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CHAPTER - 2

CONCEPT OF SELF

1. Five Reals

How many reals are there? If such a question is asked by someone, different philosophical systems would answer it differently. According to Mādhyamika school of Buddhism, nothing is real and permanent. Everything is transitory and void. Cārvāka believes that matter is the only reality. According to him, consciousness is the by-product of matter and therefore unreal. As against Cārvāka Śaṅkarācārya believes that the consciousness is the only reality and matter is unreal. According to him, Brahman is the sole reality, one without the second. According to Sāṅkhya, there are two ultimate reals: puruṣa (self) and prakṛti (matter). According to Rāmānuja, Madhva and Vallabha there are three ultimate reals: God, souls and matter. Rāmānuja calls his reals Īśvara (God), Cit (souls) and acit (matter). Madhva calls them Īśvara (God), Cetana and Acetana. Vallabha calls them Īśvara,
Jīva and Jagat. According to Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system of philosophy, there are seven reals. They are dravya (substance), guṇa (quality), Karma (action), sāmānyā (generality), vīśeṣa (particularity), samavēya (inherence) and Abhāva (non-existence). In Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophy, ātmā (soul) is considered as an eternal substance. There are two kinds of souls Jīvātman (individual souls) and Paramātman or Īśvara (supreme soul).

According to Jaina philosophy, there are nine reals. They are Jīva (living), ajīva (non-living matter), asrava (influx of matter into soul), puṇya (meritorious deeds), pāpa (evil deeds), bandha (bondage), samvara (stopping the influx of new matter into the soul), Nirjara (exhaustion of karmas insoul) and mokṣa (liberation).

Śvāminārāyaṇa does not accept any of the above views. According to him, there are five reals. They are Jīva (self), māyā (matter), Īśvara (higher soul), Akṣarabrahman and Parabrahman (God). These five kinds of entities are ultimate ontological reals in the sense that they are eternally existing. They are ontologically different from each other. Their difference is eternal and irremovable.
2. **No distinction between Jīva, Jīvatman and Ātman.**

Any one who reads Vacanāṁṛta will find that for the purpose of signifying self or soul Svāminārāyaṇa uses three words. These three words are "Jīva", "Jīvatman", and "Ātman". Largely he uses the word "Jīva" to indicate self or soul. But sometimes he uses the word "Jīvatman" or "Ātman" for the same purpose. He uses these three words synonymously. He has given no reason why he chose one particular word instead of the other. This means that the current usage in Gujarati language permitted him to use these three words as synonyms.

3. **Svāminārāyaṇa proves the existence of self**

On a plain reading of Vacanāṁṛta one might have an impression that Svāminārāyaṇa does not make any attempt to prove the existence of self (jīva). One might also have an impression that Svāminārāyaṇa takes it for granted that the existence of self cannot be proved. But a careful scrutiny of the sentences of Vacanāṁṛta will disclose that such an impression is not correct. It is not that Svāminārāyaṇa makes no attempt to prove
the existence of self. It is true that Svāminārāyaṇa does not advance elaborate and well chisled arguments to prove the existence of self. But a simple manner, by simple statements, Svāminārāyaṇa does seek to establish the existence of self. Let us see how he does it.

Knowledge is defined by Svāminārāyaṇa as the awareness of something.¹ The knowledge or awareness of something is either produced by sense experience or by reasoning, or by intuitive experience.² Thus, sense, reason and intuition have been accepted by Svāminārāyaṇa as three valid methods of knowledge. Out of these three methods Svāminārāyaṇa adopts reason and intuition to establish the existence of self.

Svāminārāyaṇa, in clear terms, says that the existence of self cannot be proved by sense perception, but it can certainly be proved by inference.³ Inference is a method of reason. Using this method of reason Svāminārāyaṇa argues that when a speaker explains something to the hearer, he is revealing his self. Similarly, when the hearer understands what is explained to him, he also reveals his self. This means that there is some entity which makes possible the activity of speaking and hearing or understanding. This entity is nothing, but the
This is how, by means of reason Svâminârâyanâ establishes the existence of self.

Then Svâminârâyanâ takes to the method of knowledge by intuition. He says that when a person has an intuitive experience, the self becomes evident to him. He feels that "I am the self." In intuitive experience, he becomes conscious of his self. He feels "I am." He is certain of his self. Svâminârâyanâ says that when the limitations of sense organs are overcome and the highest intuitive experience is made possible one realises the self as it is.

This view of Svâminârâyanâ is supported by many Indian and Western Philosophers. According to Saîkara-carya self-knowledge is the basis of all knowledge. Radhakrishnan says that "All experience is always an experience to an "I". An "I" is implicit in all awareness. This "I" is not the body, however intimate the connection of the body with the "I" may be. Radhakrishnan further says that "The "I" implicit in all knowledge is not something to be inferred from experience, but something immediately lived and known by experience."
According to Dr. J. A. Yagnik, it is not necessary to prove the existence of self as it is immediately known in each and every kind of cognition. Instinctive certainty of the self is ascertained by St Augustine's formula: *S Faller Sum*. Descartes doubted everything. But he could not doubt his own existence. For, he said, I am really doubting. Whatever else may be doubtful, but the fact that I am doubting is indubitable. I could not doubt if I did not exist. He summed up his argument in his famous formula: *I think, therefore, I am* (cogito, ergo sum). According to Kant, all knowledge is contained in judgements. The "I think" must accompany all my judgements. The "I think" is an act of spontaneity. It cannot be regarded as belonging to mere sensibility. It is in all acts of consciousness one and the same, and unaccompanied by it no representation can exist for me. According to Peter Koestenbaum, the self manifests itself in consciousness in a manner altogether different from ordinary objects of experience. Self is experienced as the source of consciousness whenever experiencing takes place. Whenever man is conscious, self is experienced.
I experience myself as distinct from the body and our psychological states. I experience my anxiety, my joy and my body. The "I" that does the experiencing is structurally different from that which it experiences.\(^{12}\)

As shown above, we can see that Svāminārāyaṇa has made some attempt to prove the existence of the self. And therefore, the observation of Dr. J.A. Yajnik that "The attempt to prove the existence of self and its consciousness is not made by Shri Svāminārāyaṇa"\(^ {13}\) is to be understood only in the light of the above mentioned qualification.

4. **What is Self?**

There are many theories of self. But there are four theories which can be said to be the main theories of self. They are (1) The theory of soul-substance, (2) the theory of empirical self, (3) the theory of noumenal self and (4) the theory of self as pure consciousness.

The soul substance theory is suscribed by Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas, Descartes, Leibnitz, Locke
Berkley and others in Western Philosophy. In Indian philosophy this theory is subscribed by Jinas, \(^1\) Vaiśeṣika\(^2\), Nyāya, \(^3\) Pūrva Mīmāṃsā \(^4\) and Rāmānuja \(^5\). According to this theory, self is a permanent spiritual substance which lies behind and beyond fleeting mental processes. It is a principle of spiritual unity which underlies all thinking, feeling and willing.

In Western philosophy David Hume is the Chief proponent of the theory of empirical self. In Indian Philosophy Nāgasena \(^6\) and Nāgārjuna \(^7\) subscribe to this theory. According to this theory self is an aggregate of mental processes without any underlying principle of unity among them. This theory denies the existence of an abiding spiritual substance behind mental states.

Immanuel Kant advances the theory of noumenal self. This theory was anticipated in India by Dīnāga in the fifth century. \(^8\) According to this theory self is not a substance. Substance is a category of understanding. The self applies the category of substance to phenomena. Self is the source of categories. It is the permanent
and abiding background and support of all mental phenomena, Kant calls it pure or transcendental self.\(^9\)

Sāṅkarācārya, as is very well known, is the chief advocate of the theory of self as pure consciousness. Sāṅkhya\(^10\) and Madhva\(^11\) subscribe to this theory. Of these four theories Svāminārāyaṇa accepts the theory of soul-substance. In very clear terms he has declared that soul is a spiritual substance (caitanya vastu).\(^12\) According to Svāminārāyaṇa the self is a self-luminous spiritual substance possessing consciousness as its essential attribute.\(^13\) Svāminārāyaṇa would not agree with Kantian view which does not regard self as a substance. He would say to Kant that that which is the source of categories has to be substantial. So also he would not agree with Hume and all those who maintain that self is nothing more than a bundle of different perceptions which succeed one another with an inconceivable rapidity. Nor would he agree with Śāṅkarācārya who holds that self is mere consciousness without substance. Svāminārāyaṇiṣṭ argument against both Huminions and Śāṅkaritās would be that it is not possible either for fleeting or for pure consciousness
to be there without the ontological support of self.

Thus according to Svēminārāyaṇa consciousness is a quality of self and not an independent entity.

5. **Self is not by-product of matter**

According to Svēminārāyaṇism, soul and consciousness are not the by-product of the conglomeration of physical elements. It is well known that Cārvākas and other materialists regard them as mere by-product of matter. It is a matter of common knowledge that Cārvākas regard matter as the only reality. What is material is real. According to them, ultimate elements are four: earth, water, fire and air. Consciousness is produced when these four elements combine in a certain proportion.

Consciousness, according to Cārvākas, is the by-product of these elements. And thought is a function of matter. Just as the combination of betel, areca nut and lime produces the red colour, though the ingredients separately do not possess red colour, in the same way particular combination of the elements produces consciousness. Given these four elements and their particular combination, consciousness manifests itself in the living body.
Consciousness is always found associated with the living body and vanishes when the body disintegrates.\(^5\)

It is also said that the consciousness is nothing but an epiphenomenon of the body. According to epiphenomenalism, the relation of consciousness to body is like that of the shadow to the person. The motion of the person cause the motion of his shadow, but motion of the shadow does not cause the motion of the person. Similarly, the physical causes the mental, but mental never in turn causes physical.\(^6\)

So also behaviourism denies that there is any non-material element like mind, consciousness or soul in our make-up. According to behaviourism, human being is all body. There is neither mind nor soul. As for consciousness, it is a by-product of bodily processes which accompany them. It does not cause the processes; it accompanies.\(^7\)

The difficulty with these theories is this that they commit us to the belief that the entire course of events in the physical world would have been exactly the same.
as it is now, even if there had been no minds at all. But how, one might ask, could cities have been built, books and symphonies written, colleges attended and courses tought, if human minds were not causally efficacious in the world? 

Śvāminēṛāyaṇa would not agree with any of these theories which maintain that the Jīva is the by-product of matter. Śvāminēṛāyaṇa has clearly stated in Vacanāmṛta that the soul is in no way like the body. According to him soul is neither matter nor a by-product of matter. It is a spiritual substance completely different (Vilakaṇa) from three material bodies. Human being is not all body. There is a soul which resides in the body. 

Its consciousness pervades over entire body. If the consciousness, Śvāminēṛāyaṇa would content, is merely an outcome of the four elements, as maintained by Cārvāka materialists and behaviourists, then even the corpse can be conscious which, however, is against our experience. Consciousness in the body is always due to the contact of another substance whose essential quality is consciousness and this substance is Jīva. Śvāminēṛāyaṇa says that Jīva
wrongly identifies it's body with itself. Jīva is not body. It is different from body.13

Śvāminārāyaṇa has gone to the extent of saying that so long as one identifies one's self with one's body, all one's knowledge becomes meaningless.14 Dr. J. A. Yajnik has observed that "from the stand point of Śvāminārāyaṇism is utterly wrong to regard the self as a by-product of material forces or a psychophysical series of saṃghāta or even a synthetic unity apperception".15

6. Self distinct from body

According to Śvāminārāyaṇa the self is distinct from the body.1 Śvāminārāyaṇa has again and again, emphatically said that the self is totally different from the body. He is never tired of pointing out that the self and the body are not one. According to Śvāminārāyaṇa, the self and the body are not only not one, but are opposed to each other. The qualities of one are fundamentally different from the other. The self is conscious and the body is unconscious. The self is pure and the body is impure. The self is immortal and body is mortal. The self
is blissful and the body is painful. The body ages. The self does not age. The body is transitory and changes every moment. The self is permanent and changeless. It ever remains the same (ajara).

According to Svāminārāyaṇa the body does not possess any attribute which is possessed by the self. There is not a single quality in the body which can be attributed to the self. Nor is there any quality in the self which can be attributed to the body. Explaining the doctrine of fundamental difference between the self and the body, Svāminārāyaṇa has said that the self is different from gross, subtle and causal bodies which are material (māyika) in nature. According to him, the self is neither gross body, nor subtle body nor causal body. According to Svāminārāyaṇa self is different from three states of consciousness. The self is neither waking state nor dream state nor deep sleep state. So also self is neither cognitive senses nor conative senses nor internal senses (antahkaraṇa). Self is different from all these bodies, states and senses. But due to ignorance the self identifies itself with these external and internal
senses. Svāminārāyaṇa says that if one realise one’s self as different from the body, one will not have any attachment to the body. Nor will one have any attachment to any thing or person related to the body.

When one becomes free from the attachment to the body, one becomes free from the desire to enjoy sensuous objects.

7. Dimension of the Self.

The problem of the dimension of the self (jīva-parimāṇa) is not easy of solution. Since ancient times Indian mind has been thinking about it and yet the problem has remained as refractory as it was.

Indian philosophy gives four different answers to the question of the size of the soul. The first answer is that the dimension of the soul is atomic (aṇu-parimāṇa). The second answer is that it is of the size of the thumb (aṅguṣṭha parimāṇa). The third answer is that the soul is as big as the body (deha-parimāṇa). And the fourth answer is that it is neither atomic, nor of the size...
of the body, but it is all pervasive (vibhū). The first view is adopted by the philosophers of different schools of Vaiṣṇavism. The second view is maintained by Śvetāśvatsara Upaniṣad.¹ The third view is held by jaina philosophers. And the fourth view is advocated by Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika, Pūrva Mīmāṃsā, Śāṅkhyā-Yoga and Advaita Vedānta. Svāminārāyaṇa holds the first view.² He says that the dimension of the soul is atomic. According to him, the soul is as subtle as the atom (anusūkṣma).³

This atomic view of Svāminārāyaṇa regarding the dimension of the soul is supported by Muṇḍakopaniṣad.⁴ Rāmānuja-cārya⁵ and Madhvācārya⁶ also hold this view.

Strictly speaking in Advaita Vedānta there is no question of the dimension or the size of the soul. Soul is all-pervasive. It is identical with para-brahman, the one and the only reality. But according to Svāminārāyaṇa, the self is eternally different from para-brahman (God)⁷ and, therefore, he does not accept this view.

Now, of the remaining three views, one either accepts the atomic view (anuparimāṇavāda) or thumb-size view
Svāmināraṇyaṇa believes that the self is formless (arūpa). Size presupposes a form. And therefore Svāmināraṇyaṇa cannot accept thumb-size view. For the same reason he cannot accept body-size view. So far as body-size view is concerned there is another difficulty also. The difficulty is that this view makes the soul expanding and contracting. If the dimension of the self is identical with the body, the conclusion is inevitable that the soul is perishable like the body. Body size view purports to deprive the soul of its eternality and makes it non-eternal. Therefore, according to Svāmināraṇyaṇa, anuparimāṇavāda is the only acceptable view.

The Svāmināraṇyaṇa's view that the soul is atomic also deserves to be understood with some reservations or qualifications. It seems that the soul is said to be atomic in order to indicate its two characteristics: (1) eternality and (2) subtlety. This interpretation seems justified because Svāmināraṇyaṇa speaks of the soul also as formless (arūpa). The following section throws greater light on this point.
8. **Self is formless**

According to Svāminarāyaṇa, every physical organism has a soul. In other words, all living bodies have souls. According to Svāminarāyaṇa, the size of the soul is atomic.

What do we mean by atomic? Atomic, obviously, means like an atom. What is the size of a material atom? It is smallest; so small that it cannot be perceived. It is a mere physical point with only position and no magnitude. It is imperceptible. It defies experience. Mathematics is the only instrument of dealing with it.

According to Svāminarāyaṇa, soul is not a material entity. It is a spirit fundamentally different from matter. Soul, according to Svāminarāyaṇa, is a spiritual "atom", so to say. Now, if material atom cannot be perceived, how can a spiritual "atom" be perceived? This spiritual atom is a mere being (sattāmātra). It is a metaphysical point of mere existence. Now, such a metaphysical point can naturally have no shape. It
cannot have any form. It must be shapeless and formless. Svēminārāyaṇa says that the soul is formless (nirākāra). According to Svēminārāyaṇa, atomic soul is a mere being without any dimension and therefore it cannot have any shape or form. Soul is devoid of any shape or form.

Madhvācārya believes in the doctrine of soul as formal (śākārata). The argument advanced by him for proving the form (ākāra) of soul is based on the analogy of the light of the lamp. According to Madhva, all illuminating substances always possess some form. Illuminating flame of the lamp possesses a form. Consciousness is of the nature of illumination. Soul is also of the nature of self-illumination (svaprakāsa). Therefore, soul should possess a form. Svēminārāyaṇa would not accept this argument of Madhvācārya. Svēminārāyaṇa would argue against him and say that light had no form. If the consciousness is of the nature of illumination (prakāśa) and the soul is of the nature of consciousness, it cannot have any form. Svēminārāyaṇa would say that the argument of Madhvācārya was
not well founded.

In fact Svāminarāyaṇa was required to face a situation as would arise from the doctrine of formal soul advocated by Madhvācārya. His own disciple, Brahmānanda, had argued that soul had a form. To the argument of Brahmānanda, Svāminarāyaṇa replies by a counter-argument based on the authority of scriptures that if soul has a form, then it must also have hands, feet and other sense organs. But in the tenth part (dasāma. Skanda) of Srimad Bhāgavata it is mentioned that God creates sense-organs for the welfare of the soul. Now, if soul has a form, why should God take the trouble of creating sense-organs and other organs like mind and so on for the soul? If the soul, which is an eternally existing entity, has a form, it would not be necessary for God to create sense-organs for its welfare. Svāminarāyaṇa emphatically says that, on this evidence of scripture, the only conclusion possible is that the soul has only being (sattā) and no form.

We shall now consider an interesting question in this context. According to Svāminarāyaṇa, God is never
formless. God always has form and personality. He is always in the two-handed human form. Now, the question arises that if God is having a form (Sākāra), how can he indwell a formless (nirākāra) soul?. Does God reside in the formless soul with personality (sa-kāra) or without personality (nirākāra)?. In fact Nityānandavāmī had raised this question before Svāminārāyaṇa. Answering the question Svāminārāyaṇa says that God resides in the formless soul as its metaphysically sustaining principle. Thus according to Svāminārāyaṇa God resides in the soul as Antaryāmi and not as transcendent divine personality which is always Dvibhujā (two-armed).

9. Self neither male nor female

There are males and females in the human, animal and plant world. According to Svāminārāyaṇa, all have souls (jīvas) distinct from their bodies. A question would naturally arise: is the soul of a male of male gender and the soul of a female of female gender?. The same question can be asked in other words like this: has the soul a gender? Svāminārāyaṇa has categorically
answered the question. He says that the soul has no gender. Svāminarāyaṇa makes it clear that the soul is neither male nor female. It is a genderless sentient being. It is a mere conscious existence. Saṅkarācārya also says the same thing. According to him, the soul has neither tongue, nor hands nor feet nor genital organs. According to him, soul is of the nature of consciousness and bliss.

Svāminarāyaṇa further clarifies that the soul is neither Brāhmin, nor Kṣatriya, nor Kṣatriya, nor son, nor father. It has neither nationality nor caste. Saṅkarācārya has also said that the soul is neither father, nor mother nor son. It has neither nationality nor caste.

In Svāminarāyaṇa’s view Varṇāśrama Dharma is far inferior to Bhāgavata Dharma which is the same thing as Ekaṇṭika Dharma. This means that according to Svāminarāyaṇa what gives excellence to human life is neither Varṇa nor Āśrama but single-minded devotion to god. This being his view he has said in clear terms that a devotee of God, may be male or female or of any
caste, after attaining release from the shackles of the body, would go to the Divine Abode (Aksaradhāman) and assume a divine form to serve God.

10. Location of Self

Where does the soul reside? Svāminārāyaṇa himself raises this question and answers it. He says that the soul resides in the heart and from there it carries on all its activities. At several places in Vacanāṁṛta Svāminārāyaṇa has made it clear that the subtle and atomic soul has its residence in the heart.

This view of Svāminārāyaṇa is supported by Prasnopaniṣad which says that the soul has its seat in the heart. Rāmānujaśāstra also holds the view that the soul has its seat in the heart (hrṣṭpadma). Even Śaṅkaraśāstra says that the soul shines in the sky of heart (hrṣṭūkṣa).

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, in the heart, there is a disc (cakra) of flesh. It is in this disc of flesh that the soul resides.
disc is explained by Svāminārayana with the example of a burning torch. He says that the torch, wrapped with rags wet with oil, holds fire. Here, according to Svāminārayana, the position is two-fold. The wet rays hold fire and the fire cling to wet rags. The same is the case with the soul vis a vis the disc of flesh. The disc holds the soul and the soul clings to the disc. 

Svāminārayana says that some one might raise an objection here. The object might be to the effect that the soul is luminous and the disc of flesh is non-luminous: then how can luminous, soul cling to non-luminous disc? In other words, how can two essentially opposite elements, namely the soul and the disc, meet each other? Soul is spiritual. The disc is material. How can spiritual cling to material? Svāminārayana answers this question and attempts to remove the doubt. He gives an illustration of earthen bowl with oil and a wick in it. He says that although the bowl, the oil and the wick are non-luminous, they can hold fire which is luminous. In other words,
luminous fire can cling to non-luminous wick wet with oil. Again, fire does not remain suspended in the sky. It requires these non-luminous things to uphold itself. Similarly, the luminous soul requires non-luminous disc of flesh to uphold itself. Just as bowl, oil and wick hold fire, the disc of flesh holds the soul. Although the soul and the disc of flesh are essentially different in nature, the soul clings to the latter. To bring home this point, Svāminārāyaṇa gives another illustration. He says that just as in a red-hot iron nail fire resides, in the same way the soul resides in the disc of flesh. Thus we see that Svāminārāyaṇa has made a systematic attempt to show how the soul resides in the heart.

11. Classification of Selves

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, there are three kinds of souls. They are Anādi Mukta (eternally free), Mukta (liberated) and Boddha (bound). Anādi Muktas are eternally free souls like Nārada, Sanka, Śeṣa, Laxmi and others. They have not been made free by any body. Nor have they become free by sermons of any saint. They
were never bound. They are ever free from forces of
maya. The muktas are freed souls. They were once bound, but they obtained liberation through devotion and by the grace of God. The baddha are bound souls. They are still in bondage. They are revolving in the circuit of birth and death on account of ignorance and bad actions. They can obtain liberation through knowledge and devotion by the grace of God.

Śvāminārāyaṇa classifies freed souls into two categories. They are Jñāni Mukta and Mahā Mukta. Jñāni Muktas are those liberated souls who have determinate perception (savikalpa samādhi) and Mahā Muktas are those liberated souls who have indeterminate perception (nirvikalpa Samādhi).

Bound souls are classified by Śvāminārāyaṇa into two categories: Mumukṣu and Bubhukṣu. Mumukṣu souls are seekers of salvation, and Bubhukṣu souls are seekers of worldly enjoyment.

Śvāminārāyaṇa has also classified bound souls into another two categories which are somewhat similar to the two categories which we have just mentioned. They
are Savāsanika and Nirvāsanika. Savāsanika soul is one which is full of worldly desires. Even though such a soul intensely worships God, it would not go to Divine Abode (aṅkṣaradhāman) of God after leaving the body. It may go to any of the higher regions (loka), but not to Aṅkṣaradhāman. Nirvāsanika soul is one which has no desire for worldly enjoyments. It loves God. It wants only God and nothing else. When such a soul leaves the body, it straight goes to Aṅkṣaradhāman.

Śvāminārāyana has also classified the bound souls into still another two categories: Daivi (of divine nature) and Asuri of demonic nature). Daivi souls are those which are desireless (niśkāma) for worldly enjoyments and which seek liberation through wisdom, virtue and devotion. Asuri souls are those which are highly desirous of worldly pleasure (sakāma) and which are involved in lust, anger, greed and vanity. Śvāminārāyana says that Asuri souls cannot become daivi souls because baseer instincts are inherent in them since their birth. But this does not mean that they can never attain divine nature (daivibhāva).
If they again and again identify themselves with Brahman and live a virtuous life their demonic nature (asurabhāva) will vanish and divine nature will emerge. Madhvacārya makes a classification of the bound souls into three categories: Muktiyogya, Tamoyogya and Nityasamsāri. The Muktiyogya bound souls are those which are eligible for release. If they love and worship God, they can attain liberation. Tamoyogya are those souls which are not eligible for release. They are condemned to eternal darkness (hell). Nityasamsāri are those which are neither eligible for release nor condemned to eternal darkness. They are eternally bound to the wheel of birth and death. Svāminarāyaṇa does not accept this classification of Madhvacārya. According to Svāminarāyaṇa no soul is eternally damnable (tamoyogya). So also no soul is eternally bound to the wheel of birth and death (nityasamsāri). According to Svāminarāyaṇa every soul is eligible for final emancipation (ātyantika Kalyāṇa). The optimism and catholicity of Svāminarāyaṇa’s outlook becomes...
most visible when he says that even a soul of an animal is eligible for attaining liberation. Then what wonder if man attains liberation?.
1. Five Reals:

1. जीव, माया, हैवन, ब्रह्म के परमेश्वर ब्रह्म सबी काव्य है।
   V.G.L.S. 10

2. ते पुरुषोत्तम महान, बहार ब्रह्म माया, हैवन के जीव
   ते पार्श्व पद है ते काव्य है। V.G.F.S. 7
   कै रोधे पुरुषोत्तम, पुरुष, हैवन, जीव की माया के
   पार्श्व पद काव्य है। V.G.M.S. 31

2. No distinction between Jīva Jīvatman and Ātman:

1. V.G.F.S. 20
   V.G.F.S. 44
   V.G.F.S. 77
   V.G.M.S. 3
   V.G.M.S. 32
   V.G.F.S. 38
   V.G.F.S. 72
   V.S.S. 6
   V.G.M.S. 12

2. V.G.F.S. 8
   V.G.F.S. 37
   V.G.F.S. 64
   V.G.F.S. 25
   V.G.F.S. 61
   V.G.F.S. 73
   V.S.S. 1
   V.S.S. 3
   V.S.S. 4
3. Svēminārēyaṇa proves the existence of self:

1. ज्ञान ते ज्ञानावर्तु नाम के । V. L. S. 7

2. वाच्य हृद्रोग रोगों नाम के तथा अवधिकः करणी ज्ञान के ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान... V. L. S. 7

3. अतः जे जीव ते ..... ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान ज्ञान... V. K. S. 1

4. वे वर्तता ते ...... श्रवण स्मरित ते ते समाकायारो वर्तता ते हेतु भिन्न स्वभाविक ते ते जीव कहें ते ते श्रोति ते ते ते जो ते ते ते... V. G. F. S. 38

5. अतः ते दक्षिण तस्ताराम ते अन्यथा वाण के "हूँ शाल्मा है " V. G. M. S. 62

6. अतः पीढियां ज्ञान रूपरूप स्वभाविक जीवात्मा ते हैं... V. G. F. S. 72
1. Dr. J. A. Yajnik, The Philosophy of Sri
Swāminārāyaṇa (1972), p.16

4. What is self?

1. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Part I (1977)
   pp. 296, 298.
2. Ibid Part II, p. 188
3. Ibid Part II, p. 189
4. Ibid Part II, p. 417
5. C. D. Sharma, Indian Philosophy (1952), p.494
6. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, Part I,
   pp. 390, 392, 393
7. Ibid., p. 667
8. D. N. Shastri, Critique of Indian Realism (1976)
   p. 44
11. Radhakrishnan, Ibid., part II, p. 743
   C. D. Sharma, Indian Philosophy (1952), p. 494

5. Self is not by-product of matter.
   2. C. D. Sharma, Indian Philosophy, (1952), p. 46
   3. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, part I (1977), p. 279
   4. C. D. Sharma, Indian Philosophy, (1952), p. 46
   5. C. D. Sharma, Ibid, p. 46
   9. जीव निरीक्षण जैवो नयी.
      V. G. M. S. 66
   10. जीव..... कैसे बनता है?
      V. G. M. S. 66
   11. मैत्रीसंयम्भानामः
      S. P. 115
6. **Self distinct from body:**

1. वा देही नासी वे बात्माजे ते हूँ हूँ
   V. G. S. 33

2. ताहे स्वभ् ती बात्मा हे, देह नषी
   V. G. S. 25

3. पौताने देही पुक्क बात्मा नायकी
   V. G. L. S. 39

4. हूँ देह नषी, हूँ तो देही नौशी..... बात्मा ते हूँ
   V. G. F. S. 61

5. देह थकी पौताना बात्माने विकल्पण सधी
   V. S. S. 1

2. हूँ देहांचे हूँ वे देह वड छे, अने हूँ मुझ हूँ वे देह नरक्कूँ छे,
   अने हूँ वरिनाशी हूँ वे देह नासीत हूँ, अने हूँ वार्तेक्कूँ हूँ
   ते देह दुःख्य हूँ
   V. S. S. 1
3. परशे तो देह परशे पण हूँ तो आत्मा हूँ को अर जनर हूँ
V. S. S. 4

4. हूँ आत्मा हूँ मा रा चौथी गुण देहने विषे आत्मा जाती नहीं
बैं जह, दूस के निम्यारुप के देह तीना के गुण ते हूँ क्लन्य
ते मारे विषे आत्मा जाती नहीं।
V. S. S. 4

5. शुद्ध, सूचन कै सारण वे पृण फकी नौली कै सवी......
जीवान्मार।
V. G. M. S. 32
मिनाल्पार्न क्षत्रिय देहरिविलक्षण।

S. P. 116

6. कारण शरीर के के जीवनी माया है के ज कारण शरीर ते
शुद्ध, सूचन ये याय है। याटे शुद्ध, सूचन के कारण के अरण
जीवनी माया है।
V. K. S. 12

7. शुद्ध देह, सूचन देह, कारण देह के हूँ नयाँ, के जागुर, स्वप्न,
हुष्टित के अरण कहरा हूँ नयाँ, के ज परिशान हैं स्विर ने पंच
की इंद्रियो ने कर जत: कारण ने लेषना देखा के सवे हूँ हूँ,
हूँ तो लगेको प्रभु हूँ।
V. P. S. 3

8. कालै करोने जीव इंद्रियो कै सकरण ने रोतानु रूप माने के
पृण कष्टमार्ग जीव इंद्रियो कै सकरण फकी नौली है।
V. G. M. S. 2
7. **Dimension of the self**

1. **वृष्ण्व प्रकारः पृष्ण्वो चॆत्तत्त्वः।**
   सदावजाना जूलेन्द्रिन्यं विष्णुः।।
   *Svetasvatara Upanishad 3:13 and 5:18*

2. **जीव तो...... अणुमात्र देखो है।**
   *V. J. S. 2*

3. **जीव है ते सूक्ष्म हैं।**
   *V. K. S. 8*
   *S. P. 105*

4. **मृगायुण्गारत्मः।**
   *Mundakopanishad 3-1-9*


7. V. G. F. S. 7

8. V. P. S. 3
8. Self is formless:

1. V. G. F. S. 72
2. V. J. S. 2
4. है तो देखो नौहो... है
   V. G. F. S. 61
5. V. G. M. S. 66
   See also V. G. L. S. 33
   and V. S. S. 12.
6. V. L. S. 15
   See also V. P. S. 3
7. K. Narayana, An Outline of Madhva Philosophy,
8. K. Narayana, Ibid., p. 141
9. जो जीव साकार होय तो कर्मयोगादिकै युक्त थया, त्यारूः
   दशमाननानी तिनो वेदक्षेत्रितिः कथायन्त आः कहै है ते, भवानि
   जै तेजविक्षणः चतुर्विन्नेनौ कृत्यै जीवनः चुंबिः श्रंदिः, मने प्राणः
   मुक्ता स्वाभाविक, ते जो जीव साकार ज शोय, तो प्रेमे आः चुंबिः श्रंदिः,
   मने प्राण श्रुत्यांनौ हृद काम के १. माते की रीतार शाक्ता
   वकने जीतां भैय ज निवार थाय है ते, जीव कै से ते स्वयमः
   हरीने सत्त्यान्त के हैं,

V. G. M. S. 66.

10. भवानि जै सदा साकार ज हैः
V. P. S. 7
9. Self neither male nor female:

1. V. G. F. S. 61
2. וְזֶהָ שֶׁאֵלֵּךְ אֵלֵּךְ
   V. P. S. 3
3. וְזֶהָ שֶׁאֵלֵּךְ אֵלֵּךְ
   V. G. L. S. 22

4. בְּצָרְקָה לָא לְעַיּוֹן לָא לְעַיּוֹן
   נִירְבָּנָאָסְטָקַמָּה -2

Nirvana Satkam -2
10. Location of self:

6. स्वयं तथा कौन्षीये ते जीव वर्गः रहिष्ये कै ते। ते हृदयाकास सेव च रुपव च विश त्रिवेणेन कै हृष्ये कै।
   V. J. S. 2

7. हृदयाकास सेव च जीव तैनात निवासः कै।
   V. K. S. 12

8. वेदावित सृष्ट ते हृदयन्ते निवार्यः कै।
   V. G. M. S. 34

See also S. P. 105

3. दृढि अंक्ष्यत वात्मः

Praśnopañiṣad 3.6

5. Sankarācārya, *Ātmabodha* 67


7. V. G. L. S. 4

8. V. G. L. S. 4

9. V. G. L. S. 4

10. V. G. L. S. 4

11. Classification of selves:

2. V. G. P. S. 32
2. तीव्र बादामी मुख्त जब हुए पण कौनें उपदेश करोने मुख्त नयी बालो।
V. G. F. S. 18

3. V. A. S. 2

4. V. S. S. 5

5. V. G. M. S. 69

6. की तो जीव के रहे हैं... बद रहे।
V. G. M. S. 31
V. G. M. S. 66
V. P. S. 3

7. V. G. F. S. 21
V. G. M. S. 69

8. संकल्प समाप्तिवाद जै ज्ञाति युक्त ते जै ते जीव, ईश्वर, माया
तथा क्षणुः अध्यात्म जै बुद्धि जै ध्वस्त धृष्ट्याय पुष्कर देवताणां देवते हैं।
किंवं कल्प समाप्तिवाद जै महायुक्त ते जै ते जीव, ईश्वर की माया
देवते ते क्षणुयाय करोने ज देवते हैं पण पुष्कर पण नयी देखला।
V. G. F. S. 39 (99)

9. आपणेपण ते क्षणरूप जै मुख्त तेमी पैकित्यां पूर्व हैं।
V. G. F. S. 21 (62)

10. V. G. F. S. 34

11. महावनी भक्त हौय के काहे जगती वासना रहे हैं हृदयादिबिक
देवता ना हे लोक तैली प्रा प्रा थाय... पाही महावनी
पक्त करोने ने निवासवित चढ़िने केवळे महावनी वासना पापमें,
V. S. S. 4

12. V. G. F. S. 61
13. V. V. S. 7
14. Gītā, Chapter-16
15. Ibid., Chapter-16
16. बाहुरी जीव ती देवो न म थायः
कैम जै जै जनवयि ज ज्ञाआस्ये शुचि हि
V. V. S. 7
17. पक्षी सलोगम्भरस्तयो धक्की ज ज्ञासि श्रीरस्ये मुक्ते त्यारे ब्रह्मन विष्णु लीन थाय ने बली पायी निभाले, कैम वर्तवार ब्रह्माय: लीन थाय ने पायी निभारे त्यारे केनो अवृत्ताय हि ते नाश पामे
V. V. S. 7
V. V. S. 15
19. कैं के बलसंगम्भरको भावानो पायो त्वत्ता के केनो कैरोने पिन्ने पुष्प कल्याण थाय हि, ती पुष्पमयं कल्याण थाय तेमा
हि आश्रय कल्याण तः
V. G. F. S. 21
CHAPTER - 3

METAPHYSICS OF SELF

1. Plurality of Selves
2. Metaphysical Nature of Self
3. Metaphysical Status of Self
4. Doctrine of Intrinsic Difference
5. Self Pervades the entire Body
6. Metaphysical dependence of Selves on God.
7. Self as Knower
8. Knowledge of Self.
1. **Plurality of Selves**

A question was asked by Nityānanda Svāmi to Svāminārāyaṇa: does one soul reside in all the bodies or does each body have a separate soul? The answer of Svāminārāyaṇa is that each living body has a separate soul. There are as many souls as there are living bodies. It is not that only one soul resides in all the living bodies.

Svāminārāyaṇa believes that the souls are innumerable (asaṅkhya). He thus maintains the doctrine of the plurality of souls (Jīvasamūha). According to him, souls are infinite in number. Each soul is distinct from the rest. God is the soul of all souls. He comes down upon the earth for redemption of souls. The plurality of souls is evident from the distribution of pleasures and pains.

The doctrine of the plurality of souls is almost a common feature of the Indian Philosophical schools, and more particularly of Vaishavite schools. Even in
Kathopanisad we find a trace of this doctrine. Ramanuja, Madhva, Sankhya, Yoga, Nyaya, Vaisesika, Mimamsa, and Jains maintain this doctrine.

According to Swaminarayan, the plurality of souls remains in tact even in the state of emancipation (moksha). The emancipated souls (mukta jivas) do not merge in God. They retain their individuality. Each liberated soul is distinct from the rest of the liberated souls. All the liberated souls are different from each other as regards their capacity of receiving knowledge and enjoyment of bliss of nearness of God. According to Svaminarayana, infinite number of liberated souls reside in the Divine Abode (Aksaradhman) of God and are engaged in his service.


According to Svaminarayana, jivas are finite individual selves. They are basic spiritual units. They are many. Their number is infinite (asaṅkhya). They are eternally different from God. Each self is different and distinct from every other self.
According to Svāminārāyaṇa, self is a spiritual substance (caitanya Vastu). It is atomic (ajñāttra). It is very subtle (sūkṣma) and imperceptible. According to Śvetāśvatsara Upaniṣad, the self is as subtle as one hundredth part of a hair point.

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, self is eternal (nitya) and unique (vicitra) and formless (arūpa). It is whole, without parts (akṣaṇa). It is absolutely a pure (suddha) being (sattarūpa). It is indivisible (akṣaṇa) and impishable (oṣāsī) and immortal (amara) and unchanging (nirvikara) and insatiable (acūtya). It cannot be pierced (abhedya). Weapons cannot cut it (sachedya). Water cannot wet it (aklēśya) and cannot dry it (vādhyā). Fire cannot burn it (adāhyā).

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, consciousness is the essential attribute of self (caitanyarūpa). Knowledge is its inseparable quality (jñānarūpa). It is different from three bodies (dehatraya Vilakaṇa); namely, gross (sthula), subtle (sūkṣma) and causal (kāraṇa). Waking (jaegrata), dreaming (svapna) and sleeping (aṣuṣṭi).
are three states (avasthā) of its consciousness. By virtue of consciousness as its essence, it pervades all the three bodies including manas (mind), buddhi (intellect), cit (awareness) and ahamkāra (ego). It knows through antabkarana (internal instruments of knowledge) which has four above said modes. It is the real subject of knowledge (jñāta) It is doer (kartā) and enjoyer (bhokta) also. Nevertheless, by itself, it is not capable of knowing doing or enjoying anything, All its power of knowing (jñānasakti), willing (icchāsakti) and doing (kriyāsakti) comes from God who dwells in it. For all purposes self is dependant on God (paratantra). According to Svāminārayaṇa, self is existence (sat), knowledge (cit) and bliss (ānanda). The self must exist. One can never talk about anything which does not exist. The self is aware of its own existence. Self is self-conscious (jñānarūpa). In other words, the self is self-luminous. Unless self is aware of itself, there can be no knowledge at all. Self is bliss (sukhārūpa).
Svāminārāyaṇism is a system of Vedānta. Like other Vedānta systems, Svāminārāyaṇism recognises ānanda as an essential character of self. This character of self remains unmanifest due to ignorance (avidyā). So long as self remains associated with three bodies, it does not enjoy real bliss. When it is separated from them, it realises its true nature which is bliss. By grace of God this character of self is revealed to it in the state of liberation.

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, self is a real entity. It is knower. It has consciousness. It is not mere consciousness as Kevalādvaitins contend. Nor is it a mere appearance of Absolute as Bradley holds. Nor is it a "bundle of sensations" as Hume maintains. If we put the Svāminārāyaṇist stand point in Kantian way, we can say that self without consciousness is blind and consciousness without self is empty.

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, consciousness and bliss constitute the essential nature of self. This aspect of Svāminārāyaṇa's philosophy might create some misunderstanding on account of its similarity with the
philosophy of Śaṅkara. But it should be noted that the qualities of consciousness and bliss belong to self and they are not the same as the consciousness and bliss of parabrahman as in Śaṅkara Vedānta.

Thus, we notice four salient features about the concept of self as has been put forward by Svāminārāyaṇa namely, eternality of self, difference between self and God, difference between selves intrinsically and complete dependence of selves on God. Svāminārāyaṇism, like all orthodox systems of Indian philosophy, considers eternality as a necessary ingredient in the concept of self, without which no ethics would be possible. Unless self is believed to exist for ever, it would be impossible for it to experience good or bad consequences of its actions. The idea of permanence of self provides a rational basis for ethics.

3. Metaphysical Status of the Self

There are four theories about the status of the soul vis-à-vis God. One, soul (jīva) is God (Brahman). This theory is advocated by Śaṅkara-cārya and the followers of Advaita Vedānta. Two, the soul is a portion (āmśa)
of God. This theory is held by Rāmānuja.\(^2\) With slight difference from the theory of Rāmānujaśārya, Madhvacārya also accepts the idea of parthood (aṃśatva) of soul. He explains the parthood of soul as reflection of God (pratibimbāṃśaka).\(^3\) Somewhat similar to this theory, the third theory propounds that God evolves souls out of his Self. This theory is maintained by Judaism and Christianity.\(^4\) And the fourth theory declares that God and the soul both are coeternal. According to this theory soul was never created. It always existed and will always exist. Soul is as eternal as God. Soul existed eternally with God and will exist eternally with God. Soul would neither have an end nor distinction.

Out of these four theories Śvāminarāyana adopts the fourth one. According to him, soul is never created. Soul is as eternal as God.\(^5\) Soul is a subtle spiritual substance existing since eternity. Śvāminarāyana has very explicitly said that soul is not a part or portion (aṃśya) of God. It is an eternal entity.\(^6\) The number of souls is infinite (asaṃkhyya).\(^7\) There can be no addition to the existing number of souls. New souls do not come into
existence. There can neither be addition to nor subtraction from this infinite number of souls. Infinity of souls remains constant. According to Svāminārāyana, there is no question of increase in the number of souls.

4. **Doctrine of Intrinsic Difference.**

From the doctrine of plurality of selves the doctrine of intrinsic difference would logically follow. Of course, it is very difficult to define precisely what distinguishes one self from another. But the wide range of inequalities in the lives of living beings extending over human, animal, plant, aquatic and other spheres of life could not be satisfactorily explained except on the principle of intrinsic differences. The uniqueness of individual experience and inequalities of equipment point ultimately to the existence of inalienable essence of personality which underlies all states of experiences, and which is never seen to overlap in any two cases. According to Svāminārāyana, the difference is not merely a component part of reality, but constitutes its very essence. So much so that to know a thing is to know it as distinct from all others.
We have seen that God, matter (māyā) and selves (jīvas) are three major and distinct realities in Svēminārāyaṇa's metaphysical system. God is distinct and independent of the other two realities which are dependent on God. Selves are unique and infinite in number. Modifications of matter are innumerable. Each order of reality is different from other. Each self is different from the other. Each self is different from God.

According to Svēminārāyaṇa, no self can become like God, even in the state of emancipation. If the selves attain to the position of absolute equality with God in the state of emancipation, it would be difficult to find a rational basis for difference, when they were in the state of bondage; because in bondage selves suffer miseries where as God is always untouched by miseries.

If there is no intrinsic difference between the selves, the following questions would arise. How is it that some souls attain liberation ages before others? Why should others lag behind? The theory of Karma
will not be able to answer these questions, because the
difference in Karmas of different souls ultimately depe-
nds on their own intrinsic difference. Every individual
experience is always unique. According to Madhva the
uniqueness of each individual experience is a sufficient
reason for admitting the distinctiveness of each indivi-
dual soul. Svāminārāyaṇa finds the basis of the doct-
rine of plurality of selves in the intrinsic diversity
of their essences.

Does one self become many? Śaṅkara would say "Yes"
Svāminārāyaṇa would say "No". According to Svāminārāyaṇa
One does not become many. Many are eternal and remain
many eternally. If there is only one individual self,
all selves would be automatically released, the moment
a single self attains release. The very existence of
both freed and bound selves at the same time is a proof of
their distinction and plurality. The clarification of
selves made by Svāminārāyaṇa is nothing but a comprehen-
sive theory embodying the same idea of difference and
distinction among selves.

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, this distinction between
selves persists even in the state of release. The released self knows God directly, but no two released selves have the same degree of knowledge of God. Each self has a different degree of knowledge of God. In this context Svāminarāyaṇa gives two illustrations: One, of the ocean; the other, of the sky. He says that the ants, the beasts, the horses, the elephants, the crocodiles and the human beings take water from the ocean according to their capacities, but the water of ocean remains inexhaustible. Each realises the greatness of ocean according to its capacity. Similarly, the mosquitoes, the sparrows, the hawks and the eagles all fly in the sky according to the strength and power of their wings and yet the sky remains boundless and unfathomable. Each realises its utter insignificance before the greatness of the sky. In the same way, each self attains knowledge of God only proportionate to its receiving capacity. Of course, Svāminarāyaṇa has admitted growth in the capacity of self to know. The more the self attains the knowledge of greatness and glory of God, the more it realises the infinite character of the greatness and
glory of God. Greatness and glory of God being infinite and inexhaustible, the self would never have complete knowledge of God. Each self realises the even increasing glory of God in accordance with the degree of its realisation.

According to Ramanuja, there are no qualitative distinctions among selves. The selves are many, but all of them are of the same quality. There is no difference between selves as regards jñāna and enjoyment of bliss. This view of Ramanuja is not acceptable to Madhva. According to him, plurality of selves without distinction is inconceivable. The selves, in his view, are qualitatively and quantitatively different from one another. For him, no two souls are alike. For explaining the qualitative pluralism of selves Madhva introduces two conceptions: One, Svarūpabheda; the other, tāratamya. By conception of Svarūpabheda he shows that there are intrinsic distinctions in the nature of selves. By the conception of tāratamya he points out that there are gradations based on varying degree of knowledge and bliss, since beginningless time. Each self has its
own capacity to enjoy bliss. According to Madhva, if the selves are essentially the same, there would be no meaning in their qualitative plurality. A difference is no difference unless it makes a difference. Madhva explains the conception of qualitative pluralism with the help of an illustration of sheep. To the ordinary passer-by the sheep may all be just so many numerable units; but to the shepherd who lives with them and has daily contact with them, they are real individuals each with very different features and characteristics. So with the Divine Shepherd each self is different from the other. Svāminārāyaṇa agrees with Madhva in his conceptions of tāratamya. He would also agree with Madhva in his conception of Svārūpabheda.

German philosopher Leibniz also believes in the qualitative plurality of selves. He calls self 'Monad'. According to him, no two monads are exactly alike. Monads differ among themselves in the clearness of perceptions. On these points Svāminārāyaṇa would agree with Leibniz. But according to Leibniz monads are windowless and there is no relation between them. The 'Jīva' of
Svāminārāyaṇa is not an exclusive windowless entity, but is related with so many selves in various ways. According to Svāminārāyaṇa, even in the state of liberation jīvas maintain social character in as much as they all aim at one and the same thing, namely, God. Thus, as they are all related to God, they can be said to be related to one another.  

5. **Self Pervades the Entire Body.**

As we have seen above, the dimension of the soul is atomic. An objection can be raised that if the soul is atomic, it can only be in one place in the body and so it cannot perceive throughout the body. In other words, if the soul is anuparimāṇa, how can it be the knower of experiences all over the body? Svāminārāyaṇa attempts to meet the objection on the analogy of the lamp. He says that a lamp, placed at one spot in a room, extends from there light to the whole of the room. Similarly, the soul although residing in the disc of flesh in the heart extends its consciousness all over the body. Further, the flame of the lamp particularly pervades the wick.
and generally pervades the entire room. Similarly, the soul particularly pervades the disc of flesh and generally pervades the entire body.\(^1\) Svāminārāyaṇa says that through its power of consciousness the soul pervades the entire body (akhilam tanum).\(^2\)

A question can be asked: how is it that the consciousness of the soul is felt unevenly in different parts of the body? What is the reason of such uneven influence of soul on the body?\(^3\) Answering the question Svāminārāyaṇa says that although the sun, through its rays, illuminates all the objects, the intensity of the illumination depends on the purity of the object which it illumines. On the surface of the grass and on the surface of the pure water, the light of the sun would be experienced more than on the surface of the sand and on the surface of the dirty water. Although, the sun illuminates all the objects equally, we win experience more light on pure objects and less light on the dirty or polluted objects. The reflection of the sun's rays varies in intensity according as the object is pure or polluted. Similarly, the pervasiveness of the soul is the same throughout the body,
but it is felt more in the senses (indriyas) which are pure (svacchā). Our nose and ears do not experience the same light as is experienced by our eyes. Again, the four internal psychological instruments (antahkarāṇa), namely manas, buddhi, cit and ahākāra, experience the light of the soul more than the senses. Compared to the light experienced by four internal organs, the light experienced by senses is less. So, the consciousness of the soul is experienced throughout the body, but it differs in intensity according to the purity of the experiencing organ.

Svāminārāyaṇa says that as the soul, through its power of consciousness, pervades the entire body, it experiences pleasure and pain that are caused to the body. The pleasure and the pain of the body are the pleasure and pain of the soul. Thus, the soul is bhaktā and not away from the pleasure and pain of the body.

6. Metaphysical Dependence of Soul on God.

According to Svāminārāyaṇa there are two kinds of realities: One, independent (Svatantra); the other,
dependent (Paratantra). According to him, there are five realities: jīva, īśvara, māyā, brahman and parabrahman. Out of these five realities, the last one, parabrahman (God) is the only independent reality. The rest of them are dependent realities. Accordingly, individual selves are dependent realities. They dependent on God for their existence and activities. Here it should be made clear that the term "independent" is not synonym for "eternal". The idea of Svāminārāyaṇa is not that only independent reality can be eternal. A reality, according to him, can be eternal and yet dependent. A dependent reality also can be eternal. God is a reality. He is independent as well as eternal. But the other four realities are eternal and yet dependent upon God for their existence.

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, selves (jīvas) are eternally existing entities. Consciousness and bliss constitute their intrinsic nature. Even then, they are dependent upon God for their existence and activities. This dependence is not a passing phase in their lives. It is a permanent feature. It is the very condition of their being as finite entities. Even
temporarily they cannot be independent of God. At all times, in bondage as well as liberation, they are dependent upon God. They have no power to experience fruits of their actions at their will. They can experience the fruits of their actions when God enables them to do so. In fact, apart from God, they have no power of willing, feeling, thinking or doing. That power comes from God. By themselves they can do nothing. Their power of thinking, willing, feeling and doing is derived from the pervasion of God over selves. God pervades the selves and enables them to enter into various activities. According to Svāminārāyaṇa, even in the state of liberation (mokṣa) they are dependent upon God for realisation of greater and greater bliss. And after all what is liberation? According to Svāminārāyaṇa, it has two aspects: negative and positive. So far as negative aspect is concerned, it is nothing but release from the fetters which prevent the realisation of their true selves. In its positive aspect liberation is the enjoyment of bliss in the eternal service of God.
which they suffer. These limitations are partly extrinsic and partly intrinsic. The extrinsic limitations arise from the association of the self with the causal body, which evolves into subtle and gross bodies, since beginningless time. The intrinsic limitations arise from their finite nature and inherent peculiarity. The finite nature warrants impossibility of the self to be like God. Svēminārāyana has often said that no self can even attain the status, power, greatness and glory of God. Self can never become like God. Inherent peculiarity entails uniqueness which creates its own limitations. Of the two types of limitations, extrinsic limitations are removable by the process of sādhanā shown by Svēminārāyana. The intrinsic ones remain for ever with the self. Thus, we see that dependence on God constitutes a distinctive mark of all finite selves at all times.

7. **Self as Knower**

According to Svēminārāyana the self resides in the body and God, in the form of Sākṣī (witness self) resides in the self. Whether the self is bound (baddha) or free
According to Svāminārāyaṇa, there are three kinds of cognitive ways: indriyas (sense organs), antahkaraṇa (internal instruments) and Sākṣi (witness self). Mind (manas), buddhi (intellect) and citta (the faculty of reflection) are internal senses. External senses apprehend empirical objects. Mind and intellect interpret and decide. This is how perceptual knowledge originates.

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, manas, buddhi and citta are products of matter (māyika) which is insentient (jāda) and, therefore, the or any of them cannot be the subject of knowledge. According to Svāminārāyaṇa, the self is the real subject of knowledge (jñātā). He has said that "Buddhi is enabled to know because it is pervaded by the self and the self is enabled to know because it is pervaded by Sākṣi."  

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, Sākṣi resides in the self, but it is not identical with the self. It is a
mere witness of Jīva's activity. While Sākṣi is conscious of Jīva's activity, it is in no way moved by it. In Gītā this witness self (sākṣi) is described as Upadraṣṭā and the passer-self is described as Anumanta.⁶

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, the truth and knowledge of pleasure, pain, desire and such other things cannot be cognised by ordinary instruments of knowledge. Inspired by Sākṣi the self has the direct knowledge of these things. Since knowledge of these things is direct, it is never subject to contradiction. It has to be accepted as certain, valid and infallible. When we have an experience of pain, say toothache, we never want its verification. We are certain about its truth. Svāminārāyaṇa says that one would not accept anything as true unless one has a personal experience of it.⁷ This means that according to Svāminārāyaṇa, personal experience needs no verification.

8. Knowledge of Self

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, we cannot have knowledge of self by sense perception. Self is beyond the reach of senses. Sensuous knowledge of self is absolutely impossible.
According to Svāminārayana, we CAN have knowledge of self by logical reasoning. Inference can give us knowledge of the self. Svāminārayana has, however, made it clear that the knowledge of self given by logical reasoning is mediate and not immediate (Sākṣātkāra).²

According to Svāminārayana there is a third kind of knowledge which is distinct from sensuous and logical knowledge. This is intuitive knowledge. Svaminarayana calls it non-sensuous and immediate knowledge. This intuitive knowledge arises from the direct and immediate experience of self.³

According to Svāminārayana, the knowledge of self derived from the logical reasoning and ordinary intuition is only about its existence and not about its metaphysical nature. By ordinary intuition self cannot know its own metaphysical nature. The self can know beauty, ugliness, childhood, youth, oldage and a great number of things, but it cannot know anything about its own nature.⁴

According to Svāminārayana, metaphysical nature of self can never be known by ordinary means of knowledge. Some aspects of it can be mediately known through...
inference, Svāminārāyaṇa explains this position with the help of an illustration. He says that when one sees a large heavy sword weighing ten mannds, one can infer that the person who wields this sword must be heaving a large and stout body. Similarly, from the fact that the self simultaneously pervades the entire body and illumines all the external and internal senses, we can infer that the self must be great and powerful. Thus, the knowledge that self is great and powerful is inferential and not immediate. Immediate knowledge of the metaphysical nature is not attainable by ordinary means of knowledge, because, according to Svāminārāyaṇa, it belongs to a region where neither speech nor mind can reach. Thus, as Tillich has asserted, man must always remain a question mark to himself. As Plato has pointed out, Socrates ever remained an unfathomable mystery to himself, although he devoted the whole of his life for understanding himself.

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, intuition is of two kinds: One ordinary intuition (anubhava) and the other, mediative intuition (Samādhi). Meditative intuition can also be called yogic intuition. The ordinary intuition gives knowledge only of the existence
of self. It does not give knowledge of the metaphysical
tapestry of self. According to Svāminārāyaṇa, such know-
ledge of self can be derived from the state of samādhi. According to Svāminārāyaṇa, when a
person attains the state of samādhi, he experiences his true self and gains the knowledge of self. For Bertrand
Russel, "the question whether we are also acquainted with our bare selves as opposed to particular thoughts and feelings is very difficult one". Svāminārāyaṇa finds no such difficulty. According to him, we can be acquainted with our bare selves in the state of Samādhi.

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, the attainment of self knowledge is not the goal. It is a preliminary towar
a higher goal. It is a gateway leading into a new region wherein the realisation of God is made possible. When the self enters into the supreme state of being in Samādhi, it becomes impossible for it to return to the ordinary existence. This is comparable to Gītā's assertion that once the soul reaches the Supreme Abode of God, it never returns earthly existence.
It should however, be noted that Svāminārāyaṇa does not believe that the method of Aṣṭāṅga Yoga is the only method of attaining Samādhi. According to him, Samādhi can also be attained by making our consciousness (citta Vṛtti) undividedly and uninterruptedlly absorbed in the form of God. It is true that by control of breath, we can control the mind. But it is also true that by control of mind, we can also control the breath. According to Svāminārāyaṇa a devotee of God, whose consciousness has become completely united with the form of God, realises everything that can be realised by the practice of Aṣṭāṅga Yoga. Such a devotee, without practising Aṣṭāṅga Yoga, achieves all the benefits which can be achieved by its practice.
1. **Plurality of Selves**

1. प्रकृति श्रेयसिन हस्ताक्षरायोगिने प्रत्येक प्रकृति की देव देह प्रत्येक जीव के के केवल २।
   
   V.G.F.S.13

2. V. G. F. S. 13

3. जीव जंग पहुँच घरे घाय के देव नहीं
   
   V. G. F. S. 13

4. तैन शारीर आत्मा जीव घाय के
   
   V. A. S. 5

5. भावना...... कवि जीवना पुरुष तैमने विषये...... रूपा के
   
   V. G. L. S. 37

6. V. A. S. 5

7. V. S. S. 17

8. कै सरे जीवना जीवन के
   
   V. G. L. S. 37

9. भावना...... अर्था जीवना क्याण की...... देव घायण करे के
   
   V. A. S. 5

10. नित्योंभिंत्यानां चेतान शुचिनामाः

Kathopanishad 2.5.13

11. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, part II, p.691

12. Ibid., p. 743

13. पुरुषात्मक सिद्धां

Sāṅkhya Kārikā 18

See also Ibid., p. 282.
2. Metaphysical nature of self:

1. V. A. S. 5

2. V. A. S. 7

3. V. G. L. S. 39

4. V. G. F. S. 7

5. V. G. F. S. 41

6. V. G. M. S. 66

7. V. J. S. 2

8. V. K. S. 2

S. P. 105

9. V. K. S. 8

Svetāvatara Upaniṣad, 5-9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Number</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Gita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>V. V. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>V. P. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>V. G. F. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>V. P. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>U. G. F. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S. S. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>V. F. F. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>V. J. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>V. S. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>V. L. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>V. S. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S. S. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>V. L. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>V. G. F. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>V. J. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>V. G. F. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>V. G. F. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>V. S. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>S. P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Gita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>S. P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Gita</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


32. S. P. 105

Gita 2-24

33. V. J. S. 2

V. P. S. 3

34. V. S. S. 12

35. S. P. 116

36. V. G. F. S. 23

37. S. P. 105

V. G. L. S. 4

38. V. K. S. 4

39. V. G. M. S. 63

40. मात्रे वाल्मीकि देव ज्ञानवान्य हैं

V. G. L. S. 39, V. G. F. S. 38

41. V. G. L. S. 4

42. V. G. F. S. 63

43. इत्यादि विचारण गृहि

V. G. F. S. 8

44. V. S. S. 12

45. ते वाल्मीकि तार वृद्धिका तथा वर्गेश जैसी तेजस्वी हैन

ज्ञानवान्य हैं

V. G. L. S. 39

ते वाल्मीकि सूर्यवत जैसी प्रकाश्य हैं

V. G. M. S. 35

V. G. L. S. 33

V. K. S. 8
36. V. S. S. 12

37. ज्याँ ते प्रीति त्यानेन त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः त्यः

V. G. M. S. 66

38. भावानकी भ्या वाण्या ने भावानाना धारणा पाये
V. S. S. 11

39. तेन ज्याणनारो तेन ज्याणनारो तेन ज्याणनारो
V. G. F. S. 38

3. Metaphysical status of the Self:

1. जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जीव जी
4. **Doctrine of intrinsic difference**:

1. V. G. M. S. 67
2. V. S. S. 17
3. V. G. F. S. 7
4. V. G. M. S. 31
5. V. A. S. 5
6. V. A. S. 7
7. V. G. L. S. 37
8. V. G. F. S. 12
9. V. G. F. S. 7
10. V. G. F. S. 41

**Note**: See, Note on Classification above.
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14. V. S. S. 17

**Note**: See, Note on Classification above.


16. V. S. S. 17

17. V. S. S. 17
बाणी हैं।
V. S. S. 17

१५. कैम बाकाश है कैम विषों मध्य उठे ने चरखु उठे ने समझा
उठे ने सीवाणी पण उठे ने बलबहारी पण उठे ने गहड़ पण
उठे, तो पण ने सवैने बाकाश व्यासी व्यास रहे हैं। कैम आजे
पानी विषों वसु का हौं धे बाकाशो महिमा वसु जाणे हैं।
कैम पोताना विषों न्वृत्तपुत्र समझतो जाय हैं।
V. S. S. 17

१६. कैम सवै भावनानो महिमा समझानो हीव तेना हृदयमाँ
तैतलो न प्रकाश धाय हैं।
V. G. F. S. 24

१७. कैम सवै मृण मृण बामथिने पाप्या हैं। तेन हैम भावनानो
महिमा वसु वसु जाणवता गया हैं।
V. S. S. 17

१८. कैम हैम सुरचन प्रसन्न ठीकी धाय हैम हैम भावनाने पोता ठीकी
पर जाणतो धाय कैम महिमा वसु वसु समझतो धाय।
V. S. S. 17

१९. कैम भावनाना महिमानी कोई पार पामता न हो।
V. G. L. S. 37

२०. कैम हैम बाधिक तिधिने पाप्या गया ने भावनानो महिमा
बाधिक जाणवता गया हैम हैम मुक्तपणामां चिरिश्चमणु
आवलु गई।
V. S. S. 17
92

5. Self pervades the entire body:

1. The essence of everything is the self, the self is the whole, the self is the entire body, the self is the whole body.

V. G. L. S. 4
2. व्याच्याक्रिया करता है ज्ञानसममता स्थिरी जीवों ।

S. P. 105

3. जीव जैसे ते सामान्यपणे सवे देखता व्यापोने विशेषपणे
हृदयाकाशमा रहता है, त्यारे तने सरल दागणपणु नकी जगतातू तैरून कैम समझूँ ।

V. L. S. 15

4. कैम सूर जैसे ते लिरोण करोने सवे पदार्थपणे व्यापोने रहता है
पण आगल जैसे पदार्थ के त्यारे तैने सृजनो प्रकाश जगणाय के ।
कैम जैसे कार्ती धृती होय तथा स्वच्छ निमिताधिक पाणी होय
t्यारे जैसे रूखे सृजनो हृद प्रकाश जगणाय के तैने रूखे
पाणीने धृती, रूखीने धृती तथा ठोला जैसे पाणी तेमा
जगणातै की ही, तैने सृजनो प्रकाशमा न्यून विकिरणपूर्वत
जगणाय है, तैने जैसे, ईंडियाह, आँक्रण, गोला जै
सवी विषे समानपणे रहते है पण ईंडियाहोने विषे स्वयम्भ-पूर्वपूर्व के मार्ग तैने विषे विशेष जगणाय के, जूमीके मैत्राने तैले
ते ज जगणाय है तैने नाटक-काण्मा की विख्य जगणाय के ।
नकी जगणातू तने चार आँक्रणपूर्वविकिरणपूर्व के ते त्यारे
जीवनी विशेष प्रकाश जगणाय है, तने जैसे ईंडियाहो न्यून
जगणाय है, पण जैव तो सवे देखने विषे समानपणे रहते है।

V. L. S. 15

5. कैन धैर भैली सुख़ाने तने तो पाम तरी।

V. L. S. 4
6. **Metaphysical dependence of selves on God**:

1. V. G. F. S. 64
2. V. G. M. S. 21
3. V. G. F. S. 7

4. भावना के स्वतंत्र होने पर जीवन ने कार के तो भावना ने अवैध हो गया है परंतु हो
   V. G. F. S. 64
5. भावना जीवन ने कार के स्वतंत्र होने पर मैं हो होता है निधन होता है
   V. G. F. S. 64
6. V. G. F. S. 64
7. V. G. F. S. 52
8. जीव …… भावना होने करवाने समय नहीं
   V. G. F. S. 52
9. See Dr. Yajnik J. A. *The Philosophy of Sri Svaminarayan*, p. 52
10. V. G. M. S. 21
11. V. G. F. S. 64
12. जीव पीना भी होने करवाने …… कार के करवाने
    मौजूदा घटना नहीं
    V. G. F. S. 65
13. कार के मौजूदा पीना वालने परमेश्वर है
    V. G. F. S. 65
६। व. ग. फ. स. ५२

७। व. ग. फ. स. ५२

ॐ। कैली रोले मापानें विष्णु ज्ञानशक्ति, विज्ञानशक्ति को
कैलीशक्ति तै रही है।

व. ग. फ. स. ६५

८। व. ग. फ. स. ७१

उ। ज्यारे के जीवनमंगल क्षणी निग्रिति थाय हे त्यारे के मायको
व्रण देखने संबंध हुटी जाय हे। कुछे के जीव केवल तीना सलाम
पाते रहे हे।

व. ग. म. स. ६६

९। नैम कैम वहु माननी पाप्पा गया तैम तैम मापानें विष्णु,
वनामी-सैक्षणणानां माव पण अति हुट पली गयी हे।

व. स. स. १७

१०। व. क. स. १२

११। क्षार पूके कौई पण पुंशावलम् मापान जैसा सदैव निती थाता।

व. क. स. ८

१२। नारायण जैसा तो नै नारायण ज हे, पण बोधी
कौई के जैवी धरी निखो।

व. क. स. १३

मापान हे कैक ज हे पण बोधी के जैवी धरी निखो।

व. ग. ल. स. ३९

१३। व. स. स. १७
7. Self as Knower:

1. आ देखने विषय जीव रहे हैं, तो जै जीवन विषय परमेश्वर
   पण साक्षात्कृत करीते रहे हैं।
   V. G. L. S. 4

2. वह जीव तथा मुक्त जीव जै केवल हृदयमां साक्षात्कृत अत्यन्त
   रूपमें है कि वह बलपूर्व के मुक्ताकः अने अद्वैत नयो...... ते
   पुराणांमूर्ति अन्वयमें है।
   V. S. S. 5

3. V. L. S. 10
   V. V. S. 4

4. V. G. F. S. 12
   V. G. M. S. 34

5. किष्किन्द्रविवर्ण ने हंदियोणां वाणापप्पू हैं ते जीवमें ज जै,
   V. G. M. S. 63

   बुद्धि है ते आ देखने विषय नसिंधित पक्षत व्यापीने रही हैं।
   ते बुद्धि ते ब्रह्म हंदियोणां कलाने सक्ताविचार ज्ञात हैं ते
   बुद्धि विषय जीव व्यापीने रही है। ते जीवन वाणापप्पाने
   कोई वे करीने हंदियोण वाणापप्पू कहेतात्तु कि ते जीवन विषय जीवन
   साधनी रूपमें मात्र साक्षात्कृत वाणापप्पाने कहेते करीने
   जीवमें वाणापप्पू कहेतात्तु।
   V. K. S. 4

6. उपक्रमांकुःनवत्ता न करी भूलता परमेश्वरः।
   Gita 13.23

7. पौरे तै कामावेल वाला न होय तेनी विज्ञान कैम थाय ।
   V. G. L. S. 35
8. Knowledge of self:

6. जीवात्मा है ते ते…… कभी दिशा करीने गुरुण कर्मांक बावति नयो। V. G. L. S. 3

2. अनुमाने करीने ज्ञात ते पण हावारकार नयी ज्ञाताती। V. K. S. 1

3. ने…… अंडेश्ठ कार हते ते ते पोताना स्थाप्ने…… तुजे है।

4. V. G. F. S. 20

8. वा देहमर रहैनरी जे जीव है ते रुपमे जुबे हे अने कुस्पने जुबे है तथा भाव, वौनन को वृद्धामने जुबे है, तथा अनेक पदार्थमे जुबे है पण जीनारी पीते पोताने जो तो नयानी।

V. G. F. S. 20

5. जैम कौशक वश मानसी वस्त्रार जीव तैने जोड़ये माणस अनुमान करे जे वे वस्त्रानी उपायनारी कहू मोटी हसे, तैम जे जीविके, ईंध्यादिने अद्यकाले प्रकाश है, मार्टि जे जीव कहू मोटी हे जैम रीते अनुमाने करीने ज्ञाताती है।

6. जे जीवात्मा है ते…… अभावानि जीविक है,

V. G. L. S. 3

7. J. A. Yajnik, The Philosophy of Sri Svāminarāyaṇa, p. 103

8. Plato, Phaedrus, 229 A.

5. जीनारी जे पोतानो जीव तैना रुपमे पण देखनु

V. A. S. 1

अने बाध्याना स्थाप्नी वातावरनी करीने कीजे…… केनु पराठे मुख है ते तो स्वार्थिक करीने वाप्पामर्मा आवे है।

V. G. M. S. 27
20. समाविष्टुक पृथ्वा धाय है तथा माया चणी पर स्थिति धाय है।
V. G. M. S. 20

21. समाविष्टता तो देह इंद्रियों अतः स्थिति जुड़े पड़े वहीं की है।
V. G. M. S. 20


23. ज्ञान क्युँ है तो प्राचीनपुरुषों पर है। नै उग्नातीतिह सिद्धि स्थिरति धाय है लवणी प्राचीनपुरुष ने प्राचीनपुरुषों बाह्य है ते काही नवराता धारक क्यों नहीं। नै नित्य स्थिरति धाय है
तैने अव ख्यात्यय माहै है नै तैने विषे माखानी भूति ज रूढ़कै प्रण बीजो बाधार रक्तता क्यों।
V. G. F. S. 24

24. समाविष्ट धाय केहै तो प्राण स्वप्नपाची देहमा कोई रती खाँतु क्यों।
V. G. F. S. 73

25. यह गत्वा न सिद्धैन्त स्वप्नपाच्छ प्रणमम्म।

26. प्राणायाम्लांय बाहे मेल क्यों।
V. A. S.

27. बैठै ते तात्त्वात्मक्य धान व निरयिक व यमाविष्ट प्रण मेरै।
V. G. M. S. 14

28. प्राणने निरीण करीण निरीण धाय है।
V. G. F. S. 25

29. बीतै निरीण करीण प्राणने निरीण धाय है।
V. G. F. S. 25
०. अष्टाङ्ग योग साधने करने प्रियों निरीक्षण धार्मिक नहीं है।
स्वातन्त्र्य स्वातन्त्र्य विषेश जोड़ने करने प्रियों निरीक्षण
धार्मिक नहीं है।
V. G. F. S. 25
के चेतन चिकित्सा मायावनस्थ स्वातन्त्र्य विषेश जोड़ने
के अष्टाङ्ग योग नए साधन सुधार स्वयं।
V. G. F. S. 25
CHAPTER 4

SELF AND GOD

1. Various names of God
2. Svaminarayana proves the existence of God
3. Form and personality of God
4. Man in the image of God
5. The doctrine of double soul
6. Relation between self and God
7. Jiva, law of Karma and God
8. God as the goal
9. Self's knowledge of God
10. Jiva's Sādharmya with God
11. Can Jiva become God?
1. **Various Names of God**

Svāminārāyaṇa makes reference to God by various names. He refers to God as Bhagavan, Puruṣottama, Paramāvara, Nārāyaṇa, Naranārāyaṇa, Laxminārāyaṇa, Puruṣottamanārāyaṇa, Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Vāsudeva, Parabraman, Rājādhīrāja and Saccidānanda. But largely he uses the word "Bhagavan" for God.

2. **Svāminārāyaṇa proves the existence of God**

Saint Acquinas advances five arguments for proving the existence of God: argument from (1) Motion, (2) Cause, (3) Necessity (4) Gradation and (5) Design. There are and can be many more arguments for proving the existence of God. But generally the arguments for proving the existence of God can be classified into five types: Ontological, Cosmological, Teleological, Moral and Religious. Out of these five, Svāminārāyaṇa advances three types of arguments for proving the existence of God: the teleological argument, Moral argument and the argument from religious experience.

First, we shall take up the teleological argument.

What is a teleological argument? This is a very
popular argument, both in the West as well as in the
East, for proving the existence of God. The argument
points out that everywhere in the world there are clear
signs of order in accordance with a purpose. This pur-
pose order cannot be due to the blind working of the
mechanical laws. This order, so runs the argument,
cannot be explained by anything in the things themsel-
ves. The order has to be conceived as imposed on things
by some intelligent agency outside them. Saint Thomas
Acquinas has very sharply formulated this argument.
He argues that we see that things which lack knowledge
such as natural bodies, act for an end, and this is evi-
dent from their acting always in the same way so as to
attain the best result. Hence it is plain that they achi-
eve their end, not fortuitously, designedly. Now, what-
ever lacks knowledge cannot move towards an end, unless
it is directed by same being endowed with knowledge and
intelligence, as the arrow is directed by the archer.
Therefore, some intelligent being exists by whom all
natural things are directed to an end ; and this being
we call God.² Svāminārāyaṇa presents a similar argument.
He says, Look at the universe. We find everything orderly.
Everything behaves in an orderly way. None deviates from the order. And order is the result of design.

God is the Master Director. He directs everything and every activity. He designs everything. There is nothing in the universe which is outside his design. Unless directed, not even a blade of grass can move. This is how Svāminārāyana has formulated his teleological argument.

Another argument, for the existence of God, that can be traced in the Vacanāmṛta is the moral argument of which Immanuel Kant is the Chief Exponent. The moral argument runs as follows: We see uniformity in the natural order. According to Kant, natural order is also a moral order. From the moral order we can rationally think that world is controlled by a morally perfect Being. Reason tells us that there ought to be a Being who controls everything and apportions happiness according to desert. In order to do this, such a Being must be all-wise, all-good and all-powerful. The inviolability and certainty of moral law inevitably leads to the concept of a morally perfect Being having adequate power.
and wisdom to adjust world to the supreme teleological end. Without such an enforcing power, moral values would be meaningless, and such a Being is God.

Svāminārāyaṇa would completely subscribe to Kant's formulation of the moral argument. According to Svāminārāyaṇa, we see uniformity in the natural order. This presupposes one supreme Being who controls everything. According to Svāminārāyaṇa, God is the controller (niyantā) of everything. All the actions and their consequences are within his control. The inviolability of moral law is due to overall control of God. God is the Supreme Controller. He apportions happiness according to desert. He is the cause of all causes. Moral law implies supreme good. God is the supreme Good (ātyantika Kalyāṇa) on realizing which nothing remains to be realized.

The third argument that we can trace in Vacanāmṛta for proving the existence of God is the argument from religious experience. According to this argument the occurrence of religious experience proves the existence of God.

According to F.R. Tennant the religious experience
is enjoyed at the highest stage of raptness which can be attained through mystical contemplation. The experiences induced by raptness are not of the ineffable kind, but admit in some measure or even full measure, of translation into terms of ordinary imagery and knowledge. Mystics are able to visualise otherwise than by eye and to understand otherwise than understanding the mystery of God. Svāminārāyaṇa would fully endorse this view of Tennant and add that because the mystical or religious experience is most objective and translatable into ordinary language through the use of symbols and analogies from ordinary experience of the natural world, it is possible to prove the existence of God on its basis.

For Svāminārāyaṇa the religious experience constitutes the most important argument for establishing the existence of God. In Vacanāmrta he repeatedly talks about his personal experience of God. He claims to be in constant touch with God. Svāminārāyaṇa enjoys the religious experience in mystical raptness, and translates it in terms of ordinary imagery. He emphatically says to his disciples, "Do believe me. I see God even right
now. He further reiterates, "I talk about God from my highly personal experience of God." He swears in the name of Paramahansas and says that he describes God from his knowledge of having personally seen (joine) Him. Thus, his religious argument is based on his direct personal experience of God. It should be made clear that, although in Vacanāmrta we can trace the afore-said arguments for proving the existence of God, neither God nor Proofs for the existence of God, as Dr. J. A. Yajnik has rightly pointed out presented any problem to Svāminārāyaṇa. He was constantly feeling his presence.  

3. Form and Personality of God

Parabrahma or Puruṣottama is God of Svāminārāyaṇa. Puruṣottama is the supreme personality. The concept of Puruṣottama is highest one in Svāminārāyaṇam. The personality of Puruṣottama occupies the central position not only in Akṣaraśāhman but also in the totality of existence.

In Vacanāmrta Svāminārāyaṇa shows great concern about the form and personality of God. He regards them
as important aspects of God's being. Svāminarāyaṇa seeks to establish beyond doubt the form and personality of God, and refutes the doctrine which denies them. In very unambiguous terms Svāminarāyaṇa says that the form and personality of God are like those of a human being. God has two arms and two legs. Personality of God is very beautiful. But the body of God is not material (māyika). It is divine (divya).

According to Svāminarāyaṇa, God is never formless (nirākāra). It is always with form and personality (sākāra). In his view, formless God can do nothing! Without form and personality activities of God are inconceivable. Those who quote Śrutī to establish formlessness and impersonality of God are mistaken. They do not understand its real import. What Śrutī negates is the material form and not the divine form of God. Śrutī never negates the divine form of God. On the contrary Śrutī speaks of it. Svāminarāyaṇa says that, in Śrutī it is mentioned that God looks at māyā. If God has no eyes, how can He look at māyā? Now, if He has eyes, He must also have ears, hands, and legs. In the same way He also
must have all the fourteen sense organs. God possesses all the faculties of cognition and connotation. But His sense organs are not material. They are divine. When Sruti declares God to be formless, it only means that God has no material form. Sruti negates only the materiality of divine form. According to Svāminārāyaṇa, if God is not personal, how can He be the object of man's love, devotion and worship? The desire to behold and know the form of God is the highest desire of mumukṣu.

The supreme Puruṣottama, of Svāminārāyaṇa is thus person. He has a character of His own. God of Svāminārāyaṇa is not a mere abstraction. He is not only an ultimate ground of the universe but also an object of love, devotion and worship of devotees. It is a personality that can be beheld and experienced. Svāminārāyaṇa has no regard for the Absolute Brahman of Śaṅkara. Radhakrishnan says "The absolute of Śaṅkara rigid, motionless and totally lacking in initiative, cannot call forth our worship." Svāminārāyaṇa would completely agree with this observation of Radhakrishnan. According to
Svāminārāyaṇa, to conceive God as formless and impersonal is the greatest crime against Him. No one should listen to the person who says that God is formless and impersonal.

4. Man in the Image of God

The Jewish doctrine of creation is found in the account given in chapters 1 and 2 of the Book of Genesis in the Old Testament. The description of the creation of the world by God is given in vivid pictorial language. God created firmament, waters, earth, beasts and so on. Then God said, "let us make man in our image, after our likeness." God willed to create man and created him in his own image. And thus God created man in his own image, in his own likeness. This view of creation of man would not be completely acceptable to Svāminārāyaṇa. However, we find Svāminārāyaṇa in full agreement with the view in so far as the complete similarity of the images of man and God is concerned. Here also a difference in the two views is worth noting. It is this: unlike Old Testament Svāminārāyaṇa does not say that man is like God; he rather says that God is like man. Thus the Svāminārāyaṇist belief is that the visible form of a human being is
the true form of God. Just as a human being has a two-armed and two-legged figure, God has also a two-armed and two-legged form. Svāminārāyaṇa very clearly says that the form of God is like that of man.

It may be argued that, according to Svāminārāyaṇa, God has created man and, therefore, God is prior to the creation of man. Now, when form of God resembles that of man and God is prior to the creation of man, it becomes pretty obvious that God created man in His own image, in his likeness. This argument will not hold good because according to Svāminārāyaṇism there is no beginning of creation. It is beginningless (anādi). Hence, the point of God being "prior" is not at all relevant. This means that the Christian and Svāminārāyaṇist positions are comparable but not identical.

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, when Jīva after leaving the physical body, goes to Ākṣaradhaman, the divine body given to it is also in the likeness of divine form of God. It is very interesting to note in this connection that Svāminārāyaṇiya doctrine in this respect goes farther than
Biblical one. Whereas the Biblical doctrine of similarity between man's image and God's image is limited to Jīva's physical body in this world only, Svāminārāyanīya doctrine goes beyond physical plane and postulates similarity between divine body of jīva and divine body of God in Akṣarāradhāman also.

5. **The Doctrine of Double Soul**

Svāminārāyanā has expounded the doctrine of double soul. According to him, every living creature has a double soul. By doctrine of double soul is not meant that every living creature has two souls. The doctrine does not mean that. In its true connotation it is a doctrine of soul within soul.

According to Svāminārāyanā, there is a soul in every living body. And the soul also has a soul within it. Svāminārāyanā says that just as Jīva resides in the heart, God resides in Jīva by his antaryāmi Sakti. So the soul which indwells the soul of every living creature, according to Svāminārāyanā, is none else than God himself. This view has found expression in number of religious leaders and traditions. For example, Sri Aurobindo says
that the indwelling God is the inner light and the inner voice of the mystic.\(^3\) He calls the indwelling God "THE HIDDEN GUIDE."\(^4\) Saint Augustine says, "thou art more inward to me than my most inward part."\(^5\) Thomas Acquinas says, "the Holy Ghost inhabits the mind by his substance."\(^6\) In Kathopanisad we find the doctrine of doublé soul. According to Kathopanisad, the wise men, who perceive God as dwelling in their own selves, attain eternal peace and none else.\(^7\) In Gītā also we find this doctrine. According to Gītā, God resides in the heart of man.\(^8\) This means Jīva resides in the heart and God resides in Jīva is a widely acceptable doctrine.

Śvāminārāyana has repeatedly said that God resides in the soul of every living creature. The peculiarity of Śvāminārāyana's assertions consists in the fact that he repeatedly authenticates the truth of this doctrine by his own personal experience. He says that he sees the person of God in the illumination which exists in his heart.\(^9\)

A question may arise, How can God, who is eternally and intrinsically different from Jīva, reside in Jīva?
To this question Svāminārāyana gives a very clear answer. He says that just as the fire exists in the wood, although its nature is intrinsically different from that of wood, God resides in each and every soul, although His nature is different from jīva.  

According to Svāminārāyana without God residing in it, Jīva cannot do anything. It even cannot enjoy the fruits of its own actions. It can only do what it is enabled by God to do. God is independent, jīva is not. Jīva is dependent upon God for its existence and activities. Just as a human body without a soul is unable to do anything, jīva without Puruṣottama would be unable to do anything. God is the soul of soul; the self of self and the life of life.

The doctrine of double soul does not imply that God is present in everything with the same fulness. According to Svāminārāyana he is more fully present in Akṣara-brahman than in Puruṣa Prakṛti. In the same way He is more fully present in man than in birds and beasts. The doctrine of degrees of fulness with which God is present in different things is explained by Svāminārāyana with
the leaf of an illustration. He says that in a sense, it can be said that a long fire is present in a long log of wood and a curved fire in a curved log of wood. It is in this sense that Svāminārāyaṇa speaks of greater or lesser fulness of presence (Nyūnādhikabhāva) of God in different degrees of realities. God is more present in higher reality than in a lower reality. His manifestation depends upon the kind of reality in which He is immanent. Thus, as Dr. Yajnik has pointed out, "God is immanent in each and every being, not partially, but wholly and indivisibly." 

With reference to the presence of God in jīva, it should be noted that God as God in jīva and God as Witness Self (Sākṣī) in jīva refer to two different things. The former has an ontological implication and the latter has an epistemological context. From the standpoint of ontology God resides in jīva as ultimate reality and supports very existence. From the standpoint of epistemology God resides in jīva as sākṣī and enables it to know all that it can know.
6. Relation between Self and God

As we have seen according to Svāminārāyana there are five eternal reals. He conceives two types of reals: One, independent (Svatantra) and the other dependent (Paratantra). He has drawn a bold line of demarcation between these two types of ultimate reals.

According to Svāminārāyana, God, as the only independent real is the highest ontological principle. Nārāyaṇa, whom he also calls Bhagavāna and Purusottama, is the only independent reality. All other realities are viewed as dependent on Him. Under the dependent type of realities are covered Akṣarabrahman, Māyā, Isvara and Jīva. It should be noted that all eternals, whether independent or dependent, are equally real, and so are the differences between them.

Although jivas are eternal realities, eternally different and distinct from God, they depend upon Him for their existence and activities. They exist in and through God. Their existence cannot be conceived except through God. God constantly sustains them. He is eternally independent of them. God is sovereign. His will is final.
He is the only ultimate reality to which all other existences stand in relation of constant and complete dependence. All other reals are subject to His will and power. They are metaphysically dependent upon God for their being and becoming.5

This relation of metaphysical dependence of Jīva has been explained by Svāminārāyaṇa in terms of Sarīra-śarīrī relation. God is the self of all the lesser realities which constitute His body.6 God is the soul of soul, self of self and life of life.7 Svāminārāyaṇa has explained Aksarabrahman, Māyā, Ḫiva and Jīva to be God’s body in the sense that they are pervaded by Him, just as physical body is pervaded by jīva, jīva is pervaded by God. Just as physical body without soul is incapable of doing anything, in the same way jīva without God indwelling it is incapable of doing anything.8

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, this relation of metaphysical dependence continues between jīva and Puruṣottama even at the transcendent level. In the state of liberation there is complete realisation of metaphysical dependence of jīva upon Puruṣottama. In a sense it can be
said that liberation is jīva's realization of its eternal metaphysical dependence on Puruṣottama at transcendent level, which results in eternal Svāmīn Sevaka relation.⁹

Here it is necessary to point out, as it has been stated by Dr. J.A. Wajnik, that "Dependence is a kind of relation and there is nothing in the concept of this relation which makes it impossible to apply this relation to eternal substances. Similarly, the notion of eternity is not necessarily connected with the notion of independence."¹⁰ This means that one need not suppose that what is eternal cannot be dependent on another eternal. Simply, an eternal entity is determined by another eternal entity, it does not mean that the determined eternal entity loses its eternal character. An eternally dependent entity by its being eternally dependent on another eternal entity does not cease to be eternal. Even in dependence it remains eternal. Similarly, the depended eternal entity by its caprice cannot render depending eternal entity non-eternal. It is well known that the eternal atoms of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Philosophy are not exempt from the sway of God. Even though atoms are moved
by God, they remain eternal. What is eternal is eternal. Eternal can never become non-eternal. There is no logical difficulty in holding that eternal realities can be eternally dependent on God.

It should also be pointed out that notion of "eternity" is not necessarily associated with the notion of independence. What is meant by an eternal entity is only this that it was never created by anyone at any time nor will it be destroyed at any time.

7. **Jīva, Law of Karma and God**

According to Śvāminārāyaṇa, God is Karmaphalapradāta. Although jīva is bound by Law of Karma and has to suffer or enjoy according to its deserts, it cannot enjoy the fruits of its own action at its will and by its own effort. It is only when God enables jīva to enjoy the fruits of its action, it can do so. Not otherwise. No one can go against the will of God. He controls everything and every activity in the universe. No one can do anything nor enjoy anything otherwise than in accordance with the will of God. Only God is rewarder of all actions. It is God who creates objects of ordinary sense experience as
well as dream objects. Jīva does not create dream objects. He simply cannot create them. Even in dream it cannot enjoy the objects of its choice. Dream objects are given by God. Not only this. Even states (avasthā) of jīva are determined by Him jīva by itself cannot go from one state to another. It is He who takes jīva from the state of waking (jāgrata) to the state of dream (svapna) or from the state of dream to the state of deep sleep (sūṣupti).

Other aspects of this point are discussed in the Chapter on Law of Karma.

8. God as the Goal

What is the ultimate goal of human existence? In very clear terms Svāminārāyaṇa has said that realisation of God is the supreme goal (paramapada) of human life. There is no other goal higher than God. God is not only the metaphysical ground and the moral governor of the universe, but He is the Supreme Value (paramarūpa) also.

According to Hoffding, every religious standpoint gathers up into its conception of God the highest known values. There are three ultimate values commonly recognised in the East as well as in the West. They are truth
(satyam), goodness (āivam) and beauty (sundaram). Svāminārāyanā recognises these three values. Svāminārāyanā also recognises eternal bliss as a value.

These values are indefinable. But they are not unintelligible. It is a matter of common experience that truth satisfies the intellect, good satisfies the will and beauty satisfies the feeling. There supreme values are not mere social conventions. The religious consciousness regards them as possessing objective validity. These values are ideals realised in God. God is the eternal embodiment of truth, beauty, goodness, bliss, perfection and righteousness. According to Svāminārāyanism, these values constitute important aspects of the supreme personality of God. Svāminārāyanā's view of God establishes relation between values and spiritual reality. Individual selves achieve approximations to the supreme personality of God and share in God's highest values. When jīva attains Sādharmya with God, on liberation, it attains not only in form, but in the embodiment of values also.

According to Svāminārāyanā, God is not only the most beautiful and the most perfect Being, but supreme bliss
also. 
No bliss is superior to the bliss of God. 
According to Saint Augustine, God is the Chief good.
Nothing is better than God. Svāminārāyaṇa completely agrees with Saint Augustine and says that God is the chief good (Paramāśāra).

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, the greatest good of man lies in the realisation of God, and no where else.
There is no gain greater than that of God. Having gained God nothing remains to be gained. God is the highest goal. He is the greatest value of human life.
We thus see that "the philosophy of Svāminārāyaṇa starts with the conception of Parabrahman as the ground of finite existence, and ends with the emphasis that realisation of Parabrahman, who is immanent in man, is the highest goal of human existence."  

Self's Knowledge of God

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, God can be known. Let us see by what method and how much of God can be known.

As it has been worked out by Dr. J.A. Yajnik, "sāṇe reason and intimation are the three ways accepted by
Svāminarāyaṇa as valid method of knowing reality.  

Generally it is true that the use of all the three is necessary if reality is to be fully grasped. Now, the sense experience is not always beyond doubt. Knowledge given by sense is not always certain. This is the limitation of sense experience. Logical reasoning is also not without its limitation. Logical knowledge has certainty, but it lacks in immediacy. Logical knowledge is mediate knowledge. This is the limitation of Logical knowledge. And, therefore, very obviously God cannot be known through sense experience or logical reasoning. Svāminarāyaṇa has said that God is beyond the reach of sense and reason.

The intuitive knowledge is free from these limitations. It is certain as well as immediate. The intuition is rooted in the very being of the self and functions completely independent of the psycho-physical organism. This being so, knowledge given by intuition is immediate, certain and beyond all doubt. According to Svāminarāyaṇa, intuition (anubhava) is the only way of knowing God.

According to Svāminarāyaṇa, God can be known, but
can never be completely known. Svāminārāyaṇa has emphatically pointed out the inexhaustible character of God. God's glory, greatness and power are inexhaustible and can never be fully known by any one. The liberated soul residing in Akṣara-Ākṣaraṇam, directly knows God. But it does not know Him completely. It knows only within its capacity to know. Its knowledge of God is proportionate to its receiving capacity. Of course, Svāminārāyaṇa has accepted the possibility of growth in this capacity. According to Svāminārāyaṇa, the capacity to receive knowledge of God admits of continuous growth. More Śrīva knows God, more develops its capacity to know Him. This capacity will continuously go on developing further and further, but infinite nature of God can never be completely known.

Thus we see that Svāminārāyaṇa denies absolute unknowability of God. But at the same time, he also denies the absolute knowability of God. According to Him, God is never fully known; never fully unknown. For him God is known as well as unknown. "It is interesting to note" to quote Dr. J.A. Yajnik, "that the Svāminārāyaṇist view regarding the knowability of God
is strikingly similar to one maintained by Pringle- Pallison in his "Idea of God". Both conceive God as the Known-Unknown. 10

10. Jīva's Sādharmya with God

Referring to the Śrutī text Nirañjana, Paramam Samyamupatti,1 Svāminārāyaṇa says that jīva attains similarity with God. 2 According to Svāminārāyaṇa, when the self attains liberation, it goes to Aksaradhaman, where it acquires a divine body (Bhagavati tanu) which is similar to the divine body of God. 3 In Aksaradhaman there are infinite number of liberated souls (muktas) who have attained similarity with God. 4

The doctrine of attaining similarity (sādharmya) with God is explained by Svāminārāyaṇa with the help of the illustration of bee. Svāminārāyaṇa says that a been catches hold of a worm (iyala) and gives it a sting and them hovers over the insect making a buzzing sound. Because of the processes that take place in the worm due to sting and the buzzing sound, it gets transformed into a bee. It ceases to be a worm and becomes
a bee like a real bee. In the same way, according to Svāminārāyaṇa, when temporal processes of Śādhanā are undergone, Jīva gets transformed into a divine form like that of God. Svāminārāyaṇa says that by these processes of Śādhanā the devotee of God gets transformed into divinity, even though embodied.

The liberation, ultimately, is a self-discovery. And when the self is discovered, jīva finds that it has similarity with God both in form as well as in the enjoyment of divine bliss. The devotee of God, who acquires knowledge of greatness and glory of God, when it leaves the body and goes to Akṣaradhāman, it attains the glory greatness, bliss and charm similar to those of God. The devotee of God who attains self-realisation and God-realisation also attains sādharmya with God.

This point is further discussed in the section on liberation.

11. "Can Jīva become God?"

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, this question is out of place. Such a question is not warranted in Svāminārāyaṇa theism. In Svāminārāyaṇism such a question is
irrelevant and inconceivable.

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, there are five eternal realities. God is the supreme reality. These five realities are eternally different from one another. One cannot become the other. At least, none can become God. One can at the most attain Sādhārmya with God. But one cannot become God nor absolutely like God.¹

In advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara, Jīva, can realise itself as Brahman. According to Śaṅkara Jīva and Brahman are identical. In Svāminārāyaṇism Jīva can realise itself as essentially of the nature of Akṣarabrahman. But Jīva can never become Akṣarabrahman, or Puruṣottama. Jīva eternally remains Jīva. According to Svāminārāyaṇa, Puruṣottama is absolutely unfathomable and can never be fully known by any one.² And, therefore, there is no question of any one ever becoming Puruṣottama.

Svāminārāyaṇa argues that if Jīva can become Puruṣottama, then there would be many Gods. Each God would decide on a different course of action with the result that there would be no order and uniformity in the functioning of the universe.³ But, because no one can become
Purusottama and there is only one Purusottama, the order and uniformity in the universe are maintained.
1. Various names of God:

   (1) V, G, F. S. 44
   (2) V, K. S. 12
   (3) V, L. S. 13
   (4) V, J. S. 5
   (5) V, G, F. S. 4
   (6) V, G, M. S. 3
   (7) V, G, F. S. 5
   (8) V, E, M. S. 31
   (9) V, G, M. S. 3
   (10) V, L. S. 18
   (11) V, L. S. 18

2. Svāminārayāna proves the existence of God:


13. के आ तो जो, जगत्माः कैकी रोते वरावर बल प्रमाणे स्वे
    डूबानी प्रवृत्ति धाय के पण त्वत्मार पण पैर पहलौं नाहीं.

   V, G, L. S. 39

14. सवे डूबाना प्रकाशिनारा नै सवेना स्वापी कैक ज भवान के.

   V, G, L. S. 39

(5) वैद्यानू स्वापान के वैद्यानू ज पाव के.

   V, G, F. S. 18
(6) भावना होतों चिन्ता के तृण पण होताने घम्भी नथी.

V. G. F. S. 18

भावना चिन्ता सल्ला पावडू पण फारणाने घम्भी नथी.

V. G. F. S. 37

(7) Frank Thilly, A History of Philosophy (1949) p. 386

(8) Ibid., p. 386

(9) See above 3–39 (696) V. G. M. S. 39

(10) जे सबॅ —— निर्देश ने:

V. G. F. S. 39

(11) सवॅना प्रकारकऱ रा —— के.

V. G. L. S. 39

(12) सवॅना प्रकारकऱ रा —— के.

V. G. L. S. 39

(13) कृपा फलंदणा है परंपराने हे हे जीव कपदल मौगऱे हे

र्यारे मौगऱे हे.

V. G. F. S. 65

(14) सवॅ कारणना पण कारण ने:

V. G. L. S. 39

(15) भवलनो —— तांत कल्यंकारी गुण तेना पावू हुणा;

हास्य, खर्चिक केल्या, तथा चार्जे पावला नथी.

V. G. M. S. 61

See also V. G. M. S. 7


(17) ते पुस्तकेती के प्रकट प्रमाण हवाणं पण देखीरे होईरे.

V. G. M. S. 13
3. Form and Personality of God:

(1) ज्योति के गृहपालक से मूल्य है, तथा ज्योति ज्योति प्रकाश प्रकाश है, ज्योति ज्योति प्रकाश प्रकाश है.
---
V. G. M. S. 42

(2) प्रकाश के भावन ब्रह्म ब्रह्म पर पयार है, प्रकाश के रूप प्रकाश जोहेल है।
---
V. G. M. S. 42

(3) प्रकट प्रमाण भूमिकारी विद्याय है, तथा भावान्दु सहाय
---
V. G. M. S. 13

(4) पौरी के प्रयोग दशु के, तै चारण है, तै मूल्य दशु के तै मूल्य है.
---
V. G. M. S. 13

(5) कामदेख स्थापना लोका प्रमाण वैसा भावन रूपाणा है.
---
V. L. S. 18

(6) भावना सा कार के तै दिख है प्रणालो विधिक नथी.
---
V. G. F. S. 45

(7) भावना गृहपालक सदा सशक्त जै प्रणाली प्रणाली नथी.
---
V. G. F. S. 45; V. P. S. 7; V. P. S. 1; V. G. L. S. 35
18। जो साक्षात् न होय तो दैव विशेष क्लाॅप्यूं कह्याय नहीं।
- V. P. S. 1
18। मामले ति साक्षात् कही तैल सम्बन्धार्थी कहली सम्भवन है।
V. G. P. S. 66
18। शूरित्व सरलापादित्वानी निपथ बाह्य है तैर तो माधिक
हरचरणापादित्व बाह्य है।
V. G. F. S. 45
18। V. G. F. S. 45
18। शूरित्व प्रणा खेम कर्यूँ है ते मामले बाह्य माया बाह्य जोता है।
V. G. F. S. 45
18। ज्याँ उहे त्याँे लेते हैं जैसी अंश ज होय न हापन पण होय।
V. S. F. S. 45
मामलने मैत्र पण है, मामलने कान पण है।
V. G. F. S. 8
18। केवल रैली चौथे इंडिया है पणा अलौकिक है।
V. G. F. S. 8
18। शास्त्रमां कै मामलने निराकार स्वप्न कर्यूँ है, ते तैर माधिक बाह्य होता कस्त्वाने कर्यूँ है।
V. G. F. S. 8
मामलनो मूलम विशेष मधिक वे चंचलत तथा दश इंडिया तथा चार कै निराकार थे प्राकृत जीवना जमा नहीं, पाठ्य शास्त्र में निराकार क्या है।
V. G. F. S. 8
18। मामला...... उपास्य है।
V. G. L. S. 37
राजना तो वैद प्रक्षेपे ते मार्गना स्वयम्ने विन्धो सदा बाजा संपाती द्रव्य विष्टा ह्याय
V. G. F. S. 40

१३। छै तौ मार्गना धाम्मा के भेद पूरू हे पण वकर्नां क्रोधः
भेदाधिक तुच्छ जे खाँच विष्णु राज्यको युक्त तेमा लीमाई नयी
V. P. S. 1
भावान्तू के ग्रह निपूण मान्य दशक तैहसे प्लार जन्त कोटि
व्रह्मरना जे विष्णु सुंदर हे ते स्थानी वाटी पूरोते नाशो बढ़ते
V. S. S. 1

१४। छैर स्वाभिमान बीता श्रद्धा प्रक्षाधन कथू हे तैन विष्नो तो
भागि रुची नयी
V. L. S. 14

१५। Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, part-II
(1977), p. 659
२०। मार्गना जे विरोधार सम्बे के ती एखा महापाप कर्ता पणा
क्षति मोूट पाप हे, भे पापूच जोई प्रायश्चित्त न नयी
V. G. M. S. 39
भावाना बाइकरू सेहन खाँच हे मोूटो कराण ने, V.G.F.S.71

२१। V. G. M. S. 34

४। Man in the image of God:

१। Genesis 1.26
२। Genesis 1.27
३। पृष्ठ प्रमाणेन नूष्पाकारे देखाय ने भे भे मार्गानु रुधवाय
मूल स्वयम्ने हे
V. K. S. 8
5. The doctrine of double soul:

16. The doctrine of double soul.

V. G. M. S. 13

V. G. F. S. 13

V. G. L. S. 4

Aurobindo, Life Divine, (1965), p. 207

Ibid., p. 207

Saint Augustine, Confessions, 3-11

C. Gent, Thomas Aquinas, IV 18

Kathopanishad 2.5.13

The doctrine of double soul:

16. V. G. M. S. 13

V. G. F. S. 13

V. G. L. S. 4

Aurobindo, Life Divine, (1965), p. 207

Ibid., p. 207

Saint Augustine, Confessions, 3-11

C. Gent, Thomas Aquinas, IV 18

Kathopanishad 2.5.13

16. V. G. M. S. 13

V. G. L. S. 37
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50. वैम अर्जन ते काफ्ते विषे ने पाण्याकोणी विषे रहळे हे ते जीवनात्मक कल्याण कोणाचे ने काफ्तपाण्याकोणी स्वरूप विषे रोष ते, तै साधनाच्या विषे रहळे हे ते जीवनात्मक स्वरूप कल्याण कोणाचे ने जीवनात्मक स्वरूप विषे रोष ते.
V. G. L. S. 37

51. वैयोमच जीवन चरे काटे करतात सभी कोणी.
V. G. F. S. 52

52. ने काफ्ते जे ते जीवन ते जीवनात्मक कोणाचे जीवनात्मक कोणाचे परिपालन हे.
V. G. F. S. 64

53. सरी जीवन जीवन हे, ते के विषे ते जीव काटे करतात ने भौगोल्क सभी कोणी थाला.
V. G. L. S. 37

54. वैम वैमच जे ते वैमच वैमच अर्जनाचे अन्याच्या हूने प्रवृत्त कोण राहे हे, पण वैमच अर्जनाचे तैले रोढे पुरुष-पुरुषीतमाला नया.
V. G. F. S. 41

55. ने चार्जच मुनि श्यामाचे ते चार्जच पुष्पकालीमा नया.
V. G. F. S. 41

56. वैम काफ्ते विषे वर्गन राहे हे, तै पौटा काफ्ते पौटा बर्गन राहे हे तै लांबा काफ्ते लांबा वर्गन राहे हे तै बांका काफ्ते बांका वर्गन राहे हे, तैम ते पूर्णाक्त जीवन हे.
V. G. F. S. 41
6. Relation between self and God:

1. V. G. F. S. 7
2. V. G. F. S. 64
3. V. G. F. S. 64
4. V. G. F. S. 64
5. V. G. F. S. 52

6. आत्मा ने कार…… के बैठना शरीर र है अन्य के बैठू जे ते

7. मारी जीव र है तो शरीर है अने भावत ती मारा

8. सवी जीवना जीवन है ने जे बिना के जीव का है कटाने के

9. अत्मा ने कार जे बैठे के पुकार्का भावत शरीरसूची

V. G. L. S. 37

V. G. F. S. 64
6. जीवन तत्त्व जीवन जीवन शास्त्रीप्रणाली पाये है तो पण रुपानि रेखा पणू रहे हैं।
V. G. M. S. 67


7. Jīva, Law of Karma and God:

1. केवळ एकौ दृष्टिकोण विकृतिप्रकृति: ।
S. P. 107

2. जैव पौत्ताती खेराबै करिये अक्षा कमी करीते करिये करिये
फले भोगवी कल० नकी।
V. G. F. S. 65

3. ज्यांत्र के करिये फले भोगवाचना परमेश्वर है ते भें के
कल्याणा करिये भोगवाचे तें ज भोगवी रहे हैं।
V. G. F. S. 65

4. कौश कोटि झल्कने विषणे वे उत्पत्ति, रचना, प्रलय थाय हैं,
किं भें के दिमे सुकृतन जीवोऽने संस्कृत थाय है ते सवे भावना
हायम हैं।
V. G. F. S. 78

5. See above S. P. 107
See below V. G. M. S. 11

6. परमेश्वर कम्पनस्वरूपा है ते के जीव इत्यादि करिये अक्षारारी
करिये के स्वप्न उपनिषद चूजे हैं।
V. G. M. S. 21

7. जीव तत्त्वमुक्तिने चुजता नकी।
V. G. M. S. 21
8. **God as the goal:**

1. तैयार मानद तै है [फ़र्जी] भावानी प्राप्ति है ज परम्पर भै.
   
   V. G. M. S. 8

2. V. G. M. S. 56


4. भावानी सृजनात्मक रूप है. — V. L. S 18

5. V. G. M. S. 10

6. V. G. M. S. 56

7. V. K. S. 1

8. V. K. S. 1

9. V. L. S. 13

10. V. K. S. 1

11. भावानीं बैंडु रूप है तैं भूल छा नवादम... कौछूँ रूप है.

   V. P. S. 4

   कौटि जाने ये पण लक्षण चमाहे जसे तै भावान हुपाहा है.

   V. L. S. 18

12. अत्यं बुल तै भावानी चाँगने विषिए है.

   V. G. M. S. 10

13. भावानीं बैंडु बुलत है तैं कौछूँ विषिए नहीं.

   V. P. S. 1

138. भावान्त हैं जे ज परम सुखवायक हैं ने परस्पर वातम्भ हैं।
V. G. M. S. 56

139. भावान्ती मक्त होय तैने तो भावान्ती श्री जी हो पदार्थ
अभिन्न हीय न निम्न।
V. G. M. S. 57
V. P. S. 1

140. V. P. S. 1

141. भावान्तु स्वयं ज्ञाय ख़ोटी जै कोई ज्ञानवाह रोहें नयो।
V. G. P. S. 63

142. ज्ञान हो जै के जीवन पदार्थ हैं तो ज्ञात हुँ तो ज्ञान लृक्ष हैं ने अलि आर ने।
V. G. M. S. 56

143. ज्ञान विश्वमूलि जे भावान्त हैं, सुश्रीय हैं।
V. G. L. S. 37
Dr. J. A. Yajnik, The Philosophy of Sri Svaminarayana, p. 82.

9. Self is Knowledge of God:

1. Dr. J. A. Yajnik, The Philosophy of Sri Svaminarayana, p. 18

2. एवं यह ईद्डियों करोणे तात हे तथा एकाग्रण करोणे तात हे एवं एकाग्रण ईद्डियों पर जो जीवनात उत्तर्दित हे अनुभव तात हे.
V. L. S. 7

3. ईद्डियों एकाग्रणे जातावर येथे सवान राह्या हे.
V. P. S. 4

4. येव एकाग्रण ईद्डियो नवी पुस्ता.
V. L. S. 7

5. V. L. S. 7, V. P. S. 4

6. येव एकाग्रण ईद्डियो नवी पुस्ता केवल अनुभव जाणे करोणे ज जाणाय हे.
V. L. S. 7

7. अ भावनन पिस्तानी कोई पार पाया नयी.
V. G. L. S. 37

8. जैन जेवो भावनानी पिस्ता सम्बन्धाने होय तेना अङ्गरं नेत्तले ज पुकास पाय हे.
V. G. P. S. 66
6. जीव तेनी हृदिष्ठ जैम जैम सुख्म खोय जाय के तैम तेम देये....
भावाननी महिमा पण अर्थक अर्थक ज्ञातो जाय के.
V. S. S. 17

80. Dr. J. A. Yajnik, The Philosophy of Sri
Svaminārāyanā, p. 82.

10. Jīvaś Sadharmya with God:

9. Mundaka Upaniṣad, 3-1-3
V. K. S. 1
V. L. S. 13

2. जैवी रोही नारायणना साध्येरनाने पांड्या है.
V. L. S. 13

3. भावाननी महत.... देहने मुदोने मुदी धाय के त्यारे ने जीवते जीवान मागवती जु दाहे है.
V. S. S. 14

5. जैवानना महत हृद प्रवा तेना देह, हंडियाय.... सवे भावाननी
जाने करोने माहानन जाकार पहऱे-धाय है ने थिन्य पहे धाय है.
V. K. S. 1

5. जैवानने स्थानी नील नील वेध्य हास्य धाय है.
V. G. M. S. 67

5. त्यां दृष्टत है, जैव मनस खेलते हाली लाई है ने तैने नष्टकी
लहेने उपर उसारत करा है तैनो करोने हें खेलत देह ने देह करीने
करोने त्वमकार पहे धाय है, पण कोई का खेलनु रहेलु नकी, मनसे
अैवी न मनस धाय धाय है.
V. K. S. 1
6. Can jiva become God?

11. Can jiva become God?

6. The jiva cannot be a god as it is not possible to become a god.
   V. K. S. 1

7. The jiva cannot become a god as it cannot be said to be a god.
   V. K. S. 1

8. The jiva cannot become a god as it is not possible to become a god.
   V. K. S. 1

9. The jiva cannot become a god as it is not possible to become a god.
   V. G. M. S. 67

10. The jiva cannot become a god as it is not possible to become a god.
    V. K. S. 10
Because no body can become second God

V. G. L. S. 39
CHAPTER 5

JIVA AND AKSARABRAHMAN

1. Introductory Remark

2. Second in Rank

3. Personal aspect of Aksarabrahman

4. Impersonal aspect of Aksarabrahman

5. Jīva's Sādharmya with Aksarabrahman

6. "Going" to and "Residing " in Aksarabrahman

7. Aksarabrahman as the Goal

8. Aksarabrahman of Svāminārāyaṇa and Brahman of Śaṅkara.
1. **Introductory Remark**

According to Svāminārāyaṇa, as we have seen, there are five eternal realities which are intrinsically different and distinct from one another. Akṣarabrahman is one of them. The other four are: God, Māyā, Īśvara and Jīva.¹

Akṣarabrahman occupies second rank in the metaphysical order of the ultimate realities in Svāminārāyaṇatism.² Its position in hierarchy of reals is very unique and important. And yet, it is not self-existent. Only God is self-existent. Akṣarabrahman exists only in and through God. It is metaphysically dependent on God for its existence and activities.³ Its uniqueness and importance is due to God.⁴ Akṣarabrahman is not.⁵ It is eternally different from God. Akṣarabrahman cannot become God. No one can become God.⁶

2. **Second in Rank**

As already seen, according to Svāminārāyaṇa, there are five eternal realities. They are: Parabrahman (Puruṣottama), Akṣarabrahman, Māyā, Īśvara and Jīva. Parabrahman (God) is the highest reality both in the order and the
Parabrahman is the supreme ontological entity. Akṣarabrahman is immediately next to Parabrahman in the order and is subordinate to Him. Except Parabrahman it is subordinate to none. Svāminārāyaṇa always mentions Akṣarabrahman as the second in the order of eternal realities. Whenever he mentions Akṣarabrahman along with other four realities, he never changes the order. If he places Parabrahman first in the order, then Akṣarabrahman is placed second. If he places Parabrahman as the fifth, then Akṣarabrahman is placed fourth.

Akṣarabrahman is higher than māyā, īśvara and jīva. God is described as Akṣaratīta which means God is higher than Akṣarabrahman. The term "Akṣaratīta", which is used to describe Parabrahman as higher than Akṣarabrahman and there being none higher than God, Akṣarabrahman naturally falls in the second rank.

Akṣarabrahman is a dependent reality. It occupies a very important position in the metaphysical hierarchy of ultimate realities in Svāminārāyaṇism. Akṣarabrahman is a very important ontological category in Svāminārāyaṇīya metaphysics. Except God it is second to none. It is second only to God.
3. **Personal Aspect of Āksarabrahman**

This Āksarabrahman has two aspects: formal (sākāra) and formless (nirākāra). In other words, Āksarabrahman has personal as well as impersonal aspects. We shall first deal with the personal aspect.

In its personal aspect Āksarabrahman has a form and personality, which resembles God. God is eternally in the form of a human being. Āksarabrahman, in its personal aspect, is always in the human form with two hands and two feet. But its form and personality are not material (māyika). They are divine (amāyika). Āksarabrahman is beyond three guṇas of prakṛti and hence it is called tri-guṇācita.

Āksarabrahman is eternally liberated. There is a distinction between liberated (mukta) and eternally liberated (nitya mukta). Liberated soul was in bondage prior to its liberation. It attained liberation through the temporal process of sādhanā. Eternally liberated souls were never in bondage, and their state of liberation is not due to any process of sādhanā. They are free and liberated since eternity. Āksarabrahman is liberated
since eternity (anādimukta). It was never in bondage. Aksarabrahman is nitya mukta.

Aksarabrahma is a devout servant of God. It is the nearest and dearest devotee eternally in the service of God. Aksarabrahman always enjoys communion with God and eternally worships God in love. Aksarabrahman is the first devotee of God. If the expression be permitted, Aksarabrahman is the personal attendant of God. It serves God always and everywhere. It serves God not only in His divine abode, but also in all places where He incarnates. It is impossible to think of Aksarabrahman away from God in Svāminārāyaṇiya theology. Wherever Aksarabrahman is God is present.

Aksarabrahman in its personal aspect is supreme knowledge and service in love personified. Aksarabrahman is the supreme ideal of love, service and devotion to God. It is the best example of the highest state of liberation eternally realised. In its personal aspect, Aksarabrahman is an eternally existing ideal for spiritual aspirants. It provides eternal inspiration for finite selves, either in bondage or in liberation, to endeavour
to attain a position similar to Akṣarabrahman. Its eternal service to God is proverbial: serve God like Akṣarabrahman.

4. **Impersonal Aspect of Akṣarabrahman.**

Simultaneously with the personal aspect Akṣarabrahman expresses itself in another aspect as an impersonal entity. According to Svāminārāyana, Akṣarabrahman, in its impersonal aspect is formless, homogeneous, undifferentiated consciousness pervading everywhere. It consists of an infinite mass of effulgence overflowing endlessly in all directions. It is extremely luminous and radiates infinite flood of light. It is eternal, non-empirical, infinite and partless whole. It is existence (sat), consciousness (cit) and bliss (ānanda). It is beyond the ambit of māyā (aprakṛta). It never contracts or expands. It is unchanging and always remains in the same state. It is same for ever. It is variously described in Vacanāṃṛta as Akṣara, Brahman, Akṣarabrahman, Ātma, Akṣaradhāma, Cidākāśa, Brahmatantra, Brahmajyoti and Saccidānanda.

In its impersonal aspect also Akṣarabrahman serves
God by being His divine abode, God eternally resides in its**. It also serves the liberated souls as the transcendent supreme abode for their eternal habitation. It is a most desired place for all mumukṣus who aspire to be in communion with God.

This cidākāśa is not a created entity. It is eternally there. It is not destructible. It has eternal existence. It serves as the substratum and support of all elements.

5. Jīva's Sadharmya with Aksarabrahman.

Śvāminārāyaṇa has expounded the doctrine of jīvas sadharmya with Aksarabrahman. According to Śvāminārāyaṇa, the single minded devotee (Ekāntika Bhakta) of God, after leaving the body, goes to Aksarabrahman and attains similarity (sadharmya) with Aksarabrahman. On reaching Aksarabhāman, the disembodied self gets a divine body (Brahma-maya śarīra) similar to that of Aksarabrahman. Now, Śvāminārāyaṇa also says that jīva, on reaching Aksara-bhāman, attains similarity with Purusottama. This tends to create a confusion in the mind of one who seriously tries to understand the position. A question would naturally arise in
one's mind. How can jīva attain similarities both with Akṣarabrahman as well as God?

Śvāminārāyaṇa himself answers the question and clears up the confusion. He says that Akṣarabrahman has sādharmya with Puruṣottama. Now, as jīva has sādharmya with Akṣarabrahman and Akṣarabrahman has sādharmya with God, jīva has also sādharmya with God. The position is just similar to a mathematical formula like this. A is equal to B and B is equal to C. Therefore, A is equal to C. This position can also expressed in the form of Hypothetical Syllogism (H S) which is one of the Rules of inference in the Propositional calculus in Symbolic Logic. Stated symbolically, the formula can be expressed as under :-

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & B \\
B & C \\
A & C
\end{array}
\]

But it is not necessary to resort to the above mentioned Rule of inference to prove that jīva has sādharmya with Puruṣottama. As seen above, Śvāminārāyaṇa himself has said that on reaching Akṣaradhāma jīva attains sādharmya.
with God. Thus, we can see that jīva has sādharmya both with Akṣarabrahman as well as Puruṣottama. To say that jīva has sādharmya with Akṣarabrahman is the same thing as to say that jīva has sādharmya with God. Thus Svāmi-nārāyaṇa expounds the doctrine of Double Sādharmya. It means that in Akṣaradhaṇan, God, Akṣarabrahman and all liberated jīvas possess similar forms, and similar nature as

6. "Going to " and " Residing in " Akṣaradhāna

What is the meaning of "Going to " and "residing in" Akṣaradhāna ?. This question came up for consideration before Dr. J.A. Yajnik. According to him, "going to" Akṣaradhāma does not mean travelling in space and reaching at some place. So also, according to him, "residing in " does not mean residing in some locality. According to him, Akṣaradhāma is not a place and there is neither "going to " or "residing in" Akṣaradhāma. In his view, " one who goes beyond māyā and attains the state of Saccidānanda can be said to have reached or gone to Akṣaradhāma. ¹

Now, the question is whether this interpretation
given by Dr. J.A. Yajnik is borne out by the internal evidence available in Vacanāmṛta. Let us see. Firstly, Svāminārāyaṇa always refers to Akṣaradhāman as if it is a vast place in which society of the liberated souls is located. From the said references made by Svāminārāyaṇa to Akṣaradhāman, one gets an impression that Akṣaradhāman is a residential locality, of course infinitely vast.

Secondly, Svāminārāyaṇa has described Akṣaradhāman in details. He inter alia describes the patterns of buildings and types objects and articles available in Akṣaradhāman. From this description of Akṣaradhāman one definitely feels that Akṣaradhāman is a City of God. Svāminārāyaṇa himself calls Akṣaradhāman a city of Brahman (Brahmapur). The use of the word "Brahmapur" for Akṣaradhāman shows that Svāminārāyaṇa regards it as a divine place for eternal habitation of liberated souls. Dr. Yajnik has observed that "Svāminārāyaṇa has never described Akṣaradhāman in the way in which the paradise of popular imagination is described." It appears to me that this observation of Dr. Yajnik is against the evidence contained in Vacanāmṛta. Thirdly, Svāminārāyaṇa refers to the passage by which Jīva travels and reaches Akṣaradhāman. He calls
it the Way of Light (arcimārga). Fourthly, he mentions the vehicles by which souls travel to reach Akṣaradhāman.

So, we can see that the interpretation given by Dr. Yajnik is not borne out by the internal evidence of Vacanāṃṛta. Dr. Yajnik himself refers to the "Social Character" of the liberated souls. According to him, the liberated souls are related to one another in the way in which the bound souls are related, because they all aim at one and the same thing, God. In his view, the liberated souls are related to one another in the sense that they are all related to God. Now, "Social Character" of liberated souls connotes a "Society" of liberated souls. And "Society" presupposes a place where it is located. So, willy-nilly Dr. Yajnik has to concede, if not directly, then indirectly, to the position that Akṣaradhāman is a place in Svāminārāyaṇiya theology.

Again the interpretation given by Dr. J.A. Yajnik to the expressions "going to" and "residing in" has not Svāminārāyaṇiya, but Śaṅkarite Flavour. The interpretation appears to be in the vein of Śaṅkara's Brahmavāda which is against the tenor of Svāminārāyaṇa's theistic philosophy. However, the standpoint of Dr. Yajnik is that
Svāminārāyaṇa accepts Saṅkara's position up to a point and then goes beyond it.  

7. **Aksaradhaman as the Goal**

According to Svāminārāyaṇism, Aksaradhaman is the highest goal for the devotee of God. In Aksaradhaman is located the society of liberated souls. It is a perfect society. It is full of joy and beauty. Every devotee of God, in Svāminārāyaṇism, desires to go to Aksaradhaman and eternally reside there. The devotee very keenly aspires to enjoy communion with God in Aksaradhaman. Aksaradhaman is the most cherished goal of all aspirants (mumukṣus) in Svāminārāyaṇism.

But, it is to be noted that Aksaradhaman is not the ultimate goal. The ultimate goal is God. It is through realizing the goal of Aksaradhaman that the devotee can realise the ultimate goal of having communion with personal God. Thus, God is the goal of goal. Aksaradhaman is the goal to be realised in the first instance with a view to realise the ultimate goal which is God. Thus we see that Svāminārāyaṇism has accepted the theory of two goals.
But as Dr. Yajnik has pointed out, "though Aksarabrahman is a goal, it is not to be preferred to the goal of the realisation of the personal God." 2

Gita also accepts the theory of two goals. According to Gita, Aksara is Brahman. 3 There are two purusas: Kshara (jiva) and Aksara (Brahman). 4 God is greater than both. 5 Aksara is the divine abode of God. 6 It is a place of supreme illumination. 7 A devotee having gone there never returns. 8 God is superior to Aksara. 9 Gita speaks of the worship of Aksara. According to Gita, the goal of Aksara is to be attained for realising the higher goal of being near God and serving Him in great love and devotion. 10

According to Svaminarayana the goal of eternally enjoying the communion with God cannot be achieved by those who meditate upon the formless effulgent consciousness (nikakara caitanya teja) of Aksarabrahman. So also those who believe God to be impersonal and formless cannot achieve the goal. Such devotees cannot realise God. They lose their consciousness of individuality and are merged in the formless effulgence of Aksarabrahman from which they never come out. 11 Only those who meditate upon the
personal form of God achieve the goal.12

8. **Aksarabrahman of Svāminārāyaṇa and Brahman of Śaṅkara**

From what has been said before it will be clear that Aksarabrahman of Svāminārāyaṇa is in many respects similar to Brahman of Śaṅkara's philosophy. Like Brahman of Śaṅkara, Aksarabrahman of Svāminārāyaṇa has saguṇa and nirguṇa aspects. But there are vital differences between the Brahman of Śaṅkara and Aksarabrahman of Svāminārāyaṇa. In Śaṅkara's philosophy, Brahman is the highest reality, whereas in Svāminārāyaṇa's philosophy Brahman is not the highest reality. Brahman is subordinate to Puruṣottama. Puruṣottama is the highest reality. There is another difference also. In Śaṅkara's philosophy jīva is Brahman. In Svāminārāyaṇism jīva is not Brahman. So also jīva is not puruṣottama. All the three are eternally different. In Śaṅkara's philosophy jīva is identical with Brahman, the highest reality. In Svāminārāyaṇism, jīva is identical neither with Brahman nor with Puruṣottama.
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1. V. G. F. S. 7
2. V. G. F. S. 7
3. मायान जैसे स्वरूप हैं ने आत्मा ने कार जैसे तो मायानी आध्यात्म है परम्पर है।
   V. G. F. S. 64
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5. कार्मिक पद भावन न प्रकाश,
   V. L. S. 13; V. G. F. S. 64
6. उपकारिक पद जैसे तो प्रकाश नारायण जैसे, पद बर्मो कोई जैसे जैसे कहीं नहीं।
   V. L. S. 13

2. **Second in rank:**

1. मायान पुरुषार्च हैं जैसे सर्वोच्च श्रेष्ठ हैं,
   V. G. F. S. 37
2. पुरुषार्च मायान, कार्यकुल, माया, ईश्वर जैसे जीव जैसे परमेश्वर हैं अनादि हैं।
   V. G. L. S. 746
   जीव, माया, ईश्वर, ब्रह्म जैसे परमेश्वर हैं सबे अनादि हैं।
   V. G. L. S. 10
   जीव, ईश्वर, माया, ब्रह जैसे
   V. G. M. S. 8
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3. ने कार जैसे धर्म पर जैसे अध्यात्मित रूप है पुरुषार्च है जैसे अत्यन्त उपयोगिता जानता है।
   V. S. S. 4, See also V. G. M. S. 13
3. **Personal aspect of Akāgarabrahman:**

1. तै कार ना वै स्वरूप है.
   
   V, G, F, S, 21

2. केवल निराकार. . . .
   
   V, G, F, S, 21

3. ब्रजकार की रूप करैने पुरुषार्थम मारायणानी शेवांमां रहे है.
   
   V, G, F, S, 21

4. V, L, S, 13

5. मुनिकारे देखाय है के ज मारानै बहायम पूल स्वरूप है.
   
   V, K, S, 8

6. पैठती तै सदा दिलिपुर नै.
   
   V, L, S, 4

7. V, L, S, 18

8. V, G, M, S, 13

9. V, V, S, 18
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    V, G, M, S, 10

11. V, G, E, S, 42
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4. Impersonal aspect of Aksarabraham:

1. \textit{V. G. F. S. 21}

2. \textit{V. L. S. 14}

3. \textit{V. G. M. S. 13}

4. \textit{V. G. F. S. 12}

5. \textit{V. C. F. S. 63}

6. \textit{V. G. M. S. 13}

7. \textit{V. G. F. S. 21}

See also \textit{V. G. F. S. 46}
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5. V. G. F. S. 71
   V. L. S. 11
   V. V. S. 1
6. V. A. S. 6
30. V. G. I. S. 36

31. See above दे. G. F. S. 12

82. कारार्गुप्त जी बुद्ध है ते ज गुणेश्वर नारायणने रेखा
   साह कामलह थु है ते.
   V. A. S. 6

     ते क्लार जो पुरुषोत्तम मातावाहु चाम है.
   V. G. F. S. 63

83. जे क्लार बुद्ध है ते ती जे मातावीने रेखातू घाम है.
   V. P. S. 1

     जे क्लाराल्पे विश्व वीरमनुषुन्युत्तम मातावणने ते
     सदा विरामाकान है.
   V. G. F. S. 21

     ते यस्मायिने विश्व माताव मेंड विरामाकान रहें है.
   V. G. M. S. 64

84. पौते तो सदा ज्ञाताना क्लाराल्पमा ज बे.
   V. G. M. S. 64

85. ज्ञाताकल्पन सुव से देशी स्थान करिहे..... भावना क्लार-
   भामने पामे है.
   V. G. F. S. 12

     भावनाकल्पन सुव है ते..... जे क्लाराल्पे जे मातावाहु घाम देने
     पामे है.
   V. G. F. S. 12
15. अपनी पण हे कारुप हे मुक्त हैमनी बंकिमरा मुख्य हे 
अने कारणारं जन्मने अंद माहानी सेवार्थ रहेने हे.
V. G. F. S. 12

15. ते चित्राकाश कलादिस्त हे ने दैली उत्पच्छ विनाश को.
V. G. F. S. 46

16. सर्वथा आचार देवी ने चित्राकाश दैली तो हीना जीन को.
V. G. F. S. 46

5. Jīva's sādharanya with Aksarabrahman:

1. कारणारं पालये हे मुठ ते कारणा सावधनी पावे हे. की 
भावनी काल सेवारण रहे हे.
V. G. F. S. 21
कारणारं चित्रे कारणा सावधनी पावी हे अंद काळ कोटि 
मुठ रहेया हे ले सर्व गृहरूपसम दासावां चे हे.
V. G. F. S. 21
कारणारं चित्राकाश पालने केले माहीं मुठीं सिरे 
बे निम्न रहेये लोक हीवे चित्रहिलय समाधिवाद हीहे.
V. G. F. S. 40
Also See for Aksara's sādharanya with Puruṣottama.
V. L. S. 13

2. काळ कोटि केवल माहीं दरका यथा हे.
V. G. M. S. 67
बण्य हमारा माहाना सावधनिकाले पावी हे.
V. G. L. S. 39
माहाने भी हो आहे भी माहाने लाकारे येते जय हे.
V. K. S. 1

3. Aksara's sādharanya with Puruṣottama.
V. L. S. 13
6. "Go to" and "residing in" : Aksaradhaman:


2. कार ब्रह्म है तै है ब्रह्माननी रााभार प्राय है,

V. P. S. 13
काराचारण केविने रहणा जे गुका......

V. L. S. 13
तैत्तरीयन यमुना यमुनाने विषेस क्रे मौद्रु सिनहातन है ने तैनी उपर.....मालित ते विराजमान है ने तै सिनहातन पारे कौरे कारक कौरे गुके ज भाव ते नारायणना दृष्ट नहीं है.

V. L. S. 14

3. V. A. S. 6
4. V. A. S. 6
5. कैलिक मृत्यु ते देहूँ द्वायण करोरे..... अधिकारिने करोरे मालित अक्षारधाम पामी है.

V. G. F. S. 21
6. V. G. F. S. 1
7. Dr. J. A. Yajnik, The Philosophy of Sri Svaminarayana, p. 109
8. Dr. J. A. Yajnik, Ibid., p. 102 and 103.

7. Aksaradhaman as the goal:

1. मृत्यु ब्रह्म है ब्रह्मानना विश्व है ज चूड़ बिश्व है जे आ देहूँ करोरे
2. मालित ब्रह्मानना चभारण नववाल करोरे हे पण वयमा वयमा

V. G. M. S. 22
लाभी पण हे अकारुप हे मुख्य तैमरी पंक्तिमारी मल्लु हे की अकारापणां नाही अर्थ मध्यानी सेवामरी राखू हे. पण नाकांते ने तुहाच्या कळ्यांना पाहिजे हुया तैने हा लहान्यात नाही.  
V. G. F. S. 21  
3. काराई ब्रह्म परम्।  
Gītā 8.3.  
4. द्वाचिवी पुरुणवी लोके भार्ष्याचार अस न।  
Gītā 15.16  
5. उष्णः पुरुषोत्स्वचः परामाख्युदाः।  
Gītā 15.17  
6. व्ययको नार वैसुधकोदुः परमं भविषयं।  
ये श्रीधर्म न निजस्वते तद्भाम परमेन पन।।  
Gītā 8.21  
7. A place of high illumination, य Gītā 15.6  
8. युक्त्व न निजस्वते तद्भाम परमेन मम।  
Gītā 15.6, See also Gītā 8.21 above  
9. कह्म्यारागारी चोऽक्षण।  
Gītā 15.18  
10. क्रमुसः पूर्व-नायकम्.... मद्विविहिरी पराम्।  
Gītā 18.54  
11. की वे के मध्याने निराकार जाणीने र्यानिने र्यानि उपासना करे हे के ते ते ब्रह्म भवायुण्यिते विष्णु लीला थाय हे. ते पाहिजे कोई विष्णु नीतेने नाम नाही, की मध्यान थकी कोई वेदांनी पावली पण नाही।  
V. G. F. S. 64
१२. पण केवल तैलन्य सेवन साकार कठोर्ने तैनी उपासना कसती है। तैनी साकार न मानवो हावणे तैनी उपासना कसती है। तैनी साकार वो है तै वै गै।
V. G. L. S. 30

सवा विषय साकारपूर्विति...... लेक्षण जी भावान्तु स्वरूप के ...... के बाणातो हावणे ते ...... देव मूर्तिः की भावान्तु ते कलाम समान तैने विशेष भावान्ते समीपे बजे।
V. G. M. S. 9

8. Aksarabrahman of Svāminārāyaṇa and Brahman of Saṅkara:

१. V. G. M. S. 42
२. V. G. F. S. 7