

Article

Śrīmad Rājendra's Spiritual Biophilia from a Jain Perspective [†]

Cogen Bohanec 

Claremont School of Theology, Arihanta Institute, San Jose, CA 95135, USA; cogen.bohanec@arihantainstitute.org

[†] My gratitude to Arihanta Institute for supporting this research, to Rita Sherma for first suggesting my engagement with biophilia, and to Pramod Patel for instructing me in Śrīmad's tradition. All Gujarati translations herein are my own.

Abstract

This interdisciplinary study expands the concept of biophilia by integrating a mystical dimension—spiritual biophilia—through an in depth exploration of biophilic themes in the works of modern Jain Ācārya Śrīmad Rājendra. This paper aims to expand the concept of biophilia by incorporating a mystical aspect—spiritual biophilia—to emphasize the holistic nurturing of both the planet and the human spirit, promoting ecological ethics in the form of understanding a human spiritual connection to nature in contemporary society. By combining insights from ecology, mysticism, and Jain philosophy, this research aims to foster a deeper appreciation of nature's inherent value and promote ecological ethics. Śrīmad's writings and mystical insights provide valuable perspectives on how spiritual experiences can deepen connections to ecological preservation, foster interfaith dialogues on global environmental issues, and enrich contemporary environmental humanities through a biophilia lens. His insights support the biophilia hypothesis and its link to mystical experiences from a Jain perspective, potentially encouraging ethical stewardship and environmental care. The paper discusses key principles of biophilia and their significance to environmental ethics, focusing on mutual respect and ethical considerations for all living entities. It explores spiritual biophilia in Śrīmad Rājendra's writings and engages with traditional texts from his lineage that align with the biophilia hypothesis, advocating for sustainable living and environmental stewardship. By integrating a Jain perspective, this study seeks to enhance the biophilia hypothesis with spiritual and moral dimensions, promoting a deeper appreciation of nature's inherent value with broader implications for environmental education, policy, community engagement, and personal commitment to connecting with and preserving the natural world by considering the spiritual dimensions of human-nature relationships.

Keywords: biophilia; Śrīmad Rājendra; Jainism; mysticism; environmental ethics; *dharma* traditions



Academic Editor: Cristóbal
Serrán-Pagán y Fuentes

Received: 23 December 2025

Revised: 23 February 2026

Accepted: 25 February 2026

Published: 2 March 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the author.

Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland.

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.

1. Introduction

This interdisciplinary study expands the concept of biophilia by introducing what I term *spiritual biophilia* (Bohanec Forthcoming) through an examination of biophilic themes (defined below) in the life and writings of the modern Jain lay teacher and saint Śrīmad Rājendra (1867–1901). Śrīmad was a poet, contemplative, and guru whose teachings gave rise to a distinct yet broadly orthodox lineage of modern Jain spirituality. His thought is marked by a sense of revivalism, a strong critique of sectarianism, and an emphasis on *bhakti-mārga*—devotional commitment to the realized guru—as integral to liberation. Although he remained formally a householder, Śrīmad articulated a rigorous vision of

ethical restraint, contemplative vigilance, and experiential realization, translating classical Jain soteriology into a form responsive to the conditions of modern life.

From his early writings to his later retreats in forests and quiet lakeside settings, Śrīmad consistently turns to nature as a setting, catalyst, and exemplar of inner transformation. This trajectory includes his widely attested self-realization beneath a mango tree at Ut-tarasanda in 1890 (cf. [Salter 2002](#), pp. 68, 135–36) and his final period of retreat and teaching in Morbī. Across his corpus and lived practice, natural environments function not merely as symbols of impermanence and interdependence but as formative settings that embody and cultivate virtues such as forgiveness, equanimity, and passionlessness. Read through the lens of virtue ethics, these dispositions represent not only moral qualities but a vision of the *telos*—the fully realized moral and spiritual self. When interpreted through a MacIntyrean lens ([MacIntyre \[1984\] 2015](#)), biophilia positions nature as an exemplar of the *telos*—the vision of human flourishing that gives coherence and direction to a virtue-ethical framework.

By combining insights from ecology, mysticism, and Jain philosophy, this study demonstrates how Śrīmad Rājendra's teachings illuminate a holistic connection between human spiritual flourishing and ecological care. His writings and contemplative practices provide valuable perspectives on how mystical experience can deepen bonds with the natural world, foster ecological stewardship, and enrich contemporary environmental humanities. Methodologically, the study focuses on two representative corpora that bookend Śrīmad's life: his early engagement with the *Dvādaśānuprekṣā* contemplations—explicitly dated in the *Vacanāmṛta*¹ ([Rājendra 2012](#); hereafter VĀ) as written “before his seventeenth year”² (*varṣa sattara māṃ paṭhelā*, VĀ 10, pp. 15–22)—and his final Morbī discourses (VĀ 959) delivered in 1898–1899, shortly before his death at age thirty-three. Read together, these materials trace a sustained and evolving engagement with nature as a contemplative, ethical, and soteriological resource.

Engaging both classical Jain contemplations and Śrīmad's later reflections, this paper advances my previous application of the biophilia hypothesis to the soteriology of *dharma* traditions ([Bohanec Forthcoming](#)) by grounding it in a distinctly Jain soteriological vision—one that integrates ecological ethics with the cultivation of virtues necessary for liberation. In doing so, it gestures toward implications for environmental education, policy, and community engagement, while also inviting personal commitments to align spiritual practice with the preservation of the natural world.

2. Biophilia Defined

The biophilia hypothesis proposes that humans possess an innate need to affiliate with natural biosystems. This inclination extends beyond material survival to include aesthetic, intellectual, cognitive, and spiritual fulfillment ([Kellert 1993](#), p. 20). Stephen Kellert emphasizes that conservation is most effectively supported when it is grounded in the meaningful, life-enriching ways people experience nature, rather than in material incentives alone ([Kellert 1993](#), pp. 64–66). Properly understood, biophilia thus articulates a broadly shared ecological ethic—one in which people value the natural world in ways that historically supported human health and flourishing and that, in contemporary contexts, continue to foster self-development and well-being.

Roger Ulrich lends support for the biophilia hypothesis by examining the psychological and physiological dynamics of human responses to natural environments. He identifies an evolved “approach response” to non-threatening natural settings, in which rapid affective and bodily shifts facilitate stress reduction and psychological recovery. Drawing on both long-term observations and empirical research, Ulrich shows that exposure to nature reliably lowers stress and restores psychological balance. The evidence that he cites spans hospital rooms, prisons, urban parks, and wilderness areas. Patients recovering

from surgery heal more quickly and with fewer complications when their windows look out on greenery rather than brick walls. Prisoners with views of farmlands and forests require fewer health services than those facing bare yards. Even brief exposure to natural imagery—landscape murals, aquaria, or scenic views—reduces anxiety in clinical settings. In urban parks and wilderness areas, visitors consistently associate stress reduction with savanna-like landscapes—scattered trees, open grass, and gentle water features—as well as with lush vegetation and expansive vistas. Ulrich notes that “restoration” extends beyond stress recovery alone, encompassing relief from fatigue and understimulation (Ulrich 1993, pp. 100–9).

In addition to stress reduction, nature supports higher-order cognition. Exposure to natural environments not only restores attention but also facilitates creative problem-solving, remote association, and integration of diverse information. Studies show that participants who walk in natural settings perform better on cognitive tasks and report more positive emotional states than those who walk in urban areas or remain sedentary. Psychophysiological measures confirm that natural exposure engages parasympathetic systems and reduces arousal, reinforcing the sense that such settings uniquely foster cognitive clarity. Ulrich even speculates that human creativity may be sustained at higher levels in environments designed with natural views (Ulrich 1993, pp. 102–14).

Taken together, Kellert’s emphasis on intrinsic value and Ulrich’s account of nature’s restorative effects point toward what a dharmic articulation of spiritual biophilia might entail. Such an approach involves disciplined practices that intentionally draw upon humanity’s affinity with natural landscapes to cultivate compassion, mindfulness, and moral insight, while remaining consonant with empirical findings that link nature exposure to reduced stress and enhanced creativity. In this way, a dharmic spiritual biophilia both aligns with contemporary scientific research and extends it into ethical and soteriological domains, affirming nature’s intrinsic worth while grounding ecological responsibility in concern for both planetary well-being and human flourishing.

By *spiritual biophilia*, I refer to an extension of the biophilia hypothesis that foregrounds the religious, contemplative, and ethical dimensions of humanity’s innate affiliation with the natural world. Building on Roger Ulrich’s and Stephen Kellert’s accounts of biophilia especially as encompassing aesthetic, cognitive, and spiritual dimensions beyond material survival, this framework highlights how *dharma* traditions—especially Jain, Buddhist, and Hindu sources—understand nature not merely as an object of appreciation or conservation, but as a formative context for virtue cultivation, contemplative discipline, and liberative insight. As developed in a forthcoming study (Bohanec Forthcoming), spiritual biophilia describes how sustained engagement with natural environments supports the cultivation of virtues such as compassion, equanimity, restraint, and attentiveness, while situating ecological ethics within an intrinsic rather than instrumental valuation of both human and non-human life. In this sense, spiritual biophilia integrates environmental humanities with virtue ethics and contemplative traditions, advancing biophilia as a moral-spiritual orientation as much as an ecological one.

3. Biophilia in the *Dharma* Traditions

Previous work has argued that the *dharma* traditions of South Asia—especially Jainism, Buddhism, and Hinduism—provide distinctive insights that deepen our understanding of the biophilia hypothesis, thereby broadening its significance for environmental ethics (Bohanec Forthcoming). That study offers a textual exploration of the intersections between these traditions and the environmental humanities, proposing that the biophilia hypothesis is not merely compatible with *dharma* worldviews but is enriched by them. The paper began by outlining the foundations of biophilia as originally developed by E. O. Wilson

but particularly supported by the works of Stephen Kellert and Roger Ulrich (amongst others), emphasizing its claim that human beings possess an innate tendency to focus on life and biotic processes. Building from this premise, I argued that *dharma* traditions contribute distinctive conceptual and ethical resources that deepen the biophilia hypothesis and orient it toward environmental stewardship and care (Bohanec Forthcoming). This thesis was advanced through three interlocking moves: first, situating *dharma* doctrines in relation to the conceptual and ethical significance of biophilia; second, drawing out motifs of what I termed *spiritual biophilia* within traditional texts; and third, underscoring how the cultivation of ecological consciousness is inseparable from the cultivation of inner virtues in *dharma* traditions.

A related study develops this same logic of the relationship between internal states and the external environment through the lens of ecopsychology, arguing that environmental destruction is not only a matter of policy and technology but also a symptom of damaged patterns of desire, identity, and meaning. Ecopsychology proposes that ecocide is driven, in part, by unhealthy psychological tendencies that seek comfort, status, and control through consumption, and it therefore treats ecological repair as inseparable from forms of psychological restoration. I suggested that Jain thought offers unusually precise resources for this diagnosis: the tradition frames harmful consumption and domination as expressions of attachment (*rāga*) and delusion (*moha*), sustained by acquisitiveness (*parigraha*), and it locates the remedy not merely in external restraint but in the cultivation of ethical and contemplative dispositions—nonviolence (*ahimsā*), self-restraint (*saṁyama*), vigilance (*apramāda*), and the gradual attenuation of passion (*kaṣāya*). In this sense, my ecopsychology paper clarifies the stakes of spiritual biophilia by naming the psychological mechanisms through which a disrupted relationship to nature becomes a disrupted relationship to the self, and conversely how contemplative and ethical formation can support ecological care (Bohanec 2026a).

A key motif that I have identified in my work on ecopsychology, biophilia, and the *dharma* traditions is the dialectic between the virtues and dangers of nature and their corresponding likenesses within our own psyche. I wrote that “motifs of spiritual biophilia in the *dharma* traditions reveal that nature embodies both ideals to be cultivated and dangers to avoid both of which are analogous to our own uncultivated minds, evincing the interconnectedness of our psyches and the natural world” (Bohanec Forthcoming). This allows the texts to map natural landscapes onto the human psyche: the grove, the mountain, or the river is not only external but mirrors the internal topography of afflictions (*kleśa*) and virtues (*guṇa*). On this basis, I constructed a syllogism:

Nature possesses ideals that we are to cultivate, and nature also is dangerous like our own uncultivated minds. The dangerous aspects of nature and the dangerous aspects of our minds are interconnected. . . . To cultivate the qualities of nature, one must immerse in nature (meditatively, or literally), and by overcoming the harshness of nature, we overcome our own internal afflictions since they seem to be connected. . . . Therefore, to cultivate the virtuous qualities of nature within ourselves, we must overcome the harshness of nature and our own untutored, wild nature simultaneously. (Bohanec Forthcoming)

This formulation demonstrated the resonance between biophilia and *dharma* literature: spiritual progress requires both immersion in and transcendence of natural forces.³

Moreover, Jain, Buddhist, and Hindu sources articulate the intrinsic value of non-human beings, providing a religious-philosophical foundation for ecological stewardship. Within these traditions, nature is not merely a resource but a partner in ethical and spiritual cultivation. Texts repeatedly illustrate how forests, rivers, trees, and mountains provide the setting, metaphor, and substance for practices of restraint (*saṁyama*), compassion (*karuṇā*),

and detachment (*vairāgya*). Thus, spiritual biophilia emerges as a mode of perceiving and inhabiting the world in which nurturing the “planet, life, and the human spirit in a holistic manner” becomes a guiding principle (Bohanec Forthcoming).

Having thus established in my previous study that *dharma* traditions broadly support and extend the biophilia hypothesis, the present paper narrows its focus to the modern Jain mystic Śrīmad Rājendra. Śrīmad’s writings often exemplify the principle of spiritual biophilia in especially vivid ways: his contemplative use of natural imagery, his ethical emphases on nonviolence and compassion toward all beings, and his mystical insights into the interconnectedness of self and world all converge to articulate a uniquely Jain contribution to ecological thought. By situating Śrīmad’s life and teachings within the framework of biophilia, we may further enrich both our understanding of his spiritual vision and the broader project of ecological ethics.

In what follows, I propose four interrelated modes of spiritual biophilia in Śrīmad Rājendra’s thought: nature as a training-ground, as an exemplar of virtue and cultivation, as a restorative setting, and as a disciplinarian. These categories draw on Ulrich’s account of nature’s restorative effects and Kellert’s emphasis on meaning-making, while extending both frameworks into the moral and contemplative domains developed in my other publications. Read sequentially, natural environments first function as sites of disciplined formation, then as living exemplars of the virtues to be embodied, next as restorative contexts that recalibrate the aspirant’s inner equilibrium, and finally as disciplinarian forces that disclose impermanence, limitation, and karmic consequence. Across each mode, nature presents both challenge and instruction: its wildness mirrors untutored passions, while its order and tranquility model the virtues required for liberation. Together, these four modes provide a coherent framework for understanding how Śrīmad Rājendra operationalizes spiritual biophilia as a pedagogy of ethical and soteriological transformation.

4. Training-Ground Biophilia

Training-ground biophilia refers to the fact that natural environments serve as practical contexts for spiritual cultivation—settings in which the conditions necessary for sustained attentiveness, recollection, and inward discipline are most readily available. This mode describes how nature functions less as a symbol than as an atmosphere, an enabling field in which vigilance, steadiness of attention, and contemplative effort can be practiced without the constant interruptions characteristic of social and commercial life. Natural environments thus operate both as sources of formative imagery for contemplation and as lived pedagogical spaces that support prolonged inward examination.

In what follows, I will situate Śrīmad Rājendra’s teachings by juxtaposing his earliest contemplative reflections with his later patterns of physical retreat, showing how themes of nature persist across both his early thought and his mature practice. For example, the *Dvādaśānupreṣā* passages cited below, composed when he was only fifteen years old, reveal an early internal training in perceiving impermanence, dispersal, and karmic law through imaginal engagement with natural and cosmological processes. These youthful contemplations establish a perceptual and ethical orientation that later finds concrete expression in Śrīmad’s repeated withdrawal into forests, riverbanks, and sparsely populated landscapes. As the sections below will show, his final teachings in the natural environments of Morbī exemplify training-ground biophilia, where his immersion in nature serves to foster sustained awareness, karmic discernment, and spiritual steadiness. In this sense, training-ground biophilia names the way natural environments function as conditions of spiritual maturation, shaping the aspirant through an ongoing, dialectical relationship with nature.

4.1. Early Training-Ground Biophilia

Some of the earliest articulations of training-ground biophilia in Śrīmad Rājcandra's writings appear, impressively composed before he was sixteen years old, in his purports (*anuvāda*) on the *Dvādaśānuprekṣā* section of the *Ratnakaraṇḍaśrāvaka-cāra*, a classical Jain lay manual (*śrāvaka-cāra*) traditionally attributed to Samantabhadra (variously dated between the second and sixth centuries CE in modern scholarship).⁴ Its purpose is not doctrinal completeness but contemplative formation: training perception, attention, and evaluative judgment through repeated engagement with natural, cosmological, and social imagery. Read in this light, the *Dvādaśānuprekṣā* passages (VĀ 10) preserve a record of the kinds of contemplative exercises Śrīmad was internalizing in his formative years. To instantiate this *training-ground* theme, I offer a brief indexing of the natural imagery employed in this text, reserving fuller analysis of its exemplary, restorative, and disciplinary functions for later sections.

Throughout these contemplations, natural imagery functions as a cognitive training device, repeatedly exposing the aspirant to patterned forms of dispersal and dissolution. Bodies perish like droplets of water (*pāṇīnā bindu*) or clusters of dew (*jhākaḥṇā puṁja*), pleasures vanish like rainbows (*indradhanuṣya*), and youth fades like the redness of twilight (*saṁdhyākālānī lālinī*, VĀ 10, p. 16). Even the body itself is imagined at the atomic level as scattering irreversibly into earth and sky⁵ (VĀ 10, p. 16). Social bonds are likewise framed through ecological and travel metaphors that function pedagogically. Family members are compared to travelers who gather briefly on a single ship (*eka jahāja*) and then disperse toward different destinations according to karma⁶ (VĀ 10, p. 16). Dwelling with kin is likened to resting beneath the shade of a tree at a crossroads, where travelers pause only temporarily before continuing onward⁷ (VĀ 10, p. 16). Birds gather in a tree without prior arrangement and disperse just as naturally⁸ (VĀ 10, p. 16), and entire families scatter like autumn clouds driven by seasonal winds⁹ (VĀ 10, p. 16). Celestial bodies rise and set again, seasons return in their appointed order, yet senses, youth, and lifespan do not return once spent¹⁰ (VĀ 10, p. 17). Life is likened to a river flowing from a mountain, whose waves never reverse course¹¹ (VĀ 10, p. 17). Old age, in particular, is rendered as a hostile ecological force that dismantles every support structure the aspirant might rely upon. It appears as a forest fire consuming the tree of youth, a dust-storm destroying the flowers of fortune, a tiger seizing the deer of erotic attachment, frost killing the lotus of austerity, and a blinding shower of dust obscuring the eye of knowledge¹² (VĀ 10, p. 17).

Crucially, this perceptual training is explicitly oriented toward action. After rehearsing impermanence through these dense ecological images, Śrīmad issues a directive that one must “rise quickly for the benefit of the soul”¹³ (VĀ 10, p. 16). These are not ornamental metaphors; they function as aversive training, cultivating vigilance and disidentification before decline makes discipline impossible. Such images habituate the aspirant to irreversibility, sharpening attentiveness to urgency and opportunity. These images do not merely console or admonish; they train the mind to recognize impermanence as lawful rather than tragic, cultivating equanimity through literary and reflective repetition. Together, these metaphors train perception away from possessiveness, reframing attachment as provisional and relational life as a series of temporary encounters governed by karmic law.

In this training-ground mode, biophilia is neither soothing nor merely disciplinary; it is formative. Nature functions as a context of spiritual development by furnishing patterned realities—cycles, dispersals, limits, and irreversibilities—that the aspirant repeatedly contemplates until perception itself is reshaped. Even when encountered only through reflection and metaphor, the natural world provides a stable field against which human desire, attachment, and urgency can be recalibrated. This accords closely with the biophilia

hypothesis more generally, which holds that sustained engagement with natural forms enhances cognitive integration, emotional regulation, and attentional coherence. In Śrīmad Rājendra's early contemplations, nature already serves this training function: by contemplating likenesses between human experience and ecological law, the aspirant internalizes impermanence as intelligible, karmic order as lawful, and the urgency of spiritual effort while the conditions for practice are still obtainable. Before forests and secluded landscapes became lived environments of practice, nature had already assumed its role as a rigorous training ground for spiritual cultivation within Śrīmad's contemplative imagination.

4.2. Later Training Biophilia

Śrīmad's final year in Morbī (VS 1956/1899 CE¹⁴) represents the most concentrated period of his late-life teaching (considering that he died at age thirty-three.), and the environmental context of this period is indispensable for understanding his contemplative outlook. Morbī, a small town in the Kathiawar region of Gujarat, lies along the Machchhu River and was surrounded at the end of the nineteenth century by open plains, scattered groves, and lightly cultivated agricultural land. Compared to the dense commercial environments of Bombay and Ahmedabad, Morbī offered a notably quiet, sparsely populated landscape. His disciples later described it as unusually calm, with open space and few disturbances—precisely the sort of environment that had long supported his efforts toward inner detachment and concentration.

These later teachings cannot be separated from the trajectory of Śrīmad's life, particularly his increasing need for solitude and his progressive withdrawal from worldly engagements. As Salter documents, even after his early experience of self-realization, Śrīmad continued as a successful householder and businessman for several years, known for his scrupulous honesty and compassion.¹⁵ Yet during this same period he experienced growing frustration at the constant interruptions caused by admirers, seekers, and disciples who sought his company. He confessed to Lalluji, "Why are you after me? . . . I wish to stay here incognito and I do not want to be in contact with anybody." Throughout his adult life he made periodic retreats to remote areas of Gujarat "where he could practise his religion in solitude," and his biographers recall that by age thirty he renounced business, adopted celibacy, and increasingly lived "a life of a muni [sage] without any encumbrances internal or external" (Mehta and Sheth, quoted in Salter 2002, pp. 139–40).

Moreover, his pattern of withdrawal is inseparable from his worsening health. Salter notes that Śrīmad's mother consented to his long-desired initiation into mendicancy only on the condition that he recover from a persistent illness—but "Śrīmad never did recover" (Salter 2002, p. 140). His ailment predated the Morbī period and partly motivated his search for seclusion in environments conducive to rest, clarity, and contemplative renewal. When his condition deteriorated further after his stay in Morbī, he relocated to Rajkot for medical attention and died there on 9 April 1901, at the age of thirty-three. The Morbī discourses therefore constitute the last substantial body of teachings delivered before his death, shaped by both physical fragility and an intensified commitment to inner vigilance, surrounded by nature as a sort of spiritual training ground for his departure for this world.

This biographical arc—marked by retreat, illness, and persistent seeking of secluded natural spaces—illuminates why Morbī functioned as more than a change of scenery. In the *Vacanāmṛta*, Śrīmad explicitly links natural solitude, inner vigilance¹⁶ (*apramatta*), and karmic discernment. He repeats the classical Jain affirmation that "without leaving *saṃsāra*, the *apramatta* stage does not exist," where *saṃsāra* can be understood as worldly life in contrast to nature emphasizing that perfect attentiveness requires stepping out of ordinary social and perceptual entanglements¹⁷ (VĀ 959.6 p. 768). In the same discourse, he invokes the forest-dweller (*vanavāsini*) as the archetype of detachment: one who frees oneself from

the oscillation between worldly and non-worldly conduct and enters an environment structured by simplicity and perceptual quiet¹⁸ (VĀ 959.6 p. 768). This juxtaposition suggests a microcosm–macrocosm relationship: withdrawing into nature functions as a provisional analogue to the *apramatta-guṇasthāna*, a lived approximation of the clarity, stability, and unbroken attentiveness doctrinally associated with the later stages of the spiritual path.

It is within this framework that we may identify the emergence of training-ground biophilia. Here nature is a field in which spiritual capacities—awareness, steadiness, recollection—are trained. Nature provides the conditions necessary for spiritual advancement: spaciousness allowing unbroken awareness, rhythmic quiet enabling subtle impressions to settle, and perceptual simplicity supporting inwardness. Although the Morbī discourses contain only a handful of explicit references to natural settings, these few moments carry disproportionate doctrinal and pedagogical weight, revealing how Śrīmad understood natural environments to facilitate the slow formation of stable spiritual dispositions.

One such moment occurs when Śrīmad asks whether, “in a beautiful forest (*eka sundara vanamāṇ*),” the aspirant’s inward examination (*tapāsātā*) reveals the soul’s inherent purity (*nirmalpaṇuṇ*), thereby enabling the arising of *smṛti*—“mindfulness,” but also “memory,” including the heightened recollective capacity associated with knowledge of past lives¹⁹ (VĀ 959.6 p. 767). Nature here functions not as backdrop but as rehearsal space, an external ecology whose simplicity and quietude allow attentional and recollective faculties to intensify. In this sense, natural surroundings serve as an environmental analogue to the inner work of spiritual maturation: they cultivate the clarity, steadiness, and sustained awareness required for advancement on the path.

5. The Exemplar Function of Biophilia

If the *training-ground* function of biophilia shows that nature provides an ideal environment for spiritual development, the *exemplar* function begins to explain why this is so. In this mode, features of the natural world do more than offer supportive conditions for contemplation; they present blueprints for spiritual formation. The exemplar function reveals the qualities that must be cultivated—virtues rehearsed in nature and then embodied by the practitioner.

Stephen Kellert observes that biophilia includes aesthetic, symbolic, and spiritual resonances that exceed biological utility (Kellert 1993, p. 20). Śrīmad Rājcandra extends this into a contemplative pedagogy where the natural world becomes a model for the soul’s dormant excellences, both showing in accessible images and stimulating by immersion the dispositions that must be actualized inwardly. This exemplar function corresponds to what virtue ethicists such as MacIntyre describe as the *telos*—the envisioned form of the fully developed moral–spiritual self—without which ethical practices cannot cohere²⁰ (MacIntyre [1984] 2015, pp. 52–55). Through this lens, nature does not merely accompany contemplation; it embodies its aim, disclosing the virtues toward which the aspirant must progress. In Śrīmad’s writings, this exemplar role of biophilia provides a conceptual bridge between the stimulation of a training environment in relationship to nature and the developmental arc of spiritual maturation, while resonating with broader virtue-ethical frameworks (Bohanec 2024a, 2026b).

5.1. Early Exemplar Biophilia: Groves, Rivers, Seasons, and Sky as Models

Even in the *Dvādaśānupreṣā* discourse—whose dominant register remains disciplinary and diagnostic—Śrīmad occasionally allows nature to function in a more explicitly exemplar sense, disclosing the virtues that contemplative life aims to stabilize. Most clearly, he appeals to natural regularity as a model for equanimity: “Who can stop the sun when

it rises? Likewise, knowing that the rise of karma cannot be stopped, take refuge in an equanimous disposition (*śamatā-bhāva*)... one's own passionlessness (*vītarāga-bhāva*), contentment (*śantoṣa-bhāva*), and supreme equanimity (*parama śamatā-bhāva*)—that alone is refuge; there is no other refuge" (VĀ 10, p. 20). Here the sun's unimpeded course functions normatively, presenting steadiness and non-reactivity as dispositions to be embodied. The same logic governs Śrīmad's claim that "the soul's highest dispositions—such as forgiveness (*kṣamā*)—are themselves the refuge"²¹ (VĀ 10, p. 20). Forgiveness, like equanimity, is not commanded abstractly but disclosed as a mode of dwelling that absorbs injury without retaliation, much as nature receives disturbance without resistance.

A more compressed exemplar appears in the image of "the lotus of austerity" (*taparūpa kamala*), threatened by frost²² (VĀ 10, p. 17, para. 1), where purity and discipline are cast as delicate virtues requiring protection rather than force. Taken together, these passages show that even within its largely disciplinary framework, the *Dvādaśānupreksā* gestures toward an exemplar logic: nature becomes a quiet mentor of forbearance, steadiness, and passionless clarity.

5.2. Later Exemplar Biophilia

In the Morbī discourses, the exemplar function of biophilia does not appear as a dominant or elaborated theme, yet it becomes more discernible in the way Śrīmad Rājcandra deploys natural imagery with increased selectivity and precision. Unlike earlier passages, where nature often functions as a training ground or as a cautionary mirror of impermanence, the Morbī analogies are fewer but more tightly aligned with specific moral dispositions. These images do not expand the range of biophilic themes so much as clarify their pedagogical direction, allowing nature to serve—occasionally but decisively—as a model for inner virtues such as equanimity (*śamatā*), tolerance and forgiveness (*kṣamā*), and passionless detachment (*vītarāga*).

One of the most important biophilic images is Śrīmad's reflection on the "beautiful forest" as an environment that is ideal as a spiritual training ground that we mentioned above. Here, as we have seen, the soul's intrinsic purity (*nirmalpaṇṇam*) becomes discernible through internal examination (*tapāsatā*), giving rise to heightened mindfulness and memory (*smṛti*), including even the recollection of past lives (*jāṭismaraṇa*) (VĀ 959.6 p. 767, above). A few paragraphs later, Śrīmad clarifies the mechanics of such emergence through a horticultural analogy: just as the grafting of mango trees succeeds only when surrounding conditions are favorable (*sānukūlatā*), so too does past-life memory arise only when the aspirant possesses the appropriate inner aptitudes generated by karmic subsidence and destruction (*kṣayaopaśama*)²³ (VĀ 959.6 pp. 767–68). This analogy signals a decisive shift from nature as mere ambience to nature as exemplar. Spiritual development, Śrīmad suggests, is not a mechanical achievement but a process of cultivating qualities exemplified by the image of grafting a tree. Wild, uncultivated nature corresponds to the untrained mind: rich in potential yet uneven, unstable, and easily disrupted. Cultivated nature, by contrast, reveals what those same natural potentials can become under patient guidance, repetition, and disciplined care. Just as a grafted mango tree expresses sweetness and structure otherwise latent in the wild, the cultivated soul expresses equanimity, clarity, and non-attachment otherwise obscured by karmic agitation. In this sense, the orchard itself becomes a macrocosmic analogue of the cultivated inner life: an ordered, rhythmic, self-regulating ecology that mirrors the aspirant's emerging internal ecology. As argued elsewhere (Bohanec Forthcoming), this cultivated–uncultivated nature contrast functions across *dharma* traditions as a central biophilic schema for moral and spiritual formation.

Śrīmad reinforces this exemplar logic through a carefully structured ecological analogy that clarifies how perception and attention should function in the midst of desire.

He observes that wind (*pavana*) can agitate water and set it into motion without ever compromising its purity²⁴ (VĀ 959.30.6 p. 784). In Śrīmad's own explanation, the water represents the soul's knowledge (*ātmā-na jñāna*), whose intrinsic clarity remains intact, while the wind represents the activity of karma and passion, which disturbs the surface without corrupting the depths. What appears as agitation is thus not a loss of purity but a movement caused by external forces. The analogy becomes ethically and contemplatively instructive when read alongside Śrīmad's distinction between types of desire (*rāga*). He insists that all desire has a bitter underlying flavor (*kaḍavo svabhāva*), even when it takes the form of merit (*punya*), and distinguishes between auspicious attachment (*praśasta-rāga*) and inauspicious attachment (*apraśasta-rāga*)²⁵ (VĀ 959.30, p. 784). Read together, these passages suggest that the practitioner's task is not to eliminate all movement but to avoid the violent storms of inauspicious desire that churn the surface so intensely that the soul's depth becomes unreadable. Gentle, regulated movement—analogue to a mild breeze—may still be present, but it does not obscure clarity. Natural environments make this lesson perceptible: standing before water stirred by wind, one can directly observe how surface disturbance leaves depth untouched. In this way, nature functions as an ethical and contemplative exemplar, teaching discernment between agitation that merely moves and passion that destabilizes. Contemplative engagement with natural scenes—whether through direct immersion or meditative visualization (*dhyāna*)—thus trains attention to rest with depth rather than surface fluctuation. Empirical biophilia research supports this intuition: Ulrich has shown that exposure to natural environments reliably reduces stress responses and facilitates cognitive restoration by calming excessive arousal, thereby allowing deeper attentional clarity to re-emerge (Ulrich 1993; Ulrich et al. 1991 cited in Bohanec Forthcoming). Śrīmad's analogy anticipates this insight, presenting nature not only as a metaphor but as a perceptual instructor in how to recognize the soul's unbroken purity beneath the winds of worldly desire.

Continuing with this section, Śrīmad deepens this ecological pedagogy by extending the wind–water analogy into a theory of how understanding itself takes form. Just as wind may disturb the surface of water without compromising its depth, so too sensory input and mental activity can agitate consciousness without yielding insight. Hearing (*śravaṇa*), he cautions, is “like a wave of wind” (*pavana-nī lehara māphaka*)—it arises and passes quickly, leaving little trace. Excessive hearing, far from deepening understanding, weakens the capacity for reflection (*manana-śakti manda thatī*), producing agitation rather than clarity. Against this background of movement and disturbance, Śrīmad introduces a contrasting image drawn from natural sedimentation: through reflection (*manana*), an imprint (*chāpa*) is allowed to settle, and through sustained contemplative assimilation (*nididhyāsana*), true grasping or integration (*grahaṇa*) occurs. Insight, in other words, does not emerge from continual motion but from stillness—when agitation subsides and impressions are permitted to consolidate. This natural process mirrors how sediment forms structure only when water grows calm, offering a vivid exemplar for contemplative practice. Śrīmad reinforces the ethical stakes of this model by warning that painful or restless contemplation (*ārtadhyāna*) arises primarily from passions (*kaṣāya*), while negligence (*pramāda*) and unchecked activity further entangle consciousness within karmic processes²⁶ (VĀ 959.30.8–12, p. 784). Read together, these images present nature not merely as metaphor but as instructor: natural stillness teaches how attention must be stabilized so that understanding can take shape. In this exemplar mode of biophilia, the calm of natural environments—and even their internalized contemplation—models the cognitive conditions under which spiritual insight becomes possible, showing how serenity, patience, and quiet repetition allow knowledge to settle into form.

Yet the most significant exemplars in this section of Śrīmad Rājacandra's Morbī teachings are not landscapes themselves but persons whose conduct has become finely attuned to the karmic–natural order. Śrīmad repeatedly invokes figures such as the *jñānīpurūṣa* (“person of knowledge”) and the *samyagdṛṣṭi puruṣa* (“person of right/equanimous vision”) to show how a trained consciousness navigates an unalterable ecology of causation. Continuing the wind imagery introduced earlier, he likens the advanced practitioner to a boatman (*nākhudā*) steering against the wind (*pavana*), where the wind represents the pressure of passions and karmic conditions, the water signifies the soul's intrinsic purity, and the boat figures disciplined consciousness²⁷ (VĀ 959.30.19, p. 785). Crucially, the exemplar here is not found in any single natural element but in the human capacity to inhabit their dynamic relation without being overcome by them. Between the calm depth of the water-like soul and the agitating winds of attachment—whether auspicious (*praśasta-rāga*) or inauspicious (*apraśasta-rāga*, VĀ 959.30.8, cited above, fn. 26)—the skilled practitioner learns to navigate without capsizing. The image draws on a familiar river-crossing soteriological trope across South Asian traditions, yet here it is sharpened into a lesson in ethical and contemplative skill: liberation does not arise from eliminating forces alone but from learning how to steer within them while preserving orientation.

Śrīmad situates this image within a broader ethic of disciplined restraint by cautioning against the instrumentalization of spiritual capacities. Although accomplished practitioners (*siddhi-vālā puruṣa*) may possess real powers, including the capacity to pacify afflictive states (*aśātā-nī śānti*), he insists that genuine purification (*nirjarā*) is achieved only through actively undergoing karmic experience (*vedavāmāṃ ja nirjarā samaje che*), not through its avoidance or circumvention²⁸ (VĀ 959.30.16, p. 785). Powers (*siddhis*) are thus acknowledged as real, yet their proper function is not to manipulate circumstances but to disclose the wonder (*camatkāra*) and pure essence (*śuddha rasa*) of consciousness itself²⁹ (VĀ 959.30.16). This orientation does not imply passivity but disciplined agency: Śrīmad emphasizes that spiritual energy (*vīrya*) must be actively sustained³⁰ (VĀ 959.30.17), that one should act before affliction arises so as not to strengthen its future emergence, and that worldly conduct (*vyavahāra*) and contemplative absorption (*samādhi*) must be carefully distinguished rather than collapsed³¹ (VĀ 959.30.19–21, p. 785).

Taken together, these teachings show that the boatman analogy functions as a paradigmatic human exemplar embedded within natural process: a figure who remains ethically oriented and inwardly steady while navigating karmic conditions that must be undergone but not exacerbated. In this precise sense, exemplar biophilia in the Morbī discourses operates on two interrelated levels at once. Natural systems render visible how clarity, restraint, and responsiveness arise under lawful conditions, while spiritually mature persons demonstrate how a consciousness trained within such conditions moves skillfully through the world. Nature and the realized practitioner thus mirror one another: both reveal what it means to inhabit an unalterable causal environment with discernment, patience, and inner freedom. Exemplar biophilia here does not present nature as a static model to imitate, but as a dynamic field in which spiritually mature agency is formed, tested, and displayed.

6. Restorative Biophilia

Restorative biophilia refers to the way natural forms, environments, and metaphors alleviate psychic strain, reorient disordered affect, and renew the soul's capacity for clarity and equanimity. Although analytically distinct from exemplar biophilia, the two functions overlap substantially. The virtues disclosed through exemplar biophilia—such as equanimity (*samatā*), forgiveness (*kṣamā*), restraint, and non-attachment—are not cultivated as ends in themselves but as conditions for restoring the soul's intrinsic orientation toward the good. In this sense, exemplar biophilia supplies the *content* of spiritual formation,

while restorative biophilia names its *therapeutic effect*. This dimension aligns closely with Ulrich's empirical findings that exposure to trees, water, and natural landscapes reduces stress and restores physiological balance (Ulrich 1993, pp. 100–09). Kellert similarly argues that biophilia's restorative power is not only biological but symbolic, assisting humans in re-establishing meaning, coherence, and vitality (Kellert 1993, p. 20).

In the *Vacanāmṛta*, Śrīmad Rājendra explicitly draws on this restorative register by likening contemplative practices (*cintvanā*) to refuges (*śaraṇa*)—such as shade from the sun or the coolness of a grove—where beings scorched by suffering (*duḥkha*) may recover equilibrium. Nature thus functions not only as a model of virtue but as a medium of repair: its rhythms and shelters stabilize attention, restore latent purity (*nirmalpaṇṇi*), and counteract the agitation produced by karmic entanglement. Restorative biophilia, therefore, does not replace exemplar biophilia but completes it, showing how virtues cultivated through contemplation return the practitioner to spiritual health rather than mere moral rectitude.

6.1. Early Restorative Biophilia

To understand the restorative nature of Śrīmad's understanding of contemplative practices, it is important to recognize how Śrīmad frames the *Dvādaśānupreṣā* contemplative discourses at the outset. Far from being abstract doctrinal exercises, they are introduced as profoundly restorative disciplines. They are called “the mother of detachment” (*vairāgyanī mātā*),³² as practices that nurture the very capacity for release from the factors and consumptive habits that cause worldly suffering. They are described as bringing about “the welfare of all living beings”³³ and as “a most excellent refuge” (*uttama śaraṇa*) for “worldly beings (*saṁsārī jīvoṇi*)” overwhelmed by many sufferings (*anek duḥkhotī vyāpta*).³⁴ The text asserts that, “for the soul there is nothing else so beneficial as these twelve contemplations”³⁵ (VĀ 10, pp. 15–16).

This prophylactic statement is enhanced with a natural analogy: beings who are “scorched by the fire of suffering” who enter into this contemplative practice are said to be “like a dwelling in the midst of a cool banyan grove” (VĀ 10, pp. 15–16).³⁶ Just as the tree offers shade, stability, and protection from oppressive conditions, the contemplations are said to reveal the path of ultimate truth (*paramārthamārga*), enable discernment of reality (*tattvano nirdhār*), give rise to right vision (*samyaktva utpanna*), and destroy inauspicious karma (*aśubha karmanā nāś*)³⁷ (VĀ 10, p. 16). Here the grove is not only a metaphor for contemplative practice but also an evocation of the lived experience of physical coolness, shade, and renewal provided by trees, underscoring the psychosomatic ways in which natural imagery restores equilibrium, again demonstrating how the external qualities of natural settings exhibit the conditions of internal virtues to cultivate. The banyan grove here functions less as a moral ideal to be imitated than as a site of relief, a space in which heat, agitation, and exhaustion are eased. These effects describe not only the goal of practice but the *restorative processes* through which depleted capacities for clarity and steadiness are renewed. The banyan grove signifies calm, orientation, and shelter primarily as sources of recuperation. The contemplative mind is invited first to rest—to cool reactive patterns, stabilize attention, and recover balance—before any further work of cultivation can proceed. The image thus foregrounds restoration rather than normativity: it conveys what contemplation *does* for the suffering being, not only what it ultimately *makes* of the practitioner.

Beyond the restorative function of the natural imagery, we can see here an ecopsychological and ethical thrust consistent with the biophilia hypothesis: the exemplary qualities of a natural refuge—soothing, calming, peaceful, *restoring*—become the very qualities the aspirant seeks not only for the self but also for the welfare of all beings. Consistent with

the biophilia hypothesis, in the very act of reading or reciting this text, the practitioner envisions the natural analogy and, through visualization, enters it. In so doing, the aspirant not only cultivates a desire to commune with nature for their own well-being (to cultivate exemplary virtues or restore one's well-being) but also awakens a commitment to protect the living beings who dwell within the natural world (cf. Bohanec 2024a, 2024b, 2026a, 2026b, forthcoming, esp. on spiritual biophilia and ethical extension).

In the very next section, however, the arboreal metaphor is complicated by another image: living with family and loved ones is compared to “resting under the shade of a tree at the crossroads of four roads in the summer season,” where travelers pause before dispersing to their own destinations (VĀ 10, p. 16, para. 2, see fn 8). This comparison preserves the restorative quality of shade and respite (*viśrāma*), but simultaneously signals impermanence and transience—attachments are as fleeting as travelers' rest, and the cool shade will not last. There is therefore a dual sense of this arboreal metaphor; it can represent the spiritual virtues of calm and serenity to be cultivated and the restorative value they provide, but it can also represent the alluring comfort of the material world that causes the worldly attachments that ultimately cause us pain. Taken together, these passages frame nature as both comfort and warning: it heals, shelters, and restores, yet it also reminds us that worldly rest is temporary, and only contemplative insight offers lasting refuge.

These examples presuppose a dharmic conception of attention in which directing awareness toward a domain is not escapist but re-locative, what I have elsewhere described as the “translocative” function of attention (cf. Bohanec 2024b). Against a modern tendency to regard imagination as merely fictive, Śrīmad's pedagogy assumes that contemplative attention participates in the realities it attends to. To imagine oneself in the shade of a banyan is already to enter a space of cooling, stability, and respite. The text reinforces this restorative efficacy by asserting that “there is nothing else so beneficial for the soul as these twelve contemplations” by specifying the affective orientation (*bhāva*) required before undertaking reflection on impermanence (*anitya*)³⁸ (VĀ 10, p. 16).

The refuge these contemplations offer is therefore not mere consolation but a recovery of the conditions necessary for spiritual progress. This logic clarifies why both physical retreat into nature and reflective engagement with natural imagery function analogously in Śrīmad's pedagogy. To step away from the pressures of household and commercial life and sit beneath a tree is, in lived form, to allow the same restorative processes that contemplation performs inwardly: easing karmic agitation, quieting reactive desire, and restoring attentional balance. Even when undertaken imaginatively, this relocation of attention performs genuine ethical and soteriological work. In this way, restorative biophilia explains how engagement with natural settings—literal or contemplative—supports the soul by renewing the energies required for sustained practice, making nature not only a training ground or exemplar, but a vital source of spiritual replenishment.

6.2. Later Restorative Biophilia: Retreats, and Quiet Natural Landscapes

In the Morbī teachings, landscape becomes a *restorative* locus of memory, realization, contemplative reflection, and epistemic restoration. Here at Morbī, Śrīmad explicitly demonstrates the restorative power of natural solitude for his disciples, where he notes that “environment (*sthala*) is a contributory cause (*nimitta kāraṇa che*)”³⁹ for enhancing one's memory and other perceptive/cognitive abilities such as *matī-jñāna* (see fn. 44). He speaks of the serenity of the “peaceful (*śānta*) and cool (*śīṭla*) spaces” of Īḍar, Vaso, and Vaḍavā⁴⁰ as sites where the soul's purity became perceptible, where tranquility, mindfulness, and memory, and where the aspirant could remember experiences “five hundred times” (VĀ 959.6, p. 768).⁴¹ He notes specifically that “in a beautiful forest (*eka sundara vanamāṇi*)” the soul (*ātman*) becomes inwardly purified (*nirmalpaṇum*). In such environments, he

observes, one naturally “experiences more and more (*vadhāre vadhāre*) *smṛti*” (cited in fn. 20)—where *smṛti* can denote not only episodic memory but also mindful attentiveness—as one’s internal power (*śakti*) becomes fully manifest (*sphurāyamāna*)⁴² (VĀ 959.6, p. 767).

The texts themselves suggest that the heightened clarity realized contemplatively in the natural environment is not merely psychological but epistemic. In Jain epistemology, the cognitive capacities that constitute *matī-jñāna* are inherent to the soul but obscured by karmic inflow;⁴³ they are thus restorable. Calm landscapes support precisely this process: they loosen the obscuring conditions (a kind of *kṣayopāśama*)⁴⁴, allowing natural perception, recollection, and attentional precision to resume their proper functioning.⁴⁵ Śrīmad remarks that this clarity includes remembering events in “their true condition (*yathāsthiti*)”⁴⁶—suggesting not just better recall, but the recovery of accurate cognition. And while such clarity may not arise for everyone who situates themselves in a natural setting,⁴⁷ under favorable karmic conditions (*kṣayopāśama*)⁴⁸ such restorative lucidity can even contribute to the emergence of *jātismaraṇajñāna*—the ability to remember experiences from previous births⁴⁹ (VĀ 959.6, pp. 767–68).

In this sense, the Morbī teachings reveal a twofold model of restorative biophilia. On the microcosmic level, calm natural environments serve as catalysts for inner purification, heightening the aspirant’s attentional clarity, reflective awareness, and perceptual accuracy—an experiential loosening of karmic obscurations that allows the inherent powers of *matī-jñāna* and *smṛti* to function more openly. On the macrocosmic level, these micro-restorations and retreats from the urban and household setting symbolically prefigure the final ontological restoration of liberation, where the soul’s suppressed capacities (*jñāna*, *darśana*, *sukha*, *vīrya*) become fully unobstructed. Thus, the Morbī discourses treat calm landscapes not merely as supportive conditions for meditation but as active participants in moral, epistemic, and contemplative refinement and restoration—foreshadowing the very structure of liberation in lived, experiential form.

7. Disciplinary Biophilia

Disciplinary biophilia names the way natural phenomena—especially impermanence, decay, predation, dispersal, and seasonal loss—discipline the mind by breaking illusion, weakening attachment, and sharpening moral discernment. In this mode, nature becomes both a metaphor for and a lived encounter with danger, dissolution, limitation, and karmic bondage. This remains biophilia because the bond with nature is not severed but intensified: the relationship is no longer primarily soothing or restorative, but aversive, pedagogical, and disillusioning—now nature is something to be overcome. Whereas the exemplar and restorative dimensions of biophilia align with Ulrich’s emphasis on enhancing cognitive function, stress reduction, and recovery, the disciplinary dimension resonates with Kellert’s insight that biophilia also includes meaning-making functions born of fear, awe, confrontation with limits, and exposure to life’s harsher realities (Kellert 1993, pp. 64–66).

Underlying this disciplinary register is a presupposition central to Śrīmad Rājcandra’s pedagogy: the dangerous, unstable, and destructive aspects of the natural world correspond structurally to the untutored, attachment-driven mind. The wilderness outside mirrors the wilderness within. Because these domains are interconnected, immersion—whether literal or contemplative—in nature’s harsh realities becomes a means of confronting and transforming internal afflictions. Nature disciplines precisely because it exposes the same patterns of impermanence, vulnerability, and loss that govern embodied existence. In this sense, overcoming fear, clinging, and false security in relation to nature simultaneously trains the aspirant to relinquish attachment within the psyche.

Accordingly, Śrīmad deploys natural imagery not only as sanctuary or exemplar but as admonition. Nature’s fleeting, destructive, and uncompromising dimensions mirror the

passions and delusions that bind the soul, while sustained contemplation of those same patterns becomes a tool for cultivating detachment (*vairāgya*) and discernment (*viveka*). Disciplinary biophilia thus articulates an austere but coherent logic: spiritual maturation requires learning to see clearly within a world that does not protect, preserve, or stabilize what one clings to. Nature teaches this lesson not by abstraction but by exposure, forcing the aspirant to confront impermanence as a lived reality rather than a doctrinal claim.

7.1. Early Disciplinary Biophilia

Śrīmad's purports of the *Dvādaśānupreṣā* are filled with vivid natural analogies that strike precisely at this pedagogical nerve. Humans and animals alike, he writes, perish "like drops of water or clusters of dew."⁵⁰ Sense-pleasures vanish "like the colors of a rainbow,"⁵¹ and the vigor of youth fades "like the redness of twilight"⁵² (VĀ 10, p. 16, para. 2). Here beauty and fragility are deliberately paired: just as rainbows and sunsets captivate the eye yet vanish quickly, so too do pleasures and youth evaporate. The discipline lies in contemplating beauty not as secure possession but as fleeting spectacle.

The body itself becomes a vehicle for such disillusionment. Śrīmad reminds his readers that it will be reduced to ashes by fire, mingled with earth, or consumed and turned into excrement and fungus-ridden remains.⁵³ The scattering imagery intensifies this lesson: "each atom will scatter into infinite divisions in the earth and sky" (see fn. 6 above) and families "will scatter like autumn clouds (fn. 10). Possessions too are fleeting, for all bonds of property (*parigraha*) "will surely fall apart"⁵⁴ (VĀ 10). Against greed for kingdoms, land, and markets, Śrīmad warns that the apparent solidity of possessions is illusory; nature guarantees their eventual dissolution.

Other metaphors sharpen the disciplinary sting. Youth is said to decline "like the shadow of a gazelle"⁵⁵ (VĀ 10, pp. 16–17), an image of animal grace paired with ephemerality. Seasons like winter (*hemanta*) and spring (*vasanta*) return again and again, but "senses, youth, and life do not" (cited in fn. 11). Life itself is likened to waves falling from a mountain river, passing "moment by moment without being halted."⁵⁶ Old age is portrayed as a shower of dust blinding the "eye of knowledge"⁵⁷ and withering the blossoms of fortune.⁵⁸ It is also a tiger slaughtering the "doe of womanly affection."⁵⁹ Each image combines natural process with mortal vulnerability, forcing the aspirant to look squarely at decline and death (VĀ 10, p. 17).

The text also deploys shock-metaphors, disciplining the aspirant through paradox. To seek happiness in sensuality, Śrīmad warns, "is like drinking poison for the sake of life,"⁶⁰ "like entering fire in order to become cool,"⁶¹ or "like watering a poisonous tree for the sake of sweet food"⁶² (VĀ 10, p. 17, para. 3). Life's one-way trajectory is emphasized again: just as "the flow of a river continues on and does not return," so too "lifespan, body, beauty, and sensory power, once gone, do not return"⁶³ (VĀ 10, p. 17, para. 4). The human body is compared to "an unbaked pot filled with water," fragile and doomed to break quickly⁶⁴ (VĀ 10, p. 17, para. 6). Wealth is unstable like a wave on water,⁶⁵ or uselessly buried like a stone in the earth⁶⁶ (VĀ 10, p. 18). Greed drives beings into oceans, dreadful forests, dangerous mountains, and places devoid of righteousness (*dharma-rahit deś*)⁶⁷ (VĀ 10, p. 18).

At its most severe, disciplinary biophilia situates the aspirant within the broader ecology of *saṃsāra* itself. Predation governs every realm: birds prey on birds in the sky, fish devour fish in water, and land beings fall to lions, tigers, snakes, and cruel humans⁶⁸ (VĀ 10, p. 22). Beings flee hunters only to mistake the open mouth of a python for a place of refuge, just as the deluded soul, tormented by hunger, thirst, lust, and anger, enters the python-mouth of sense passions⁶⁹ (VĀ 10, p. 22). Even the pits (*bilas*) of hell, likened to a camel's mouth,⁷⁰ are mapped as an environment governed by physical laws—diamond-

hard ground, fiery pits, gravitational force—through which karmic consequences unfold with inescapable regularity⁷¹ (VĀ 10, p. 22).

This gallery of natural images makes clear that for Śrīmad, biophilia does not only soothe; it also disciplines. To contemplate water drops, rainbows, clouds, rivers, dust, tigers, or fragile pots is to rehearse the inexorable truth of transience. Nature teaches not only how to rest and recover but also how to relinquish illusions, stripping away attachments to body, kin, wealth, and pleasure. In this disciplinary register, the biophilic bond with nature becomes a stern instructor, compelling the aspirant to recalibrate desires and turn toward the soul's lasting welfare. Nature here becomes a diagnostic field, revealing the consequences of distorted valuation.

7.2. Later Disciplinary Biophilia: Morbī Teachings on Memory, Purity, and Forest Life

In the Morbī discourses Śrīmad turns to the most subtle physiological processes as a site of disciplinary insight, beginning with a clarification of the Jain technical terms *cayopacaya* and *cayavicaya*, which refer to the ongoing accumulation and dissipation of matter (*pudgala*) within the embodied soul. These processes, he stresses, apply to subtle bodily operations such as inhalation and exhalation, not to the mere comings and goings of thought⁷² (VĀ 959.27.1.1). Yet *cayopacaya* and *cayavicaya* do bear upon one's mental state in the sense that when the soul's knowledge becomes obstructed by anxiety, the body can no longer assimilate the new matter (*paramāṇus*) it requires for maintenance, and thus necessarily loses weight and begins to wither⁷³ (VĀ 959.27.2.1). He universalizes the point by citing the *Ācārāṅgasūtra* and *Śaḍdarśanasamuccaya*, which compare humans and plants to show that both are born, grow, take in food, absorb and expel matter (*paramāṇus*), and die⁷⁴ (VĀ 959.27.3.1). In this way the withering of vegetation in a natural landscape becomes a disciplinary mirror: the same processes of accumulation, depletion, and dissolution visible in plant life operate within one's own body. Nature thus admonishes: what we observe in the forest is the law of our own impermanence. Here karmic obstruction manifests not only mentally but physiologically as a tangible depletion of the embodied person.

The convergence between this doctrinal description and the trajectory of his final years invites comparison. As Salter notes, “[s]ince his youth he had complained that his full mental capacity was restricted by imperfect health and throughout most of his adult life he suffered phases of sickness, which he attributed to the effect of karma.” In his final years he endured a “chronic digestive disorder,” and “no specific condition or cause of death was diagnosed other than ‘extreme weakness.’” By 1900 “he weighed sixty-five pounds; a year later his weight had plummeted to only forty-five pounds” (Salter 2002, pp. 148–49). This physiological decline echoes Śrīmad's own description of the obstructed epistemic capacities of the soul leading to a depletion of the body's material constitution.

In Śrīmad's final recorded discourse—a teaching delivered in the last months of 1899, when he was already suffering the severe decline that would end his life less than two years later—the imagery of nature acquires a new disciplinary sharpness. In one passage he observes that wind cannot “break” the purity of water, though it can disturb its surface (VĀ 959.30.6.1, see fn. 25 above). The contrast is unmistakably didactic: wind becomes an image of life's ephemerality, passing across surfaces without stability, whereas, as we have seen before, water becomes an image of the soul's inner purity (*nirmalātā*), which bodily or psychological agitation may obscure but cannot corrupt. The aspirant is thus trained to read nature as a teacher of discernment: when turmoil arises, one must distinguish surface disturbance from depth, the agitation produced by karmic activity from the soul's deeper clarity.

Śrīmad intensifies this lesson with a second wind-image. Hearing, he says, is like a “wave of wind” (*pavana-nī lehara*), something that simply comes and passes away (VĀ

959.30.10.1, see fn. 27 above). Only deliberate reflection (*manana*) leaves a lasting imprint (*chāpa*), and only deep contemplative assimilation (*nididhyāsana*) allows insight to take root (VĀ 959.30.11.1, fn. 27). The disciplinary force of this metaphor emerges through contrast: just as passing wind leaves no mark on the landscape, excessive or indiscriminate listening (*vadhāre śravaṇa*) weakens (*manda*) the very capacity for reflection it was meant to strengthen (VĀ 959.30.12.1, fn. 27). The imagery is forest-like—wind that rustles everything yet transforms nothing—and Śrīmad uses it to warn against the spiritual equivalent of overconsumption. Even insight, like ecological nourishment, must be taken in moderation; too much movement, too much stimulation, prevents the imprint (*chāpa*) from settling and prevents experience from becoming wisdom.

Śrīmad explicitly aligns this warning with disciplined worldly activity. It is merely a conventional excuse (*prākṛtajanya laukika vacana*), he says, to claim that one has “no time” to reflect on the soul; if one finds time for eating, drinking, and sleeping, one must also find time for spiritual labor⁷⁵ (VĀ 959.30.14.1–2). Nature again underscores the point: the wind-wave that leaves no imprint becomes a metaphor for the life lived without assimilation, a life whose lessons never penetrate because it is lived in excess, haste, or distraction. The natural world—its winds, its rhythms, its transience—becomes a mirror for how one should live one’s final years, months, even breaths: not in agitation, but in steady internalization of what matters.

Śrīmad extends this disciplinary reading of nature through a third wind-image—one of his most vivid. Revisiting the metaphor cited above, a spiritually grounded person is like a boatman navigating against the wind (*pavana*): when the gusts shift, the boat swerves, and the pilot must adjust course (VĀ 959.30.19.1, cited above). Here nature ceases to be merely symbolic; it becomes a model of ethical navigation. Just as a sailor cannot demand a steady wind, the aspirant cannot expect karmic conditions to remain favorable. The task is to steer wisely, not to insist on calm weather. In Śrīmad’s late teaching, wind thus becomes a metaphor for the uncontrollable forces—karmic, psychological, existential—that impinge upon a human life. The disciplinary lesson is unmistakable: virtue is not static; it requires continual recalibration. The aspirant must learn, from nature itself, the art of adjusting one’s orientation without abandoning one’s destination. In this sense the wind that disturbs the boat is the same wind that instructs the soul, revealing how resilience, vigilance, and inner steadiness must rise precisely when external conditions become unstable.

Read in the context of Śrīmad’s declining health—his dramatic weight loss, chronic digestive illness, and awareness of his approaching death—the disciplinary force of these images in VĀ 959.30—his final teaching presented in the *Vacanāmṛta*—becomes even more poignant. Wind and water are not abstractions here; they function as meditative symbols through which he instructs his followers, and likely himself, to meet mortality with nonattached clarity. The stirrings of illness, fear, or bodily dissolution need not disturb the deeper purity of the soul’s knowing. The wave of life will pass, as all waves pass, but the imprint we allow to form—through moderation, reflection, and inward turning—shapes the dispositions (*saṃskāras*) carried forward in this life and beyond. In this sense, Śrīmad’s final natural metaphors are also his final ethical teachings: the forest, the wind, and the water discipline the practitioner to read their own mortality as a site of purification rather than despair.

8. Bridging Conclusions

Taken together, these four registers—training-ground, exemplar, restorative, and disciplinary—constitute a typology of Śrīmad Rājendra’s biophilic metaphors across the *Vacanāmṛta* in the *Dvādaśānupreṣā*, and *Vyākhyānasāra* (VĀ 959). Each register highlights a distinct way in which natural imagery mediates the aspirant’s relationship to suffering,

practice, and liberation: as a field for shaping resolve and disciplined attention (training-ground), as an icon of virtues to be cultivated and embodied (exemplar), as refuge and recalibration amid psychic and karmic strain (restorative), and as a stark confrontation with impermanence, danger, and dissolution (disciplinary).

The value of this schema is not only analytical but also prospective. Read together, the *Dvādaśānupreṣā* and the *Vyākhyānasāra* function as contemplative bookends to Śrīmad's teaching career, spanning roughly from his early maturity to the final years of his life (ages 15 to 31). Across this arc, biophilic imagery remains remarkably stable in form even as its pedagogical emphasis shifts, suggesting not a late innovation but a sustained contemplative strategy refined over time. In this respect, Śrīmad's use of nature aligns closely with broader dharmic traditions, in which forests, rivers, animals, seasons, and elemental processes repeatedly serve as sites of moral instruction, spiritual testing, and ethical formation rather than as romanticized backdrops (cf. [Bohanec Forthcoming](#)).

Seen in this light, biophilia in Śrīmad's thought is neither ornamental nor incidental. It names a disciplined mode of engagement with the natural world through which the aspirant learns to train attention, embody virtue, recover balance, and relinquish illusion. That this pedagogy culminates in teachings delivered amid bodily decline and increasing limitation only underscores its coherence: nature remains, to the end, not something to be mastered or escaped, but the very medium through which clarity, restraint, and liberation are disclosed.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Notes

- ¹ *Vacanāmṛta* (hereafter VĀ) refers to the collected Gujarati writings of Śrīmad Rājendra (1867–1901). Citations are given by page, section, subsection, and (when applicable) item number.
- ² The phrase “before his seventeenth year” (*varṣa sattara māṃ pahelām*) follows traditional age reckoning by year entered rather than completed birthdays; by modern convention this corresponds to approximately age fifteen.
- ³ In support of this thesis, I engaged key Buddhist, Jain, and Hindu sources. In the *Makhādeva Sutta* (MN 83), the mango grove functions not as neutral backdrop but as a setting that nurtures enlightenment, exemplifying how Buddhist spirituality integrates nature into the path to nirvāṇa. In Jainism, the *Kalpa-sūtra* repeatedly situates the Tīrthaṅkaras' lives in natural environments: initiations under trees (KS 116, 157, 173, 211), austerities in mountain parks (KS 128, 227), and enlightenment beneath trees or on mountains (KS 120, 159, 174, 182). These accounts underscore how nature becomes the locus of spiritual development, supporting the biophilic insight that natural settings provide psychological benefits ([Bohanec Forthcoming](#)). The *Kalpa-sūtra* further links ecological hardship to inner transformation, describing the Tīrthaṅkaras' endurance of weather, hunger, and solitude with *kṣamā* and *titikṣā* (KS 117, 158). Likewise, the (Hindu) *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (BhP) depicts sages and devotees retreating to forests, mountains, and riverbanks, where natural settings frame both yogic cultivation and theophany: Kardama's forest renunciation and liberation (BhP 3.24.41–45), Dhruva's austerities in the Madhuvana forest and worship using natural offerings (BhP 4.8.24, pp. 42–63, 55–56), and the rainy season setting where sages meditate amid rivers, trees, and mountains (BhP 10.20.5–25). These narratives culminate in visions of God manifest through nature's harmony, a vivid expression of spiritual biophilia ([Bohanec Forthcoming](#)).
- ⁴ The editors of the *Vacanāmṛta* explicitly note that this section is neither complete nor systematic, but a selective and pedagogical *anuvāda*. In this context, *anuvāda* should be understood not as a literal translation but as an interpretive rendering or purport of the source text. The Gujarati editorial note states: *ratnakaraṇḍaśrāvākācār-māṃthī pratham-nī trāṇ anupreṣā-no ā anuvāda che; te apūrṇa che*—that is, “This is an *anuvāda* (interpretive rendering) of the first three contemplations (*pratham-nī trāṇ anupreṣā*) from the *Ratnakaraṇḍaśrāvākācāra*; it is incomplete (*apūrṇa*).” (VĀ 10, p. 15).

- 5 VĀ 10, p. 16: *eka eka paramāṇu jamīna, ākāśamāṇi ananta vibhāgarūpe vīkharāi jāśhe; pachī kyāṁthī mālashe?* Each atom (*eka eka paramāṇu*) will scatter (*vīkharāi jāśhe*) into infinite divisions (*ananta vibhāga-rūpa*) in the earth (*jamīna*) and in the sky (*ākāśa*); how then (*pachī*) could it be reassembled (*kyāṁthī mālashe*)?
- 6 VĀ 10, p. 16: *jema eka jahājamāṇi aneka deśanā ane aneka jātenā mānaso bhegā thī base che, pachī kenāre jāi nānā deś prati gamana kare che.* Just as (*jema*) in a single ship (*eka jahāja*) many people (*mānasa*) from different lands (*aneka deśa*) and castes (*aneka jāti*) sit together (*bhegā thī base che*), and then (*pachī*) upon reaching the shore (*kenāre jāi*) depart (*gamana kare che*) toward their own countries (*nānā deśa*), VĀ 10, p. 16: *tema kuḷārūpa jahājamāṇi aneka gatīthī āvelā prāṇī bhegā thī vase che, pachī āyusya pūruṇi thaye potapotānā karmanusāra cāre gatīmāṇi jāi utpanna thāya che; so (tema), in the family-ship (kuḷa-rūpa jahāja), beings (prāṇī) arriving from many destinies (aneka gati) dwell together (bhegā thī vase che), and then (pachī), when life ends (āyusya pūruṇi thaye), they are reborn (utpanna thāya che) in the four destinies (cāre gati) according to their karma (karmanusāra).*
- 7 VĀ 10, p. 16: *bhāi, mitra, putra, kuṭumbādik sāthe vasavum, te grīṣmatṛtumāṇi cāra mārganī vacamāṇi eka vṛkṣanī chāyā nīce aneka deśanā vaṭemārga viśrāma laī potapotāne thekāne jāya che.* Dwelling (*vasavum*) with brothers (*bhāi*), friends (*mitra*), sons (*putra*), and family (*kuṭumba*) is like (*te . . . samāna che*) resting (*viśrāma laī*) under the shade (*vṛkṣanī chāyā nīce*) of a tree (*eka vṛkṣa*) at the crossroads of four roads (*cāra mārga-nī vacamāṇi*) in the summer season (*grīṣma-tṛtu*), where travelers (*vaṭemārga*) from many lands (*aneka deśa*) rest (*viśrāma*) before going (*jāya che*) to their own destinations (*potapotāne thekāne*).
- 8 VĀ 10, p. 16: *jema eka vṛkṣa viṣe pakṣī pūrve saṅketa karyā vinā ja āvī vase che, tema kuṭumbanā mānaso saṅketa karyā vinā karma ne vaśa bheḷā thī vīkhare che.* Just as (*jema*) birds (*pakṣī*) come (*āvī*) and dwell (*vase che*) in a tree (*eka vṛkṣa*) without prior arrangement (*pūrve saṅketa karyā vinā*), so (*tema*) the people of a family (*kuṭumba-nā mānasa*) gather together (*bheḷā thī*) and disperse (*vīkhare che*) under the sway (*vaśa*) of karma (*karma*).
- 9 VĀ 10, p. 16: *je putra, strī, bhāi, mitra, svāmī, sevakādīnā ekṭhā thayela sukhthī jīvana cāho cho, te samasta kuṭumba śaradkālānā vādīlānī jema vīkharāi jāśhe,* The happiness (*sukh*) of life (*jīvana*) you desire (*cāho cho*) with sons (*putra*), wife (*strī*), brothers (*bhāi*), friends (*mitra*), masters (*svāmī*), and servants (*sevaka*), gathered together (*ekṭhā thayela*), this whole family (*samasta kuṭumba*) will scatter (*vīkharāi jāśhe*) like clouds of the autumn season (*śarad-kāl-nā vādīlā*).
- 10 VĀ 10, p. 16: *candra, sūrya, graha, nakṣatrādik to asta thī pāchā ūge che, ane hemanta-vasantādik ṛtuo paṇa jāi jāi pāchī āve che, paraṁtu gayel indriyo, yauvana, āyu, kāyādik pāchāṇi nathī āvatā.* The moon (*candra*), sun (*sūrya*), planets (*graha*), and stars (*nakṣatra-ādika*) set (*asta thī*) but rise again (*pāchā ūge che*), and the seasons (*ṛtu*), such as winter (*hemanta*) and spring (*vasanta*), come and return (*jāi jāi pāchī āve che*); but (*paraṁtu*) departed senses (*indriya*), youth (*yauvana*), lifespan (*āyu*), and body (*kāya-ādika*) do not (*nathī*) return (*pāchāṇi āvatā*).
- 11 VĀ 10, p. 17: *jem parvatthī paḍatī nadīnā taraṅga rokāyā vinā cālyā jāya che, tema āyusya kṣaṇa-kṣaṇmāṇi rokāyā vinā vyatit thāya che.* Just as (*jem*) the waves (*taraṅga*) of a river (*nadī*) falling (*paḍatī*) from a mountain (*parvat-thī*) flow on (*cālyā jāya che*) without being stopped (*rokāyā vinā*), so (*tema*) life (*āyusya*) passes (*vyatit thāya che*) moment by moment (*kṣaṇa-kṣaṇmāṇi*) without being halted (*rokāyā vinā*).
- 12 VĀ 10, p. 17: *ghaḍapaṇa kevuṇi che ke juvānī-rūpa vṛkṣane dagdha karvāne dāvā samān che.* What is old age (*ghaḍapaṇa kevuṇi che*)? It is like a forest fire (*dāvā samān*) consuming (*dagdha karvāne*) the tree of youth (*juvānī-rūpa vṛkṣa*). [. . .] *te bhāgyarūpa puṣpo(ne) nās karaṇār dhūmasa nī vṛṣṭi che.* It is like a shower (*vṛṣṭi*) of dust (*dhūmasa*) destroying (*nās karaṇār*) the blossoms of fortune (*bhāgya-rūpa puṣpa*). [. . .] *strī-prīti-rūpa haraṇīne vyāghra samān che.* It is like a tiger (*vyāghra samān*) slaying the doe of womanly affection (*strī-prīti-rūpa haraṇī*). [. . .] *jñāna-netrane andha karvā māṭe dhūlanī vṛṣṭi samān che.* It is like a shower (*vṛṣṭi*) of dust (*dhūla*) that blinds (*andha karvā māṭe*) the eye of knowledge (*jñāna-netra*). [. . .] *tapa-rūpa kamalanā vane ne hima samān che.* It is like frost (*hima*) destroying (*vane*) the lotus of austerity (*tapa-rūpa kamala*). [. . .] *dīnatā utpatti karanārī mātā che.* It is the mother (*mātā che*) of weakness (*dīnatā*).
- 13 VĀ 10, p. 16: *te māṭe ātmānā hita māṭe ja utāvale uṭhama karo,* Therefore (*te māṭe*), rise quickly (*utāvale uṭhama*) for the benefit of the soul (*ātmā-nā hita*).
- 14 Dates for the Morbī discourses are given in Vikram Samvat (VS), a luni-solar calendar not directly commensurate with the Gregorian system. The CE equivalents used here are therefore year-level approximations ($VS \approx CE + 56/57$), not precise day/month conversions.
- 15 Śrīmad Rājendra's early attainment of self-realization (*ātma-jñāna* or *samyag-darśana*) is understood by his followers as an experiential validation of Jain soteriology. As Salter documents, this experience is taken to provide the first concrete assurance that liberation is attainable and potentially near, even if not achieved in the present life, thereby reorienting religious effort toward imminent progress on the path to *mokṣa* (Salter 2002, pp. 184–98). Significantly, this realization did not immediately entail renunciation; for several years Śrīmad continued as a householder and businessman, embodying a form of spiritually reoriented worldly engagement marked by honesty, restraint, and compassion (Salter 2002, pp. 139–40).
- 16 Apramatta ("non-negligence" or unwavering attentiveness) names the seventh of the fourteen *guṇasthānas*, the stage of disciplined self-control free from spiritual laxity. Importantly, this stage presupposes self-realization (*samyag-darśana*), which Śrīmad Rājendra locates at the fourth *guṇasthāna* (*avirata-samyag-dṛṣṭi*). In his teaching, self-realization is both rare and decisive: it marks the soul's first direct perception of its true nature and guarantees eventual liberation, even if full *mokṣa* lies lifetimes

away. The difficulty of attaining even this fourth stage underscores the rigor of *apramatta* practice, which represents not an initial awakening but an advanced stabilization of insight through sustained vigilance and discipline.

- 17 VĀ 959.6 p. 768: *saṃsāra choḍyā vinā apramatta guṇasthānaka nathī*. Without (*vinā*) leaving (*choḍyā*) *saṃsāra* (*saṃsāra*), the vigilant stage (*apramatta guṇasthānaka*) does not (*nathī*) exist (*che*, implied).
- 18 VĀ 959.6 p. 768: *niḥsaṅgaṇuṃ e vanavāsiniṇo viśaya che em jñāntōe kahyeluṃ che te satya che*. Detachment (*niḥsaṅgaṇuṃ*) is (*che*) the domain (*viśaya*) of the forest-dweller (*vanavāsiniṇo*); thus (*em*) the wise ones (*jñāntōe*) have said (*kahyeluṃ che*), and that (*te*) is (*che*) true (*satya*).
- 19 VĀ 959.6 p. 767: *eka sundara vanamāṃ tamārā ātmāmāṃ śuṃ nirmalpaṇuṃ che, je tapāsātā tamone vadhāre vadhāre smṛti thāya che ke nahīṃ?* In a beautiful forest (*eka sundara vanamāṃ*), what purity (*nirmalpaṇuṃ*) is there (*che*) in your (*tamārā*) soul (*ātmāmāṃ*), which (*je*), when examining (*tapāsātā*), do you (*tamone*) experience more and more (*vadhāre vadhāre*) memory / mindfulness (*smṛti thāya che*) or not (*ke nahīṃ*)?
- 20 MacIntyre argues that modern moral discourse becomes unstable once teleology is rejected: without an account of “man-as-he-could-be-if-he-realized-his-telos,” the remaining elements (human nature + moral rules) lose their intelligible relation (MacIntyre [1984] 2015, pp. 53–55).
- 21 VĀ 10, p. 20: *jem udaya thatā sūryane koṇa roke? temaṃ karma-na udayane na rokī śakāya evā jāñī samatā-bhāva-num śaraṇa grahaṇa karo, to aśubha karma-nī nirjarā thāya, ane navo bandha na thāya. roga, viyoga, dāridrya, maraṇādika-no bhaya choḍī parama dhairya grahaṇa karo. potāno vitarāga-bhāva, santoṣa-bhāva, parama samatā-bhāva—e ja śaraṇa cha. bījuṃ koī śaraṇa nathī. ā jīva-nā uttama kṣamā-dik bhāva pote ja śaraṇa-rūpa che*. Who can stop the sun (*sūrya*) when it rises (*udaya*)? Likewise, knowing that the rise of karma (*karma-no udaya*) cannot be stopped (*na rokī śakāya*), take refuge (*śaraṇa grahaṇa karo*) in equanimity (*samatā-bhāva*). Then inauspicious karma (*aśubha karma*) is shed (*nirjarā*), and no new bondage (*navo bandha*) arises. Abandon (*choḍī*) fear (*bhaya*) of illness (*roga*), separation (*viyoga*), poverty (*dāridrya*), and death (*marāṇa-ādika*), and adopt supreme courage (*parama dhairya grahaṇa karo*). One’s own dispositions of passionlessnessness (*vitarāga-bhāva*), contentment (*santoṣa-bhāva*), and supreme equanimity (*parama samatā-bhāva*) are the sole refuge (*e ja śaraṇa cha*). There is no other refuge (*bījuṃ koī śaraṇa nathī*). The soul’s (*jīva*) highest dispositions (*uttama*. . . *bhāva*), such as forgiveness (*kṣamā*), are themselves the refuge (*pote ja śaraṇa-rūpa che*).
- 22 See note 12 above.
- 23 VĀ 959.6 pp. 767–768: *jevī rīte āmbā ādi vṛkṣonī kalam karavāmāṃ āve che temā sānukūlatā hoyā to thāya che, tema jo pūrvaparyāyanī smṛti karavāne kṣayopaśamādi sānukūlatā yogyatā hoyā to jātismaraṇajñāna thāya, pūrvasaṃjñā kāyama hovī joīe*. Just as (*jevī rīte*) the grafting (*kalam*) of mango (*āmbā*) and other trees (*ādi vṛkṣonī*) takes place (*karavāmāṃ āve che*) when (*temā*) there is (*che*) a favorable condition (*sānukūlatā*), in the same way (*tema*), if (*jo*) for producing (*karavāne*) the memory (*smṛti*) of a previous life (*pūrvaparyāyanī*) there is (*hoyā*) a favorable condition (*sānukūlatā*) such as (*ādi*) the subsidence and destruction (*kṣayopaśama*) that is (*yogyatā*) aptitude, then (*to*) knowledge (*jñāna*) of past births (*jātismaraṇajñāna*) arises (*thāya*), and the prior (*pūrvā*) cognition (*saṃjñā*) must (*joīe*) remain permanent (*kāyama hovī*).
- 24 VĀ 959.30.6 p. 784: *pavana pāñī-nī nirmalātā-no bhaṅga karī śakato nathī; paṇa tene calāyamāna karī śake che; tema ātmā-na jñāna-māṃ kātī nirmalātā ocī thatī nathī, paṇa yoga-nuṃ calāyamāna-ṇuṃ che teṭhī rasa vinā eka samaya-no bandha kahyo*. Wind (*pavana*) cannot (*nathī*) break (*bhaṅga*) the purity (*nirmalātā*) of water (*pāñī-nī*), but (*paṇa*) it can make it move (*calāyamāna*); similarly (*tema*), the purity (*nirmalātā*) of the soul’s (*ātmā-na*) knowledge (*jñāna*) is not diminished (*ocī thatī nathī*), but its activity (*yoga*) is what is moving (*calāyamāna-ṇuṃ*); therefore (*teṭhī*) a one-moment bondage (*eka samaya-no bandha*) is spoken of (*kahyo*) even without flavoring-passion (*rasa vinā*).
- 25 VĀ 959.30.7, p. 784: *jo ke kaṣāya-no rasa puṇya tathā pāpa-rūpa che, to paṇa teno svabhāva kaḍavo che*. Even though (*jo ke*) the flavor (*rasa*) of the passions (*kaṣāya-no*) is of the nature (*rūpa*) of merit (*puṇya*) and demerit (*pāpa*), still (*to paṇa*) its (*teno*) inherent nature (*svabhāva*) is bitter (*kaḍavo*). VĀ 959.30.8: *puṇya paṇa khārās-māṃthī thāye che; puṇya-no choṭhāṇiyo rasa nathī, kāraṇa ke ekānta śāntāno udaya nathī; kaṣāya-na bheda be: (1) praśasta-rāga, (2) apraśasta-rāga; kaṣāya vinā bandha nathī*. Merit (*puṇya*) also (*paṇa*) arises (*thāye che*) from salty substances (*khārās-māṃthī*); the taste (*rasa*) of merit (*puṇya-no*) is not mild (*choṭhāṇiyo*), because (*kāraṇa ke*) there is no (*nathī*) arising (*udaya*) of absolute (*ekānta*) peace (*śāntā*); the types (*bheda*) of passion (*kaṣāya-na*) are two: (1) auspicious-attachment (*praśasta-rāga*), (2) inauspicious-attachment (*apraśasta-rāga*); without (*vinā*) passion (*kaṣāya*), there is no (*nathī*) bondage (*bandha*).
- 26 VĀ 959.30.8-12, p. 784: *śravaṇa e pavana-nī lehara māphaka che; te āve che, ane cālyuṃ jāya che*. Hearing (*śravaṇa*) is like (*māphaka*) a wave (*lehara*) of wind (*pavana-nī*); it comes (*āve che*) and (*ane*) passes away (*cālyuṃ jāya che*). [item 11] *manana karavāthī chāpa bese che, ane nididhyāsana karavāthī grahaṇa thāya che*. By reflection (*manana*) an imprint (*chāpa*) settles (*bese che*), and (*ane*) by deep-meditation (*nididhyāsana*) assimilation (*grahaṇa*) occurs (*thāya che*). [item 12] *vadhāre śravaṇa karavāthī manana-śakti manda thatī jovāmāṃ āve che*. By excessive (*vadhāre*) hearing (*śravaṇa*), the power (*śakti*) of reflection (*manana*) is seen (*jovāmāṃ āve che*) to become weak (*manda*).
- 27 VĀ 959.30.19, p. 785: *samyagdrṣṭi puruṣa-ne nākhudā-nī māphaka pavana viruddha hovāthī vahāṇa maraḍī rasto badalavo paḍe che*. A right-viewed person (*samyagdrṣṭi puruṣa*), like (*māphaka*) a boatman (*nākhudā-nī*) facing (*viruddha*) the wind (*pavana*), must (*paḍe che*) change (*badalavo*) direction (*rasto*) when the boat (*vahāṇa*) swerves (*marāḍī*).

- 28 VĀ 959.30.16, p. 785: *evī siddhi-vālā puruṣo aśātā-nī śānti karī śake che, temaṃ chhatā tenī apekṣā karatā nathī; te vedavāmām ja nirjarā samaje che.* Such (*evī*) attainment-bearing (*siddhi-vālā*) persons (*puruṣo*) can (*karī śake che*) pacify (*śānti*) affliction (*aśātā-nī*), yet (*temaṃ chhatā*) they do not (*nathī*) expect (*apekṣā karatā*) it; they understand (*samaje che*) purification (*nirjarā*) only (*ja*) in experiencing (*vedavāmām*).
- 29 VĀ 959.30.16, p. 785: *e śakti badhī sācī che. caitanya-mām camatkāra joie, teno śuddha rasa pragaṭavo joie.* All (*badhī*) those powers (*śakti*) are real (*sācī*); in consciousness (*caitanya-mām*) one should perceive (*joie*) wonder (*camatkāra*) and manifest (*pragaṭavo*) its pure (*śuddha*) essence (*rasa*).
- 30 VĀ 959.30.17, p. 785: *tamē jīvo-mām ullāsamāna vīrya ke puruṣārtha nathī. vīrya manda paḍyūṃ tyāṃ upāya nathī.* Among you (*tame*) beings (*jīvo-mām*) there is not (*nathī*) exuberant (*ullāsamāna*) energy (*vīrya*) or effort (*puruṣārtha*); where (*tyāṃ*) energy (*vīrya*) has fallen weak (*manda paḍyūṃ*), there is no (*nathī*) remedy (*upāya*).
- 31 VĀ 959.30.19, p. 785: *tethe teo pote līdelo rasto kharo nathī ema samaje che; tema jñānipurūṣo udaya-viśeṣa-ne laīne vyavahāra-mām paṇa antarātma-drṣṭi cūkta nathī.* Thus (*tethe*) they (*teo*) understand (*samaje che*) that the path (*rasto*) they took (*līdelo*) is not (*nathī*) wrong (*kharo*); likewise (*tema*) the wise (*jñānipurūṣo*), accounting for (*laīne*) karmic rise (*udaya-viśeṣa*), are not (*nathī*) mistaken (*cūkta*) in inner vision (*antarātma-drṣṭi*) even in worldly conduct (*vyavahāra-mām*). [959.30.20] *mām samādhi rākhavī. aṅgrejo-nī māphaka kāmāṭaṇe kāma ane ārāmāṭaṇe ārāma. ekabījā-ne seḷabeḷa karī devām nathī joie.* In conditions (*upādhi-mām*) one should maintain (*rākhavī*) conditions (*upādhi*); in absorption (*samādhi-mām*) one should maintain (*rākhavī*) absorption (*samādhi*). Like the English (*aṅgrejo-nī māphaka*) who keep work (*kāmāṭaṇe kāma*) for work and rest (*ārāmāṭaṇe ārāma*) for rest, one should not (*nathī joie*) mix (*seḷabeḷa karī*) the two (*ekabījā-ne*). [959.30.21] *vyavahāra-mām ātmā-kartavya karatā rahavūṃ.*—In worldly conduct (*vyavahāra-mām*) one should continue (*karatā rahavūṃ*) performing (*kartavya*) the soul's (*ātmā*) duty (*kartavya*).
- 32 VĀ 10, p. 15: *ā cintavanāṃ vairāgyanī mātā che.* These contemplations (*ā cintavanāṃ*) are the mother (*mātā*) of detachment (*vairāgya*).
- 33 VĀ 10, p. 15: *samasta jīvoṃṇuṃ hita karavāvālī che.* They bring about (*karavāvālī che*) the welfare (*hita*) of all living beings (*samasta jīvoṃ*).
- 34 VĀ 10, pp. 15–16: *anek duḥkhotī vyāpta saṃsārī jīvoṃṇe ā cintavanāṃ bahu uttama śaraṇa che.* For worldly beings (*saṃsārī jīva*) overwhelmed (*vyāpta*) by many sufferings (*anek duḥkha*), these contemplations (*cintavanā*) are a most excellent refuge (*uttama śaraṇa*).
- 35 VĀ 10, p. 16: *dvādaśa cintavanā samāna ā jīvoṃṇuṃ hita karanār bījūṃ kaīm nathī.* For the soul (*jīva*) there is nothing else (*bījūṃ kaīm nathī*) so beneficial (*hita karanār*) as these twelve contemplations (*dvādaśa cintavanā*).
- 36 VĀ 10, p. 16: *duḥkharūpa agnīthī tassiyāmāna thāyēlā jīvoṃṇe śītal vaṭavananī madhyamā nivāsa samāna che.* For beings (*jīva*) scorched (*tassiyāmāna*) by the fire of suffering (*duḥkha-rūpa agni*), they are like a dwelling (*nivāsa*) in the midst of a cool banyan grove (*śītal vaṭa-vana-nī madhyama*).
- 37 VĀ 10, p. 16: *paramārthamārga dekhādanārī che. tattvano nirdhār karāvanārī che. samyaktva utpanna karanārī che.* They reveal (*dekhādanārī*) the path of ultimate truth (*paramārtha-mārga*). They enable (*karāvanārī*) discernment (*nirdhār*) of reality (*tattva*). They give rise (*utpanna karanārī*) to right vision (*samyaktva*).
- 38 VĀ 10, p. 16: *dvādaśa cintavanā samāna ā jīvoṃṇuṃ hita karanār bījūṃ kaīm nathī. bār aṅganuṃ rahasya che. eṭalā māṭe ā bār cinta-vanāṃṇamīthī bhāva sahita deve anitya anupreṣāṇuṃ cintavan karīe chīe.* For the soul (*jīva*) there is nothing else (*bījūṃ kaīm nathī*) so beneficial (*hita karanār*) as these twelve contemplations (*dvādaśa cintavanā*). They are the hidden essence (*rahasya*) of the twelve aṅgas (*bār aṅga*). Therefore (*eṭalā māṭe*), with devotion (*bhāva sahita*), we begin the contemplation (*cintavan*) of impermanence (*anitya anupreṣā*) from among these twelve contemplations (*bār cintavanā*).
- 39 VĀ 959.6, p. 768: *sthala paṇa nimitta kāraṇa che.* Place (*sthala*) too (*paṇa*) is a contributory cause (*nimitta kāraṇa che*).
- 40 Īḍar, Vaso, and Vaḍavā are sites associated with Śrīmad Rājcandra's itinerant teaching activity in or near the Morbi region. Their mention situates his final discourses within a naturally, ecologically rich landscape.
- 41 VĀ 959.6, p. 768: *potānuṃ drṣṭānta āpatām janāvvyuṃ ke potāne īḍara ane vasonī śānta jagyāṃṇ sambhāravāthī tad-rūpa yād āve che.* Giving (*āpatām*) his own (*potānuṃ*) example (*drṣṭānta*), he stated (*janāvvyuṃ*) that when recalling (*sambhāravāthī*) the peaceful (*śānta*) places (*jagyāṃṇ*) of Īḍar (*īḍara*) and Vaso (*vaso-nī*), the memory (*yād*) arises (*āve che*) just as they were (*tad-rūpa*). [sent. 3:] *temaja khambhāta pāse vaḍavā gāmē sthiti thāi hatī, tyām vāva pachī tyām thoḍī ūmchī bhekhada pāse vāḍthī āgaḷ cāltām rasto, pachhī śānta ane śīḷa avakāsanī jagyāṃ hatī.* Likewise (*temaja*), when residing (*sthiti thāi hatī*) at Vaḍavā village (*vaḍavā gāmē*) near Khambhat (*khambhāta pāse*), after the stepwell (*vāva pachī*), there was (*hatī*) a path (*rasto*) going forward (*āgaḷ cāltām*) by a slightly raised (*thoḍī ūmchī*) hill (*bhekhada pāse*), and then (*pachhī*) there were (*hatī*) places (*jagyāṃ*) of peaceful (*śānta*) and cool (*śīḷa*) space (*avakāsanī*). [sent. 4:] *te jagyāoe pote śānta samādhi-stha daśāmām beṭhelā te sthiti āje potāne pāṃcaso vāra smṛtimām āvī che.* Those places (*te jagyāoe*) where he himself (*pote*) had sat (*beṭhelā*) in a peaceful (*śānta*) meditative state (*samādhi-stha daśāmām*), that condition (*te sthiti*) has today (*āje*) come into memory (*smṛtimām āvī che*) for him five hundred times (*pāṃcaso vāra*).
- 42 VĀ 959.6, p. 767: *tamārī śakti paṇa āmārī śakti-nī peṭhe sphurāyamāna kem na thāya?* Why (*kem*) does your (*tamārī*) power (*śakti*) also (*paṇa*) not become manifest (*sphurāyamāna na thāya*) in the same way (*peṭhe*) as our (*āmārī*) power (*śakti-nī*)?

- 43 In classical Jain epistemology, knowledge is classified into five types (jñāna-pañcaka), each an inherent capacity of the soul whose manifestation is conditioned by the attenuation or destruction of obstructing karmas. (1) *mati-jñāna*—sensory, perceptual, and inferential cognition—arises through the operation of the senses and mind; (2) *śruta-jñāna*, scriptural or linguistic cognition, depends on verbal and symbolic structures; (3) *avadhi-jñāna*, clairvoyant cognition, apprehends material objects beyond ordinary sensory limits; (4) *manahparyāya-jñāna*, telepathic cognition, directly apprehends the mental states of others; and (5) *kevala-jñāna*, omniscience, is the soul's fully unobstructed knowledge once all obscuring karmas, including the *jñānāvaraṇa* and *mohanīya* categories, are destroyed. Within this hierarchy, *mati-jñāna* is the most immediate and foundational mode, and Śrīmad's Morbī reflections treat calm natural environments as conditions that allow this inherent epistemic capacity to manifest with greater clarity.
- 44 Although not itself a *guṇasthāna*, *kṣayopasaṃa* is one of the core karmic conditions that shapes advancement through the fourteen *guṇasthānas*. The term refers to a mixed state in which a particular karmic obstruction is partly destroyed (*kṣaya*) and partly suppressed (*upaśama*), allowing a partial manifestation of the soul's inherent qualities. Several *guṇasthānas*—especially those associated with right view (3–5) and the graded attenuation of the passions (6–11)—are defined by varying degrees of *kṣayopasaṃa* of the deluding (*mohanīya*) and knowledge-obscuring (*jñānāvaraṇa*) karmas. The twelfth stage (*apramatta-guṇasthāna*) represents the final moment in which vigilance is maintained through this mixed state before the total destruction of delusion (*kṣīṇa-moha*) in the thirteenth. Śrīmad's use of *kṣayopasaṃa* in the Morbī teachings reflects this classical framework: natural solitude can occasion temporary reductions in karmic agitation that function analogously to *kṣayopasaṃa*, permitting clearer perception and more refined cognition.
- 45 VĀ 959.6, p. 767: “*jātismaraṇajñāna*” e *matijñānno bheda che*. “Knowledge of past births” (*jātismaraṇajñāna*) is (*che*) a subdivision (*bheda*) of sensory knowledge (*matijñānno*).
- 46 VĀ 959.6, p. 768: *pūrvemāṃ smṛtimāṃ āvelī vastu śāntpaṇe saṃbhāre to yathāsthiti saṃbhāre*. If (*to*) one recalls (*saṃbhāre*) something (*vastu*) that has arisen (*āvelī*) in memory (*smṛtimāṃ*) from before (*pūrvemāṃ*), calmly (*śāntpaṇe*), then (*to*) one remembers (*saṃbhāre*) it in its true condition (*yathāsthiti*).
- 47 VĀ 959.6, p. 768: *bijāo paṇa te samaye tyāṃ hatā. paṇa badhāne tevī rīte yād na āve*. Others (*bijāo*) also (*paṇa*) were (*hatā*) there (*tyāṃ*) at that time (*te samaye*). But (*paṇa*) not everyone (*badhāne*) remembers (*yād āve*) in the same way (*tevī rīte*).
- 48 VĀ 959.6, p. 768: *kāraṇake te kṣayopasaṃne ādhīn che*. The reason (*kāraṇake*) is that (*te*) it is subject (*ādhīn che*) to the subsidence and destruction (*kṣayopasaṃne*) of karma.
- 49 VĀ 959.6, pp. 767–68: *tema jo pūrvaparyāyanī smṛti karavāne kṣayopasaṃmādi sānukūlatā (yogyatā) hoyā to “jātismaraṇajñāna” thāya*. In the same way (*tema*), if (*jo*) for remembering (*smṛti karavāne*) a previous life (*pūrvaparyāyanī*), there is (*hoyā*) favorable condition (*sānukūlatā*), such as (*ādi*) the subsidence or destruction (*kṣayopasaṃa*) of karma, that is, aptitude (*yogyatā*), then (*to*) “knowledge of past births” (*jātismaraṇajñāna*) occurs (*thāya*).
- 50 VĀ 10, p. 16: *have, manuṣya, tiryāṇc, e samasta jotajotāmāṃ pāṇīnā bindunī peṭhe ane jhākaṇā puṇjīnī peṭhe viṇasī jāya che, jotajotāmāṃ viyamāna thī cālyā jāya che*. Now (*have*), humans (*manuṣya*) and animals (*tiryāṇc*), all of them (*samasta*) perish (*viṇasī jāya che*) in a moment (*jotajotāmāṃ*) like drops of water (*pāṇīnā bindu*) or clusters of dew (*jhākaṇā puṇjī*), and in a moment (*jotajotāmāṃ*) they depart (*cālyā jāya che*) and vanish (*viyamāna thī*).
- 51 VĀ 10, p. 16: *samasta indriyajanita sukha je je dr̥ṣṭigocara dekhāya che, te indradhanuṣyanā raṅganī peṭhe jotajotāmāṃ nāśa thī jāya che*. All sense-generated pleasures (*indriya-janita sukha*) that appear (*dr̥ṣṭigocara*) vanish in a moment (*jotajotāmāṃ*), like the colors of a rainbow (*indradhanuṣya*).
- 52 VĀ 10, p. 16: *yauvananuṃ jośa saṃdhyākālānī lālinīnī peṭhe kṣaṇa kṣaṇamāṃ vināśa pāme che, eṭalā māṭe ā māruṃ gāma, ā māruṃ rājya, ā māruṃ ghara, ā māruṃ dhana, ā māruṃ kuṭumba, evā vikalpa karavā te ja mahā-moṭhno prabhāva che*. The vigor of youth (*yauvana-no jośa*) fades moment by moment (*kṣaṇa-kṣaṇamāṃ*), like evening's redness (*saṃdhyākāl-nī lālinī*); therefore, thinking “this is my village/kingdom/house/wealth/family” is merely the effect of great delusion (*mahā-moṭhno prabhāva*).
- 53 VĀ 10, p. 16: *je dehthī strī, putra, mita, bhāī vagere nī sāthe sambandha mānī rāgī thī raho che, te deha agnīthī bhasma thashe, vaḷī māṭī sāthe māḷī jāśe tathā jīva khāshe to vṛṣṭā ane phuṅgī-klevararūpa thaśe*. The body (*deha*), by which one remains (*raho che*) attached (*rāgī thī*) through relationships (*sambandha mānī*) to wife (*strī*), son (*putra*), friend (*mita*), brother (*bhāī*), and others (*vagere*), will be reduced to ashes (*bhasma thaśe*) by fire (*agnīthī*), will mix (*māḷī jāśe*) with the earth (*māṭī*), and if consumed (*khāshe*) by creatures (*jīva*), will become excrement (*vṛṣṭā*) and a fungus-ridden corpse (*phuṅgī-klevara-rūpa*).
- 54 VĀ 10, p. 16: *te samasta parigraha no sambandha tamārāthī jarūr vikhūṭo paḍshe*. All these possessions (*samasta parigraha no sambandha*) will surely (*jarūr*) fall apart (*vikhūṭo paḍshe*) from you (*tamārāthī*).
- 55 VĀ 10, pp. 16–17: *juvānī mṛgākṣaṇī chāyānī peṭhe dhaḷī jāśhe, sthira nahīṃ raheśe*. Youth (*juvānī*) will decline (*dhaḷī jāśhe*) like the shadow of a gazelle (*mṛgākṣa-nī chāyā*), it will not (*nahīṃ*) remain firm (*sthira raheśe*).
- 56 VĀ 10, p. 17: *jem parvatthī paḍatī nadīnā taraṅga. . .* — see the earlier citation/translation above.
- 57 VĀ 10, p. 17: *jñāna-netrane andha karvā māṭe dhūḷanī vṛṣṭī samān che*. It is like a shower (*vṛṣṭī*) of dust (*dhūḷa*) that blinds (*andha karvā māṭe*) the eye of knowledge (*jñāna-netra*).

- 58 VĀ 10, p. 17: *te bhāgyarūpa puṣpo(ne) nāś karaṇār dhūmasa nī vṛṣṭi che*. It is like a shower (*vṛṣṭi*) of dust (*dhūmasa*) destroying (*nāś karaṇār*) the blossoms of fortune (*bhāgya-rūpa puṣpa*).
- 59 VĀ 10, p. 17: *strī-prīti-rūpa haraṇīne vyāghra samān che*. It is like a tiger (*vyāghra samān*) slaying the doe of womanly affection (*strī-prīti-rūpa haraṇī*).
- 60 VĀ 10, p. 17: *je viṣayonā sevavāthī sukha icchavum che, te jīvanāne arthe viṣa pīvum che*. To desire (*icchavum*) happiness (*sukha*) through the enjoyment (*sevavāthī*) of sense-objects (*viṣaya*) is (*che*) like drinking poison (*viṣa pīvum*) for the sake of (*arthe*) life (*jīvana*).
- 61 VĀ 10, p. 17: *śītala thavā māṭe agnimāṇi praveś karvā barābara che*. It is the same (*barābara che*) as entering (*praveś karvā*) fire (*agni*) in order to (*māṭe*) become cool (*śītala thavā*).
- 62 VĀ 10, p. 17: *mīṭhām bhojan māṭe jher nā vṛkṣane pāṇī pāvum che*. It is like (*che*) watering (*pāṇī pāvum*) a poisonous tree (*jher nā vṛkṣa*) for the sake of (*māṭe*) sweet food (*mīṭhām bhojan*).
- 63 VĀ 10, p. 17: *jem nadīno pravāha nirantara cālyo jāya che, pharī nathī āve, tema āyusya, kāyā, rūpa, bala, lāvaṇya ane indriya-śakti gayā pachī pāchām nathī āve*. Just as (*jem*) the flow (*pravāha*) of a river (*nadī*) continues on (*nirantara cālyo jāya che*) and does not return (*pharī nathī āve*), so also (*tema*) lifespan (*āyusya*), body (*kāyā*), form (*rūpa*), strength (*bala*), beauty (*lāvaṇya*), and the power of the senses (*indriya-śakti*), once gone (*gayā pachī*), do not return (*pāchām nathī āve*).
- 64 VĀ 10, p. 17: *ā śarīrno jalṭhī bharelā kācā ghaḍānī peṭhe jaladī vināś thaśe*. This body (*śarīra*), like an unbaked pot filled with water (*jalṭhī bharelā kācā ghaḍānī peṭhe*), will quickly be destroyed (*jaladī vināś thaśe*).
- 65 VĀ 10, p. 18: *ā lakṣmī jal-taraṅgavat asthir che*. This wealth (*lakṣmī*) is unstable (*asthira*) like a wave of water (*jal-taraṅga*).
- 66 VĀ 10, p. 18: *krpaṇe lakṣmīnum rakvālpānum ane dāsapaṇum jānavum*. The miser (*krpaṇa*) should recognize that guarding (*rakvālpānum*) and serving (*dāsapaṇum*) wealth (*lakṣmī*) is bondage. *dūr jamīnmām nākhīne lakṣmīne pahāṇa samān karī che*. By burying wealth (*lakṣmī*) in distant lands (*dūr jamīna*), he has made it like a stone (*pahāṇa samān*). *jem bhūmimām bījā pahāṇa rahe che, temām lakṣmīnum jāno*. Just as (*jem*) other stones (*bījā pahāṇa*) lie in the ground (*bhūmī*), so too know wealth (*lakṣmīnum jāno*).
- 67 VĀ 10, p. 18: *saṅgrāmā ghor saṅkaṭmām jāya che*. He goes (*jāya che*) into terrible dangers (*ghor saṅkaṭ*) of battle (*saṅgrām*). *samudramām praveś kare che*. He enters (*praveś kare che*) the ocean (*samudra*). *ghor bhayānak rāna-parvatmām jāya che*. He goes (*jāya che*) into dreadful (*ghor bhayānak*) forests and mountains (*rāna-parvat*). *dharma-rahit deśmām jāya che*. He goes (*jāya che*) into lawless lands (*dharma-rahit deś*).
- 68 VĀ 10, p. 22: *ākāśmām ūdatā pakṣīne bījum pakṣī māre che; jalāmām vicharatā macchādi-ne bījā macchādi māre che; sthaḷmām vicharatā manuṣya, paśu ādikne sthaḷsārī siṃha, vāgha, sarpa vagere duṣṭa tiryāṇa tathā bhīla, mleccha, cōra, lūṇṭārā, mahā nirdaya manuṣya māre che*. In the sky (*ākāśmām*), one bird (*pakṣī*) kills (*māre che*) another (*bījum pakṣī*); in the water (*jalāmām*), one fish (*maccha*) kills another (*bījā macchādi*); on land (*sthaḷmām*), humans and animals (*manuṣya, paśu ādik*) are killed (*māre che*) by land-dwellers (*sthaḷsārī*) such as lions (*siṃha*), tigers (*vāgha*), and snakes (*sarpa*), as well as by wicked beings (*duṣṭa*) like wild tribesmen (*bhīla*), foreigners (*mleccha*), thieves (*cōra*), plunderers (*lūṇṭārā*), and cruel men (*mahā-nirdaya manuṣya*).
- 69 VĀ 10, p. 22: *śikārīnā upadrava-thī bhayabhīta thayel jīvo modhum phādī beṭhel ajagara-nā modhāmām bila jānī praveś kare che, tema ajñānī jīva bhūkha, tarasa, kāma, kopa vagere tathā indriya-na viṣayoni tṛṣṇānā ātāpa-thī santāpita thaī, viṣayādika-rūpa ajagara-nā mukhmām praveś kare che*. Just as (*jem*) creatures (*jīvo*) terrified (*bhayabhīta thayel*) by the attack (*upadrava-thī*) of hunters (*śikārīnā*) flee into (*praveś kare che*) the open mouth (*modhum phādī beṭhel modhāmām*) of a python (*ajagara*) thinking it a burrow (*bila jānī*), so (*tema*) the ignorant soul (*ajñānī jīva*), tormented (*santāpita thaī*) by the heat (*ātāpa-thī*) of hunger (*bhūkha*), thirst (*tarasa*), lust (*kāma*), anger (*kopa*), and craving for sensory objects (*indriya-na viṣayoni tṛṣṇā*), rushes into (*praveś kare che*) the python-mouth (*mukhmām*) of saṃsāra (*viṣayādika-rūpa ajagara*).
- 70 VĀ 10, p. 22: *te ūṇṭa-nā mukh-nā ākāra ādī-vālām, sāṅkaḍām modhā-vālām ane ūndhe māthe che*. These (*te*) have the form (*ākāra*) of a camel's mouth (*ūṇṭa-nā mukh*), with narrow openings (*sāṅkaḍām modhā-vālām*), and are inverted (*ūndhe māthe*).
- 71 VĀ 10, p. 22: *naraka-nī sapta prthvī che*. There are (*che*) seven earths (*sapta prthvī*) of hell (*naraka-nī*). *tenī vajra-maya bhūmi bhīnt-nī māphaka chhajel che*. Their (*tenī*) ground (*bhūmi*) is diamond-like (*vajra-maya*) and covered (*chhajel che*) as if by a wall (*bhīnt-nī māphaka*). *te ūṇṭa-nā mukh-nā ākāra ādī-vālām, sāṅkaḍām modhā-vālām ane ūndhe māthe che*. These (*te*) have the form (*ākāra*) of a camel's mouth (*ūṇṭa-nā mukh*), with narrow openings (*sāṅkaḍām modhā-vālām*), and are inverted (*ūndhe māthe*). *uparṇī cāra prthvīnām cālīsa lākh bila ane pañcama prthvīnī be lākh bila em beṇṭālīsa lākh bila-mām to keval ātāpa, agnī-nī uṣṇa vedanā che*. In the forty lakh pits (*cālīsa lākh bila*) of the upper four earths (*uparṇī cāra prthvīnām*), and the two lakh pits (*be lākh bila*) of the fifth earth (*pañcama prthvīnī*), making forty-two lakh pits in all (*beṇṭālīsa lākh bila*), there is only (*to keval*) the burning heat (*ātāpa*) and fiery torment (*agnī-nī uṣṇa vedanā*).
- 72 VĀ 959.27.1, p. 783: *cayopacaya-javum-javum, paṇa prasangavaśāt āvavum-javum, gamanāgamana. mānasana jāvā-āvavāne lāgu paḍe nathī. śvāsochchhāvāsa ityādi sūkṣma kriyāne lāgu paḍe. cayavicaya-javum-āvavum*. Accumulation-and-dissipation (*cayopacaya*) means going-and-going (*javum-javum*), but (*paṇa*) by circumstance (*prasangavaśāt*) coming-and-going (*āvavum-javum*), movement-and-return (*gamanāgamana*); it does not (*nathī*) apply (*lāgu paḍe*) to mental (*mānasana*) goings-and-comings (*jāvā-āvavāne*), but (*paṇa*) applies (*lāgu paḍe*) to subtle (*sūkṣma*) processes (*kriyāne*) like (*ityādi*) inhalation-exhalation (*śvāsochchhāvāsa*); accumulation-dissipation (*cayavicaya*) means going-and-coming (*javum-āvavum*).

- ⁷³ VĀ 959.27.2, p. 783: *ātmānuṃ jñāna jyāre cintā-māṃ rokāya che tyāre navā paramāṇu grahaṇa thaī śaktā nathī; ne je hoy che tenānuṃ javuṃ thāya che, teṭale śarīranuṃ vajan ghaṭaī thāya che.* When (jyāre) the soul's (ātmānuṃ) knowledge (jñāna) is obstructed (rokāya che) in thought (cintā-māṃ), then (tyāre) new (navā) atoms (paramāṇu) cannot (nathī) be taken in (grahaṇa thaī śaktā), and (ne) what (je) exists (hoy che) departs (javuṃ thāya che), therefore (teṭale) the body's (śarīranuṃ) weight (vajan) decreases (ghaṭaī thāya che).
- ⁷⁴ VĀ 959.27.3, p. 783: *śrī ācārāṅgasūtra-nā pahalā adhyayana śastraparijñāna-māṃ ane śrī śaḍdarśanasamuccaya-māṃ manuṣya ane vanaspatīnā dharminī tulanā karī vanaspatī-māṃ ātmā hovānuṃ siddha karī batāvvyuṃ che, te evī rīte ke banne janme che, vadhe che, āhāra le che, paramāṇu le che, mūke che, mare che, ityādi.* In the first (pahalā) lecture (adhyayana) of Ācārāṅgasūtra (ācārāṅgasūtra-nā) on scriptural knowledge (śastraparijñāna-māṃ) and in Śaḍdarśanasamuccaya (śaḍdarśanasamuccaya-māṃ), by comparing (tulanā karī) the qualities (dharminī) of humans (manuṣya) and plants (vanaspatīnā), it has been shown (batāvvyuṃ che) that (ke) the soul (ātmā) exists (hovānuṃ) in plants (vanaspatī-māṃ), in this way (evī rīte) that both (banne) are born (janme che), grow (vadhe che), take in food (āhāra le che), take in atoms (paramāṇu le che), expel (mūke che), die (mare che), and so on (ityādi).
- ⁷⁵ VĀ 959.30.14, p. 784: *ātmā samaya-samaya upayogī chhatā avakāśa-nī khāmī athavā kāma-na bojāne laīne tene ātmā-sambandhī vicāra karavāno vakata maḷī śakato nathī ema kahaṃ e prākṛtajanya “laukika” vacana che.* Although (chhatā) the soul (ātmā) is active (upayogī) at various times (samaya-samaya), yet because of (laīne) lack (khāmī) of leisure (avakāśa-nī) or the burden (bojāne) of desires (kāma-na), the statement (vacana) that (ema kahaṃ) one cannot (maḷī śakato nathī) find time (vakata) to think (vicāra karavāno) about the soul (ātmā-sambandhī) is a conventional (prākṛtajanya) “worldly” (laukika) saying (vacana). *jo khāvāno, pīvanāno, ūṅghavāno ityādīno vakata maḷyo ne kāma karyuṃ te paṇa ātmā-na upayoga vinā nathī thāyuṃ, to paścī kāśa je sukh-nī āvaśyakatā che, ne je manuṣyajanma-no kartavya che, temāṃ vakata na maḷyo e vacana jñānī koī kālē sācuṃ mānī śake nahīṃ.* If (jo) time (vakata) is found (maḷyo) for eating (khāvāno), drinking (pīvanāno), and sleeping (ūṅghavāno), and (ne) these actions (kāma) too (paṇa) are not (nathī) done (thāyuṃ) without (vinā) the soul's (ātmā-na) activity (upayoga), then (to paścī) the statement (vacana) that one finds no time (vakata na maḷyo) for what is required (āvaśyakatā) for the happiness (sukh-nī) that truly matters (kāśa), namely (je) the duty (kartavya) of human birth (manuṣyajanma-no), can never (koī kālē) be accepted (sācuṃ mānī śake) by the wise (jñānī).

References

- Bohanec, Cogen. 2024a. *Bhakti Ethics, Emotions, and Love in Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava Metaethics*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Bohanec, Cogen. 2024b. Semiotics and illocution in Gauḍīya sādhanā. In *Contemplative Studies and Hinduism: Meditation, Devotion, Prayer, and Worship*. New York: Routledge, pp. 143–159.
- Bohanec, Cogen. 2026a. Jain ecotheology engaging with ecopsychology. In *Engaged Jainism: Critical and Constructive Studies of Jain Social Engagement*. Edited by Christopher Jain Miller and Cogen Bohanec. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bohanec, Cogen. 2026b. Jain virtue ethics engaging with animal rights. In *Engaged Jainism: Critical and Constructive Studies of Jain Social Engagement*. Edited by Christopher Jain Miller and Cogen Bohanec. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bohanec, Cogen. Forthcoming. Exploring the connection: Biophilia and natural landscape in the dharma traditions. *Journal of Dharma Studies*.
- Kellert, Stephen R. 1993. The biological basis for human values of nature. In *The Biophilia Hypothesis*. Edited by Stephen R. Kellert and Edward O. Wilson. Washington: Island Press.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. 2015. *After Virtue*, 3rd ed. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. First published 1984.
- Rājendra, Śrīmad. 2012. *Vacanāmṛta [Collected Sayings]*, 11th ed. Agās: Śrīmad Rājendra Āśram.
- Salter, Emma. 2002. *Raj Bhakta Marg: The Path of Devotion to Srīmad Rājendra: A Jain Community in the Twenty-First Century*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wales, Cardiff, UK. Available online: <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/9211/> (accessed on 24 February 2026).
- Ulrich, Roger S. 1993. Biophilia, biophobia, and natural landscapes. In *The Biophilia Hypothesis*. Edited by Stephen R. Kellert and Edward O. Wilson. Washington: Island Press, pp. 73–137.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.