APPLICATION OF SCIENCE AND LOGIC
IN INTERPRETATING GURBANI
Part II: Ontology of God

ABSTRACT
In continuation of our work on the “Application of Science and Logic in Interpreting Gurbani” we have discussed in the Part I that “Etymological Study” of words, used in Gurbani, was a great help to achieve interpretation very close to the theme of the Sabd. Existence of the God has been and will continue to be a “Question” in comprehending the Truth in its propriety by the evolving humanity. The theologians in almost every known religion of the world are promulgating the existence of God in one form or another based upon their imagined descriptive attributes reflected in the natural phenomena. Most of the terminology applied in describing God as an Entity is either reductive or deductive of existing attributes in natural phenomena. In this article we are looking for if existence of God or “Ontology of God” can also be demonstrated by the application Science and Logic?

INTRODUCTION
Right from the beginning we must admit that ‘Ontology of God’ is most difficult topic to cover in this article. The word ‘Ontology’ seems to create a lot of controversies about its definition, concept, and origin. The term is borrowed from Philosophy, where Ontology means “The Nature of Being”. Having a philosophical origin, the contemporary definition of Ontology seems slightly difficult to grasp at first hand. However a detailed study of its origin, history and use of the word in different context not only demystifies it but also makes it an interesting field to study and explore. The latest ‘Oxford English Dictionary’ defines it as ‘A branch of Metaphysics concerned with the nature of being’ as reported by Mushtaque (24). We have tried to collect some pertinent references to draw some preliminary conclusions for further consideration by the expert scientists and theologians.

ONTOMETRY OF GOD
Besides the above definition of ‘Ontology’ in Oxford Dictionary other definitions are as follow:

Study of existence - the most general branch of metaphysics, concerned with the nature of being.
Encarta Dictionary

The branch of metaphysics that studies the nature of existence or being as such.
Dictionary.com

Of or relating to the argument for the existence of God holding that the existence of the concept of God entails the existence of God.
http://www.thefreedictionary.com/ontological

Ontology is a specification of a conceptualization.
Tom Gruber

It becomes evident from different definitions of ‘Ontology’ that it is a study of nature of existence or being. While Freedictionary.com defines it as the argument for the existence of God, however, Gruber defines it as a specification of a conceptualization. The definition given by Gruber appears to be more appropriate for many theologians for discussing the existence of God which can...
be conceptualized easily as compared to proving the existence of God.

Houdmann (16) writes about existence of God as follows:

“The question of whether there is a conclusive argument for the existence of God has been debated throughout history, with exceedingly intelligent people taking both sides of the dispute. In recent times, arguments against the possibility of God’s existence have taken on a militant spirit that accuses anyone daring to believe in God as being delusional and irrational. Karl Marx asserted that anyone believing in God must have a mental disorder that caused invalid thinking. The psychiatrist Sigmund Freud wrote that a person who believed in a Creator God was delusional and only held those beliefs due to a “wish-fulfillment” factor that produced what Freud considered to be an unjustifiable position. The philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche bluntly said that faith equates to not wanting to know what is true. The voices of these three figures from history (along with others) are simply now parroted by a new generation of atheists who claim that a belief in God is intellectually unwarranted.”

In spite of the above report against the belief in God and religion we still do not have any convincing scientific proof about the existence of God. However, a new survey conducted by the Ipsos/Reuters shows that 51 percent of people in the world believe in God. Only 18 percent don’t and 17 percent are undecided. It also shows that 51 percent believe that there is an afterlife while 23 percent believe they will just “cease to exist” and around a quarter (26 percent) simply don’t know what will happen after death (25).

Larson and Witham (19) reported that the question of religious belief among US scientists has been debated since early in the century. Their latest survey found that Disbelief in God and immortality (of so-called soul) among National Academy of Sciences (NAS) biological scientists it was 65.2% and 69.0%, respectively, and among NAS physical scientists it was 79.0% and 76.3%, respectively. Most of the rest were agnostics on both issues, with few believers. Richard Dawkins (12) the famous author of “God the delusion”, Stephen Hawking (15) - world’s preeminent scientist advocates atheism in his book The Grand Design, Carl Sagan - Astronomy, Francis Crick and James D. Watson – DNA, etc are among hundreds of atheists (4).

On the other hand Francis S. Collins, MD, PhD is the director of the Human Genome Project is a famous theist. His most recent book is "The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief" (10). He is a scientist and a believer in God and Jesus, and he does not find any conflict between Science and faith. He sees DNA, the information molecule of all living things, as God's language, and the elegance and complexity of our own bodies and the rest of Nature as a reflection of God's plan. John Borland, Waukegan from Illinois considers his interview to CNN more like an advertisement for Christianity than a thoughtful discussion of spirituality (11). Collin is a strong believer that it is the God who does every action and reaction very intelligently and precisely whereas Francis Crick and James D. Watson, who discovered the double helix structure of DNA, are included in the list of atheists (4).

Lennox (20) is of the opinion that God is a person and not a theory, therefore, it is to be expected that one of the prime evidences of God’s existence is personal experience. He is very critical about the “The Grand Design” of Hawking (15). Lennox (20) is also against the atheists and remarked that they are only too eager to denounce the possibility that there exists a vast, intelligent being “out there”, namely God, who has left his fingerprints all over his creation.

Although almost all religions, except Buddhism and Jainism, believe in existence of God but so far no theologian of any religion has been able to prove the existence of God. “The first, and best-known, ontological argument was proposed by St. Anselm of Canterbury in the 11th century CE. In his Proslogion, St. Anselm claims to derive the existence of God from the concept of a being than which no greater can be conceived. St. Anselm reasoned that, if such a being fails to exist, then a greater being—namely, a being than which no greater can be conceived, and which exists—can be conceived. But this would be absurd: nothing can be greater than a being than which no greater can be conceived. So a being than which no greater can be conceived—i.e., God—exists.” http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ontological-arguments/

Then there are ontological arguments that God is Perfect, Benevolent, and Exists everywhere. In almost all religions God is described as Eternal; created by Itself from nothing; and God created the Universe from nothing. But no religion defines that “Nothingness” from which God appeared and then that “nothingness” from which God created the Universe. It was only Guru Nanak (1469-1539) (9) who has defined this “Nothingness” as ᴴ ᵃ ᵆ (Sunn) in his Bani (Siddh Gost) incorporated in the Aad Guru Granth Sahib (AGGS) (1).
Is there any scientific, logical, reasonable argument for the existence of God?
The answer is, YES, if we know what the God is.
Almost all religions believe in Monotheism (One God) but in Christianity the God has a son, Jesus; in Islam God has only one Prophet, Mohammad; in Hinduism God exists in Trinity – Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva besides God also has millions of its manifestations. Over and above Hinduism also believes in One God. On the other hand Sikhism in general believes in One God and calls itself as Monotheistic religion. But if we study Nanakian Philosophy in depth we will find that Guru Nanak’s God is Monistic rather than Monotheistic which may manifest Itself into many forms but not in many anthropomorphic gods and goddesses.

Monism is defined as:

There are two sorts of definitions for Monism (5):

The wide definition: a philosophy is monistic if it postulates unity of origin of all things; all existing things go back to a source which is distinct from them.

The restricted definition: this requires not only unity of origin but also unity of substance and essence.

Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677) held that the two are the same, and this monism is a fundamental quality of his philosophy. He was described as a “God-intoxicated man,” and used the word God to describe the unity of all substance. Spinoza contends that "Deus sive Natura" ("God or Nature") is a being of infinitely many attributes, of which thought and extension are two (2).

Sodhi (3) defines Monism in Sikhism as: “Besides its monotheism, Sikhism also emphasizes another philosophical idea, which is known as monism. Monism is the belief that all that our senses apprehend is only appearance; that God is the sole Reality. Forms being subject to Time, shall pass away. God’s Reality alone is eternal and abiding. However, this Monism is not the same as defined above where Monism means “unity of origin of all things; all existing things go back to a source which is distinct from them.” If it is so then that all substances do not pass away as mentioned by Sodhi but, in fact, change forms.

According to German Philosopher Karl Jaspers (17), when Spinoza wrote "Deus sive Natura" (God or Nature) Spinoza meant God was Natura naturans NOT Natura naturata, that is, "a dynamic nature in action, growing and changing, not a passive or static thing." In simple language ‘Nature is God’ for Spinoza.

### EXISTENCE OF GOD IN NANAISKAN PHILOSOPHY

#### Name of God

In this article the term, God, will be used for an Entity, which is considered to be ‘Eternal Entity’ or ‘Transcendent Entity’ or ‘Supreme Being’ or ‘Supernatural Being’ by most of the religions of the world. And this term, God, can be easily understood by the English-speaking people throughout the world, although God is known by hundreds of names in different religions and in different languages. Malaysian Muslim Government is trying to monopolize the name of God as ALLAH and this name cannot be used by non-Muslims in Malaysia.

Various names of God, used in Hinduism as well as in Islam, have been used in the Bani incorporated in the Sikh scriptures, Aad Guru Granth Sahib (AGGS) (1). For example, Brahma, Vishnu, Mahesh, Shiva, Ram, Krishan, Gobind, Ishwar, Swami, Narain, Gosain etc. from Hinduism; and Allah, Rahim, Kareem, etc. from Islam. Besides ‘Nirankar’ (without any form) and ‘Akal Purakh’ (Timeless Entity) have also been used in Gurbani.

However, Bhatt Giand has used ‘Waheguru’ (Vaheguru) to address Guru Ramdas and some theologians think that ‘Waheguru’ has also been used to address God by him (AGGS, Giand, p 1402-1403) (1). Moreover, Bhai Gurdas has declared that ‘Waheguru’ is a ‘Gurmantra’ for the Sikhs. He further says that ‘Waheguru has been coined by taking first letter from the name of different gods from Hinduism, like ‘Wawa’ (W/V) from Vishnu, ‘Haha’ (H) from Hari (Krishna), ‘Gaga’ (G) from Gobind, and ‘Rara’ (R) from Ram to coin the name of God as ‘Waheguru’{(28) VaaR 1, Pauri 49}. Now the word, ‘Waheguru’, has been accepted as the name of God by many Sikh theologians and scholars.

In fact neither Guru Nanak – the founder of Sikh (Sikhism), nor any Sikh Guru has assigned ‘Waheguru’ or any other specific/descriptive name to the God. In spite of the above fact the name ‘Waheguru’ for God is extensively used by the Sikhs in their literature and everyday talks. And this name, ‘Waheguru’, is repeated several times in Gurdwaras continuously for hours as ‘Naam Japna’ or as ‘Naam Simrana’ and also repeated again and again while reciting Kirtan (Sabd).

In general, God is addressed as male by almost all religions of the world although there are many female Goddesses as the manifestation of God (Brahman) in Hinduism and as ‘Athena’ – the Greek goddess of wisdom. When God is addressed or presented as a male, some women become offended that how come God is
never addressed as female. Since Guru Nanak has not assigned any specific/descriptive name, therefore, he prefers to address God as श्री, माता, पिता, श्रीकृष्ण, श्री, श्रीकृष्ण, आपा, उपासक, उपासिन, लोक, etc. Contrary to this rule Guru Nanak himself has addressed or presented God as ‘Husband’ and the devotee as ‘woman’ and by all other Vedic and Vedantic names from Hinduism and also Islamic names but as metaphors to represent God.

The above philosophy, “no name can be assigned to the God”, of Guru Nanak has been explained by Guru Arjan as follows:

विलुभ्र नम्न चतुरे उजे निन्द्या
Kirtam nami kathe teere jilbha.

The descriptive names of That (Eternal Entity), which existed even before the beginning of the time and space appeared.

(Therefore, Its name is Ever-existing Entity - अजुनी)

AGGS, M 5, p 1083 (1).

Van Biema (32) reported about a debate, GOD VS. SCIENCE, between Richard Dawkins, an atheist Biologist, who occupied the Charles Simonyi Professorship for Public Understanding of Science at Oxford University, and a Christian Geneticist, Francis Collins, the Genome pioneer and Director of the US National Human Genome Research Institute since 1993. The discussion was based on the best seller, The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief, of Francis Collins (Free Press). The conclusions were:

Richard Dawkins said:

“Close reading of the physical evidence should lead towards atheism.”

And

Francis Collins says:

“Material signs point to God but that God also exists outside of space and time.”

Let us now discuss the following statement of Dawkins, the protagonist of atheism and author of ‘The God Delusion’ in that discussion:

“I don’t see the Olympian gods or Jesus coming down and dying on the cross as worthy of that grandeur. They strike me as parochial. If there is God, it's going to be a whole lot bigger and whole lot more incomprehensible than anything that any theologian of any religion has ever proposed.”

I appreciate Dawkins’ comprehension about God: “I don’t see the Olympian gods or Jesus coming down and dying on the cross as worthy of that grandeur.”, since that is very cogent to that proclaimed by Guru Nanak in the Commencing Verse of the AGGS that God is अजुनी (Ajuni) - does not take birth or die (नामिन अजुनी तरी थीया पृथ्वी)

AGGS, M 1, p 931 (1), (6). (Birth and death are not the God’s attributes: God is free from birth and death cycle.). It means exactly the same what Einstein proclaimed that: “God does not come to this earth in anthropomorphic form.”

Again I feel proud to compare Dawkins’ other statement, “If there is God, it's going to be a whole lot bigger and whole lot more incomprehensible than anything that any theologian of any religion has ever proposed.” with that of Guru Nanak, who had declared it consistently in his Bani that God is whole lot bigger and whole lot incomprehensible more than 500 years before Dawkins could realize these attributes of God. A typical verse of Guru Nanak in this respect is cited as follows:

वेंटी वेंटी अजुनी धर्म वीनास्त अजुनामा
Kot kothe meri arjaa pavan piraapi.

मुरंट दुही ऊपर देखे सुंप्ती संस्कृतर त बरसी
Chand suran deye gauj na dekhā supnai saaun na thāo.

चौद वीरंजन त घड़े ऊपर वेनक अमृत राजी
Bhī jīrī kīmaṇ nā pavaī hāo kevā akkā nāo. ||

If my life is millions of millions years and air is my food and drink;

If by living in cage and not seeing moon or sun to know whether it is day or night and never slept even in dream; even then I cannot evaluate that how great God is and how could I name the God?

Guru Nanak says should I long for names? ||

Sāchā nirankār nij thāe.

Suṟṇa akānsū akānsū ||

God is Formless by Itself.

(After) hearing again and again about Gods attributes from various sacred Granthis (books) Guru Nanak says should I long to say so if it pleases God. Pause.
EXISTENCE OF GOD AS ENERGY

We have discussed that the logo, ੰਗੜ੍ਹੀ, of God represents ‘Singularity’. And ‘Singularity’ is highly concentrated form of Energy into a smallest point which is invisible, therefore, it is also called ‘Nothingness’ (9).

Thus this God (ੰਗੜ੍ਹੀ) was always there as described by Guru Nanak:

ਅਸਾਿ ਮਰੋਤ ਤਾਹਾਿ ਮਰੋਤ ।

ੰਗੜ੍ਹੀ ਜੰਗੜ੍ਹੀ

Ad sachi jugad sach.

ੰਗੜ੍ਹੀ ਮਰੋਤ ਜੰਗੜ੍ਹੀ

ੰਗੜ੍ਹੀ ਪੰਠੀ.

The above Sloka (Sloka) appears as a Manglacharan just after title ਮਰੋਤ (JAP). In the above Sloka there is no indication of any subject to which it is addressed. This is based on the philosophy of Guru Nanak that there is no descriptive or specific name for that Entity which is commonly known as God in English; Allah, Bhagwan, Gobind, Gosain, Ram, etc in Indian languages and many other names in other languages. In fact this is an extended description of ਮਰੋਤ in the Commencing Verse. It is important to understand the meanings of ਮਰੋਤ (sach) and ਮਰੋਤ (sat) before interpreting the above stanza.

The words ਮਰੋਤ (sach) and ਮਰੋਤ (sat) are commonly used in the Gurbani and both mean ‘true’ or ‘truth’ and/or ‘exist’ or ‘existence’ depending on the context these words have been used. ‘Sach’ in English means ‘Truth’, which means as follows:

Truth: noun, plural truths [trooth z, tongues]

(Dictionary.com)

The true or actual state of a matter: He tried to find out t he truth.

Conformity with fact or reality; verity: the truth of a statement.

A verified or indisputable fact, proposition, principle, or the like: mathematical truths.

The state or character of being true.

Actuality or actual existence.

The antonym of ‘Truth’ is ‘Falsehood’.


According to the view of Christian Science, ‘Truth’ means God, was first used by Macauliffe (21) who interpreted ‘Sach’ as ‘True’ in the above Sloka. The same interpretation was accepted by Dr Gopal Singh (26) in his English translation then Mannmohan Singh (SGPC) accepted the same meanings and Sant Singh Khalsa follows Mannmohan Singh’s interpretation in their English translations (31). Later on many more writers interpreted ‘Sach’ as ‘Ture’ and now ‘Sach’ is
On the other hand it was Faridkot Vala Tika which has interpreted ‘sach’ as ‘True’ in Punjabi. However, Prof Sahib Singh (31) and Giani Harbans Singh (29) have interpreted ‘sach’ as ‘exists’. This ‘sach’ represents that ‘Entity’, which has no descriptive/specific name, but exists. Here the word ‘sach’ has been interpreted as ‘exists’, which appears to be appropriate interpretation in this Sloka. Therefore, this Sloka is interpreted as follows:

\[ \text{‘exists’, which appears to be appropriate interpretation in this Sloka. Therefore, this Sloka is interpreted as} \]

Hai bhi sach Nānak hosī bhi sach. \[\|1\|\]

Was in existence before the beginning of the time and space;
Was in existence in the past; Is in existence in the present;
And will remain in existence forever (in the future).

As discussed above some theologians interpret सच (sach) as ‘true’ or ‘truth’. It is not appropriate interpretation since ‘truth’ is not an entity but a qualification of some ‘entity’ which must meet the conformity to fact or actuality or actual existence. Moreover, ‘truth’ has an antonym as ‘falsehood’. Therefore, here ‘sach’ represents some Entity which exists forever and has no antonym since according to Nanakian Philosophy there is no equivalent or opposite of that ‘Entity’. That ‘Entity’ is the God of Guru Nanak. No name for that ‘Entity’, which exists forever, has been assigned by Guru Nanak in this Sloka and anywhere else in his Bani.

What is that Entity?
In the above Sloka Guru Nanak is describing that ‘Entity’ in such a way that leads us to believe that God could be the Energy which existed before the time and space appeared, existed in the past, is existing now in the present and will exist forever.

Guru Nanak has also described that God can neither be constructed nor created since it came into existence of by Itself:

\[ \text{That One without any flaw came into being of Its Own.} \]

AGGS, Jap 5, p 2.
And that FACT has been expressed by Albert Einstein for ‘Energy’ exactly in such a way that it is comparable to meets the characteristics of "Energy"

\[ \text{“Energy cannot be created or destroyed; it can only be changed from one form to another.”} \]
— Albert Einstein

Since the logo, फैन, for God is represented as Singularity, Nothingness, सन (Summ), निर्गुण (Nirgun), which is a state of highly concentrated form of Energy which is also called as रज (Energy) by Guru Nanak (8), therefore, this logo, फैन, for God and the above Sloka lead us to believe that God of Guru Nanak is ‘Energy’, which became नागरज (Sargun) in the form of Universe.

It is well established theory that this Universe was in highly concentrated form of energy in a very minute point (Singularity) almost to ‘Nothingness’ when it exploded (Big Bang) and everything was created thereafter as we see the Universe today. About this Guru Nanak has explained it as follows:

\[ \text{Bīn mānhī} \text{ देवे बहुष } \]

Kītā pasā hā kāvī. \[\|2\|\]

\[ \text{Fis te hō-e lakhi dārīāhīte} \]

\[ \text{AKHI, तप 16, पृष्ठ 3.} \]

AGGS, Jap # 16, p 3.

The Universe exploded from one source of energy (Singularity) and started to expand. Thereafter many things appeared.

This Sloka has been discussed in details in Part I of this paper.

EXISTENCE OF GOD AS KUDRA (KUDRAT - NATURE)
Guru Nanak has used the word, कुद्रत (Kudrat - Nature) extensively in his Bani. It appears that he has picked up an Arabic word, kudrat, while he was in Middle East possibly from 1511 to 1521 CE (7). ‘Kudrat’ has many meanings:

‘Kudrat’ (Nature) in Arabic means (13): Power, *Power of God, *Will of God, *Divine Power, and it also means majaal = to dare (To have enough courage or audacity for some act; be fearless; venture).
*Power of God, *Will of God, *Divine Power: in scientific terms all these powers mean “Laws of
Nature’.


‘Kudrat’ (spelled as: ਕੁਦਰਤਾ, ਕੁਦਰਤੀ, ਕੁਦਰਤੁ, ਕੁਦਰਤੀ) in Bhai Kahn Singh’s Mahan Kosh (encyclopedia) means (30): Power, Maya (illusion), Creation of God (Nature).

‘Kudrat’ according to Gurcharan Singh (27) means: Power, nature, Maya, astonishing, play, unlimited power.

1. The material world and its phenomena.
2. The forces and processes that produce and control all the phenomena of the material world: the laws of nature.

The Dictionary of Science and Technology (23) does not define or explain terms like, the ‘God’, and the ‘Nature’, except that it describes the ‘Nature’ only of its involvement in the living organisms as follows: “An abstract entity regarded as regulating or epitomizing the general activities of plants and animals, especially higher animals.” This term is restricted to the living organisms, i.e. the nature of plants, or animals (23).

The English Language dictionaries have defined the ‘Nature’ as follows:

The Nature
“A creative and controlling force in the universe.”(22)

A more explanatory definition of the ‘Nature’ is as follow (14):
“A creative, controlling agent, force, or principle, or set of such forces or principles, operating or operative in a thing and determining wholly or chiefly its constitution, development, well being, or the like.” Specifically:
(a) In the universe, such a force or agency, often viewed as a creative guiding intelligence, or such principles regarded as established for the regulation of the universe or observed in its operation often personified and sometimes equivalent to God, natural laws, universal order, etc.
(b) In an individual, an inner driving or promoting force, as instinct, appetite, desire, or the sum of such.”

(It is almost same definition given in the Dictionary of Science and Technology as above (23).

The God
“The supreme or ultimate reality.”
[It is almost the same definition as given above in (a)]
“The being perfect in power, wisdom, and goodness whom men worship as creator and ruler of the universe.” (22)
(This is almost the same concept of the God as that of the major religions of the world.)

The Almighty
“Having absolute power over all (Almighty God). Relatively unlimited in power.”(22)

Since Guru Nanak has not assigned any specific name to the ‘Transcendent Entity’, commonly called ‘God’, therefore, for the sake of simplicity and consistency in this book, the ‘Transcendent Entity’ will also be called as ‘God’. But a pronoun, ‘It’, has been assigned instead of ‘He’ or ‘She’ used by many theologians. The ‘It’ was considered the most appropriate pronoun for this ‘Transcendent Entity’ since it is free from gender classification.

i) Kudrat (Nature)
In the following phrase, Guru Nanak says since God is not comprehensible so is the ‘Kudrat’ (Nature):

Kuḍrāt kavāṅ kahā víchārā. ॥

ii) Kudrat (Nature) as God
Then in the following phrase Guru Nanak considers ‘Kudrat’ (Nature) is God:

Nānak sacẖ dēṯīr sināẖẖat kūḍrāṯī. ॥8॥

Guru Nanak says:
‘I am not worth to be sacrificed myself upon Nature even once.
AGGS, Jap 17, p 4.

Nanak says1:
The Ever-existing Bountious (God) is recognized
(identified) as Nature\(^5\).

AGGS, M 1, p 141.

Here Guru Nanak is equating God with Nature. That means “God is Nature” or “Nature is God”.

In the following phrase Guru Nanak makes it clear that “God is Nature”:

वर्त	 जै विष्णु वर्त र तत्त्व || कहाँ हाँकिच्छ कहाँ ना जाँे ||

उधे व्रतादि  वीर्भादि  रजी भर्पि || 11  तत्त्व ||

ताँ वृतादि  मिश्रि  उ वर्ति  र तत्त्व || 11  तत्त्व ||

Guru Nanak says:

I want to describe\(^1\) (God) but cannot describe It.

Since You\(^2\) (God) are the Nature\(^3\), therefore, I cannot evaluate\(^4\) You (God).

AGGS, M 1, p 151.

iii) God Pervades in Kudrat (Nature)

In the following phrase Guru Nanak has indicated that Kudrat (Nature) Itself is God since God pervades in It:

बुरतादि  वर्ति  जै मस्तिष्क  मेंति ||

Kuḍrā  kar kai vasi-a so-e.

*स्थंतर वृतादि  मिश्रि  उ वर्ति  र तत्त्व ||

vakhaat vichāre so bandā ho-e.

व्रतादि  जै जीवित तत्त्व ||

Kuḍrā hai kīmat nahi pā-e.

तां वीर्भादि  भर्पि  उ वर्ति  र तत्त्व ||

Jā kīmat pā-e ta kahi na ja-e.

महेर सा वीर्भादि  ववि  घीर हदु ||

Sarai sahari karahi bichār.

धिश्व बुधे जै धर्म पहु ||

Bin būdhā kaise pāvahi pār.

मिश्रि  वर्ति  मिन्नति  भलो  भविष्यति 11 ||

Sīdāk kar sīdā man kar maṣṭṣūd.

मिन्नति  वाट  मिन्नति  भविष्यति 12 ||

Jīh dīh dekhā jīh dīh ma-ujūd. ||1||

AGGS, M 1, प. 83-84.

It (God) created the Nature\(^1\) and then pervades\(^2\) in it.

(If one comprehends\(^4\) the time\(^5\) then one becomes bound\(^6\) to it.)

(If, the one who understands Vakht (time) as explained in the following note, becomes Banda (man) bound to Laws if Nature.)

It is the Nature\(^6\), which cannot be appraised.

If someone can appraise It (Nature) even then one cannot describe it.

Although one tries to contemplate on Shria\(^7\) (Islamic Laws/C ode of conduct),

However, one cannot cross the sea of life without understanding It (Nature).

Being contented\(^8\) and praying\(^9\) for conquering the mind\(^10\) should be your goal\(^11\) (of life).

Wherever\(^12\) I see, You (as Nature) are pervading\(^13\) everywhere\(^14\).

AGGS, M 1, p 83-84.

*Note: *स्थंतर : Here ‘Vakht’ means ‘Time’: Indefinite, unlimited duration in which things are considered as happening in the past, present, or future; every moment there has ever been or ever will be.

a) the entire period of existence of the known Universe;

finite duration, as distinguished from infinity

b) the entire period of existence of the world or of humanity;

earthly duration, as distinguished from eternity.

iv) God Created by Itself and is Pervading in Nature

According to Guru Nanak It (the God) was created by itself, It created its own characters, then It became the Nature since It (God) pervades in the Nature. The following verses explain some characteristics of It, creation of the Nature, the Laws of the Nature, and Its absolute power over all.

अथोपूर्वसो अनन्त मनिषिः  अथोपूर्वसो चिन्तिः 5  चिन्तिः ||

अपिन्हाइ अपी है अपिन्हाइ रांचि तौ नाहिं. ||

शुद्ध सुरतादि  मनुष्यादि  वक्ते अनन्त दिते चिन्ते 9 11 ||

Duṣy kuḍrā sajjī-ai kar āsaṇ dītho chā-ō.

You\(^2\) became into existence (God)\(^1\) by Yourself\(^8\) and established\(^2\) Laws of Nature\(^6\) by Yourself\(^8\).

Then\(^7\) became\(^9\) Yourself as Nature\(^8\) to delight Yourself\(^10\).

जान वविष्यति अर्थान ज्ञान तम देवेदह वविष्यति 6 ||

Dātā kuḍrā āp jūn tūs ādevch karahi pasā-ō.

ज्ञान सौतेदे समाधि देहमाते तन्मेह चित्रिति 2 9 11 ||

वविष्यति अनन्त दिते चिन्ते 12 13 चिन्ते 11 ||

Tūn jān-o-ti sabhāsai ā de laisahi jinā kavā-ō.

Kar āsaṇ dītho chā-ō. ||1||

AGGS, M 1, प. 463.

You\(^2\), Yourself\(^8\), are benevolent\(^1\) and creator\(^2\) and give rise to expansion\(^2\) of the Universe.

You\(^2\) know\(^7\) how to give and take away\(^6\) the energy\(^11\) of
life\(^{10}\) from all\(^{10}\) (under the Laws of Nature).

Guru Nanak again repeats:

\textit{You are Nature since You are sitting\(^{12}\) in Nature and
delight\(^{13,14}\) Yourself.}

AGGS, M 1, p 463.

\textit{रूढ़ि} = It is usually interpreted as the “Name of God”
but critical analysis of theme indicates that here \textit{रूढ़ि}
means ‘Laws of Nature’. In Punjabi Dictionary (18) it
also means Dynamic creative principle, God, mystical
word or formula to recite or meditate, but according to
Bhai Kahn Singh (30) it means name, justice, boat, and
to take bath/shower.

The above verse is detailed explanation of \textit{मैद्रा}
(Sailbhang), an attribute of God in the Commencing
Verse of Guru Nanak, which means the God came into
existence by ‘Itself’.

Finally, Guru Nanak praises the vastness of God as
\textit{Kudrat} (Nature) as follows:

\textbf{v) Vastness of Kudrat (Nature)}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Balihārī kūḍrāt vasiā.}
  \item \textit{उष्णं भूमि स्वर्गीय सद्रश्यम्} \textit{nāk hai.}
  \item \textit{Tiērā ānt na jāī lakhiā.} \textit{rahā-ō.}
\end{itemize}

\textit{अनाम, म: 1, पं: 469.}

Nanak praises the Nature:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{I sacrifice myself\(^{1}\) on That Who pervades\(^{3}\) in the
Nature\(^{2}\); Your\(^{4}\) limit/vastness\(^{5}\) (as Nature) cannot be
comprehended\(^{6}\). Pause.}
\end{itemize}

AGGS, M 1, p 469.

From the above five phrases (i to v) it can be
concluded that Guru Nanak’s God is \textit{Kudrat} which
means ‘Nature’ in English. Therefore, God and Nature
are identical with each other as described earlier by
Spinoza (1632-1677) about 200 years after Guru
Nanak.

\textbf{Kudrat (Nature) also means Laws of Nature:}

In the following phrase Guru Nanak says that one sees and
hears according to the Nature, ie. Laws of Nature:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{दिमे वृक्षादि तृणोदि जलादि सूर्यादि सिद्ध समुद्र।}
  \item \textit{Kudrat dīsai kudrat suōi-ai kudrat bha-ō sukḥ sār.}
\end{itemize}

\textit{अनाम, म: 1, पं: 484.}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{We see\(^{1}\) and listen\(^{2}\) according to the Laws of Nature\(^{2,4}\); similarly
the love\(^{3}\) and happiness\(^{5}\) also occurs
according to Laws of Nature.}
\end{itemize}

AGGS, M 1, p 484.

\textbf{‘Naam’ as Laws of Nature}

Repetition of \textit{NAAM} (some name of God) in the \textit{Sangat} (congregation) is usually considered as the most
important religious duty. But in the following stanza
Guru Nanak explains that it is also important to discuss
collectively in the congregation to understand that
\textit{NAAM} also means ‘Laws of Nature’:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Sajaṅgaṅ kaisī jāī-ai.}
  \item \textit{Jīhāī eko nām vakẖāī-ai.}
  \item \textit{Ēko nām hukam hai Nānak satgur Ḍīē buẖāī-ē īī-ō.}
\end{itemize}

\textit{अनाम, म: 1, पं: 72.}

Guru Nanak poses a question:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{How do we know the true\(^{1}\) congregation\(^{2}\)?}
\end{itemize}

Then Guru Nanak answers:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{That congregation is true where only Naam\(^{3}\) (Name of
God) is discussed.}
  \item \textit{What is that Naam?}
\end{itemize}

Here Guru Nanak is explaining one of the various
meanings of \textit{NAAM} that:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Here the \textit{NAAM}\(^{4}\) is HUKM\(^{4}\), which means the Laws of
Nature; this has been known\(^{5}\) to me through true
enlightenment\(^{6}\) (his intellectual vision.)}
\end{itemize}

AGGS, M 1, p 72.

\textbf{‘Hukm’ as Laws of Nature}

\textit{Hukm} has been used as Laws of Nature:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{दिमे न्यूतटि मसू बे घरविलि जवल त बैंडि}
  \item \textit{रसात दुईाँ ते घराई ओ दुईाँ ते बैंडि 2}
\end{itemize}

\textit{अनाम, पं: 2, पं: 1.}

Hukmai anḍar sakh ko bāhr hukam na ko-e.
Nānak hukmai je buẖai Ḍīē ha-vēumai kahai na ko-e. \textit{12}\textit{1}

Nanak says:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{If one can understand\(^{5}\) the Laws of Nature\(^{6}\) then one will
not boast\(^{7}\) about one’s pride because every action and
reaction is going on under\(^{8}\) these laws\(^{9}\) and nothing is
out\(^{10}\) of them.}
  \item \textit{झुढ़ि पहलवें मू तरखा छुट्टी लड़कें 2}
\end{itemize}

\textit{Hukam pachẖāīai so har gun vakẖāīai.}

\textit{अनाम, म: 1, पं: 109.}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Those who understand\(^{2}\) the Laws of Nature\(^{1}\) know\(^{3}\) what
the God\(^{4}\) is.}
\end{itemize}

AGGS, M 1, p 109.
‘Naam’ (Laws of Nature) in the ‘House of Nanak’

Guru Arjan sums up that the NAAM in the ‘House of Nanak’ (Teachings of Nanak) means Laws of Nature to understand and use them for the welfare of the humanity:

Ehu ahera kina dan.
Nanak kai ghar keval nam. ||4||4||

There is only Naam (Laws of Nature) in the ‘House of Nanak’ (teachings of Nanak).

He (Nanak)* has given me this Naam (Laws of Nature) as gift (methodology) to control my life.

CONCLUSIONS

The available literature indicates that no theologian or scientist has been able to prove “Ontology of God”. Almost all the prophets including Guru Nanak admit that it is difficult to describe God; however, some have conceptualized the essence of God in various forms of personal God which can only be experienced but cannot be described. On the other hand many scientists and philosophers plus many Buddhists and Jainis do not accept the existence of God.

Guru Nanak is of the view since it is difficult to describe God, therefore, no specific /descriptive name (Kirtam Naam) could be assigned to God although he himself has used many such descriptive names as metaphors in his Bani.

Explanation of logo, ਨਾਂ, of God as Singularity or ਸੁਨੂਂ (Sunn) or ਨਿਰਗੁਣ (Nirgun) state of God in highly concentrated form of ENERGY which became ਸਰਗੁਣ (Sargun) – the Nature and/or Universe and is operative under the ‘Laws of Nature’ leads us to believe that ਨਾਂ, which represents God, is ENERGY. Spinoza also declared that ‘God is Nature’ about 200 years after Guru Nanak.

This ENERGY existed before the time and space appeared, existed in the past, exists now and will exist in the future- forever (ਅਧੀ ਕਾਲ ਤੋਂ ਕੁਝੇ ਕਾਲ ਇੱਕੇ ਹੈ। ਨਾਂ ਜਿੱਥੇ ਨਾਂ ਨਾਂ ਜਿੱਥੇ ਨਾਂ ਨਾ ਜਿੱਥੇ ਨਾਂ) And God cannot be structured or created. Einstein also made a similar statement about Energy after 400 years after Guru Nanak:

“Energy cannot be created or destroyed; it can only be changed from one form to another.”
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