassakāya-sattha-samāraṃbhā pariṇṇāyā bhavaṃti, se hu muṇī pariṇṇāya-kamme—tti bemi.*

The ascetic who comprehends and abandons these acts of violence to mobile beings is indeed an ascetic who has fully comprehended and abandoned all acts of violence.

There are mobile being such as those born :

- (i) Out of eggs
- (ii) Out of fetus (born complete)
- (iii) Out of fetus with amnion (or the chorine, an enveloping membrane)
- (i) Out of fluids
- (ii) Out of sweat
- (iii) By coagulation
- (iv) By sprouting from the earth
- (v) Spontaneously.

The Mobile creature are of three types, namely-

- (a) Born of coagulation (invertebrate)
- (b) Born of womb (vertebrate) and
- (c) Born spontaneously (and accomplished).

Coagulation means birth without beings fetus in the mom. In such birth, the body is made of food accepted from nature. Among those born of coagulation are those who are born out of fluid, born out of sweat, and born by sprouting from the earth.

**1.4.5.1 Creatures born of womb :** Creatures born in placenta (viviparous). They include the creatures born out of egg (oviparous), born out of fetus, and born out of fetus with amnion.

**1.4.5.2 Spontaneous :** Those born with a protean body. The beings that have protean body are called spontaneously born. They are the demizens of heaven and hell.

It is only the mobile beings that can move and there fore the world comprising them is called the world of motion, *samsāra*.

The beings that have the consciousness of movement to and fro are mobile beings. Moreover, they are in distress beings afraid, worked shrieved and frightened. They flee from one place to another. Hence they are called mobile.

Some people kill (mobile beings) for obtaining their body, while others do so for their hide, flesh, blood, heart, bile, fat, feathers, tail, hair, horn, tusk, tooth, jaw, nail, sinew, bone and marrow. Some people kill with a purpose and some without any. Some people kill for vendettas, reflecting that they committed violence to him (or his kith and kin) the past. Some people kill for they are doing at present or are likely to do violence to him (or his kith an kin) in future. In the present *Sūtra*, the motives behind the killing of mobile being are given. These are indicative of the customs prevalent in society in those days.

**1.4.5.3 Body :** In the *Cūrṇi* and *Vṛtti* there is an example of how a person who has taken poison is inserted in the corpse of an elephant killed for the purpose to cure him of his poison. For the purpose of achieving the desired result, people practiced occult science and chanted mantras on the sacrificed body of a person possessed of auspicious marks of excellence and with unmotivated body. Some people sacrificed goats, etc., as offering to the deity.

**1.4.5.4 Hide :** People kill lion, tiger etc. for their hide. Some people kill various animals in order to get their flesh, blood, heart, bile, fat, feather, tail, hair, horn, tusk, tooth, jaw, nail, sinew, bone-marrow etc.

It is not that people indulge in injury to life only with specific motives. But sometimes they do so without any motive.

People indulge in acts of violence out of revenge, retribution or suspicion. This is indicated in the last part of the *sūtra* : as he had killed a relation of mine.

I shall kill him; he is killing, therefore I should kill him; if he survives, he would kill me, and therefore I should kill him.

#### 1.4.6 Air-bodied being

*lajjamāṇā puḍho pāsa.*

Look at various self-restrained people ashamed of their violent activities.

*aṇagārā motti ege pavayamāṇā.*

Some people style themselves as homeless mendicants.

*jaṃiṇaṃ virūvarūvehiṃ satthehiṃ vāukamma-samārambheṇaṃ vāusattaṃ sammārambhamāṇe aṇṇe vaṇegarūve pāṇe vihiṃsati.*

They indulge in violent actions to air-bodied beings with various weapons, which involve destruction of various other classes of beings.

*tattha khalu bhagavayā pariṇṇā paveiyā.*

On this subject the Lord has propounded the principle of comprehension and abandonment.

*imassa ceva jīviyassa, parivamdaṇa-māṇaṇa-pūyaṇṇe, jā-maraṇa-moyaṇe, dukkhaṇṇaḍighāyaheṃ.*

Longing for survival; praise, reverence and adoration; birth and death, emancipation; and elimination of physical and mental suffering.

*se sayameva vāu-sattaṃ samārambhati, aṇṇehiṃ vā vāu-sattaṃ samārambhāveti, aṇṇe vā vāu-sattaṃ samārambhamte samaṇujjāṇai.*

He himself indulges in killing the air-bodied beings or instigates others to do so or he approves of such killings by others.

*taṃ se ahiyāe, taṃ se abokīe.*

Such violence is for his harm, is for his non-enlightenment.

*se taṃ sambujjhamāṇe, āyāṇṭyaṃ samuṭṭhāe.*

He (the ascetic) comprehends the result of violence and applies himself to the practice of self-restraint.

*soccā bhagavao aṇagārāṇaṃ vā aṇṭie ihamegesiṃ naṃ bhavai—esa khalu gaṃthe, esa khalu mohe, esa khalu māre, esa khalu ṇīrae.*

Hearing from the *Jina* or other ascetics, some people come to know : such violence is indeed a knot, it is delusion, is death, is hell.

*icchatthaṃ gaḍhie loe.*

Nevertheless, the people entrapped into the pursuit of pleasure (indulge in violence to air-bodied beings).

*jaṃiṇaṃ virūvarūvehiṃ satthehiṃ vāukamma-samārambheṇaṃ vāusattaṃ sammārambhamāṇe aṇṇe vaṇegarūve pāṇe vihiṃsati.*

They indulge in violent actions to air-bodied beings with various weapons, which involve destruction of various other classes of beings.

*se bemi—appege aṇḍhamabbhe, appege aṇḍhamacche.*



Thus I say : somebody pierces and cuts the blind (air-bodied beings which have the feeling of intense pain like that of the human beings born blind, deaf, dumb, lame and deficient in other limbs).

*appege pāyamabbhe, appege pāyamacche.*

Some people pierce and cut foot, ankle etc.

*appege sampamārae, appege uddavae.*

Sometimes a person is beaten to a state of unconsciousness and sometimes tortured to death.

*se bemi—samti sampāimā pāṇā, āhacca sampayamti ya. pharisam ca khalu puṭṭhā, ege samghāyamāvajjamti.*

*je tattha samghāyamāvajjamti, te tattha pariyāvajjamti. se tattha pariyāvajjamti, te tattha uddāyamti.*

Thus I say : There are insects which fly into air impetuously, some of them are shrivelled by air-touch, faint and eventually die.

*ettham sattham samārambhamāṇassa iccete ārambhā aparīṇṇāyā bhavamti.*

The person thus indulging in acts of violence does neither comprehend, nor abandon them.

*ettha sattham asamārambhamāṇassa iccete ārambhā parīṇṇāyā bhavamti.*

The person thus indulging in acts of violence does neither comprehend, nor abandon them.

*ettha sattham asamārambhamāṇassa iccete ārambhā parīṇṇāyā bhavamti.*

The person not indulging in acts of violence is capable of comprehending and abandoning them.

*taṃ parīṇṇāyā mehāvī neva sayam vāu-sattham samārambhā, nevaṇṇehiṃ vāu-sattham samārambhā, nevaṇṇe vāu-sattham samārambhamte samaṇu-jāṇejjā.*

Comprehending this, an intelligent ascetic should not indulge in violence to the air-bodied beings, nor should he instigate others to do so, nor should he approve of such violence committed by others.

*jassete vāu-sattha-samārambhā parīṇṇāyā, bhavamti, se hu muṇī parīṇṇāyā-kamme.—tti bemi.*

The ascetic who comprehends and abandons these acts of violence to the air-bodied beings is indeed an ascetic who has fully comprehended and abandoned all acts of violence.

*ettham pi jāṇe uvādīyamāṇā.*

Here also one should know the monks—who are seized (by the sensual objects).

*je āyāre na ramamti.*

Who do not find interest in the discipline.

*ārambhamāṇā vāyāyam vāyamti.*

Who preach the discipline but indulge in violent activities.

*chamdevaṇṇīyā ajjhovavaṇṇā.*

Who are carried by their wishes and are addicted to sensual objects.

*ārambhasattā pakareṃti samgam.*

Who produce fresh bondage being addicted to violent activities.

*se vasumam savva-samannāgaya-paṇṇāeṇam akaraṇijjam pāvam kammam.*

A self-disciplined monk, endowed with comprehensible wisdom, cannot indulge in any harmful activity.

*taṃ no aṇṇesim.*

He should not seek for such (harmful activities).

*taṃ parīṇṇāyā mehāvī neva sayam chajjīva-ṇikkāya-sattham samārambhejjā, nevaṇṇehiṃ chajjīva-ṇikkāya-sattham samārambhāvejjā, nevaṇṇe chajjīva-ṇikkāya-sattham samārambhamte samaṇujāṇejjā.*

Comprehending this, an intelligent ascetic should not indulge in violence to the six classes of living beings, nor should he instigate others to do so, nor should he approve of such violence committed by others.

*jassete chajjīva-ñikāya-sattha-samārambhā pariññāyā bhavaṃti, se hu muṇīpariññāya-kame. —ttibemi*

The ascetic who comprehends and abandons these acts of violence to six classes of living beings is indeed an ascetic who has fully comprehended and abandoned all acts of violence. Thus I say.

In the *Nisūtha Bhāṣya* and the *Cūrṇi* the air-bodies are propounded as weapons to one another. In the *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*, the live or dead nature of air-bodies is said to be by virtue of their being at specific place and time.

Some body pierces and cuts the blind (air-bodies beings which have the feeling of intense pain like that of the human beings born blind, deaf, dumb, lame and deficient in other limbs).

Some people pierce and cut foot, ankle etc. (See *Sūtra* 29 for all the thirty two limbs of the body).

Some time a person is beaten to a state of unconsciousness and sometimes tortured to death.

The persons who are seized by the sensual objects, that is, attacked by them, indulge in injury to the air-bodie beings.

Those who do not find joy in the ethical bode have their minds overwhelmed by desire for pleasure and they indulge in injury to the air-bodies beings.

The people, who are not seized by the sensual objects, who find interest in the discipline, not indulging in injury to air-bodie beings.

In the absence of self-realization, equality cannot materialize in practical life. The person who has realized the self does not strive for anything else. He exerts only for the realization of the self.

One who perceives his pure self as essentially free from all dirt of karma is liberated from karma. The person who rivets his attention on pure consciousness does necessarily revel in it and not in anything else that causes karmic bondage, nor in sensual objects and passion.

By cutting down attachment and aversion by means of self-restraint and penance, the monk perceives is pure self-free of karma.

The unique state is pure consciousness. It is eternal and substantial, being ever beneficial; there is nothing else more valuable than it. All the sensual objects, being impermanent, are devoid of any essence.

The monk pursuing the unique end does not kill any creature, nor get it killed by others, nor does he approve of such killer. The person who has realized the unimpeachable self does not commend evil karma.

The heroes have directly experienced all these facts about the fire-bodie beings by cutting down the veils covering their power, knowledge and intuition by means of white (pure) meditation.

### 1.5. Critical Study

While describing the six classes of beings, the air-bodie are usually mentioned after the fire-bodie ones. Although the air-bodie beings are invisible and therefore difficult to believe. In order that the disciple might not have distrust in scripture by not believing in the existence of the air-bodie beings, the proper order is violated. But this view of the *Cūrṇi* deserves critical consideration.

Air though invisible, is not difficult to believe. In the present chapter, the main purpose is not to prove the existence of air, but the real intention is to prove that it is animate. On this issue, it can be asserted that the existence of life in earth, water etc. is equally difficult to believe. The plausible reason of the violation of the order is: the four immobile beings are considered together and thereafter the mobile beings are taken up for discussion. Air is included among the mobile beings and therefore air-bodie have been explained after discussing the immobile ones.

In the *Sthānāṅga* and the *Tattvārhasūtra*, the mobility of fire too is accepted. But fire is not mobile in the same sense as the air that has horizontal motion. This is why fire-bodie beings were mentioned in the series of immobile beings.

In the *Niryukti*, the following are mentioned as the weapons that cause injury to the air-bodie beings :

- (i) The generator of air current, viz. fan, palm fame, winnowing basket, cowries, and leaf, corner of a garment.
- (ii) Stationing oneself: It means standing against the air current, when one is perspiring.
- (iii) Fragrance of sandalwood and the fragrant root of the plant *Andropogon muricatus*, etc
- (iv) Fire : Its flame and heat.
- (v) Homogeneous weapon : The opposites viz. the cold and the hot air are the weapons mutually.

The world of long-bodies being refers to the vegetation world. It is so called because its body is long in size, and in respect of quantity of its substance it is infinite; the plant is in the world of long-lived beings as it is born repeatedly in a similar body for a long time. This meaning is available in the *cūṛṇi* and *Vṛtti*. But in the *Dasavaikālika*, “the world of long-bodie beings” stands for all kinds of loving beings, namely the earth-bodie and the like.

### 1.6 Nature of Non-violence

*Esa dhamme suddhe ṇiie sāsae samicca loyam kheyaṇṇehim pavēie.*

This is the pure, perennial and eternal doctrine, which was propounded by the self-realized *Arhats* who comprehended the world of living beings.

This five-member discipline of non-violence has four characteristics :

- (i) It is pure on account of its beings free from attachment and aversion,
- (ii) It is perennial because there is no scope of any change in it,
- (iii) It is eternally valid because it does not lose its validity in any of the three periods of the time,
- (iv) It is propounded by the self-realized *jīnas* who comprehended the world of living beings.

The religion propounded by the people, ignorant of the self, is impure, because it is polluted by attachment and aversion. Such religion is possessed of plurality of views with vitiated self-nature, on account of being devised by wayward intelligence. From this follows the universal rule that there is essential identity in the religion, which is revealed by the self-realized persons. Contrarily, there is no such identity in the religion that is preached by persons who have not realized the self.

The discipline of non-violence has been propounded by the self-realized *Jīnas*. The implication is that self-realization is the fountainhead of the discipline, not the intellect. One who has realized the self is omniscient. It is only the self-realized person who is capable of knowing the root cause of suffering.

*diṭṭham suyam mayam viṇṇāyam, jameyam parīkahijjai.*

Whatever has been said about the doctrine of non-violence has been realized, heard of, thought of and discriminated about. The aphorism of non-violence that is explained here has been realized, heard of, thought of and discriminated about. Realization means directly intuited by pure intuition. Heard of means learnt from the omniscient. Thought of means well pondered over. Discriminated means subjected of shifting knowledge.

#### 1.6.1 Basis of non-violence

According to *Ācārāṅga* basis of non-violence is self-restraint *sūtrakāra* has said—

*Iti kamaṃ pariṇṇāya, savvaso seṇa hiṃsati, samjamati ṇo pagabbhati*

Perfectly knowing the nature of karma in this manner, he does not indulge in violence to any being. He controls his senses and does not allow them to go astray.

In this way, having comprehended the nature of karma and the cause of karmic bondage, he does not indulge in any act of violence to any class of living beings. The basis of non-violence is self-restraint. Therefore, he restrains the activities of the senses and the mind. The root of self-restraint is shame (external and internal) or self-discipline. A person with shame (internal) does not commit any unworthy act even in privacy. He is never arrogant.

*Se bemije aīya, je ya pa uppanā, je ya "gāmess" arāham tā bhagavam to te save evemāikkham ti, evam bhāsam ti, evam pañnavem ti, evam parīvem ti—savve pāṇā save bhūtā save jīvā save sattā ṇa ham tavvā, ṇa ajjāveyavvā, ṇa parighetavvā, ṇa paritāveyavvā, ṇa uddaveyavvā.*

Thus do I say : All the adorable Lord who flourished in the past, are flourishing in the present and will flourish in the future unanimously declare, speak, propound and explain: animates, living beings, souls and living entities should not be injured, commanded, enslaved, tortured or killed.

No, to the query about promulgator of the aphorism of non-violence; no living being should be injured; the *Sūtra* says that the Adorable one promulgated this. This is an eternal truth and therefore the Adorable Ones of the past also did so; the present Ones are doing the same and the future Ones also will do so.

*assim ceyam pavuccai.*

It is rightly enunciated in the teaching of the Jinās. The doctrine "no living being should be injured" is the ultimate truth. It is exactly as it has been propounded.

### 1.6.2 Secret-realizer of Non-injury

*ṇa lippāi chaṇapaṇa vīre.*

He is not tainted by the acts of violence.

The present sutra discloses the heart of the principle of non-violence and defines the distinction between physical and spiritual violence.

The doctrine of the untrained state of the soul is very ancient. This is found in the *Uttarādhyayana*, 25/39 that says : "Tainting takes place in the case of the person who is addicted to sensual objects but it does not affect him who is free from such addiction."

In the Bhagavad-Gita also it is propounded that tainting does not occur in a person endowed with equanimity : "Even when engaged in any activity, a person is not tainted by it, if he is equanimous, pure, self-conqueror of self, sunder of the senses, and identified with the self of all other beings."

*Se mehāvī aṇugghāyaṇassa kheyāṇṇe, je ya bam dhappamokkh-amāṇṇesī*

The monk is in search of liberation from bondage is intelligent and the realizer of the secret of non-injury. The wise man that is in search of the release from karmic bondage acquires knowledge of non-injury. "Injury" means violence. "Non-injury" is non-violence. There is karmic bondage due to violence. And therefore, for the release from bondage, the knowledge of non-violence and also non-possessiveness which is the condition of the non-violence is indispensable. In the *cūrṇi*, the explanation of the word "aṇugghāyaṇa" is given differently : *aṇam* means karma; its *udghatanam* means production (*utpādanam*). The wise man knows the cause of production of karma.

### Who is entitled for non-violence?

*Tam jahāouṭṭhiesu vā, aṇuṭṭhiesu vā, uvatṭhiesu vā, aṇuvattṭhiesu vā. uvarayadam esu vā, aṇuvavarayadam esu vā, sovahiesu vā, aṇovahiesu vā, sam jogaraesu vā, asam jogaraesu vā.*

The discipline of non-violence is propounded for all (irrespective of their spiritual) condition such as whether they are spiritually awakened or not awakened for the practice of discipline; whether they are alert to the practice or not; whether they are eschewing or not eschewing the weapon of injury to life; whether they are possessed or not possessed of worldly thing; whether they are attached or not attached to their relations. There is a universal purpose for the formulation of a religious discipline. Ten conditions of such formulation are given here :

- (1) Awakened : exerting for the discipline.
- (2) Not awakened.
- (3) Alert : desirous of hearing or accepting the discipline.
- (4) Not alert.
- (5) Eschewing the weapon : self-restrained.
- (6) Not eschewing the weapon.
- (7) Possessed of material property : possessed of gold etc.
- (8) Not possessed of material property.
- (9) Attached to relations : with attachment to progeny, wife etc.
- (10) Not attached to relations.

The self-realized ones have propounded the discipline for all these categories of people.

### 1.7 Knowledge of non-violence is to know all doctrine

It is said in *ācārāṅga sūtra-jassa naṭhie imā nāi, añṇā tassa kao siyā?*

How could one who has no knowledge of the doctrine of *ahimsā* know about other doctrines?

One should cultivate disgust for the sensual objects; nor should one indulge in the hankering for worldly thing. This is the basic truth of non-violence and spiritualism. A person who has not the knowledge of this doctrine cannot have the knowledge of any other doctrine. The person, who cannot subdue the senses, cannot enter the realm of non-violence. Vigilance is non-violence.

Some *śramaṇas* and *brāhmaṇas* mutually contend. We have perceived, heard, reflected upon, thoroughly comprehended, scrutinized in all directions that there is no sin in committing violence of the living being.

One wonders whether there are *śramaṇas* and *brāhmaṇas* who approve of such kind of violence. One should not forget that in the age of Lord *Mahāvīra*, the principle of non-violence was not held in that great respect which it commands today. In those days, sacrificial violence was considered a religious act. Violence was approved for acquiring non-vegetarian food. In the present *Sūtra*, the opinion of the learned people who supported such violence in those days has found record. The propounder of Lord *Mahāvīra* said—We do however say, speak, explain and propound that “no animates, living beings, souls and living entities should be injured, commanded, enslaved, tortured and killed; you should know that there is no blemish in such actions (of non-violence).”

Clarification of the subject is given in Riga such as *puvvaṃ nikāya samayam patteyam pucchissāmoó ham bho pavāduryā! Kim bhe sāyam dukkham udāhu asāy am?*

The heretical teachers sticking to their own respective doctrines we should address, “O teachers! Is pain pleasant or unpleasant to you?” If the unwise persons do not properly understand the principle of non-violence even though adequately explained, one should feel indifferent. One should engage in debate with the council of knowledgeable people in the following order. First of all the opponents should be asked to make the solemn vow to speak the truth or they should be asked to acknowledge their own doctrines. And thereafter the question should be raised : “O heretics! Is pain pleasant to you or not?” Being thus asked, if they reply that pain was pleasant to them then such doctrine should be repudiated by the evidence of perceptual experience, verdict of the scripture and popular feeling against it. But if they confess that pain was not pleasant to them then the monk should address such people who have been brought to the right way of thinking in the above manner, as follow, “the pain is not only not liked by you, but it is not liked by all animates, living beings, souls and living entities; the pain is unpleasant, disagreeable and most dreadful. So it is said in *ācārāṅga eṇam bahiyāya loyam*’.

Overlook the world, which is opposed to non-violence. (The disciple is admonished thus:) “Comprehend the external world of heretics who are opposed to non-violence.” Comprehension is two fold: a close look at an object and non-indulgence in what is not right. You should not pay attention to the doctrines that are averse to non-violence. Whoever closely observes the living world is a knowledgeable person in this world.

### 1.7.1 Obstruction of non-violence

There are two obstacles to follow non-violence. They are (1) attachments to sensible, (2) hankering after worldly things. It is said in *inódiṭṭhehim nirveyam gacchejjā*—One should imbibe disgust towards sensual objects. Until and unless the obstructions that lie on the way of pursuing the discipline of non-violence are avoided, it is not possible to follow the discipline. The first obstruction is sensible. “Sensible” means sense-object such as sound, colour, smell, taste and touch. The person attached to the sensible is unable to keep the vow of non-violence. This is embodied in the statement that a follower of non-violence should imbibe disgust for the sensible; he should not relish them. Second one is hankering after worldly things.

“*no logassesaṇam care.*” One should not hanker after worldly things. The second obstruction to be practice of non-violence is the hankering after worldly things. “World” stand for the sensual objects. One should not run after such objects. Alternatively, the entire world hankers.

*narā muyaccā dhammavidu tti amjū.*

Only the person who are not-attached to the body can know the discipline and only those who know the discipline are straightforward.

Only those who are dead to embellishment of the body know the principle of *ahimsā*. Only those who are not attached to the body are upright.

In the *Sthānāṅga*, three varieties of possessions have been distinguished. Among them, the first and for most is “body”. Persons attached to the body indulge in manifold violence. This is why Lord *Mahāvīra* disclosed the secret: “Until and unless a person is dead to his body, he cannot really know the discipline.” The implication is that the person who is not dead to his body does not practice the discipline, although he learns and studies it.

It can be said that the person knowing the discipline is upright and also that the upright is the knower of the discipline. Says the *Uttarādhyāna* (3.12): “Purity belongs to the upright and the discipline flourishes in one who is pure.”

After the sensual objects; should not then I too engage in the search of them? Such though is but hankering after the world. A follower of non-violence should not indulge in such hankering. Such hankering leads to indulgence in violence. This is shown in the following passage of the *Uttarādhyāna* :

*jaṇeṇa saddhim kokkhāmi, ii bāle pagabbhāi  
kāmahogāṇurāṇam, kesam sampa ivajjāi*

I shall live as the people live, such is the thought of the in adept. He incurs affection on account of his lust for sensual enjoyment.

*tao se dam am samārabhāi, tasesu thāvaresu ya  
aṭṭhāe ya aṇaṭṭhāe, bhūyaggāmam vihim saī*

As a result, he commits injury to mobile and immobile beings and tortures the creatures with or without any purpose.

It is said in *ācārāṅga* - Having adopted the vow of non-violence, one should neither hide it nor forsake it. One should know it as it is (and practice it through out his life).

### 1.8 Conclusion

Having accepted the vow of non-violence, that is, the right view as predilection and also as practice, one should not conceal it or abandon it. For instance, some monks, after having accepted the vow of monk hood, run away from the discipline. A monk should observe the discipline for the whole life. The reason is, the discipline should be comprehended just as it is, and, therefore, even the idea of abandoning it is repugnant. Should any self-possessed person, after having appreciated the wisdom, like to abandon it? Only the person of unsettled mind would like to do so. One should not abandon it, but rather he should end his life instead, following the discipline. As it is said in the *Daśavaikālika Sūtra* : “one should rather give up his body than the commandment of the discipline”. It is commanded in to follow the vow of non-violence at greatest level—

*narā muyaccā dhammavidu tti amjū.*

Only the person who is not attached to the body can know the discipline and only those who know the discipline are straightforward. Only those who are dead to embellishment of the body know the principle of *ahimsā*. Only those who are not attached to the body are upright. In the *sthānāṅga*, three varieties of possessions have been distinguished. Among them, the first and foremost is “body”. Persons attached to the body indulge in manifold violence. This is why Lord *Mahāvīra* disclosed the secret: “Until and unless a person is dead to his body, he cannot really know the discipline.” The implication is that the person who is not dead to his body does not practice the discipline, although he learns and studies it. It can be said that the person knowing the discipline is upright and also that the upright is the knower of the discipline. Says the *Uttarādhyayana*. “Purity belongs to the upright and the discipline flourishes in one who is pure.”

## QUESTION BOOK

### Long Answer Type Questions :

1. Give an introduction to *Acāraṅga* and throw light on its importance.
2. Write an essay on “*Atmawada*”(Doctrine of Soul) on the basis of *Acāraṅga*.
3. Write an useful essay on rebirth.
4. Brief detail of *Sadjiva Niakaya*.
5. Throw light on the subject matter of *Acāraṅga*.

### Short Answer Type Questions:

1. What is violence?
2. Whoes, which have write of Non-violence?
3. In *Ayaro*, what is the nature of violence?
4. What is transformation of *Atma-darshan*?
5. Give detail of commentary text on *Ayaro*.

### Objective Type Questions:

1. Is the soul both knowledge and knower?
2. What is the meaning of *Sat*?
3. What is said for consciousness in *Bhagwati Sutra*.
4. What is the main theme of first chapter named *Sastra Parijna*?
5. The ancient part of Jain literature is .....
6. In *Dvadasamgi* ..... comes first.
7. *Niryuktikara Bhadrabahu* has said for *Acāraṅga Bhagavan* and .....
8. Self-controlled action is called.....
9. In first chapter of *Acāraṅga* ..... word has been used for plant- bodied beings.

### Reference Books:

- (i) *Ayaro* (ii) *Acāraṅga niryukti* (iii) *Samavāyāṅga* (iv) *Sutrakṛtāṅgacūrri* (v) *Āicāraṅgabhāsyā*, (iv) *Suttanipatta* (vii) *Gīṭā* (viii) *Pātanjalayogadarsana* (ix) *Uttarādhyayana Sutra*

## Unit - 2 : Sūtrakṛtāṅga

- 1.0 Meaning of the word *āgama* (scriptures), its synonym and definition
  - 1.1 Meaning of the word *āgama*
  - 1.2 Synonyms of *āgama*
  - 1.3 Definition of *āgama*
  - 1.4 Different names of SūtraKṛtāṅga
- 2.0 Form and size of SūtraKṛtāṅga
- 3.0 Subject and nature of this holy text:
  - 3.1 First part of SūtraKṛtāṅga
  - 3.2 The second volume
- 4.0 Author and the time of writing Sūtrakṛtāṅga
- 5.0 Writing style
- 6.0 Commentaries and associated later writings
  - 6.1 Niryukti
  - 6.2 Cūṃṇi
  - 6.3 Vṛtti
  - 6.4 Dīpikā
  - 6.5 Vivaraṃa
  - 6.6 Stabaka
- 7.0 Brief explanation of the first volume of Sūtrakṛtāṅga.
- 8.0 First topic
  - 8.1 Bondage and release from it
  - 8.2 Paṃcamahābhūtavāda
  - 8.3 Ekātmavāda
  - 8.4 Tajjīva-taccharīravāda
  - 8.5 Akāra kavāda (Sāṃkhya)
  - 8.6 Ātmañāṅṭhavāda
  - 8.7 Paṃcaskāṃdhavāda and Caturdhātuvāda
  - 8.8 Non-sustainability of these monist philosophies.
- 9.0 Supplement- Second lesson second topic
  - 9.1 Fatalists, Niyativāda
  - 9.2 Ajñānavāda
  - 9.3 Kriyavādi
- 10.0 Third topic
  - 10.1 Ādhākarma flaws
  - 10.2 Views of different philosophies concerning creation and functioning of the world.
  - 10.3 Reincarnation (Avatāravāda)
  - 10.4 Assurance of liberation and praise own doctrine
- 11.0 Fourth topic
  - 11.1 Principle of begging (for food)
  - 11.2 Lokavāda
  - 11.3 Nature of Ahimsā (non violence)
  - 11.4 Life style of a monk for spiritual purification..



## 1.0 Meaning of the word *āgama* (scriptures), its synonym and definition

The unique and fundamental literature of any religious order and faith hold an important place amongst its followers and practitioners. This is the reason that each and every religion of the world has its own holy texts which enshrine its basic doctrines, principles, directives and sermons of its propagator.

The holy texts / scriptures of Vedic tradition are called Vedas; Tripiṭṭakas of Buddhists, Bible of Christians, Avestā of Parsis, and Quran shariff of Muslims. In a similar fashion, the holy texts of Jains are called *āgamas*. These *āgamas* contain the sermons of the latest fordmaker (*tīrathamkara*) of Jains, Bhagavāna Mahāvīra.

### 1.1 Meaning of the word *āgama*

The word *āgama* is an amalgam of two words namely “*ā*” and “*gama*” where “*ā*” stands for complete meaning and the word “*gama*” means motion /state or achievement. In Ācāraṅga, the word *āgama* has been used for knowing.

### 1.2 Synonyms of *āgama*

In Jain tradition, generally the ancient holy texts are called *āgama* but they were as *śruti* even before this usage. In Anuyogadwāra and Viśeṣāvāsyakabhāṣya, we find the synonyms like *sutra*, *grantha*, *siddhānta*, *pravacana*, *ājñā*, *vacana*, *updeśa*, *prajñāyapanā* etc for *āgama*. Similarly Umā Svāti in Tattvārathabhāṣya uses *śruti*, *āpta*, *vacana*, *āgama*, *updeśa*, *āmnāya*, *pravacana* and *jinavacana* as synonym of *āgamas*. Thus we find many synonyms for *āgama* in Jain holy texts.

### 1.3 Definition of *āgama*

Various authors (both preceptors and scholars) of Jain religious texts have given many definitions of *āgama*, namely:

- i. *Sarvajñapranītopadeśa* or the sermons of the omniscient.
- ii. That which provides the true knowledge of the substances and entities.
- iii. That which provides comprehensive knowledge with limitations of the entities.

Jain *āgamas* have been classified in tow categories namely Aṅga Praviṣṭa and Aṅga Bāhya.

### 1.4 Different names of Sūtrakṛtāṅga:

This *āgama* is the second limb /part of Aṅga Praviṣṭa. In Samvāya, Nandi and Anuyogadwārasutra, we find its name mentioned as Sūyagaḍo. Author of Niryuktis, Ācārya Bhadra Bāhu II has used following three different names for this *āgama*:

- i. Sūtagaḍa                      Sūtakṛta
- ii. Suttakaḍa                     Sūtrakṛta
- iii. Sūyagaḍa                    Sūcākṛta

These three names have further been detailed as follows:

- i. This *āgama* had been written based on the sermons of Mahāvīra and composed in text form by his principal disciples called *gaṇadhara*s. Therefore it is called *sūtakṛta*.
- ii. We acquire knowledge about basic elements (*tattvas*) through the use of aphorisms (*sūtra*) hence it is called *sūtrakṛta*.
- iii. It gives detailed exposition of self and non-self entities. So it is called Sūcākṛta. It abounds in philosophical discussions.

## 2.0 Form and size of Sūtrakṛtāṅga:

This *āgama* consists of two volumes /parts as indicated in Nandi and Samavāya. The first volume consists of sixteen chapters while the second volume consists of seven chapters as mentioned in Uttarādhyayana, Āvaśyaka, Nandi and Samavāya. Their particulars are as follows:

## First Volume

Topics	Topics	Size (verses)
01 Samae (samaya) doctrine	4	88
02 Veyālie (Vaitāliya)	3	76
03 Uvasaggapariṇṇā (upasargaparijñā)	4	82
04 Itthipariṇṇā (striparijñā)	2	53
05 Narayavibhatti (Narakavibhakti)	2	52
06 Mahāvīratthui (Mahāvīrastuti)		29
07 Kusilaparibhāsitaṃ (Kusilaparibhāsita)		30
08 Vīriyaṃ (Vīrya)		27
09 Dhammo (Dharma)		36
10 Samāhi (Samādhi)		24
11 Magge(Mārga)		38
12 Samosaraṇaṃ (Samavasaraṇa)		22
13 Ahuttahiyaṃ (Yathātathya)		23
14 Gaṃtho (Gaṃtha)		27
15 Jamaie (Yamkiya)		25
16 Gāhā (Gāthā)		6 sutras

## Second Volume

Topics	Size (verses)
01 Poṃḍarie (Paṇḍarika)	72 sutras
02 Kiriyaṭhāṇe (Kriyasthāna)	81 sutras
03 Āhārapariṇṇā (āhāraparijñā)	102 sutra
04 Paekkhāṇakriyā (Pratyākhānakriyā)	25 sutras
05 Āyārasuyaṃ (ācārasruta)	33 verses
06 Addijjaṃ (ādrakiya)	55 verses
07 ṇālaṃdaijjaṃ (Nālaṃdiya)	38 sutras

It is mentioned that the total words (*pada*) in this text is 36000.

### 3.0 Subject and nature of this holy text:

While describing / mentioning SūtraKṛtāṃga in Nandi and Samvāya; it is mentioned that topics like his-creed (*sva-mata*) and other-creeds (*para-mata*), *jīva*, *ajīva*, *puṇya* (merit), *pāpa*(demerit), *āśrava* (influx), *bandha*, *saṃvara* (stoppage), *nirjarā* (dissociation) and *mokṣa* (liberation) have been discussed and analyzed along with the sermons for the newly inducted monks in the creed. Further it has discussions about refuting 180 *Kriyāvādi*, 84 *Akriyāvādi*, 67 *Ajñānvādi* and 32 *Vinayavādi* for a total of 363 other creeds.

### 3.1 First part of SūtraKṛtāṃga

The first topic of the first part of the text is called *samaya*. Here possessions are equated to bondage and violence as the basis of animosity, other creeds (*para-mata*) along with refutation of creeds like *bhūtavāda*, monism like *ātmādvaitavāda* (one type of reality i.e. living beings), one soul only (*ekātmavāda*), inertness of the soul (*akāra-kavāda*), *kriyāvāda* and *niyatīvāda* (fatalism or determinism).

The second topic “Vaitālika” preaches reduction of family affection, winning bodily afflictions (*pariśaha*) and passions (*kaśāya*) etc; monks to give up walking or moving from one place to other after sunset so that he can free himself from delusions and physical inclinations and meditate on his self. This topic has three sections.

The third topic “*Upsarga*” describes both pleasant and unpleasant bodily afflictions and the greater danger of pleasant afflictions. In the end, service of the sick and developing endurances to the afflictions is emphasized. It has four sections.

The fourth topic “*Stri Parijñā*” emphasizes endurances of the afflictions due to women. By describing the conditions of those who have fallen to female attractions and those who have overcome such attractions, it encourages the monks to stay away from the company of females. It has two sections.

The fifth topic “*Naraka Vibhakti*” describes the enormous pains that infernal beings suffer in the hell. All the three traditions namely Buddhism, Vedic and Jain literature describes the conditions of hells. Yogasutra’s Vyāsabhāṣya talks of seven hells while Bhāgavata talks of 28 hells. Kokāliya of Suttanipāta (of Buddhists) describes the hells which is very similar to the description of hells given here. This topic has two sections.

The sixth topic “*Vīrastuti*” gives veneration of sramana Mahāvīra by using many similes. This is the oldest *stuti* of Mahāvīra which gives a heart touching rendition of his virtues by equating him with Airāvata amongst elephants, lion amongst the dears, Ganga amongst the rivers, *garuḍa* amongst the birds etc thereby making him the supreme most.

The seventh topic is about *kuṣīla* or wicked character. It talks of desirable (*śīla*), non-compliance of desirable (*aśīla*) and bad /undesirable (*kuṣīla*) conduct /character. Also this topic describes a householder who does not practice self-restraint, and does not have good character. These types of character are discussed in this topic namely:

- i. Perfection is reached by abstaining from salt.
- ii. Perfection is reached by use of cold water
- iii. Perfection is reached by using fire.

The author has first given examples to refute these beliefs and then said that perfection is attained by one who destroys attachment, aversion, anger, lust, greed etc. There are 30 verses in this topic.

The eighth topic talks about exertion (effort). It talks of two types of exertions namely abstention-pious (propagating self-restraint and pious for attaining perfection) and careless-wicked.

The ninth topic is path of the religion (law of *dharma*) as enunciated by Lord Mahāvīra. The commentator has talked about law of nation, cult, congregation, heretics, scriptures, right conduct and the householder.

The topic is devoted to carefulness (*samādhi*) which means contentment in self, happiness and bliss. This topic talks of four types of carefulness namely thought, scriptures, faith and conduct.

The eleventh topic is called the path. Here the path is described as consisting of knowledge, faith, and conduct and austerities for attaining *samādhi*.

The twelfth topic is known as the creed (*samavasaraṇa*). The four heretic creeds mentioned are *Akriyāvādi*, *Kriyāvādi*, *Ajñānavādi* and *Vinayavādi*.

The thirteenth topic talks of the real truth. The true practitioner of *mokṣa mārga* is without any pride.

The fourteenth topic is called *nirgrantha*. For the practitioner of *mokṣa mārga*, the first requirement is that he should be in the vicinity of a teacher. The four main limbs of the practice are i. non-possession, ii. celibacy, iii. obedience of the teacher and iv. alertness (absence of laziness).

The fifteenth topic is called the *yamakiya*. It is also known as *ādānīya* describing the benefits accrued by practicing self-restraint and *mokṣa mārga*.

The sixteenth topic is called the song (*gāthā*). The commentator has clarified the meaning of *gāthā* as something which can be sung in sweet tone. Another explanation of *gāthā* is given as the verse with plenty of meanings / sermons. In this topic the monk is also called as *māhaṇa*, *śramaṇa*, *bhikṣu* and *nirgrantha*.

### 3.2 The second volume:

The first topic is called the lotus (*punḍarīka*). It describes the world as the lotus pool. This pool is filled with

water like karmas and mud like lust. In the centre of this pool, there is a lotus which can be reached and achieved only by a practitioner of great vows of detachment, non violence etc.

The second topic is called activity and its place. It encourages the practitioner to practice religious activities by describing them.

The third topic is called knowledge of food. This topic details the food of the practitioner. It says that the practitioner should accept food with utmost care.

The fourth topic is called knowledge of renunciation activity. This topic describes these activities to make the life of self restraint.

The fifth topic is called freedom from errors or knowledge of conduct for monks. It emphasizes the need for deep knowledge of scriptures to practice right conduct. It also gives details of the type of language to be refrained from by the monk.

The sixth topic is called Ādrakiya and describes the non Jain prince Ādraka becoming a Jain monk and then refuting the heretics like Gośālaka, Hasti etc.

The seventh topic is called Nālandā. This topic describes the discussions between *gaṇadhara* Gautama and Pethālaputra and his acceptance of the five fold vows instead of the four fold vow of Pārśva.

We thus find very important philosophical discussions in *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*. Side by side it also encourages us to practice the spiritual doctrines along with the vows of the monks and refute the heretic creeds. The main reason for the extreme importance of *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* is due to its being the only *aṅga* which talks of other creeds. The way the doctrines of other heretic philosophies are discussed here make one conclude that those were not yet matured faiths and were just the pronouncements of their preacher-leaders. Ācārya Śīlāṅka has presented these philosophies in the form of discussions in his commentary. This *aṅga* is also important for those who wish to perform research in other philosophies existent at the time of Mahāvīra, their religious and philosophical beliefs etc.

#### 4.0 Author and the time of writing *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*.

Traditionally, it is said that the twelve limbs were authored by the eleven main /principle disciples (*gaṇadhara*) of Mahāvīra. However none of the *aṅga* is available today in its original form and without any changes made to the original. Whatever *aṅga* literature we have got today is compilations in later periods. In this way we can say that Devārdhigaṇī is the author of the present *aṅgas*.

Further we can accept the views of Prof Winternitz that the first volume of present *aṅga* is original while the second volume is newer compared to the first volume. Language, style of writing and use of words in the first volume does lead us to this conclusion (like in *Ācāraṅga*). Like the second volume of *Ācāraṅga* had been added to it as an annexure; so does the second volume of *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* appears to have been added as an annexure to it later on.

The first volume had been written by Sudharmā and hence its time can be considered as 5<sup>th</sup> century BC while we are not sure about the time of writing of the second volume. The first volume was available to Devārdhigaṇī. It has certain words from Māgadhi e.g. *akammā*, *asmākaṃ* which should have been in Pākṛta as *akamhā*, *amham*. Śīlāṅka in his commentary says that these words (in second volume) were used (like in Saṃskṛta) by the nomads and women in Magadha at that time leading us to say that the second volume was written in 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC as the Jain monks were also moving around in that area during that time.

#### 5.0 Writing style

The first volume appears to be written in verse form except the sixteenth topic. Actually it is also not written in prose form as the commentator has given detailed explanations of the word verse and hence called this section also as song and a verse. The major part of second volume is written in prose form. We also find occasional use of some mysterious styles also. The second volume is mainly written in detailed prose form. Occasionally we find certain mythical prose also used as seen below.

*Jahā puvvaṃ avaram, jahā avaram taha puvvaṃ* Su 2.1.54

*Ettha vi siyā, ettha viṇo siyā* Su 2.1.60

This text has also used dramas and examples as appropriate. In the first volume, the drama of the lotus is indeed very beautiful. We can also find examples given at many places. In these the dialogue form of question and answer had been used. This method had been used nicely in the second volume.

The first volume's topic titled "Yamaka" uses a lot of adjectives which is a beautiful example of the poetic form of the holy texts. Given below are the two verses as examples.

*Bhutesu ṇa virujjhejjā esa dhamme vusimao.  
Vusimaṇ jagaṇ pariṇṇāya asti jīviyabhāvanā  
Bhāvaṇajog asuddhappā jale ṇāva va āhiyā.  
ṇāvā va tisaraṇpaṇṇā savvadukkhā tiṭṭhi.*

## 6.0 Commentaries and associated later writings

Sūtrakṛtāṅga is a highly venerated canonical text of Jains. Its philosophical value is immense as it has detailed discussions of different philosophies at Mahāvīra's time. A number of preceptors have therefore written a lot on this canon. The following are the principle texts written on Sūtrakṛtāṅga, namely Nirukti, Cūṇi, Vṛtti, Dīpikā, Vivarana and Stabaka.

### 6.1 Nirukti

This is the oldest explanatory text on Sūtrakṛtāṅga with 204 *gāthās*. It contains many important information and historical pointers. This is the basis of all other explanatory texts written. It is written in prose form in Prākṛta language. It is written by Bhadra Bāhu-II in fifth century Vikrama.

### 6.2 Cūṇi

After Nirukti, this is the second explanatory text. It is very important to understand the gist of Sūtrakṛtāṅga. It is written in prose form in mixed Saṃskṛta-Prākṛta languages. It is written by Jinadāsagaṇi. From historical view, it is an important text for review and analysis. Its style is similar to the Ācāraṃga-cūṇi. The writer has at one place even said that a particular section is written in a similar fashion as in Ācāraṃga-cūṇi and Kalpacūṇi. From this we can conclude that all these cūṇis were written by one author.

### 6.3 Vṛtti

Written by Śīlāṃka in Saṃskṛta, this is the third explanatory text having crisp explanations at a number of places. It is assumed to have been written in 8<sup>th</sup> century AD.

### 6.4 Dīpikā

It was written by Sādhuraṅga in 1542 in Saṃskṛta language.

### 6.5 Vivarana

It was written in 1826 by Harṇakula in Saṃskṛta language.

### 6.6 Stabaka

It was written by Pārśvacandra in Gujrati

The last three texts are based on Vṛtti by Śīlāṃka.

## 7.0 Brief explanation of the first volume of Sūtrakṛtāṅga.

The subject of this part is Jain creed (*svamata*) and few doctrines of other creeds (*paramata*). It has four chapters and 88 verses. Various other creeds discussed in these four chapters are as follows.

- Paṃcabhūtavāda, Ekātmavāda, Tajjīva-taccharīravāda, Akāra kavāda, Ātmañāṅthavāda and Afalavāda.
- Niyativāda, Aṇṇavāda, Jṇānavāda and Karmacaya-abhāvavāda.

- iii. Ādhākarma and kṛtavāda.
- iv. Paratīrthika is compared to laity not practicing any vows.

Actually this part is an analysis of some popular principles of other creeds. Ācārya Mahāprajña has grouped various subjects in this part in the following manner.

Verse	Subject
1-6	Bondage and release from it
7-8	Pañcabhūtavāda
9-10	Ekātmavāda
11-12	Tajjīva-taccharīravāda
13-14	Akārakavāda
15-16	Ātmañāṅṭhavāda
17-18	Buddhist doctrine of <i>pañcaskandha</i> and <i>caturdhātuvāda</i>
19-27	Refuting the doctrines of Ekātmavāda philosophies
28-40	Niyativāda
41-50	Ajnānavāda
51-59	Karmacaya-abhāvavāda of Buddhists
60-63	Views on creation of the universe by different philosophers
64-69	Ādhākarma flaws and their discussion
70-71	Reincarnation
72-73	Praise of the knowledge of the soul.
74-75	Siddhavāda
76-79	Doctrine of begging for food
80-82	discussion on the universe form and nature
83-85	Nature of Ahimsā
86-88	Way of life for the monk

Some original concepts discussed in this part are:

- i. Relation between possessions and pain (2)
- ii. Relation between violence and animosity (3).
- iii. Revealing the basis of violence based on possessions
- iv. To give up violence and possessions, right faith is essential
- v. Relief from pain is from knowledge of *dharma* (desirable activities) and *adharma* (activities to be given up) and not from logical discussions. (46-49).

In this way, this part of Sūtrakṛtāṅga has beautiful discussions on different creeds, their doctrines and knowledge on bondage and release from it. Jambū asks Sudharmā “*Kimāha bandhanaṃ vīre?, Kim vā jānaṃ tiuṭṭai?*” i.e. What is bondage according to Mahāvīra and what are the ways to break them? In response to this query, Sudharmā says Possessions is bondage, violence is bondage and their cause is attachment. The way to get release from bondage is to experience and have faith in the painful nature of possessions and family and the progression of life towards death fast.”(verse2-5).

Similarly the cūṃpi unveils a number of facts. Śīlāṅka as also given valuable information such as in 66<sup>th</sup> verse, it says “*mārena santhuyā māyā*” pointing to the story about the origin of death, as also discussed in Mahabharat chapter 53 Dronaparva. He has given the verse of Nāgārjuna (given below) instead of the original one.

*Ativaddhīyajīvā nam, mahī viṇṇavate pabhūṃ,  
tato se māyāsamjutte, kare lokassaabhiddavā*

Now we shall present the subject discussed in the first four chapters serially

## 8.0 First topic

### 8.1 Bondage and release from it

The first six verses of the first chapter of Sūtrakṛtāṅga discuss bondage and the ways to get release from it. The first verse talks of knowing the bondage and then breaking it. The next three verses (2-4) talk of causes of bondage, and next two verses (5-6) talk of achieving release from bondage.

1. *Bujjhejja tiuttejjā, bamdhaṇaṃ parijāṇiyā*  
*Kimāha bamdhaṇaṃ vīre? Kim vā jāṇaṃ tiuttai?* -1

Meaning: Sudharmā says “Acquire the true knowledge. Knowing the bondage of soul, then try to get release from the same”. Jambū then asks “What is bondage as per Mahāvīra? which truth, when known helps in getting the release of soul?”

2. *cittamaṃtamacittaṃ vā, parigijjha kisāmavi*  
*aṇṇaṃ vā aṇṇujāṇāi, evaṃ dukkhā ṇa muccai* -2

Meaning: Sudharmā answered “He who owns even a little live or non living beings as possessions or even has a feeling of mine towards them; or supports /praises others who have them, can never get the release of his soul from pain/bondage”.

3. *sayam tivātae pāṇe, aduvā aṇṇehiṃ ghāyae*  
*haṇamatam vāṇujāṇāi, veraṃ vaddhai appaṇo* -3

Meaning: ‘A person with possessions, kills living beings, or causes other men to kill them or consents to their killing them, his iniquity /pain/bondage will keep on increasing.’

4. *jassimi kule samuppanṇe, jehiṃ vā samvase ṇa e*  
*mamātī luppatī bāle, aṇṇamannehiṃ mucchie* -4

Meaning: A man develops fellow feeling with the family he is born in and with whom he lives. He makes the interests of his kinsmen and companions his own. Thus his interests keep on growing and destroy him. He can never get release from pain /bondage.

5. *vittam soyariyā ceva, savvameyaṃ ṇa tāṇai*  
*saṃdhāti jīvitaṃ ceva, kammaṇā u tiuttai* -5

Meaning: All this wealth and his nearest relations cannot protect him from future miseries; knowing this and the value of life, he will get rid of karma.

6. *ee gamthe viukkamma, ege samaṇamāhaṇā*  
*ayāṇamā vūssitā, sattā kāmehiṃ māṇavā* -6

Meaning: Some men, śramaṇas and brāhmaṇas, who ignore and deny these true words and adhere to their own tenets with pride, are engrossed in the worldly pleasures.

“*ācāraḥ prathamo dharmah*” is the famous aphorism of the holy texts on conduct. On closer evaluation of this aphorism, we find that importance of conduct is indicated but not the basis or the reason thereof. Mahāvīra’s sutra for conduct is “*jñānaṃ prathamo dharmah*” i.e. knowledge first and then conduct as it is said in Dasavaikālika sūtra “*paḍhamam jñānaṃ tao dayā*”. Without knowledge, one can neither decide about the right conduct nor practice it. The first part of first verse “*Bujjhejja tiuttejjā*” reveals thus truth also. First know the bondage and then try to achieve release from the same. What is bondage and what are its causes? What are the means to achieve the release from the same? Only after knowing all these can we get release from bondage. This view neither just supporting the votaries of knowledge only nor the supporters of just action /conduct only but a combined version of both.

“*budhyate aneneti bodhaḥ*” means the means by which knowledge is acquired as knowledge but Mahāvīra does not imply this. His reference is to the knowledge which originates from the soul directly. His reference to the

knowledge (*bodha*) is to know the attributes of pure soul (non concrete, eternal, having infinite intuition-knowledge-bliss etc) and its bondage with the body is due to auspicious and inauspicious acts by him and these acts /karmas are unworthy. To acquire this type of knowledge is implied by “*Bujjhejja*”. “*tūṭṭhejja*” means to break. Breaking is of two types” namely material breakage (i.e. breakage of any material things) and psychic breakage (removing or eliminating delusion, ignorance and disinterest in vows). To eliminate attachment, aversion, laziness etc and bondage of eight types of karmas is also termed as psychic breakage. Here “*tūṭṭhejja*” implies psychic breakage.

“*Bujjhejja* “*tūṭṭhejja*” also points to a very important and distinguishing doctrine of Jains i.e. “*jñānakriyābhyām mokṣaḥ*” or knowledge and conduct together are essential to attain liberation. Vedānta and Sāṃkhya support liberation by just knowledge while Mīmāṃsā and others support liberation by just action. However Jains say that first acquire the knowledge and then break it by conduct.

It is in this context that Jambū asks Sudharmā as to what bondage as per Mahāvīra is and how the same can be broken? In response to these two questions, said “possession and violence are bondages, cause of bondage is-mineness and means to attain release from bondage and attachments are (i). faith in the incapability of family and material possessions to protect and (ii). life is moving fast towards death.”

### 1.1. Nature of bondage

*Bandhana* or bondage is an act by which the soul becomes dependent on others. Here *bandhana* is the definitive word of Jain karma doctrine. Therefore the commentator Śīlāṅka has given the meaning to bondage as “bondage is the coming together firmly of the matter karma particles with the space points of the soul”. Tattvārathasūtra gives the nature of bondage as “Soul tainted with passion accumulates the matter particles capable of becoming karmas.”

### 1.2 Causes of bondage

Tattvārathasūtra gives five main causes of bondage namely perverted views (*mūḥyādarśana*), disinterest in the vows (*avīratī*), vigilance (*pramāda*), passions (*kaṣāya*) and activities (*yoga*). Sūtrakṛtāṅga in verses 2-4 talks of possessions as the root cause of bondage. *Avīratī* i.e. disinterest in *ahiṃsā*, *satya*, *acaurya*, *aparigraha* and *brahmcarya* is of five types. Because all opposite activities i.e. violence, telling lies, stealing, having possessions and adultery in conduct are all for possessions only, therefore Sūtrakṛtāṅga calls possessions as the main cause of bondage.

Commentators of the canonical texts talk of two types of possessions namely external and internal. In the second verse, two types of external possessions are indicated namely of living beings and non living beings. Human beings, birds, animals trees, grain etc. belong to the living beings possession while house, money, gold, cloths, jewelry etc. belong to the non living beings category. The four passions (anger, greed, pride and deceit), nine small passions like laughter etc, perverted views, craving, attachments etc are internal possessions as they belong to the soul. If one develops even the slightest attachment towards these then they become the cause for bondage as Mahāvīra as identified infatuation as possession also.

Like having possessions is the cause of bandage, similarly due to the fear of bondage if we ask others to protect or keep our possessions or if we encourage others to acquire possessions, then the same also becomes the causes for bondage. The preceptors say that a man with possessions cannot be released from pains. To acquire possessions involve pain. After earning protection of the possessions also cause pains. Loss of possessions also causes pains. The ill-like jealousy, animosity, aversion, attachment, deceit etc all are caused by possessions. Therefore possession by themselves are pain causing. An empirical soul with possessions experience many pains through transmigration in different destinies like subhuman, hellish etc. In this way a person with possessions get pain in this and future lives.

In the third verse, even violence is also indicated as a cause of bondage. The synonym for violence in Jain texts is *prāṇātīpāta*. Generally *hiṃsā* is meant as to kill. But the word *prāṇātīpāta* implies even causing pain or destroying one of the ten life forces (*prāṇa*). The violent person enhances the generation of his enemies since the



victim develops anger, hatred, aversion and animosity against the violent person. In the present verse, all three types i.e. one who commits violence or the one who asks others to commit violence or the person who admires the violence or violent person are mentioned. We commit violence to acquire possessions. Wherever there are possessions, violence will be there. Thus there is a universal relationship between violence and possessions. Both are the causes of bondage. Even though attachment and aversion are also the causes of bondage, yet both of them also stimulates due to possessions only. Therefore possessions and violence are the only root causes of bondage.

A man with possession destroys the life forces of living beings thereby developing animosity for several life spans. In this way he can never be free from the pains of bondage. He immediately gets entangled in one pain after getting relief from the other.

In the fourth verse, the author again describes a psychological fact that a person maintains attachment with the family he is born in or with whom he lives. Hence he cannot get release from the chain of perpetual bondage. Author of cūṃṃi presents a four prolonged explanation in this regard.

- i. The person develops infatuation with his parents even though they do not so
- ii. The parents are infatuated with the son but the son is not.
- iii. Both are infatuate with each other.
- iv. Both are not infatuate in each other.

The commentator has interpreted the third explanation as “first a man loves his parents, then he loves his wife and children and then his grand children and so on”. Thus he cannot destroy his attachment /infatuation and progress on the path to liberation. Thus infatuation or attachment has been identifies as a cause for bondage.

### 1.3 Methods for achieving the release from bondage.

In the first verse the question was raised what is to be known so as to break the bondage. In reply to this question the fifth verse talks of two ways namely:

- i. All living and non-living beings are incapable for providing protection
- ii. Life is momentary and of very short duration.

“*mana eva manuṣyāṇāṃ kāraṇaṃ bandhaṃokṣayo*”- i.e. the cause of bondage of a human being is his mind. It is mind which causes the infatuation-attachment resulting in bondage. Again it is the mind only which causes the release from the bondage. When a person realizes that nothing can protect him and the life is fast approaching death, then he succeeds in getting release from the bondage. Thus we conclude that karma is bondage, its (bondage) indirect causes are attachment and aversion and the direct causes are possessions and violence. Without eliminating the causes, the effect cannot be eliminated. Therefore without eliminating the causes of bondage, one cannot achieve release from bondage. Infatuation for violence and possessions are those eternal truths knowing which one can get the release from the bondage. Perverted view i.e. non belief or opposite belief in the nature of reality (i.e. with origination-decay and persistence), is the first of the five main causes of bondage. Reality is both eternal and momentary, and to consider the reality as just eternal or just momentary is perverted view. There are two types of primary elements namely *jīva* (living beings) and *ajīva* (non living beings). To consider just one of them as real only is perverted view. From this viewpoint, Paṃcabhūtavāda, Ekātnavāda, Tajjīvataccharīravāda, and Akārakavāda etc. are morist doctrines and fall in the category perverted views /doctrines and so cause bondage. Hence to have belief in morist doctrines is the cause of bondage.

### 2.0 Paṃcamahābhutavāda

Earth, water, fire, air and space are the five gross elements which are the cause of origination of an element called *ātmā*. When these five gross elements are destroyed then the soul also gets destroyed. These are described in Sūtrakṛtāṅga as follows:

7. *saṃti paṃca mahabbhūyā, ihamegesimāhiyā  
puḍhavi āu teū, vāu āgāsapaṃcamā*

-7

Meaning: Some philosophers profess the exclusive belief in the five gross elements namely earth, water, fire, wind and air.

8. *ee pañca mahabbhūyā, tebbho ego tti āhiyā*  
*aha esiṃ viñāse hoi dehiṇo*

-8

Meaning: These five gross elements are the original causes of things, from them arises another thing i.e. soul (*ātmā*). On dissolution of these five gross elements, the soul ceases to exist.

In these verses, the nature of Pañcamahābhūtavāda is discussed. The commentator calls Cārvākas as the proponent of Pañcamahābhūtavāda. The commentator further raises an issue of including the Sāṃkhya and Vaiśeṣika etc as Pañcamahābhūtavādīs also. He then himself answers by saying that “Sāṃkhya consider *prakṛti* transforming into *mahat*, *mahat* into *ahaṃkāra* and so in sixteen other elements while Vaiśeṣika consider time, soul etc as other gross elements also while Cārvākas do not consider soul or any other gross element except the five indicated”. So, These two verses have been referred to Cārvākas only.

According to Cārvākas, these five gross elements are earth, water, fire, air and space. These five gross elements are omnipresent /all-pervasive. Hence they are termed as gross elements. These five have not been created by anyone. These are free from creation and destruction and are the cause of all activities /existents. There is no other entity for their activities. They are independent, eternal and real. There is no other element like soul proclaimed by other doctrines/philosophies which transmigrates to other destinies after death. Valid knowledge is what we see and feel (sensual experiences referred as *pratyakṣa*) and it does not support the existence of soul. They do not consider inference and scripture as valid knowledge, as inference is not based on the direct contact of the object of knowledge by the sensual organs and so the possibility of this type of knowledge is likely to be false. According to them, the transformation of these five gross elements into body which also has the attribute called consciousness, e.g. fermenting grape juice creates an attribute which gives a feeling of wellness (*naśā*). Similarly the soul (consciousness) is not different from the five gross elements as it is only their activity. For example a bubble created in water by air and water and the bubble then dissolves in the water, itself similarly the soul is created by mixing the five gross elements and then gets dissolved in them again on death. Lack of any one gross element in this mixture (person) causes these five gross elements to separate and return back to their individual state (i.e. water returns to water and so on). Therefore the question of transmigration, liberation, rebirth etc does not arise. According to them death itself is liberation. It is be noted that at present, mention of only four gross elements are found in literature of Cārvākas (space is not mentioned a gross element). This is so as the believers of only direct knowledge as valid cannot accept the existence of space which is non concrete. During the canonical period they believed in five gross elements as propounded by Pakudhakātyāyan.

## 2.1 Review

Author of Niryukti, Bhadrā Bāhu II, refutes this doctrine as follows. Mixture of the five gross elements cannot create the attributes of consciousness and its derivatives like speaking, hearing, walking, thinking etc as these are not the attributes of the five gross elements themselves. Elements which do not have these attributes cannot create other elements /lumps with non existent attributes in them e.g. by grinding sand, we cannot produce oil, and similarly the five gross elements cannot produce consciousness. Besides each sense organ has the capability to cognize only one attribute of an object as its subject and cannot cognize the attribute which is the subject of other sense organ. So how (and who) the compilation of the cognition (like I have seen and heard and felt an entity) of each sense organ independently can be done? We do have some compiled cognition which leads us to believe in the existence of other entity besides the physical sense organs. The commentator also questions the validity of a dead body being unable to cognize if there is no other entity called soul existent.

Even though it had been refuted by Cārvākas as the deficiency of one of the existence of one of the five gross elements in the body causes the disappearance / destruction of the attribute consciousness resulting in the body being declared as dead. However this explanation is baseless as all the five gross elements exist in the dead body also and yet consciousness does not. This proves that the consciousness (or soul) is different from the five gross elements; this soul is eternal and it is not destroyed when the body is declared as dead.

We experience and infer the existence of soul by such feeling “I am happy, I am suffering etc” which are direct valid knowledge and by writings in the scriptures while Cārvākas, though accept only sensual knowledge a direct valid only knowledge and refute (even though they use) the inferential knowledge.

## 2.2 Refutation of the doctrine of destruction of soul with the destruction of body.

If we accept the views of Cārvākas that the soul is destroyed on death, then we are faced with the following three anomalies:

- i. No utility of practices /activities like acquiring knowledge, faith penance, observing the vows, self restraint etc performed to attain omniscience and liberation.
- ii. No one will accrue the benefits of good conduct and activities like charity, serving others, involvement in the welfare of others.
- iii. Those engaged in activities like violence, telling lies, stealing, and other similar sinful activities shall continue to do so as the results of such activities are inconsequential on death (as the soul also gets destroyed at death). This will result in lawlessness everywhere as the fear of such activities resulting in the pains in the future lives will be irrelevant.

These discussions thus lead us to believe that the doctrine of Cārvākas is flawed (perverted view), invalid doctrine and a cause of bondage.

## 8.3 Ekātmavāda

The earth even though is one omnipresent one lump and yet perceived as different countries, cities, villages, rivers, oceans, mountains etc; similarly due to ignorance we perceive the omnipresent Brahma as human beings, birds, animals etc. This doctrine of Ekātmavāda is stated in Sūtrakṛtāṅga as follows:

9. *jahā ya pūḍhavāṅhūbhe, ege nānā hi dīśai  
evam bho! kaṣiṇe loye, viṇṇū nānā hi dīśae* -9

Meaning:

As the earth, though it is but one pile /heap, presents itself in many forms, so the intelligence (principle like soul) appears under various forms as the universe.

10. *evamege tti jampanti, maṇḍā ārambhaṇissiyā  
ege kiccā sayam pāvam, tivvam dūkkham ṇiyacchai* -10

Meaning: Some heretics, who are lazy in activity (like self restraint /penance etc) and engaged in violence, justify the above doctrine. Then how can they prove that a particular living being (soul) which commits a sin, also bears the fruits of the same.

In these two verses, the doctrine of Uttara Mīmāṃsakas (Vedāntis) is briefly indicated. The chief doctrine of these philosophies is that everything in his universe is a manifestation of one entity called Brahma. The variedly looking entities are non-existent i.e. all entities like earth, five gross elements, conscious and non-conscious beings are all manifestations of Brahma only. This is also depicted by the author of the present text as “*ege kiccā sayam pāvam, tivvam dūkkham ṇiyacchai*” i.e. variedly looking entities are also proved by them as one like the lump of one earth. Like earth is one but looks in different forms like countries, cities, rivers, mountains etc even though the primary element in all of them is earth; similarly Brahma is the only entity which is manifested in all living and non-living beings in different forms throughout the universe. Brahmabindu Upaniṣad in the following verse supports this.

*eka eva hi bhūtātmā, bhūta bhūte vyavasthītaḥ  
ekadhā bahudhā caiva, drśyate jalacandravat*

i.e. only one gross soul is present in all gross elements. Even though it is one, yet like the moon shadow in water it appears in different forms. Kaṭhōpaniṣad through the example of fire explains this concept. For example Fire after entering in the universe appears in different forms; similarly one gross soul appears in different forms in different gross elements and entities.

### 3.1 Review:

On deeper analysis we do not find the above doctrine as appropriate. On this point, Jain's view that one soul only and its manifestation as consciousness in different beings is neither real nor the material cause of this perceptible universe. There are infinite independent souls existing in this universe. There is no one material cause for their existence they themselves individually. Consciousness is private to an individual soul and every soul has its own independent consciousness.

This doctrine however does not support the utility of action / activities performed by individual entities. Therefore they are referred as believers of just knowledge (Jñānavādīs) for attaining release from pain and suffering. Therefore they do not consider anyone as a violent entity nor the action of violence. Therefore, while committing violence, they do not claim it as violence. Further belief in existence of just one soul results in the following flaws:

- i. Sins omitted by one will have to be enjoyed by each and every one as there is only one Brahma. This is against the experience in reality.
- ii. Bondage of one will cause bondage of all and release from bondage by one will result in the release from bondage of all. This way a bonded living-being can become liberated and a liberated being can become bonded again. This will cause conflict in the doctrines of bondage and liberation also.
- iii. If someone called Devadatta acquires some knowledge then everyone like me, Brahmadata etc will also acquire the same knowledge. Similarly if someone is born or dies then me or everyone will be born and die.
- iv. By accepting manifestation of Brahma in all sentient and insentient beings, then the attribute of consciousness in living beings will also be present in non living beings. This is impossible.
- v. There will be no difference in the listener and the preacher of the canonical this fact will eliminate the need of authors of the canonical literature. Therefore the author of this text says "*ege kiccā sayam pāvam, tivvam dūkkham niyaccha*".

We arrive at the conclusion that one who commits a sin also enjoys the results of his sinful acts only and not others. Thus the claims of the doctrine of Ekānavāda appear to be flawed.

### 8.4 Tajjīva-taccharāvāda

According to them, each and every body has one individual soul. This soul exists only as long as the body exists. This soul is destroyed on the destruction of the body. The five gross elements when combine together to form body produce consciousness. Their doctrine is therefore similar to Cārvākas. Their doctrine in Sūtrakṛtāṅga is given as follows:

11. *patteyam kasuṇe āyā, je bālā je ya paṇḍiyā  
samti peccā na te samti, natthi sattovavāiyā* - 11

Meaning: Everybody, has an individual soul. Therefore, some are sage and some are heretic. These souls exist as long as the body, but after death they are no more; there are no souls which are born again.

12. *natthi punṇe va pāve vā, natthi loye to pare  
sarīrassa viṇaseṇam, viṇāso hoi dehiṇo* - 12

Meaning: There is neither virtue nor vice, there is no world beyond; on the dissolution of the body the individual ceases to exist.

The first verse depicts the doctrine and the second its results /effect of Tajjīva-taccharāvāda. Tajjīva-taccharāvāda believes in that jīva and body are same. However they are different from Cārvākas ( who believe that five gross elements form the body and the body performs all the activities like running, walking, cognizing etc) as they propagate that soul is the product of manifestation of the body.

Jains and Naiyāyikas believe in the existence of independent soul (which is omnipotent, eternal and complete by

itself) in each living being. However the Tājīva-taccharāvāda believes in the existence of soul as long as the body exists as the consciousness which is created by the five gross elements when the body is formed by them gets extinguished on body's dissolution. The soul leaving a dead body is not perceptible and hence they say that after death the soul has no existence in this world or beyond. They thus conclude that there is no soul different from body, a fact which is depicted in the present text as "natthi sattovavāiyā" i.e. no living being transmigrates from this life to future lives.

There are three following conclusions which result from the doctrine of Tājīva-taccharāvāda. It is depicted in the second verse.

- i. The auspicious and inauspicious activities of an individual resulting in merit or demerit do not exist
- ii. There is no world beyond this world.
- iii. The soul also gets extinguished along with the body on death.

Merit and demerit were not accepted as they propagate destruction of soul on death. To accept merit and demerit, they have to accept transmigration of soul after death to other lives. Therefore in their doctrine neither merit and demerit nor an entity to enjoy their results after death in this and the other worlds like hell and heaven exist as there is nothing like soul exists which goes/ transmigrate from one destiny to other on death in their doctrine. For example a bubble in water is not different from water; it originates from water and then submerges in the same. Similarly the consciousness originates from the body, constituted by the five gross elements, and submerges in the same on death and it (bubble) has no independent existence of its own. Like we see a mirage in desert during summer season even though there is no water there, similarly the lump of the five gross elements i.e. body performs all activities like speaking, walking, thinking etc. causing us to imagine the existence of soul also.

If a question is asked to these philosophers to justify the existence of rich and poor, healthy and sick, happy and unhappy etc states of individuals if an entity different from body called soul and the results like merit-demerit etc do not exist. Their answer is that such differences exist due to the nature of individuals, e.g. two stones are lying side by side and one is picked up by a sculptor and who casts it into an idol of god to be worshipped and the other is only kicked around under feet of different persons. In both these situations there is neither merit nor demerit of either stone but it is natural. Hence the differences in this perceptible world are due to the nature only. Hence soul, distinct from body, does not exist. Those who claim the existence of soul distinct from body cannot show its existence like we take a sword out of its case. Therefore the views of those who consider the soul as different from body is not appropriate.

#### 4.1 Review:

The views of Tājīva-taccharāvāda are not valid due to the following reasons;

By not accepting the existence of soul as distinct from body as well as of life after death, the acts of violence and stealing etc will become rampant and uncontrollable. They will not be able to discriminate between good and bad acts, right and wrong conduct etc resulting in enormous evil acts like sexual assaults, killing and stealing etc. By not accepting merit and demerit and their effects as hell and heaven will become mute and the entire world will become a chaos. There will be rampant barbarian acts causing misrule. Therefore this doctrine also becomes pervert causing bondage of inauspicious karma.

#### 8.5 Akāra-kavāda (Sāṃkhya)

They accept the existence of inactive / inert soul as distinct from the gross elements. Thus the soul neither acts nor enjoys anything. This is discussed in Sūtrakṛtāṅga as follows:

13. *kuvvaṃ ca kārayaṃ ceva, savvaṃ kuvvaṃ na vijjai  
evaṃ akārao appā, te u evaṃ pagabbhiyā* - 13

Meaning: When a man acts or causes another to act, it is not his soul which acts or causes to act. Therefore the soul is inactive as proclaimed by them (Sāṃkhya or Akāra-kavāda).

14. *je te u vāṇo evaṃ, loe tesim kuo siyā*

Meaning: How can those who hold such *opinions* explain the variety of existences in the world? They go from darkness to utter darkness being unable to act due to laziness.

These two verses present the nature of Sāṃkhya and their Akārakavāda. In their philosophy they call soul as *puruṣa*. “*akarttā nirguṇo bhottā ātmā Kapila darśane*” is a popular quotation from Sāṃkhya philosophy. According to them the soul is non-concrete, eternal and inert, all pervading and hence unable to perform any activity. Even though it is inert, still it performs activities space and enjoyment activities based on the principle rule of *japāsphaṭika* or *mudrāpratibimbodaya*. *Mudrāpratibimbodaya-nyāya* /rule says “Like the image of an idol or person in a mirror does not do anything about its place /shape etc and stays in its presentation only in the mirror, similarly *puruṣa* does not do anything in this mirror of *prakṛti* (the main insentient element of this universe) and the deformities of *prakṛti* are reflected in *puruṣa*. In this way the soul present in an active entity is itself inactive. *Japāsphaṭika-nyāya* / doctrine says— by keeping the red flower of *japa* near a crystal glass, the crystal glass appears red even though it itself is transparent and colourless, similarly inactive soul appears active.

Sāṃkhyakārikā gives five characteristics of the soul (*puruṣa*), namely omniscience (*kaivalya*), indifference (*mādhyaṣṭha*), *drāstatva* (visibility), inert (*akartṛtva*) and *sākṣtva*. There are two causes for the inertness namely intelligence and complete lack of the attribute of extension. Further lack of intelligence only results in activity and extension and thus acquires the capability to create other entities. The soul is without any attributes and hence lacks both these attributes. *Sattva*, *raja* and *tama* are the qualities that comprise the activity attribute (*kartṛtva*). All these three are the attributes of *prakṛti* only. Hence *prakṛti* is active, creator and due to its association with soul, the soul appears to be active. On this basis the translating of the first verse “*Kuvvam ca kārayam ceva, savvam kuvvam ṇa vijjai,*” can be that the soul appears to be the doer and supporter of all activities even though it (soul) is not so.

### 5.1 Review

This doctrine of Sāṃkhya is self contradictory. Normally the one who is the doer is the enjoyer also. But Sāṃkhya doctrine says that *prakṛti* is the doer and *puruṣa* is the enjoyer. Activities like charity etc are performed by *prakṛti* while its results are enjoyed by sentient *puruṣa*. This is the first contradiction of this doctrine. Further *puruṣa* is sentient and still it does not know is the second contradiction. *Puruṣa* is neither bonded nor is liberated or transmigrates in other form. It is the *prakṛti* which is bonded, is liberated and transmigrates. These are contradicting statements as indicated in the verse as “*evam akārao appā, te u evam pagabbhiya*”

The fourteenth verse questions the validity of both Tajjīva-taccharāvāda and Akārakavāda by refuting their claim of no transmigration of soul in different life cycles and destinies. Tajjīva-taccharāvāda considers creation of soul by the body itself and its destruction with the body and its (soul) non-transmigration to other destinies. This view is non tenable as it had been accepted that both body and soul are different which is shown as valid by the commentator as follows:

- i. The potter, who is the owner of the wheel, stick and other means to make pots, is different from them. Similarly the soul being the owner of sense organs etc is different from them.
- ii. An enjoyable entity like the body must have an owner who is different from it, i.e. the soul is that other entity.

To say that the soul does not transmigrate to other destinies is also wrong as this is proved so by the following inferential knowledge. A child who is newly born desires to be breast-fed from his mother due to the knowledge from breast feed of the previous birth. This proves the existence of earlier birth thereby establishing the birth after this life i.e. death. How can we establish the validity of pleasures and pains we experience without accepting the results of auspicious and inauspicious activities performed in earlier and this life. Similarly by accepting existence of soul with attributes, existence of its meritorious and de-meritorious activities is proved thereby validating the different experiences and existence of different types of beings. Another objection raised by the commentator is the difficulty in establishing the validity of these different types of experiences like birth and death, hell and

heaven etc, if we take the soul as inert, eternal non concrete and all pervading. According to Sāṃkhya, the soul is inert and not going through transformation, the child will remain the child, a fool will always remain as a fool etc and no new development can take place in them. In such a situation all our efforts to eliminate the pains of birth, death and life , self restraint and hard work to achieve success will all become futile.

The author of Niryukti also raised several objections to the Sāṃkhya's doctrine, namely: if the soul is inert and not doer any activity like auspicious or inauspicious then how it can become the enjoyer of their fruits. If we accept the doctrine of enjoyment without the effort then we face the problem of destroying the need for efforts and getting comfort without efforts i.e. the efforts put in by someone will become useless and he will enjoy the fruits of activities which he has not performed. Similarly by accepting the soul as inert, we shall face the invalidity of liberation, three types of pains and remembrances of previous lives. Therefore Sāṃkhya's doctrine is not tenable.

### 8.6 Ātmaśaṣṭhavāda

According to Ātmaśaṣṭhavāda, there are five gross elements along with the sixth called the soul. The soul and the universe are both eternal. These are never destroyed. A non existence can never be created and an existent can never be destroyed. Ātmaśaṣṭhavāda is depicted in Sūtrakṛtāṅga as follows:

15. *Samti pañca mahabbhūyā, ihamegesi āhiyā  
āyachañṭhā puṇegāhu, āyā loge ya sāsae* - 15

Meaning: Some say that there are five gross elements and that the soul is the sixth (substance), but they contend that the soul and the world (the five elements) are eternal.

16. *Duhao te ṇa viṇassaṃti, ṇo ya uppajjāe aṣaṃ  
savvevi savvakā bhāvā, ṇiyatibhāvamaṅgayā* - 16

Meaning: The two (soul & world) substances never perish; the non existent does not come into existence, but all things are constant and eternal.

The above two verses depict the doctrine of the fatalists. The commentator expresses this doctrine as of VedavādiSāṃkhya and Śaiva-Vaiśeṣikas. Dr Herman Jacobi assigns this doctrine to Caraka. In Buddhist holy texts "Udāna" we find mention of some *śrāmaṇa-brāhmaṇas* who believe in the eternal nature of soul and world. Here in these verses, the author gives the following five characteristics of fatalists.

- i. Along with five insentient gross elements, there is a sixth sentient gross element.
- ii. Soul and the world (five gross elements) are eternal.
- iii. All the six gross elements cannot be destroyed with or without any cause.
- iv. The non existent can neither be created nor an existent be destroyed.
- v. All elements are always eternal.

While the above have been accepted as momentary by the believers of all sentient elements, here the followers believe in the eternal nature of all elements. According to them if we accept only momentary as the nature of the elements, then we can not accept the existence of liberation. Hence like space, the soul being all pervading and non-concrete. Further earth and other elements also do not loose their nature and hence are always eternal.

According to Buddhism, an entity after creation is immediately destroyed without any cause (i.e. it is the nature). Hence except creation there is no other cause for destruction. But the fatalist do not accept this destruction without cause nor they accept the views of Vaiśeṣikas i.e. destruction caused by stick, gun etc. The conclusion they derive is that the soul and the five elements are not destroyed either without or with cause. They never leave their nature and hence are eternal. Soul also is not created by any one. Hence it is also eternal. In Gītā also it is said no weapon cut the soul, no fire can burn it, water cannot moisten it, and air cannot dry it". Hence the soul cannot be pierced, cannot be burnt, cannot be spoilt and is eternal all pervading, immovable and without a beginning and end. A non existent entity can never be created. Only existents can be created. Hence Sāṃkhya proves the existence of the world by their doctrine of Satkāryavāda as depicted in Sāṃkhyakārikā.

*Asadakaraṇādūpādanagrahaṇāt sarvasambhavā bhāvāt  
śaktasya śakyakaraṇāt kāraṇabhāvācca satkāryam*

- i. *Asadakaraṇāta*: Like the horns of a donkey, the non existents cannot be made existent.
- ii. *Upādanagrahaṇā*: The material of only existent is present. By accepting the existent's material, the existent can be created and not the non existent.
- iii. *Sarvasambhavā bhāvāt*: All the causes cannot create all the existents. We cannot extract oil from sand; only oil seeds can be crushed to get oil. If non existents can become existent, then we can produce wheat from the bark of the tree. Hence material cause only can create a specific existent.
- iv. *śaktasya śakyakaraṇāt*: A person creates something which is possible with his own power and limitations. He cannot create everything. If non existents can be created as existents, then he should be able to create imaginary entities also.
- v. *kāraṇabhāvācca satkāryam*: An appropriate entity having existing substance only can be created. Else we can create a mango tree from the bud of a *pipala* tree.

To conclude they support only the creation of a new entity from an existent entity with similar material cause present. An entity can never be completely destroyed nor created afresh. It always exists in its own nature.

## 6.1 Review

According to Ātmaśaṣṭhavāda, soul and the five gross elements are all eternal. But to say that all the elements are just eternal or always eternal is not correct. By accepting this doctrine, the cause-effect relationship will not hold good for soul and accordingly there will be no bondage of karmas. In the absence of *kārmika* bondage, the effects like pain and pleasure etc to be experienced by soul will not be possible by accepting the soul as eternal and rejecting the *kārmika* bondage accordingly.

If the non existent will not be accepted as creatable, then getting born in the new destiny, like the four destinies and the fifth as liberated from previous birth, will not be possible. By accepting soul as not being capable of being created in new forms, still and inert etc, it will not be possible for the soul to go to hell, heaven etc. Therefore it is perverted to consider the soul as inert.

Sāṃkhya's view that the effect is always present in the cause is also untenable. Because if the existent is present in the cause then how creation will take place. Until the pitcher can be created, how can they store water etc. Hence we have to accept the non-existence of the water portability attribute of pitcher in the sand before it is transformed into a pitcher.

Hence, to conclude it is to be accepted that all entities are from the substantial point of view eternal and from the momentary also.

## 8.7 Pañcaskandhavāda and Caturdhātuvāda.

Sūtrakṛtāṅga talks of the some *kṣaṇikavādi* Buddhist who accept that water, earth, air, fire when transformed into the four *dhātus* and become one, then the consciousness (*nāma* or *jīva* attribute) is created. It is depicted in the present text as follows:

17. *pañca khaṇḍhe vyaṃtege, bālā u khaṇajoiṇo  
aṇṇo aṇaṇṇo ñevāhu, heyyaṃ va aheyyaṃ* -17

Meaning: Some philosophies say that there are five *skandhas* (*rūpa, vedanā, vijñāna, saṃjñā, saṃskāra*) of momentary existence. They do not admit that the soul is neither different from nor identical with the elements, that the soul is produced from a cause i.e. elements is acceptable to them.

18. *puḍhavi āū teū ya, tahā vāū ya egao  
cattāri dhāuṇo rūvaṃ, evamāhaṃsu jāṇagā* -18

Meaning: They say that the four elements i.e. earth, water, fire and wind form the body (or soul?).



The seventeenth verse describes the doctrine of momentary nature of reality believer pañcaskandhavādi Buddhists. According to Viśudhimagga, Suttapiṭaka and other Buddhist texts, these five *skandhas* are: *rūpa*, *vedanā*, *vijñāna*, *saṃjñā*, *saṃskāra*. These five can also be said as material causes or *upādāna skandha*. There is no other existent like base of the feelings (soul) of pain, pleasure, lust, aversion, consciousness etc different from these five *skandhas*. The soul which is different from these five *skandhas* cannot be experienced directly. Further there is no other entity with which we can establish a universal relationship with the soul so that we can infer its (soul) existence. Direct and inferences are the two types of knowledge considered as valid in Buddhism.

According to them the *skandhas* are momentary in nature. They accept only the existence of specific and not generic /common which is considered as unreal by them. They do not consider these *skandhas* either as inert or as eternal. These are just of momentary existence. The next moment they are destroyed with the root itself. To prove their doctrine of momentary nature of *skandhas* they use inferential knowledge namely *skandha* is momentary as they real; whatever is real is momentary e.g. clouds, because clouds are real, therefore all entities are momentary. The nature of real is its ability to transform. A real cannot be eternal or inertness as such elements cannot transform themselves. Therefore only momentary is the characteristic of reality and creation is the root cause of its destruction. An entity which is not destroyed immediately on its creation can never be destroyed. Hence we conclude that the real is momentary and temporary. .

While explaining the meanings of “*anno ananno*” the commentator says that these Buddhist do not accept the existence of soul neither different nor similar from the five *skandhas* i.e. they consider soul as eternal neither as caused by these five *skandhas* nor existent without any cause.

In the eighteenth verse, doctrine of other group of Buddhists (according to the commentator) called Caturdhātuvāda is explained. The nature of Caturdhātuvāda as given in Majjhimanikāya of Suttapiṭaka is “there are four *dhātus* namely earth, air, water and fire. These four *dhātus* are the substratum of the world and hence are called *dhātus*. When these four *dhātus* mix together to form the *rūpaskandha*, the body (*śarīra*) is created along with the attribute *jīvasaṃjñā*. In other words they say that the body is made of four *dhātus*, here is nothing like soul which different from these four *dhātus* and existent. Hence Caturdhātuvāda is also a part of the *kṣaṇikavādi* buddhist.

## 7.1 Review

The commentator considers all these i.e. Buddhists, Sāṃkhya and other doctrines discussed above are all non-believers in cause-effect principle (Avalavāda). According to Buddhists, all our acts like charity and soul etc are momentary. Therefore immediately after performing an act, the act and the soul get destroyed. Hence the soul has nothing to do with the results of the activity. If it so, then who will enjoy the results of activities in this and future lives?

Sāṃkhya’s concept of inert, eternal and non active soul cannot be associated with being the doer and enjoyer of activity and results respectively. Similarly the doctrine of five *skandhas*, which considers soul as non existent and hence is neither the doer nor enjoyer of activities and results are unable to explain the entity which (and how) entity will enjoy the results like pain, happiness etc? They claim even their *vijñānaskandha* as momentary. Hence even this *vijñānaskandha* is unable to enjoy the results like pain, happiness etc.

When the soul does not exist, then the entire concepts of birth-death, bondage and liberation, hell and heaven etc will become mute along with the entire practice of scriptures based conduct. By accepting the momentary nature of existence only, the destruction of the doer and arrival of non-doer as enjoyer immediately make the universal relationship of doer-enjoyer invalid. This is so as the soul which performs an activity is destroyed immediately at that moment and hence could not enjoy the results of his actions and the entity which has not performed the activity starts enjoying the fruits of the activity.

## 7.2 Anekāntika view of the nature and form of soul and other existents.

Jains consider the soul as active and eternal simultaneously. Therefore the soul, being with the body is slightly different from and slightly similar to the body and the body being formed by the five gross elements is slightly different from and slightly similar to them is accepted. This soul, due its auspicious and inauspicious acts, keep

on transforming into states like hell, heaven etc. Therefore the soul is eternal and with a cause and the nature of the soul is eternal i.e. indestructible. In this way the doer will be able to enjoy the fruits of his actions and the concept of bondage and release /liberation will also become valid.

### 8.8 Non-sustainability of these monist philosophies.

The author in verses 19<sup>th</sup> till 27<sup>th</sup> has indicated the non-sustainability of these monist philosophies as follows.

19. *agāramāvasamā vi, āraṇṇā vā vi pavvayā*  
*imaṃ darisaṇamāvaṇṇā, savvadukkhā vimuccanti* - 19

Meaning: The proponents of this doctrine say “Those who dwell in houses, woods or on hills, will be released from all miseries if they adopt our creed.”

20. *tenāvimam tinaccā naṃ, na te dhammaviṭṭu janā*  
*Je te u vāiṇo evaṃ, na te ohamtaraaahiyā* - 20

Meaning: But they do not become the experts of the Law (dharma) by reading texts like Tripiṭakas etc. They are unable to cross the flood of life, as they ignore the true relation of things, and not versed in the true law (dharma).

21. *tenāvimam tinaccā naṃ, na te dhammaviṭṭu janā*  
*je te u vāiṇo evaṃ, na te saṃsārapāragā* - 21

Meaning: By adopting any creed or just reading the texts like Tripiṭakas etc one does not become the expert of the Law (dharma). They are unable to put an end to world, as they ignore the true relation of things, and not versed in the true law (dharma).

22. *tenāvimam tinaccā naṃ, na te dhammaviṭṭu janā*  
*je te u vāiṇo evaṃ, na te gabbhassa pāragā* - 22

Meaning: By adopting any creed or just reading the texts like Tripiṭakas etc one does not become the expert of the Law (dharma). They are unable to end to transmigration, as they ignore the true relation of things, and not versed in the true law (dharma).

23. *tenāvimam tinaccā naṃ, na te dhammaviṭṭu janā*  
*je te u vāiṇo evaṃ, na te jammassa pāragā* - 23

Meaning: By adopting any creed or just reading the texts like Tripiṭakas etc one does not become the expert of the Law (dharma). They are unable to end to birth, as they ignore the true relation of things, and not versed in the true law (dharma).

24. *tenāvimam tinaccā naṃ, na te dhammaviṭṭu janā*  
*je te u vāiṇo evaṃ, na dukkhassa pāragā* - 24

Meaning: By adopting any creed or just reading the texts like Tripiṭakas etc one does not become the expert of the Law (dharma). They are unable to put an end to miseries, as they ignore the true relation of things, and not versed in the true law (dharma).

25. *tenāvimam tinaccā naṃ, na te dhammaviṭṭu janā*  
*je te u vāiṇo evaṃ, na te māraṇassa pāragā* - 25

Meaning: By adopting any creed or just reading the texts like Tripiṭakas etc one does not become the expert of the Law (dharma). They are unable to put an end to death, as they ignore the true relation of things, and not versed in the true law (dharma).

26. *ṇāṇāvihāim dukkhāim, aṇuhavaṃti puṇo puṇo*  
*saṃsāracakkavālammi, vāhimaccujarākule* - 26

Meaning: They (the heretics) will again and again experience manifold pains in this cycle of world which is full of death, disease and old age.

27. *uccāvayāṇi gacchamā, gabbhamessamāntamāso*  
*ṇāyaputte Mahāvīre !, evamāha jīṇottame* - 27  
*-tti bemi*

Meaning: The highest *jina*, Mahāvīra the Jnātaputra, has said that they will undergo never ending numbers of births in all sorts of destinies (existences).

Thus I say.

In the nineteenth verse, the author has tried to project the intention of other philosophers to attract people to their doctrine /religion. All these heretics say “Whether you are a child, householder, a mountain dweller or a forest dweller, sick or a monk; by accepting our religion you will be instantly free from all the pains of the body, mind, and spiritual and of spirits. You will also be released from the pains of birth, death, old age, pregnancy etc.”

These heretics also attracted to their creed, by offering instantaneous release from bondage /pains without observing any austerities or efforts and just by accepting their creed, the forest dwelling or mountains dwelling monks or other monks who are performing penance, who are non observant of social, national or ethico-moral conduct and norms. In this way the nineteenth verse indicates the false hope /promise raised by the heretics to accept their creed for release from bondage and pains.

From the twentieth till twenty sixth verses, the author has generally repeated just one view (these heretics do not understand the source of pain i.e. birth, death, old age, sufferings in the four destinies, transmigration in the four destinies, repeated pregnancies for birth etc and hence are unable to get release from sufferings) in many ways. The author gives two main causes of this series of pains, namely:

- i. Indulgence in activity without knowing the result (cause effect relation) and
- ii. Ignorance about the basic Law (dharma).

To explain this further, the author in the 26<sup>th</sup> verse says “*ṇāṇā vihāim dukkhāim, aṇuhavanti puṇo puṇo*” i.e. different heretics enjoy the varied pains again and again. This implies that “till the life is full of perverted views and lack of the vows, laziness towards auspicious activities, passions, and activities of mind body and speech; and the heretic may go to the mountains or forests for austerities or meditation or any other so called religious activities; he will be unable to get release from the pains associated with birth, death, old age, diseases, stay in the womb during pregnancy and transmigration in different destinies. The first and foremost cause for not getting release from bondage is the lack of true knowledge about bondage (*saṃdhiṃ*). “*te nāvi saṃdhiṃ ṇaccā*”, in this the word “*te*” is used for those persons (heretics) whose perverted views have been described by the author in previous verses. In this verse, the word “*saṃdhiṃ*” is very important. In Prākṛta dictionary, there are following six meanings of this word.

i. getting together, ii. Unison or bondage, iii. Sequential knowledge of an object, iv. View or intention, v. opportunity and vi. Understand mysticism. With these meaning we can interpret the sentence “*te nāvi saṃdhiṃ ṇaccā*” in the following different ways.

- i. Where and how the bondage of the karmas with the soul take place?
- ii. Where and due to which reasons the bondage of the karmas with the soul takes place?
- iii. They do not cognate the sequentially changing entities.
- iv. They do understand the meaning of “How the soul can be freed from the *kārmika* bondage?”
- v. They do not understand the mystic of the knowledge obscuring and other eight types of karmas.
- vi. How can they get an opportunity to get freed from the bondage?

This way without understanding the mysticism associated with bondage, these heretics engage themselves in various activities and hence are unable to get released from the chain of painful existences in different destinies.

Another reason for not being able to get freedom from bondage is the lack of knowledge about the Law (*dharma*). As long as they doubt the existence of soul and its nature and attributes; and limit their thinking of soul as

momentary in nature or consisting of the five gross elements etc; they will not be able to appreciate the nature and attributes (infinite intuition, knowledge and conduct) of soul. Therefore they keep on getting evolves in the cycle of transmigration only.

In the 27<sup>th</sup> verse, the prophecy “*uccāvayāṇi gacchamta, gabbhamessamtaṇamtasō*” is made by Mahāvīra for these heretics. In this way Sudharmā Swāmi described the direct knowledge he acquired from Mahāvīra to Jambū Swāmi.

## 9.0 Second topic

In the first topic the self and the non self or Jain creed and the heretic creed was being discussed. In the first topic the doctrine of believers in gross elements as the cause of the world was discussed. In this topic doctrines of fatalist and other similar philosophers will be discussed. In the first topic, through the aphorism “*Bujjhejja tiṭṭhejja*” and others, we were told that first we should acquire knowledge of the self and on acquiring this knowledge we should break its bondage to get the release and attain the pure soul state. What the other philosophers have said about the relationship between the nature of the soul and its bondage? Who accepts bondage and who does not is important to know? Therefore the author tries to explain the views of other heretic philosophies like fatalists and others in this section.

### 9.1 Fatalists (Niyativāda)

Explaining the meaning of *niyati*, it is said “*niyamate dharmā anayā itī niyatī*”. According to them, everything in this world is pre-determined / established. The soul does not have the power to break this cycle of pre-determined results. In the first thirteen verses of this topic of Sūtrakṛtāṅga, the author explains the doctrine propagated by Fatalist.

- |          |   |   |
|----------|---|---|
| 28.      | <i>āghāyaṃ puṇa egesim, uvavaṇṇā puḍho jiyā<br/>vedayaṃti suhaṃ dukkhaṃ, aduvā luppamti śhāṇao</i>  | 1 |
| Meaning: | Some heretics (fatalist) say that living beings are born individually and independent of each other. They enjoy the pains and pleasures individually and die from their lives individually.   |   |
| 29.      | <i>ṇa taṃ sayam kadam dukkhaṃ, ṇa ya aṇṇakadam ca ṇam<br/>suhaṃ vā jai vā dukkhaṃ, sehiyam vā asehiyam</i>  | 2 |
| Meaning: | These miseries and pleasures are neither caused by themselves nor by anyone else; final liberation and temporal pleasures and pains are not caused by (the soul) themselves nor by others. These are caused by destiny.                         |   |
| 30.      | <i>ṇa sayam kadam ṇa aṇṇehim, vedayaṃti puḍho jiyā<br/>saṃgaiyam taṃ tahā tesim, iehamegesimāhiyam</i>  | 3 |
| Meaning: | All living beings do not enjoy miseries and pleasures caused by themselves (their souls individually). They also do not enjoy the miseries and pleasures caused by others. But the individual souls experience them as assigned by the destiny. |   |
| 31.      | <i>evameyāṇi jaṃpamtā, bālā paṃdiyamāṇiṇo<br/>ṇiyayāṇiyayam saṃtam, ayāṇamā abuddhiyā</i>   | 4 |
| Meaning: | Those who proclaim these opinions are ignorant who consider themselves as learned; they have no knowledge, and do not understand that things depend partly on fate and partly on human efforts.   |   |
| 32.      | <i>evamege u pāsathā, te bhujjo vippagabbhiyā<br/>evampuvaṭṭhiyā saṃtā, ṇaattadukkhavimoyagā</i>  | 5 |
| Meaning: | Thus some heretic say they are bold men and so practice their path of release from bondage. If they act on their principles they will never be released from misery.  |   |

33. *javiṇo migā jahā samtā, paritāṇeṇa tajjiyā*  
*asamkiyāim samkamti, samkiyāim asamkiṇo* 6
- Meaning: As the swift deer, who are destitute for protection, are frightened where there is no danger, and not frightened where the danger is?
34. *paritāṇiyāṇi samkamtā, pāsiyāṇi asamkiṇo*  
*aṇṇāṇabhaya samviggā, sampalimti taḥim taḥim* 7
- Meaning: As they dread safe palces, but do not dread traps; they are bewildered by ignorance and fear and run hear and there.
35. *aha taṃ pavejja vajjhaṃ, ahe vajjhassa vā vae*  
*muccejja payapāsāo, taṃ tu maṃdo ṇa dehaī* 8
- Meaning: If they jump over the noose or pass under it, they will escape the snare; but they do not notice due to none or very low intelligence.
36. *ahiyappāaahiyapaṇṇāṇe, visamaṃteṇuvāgae*  
*se baddhe payapāsāim, tattha ghāyaṃ ṇiyacchai* 9
- Meaning: Not understanding their welfare and devoid of intelligence, they do not jump over the noose or pass under it to escape the snare; but they do not notice it and get trapped and get killed there.
37. *evaṃ tu samaṇā ege, micchadiṭṭhi aṇāriyā*  
*asamkiyāim samkamti, samkiyāim asamkiṇo* 10
- Meaning: So some unworthy *śramaṇas* who hold wrong doctrines are afraid of what is free from danger, and are not afraid of the real danger.
38. *dhammapaṇṇavaṇā jā sā, taṃ tu samkamti mūdhagā*  
*āraṃbhāim ṇa samkamti, aviyaṭṭā akoviya* 11
- Meaning: Such *śramaṇas* dread the preaching of the Law (dharma), but they do not dread being without knowledge and hence indulge in violent activities.
39. *savvappagaṃ viukkassam, sevvaṃ ṇūmaṃ vihūṇiyā*  
*appattiyam akammaṃse, eyaṃatṭhaṃ mige cue* 12
- Meaning: Shaking off greed, pride, deceit and anger completely one becomes free from karmas and achieve full release. This is a subject which an ignorant man like a brute animal does not understand and hence does not achieve the final release.
40. *je eyaṃ ṇābhijāṇamti, micchadiṭṭhi aṇāriyā*  
*migā vā pāsabaddhā te, ghayamesamtaṇamtasao* 13
- Meaning: The unworthy heretics, who do acknowledge this, will incur death an endless number of times, like a deer caught in the snare / trap.

In the first three verses of this topic, the author has discussed the doctrine of fatalists and in the verses from 4<sup>th</sup> till 13<sup>th</sup>, he has refuted their doctrine. Some persons believe that the rise and fall of some people or the miseries and pleasures experienced by different people is not due to their own efforts / actions but their basic cause is destiny / luck. Whatever has to happen at a place is destined to happen so there. Time, people or efforts cannot change anything. Everything is predetermined to happen. Some Fatalist philosophers say that different persons are born differently; they suffer or enjoy miseries and pleasures differently and die at different times and palces. All these are neither self inflicted nor by anyone else. To experience pleasures of liberation or miseries of hell are all predetermined and happen accordingly.

In the Buddhist text Dighanikāya's chapter Sāmaññiya-sutta, the description of Ājīvaka fatalist Makkhali Goṣālaka is given as follows: "There is no cause or the pains of the living beings. The living beings are pure without a cause and place. There is nothing like effort. Neither they can do anything themselves nor anyone else can do

anything for them. There is nothing like power/ energy / courage / bravery of a person. All existents, living beings and gross elements are without energy /power / courage. Due to their luck /*niyati* they are born in one of the six communities and suffer or enjoy in life. The fools and the wise cannot know the causes of these nor can eliminate them by observing austerities /penance /self control / celibacy / good conduct etc. Miseries and pleasures are predetermined in occurrence and their duration and intensity. They can neither be increased nor reduced in this world. All future events are predetermined and they cannot be changed. Like a ball of cotton thread when falls on the floor, opens up and keep on rolling out the thread, similarly the cycle of time keep rolling out the events which are predetermined”.

In Śāstravārṭasamuccaya, while discussing Fatalism, it is said “Because all entities in this are according to their pre determined nature; hence we know that these entities are born according to predetermined cycle” All entities, which fill this entire world, are bound with predetermined relations and happening. The form, time and relationship of events happening are predestined to happen accordingly. In this way, who can refute the validity of fatalism? Also it refutes logically the effects of time, nature, karma and efforts.

The Fatalists say (while refuting the claims of the proponents of time as omnipotent and all pervasive and cause of all effects, destructions, calamities or happenings). They ask “Why there is a difference (one successful and other a failure) in the effects of two similar persons doing similar things at the same time?” Thus there are no way out except to support the claims of the fatalists (pre-determinism).

The proponents of Naturalism (Svabhāvavādi) say that every event happens due to the nature of entities. They say “It is nature of the sand to become pot and not to become the cloth. Similarly the nature of cotton is to become cloth.” Thus the predetermined cause-effect cannot happen without the nature. All entities are created themselves due to their nature of transformation without the acceptance of predetermined cause-effect relationship. The fatalists refute these claims as “it is not possible to determine the nature of different people and even of the twins born from the same parents without accepting their doctrine of pre-determinism. Only their doctrine can prove the validity of such events”. Therefore the nature being different from a person cannot be the cause of miseries and pleasures.

Efforts of an individual or of the *īśvara* also cannot be the cause of the miseries or pleasures and the creation / destruction of the entities in this world. Why the same efforts of two persons bring different results? Hence here is destiny (pre-determinism) is the cause. Similarly to consider *īśvara* as the cause of all the effects is also flawed. Now let us look at the proponents of the karma doctrine who say that the different effects of the similar efforts made by farmers, traders etc is caused by their auspicious and inauspicious karma. Fatalists refute these claims as “If we say that karmas are not different from the individual, in fact they are inseparable from the individual, and such statement will create a situation where the person and karmas will become same. But the individual cannot be the cause of the miseries and pleasures.” Hence destiny is the only sustainable cause of validly explaining such happenings. The miracles and the spontaneous effects in this world are not so; in fact they are also predetermined. Those who do not understand the secrets of pre-determinism feel these as miracles etc.

Bhagavāna Mahāvīra was a believer of the doctrine of making efforts to achieve success. He said that an individual is free to determine his objective and he can achieve the same with his efforts. But those dependent on fatalism forget the importance of making efforts and keeps on living in an atmosphere of all events happening due to their predetermined happening.

We find detailed discussions in Bhagavati’s fifteenth chapter on the doctrine of Ājivaka fatalist Makkhali Gośālaka as well in the seventh chapter of Upāsakadaśā.

Bhagavāna “Mahāvīra was visiting the pottery of Saddhālaputra. Saddhālaputra was drying the newly made pitchers in the sun. Bhagavāna Mahāvīra asked Saddhālaputra “How do you make these pitchers?” Saddhālaputra said “Bhante! First I mix sand, then after adding little water to it I knead the paste into a roll and then I add some ash to it. Then I make small balls of this sand lump and put one at a time on the wheel to mould with my hands. This is how I make the pitchers”. Bhagavāna Mahāvīra then asked Saddhālaputra “These pitchers are made by

efforts, bravery, karma or power? Or are these made without them?” Saddhālaputra replied “Bhante! These are made without all these. Everything is pre-determined?”

Cūṃikāra of Sūtrakṛtāṅga has mentioned one argument for the fatalists as “The fatalist accepts that un-created entity does not have an effect. Whatever a person enjoys has some effort as a cause behind it. But this effort is not of the individual person himself. If this effort is by the person and he is free to do whatever he wishes to do then he will do all activities of his liking only. He will not do anything which is not liked by him. However we see that a person also does a lot of activities which he does not like at all. This proves the validity of fatalism.”

## Review

The doctrine of fatalism is acceptable up to the point where they accept existence of independent living beings. This fact is held valid by direct and inferential valid knowledge also. Until we accept the independent existence of each living being, till then we shall not be able to justify the effects of the kāmika bondage of each living being separately in their present bodies as well as to continue enjoying the effects this supports the facts that the soul has to leave one body and go on in different destinies in different bodies. These statements can be accepted only after we accept the independent existence of each living being. Besides the direct and inferential knowledge, this fact is also held valid due to different states like rich and poor, miserable and happy etc of different persons. We cannot ignore the fact that miseries and pleasures of different gader experienced by different persons and on completion of their life span (i.e. death), they leave their present body here and go to another destiny. Some people also remember incidences of their previous lives also cannot be refuted. Thus by proving the validity of independent existence of each soul we refute the doctrines of Paṃcamaḥābhutavāda, Ekātmavāda, Tajjīvataccharīravāda, Ātmaṣaṣṭhavāda and Buddhists are refuted automatically. In this respect the doctrine of Fatalist is true upto this point (i.e. independent existence of souls). But when the fatalists say that the miseries and pleasures enjoyed by individuals are neither self inflicted not by others but is predetermined only is false /invalid. In the fourth verse the statement “*niyayāñiyayam samtam, ayānamtā abuddhiya*” refutes the claim of fatalists trying to force every explanation on their doctrine only. They do not understand that all miseries and pleasures in this world are not predetermined; but some are predetermined like the *nikācīta* karmas as the effects of *nikācīta* karmas is fixed and cannot be changed by any effort or means. But there are many miseries and pleasures which can be changed by efforts, time, nature etc. Thus just to apply pre-determinism to every event /effect is invalid and lacks true knowledge.

Ācārya Siddhasena in Sanmatitarka says that to claim one of the five co-factors namely time, nature, efforts, karma and destiny as the only cause of all events /effects is false but when we take them in relation to each other then it becomes true and valid.

Jains considers some miseries and pleasures as slightly transferable by efforts also as actions results in effects and actions are dependent on individuals. At some places effort is the cause of differences in result and somewhere the destiny is the cause of such differences as sometime similar efforts by two persons result in different effects due to their previous karmas. Similarly time is also a cause for pleasures and miseries e.g. mangoes and other fruits are produced only in different seasons and ripe as per the time duration. Similarly seeds sown in one type of soil germinate and produces plants and grains while in another type of soil they do not germinate due to the nature of the soil itself. Thus we see time, nature, efforts, karma and destiny are correlated and to consider just one of them only as the cause is flawed.

## 9.2 Ajoānavāda

This doctrine propagates that lack of knowledge is useful /bliss. Hence lack of knowledge is the basis of this philosophy. In Sūtrakṛtāṅga their doctrine is described as follows:

41. *māhaṇā samaṇā ege, sarve ṇāṇam sayam vae  
sarvaloge vi je pāṇā, ṇa te jāṇamti kiṃcaṇam*

14

Meaning: All *Brahāmaṇas* and *Śramaṇas* contend that they possess the knowledge of the truth, even though creatures in the whole world do not know anything.

42. *mīlakkhū amīlakkhussa, jāhā vuttāṇubhāsae*  
*ṇa heuṃ se vīyāṇāi, bhāsīyaṃ taṇṇubhāsae* 15
- Meaning: As a *Mallecca* repeats what an Ārya has said without understanding its meaning;
43. *evamaññāṇīyā ṇāṇaṃ, vāyaṃtā vi sayāṃ sayāṃ*  
*nicchayattham ṇa jāṇamti, mīlakkhu vva abohiyā* 16
- Meaning: So does an ignorant, though pretending to possess knowledge, do not know the truth themselves still teach others the same.
44. *aññāṇīyāṇavīmaṃsa, aññāṇe ṇa ṇīyacchāi*  
*appaṇo ya param ṇālam, kato aññāṇusāsīṃ?* 17
- Meaning: The speculations of these ignorant heretics cannot lead to the knowledge of truth; they cannot reach the truth themselves, then how can they teach others about the same?
45. *vaṇe mūḍhe jāhā jāṃtū, muḍhaṇe yāṇugāmie*  
*do vi ee akoviya, tivvaṃ soyaṃ ṇīyacchāi* 18
- Meaning: As when a man in the woods who does not know it, follows a guide who also does not know it, both being unacquainted with the place come to a great trouble.
46. *aṃdho aṃdham paḥam ṇemto, dūramaddhāṇa gacchāi*  
*āvajje uppaham jāṃtū, aduvā paṃthāṇugāmie* 19
- Meaning: As when one blind man is the guide of another, the man walks a great distance, loses his way, or follows a wrong way.
47. *evamege ṇīyāgaṭṭhi, dhammamārāhagā vāyaṃ*  
*aduvā ahammamāvajje, ṇa te savvajjuyāṃ vāye* 20
- Meaning: Thus some who search after the salvation and pretend to practice the true Law and does not arrive at the thoroughly right thing viz self control.
48. *evamege vīyakkāhim, ṇo añṇaṃ paḍḍivāsīyā*  
*appaṇo ya vīyakkāhim, ayaṃmaññū hi dummaī* 21
- Meaning: Thus some wrong philosophers do not apply to others for arguments, but they continue to err because they believe their own arguments to be right.
49. *evaṃ takkāe sāherṇā, dhammādhamme akoṇiviyā*  
*dukkham te nāivaṭṭamti, saṇṇī paṃjaram jāhā* 22
- Meaning: Thus arguing according to their light, and ignorant about what is right and wrong, they do not get out of misery as birds do not get out of their cage
50. *sayāṃ sayāṃ pasamsaṃtā, garaḥamā param vāyaṃ*  
*je u tattha vīussamti, saṃsāram te vīussuyā* 23
- Meaning: They praise their own creed and blame that of their opponents, but those who act in this respect and be proud will be confined in the cycles of births-deaths.

According to them, the root cause of all problems is knowledge. Cūṃkīkāra calls the monks without observing austerities and those heretics who live leading the life of a deer as followers of this doctrine. The commentator of *Sūtrakṛtāṃga* has given three meanings of this doctrine. He has even placed Buddhists as believers of this doctrine. He considers all those who consider lack of knowledge as virtue belong to this doctrine.

Ajnānavādis say that it is very difficult to come to a conclusion of truth and false. Everybody talks of their doctrine as true and present logic and supporting cases. In such a situation it is difficult to come to a true conclusion. Therefore lack of knowledge is better than having knowledge. The following points emerge clearly from Ajnānavāda.



- i. Knowledge results in fighting, arguments, ego, debates and passions etc.
- ii. Ignorance is a better way to escape from sins/ mistakes.
- iii. Ignorance does not result in attachment, aversion etc in the mind.
- iv. There are many philosophies in the world that are mutually opposing to each other and hence are not able to come to a right conclusion.
- v. A non-omniscient person cannot validate an omniscient.
- vi. Ignorance is best to attain liberation.

Ajñānavāda does not consider knowledge as essential to attain liberation. They say that we cannot know anything about heaven and hell, good and evil and their results. We can neither prove establishment of nor the non existence of heaven or hell. Monist, Saṃśāyavādi and philosophers infected with ignorance and perverted views have been compared to the wild deer in the forests as

- i. they consider safe places as unsafe and vice versa.
- ii. They can get release from bondage but they do not understand the bondage.
- iii. In the end they arrive at a difficult place and get bonded and ultimately die there only.

Similarly there are some monist sramanas who are infected with lack of knowledge and perverted views that are not completely protected by right faith-knowledge-conduct. They accept without any doubt violence, perverted and false views as true and practice the religion on these bases and worship their proponents. But they run away dubiously from right faith-knowledge-conduct, non violence, non possessions and anekānta. They doubt the proponents of true path of detachment as well as the canons which describe the virtues such as forgiveness, non violence etc. They disown such texts and their proponents as perverted and false religion. On the other they do not doubt at all the canons which are full of *yajnas*, violence, animal sacrifice, lust and possessions and adopt them as real. Such ignorant and pervert persons get entangled in the cycle of inauspicious activities and never able to be released from bondage and hence get in the cycle of births- deaths.

Three states of such ignorant persons are indicated as:

- i. To doubt the un-doubtable and not to doubt the un-doubtable.
- ii. To get entangled in karma bondage.
- iii. In the end to be destroyed.

### Two kinds of Ajñānavādi

Sūtrakṛtāṅga talks of two types of Ajñānavādi namely:

- i. those who acquire scanty knowledge and continue to be proud of their knowledge and say that they have the entire knowledge is with them. But there knowledge is superficial and not deep and substantial. They do not go deeper in the self realization and repeat only the sutra and statements from the scriptures which is repeated before the ignorant persons. Like the foreigners not understanding the language of local people repeat the utterances of the locals. Similarly these people without understanding the anekāntika sermons of the detached omniscient just repeat what is stated in the scriptures.
- ii. Those who think that ignorance is the only worthy thing. There is no need to know anything. Being ignorant, they will be protected /free from arguments, ego, passions and fighting etc. The punishment for intentional sins is intense while the sins committed in ignorance attract very little punishment and sometimes even go without punishment. To prevent from developing attachment and aversion by the mind, the best way is to be ignorant and stop inquisitiveness for the knowledge about them. Therefore for a practitioner ignorance is the worthy act.

Again there are many religions, many preachers and many scriptures, each has a different doctrine. Who is right and who is wrong is difficult to ascertain. We have not seen any omniscient delivering sermons of any scripture. Whether these writings in the scriptures are by an omniscient or not is not certain. Are these the only meanings

of the scripture texts or something else. Such decisions are also very difficult to make. Hence to keep away from all such confusions, it is better to be ignorant.

### Review

After describing the intentions of both types of Ajñānavādīs, the author says how the first type with the pride of their knowledge keep on whirling in the cycle of births and deaths. His intention is to say these heretics in the garb of monks appear to be practicing the path of liberation and project them as the real pious persons even though they do not know even a, b and c of religion. They are busy in committing violence, themselves and through others, of the six body types of living beings and even preach violence to others. What to talk of their engagement in the right faith-knowledge-conduct; they are engaged primarily in inauspicious activities. They refrain from self control and do not consider serving the monks practicing self restraint as worthy. Without understanding the fundamentals of worthy and unworthy, they use wrong logic to prove their doctrines /views. Like a bird in cage cannot come out of it by breaking the cage, similarly these heretics cannot break the cage of ignorance /lack of knowledge. They are engrossed only in the praise of their creed. As a result they get deeply whirled in the cycle of birth and deaths.

The second types of Ajñānavādīs, who consider ignorance as worthy are refuted by the author as follows: Why do these heretics use knowledge (inferential, logical and using similes etc) to prove their doctrine as worthy? Thus they refute their own doctrine only. When they themselves cannot practice ignorance /lack of knowledge; then how can they preach and teach their doctrine to others? When such a heretic is himself misguided, then a novice under his guidance will only suffer miseries. Here the saying “blind man following another blind man will only loose the right path”. Same will be the situation of an ignorant follower who I guided by a foolish ignorant one.

The author says “*aññaniyā vā kusalā vi santā*” i.e. the ignorant heretics consider themselves as experts, but no living being is expert and auspicious without knowledge. A living being becomes miserable only due to lack of knowledge resulting in his performing wrong acts and hence whirling in the cycle of births-deaths. Hell is full of those who lack right knowledge. If ignorance was a cause for happiness, then why the hellish beings continue to fight all the time and stay unhappy? Hence the point that knowledge is the cause of happiness and not ignorance or lack of knowledge.

Practically all religions have given importance to knowledge. In Jain philosophy it is given high importance as is evidence from “*Jñānakriyābhyām mokṣaḥ*”. Vedantis are called Jñānavādi. In Buddhism, intellect (*prajñā*) is the pointer to knowledge only. These are the reasons that no community exists in the world today called Ajñānavādīs as well as no famous doctrine preaching it. Hence considering ignorance or lack of knowledge as worthy is a cause of bondage only.

### 9.3 Kriyāvādi

Activity is the sign of the soul. Hence those who believe in the existence of soul all in this category i.e. are Kriyāvādi. Those who believe that the soul experiences pain in the hell and those who have complete knowledge of pain and the way of eliminating it are considered as the practitioners of Kriyāvāda. These are one of the branches of Buddhism even though Buddhism preaches akriyāvāda. Here in the following verses, they are described as Kriyāvādi

51. *ahāvaram purakkhāyam, kiriyāvāidarisaṇam*  
*kammacimntāpanatṭhanam, dukkhakhamdhavivaddhanam* 24

Meaning: There is the doctrine of Kriyāvādīs, which is established since ancient time? It augments the miseries of the worldly existence of those (some Buddhists) who do not well consider the nature of acts.

52. *jāṇam kāṇaṇāṇuttī, abuho jam ca himsai*  
*puṭṭho vedei param, aviattam khu sāvajjam* 25

Meaning: He who intends to kill a living being but does not do it by an act of his body, and he who unknowingly kills one, both are affected by that act through a slight contact with it only, but the demerit in their case is not fully developed.

53. *saṃtime tao āyānā, jehim kīrai pāvagam*  
*abhikkammā ya pesā ya, maṇasā anujāṇiyā* 26

Meaning: There are three ways of committing a sin (to accrue bondage) namely one's own activities, by commissioning some one else to do so and by approval of the deed.

54. *ee u tao āyaṇā, jehim kīrai pāvagam*  
*evam bhāvavisoḥīe, ṇivvāṇamabhigacchai* 27

Meaning: There are three ways of committing sins as mentioned above. One who does not perform these, he attains liberation through purity of heart (void of attachment, aversion etc.)

55. *puttam pi tā samārambha, āhāraṭṭham asaṃjae*  
*bhumjamāṇo vi mehāvī, kammunā ṇovalippate* 28

Meaning: An unrestrained layman may kill a pig or a goat and cook the meat for the monk. A wise monk who eats that meat will not be defiled by the sin.

56. *manasā je paussamti, cittaṃ tesim ṇa vijjai*  
*aṇavajjam ataham tesim, ṇa te samvudacāriṇo* 29

Meaning: The mind of those who sin in thoughts is not pure. Just the activities of body are not enough for karma bondage. They do not conduct themselves carefully and so are engaged in bondage.

57. *icceyāhim diṭṭhīm, sāyāgāraṇissiyā*  
*saraṇam ti maṇṇamāṇā, sevamī pāvagam jaṇā* 30

Meaning: Men attached to pleasure and accept the above doctrine thinking that they will save him, commit sins.

58. *jahā āsāvīṇim ṇāvam, jāiamdho durīhiyā*  
*icchaī pāramāgāmtum, amtaṃ āle viṣīyāī* 31

Meaning: As a man blind since birth get into a leaky boat, wants to reach the shore, but is drowned during the passage.

59. *evam tu samanā ege micchadiṭṭhī aṇāriyā*  
*samsārapāraṅkamkhī te, samsāram anupariyaṭṭamti* 32

Meaning: Similarly some śramaṇas wish to get beyond the cycle of births-deaths, but they are whirled around in it.

In verses 24<sup>th</sup> through 32, the doctrine and the thoughts of Kriyāvādīs has been reviewed. Why are they believers of just activities only? This mystery is solved in 24<sup>th</sup> verse by “*kammacintāpaṇaṭṭhaṇam*” i.e. they are free from the causes and methods of bondage of eight types of karmas like knowledge obscuring etc and whether they are the causes of miseries and pleasures etc or not? What are ways of getting release from them? Thus they are free from all concerns about karma, their bondage, release and effects.

Whatever you do, even if it involves violence, if done with pure mind (i.e. free from attachment etc) will not result in bondage. Buddhists are called moralist- Kriyāvādīs due to their thoughts. There have been states about the doctrine of non-violence. Concerning non-violence, the views of Buddhists are given in these verses showing three opinions:

- i. Do we commit violence only when we kill a living being?
- ii. Is violence not committed if the living being is not killed?
- iii. Is violence not committed even if the living being dies?

These have been the three basic questions which arise while discussing non-violence. These questions have been answered by all religious teachers in their own style and manner. In the above discussions, the author raises the question about the moment when the bondage takes place?

*prāṇi prāṇijñānaṃ ghātakacitaṃ ca tadgatā cestā  
prāṇaisca viprayogaḥ paṃcabhirāpādyate hiṃsā*

i.e. there are five causes for committing violence, namely

- i. First the living being to be killed should be present before the person committing violence.
- ii. Then the person committing violence should have the knowledge that the entity to be killed is a living being.
- iii. Then the violent person should feel that he should kill or will kill the entity in front of him.
- iv. With all the above three causes existent and he tries to kill and
- v. That entity is killed and so violence is committed then

In the above four cases, no bondage occurs in the first four cases is propounded by the Buddhists due to their ignorance and miseries. Besides these Buddhist philosophers do not accept kāmika bondage due to the four activities performed out of ignorance.

- i. Just by thinking of killing does not kill anyone. Therefore just thinking of killing does not result in kāmika bondage.
- ii. Even unintentional killing does not result in karmic bondage.
- iii. Living beings killed while one is walking carefully does not result in developing kāmika bondage.
- iv. Killing some one in dream also does not result in kāmika bondage as the intention was not to kill anyone.

The commentator has also given three conditions resulting in bondage in the above cases, namely:

- i. To go to kill and then kill.
- ii. Commanding other to kill
- iii. Support the one who has killed.

In killing, anyone of the acts namely to kill, to command to kill or to support the one who killed result in kāmika bondage. According to Buddhist philosophers, where these three actions do not occur, no bondage of karmas occurs even if the killing takes place. To prove this point the author has given the example of eating meat in verse 28. From this example it becomes clear that unintentional killing does not result in kāmika bondage.

Bondage does not occur when the mind is pure: In the 27<sup>th</sup> verse, describing their own philosophy, it is said “*evaṃ bhāvaṃ viśohī, nirvāṇam abhigacchati*” which implies “whenever the mental activity is without attachment or aversion; and an act of violence takes place physically or mentally, the same will not cause bondage due to the mind being pure and so the person can attain liberation also”. In this connection, we find in Suttapiṭaka’s Khuddanikāya’s “Bālovāda Jātaka”, Buddha saying “Leave aside the meat of someone else, even if a person kills his wife or son and offer the meat of the same to a wise monk and the same monk eats it too, even then the monk does not accrue demerit (*pāpa*).”

## Review

The logic, arguments and example given in the above verses (cited) concerning bondage of karmas, have been refuted in the 29<sup>th</sup> verse itself as “*manasā je paussamti, cittaṃ tesim na vijjati*” which means that anyone who commits violence due to any reason, but with a pure mind, does not commit a sin and hence no bondage takes place. This is not true as it is not sustainable by logic or doctrine. It is just not possible to have a pure mind (i.e. without attachment or aversion) without the thought of committing violence when one commits violence. We commit mental violence only when we develop the feelings of attachment or aversion in our mind as it is

impossible otherwise. In fact to have kāmika bondage, the mind is the primary cause as also indicated in Buddhist text Dhammapada and given below:

*manopuvvaṃgabhā dhammā mano seṭṭhā manomayā  
manasā ca paduṭṭhena bhāsati vā karoti vā.*

The example “That in the time of distress, a father kills his son to eat his meat himself and offer to the monk who also eat the same, does not accrue sin or bondage to either.” In Buddhist texts is inappropriate a without developing the feelings of attachment or aversion no one can commit violence. “I kill my son, this feeling cannot be proved as pure by anyone”. Further they also have accept that violent acts performed by oneself or commanded others to do so or supporting those act done by others as same and result in bondage. Even walking without a purpose is also not possible an hence must result in bondage. However, if a person performs any activity carefully, without any laziness and with intent of not causing any harm to any one, then the Jains also accept that such acts do not accrue bondage. But all acts done with intent and without any purpose and due to laziness are bound to result in bondage. Similarly we dream of killing some one only when our mind is infested with such thoughts and cause bondage. Thus it is established that all such act result in four fold kāmika bondage. Therefore the author as assigned two flaws in Buddhist doctrine, namely:

- i. They are devoid of right thoughts about karma
- ii. They do not exercise self control and carefulness in any activity.

They are like a person who is blind by birth and rides a boat with many holes to cross a river but sink as the water fills the boat itself. This is the state of these monist philosophers also. Hence heir views are not sustainable as right.

### 10.0 Third topic

From here the third topic in the first chapter starts. In the first two topics, self and non self were discussed. But there heretics viewpoints were given along with associated flaws in their doctrines. Now the author talks about their conduct and shows the flaws in their religious conduct.

This topic is related to the first two topics in the sense that the first verse in the first topic talked of knowing the nature of bondage and then to break those bondages. The main causes of karma bondage are perverted views, disinterest in the vows, laziness in following the creed, passions and activities of mind, body and speech. In the earlier two topics, the doctrines of others were identified as perverted views resulting in bondage and the result thereof. Now in this topic, emphasis is laid on explaining the flaws of conduct due to laziness and disinterest in vows and associated results. Then the author talks of the right conduct to break the bondage and so the knowledge about these should be acquired.

### 10.1 Ādhākarma flaws

The author first talks of the first cause of kāmika bondage i.e. eating non-edible and mixed (pure and impure) food by *śramaṇas*, Buddhist monks and *nirgrāṃthas* alongwith the results of doing this (eating mixed food).

60. *jaṃ kiṃci vi pūṭikāḍaṃ, saḍḍhī āgantu ṭhiyaṃ  
sahassaṃtariyaṃ bhūṃje, dupakkhaṃ ceva sevaī* 1

Meaning: If a monk eats forbidden food which a pious layman has prepared for some guests, and which food has been mixed up with even thousand times more pure food from different homes, he would neither be a monk nor a pious layman i.e. he behaves like an ordinary layman.

61. *tameva aviyāṇaṃtā, visamaṃsi akoviyā  
macchā vesāliya ceva, udagassaabhiyāgame* 2

Meaning: *Śramaṇas*, who do not comprehend this and do not know what is dangerous, who care for the pleasures of the moment only, will suffer death an endless number of times like big fishes who are deposited on dry land when the water rises.

62. *udagassa ppabhāveṇaṃ, sukkammi ghātamenti u  
dhamkehi ya kamkehi ya, āmisatthehiṃ te dukhī* 3

Meaning: When the high tide of water returns, the sand of the ocean / river dries and the meat eating *dhamkas* and herons (*kamkas*) eat these poor things (big fishes as in verse 2 described). The big fishes die with the feeling of great pain and misery.

63. *evaṃ tu samaṇā ege, vaṭṭamāṇasuhesiṇo  
macchā vesāliyā ceva, ghāyamesamtaṇaṃtaso* 4

Meaning: In this way, those heretics (laymen and *śramaṇas*) who long for momentary pleasures die infinite deaths like the big fishes.

In the first four verses, the author describes the flaws and the pitiable condition of the self (*nirgrāṃhika śramaṇa*) by accepting and consuming the mixed (pure and impure) food. The author has greatly emphasized the purity of food. This is so because if the food of the monk has flawed mixed food, then his thinking, intentions and mind will also become flawed. Flawed food endangers the monk becoming lazy in his conduct. In the fourth verse, this is clearly stated so “*vaṭṭamāṇasuhesiṇo*” i.e. ignoring the purity of food the monk starts yearning for comfort and momentary pleasures in the present. They become lazy and prefer momentary physical pleasures. They ignore the bliss to be achieved in the future.

The question arises “What are the flaws and pains associated which result from taking mixed food?” To explain this point, the conversation given in Bhagavati is relevant and given here. Gaṇḍhara Gautam asks Bhagavāna Mahāvīra “Bhagavāna! Which karmas are bonded by a *śramaṇa* who accepts and consumes mixed and so flawed food? Which acts he performs with intentions? How many karmas he binds and enjoys the results thereof?”

In reply, Bhagavāna Mahāvīra says “Gautam, A monks who consumes mixed food, causes the seven (except the *āyu* or life span determining karma) karma natures firmly bonded which otherwise were dormant, binds karmas and enjoys their fruits and whirls for a very long time in the cycle of births and deaths.”

In the second verse, by comparing with a huge monstrous fish to the monk consuming mixed food, the author says “like a fish with huge body enjoying the high tide in the ocean, is engulfed by them and is driven to the shore. But as soon as the wet waves return, these big fishes are left high and dry on the sand and unable to return to the ocean. They suffer great pains and ultimately die suffering. The monk who eats the flawed mixed food also suffers like the fish. They also, due to firm karmic bondage, are born in hell or as animals where they are tortured by demons, or by hunters fond of their meat or skin etc.

Here the question again arises “Does one, who does not have the knowledge of pure or impure and mixed food, also get bondage due the flaws of consuming mixed food?” For this the author says “*te dukhī*” i.e. those who are ignorant about mixed foods and the flaws associated also has to enjoy the miseries associated with such acts. Whosoever consumes flawed mixed food has to enjoy as expressed in “*ghāyamesamtaṇaṃtaso*”

Knowing the flawed and mixed food:

How do we know that the food is flawed and mixed? Does the same food when mixed with greater quantity of pure food stay as flawed or not? In response to such questions, the first verse itself says “*pūikaḍaṃ, saddhī āgamtuṃ thiyam*” i.e. some obedient devotee prepares food for a monk visiting the village is flawed; and if even a small part of the same is mixed with pure food, then the pure food will also become flawed. Even if this food is given to the monks brought not one but even thousand homes, will continue to be flawed. The author further says “*dupakkhaṃceva sevaī*” i.e. the monk, who consumes such food, becomes flawed in two ways.

*Dupakkhaṃ* here conveys three different meanings namely:

1. He earns the flaws himself for consuming such food, but he also earns flaws of the householder who served that food. Hence, even though he is a monk, he earns the flaws of the householder also.
2. Because of his carelessness in walking as well as doing, he earns to flaw namely *īryāpathika* or

flaws associated with walking to get the food and *sāmparāyika* (deceit and greed passions) for eating the food.

3. By accepting the food, he first accrues the bondage and makes the *nidhati* and *nikācīta* karmas deeply bonded.

## 10.2 Views of different philosophies concerning creation and functioning of the world.

In the philosophical parlance, the issues concerning the creation of *jīva* and the world have been discussed in depth. In *Sutrakṛtāṅga* it has been discussed as follows:

64. *ināmaṇṇam tu aṇṇāṇam, ihamegesimāhiyam*  
*devautte ayam loe, bambhautte tti āvare* 5

Meaning: We also hear of another error of some philosophers. Some say that the world has been created or is governed by the gods and others say by *Brahmā*.

65. *īsareṇa kaḍe loe, pahāṇāi tahāvare*  
*jīvājīvasamāutte, suhadukkhasamaṇṇie* .6

Meaning: Some say that this world, with living and non living beings and with its variety of miseries and pleasures, has been created by *Īswara* and the others say by *prakṛti*.

66. *sayambhūnā kaḍe loe, iti vuttam mahesiṇā*  
*māreṇa santhūyā māyā, teṇa loe asāsae* 7

Meaning: The great *ṛṣi* said that the world had been created by *Svayambhū*; *Māra* originated *Māyā* associated with death and so the world appears to be non-eternal.

67. *māhaṇā samaṇā ege, āha āṇḍakaḍe jage*  
*aso tattamakāsī ya, ayāṇamti musam vae* 8

Meaning: Some *Śramanas* and *Brāhmanas* say that the world was produced from the primeval egg, and He (*Brahmā*) created all the things. These ignorant men speak untruth.

68. *saekim pariyāekim, logam būva kaḍe tti ya*  
*tattam te ṇa viyāṇamti, ṇayam ṇāasī kayāi vi* 9

Meaning: This world is created by its own modifications. Those, who on arguments of their own maintain that the world has been created; they do not know the truth. world never existed- it is not that.

69. *amaṇṇasamuppāyam, dukkhameva vijāṇiyā*  
*samuppāyama jāṇamti, kiha ṇāhimi samvaram* 10

Meaning: Know that misery arises from the wicked deeds (unrestrained activities). How can those who do not know the origin of misery know its prevention (*samvara*)

In verses 64 to 69, the author has called this as the second ignorance of *Ajñānavādis* and described different views about creation of the world. The seeds of all these views can be traced to *Upariśadas*, *Purāṇas*, *Smṛtis* and *Sāṃkhya* texts. Here the author has given following seven different popular views on the subject.

- i. This world is created by some god, secretly protected and was planted.
- ii. This world was created by *Brhamā* and administered by him. It is a creation.
- iii. *Īswara* created this world.
- iv. *Pradhāna (prakṛti)* has created this world.
- v. *Svayambhu (Visnu)* has created this world.
- vi. *Yamarāja (Māra or death)* has created this world (*māyā*) and so it is momentary.
- vii. This world has originated from an egg.

Let us take these views one at a time.

### i. Created by god

In Vedic era, a section of the people was the worshippers of natural and powerful elements like air, fire, water, light, space; direction etc. A man does not have so much energy that he can create this world. Therefore only a god has those supernatural powers. These feelings created a view that the world has been created by a god. Therefore it was said “*devautte*”. This can be stated in three ways in Saṃskṛta namely *deva-upta*, *deva-gupta* and *deva-putra*. “*deva-upta*” means planted like a seed by gods. We find supporting statements in Aitareyopariṣad, Chāndogyaopariṣad etc. “*deva-gupta*” means protected by the gods i.e. the entire world is protected by gods. “*devaputra*” means that the world is like the son of a god and so he created it like his son.

### ii. Created by Brahmā

Some people believe that the world is a creation of Prajāpati (Brahmā). They say “The man does not have so much power that he can create such a vast world and then protect it also. Perhaps gods may be more powerful than men but they cannot be capable of creating such a vast world. So Brahma, called Hiranyagarbha, being alone, and is the only creator of this world as is said in Upaniṣad.

Mundakopariṣad clearly states “Creator and protector of this world is the first amongst gods called Brahma. “Taitariya upaniṣad says “He wished - I am alone, I wish to manifest in many and create my subjects. He then performed *tapasa* and as a result created this world.” Praśnopariṣad also supports these claims. Similarly Chāndogyaopariṣad says so. There is a strange description of creation and its sequence by Brahma in Bṛhadāranyaka as “Brahmā alone never wandered around. He wished for a companion. Like husband and wife, Brahmā split himself in two parts and these two parts became husband and wife. He then created men, cows, bull, goat and female goat, birds and so on in pairs till the entire world was created.” He thought “I am the representation of the world. I only have created it.” In one of the Vedic *purānas*, the sequence of creation had been described as - in the beginning this entire world was completely dark, totally unknown, without logic etc as if it is sleeping. It was in the form of an ocean. All stationary and mobile beings, demons, gods, human beings etc all living beings got destroyed. Only a big pit was existent which was free from gross elements like earth etc. From the navel which is unthinkable in size, a large lotus emerged which was shining brighter and more powerfully than sun. From its trunk Brahmā was born. He created eight mothers from there, namely Diti, Aditi, Manu, Vinatā, Kadru, Sulasā, surabhi and Ilā who in turn created demons, gods, human beings, birds, snakes, crawling beings, four legged beings and all kinds of seeds respectively. In this different stories abound in Vedic literature about creation of this world. Therefore the author has used the word “*bambhauṭte tti āvare*”. Like *devautte*, the word *bambhauṭte* also can be interpreted in three ways.

### iii. Created by Īswara.

There were three types of philosophers, namely Vedāntī, Naiyāyika and Vaiśeṣika, who consider Īswara as the material and efficient cause of the creation of this world. They have presented many arguments in support of their claim. In Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad it is said “In the beginning there was only one existent namely Brahmā. He then created a worthy place and then a number of *kṣtrāṅis* who gave birth to Varuna, Soma, Rudra, Parjanya, Yama, Mṛtyu, Iśāna and other gods. Then he created brāhamaṇas, kṣatriyas and vaiśya and in the end śudras to serve them.

Taitariyopariṣad says “The Īswara (Brahmā) from whom these beings are born, all the living beings after being born live and due to the chaos which they created, get dissolved in it all have a universal relation with Īswara (Brahma).

Further in Bṛhadāranyaka it is said “that Brahmā has two modes, concrete and non-concrete or poison and nector which are called *yat* and *tyat*. That Īswara (Brahmā) exists in every thing and being. Brahmāsutra by Bādarāyana Vyāsa in its first aphorism says “Creation, existence and destruction is due to this Brahmā only.” Vedāntis use inferential knowledge also and say “Īswara is the creator of this world as he is sentient and the one who is sentient is a doer like potter is of the pitcher”

The other proponents of this doctrine are Naiyāyikas. The venerated deity of these Naiyāyikas is Maheśvara.



Maheśvara is the the creator and destroyer of this world filled with so many beings. They also use inferential knowledge to prove their doctrine. “Earth, mountains, moon, sun, oceans, body, sense organs etc are created by some intelligent persons e.g. pitcher. This world is also an effect and hence it also has to be created by some very intelligent person. That person is Maheśvara only. The things which are not created by intelligent persons are non existent, like space.”

Alongwith accepting him as the creator of the world, they also consider him to be all pervading, eternal, self sufficient, omniscient, and all powerful. He is the one who rewards and punishes the people for their deeds. By saying so, the Naiyāyikas consider *īśvara* as the efficient cause and not the material cause and efficient cause like Vedāntis say. Vaiśeṣikas also have approximately similar views.

#### iv. Creation by *pradhāna/prakṛti*

According to Sāṃkhyas, there are two primary elements in this world namely *puruṣa* (sentient and inert) and *prakṛti* (active and insentient). Both of them are beginningless and independent. A sentient cannot be the cause of an insentient and an insentient cannot be the cause of sentient. In this way they are the proponents of creation but believers of Satkāryavāda. The insentient world is extended by *prakṛti*. Because of this statement, the author has counted them as believers of creation.

The basic state of *prakṛti* i.e. without its transformation is called *prakṛti*. From this, elements like *mahat* and *buddhi* are evolved. Then a series of transformations from these takes place as-ego-mind- ten types of sense organs, five *tanmatras* (sound, touch, form, taste, odour) - five *bhūtas* (sound - space; sound and touch - air; sound and touch - fire /energy; sound, touch and form with taste - water and all the *tanmatras* together result in earth. In these twenty four elements, *prakṛti* is not caused by anyone and is beginningless. It has no cause. *Mahat*, ego and five *tanmatras* exist in both basic *prakṛti* and the transformed *prakṛti* as well. *Puruṣa*, being inert, does not create anything and so has no manifestation. Basic *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* exist from beginningless time. The remaining twenty three elements are manifestations of *prakṛti* only. This is the doctrine of Sāṃkhya for creation.

The word “*pradhānā*” includes etc and implies nature etc. Some say “Like the sharpness of thorns is due to their nature, similarly the world is created by its own nature.

Some say that like the feathers of the peacock, creation of this world was predestined.

Now the question arises as to the nature of the world created according to the doctrines of the philosophies discussed above? To answer this question, the author uses two adjectives namely *jīva-jīvasamāutta* and *suhadukhasamannī*: “meaning this world consists of both living and non living beings and is full of miseries and pleasures.

#### v. Created by Svayambhū

The great ṛṣi says “This world is created by Svayambhū. The cūṃikāra derives two meanings from this statement by the great ṛṣi namely:

- i. The great ṛṣi i.e. Brahmā
- ii. The great ṛṣi like Vyās

The author of Vṛtti derives the meanings of the word Svayambhū as Brahmā or Viṣṇu. It can only refer to someone else also. Nārāyaṇopariṣad says “Viṣṇu, after creating and then pervades the internal or the external world as seen and heard”. Nārāyaṇātharvasira upriṣad says “Viṣṇu desired that he should create his subjects. From this the entire universe of living beings, mind, sense organs, space, air, fire, water, earth, Brahmā, Rudra etc were born.”

Like the sequence of creation of the world in Purāṇas, we also find similar construction in Manusmṛti also. This world was dark everywhere as if it is sleeping or dreaming. Then Svayambhū removes this darkness of the unexpressed world by his light and energy and makes it expressed. This Svayambhū, who can be experienced by mind only and is subtle, eternal, all pervading was himself born as world. By meditating he created all the subjects in the world. First he created water and then he planted seeds in it.

## vi. Created by Māra i.e. Māyā associated with death.

“*māreṇa santhūyā māyā, teṇa loe asāsaē*” i.e. Māra created Māyā. That Māra was Yamarāja or death. This is why this world is perishable and not eternal.

Vṛttikāra derives two meanings of Māra, namely the one who kills / destroys. That Māra is Yamarāja. The authors of Puranas say Svayambhū, after he created this world was scared that the earth may not be able to bear the heavy burden of his subjects and so created Yamarāja /Māra. Then Māra created Māyā which kills the subjects”. The cūṃkīkāra derives the meaning of Svayambhū as Viṣṇu. “*māreṇa santhūyā māyā*” also points to a story in Vedic literature describing the origin of death as given below:

Brahmā created this world of miserable beings. The earth became intolerant of the weight of the beings it was carrying. It became unable to bear their burden any further. She (earth) ran to Brahmā for help and said O Lord! If this sequence of creating more beings on me continues, then I may be unable to bear their load. How can I bear the ever increasing load if everybody continues to live? At that time Nārad and Rudra were also present. To this Brahmā replied “How can I destroy my own subjects?” Therefore from his worldly light, he created a woman from the south and named her Mṛtyu and ordered her to destroy the subjects. On hearing this she started crying and trembling and with tears in her eyes said “O Lord why I have to perform such a dreadful act?” Then Brahmā collected all her tears and said there will be as many diseases as there are tears here and hence the subjects will die themselves. This way the Law (dharma) will not be breached. Mṛtyu agreed to this and went away.

The cūṃkīkāra describes this story as follows:

Viṣṇu created this world. Being eternal, the earth became uneasy to carry such a heavy burden. Due to this uneasiness she went to Prajāpati. Prajāpati thought of creating a catastrophe. On hearing this, the earth got scared and started trembling. Seeing her tremble, Prajāpati gave up this idea and created many diseases to cause deaths. After that, simple and religious persons started getting born in heaven. The entire heaven started become intolerant of the growing burden of the people. The heaven then went to Prajāpati. Then Prajāpati created Māyā with death. The people started becoming devotees of Māyā and started getting born in hell. Prajāpati said to the heaven “The people, even knowing the scriptures, do not conduct themselves in accordance with them. Therefore they will not be born in heaven. Therefore O heaven go and do not be scared.”

Ācārya Nāgārjuna has supported this view. This is provided verbatim in the following verse

“*ativaddhīva jīvāṇaṃ mahi viṣṇava te prabhuraṃ  
ta to se māyā samjutte kare logassaabhidā vā*”

i.e. due to enhanced burden on the earth, she prays to Lord Viṣṇu. The lord therefore created Māyā associated with death to destroy the world.

In Vedic texts we find the following famous aphorism:

“*viṣṇaurmāyā bhagavatī, yayā sammohitam jagat*”

## vii. The world created out of an egg.

Some śraṃaṇas and brāhamaṇas and some authors of Purāṇas have said about the creation of this world out of an egg. Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa says “In the beginning there was just an ocean full of water. A huge egg appeared from that ocean which kept on floating here and there for a long time. Then it split in two parts. One part became the earth and the other sky. Then in this the entire world of human beings, animals, birds etc appeared. Then mountains, rivers, air, water, fire, river etc appeared. In this way this entire world has been created out of an egg.” The word Brahmāṇḍa itself consists of two words namely Brahma and *aṃḍa* (egg).

Manusmṛti also has a similar story. There the egg is golden and became shining and potent like the sun. From it Lord Brahmā emerged. There He lived for a longtime. Then He meditated upon his self and broke the egg in two parts. These two parts are the earth and sky respectively.

### viii. Review. (All the views discussed above concerning creation are false)

Later part of verse 67<sup>th</sup> and verse 68<sup>th</sup> of Sutrakṛtāṅga describe the proponents of the above views about creation of this world as those of ignorant and perverts who, based on their own professed logic and views or referring to various texts have proved this eternal and indestructible world as non-eternal and destructible also. The basic verses do however in the passing, point out that they call this indestructible world as destructible also. They do not understand the real nature of this world. Vṛtikāra has translated this line and said “In fact this world is never destroyed completely as from substance view point, it is eternal. This world existed in the past, exists now and will continue to exist in future also. Hence this world cannot be created in the beginning by any Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Deva, and Īswara etc. If it was created by someone, then it has to be destroyed also. But this is not so. Hence this world is not created by anyone. There is no valid proof with any one of the above proponents to prove validity of their doctrine of creation. Proponents of creation by Īswara have compared him to a potter to prove their views.

The second question posed to these proponents of creation is “Whether the creator created himself first or created this world without doing so?” Without creating himself, he cannot create anything else. If he is created first, then the question arises whether he created himself or others created him? If he was created without the parents, then why not consider this world also to be self created? If we say that he was created by others, then the question arises who created these others? Thus as a series of creators arise, they lead to an infinite regress. These proponents have no answers to such issues.

The third question posed to these proponents of creation “Is the creator himself eternal or non-eternal?” An eternal entity, being not active, cannot perform any activity sequentially or simultaneously as he cannot even move a centimeter to act and his nature cannot change. If he is non eternal then after creation, he himself can be destroyed? Hence there is no guarantee that he created the world as the one who cannot protect himself and so cannot be involved in creating others.

Now the question also arises whether the creator is concrete or non-concrete? If he is non concrete, then like space he is also inert /non active. If he is concrete, then like ordinary people he will need tools and appliances. From where will such tools and appliances come? Thus accepting the creation and the creator, then flaws like cruel, biased, and weak, having desires, attachment and aversion by the creator will arise. Therefore Bhagavat Gītā says:

*na kartṛtvam na karmāṇi, lokasya sṛjati prakṛuḥ  
na karmafalasamyogam, svabhāvastu pravartate*

i.e. The God neither creates this world, nor rewards or punishes the people of good or bad deeds. By nature this world is self propelled and administered.

To consider the emergence of *brāhmaṇas* from mouth, *kṣatriyas* from arms, *vaiśyas* from the stomach and *śūdras* from the feet of Brahmā and the world from the egg is illogical and unstainable. When Īswara and others could not be the creators then creation of Māra by Svayambhū, origin of the egg, origin of non concrete and sentient from the insentient and concrete *prakṛti* are sheer imaginations like flowers in the sky.

### ix. How can the non creator of the world be the provider of miseries and pleasures?

Verse 69 of Sutrakṛtāṅga is also associated with discussions on the creation of this world. Earlier in the verse 65, it was said “*jīvājīvasamāutte*” i.e. Īswara or *pradhāna* created this world filled with living and non living beings along with their miseries and pleasures. In this context, it is replied here “these people do not know that the living beings are facing miseries due to perverted views, disinterest in the vows, laziness in the practice of religious conduct, passions and activities of mind body and speech. They also do not know that practice of the vows with right belief and non violence is the way to get relief from the miseries.” Therefore in the 69<sup>th</sup> verse it is said that “*amaṇuṣṇasamuppāyam,..... nahi nāhīnti samvaram*” which means, “miseries are caused by performing inauspicious activities. On the other hand performing auspicious activities result in pleasures” No other god, Brahmā etc can give miseries or pleasures to anyone. If this was possible (i.e. he could give miseries etc) then he would have given pleasures only to everyone. Those who do not understand the causes of miseries

and pleasures cannot provide or guide others about the same. Through this verse the author has established the validity of the oneself is responsible for his miseries and pleasures and refuted the claims of others who assign this responsibility to Brahmā, Viṣṇu etc. This is the basic doctrine of self purification propounded by śramaṇas.

### 10.3 Reincarnation (Avatāravāda)

Some philosophers say that the pure soul, i.e. one who has achieved liberation, again gets defiled when he sees his creed not being venerated and becomes happy when he sees the devotees worshipping him. In this way, due to attachments and aversions developed by him, he again is born (reincarnated) as a human being. This is Avatārvāda which is described in Sutrakṛtāṅga as follows:

70. *suddhe apāvae āyā, ihamegesimāhiyaṃ*  
*puno kīdāpadoṣeṇaṃ, se tattha avarajjhaī* 11

Meaning: Some say that the soul of him who is pure will become free from bad karma on reaching the beatitude (*mokṣa*), but that in that state it will again become defiled through attachment and aversion.

71. *iha saṃvude muṇī jāe, pacchā hoi apāvae*  
*viyaḍaṃ va jahā bhujjo, nīrayaṃ sarayaṃ taḥā* 12

Meaning: According to them, he who has lived on earth as a restrained monk will afterwards become free from karma. As clear water which was free from defilement again becomes defiled, so will the pure soul of the monk.

### 3.1 Trairāśīkavāda (Avatāravāda)

According to Vṛttikāra, both these verses talk of the doctrine of Ājīvaka Makhali Gośālaka. Vṛtti of Samavāyāṅga and the second volume of this text (sixth topic) also mention Trairāśīka as followers of Ājīvaka Makhali Gośālaka. The meaning of the word “Trairāśīka” is the acceptance of three existents, namely *jīva*, *ajīva* and *no-jīva*. Here the three states of soul are also mentioned as follows:

- i. Empirical soul bonded with karmas and having attachments and aversions.
- ii. Getting release from empirical state by religious activities and achieving pure state i.e. liberated soul.
- iii. Later on when the pure soul after becoming liberated, again gets defiled (bonded with karmas) due to attachments and aversions and becomes empirical again.

Due to their belief in these three states they are called “Trairāśīka”. In these verses this doctrine is described.

### 3.2 Why does pure and without defilement soul again gets defiled?

The question arises: When the soul becomes pure after intensive penance and austerities, totally free from all merits and demerits; then how can it again get defiled with merit and demerit? Like a seed when burnt once cannot germinate again, similarly kāmika seeds once burnt cannot germinate again to make soul defiled and become prone to whirl in the cycle of births and deaths. Gītā also support this fact many time,

*dagdhe bīje yathāatyantam prādurbhavati nāmīkuraḥ*  
*karmabīje tathādagdhe na rohati bhavāmīkuraḥ*

All spiritual activities which are performed are done with the sole objective of getting release from all sins, attachments, aversions, passions completely and forever. It is unthinkable that a practitioner, who after getting liberated from these and attained the ultimate state, i.e. pure soul state, will like to get defiled with them again. If this happens then all our practices will become mute and useless. But Trairāśīka followers do not care for these truths and say that the liberated soul again gets defiled and is born again as an empirical soul and give two reasons for this. For example: *puno kīdāpadoṣeṇaṃ* means that the liberated soul when sees his creed being forgotten and other creeds prosper, he develops aversion and develops attachment when he sees his creed become more popular than others. In this way this liberated soul becomes bonded again and develops attachments, aversion etc. They give the following example to support their belief.

“*viyaḍambu jahā bhujjo nīrayaṃ sarayaṃ taḥā*” i.e. like muddy water is made clear by using alum (*ṣṭakari*), but the same clean water gets dirty again by dust storms, hails, rains and garbage dumped etc. Similarly *ajīva* being born as a human being cleans his soul defiled with attachment by practicing monkhood until one day his soul becomes completely free of all defilements. But again, as stated about the storms of attachment and aversion etc, defiles his soul and the free /liberated soul get defiled again.

In this context, the Cūmīkāra in the first part of verse 70, presents a view of the Avatāravāda “*puṇo kīḍāpadoseṇaṃ, se tattha avaraṃjha*” which says that this soul even after getting liberated because of its tendency to act/engage, develops aversion and get defiled again. Therefore this pure soul again gets born in the world to establish his creed or is reincarnated in this world.

Similar beliefs are also presented by some sects of Buddhism and other doctrines. They say that Sugata (Buddha) and other proponents of their religions, when see degradation of their creeds, and then even after attaining liberation, they are born again to re-establish their creed. This belief is popular in Vedic literature as well as in Gītā. “as and when I see the downfall of my creed or rise of sinful activities, I present myself in different forms of human being and protect the righteous beings, monks and destroy the evils and evil beings.” Hence this can be termed as Avatāravāda or Punarāgamavāda.

Sutrakṛtāṅga’s 70<sup>th</sup> verse talks of two causes for reincarnation, namely: activity /involvement (*krīḍā*) and aversion. These appear to support this version of Avatāravāda. The version of *krīḍā* popular in devotion based traditions is called *līlā*. They say that the lord is reincarnated to display his *līlā*. Or they demonstrate their *līlā* to protect the noble and destroy the evils. In such circumstances it is necessary for them to develop attachment and aversion. Thus the word *kīḍāpadoseṇaṃ* is appropriate in this verse.

### 10.5 Assurance of liberation and praise own doctrine.

In the last four verses i.e. 72-75, praise of the own creed and liberation are explained. Proponents of different doctrines praise their own creed.

72. *eyāṇuvī meḥāvī, bambhaceram na iāṃ vase*  
*puḍho pāvāyā savve, akkhāyāro sayam sayam* 13

Meaning: A wise man should consider that these heretics do not lead a life of chastity, and that all these disputants claim their own creed as true in opposition to the others.

73. *sae sae uvatthāṇe, siddhimeva na aṇṇahā*  
*adho vi hoti vasavati, savvakāmasamappie* 14

Meaning: They (others) maintain that perfection can be achieved only by their method of religious life, not otherwise; and that even before that time they have their senses under control and possess the eight magical powers wished for.

74. *siddhā ya te arogā ya, ihamegesim āhiyaṃ*  
*siddhimeva purokāum, sāsaē gadhiyā narā* 15

Meaning: Some philosophers say that those monks with magical power and embodied, even though have attained perfection, do not die with illness, but they leave their bodies on their own and attain liberation. In this way these laymen and monks continue to be engaged in violence etc.

75. *asaṃvuḍā aṇādīyaṃ, bhamihimti puṇo-puṇo*  
*kappakālamuvajjanti, thānā āsurakibbisiya* 16  
*-tti bemi*

Meaning: But these uncontrolled men will whirl around in the beginningless circles of births-deaths; after a kalpa they will continue to rise from their lowest sphere to become the *asura* / devils.

-Thus I say.

All the proponents praise their own creed and refute doctrines of other’s creed and the same have been explained

under different headings namely creation of world, avatāravāda etc. and termed as *pāvāuyā* in verse 72. The author presents two causes for being *pāvāuyā*.

- i. Ignorant of cause-effect relationship and without being logical, they praise their own creed.
- ii. They are not established in purification and welfare of their own self's.

To explain these two causes, the author has presented the next two verses (73, 74).

Due to these perverted views, defilement of pure souls (free from seeds in the form of karma as well as attachment and aversion), is contrary to the law of cause-effect. When the cause of the rebirths i.e. seeds in the form of karmas are already extinguished completely, then how can they be defiled and reborn as human beings.

As a matter of fact, these proponents of Avatāravāda get so entrenched in their doctrine that they forget the natural tendency of the soul to move upwards. When a soul reaches the summit from where it is impossible for it to fall, as the nature of pure soul is like the flame of fire which moves upwards only and not to fall down. In such a situation how can the pure soul come down again? Ācārya SiddhaSena has written as follows to refute the deluded views of Avatāravādīs.

*dagdhendhanaḥ punarūpaitti bhavaṃ pramathyam  
nīrvāṇamapyanavadhārīta-bhūruniṣṭham  
muktaḥ svayaṃ kṛtabhavaśca parārthaśūram  
tvacchāsanapratihate,svika moharājyam*

i.e. O Lord, the pure and detached! Those who refute your creed are under deep delusion. They say that the soul which has burnt the fuel in the form of karmas and thus destroyed the cycle of births and deaths again becomes defiled with karmas and get into the cycle of births and deaths. They prove their bravery by being born just to provide liberation to others and hence refute the law of causation. This shows their delusion whereby they forget their own pure soul state to enable others to achieve the same (pure soul state).

It is a definitive dictum that pure souls cannot be defiled. They do not have any discrimination between their own and other's creed. They visualize everybody with the same view and maintain equanimity in praise and refutation. How can such pure souls be defiled and be born again in this world for any reason?

The second reason is "Their own inability to be engrossed in their own doctrine and Brahma. When they consider all souls in this world as equal or same, then the question as to who is theirs and who is not does not matter. Then why would they consider the rise and fall of their own creed?" Such thinking is a refutation of their creed by them only.

In conclusion the Jain view of a perfect being (*siddha*) is as follows:

*Sivamayalamaru yamaṇṇitamakkhaya mavvābāhamapunaravittisiddhigaiṇāmadheyam thānam sampattānam*

i.e. they (the pure soul or *siddha*) attain the *mokṣa* (*siddhigati*) is the state which is the eternal, immobile, infinite, indestructible, unimpregnable, free from the cycle of births-deaths etc.

Here the words "free from the cycle of births-deaths" is worth noticing. This means that after a soul goes to the summit (*mokṣa*) it does not come back to the world. Bhagavata Gītā also says "*yadgatvā na nivartante taddhāma paramam ānāma*" i.e. once being there from where the living beings do not return. extremely important. This is my supreme home. Other heretics do not accept this. Some of them consider *siddha* as returnable to the cycle of births-deaths and *siddhi* (attainment of the objective) is translated as *mokṣa* or *mukti*. But they do not consider the trio of right faith-knowledge and conduct and penance or destruction of all karmas as *mokṣamārga*, but due to their own imagined knowledge consider either one of these alone as the *mokṣamārga* or by acquiring knowledge and practicing yoga to attain some or all the eight super natural worldly powers (*siddhis*). Such attainments are characterised by their being free from illness /diseases.

Therefore the author says "*siddhimeva gadhiyā nara*" i.e. these proponents of *siddhi*, with their preconceived notion even of *siddhi*, keep focussed on it to propagate their doctrine and support /praise the same. They even consider it to be beneficial not only in this but in future live also and try to manipulate various logical answers.

In this way they are engrossed deeply in their own purpose. They do not accept the logical and true doctrines of truly detached persons.

#### 11.0 Fourth topic

In the third topic, the conduct and doctrine of other doctrines which is insisted upon by them as right was explained from different viewpoints. In this fourth topic, discussing the views of the other doctrines, the conduct and duties of the *nirgramtha* monks have been briefly presented.

#### 11.1. Principle of begging (for food)

In the first four verses, the conduct with laziness of the monks of other creeds along with the preferred manner in which they should beg is described.

76. *ete jiyā bho! na saraṇam, bālā paṇḍiyamāṇiṇo*  
*hiccā naṃ puvvasamjogam, sitakiccovaesagā* 1

Meaning: O disciple! Those preachers, who are engrossed in passions and pleasure, cannot protect or guide you. Even though they themselves are ignorant, they consider themselves as experts / wise. Though having given up their previous occupations, they will give advice in worldly matters.

77. *taṃ ca bhikkū pariṇṇāya, vijjam tesu na mucchae*  
*aṇukkase aṇavalīṇe, majjheṇa muṇi jāvae* 2

Meaning: A wise monk, who fully appreciates this, should not mix with those heretics; without conceit and not attached to them a sage should lead a life equally free from love and hate.

78. *sapariggahā ya sāraṃbhā, ihamegesimāhiyam*  
*apariggahēaṇāraṃbhe, bhikkhu jāṇam parivāe* 3

Meaning: Some say those who own possessions and engage in worldly activities may reach perfection. But a monk should take refuge to those who neither own possessions nor engage in worldly activities.

79. *kaḍesu ghāsamesejjā, viū dattesanaṃ care*  
*agiddho vippamukko ya, omāṇam parivajjāe* 4

Meaning: A wise monk should beg food which has been prepared for someone else, and he should accept what is freely given to him and without greed and passions; he should practice the path of non possessions and non engagement on worldly activities.

In these four verses of the fourth topic, the principles of self control and self restraint have been given to the monk. It is as follows:

- The monks of the other creeds, being with attachments, even though they had given up the household earlier, are not worthy of company or guidance.
- An intelligent monk should not develop attachment with them and maintain detached relations with them.
- The monk should leave the company of those monks who have possessions and support violence. They should maintain company of those monks who have no possessions and practice non violence.
- He should beg, eat and think of food without any infatuation or attachment to the same.

In this way the sermons to the monk in the above four verses for four duties has been given.

i. First duty. Those monks are not worthy of company.

In the first verse, the word “*bho*” is used by the author to draw attention of the monk that they should not maintain company of those monks (of other creeds) as they are not capable of providing protection against the sins and bondage. Five reasons for this statement have been given

- They are ignorant like a child / fool.

- b. They consider and claim themselves to be equipped with true knowledge even though they do not have it.
- c. They have been bettered by the afflictions and difficulties arising in the conduct of their monkhood. They have been overpowered by anger, pride, greed etc.
- d. Even after giving up their family, property and worldly possessions, they are possessed by other worldly things.
- e. They preach activities involving violence to their followers (laity).

ii. Second duty. Do not develop infatuated relations with them

If a wise monk, after testing the monks of other creeds as having false pride, or his conduct is not right; then the author has prescribed three types of carefulness to be observed while dealing with them. These are, “*vijjam tesu na mucchae*”, “*anukkase anavalīne*”, and “*majjhena muni jāvae*” i.e. should not develop infatuation with them, should not develop feeling of revenge or support to them and should contemplate on the nature of reality with detached / unbiased views. Here it is worthy of understanding the meaning of “*anukkase anavalīne*” where *anukkase* means ego or pride. There are eight types of pride namely caste, family, appearance, strength, knowledge etc. The one who does not develop pride due to any of these is *anavalīne* which is opposite of developing pride /ego. During that period, superiority of caste was one of the primary indicators of respect. Therefore a person born in high caste experienced higher status and the one born in lower caste experienced lower status. Bhagavāna Mahāvīra preached the religion of equanimity and addressed the monks of both categories and said the path to liberation is based on practicing equanimity and to give up pride of any type. Thus a monk practicing equanimity should take a middle path and neither develops a feeling of pride nor of lowness. This intention is also seen in the sutra “*no hīno no ariṇe*” from Ācāraṅga.

iii. Third duty. Keep company of a non violent and non possessed monk.

Some religious leaders propagate that it is not necessary to be non violent and non possessed and those having possessions or engaged in violent activities can also achieve liberation. Jain path of purification is exactly opposite of this. They say that non possession and non violence are essential to be practiced to attain liberation. Only non possessed and non violent monks are worthy of company. The question immediately arise “how a person who is non violent and non possessed can live i.e. earn his livelihood?” This question has been answered in the next verse.

iv. Fourth duty. Free from infatuation and observing three attitudes of carefulness, the monk should take food.

The monk has been ordered to lead a life of non possessions and non violence. An important question is raised here as “Activities involving cultivating, securing, eating and digesting food; other essential activities for living cannot be performed without violence and possessions” i.e. are not possible. Hence to exist and live, violence and possessions are essential. The clarifications concerning these have been given in five ways by the author as follows:

- a. The monk should beg for the food cooked by the householder for himself. “*gaveṣaṇā*”
- b. On giving the food by the householder, the food is accepted by the monk. “*grahēṣaṇā*”
- c. The accepted food should be eaten without developing any likes /dislikes for it. “*paribhogaiṣaṇā*”
- d. Do not develop infatuation for food. He should not develop attachment to the family or town where favourable food is available.
- e. If the food with the householder is not sufficient, then he should not accept food from there.

All this knowledge is given to the monk to get and use the food in a non violent manner.

## 11.2 Lokavāda

All the philosophies of the world try to explain the form and nature of the world in one way or the other. There



is one main concern in philosophical research and that is “to know complete and whole truth about the world.” Therefore all philosophies keep on making efforts to acquire deeper and deeper knowledge about the world. It is all right that one thought stream emphasizes one aspect while the other does the same in a different way even though the subject of everyone is the world. Jain philosophy considers the nature of this world as with five existents (*pañcāstikāya*). The doctrine concerning the world has been given in Sutrakṛtāṅga as follows:

80. *logavāyam ṅisāmejjā, ihamegesimāhiyam*  
*vivarīyapaññasambhūyam, añṇavutta-tayāṇugam* 5

Meaning: He should know the talk of people who say things which are the outcome of a wrong understanding and are but opinions of others repeated.

81. *aṇamte ṅitīe loe, sāsae ṅa viṅassāi*  
*aṇtavam ṅitīe loe, iha dhīroatipāsāi* 6

Meaning: The world is boundless and eternal, it exists from eternity and does not perish (i.e. maintain the same destiny); another one says that the world is limited in every way.

82. *aparimāṇam viyāṇāi, ihamegesi āhiyam*  
*savvattha saparimāṇam, ii dhīroatipāsāi* 7

Meaning: Some say that the (knowledge of the highest authority) world is unlimited; but the some philosopher says that it is limited in every way.

Analysis of different doctrines concerning the world is given in these three verses in which the author has emphasized on hearing and knowing. The author has reviewed the following points in these verses.

- i. How far is the doctrine about the world worth knowing, or not knowing or useful?
- ii. Some say that this world is eternal, infinite and inert while others say it is non eternal.
- iii. The creator of the world in Purāṇas etc is an incarnation of some super entity that is with infinite knowledge.
- iv. The mobile beings stay mobile and the immobile i.e. stationery stay immobile.

### Why and since when Lokavāda?

The author has brought up discussion about Lokavāda as at the time of Māhāvīra, there were a number of authors of Purāṇas who were becoming very popular. They were very vocal and posed as omniscient and were trying to convince the ignorant people with their own views about the origin, administration and catastrophe for destruction of the world along with life after death. These people due to their blind faith and ignorance took them as reincarnations of god. These vocal people put up strange logic to prove their validity.

Lokavāda. Views those are mutually contradictory.

In those times the prominent question was “whether the world is with limits/boundaries or infinite?” Nirgrāṃtha Piṅgala asked Skaṃdhaka “Māgadha! Whether the *loka* is with limits or is it infinite?” Skaṃdhaka could not reply this and so went to Mahāvīra and requested him for clarification. Mahāvīra replied “Skaṃdhaka, I know the world from four different viewpoints. From substance and space viewpoints, this world is with limits. From time and mode viewpoint, this world is infinite” In another episode, Mahāvīra said “Jamālī! Loka is eternal as well as temporary.” In this response the answer was from substance and mode viewpoints. In the present verses, the description of *loka* is presented from four angles i.e. substance, space, time, modes and from substance and mode viewpoints. In contradiction to the view of just infinite, he said that it is with limits also. Similarly for eternal, he said it is temporary also. The conclusion of these discussions is that no state is just infinite; it is with limits also in some respect.

According to cūṃikāra, Sāṃkhya believe *loka* to be infinite and eternal as their concept of *puruṣa* describes it as all pervading, etenal and inert. He further talks about Vaiśeṣika doctrine and says that they consider *paramānu* as active and eternal i.e. they are never created or destroyed.

“*antavam nītie loe*” is the doctrine of Paurāṇikas who consider *loka* to be with limits from space viewpoint and eternal from the time viewpoint.

Vṛttikāra derives two meanings of infinite. An entity is infinite if it can never be destroyed i.e. the entity which exists in one mode in this life period stays in the same mode in the future lives also i.e. man continues to be man and woman continues to be woman in all lives.

Another meaning of infinite is without limits and void of time.

Besides these there are other views of Lokavāda also. For example the statement “*aputrasya gatirnāsti, svargo naiva ca, naiva ca*” i.e. person without a son has no destiny and cannot go to heavens in their future lives. “*gobhīrkhatasya gohanasya vā na santi lokā*” i.e. one who kills a cow or the one whom the cow kills can never go to heaven and has also no destiny. Such morist and illogical doctrines can be seen in Purāṇas.

The author has also presented the following concerning beliefs of Paurāṇikas and Lokavādi:

- i. Some omniscient say that an omniscient has infinite knowledge. He knows everything and his knowledge is always without bounds.
- ii. Some omniscients say that their knowledge of the world is limited in time and space to upper, lower and sideways directions only.

Vṛttikāra in verse 82 has given two views. Some philosophers do not believe in the existence of omniscient. Our great seers with super sensual vision know the space without bounds and without limitations of time but they are not omniscient. This is one meaning of the word “*aparimīta*” or boundless. Another view on this is that our great seers know the important elements with their supersensual vision. A famous verse in this direction is given below:

*sarvaṃ paśyatu vā mā vā iṣṭamarthaṃ tu paśyatu  
kājasamkhyāparijñānaṃ, tasya na o kvoccha vijyate*

i.e. one may or may not be an omniscient but it is important that he should know important objects/entities. The knowledge about the number of insects in this world is useless as it does not serve anyone’s purpose.

The second meaning assigned by other philosophers is “There is no omniscient. Space and time can be known only within limits. Brahmā sleeps for thousand divine years. In that state he does not see anything. He again wakes up and stays awake for thousand divine years. Therefore the author says “*dhūroatipāsai*” i.e. this is Brahmā’s infinite vision.

## Review

Sutrakṛtāṅga’s verse 83 refutes the prevailing doctrines concerning Lokavāda which were without valid logic namely “Lokavādis say that this world is eternal, boundless, indestructible and inert”. In this matter Jain philosophers say that if their doctrine considers the entities existing in the *loka* as eternal (without origination and decay), and permanent, then it is against the direct valid knowledge of the *loka* as no living or non being in this world appear to be so which does not transform every moment. Every entity appears to be originating and destroying every moment. How can all these entities be always eternal, inert and without modes? With the doctrine of inert and eternal, the statements made that the mobile beings always stay as mobile and the stationary beings stay always immobile or the men are always born as men and women as women are also illogical. In Ācāraṅga Bhagavāna Mahāvīra says that immobile beings like earth bodied can be born as mobile beings and vice versa i.e. a living being (except pure souls) can be born in any destiny in future.

If we accept the doctrines of Lokavāda mentioned in these verses, then a man will be born exactly the same in the next life also. Then all the practices of charity, good work, observing vows etc will become useless as they may not cause any change in future. However, even these Lokavādis accept the birth of a living being in different modes and destinies e.g. “*sa vai śrgālo jāyate, ya o sapurīṣo dahyate*”. i.e. that person will be born as a jackal who is cremated with the dung as said in the following verse.

*gurūṃ tumkṛtya humkṛtya viprānnirjīya vādata”  
śmaśāne jāyate vṛkṣa, kamka-grdhropasevita”*

i.e. a person who is not humble before his teacher and uses the words like you (*tu*) or (*hum*) and show disrespects to him and defeats the *brāhamaṇas* in logical discussions, is born after death in the cremation ground as a tree which is used by *kamka*, vultures etc. Thus they refute their own doctrine. Thus we conclude that every body is born again in a mode and destiny in different lives according to his karmas.

To prove that *loka* is with boundaries and divide it into seven continents is also contrary to any valid explanation. Another contention of Lokavādis, namely their God or reincarnation, even though having limitless knowledge is not an omniscient. This also does not stand the test of validity as it implies that a person with knowledge of unlimited objects cannot differentiate and preach worthy and unworthy acts /things and also issues related to super sensual knowledge if he is not an omniscient.

Another statement of Lokavādis that no one is unique as said in their statement “Brahmā while sleeping does not know anything and while awake he knows everything as the same can be said about all human beings.” Similarly the statement that when Brahmā is sleeping catastrophe is caused and when he is awake, creation takes place is also not supported by any valid argument.

Hence the *loka* is neither totally destroyed nor is created afresh. As a substance *loka* always exists and its modes keep on changing continuously.

The statement of Lokavādis that a person without a son has no destiny in future is also debatable. If this was so then pigs and dogs with so many sons will pervade the universe. Hence the doctrine of Lokavādi, as contrary to the doctrine to karma and devoid of any valid logic can never sustain the test of validity.

### 11.3 Nature of Ahimsā (non violence)

To avoid karmika bondage due to disinterest in vows, the nature of non violence in Sutrakṛtāṅga is described as follows:

83. *je kei tasā pānā, ciṭṭhamtaduva thāvarā  
pariyāe atthi se amjū, jeṇa te nāsahāvarā* 8

Meaning: Some living beings have motion i.e. are mobile, others are stationery i.e. without mobility; it depends on certain conditions whether they are in one state or the other.

84. *uralam jagato jogam, vājāsam palleṃti ya  
savve akamṭadukīṇa ya, ao savve ahimsagā* 9

Meaning: The different forms of living beings are in front of us. When the first state ends, the second similar or different state appears. But all are subject to pain even though no one wants it. Hence they should not be killed.

85. *eyam khu nāṇiṇo sāram, jam na himsai kamcaṇam  
ahimsā samayaṃ ceva, eyāvaṇtam viyāṇiyā* 10

Meaning: The essence of wisdom is not to kill anything. Know this to be the legitimate conclusion from the principle of reciprocity with regards to non-killing.

While discussing Lokavāda, it was said that a living being is reborn in the same mode in future as he is in this life i.e. a pig is reborn as a pig and a man as a man. To avoid the disowning or disinterest in non violence by any *śramaṇa*, the author has given these three verses. These verses justify that all living being in this world are not be tormented or killed. Three reasons have been given to support this.

- i. In this perceptible world of living beings and their tendencies of mind, body and speech or their states as child /young and old are all gross.
- ii. The modes of all mobile and immobile living beings do not stay the same.
- iii. All living beings wish to live and do not want miseries.

Some philosophers say that the soul is inert and eternal and devoid of origination and decay. The soul does not have states of childhood, youth or old as well as it does not experience miseries or pleasures. Therefore there is no violence in beating or tormenting or killing any living being. To refute this wrong notion, the soul has been identified as slightly non eternal also, going through transformation continuously and experiencing pains and pleasure by Jains. This is so as the childhood or other activities do not stay same all the time. All living beings have to die sometime. They experience pain on being beaten or tormented. Hence no living being should be tormented or killed.

In Dasavaikālika and Ācārāṅga sutra it has been clearly said that all living beings wish to live and no one wishes to die. Therefore *nirgrāṃthas* should not kill or torment anyone as it is a big sin.

Further clarifying the basis of non violence, the author says “*eyam kḥu nāṇiṇo sārām*” i.e. the essence of being wise /intelligent is to not to kill or torment anyone. Here the wise man does not mean a person with knowledge of material things but one who is knowledgeable about soul, merit and demerit, influx, stoppage of influx and bondage and its release etc of karmas. Further he should refrain from the activities involving lying, sex, possessions etc.

The second fundamental about non violence has been given as “*ahiṃsā samayam ceva, e jāvaṃtam viyāṇiyā*”. It can have three meanings as:

- i. Know equanimity with non violence, this is the essence.
- ii. Equanimity as a special case of nonviolence, know this essence.
- iii. Know that non violence is the essence of all conduct/ spiritual practices

The intention of all three statements is to remind the monk that he has taken a vow on initiation in monkhood saying “*karemi bhante sāmāiyam*”. Non violence is a type of equanimity or a cause for equanimity. This is so as a practitioner can only practice spiritual duties when he observes equanimity towards all. Thus non violence can be practiced only when one develops equanimity.

To conclude we can say that development of equanimity in life is non violence. This should be learnt by heart as this is the essence of all knowledge. Hence it is right for all intelligent persons to practice non violence and not kill or torment anyone.

#### 11.4 Life style of a monk for spiritual purification

Sutrakṛtāṅga preaches the practice of purifying the conduct to break the bondage. Actually right faith-knowledge and conduct together constitute the path of purification. The author has described beautifully in previous verses the way for purifying faith and knowledge. Now in these three verses he emphasizes the purification of conduct.

86. *vusite vigayagidāki ya, āyāṇam sārakkhae*  
*cariyāsaṇas, jāsu, bhattapāṇe ya amitaso* 11

Meaning: The monks practicing self-restrained should not be infatuated with any sensual pleasures. He should control (and be careful) himself throughout his life concerning walking, sitting, eating and lying down.

87. *eteḥim tihim thāṇehi, samjāe sayayam muṇī*  
*ukkasam jalaṇam nūmamajjhattham ca vigimcae* 12

Meaning: And he should leave pride, wrath and deceit while controlling (and be careful) himself throughout his life concerning walking, sitting, eating and lying down.

88. *samie tu sayā sahū, paṃcasamvarasamvude*  
*sīteḥim asīte bhikkhū, āmokkhāe parivvaejjāṣṭ* 13

Meaning: Possessing the *samīs* (attitudes of carefulness) and practicing the five *samvaras* (means to achieve stoppage of bondage), a pious monk should live, till he reaches perfection, as a man free from fetters among those bound by fetters i.e. the householders.

Thus I say.

Purification of conduct results in spiritual purification. Umāsvāti / Umāsvāmi in Tattvārthasūtra has identified attitudes of carefulness (*samiti*) and restraint (*gupti*), ten spiritual values (*dasalakṣaṇa*), contemplations (*anupreksās*), overcoming afflictions (*pariśahajayā*), conduct and penance to be practiced for spiritual purification. The author here gives ten wise aphorisms for purification of conduct.

- i. Stay/ observe in ten types of *sāmācārī* (practices of the monk).
- ii. Do not be engrossed /infatuated with food.
- iii. Leave aside laziness and concentrate on your self /soul.
- iv. Be vigilant in activities concerning walking, sitting, sleeping and eating.
- v. Practice attitudes of restraints of the mind, body and speech.
- vi. Give up the four passions i.e. anger, pride, deceit and greed.
- vii. The monk should always be careful.
- viii. Always practice the five major vows like non violence for stoppage of influx.
- ix. Do not develop attachment with the householders.
- x. Observe self control till complete release from karmic bondage (i.e. *mokṣa*) is achieved.

These are the ten aphorisms given for the monk to develop purification of conduct in the present context.

### **i Sāmācārī**

This is the first aphorism of wisdom for purification of conduct. *Sāmācārī* is the code of conduct for the monk. It has ten sub types.

- a. *Āvasyakī*: To recite “I am going out for an important work” while leaving the *upāśraya*.
- b. *Naiṣidhikī*: To recite the words I am free from my work or “*Naiṣidhikī*” after completing the work while entering the *upāśraya*.
- c. *Āpracchanā*: To seek permission from the teacher before starting any work.
- d. *Pratipracchanā*: After seeking permission of the teacher and the monk could not complete the work for a long time. Then to seek permission again from the teacher to start the work.
- e. *Chandanā*: To invite other monks to share food.
- f. *Īcchākāra*: To use the words “*Īcchākāra*” while starting the work or requesting others to perform work. It means “if you wish you may do my work”.
- g. *Mithyākāra*: To accept one’s mistakes promptly, and to say “*micchāmi dukkaḍam*” when the mistake was not accepted promptly.
- h. *Tathākāra*: To say “*tathā*” while accepting the orders or approval of the teacher for work assigned.
- i. *Abhyutthāna*: To venerate the teachers and to bring food for them etc.
- j. *Upasampadā*: To stay with some other teacher to acquire more knowledge about faith, knowledge and conduct.

These ten *sāmācārī* are important limbs of the conduct of a monk.

### **ii. Infatuation in food**

“*vigayagiddhī*”: Do not develop longing for favourable or tasty food.

### **iii. To protect and purify the soul**

“*āyānaṃ samikkhae*” i.e. to practice the three jewels (right faith-knowledge-conduct) to purify the soul.

### **iv. To practice attitude of carefulness (*samiti*)**

There are five *samitis* namely

- a. *īryā* i.e. to walk carefully keeping the eyes on the tip of the nose or to the earth equivalent to the size of the body (to avoid killing the living beings).
- b. *bhāṣā* i.e. to carefully use the language which is sweet and without attachment.
- c. *eṣaṇā* i.e. to accept food and water which is free from the flaws of begging.
- d. *ādāna nikṣepa* i.e. to keep and accept accessories like clothes, pots etc carefully.

- e. *utsarga* i.e. to excrete carefully (to attend to nature"call at appropriate place and carefully).
- v. To practice three restraints (*gupti*)
- mano* i.e. to restrain the wandering nature of mind and focus it on self meditation.
  - vāka* i.e. restrain the speech and try to maintain silence.
  - kāya* i.e. restrain the tendencies of the body.

**vi. To give up the four passions.**

The four passions (*kaṣāya*) i.e. anger, pride, deceit and greed are the causes of bondage. These are to be given up.

vii. The monk should be *samīta*

The intention is to observe *samītis*

viii. To practice the five major vows.

The monk should always observe non violence, speak the truth, not lie, non possessions and celibacy.

ix. The monk should not develop attachment with householders.

x. To observe self restraint till liberated.

This is the most important wisdom aphorism. If the monk is faced with some afflictions or other obstacles, he should exercise self restraint and make progress in his conduct. He should not think of giving up his monkhood. Therefore the author says "*āmokkhāe parivvaējjāsī*" i.e. till all the karmika bondage is annihilated; the monk should practice the path with self restraint. This is essential for purifying the conduct.

### EXERCISES

**Essay type question:**

- Present a critical overview of Sūtrakṛtāṅga.
- Describe the nature of bondage and release from bondage based on Sūtrakṛtāṅga.
- Describe the nature and rules of the any four principle doctrines as discussed in Sūtrakṛtāṅga and review their views in relation to the Jain doctrines.
- What are the rules to be practiced to purify one's conduct? Please explain.
- What are the views of different philosophers concerning the creation of this world?

**Short notes type questions:**

- Briefly discuss the explanatory texts of Sūtrakṛtāṅga.
- How far is the doctrine of Niyati vāda sustainable as per Jain doctrine?
- In Sūtrakṛtāṅga which are the four duties for the monks mentioned?
- Explain the verse *Bujjhejja tūṇhejjā, bamdhaṇaṃ parijāṇiyā, Kimāha bamdhaṇaṃ vīre? Kim vā jāṇaṃ tūṇṇai?*
- Does Jain doctrine support the concept of reincarnation (Avatāravāda)?

**Fill in the blanks based on this lesson**

- What is the serial number of Sūtrakṛtāṅga of Aṅga Praviṣṭa?
- What are the names used for Sūtrakṛtāṅga by the commentator?
- Who propagates the doctrine "This world is the manifestation of the Brham"?
- What are the five *skandhas* according to Buddhist?
- What are the five co-factors (*samavāyas*) according to Jains?
- What is the meaning of "*avijñopacīta*"?
- What is the meaning Of flaw "*Ādhākarma*"?
- Which philosophy propagates "This world is created by *īswara*"?
- What is the meaning of perverted conduct /practice (*mīthyākāri sāmācārī*) of the monk?
- What is the nature of the world as per Jains?

**References**

- Suyagado-1 editor Yuvācārya MahāPrajña.
- Sūtrakṛtāṅga. Editor Amar muri
- Sūtrakṛtāṅga. Editor Yuvācārya Madhukar muri

**Author : Samani Riju Prajñā**

## Unit-3: Bhagavatī

Outline of the Unit

Introduction of Bhagavati Sutra “Vyākhyāprajñapti”

1.0 *Maṅgala-Padam*

- 1.1 The Auspicious Eulogy
- 1.2 Variants in manuscripts
- 1.3 Scrutiny of variants
- 1.4 The origin of super-mantra of obeisance and its authors
- 1.5 Obeisance to the *Brāhmī* script

2.0 *Relation of soul and body*

- 2.1 *Poggala-jivāṇaṃ tekāliyatta-padam*
- 2.2 The topic of sustaining strata of cosmos
- 2.3 Jiva-poggala-padam
- 2.4 Mind-body relation

3.0 Fruition of karmā

- 4.0
  - 4.1 Premature fruition of karma (*udīraṇā*)
  - 4.2 Karma that has already arisen (*udīraṇa*)
  - 4.3 Karma that has not arisen (*anudīraṇā*)
  - 4.4 Karma that has not arisen but is capable being prematurely aroused (*anudīraṇa udīraṇa bhavya karma*)
  - 4.5 Fitness for premature arising in respect of karmic types
  - 4.6 Fitness for premature arising in respect of karmic duration
  - 4.7 Karma that has been experienced and dropped behind after arising

5.0 *Kamkhāmohanijja-padam*

- 5.1 *Kamkhāmohanijjassa-bandhādi-padam*
- 5.2 Activity : action of body
- 5.3 Quality of bondless *samaṇa*
- 5.4 Detail of karma bondage

6.0 *Pramāṇa* : Nature and divisions

- 6.1 *Jñānāntara* (doubt about the varieties of knowledge)
- 6.2 *Darśanāntara* (doubt about the varieties of intuition)
- 6.3 *Cārītrāntara* (varieties of religious conduct)
- 6.4 *Liṅgāntara* (varieties of outfit)
- 6.5 *Pravacānāntara* and *pravacani-antara* (varieties of scripture and preceptors)
- 6.6 *Kaṭṭhāntara* (varieties of religious customs)
- 6.7 *Mārgāntara* (varieties of path)
- 6.8 *Matāntara* (varieties of opinions)
- 6.9 *Bhaṅgāntara* (varieties of categories)
- 6.10 *Nayāntara* (varieties of standpoints)
- 6.11 *Niyamāntara*
- 6.12 *Pramāṇāntara* (varieties of valid sources of knowledge)

7.0 *Pasatthaniijarae seyatta padam* (*karmavedanā* and *nirjarā*)

- 7.1 Cause of dissociation (*nirjarā*)
- 7.2 *Mhāvedanā-mahāniijara-caubhaṅga-padam*
- 7.3 *Vedanā-nijjarā padam*

8.0 Experiencing and falling away of karma

### **Introduction of Bhagavati Sutra “Vyākhyāprajñapti”**

The scriptures of Lord Mahāvīra are compiled in the “*dvādaśāṅgī*” (the twelve canonical texts of the Inner Corpus). The fifth “*anga*” is titled as “*Vīāhapaññatti*”. The Sanskrit form of it is “*Vyākhyāprajñapti*”. A book which is written in a question-answer style is called “*vyākhyāprajñapti*”. The term “*vyākhyā*” means “to describe” and the term “*prajñapti*” means “to explain”. That which explains descriptively the truth is called “*vyākhyāprajñapti*”.

The references to the contents of the Fifth *Anga-Vyākhyāprajñapti* found in the *Trv.*, *Nandī* and *Samavāo* corroborates that there is the description of the substances such as non-soul etc. We get both the names *Vyākhyāprajñapti* and *Vyākhyā* of this text in the *Samavāo* and the *Nandī*. *Vyākhyā* is none other than the abridged form of *Vyākhyāprajñapti*. Abhayadevasūri has explained the term *Vyākhyāprajñapti* in the very beginning of the commentary on the text. According to him, the present *āgama* deals with the exposition (*prajñāpanā*) of the replies given by Lord Mahāvīra to the queries put forward by his disciples—Gautama and others. Hence, it is called “*Vyākhyāprajñapti*”.

According to the *Samavāo* and the *Nandī*, the present *āgama* deals with the exposition of thirty-six thousand questions. However, according to the *Tattvārtharājavārtika*, *Ṣaṣṭkhaṇḍāgama* and *Kasāyapāhuḍa*, the number of questions addressed to is sixty thousand. We get different information about its contents. According to the *Samavāo*, the subject matter was related with various questions of gods, kings and royal seers (*rājarṣis*) about subjects like the doctrines of the conformists as well as the non-conformists, soul, non-soul, cosmos and trans-cosmos. According to Ācārya Akalaṅka, there are many questions such as “Does the soul exist or not?” in the present *āgama*. Ācārya Vīrasena states that the present *āgama* deals with ninety-six thousand *chinnacheda* stand-points. And the worthy-knowing good and evil.

Any scholar who makes their in-depth studies would never have this type of misconception. The Lord Mahāvīra was the propounder of the doctrine of *Ṣaḍjīvanīkāya* becomes quite clear from the statement of Ācārya Siddhasena who says in the eulogy of Lord Mahāvīra : “O Lord! I have not to give many proofs for your omniscience; the doctrine of *Ṣaḍjīvanīkāya* propounded by you is adequate enough to prove your omniscience.”

Lord Mahāvīra has asserted that there are six classes (*nikāyas*) of souls. Out of these, the existence of the souls of *trasa-nikāya* (mobile class) is self-evident. The existence of the souls of *vanaspati-nikāya* class of vegetable-bodied is now accepted even by science. But the existence of the souls of the earth-bodied, water-bodied, fire-bodied and air-bodied beings is not accepted by science. Lord Mahāvīra has not only propounded the existence of the earth-bodied souls, etc., but also elucidated extensively their life-span, food, breath, development of consciousness, instincts, etc. The minimum and maximum life-span of earth-bodied souls is intra-hour and twenty-two thousand years respectively. Their rate of breathing is not uniform; sometimes they breathe rapidly, sometimes slowly. A desire for food crop up in them instinctually. They appropriate nourishment every moment. Although the manifestation of their consciousness is evident through their tactile sensitivity, manifestation of other aspects of their sentience is not clear. During the respiration, just as the human beings breathe in oxygen (air), the earth-bodied souls not only breathe in air, but also appropriate matter from earth-bodied, water-bodied, fire-bodied and vegetable-bodied beings.

Like the earth-bodied souls, the souls like water-bodied etc. also breathe, eat etc. The modern science has made research on various aspects of the plant-life (i.e. vegetable-bodied souls) and has found out many of their secrets. But it has not yet made any considerable research in the field of the earth-bodied souls, etc. The modern scientific investigations show that the vegetable-bodied souls also exhibit anger, fear and love. Affectionate and sympathetic treatment make the plant blossom, while hateful cruel treatment makes it wither.

Western Indologist, Dr. Joshef Deleu remarks as follows : “In conclusion I would like to state, that the great diversity of topics discussed in the *anyatīrthika* texts is illustrative both of Mahāvīra’s personality as a thinker and a teacher, and of that wonderful time of creative ferment in religion and philosophy that was his. It would seem that Mahāvīra, more than anyone around him, even more than the Buddha, was inspired by the *spiritual*



*unrest and eagerness of his day*. Speaking of the Buddha, and probably comparing him with the Jina, Frauwallner, in his *History of Indian Philosophy*, expressed the opinion that “his (the Buddha’s) contribution to the enlargement of the range of philosophical ideas in his time was a rather small one”. As severe verdict indeed, which, however, is soundly based on the Buddha’s well-known stern refusal to consider a great many question that occupied his contemporaries. Because of his systematic approach to all these questions, Mahāvīra has, I think, rightly been called “the most versatile thinker we know of in ancient India”.

### Divisions & Sub-divisions (Chapters & Sections)

According to the records of the *Samavāyāṅga* and *Nandī* (which are themselves *āgamas*), there were—

More than	100	<i>adhyāyānas</i>	(chapter)
	10000	<i>uddeśakas</i>	(section)
	10000	<i>samuddeśaka</i>	(sub-sections) in the <i>Bhagavati</i>

The present (extant) form, however, is quite different from this account. In the present form of *Bhagavati*, we have—

138 *Śatakas* or *śatas* (chapters)

1925 *uddeśakas* (sections)

Out of them, the first thirty-two *Śatakas* are independent chapters. From thirty-three to thirty-nine *Śatakas*, i.e., in the next seven chapters, each is a cluster of 12 *Śatakas*; and the 40<sup>th</sup> *Śataka*; again 41<sup>st</sup> *Śataka* is an independent one. Thus, the total number of *Śatakas* come out to be 143, out of which 41 *Śatakas* are main; the rest (i.e., 107) are extra.

There is a mention that thirty-six thousand *vyākaraṇa* (expositions on queries) have been given in the *Vyākhyāprijāpti*. From this, it is easily deduced that the canon was composed in the style of questions and answers. The author of the *Cūrṇī* on the *Nandī* states that Lord Mahāvīra had made *vyākaraṇa* of the questions asked by *Gautama* and others, but also some unanswered questions. Even in the present version of the *āgama*, the same question-answer style is extant. However, the style of both the questions and answers thereof is very terse and pitty. The questions starts with the phrase “*se nūṇaṃ bhaṃte!*”, while the answer with *haṃtā goyamā*.

For example,

“*se nūṇaṃ bhaṃte! calamāṇe caṭie*”

“*haṃtā goyamā! calamāṇe caṭie*”

Or “*no innaṭṭhe samaṭṭhe.*”

The language of the questions as well as answer is almost simple and straightforward. At some places, the dialogue takes the form of almost a prosody, presenting an elegant piece of literature, e.g.,—

“*puvviṃ bhaṃte! aṃḍae, pacchā kukkuḍi? puvviṃ kukkuḍi, pacchā aṃḍae?*”

In most of questions, the style used is a direct one in which the questioner (mostly *Gautama*) asks directly the question to Lord Mahāvīra who gives the reply directly back to the questioner. At other places, however, the propounder of the *āgama* (*sūtrakāra*) has used an indirectly style (of questioning where the questioner is not directly mentioned).

The present *āgama* is the fifth *aṅga* (*āgama*). As the discourses delivered by Lord Mahāvīra have been compiled by Gaṇadhara Sudharmā, the authorship (of the *Bhagavati*) should be ascribed to him. The present edition/version is the one which was compiled at the time of Devarddhigaṇ’s Synod. We get in it the *sūtras* composed between 500 B.C. and 500 A.D. For example,

That is,

“O Lord! How long the *pūrvagata śruta* (i.e., the scripture knowledge contained in the *pūrvas*) will last?

“Gautama! It (i.e., the *pūrvagata śruta*) will last for 1000 years after my *nirvāṇa*.”

The present volume of the *Vyākhyāprajñapti* is believed to be equivalent to 16000 *anuṣṭupa* verses. We have completed the texts at many places where “*jāva*” (*yavat*) is given (to indicate the abridged text), in our edition of “*Arigasuttāṇi*”, vol. II, wherein the original text of *Viāhaparṇatti* is published. On calculation of the number of letters used, the whole volume comes to be exactly equivalent to 192891/2 *ślokas*.

## 1.0 *Maṅgala-padaṃ*

### 1.1 *namo arahantāpaṃ,*

*namo siddhānaṃ,*  
*namo āyariyānaṃ*  
*namo uvajjhāyānaṃ,*  
*namo savvasākhūnaṃ*

Auspicious Eulogy

Obeisance to the Adorable Ones,  
Obeisance to the Liberated Ones,  
Obeisance to the Preceptors,  
Obeisance to the Masters of Scripture,  
Obeisance to all Ascetics.

### 1.2 *namo bambhie livie*

Obeisance to the *Brāhmi script*.

#### 1.1 The Auspicious Eulogy

The present chapter begins with an auspicious eulogy comprised of three auspicious *Sūtras*. In the first, obeisance is offered to the adorable, the liberated, preceptors, master and ascetics; in the second, obeisance is offered to the Brāhmi script and is followed by a summary verse. The eulogy closes with an obeisance offered to the scripture. The motive behind the auspicious eulogy rests on the belief that it possesses a power to help facilitate achievement of a desired goal. It is used with the anticipation that, having done so, success will ensue (for example, in the completion of scriptural works or in worldly affairs). It is this motive which underlies such eulogies at the beginning, middle and end of scriptures. Through the eulogy at the beginning ensures completion of the scripture without any mental distraction and the eulogy at the end is used with the aim of procuring the dedicated and long-lived student to carry on future work.

Auspiciousness is of two types: that which concerns the mundane and that which concerns the supra-mundane. Rice, vermilion, yoghurt, coconut are considered as auspicious objects for mundane affairs. In the supra-mundane affairs, the eulogy of the cherished deity is considered auspicious.

There was no custom of writing an auspicious eulogy at the beginning of the scriptural texts in the ancient period. This custom developed in later times. Abhayadevasūri, the commentator of the *Bhagavati Sūtra*, regarded the scripture itself as auspicious and thus saw no need of incorporating a separate eulogy in it. Furthermore, he considered this practice as potentially encouraging the pointless addition of eulogies. Abhayadevasūri, however, opines that the incorporation of an eulogy has been made in the present *Sūtra*, with the purpose of making the mind of the disciple auspicious and also for the preservation of the noble tradition. The commentator did not give any historicity, but called out attention to the ancient tradition. For example, he writes, “The earlier commentators did not explain the above mentioned three *Sūtras*, so there might have been extrapolated in later times. Our hypothesis is corroborated by the lack of commentaries on the eulogy in the *Cūrṇi* and the earlier commentaries that precede Abhayadevasūri.

In the beginning of the fifteenth *śataka* of the *Bhagavati Sūtra*, the auspicious eulogy — “obeisance to the goddess of scripture” — is found incorporated. Absence of Abhayadevasūri’s comment on it suggests that the initial eulogy was added by a scribe or some other preceptor before the composition of the *Vṛtti*. And since the study of the fifteenth *śataka* was considered to be particularly perilous, and thus potentially obstructive, it is

plausible that the auspicious eulogy was added in the beginning of the *Śataka* with the aim of counteracting any such impediments. The interpolation of auspicious eulogies is confirmed by the evidence of their absence in the other scriptural texts.

In the *Vṛtti* to the *Daśāśrutaskandha*, the Obeisance *Mantra* as eulogy has been explained. But the *Cūrṇi* does not explain it, and thus we can deduce that when the *Cūrṇi* was composed, the eulogy was not yet a part of the manuscript. We found Obeisance *Mantra* incorporated at the beginning of the *pajjosaṅkappo*. Which is the eighth chapter of the *Dasāo*. Muni puṇyavijaya who critically studied the scripture, considered it to be an interpolation. According to him, the eulogy was not available, in the earliest palm leaf manuscripts and is not explained in the *Vṛtti*. Furthermore, it cannot be regarded as a eulogy in the middle because it is found at the beginning of the eighth chapter, which is not in the middle of the text. In the beginning of the *pañṇavanā*, the Obeisance *Māntra* is found, but neither Haribhadraśūri nor Malayagiri explain it in their commentaries.

Śri Śyāmārya, the author of *Pañṇavanā*, composed an auspicious eulogy at the beginning of his text. Hence, it follows that the custom of writing auspicious eulogies was there at the early period of the composition of scriptural texts, around the first century B.C. The auspicious eulogy composed by the author himself is technically called “incorporated eulogy” as distinct from the eulogy composed by a person other than the author, which is called “non-incorporated eulogy”. Sometimes scribes added non-incorporated eulogies to the manuscripts and therefore, it is difficult to properly ascertain the exact chronology of its composition.

The scripture under comment is the fifth book of the inner Corpus. Excepting this book, none others of the eleven books of the Inner Corpus have eulogy at the beginning. Evidence gathered from the starting parts of other scriptural texts shows that the scribes added the auspicious eulogy of the Obeisance *Mantra*, which was later on regarded as the integral part of the text.

The study of the initial *Sūtras* of the *Āyāro* and the other scriptural texts raises the question as to “why the present scripture alone has the obeisance-eulogy at the beginning?” The answer is not difficult. It appears that at the time of composition, this scripture also began with “*teṇam kāleṇam teṇam* etc. But the obeisance eulogy written by the scribes got incorporated in the texts, and was considered as the integral part of the latter.

*ṇamo āyariyāṇaṃ,*  
*ṇamo uvajjhāyāṇaṃ,*  
*ṇamo loe savvasāhūṇaṃ*

1.2 In the ancient manuscripts, variants are available for many individual words and sentences. For examples:

*ṇamo\_ ṇamo*  
*arahaṃtāṇamarikaṃtāṇaṃ aruhamtāṇaṃ*  
*āyariyāṇamóāiriyaṇaṃ*  
*ṇamo loe savvasāhūṇaṃṇamo savvasāhūṇaṃ*  
*ṇamo arahaṃtāṇaṃ ṇamo savasidhāṇaṃ*

### 1.3 Scrutiny of Variants

Four kinds of changes are evident from linguistic viewpoint, viz., phonological, morphological, syntactical and semantic.

Phonological change : In the Prākṛta language the initial dental nasal is alternately changed into cerebral one. So we get both *ṇamo* and *namo*.

Morphological change: The Sanskrit word “*arha*” becomes “*aruha*” or *ariha* in Prākṛta. This is due to anaptyxis. *Āyariyāṇaṃ* and *āiriyaṇaṃ* are example of *samprasāraṇa* and Epenthesis.

Syntactical change : *ṇamo loe savasāhūṇaṃ* and its rendition without *loe* is example of syntactical change.

Semantic change: This kind of change is related to meaning. For example, *arahanta* and *arihanta* translated as “adorable one” and subjugator of the enemy (which is passion)” respectively.

The semantic change has been noted by the author of the *Āvaśyaka Nirṣukti* who ascribes three different meaning to the words *arahanta* and *arihanta* namely.

1. the *Jina* is called *arahanta* because he is the adorable one,
2. *arihanta* because he is the subjugator of the enemy which is passion, and
3. also because he has cast off the karmic dust.

Acharya Vīrasena in his *Dhavalā* has ascribed four meaning to the word *arihanta*:

1. The subjugator of enemies, namely passion.
2. The eliminator of the dust of karma.
3. One who is devoid of secrecy.
4. Being worthy of highest adoration.

The first three meaning are derived from *arihanta* and the fourth from *arahanta* as derived from

root  $\sqrt{\text{arha}}$ .

Apart from the above linguistic analysis of *ṇamo* and *ṇamo* on the one hand, and *arahantāṇam* and *arihantāṇam* on the other, there are also fundamental differences from the standpoint of the science of *mantra*, for example, between pronunciations of the dental “*na*” and the cerebral “*ṇa*”. The cerebral “*ṇa*” produce an electromagnetic force affecting the bio-electricity of the cerebral cortex, whereas the dental “*na*” has no such effect.

In the science of *mantra*, there is vast occult difference between the vowels “*a*” and “*i*”. The colour of both “*a*” and “*i*” are golden, but the taste of “*a*” is astringent. The “*a*” is masculine, whereas the “*i*” is feminine.

The variant *aruhaṇtāṇam* is explained by *Abhayadevasūri*, in the *Vṛtti* to the *Bhagavati*, as “the cessation of rebirth”. Just as with the total annihilation of the seed, a sprout cannot rise, so too the sprout of rebirth cannot grow with the total destruction of the seed of karma.

In the *Āvaśyaka Nirṣukti* and the *Dhavalā*, the variant *aruhaṇta* has not been explained, which indicates that it is a later derivative. Tradition has it that this variant developed with the influence of Tamil and Kannada languages, but there is no evidence to confirm this.

The word *aruha* is found in the works of *Acharya Kundakunda* who uses the word *aruhaṇta* synonymously. He hailed from South India, and thus it is likely that the substitution of *aruha* for *araha* came about as a result of the southern dialect, which did not make a sharp distinction between “*aru*” and “*ara*”.

In the *Bodhapāhuda*, *arahanta* is used in four *gāthās* (verses) whereas *aruha* is used in five. *Acharya Hemchandra* approve three forms of the word “*arhat*” from its common usage, name *araha*, *ariha*, and *aruha*.

*Pischel* has distinguished the different forms of *arhat* according to dialect. In *Ardhamāgadhī*, it is *araha*, *arahanta*, in *Śaurasēnī* it is *arihā*, in *Jain Mahārāṣṭrī* it is *aruḥā*, and in *Māgadhī* it is *alihantāṇam*.

In the scriptural literature “*ya*” is changed into “*i*”, for example, “*vayagutta*” as “*vaigutta*”. Similarly “*āyariya*” is changed into “*āiriya*”.

According to *Abhayadevasūri*. The fifth sentence of the Obeisance *Mantra* eulogy in the *bha* is *ṇamo savvasāhūṇam*. He has mentioned “*ṇamo loe savvasāhūṇam*” as a variant. While explaining the variant, he points out that the word “*savva*” indicates only one group of the ascetics. Therefore, in order to include all the ascetics, the word “*loe*” has been added as a variant. The question naturally arose about the use of the “*loe*” and “*savva*” and *Abhayadevasūri* resolves the queerly satisfactorily.

*Brahmaṛṣi*, the commentator of *Daśāśruta skandha*, has also accepted the sentence “*ṇamo loe savvasāhūṇam*” as a variant. He follow verbatim the exposition of *Abhayadevasūri*.

We have also accepted the reading “*ṇamo loe savvasāhūṇam*” in the eulogy of the *Bha* as the basic

reading and “*namo loe savvasāhūṇam*” as a variant. This should not mean that “*namo loe savvasāhūṇam*” is considered as variant everywhere. In our edition of *Āvassayaṃ*, we have accepted “*namo loe savvasāhūṇam*” as the basic reading. The methods we adopted for editing the scripture give priority to the reading of the commentaries embodied in the earliest manuscripts of *Cūrṇi* or *Vṛtti*, etc. Our highest priority has, however, been given to the readings available in the scripture itself which should be regarded as the most authentic source for the critical apparatus. According to this, we should have accepted “*namo loe savvasāhūṇam*” as the basic reading, but it has not been possible for us to identify the scriptural texts which contain “*namo loe savvasāhūṇam*” as the basic Obeisance *Mantra*. Wherever this *mantra* is included, it is not as a part of the text, but only as an eulogy added to it. Thus, although we find the Obeisance *Mantra* in the beginning of the *Āvassayaṃ*, it is not an integral part of it. The *Sāmāyika*, *Caturvimsatistava*, etc., are the original part of the *Āvassayaṃ*. In view of this, we have accepted the ancient form of the Obeisance *Mantra* as the basic reading in the *bha*. We do not have in our possession any manuscripts earlier than, or even contemporary to, the commentary of Abhayadevasūri. The commentary itself is the earliest evidence for the reading, and so we felt it was correct for us to accept the commentator’s rendition as authoritative.

In the Hōtigumpha inscription of Khāravēla, we have “*namo arahaṃtāṇam*” “*namo savasidhāṇam*”. There are some linguistic peculiarities here, the first “*na*” has not been cerebralized; the word “*siddha*”, has been qualified by “*sava*”, which is not found anywhere else; and instead of “*siddha*”, we find “*sidha*”. This is a very early reading and should not be neglected.

#### 1.4 The Origin of *Super-mantra* of Obeisance and its Authors

The *super-mantra* of Obeisance is found in many of the Scriptural and post-scriptural works as an initial auspicious eulogy. But it is not possible to determine the original source of the *mantra*. It is said in the *Mahānīśītha* that the exposition of the five-membered auspicious eulogy, as the *Mahāśrutaskandha* (super scripture-body), is found in its *Niryukti*, *Bhāṣya* and *Cūrṇi* of the scriptural texts and that the exposition was handed down from the *Tīrthāṅkara* (ford-founders) themselves. But, *Niryukti*, *Bhāṣya* and *Cūrṇi* were lost in the course of time. According to the tradition of the elders, Vajrasūri restored the *Super Obeisance Mantra* and incorporated it into the original *sūtra*. But this also does not throw any light on the original source of the Obeisance *Mantra*.

In the *Āvaśyaka Niryukti*, there is a complete section on Vajrasūri, but even there, there is no mention of the above event. Vajrasūri, who lived in the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE, was versed in the ten “*pūrvas*”. Sayyambhavasūri who lived in the 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> century BCE, was versed in fourteen “*pūrvas*”. He prescribed the recitation of the Obeisance *Mantra* at the end of the practice of “*Kāyotsarga*”. In both the *Cūrṇi*s and Haribhadra’s commentary of the Daśavaikālika, the Obeisance *Mantra* has been explained as the *mantra* consisting only of “*namo arahaṃtāṇam*”.

Acārya Vīrasena describes the Obeisance *Mantra*, found in the beginning of the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, as an incorporated auspicious eulogy (*nibaddhamāṅgala*) which implies that Acārya Puṣpadanta, the author of the *Ṣaṭkhaṇḍāgama*, is also the author of the *Super-mantra* of Obeisance. It is, however, not known why Acārya Vīrasena asserted that the *mantra* is the part of the text. Just as the Obeisance *Mantra* found at the beginning of the *Bha* manuscript was accepted by Abhayadevasūri as constituting a part of the *Sūtra*, so Acharya Vīrasena, (it can be argued) accepted Achāya Puṣpadanta, who lived seven century after Mahāvīra’s Nirvāṇa (that is, first century CE), as its author. Khāravēla’s inscription which dates 152 BCE contains the *mantra* “*namo arahaṃtāṇam, namo savasidhāṇamā*”, which proves that the *Super-mantra* of Obeisance was much earlier than the time of Puṣpadanta. This is also confirmed in the *Dasaveāliyaṃ* of Sayyambhavasūri who asserted that Mahāvīra offered obeisance to the *Siddhas* (liberated souls) at the time of his initiation. In the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> chapter of the *Uttarajjhayaṇāṇi*, Lord Mahāvīra himself offers respectful obeisance to the liberated souls and the self-restrained ascetics at the very outset of his sermon (*siddhāṇam namo kicchā, samjayāṇam ca bhāvao*). All this evidence proves that the custom of offering obeisance is very old but it is not easy to determine with certitude whether or not the five-membered auspicious Obeisance *Mantra* was prevalent in the time of Mahāvīra. On the basis of the above mentioned reference to the *Mahānīśītha*, it may be said that the modern

form of the Super-mantra of Obeisance was prevalent in the time of Mahāvīra, but additional evidence is required to confirm it. The *Āvaśyaka Nirṇyūkti* provide the important information that the *Sāmāyika* should be practiced after offering obeisance to the five great personalities, which suggests that the five-membered obeisance was an integral part of the *Sāmāyika* itself.

It follows from our discussion that the *super-mantra* of Obeisance is as old as the *Sāmāyikasūtra*, which is the first chapter of *Āvaśyaka* as mentioned in the Nandi's account of the scriptural corpus. Significantly, however there is no mention of the *Super-mantra* of Obeisance as either a scriptural or super-scriptural corpus. Thus it can be inferred that it was an integral part of *Sāmāyika*. Obeisance used to be offered to the five personalities at the beginning and end of *Sāmāyika*, and likewise at the beginning and end of *Kāyotsarga*. According to Acharya Bhadrabāhu, study of the *Sūtra* should commence by offering obeisance to the five great personalities and properly cultivating the knowledge of *Nandi* and *Aṅuogadārāim*. It is possible that Bhadrabāhu's injunction was responsible for the custom of writing the *Super-mantra* of Obeisance in the beginning of all the scriptural texts. And for the same reason, the *Super-mantra* of Obeisance came to be characterized as an integral part of all the canonical texts by Jinabhadragāṇi Kṣamāśramaṇa according to whom the preceptor books of the scriptural corpus, only after reciting the five-membered obeisance. In this way, the Obeisance *Mantra* was recited before other *sūtras* and thus came to be considered an inalienable part of all books of the scripture. However, although the *super-mantra of Obeisance* is an integral part of *Sāmāyika*. If Gautama Gaṇadhara is accepted as the author of the *Āvaśyaka* (or *Sāmāyika*), it would necessarily follow that he is also the author of the five-membered *super-mantra* of Obeisance.

### 1.5 Obeisance to the Brāhmī Script

Script means arrangement of letters. In the *Nandī*, three types of letters are recognized: (i) letter as symbol, (ii) spoken letter and (iii) letter as potential capacity of the soul.

The configuration or shape inscribed in a wooden strip or on a piece of paper is a letter as symbol. Letter as symbol or script or arrangement of coloured shapes are synonymous.

The expressive medium of man's thought, memory, and imagination is language. Language as written medium is composed of letter. A man knows something while contemplating through words and their meaning. Such contemplation is the letter potential. The expression of one's thought in language is vocalization of the symbol. The eternal shape of the letter is a written symbol. Man first learns to know and think, then to speak, and lastly to write. Men have two powerful media to express their inner feelings: oral speech and written alphabet that embody his thoughts.

In the pre-historic literary traditions of the Jainas, the Brāhmī script is ascribed to Lord Ṛṣabha acquainted his daughter Brāhmī with perceived by the Jina. It is not pre-determined that a karma will give its fruit exactly as it was bound, because it is determined that a particular karma can be transformed to a particular form by means of the soul's self-efficiency. The transformation that appears to the knowledge of the Jina is determined. The occurrence of the transformation is not the work of determinism. That is the function of free will (*puruṣārtha*). In this way both determinism and free will are reconciled in the present dialogue.

In the *Pātañjala Yoga Bhāṣya*, two alternatives of the karmic store of one life-span are given: determined fruition and undetermined fruition. The author of the *Bhāṣya* has shown that the course of karmic fruition is peculiar and difficult to know because of non-determination of "such experience" and "experience otherwise" is worth study.

### 2.0 Poggala-jivāṇaṇi tekāliyatta-padaṇi (1.191-199)

The Topic of The Eternality of Matter (Physical Substance) and Soul

*Esa ṇaṇ bhamte! Poggale tīraṇ aṇaṇtaṇ sāsayāṇ samayāṇ bhuvvī vattavvaṇ siyā? haṇtā goyamā!*  
*Esa ṇaṇ poggale tīraṇ aṇaṇtaṇ sāsayāṇ bhuvvī vattavvaṇ siyā.*

Can it be said, O lord, that the *Paramāṇu* (the ultimate atom) existed eternally in the infinite past?

Yes, Gautama, it can indeed be said that the *paramāṇu* (the ultimate atom) existed eternally in the infinite past.

- *Esa ṇaṃ bhaṃte! Poggale Paḍuppanṇaṃ sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhavatīti vattavvaṃ siyā?*

*Haṃtā goyamā! esa ṇaṃ poggale Paḍuppanṇaṃ sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhavatīti vattavvaṃ siyā.*

Can it be said, O Lord, that the *paramāṇu* will exist eternally in the present time? Yes, Gautama, it can indeed be said that the *paramāṇu* will exist eternally in the present time.

- *Esa ṇaṃ bhaṃte! Poggale aṇāgayam aṇantaṃ sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhavissatīti vattavvaṃ siyā?*

*Haṃtā goyamā! esa ṇaṃ poggale aṇāgayam aṇantaṃ sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhavissatīti vattavvaṃ siyā.*

Can it be said, O Lord, that the *paramāṇu* will exist eternally in the infinite future? Yes, Gautama, it can indeed be said that the *paramāṇu* will exist eternally in the infinite future.

- *Esa ṇaṃ Bhaṃte! Khamdhe titaṃ aṇantaṃ sāsayaṃ bhuvīti vattavvaṃ siyā?*

*Haṃtā goyamā! esa ṇaṃ khamdhe titaṃ aṇantaṃ sāsayaṃ bhuvīti vattavvaṃ siyā.*

Can it be said, O Lord, that the *skandha* (material cluster or aggregate of *paramāṇus*) existed eternally in the infinite past?

Yes, Gautama, it can indeed be said that the *skandha* existed eternally in the infinite past.

- *Esa ṇaṃ Bhaṃte! Khamdhe Paḍuppanṇaṃ Sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhavatīti vattavvaṃ siyā?*

*haṃtā goyamā! Esa ṇaṃ khamdhe Paḍuppanṇaṃ Sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhavatīti vattavvaṃ siyā.*

Can it be said, O Lord, that the *Skandha* exist eternally in the present time?

Yes, Gautama, it can indeed be said that the *skandha* exists eternally in the present time?

- *Esa ṇaṃ Bhaṃte! Khamdhe aṇāgayam aṇantaṃ Sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhavissatīti vattavvaṃ siyā?*

*haṃtā goyamā! Esa ṇaṃ khamdhe aṇāgayam aṇantaṃ Sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhavissatīti vattavvaṃ siyā?*

Can it said, O Lord, that the *skandha* will exist eternally in the infinite future? Yes,

Gautama, it can indeed be said that the *skandha* will exist eternally in the infinite future.

- *Esa ṇaṃ bhaṃte! Jīve titaṃ sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhuvīti vattavvaṃ siyā?*

*humaṃtā goyamā! Esa ṇaṃ Jīve titaṃ sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhuvīti vattavvaṃ siyā.*

Can it be said, O Lord, that the soul existed eternally in the infinite past? Yes, Gautama, it can indeed be said that the soul existed eternally in the infinite past.

- *Esa ṇaṃ bhaṃte! Jīve paḍuppanṇaṃ sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhavatīti vattavvaṃ siyā?*

*haṃtā goyamā! Esa ṇaṃ Jīve paḍuppanṇaṃ sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhavatīti vattavva siyā.*

Can It be said, O Lord, that the soul exists eternally in the present time?

Yes, Gautama, it can indeed be said that the soul exists eternally in the present time.

- *Esa ṇaṃ bhaṃte! Jīve aṇāgayam sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhavissatīti vattavvaṃ siyā?*

*haṃtā goyamā! Esa ṇaṃ Jīve aṇāgayam sāsayaṃ samayaṃ bhavissatīti vattavvaṃ siyā.*

Can it be said, O Lord, that the soul will exist eternally in the infinite future?

Yes, Gautama, it can indeed be said that the soul will exist eternally in the infinite future.

In the present dialogue, the eternal continuity through the three periods of time, of matter (the physical substance) and soul has been propounded. The eternality of the present is linked with the with the infinite past and the infinite future. The trinity of time can be illustrated in our daily life by the forenoon, noon and afternoon. But such trinity is not intended here, and so the expression “infinity” has been attached to the past and the future period of time. A substance continues through the three periods of time whereas the modes, however, do not persist through infinite time, and so it is said that a substance is an independent truth (reality) while the mode is only a relative one.

Truth (*reality*) has two meanings: 1. Pure existence; 2. Present manifestation. In the present *Sūtra*, pure existence has been propounded. The “truth” is which was existent in the infinite past, which is existent in the present, and which will be existent in the future.

Umāsvāti defines substance or truth as consisting of origination, cessation and persistence,”of which the first two stand for the relative truth, and the last one for the absolute truth.

In the chapter on “extended substance”(astikāya), the eternity of five substances has been propounded. In the present dialogue, the eternity of soul and matter only has been dwelt upon. There are also the media of motion and rest and space which are substances, but they have no bearing here, because only soul and matter are directly perceived in the cosmological transformation. These two substances are the basic building blocks of the cosmos, so they alone are mentioned here. Perhaps, there had been an ancient tradition in the pre-Mahāvira times, that propounded soul and matter as the basic constituents of the cosmos. Against this tradition, Lord Mahāvira might have propounded the doctrine of five extended substances or the general doctrine of six substances. In the present scripture, however, both the traditions have found place, the present *Sūtra* incorporating the ancient tradition.

## 2.1 Semantics

*Poggale (Pudgala Paramāṇu Pudgala* stands for the physical substance or matter, but here, it stands for *paramāṇu*.

*khamdhe (skandha)*\_\_Cluster of paramanus.  
*śasayaṃ (śāśvata)*\_\_Eternal, ever present. \_\_  
*Samaya*\_\_Time (*Kāla*).

## 2.2 The Topic of Sustaining Strata of Cosmos(1.310-311)

Addressing him as “O Lord” Lord Gautama, with folded palms, offering adoration, asked the Ascetic Lord Mahāvira thus:

*kativihā naṃ bhante! loyatthi paṇṇattā?*  
*goyamā! atthavihā loyatthi paṇṇattā, naṃ jahā—1. āgāsapaiṭṭhi vāe,*  
*2. vāyapaiṭṭhi udahi, 3. udahipaiṭṭhiyā pudhavi, 4. Pudhvipaiṭṭhiyā tasathāvarā pāṇā.*  
*5. ajīvā jīvapaiṭṭhiyā, 6. jīvā kammapaiṭṭhiyā, 7. ajīvā jīvāsamgahiyā, 8. jīvā kammāsamgahiyā.*

How many sustaining strata are there, O Lord, in the cosmos?

Gautama, there are eight sustaining strata that are thus described:

1. The air is sustained by the space.
2. The ocean is sustained by the air.
3. The earth is sustained by the ocean.
4. The mobile and immobile creatures are sustained by the earth.
5. The non-souls are caught by the souls.
6. The souls are sustained by the karma.
7. The non-souls are caught by the souls.
8. The souls are caught by the karma.

*se keṇatthenaṃ bhante! evaṃ vuccaióatthavihā loyatthi jāva jīvā kammāsamgahiyā?*

*goyamā! Se jahāṇāmae kei purise vatthimāḍovei uppimsitam bamdhai bamdhittā majjhe gamṭhim bamdhai bamdhittā uvarillam gamṭhim muyai, muittā uvarillam desam vāmei, vāmettā uvarillam desam āuyāyassa pūrettā uppim sītam bamdhai, bamdhittā majjhīllam gamṭhim muyai, se nūṇam goyamā! Se purise āuyāe tassa vāuyāyassa uppim uvarimatale ciṭṭhai? haṃtā ciṭṭhai.*

Why is it said, O Lord, that there are eight sustaining strata of the cosmos up to the souls are caught by the karma?



O Gautama, some person fills a leather bag with air and ties its mouth tightly with a thread. Then he ties a knot in the middle, and then unties the upper knot. Then he empties it of air (from the upper open end). Then he fills the upper part with water and then ties the upper end (with a thread). Then, he unties the middle knot. Does, O Gautama, the volume of water rest upon the volume of air below?

*hamtā ciṭṭhai*

yes, it rests, indeed.

*Se teṇaṭṭheṇaṃ goyamā! evaṃ vuccai aṭṭhavihā loyaṭṭhiti jāva kammaṣaṃgahiyā. Se jahā vā kei purise vatthimāḍovei, vatthimāḍovettā kaḍḍi bamdhai, bamdhittā atthāka matāramaporūsiyaṃsi udagaṃsi ogāhejjā. Se nūṇaṃ goyamā! Se purise tassa āuyāyassa uvarimatale ciṭṭhai?*

*hamtā ciṭṭhai*

*evaṃ vā aṭṭhavihā java kammaṣaṃgahiya.*

Yes, it rests, indeed!

For this reason, Gautama, It is said that there are eight strata of the cosmos up to caught by the karma.

And Gautama, some person fills a leather bag with air, ties it to his waist. Then he dives into deep, uncrossable and unfathomable waters. Does, Gautama, such person floats on the surface of the waters?

Yes, he does float on the waters, O Lord!

In the same way, there are eight strata up to souls are caught by karma.

*āgāsapaiṭṭhiē vāe* (The air is sustained by the space)

The space rests on itself; so there is no discussion about the place on which it rests. The air (or the atmosphere) is sustained by the space. The earth is sustained by the ocean. This is, however, to be understood with an exception that the land (*īṣatprāgbhārā*) which is the abode of the liberated souls does not rest on the land but on the space. The mobile and immobile beings rest on the earth. This has also exception, because there are such creatures which also rest on space, mountains and space-vehicles.

*ajīvājīvapaiṭṭhiā* (The non-souls are sustained by the souls)

The *Vṛtti* explains “non-soul” as the matter in the form of material body of the souls and the like, which are sustained by the soul. The implication is that the varieties of the physical world, and the changes and transformations that take place there, are all due to the activities of soul, whatever is visible in the world is either living bodies or bodies left behind by the souls. It is in this sense that non-soul rests on soul.

*Jīvā kammaṣaṃgahiyā* (The souls are sustained by the karma)

Whatever varieties and whatever changes and formations are there of the soul, all of them are due to *karma*. It is this sense that the soul is said to rest on the karma. It is in this context that the various forms of the soul are mentioned as due to karma in the *Bhagavati*

*ajīvā jīvaṣaṃgahiyā* (The non-souls are caught by the souls)

“The non-souls is caught by the soul” means that there is some kind of identity established between the soul and the non-soul, which is responsible for the transformations that occur in the physical world.

*jīvā kammaṣaṃgahiyā* (The souls are caught by the karma)

There is a close relationship between karma and soul, which rings about various forms and transformations in the world of souls. The *Vṛtti* explains the concepts of “rest” with reference to the container and the contained, and “catching” as the “caught and catcher”.

*Sīta*\_\_it means *granthi* (knot).

*Aporusiya* (unfathomable)

The depth of waters which is deeper than the height of the human body.

## Jīva-poggala-padam (1.312-313)

### (Relation of Jīva and Matter)

2.3 *atthi naṃ bhamte! Jīva ya poggalā ya añṇamañṇapuṭṭhā, añṇamañṇamogādhā añṇamañṇasiṇehapaḍibaddhā, añṇamañṇaghaḍattāe ciṭṭhamti?*

Do the souls and the material bodies, O Lord, exist bound with each other, in contact with each other, pervading each other, stuck with each other through mutual attraction and mutual identification?

Yes, they do.

*Se keṇaṭṭheṇaṃ bhamte! evaṃ vuccai\_\_atthi naṃ jīva ya poggalā ya añṇa-mañṇābaddhā, añṇamañṇapuṭṭhā, añṇamañṇamogādhā, añṇamañṇa-siṇehapaḍibaddhā, añṇamañṇaghaḍattāe ciṭṭhamti?*

*Goyamā! Se jahāṇāmae harade siyā punṇappamāṇe volaṭṭamāṇe vasatṭamāṇe samasohāraghaḍattāe ciṭṭhai*

*Ahe naṃ kei purise taṃsi haradaṃsi egaṃ maham nāvam sayāsavam sayachiddam ogāhejjā. Se nūnam goyamā! sā nāvā tehiṃ āsavadārehiṃ āpūramāṇi punṇā punṇappamāṇā volaṭṭamāṇā vosatṭamāṇā samabharaghaḍattāe ciṭṭhai?*

*hamtā ciṭṭhai*

*Se teṇaṭṭheṇaṃ goyanā! evaṃ vuccai\_\_atthi naṃ jīvā ya poggalā ya añṇamañṇagha-ḍattāe ciṭṭhamti*

For what reason, O Lord, is it said that the souls and the material bodies exist bound with each other, in contact with each other, pervading each other, stuck with each other through mutual attraction and unified with each other through mutual identification?

Gautama, suppose there is a lake that is full, full to the brim, overflowing, even swelling and evenly full of water like a pitcher.

Now, some person floats a giant boat with hundred inlets and hundred pores. In such a situation, O Gautama, does the boat, with water constantly flowing in through the inlets and the pores, become full, full to the brim, overflowing ever swelling and evenly full of water like a pitcher?

Yes, it does so.

For this reason, Gautama, it is said that the souls and the material bodies exist bound with each other, in contact with each other, pervading each other, stuck with each other through mutual attraction and unified with each other through mutual identification.

### Relation between Soul and Matter

The soul and matter are absolutely different entities. The soul are sentient beings and matter is non-sentient. The sentient can never become non-sentient and the non-sentient can never become sentient. Under such a circumstance can there be any kind of relationship between them, eternally independent entities as they are? In the present Sūtra, this problem has been discussed. Gautama asked the Lord whether soul and matter can bind each other, contact each other, pervade each other and stick together through mutual attraction and identification.

The Lord replied in the affirmative. There is a deep relationship between the two principles: soul and matter. The souls fall in two categories as “related to matter” and as “dissociated from matter”\_\_the souls entangled in worldly life and the bound souls. The souls untouched by the matter are called “liberated”.

The worldly souls are so intimately mixed up with matter that they cannot be explained or understood independently of matter. Acārya Siddhasena Divākara has considered this close relationship between soul and matter from the non-absolutistic standpoint. His view is: Soul and matter are inter-mixed like milk and water, so it is not proper to distinguish them as soul or matter. This is the identification of soul and matter. The physical form., childhood, youth, etc., belong to the body, but it cannot be said that they are not influenced by soul. Soul has the modes of sensual knowledge, memory, etc., which also cannot be characterized as uninfluenced by

matter. Viewed from this angle, there is the most intimate relationship between soul and matter, although their real nature is quite contrary and so they are also very distinct entities. This is the non-absolutistic view of identity and difference between soul and matter.

Now, the most important question is whether the nature of the relationship between soul and matter is “material” or “non-material”. In his worldly career, soul is not absolutely non-material. According to the present *Sūtra*, this relation is bilateral. It is not exclusively due to soul or exclusively due to matter. Soul and matter are involved as cooperative partners. This follows from the phrase “*anṇamañṇasinehapadibaddhā*”. Soul has affection which is called *āśrava* i.e., cause of influx (of karma), and affection in matter is its viscosity which is its competence to be attracted and assimilated. This bilateral “affection” establishes intimate relationship between the two. If there are pores in a boat, water will naturally flow in and fill the boat. In the present *Sūtra*, this relationship has been conveyed through the five expressions “bondage, contact, pervasion, affection and identification (*gañja*).

Acārya Amṛtacandra has explained the mode of affection that occurs in the soul as due to its beginningless association with matter.

## 2.4 Mind-Body Relation

In the Jain philosophy, the psyche (*citta*) and mind (*manas*) are two different principles; the former is sentient and the latter non-sentient. Even then, in common parlour we use “mind” in place of “psyche”. Thus, mind is sentient and body non-sentient. Now the problem is how mind and body influence each other and what is the exact nature of their mutual relationship. The Jain philosopher is clearly of the view that soul in its worldly career is not absolutely different from the material body. Even though in its true nature, it is pure sentience. There is beginningless “natural” relationship between the two. They are mutually related, so there is internal interaction between them, and as such they influence each other.

In western philosophy, the subject of mind-body relation is a perennial problem. Descartes added a new meaning to the concept of mind. Before him the philosophers accepted mind and body as two aspects of the same principle, but Descartes considered mind as distinct from the body. Before him mind and body were relative concepts. But Descartes accepted the independent existence of both of them. The substance which is the immediate subject of local extension and of the accidents, such as figures, positions, local motion, etc., is called body. Though immediately resides in mind, according to Descartes.

The influence of mind on body and body on mind occur, according to Descartes through “a little gland at the base of the brain” (the pineal body) which stands in specially intimate relation to mind.

For Spinoza, the mind is a finite modification of God, considered under the attribute of thought, and the body is the very same modification of God, considered under the attribute of extension. Mind and body thus are the same thing, viewed under two different aspects, and both are modifications of the one substance—God. The body is always influenced by the external objects and appears to have new forms without stop. The mind is conversant with these changes. The mind knows the influences of the external objects from the body exactly as they appear and not as they really are. This proves that the body does not influence the mind, nor mind the body.

If the difference of soul and body is granted, their union can be explained, according to Leibniz, without the vulgar hypothesis of influence which cannot be understood, and without the hypothesis of the occasional cause, which calls on a God different from the machine. For God has from the beginning so fashioned soul as well as body, with so much wisdom and so much artifice, that from the first constitution or concept itself of either one, everything that happens in the one corresponds perfectly to everything that happens in the other. This Leibniz called “the hypothesis of concomitance.” This is true in all substances of the whole universe, but is not perceptible in all, as it is in the case of mind and body.

## Psychology

Psychology also considers the influence of body and mind on each other. The same question is before us whether body influences the sentient or the sentient influences the body. What is the relation between the two? They influence each other and cannot be separated, one from the other. Body and the sentient principle cannot

be accepted as absolutely independent. Their relation and mutual influence can be explained only by admitting their relative independence.

### The Enjoyer and the Enjoyed

Soul has been called in the present *Sūtra* as enjoyer and matter as an enjoyed. The soul is the sentient principle, so it is the enjoyer, and the matter is non-sentient, so it is the enjoyed. The sentient principle has the mode of “enjoyership” and the non-sentient has “enjoyedness”. Because of these modes relation is established between them. We eat, work, have sensual experience, respiration, speech, and thought—all this is the influence of the non-sentient principle on the sentient. We have sensation and knowledge with the help of the brain. The non-sentient body become sentient due to the Influence of the sentient on it. The appreciation of the *modus operandi* of the relationship between soul and matter has not only a philosophical value, but it has also a spiritual importance. It is only after the appreciation of this relationship that the spiritual discipline which transcends relation, thought and mutual influence of objects is feasible.

### Conclusion :

1. From the non-absolutistic view-point, the sentient and non-sentient principles are not absolutely different, so relationship is possible between them.
2. In worldly life, the existence of soul is not free from matter, the worldly soul is not pure, but a mixture of spirit and matter.
3. The problem of relationship become complex and insoluble if the sentient and non-sentient principles are regarded as absolutely incompatible, and the worldly soul as absolutely pure.
4. The spiritual discipline that discriminates between the sentient and the non-sentient principles is possible only on the recognition of the relative relationship between the sentient and non-sentient; it is very valuable from the spiritual point of view.

### 3.0 Fruition of Karma (1.147-162)

In the philosophy of karma, three concepts of causality of experience are prominent: God as the cause of the karmic fruition, cause as an unknowable factor, and one's own karma as the cause. Some philosophers opine that the experience of pleasure and pain is affected by God, others ascribe the experience to an unknown cause, and the third group of thinkers relates it to the person's acts themselves. The Jains have their own doctrine of karma. All our experiences are due to our own karma. This is why the question whether one experiences the results of the karma done by him has been raised. Does a soul experience the results of all the karma that he has done in a particular life? If so, how is this sequence of experiences determined? To this query, the Lord answers that the sequence is determined by the doer himself, or rather by the karma itself. The different aspects of the karma are responsible for the sequence, and other peculiarities of the fruition of the karma. And when the maturity of the karma occurs, the karma produces its effect. The effect is synchronous with arising of the karma. In the absence of the rising (maturity) of the karma, there is no experiencing of the result. It is in order to explain this principle of the karmic fruition that the Lord states that the soul sometimes experiences the karma done by himself, sometimes it does not. In the *Vṛtti*, suffering is identified as karma. Mundane happiness is also suffering. The cause of suffering is karma, so the meaning of suffering is karma. Here the word “suffering” and “karma” should be interpreted jointly.

There is another question that is related to the life span. The bondage of life span takes place in the previous birth, but its experience begins with the new birth. It can thus be said that the new birth is the determinant of the experience of pleasure, pain and life-span. A comparison can be made here with *Yogadarsana*: “*sati mule tadvipako jatya yurbhogah*”—on the existence of the root, there is its result, namely, birth, life-span and experiencing of pleasure and pain. The *Vṛtti* gives the opinion of an ancient commentator on life-span. According to it, a soul binds the life-span karma of the seventh hell, but in course of time, due to the change in its psyche, it transforms that life-span into one of the third hell. In this way, the soul does not experience the karma that has not arisen, but only experiences the karma that has arisen.

*Se nūṇaṃ bhaṃte! appaṇā ceva udīreti? appaṇā ceva garaḥati, appaṇā ceva saṃvareti? haṃtā goyamā! appaṇā ceva udīreti, appaṇā ceva garaḥati, appaṇā ceva saṃvareti.*

Now, does the soul itself, O Lord, make the karma rise prematurely, itself censure the karma and itself inhibit the karma?

Yes, Gautama, the soul itself makes the karma rise prematurely, itself censures the karma and itself inhibits the karma.

*Jaṃ ṇaṃ bhaṃte! appaṇā ceva udīreti, appaṇā ceva garaḥati, appaṇā ceva saṃvareti, taṃ kiṃ 1. udiṇṇaṃ udīreti? 2. aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīreti? 3. aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ udīreti. 4. udayāṇaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ udīreti.*

*goyamā! 1. no udiṇṇaṃ udīreti? 2. no aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīreti? 3. aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ udīreti 4. no udayāṇaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ udīreti.*

O Lord, when the soul itself makes the karma rise prematurely, itself censures the karma and itself inhibits the karma, does it 1. make that arise, which has already arisen or 2. that which has not arisen or 3. that which has not arisen but is capable of being aroused prematurely, or 4. that karma which had been experienced and dropped behind after it had arisen?

Gautama, 1. the soul does not arouse prematurely the karma that has already arisen, 2. it does not arouse prematurely which has not arisen, 3. it arouses prematurely the karma that has not arisen but is capable of being aroused, 4. it does not make arise prematurely what has been experienced and dropped behind after it has arisen.

*Jaṃ ṇaṃ bhaṃte! aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ udīreti. taṃ kiṃ uṭṭhāṇeṇaṃ, kammeṇaṃ, baleṇaṃ, vīrieṇaṃ, purisaḅkārāparakkameṇaṃ aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ udīreti? udāhu taṃ aṇuṭṭhāṇeṇaṃ, akammeṇaṃ, abaleṇaṃ, avīrieṇaṃ, apurisaḅkārāparakkameṇaṃ aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ udīreti goyamā! taṃ uṭṭhāṇeṇa vi, kammeṇa vi, baleṇa vi, vīrieṇa vi, purisaḅkārāparakkameṇa vi aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ udīreti, no taṃ aṇuṭṭhāṇeṇaṃ, akammeṇaṃ, abaleṇaṃ, avīrieṇaṃ, apurisaḅkārāparakkameṇaṃ aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ udīreti.*

O Lord, when the soul arouses prematurely the karma which has not arisen but is capable of being aroused, does it do so by means of enthusiasm, action, strength, energy, self-exertion and self-efficiency? Or does it so by non-enthusiasm, non-action, non-strength, non-energy, non-self-exertion and non-self-efficiency?

Gautama, it arouses prematurely the karma which has not arisen but is capable of being aroused, by means of enthusiasm, action, strength, energy, self-exertion and self-efficiency, and not by non-enthusiasm, non-action, non-strength, non-energy, non-self-exertion and non-self-efficiency.

*Evam sati atthi uṭṭhāṇe vi vā, kamme vi vā, vīrie vi vā, purisaḅkārāparakkame vi vā.*

It being possible thus, there exist enthusiasm, action, strength, energy, self-exertion and self-efficiency.

*Se nūṇaṃ bhaṃte! appaṇā ceva uvasāmei? appaṇā ceva garaḥai? appaṇṇa ceva saṃvare vi*

*Haṃtā goyamā! appaṇā ceva uvasāmei, appaṇā ceva garaḥai, appaṇṇa ceva saṃvare vi*

O Lord! Does the soul itself suppress the karma by its own efforts, itself censure it by its own efforts and itself inhibit it by its own efforts?

Yes, Gautama, it itself suppresses, censures, and inhibits it by its own efforts.

*Jaṃ ṇaṃ bhaṃte! appaṇā ceva uvasāmei, appaṇā ceva garaḥati, appaṇā ceva saṃvareti, taṃ kiṃ 1. udiṇṇaṃ uvasāmei? 2. aṇudiṇṇaṃ uvasāmeti? 3. aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ uvasāmei? 4. udayāṇaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ uvasāmei?*

*goyamā! 1. no udiṇṇaṃ uvasāmei, 2. aṇudiṇṇaṃ uvasāmeti, 3. no aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ uvasāmei, 4. no udayāṇaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ uvasāmei.*

O Lord, when the soul itself suppresses, censures and inhibits the karma by its own efforts, 1. does it suppress what has already arisen? 2. does it suppress what has not arisen, 3. does it suppress the karma that has

not arisen but is capable of being aroused? 4. does it suppress what had been dropped behind after it had arisen? Gautama, 1. it does not suppress what has already arisen, 2. it suppresses what has not arisen, 3. it does not suppress what has not arisen but is capable of being aroused, 4. it does not suppress what had been dropped behind after it had arisen.

*jaṃ naṃ bhante! anudīṇaṃ uvasāmei, taṃ kiṃ uṭṭhāṇeṇaṃ, kammeṇaṃ, baleṇaṃ, vīrieṇaṃ, purisakkāra-parakkameṇaṃ, anudīṇaṃ uvasāmei? udāhu taṃ anuṭṭhāṇeṇaṃ, akammeṇaṃ, abaleṇaṃ, avīrieṇaṃ, apurisakkāraparakkameṇaṃ, anudīṇaṃ, uvasāmei?*

*goyamā! taṃ uṭṭhāṇeṇa vi, kammeṇa vi, baleṇa vi, vīrieṇa vi, purisakkāra-parakkameṇa vi, anudīṇaṃ uvasāmei no taṃ anuṭṭhāṇeṇaṃ, akammeṇaṃ, abaleṇaṃ, avīrieṇaṃ, apurisakkāraparakkameṇaṃ anudīṇaṃ uvasāmei.*

O Lord, when it suppresses (karma) that has not arisen, does it suppress what has not arisen, by means of enthusiasm, action, strength, energy, self-exertion and self-efficiency? Or does it do so by non-enthusiasm, non-action, non-strength, non-energy, non-self-exertion and non-self-efficiency?

Gautama, it suppresses what has not arisen by means of enthusiasm, action, strength, energy, self-exertion, and self-efficiency but it does not do so by non-enthusiasm, non-action, non-strength, non-energy, non-self-exertion and non-self-efficiency.

*evaṃ sati atthi uṭṭhāṇe vi, kamme vi, bale vi, vīrie vi, purisakkāra-parakkame vi.*

It being possible thus, there exist enthusiasm, action, strength, energy, self-exertion and self-efficiency.

*se nūnaṃ bhante! appaṇā ceva vedeti? appaṇā ceva garahati?  
hamtā goyamā! appaṇā ceva vedeti, appaṇā ceva garahati.*

O Lord, does the soul itself experience and itself censure (the karma) by its own efforts?

Yes, Gautama, it itself experiences and itself censures (the karma) by its own efforts.

*jaṃ naṃ bhante! appaṇā ceva vedeti, appaṇā ceva garahati, taṃ kiṃ—1. udīṇaṃ vedeti? 2. anudīṇaṃ vedeti? 3. anudīṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ vedeti?*

*udayānaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ vedeti?*

*goyamā! 1. udīṇaṃ vedeti, 2. no anudīṇaṃ vedeti, 3. no anudīṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ vedeti, 4. no udayānaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ vedeti.*

O Lord, when the soul itself experiences and itself censures (the karma) by its own efforts, does it experience (the karma) 1. what has already arisen, 2. what has not arisen, 3. what has not arisen but is capable of being aroused, 4. what has been dropped behind after it had arisen?

Gautama! 1. it experiences what has already arisen, 2. it does not experience what has not arisen, 3. it does not experience what is capable of being aroused, 4. it does not experience what has been dropped behind after it had arisen.

*jaṃ naṃ bhante! udīṇaṃ vedeti taṃ kiṃ uṭṭhāṇeṇaṃ, kammeṇaṃ, baleṇaṃ, vīrieṇaṃ, purisakkāra-parakkameṇaṃ udīṇaṃ vedeti? udāhu taṃ anuṭṭhāṇeṇaṃ, akammeṇaṃ, abaleṇaṃ, avīrieṇaṃ, apurisakkāraparakkameṇaṃ udīṇaṃ vedeti?*

*goyamā! taṃ uṭṭhāṇeṇa vi, kammeṇa vi, baleṇa vi, vīrieṇa vi, purisakkāra-parakkameṇa vi udīṇaṃ vedeti no taṃ anuṭṭhāṇeṇaṃ, akammeṇaṃ, abaleṇaṃ, avīrieṇaṃ, apurisakkāraparakkameṇaṃ udīṇaṃ vedeti.*

O Lord, when the soul experiences what has already arisen, does it experience what has already been aroused by enthusiasm, action, strength, self-exertion and self-efficiency? Or does it do so by non-enthusiasm, non-action, non-strength, non-energy, non-self-exertion and non-self-efficiency?

Gautama, it experiences what has already been aroused by enthusiasm, action, strength, self-exertion and self-efficiency; but it does not do so by non-enthusiasm, non-action, non-strength, non-energy, non-self-exertion and non-self-efficiency.

*evam sati atthi utthāṇeī, vā, kammeī vā, baleī vā, vīrieī vā, purisakkāra-parakkameī vā.*

It being possible thus, there exist enthusiasm, action, strength, self-exertion and self-efficiency.

*se nūṇaṃ bhaṃṭe! appaṇā ceva nijjareti? appaṇā ceva garahati?*

*haṃtā goyamā! appaṇā ceva nijjareti, appaṇā ceva garahati.*

O Lord, does the soul itself throw off and itself censure (the karma) by its own efforts?

Yes, Gautma, it itself throws off and itself censures it by its own efforts.

*jaṃ ṇaṃ bhaṃṭe! appaṇā ceva nijjareti, appaṇā ceva garahati, taṃ kiṃ—1. udiṇṇaṃ nijjareti? 2. aṇudiṇṇaṃ nijjareti? 3. aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ nijjareti?*

*udayāṇaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ nijjareti?*

*goyamā! 1. no udiṇṇaṃ nijjareti, 2. no aṇudiṇṇaṃ nijjareti, 3. no aṇudiṇṇaṃ udīraṇābhaviyaṃ kammaṃ nijjareti, 4. udayāṇaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ nijjareti.*

O Lord, when the soul itself throws off and itself censures the karma by its own efforts, does it throw off 1. what has already arisen, 2. what has not arisen, 3. what has not arisen but is capable of being aroused, 4. what has been dropped behind after it had arisen?

Gautama, 1. it does not throw off what has already arisen, 2. it does not throw off what has not arisen, 3. it does not throw off what has not arisen but is capable of being aroused, but 4. it throws off what had been dropped behind after it had arisen.

*jaṃ ṇaṃ bhaṃṭe! udayāṇaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ nijjareti, taṃ kiṃ utthāṇeṇaṃ, kammeṇaṃ, baleṇaṃ, vīrieṇaṃ, purisakkāra-parakkameṇaṃ udayāṇaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ nijjareti? udāhu taṃ aṇuttāṇeṇaṃ, akammeṇaṃ, abaleṇaṃ avīrieṇaṃ, apurisakkāraparakkameṇaṃ udayāṇaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ nijjareti?*

*goyamā! taṃ utthāṇeṇa vi, kammeṇa vi, baleṇa vi, vīrieṇa vi, purisakkāra-parakkameṇa vi udayāṇaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ nijjareti. no taṃ aṇuttāṇeṇaṃ, akammeṇaṃ, abaleṇaṃ, avīrieṇaṃ, apurisakkāraparakkameṇaṃ udayāṇaṃ tarapacchākaḍaṃ kammaṃ nijjareti.*

Does the soul, O Lord, throw off the karma when it had been experienced and dropped behind after it had arisen, by means of enthusiasm, action, strength, self-exertion and self-experience, or does it do so by non-enthusiasm, non-action, non-strength, non-energy, non-self-exertion and non-self-efficiency?

Gautama, the soul throws off the karma that had been experienced and dropped behind after it had arisen by means of enthusiasm, action, strength, self-exertion and self-efficiency, and not by non-enthusiasm, non-action, non-strength, non-energy, non-self-exertion and non-self-efficiency.

*evam sati atthi utthāṇeī vā, kammeī vā, baleī vā, vīrieī vā, purisakkāra-parakkameī vā.*

It being possible thus, there exist enthusiasm, action, strength, self-exertion and self-efficiency.

**4.0** In all these sūtras, the doctrine of self-efficiency and self-exertion has been propounded. Premature fruition of karma, censure of the past karma, inhibition, suppression, experiencing and wearing off of karma are all effected by the soul itself by means of enthusiasm, action, strength, self-exertion and self-efficiency.

#### **4.1 Premature fruition of karma (Udīraṇā)**

This is the fifth among the eight karmic processes. It is maturation of karma before the destined period. Rising of karma is of two kinds : (1) Simple rising at its proper time, (2) Made to rise before the destined period. Simple rise stands for fruition on the maturation of time. Premature fruition means forcing maturation before time. In the *pañcasamgraha*, simple rising has been defined as “rising at the appointed time (*samprāpti*)” and premature rising as “rising before the appointed time (*asamprāpti*). In the *TRV*, premature rising has been called fruition at improper time (*ayathākāla*).

#### **4.2 Karma that has already arisen (udīraṇā)**

The karmic material cluster that has become transformed for giving the fruit is called *udīraṇā*. It is obvious

that what has already arisen cannot be aroused prematurely. The *Vṛtti* has advanced the argument: if what has arisen can be prematurely aroused again, there will be no end of the process of prematurely arousing.

#### 4.3 Karma that has not arisen (*anudūrpa*).

The karmic material cluster that has not been transformed to the state of rising, in order to give the fruit is called “what has not arisen” (*anudūrpa*).

The *Vṛtti* has explained this concept in two ways: (1) The karma that will arise in remote future, (2) The karma that will never be subject to premature fruition.

It is not possible to arouse a karma in the present, if it is destined to be aroused in the remote future. The karma which is not amenable to premature fruition cannot be aroused before time even in the future. There are three processes that are nameable to premature fruition: (1) Karma in the state of *upaśama* (suppression), (2) What has been made incapable of all karmic processes excepting augmentation and reduction (*nidhatti*) and the (3) Karma that has been made incapable of all karmic processes (*nikācanā*).

#### 4.4 Karma that has not arisen but is capable of being prematurely aroused (*anudūrpa udūrapābhavya karma*)

The topic under consideration is concerned with karma that is capable of being aroused prematurely. All karma cannot be aroused prematurely. It is only those karma which have become capable of being aroused prematurely can be subjected to premature arising. The criterion of such capability is determined by the varieties of premature arising of karmic type, karmic duration, karmic intensity and karmic units.

#### 4.5 Fitness for Premature Arising in respect of Karmic Types

According to the *pañnavanā*, there are 148 types of karma. In the classical treatises on karma, 158 types are found mentioned. In the Digambara literature, 148 types have been described. According to *pañcasamgraha*, 110 types of karma are capable of premature fruition. In the Digambara tradition, 122 types are so capable.

#### 4.6 Fitness for Premature Arising in respect of Karmic Duration

There are two varieties of premature arousing in respect of duration: fitness for arousing and unfitness for arousing. There three durations that are unfit for arousing are: bondage *āvalikā*, transfer *āvalikā*. All other are fit for arousing.

For information about the minimum, maximum and other varieties of intensity-duration and units-duration, see *Pañcasamgraha*.

#### 4.7 Karma that had been experienced and dropped behind after arising

A karma is experienced after it has arisen. After being experienced, the karma becomes non-karma (*akarma*). This is the reason why after it has arisen, the karma is called “done before” (*paścāt-kṛta*), that is, the karma that has become a thing of the past.

Out of the aforesaid four possible alternative (1.148), the third one is appropriate for premature arousing (1.148). For karmic suppression, the second alternative (i.e., *udūrpa* the karma that has already arisen), is approved (1.152). In the state of suppression, there is elimination of the karma that has been aroused and complete suspension of the rise of the fruit and the rise of the units of the karma that has not been aroused. There fore, suppression is possible only of the karma that has not arisen. In the case of experiencing, only the first alternative is approved (1.156). In the case of wearing off of karma, the fourth alternative is accepted (1.160) Gautama asked: O Lord, is experiencing nothing but wearing off? Is wearing off nothing but experiencing? There Lord said in reply: O Gautama, this is not true: experiencing is related to karma, while wearing off is concerned with non-karma. The implication is that so long as karma is karma, it is not separated from the soul-units. It is separated from the soul-units only when it has lost the nature of karma and has become non-karma.

In connection with immature arousing and suppression. The phrases “censuring the past” and “inhibiting the present” have been used. Censure is done with reference to the past karma, while inhibition is done with



reference to the present karma. According to Śrīmad Jayācārya, there is no indispensable relationship between premature arousing and suppressing with the acts of censure and inhibiting. The latter two have been mentioned here in order to point out that they are mostly associated with the former two. The act of censuring the past only has been mentioned in connecting with experiencing and wearing off of karma, as inhibiting is not possible there.

### 5.0 *Kaṃkhāmohaṇijja-padaṃ* (1.118-119)

*jīvāṇaṃ bhaṃte! kaṃkhāmohaṇijje kamme kaḍe?*

*haṃtā kaḍe.*

The Topic of View-deluding Inclination

Do the souls, O Lord, have view-deluding inclination karma as bound.

Yes, they do have.

*se bhaṃte! Kiṃ 1. desenaṃ dese kaḍe? 2. desenaṃ save kaḍe? 3. savveṇaṃ dese kaḍe? 4. savveṇaṃ save kaḍe?*

*goyamā! 1. no desenaṃ desekaḍe dese kaḍe 2. desenaṃ save kaḍe? 3. no savveṇaṃ dese kaḍe 4. savveṇaṃ save kaḍe*

In that case, O Lord, is 1. a part of the karma bound by a part of the soul? 2. a part of the karma bound by all parts of the soul? 3. the complete karma bound by a part of the soul? Or 4. the complete karma bound by all parts of the soul?

Gautama, 1. a part of the karma is not bound by a part of the soul, 2. a part of the karma is not bound by the complete soul, 3. the complete karma is not bound by a part of the soul, 4. but the complete karma is bound by all parts of the soul.

In the present dialogue, a problem of the doctrine of karma has been explained. A soul appropriates only those karmic clusters which co-exist with soul-units. The implication is that the soul appropriates only those karmic clusters which occupy the same space-units as are occupied by the soul-units. They do not appropriate the karmic clusters that occupy contiguous or remote space-units.

The following is the process of appropriating karmic clusters: Sometimes the soul appropriates karmic clusters occupying one, two or many soul-unit, and sometimes the clusters occupying all the soul-units. In the *Karmaprakṛti*, this law of appropriation by all soul-units is found enunciated. The same law with respect to nutrition is available in the present scripture as well as the *pañṇavanā*. In the *Vṛtti* also, the same law has been explained, accepting it as the intrinsic activity of the soul.

In the second part of the aforesaid law, it is laid down that the karmic matter is appropriated completely and not in part. Similarly, the law *savveṇaṃ savvaṃ* concerns both the appropriator and the appropriated matter. Out of the four alternatives mentioned in the *Sūtra*, the fourth one is approved, the other three are rejected as inappropriate for the karmic bondage

*1.129 jīvāṇaṃ bhaṃte! kaṃkhāmohaṇijjaṃ kammaṃ vedemṭi?*

Do the souls, O Lord, experience the karma of view-deluding inclination?

Yes, they do.

*1.130 kahaṇṇaṃ bhaṃte! jīvā kaṃkhāmohaṇijjaṃ kammaṃ vedemṭi?*

*goyamā! tehiṃ tehiṃ kāraṇehiṃ samkiyā, kaṃkhiyā, vitigimchiyā, bhedasamāvanā, kalusasamāvanāōevam khalu jīvā kaṃkhāmohaṇijjaṃ kammaṃ vedemṭi.*

How do the souls, O Lord, experience the karma of view-deluding inclination?

Gautama, for various reasons, they are in suspicion, have misguided inclination and doubt, and are subject to split in opinion and subject to defilement. Thus do the souls indeed experience the karma of view-

deluding inclination. In the present dialogue, five causes have been shown for experiencing the karma of view-deluding inclination.

1. Suspicion about the truth
2. Inclination for the perverse truth
3. Doubt about the fruit of the religious discipline
4. Split, i.e. dilemma about the truth or reality—occurrence of uncertainty and indecision.
5. Defilement, that is, lack of pure intelligence about the truth.

In the first section of the second *Śataka* of the present scripture, the *Vṛtti* has explained the five phrases viz., suspicion, etc., in a different way. There the context is quite different and so the change of meaning is but natural.

In the present context, the *Vṛtti* has explained “split” as dilemma and “defilement” as the perverse view like “this is not so”.

The *Vṛtti* has posed the question: in *Bka.* 1.129, it has already been propounded that the soul experiences the view-deluding inclination. Then what was the necessity of reasserting it in *sūtra* 130? In reply, the *Vṛtti* quotes a verse that purports to say that a truth already propounded is propounded again for three reasons: prohibition of the undesired, approval, and appreciation of a particular reasoning.

5.1 *Kamkhāmohaṇijjassa-baṇḍhādi-padam* (1.140-146)

*Jivā ṇaṃbhaṃte! kamkhāmohaṇijjāṃ kammāṃ baṇḍhaṃti?*  
*haṃtā baṇḍhaṃti*

The Topic of Bondage of View-deluding Inclination and the like

Do the soul, O Lord, bind the karma of view-deluding inclination?

*Kahaṇṇaṃ bhaṃte! jivā kamkhāmohaṇijjāṃ kammāṃ baṇḍhaṃti?*  
*goyamā! pamādapaccayā, joganimitaṃ ca.*

Why indeed, O Lord, do the souls bind the karma of view-deluding inclination? Gautama, remissness is the material cause and activity (of mind, speech and body) is the formal cause.

*Se ṇaṃ bhaṃte se ṇaṃ bhaṃte! Pamāde kimpavahe?*  
*goyamā! Jogappavahe.*

Now, O Lord, what is the origin of remissness?

Gautama, activity is the origin of remissness.

*se ṇaṃ bhaṃte! Ice kimpavahe?*

*goyama! Vīriyappavahe.*

Now, O Lord, what is the origin of activity?

Gautama, energy is the origin of activity.

*se ṇaṃ bhaṃte! Vīrie kimpavahe?*

*Goyama! Sarirappavahe.*

Now, O Lord, what is the origin of energy?

Gautama, body is the origin of energy.

*Se ṇaṃ bhaṃte! sarīre kimpavahe?*

*goyamā jīvappavahe.*

Now, O Lord, what is the origin of body?

Gautama, soul is the origin of body.

*Evam sati atthi utthānei vā, balei vā, vīriei vā, purisakkāraparakkameivā.*

Thus there exist enthusiasm, action, strength, energy, self-exertion, self-efficiency.

In the present dialogue, the doctrine of autonomy of the soul and its mastership are propounded. A soul binds karma by its own efficiency. Binding of karma is not governed by determinism, the denial of which is expressed by enthusiasm, action, strength, energy, self-exertion and self-efficiency. Determinism does not admit karmic bondage as due to enthusiasm and the like. Lord *Mahāvira* was the originator of the doctrine of self-exertion and self-efficiency. In the *Vṛtti* Determinism has been discussed with the explicit mention of *Gośālaka*.

The theory of karma is an important doctrine of Jainism, which discusses bondage, rise, elimination-cum-suppression, and such other topics related to karma. In the present dialogue, the causes of the bondage of karma of view-deluding inclination have been indicated. The two principal causes of karmic bondage are : remissness and activity (of mind, speech and body). In the *pañnavanā* the two factors lust and hatred have been shown as the principal causes of karmic bondage. Lust has two aspects : deceitfulness and greed; hatred has also two aspects: anger and pride.

There are four causes of karmic bondage. In the *Thānam* also, the same four causes are found mentioned. Five causes of karmic inflow have also been enumerated there. In the later Jain literature also, the same five are noted. It was *Umāsvāti* who, for the first time, enunciated the five causes of karmic bondage: deluded world-view, non-abstinence, remissness, passions and activity, which have been followed in the later treatises too. But in the books of karmic literature, in general, only four causes have been pointed out, not mentioning remissness, perhaps because the latter was considered as the common factor to the other four.

Chronologically considered, the concatenation of cause of karmic bondage given in the present dialogue seems to be the earliest. In the eighth *Śataka* of the same scripture, remissness and activity have again been mentioned as the cause of karmic bondage. The same two are mentioned as the cause of worldly deeds and urges.

In the *Vṛtti*, remissness has also been explained as intoxicant, etc. Such classification of remissness is found in the *Thānam* which enumerates six varieties of remissness: intoxicants, sleep, sensual objects, passions, gambling, and *pratīlekhana*\_\_inspection of outfit (undertaken heedlessly). Alternately, it includes deluded world-view, non-abstinence and passions under remissness and quotes two verses in order to confirm this. In those verses, eight varieties of remissness have been mentioned: ignorance, doubt, wrong knowledge, lust, hatred, loss of intelligence, disregard for religion, and misconception of activity (of mind, speech and body). In the *Thānam*, remissness has been described as the cause of suffering and karmic bondage. In the *TRV*, we find fifteen varieties of remissness\_\_

Four irrelevant talks\_\_about women, food, the country, the king

Four passions\_\_anger, pride, deceit, greed

Five sensuous dispositions\_\_inspired by lust and hatred

Sleep, and

Affection.

The above classification of remissness does not lead to any definite connotation of the term. If all possible harmful activities are considered as remissness, then the word *yoga* which stands for all activities of mind, speech and body will have no speciality of its own. In that case, remissness will be synonymous with any kind of inauspicious (harmful) activity. In *Bha.* 1.141, two causes of view-deluding inclination have been mentioned, namely, remissness, and activity (of mind, speech and body), and so there must be a line of demarcation between the two. In view of such line of demarcation, we arrive at the conclusion that, there are two basic causes of karmic bondage, namely, the deluding karma and the body-making-karma. Remissness stands for the deluding karma, and activity for the body-making-karma.

Śrīmad Jayācārya has quoted the opinion of Monk Dharmarsi that activity (*yoga*) stands for inauspicious (harmful) activity. But this seems questionable, when we critically consider the relation between remissness and activity. If activity is considered as inauspicious (harmful), then what will be the meaning of remissness? Here, remissness is itself a kind of sinful (*sāvadya*) activity. This will obliterate the line of demarcation between remissness and activity. It will, therefore, be reasonable to explain remissness as the clinging that results from the rise of the deluding karma, or any kind of inauspicious (harmful) activity.

Activity (*yoga*), on the other hand, should be regarded as the rising of the body-making-karma resulting in the activity of body, speech and mind. All the activities of a living being result from the interaction of the soul and the body. The body is built by the soul. Energy (*vīrya*) is of two kinds: activity (*sakarāṇa*) and inactive (*akarāṇa*). The non-vibrating energy of the soul is related exclusively to the soul; thus it is *akarāṇa*. The vibrating energy of the soul arises from the body, which governs the activities of the mind, speech and body and it is *sakarāṇa*.

## 5.2 Activity : Action of Body

*Umāsvāti* defines activity (*yoga*) as the action of body, speech and mind. Siddhasenagaṇi has mentioned four factors in the process of activity: the soul, the body, the active energy (*karāṇa*) and activity (*yoga*), which can be compared with the *sūtras* 1.143-145, laying down the causal relation between soul, body, energy, and yoga.

The problem of body and mind is a Gordian Knot in philosophy, which is successfully cut by the process laid down in the present dialogue. Mind is activated by the energy derived from the body. The relation between body and mind can thus be easily understood. The activity of mind, speech and body when connected with the rising of the deluding karma turns into remissness. This is why activity (*yoga*) has been considered as the original source of remissness.

### 2. Material Cause (*paccaya*)

The root cause, matter or material cause.

### 3. Formal Cause (*niṃitta*)

Auxiliary cause.

### 4. Enthusiasm (*uṭṭhāna*)

Preparation for completing the act.

### 5. Action (*kamma*)

To engage in activity.

### 6. Strength (*bala*)

Physical stamina.

## 7. Energy (*vīriya*)

The physical energy or the life-force, that activates the mind, speech and body.

### 8. Self-exertion (*purisakkāra*)

Self-pride the assertion “I can do this”.

### 9. Self-efficiency (*parakkama*)

Able striving for completing an act.

In the *Vṛtti* Energy has been explained as the enthusiasm of the soul. But in the *Sūtra* 144, energy has been shown to originate from the body. In the *Vṛtti*, Self-exertion has been alternatively explained as “the deed” or “urge of the person.”

### 5.3 Quality of bondless Samaṇa(1.169-172)

*Atthi ṇaṃ bhaṃte! samaṇā vi niggamthā kaṃkhā mohaṇijjaṃ kammaṃ vedemti? haṃta atthi.*

O Lord, do the bondless samaṇas experience the karma a view-deluding inclination?

Yes, they do.

*Kahaṇṇaṃ bhaṃte! samaṇā vi niggamthā kaṃkhā mohaṇijjaṃ kammaṃ vedemti? goyamā! tehiṃ tehiṃ nāṇaṃtarehiṃ, dāmaṇaṃtarehiṃ, caritaṃtarehiṃ, līṃyaṃ tarehiṃ, pavayaṇaṃtarehiṃ, pāvayaṇaṃtarehiṃ, kappāṃtarehiṃ, ma-ggaṃtarehiṃ, mataṃtarehiṃ, bhaṃgatarehiṃ, na yaṃtarehiṃ, niyaṃtarehiṃ, paṃā ṇaṃtarehiṃ, saṃkhitā kaṃkhitā vitīkicchitā bheda samāvannā.*

*Kalu sasanāvannā-evaṃ khalu samaṇā niggamthā kaṃkhā-mohaṇijjaṃ vedemti.*

How do the bondless samaṇas, O Lord ,experience the karma a view-deluding inclination?

Gautama, they have suspicious, misguided inclination, doubt, split in opinion and defilement in respect a varieties of knowledge, belief, conduct, outfit, scripture, preceptor (author the scripture), religious custom (kalpa), path, opinion. Categories, stand points, rules, and valid sources of knowledge.

Thus the bondless samaṇas experience the karma of the view deluding inclination.

*Se nūṇaṃ bhaṃte! Tameva saccam nīsamkaṃ, jaṃ jīṇehiṃ paveditaṃ?*

*Haṃtā goyamā! Tameva saccam nīsamkaṃ jaṃ jīṇehiṃ paveditaṃ.*

That indeed, O Lord, which has been propounded by the *Jinas* is true and doubtless?

Yes, Gautama, that what has been propounded by the *Jinas* is true and doubtless.

*Evaṃ jāva atthi uṭṭhāṇeī, vā, baleī vā, purisakkāra-paṃ akkameī vā.*

Similarly, (asin *Bha*, 1.132-162) up to there exist enthusiasm, action, strength, energy, self-exertion and self-efficiency.

### 5.4 Detail of *Karma Bandha*

In the present dialogue, the expression *niggamthā* (bondless) is a differentiating adjunct. The expression *samaṇa* stands for all classes of ascetics whether they are Jains or *Ājīvikas* or Buddhists. When the expression *niggamthā* is added to *samaṇa*, it become representative of the Jain ascetics. Thus the phrase *samaṇa niggamthā* stands for the monks of Lord Mahāvīra's order.

Even a Jain monk experiences the karma of view-deluding inclination. There are five aspects of such experiencing. Suspicion, misguided inclination, doubt, split in opinion, and mental defilement. When we are faced with varieties of definitions, thoughts and perspectives of a particular subject, we start experiencing the karma of view-deluding inclination.

Śrīmad Jayācārya has identified the experiencing of the view-deluding inclination with the experience of view-deluding karma. His argument is: when there is the experience of view-deluding inclination, there occurs perversion of view (*mīthyātva*). This explanation has been offered on the basis of the *Vṛtti* which approves *mīthyātva-mohaṇīya* in this context. Śrīmad Jayācārya, in his *Bhagavatī Joḍa* on *Śataka* 14, has defined *mīthyātva* as perverted faith any of the ten subjects enumerated by him.

The present 13 varieties of topics do not relate to the question of “faith in truth” (*tattva-śraddhā*). The main issue is the misguided inclination to the different opinions presented under the 13 varieties of topics. According to Acharya Bhikshu, the perverted faith in the respect of other topic produces the fault of falsity (*asatyadoṣa*) which, however, does not destroy the right faith. Says Acharya Bhikshu\_\_

“The Lord of the world has spoken of the true (enlightened) faith; the perverted faith about his words generates deluded view (*mīthyā*). The perverted faith about topics other than those spoken of by the Lord involves epistemological falsity which does not destroy the religious faith.

In his disquisition on epistemological delusion, Acharya Bhikshu writes: epistemological delusion

produces error in knowledge, which is the rise of the knowledge-covering karma, which is definitely not the rise of view-deluding karma. Says Acharya Bhikshu\_\_

“There is mention of epistemological delusion in the scripture, which is a kind of error in knowledge. That is due to the rise of the knowledge-covering karma. Definitely, that is not an example of spiritual delusion.

Thus considered, as in the case of epistemological delusion, the view-deluding inclination (*kāṅkṣā-mohanīya*) can be considered as a type of knowledge-covering karma. It has been said in the *Kasāyapāhuḍa* that when doubt, error and indeterminate knowledge arise in the mind of any Chief Disciple of the *jina*, they are dispelled by the power of the divine articulation (*divya-dhvani*). In the mind of Gautama Gaṇadhara, three arose suspicion, misguided inclination and doubt about the power of clairvoyance in the lay disciple Ānanda. On this occasion, Ānanda addressed Gautama thus: “O Lord, self-censure is not prescribed in the scripture for what is true; that is prescribed only for what is untrue. What I say is true. What you said is not true. And Therefore, you should please censure yourself.” On hearing Ānanda say thus, there occurred suspicion, misguided inclination and doubt in the mind of Gautama.

Gautama had suspicion, misguided inclination and doubt in his mind about the *trāyastriṃśa* gods. From both these occasions, it clearly follows that such cases of suspicion, misguided inclination and doubt are also related to the rise of knowledge-covering karma. In the *Uttarajjhayanāni*, in connection with guarding of celibacy, there is the mention of four factors, namely, suspicion, misguided inclination, doubt and split in mind.

There are five transgressions of the enlightened world-view. Of them, the first three are suspicion, misguided inclination and doubt. Which are related to the delusion of view. Briefly, it can be said that when suspicion, misguided inclination and doubt are in respect of the fundamental truths, they are experiences of view-deluding karma, but when they are concerned with other topics, there is only the experiencing of knowledge-covering karma. In connection with the 13 varieties of topics mentioned in the *Bha.* 1.170, it seems that the experiencing of the view-deluding inclination is a kind of epistemological error of knowledge.

In the present dialogue, 13 topics have been mentioned which are all concerned with epistemological error. This is a historic description, which gives significant information about the very many opinions and diversities of thought that were prevalent among the Jain thinkers.

## 6.0 *Pramāṇa*: Nature and Division

Jainism does not attach exclusive importance to books but hold persons as superior agents of knowledge, as it accepts the authority of many learned people. Five classes of people have been cited as acceptable authorities: the omniscient *Jinas*, persons possessed of the power of mind-reading, persons possessed of the power of clairvoyance and persons versed in the 14 books of the early scripture and persons learned in the 10 books of the early scripture. In addition to them, different eminent preceptors also propounded truths from the relative standpoints, which may be occasions for experiencing of the view-deluding inclination for an ordinary ascetic. In the present dialogue, there is an account of the opinions and views, that were established among the Jain order of the ascetics within a millennium after the *nirvāṇa* of Lord Mahāvīra. A detailed study of these opinions and doctrines in Jainism that spread over a millennium after Lord Mahāvīra's *nirvāṇa* is available in the present dialogue, which will provide material for a voluminous dissertation, if studied carefully and deeply. We shall briefly discuss these topics there.

### 6.1 *Jñānāntara* (Doubt about the Varieties of Knowledge)

There are many traditions of classification of knowledge. Primarily knowledge was classified as of five kinds, which is available in the *Rāyapaseṇīyam*. In the present scripture, five kinds of knowledge are mentioned: empirical knowledge (*ābhinibodhika jñāna*), articulate knowledge (*śruta-jñāna*), clairvoyance, mind-reading and omniscience. The *Bhagavati Sutra* refers to *Rāyapaseṇīyam* for details. The second tradition of classification of knowledge is found in the *Thānaṃ*, which classifies knowledge in two categories: immediate and mediate. Clairvoyance, mind-reading and omniscience are considered as immediate, and empirical and articulate knowledge as mediate. In the *Bhagavatī*, (8.89) the empirical knowledge has been assigned four varieties. In the *Thānaṃ*,

the empirical knowledge has been divided as semi-linguistic (*śrutaniśrita*) and non-linguistic (*aśrutaniśrita*), each of which again is classified into two : sensation of contact (*vyāñjanāvagraha*) and cognition of a thing (*arthāvagraha*). Here there is not mention of speculation, perception and retention. The third tradition of classification is found in the *Nandī*, where five classes of knowledge are given and divided into two, namely, immediate cognition (*pratyakṣa*) and mediate knowledge (*parokṣa*). The immediate cognition is divided into sensual cognition (*indriya-pratyakṣa*), namely clairvoyance, mind-reading and omniscience.

In the *Bhagavati*, the division of knowledge as mediate and immediate is not available. In the *Thānam*, the sensual cognition has not been included under immediate knowledge (*pratyakṣa*), which, however, is found in the *Nandī*. In this way, three different traditions of classification of knowledge are found in scriptural literature.

Siddhasena Divākara recognized only three varieties of knowledge. According to him articulate knowledge (*śrutajñāna*) and empirical knowledge (*matijñāna*) are not different varieties and similarly mind-reading and clairvoyance are not also different. In this way, by the time of Devardhigaṇi, the compiler of the *Nandī*, there had developed discrete traditions of classification. This is why the diverse classification of knowledge was considered as the experience of the view-deluding inclination. The *Vṛtti* has discussed the topic by the examples of clairvoyance and mind-reading.

### 6.2 Darśanāntara (Doubt about the Varieties of Intuition)

There are four varieties of intuition : ocular intuition, non-ocular intuition, clairvoyant intuition, and omniscient intuition. There was an opinion that only three varieties of intuition were sufficient as there was no line of demarcation between ocular and non-ocular intuition. Such difference of opinion has become a cause for experiencing view-deluding inclination. In the *Vṛtti*, the discussion of ocular and non-ocular intuition is supplemented by the discussion of enlightened world-view (*samyaktva*) due to elimination-cum-suppression or complete suppression of the relevant karma.

### 6.3 Cāritrāntara (Varieties of Religious Conduct)

In the dispensation of Lord Pārśva, there were only three varieties of religious conduct : practice of equanimity (*sāmāyika*), conduct that was accompanied by flickering passion (*sūkṣmasamparāya*), and pure and perfect conduct (*yathākhyāta*). In the dispensation of Mahāvīra, two varieties were added, namely, *chedopasthāpanīya* (reordination), and *parivāra-vīśuddhi* (purification through service). Such difference of opinion was also responsible for the experience of view-deluding inclination. In the *Vṛtti*, the difference between the practice of equanimity and preordination have been discussed.

### 6.4 Liṅgāntara (Varieties of Outfit)

The disciples of Lord Pārśva were used to wear cloth, whereas the disciples of Lord Mahāvīra discarded cloth or accepted the use of meager cloth. There is a dialogue between Keśī, a disciple of pārśva and Gautama, Mahāvīra's disciple, disciplines, and also difference in outfit (nudity and wearing cloth). This is also discussed in the *Vṛtti*.

### 6.5 Pravacanāntara and pravacanīśāntara (Varieties of Scripture and Preceptors)

*Pravacana* stands for the scripture or the twelve books of the Inner Corpus. *Pravacani* means the teacher of the scripture. It seems that, after their split, there were differences between the Śvetāmbara and Digambara traditions, in respect of their concepts of the scripture and the teachers of the scripture. Those differences were responsible for experiencing the view-deluding inclination. Regarding the varieties of scripture, the *Vṛtti* refers to the four-fold and five-fold disciplines varieties of spiritual conduct. Therefore, it needs scrutiny. The *Vṛtti* sanskritizes the word “*pāvayaṇī*” as *prāvacaṇaḥ* and *prāvacaṇika*. According to it, there cropped up different codes of monastic conduct through the ages. Which gave rise to suspicion and misguided inclination. Shrimad jayacharya mentions the diverse expositions made by the scriptural teachers, which deserve attention.

### 6.6 Kalpāntara (Varieties of Religious Customs)

The varieties of religious customs (*kalpasthiti*) have been shown to be of six kinds: *Sāmāyika kalpasthiti* (the custom of equanimity), *chedopasthāpanīya kalpasthiti* (the custom of reordination), *nirvīśyamāno kalpasthiti*

(the custom of service rendered) to the four ascetics when they are practicing austerity), *nirviṣṭa kalpasthīti* (the custom of service rendered to the four ascetics when they have finished their practice of austerity), *jinakalpasthīti* (the custom followed by the ascetic practicing the *Jina's* code), *sthavīrakalpa-sthīti* (the custom followed by the ascetic practicing the code of the elders). These varieties are mainly related to the distinction between the customs prevalent in the dispensations of Pārśva and Mahāvīra. In the dispensation of Lord Pārśva, the monastic discipline was based on equanimity (*sāmāyika*), whereas in the times of Mahāvīra there developed higher ordination (*chedopasthāpaniya*) and the like. This difference between dispensations occasioned experiencing view-deluding inclination. Shrimad Jayacharya has provided another example of view-deluding inclination in this connection. Omniscience does not arise even when an ascetic practices the conduct of the Jina; what then is the justification of undergoing the hardships of the Jina; what then is the justification of undergoing the hardships of the *Jina's* life? Is it not then better to practice the discipline of the elders rather than the *Jina's*?

### 6.7 Mārgāntara (Varieties of Path)

In the scriptural literature, the word *mārga* (path) has been used in many contexts. For instance, in some places the path is said to consist of knowledge, faith, conduct and austerity. Umāsvāī has given only three constituents as path: enlightened world-view, knowledge and conduct. The eleventh chapter of *Sūyagaḍo* has propounded the path. There, knowledge is identified with non-violence. In the *Tīrthaṅgam*, defining the wrong path as the right and vice-versa is explained as perversity of view (*mūhyātva*). The intention of the present Sūtras with respect to the path can be clarified only in its historical perspective.

In the *Vṛtti*, the path has been defined as the traditional religious code. This explanation may be relevant, but history compels us to go further. In the dispensation of Lord Pārśva, “recoiling from past bad deeds” (*pratikramaṇa*) was not an indispensable religious conduct. In the discipline of Lord Mahāvīra, however, that was a compulsory monastic duty. The “path” also stands for the six compulsory duties beginning with equanimity (*sāmāyika*). Shrimad Jayacharya has discussed in this connection diversity of the religious customs with respect to the monks and nuns. Such differences in the practice of the path becomes a cause of misguided inclination and suspicion among monks. Shrimad Jayacharya has discussed the compulsory duties in the context of customs. According to him, the compulsory duties are indispensable for an ascetic practicing an established custom (*sthītakalpī*) whereas it is not so in the case of *asthītakalpī*—an ascetic not bound by the established custom.

### 6.8 Mañāntara (Varieties of Opinions)

Here opinion means difference of views. This variety of opinion started when there was the end of the tradition of omniscient Jina and the preceptors who were omniscient in scripture (*śrutakevalī*). In the scriptural literature, there are varieties of opinions available. Upādhyāya Samayaśundara has compiled one hundred varieties of opinions from the scriptural literature. In the Digambara literature, a long list of diverse opinions is available. In the Jainendra-Siddhānta-Koṣa, 89 varieties of opinions have been collected.

Jinendra Varmī, while explaining the background of varieties of opinions, writes, “Even though there is no possibility of any kind of contradiction or difference of views about spiritual matters that are amenable to common experience, in the scriptural literature, there are at some place difference of opinions among the preceptors about the subtle, remote and intercepted objects. As in the absence of saints, with the power of supersensory perception, their opinions are difficult to know. Acharya Vīrasena, the author of the *Dhavalā*, always asserts that it would be proper to accept both the apparently contradictory views in their proper perspectives.”

In the *Vṛtti* here, there is a mention of the views of Siddhasena Divākara and Jinabhadragarī who were very sharply opposed on some basic issues relating to knowledge and intuition. Siddhasena was the supporter of the simultaneous occurrence of knowledge and intuition, while Jinabhadragarī was a believer in their successive occurrence even in the state of omniscience.

Acharya Kundakunda was the advocate of the simultaneous occurrence of knowledge and intuition. In the Śvetāmbara tradition, Mallavādi agreed with Kundakunda. Siddhasena Divākara advocated the non-difference



or identity between knowledge and intuition. Jinabhadragani was the advocate of successive occurrence of knowledge and intuition. Upādhyāya Yaśovijaya reconciled all the three views from different philosophical standpoints. Shrimad Jayacharya has recorded some different opinions in the interpretation of the varieties of scriptural texts. He has discussed in the present context the different recensions and variant readings.

### 6.9 *Bhaṅgāntara* (Varieties of Categories)

Categorization means classification of an object or concept into different varieties in consideration of its nature or number. The *Vṛtti* mentions the quadruple concept of violence in order to explain its different aspects. For instance, violence can be simply a physical act without any ethical content. It can also be a purely ethical act without any physical commitment. It may be both, physical and ethical, or it may be neither of the two.

### 6.10 *Nayāntara* (Varieties of Standpoints)

A standpoint means the relatively different views or intentions of the speaker about a particular mode among the infinite ones of an object. The standpoints have been classified in various ways. The basic standpoint are, however, two: concerning enumerated: common man's view, generic view, practical view, linear view, literal view, etymological view, and actuality view. According to the auto-commentary of the *Tattvārthasūtra*, there are five basic standpoints. According to *TRV*, there are seven. Siddhasena Divākara does not recognize the common man's view as an independent standpoint. In this way the plural classification of standpoints occasion the experience of view-deluding inclination.

### 6.11 *Niyamāntara* (varieties of Rules)

In the *Vṛtti*, the rule is interpreted as a special resolve which explains the mode of austerity such as one practiced for a period of one quarter of a day, etc. By means of practice of equanimity (*sāmāyika*) one abandons all kinds of sinful activities. What then is the necessity of practices like abandoning food for a particular period of time? The *Vṛtti* justifies the varieties of rules by pointing out that rules are for intensification of austerities for strengthening the virtue of freedom from remissness. It appears from the context that between the traditions of Pārśva and Mahāvīra, there were differences with respect to subsidiary rules, just as about the great vows in those traditions. These differences occasioned view-deluding inclination.

### 6.12 *Pramāṇāntara* (Varieties of Valid Sources of Knowledge)

A valid source of knowledge stands for a definitive knowledge. In the *Tthānaṃ*, such definitive knowledge has been classified into three varieties, namely, immediate knowledge, knowledge arising from some source such as the senses and the mind, or the words of Jina; and knowledge are given, such as immediate (*pratyakṣa*) and mediate (*parokṣa*). Likewise, four varieties of sources of knowledge are mentioned; perception, inference, analogy and scripture. In the *Aṅugodārāṇi* the standard of attributes of determinate knowledge is four-fold: perception, inference, analogy and scripture. In the *Nandī*, two varieties of knowledge are mentioned: immediate (*pratyakṣa*) and mediate (*parokṣa*). In this way, valid knowledge has been classified through various nomenclatures. In the philosophy of the Jainas, the latest classification of valid knowledge was done in the times of Akalanka and Haribhadra. In his *Nyāyāvātāra*, Siddhasena Divākara has approved three varieties of valid knowledge: perception, inference and scripture. Such classifications of valid knowledge prior to the compilation of the scriptural literature turned to be sources of view-deluding inclination.

### 7.0 *Pasatthanijjarāe seyaṭṭa-padaṃ* (Topic : *Karmavedana* and *Nirjarā*) 6.1-4

*Se nūṇaṃ bhaṃṭe! Je mahāvedane se mahānijjare? Je mahānijjare se mahāvedane? mahāvedanaṃssa ya appavedanaṃssa ya se see je pasatthanijjarāe? haṃṭā goyamā! je mahāvedane se mahānijjare, je mahānijjare se mahāvedane, mahāvedanaṃssa ya appavedanaṃssa ya appavedanaṃssa ya se see je pasatthanijjarāe.*

Is indeed the person with intensive experience of pain the person with massive falling away of karma?

Is a person with massive falling away of karma a person with intensive pain? Of the person with great experience of pain and one with little experience of pain, one who has auspicious passing away of karma is good?

Yes Gautama! Who is with intensive experience pain is with massive passing away of karma, who is with massive passing away of karma who is with intensive experience of pain: of the person with intensive experience of pain and the person with weak experience of pain, the person with auspicious passing away of karma is better.

*Chaṭṭha-sattamāsuṇaṃ bhaṃte! puḍha vīsuneraiyā mahāvedaṇā?*

*Haṃtā mahāvedaṇā.*

Are the infernals in the sixth and seventh infernals lands with in intensive experience?

Yes, they are in intensive experience.

*Te ṇaṃ bhaṃte! Sa ṇehiṃto niggamthehiṃto mahānījjaratarā?*

*goyamā! no iṇaṭṭhe samatṭhe.*

Are they O Lord! With more massive passing away of karma than samana nirgrantha?

Gautama! this is not possible.

*Se keṇaṃ khāi aṭṭheṇaṃ bhaṃte! evaṃ vuccai je mahāvedaṇe se mahānījare? Je mahānījare se mahāvedaṇe? mahāvedaṇassa ya appavedaṇassa ya se see je pasatthanījare?*

*Goyamā! se jahānāmae duve vatthā siyā ege vatthe kaddamarāgaratte, ege vatthe khamjaṇarāgaratte. eesi ṇaṃ goyamā! doṇhaim vatthāṇaṃ kayare vatthe duddhoyatarāe ceva, duvāmatarāe ceva, duparikammaatarāe ceva; kayare vā vatthe suddhoyatarāe ceva, suparikammatarāe ceva; je via se vatthe kaddamarāgaratte? je vā se vatthe kamjaṇarāgaratte?*

In what sense has it been said O Lord! That when he is with intensive pain is with massive passing away of karma?

Gautama! one who is with massive passing away of karma is with great pain?

Of the persons with great pain and of the persons with little pain, one who has auspicious passing away of karma is better Gautama! suppose there are two pieces of cloth. One is spoiled by wet-mud and another is spoiled by black grease these two pieces of cloth O Gautama! which is more difficult to clean which is more difficult to make stain free and more difficult to polish and which one of these two is easier to clean, easier to make stain free, easier to polish-the one shock in mud, or the one made dirty by grease?

In the present dialogue, attention has been drawn to the relationship between experiencing pain and falling away of karma. We give below the three laws related to the topic.

(a) Experiencing intensive pain versus massive falling away of karma.

(b) Whether experiencing of pain is intensive or little, the auspicious falling away of karma is the past (as massive).

(c) When the karma is intensified, there does not occur massive falling away of karma inspire of experiencing intensive pain. For example, the infernals of the sixth and seventh land experience intensive pain, but there does not occur massive falling away of karma. On the contrary, though the *śramaṇa nigrantha* experiences little pain, there is massive falling away of karma, the reason being that he has loosened his karma due to *saṃvara* (inhibition).

It is a general rule that experiencing intensive pain is accompanied by massive falling away of karma, which has the acception that experiencing mild pain is sometimes accompanied, by massive falling away of karma.

### 7.1 Cause of Nirjarā

The basic cause of falling away of karma is auspicious psychical state and auspicious activity (of mind, body and speech); the massiveness or meagerness of the falling away of karmic depends upon it.

Umasvati has explained that the suppression or elimination of karmic particles increases innumerablely at

each of the ten stages of spiritual development which are\_\_

1. The possessor of enlightened world-view.
2. The lay-learner practicing partial abstinence.
3. The ascetic practicing complete abstinence.
4. The ascetic suppressing/eliminating the tenacious passions
5. The ascetic eliminating view-deluding karma.
6. The ascetic suppressing conduct-deluding karma.
7. The ascetic who has suppressed conduct-deluding karma.
8. The ascetic eliminating conduct-deluding karma.
9. The ascetic who has eliminated conduct-deluding karma.
10. The *Jina* (the omniscient).

The author of *Tattvārtha Bhāṣya* has recognized two kinds of falling away of karma: involuntary and due to good karma. The falling away of karma in the case of the infernals, which is the result of the past karma, is involuntary, There is no such conscious willing like “I shall through away my karma.” But the failing away of karma here is due to the fruition of past karma, so it is involuntary. Such falling away of karma is result of bad karma. The falling away of karma due to austerity and conquering of hardships is the result of good karma. The auspicious falling away of karma can be conquered that due to good karma Abhayadevasūri has explained auspicious falling away of karma due to beneficial activity. In the *Tattvārtha Bhāṣya* two types of falling away of karma due to good activity have been distinguish: with auspicious result, and with no result. The falling away of karma that produces good result like the birth in heaven etc. is *Śubhānubandha* (producing good result). What is cause of liberation is falling away of karma with no result (*niranubandha*). An elaborate description of this subject matter is available in *Sūtra* no. 15,16 of this *Śataka*.

### 7.2 *Mhāvedaṇā-mahāijjarā-caubhaṅga-padaṃ(6.15-16)*

*Jīvā ṇaṃ bhaṃte! kiṃ mahāvedaṇā mahāijjarā? mahāvedaṇā appanijjarā?*

*Appavedaṇā mahāijjarā? appavedaṇā appanijjarā?*

*Goyamā! atthegatiyā jīvā mahāvedaṇā appanijjarā, atthegatiyā jīvā appavedaṇā mahāijjarā, atthegatiyā jīvā appavedaṇā mahāijjarā, atthegatiyā jīvā appavedaṇā appanijjarā*

Are the souls O Lord! intensive pain with massive falling away of karma? Intensive pain and meagre falling away of karma? Mild pain and massive falling away of karma mild pain and meager falling away of karma?

Gautama! there are souls intensive pain with massive falling away of karma, intensive pain and meager falling away of karma, mild pain and massive falling away of karma, mild pain and meager falling away of karma.

*Se keṇājjeṇam?*

*Goyamā! paḍimāpaḍivannaṃ aṇagāre mahāveda ṇe mahāijjare. chaṭṭha-sattamāsu puḍhavīsu neraiyā mahāvedaṇā appanijjarā, selesim paḍivannaṃ aṇagāre appavedaṇe mahāijjare, aṇuttarovavāiyā devā appavedaṇā appanijjarā.*

In what way is it?

Gautama! An ascetic practicing the intensive course of fasting has intensive pain and massive falling away of karma The infernals in the sixth and seventh land are with intensive pain and meager passing away of karma The ascetic in the state of the absolute motionless condition like that of the Meru mountain is with little pain and massive falling away of karma The gods of the highest heaven are with little experience and meager falling away of the karma.

In the first dialogue (*Sutra 1 to 4*) the description of intensive pain and massive falling away of karma etc. are made away on the basis of auspicious falling away of karma. In the present dialogue these topics have been described with illustrations. There is prescription of intensive courses of fasting for monk. A monk practicing the intensive course has to endeavor many hardships. So he experiences intensive pain. He is in auspicious psychic state. He has equanimity while tolerating hardships so he has massive falling away of karma. This infernal in the sixth and seventh land experience intensive pain on account of their environment. They have very little falling away of karma. A comparative study of these two space of the soul shows that the cause of massive passing away of karma is not little or intensive experience of pain. The meagreness or massiveness of falling away of karma is due to the way of tolerating the hardships. The ascetic practicing the intensive course of fasting tolerates the intensive pain with equanimity, so there is massive falling away of karma.

The infernal in the sixth and seventh lands does not endure his intensive pain with equanimity so there is little passing away of karma. The ascetic in the state that is as firm of Meru Mountain experiences little pain but his equanimity is very great so even though there is little pain the falling away of karma is massive.

The gods in the highest heaven experience little pain and have also meager falling away of karma.

A comparative study of the four illustrations shows that the souls who endured to affect falling away of karma have falling away of karma this is not the result of past karma. They bring up by that power the karma that has not mature and throw away out. The ascetic practicing the intensive course of fasting and the ascetic in the state of as firm Meru Mountain are examples of this category. The infernals in the sixth and seventh land and the gods in the highest heavens are examples of *vipākīnirījarā*, that is, falling away of karma due to *vipāka* due to fruition. There is no endeavor for throwing away the karma. The inauspicious and auspicious karma that come to the state of fruition falls away after producing their fruit.

### 7.3 *Vedaṇā-nijjarā-padaṃ* (Topic of *Vedaṇā* and *Nijjarā*)

*Se nūṇaṃ bhaṃṭe! jā vedaṇā sa nijjarā? jā nijjarā sā vedaṇā?*

*Goyamā! no iṇaṭṭhe samaṭṭhe.*

O Lord! Is experiencing of karma the same as falling away of karma? Is falling away of karma the same as experiencing of karma?

Gautama! This is not possible

*Se keṇaṭṭheṇaṃ bhaṃṭe! evaṃ vuccaió jā vedaṇā na sā nijjarā? jā nijjarā na sā vedaṇā?*

*Goyamā! kammaṃ vedaṇā nokammaṃ nijjarā. Se teṇaṭṭheṇaṃ goyamā! evaṃ vuccai jā vedaṇā sā nijjarā, jā nijjarā na sā vedaṇā.*

For what reason has it been said, O Lord! That the experiencing of karma is not falling away of karma, the falling away of karma is not experiencing of karma.

Gautama! The experiencing of karma is karma and falling away of karma is not falling away of karma. For this reason O Gautama! Has it been said that what is experiencing of karma is not the falling away of karma, what is the falling away of karma is not the experiencing of karma.

*Se nūṇaṃ bhaṃṭe! jaṃ vedemti taṃ nijjareṃti? jaṃ nijjareṃti taṃ vedemti? goyamā! no iṇaṭṭhe samaṭṭhe.*

Is what the souls O Lord! Experience (in the present), is the same as what they part with (in the present)? Is what they part with (in the present) the same as what they experience (in the present)?

O Gautama! This is not possible.

*Se keṇaṭṭheṇaṃ bhaṃṭe! evaṃ vuccai jāva no ta vedemti?*

*Goyamā! kammaṃ vedemti, nokammaṃ nijjareṃti. Se teṇaṭṭheṇaṃ goyamā! jāva no taṃ vedemti.*

For what reason, O Lord! Is it said that up to what they part with is not the same as what they experience?

*Se nūṇaṃ bhaṃṭe! Je vedaṇāsamae se nijjarāsamae? Je nijjarāsamae se vedaṇāsamae?*

*No iṇaṭṭhe samaṭṭhe.*

Is the time-unit O Lord! Of experiencing the karma the same as the time-unit of parting with the karma?  
Is the time-unit of parting with the karma as the time-unit of experiencing the karma?

No, This is not possible.

*Se kenattheṇaṃ bhamte! evaṃ vuccai je vedanāsamae na se nijjarāsamae?*

*Je nijjarāsamae na se vedanāsamae?*

*Goyamā! jaṃ samayaṃ vedemti no taṃ samayaṃ nijjareṃti, jaṃ samayaṃ nijjareṃti no taṃ samayaṃ vedemti añṇammi samae vedemti, añṇammi samae nijjareṃti. añṇe se vedanāsamasae, añṇe se nijjarāsamae. Se teṇattheṇaṃ jāva na se vedanāsamae, na se nijjarāsamae.*

For what reason has it been said O Lord! That what is time-unit of experiencing the karma is not the time-unit of parting with the karma, what is the time-unit of parting with karma is not the time-unit of experiencing of karma?

Gautama! The time-unit when the souls experience the karma is not the same as the time-unit when the soul part with the karma, the time-unit when the souls part with the karma is not the same time-unit when the souls experience the karma. The souls experience the karma at time-unit that is different from the time-unit when the souls part with the karma. Different is the time-unit of experiencing the karma from the time-unit of parting with the karma. For this reason it has been said up to the time-unit of experiencing the karma is not the same the time-unit of parting with the karma.

## 8.0 Experiencing and Falling away of karma

Karma has many stages, the first being “bondage” and the last “arising” (fruition). The (result of) karma is experienced at the time of its arising to produce the effect. After being experienced, the karma transforms into non-karma (*non karma* i.e. the material clusters that has produced its effect and is defunct). In the present dialogue, the ontological, difference between the karma that is being experienced and the karma that has been experienced (*no karma*) is explained. What is experienced is ‘karma’, what is parted is the non-karma. The power of producing fruit ceases after the fruit has been produced. It can no more produce any karmic result; it simply becomes non-karma. It is that non-karma, which is parted with; therefore the time-unit of experiencing is separate from that of falling away.

Semantics

*kaddamarāgarattāṃ*—soiled by deep oily mud.

*khaṃjaṇarāgarattāṃ*—vismered by ordinary mud.

*gāḍhikayāṃ*—tightly bound with the soul units like an object tightly bound a hemthread.

*cikkaṅkayāṃ*—subtle karmic cluster that is unbreakable on account of its being tightly bound for instance a clod of earth.

*sili ṭṭhikayāṃ*—*niḍhatta*, e.g. a bundle of red hot iron rods.

*khilābhūyāṃ*—*nikacīta* karma, whose result is sure and certain.

*mahāpajjavasāṇāṃ*—the falling away of karma which results in liberation.

*paramparāghāṇāṃ*—struck again and again e.g. anvil.

*ākābāyarāṃ*—very gross karmic cluster.

*niṭṭhiyāṃ*—what has been made innocuous.

*viparināmiyāṃ*—the karma that has been transform by *sthitighāta* and *rasaghāta*.

## QUESTION BANK :

### Essay Type Questions :

1. Write brief introduction of Bhagavai in your own words?
2. Give detail of division of *Kāṅkṣā Mohanīya Karma*.
3. What you know about “*Ātmakartrtvavāda*”?
4. Write an essay on the relation of *Jīva* and *Pudgala*?
5. What is *Karma Vedanā* and *Nirjarā*? Give detail.

### Short Answer Type Question :

1. Is invariant relation is in *Mahavedanā* and *Mahanirjarā*?
2. “Bondage of *Kāṅkṣā Mohanīya Karma*”
3. *Kāṅkṣā Mohanīya* is related with *jñānavarnīya* or *mohanīya*? Give your view?
4. “Joy and pain is by self”. Illustrate it.
5. Illustrate the relation between distress and dissociation?
6. Illustrate the relation of soul and body with various way?

### Fill in the blanks :

1. According to *samvāyāṅga* and *naṃdī* in this canon there are exposition of ..... questions .
2. On the base of relation and non-relation *jīvas* are divided in two part .....
3. The thinkfull topic in the detail of soul (*ātmataīya*) is .....
4. *jīva attracts* only that karma *parmanus* are obscuration whoes are on the .....
5. By the fruition of *nāmakarma* ..... yoga are.

### Write an answer in one world :

1. *vedanā* (distress) and *nirjarā* (dissociation) are related with whom?
2. Is the time of distress and dissociation equal.
3. What is the meaning of *kāṅkṣā*?
4. Is right believe destroy by *jñānamoha* or not?
5. What is the cause of birth dissociation and death dissociation?

### Reference Body :

- *Bhagvai : Virāeha Paṇṇatti*, ed. by Ācārya Mahāprajña.
- *Bhagvati Sūtra*, ed. by Ghevar Chand Banthiya.
- *Vyakhya Pragyaṭi* (part-2), ed. by Yuvacharya Madhukar Muri.

# Unit - 4 (A) : Uttarādhyayan

## 0.0 Introduction

### 1.0 Place of Uttarādhyayana in the classification of Jain āgamas.

- 1.1 Why Uttarādhyayana is called a root āgama (canons)?
- 1.2 Changes in the sequences and timings of reading canons
- 1.3 The name
- 1.4 Time and the writer /author of Uttarādhyayana.
- 1.5 Does Uttarādhyayana represent the last sermons of Mahāvāra?
- 1.6 Representative sutra of the sermons of Mahāvira
- 1.7 Subject matter and size of Uttarādhyayana

### 2.0 Commentaries on Uttarādhyayana:

- 2.1 Niryukti. Niryuktis
- 2.2 Cūrṇi
- 2.3 Śiṣyahitā
- 2.4 Sukhabodhā
- 2.5 Sarvārthasiddhi

### 3.0 Chapter I. Vinayśruta. Lesson on modesty /humility

- 3.1. Ācārya Candrarudra
- 3.2 Gandhahasti Secanaka

## 0.0 Introduction

In the Jain scriptural and canonical literature, Uttarādhyayana has an important place and is one of the most favourite holy texts. It is written in a mixed version of ArdhaMāgadhi and Mahārāṣṭri languages.

### 1.0 Place of Uttarādhyayana in the classification of Jain āgamas

We find many methods of classifying Jain āgamas. The oldest classification of āgamas talks to two way classification namely *Pūrva* (i.e. prior to Mahāvira) divided in 14 sections and the second as *Aṅga* or limbs consisting of 12 limbs /parts.

The second classification is from the time when the āgamas started were being compiled. At this stage also, the āgamas were classified in two categories namely *Aṅga Praviṣṭa* and *Aṅga Bāhya*. Since Uttarādhyayana was not composed by *gandharas*, it was placed in the second category i.e. *Aṅga Bāhya*

The third classification of āgamas categorizes them in four groups namely i. Charaṇānuyoga, ii. Dharmakathānuyoga, iii. Gaṇitānuyoga and iv. Dravyānuyoga. This categorizations places Uttarādhyayana in the group Dharmakathānuyoga. But its chapters on ethics and metaphysics belong to first and fourth groups. Thus the present version of Uttarādhyayana belongs to more than a group. It appears that this compilation of Uttarādhyayana was done during the time of Devārdhigaṇi.

Another classification of āgamas is done according to time when they are read. Those which are read in the first four hours of the day or night are called *Kālīka* while those which can be read at any time of the day or night are called *Utkālīka*. Uttarādhyayan falls in the category of *Kālīka*.

Another way of classification which is the latest gives four way classifications of āgamas namely *Aṅga*, *Upāṅga*, *Mūla* (root) and *Cheda*. According to this classification Uttarādhyayana falls in the category of root āgamas.

### 1.1 Why Uttarādhyayana is called a root āgama (canons)?

There is no old /ancient record of this classification. Different scholars have even inferred different meanings of the word 'root'. One of the explanations is that both Uttarādhyayana and Dasvaikālīka become helpful in the

initial stages of the monk-hood and all other *āgamas* are read only after studying Uttarādhyayana. Therefore it is called as a root canon.

Another explanation is that Uttarādhyayana describes the root/basic attributes, namely major-vows (*Mahāvratas*), attitudes of carefulness (*samitis*) and restraints (*guptis*) etc of the monks. Hence Uttarādhyayana is called as a root canon.

## 1.2 Changes in the sequences and timings of reading canons

Changes brought about in the reading time and sequence of canons also support the grouping of Uttarādhyayana as root canon. Before the compilation of Dasvaikālika and after Ācārāṅga, Uttarādhyayana was read. However after the composition of Davaikālika, both Uttarādhyayana and Dasvaikālika were both read instead of just Dasvaikālika justifying the grouping of Uttarādhyayana as a root canon.

## 1.3 The name

Uttarādhyayan is formed by putting the two words *uttara* and *adhyayan* together. A number of acaryas have given views about the meaning of *uttara*. According to the writer of Niryuktis, Bhadra Bhahu II, those canons which are read after Ācārāṅga are called *Uttarādhyayana*. After *ācārya* Śaṅkara, compiler of Dasvaikālika, these canons were read after Dasvaikālika and hence they continued to be called *Uttarādhyayana*. Digambar *ācāryas* have also explained the meaning of Uttarādhyayana. Dhavalākāra (Vik 9<sup>th</sup> century) says that Uttarādhyayana described the responses (replies) to make the reader understand the holy texts. AṅgaPaṇṇatti (Vik 16<sup>th</sup> century) gives the following two meanings of the word *uttara*:

- i. *Uttarakāla* i.e. those canons which are read after some other canons.
- ii. Study of the answers to the questions

## 1.4 Time and the writer /author of Uttarādhyayana.

The questions related to the timing of writing and the authorship of Uttarādhyayan was analyzed by different scholars at regular intervals. On this basis, it is assumed that Uttarādhyayana is not the work of just one but many authors. Its different chapters were written by different monk scholars during different time periods. These analyses conclude that Uttarādhyayana represents writings on religious and philosophical issues by different scholar-monks from 600BC to 400AD. On this basis we can say some part of Uttarādhyayana is from the time prior to Mahāvīra also. Cūṃṇi also support that the sixth chapter is as per the sermons of Pārsvanāth. Dasvaikālika was compiled in the first century after Mahāvīra (5<sup>th</sup> century BC). Uttarādhyayana, in the form of a text was compiled before this period but it cannot be said definitely as to how many chapters were there in Uttarādhyayana at that time.

During the 10<sup>th</sup> century after the *nirvāṇa* of Mahāvīra, Devārdhigaṇi compiled the entire canons of Jains at that time, he compiled all the thirty six chapters of Uttarādhyayan written over a period of time till then. In this way we can conclude that Devārdhigaṇi is the compiler of Uttarādhyayana as it exists today.

## 1.5 Does Uttarādhyayana represent the last sermons of Mahāvīra?

Kalpasūtra says that Mahāvīra attained *nirvāṇa* while delivering his sermon on *Pradhāna* chapter after completing 55 chapters of the results of karmas (*Karma-vipāka*), 55 chapters of the karmas resulting in sinful results (inauspicious) and 36 unclear (*aprastha*) chapters. On this basis it is inferred that Uttarādhyayana represents the 36 unclear chapters. The last verse of Uttarādhyayana also supports this claim:

*Iha pāukare buddhe, nāyae parinivvue  
Chattīsam uttarajjhāe bhavasiddhiyasammae.*

Author of Cūṃṇi has translated this verse as follows:

Mahāvīra, born in the family known as *Jhātakula* attained *nirvāṇa* after explaining / elucidating the 36 chapters. We therefore get attracted towards such justifications as Uttarādhyayana has 36 chapters also being the same as 36 unclear /difficult chapters mentioned in Kalpasūtra. However Samavāyaṅga not having a mention of these



36 chapters do distract a number of scholars from such presumptions and all scholars are therefore not unanimous in their conclusions.

### 1.6 Representative sutra of the sermons of Mahāvīra.

Uttarādhyayana may not be a complete representation of the direct sermons of Mahāvīra, yet the manner in which the sermons of Mahāvīra have been presented makes one conclude easily that Uttarādhyayana is the representative sutra of Mahāvīra's sermons.

Ahiṃsā, Aparigraha and others are not new doctrines and they were also not new even in Mahāvīra's time. Many *tīrthamkaras* and preceptors have explained these doctrines also prior to him. But the elucidation of these doctrines with reference to the social and other ills prevailing at that time is indeed unique. The social climate during Mahāvīra's time was pervaded with the following primary flaws of the vows of Ahiṃsā and Aparigraha.

- i. Slave trade and practice, ii. Casteism, iii. Animal sacrifice, iv. Unlimited hoarding of wealth, v. Misuse of the punitive rules and vi. Unlimited consumption of resources.

The philosophy which Mahāvīra preached to eliminate these flaws has been enshrined in a mind capturing manner in Uttarādhyayana. During Pārśvanāth's time, there were four major vows and *Sāmāyika cāritra*. Mahāvīra enhanced the major vows to five and preached *Cheḍopasthāpanīya cāritra* i.e. conduct with flaws and corrections.

Pūjya Pāda (vik 5-6 century) says "Mahāvīra had classified the conduct/path of spiritual purification into thirteen classes namely five major vows, five attitudes of carefulness and three attitudes of restraints. This classification did not exist in Pārśvanāth's time". Uttarādhyayana has a well organized description of these thirteen classes. Similarly the doctrine of six types of living beings (*ṣaḍjīvanikāya*) is a primary element of Mahāvīra's doctrine. Such a comprehensive and lucid description of living beings cannot be found in any other religion. Ācārya Siddha Sena has presented this as the yardstick to establish the omniscience of Mahāvīra. Uttarādhyayan has also a beautiful description of living beings. Similarly it has described the concepts of non-living beings, doctrine of karmas, six types of substances and nine basic elements (*navatattva*) etc.

### 1.7 Subject matter and size of Uttarādhyayana

Uttarādhyayana has thirty six chapters with 16382 verses and 81 *sutras*. Subject matter of each chapter is as follows:

1.	Viraya	Discipline
2.	Parīṣaha	Afflictions
3.	Caturangiya	4 Essentials
4.	Asamskruta	Irreparability of life
5.	Akamamaraniya	Art of dying
6.	Ksulaka Nirgranthiya	Young ascetic
7.	Urabhriya	Parable of the lamb
8.	Kapilya	Conquering greed
9.	Namipravrajya	Jaina spirituality
10.	Drumapatraka	Awakened life
11.	Bahusruta	The learned one
12.	Harikesiya	Austerity and Yagna
13.	Chitta Sambhuta	Bitter fruits of volition
14.	Ikkhukariya	Renunciation
15.	Sabhiksuka	Qualities of an ascetic
16.	Brahmacarya	Celibacy
17.	Papa sramaniya	Sinful sage
18.	Sanjatiya	Fearlessness and King Sanjaya

19.	Mrugaputriya	Detachment of the body
20.	Maharigranthiya	Biography of Anathi Muri
21.	Samudrapaliya	Fruits of deeds done
22.	Rathanemiya	Steadiness in restrain
23.	Keshi Gautam	Dialogue between the two
24.	Pravacana mata	Mother of ascetics
25.	Yajiriya	True Yajna
26.	Samacari	Duties of an ascetics
27.	Khalunkiya	Parable of bullocks
28.	Moksa marga gati	Path of emancipation
29.	Samyaktva Parakrama	Right exertion
30.	Tapomarga	Austerities
31.	Caranavidhi	Conduct
32.	Apramada sthana	Causes of negligence
33.	Karma prakriti	Karma theory
34.	Lesya	Colouring of the soul
35.	Anagara marga	Asceticism
36.	Jivajiva vibhakti	Description of soul and matter

Based on the subject matter classification, Uttarādhyayan's thirty-six chapters can be grouped as follows:

Religious stories	7,8,9,12,13,14,18,19,20,21,22,23,25,27
Sermons /teachings	1,3,4,5,6,10
Conduct /ethics	2,11,15,16,17,24,26,32,35
Doctrines	28,29,30,31,33,34,36

Therefore seeing the coverage of different topics, we can call Uttarādhyayan as a complete holy text. We find on the one hand description in an all encompassing way the method of being modest (*vinay*), discipline of the disciple, basis of the relationship of the teacher and disciple, qualification to acquire knowledge, respecting / venerating the virtuous, nature of the practitioner, venerating the scriptures etc; and on the other hand explanation of the uniqueness of getting born as human beings, endurance of the inflicted pains and afflictions, exercising self restraints in life, dying in a virtuous manner, practicing celibacy, benefits of performing penance, living a peaceful life etc topics touching and affecting the very life in a nice and lucid manner. We find on one hand discussions of metaphysical subjects such as substance, reality, attributes and modes, *leśyā*, karma, living and non-living beings etc; and on the other hand directions concerning socio-cultural issues prevailing at that time. Religious sermons of Pārśvanāth and Mahāvīra, and the discussions between the disciples of both is given in a simpler and easy to understand manner. Similarly the lucid and easy to understand discussions in an interactive manner of both āramaṇa and Vedic doctrines found in Uttarādhyayana is hard to find elsewhere. We can thus conclude in one word that Uttarādhyayana is an interesting amalgam of religious sermons, stories and philosophical doctrines.

### 1.7.0 Similes and examples in Uttarādhyayana

Uttarādhyayana gives a simple, interesting and clear presentation of the most difficult philosophical and doctrinal issues. To achieve this objective, use of similes and examples play a very important role. This is a holy religious text. But the abundant existence of similes gives the impression of its being a collection of poetry. It is therefore possible that Winternitz calls Uttarādhyayana as supreme holy text of poetry.

Comparison of human life is done with the leaf of *druma* (type of plant) and the dew drop on its edge (10/2). Lust and its enjoyment is compared to poisonous fruit (*kiṃpāka*) (30/20) as this fruit is beautiful to look at and sweet in taste but results in death when consumed. At a number of places this comparison becomes very lively.

Bhrugu Purohit tells his wife “Without a son, I am feeling like a bird without wings. *Pamkhavihuṇo va jahēh pakkhi* (14/30)”. Like a snake moves away after shedding its skin, similarly the children /sons go away after enjoying the family pleasures (14/34).

Maharani Kamalavati says “Like a bird does not find solace in the cage, similarly I do not find peace in this bondage *Nāham rame pakkhiṇi pamjare vā* 14/41”. As one cannot see anything when the lamp is extinguished in a dark night without the moon, similarly a person deluded in the wealth cannot realize the reality even though that person can see (4/5).

### 1.7.1 *Chamda*

Major part of Uttaradhyana is written in the form of verses with 16382 verses. These verses are written in both types of *chamda* i.e. *mātrāvrata* (using *gāthā chamda*) and *varnāvrata* using *anuṣṭupa*, *upajāti*, *upendravajrā*, *vaṁśastha* types.

### 1.7.2 Educational quotations

Quotations occupy an important place in making life colourful and enjoyable with learning. Besides being explanatory, definitional and analytical, Uttarādhyayana abundantly uses educational quotations. Some such quotations are listed below as examples:

1. *Aṇusāsio na kuppejā*. Do not get angry when disciplined. 1/9
2. *Khuddehiṃ saha saṃsaggiṃ hāsam kīdam ca vajjāe*. Do not keep company of an ignorant. Do not cut jokes or make fun of other 1/9
3. *Nā puṭṭho vāgare kiṃci puṭṭho vā nāliyam vae*. Do not speak unless permitted and do not lie when asked to speak. 1/14
4. *Koḥam asaccam kuvvejjā*. Extinguish the anger. 1/14
5. *Appā danto suhī hoi*. The one who conquers self gets happiness. 1/15
6. *Suī dhammassa dullahā*. It is very difficult to get opportunity of listening to religious sermons. 3/8
7. *Sohī ujjuyabhūyassa*. He who is simple is holy. 3/12
8. *Dhammo suddhassa ciṭṭhai*. Religion exists in a holy soul. 3/12
9. *Ghorā mukuttā abalam sarīram*. Time is very cruel and body is very vulnerable. 4/6
10. *Kammasaccāhu paṇiṇo*. No effort made goes waste. 7/20
11. *Samayaṃ goyama! Mā pamāyae*. Do not be lazy even for a moment. 10/1

## 2.0 Commentaries on Uttarādhyayana:

Uttarādhyayana is an important āgama. One of the points given to establish its importance is the largest number of commentaries written on it by different scholars and monks. Given below is a brief description of some of the important commentaries on Uttarādhyayana.

- 2.1 *Niryukti*. *Niryuktis* are the oldest form of commentary on *āgamas*. It has 5567 *gāthās*. It is an abridged version but it has many important explanations. Therefore it has been the basis of all later commentaries. It has been authored by *ācārya* Bhadra Bāhu II of Vikram 6<sup>th</sup> century.
- 2.2 *Cūṃi*. *Cūṃi* is an important commentary written in Prākṛta and Saṃskṛta. It has very brief description of the last eighteen chapters of Uttarādhyayan. In the text, the author has introduced himself as Gopālika Mahatara śiṣya who existed in Vikram 7<sup>th</sup> century.
- 2.3 *Śiṣyahitā*—This is the most important commentary on Uttarādhyayana. It has stories written in Prākṛta authored by Vādi Vetāla Śāntisūri in Vikram 11<sup>th</sup> century.
- 2.4 *Sukhabodhā*—It is an abridged version of the earlier commentary authored by Nemicandra suri in Vikram 12<sup>th</sup> century.
- 2.5 *Sarvārthasiddhi*. It is authored by Bhāvavijay in Vikram 17<sup>th</sup> century. It has stories in the form of verses.

Besides these there are more than 20 other commentaries on Uttarādhyayan which are subsidiaries or associated texts of the above commentaries. Each has clear mention of their authors and their time of writing.

It is not possible to discuss all the chapters of Uttarādhyayana here. Therefore in this lesson we shall talk about the first chapter. However it can be said that the one who studies and contemplates on this holy text completely gets bestowed with newer and clearer facts about the self and reality.

### 3.0 Chapter I. Vinayaśruta. Lesson on modesty /humility

One of the parts of spiritual path of purification practiced by Mahāvira is called penance (*tapayoga*). Penance has twelve limbs and the eighth limb is called *Vinaya* or modesty. *Vinaya* is considered as the root of Jain doctrine. One who is devoid of *vinaya* cannot progress on the path of spiritual purification. Seven limbs of *vinaya* are found in texts namely:

i. Knowledge, ii. Faith, iii. Conduct, iv. Mind, v. speech, vi. Body and vii. Worldly behaviour.

In this chapter all these types of modesty have been discussed. In ancient times, modesty was accorded a very important place. Ācārya Vaṭṭakera explains the supreme modesty thus “All knowledge and education without modesty is useless. Fruit /result of knowledge is modesty. It is therefore not possible that a person is educated and not modest”.

Some ignorant people equate modesty with mental slavery. But it is not so as modesty is the expression of unique spiritual and physical attributes. We will find in such modest persons absence of ill will and sense of aversion; abundance of spiritual purification, simplicity, sweet temper, full of devotion and absence of infatuation.

Worldly benefits of modesty are friendship and respect. A modest person eliminates pride, develops respect for the teachers and virtuous, obeys the dictate of *tīrthankaras* and praise their attributes.

The writer has accorded a very important place to modesty. He has gone to the extent saying “Like earth is the foundation of living beings, so is modesty the foundation of all disciples practicing religion”. In this way the first chapter has a very beautiful and educative description of the nature and benefits of modesty.

1. *Samjogā vipamukkassa aṇagārassa bhikkhuṇo*  
*Viṇayaṃ pāukarissāmi āṇipuvvīṃ suṇeha me.*

Meaning: Listen! I will now explain the modesty of the one who is free from attachments /attraction, has left his home, and survives by begging his food in a serial order. (*Samjogā vipamukkassa aṇagārassa bhikkhuṇo*).

The meaning of the word *Samjoga* is relations. It is of two types namely external and internal. Family relationship like with father, mother etc is external. Associations with passions, sensual indulgences are internal relationships. *Bhikṣu* should be free from both these types of relations. Trees do not move and so are called *aga*. In ancient times, houses were built mostly with wood by felling the trees. Therefore the house is called *agāra*. The one who does not have a house is called *aṇagāra*. According to ācārya Nemicandra, *bhikṣus* live in the houses built for others and so do not develop attachment with them. Therefore they are also called as *aṇagāra*.

Free from relations, *bhikṣu* and *aṇagāra* are three important words as they are also inter-related. A person who is free from all types of relations ends all types of social contacts and life. Society means relations and their development. A monk is not a social person. He is not related or associated with any one in any manner. He leads a life beyond relations. This is the first stage of a *bhikṣu* (monk)'s life. He is without any relationships / associations. He has no home of his own. He is an *aṇagāra*. Then the question arises “If he has no relations and home of his own, then how does he earn his livelihood?” The reply to this question is provided as “By begging”. In this way these three words are a part of the same series. In a word it can be summarized thus “The one who is free from all types of relationships, is without a home of his own and has no worldly possessions, easily becomes the lord of the entire wealth of the world.

#### Relation of Teacher (Monk) and Disciple

*Vinaya* (*Viṇaya*). Śāntiācārya has given two versions of this word in Sanskrita namely *vinaya* and *vinata*; *vinaya* means conduct and *vinata* means humility /humbleness.

Sudarśana Seth asks Thāvaccāputra “*Bhamte!* What is the foundation of your religion?” Thāvaccāputra says “Sudarśana! Foundation of our religion is modesty /humbleness. It is of two types namely for the householder and the other for the monks. For the householder (*agāravīnaya*), it consists of twelve vows and 11 stages of spiritual purification. For the monks (*aṅgāra vīnaya*), it consists of 5 major vows, giving up food intake at night, ten types of repentances and 11 stages of spiritual purification of the monks.

2. *Āṇā niddesakare guruṇamuvavāyakārae  
iṅgiyāgārasampanne se vinie tti vuccai*

Meaning: The one who obeys the directions and orders of his teacher (*muni* or monk teacher), serves his teacher, understands the body language and mindset of his teacher, is called modest / humble (*vinīta*).

Comments: The one who obeys the directions and orders of his teacher (*Āṇā niddesakare*). The words order and directions are synonymous. In another form these words are meant to indicate as follows:

Order - Doctrines and sermons as given in the *āgamas*. Direction means the explanations and clarifications provided by the teacher which are not in contradiction of the *āgamas*.

Serves the teacher(*uvavāyakārae*): *Cūrṇi* gives its meaning as the one who serves while in the commentary the meaning is given as the one who lives and stays close to the teacher (so that he is able to be seen by the teacher and he can hear what the teacher says or orders). However all the words are considered as synonymous also.

*Iṅgiyāgāra*: Both words i.e. *iṅgiya* and *āgāra/ākāra* represent the bodily intentions. To express both agreement and disagreement with the movement of the head is called *iṅgiya*. This intended act is subtle and only intelligent persons can understand its meaning. The intentions conveyed by the word *ākāra* are understood by ordinary persons also. For example, when the teacher is trying to get up from his seat, one can easily understand that the teacher wants to leave. Similarly looking at different directions, to yawn or to cover himself with his sheet etc all indicate intentions of the teacher to leave (meaning conveyed by *ākāra*). Both *iṅgiya* and *āgāra* are considered as synonymous also.

3. *Āṇā niddesakare guruṇamaṇuvavāyakārae  
paḍiṅṅe asambuddhe aviṅṅe tti vuccai.*

**Meaning:** The one, who does not obey the directions and orders of his teacher, does not serve his teacher, does not understand the body language and mindset of his teacher, is called non-modest / not humble (*avinīta*).

#### Comments:

*Aṇuvavāyakārae* i.e. does not serve the teacher. Disciple without modesty does not pay attention and perform his duties of venerating the teacher whole heartedly. He maintains distance from the teacher. He always thinks “If I serve the teacher and venerate him, then the teacher will have more opportunities to punish /rebuke me.” He forgets that even the punishments /rebukes by the teacher are in his good and for the benefit of his development.

*Paḍiṅṅe asambuddhe* i.e. the disciple, who acts contrary to the orders of his teacher, argues with the teacher against his teachings, always finds fault in his teacher is called an ignorant one or with perverted intellect (*asambuddhe*) i.e. he does not understand the *iṅgiya* and *āgāra* of his teacher.

4. *Jahā suṇi pūikaṇṇi nikkasijjai savvaso  
evaṃ dussila paḍiṅṅe muhari nikkasijjai*

Meaning: Like a bitch with infected and in pain ears is pushed out from wherever she goes, similarly a disciple(monk) with bad conduct, out spoken, always acting against the orders of his teacher is expelled from the congregation.

#### Comments:

*Jahā suṇi pūikaṇṇi nikkasijjai savvaso*: The word *suṇi* is indicative of extreme insult and unacceptability. The word *pūi* is indicative of two meanings namely-

- i. When the ears get infected then they start emitting foul odour.
- ii. When the puss develops in the ears, then extremely foul odour starts emitting out of the ear.

Both of these mean that when all parts of the body of the bitch have become rotten. Such a bitch is pushed out from wherever she goes. Similarly an un-humble disciple is expelled from the congregation and get insulted. He does not command respect anywhere. *Ācārya* Bhikṣu has translated the same verse in a sweet manner as follows.

*Kuhyā kānā ri kūtari, tiṇa re jharai kidā rādha lohi re*  
*Sagale thāma syūn kādhe hui, hud kare, ghara mem āvaṇa na de koi re.*  
*Dhig dhig avinūta ātamā.*

*Dussīla*: *Śīla* has three meanings namely nature, Samadhi and conduct. The one whose conduct is polluted with attachment and aversion and other flaws is called *dussīla*. Both *ācāra* and conduct are synonymous. They are inter-related. Modesty is a part of conduct only. Result of modesty is conduct. The one who is not modest is termed as *dussīla*; such a person always faces destruction/pains. The following old verse expresses the same.

*Vrattam yatnena samrakṣet, vīttamāyati yāti ca*  
*Akṣīno vīttata kṣīno vrattatastu hato hatah*

In Buddhist literature, *dussīla* is considered as ill conduct of physical, mental and speech activities.

*Muhārī* (talkative monk or the one indulging in too much talking): An un-modest person is generally talkative. The talkative attribute is generally an expression of the smallness of the talker. The famous verse of law says:

*Maukharya lāghavakaram maunamunnatikārakam*  
*Mukharau nūpurau pāde hāra kaṇṭhe virājate.*

5. *Kaṇakūṇḍagam caittānam viṭṭham bhujjai sūyare*  
*evam sīlam caittānam dussīle ramāi mie*

Meaning: As the pigs leave the rice husk to eat the excreta, so do the ignorant monks leave *śīla* and practice *dussīla*.

#### Comments:

*ṇakūṇḍagam* (husks/bran of rice). Commentary and *Cūrṇi* give two meanings of this. One is the mixture of rice and husk and the other is just rice-husk. *Cūrṇikāra* clarifies it further by calling it as the favourite food of pigs.

*Mrga* (*miye*) has two meanings i.e. deer and animal. In the present context the meaning assigned is to the attributes of an animal i.e. ignorant or without intelligence.

*Śīla* here implies conduct or self-restraint. The entire conduct or practice of self-restraint is included in the word *śīla*. In the present context this word points towards the conduct of the humble disciple monk. According to *sūtrakāra*, the meaning of the word nature of *śīla* for the humble monk is as follows:

- i. Obey the order and directions of the teacher.
- ii. Sit in the proximity of the teacher and serve him
- iii. To know and understand the body language of the teacher.
- iv. To live and behave in a manner congenial to the teacher.
- v. Not to be talkative. To speak less.

6. *Suṇiyābhāvam sāṇassa sūyarassa narassa ya*  
*viṇae thavejja appānam icchanto hiyamappaṇo.*

**Meaning:** A monk who wishes good of his self, like a bitch and a pig, should learn the ill effects of *dussīla* and establish himself in modesty / *śīla*.

#### Comments:

*Hiyamappaṇo* (good of his self): Good on one's self, both in this and future lives, is possible only by practicing modesty. By practicing modesty, the knowledge is enhanced, by knowledge the faith is enhanced and by faith the conduct is enhanced resulting in attaining liberation. Liberation (*Mokṣa*) is the absence of pain forever.

*Supriyābhāvam* means developing a feeling of low-ness (*Abhāvam*) on hearing. In Sanskrit, it can have two representations namely a. *śrutvā abhāvam* (lack of knowledge) and b. *śrutvābhāvam* (state of learning). Here as it is associated with hearing (*Supriya*) the first meaning is implied. Here the word *bhāva* means state or mode.

7. *Tamhā viṇayamejjā sīlam paḍilabhe jao  
buddhapūta niyāgaṭṭhī na nīkasijjai kaṅhūz.*

**Meaning:** One should practice modesty so that he can acquire *sīla*. One who wishes to be dear to the teacher and attain liberation is not thrown out from anywhere.

Commentary:

*buddhapūta niyāgaṭṭhī*: i.e. dear disciple of the teacher and practitioner of the path of purification.

*Buddhapūta* means the disciple who is dear to the teacher and *niyāgaṭṭhī* means one who wishes to attain liberation.

8. *Nisante siyāmuhaṛī buddhānaṃ antie sayā  
aṭṭhajuttāni sikkhejjā niraṭṭhāni u vajjāe.*

**Meaning:** Monk should always be calm and quiet and not be talkative when in the company of the teacher. He should learn the words with beneficial meanings and discard those words which are meaningless.

*Nisante aṭṭhajuttāni*

*Nisante* Based on Cūṭṭi and commentaries, we find three meanings for this namely 1. one whose internal-self (*antaĒkarana*) is without anger, 2. one whose external form is composed and calm and 3. whose intentions are very calm and composed.

*Aṭṭhajuttāni* — Here also we find three meanings namely 1. sermons of the *āgamas* 2. methods of attaining liberation and 3. with meanings

9. *anusāsio na kuppejā khamtiṃ seviṃṇa paṇḍie  
khuḍḍehiṃ saha saṃsaggiṃ hāsari. kīḍaṃ ca vajjāe.*

**Meaning:** A wise person should not develop anger when disciplined by the teacher. He should seek forgiveness. He should neither keep company with ignorant nor should he cut jokes and play with them.

*Kīḍaṃ (kīḍā)*: Its generic meaning is play, have fun etc. Śāntiācārya and Nemicandra give the following meaning to it “To develop excitement by engaging in quizzing, *antākṣari* etc.” *Cūṭṭikāra* has implied the meaning of cutting jokes while playing (or with play) for both *hāsari kīḍaṃ* together.

10. *Mā ya caṇḍāliyaṃ kāsi bahuyam mā ya ālave  
kāleṇa ya ahijjittā tao jhāeṃṇa egago.*

**Meaning:** The monk (disciple) should not be cruel (*caṇḍāliyaṃ*) in his behaviour. He should not speak too much. He should study during the time allotted for studies and after that he should meditate alone.

*Caṇḍāliyaṃ*: Cūṭṭi gives the meaning for this as “speaking lies or anger”. Brahadvṛtti gives the meaning “primarily as speaking lies in anger and the secondary or implied meaning as cruel behaviour also”.

*jhāeṃṇa egago* or meditate alone. It points towards a worldly practice that is to meditate alone, to study in groups of two's and to wander from village to village in groups of three's or more. Eating, seeking forgiveness and study are the activities performed in groups while meditation is done in solitude and not in groups. The author leads us to this ancient tradition. In modern times, group meditation is also given importance. In this way the practitioners with low capabilities get benefited by the company of practitioners of high achievements. They get a support to their concentration and thus can delve deeper in their self.

In the ancient tradition, the monk was asked to study during the first and fourth parts of the day (four parts form a day) and in second part he is asked to meditate. Thus he is asked to study in parts of day and night and meditate in two parts of day and night (the day is divided in four parts called *prahara* and so is the night).

11. *āhacca caṇḍāliyaṃ kaṭṭu na niṇhavijja kayāi vi  
kaḍaṃ kaḍe tti bhāsejja akaḍaṃ no kaḍe tti ya.*

**Meaning:** The monk should never hide his accidental cruel acts. He should always accept the wrong deeds as done and reject such acts if not done.

12. *Mā galiyasse va kaṣaṃ vayaṇamicche puṇo puṇo.  
kaṣaṃ va daṭṭhumāiṇṇe pāvagaṃ parivajje.*

**Meaning:** A monk with modesty should not expect directives or reprimands from the teacher like a stubborn (un-humble) horse expects to be whipped again and again to perform even the normal activities. Like the humble horse leaves the wrong direction on just seeing the whip, so should the monk with humility leave the inauspicious activities on seeing the facial and physical expressions of the teacher.

*galiyasse* ṅ *āiṇṇe*. *Galiyassa* means a stubborn or un-modest horse; *āiṇṇe* means a modest /humble horse. The three words (*ākārṇa*, *vinūta*, *bhadraka*) are synonyms for a humble horse or an ox.

*pāvagaṃ parivajje*. It means that the monk disciple should quit the inauspicious tendencies. On the other hand Brhadvṛttikāra adopts its meaning as accepts or accepted the auspicious tendencies /acts.

13. *Aṇasavā thulavayā kusīlā miuṃ pi caṇḍaṃ pakareti sīsā.  
cittānuvā lahudakkhovaveyā pasāyae te hu durāsayaṃ pi*

**Meaning:** The un-humble disciple who does not obey the teacher and speak haphazardly make even a soft hearted monk teacher angry. On the other hand, the disciple monks who are soft, act intelligently and perform their duties faithfully make even an ill tempered teacher happy.

*Lahudakkhovaveyā*: The word *laghudākṣya* means ability to act, subtle expertise, spontaneous.

*Durāsayaṃ*: In Sanskrit it can have forms namely *durāśraya* and *durāśaya*. Śīlāṃkācārya adopts the meaning as *durāśraya* and translates it as "it is very painful to take refuge of a teacher with ill temper". On the other hand Nemicandra translates it as the one who gets angry very fast. The commentators have written the following story to explain this.

### 3.1. Ācārya Candrarudra.

Ācārya Candrarudra was an extremely angry person. Once upon a time he came to Ujjaini with his disciples. He was busy in self studies in a solitude place there. Then a newly wedded person with his friends came there and started paying respects to the teacher in a jocular manner and said; Bhante! Please teach me religion. The monks knew his jocular intent and so kept quiet. The young man then again said, Bhante! Please initiate me in your order. I have become disinterested in the worldly affairs. Seeing my poverty even my wife has left me. Please be kind to me and initiate me in your congregation. The monks sent him to heir teacher i.e. Ācārya Candrarudra. On seeing the teacher, he requested the ācārya to initiate him in his congregation. On realizing the jocular intent of the young man, acaryas asked him to bring some ash. . The young man went and brought some ash. Ācārya started pulling the young man's hair. The friends of the young became nervous and asked the young man to run away as he was just married, lest the ācārya make him a monk. The young man thought that now his hair have been pulled out and so cannot return to his home. He became a monk. His friends deserted him and left.

The next day the newly initiated disciple said to the ācārya "Bhante! Let us go somewhere else from here, lest my family members will insist on my returning home." In the night the ācārya with his entire new disciple monk started moving to another place. While walking in the darkness, suddenly the ācārya stumbled on a rock stone and fell down. In anger, he hit his disciple with his stick resulting in the breakage of young disciple's head. The young disciple tolerated the pain with equanimity and thought "How inauspicious am I? I have caused difficulty to the ācārya who was leading a comfortable life with his other disciples." He kept on making penance and advanced quickly in spiritual purification and ultimately became an omniscient fast.

After the night passed, the ācārya saw his young disciple bleeding profusely from his head. He became repentant



on himself and started seeking forgiveness. Due to the auspicious circumstances, he started hating his ill deeds and ultimately attained omniscience. Thus the disciple, because of his good temper caused even his short and ill tempered teacher to become soft and humble.

14. *Nāpuṭṭho vāgare kiṃci puṭṭho vā nāliyaṃ vaye  
kohaṃ asaccaṃ kuvvejjā dhārejjā piyamappiyaṃ.*

**Meaning:** Do not speak unless asked for. Do not lie when asked to speak. Extinguish the anger when it erupts. Accept the pleasant and unpleasant. Do not develop attachment and aversion.

*Nāpuṭṭho vāgare kiṃci:*

It has two meanings.

- i. Unless the teacher says “How is it?”, the disciple should keep quiet and not utter any word.
- ii. Do not speak unless asked for, by the teacher or any body else also.

*kohaṃ asaccaṃ kuvvejjā:*

Two brothers were living with their mother. One of them was killed by an enemy. The mother told his living son “Son! Please catch the murderer of your brother and kill him.” The ego of the son got aroused. He started on to look out for the enemy.

After twelve years he came back to the mother with the enemy. The enemy prayed to the mother “O mother! I am at your mercy. Kill me or pardon me.” The son told his mother “O mother, each and every part of my body is enraged with revenge. How can I satisfy my anger?” To this the mother said “O son! Learn to extinguish the anger. Please remember not to attack any one who has come under your protection as well as the disabled ones.” The son got peace and he let go the enemy.

*dhārejjā piyamappiyaṃ:*

Once upon a time the entire town was inflicted with an epidemic. The king and his subjects developed extreme pain. By chance three faith healers (hypnotizers) came to the town and told the king that they have supernatural powers to get rid of the cause of their pains. The king asked each one of them to introduce their supernatural powers.

The first one said “I will transform myself into a beautiful person and entertain people on the streets of the town. If I see some one getting angry at the entertainer, then he will kill that person. Those who feel happy on being entertained will be relieved of their pains.” The king said I do not want such a person.

The second one said “I will transform myself into a fierce giant and dance on the streets of the town. If anyone ridicules that giant then he will break head of that person. If any one worships him or praises him, then he will become free from the pains”. The king said that such a giant can be dangerous.

The third said “O King! My super natural powers are simple. Regardless of anyone making fun or worship my transform, he will free everyone from pain”. The king said that he needs such a person. That person extinguished existence of all pain in the town.

15. *Appā ceva dameyarvo, appā hu khalu duddamo  
appā danto suhi hoi, assim loye parattha ya.*

**Meaning:** One should control (suppress) his own self as only his own self can be controlled. The controlled self only gets happiness in this and the future worlds. (One should control (*dameyarvo*).

Here the intention of suppression is to suppress the tendencies of mind and sense organs. Thus the meanings of suppression of own self will be the suppression of the tendencies of the mind and sense organs. Like a horse is controlled by pulling his reins, similarly the control of the tendencies of the mind and sense organs is suppression.

The meaning of suppression in the puritive laws is not implied here. In the legal parlance, the faults of the criminal are suppressed forcefully. However in the spiritual parlance, the person completely on his own and at his own free will suppresses the free wheeling tendencies of his mind and sense organs. This is the control of own-self.

16. *Varam me appā danto samjameṇa taveṇa ya  
māhaṃ parehiṃ dammanto bandhaṇehi vahehi ya.*

Meaning: It is better that I suppress my own self by observing self restraint and penance. It is not good that others suppress me by keeping me in bondage or by causing pain to me.

*Varam me appā danto:* The following story has been narrated by the vṛttikāra:

### 3.2 Gandhahasti Secanaka

There was a dense forest in which a herd of elephants used to live. The leader of that herd used to kill all the new born baby elephants. One of the female elephants thought “If I give birth to a baby elephant then the leader will kill my baby. It is therefore better that I leave / separate from this herd”. One day seeing an opportune time, she left the herd and went to a cottage of the sage living nearby. The sons of the sage gave her shelter. She gave birth to a baby elephant. The newly born baby along with the sons of the sage started looking after and irrigating the garden. The baby elephant was thus called as Secanaka. Secanaka grew up and one day he saw the leader of the herd of the elephants. Secanaka attacked the herd leader and killed him and became the leader of the elephant herd. Secanaka thought of something and destroyed the very cottage where he was born. The sons of the sage escaped from that place and went to King Śreṇika and narrated Secanaka’s story. Śreṇika went himself to capture Secanaka who was under the evil influence of some deity. Śreṇika addressed Secanaka as follows “O son, you control your self. It is not good to be captured and kept in bondage by others.” On hearing this Secanaka became satisfied and calm. He came and stood peacefully near the tower where Śreṇika was standing.

17. *Paḍiṇiyam ca buddhāṇaṃ vāyā aduva kammaṇā  
āvi vā jai vā rahasse neva kujjā kayāi vi.*

**Meaning:** Never act (in mind, speech or body acts) ill of the teacher in private or public.

#### Commentary:

The disciple should never conduct himself against the teacher. He should never say to the teacher that the teacher does not know anything. He should never speak against the teacher in front of him or elsewhere. He should never sit on the bed or the seat meant for the *ācārya* or the monk teacher, should not bodily come close to them causing pain to them. He should not walk carelessly to avoid his feet touching them.

18. *Na pakkhao na purao neva kiccāṇa piṭṭhao  
na jūṇje uruṇa uruṇṇa saṇjaye no paḍissuṇe.*

**Meaning:** Do not sit close to *ācārya*. Do not sit in front or behind them. Do not sit with your hips touching theirs. Do not accept his orders while sitting on your place but should accept the orders gracefully by leaving the seat i.e. standing up with folded hands.

#### kiccāṇa

Action (*kṛti*) means veneration. They who are worth venerating are called holy *ācārya*. How the disciple should conduct himself before the *ācārya* is explained in four sentences as follows.

- The disciple should not sit to the left or right of the teacher as the teacher can develop pain in his neck or shoulders by turning his head frequently to the left or right.
- The disciple should not sit very close in front of the teacher as it can cause pain/ inconvenience to the visitors coming for venerating the teacher / *ācārya*.
- The disciple should not sit behind the teacher as the communication by both is not so crisp and pleasant as facing each other.
- The disciple should not sit very close to the teacher as touching his body can cause flaws and is a sign of disrespect.

19. *Neva palhathatthiyam kujjā pakkhapindam va sanjaye  
pāe pasāriye vāvi, na ciṭṭhe gurunantiye.*

**Meaning:** A disciple who is self-restrained should not sit with his legs and body fully covered by the cloth (i.e. squatting with the sheet cloth or dhoti wrapped around his body and pressed under the hips). He should also not sit with his legs stretched or with his both hands pressing his knees against the floor.

*Palhathatthiyam:* To squat and tying the cloth around the knees and waist.

*Pakkhapindam:* To squat with both palms pressing the knees and hips against the floor. This posture is considered as disrespectful.

20. *Āyariem vāhinto tusiṅto na kayāi vi  
pasāyapei niyāgaṭṭhi uvaciṭṭhe gurum sayā*

**Meaning:** When asked by the teacher / *ācārya*, the disciple should not remain silent. The disciple who seeks blessings of the teacher / *ācārya* should always stay in their close proximity.

*Vāhinto* (on being asked for): Both Cūṛṇi and commentary has the word *vāhinto*. Its Sanskrit equivalent is *vyākṛta*. In later copies, we find *vāhito* instead. On this basis Pischell has changed its Sanskrit version as *vyākṣipta* which is transform of the Prākṛta word *vakkhitta*. Hence this does not appear to be correct interpretation. In this context, *ācārya* Nemicandra says "The disciple should consider himself blessed when called for by the *ācārya*". He has presented the following ancient verse.

*Dhannāna ceva guruṇo, ādesam demti guṇamahoyahino  
Caṇḍaṇaraso apunnāṇa nivadae neya amṇammi.*

A virtuous teacher always issues directions/orders to an able/ qualified disciple. No one puts sandalwood paste on the body of those who are not blessed/ less auspicious.

*Uvaciṭṭhe:* (stay in close proximity). Churṇikāra translates it as sitting in close proximity while in commentaries it is translated as "Saying I extend my respects/honours to you, the disciple should walk towards the teacher".

21. *Ālavante lavante vā na nisiejja kayāi vi  
caṭṭamāsanaṃ dhīro jao jattam paḍissune.*

**Meaning:** An honourable discipline should never continue to sit while talking or seeking answers to his questions from the teacher. On the other hand, he should leave his seat while accepting the directives from the teacher.

*Ālāpa* and *lapana*: These are two words. *Ālāpa* means to talk in brief or less or seek answers by briefly asking questions. *Lapana* on the other hand means to talk continuously or to speak in different ways.

22. *Āsanagao na pucchejja neva sejjāgao kayā  
āgammukkuḍuo santo pucchejja pamjattūdo*

**Meaning:** The disciple should neither ask questions nor talk to the teacher while sitting on the bed or the seat. He should go nearer to the teacher; knees and feet touching the floor and hips on his feet posture and with folded hands.

*Ukkūdu* (*ukūdu baiṭhana*): Sthānāṃga talks of five body postures, *Utkuṭukā* is one of them. Sitting on the floor with both feet touching it but not allowing the buttocks to touch the floor is called *Utkuṭukāsana*. It affects the testicular glands. It is one of the postures of *vinaya* (modesty).

23. *Evam viṇayajuttassa suttaṃ atthamca tadubhayam  
pucchamānassa sāsassa vāgareja jahā suyam.*

**Meaning:** In this way the disciple develops modesty. The teacher should then answer the disciple's questions both as sutra and their meanings as he has heard or learnt.

*Viṇayajuttassa* (the disciple with modesty): How should a monk endowed with modesty behave /act? How should he present his inquisitiveness to the teacher and seek clarifications? How should he behave in front of the teacher? The commentator has given responses to these questions as follows.

The monk should not seek answers or raise his inquisitiveness while sitting on his seat or in his bed. He should present himself before the teacher, fold his both hands and sit in *Utkuṭukāsana* to seek answers to his questions or inquisitiveness. At present the tradition of sitting in the *vandanāsana* is more prevalent.

*suttam atthamca tadubhayam* (sūtra, artha and both): Agamas have been written in three formats namely

- i. In the form of sūtras. These are brief.
- ii. In the form of commentary. These are very detailed.
- iii. A combination of both i.e. of first type at some places while of second type at other places.

24. *Musam parihare bhikkhū na ya ohāriṇim vaye  
bhāsādosam parihare māyam ca vajjae sayā.*

**Meaning:** The monk should give up speaking lies. He should speak definitive / assertive language. He should give up the flaws of the language. He should always be simple and give up deceit (i.e. be simple and straightforward).

**Commentary:** In the present verse, the monk has been directed not to lie, not to use assertive language, not to use wrong language and should not be deceitful. There are six flows of speaking a lie namely:

- i. degrading or loss of religion.
- ii. Lack of faith
- iii. Physical tension
- iv. Loss of meaning /wealth
- v. Rebuke
- vi. Bad state or condition.

25. *Na lavejja puṭṭho sāvajjam na niraṭṭham na mammayam  
appanaṭṭhā paraṭṭhā vā ubhayassantareṇa vā.*

**Meaning:** Even when asked, never speak penetrating and biased words for personal or the listener's benefit or without any use to any one.

*Ubhayassantareṇa* (for use of either speaker or listener or useless):

Commentaries adopt the meaning as "for use of either the speaker or listener or without any purpose". Cūṃi on the other hand describes this as to speak between two or more persons.

*Niraṭṭham:* Sukhbodhā commentary has given an ancient verse to indicate the meaning of this word.

*Eṣa bandhyāsuto jāti, khapuṣpakṛtaśekharaḥ  
Mrgatrasnāmbhasi snātaḥ śaśaśramgadhamurdharaḥ*

Look! The son of the frigid (*bāñhā*) woman is going. He is wearing the crown of imaginary flowers. He has taken a bath in the water of thirst of dears and holding a bow made of the horns of the hare.

*Mammayam* i.e. penetrating words. The word *marma* has many meanings such as painful, secretive, bitter etc. The commentator has adopted the meaning as painful e.g. to call a blind man as blind, impotent as impotent, thief as a thief are penetrating or painful words to speak. Even though they are true yet they cause pain to the listener.

26. *samaresu agāresu, sandhīsu ya mahāpahe  
ego egiṭṭhe saddhim neva ciṭṭhe na samlave.*

**Meaning:** The monk should not talk /meet or stand with a lonely women in the temples of lust-god, in the homes or the bye lanes between homes or on the road.

*samaresu agāresu, sandhīsu* means sex related or sex god temples. In fact these words indicate the dubious places.

27. *jam me buddhānusāsanti sīṇa faruseṇa vā  
mama lābho tti pehāe payao tam padissune.*

**Meaning:** The monk should consciously accept the harsh or sweet orders of the teacher thinking that they are beneficial to him.

*sīṇa* i.e. sweet or cold ; *faruseṇa*: harsh, strong and without affection.

28. *Aṇusāsaṇamovāyaṃ dukkaḍḍassa ya coyaṇaṃ  
hiyaṃ taṃ mannae paṇṇo, vesam hoi asāhuṇo*

**Meaning:** An intelligent disciple considers the discipline enforced on him either sweetly or with harshness for his own good as it is a means to stay on the path of spiritual purification and eliminator of ills. The same becomes a cause of aversion for an unintelligent monk.

29. *Hiyaṃ vigayabhayaṃ Buddhā, farusaṃ aṇusasaṇaṃ  
vesam taṃ hoi mūḍhaṇaṃ khamtisohikaraṃ payaṃ.*

**Meaning:** An intelligent and fearless disciple considers even the tough discipline of his teacher as beneficial. But for an infatuated discipline, the same which is the cause of developing equanimity and enhancing intelligence becomes the cause for aversion.

**Vigayabhaya:** without fear or fearless. One meaning of this is without fear. Another implied meaning is acquiring fear. A monk gets pervaded with a fear. He thinks that his disobedience to the teacher will result in his being insulted. What will the other monks think of me? With this feeling he thinks the reprimand of the teacher as beneficial. This is a constructive fear. This becomes a cause of virtuous transformation in the monk's life.

30. *āsaṇe uvacitthejjā aṇucce akue thīre  
appuṭṭhāt niruṭṭhāt nisiiejjappakukkue.*

**Meaning:** The monk should take a seat which is lower than the one meant for the teacher, is stable i.e. rests on the floor and is not shaky. He should not get up frequently even if needed. He should not get without any purpose. He should sit calm and composed and not move his hands and legs unnecessarily.

*Appakukku:* should not move his hands and legs to show restlessness etc. Here the word little (*appa*) is indicative of negation.

31. *kāleṇa nikkhame bhikkhu kāleṇa ya paḍikkame  
akālaṃ ca vivajjittā kāle kālaṃ samāyare.*

**Meaning:** He should go on begging tour on fixed time and return at the fixed time. By fixing his schedule, he should perform duties at specified times.

**Comments:** *kāle kālaṃ samāyare* is the indication of the daily activities (*samācāri*) of the monk. The monk should be involved in different activities throughout the day. If he performs every duty as per the schedule then all his responsibilities /duties shall be completed. The monk should go the begging tour as per the prevalent practice of time at the place and time he is. This is so as by going on an improper time, the monk may get annoyed due to responses of the householders. He should thus go on time and return also on time. He should not wander around if his alms are not as per his needs. He should remember the sutra “*alābho tti na soejjā tavotti ahiyāsaē*” i.e. do not be little due to the inadequacy of the alms received. He should consider this as a part of the penance itself and thinking so he should not wander around unnecessarily. Also wandering around will disturb the schedule of other activities. He may not be able to study or perform prayers etc.

32. *Parivāḍie na cītthejjā bhikkhu dattesaṇaṃ care  
paḍiruveṇa esittā miyaṃ kāleṇa bhakkhae. :*

**Meaning:** The monk should not stand in a queue to get the alms. He should accept the food given by the householders. He should eat adequately dressed as a monk.

*Parivāḍie na cītthejjā* i.e. not stand or sit in queue of people waiting for the food to be given. Queue here has two meanings namely:

- Row of homes. The monk should not stand at one place and wait for the food being brought from homes far away in the row of homes. This is so as the purity of the state of the person bringing the food from his home cannot be ascertained.

- ii. Queue of the people / householder waiting for the food. The monk should not join that queue. This is so as it may cause flaws like lack of affection/ respect etc. in the mind of the householder

*Paḍiruveṇa*: i.e. looks of a monk. It has three meanings as follows:

- i. Gracious appearance
- ii. With a broom, pots and dressed in white robe
- iii. Like the *jīna* i.e. the one who eats out of the palm of his hands.

The intention of all these meaning is that the monk should eat in a form as he is practicing i.e. *sthavira* or *jinakalpi* and not change his form for eating.

33. *nāidūramaṇāsanne nannesim cakkhufāsao*  
*ego cīṭṭhejja bhattaṭṭhā lamghiyā tam naikkame*

**Meaning:** If there are monks standing already, then the monk should not stand close or far away from the other monks waiting and he should not be seen by the householder giving the alms but should stand alone away from the sight of the householder giving alms and other monks accepting the alms. The monk should never overtake other monks to accept alms.

**Comments:** In the verse 32, mention had been made about the manner in which the alms should be accepted “*miyaṃ kāleṇa bhakkhae*”. Still as the same had been repeated here again, it can be concluded as “The monk should go on a begging tour only once. Still if his hunger is not satisfied, then he should go another time as well”.

34. *nātuṅce va nie vā, nāsanne nāidūrao*  
*fāsuṃyam parakaḍam piṇḍam paḍigāhejja samjāe*

**Meaning:** A monk who is practicing self restraint should accept only pure and clean (*prāsuka*) properly cleaned and cooked food. (*prāsuka* means seedless, without living beings like insects, germs etc and without any other flaws). He should not accept food brought from low and high families. Nor should he accept food brought from distant or nearby homes.

**Comments:** The first part of this verse *nātuṅce va nie vā* point towards the flaws associated with alms from different places as described in other canons. *Vṛttikāra* has given the following implied meanings.

- a.
  1. With respect to place: Should not stand at an elevated place.
  2. Body postures: Should not raise his shoulders or make them tight.
  3. Thoughts: Should not think that he is superior or with certain worldly powers.
- b.
  1. With respect to place: Should not stand at a lowly (depressed) place.
  2. Body postures: Should not bend his shoulders to signal his lowness/ inferiority.
  3. Thoughts: Should not consider himself little or unfortunate due to his not getting any alms today

35. *appapāṇe appabīyammi paḍicchannanmi samvudde*  
*samayaṃ samjāe bhunṇe jayaṃ aparisāḍayaṃ*

**Meaning:** The self restrained monk should eat carefully food brought as alms (which is without seeds and flaws) with other monks in a covered place of the *upāsāya* (living quarters of the monks in the temple complex) which is washed and is clean. The food parts should not drop while eating.

*Appapāṇe appabīyammi* means place or thing free from seeds and living beings.

*Appapāṇe*: means a place or thing free from living beings. Śāntiācārya argues that there are two words influencing this namely “*alpa prāṇa* or small living beings or little life” and “*alpa beeja* or small seed” and the second word small seeds is redundant as small living beings is all inclusive word for living beings as seeds are also with life. Actually the word *prāṇa* is traditionally meant for those things which breathe i.e. inhale and exhale air, a faculty which exists in living beings with two or more sense organs and not the stationary (or with one sense organ only). Hence the inclusion of seeds is correct in the meaning of the word.

*Appabīyammi* means a place free from seeds. As a corollary it means a place free from all types of living beings with one sense organ i.e. *sthāvara jīva* thereby eliminating the use of gardens and green places for eating.

*paḍicchannammi samvude*: The word *paḍicchannammi* means the *upāśraya* covered from the top and *samvude* means the rear portion of the *upāśraya* cleaned with whitewash etc.

*samayam samjāe bhujje jayam aparisādayam*: *samayam* means together or in the company of. This word points towards the monk practices of the monks who live in a congregation. It is the duty of the monks who are members of the congregation that they should first invite other member monks of the congregation to eat food with him. The monk should not eat alone.

*Aparisādayam* means not falling on the floor.

36. *sukaḍe tti supakke tti succhinne sukaḍe maḍe  
sunīṭṭhie sulatṭhe tti sāvajjam vajjāe muni*

**Meaning:** The monk should not use words for food like- food very well prepared (like leaf vegetables properly dressed/cut) or the food is very good (like lots of sweets) or parted (removed the poisonous or harsh parts like in cucumber, bitter gourd etc), very well filled (like ghee in sweets like *churmā* etc), very well soaked (like *jalebi* in sugar syrup) and I like it very much.

**Comments:** *Supakke* is the only word which is not commented with examples related to the subject. All other words have examples to explain their meanings.

*Sukṛta*. This and other such words are also used without any ill intentions. For example a good deed done like religious meditation (*sukṛta*); his knowledge is thorough (*supakva*); he had shown affection (*suchinna*); he had destroyed the *kārmika* enemies or he has observed *saṁthāra* and attained *paṇḍita maraṇa* etc. (*suhata*); He has collected the tools/appliances to perform spiritual purification (*sukṛta*); His conduct or practice (conduct of the monk) is good (*sulaṣṭa*) etc.

37. *ramaḍe paṇḍie sāsam hayam bhaddham va vāhae  
bālam sammai sāsanto galyassam va vāhae*

**Meaning:** The teacher enjoys disciplining an intelligent and modest disciple like a jockey enjoys riding and directing a good horse. Similarly the teacher feels pained disciplining an immodest and bad disciple like the jockey feels angry and pained in disciplining a bad horse.

**Comments:** An immodest person is with ill intentions. Such a person is never happy when disciplined by his teacher. The teacher also gets unhappy with the behaviour of such a disciple. Such an ill intentioned disciple is compared with a bad horse. *Ācārya* Bhikṣu has written the following poem for such an immodest and ill intentioned person.

*galyāre ghadho ghoḍo avinīta te kūṭyā binā āge na cāle re  
jyūṁ avinīta ne kāma bholāvīyām kahyām nīṭha nīṭha pāra ghāle re.  
galyāra ghadho ghoḍo mola le khādeti ghano duḥkha pāvai re  
jyūṁ avinīta ne dikhyā diyā pacche paga paga guru paichatāvai re.*

38. *khaḍḍuyā me caveḍā me, akkosā ya vahā ya me  
kallāṇamaṇusāsanto pāvadiṭṭhi tti mannai*

**Meaning:** A disciple with ill will and views sees the harsh discipline of the teacher like being slapped, being kicked. He considers the teacher's beneficial sermons as attacks and anger on him.

The present verse leads to the following three meanings.

1. The disciple considers the *ācārya*; who kicks, slaps, punishes and even speak harsh language for the well being of the disciple; with evil eyes. He thinks- The *ācārya* is a sinister, he does not have compassion for me, he is cruel, he punishes me as if I am a prisoner.
2. Slaps, punishments and even hearing harsh language are the only things in my destiny. Thinking all

these he considers the *ācārya* has evil intentions (even though the *ācārya* does all these for the welfare of the monk).

3. The *ācārya* disciplines the disciple only with his speech / spoken words. The ill intentioned disciple considers them like slaps, kicks etc. He considers his words for the welfare of the disciple as with anger and personal attack.

39. *putto me bhāya nai tti sāhū kallāṇa mannaī*  
*pāvadiṭṭhi u appāṇaṃ sāsam dāsam va mannaī*

**Meaning:** The modest disciple thinks that the teacher considers him like his son /brother or near one and tries to teach things for my welfare. But a bad disciple considers himself as a slave when the teacher discipline him for his well being.

40. *na kovae āyariyam appāṇaṃ pi na kovae*  
*buddhovaghāt na siyā na siyā tottagavesae*

**Meaning:** The disciple should not annoy the *ācārya*. He should not get angry himself. He should not hurt the *ācārya*. He should not pick faults in *ācārya*.

*buddhovaghāt na siyā* or do not be fault finder of or to hurt the teacher (*ācārya*). Finding faults or hurting can be of three types namely:

- i. *Jñāna upghāta*- This *ācārya* has very low level o knowledge or he does not impart full knowledge.
- ii. *Darśana upghāta*- This *ācārya* teaches the wrong path or he does not have full faith in the doctrine.
- iii. *Cāritra upghāta*- This *ācārya* is with bad conduct or with low character.

A person who thinks or talks like this, is said to be finding faults with the teacher.

In this way the other meaning of the above can be like this. The disciple who finds fault in the teacher is also called less intelligent with faulty intelligence. When such a disciple sees a teacher with long life, he thinks “How long will I continue to serve him? We should do something so that he goes on fast. He thus bring tasteless food in the alms for the teacher and say “Bhante! What can we do? The householders do not give good food” On the other hand the householders think that the teacher is old and with their good luck he is still with them. Hence we ourselves give food which is conducive to his health. They want to offer good food to the monks but then the monk says “*Ācārya* does not want good food. He is observing *samlekhanā* and getting ready to weaken his body in preparation to holy death”.

The householders tell the *ācārya* “You are a very firm practitioner of the path of spiritual purification. Therefore why you are observing *samlekhanā* as it is not the right time yet. It is not good for a religious person to create unfavourable situations. You are not a burden on us. We wish to serve you to the best of our capabilities. Your modest disciples also wish to serve you. They are also unhappy with you for this decision.

The *ācārya* analyzes the entire situation and thinks thus “What is the use of this life? It is not good to create unfavourable situation for such religious persons. He immediately replies back to the householders saying “Being a person with fixed life, how long shall I continue to stop such disciplined monks and householders? Therefore I shall pursue a better path.” Thus after making the householders understand, he starts observing fast unto death.

Such intentions of the disciple are also called finding fault or hurting the teacher. Therefore a humble disciple should not develop ill intentions. They should not force the teacher to observe fast etc.

*Tottagavesa* (fault finder). The thing /act which cause pain are called *totta*. Such material things are whip, physical attack etc while insulting spoken words, finding faults etc are such psychic things. Another meaning of this can be that the disciple should not act in a manner that the teacher has to repeatedly ask the discipline against this.

41. *āyariyam kuviyam naccā pattieṇa pasāyae*  
*vijjavejja paṃjalūdo vaejja na puṇo tti ya.*



**Meaning:** Knowing that the teacher is angry, a humble disciple should try to make the teacher happy with kind and favourable words. With folded hands he should appease him and say “I shall not repeat such acts”.

**Kuviyam:** It is the duty of the humble disciple to calm /appease the teacher if he thinks that the teacher is angry. The question is how to know whether the teacher is angry? *Cūrṇikāra* has given the following six characteristics of an angry person.

- |      |   |     |                                       |
|------|---|-----|---------------------------------------|
| i.   | Not to look at the disciple i.e. ignore him | ii. | Forget the past deeds.                |
| iii. | Insult him                                  | iv. | To speak of the bad conduct.          |
| v.   | Not to talk                                 | vi. | To express surprise at his qualities. |

**Pattiepa:** Śāntiācārya has, considered its use in a giving direction mode, given two meanings namely a. i.e. to take a vow or to make one experience and b. to love. He has implied the first meaning here while Nemacandra has endorsed the second meaning.

42. *dhammajjiyaṃ ca vavahāra, buddhehāyariyaṃ sayā  
tamāyaranto vavahāraṃ garaḥaṃ nābhigacchāi*

**Meaning:** That which is earned by practicing religion, which has been practiced always by the ācāryas who are fully knowledgeable with the Jain doctrine, the monk following that religious practice (conduct) is never insulted (does not earn insult) anywhere.

*Dhammajjiyaṃ* means practice of conduct as per the religious dictates of Jain canons and practiced by ācāryas since ancient times.

43. *manogayaṃ vakkagayaṃ jāṇittāyarissa u  
taṃ parigijjha vāyāe kammaṇā uvavāyae.*

44. *vitte acoie niccaṃ khippaṃ havaī sūcoie  
jahovaiṭṭhaṃ sukayaṃ kiccāiṃ kuvaī sayā*

**Meaning:** The one, who is bestowed with humility /modesty, is always busy practicing the conduct (as per Jain canons) without being asked /encouraged. After being in the company of a good teacher, immediately he starts practicing conduct as per his (teacher) instructions.

*Kiccāiṃ* : All commentators have translated this word as to act / work. But in the present context, due to grammatical punctuations of the word, if we conclude this word as *kiccāṇaṃ* then its meaning would be ācārya's.

45. *naccā namaī mehāvi loye kūtī se jāyae  
havaī kiccāṇaṃ saraṇaṃ bhūyāṇaṃ jagaī jahā*

**Meaning:** An intelligent monk, after knowing the above method of acquiring humility, starts implementing it and is always busy doing it. He is always praised all over the places. Like the earth is the foundation of life, similarly he becomes like the foundation for the teacher.

46. *pūjjā jassa pasīyanti sambuddhā puvvasamthūā  
pasannā lābhaissantī viūlaṃ aṭṭhiyaṃ suyaṃ*

**Meaning:** The knowledgeable ācāryas become pleased with such a monk /disciple. They become aware of his conduct of humility even before his studies are over. Being happy, they start acquainting him with the knowledge of the path of achieving liberation/salvation.

*Pasīyanti* means to become /be happy. The question arises “Do the ācāryas, after being happy actually get him the stay/ entry in the heavens or the *mokṣa*? Do they give boons to him?” The reply to these questions is “No they cannot get him the heaven or *mokṣa* but they can and do impart knowledge to him to attain these”.

*Pasannā*: means to be happy or to bless. However, here the intended meaning is to say the process of making the mind clean / unbiased.

47. *sa pūjjasatthe suviṇṇiyasamsae maṇoruī ciṭṭhai kammaṣampayā  
tavo samāyārisamāhisamvude mahajjuī paṃcavaṃyāiṃ pāliyā*

**Meaning:** He becomes like a religious text worth venerating. His scriptural knowledge is acknowledged everywhere. All his doubts get eliminated. He becomes a favourite of the teacher. He lives fully enriched with the tenfold monk practices. He is also enriched with austerities and of meditation on the self (*Samādhi*). He becomes a very powerful person by practicing the five major vows.

*Pujjasatthe:* whose scriptural knowledge is praised / worshipped everywhere. There is a sentence/quote in legal parlance “*sāstram bhāro avivekinām*” i.e. for an ignorant person, the scriptural knowledge is like a burden. One, who is modest and intelligent, his scriptural knowledge is fruitful and worth praising.

*Suviññiyasamsae* means all his doubts get extinguished. Brahadvṛtti derives two meanings for this:

1. whose all inquisitiveness or doubt are extinguished.
2. whose state is humble or who is humble /modest.

*Kammasampayā:* In ancient times, special monks were appointed to preach the practice of monk-hood. They trained the monk in the tenfold monk practices and kept a vigil on its practice. Cūṃi describes the meaning as attributes of a yogi. Brahadvṛtti gives two meanings namely endowed with th monk practices and with practices of a yogi. 48. *sa devagandhavvamanussapuṃe cahattu deham malapanka purvayam*

*siddhe va havai sāsae dee ya apparae mahiditae.*

**Meaning:** That humble /modest disciple, worshipped by gods, gandharas and human beings, after leaving this body made of dirty and impure things, either attains *mokṣa* or is born as *mahardhika* god.

*Devagandha:* Here the word *deva* implies *devas* belonging to *vaimānika* and *jyotira* and the word *gandha* implies *vyantar* and *bhuvanvāsi devas*.

*Malapanka purvayam:* Human body is built with impurities and fluids like blood and sperm etc. Therefore the body is indicated so. *Apparae:* Activities generated due to perverted influences are of short duration and so the bonded karmas. The one whose bonded karmas are of short duration are called *alparaja*”. *Apparae* can mean either of these.

### Exercises

#### Essay type question:

1. Present a critical overview of Uttarādhyayana.
2. Describe the nature of modesty based on Uttarādhyayana.
3. Describe the nature and rules of discipline based on the first chapter of Uttarādhyayana.

#### Short notes type questions:

1. Why Uttarādhyayan is called the root canon?
2. Briefly review the commentary literature on Uttarādhyayana.
3. Describe the story (and its message) of Gandhahasti Secanaka.
4. Explain the meaning of “*kāle kālam samāyare*”.
5. Who is *āussīla* i.e. with bad conduct? Briefly discuss.

#### Fill in the blanks based on this lesson

1. Conduct and ..... Are the synonyms of modesty?
2. Uttarādhyayan is considered as ..... . *Āgama* canon.
3. Language of Uttarādhyayan is a mix of Ardha Māgadhi and ..... ?
4. A number of acaryas have analyzed ..... of the word *uttara*?
5. *Tapoyoga* /penance is ..... . Of Mahāvira’s path of spiritual purification?
6. Benefit of characteristic of education is ÖÖ..?
7. One of the meanings of *vinay* is conduct. The meaning of ..... is modesty?
8. Order (sermons in the canons) and ..... are synonyms?
9. The word *bitch* (*sunī*) is used to express ..... ?

**References :** Uttarādhyayansutra, Compiler : Sādhvi Jina Prabhā

## Unit - 4 (B): Daśavaikālika- first chapter, a study

### 1.0 Introductory study of Daśavaikālika.

Āgamas are primarily classified in two groups namely *Aṅga Praviṣṭa* and *Aṅga Bāhya*. Ācāraṅga and Sūtrakṛtāṅga etc are included in *Aṅga Praviṣṭa*. Jivābhigama and Aupapātika etc are included in *Aṅga Bāhya*. There are two types of *Aṅga Bāhya* namely Kālika and Utkālika.

Kālika: The canons /scriptures which are read in the first and last part (day and night are divided in four parts each) of the day and night are called Kālikaśruta. *Aṅga Praviṣṭa* falls in this category.

Utkālika: Those canons /scriptures which are not restricted by any time limits are called Utkālikaśruta. Daśavaikālika falls in this category.

A further classification, beyond *Aṅga Praviṣṭa* and *Aṅga Bāhya* came into being later. Root (*mūla*) and *Cheda* are the additional classifications of the canons. Daśavaikālika is considered as a root canon.

Daśavaikālika is a work of compilation of Ācārya Śayyambhava. Writings can be of two types i.e. independent or a compilation. Daśavaikālika is not an independent work of Ācārya Śayyambhava but is a compilation only. He was a *śrutakevali* (knowing all canons). It is a belief that he has compiled Daśavaikālika from different *pūrvas*.

According to Niryukti of Daśavaikālika, its fourth chapter is compiled from Ātma-Pravāda, fifth chapter from Karma Pravāda, seventh chapter from Satya Pravāda, and the remaining chapters from Pratyākhāna Purva's third subject.

We find two opinions about the compilation of Daśavaikālika. The first indication shows that Daśavaikālika is a compilation from the *pūrvas* and the second indication is that it is a compilation from the twelve *aṅgas*.

### 1.1 Life sketch of the author.

A Brahmin by the name Śayyambhava lived in Rājagṛha. He was an expert of many skills and knowledge. One day Prabhavasvāmi thought about his successor. He looked at his congregation and disciples and could not locate any worthy disciple to succeed him as *ācārya*.

Then he looked at his householder disciples. He felt that Śayyambhava, a Brahmin in Rājagṛha can possibly become his successor. He sent his two disciple monks to Śayyambhava's cottage (*yajñaśālā*). The disciples reached his cottage and exchanged pleasantries. According to the directions of the *ācārya*, they said "*ako kaṣṭamahokaṣṭam, tattvam na jñāyeta param*". Śayyambhava heard these and thought "these peaceful and austere munis never speak a lie. There must be some secret". He got up and went to his teacher and said "Please tell me what is *tattva*?" The teacher told that *tattva* means Veda. Śayyambhava pulled out his sword and said "Tell me what is *tattva* else I will behead you with this sword". The teacher thought that the end time has come and so he must tell him now. He said "*Tattva* is the religion of *Arhat*". He got up and took out the idol of *Arahanta* which was under a box and showed it to Śayyambhava. Seeing the idol he became aware of the truth. Śayyambhava touched the feet of his teacher, paid him respects, gave the entire *yajña* (worship) materials to him and went away in search of the two monks who came to him and ultimately arrived at the place where they lived. At the age of 28, he gave up his pregnant wife and got initiated in monk-hood by Prabhavasvāmi.

### 1.2 Objective of this compilation:

Śayyambhava was the fourth chief pontiff (*ācārya*) of Lord Mahāvira. He got initiated in the monk-hood after giving his pregnant wife. A son was born to his pregnant wife named Manak. When Manak turned eight years, he asked his mother about the whereabouts of his father. The mother told Manak that his father had become a monk. He is a *ācārya* and is now living in Campānagari. After getting permission of his mother, Manak went in search of his father. Ācārya Śayyambhava was returning to his place after attending to nature's call and met Manak on the way. Ācārya Śayyambhava developed a feeling of affection and asked Manak about his father? Manak said in a happy tone "I am the son of Śayyambhava Brahmin". Ācārya Śayyambhava further asked

Manaka about his father's whereabouts now? Manak said "He is now an acarya and is in Campānagari." Ācārya Śayyambhava asked the reason for his visit there?" Manaka said "I want to be initiated in the monk-hood by him. Do you know my father?" Not only do I know him but he is my inseparable friend also. You get initiated by me here. Manak agreed to it. He got initiated in the monk-hood. Due to his unique knowledge, Ācārya Śayyambhava realized that Manak has a very short life of six months left. I must get him practice special path of purification. Thinking so, he decided to write a new composite canon. For special reasons, one can compile the 14 *purvas* or the 10 *apaścimapurvis*. He said "I am also faced with such a special reason and so I must compile a special canonical text". This feeling became the basis for compiling Daśavaikālika.

Manak studied Daśavaikālika for six months and died observing *samādhi*. He could study the canons and practice the conduct correctly made the *ācārya* happy. His eyes were filled with the tears of happiness. The chief disciple of Ācārya Śayyambhava, Yaśobhadra was amazed to see the light in his teacher's eyes and asked him the reason for the same. Ācārya Śayyambhava said "Manak was my worldly son. Therefore affection was aroused. He became a right practitioner of the canons made me feel happy. I had compiled this (Daśavaikālika) text for Manak's practice. What should I do of this now?" The entire congregation thought over *ācārya*'s question and decided in the end that Daśavaikālika should be kept in tact as it is. With this the study of Daśavaikālika was added as a text in the series of study of canons.

### 1.3 Time of compiling Daśavaikālika

We feel the time of compiling Daśavaikālika is around 72 years after Mahāvira's *nirvāna*. This is confirmed by the time of Prabhavasvāmi's life period. This time is clear from the time sequence of such vents.

### 1.4 Name of the canon/ Scripture

We find two name existing for this scripture namely Dasaveāliya and Dasakālika. These names indicate a combination of two words namely Dasa (ten indicating the ten chapters comprising the scripture) and *vaikālika* or *kālika*.

**Dasaveāliya:** This scripture was compiled during an unfortunate time period and so is called *vaikālika*. As a normal practice, the scriptures are written in the forenoon and Daśavaikālika started writing in the afternoon and completed in the afternoon also, as Ācārya Śayyambhava saw Manak's death looming in not so distant future. Also the period to study the scriptures is the four time period namely 1<sup>st</sup> and last parts of the day and night (day and night are each divided in four equal parts). This scripture can be read during other time periods also. Hence it is called Daśavaikālika.

**Daśakālika:** It hails from the time of *caturdaśa purvas* or it was written to complete with a time period in mind. Hence its name is Daśakālika. Agastya cūrmi gives its name as Dasavaitāliya as its tenth chapter is written as comments by Vaitāliya.

### 1.5 Writing format:

From the writings, we conclude that Daśavaikālika is written in *sūtra*. Definite words of Jainism have been compiled in a very brief manner. It was written with the intent of giving Manak a lot of knowledge in short sentences quickly. The author had been very successful in doing this. Subject classification of the text is also very authoritative and correct.

Major portion of the text is in verses but there is a large part written as prose also. The first part of the prose section is written in the style of Uttarādhyayana, e.g.

*Suyam me āusam! Teṇam bhagavayā evamakkhāyaṃiha khalu sammatta parkkame nāmaṃ Ajjhayaṇe samaṇeṇam bhagavayā Mahāvireṇam kāsaveṇam paveie. Uttarādhyayana 29/1.*

*bhagavayā Mahāvireṇam kāsaveṇam paveiā suyakkhāyā supannattā. (Daśavaikālika 4/1)*

In the prose section itself, in between we find verses for the subject discussed in prose. This style is prevalent in Upariśadas. To clarify the concepts and subject, a number of similes had also been used. Use of similes and examples bring interest and life in the reading and they become easy to remember e.g. 1. *vihaṃgamā va pupfesu* 2. *pupfesu bhamarā jahā* 3. *mahukāra samā* 4. *mā kule gaṃdhanā homo* and 5. *vāyāiddhovva haḍo*.

## 1.6 Chapters and size of verses and prose.

Daśavaikālika has ten chapters and two annexure. Their names and size are as follows.

	Chapter	Verses	Prose
1.	Druma puṣpikā	5	-
2.	Śrāmaṇya pūrvaka	11	-
3.	Kṣullakācāra	15	-
4.	Dharma Prajñapti or Śatjīvarikāya.	28	23
5.	Pindaiṣanā	150	
6.	Mahācāra	68	
7.	Vākyaśuddhi	57	
8.	Ācāra Prañidhi	63	
9.	Vinaya Samādhi	62	
10.	Sabhikṣu	21	
<b>Annexure</b>			
1.	Rativākya	18	
2.	Vivikttacaryā	16	

### 2.1 *Druma puṣpikā*

In the ten chapters the *druma* flower and the bumble bee are the similes and the food and the monk are the subjects for these similes. According to Nirukti, the reason for using the bumble bee as simile can be 1. Mobile or use of poly sources tendencies; 2. Observing non violence. Mobile or use of poly sources tendencies are indicated by “*je bhavaṃti aṇissiyā*” and non violence is indicated by “*na ya puṣṣam kilāmei, so ya piṇeṭ appayaṃ*”

*Druma puṣpa* is an easy source of food for the bumble bee. The existence of sweet taste in the *druma puṣpa* is the most appropriate indicator of the entire sweet tendencies. In this chapter, the primary objective of the author is to show the feasibility /possibility of practicing the religious conduct. This chapter is the description of the doctrine of non violence and its practice. The monk who is practicing non violence should not practice violence even for his livelihood. He should accept adequate and right food and make his life full of self restraint and penance/ austerities to establish the unity of religion and being religious.

### 2.2 *Śrāmaṇya pūrvaka*

A tree cannot come into existence without a seed and seed exists before the tree . The curd cannot exist without milk and milk exists before curd. The night cannot come into being without a day and the night comes after the day. The question arises what exists before the monk-hood? Which is the thing without which the monk hood cannot exist? In this chapter those entities are discussed without which monk hood cannot exist and thus this chapter derives its name. The description of religion in the first chapter cannot be understood without the keenness about the knowledge of these entities. Hence these entities are discussed in this chapter.

### 2.3 *Kṣullakācāra*

Conduct is the essence of the entire knowledge. One, who is not keen about the knowledge of the religion, becomes indifferent to the importance of the differences between being religious and non-religious. One who maintains keenness in religion also practices rightly the conduct and protects himself from bad conduct. Non violence is conduct and violence is bad conduct. Or we can say that the conduct which is conducive to attaining *mokṣa* or as per the scriptures is right conduct and the remaining is bad conduct. In this chapter the bad conduct are left out and the good conduct is described, therefore its content is conduct. Compared to the sixth chapter of Daśavaikālika, this chapter is brief and hence it derives its name *Kṣullakācāra*.

### 2.4 *Dharma Prajñapti or Śatjīvarikāya*

Foundation of monk hood is conduct. Quality /attribute of conduct is non violence, practice of restraint against

all living beings. To practice restraint, it is important to know the discrimination between living and non-living beings. Therefore after discussion of conduct, description of living beings is presented. “*paḍhamam nāṇam tao dayā*” i.e. along with the growth of knowledge, the practice of non-violence also grows. The first stages of the monk hood start with the practice of non-violence and the complete practice of non-violence occurs in the last and ultimate stage of the monk’s conduct. To practice non-violence it is essential to have full knowledge of living and non-living beings. Hence the subject matter of discussion of this chapter is *Śaṭṭhvanikāya*.

### **2.5 Pindaṣanā**

In this chapter, the method and requirements for carefully begging alms and consuming the same i.e. to discriminate between pure and impure food and to accept or not are given. Therefore it is titled as *Pindaṣanā*.

There are three types of begging alms namely with a feeling of low, with a feeling of without energy / respect and with good nature and as per the canons. In the first category, orphans and disabled people beg for food. In the second category people who are able to work but beg for food. In the third category, people who are practicing self-restraint are well-disposed in the religious conduct and spiritual path of purification beg for food to survive and continue their practice. This chapter talks of the third type of begging.

### **2.6 Mahācāra**

Compared to *Kṣullakācāra*, this chapter has detailed description of the right conduct of the monk. Therefore its name is *Mahācāra*. In the third chapter, just flaws in the conduct are mentioned while the same are analyzed in details from different angles. Afflictions and wrong interpretations are mentioned a little bit.

### **2.7 Vākyaśuddhi**

In this chapter, knowledge about the correctness of the speech is described which falls in under the speech restraint (*bhāṣā samīti*). One who is unable to discriminate between painful and pleasant speech is not fit to speak, what to talk of teaching the doctrine. In this chapter use of false and mixed statements are strictly forbidden from speech.

Speech having truth and which is practical can be both painful and pleasant. Speech describing the true nature and state of an entity can be true but it may or may not be expressible. That language, which even though is true, but causes the flow of karmas and harmful to the listeners is also inexpressible. This way this chapter discusses in details the expressible and inexpressible states of the speech.

### **2.8 Ācāra Praṇidhi**

Usefulness of the conduct or the uses about the subjects of conduct: Conduct is an achievement. After achieving it, how should a monk walk, what should be his path for walking etc are given in this chapter. Another meaning of *praṇidhi* can be concentration of mind, establish or usage. These can be valid or invalid. An ill-tempered horse can take his rider to a wrong path; similarly infatuation with sensual pleasures can take a monk to a wrong direction. This is the bad achievement of the sensual organs. A monk should not use his sense organs in an invalid manner but use them only in a valid manner. This is the message given by this chapter and so its name is *Ācāra Praṇidhi*.

### **2.9 Vinaya Samādhī**

In this chapter modesty / humility is described. The present chapter has four topics. The first topic is about the behaviour of a disciple towards his teacher. Even though the disciple becomes an owner of infinite knowledge, yet he respects and venerates his teacher in the same way as before. This is the pinnacle of humility. That teacher who disciplined me in the religion, who taught me religion; the feeling of veneration by the disciple towards his teacher validates the teacher-disciple tradition.

The second topic shows the difference between modesty and immodesty. The modest achieves the ultimate wealth while the immodest does not do so. The one who knows this achieves the ultimate.

The third topic deals with modesty in relation to conduct and the practitioner becomes worthy of veneration. It talks of the characteristics of being worthy.

The fourth topic talks of the four types of *samādhis* i.e. modesty, *śruta*(knowledge), penance and conduct. *Samādhi* means welfare, happiness or health. In this way this chapter gives an all encompassing description of modesty.

## 2.10 *Sabhikṣu*

One, whose livelihood is just begging, is called a *bhikṣu*. A true monk also begs for food as does a pseudo monk. Both of them are called *bhikṣu*. As the real gold is differentiated from an imitation gold due to its attributes; so is a true monk distinguished from a pseudo monk due to his attributes. Attributes make the gold as well as a true monk. Attributes of a *bhikṣu* is the subject matter of this chapter.

### 2.1 Annexure (*cūlikā*)

Daśavaikālika has ten chapters and two annexure. Annexure means the top or the summit. This is a common meaning. In the literary world, the meaning of annexure is the later part of the text. Therefore the two annexure is said to be the later part of Daśavaikālika. This is similar to the practice of appendix today compared to annexure in the past.

We find mention about annexure of Daśavaikālika in *Pariśiṣṭa Parva* that the prime minister of Nanda dynasty, Śakdāla's second son Śrīyaka became a Jain monk. *Samvatsari Parva* arrived when it was necessary for Jain monks to observe fast but he became incapable of observing the fast. His sister Sādhvi Yakṣā came to know of this. She encouraged the brother to observe the fast. With the encouragement from the sister, he observed the fast but could not endure the affliction of hunger. In the night itself he died. Yakṣā's mind became restless. She thought that she is the cause of the monk's death. Therefore she took a vow not to accept food or drink of any kind. Acarya told that she is without any fault. But her mind was not satisfied. In the end, the congregation prayed to the ruling deity. The ruling deity took her to *sīmandhara Svāmi*. After hearing herself as without a fault from *sīmandhara Svāmi*, she freed herself from any doubt and returned with four chapters from *sīmandhara Svāmi*. She returned to her place and the *ācārya* added two chapters to Daśavaikālika. This is indicated in one verse of *Niryukti* as follows:

*Āo do cūliyāo āriyā jakkhiṇṇe ajjāe  
Sīmandhara pasāo bhaviyāṇa vi vohaṇaṭṭhāe.*

## 3.0 Commentary literature

- 3.1 *Niryukti*. *Niryukti* is the oldest form of commentary on Daśavaikālika. It is in the verse form. It has 371 *gāthās*. It has been authored by *ācārya* Bhadra Bahu II of Vikram 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> century.
- 3.2 *Bhāṣya*: This is the second verse commentary on this text... It has 63 verses. Its author is not known but it should have been written after *Niryukti* and before *Cūrṇi*.
- 3.3 *Cūrṇi*. These were written after *bhāṣya*. There are two *cūrṇis* available. One is written by Agastya Singh sthavira who belongs to Vikram 3<sup>rd</sup> century as per Muni Punya Vijayji. If Agastyamuni is after *Devārddhigaṇi* and before Jina Dass, then his time appears to be Vikram 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> century.
- 3.4 *Ṭīkā*: The era of *Prākṛta* ended and the era of *Samskṛta* dawned. Commentaries on the canons started being written in *Samskṛta*. Hari Bhadra Suri in 8<sup>th</sup> century Vikram wrote a *ṭīkā* on it.

### 3.4.0 *Dhammo maṅgala mukkiṭṭham*

*Dhammo maṅgalamukkiṭṭham ahimsā samjamo tavo  
Devā vi taṃ namamsanti jassa dhamme sayā maṇo.*

That which is non-violence, self restraint and austerity is dharma (spiritual values). It is by virtue of spiritual values that supreme spiritual beneficence results. To him whose mind is (absorbed) in spiritual values, even gods pay homage.

That which is beneficial or causes welfare is called auspicious (*maṅgala*). *Maṅgala* is of two types namely (i) material (*dravya*) only namesake or assumed and (ii) psychic (*bhāva*) the real one. *Kalaśa*, *swastika*, sound of

the conch shell, hymns, house etc are considered auspicious. These cause gaining wealth, success in the work etc. these are worldly *mangalas* i.e. in the worldly view but the knowledgeable or intelligent people do not consider these so as they are not beneficial for spiritual welfare. The *mangala* associated with the welfare of the soul is called *bhāva mangala*. It is related to the spiritual purification and realization of the self.

*Dharma* is the sole and unique *mangala*. This is one *mangala* whose nature is just to yield eternal happiness. Further it annihilates pain completely so that it does not occur again. Material *mangalas* do not have the capability to annihilate pain completely and can yield partial happiness. *Dharma* is the one which enables its practitioner to realize the self and attain *mokṣa*. It is thus considered as the supreme *mangala*.

### 3.4.1 *Ahiṃsā* or non violence

Violence or *hiṃsā* means to torture or kill the life forces with the ill intentions and activities of mind, body and soul. *Ahiṃsā* is opposite of *hiṃsā*. Not to kill or hurt the living beings is *Ahiṃsā*. "Like happiness is dear to me, so is it to all living beings. Like I wish to live, so do all the living beings. Living beings wish to live and nobody wants to die. Hence I should not cause even the slightest pain to any living being". Such a feeling is called equanimity or beneficial to the soul. In *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* it is said that "If some one hits me with a stick, strike me with his fist or stones, kicks me with his feet, bets me, shouts me, causes pain to me or make me uncomfortable, or scare me, kill me then I feel pained or hurt. All living beings feel scared or pain like me from death and so on till even uprooting the hair or nails.

Thinking so, I should not cause pain or hurt to any living being, I should not discipline anyone nor should make I arouse anger in them. This religion is eternal, real and true. Here the word *Ahiṃsā* is used in all pervading sense to include giving up stealing, telling lies, not observing celibacy or not limiting possessions.

### 3.4.2 Self restraint (*saṃjamo*)

JinaDasa Mahattara has defined self restrained as detachment (*uparama*) from sensual pleasures/ activities. To concentrate on one's self free from attachments and aversions of all types is self restraint. HariBhadra Sūri translates self restraint as "*āśravadvāroparama*" i.e. to close or being immune to the five doors (namely violence, stealing, telling lies, not being celibate and having feelings of mine with the worldly possessions) of *kārmika* influx. But here the meaning of self restraint appears to be more pervading than this. Giving up the disinterest in observing the five vows, winning the passions, controlling the wandering tendencies of senses, observing the five attitudes of carefulness and three attitudes of restraint are all included in self restraint here.

### 3.4.3 *Tavo* (austerities)

That which extinguishes the knots of the eight types of bonded karmas is called austerity/ penance. It is of twelve types

- i *Anaśana* or fasting: To give solid or liquid foods for a day, week or life long etc is called fasting. To observe fast is *anaśana*.
- ii "*nodari* or to eat a little less than needed: To reduce the quantity of food intake, to keep the stomach hungry a little bit, to minimize anger or to minimize the need for appliances for living etc.
- iii *Bhikṣācaryā*: To accept food as alms.
- iv. *Rasa parityāga* or to give up the consumption of some types of food for some time like ghee, salt, milk, sweets etc.
- v. *Kāyakeśa*: to retain the body in certain specified body postures.
- vi *Pratisamīnatā*: Not to develop attachment or aversion towards the subjects of the sense organs like words etc. To suppress the anger which has not yet been aroused and to win over the anger inflicting at present. To suppress inauspicious tendencies of the mind and to follow the auspicious tendencies of the same. To stay in a place free of men, women and neutral gender persons.
- vii *Prāyścīta*: To purify the intellect, undertake activities like self reprimand of one's faults, undertake punitive activities for the same etc.



- viii *Vinaya*: To venerate and honour /respect truly the perfect beings (*deva*), religion /creed/ scriptures and the holy teacher.
- ix *Vaiyāvṛtya*: To serve the monks with pure and wholesome food etc.
- x *Svādhyāya*: To study, ask, teach, contemplate and give religious sermons etc.
- xi *Dhyāna*: To give up contemplation of bad objectives (*ārta* and *raudra*) and mediate on religion and the self (*dharmā* and *śukla*).
- xii *Vyutsarga*: Leaving the activities of the mind body for other things and focus them on the activities related to religion.

#### 3.4.4 *Deva* or the ones worthy of being worshipped

Jains consider four types of destinies (*gati*) namely hellish, sub human, heavenly and human. Out of these, the heavenly beings are bestowed with the wealth and pleasures and influence. Simple people worship them to get worldly pleasures and comforts. Here it is said that the persons whose souls are busy in religion are more influential and have more wealth than these heavenly beings. Even the heavenly beings worship such persons. In short, the message is the kings and the gods/heavenly beings endowed with all the worldly riches and super power venerate the religious persons. This is the benefit of practicing religion.

*Jahā dumassa pupfesu bhamaro āviyai rasam  
Na ya pupfam kulāmei so ya pñei appayam.*

Like a bumble bee extracts a little nectar from many *druma* flowers without destroying any of these flowers and satisfies his hunger.

*Emee samañā muttā je lo ye samtisāhuño  
Vihamgama va pupfesu dāna bhattesane rayā.*

Similarly the *śramaṇa* monks, who are possessed by none and have no possessions, are engaged in accepting pure and flawless food from different householders / donors, e.g. the bumble bee in the flowers.

*muttā* i.e. possessed by none and have no possessions: Such persons are of four types namely;

- i. Free from external possessions and infatuation.
- ii. Free from external possessions but not so from infatuation.
- iii. Not free from external possessions but free from infatuation.
- iv. Neither free from external possessions nor from infatuation.

#### 3.4.5 *Śramaṇa*

Meaning of *samañā/ śramaṇā* is a person who sees all living beings as equal or with equanimity. From practical viewpoint, all pervading definition of *śramaṇā* is found in Sutrakṛtāṅga as follows:

“One who is without any attachments or expectations; indifferent (not practicing) to violence, stealing, telling lies, sex, possessions, anger, pride, deceit and greed, attachments and aversions and all other activities causing influx of *kārmika* matter towards his soul; able to be free from all material things and without any infatuation with his body is called a *śramaṇā*”

#### 3.4.6 *Śānti* or peace and tranquility.

There are many meanings of the word *śānti* in use, e.g. attainment of ultimate, the trio of faith, knowledge and conduct, liberation / *nirvāṇa* etc. Here the word *samtisāhuño* means the one who is busy practicing to attain the ultimate i.e. *siddhatva*.

#### 3.4.7 *Sādhu* /monk.

The word *sādhu* means the person who, with the practice of right faith-knowledge and conduct, is busy in achieving the state of *mokṣa*. The one, who after understanding the concept of *ṣaṭtīvanikāya* thoroughly, is totally abstaining himself directly from the violence of these living being by himself nor extends support to

others involved in violence nor to ask others to do so. Besides they are always practicing non violence, speaking the truth, non-stealing, celibacy and non-possessions to get rid of all the pains.

### 3.4.8 *Dānabhakta. (dāpan bhattesape)*

A *śramaṇa* monk is totally devoid of possessions of any type. He does not have any material wealth in the form of money etc. The disciple then asks “Such monks then like the bumble bee should take fruits and vegetables from the trees themselves?” The intelligent person says in response to this “How can a monk take the fruits and vegetables from the trees as he is practicing total non-violence? By plucking these, he will be considered to be stealing these from the trees and plants.” Then the disciple asks “Then the monk should beg flour, lentils etc and cook the food himself.” The intelligent person replies in response “fire is a type of living being and cooking food will involve fire, water etc which are considered as living beings. Therefore cooking will be considered as violence.” Then how can monk satisfy his hunger and need to eat to live and practice the path. The intelligent person says “He should look for a donor with the nature of donating. To avoid stealing, he should beg food from such a disciple and accept only what is donated to him. He should not take anything not given to him i.e. he should accept pure and free from living beings the food and water from the house of such donor disciples. In this way his practice of non violence and other vows would stay unblemished. The disciple then asks “The bumble bee takes nectar from the flowers without their giving the same to it. How can we then compare a monk to a bumble bee?” The ācārya says “examples are given only to emphasize one of the many attributes of the subject. Similarly here the bumble bee is compared only to emphasize the nature of bumble bee to take small amounts of nectar from many flowers without hurting them. So the bumble bee may take the nectar himself but the monk does not even think of doing so”.

### 3.4.9 *Esaṇā me rata (busy in the activities concerning food)*

A monk should exercise carefulness in search of, accepting and then eating food. This is defined as *esaṇāsamīti* or attitude of carefulness while accepting food. *Esaṇā* is of three types namely

- i. When the monk goes out in search for food (*go-cara*) the rules which the monk is to observe in begging and accepting the food are called *gavesaṇā (go-esaṇā)*.
- ii. There are rules concerning accepting the food from the donor which the monk should observe or the flaws which he should be aware and not commit are called *grahaṇesaṇā*.
- iii. The rules which the monk should observe while eating the mixed food (i.e. collected from many homes) and the flaws which he should not commit are called *paribhogesaṇā*

*Vayaṃ ca vittiṃ labbhāmo naya koi uvahammaṃ  
Ahāgaḍesu rīyaṃti pupfe su bhamarā jahā.*

We shall collect the alms (food) in such a way so that no living being is hurt /pained as the *śramaṇā* monks accept the food in an easy and comfortable manner like a bumble bee takes the nectar from the flowers.

### 3.4.10 *Yathākṛta*

The food and water etc are prepared by the householders in a routine manner for their consumption. Many types of food in a pure state (free from living beings) exist in their home, which have been purified by fire etc. This is known as *yathākṛta* (done in a normal manner). From such things which are consumable by the monks are accepted by them for food only.

*Mahukārasamā Buddhā je bhavaṃti aṇissiyā  
Nānāpiādarayā dantā tena vucchaṃti sāhuṇo.*

*-tti bemi!*

Those intelligent persons who are detached like the bumble bee, i.e. not attached or dependent on one, go to many homes and towns, are busy exercising control over their sense tendencies, they are known as monks due to their qualities. I say so!

### 3.4.11 *Anīśrita* i.e. not dependent on one or a few.

The bumble bee is not dependent on any one flower. He takes nectar from many flowers. He goes on different flowers all the time. His movements are indefinite. The monk is also like him and is not dependent on any one home completely i.e. he should be independent and go to different homes.

### 3.4.12 *nānā pīṇḍa me rata* i.e. moves in different towns and homes.

This means that the monk should

- i. collect little little food from different homes.
- ii. observe the rules concerning what to, from where and how to accept food roaming from home to home i.e. different homes.
- iii. Accept tasteless food of different types.

In this the monk will not become dependent on any one home. By observing different rules of begging protects him from committing violence. He thus proves in the true sense the meaning of the monk.

### 3.4.13 *Dānta hein* i.e. the one who exercise self restraint.

Śīlānkācārya has translated the meaning of *dānta* as the one who exercises self restraint. Cūṃikāra agrees with this translation. The meaning according to the sutra is “exercises restraint of the self /soul by observing self restraint and penance.” The one who is controlled by others (using force or bondage) are called *dravya dānta*. *Bhāva dānta* on the other hand exercises control himself on his self.

**3.4.14 *Eṣaṇā samīti*** - The third attitude of carefulness out of the five prescribed is called *eṣaṇā samīti*. Literal meaning of *eṣaṇā* is to desire. In the present context the meaning assigned is to search /find. Hari Bhadra defines it as follows: “*Eṣaṇā samītirnāma gocaragatena muninā samyagupayuktena nava koṭi parisuddham grāhyam*”

At the time of searching food, the monk should carefully accept alms which is pure and free from the stages of flaws (*nava koṭi*).

### 3.4.15 *Nava koṭi*

To kill	1. Not to commit violence
	2. Not ask others to commit violence
	3. Not to praise /support those who commit violence
To cook	1. Not to cook
	2. Not ask others to cook
	3. Not to praise or support those who cook.
To buy	1. Not to buy
	2. Not ask others to buy
	3. Not support those who buy.

The monk accepts food that is free from these nine stages of flaws. Daśavaikālika Niryuṅkti defines *eṣaṇā* as:

*Ettha ya samaṇa suvikiyā parakadaparaṅṭhiyaṃ vigayadhūmaṃ  
āhāraṃ esaṃti jogāṇaṃ sāhaṅṭṭhāe.*

The monk should search and accept food free from the flaws of smoke and cooked for others so as to practice self restraint and contemplation.

### 3.4.16 Three types of *eṣaṇā*

1. *Gaveṣaṇā*: To search food free from the flaws of the source and production.
2. *Grahaṇaṣaṇā*: To search and accept food free from the ten flaws like doubt etc.
3. *Paribhaogaṣaṇā*: To search and accept food free from the flaws like smoke etc.

Source: Flaws which can accrue at the time of growing/ acquiring and cooking the food articles for consumption. These are of 16 types.

Production: The flaws which can accrue while the monk is eating he food. These are also of 16 types.

## EXERCISES

### Essay type question:

1. Present a critical overview of Daśavaikālika.

### Short notes type questions:

1. Clarify the objective for which Daśavaikālika was compiled?
2. Briefly describe the annexure of Daśavaikālika

### Fill in the blanks based on this lesson

1. Who compiled Daśavaikālika?
2. For whom Daśavaikālika was compiled?
3. The meaning of the word *sādhu* is one who practices ..... to attain *moksha*.
4. The meaning of the word *samāna* is the one who sees everyone with.....?
5. The one who burns /extinguishes the eight types of *kārmika* bondage is called .....?
6. This..... is eternal and existent and true.
7. Because of its ability to lead one to liberation.....is supreme auspicious.
8. The one which is associated with the beneficence of the soul is called.....?
9. Daśavaikālika has .....chapters and .....annexure?
10. The ..... of this chapter is to describe the attributes/qualities of the monk?

### References

Daśavaikālika

Daśavaikālika kā samīkṣātamaka adhyāyana

Daśavaikālika niryukti and cūmi

Author

**Sādhvī Vimala Prajñā**

## Unit-5 : SAMAYASĀRA

### Introduction

*Samayasāra* is full of the one idea of one concentrated divine unity. It is as persistent and emphatic about the Soul's Identity with itself being the only living Conscious Reality as pure Mahomedanism is about the Vahdaniyata of God or Moristic Vedantism about Para-Brahma. This is the only one idea, which counts. All Truth, Goodness, Beauty, Reality, Morality, Freedom is in this. The Self and It alone is true, good, lovely, real, moral. The non-self is error, myth, *mīthyātva*, ugly, deluding, detractor from and obscurer of reality, immoral, worthy of shunning and renunciation, as bondage and as anti-Liberation. This Almighty, all-Comprehensive, claim of SELF-ABSORPTION must be perfectly and completely grasped for any measure of success in understanding Shri Kunda Kunda Acharya's works, indeed for the true understanding of Jainism. Few are the works, if any, extant of Jainism as digested of old by the Apostles and Omniscients after Lord Mahavira; and with the doubtful exception of Svami Kartikeya's *Anupreksā* none is older than Shri Kunda Kunda's. The tradition is much older. It is unbroken, continuous. Indeed it is claimed to be Eternal. But in its written form, no work is older than the Soul-analyzing, Soul-clarifying, Soul-illuminating stanzas of Shri Kunda Kunda. They sparkle with one life and shed one white lustre, namely, the Divine, Limitless Nature of Soul when absorbed in it. *Sva-Samaya* or Self-Absorption is the keynote, the purpose, the lesson, the object, the goal and the centre of Sri Kunda Kunda's all works and teachings. The Pure, All-Conscious, Self-absorbed Soul is God and never less or more. Any connection, Causal or Effectual, with the non-Self is a delusion, limitation, imperfection, and bondage. To obtain Liberation or Deification this connection must be destroyed. Thus and then the "bound" soul, becomes the Liberated Soul.

वंदितु सव्वसिद्धे ध्रुवमचलमणोवमं गदिं पते।

वोच्छ्रमि समयपाहुदमिणमो सुयकेवलीभणियं।।।।

*vaṇḍittu savvasiddhe dhruvamacalamanoavamam gadim patte,*  
*vocchāmi samayapaḥuḍamiṇamo suyakevalībhaṇiyam (1)*

1. Having bowed to all the Siddhas (Perfect Souls) who have attained a condition of existence indestructible, purified (of all Karmic matter), unparalleled, I shall speak of this Samayaprābhṛtam, O (listeners), (as) spoken by the knowers of all scriptural knowledge.

### COMMENTARY

The author Shri Kunda Kunda Ācārya bows in devotion to all the Liberated Pure Souls, because he is desirous of attaining the same condition, which is unparalleled and full of eternal happiness. Samaya Prābhṛta—"Samaya" means "soul", "Prābhṛta", "a gift"; and "Samaya Prābhṛta" means "the gift of the soul", the Discourse delivered by the Highest Soul, the Omniscient; or the discourse which gives a knowledge of the Highest Soul. The Sanskrit commentator, Jaya-Sena-Ācārya has taken the word "Prābhṛta" to mean "Sāra", essence, and has called this treatise, Samaya Sāra, the essence of Soul. This work describes the pure nature of the Soul. The Author treats in detail of the essence of Soul, so that the listeners (Shrāvakas, laymen) may understand it and try to realize it in order to reach the perfect condition of Liberation. He also says that his preaching will be quite in conformity with what has been realized and taught by the five Sruta-Kevalis or saints with full scriptural knowledge, who flourished from 464 to 364. B.C. Lord Mahāvīra (599-527 B.C.), was succeeded by the three Omniscient, Gautama (527-515 B.C.) Sudharma (515-504 B.C.) and Jambusvāmi (504-466 B.C.), the last Arhat and Liberated Soul in this fifth aeon of the semi-cycle (Avasarpiṇi) of time in this Bharata Kshetra. The last of the 5 Shruta-Kevalis was Shri Bhadrabāhu, the Teacher and Initiator of the great Mauryan Emperor Chandra Gupta who was a contemporary of Alexander the Great, and flourished in the 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C. and who met a calm and peaceful death at the Chandra Hill in Shravana Belgola in Hassan District, Mysore State, in South India.

The name “Samayasāra” may also be derived from, and is certainly justified by, the use of the word “Samaya”, so frequently made by the author, in the sense of absorption or realization. Sva-samaya or Self-absorption is the central Goal to be aimed at by the Soul struggling to be free from the fetters of the mundane bondage of Karmas.

जीवो चरित्तदंसणणाणद्धिदो तं हि ससमयं जाण।  
पोग्गलकम्मवदेसद्धियं च तं जाण परसमयं।।2।।

*jīvo carittadamsaṇaṇāṭṭhido taṃ hi sasamayam jāṇa,  
poggalakammuvadesaṭṭhiyam ca taṃ jāṇa parasamayam (2)*

2. Know the Soul (which is) concentrated in (right) conduct, belief and knowledge, to be self-absorption. And know that (which) stands in (the condition) determined by (the operation) of Karmic matter (to be) non-self-absorption.

### COMMENTARY

Although the Soul is its essence and nature is all purity, perfect knowledge, happiness, etc., yet the mundane Soul in association with Karmic matter from beginningless time has got so intimately attached to matter and impure thought-activities, due to the operation of Deluding Karmas, that it is oblivious of its reality and is absorbed in mundane pleasures. Thus it is that Souls are divided into two classes: Souls who are absorbed in right belief, knowledge and realization of their true nature or self-absorbed, “Sva-samaya”, and those who are absorbed in Karmic effect “Para-samaya” or non-absorbed in the self, or rather non-self absorbed, i.e., absorbed in the non-self.

एयत्तणिच्छयगदो समओ सव्वत्थ सुंदरो लोए।  
बंधकहा एयत्ते तेण विसंवादिणी होइ।।3।।  
*eyattaṇicchayagado samao savvatha sundaro loe  
bandhakahā eyatte teṇa visamvāḍiṇi hoī (3)*

3. Absorbed in oneness, the soul (is) everywhere admirable in the Universe. The predication of bondage (as being) one with it is censurable.

### COMMENTARY

The self-absorption of a soul is the condition of its own real self and is synonymous with “imperturbable bliss”. It would therefore be admirable so long as it adheres to circumstances native to its bright nature. A soul having capabilities so high should remain true to its real nature. To become subject to Karmic bondage and the miseries which it brings is against the Soul’s nature. The Author desires to stress the point that we should not hanker after the miserable unreality of our sinful, mundane life, when we can aspire to attain the purity of our Highest status.

सुदपरिचिदाणुभूदा सव्वस्स वि कामभोगबंधकहा।  
एयत्तस्सुवलंभो णवरि ण सुलभो विभत्तस्स।।4।।  
*sudaparicidāṇubhūda savvassa vi kāma bhogabandhakahā  
eyattassuvalambho ṇavari ṇa sulabho vibattassa (4)*

4. The discourse relating to sense-enjoyments and Karmic bondage is heard understood, and experienced by all the (mundane souls). But realization of absolute oneness (with its own nature) free from (attachment, etc.) is not easy of attainment.

### COMMENTARY

All the mundane souls have one or more of the senses in the outer bodies, whether physical or fluid, and are endowed with sense-desires. To the last they aim at their fulfillment. They have all known sense-enjoyments. Many souls have often heard and understood the discourses regarding bondage of soul with Karmic matter, and

regarding its merits or demerits, and felt the truth in their heart of hearts. This is an experience common to all persons. But it is difficult to translate the precept into practice, specially as the details of the scheme of Self-Absorption must be closely followed. The author here impresses upon the reader the necessity of paying a concentrated attention to the subject-matter of this book, for its being fully understood.

तं एयत्तविभत्तं दाएहं अप्पणो सविहवेण।  
जदि दाएज्ज पमाणं चुक्किज्ज छलं ण चेत्तव्वं।।5।।

*taṃ eyattavibhattaṃ dāehaṃ appaṇo savihaveṇa  
jadi dāeja pamaṇaṃ cukkijja chalaṃ ṇa chettavaṃ (5)*

5. I describe that absolute oneness of the soul on the strength of my (own self-realization). What I describe should be accepted (after verification by your own experience). If I err, (it) should not be considered a deception.

#### COMMENTARY

The author says that his description of the absolute oneness of the soul is based on the strength of his own self-realization, and should be accepted in the light of individual experience which builds upon (1) the Scriptures, (2) Discourses from "the preceptors", (3) analysis and tests by logical standpoints, and (4) constant meditation and realization of the true nature of the self. What one might be tempted to call errors are not errors in the accepted sense of the term, but mere different aspects of the spiritual vision vouchsafed to the author

णवि होदि अप्पमत्तो ण पमत्तो जाणगो दु जो भावो।  
एवं भणंति सुद्धा णादा जो सो दु सो चेव।।6।।

*ṇavi hodi appamatto ṇa pamatto jāṇago du jo bhāvo  
evaṃ bhaṇanti suddhā ṇādā jo so du so ceva (6)*

6. But that knowing substance (pure soul) does not become of perfect vows (or of any higher spiritual stage), nor of Imperfect vows (of any lower Spiritual Stage), Thus say the pure (from the standpoint of pure soul). And indeed that which is the known is even the same (as knower, i.e., itself, in self-absorption).

#### COMMENTARY

The fourteen spirituals stages which trace the progress of the soul from delusion to a condition of perfection are useful as a practical preliminary. In its highest essence the soul neither needs nor is capable of any divisions or stages, it is always itself infinite. The soul gets rid of delusion in the 12<sup>th</sup> stage; while in the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> it attains to the perfection emanating from perfect and permanent freedom from delusion.

In the first, and lowest stage, the soul is subject to right-conduct deluding and right-belief deluding karmas. The 25 kinds of right-conduct-deluding karmas, and wrong-belief, mixed wrong and right belief, right belief clouded by slight wrong belief, the 3 kinds of right-belief-deluding karmas all these 28 causes of delusion may be present in this stage. From here the soul always goes to the fourth, and may go to the 5<sup>th</sup>, or even the 7<sup>th</sup> stage. The soul, having fallen from the 4<sup>th</sup>, may go up to the third on the operation of mixed right-belief-deluding karmas.

In the second stage, the 3 kinds of right-belief-deluding karmas are existent, but in an inoperative condition. The remaining twenty-five are operative. The duration of this stage is the shortest, viz., at the most 6 Āvalis, or winks or twinklings of an eye. This is a state, which is never touched by the soul in its progress. It is only one of the possible 3 stages, which the soul occupies if it suffers a downfall from the 4<sup>th</sup> stage. These 3 downward stages are the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>. If the soul's right-belief of the 4<sup>th</sup> stage gets mixed up with wrong-belief-deluding karmas, the soul falls down to the 3<sup>rd</sup> stage. From the 3<sup>rd</sup>, it may come down straight to the 1<sup>st</sup>, or rise to the 4<sup>th</sup> stage. But the operation of the error-feeding passions without operation of wrong-belief brings about the downfall of the soul from the 4<sup>th</sup> to the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage. Hence also, it falls back into the first stage, the universal pit of Delusion, and wrong-belief, in which rests the bottom rung of the ladder of Progress, and from which the soul once more rises to the 4<sup>th</sup> stage, to try to rise higher, if possible.

In the third stage, only 22 causes of delusion are operative, namely, 21, i.e., all except the 4 error-feeding passions of right-conduct-deluding karma, and only one, i.e., mixed-right-and-wrong-belief of the right-belief-deluding karma.

In the fourth stage, only 21 are operative. There is no right-belief-deluding karma, except in the condition of destruction-subsidential-right-belief, where there is operation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> kind of right-belief-deluding karma, i.e., when the right-belief is clouded by slight wrong-belief.

In the 5<sup>th</sup> stage, only 17 are operative. Four more, i.e., the partial-vow-preventing passions become quiescent. From here the soul never goes to the 6<sup>th</sup>; but always to the 7<sup>th</sup> stage.

In the 6<sup>th</sup> stage, only 13 operate. The 4 total-vow-preventing passions become quiescent. The 6<sup>th</sup> stage is also a retrogressive one. It is reached by a soul which is going down from the 7<sup>th</sup> stage. But such a downfallen soul may regain the 7<sup>th</sup> stage from the 6<sup>th</sup>. Indeed this can go on for a long, long time.

In the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> stages 13 operate. But their operation is mild.

In the 9<sup>th</sup> stage, 7 operate, 6 slight passions of risibility, indulgence, ennui, sorrow, fear and disgust subside or are destroyed.

In the 10<sup>th</sup> stage, only the slightest greed remains.

In the 11<sup>th</sup> stage all the 28 causes of delusion subside. Here the soul can stay at the most for one antar-muhurta. From here the soul must fall down gradually to any of the lower stages up to 7<sup>th</sup>, so that from the 7<sup>th</sup> it can go up the destructive ladder to the 8<sup>th</sup> and higher stages, skipping the 11<sup>th</sup> or the highest point of the subsidential ladder on its way from the 10<sup>th</sup> to the 12<sup>th</sup> stage, the highest point of the destructive ladder, where delusion does not subside but is entirely destroyed.

In the 13<sup>th</sup>, the soul is subject to mundane vibratory activity due to body-making karma.

In the 14<sup>th</sup> there is no vibration at all. It is perfectly steady.

Thus, it will be seen that all these fourteen spiritual stages are due to wrong belief, vowlessness, carelessness, passions and vibratory activity. Carelessness (Pramāda) in intensity or mildness lasts from the first to the sixth stage of imperfect-vow. Therefore the first six stages are referred to by the word "Pramatta". All the other eight stages are meditative and free from carelessness in pursuing the path of self-realization and are described by the author as "Apramatta". The stages are indices of degrees of progressing thought-activities. They are mere steps of a ladder to reach the abode of Liberation. When the top is reached, the ladder is left behind. Thus the soul in its essence is devoid of any distinction of stages. It is the pure Soul substance full of the infinite attributes of Omniscience, Omnipotence, etc. In one word, the soul is itself GOD. For further details of stages, consult Gommatasāra Jiva Kāṇḍa. 6S.B.J., Vol. V, pp. 8-51.

ववहारेणुवादस्सदि णाणिस्स चरित्तदंसणं णाणं।

णवि णाणं ण चरित्तं ण दंसणं जाणगो सुद्धो।।7।।

*vavahāreṇuvadissadi ṇāṇissa carittadamsaṇaṃ ṇāṇaṃ,*

*ṇavi ṇāṇaṃ ṇa carittāṃ ṇa dāmsaṇaṃ jāṇago suddho (7)*

7. From the practical (point of view) (right) conduct, belief, and knowledge are predicate of the knowing soul. But (from non-differential point of view there is) neither knowledge nor conduct nor belief. The knower (is) pure (knower itself).

## COMMENTARY

For practical purposes, we speak of the attributes of the soul, its right-belief, knowledge and conduct. But it is an indivisible unity. All attributes are implicit in its nature and merely manifest themselves in different aspects of the activity. Every individual substance is an inter-mixed, one inseparable group of an infinity of all-pervading attributes. The soul is also such a group of infinite attributes, of which the most important are the sacred trinity of right-belief, right-knowledge and right-conduct. He who realizes this, does not lose himself in distinctions, but becomes absorbed in his own self and enjoys the nectar of his own eternal essence. For the not-



knowing pupil, the wise teacher (Ācārya) selects some of the special qualities, and describes the substance by them, so that the pupil may properly understand that substance as distinct from others. Thus it is possible only for this practical purpose to make divisions of its qualities. The substance is really an indivisible whole, and can be known truly only by the realization of its entire wholeness.

जह णवि सक्कमणज्जो अणज्जभासं विणा उ गाहेदुं  
तह ववहारेण विणा परमत्थुवदेसणमसक्कं।।८।।

*jaha ṇavi sakkamaṇajjo aṇajjabhāsaṃ viṇā u gāheduṃ,  
taha vavahāreṇa viṇā paramatthuvadesaṇamasakkaṃ (8)*

8. But as a non-Aryan (is) never capable of understanding without a non-Aryan tongue, so without practical standpoint, an exposition of reality is impossible.

#### COMMENTARY

Here the author points out that the practical point of view is nothing but a mode of representing the reality. An Arab or an Englishman, ignorant of Saṃskṛta, cannot understand the truth in that language. So the unadvanced seeker after truth cannot understand the language of Reality, unless it is translated into the language of practice and outer comparison and realization, which alone can be properly grasped by worldly people. Thus the practical standpoint (Vyavahāra Naya) is essential for the exposition of the inner reality (Nīścaya Naya) of things. The Absolute Reality transcends all our experiences of matter; hence the inadequacy of language for explaining it; but language and a distinct phraseology has to be adopted as of necessity.

जो हि सुदेणभिगच्छइ अप्पाणमिणं तु केवलं सुद्धं।  
तं सुयकेवलिमिसिणो भणंति लोयपदीवयरा।।९।।

*jo hi sudeṇabhiḡacchaī appāṇamiṇaṃ tu kevalaṃ suddhaṃ,  
taṃ suyakevalimisiṇo bhaṇanti loyappadīvayarā (9)*

9. The saints, (who are) the expounders of the Universe, call him a knower of Scripture, who in reality, from knowledge of the scriptures, knows this very soul (to be) absolutely pure.

#### COMMENTARY

The author points out that although a śruta-kevali has full knowledge of all the scriptures, yet from real standpoint he can only be termed śruta-kevali, when he realizes the absolute and pure soul. It is so because the object of scriptural knowledge is to procure self-realization, which alone is the cause of internal and eternal peace and happiness and of shedding off of the karmas which hinder soul from attaining its full and perfect status.

जो सुयणाणं सव्वं जाणइ सुयकेवलिं तमाहु जिणा।  
णाणं अप्पा सव्वं जम्हा सुयकेवली तम्हा।।१०।।

*jo suyanaṇaṇaṃ savvaṃ jāṇai suyakevaliṃ tamāhu jiṇā,  
ṇaṇaṃ appā savvaṃ jamhā suyakevalī tamhā. (10)*

10. The Conquerors call him a knower of scriptural knowledge who has all scriptural knowledge; because the soul (is) all knowledge, therefore (it is also) the knower of scriptural knowledge (śruta-kevali).

#### COMMENTARY

This Gāthā gives an illustration of the practical point of view, which has been said to be a means for explaining the real point of view. It is only with reference to his being possessed of all scriptural knowledge that a śruta-kevali is called as such from the practical point of view; and in view of his realization of the self, he is termed so from the real point of view. As knowledge of scriptures is not distinct from all-knowledge, the attribute of the pure soul, this description from practical standpoint merely indicates that a śruta-kevali is really the knower of the self in its reality.

ववहारोऽभूदत्थो भूदत्थो देसिदो दु सुद्धणओ।  
भूदत्थमस्सिदो खलु सम्मादिट्ठी हवदि जीवो।।11।।

*vavahāro abhūdattho bhūdattho desido du suddhaṇao,  
bhūdatthamassido khalu sammādiṭṭhī havadi jīvo (11)*

11. The practical standpoint does not yield the real meaning. But the pure (or real) standpoint has been said to give the real meaning. The soul dependent on the real standpoint verily is a right-believer.

#### COMMENTARY

Practical standpoint is a manner of describing a substance in a way, which is not literally true of its reality. To call a soul a man is true only from the practical point of view. Really the soul as such is quite free from matter. It is neither human nor sub-human; neither hellish nor celestial. Taking into consideration the present condition of the soul in a body of manlike form and in manlike actions, the soul is termed a man.

One who does not realize this distinction clearly cannot know the soul rightly, and therefore he cannot be a right-believer. He alone is a right-believer who knows and believes that soul is soul and nothing but soul, and that it is perfectly pure, full of its own real attributes of knowledge, peacefulness and happiness, etc. Although for exchange of knowledge in our mundane life, the practical point of view is necessary, yet knowledge from this view merely without knowledge of the real standpoint cannot reveal the truth. It is belief in real truth only which can make a man a right-believer.

सुद्धो सुद्धादेसो णादव्वो परमभावदरिसीहिं।  
ववहारदेसिदो पुण जे दु अपरमे ट्ठिदा भावो।।12।।

*suddho suddhādeso ṇādavvo paramabhāvadariśiḥiṃ,  
vavahāradesido puṇa je du aparame ṭṭhida bhāvo (12)*

12. The real standpoint expounds pure substance. It should be meditated upon by the seers of real substance. But the practical standpoint is said (to be of use for) those who (are) fixed in the lower thought-activity.

#### COMMENTARY

Those who have mastered the real standpoint and are able to keep their attention fixed upon self-meditation do not require any help from the practical standpoint; but when their attention is diverted from the self and is on the point of falling into other thought-activities (as also for those who are not fit enough to master the real standpoint), this practical standpoint is a great support. Reading the scriptures, preaching the truth, writing spiritual books, worship of Arhats, feeding the poor, comforting the afraid, educating the ignorant, serving the needy, relieving the afflicted, etc., etc. are said to be the duties (Dharma) of a right-believing layman from the practical point of view. They should be adopted, when the mind is unable to fix itself on self-meditation. Just as when one wants pure gold, and it is not procurable, it is better to have impure gold than not to have any at all; so one who aims at real standpoint may take support from religious practices from a practical standpoint. The practical is an auxiliary cause for the real point.

भूदत्थेणाभिगदा जीवाजीवा य पुण्णपावं च।  
आसवसंवरणिज्जरबंधो मोकखो य सम्मतं।।13।।

*bhūdatthenaṅbhigadā jīvājīvā ya puṇṇapāvaṃ ca,  
āsavasavaṅvarañjjarabandho mokkha ya sammataṃ (13)*

13. The ascertainment, from the real standpoint, of soul, non-soul, merit and demerit, inflow, stoppage, shedding, bondage and liberation is right-belief.

#### COMMENTARY

These 9 Padārthas or categories are only phenomena of the same noumenon. The real standpoint establishes the essential identity of the self-absorbed soul, round which the other eight group themselves. Speaking,

therefore, from the real standpoint, self-absorption alone is right-belief. There are two fundamental categories of the universe, soul and non-soul, each independent of the other in its real essence. Right-belief points to the pure soul as the great reality. The other eight only help us to see the accidents which hinder the self-realization of the soul. It is merely to emphasize caution that these distinctions are made. The man pursuing the path of self-realization is absorbed in his real quest. He ignores things which do not concern his aim.

जो पस्सदि अप्पाणं अबद्धपुट्ठं अणण्णयं णियदं।  
अविसेसमसंजुत्तं तं सुद्धणयं वियाणीहि॥14॥

*jo passadi appāṇam abaddhapuṭṭham aṇaṇṇayam ṇiyadam,  
avisesamasanjanuttam taṃ suddhaṇayam viyaṇīhi (14)*

14. Know that (person to be one of) real standpoint who sees the soul unbound and untouched (by Karmic and physical matter, like a lotus-leaf by water), not other than itself (in all its mundane existences, like gold in its various forms, as ring, bracelet, necklace, etc.), standfast in itself (even as the sea at rest), inseparable (from its attributes, as a diamond from its brilliance, etc.), and not united with impure thoughts (which are non-self, as water is not united with heat or solidity, both of which are non-water).

#### COMMENTARY

The author here describes the person who has gained the real standpoint. It is he who realizes the souls as one whole individuality without any distinctions at all.

In common parlance, we speak of the soul as bound and touched by Karmas, as embodied in the various conditions of existence-celestial, human, sub-human or hellish. But the aim of the real standpoint is to see it divested of all bondage, as a really dis-embodied entity, free from the accidents and circumstances of its visible embodiment. Again, we speak of the soul in the different modifications of its attributes, changeful and inconstant, as differing in its attributes and affected by passions and thought-activities. Here too the real standpoint differs. The soul is unchanging and constant, as one substance, all-peaceful and free from all thought-activities. It is like the lotus-leaf, gone down in water, touched by it but only superficially. It can never be other than its real self, whatever the transmutations it suffers in the course of its mundane existence. Like gold, changing outward forms-yet essentially one substance-the soul is ever itself, unchanging like an ocean under a spell of peaceful calm. As to its attributes they are no separate phenomena. They are implicit in it, even as the brilliance which is in, and has no existence apart from, the diamond to which it belongs in its relation to activities, whether of thought or action. It has a character fundamentally opposed to impure thought. There is no, and can never be any real union between the soul and these non-soul, matter-born thought-activities, etc.

जो पस्सदि अप्पाणं अबद्धपुट्ठं अणण्णमविसेसम्।  
अपदेससुत्तमज्झं पस्सदि जिणसासणं सब्बं॥15॥

*jo passadi appāṇam abaddhapuṭṭham aṇaṇṇamavisesam  
apadesasuttamajjham passadi jinaśāṣaṇam sabbam (15)*

15. (He), who sees (i.e. believes, understands and experiences), the soul, unbound and untouched (by Karmic and physical matter), not other than itself (in all its mundane existences), inseparable (from its attributes), knows the whole doctrine of the Conqueror (Jina), in the body of the scriptures.

#### COMMENTARY

Here the author emphasizes the importance of the real point of view. It is through this alone that a right-believer looks at his soul as quite pure, shorn of all defects and the soul, as it is, in its true nature and essence.

This knowledge, i.e., the self-realization of the soul, as it is, is the sum and substance of the teaching of Tirthankaras and is laid down in the Jaina scriptures. Every one, aspiring after liberation and studying Jainism for the purpose, should try to understand the real with the practical point of view. It is the former alone which can procure one the gift of self-analysis which is a key to open the store-house of omniscience and perfection (Bheda Vijñāna).

दंसणणाणचरित्ताणि सेविदव्वाणि साहुणा णिच्चं।  
ताणि पुण जाण तिण्णि वि अप्पाणं चेव णिच्छयदो।।16।।

*daṃsaṇṇāṇacarittāṇi sevidavvāṇi sāhuṇā ṇiccam,*  
*tāṇi puṇa jāṇa tiṇṇi vi appāṇam ceva ṇicchayado (16)*

16. (Right) belief, knowledge and conduct should always be pursued by a saint (from the practical standpoint). Know all these three, again, (to be) the soul itself from the real standpoint.

#### COMMENTARY

From the real point of view, we cannot make any distinction between right belief, right knowledge, and right conduct. They all are co-existent and one with the individuality of the soul. Whosoever rightly meditates upon his own self obtains the clue to the three-fold path of liberation, which from the practical point of view may be considered in three aspects.

जह णाम कोवि पुरिसो रायाणं जाणिरुण सद्दहदि।  
तो तं अणुचरदि पुणो अत्थत्थीओ पयत्तेण।।17।।

*jaha ṇāma kovi puriso rāyāṇam jāṇiṛuṇa saddahadi,*  
*to taṃ aṇucaradi puṇo atthaththīo payatteṇa (17)*

एवं हि जीवराया णादव्वो तह य सद्दहेदव्वो।  
अणुचरिदव्वो य पुणो सो चेव दु मोकखकामेण।।18।।

*evaṃ hi jīvarāyā ṇādarvo taha ya saddahedavvo*  
*aṇucaridarvo ya puṇo so ceva du mokkhakāmeṇa (18)*

17-18. As any man whosoever, knowing a king, believes (him as such), and then, being desirous of wealth, serves him by all efforts; so in reality the (pure) soul (as) king should be known, similarly should be believed, and then that same indeed should be realized by one desirous of liberation.

#### COMMENTARY

This Gāthā propounds an illustration of the illustration of a man seeking wealth, who renders service to the king and is paid wages therefore. The point of the example is that in self-realization, too, we require the belief in the real soul and the fullest concentration of mind thereon. This Gāthā forms the keynote to this book. The soul can be made perfect only by contemplation of, and concentration on, the real nature of the soul itself.

कम्मे णोकम्महि य अहमिदि अहयं च कम्मणोकम्मं।  
जा एसा खलु बुद्धी अप्पडिबुद्धो हवदि तावा।।19।।

*kamme ṇokammahi ya ahamidi ahayaṃ ca kammaṇokammaṃ,*  
*jā esā khalu buddhī appaḍibuddho havadi tāva (19)*

19. I am in Karmic matter (and thought activity produced by it), and in physical matter; or I (am) the Karmic and quasi-Karmic matter. So long as this understanding (goes on), indeed, (the soul) till then is of perverse knowledge.

#### COMMENTARY

Ignorance is ever inherent in a mundane soul, and will last so long as it does not recognize himself, and know that this body, bondage of Karmas, anger, pride, deceit, and greed, etc., all impure thought-activities, are all foreign to the real nature of soul. They are all material, because their main cause is matter. When a soul rightly believes in his pure individuality as a store of all-knowledge, all-happiness and all-peace, it becomes a right believer and then it is able to tread on the path of liberation

अहमेदं एदमहं अहमेदस्स हि अत्ति मम एदं।  
अण्णं जं परदव्वं सचित्ताचित्तमिस्सं वा।।20।।

*ahamedarū edamaharū ahamedassa hi attī mama edarū,  
aññarū jarū paradavvarū sacittācittamissarū vā (20)*

20. Other foreign substance, living, non-living, or mixed is I, I am it. I am of them; and they are mine.

आसि मम पुव्वमेदं एदस्स अहं पि आसि पुव्वं हि।  
होहि पुणो वि ममएदं अहमेदं चापि होस्सामि।।21।।

*āsi mama purvamedarū edassa aham pi āsi purvārū hi,  
hohi puṇo vi mama edarū ahamedarū cāpi hoṣṣāmi (21)*

21. It was mine formerly, I (was) its in the past time. (It) will again be mine; I also will be it.

एदं तु असम्भूदं आदवियप्पं करेदि सम्भूदो।  
भूदत्थं जाणतो ण करेदि दु तं असम्भूदो।।22।।

*eadm tu asambhūdarū ādaviyappam karedi sammūdo,  
bhūdattham jāṇanto ṇa karedi du taṃ asammūdo (22)*

22. Thus the wrong-believer indulges in such perverse thought-activity of soul. But a right-believer, knowing the real standpoint, does not so indulge.

### COMMENTARY

Gathas 20-22 tell us that the slightest identification of the self with the non-self, of the soul with the material accidents of physical existence, is the sure mark of wrong belief. This leads to delusion which overpowers meditation and takes it into wrong channels. "I", "Me", "Mind", "Soul" that is the real entity, and the consciousness of it in its pure essence, its chief object. Delusion leads to wrong belief in things of past, present and future. A right-believer is ever conscious that nothing other than his self can ever be he, or his mind, and that he can never be other than his real nature.

अण्णाणमोहिदमदी मज्झमिणं भणदि पुग्गलं दव्वं।  
बद्धमबद्धं च तहा जीवे बहुभावसंजुत्ते।।23।।

*aññāṇamohidamadī majjhamiṇam bhaṇadi puṅgalam davvam  
baddhamabaddham ca tahā jīve bahubhāvasamjutte (23)*

23. The soul whose intellect is deluded by wrong knowledge and (which is) with many kinds of thought-activity, says of the matter-substance (whether it is) bound or not bound (with the soul): this is mine.

### COMMENTARY

Wrong knowledge is here described as the cause of delusion, and an intellect is (of course from the practical point of view) attributed to the soul.

The point is that "Wrong knowledge", of which instances have been given in the preceding three Gathas, deludes the perceptive faculty of the soul, and it comes to regard matter-substance as "its" which, though apparently "genitive" or "attributive" shows attachment and leads to perversity, which should be avoided. Thus deluded, a person is affected by strong passionate thought-activities and breeds attachment to the body, which is bound to him, and with family, friends, clothes, houses, riches, country and kingdom, etc., which are not bound with him. So deluded by other objects, he desires for their possession and company, and their separation brings unbearable grief to him. For their sake he is ready to perform any of the worst injuries and irreligious acts which no wise man would ever do. His life which can best be utilized in realizing true peace, and in soul-advancement is totally ruined. The author has here described this piteous characteristic of an ignorant deluded person.

सव्वण्हूणाणदिहो जीवो उवओगलक्खणो णिच्चं।  
किह सो पोगलदक्खीभूदो किं भणसि मज्झमिणं।।24।।

*savvaṇḥuṇāṇadittho jīvo uvaogalakkhaṇo ṇiccaṃ  
kiha so poggaladavvībhūdo kiṃ bhaṇasi majjhamiṇam (24)*

24. That the soul always (possesses) the characteristic of conscious attentiveness, is seen in the knowledge of the All-knowing. How can the soul be the matter, which thou say 'st is mine?

#### COMMENTARY

Remember that the soul, as it is, can never become matter, which is devoid of consciousness; consciousness is the special attribute of the soul. It is therefore quite different from non-soul substances. This body, in which it resides and to which it is strongly attached, is made up of unconscious molecules of dead, lifeless matter. It is only the abode for mundane-soul for a short duration. Made up of material atoms it dissolves; but the soul free, and indissoluble, immaterial and conscious will retain its real existence for evermore. Therefore a truly wise man should never consider the body to be his, or otherwise identify himself with it.

जदि सो पुगलदव्वीभूदो जीवत्तमागदं इदरं।  
तो सक्को वुत्तुं जं मज्झमिणं पुगलं दव्वं। 25।।

*jadi so puggaladavvībhūdo jīvattamāgadam idaram  
to sakko vuttum jam majjhamiṇam puggalam davvam (25)*

25. If that (soul) becomes matter-substance, the other (i.e., matter) will gain soulness. Then (you) can say that this matter-substance (is) mine.

#### COMMENTARY

There is a total absence of matter in pure soul. But the impure mundane-soul has always got connection with electric and Karmic bodies. Still ever a duration of infinite time cannot change one substance into another. It is a rule that a substance can never lose its own real nature by being altered into another substance. It can modify within its own possible conditions, retaining all its natures and attributes of which the substance is an indivisible group. It may, however, modify itself into many kinds of worldly lives, and have knowledge varying from the minimum knowledge of a common fine plant-life to maximum knowledge, Omniscience.

Matter may change into many kinds of fine and gross molecules, of which the different objects of the world and the bodies of living beings are formed, yet does not and cannot lose its peculiar attributes of materiality. Colour, smell, taste and touch which are its main attributes can never be lost. This persistent retention of an unchangeable inner-self, whether of matter or soul, is the basic truth of the universe. Soul is different from the body of Karmas. It is the privilege of the real standpoint to see no connection between "self" and "non-self".

जदि जीवो ण सरीरं तित्थयरायरियसंभुदी चेवा।  
सव्वावि हवदि मिच्छ तेण दु आदा हवदि देहो।। 26।।

*jadi jīvo ṇa sarīraṃ tīthayarāyariya-sambhūdī ceva  
savvāvi havadi micchā teṇa du ādā havadi deho (26)*

26. If soul (is) not body, lauding of Tīrthankara and also of Ācārya (head of the saints) is wrong; therefore the soul is the body.

#### COMMENTARY

A student after having heard many praises of Tīrthankara and Ācārya even with reference to their material bodies may think that if bodies may not be identical with soul, the saints would not have praised their bodies. He, therefore, may doubt that the soul is a separate substance from the body.

ववहारणओ भासदि जीवो देहो य हवदि खलु एक्को।  
णदु णिच्छयस्स जीवो देहो य कदावि एक्कट्ठो।। 27।।

*vavahāraṇao bhāsadi jīvo deho ya havadi khalu ekko  
ṇadu ṇicchayassa jīvo deho ya kadāvi ekkaṭṭho (27)*

27. The practical standpoint tells (that) soul and body are certainly one, but from real standpoint soul and body (are) not one substance at any time whatsoever.

## COMMENTARY

It is only from the practical point of view that the attributes of matter are ascribed to the soul. In worldly practice, the soul having a beautiful fair body is called beautiful and fair, though really the soul is neither beautiful (Shubha) nor non-beautiful (Ashubha) which are material associations. The living conscious soul can never become non-living unconscious matter.

इणमण्णं जीवादो देहं पोगगलमयं थुणित्तु मुणी।  
मण्णदि हू संथुदो वेदिदो मए केवली भयवो।।28।।

*ṇamaṇṇaṃ jīvādo dehaṃ poggalamayaṃ thuṇittu muṇī  
maṇṇadi hu saṃthudo vaddido mae kevalī bhayavaṃ(28)*

28. By lauding this material body (which is) separate from the soul, a saint understands that the perfect deity is lauded (and) adored by him.

## COMMENTARY

When uttering praises of the body of living Arhat, or of an image, the saints know all that this lauding refers not to the body, but to the soul whose inner peace and purity has made the body adorable. It is the Perfect Soul, the Deity that is being bowed to.

तं णिच्छये ण जुज्जदि ण सरीरगुणा हि होति केवलिणो।  
केवलिगुणो थुणदि जो सो तच्चं केवलिं थुणदि।।29।।

*taṃ ṇicchaye ṇa jujjadi ṇa sarīraguṇā hi hoti kevaliṇo  
kevaliguṇo thuṇadi jo so taccāṃ kevaliṃ thuṇadi (29)*

29. That (lauding) is not from the real standpoint : the qualities of the body are not found really in the perfect soul. He, who lauds the attributes of the perfect soul, really lauds the perfect soul.

## COMMENTARY

The right-believing worshipper knows perfectly that lauding of the bodies of the great men is only from the practical point of view. From the real point of view, only that lauding which refers to the soul's qualities directly can be called a proper lauding of the Tīrthankaras and Ācāryas.

णयरम्मि वण्णिदे जहू ण वि रण्णो वण्णणा कदा होदि।  
देहगुणो थुव्वंते ण केवलिगुणा थुदा होति।।30।।

*ṇayarammi vaṇṇide jaha ṇa vi raṇṇo vaṇṇaṇā kadā hodi  
dehaguṇo thuvvaṅte ṇa kevaliguṇā thudā hoti (30)*

30. As admiring the city can never become admiration of the king, (so by) lauding the qualities of the body the attributes of the perfect soul are never lauded.

## COMMENTARY

Here the author illustrates his doctrine. As the praise of streets, roads, houses, gardens, etc. of a city is not necessarily the lauding of the qualities of the king of the city, so admiration of the body is not the admiration of Omniscience. True adoration lies in the homage to the soul's own special pure attributes. Example of this real adoration are given in the following Gathas.

जो इंदिए जिणित्ता णाणसहावाधिअं मुणदि आदं।  
तं खलु जिदिंदियं ते भणंति जे णिच्छिदा साहू।।31।।

*jo imdiye jīṇittā ṇāṇasaḥāvādhīaṃ muṇadi ādaṃ  
taṃ khalu jidīndiyaṃ te bhaṇanti je nicchidā sāhū (31)*

31. He, who having conquered the senses realizes the soul (as) full of its own inherent knowledge, him they, who (are) saints (and) knower of the real standpoint really call a conqueror of the senses.

## COMMENTARY

This illustrates the first point of real homage. Saints call only him a conqueror of the senses, who having subdued all his sense-gratifications, rightly knows, believes and realizes his own pure soul and is absorbed in his soul. A right-believer from the fourth stage of vowless right-belief can be called a conqueror (Jina), because his error-feeding or right-belief-preventing passions have at least subsided, and he has mastered his sense desires. He has the capacity of self-realization, and whenever he directs his attention to his own self-realization he finds true peace and happiness in self-absorption.

जो मोहं तु जिणित्ता णाणसहावाधियं मुणदि आदे।  
तं जिदमोहं साहं परमहवियाणया विति।।32।।

*jo moham tu jinitta ñāṇasahāvādhīyaṃ muṇaḍi ādāṃ  
taṃ jidamohaṃ sāhaṃ paramahaviyaṇaya viti*

32. The saints, the knowers of reality, call him a conqueror of delusion, who, having conquered delusion, realizes the soul (as) full of its own inherent knowledge.

## COMMENTARY

This Gāthā illustrates the second aspect of homage. The saint with perfect vows ascends the subsidential ladder and practices pure concentration, by virtue of which all kinds of deluding Karmas subside and he attains to the 11<sup>th</sup> stage of subsided delusion. There he is called a conqueror of delusion.

जिदमोहस्स दु जइया खीणो मोहो हविज्ज साहुस्स।  
तइया दु खीणमोहो भण्णदि सो णिच्छयविदूहिं।।33।।

*jidamohassa du jaiyā khīṇo moho havijja sāhussa  
taiyā du khīṇamoho bhāṇṇaḍi so ṇicchayavidūhīṃ (33)*

33. And when destruction of delusion takes place in a saint, the conqueror of delusion, then verily he is called delusionless by the knowers of reality.

## COMMENTARY

The same saint as conqueror of delusion, falling back from 11<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> stage, ascends with destructive right-belief on the destructive ladder, where he destroys the deluding Karma altogether. The destruction of delusion opens the path to reality. It is the ascent to the 12<sup>th</sup> stage of delusionlessness. It is the third aspect of real adoration. In this way all references about the real attributes of the soul constitute real homage, because they directly laud to the real nature of the soul, the meditation of which is essential to liberation.

णाणं सव्वे भावे पच्चक्खादि य परेत्ति णादूणा।  
तम्हा पच्चक्खाणं णाणं णियमा मुणेदव्वं।।34।।

*ñāṇaṃ savve bhāve paccakkhāḍi ya paretti ṇādūṇa  
tamhā paccakkhāṇaṃ ñāṇaṃ ṇīyamaṃ muṇedavvaṃ (34)*

34. As self-knowledge renounces all (impure) thought-activities, knowing them to be other than itself, therefore, self-knowledge must be recognized as renunciation in reality.

## COMMENTARY

From the practical point of view the giving up of vowlessness, worldly possessions and sense-gratifications is called renunciation. From the real standpoint, when a right believer, diverting his attention from all what is other than himself, concentrates himself in his self, i.e., is absorbed in self, without any consideration of renouncing anything, there is real renunciation of the non-self by the soul. The author here means to say that the saint who is unable to realize the true nature of his own soul cannot be called a renouncer, even if he has given up all worldly things and is practicing severe austerities. Practical renunciation is for the sake of self-realization, and true renunciation is only where there is self-absorption.



जह णाम कोवि पुरिसो परदव्वमिणं ति जाणिदुं चयदि।  
तह सव्वे परभावे णाऊण विमुंचदे णाणी।।35।।

*jaha ñāma kovi puriso paradavvamiṇaṃ ti jāṇidum cayaḍi,  
taha sarve parabhāve ṇāūṇa vimuṃcade ṇāṇī (35)*

35. As any man whatsoever knowing another's thing to be as such gives (it) up, so the (right) knower renounces all non-self-thought-activities knowing them to be non-self

#### COMMENTARY

So long as a person does not realize the distinction between his own and other's possessions, he might think as his own the things which really do not belong to him. But as soon as he knows the truth, he, as a right and honest man, gives up all attachment to them and remains content with what is his own. Similarly a right-believer, realizing the truth, understands fully that nothing except his own self with its own pure attributes belongs to him. He at once renounces all attachment to non-self and becomes content with and absorbed in his own self.

णत्थि मम को वि मोहो बुद्धदि उवओग एव अहमेक्को।  
तं मोहणिम्ममत्तं समयस्स वियाणया विंति।।36।।

*ṇatthi mama ko vi moho bujjhadi uvaoga eva ahamekko  
taṃ mohaṇimamattaṃ samayassa viyāṇayā viṃti (36)*

36. Delusion has no concern with me. I am only the attentive one. The knowers of pure soul call me as having no concern with delusion.

#### COMMENTARY

The author points out that not only riches, family, kingdom and other outer things, but even the thought-activities of delusion and attachment which are due to the operation of deluding-karma, do not appertain to the soul. A right-believer should always consider himself to be above any attachment, and centred in his own pure consciousness.

णत्थि मम धम्म आदी बुद्धदि उवओग एव अहमेक्को।  
तं धम्मणिम्ममत्तं समयस्स वियाणया विंति।।37।।

*ṇatthi mama dhamma ādī bujjhadi uvaoga eva ahamekko  
taṃ dhammaṇimmaṇaṃ samayassa viyāṇayā viṃti (37)*

37. The mediums of motion, etc., are not mine. I am only the attentive one. The knowers of the pure soul call me as having no concern with (substances, such as) mediums of motion.

#### COMMENTARY

The soul with its special quality of consciousness knows itself and all the other substances (Dravyas), which are knowable; but being one with itself, it cannot lose itself in the other knowables, which have a separate existence. Philosophers variously believe that all is knowledge, or all is the soul, or there exist no different and individual souls, or matter, space, time, and modes of motion and rest. The many-sided (Anekānta) Jain philosophy neither be other souls, nor it can be other non-soul substances. This fact is clear to the experience and realization of every wise man.

अहमेक्को खलु सुद्धो दंसणणाणमइओ सदारूवी।  
णवि अत्थि मज्झ किंचिवि अण्णं परमाणुमित्तं पि।।38।।

*ahamekko khalu suddho daṃsaṇṇaṇamaio sadārūvī  
ṇavi atthi majjha kiṃcivi aṇṇaṃ paramāṇumittaṃ pi (38)*

38. I (am) one (i.e. myself) really pure, full of perfect conation and knowledge, always immaterial. Another (i.e., the non-self) is never mine in any way, even to the extent of an atom.

## COMMENTARY

This Gatha explains the essence of this chapter. It shows what is “*Samaya Sāra*”. A right-believer must realize himself as being quite pure and in reality a store of all-knowledge, all-creation, all-happiness, all-peacefulness, without any connection with any particle of matter or with any attribute of matter, such as, colour, smell, taste and touch. This knowledge and belief of his own identity with an Omniscient, Omnipotent, Limitless Consciousness leads to real self-meditation and self-concentration, which is the only true path of liberation and happiness, from the real point of view. This is self-absorption (*Sva-Samaya*).

आप्पाणमयानता मूढा दु परप्पवादिणो केई।  
जीवं अज्झवसाणं कम्मं च तथा परूविंति।।39।।

*appāṇamayāṇatā mūdhā du parappavādiṇo keī*  
*jīvaṃ ajjhasaṇaṃ kammaṃ ca taḥ parūvinti (39)*

39. Some ignorant persons, who do not know (what) soul (is), and yet declare other (than soul to be the) soul, describe soul as (if it were identical with) attachment (to worldly objects), and (as) Karma.

अवरे अज्झवसाणेसु तिब्बमंदाणुभावयं जीवं।  
मण्णंति तथा अवरे णोकम्मं चावि जीवो त्ति।।40।।

*avare ajjhasaṇesu tivvamaṇḍaṇubhāvayaṃ jīvaṃ*  
*maṇṇanti taḥ avare ṇokammaṃ cāvi jīvotti (40)*

40. Others consider the intense or mild action of the feelings of attachment as soul, and others (consider) quasi-Karmas as soul.

कम्मस्सुदयं जीवं अवरे कम्माणुभागमिच्छंति।  
तिब्बत्तणमंदत्तण गुणेहिं जो सो हवदि जीवो।।41।।

*kammasudayaṃ jīvaṃ avare kammaṇubhāgamicchanti*  
*tivvattanaṃamaddattaṇa guṇehiṃ jo so havadi jīvo (41)*

41. Others (consider) the operation of Karma as soul, (and others consider that) soul is that which is (the result of) the intense and mild qualities of the fruition of Karmas.

जीवो कम्मं उहयं देण्णिवि खलु केवि जीवमिच्छंति।  
अवरे संजोगेण दु कम्माणं जीवमिच्छंति।।42।।

*jīvo kammaṃ uḥayaṃ deṇṇivi khalu kevi jīvamicchanti*  
*avare saṃjogena du kammaṇaṃ jīvamicchanti (42)*

42. Others believe soul to be both the soul and Karmas combined together, and some believe the soul to be the result of the combination of Karmas.

एवंविहा बहुविहा परमप्पाणं वदंति दुम्मेहा।  
ते ण दु परप्पवादी णिच्छयवादीहिं णिद्धिहा।।43।।

*evaṃvihā bahuvihā paramappāṇaṃ vadanti dummehā*  
*te ṇa du parappavādī ṇicchayavādīhiṃ ṇiddhihā (43)*

43. Thus, in many ways, (persons) of perverse intellect call the soul others (than itself). (Such persons) are therefore classed by the knower of Reality as (those who) describe the non-soul as soul.

## COMMENTARY

Gāthās 39 to 43 describe a few wrong and perverse views about the nature of soul. Practically all that is said in these views can apply to a mundane, imperfect, impure soul, while as a matter of fact this weak deluded embodied soul is a miserable shadow of the great life, which the SOUL in reality is.

Karmas are matter made up of very fine Karmic molecules. Physical bodies are formed of physical of *Āhāraka* molecules, and are also matter. Attachment, etc., all passionate thought-activities and their mild or strong characters are due to the effect of deluding Karma, which is also matter. The operation of all Karmas or its mild or strong fruition is also material.

Thus, he who believes these matter-born and material causes and effect to be of the essence of soul cannot be a true knower and seer of the reality of the SOUL.

The object of emphasizing the reality of the soul is that if we clearly understand our true nature, much of the bitterness, selfishness, cruelty, injustice, narrowness, crime, immorality, sin and suffering will be removed; we shall rise high above our impure and contaminating surroundings, and in our daily worldly lives shall be enabled to conduct ourselves so that ultimate liberation will be assured, and the world will be turned into a stage for the attainment of Godhood.

एदे सव्वे भावा पोगगलदव्वपरिणामणिप्पण्णा।  
केवलजिणेहिं भणिया किह ते जीवो त्ति उच्चंति।44।।

*ede savve bhāvā poggaladavvaparīṇāmaṇippaṇṇā.*  
*kevalijīṇehim bhaṇiyā kiha te jīvo tti uccanti (44)*

44. (It is) said by the Perfect Conqueror that all these conditions are produced by the operation of material Karmas. How can they be called souls?

#### COMMENTARY

The conditions contemplated by the last Gāthās are quite material and the soul is free of all material impurities. Its pure reality, in its real essence, has already been discussed in the first chapter.

अहविहं पि य कम्मं सव्वं पुगलमयं जिणं विंति।  
जस्स फलं तं वुच्चदि दुक्खं ति विपच्चमाणस्सा।45।।

*aṭṭhaviham pi ya kammaṃ savvaṃ puggalamayaṃ jīṇaṃ vinti.*  
*jassa phalaṃ taṃ vuccadi dukkhaṃ ti vipaccamaṇassa. (45)*

45. The Conquerors say (that) all the eight kinds of Karmas are all material. What is called pain is the (resulting) fruit of their maturity.

#### COMMENTARY

Pain, disappointment, disease, death, etc., are material from the real standpoint, because they are the result of Karmic matter. Here the operative thought-activity of the soul is also called material, as being the result of material Karma. All the impure conditions of a mundane soul are due to the operation of eight kinds of Karmas. Their fruition, on maturity, is what we call pain, because the soul is thereby obstructed from enjoying true and independent happiness born in the realization of self, shorn of interruptions, for all time. Only a soul free from the eight Karmas is always happy and perfect. There are eight Karmas of which the following four are called destructive (*Ghātīya*): (1) Knowledge-obscuring which prevents knowledge, (2) Conation-obscuring which prevents conation, (3) Deluding Karmas which delude right belief and right conduct, (4) Obstructive, which prevent the manifestation of soul-power. The other four are called non-destructive (*Aghātīya*). They are (1) feeling Karma, which brings about desirable and undesirable objects of pleasure-and-pain-feeling, (2) age Karma, which determines the duration of the soul's imprisonment in a condition of life, (3) body-making Karma which determines the formation of beautiful or ugly body, (4) family-determining Karma which invests the mundane soul with a high or low position or status. The most harmful of the 8 is the deluding Karma, which deludes the soul from right belief and right conduct. One who subdues delusion can conquer all the 8 Karmas and become a perfect conqueror.

ववहारस्स दरीसणमुवदेसो वण्णिदो जिणवरेहिं।  
जीवा एदे सव्वे अज्झवसाणादओ भावा।।46।।

*vavahārassa darīsaṇamuvadeso vaṇṇido jīṇavarehiṃ.  
jīvā ede sarve ajjhavasāṇādao bhāvā (46)*

46. All these thought-activities, attachment, etc., (are) souls. This has been described by the Conquerors as a statement from the practical standpoint.

#### COMMENTARY

If a question is raised : Attachment and all other thought-activities having been described in Jain Scriptures as due to the soul's modifications while here they are said not to belong to the soul, why should there be such different opinions on the same subject? The Ācārya answers : "Here they have been said to be material and not belonging to the soul, from the real point of view. Only from the practical standpoint, we can ascribe these material and impure thought-activities to the soul. Both opinions are correct, but each from its own different standpoint."

राया हू णिग्गदो त्ति य एसो बलसमुदयस्स आदेसो।  
ववहारेण दु उच्चदि तत्थेक्को णिग्गदो राया॥४७॥

*rāyā hu ṇiggado tti ya eso balasamudayassa ādeso.  
vavahāreṇa du uccadi tattheikko ṇiggado rāyā (47)*

47. From the practical standpoint the remark is made of (his) military forces; "the king has gone out" (although not) the king only (but also his military forces are) gone out (with him).

#### COMMENTARY

It is from the practical point of view a mere attribution of soul, its base accompaniment. Really otherwise the soul, pure, and in the full possession of its essential self, stands out alone. In common parlance, for instance, we speak of the king going out, though it would not be without many others going out with him.

एमेव य ववहारो अज्झवसाणादिअण्णभावणं।  
जीवोत्ति कदो सुत्ते तत्थेक्को णिच्चिदो जीवो॥ ४८॥

*emeva ya vavahāro ajjhavasāṇādiṇṇabhāvāṇaṃ.  
jīvotti kado sutte tattheikko ṇicchido jīvo (48)*

48. And similarly from the practical standpoint this has been said in this Scripture that this non-soul thought-activity, attachment, etc., (is) the soul. From the real standpoint the soul in itself is alone.

#### COMMENTARY

The soul in itself is alone; it is separate from the impure thought-activity, attachment, etc. In practice, however, it is united with its own non-self thought-activity, which is the result of the operation of its Karmic matter. Practical standpoint speaks of a thing so as to misrepresent its reality for the sake of explanation to the people in general. As a king may go out with his army, and it may be said that the king has gone out. Literally the words mean that it is the king only that has gone out. The going out of the army is not expressed in this imperfect, practical way of talking. Similarly the impure thought-activities are called soul, because they are connected with the soul. If we analyze, we shall find the soul as a pure knowing substance, entirely different from these thought-activities.

अरसमरूवमगंघं अब्बत्तं चेदणागुणमसद्धं।  
जाण अलिंगगगहणं जीवमणिद्धिसंठाणं॥४९॥

*arasamarūvamagaṅgaṃ avvattaṃ cedaṇāguṇamasaddhaṃ.  
jāṇa alingaggahaṇaṃ jīvamaniḍḍhisamṭhāṇaṃ (49)*

49. Know the soul (to be) without taste, without colour, without smell, invisible, without sound, with consciousness as its attribute, cognizable by no (external) sign and without any material shape.

## COMMENTARY

This Gāthā distinguishes the soul from matter, which has necessarily colour, smell, taste, touch and a material shape. Material molecules can be visible and known by their figures. The soul on the other hand is the immaterial conscious substance and can only be realized by itself in self-absorption. It is no doubt with some form which in reality has power to pervade throughout the whole universe but owing to the operation of body-sub-class of body-making Karma, it contracts and expands according to the particular body occupied by it in its mundane condition. Thus it is said to be equal in size to the body which it occupies, but in the liberated condition it retains only a little less than the outline of its last body, because the body-making Karma being destroyed contraction and expansion of the soul are no longer possible.

जीवस्स णत्थि वण्णो णवि गंभो णवि रसो णवि य फासो।  
णवि रूवं ण सरीरं णवि संठाणं ण संहणणं॥50॥

*jīvassa ṇatthi vaṇṇo ṇavi gaṅgho ṇavi raso ṇavi ya phāso.*  
*ṇavi rūvaṃ ṇa sarīraṃ ṇavi saṅghāṇaṃ ṇa saṃhaṇaṇaṃ (50)*

50. In the soul, there is no colour, neither smell, nor taste and neither touch, nor materiality, nor body, nor (physical) figuration, nor (physical) constitution.

## COMMENTARY

This Gāthā further expands the description of the soul as given in the previous Gāthā.

The material body has all these qualities while the soul has none of these.

जीवस्स णत्थि रागो णवि दोसो णेव विज्जदे मोहो।  
णो पच्चया ण कम्मं णोकम्मं चावि से णत्थि॥51॥

*jīvassa ṇatthi rāgo ṇavi doṣo ṇeva vijjāde mo ho.*  
*ṇo paccayā ṇa kammaṃ ṇokammaṃ cāvi se ṇatthi (51)*

51. In the soul, there is no attachment, nor hatred, nor is there (any) delusion, nor *Pratyaya* (i.e., the causes of bondage, wrong-belief, etc.), neither Karmic matter, and there is no quasi-karma matter also in it.

## COMMENTARY

From the pure real point of view the soul is devoid of all passionate thought-activities due to the operations of deluding Karma. Causes of inflow and bondage of Karmas are wrong belief, vowlessness, carelessness, passion and vibratory activity, through mind, body and speech. All these are the results of the operation of Karmas. So in a real soul, all the causes of bondage are absent. Material Karmic molecules out of which Karmas are bound in the form of our Karmic bodies and assimilative or *Āhāra* molecules, out of which physical, fluid and assimilative bodies are formed, are all matter. They can never be soul. Soul is always free from these.

जीवस्स णत्थि वग्गो ण वग्गणा णेव फद्धया केई।  
णो अज्झप्पहाणा णेव य अणुभायटाणा वा॥52॥

*jīvassa ṇatthi vaggero ṇa vaggerā ṇeva phaddhaya keī.*  
*ṇo ajjhappahāṇā ṇeva ya aṇubhāyattāṇā vā (52)*

52. In the soul, there is no *Varga* (i.e., a group of the degrees of a particular attribute in an atom), nor *Vaggerā* (i.e., a group of *Vargas*), nor *Spardhaka* (i.e., a group of *Vaggerā*s) whatsoever, neither any degree of attachment or impure thought-activity, nor any degree of fruition.

## COMMENTARY

*Varga*, *Vaggerā*, *Spardhaka* are all material. Degrees of attachment and those of fruition appear in impure, un bodied souls, but they are entirely due to operation of Karmic matter only. The real soul is different and always free from all these impurities.

जीवस्स णत्थि केई जोगट्ठाणा ण बंधटाणा वा।  
णेव य उदयट्ठाणा णो मग्गणट्ठाणया केई।।53।।

*jīvassa ṇatthi keī jogatṭhāṇā ṇa baṇḍhaṭṭhāṇā vā.  
ṇeva ya udayatṭhāṇā ṇo maggaṇatṭhāṇaya keī (53)*

53. In the soul there is no place whatsoever for the soul's vibratory activity (which causes inflow of Karmic matter), nor any place for bondage. And there is no place of operation (of Karmas) nor any place of soul-quest whatsoever.

#### COMMENTARY

*Mārgaṇā* is a condition in which a mundane soul is necessarily found. There are 4 such sets of conditions.

*Gati* Condition of existence—These are of 4 kinds—human, sub-human, hellish and celestial.

*Indriya*. Senses—They are 5—touch, taste, smell, sight and hearing

*Kaya*. Body—It is of 6 kinds—earth, water, fire, air, vegetable and mobile bodies.

*Yoga*. Soul's vibrations—They are of 15 kinds—

1. Mind vibration, true.
2. Mind vibration, false.
3. Mind vibration, mixed, true and false.
4. Mind vibration, neutral, neither true nor false.
5. Speech vibration, true.
6. Speech vibration, false.
7. Speech vibration, mixed, true and false.
8. Speech vibration, neutral, neither true nor false.
9. Body vibration, physical.
10. Body vibration, physical mixed with Karmic.
11. Body vibration, fluid.
12. Body vibration, fluid mixed with Karmic.
13. Body vibration, assimilative.
14. Body vibration, assimilative mixed with physical.
15. Body vibration, Karmic.

*Veda*. Sex- It is of 3 kinds—masculine, feminine, common.

*Kaśāya*. Passions- They are of 4 kinds—anger, pride, deceit and greed.

*Jñāna*. Knowledge-It is of 8 kinds- sensitive, scriptural, visual, mental, perfect, and wrong-sensitive, wrong-scriptural and wrong visual.

*Samyama*. Restraint-It is of 7 kinds—equanimity, recovery of equanimity after downfall, pure and absolute non-injury, slightest delusion, passionless, partial control, and non-control.

*Darśana*. Conation : It is of 4 kinds—ocular, non-ocular, visual and perfect.

*Leśyā*. Thought-paint : It is of 6 kinds—black, blue, dovegrey, yellow, pink and white.

*Bhavya*. It is of 2 kinds—capacity or incapacity of being liberated.

*Samyaktva*. Right belief. It is of 6 kinds—subsidential, destructive, destructive-subsidential, wrong-belief, downfall, mixed right and wrong belief.

*Sanjna*. It is of 2 kinds—rational and irrational.

*Akaraka*. It is of 2 kinds—taking or not-taking, no-Karmas or assimilative matter.

All these divisions of soul-quests are marked out with reference to the results of the operation of different

Karmas. The pure soul has perfect knowledge, perfect conation, right belief and pure right conduct. These have no reference to any operation of Karmas. Every soul from the real standpoint is free from all these distinctions of soul-quests. *Gommaṭsāra Jīva Kāṇḍa* deals in detail with these 14 soul-quests and *Karma Kāṇḍa* with degrees of vibratory activity, bondage-places and operation-places. (Vide S.B.J. Vols. V and VI).

णो ठिदि बंधहाणा जीवस्स ण संकिलेसहाणा वा।  
 णेव विसोहिहाणा णो संजमलद्धिहाणा वा।।54।।  
*ṇo ṭhidi bandhatthāṇā jīvassa ṇa saṅkilesaṭhāṇā vā.*  
*ṇeva visohiṭṭhāṇā ṇo sanjamaladdhiṭṭhāṇā vā (54)*

54. And in the soul (there is) no place of the duration of bondage, nor any place of passioned agitation. And also no place of mild passionateness nor any place of attainment of restraint.

#### COMMENTARY

All these are due to Karmic bondage. So far as passions only subside, places of restraint are acquired. But when they are destroyed, the soul in reality is full of perfect restraint.

णेव य जीवहाणा ण गुणहाणा य अत्थि जीवस्स।।  
 जेण दु एदे सव्वे पोग्गलदव्वस्स परिणामा।।55।।  
*ṇeva ya jīvatthāṇā ṇa guṇatthāṇā ya atthi jīvassa.*  
*jeṇa du ede savve poggaladavvassa pariṇāmā (55)*

55. And also (there) are no soul-classes, nor spiritual stages in the soul. Because, certainly all these conditions are caused by material substance (namely, karmic and physical matter).

#### COMMENTARY

Classes of Soul : (*Jīva Samasa*) are 14. They are :—

- Bādara Ekendriya*, gross-bodied, one-sensed souls;
- Sūkṣma Ekendriya*, fine-bodied, one-sensed souls;
- Dvīndriya* gross-bodied two-sensed souls;
- Trīndriya* gross-bodied three-sensed souls;
- Chaturīndriya* gross-bodied four-sensed souls;
- Asanni pañchēndriya* gross-bodied Irrational five-sensed souls;
- Sanni pañchēndriya* gross-bodied rational five-sensed souls;

Each of these 7 is of 2 kinds—*Paryāpta* with developability viz the gaining within one *Antar-Mūhurta*, by the soul of the capacity to develop fully the characteristics of the body into which it incarnates; *Aparyāpta* with undevelopability : not so gaining, but dying within one *Antar-Mūhurta*. The spiritual stages are fourteen—wrong belief, downfall, mixed, vowless-right belief, partial vow, imperfect vow, perfect vow, new thought-activity, advanced thought-activity, slightest delusion, subsided-delusion, delusionless, vibratory omniscient, non-vibratory omniscient. All these stages are ascribed to the soul with reference to delusion and vibratory activity. Both these are absent in a pure soul. The 14 classes also are due to the effect of body-making-Karma and so they are absent in a real soul. For a detailed description of the soul-classes, and spiritual stages, consult *Gommaṭsāra Jīva Kāṇḍa* S.B.J. Vol. V.

ववहारेण दु एदे जीवस्स हवन्ति वण्णमादीया।  
 गुणठाणता भावा ण दु केई णिच्छयणयस्स।।56।।  
*vavahāreṇa du ede jīvassa havanti vaṇṇamādīyā.*  
*guṇaṭhāṇatā bhāvā ṇa du keī ṇicchayaṇayassa (56)*

56. Although from the practical standpoint these are (found) in the soul from colour up to stages of spirituality, yet from the real standpoint (there are) no (such) conditions whatever.

#### COMMENTARY

Looked at from the practical standpoint, all these conditions may be said to appertain to a mundane soul. Soul in its pure nature is, however, free of, and different from, these.

एदेहि य संबंधो जहेव खीरोदयं मुणेदव्वो।  
णय ह्ति तस्स ताणि दु उव्वओगगुणाधिगो जम्हा।।57।।  
*edehi ya sambandho jaheva khīrodayaṃ muṇeḍavvo.*  
*ṇaya huṃti tassa tāṇi du uvaogagunaādhigo jamhā (57)*

57. And the connection with these (conditions) should be known (to be) the same as (that of) milk (with) water. But all these are not in the soul, because (it is really) full of the attribute of conscious-attentiveness (i.e., perfect conation and knowledge).

#### COMMENTARY

All the impure thought-activities and conditions of soul are due to its being bound by Karmic matter, the effects of which are infinitely more wonderful, mysterious and powerful than electric currents. If this Karmic matter is separated from the soul, the soul becomes its pure self, an enlightened Being full of All-knowledge, conation, happiness and power. But as pure water mixed with milk loses its ownness and is called milk; so this soul, though pure, mixed with Karmic dirt has lost its soulness; and its material conditions are given the name of soul. A right-believer should therefore make a clear distinction between the two, and giving up attachment with what is foreign to him should believe his soul to be potentially possessed of all the attribute of the pure soul.

पंधे मुस्संतं पस्सिदूण लोगा भणंति ववहारो।  
मुस्सदि एसो पंधो ण य पंधो मुस्सदे कोई।।58।।  
*paṇthe mussantaṃ passidūṇa logā bhaṇanti vavahārō.*  
*mussadi eso paṇho ṇa ya paṇho mussade koī (58)*

58. Common people, seeing some one looted, in the way, say, “the way is looted”, but no way whatsoever is (really) looted.

तह जीवे कम्मणं णोकम्मणं च पस्सिदुं वण्णं।  
जीवस्स एस वण्णो जिणेहि ववहारदो उत्तो।।59।।  
*taha jīve kammaṇaṃ ṇokammaṇaṃ ca passidūṃ vaṇṇaṃ.*  
*jīvassa esa vaṇṇo jiṇehi vavahārado utto (59)*

59. Similarly, seeing the Karmic matter and colour of physical matter in the soul, (it) has been said by the conquerors from the practical standpoint, “this colour (is) of the soul.”

#### COMMENTARY

The expression “This road is looted” only means that the travelers proceeding by that road are robbed, and not that the road itself is the subject of robbery. Similarly, in common parlance, from the practical standpoint, we speak of mundane souls as black, white, red, one-sensed or five-sensed, gross, fine, beautiful, ugly. This is but the practical point of view. These phrases are not true in their literal sense. The wise know that colour, touch, taste, senses, etc., are attributed of matter only, and cannot properly be predicated of the true soul. From the pure real standpoint therefore, the soul is only itself, pure, perfect and immaterial; and all the qualities of colour, etc., are true of it only from the practical point of view, as in its mundane condition it is bound with matter, and these qualities are rightly predicable of matter.

एवं गंधरसफासरूवा देहो संठाणमाइया जे या  
सव्वे ववहारस्स य णिच्छयदण्हू ववदिसंति।।60।।



*evam gamdharasaphasarivā deho samthānamāiyā je ya.  
sarve vavahārassa ya nicchayadaṇhū vavadisarnti (60)*

60. Similarly taste, smell, touch, bodily-figure, etc, which have all been described (before), (have been described) from the practical standpoint—thus do the seers of reality preach.

#### COMMENTARY

All the conditions produced in souls bound up with Karmic matter, as described in Gathas 55 to 60, are ascribed to souls from the practical point of view only. Even the spiritual stages or the gradual increases of purity are not of the nature of a soul, when it is considered from the real point of view. The soul is quite free from all these soul classes, soul-quests and stages. They are relations and conditions springing up from its connection with matter.

तत्त्वभवे जीवाणं संसारत्थाण हौति वण्णादी।  
संसारपमुक्काणं णत्थि दु वण्णादओ केई।।61।।  
*tatthabhave jīvāṇam saṃsāratthāṇa hoṃti vaṇṇādī  
saṃsārapamukkāṇam ṇatthi du vaṇṇādao keī (61)*

61. In particular incarnations of mundane souls colour, etc., are (found). But in (the souls) liberated from cycle of existence there are no colour, etc., whatsoever.

#### COMMENTARY

Colour, etc., cannot be the attributes of a soul. Attributes are always inseparable from their substances, while colour, etc., are only seen in the material bodies, as belonging to matter. As soul is connected with them, they too are ascribed to souls from the practical point of view. When souls are free from material bondage, these vanish like passing sunshine and shade. Had they been attributes, they would not have become disassociated but must have been found in pure souls also.

जीवो चेव हि एदे सव्वे भाव ति मणसे जदि हि।  
जीवस्साजीवस्स य णत्थि विसेसो दु दे कोई।।62।।  
*jīvo ceva hi ede sarve bhāva ti maṇṇase jadi hi  
jīvassājīvassa ya ṇatthi viśeso du de koī (62)*

62. And also if thou holdest certainly all these conditions (to be) in the soul, really, then in reality (there) does not remain (any) difference whatsoever between the soul and the non-soul.

#### COMMENTARY

The special qualifications of matter are colour, etc., which distinguish it from soul and other immaterial substances. If these attributes be taken to be of the inseparable nature of the soul matter alone will be the existing substance. But that is impossible because the nature of consciousness which is the inseparable nature of soul is evident to all, and is not found in non soul substances.

अह संसारत्थाणं जीवाणं तुज्झ हौति वण्णादी।  
तम्हा संसारत्था जीवा रूवित्तमावण्णा।।63।।  
*aha saṃsāratthāṇam jīvāṇam tujjha hoṃti vaṇṇādī  
tamhā saṃsāratthā jīvā rūvittamāvaṇṇā (63)*

63. If (thou believest) colour, etc., to be (inseparably connected) with mundane souls, then mundane souls will acquire materiality.

#### COMMENTARY

This in fact amounts to identifying matter with soul.

एवं पोगलदव्वं जीवो तह लक्खणेण मूढमदी।  
णिव्वाणमुवगदो वि य जीवत्तं पोगलो पत्तो।।64।।

*evam poggaladvvam jīvo taha lakkhaṇeṇa mūḍhamadī  
nirvāṇamuvagado vi ya jīvattam poggalo patto (64)*

64. O thou, of perverse intellect, thus from thy mode of talk the material substance would become soul. And then matter, having attained Liberation, will acquire soulness.

#### COMMENTARY

In discarding the real standpoint, we lose all distinction between soul and non-soul. For, if the soul is inseparably united with matter and material conditions, in Liberation also it will carry this inseparable matter with it. That is, matter will attain Liberation. Liberation is absolute freedom from itself. This is absurd. Therefore the real standpoint is essential to proper consideration of soul. The fact is that though we may find colour, etc., and all material conditions in mundane souls, they are not the attributes of the soul. Water may be called dirty by being mixed with mud; but it cannot change itself into mud. A wise man always knows that dirtiness is a quality of mud and not of water. Similarly a soul may be called impure, angry, proud, bad, good, etc., owing to its may be called impure, angry, proud, bad, good, etc., owing to its connection with Karmic effects, but it is merely saying so in coming non speech. Really the soul cannot become other than what it is in its own pure nature.

एकं च दोषिण तिणिण य चत्तारि य पंच इदिया जीवा।  
बादरपञ्चत्तिदरा पयडीओ णामकम्मस्स॥६५॥

*ekkaṃ ca doṣṣiṇi tiṇṇi ya cattāri ya pañca indiyā jīvā.  
bādarapajjattidarā payadīo ṇāmakammaṣṣa (65)*

65. One and two, three and four, and five-sensed souls, gross and developable (*pariyāpta*) and their opposites (fine and undevelopable *sūkshma* and *apariyāpta*) (these are) natures (*prakṛti*) of body—making (*nāma*) karma.

एदेहि य णिव्वत्ता जीवट्टाणा दु करणभूदाहिं।  
पयडीहिं पोग्गलमर्हहिं ताहिं कह भण्णदे जीवो॥६६॥

*edehi ya nirvattā jīvattāṇā du karaṇabhūdahīṃ.  
payadīhiṃ poggalamāṭhiṃ tāhiṃ kaha bhāṇṇade jīvo (66)*

66. These classes of souls (14 jiva *samāsa*) are formed by their own material modifications, influenced by their auxiliary causes. How can they be called souls (in reality)?

#### COMMENTARY

A mundane soul is entangled in the bondage of the body-making Karma. It is of 93 kinds (*vide* Gommatasara Karma-Kanda, S.B.J., Vol. VI). The natures enumerated in Gatha 70 are included in these 93 sub-classes. Mundane souls are called one-sensed, etc., owing to the condition of the physical body as determined by the operation of this body-making Karma and its 93 sub-classes and innumerable varieties in these 93 sub-classes. They cannot be of the soul's own nature. Thus, from the real point of view, souls are free from all these material conditions

पञ्चत्तापञ्चत्ता जे सुहुमा बादरा य जे चेवा  
देहस्स जीवसण्णा सुत्ते ववहारदो उत्ता॥६७॥

*pajjattāpajjattā je suhumā bādarā ya je ceva.  
dehassa jīvasaṇṇā sutte vavahārado uttā (67)*

67. In the scripture the souls are said to be developable, undevelopable, fine and gross, (because) the soul's name is given to the body from the practical standpoint.

#### COMMENTARY

Here again the author clears up a doubt which may be entertained by a student who has read only such Jain scriptures in which the practical point of view is mainly dealt with, and in which all these conditions are

predicated, being conditions of the soul. Though ascribed to souls, souls by their own nature, are really not these. The soul in its pure state is free from the distinction of developability or otherwise.

मोहणकम्मस्सुदया दु वण्णिदा जे इमे गुणहाणा।  
ते कह हवन्ति जीवा जे णिच्चमचेदणा उत्ता॥६८॥

*mohaṇakammassudayā du vaṇṇidā je ime guṇaḥāṇā.  
te kaha havanti jīvā je ṇiccamacedaṇā uttā (68)*

68. And these spiritual stages which are said (to be) due to the operation of deluding Karmas, how can they be souls? They are always said to be devoid of (pure) consciousness.

#### COMMENTARY

The so-called 14 spiritual stages are not the soul's real pure conditions. They are not found in liberation, in pure souls. They are due to the bondage of souls with deluding Karma and to vibrations caused by the operation of body-making Karma. Shri Kund-Kunda Acharya has done great good to seekers of Truth by pointing out the key of knowledge, for whosoever understands things only from practical point of view cannot acquire right belief (*vide* Gatha 14). One-sided view means wrong belief. In this second chapter, the author has refuted all the views of wrong-believers who described soul in different ways, and has proved that it is a real substance quite apart from all impure thought-activities. It is potentially God. This belief that I can God is a cause of attaining Godhood by concentrating one's attention upon one's Godhood itself.

The Author reiterates again the primary distinction between the Living and the non-Living. The two contradict each other. The one can never lose its own attributes and acquire the essential and special attributes of the other. The one can never become the other. The Living can in no way possibly become the non-Living. The non-Living can never become the living. The Living and it alone has Life, Consciousness, Attention, Knowledge and therefore moral and spiritual responsibility. The non-Living is incapable of Life, Consciousness, Attention and Knowledge. The non-Living substance, Matter, alone has touch, taste, colour, etc., forming the infinite variety of the objects of the Universe. The non-Matter Soul can never have touch, taste, colour, etc., etc., the attributes of Matter and of it alone. Indeed, the Soul—Pure Soul—may be said to be the Monarch of Siddha Shila, the Abode of the Liberated, at the top of the Universe, and of the whole Universe and non-Universe only from the point of view of its Omniscience. The Vibration, the Delusion, the Colour and Mundane existence of the Universe is certainly Matter, and it alone. Is Matter not thus a full and true paraphrase of Satan, as the theological conception of Evil, Sin, Temptation, Delusion, Limitation, Weakness, Sorrow, etc., etc.—the ever-present and seemingly so powerful an antithesis of God? In the aspect of Jainism as insisted upon by the Great Saint Kunda-Kunda in the first century B.C., in this book, God *versus* Satan becomes Pure Soul *versus* Matter. God is Pure Soul. Satan is Pure Matter, the tempter, seducer, deluder and Jailor of Soul. Our mundane condition is a child of Matter. The deluded Soul is bound with Matter; but non-the-less this Matter with all its variety and attraction and might is absolutely incapable of becoming anything but Matter itself, or of making Soul anything but the Soul itself. Indeed here, the Holy Preceptor Kunda-Kunda rushes up to the highest heights of pure monism of Vedanta, but is not captured by it. In glorifying the Soul and in insisting upon its independence of and entire freedom from Matter, he never forgets in the least the equal independence of and entire freedom from Soul, of Matter. The two are there. Both are mighty in their separate, individual natures. It is only a deluded person, who mistakes their temporary union and resultant mundane life as altering the true inner nature of either of the two. The thing to remember is that all mundane life is Matter-born, Matter. All its variety is Matter. This should be clearly realized. The Soul is different and quite distinct from this beautiful net and coil and dance of Matter, *Prakṛti* of the *Sāṃkhya* School of Philosophy. The spectator may be engrossed in the dancer, but he is not the dancer. The King may be in prison; but the King is not the prison, nor is the prison the King. And neither can ever become the other. The two are entirely different; and any view to the slightest degree contrary to this, spells delusion, mistake, perversity or wrong belief. The right-believer knows the unbridgeable gulf between the two and realizes the Soul as a supreme, essential, primary, eternal, indestructible reality.

## QUESTIONAIRES:

### I. Short questions

1. What is the meaning of "Samaya"?
2. Differentiate Sva-samay and Para-samaya?
3. What is the nature of pure-soul?
4. What is the usefulness of Empirical stand point ( vyavahamaya)?
5. Define the nature of Srutakevali?
6. A person with a right faith. Gives importance to which Naya, disclose it with an example.
7. What does mean by real and unreal (Bhutartha and Abhutartha)?
8. What is soul according to Suddha naya?
9. What is the identity of Apratibuddha? Write according to text?
10. Through which naya worship of Tirthankara is right? Prove it logically.
11. What is the meaning of Jitendriya or Jitamoha?
12. Define what is difference between unattachment of Moha and unattachment of Dharma.
13. By which naya volition of attachment is true? Give an example.
14. What is the nature of Jiva by ultimate view (Paramartha-vision)?
15. Give detail of this sentence "There is no intrinsic identity between jiva and varna"?

### II. Essay type questions

1. How can possible the co-existence of Non-conventional and Pragmatic (Niscaya and Vyavahāranaya) in spiritual Practices?
2. By the non-conventional point of view what is the nature of soul. Give detail?
3. By the empirical stand point what is the nature of soul? Illustrate it.
4. What are the thoughts of other Philosophers on the nature of Jiva? Criticise it.
5. What defects will come when we accept the support of jiva and varna? Give critical study in detail.
6. Write the introduction of Samayasara with objects in detail?
7. "Ahamekko Khamo Suddho" give detail of this sentence and also write the higher unity of soul.

### 5.9 Reference Books.

1. Samayasara, Acharya Kunda-Kunda, Com. By Acharya Amrit Chandra tr. By Prof. A. Chakravarti, Pub. By Bharatiya Jnanpith, New Delhi.
2. Samayasara, Acharya Kundkunda Com. By Acharya Amritchandra tr. Brahmachari Sittal Prasada ji, Publ by Today Tomorrow's Printers & Publishers New Delhi, 1990

# **JAIN VISHVA BHARATI INSTITUTE**

(Deemed to be University)

LADNUN-341306 (RAJASTHAN)

**DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION**



प्रायस्स सास्त्रव्यसो

**M.A. JAINOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE  
RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY**

**PAPER-V  
JAIN AGAM**

*COPYRIGHT*

Jain Vishva Bharati Institute, Ladnun

*Edited By :*

*Dr. Samani Ritu Prajna*

*Dr. Yogesh Kumar Jain*

*Edition : 2017*

*Printed Copies :150*

Jain Vishva Bharati Institute (Deemed University) Ladnun

---

## ***CONTENTS***

---

UNIT	NAME OF CHAPTER	PAGE NO.
<i>Unit-1</i>	: <i>Ācārāṅga</i>	1
Unit - 2	: Sūtrakṛtāṅga	40
<i>Unit-3</i>	: <i>Bhagavatī</i>	87
Unit - 4 (A)	: Uttarādhyayan	119
Unit - 4 (B)	: Daśavaikālika- first chapter, a study	139
Unit-5	: Samayasāra	149

---

Jain Vishva Bharati Institute (Deemed University) Ladnun