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PREFACE

Svāmī Dayānanda’s supreme effort in life was to give back to the world the Vedas, the ancient treasure-house of Divine Knowledge. He had taken a long and deep immersion into the perennial stream which quenched his thirst and filled his soul with indescribable solace. He had wandered long and far and wide in dismay before he visioned the light, the light of true and virgin Dharma, as revealed in the Vedas. He was a parivrājaka (a homeless preacher-prince), and the whole humanity was his congregation. He declared that the Vedas were for the lowliest of the low and for the highest of the high. They were the fountain-head from which flowed the nectar of eternal virtue and true knowledge in a never-dying stream to slake the thirst of all the children—the babes and the grown-ups of the Divine Mother. To this fountain-head of peace and purity he invited the misguided mankind and asked them to quench their thirst. This was his mission and for this he lived and died.

As a transparent and pure stream flowing from the silver-white snows gets adulterated in its downward march with muddy streamlets and dirty drains which pollute its purity, so had this eternal stream of Divine Lore become polluted with streamlets of diverse human errors. Dayānanda saw this and saw even much more. There had been commentators and interpreters who had grossly misinterpreted the Veda. It was, therefore, his mission to interpret the Veda in a proper and genuine manner.

Vedic scholarship in India, in the true sense of the term, appears to have ceased with the great work of Yāska — the Nirukta. In fact, among the ancient Vedic commentaries, only the Brāhmaṇas and the Nirukta have come down to us. That there were other works is amply proved by the fact that Yāska mentions several of them. The commentaries of Śāyaṇa, Skanda, Veṅkaṭa, Mahīdhara, etc., are of recent times. All of them belong to a time later than Yāska’s. According to Dayānanda these commentaries were gross misinterpretations. He based his commentary on the Brāhmaṇas and the Nirukta and rejected all other commentaries. His interpretations are based mainly on the etymological method.

All this explains the importance of Dayānanda and his great work, the Ṛgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā, which I am presenting to the English-
knowing people in the garb of English. I am sure the modern Vedic scholar in India as well as in other countries will be benefited greatly by this work.

The present work has been undertaken with a twofold object: first, to assist the critical scholars as well as the laymen in their studies of the Vedas, particularly its theme and method of interpretation; and secondly, to furnish them with the technical, historical and other cognate matters, relevant to their critical and comparative study.

The introductory part embodies information of general character. It also contains discussions on the problems which hitherto have remained in some respects untouched and untraced by the scholars. Some of the topics which involve endless controversies in the modern Vedic scholarship have also been critically examined so as to show the merits and demerits of Dayānanda's method of interpretation of the Veda.

So far the Vedas were read and understood in India and in occident as they were interpreted by Sāyaṇa and others or by occidental scholars (i.e., partly in accordance with the so-called traditional method of interpretation offered by Europeans). But the true Indian point of view remained unknown hitherto in India as well as abroad. A sincere effort in this direction has been made here for the first time.

It may be stated here that a chapter on the life and teachings of Svāmī Dayānanda, based on all available biographies written by various scholars, including Gopal Rao Hari, the contemporary author of Digvijaya-yārka, Lekh Ram, Devendra Nath Mukerjee, Bawa Chhaiju Singh, Lala Lajpat Rai and others, has been appended at the end (pp. 462-88) for the curious readers. It has been kept brief but I could not resist the temptation of giving the accounts of events (and also adding new facts) as given by Lala Lajpat Rai, the devout disciple of Svāmī Dayānanda and the great martyr of India's liberation. I have also reproduced, in original (pp. 476-79), the article which was published in the Christian Intelligencer in 1870, detailing the whole account of the śāstrārtha (disputation) held in Varanasi in November, 1869 between all the panditas of Kāśī on one side and Dayānanda alone on the other. The writer of this article was a Christian missionary who himself was present there. This valuable piece of evidence is still preserved in the library of Church Missionary Society in London.

The second part is the English translation of the Rgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā from the original Sanskrit which Dayānanda wrote before writing the commentary on the four Vedas. This work is much more voluminous than Sāyaṇa's introduction to the Rg-bhāṣya. It covers 400 closely
Dayānanda’s Ṛgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā is a unique work in the field of Vedic scholarship. Almost all Vedic works and other scriptural and philosophical treatises in Sanskrit have been quoted in this work. It contains more than one thousand citations from all spheres of Sanskrit literature, including three hundred verses from the Vedas.

It was not an easy job to translate such a technical work into English. I may add here that Dayānanda has interpreted many verses and citations from the Vedic literature in his own way, quite differently from the generally accepted conceptions and interpretations, and has drawn radically different conclusions. I have remained faithful to him and have tried to convey to the reader what our author aimed at. I am conscious that my translation is only an humble attempt and is open to criticism at many places, but all the same, it is a very sincere effort to clearly convey the idea of the original to the reader. I have added exhaustive critical and comparative notes on controversial points. Thus it is not merely a faithful translation but a complete bhāṣya on the Ṛgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā. I venture to say that I have made efforts to explain the things and not merely to 'explain them away'.

In the end it is my pleasant duty to thank all scholars from whose works I have frequently quoted. I am sincerely thankful to my supervisor, Dr. Vishva Bandhu, Honorary Director of the Vishveshvarananda Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur (Punjab) for his encouragement and suggestions.

—Parmanand
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CHAPTER I
IMPORTANCE OF THE WORK

1. BACKGROUND OF THE NEW BHĀSYA ON THE VEDAS

Ṛṣi Dayānanda called upon his countrymen “to go back to the Vedas” for eradicating all evils and ills of their society. It was his long meditated and well-founded conception that the cause of degradation and slavery of Indian nation was the ignorance of true Vedic teaching and the spread of the Paurāṇika culture and thoughts instead. Unless his countrymen again resorted and adhered to and followed the Vedic path, no progress was possible in social, political, economic, spiritual and religious spheres. Salvation lay only in adoption, acceptance and faithfully following the dynamic and radical ways of life as propounded in the Vedas.

But according to him the real and true significance and correct concept of the Vedas could not continue to remain in vogue after the great Mahābhārata war. True Vedic scholars and real interpreters of the Vedas, e.g., Yāśka, etc., left the world, by and by, giving place to the confused and self-centred new type of priestly class who reserved the right of the Vedas to themselves only. Countless and conflicting religious cults, professing Vedic origin (without rightly studying the Vedas), appeared in our society. They began to kill and sacrifice cow, horse and even human beings in the Yajñas, e.g., Gomedha, Asvamedha, Naramedha, and others. They forgot where all types of Hiṁsā is forbidden. Drinking of wine, meat-eating (including beef) and illicit sexual intercourse, without sparing even sisters and mothers, in the so called “Bhairavi Cakra”, were regarded as the ways of attainment of salvation by Vāma-Margins. Vedic stanzas were wrongly interpreted by them and others in support of their ill-conceived and selfish conceptions. Mahidhara, Uvvaṭa and Sāyana wrote commentaries on the Vedas under the influence of mystic cults of Tantras, Purāṇas and Vāma-Marga scriptures. This caused the birth of the Čārvāka sect, Buddhism and Jainism who rejected Vedic path (as known to them) and bitterly condemned it. Thus the long forgotten tradition of correct Vedic interpretation could not reach Sāyana and others, and they interpreted the Vedas in the way opposed to the Brāhmanas and the Nirukta. In this way, the glory and dignity of the Vedic culture and its sublime principles were
lost. Oriental and Occidental Vedic scholars were led astray and they could not find out the real concept and true significance of the Vedas.

2. DAYANANDA'S GREAT CONTRIBUTION

Dayānanda laboured hard to churn out the nectar from the fathomless ocean of the Vedas. He dived deep and explored precious gems of Vedic secrets. He studied the Vedas intensively and perceived the light in deep meditations. He then assessed the value of Vedic import and light and wanted to ward off the eclipse of wrong interpretations from the Vedic Sun. In order to achieve this end, it was unavoidable for him to write a fresh and correct commentary on all the Vedas to frustrate and foil all blemishes of current commentaries which have grossly ill-interpreted the Vedas. He clearly says:—

वेनाधिकारियें: वे टीकाकार: बेद-दृष्टा:।
दोषा: सबूं बिनसयें: अन्यपार्थ-विवर्णना:।
सत्यार्थक स्मार्तेिर वेदांतं य: सनातनः। (Rgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhumīka)

He, therefore, thought to compose a commentary on the Vedas on the lines of ancient ṛṣis and Munis. He adds:—

प्रायवाणों जुन्योगीणां वा व्याव्यारोपित: सनातनोऽ
तद समाक्षित: सन्मार्थ विवादायन: दु नान्यथा। (Ibid.)

But the time and circumstances were not favourable. It was an age when the Vedic texts were not easily available. Vedic scholars were rare. Study of the Vedas was not in vogue. Kāśi, the home of Sanskrit learning, was bereft of a real Vedic Paṇḍita. Large number of Vedic recensions (Śākhas) and the Brahmaṇas had long disappeared. Even the actual Vedas were hardly to be found out in India. No state protection could be expected from the foreign British rule who wanted to propagate their own religion and culture in India. The royal patronage available even to Sāyaṇa and Hari Svamin was a thing of the remote past. Vedic Paṇḍitas, who were easily available as help to Sāyaṇa and Skanda-Svamin, had gone into oblivion. In such a tiring atmosphere Rṣi Dayananda, because of his deep learning, penance and dedication, could muster a few faithful followers on whose scanty financial assistance he embarked on this most important and lavishly costly project of producing Veda-Bhāṣyas. For this highly dynamic and deeply patriotic adventure, he had to sacrifice his all, including his hard-earned Divine Bliss of meditation. He himself confirms it in his correspondence. He writes:—
Curses of caste system, idolatry, untouchability, all types of superstitions and slaughtering of animals in the sacrifices, and even the human sacrifices (Nara-medha), were the results of wrong Vedic interpretations and thus the Hindus had to pay heavily for all these shortcomings. Rṣi Dayānanda’s scientific interpretations on the Vedas inspired hope and courage in the nation and people began to feel proud of their rich heritage and lofty principles preached in the Vedas. India will remain indebted to this great sage for leading her to her glorious past.

3. IMPORTANCE OF THE RGVEDADI-BHĀSYA-BHŪMIKĀ

We have already described the importance of this work in our Preface and would discuss this matter later at the proper place. It would suffice here to say that this work in our opinion occupies the uppermost place in all his works, because this book embodies detailed discussions on all the fundamental principles on which his Vedic commentary is based. If they are correct, authentic, logical and credible, and also if they are supported by valid and cognate evidences, the whole of his commentary on the Vedas is acceptable. But if these are not valid and are not credible, then not only his entire Veda-Bhāṣya is inadmissible but the whole structure of his entire mission and work would also be deemed baseless and will crumble down like a house of cards. Hence, this work is regarded supreme among all his works. This work is not an Introduction to the Commentary on the Rgveda only but it is related to all the four Vedas on which he intended to write Bhāṣyas. It is clearly indicated by the title or the work itself and is expressively confirmed by our author in the Bhāṣya on the Yajurveda—

"For all these topics the reader may refer to the said Bhūmikā because it is an introduction to all the four Vedas."

The fundamental and essentially primary important position of this great work is further indicated by the fact that Rṣi Dayānanda forbade the sale of his dynamic commentary on the Vedas to persons who wanted to purchase it alone without having first purchased this book. He, however, allowed the sale of this “Bhūmikā” without the actual Veda-Bhāṣya. It is clearly stated in the following advertisement published on the third and
fourth pages of the title cover of the Rgveda, and the Yajurveda Bhāṣyas, respectively—

"जो कोई भूमिका के बिना बेव ही केवल लिखा चाहेंगे सो नहीं मिल सकते। (कितनु भूमिका ५) देने से पृथ्व मिल सकती है।”\(^1\)

4. PLACE AND DATE OF STARTING IT

Our author commenced writing this Bhūmikā during his stay in Ayodhya. Devendra Nath mentions this fact in his Biography of Svāmī Dayānanda (Hindi) in the following words—

माधव १४ सं १९३३ वि ९ अगस्त सन १९३६ को स्वामी जी
प्रयोग्य घृण कर सर्व बांग में बोधिरी ग्रह चरण लाल के मंदिर में उतरे।
अबोधा में माधव शुरुवा प्रशिष्टवा सं १९३३ वि २० अगस्त १९३६ ई ०
को र्ग्वेदाचार्य भूमिका का लिखना प्रारम्भ नियायः।\(^2\)

5. THE WRITING OF BHĀṢYA

Commencement

Mahārṣi Dayānanda started writing his regular and running commentary on the Vedas, preceded by the Rgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā, from the first day of the lunar fortnight of Bhā德拉पद, 1933 of Vikrama era (20th August, 1876), and he mentions this date in the introductory verses of this work in the following words—

कालारामदशक्तियारं (1933) भाषासे लिखि वले।
प्रशिष्टवा प्रमिरवारे भष्यारम्भ: हुतो मया।\(^8\)

“I commenced writing this great commentary on Sunday, the first day of the bright half of the lunar month of Bhā德拉पद in the year 1933 (Vikram era).”

First Rough Draft

Approximately it took three months to finish the first rough draft of this work. But there is no clear or specific internal evidence in support of this theory. Yudhiṣṭhīra Mimāṃsaka finds a reference to this effect

3. The Rgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā, verse 2.
in the following two advertisements, read together, dated bright half of
Mārgaśīrṣa 15, Samvat 1933, issued by the author indicating the progress
of his Veda Bhāṣya—

(क) संवत् १९३३ वि ५० मार्गशीर्ष मुक्ता पूर्णमासी (१ विंदम्बर १२४६)
पर्यावल द्वा हुजार र्लोकों का प्रभाव भाष्य बन गया है और कम से
कम ५० र्लोक और प्राधिक से प्राधिक १०० र्लोक पर्यावल प्रतिवाद भाष्य
को रचते हैं।

(ख) सो प्रूविधा के र्लोक न्यून से न्यून संस्कृत और भाष्य भाष्य के मिला के
आठ हजार हुए हैं। (Patra-Vyavahara, pp. 40, 46)

It can be easily concluded from this statement that the author
finished the first draft of his manuscript about the end of the first
week of Mārgaśīrṣa, i.e. he took nearly 3 months to finish bis first draft
of this work.

The book was revised and enlarged at least six times before a final
press copy of the same was prepared, as is evident from the six different
copies of manuscripts preserved in the office of the Paropakārinī Sabhā in
Ajmer. The final version appears to have come into existence on Saturday,
the sixth day of the dark fortnight of Phalguna in 1933. This fact is
corroborated from the following internal evidence from this book.

जैसे विक्रम के संवत् १९३३ फाल्गुन मास, कृष्णपक्ष यष्ठी शनिवार के दिन
बहुध आहर के भारम्भ में यह (वैदोल्यत को कल गणना की) बाह हुम ने
लिखत है।

From this statement it can be presumed that the work of finalising
the press copy of the treatise was undertaken in the last week of Magha or
in the beginning of Phalgunā in 1933 (V. E.).

Date of Publication

It is not certain when the work of printing of this treatise was
started. The work was published not in one single volume at first
but in 16 numbers (issues) out of which the first issue was printed at
Lajras Press, Kāśi, and the year of publication is mentioned on its title

1. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, Rṣi Dayānanda ke Granthōn kā
Itihāsa, page 97.

2. Rgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā, (Ram Lal Kapur Trūst edition);
page 28.
page as 1934 (V. E.). It also bears the following notification on its title page—

विविध हो कि सं 1934 वंशाब महीने में देश पंजाब के लुधियाना वा ग्लुलातर में व्याप्त व्याख्य सत्रस्तों की निवास करने।

It clearly indicates that the printing of this issue commenced in Phalguna, 1933 and the first volume came out in Caitra, 1934.

The last one volume of this treatise containing the 15th and 16th numbers was printed at the Nirñaya Sāgara Press, Bombay in Vaiśākha, 1935 (V. E.). Thus 13 months were spent in the printing of this work.

6. THE MANUSCRIPTS OF BHĀSYA-BHŪMIKA

There are six manuscripts of the Rgvedadi-Bhāsyā-Bhūmika, preserved in the office of the Paropakārīṇī Sabha, Ajmer, which governs the Vedic Yantrālaya there. The press copy of the manuscript is not traceable now. It is presumed that the same might have been lost in the Lajras Press, Kāśi where the first edition of the work was mostly printed. We write below a brief description of the six available manuscripts—

Manuscript No. 1

It is complete and it contains Sanskrit text only. The paging is regular till the end. Eight pages dealing with grammatical rules are appended and after the 87th page four pages are added. Thus total pages are 147 (135+4+8=147). Lines : 32 lines per page and about 24 letters per line. Paper : Thin, blue in colour and ruled. Last eight pages are on thick hand-made paper. Scribe : The writing shows three different hands. Pp. 1 to 60, pp. 61 to 63 and p. 64 to the last page are in different hands. Corrections : The author made corrections in it in black and red inks here and there. ‘Hartal’ is also used at many places.

Manuscript No. 2

It also contains Sanskrit text only. It is also complete. Pages : 140. Lines : 30 or 32 on each page. Letters : About 24 letters per line. Paper : Superior, glazed, ruled, and blue upto page 31; thereafter, thick, glazed, white and indigenous. Scribe : Handwriting indicates 2 hands. Corrections : In red ink and black pencil (and sometimes black ink) used by the author himself here and there for corrections.
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Manuscript No. 3

Incomplete manuscript upto "Veda-Nityatva" only. It contains both Sanskrit and Hindi versions. Pages: 51. Lines: Approximately 16 per page. Letters: About 36 per line. Paper: Hand-made, thick and white. Corrections: Only in the hand of the writer. 'Hartal' is also used sometimes.

Manuscript No. 4

(A) This manuscript has two portions. It is complete but the matter contained in pages 377 to 399 of the printed text is missing. It is only upto the topic on "Ganita Vidya" and contains both Sanskrit and Hindi versions. Pages: 10 pages added after 147. Total 190 (180 + 10 = 190). Lines: About 16 per page. Letters: About 36 per line. Paper: Hand-made. Corrections: In red and black ink by the author himself.

(B) The second portion commences after the above stated topic. It has Hindi version only. Pages: 138 (Page 4 has wrongly been repeated). Lines: 26 per page. Letters: 26 per line. Paper: Blue. Scribe: It is written in more than two hands. Corrections: Made by the author in black ink.

Manuscript No. 5

It has also two portions "A" and "B".


(B) Pages: 112 to 322. Lines: About 26 per page. Letters: About 42 per line. Paper: Blue and ruled. Scribe: Many hands. Corrections: Done by the author himself in a large number of cases.

Manuscript No. 6

Complete from beginning to end. Pages: 410. Lines: About 27 per page. Letters: About 24 per line. Paper: Blue and thick. Scribe: Written in many hands. Corrections: Corrected by the author himself in a large number of cases, but it has scribes' corrections also.

It may be noted here that none of the six manuscripts is a press copy, which might have been lost either in Lajras Press or Nirnaya Sagara Press where the first edition of the book was printed in parts. Thus, there were seven manuscripts in all, including the final press copy of this book.
7. THE PRINTED EDITIONS OF BHÄSYA

There are four publishers of this great work, namely (1) The Vedic Yantralaya, Ajmer of the Paropakâriṇi Sabha founded by Svâmi Dayânanda himself; (2) M/s. Govind Ram Hasa Nand, Delhi; (3) The Ārya Sahitya Manḍal, Ajmer; and (4) Shri Ram Lal Kapur Trust, Amritsar. Each of them brought out a number of editions. I shall examine them very briefly as under:

I. Edition of Vedic Yantralaya of Paropakâriṇi Sabha

(a) The Lajras Press, and (b) The Nirñaya-Sâgara Press: The first edition of the work was not published by any of the above-cited agencies. It was not published in one single volume, but in 16 partial issues, out of which the first 14 numbers were got printed by the author himself at Lajras Press, Kâśî, and the 15th and the 16th at the Nirñaya Sâgara Press, Bombay. The title page of the first number of the book is dated as 1934 (V. E.) and also bears the following notification at the bottom of the page indicating the plausible date of publication:

"विदित हो कि सं १९३४ वंशाव्र महीने में देश पत्रिका लुभियाना वा अमृतसर में स्वामी दयानन्द सरस्वती जी निःवाल करेंगे।"

It is clear from this that the work of printing of this issue was probably started in Phalguṇa, 1933 and the first issue was out in Caitra, 1934. The last volume containing both the 15th and the 16th numbers was printed in Nirñaya Sâgara Press, Bombay in Vaiśākhha, 1935 (V. E.). Thus it took 13 months approximately in the printing process.

(c) Vedic Yantralaya Editions: The press of the Vedic Yantralaya came into existence much later. Subsequent nine editions were printed at the Vedic Yantralaya, Ajmer in single volumes containing Sanskrit and Hindi versions. This press also brought out another edition which contained Sanskrit version only. During the intervening period of the 5th and the 6th editions a Satâbdî edition was also brought out. Thus the Vedic Yantralaya published eleven editions in all upto A.D. 1967.

II. Edition of Govind Ram Hasa Nand

This was edited by Shri Sukha Deva Vidyavacasperti of Gurukul Kangri and has improved upon the text.
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III. Edition of the Ārya Sāhitya Maṇḍal, Ajmer

It is only a faithful reprint of the Vedic Yantrālaya edition and need not be examined separately here.

IV. Edition of Shri Ram Lal Kapur Trust

It was published in A.D. 1967 or 2024 (V.E.). This is the best of all the editions so far available.

Brief Comments

The Vedic Yantrālaya Editions: The first edition brought out in 16 numbers contained some grammatical or linguistic errors which were corrected by the author himself in the corrigendum appended to it. The second edition (Vedic Yantralaya) had the corrected version in accordance with the corrigendum of the first edition. In this edition we find improved and modified Sanskrit text to some extent at some places. All subsequent editions upto the fifth edition continued to be based on the second edition. Unfortunately the Šatābdi Sāṁskaraṇa was again based on the erroneous text of the first edition and the corrigendum added to it remained neglected. Thus all the mistakes and errors of the first edition again crept into the body of the book. The sixth and the seventh edition are identical with the Šatābdi edition. The eighth edition is the result of the editorial skill of the editor, Shri Mahendra Shastri. He created separate paragraphs for different topics and added references of some of the cited authorities. The ninth edition, edited by Shri Dharam Chand Kothari, contains revised and corrected text and is free from mistakes shown in the said corrigendum of the first edition. He also added new references and put them in the brackets. His footnotes are useful, though some of them are non-essential and a few indicate his grammatical immaturity. For instance, in his footnote on न पराजयाते in the chapter on “Raja Dharma” he suggested a correction as न पराजयाताः in place of न पराजयाते. But according to Yudhisṭhira Mīmāṁsaka it is wrong, as पराजयाते is a grammatically correct form in let (लेत्) tense which is used only in the Vedas.

Govind Ram Hasa Nand Edition: It is edited by Pandita Sukhdeva Vidyavacaspati of Gurukul Kangri. It is a commendable attempt at introducing new improvements, e.g. creation of separate paragraphs, separation of questions and answers, notes on difficult passages and improvement in Hindi version. In spite of all this, errors in Sanskrit text continued to exist as before.
Ram Lal Kapur Trust Edition: The Secretary, Ram Lal Kapur Trust, Amritsar, published a scholarly edition of this great work in A.D. 1967 which was edited by a known Vedic scholar, Shri Yudhiṣṭhira Mimāṃsaka. He took sufficient pains to make this publication faultless and authentic. He kept in view all the earlier editions and also collated original manuscripts and incorporated the missing or lost pieces of the text. His footnotes are praiseworthy and indicate his deep observation and mature thinking. This edition has many useful appendices indicating the editor’s deep knowledge and mature critical faculty. This is the best of all available editions. But a critical edition is still desired.

8. COMMENTS ON HINDI VERSION

The Hindi translation given in all editions of this work is not correct and faithful to the original Sanskrit text. Rṣi Dayānanda wrote this work in Sanskrit only and the work of translation into Hindi was entrusted to Panḍitas engaged by him. The Hindi version fails to convey the real spirit and the sense of the original Sanskrit text. Sometimes it runs counter to it. At some other places it is against the accepted concept of the Vedic theology preached by the author. It has a large number of hopeless omissions and commissions. I give below one instance:

Sanskrit Text

एवमेकादश स्त्रा द्वावशास्त्रविध्या मन: षट्ठानि ज्ञानेन्द्रियाणि वायुरृत्तिर्भ्रम धीमंद्रश्चेति
शरीररूपहृत्य: । तथा स्तनविश्विविध्यजी समारोहारीरे वेब्धे स्त: ।

Hindi Version

और भ्यार्य स्त्रा, बार्थ प्राविष्ट, मन, प्रत्तिक, वायु, हो और मन-वे
मूलितरहि वेब हैं। तथा पाँच ज्ञानेन्द्रियां, बिसूली और बिविद्यज वे सब मूलिमान
प्रमूलियान बोलने हैं।

In the original Sanskrit text, five organs of sense are called as non-corporal Devas, while in Hindi they are said to be corporal as well as non-corporal. The futile clarification made in the footnote on the above Hindi version is not acceptable as it is against the original Sanskrit text.
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9. TRUE COPY OF THE TITLE PAGE OF THE RGVEDADI-BHÄSYA-BHÜMIKA (FIRST EDITION)

II ऋग्वेदादि भाष्य भूमिका II

श्रीमद्भाष्यकालसरस्वती स्वामिना निषिद्ध II

II संस्कृतार्थावलयां समलिखिता II

अस्त्रेष्कांक्षी प्रतिवल नूतनं भारतवर्षार्थार्थेशालं प्रामाण्यम्

मूले�न सहितं २०) एतद्व द्राक्षरासरानां मिलितवा

वाणिकं ४१॥) भवित II

इस प्रच्छ के प्रतिवल एक एक नंबर का मूल्य भारतवर्ष के भीतर

आकृतिक मूल्य सहित २०) और वाणिक मूल्य ४१॥)

अस्त्र प्रवनस्य प्रत्येक्षा यस्य सचेतं स काश्यां लाजरसकंपन्यायावस्य

वा द्यानन्दसरस्वती स्वामिनां समोहस्य वाणिक मूल्य प्रकटेतु ।

स प्रतिवलकै रक्षायती II

अष्ट (१)

अर्थ प्रवन्य काश्यां लाजरसकंपन्यायावस्य यतं तत्त्वेत् मुद्रित: II

संवत् १९३४

अस्त्र प्रवनयाधिकारो भाष्यकर्त्ताः सयं सर्ववा स्वामिन् एव रक्षित:।

चिह्नित हो कि संवत् १९३४ वेशाख महीने में रेख प्रज्ञाव हृदियाना व अभूतसह में

स्वामी द्यानन्द सरस्वती जी निवास करेगे।
CHAPTER II

DAYANANDA’S FAITH IN THE VEDAS

REVIVAL OF THE VEDIC RELIGION

Dayānanda’s chief aim was the revival of the Vedic religion and the reform of the abuse that had crept into Hindu society, and not the establishment of a new creed which would mean the uprooting of the venerable faith that had grown with growth of the Hindu nation. In the words of Professor Max Müller:

“He considered the Vedas not only as divinely inspired, but as pre-historic or pre-human.”

To him every thing contained in the Vedas was perfect truth. In this matter he was in full agreement with the ancient theologians of India all of whom, without any exception, looked upon the Vedas as divine or super-human. To him a Church that ignored that basic principle of Faith was unthinkable—much more a Church that should be Aryan or Hindu in its origin and conception. His object was to revive the Vedic faith and the Vedic worship. He took his stand on the Vedas. These holy writings were his great weapon against the stronghold of latter-day corrupt Hinduism. Whatever was found in them was to him beyond the reach of controversy, and in this position he had the unanimous support of all that was sacred to the Hindu. Every branch of the sacred literature of the Hindus, from the very earliest times down to the most modern compositions of the different forms of Hindu faith, agreed on that point, and unhesitatingly accepted the authority of the Vedas as final and conclusive. We shall quote later all the relevant authorities to elucidate this point at length. In fact, in the whole range of Indian thought and Indian culture, the only dissenting voice on the point is that of the Buddhists, the Jainas and the Cārvākas (i.e. atheists). Even the Brahmo Samaj had begun with faith in the revealed character and divine origin of the Vedas. Max Müller, in his *Biographical Essays*, says:

“Ram Mohan Roy also and his followers held for a time to the revealed character of the Vedas, and in all their early contro-

1. *Biographical Essays.*
versions with Christian Missionaries, they maintained that there
was no argument in favour of the divine inspiration of the Bible,
which did not apply with the same or even greater force to the
Vedas.”

(p. 168)

Speaking of Ram Mohan Roy, he further says:

“He never became a Mohammedan, he never became a Christian,
but he remained to the end a Brahmana—a believer in the Vedas
and in the One God, Who, as he maintained, had been revealed
in the Veda.”

(p. 33)

Thus the Vedas were the sheet-anchor of his propaganda and his
scheme of reform. In the words of Max Müller, the idea had taken “such
complete possession of his mind that no argument could ever touch it.”
It was impossible to shake him from that position, and this the leaders of
Brahmo Samaj soon found out. So, the attempt to win him over to that
Samaj had failed as early as 1869.

Thus we see that the Great Reformer did not attempt to bring
about a new faith in the world. He attempted at the revival of the Vedic
religion. It was certainly not his desire to impose his own faith on all who
would join the Arya Samaj. He wanted them to follow the unanimous
opinion of the great Arya sages, divines and scholars, who had made all
that was glorious and sublime in the Hindu thought and Hindu culture;
he himself was no more than an humble follower of his illustrious
predecessors. Let me elucidate this point by citing below his own words
which appear at the end of his great work called the Satyartha Prakāśa:

“My conception of God and all other objects in the Universe
is founded on the teachings of the Vedas and other true Sāstras,
and is in conformity with beliefs of all the sages, from Brahmā
down to Jaimini. I offer a statement of these beliefs for the
acceptance of all good men. That alone I hold to be acceptable
which is worthy of being believed in by all men in all ages.
I do not entertain the least idea of founding a new religion
or sect.”

He further adds:

“The four Vedas, the repository of knowledge and Religious
Truth, are the word of God. They comprise what is known as
the Sarāhītās—Mantra portion only. They are absolutely free
from error, and the supreme and independent authority in all
things. They require no other book to bear witness to their
divine origin. Even as the sun or a lamp is, by its own light, an
absolute and independent manifestor of its existence—yea,
it reveals existence of things other than itself—even so are
the Vedas.”
CHAPTER III
A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE VEDAS
THEIR IMPORTANCE

A prominent place in the history of world literature is due to the Vedas not only as the oldest Indian, but also the oldest Indo-European literary monument. This is the case too when we find that throughout 3000 years at least, millions of Hindus have looked upon the words of the Vedas as the word of God and that the Vedas have inspired them with feeling and thought. As the Vedas are the fountain-head of the Indian thought and culture, it is impossible for a man to understand and appreciate the cultural and spiritual life of India, without having deep insight into the Vedic literature.

Even the Buddhistic faith, whose birth place is India, would remain improperly understood for one who is a stranger to the Vedic lore. The teaching of Buddha is in the same relation to the Vedas as the New Testament is to the Old Testament. No one can understand India without knowing the Vedas.

IMPORTANCE FOR THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD

The study of the Rgveda is essential not only for complete understanding of the Indian culture and thought as well as the history of India, whether ancient or modern, it is essential also for the elucidation of the history of the world. To quote Professor Max Müller:

"In the history of the world, the Veda fills a gap which no literary work in any other language could fill. As long as man continues to take an interest in the history of his race and as long as we collect in libraries and museums the relics of former ages, the first place in the long row of books will belong forever to the Rgveda."  
(Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 65)

He further remarks:

"I maintain that to every body who cares for himself, for his ancestors, for his history, for his intellectual development, a study of the Vedic literature is indispensable."
Mons. Leon Delbos says:

"There is no monument of Greece or Rome more precious than the Rgveda."

Regarding the antiquity of the Veda, Sir W.W. Hunter remarks:

"The age of this hymnal (Rgveda) is unknown."

**VEDA AND PHILOLOGY**

Above all, the study of the Vedas is most important from the point of view of philology or the science of language. The study of language, as distinguished from the mere acquisition of language, is a growth of the last century, though it must be admitted that researches into the genealogies and affinities of words have exercised the ingenuity of numberless generations of acute and inquiring minds. Still nothing deserving the name of science was the result of these older investigations in the domain of languages. Those were merely hasty generalisations, baseless hypotheses, and inconclusive deductions. As in the case with every science in its early stage, the science of language, too, was attended with difficulties, namely, paucity of observed facts, and faulty standpoint. Whitney has rightly said:

"National self-sufficiency and inherited prepossession long helped to narrow the limits imposed by unfavourable circumstances upon the extent of linguistic knowledge, restraining that liberality of inquiry which is indispensable to the growth of a science." *(Language and Its Study, p. 2)*

Thus in ancient times, every one thought his own dialect to be the oldest one with which to start and compare other dialects. Until very recently Latin and Greek were supposed to be the oldest and the most primitive known languages from which every European language was derived. But the restless and penetrating investigation which characterised the last century changed the whole aspect of the study, and linguists busied themselves with the study of the special relationship of the principal languages of Europe with one another and with the languages of South-Western Asia, which led to the postulation of the Indo-European family of languages.

Whitney further remarks—

*"No single circumstance more powerfully aided the onward movement than the introduction to Western scholars, of Sanskrit, the ancient and sacred dialect of India. Its exceeding age, its*
remarkable conservation of primitive material and form, its unequalled transparency of structure give it an indisputable right to the first place among the tongues of the Indo-European family. Upon their comparison, already fully begun, it cast a new and welcome light, displaying clearly their hitherto obscure relations, rectifying their doubtful etymologies, illustrating the laws of research which must be followed in their study and in that of all other languages." (Ibid., p. 4)

Let me quote one more authority on the subject. Sayce, in his work *The Science of Language*, says:

“What has been termed the discovery of Sanskrit by Western scholars put an end to all the fanciful playing with words and created the Science of Language.” (Vol. I, p. 38)

**STUDY OF THE VEDAS IN FOREIGN UNIVERSITIES**

From all this we can easily see what an important part the ancient Vedic Sanskrit has played in the domain of the science of language. The study of the Vedic literature has created, in reality, the philology. What I want to say here is that the Vedic Sanskrit is much older than the later Sanskrit which precedes Latin and Greek, and that it represents a state of civilisation, nowhere else represented. It provides us with many links, which are otherwise obscure. It is a matter of national pride for us that the *Rgveda* and other allied Vedic literature form a special and important subject of study at most of the important universities of Europe and America; an unparalleled activity in the domain of Vedic study is manifested everywhere; single words are studied critically and their history traced through all available works; indexes and glossaries are multiplied and exhaustive commentaries produced.
CHAPTER IV

WHAT IS THE VEDA?

DERIVATION OF THE WORD

The word 'Veda' means "knowledge", then "the knowledge par excellence." Śāyaṇa and others have derived the word Veda from the root \textit{Vid} (विद्) 'to know' with suffix \textit{Ac} or \textit{Ghañ}, i.e., knowledge, sacred knowledge, holy learning. Dayānanda derives it from the following four roots:

(a) \textit{Vid} : to know (\textit{Adādi}, \textit{Set}, \textit{Parasmaipada})—\textit{Vetti}.

(b) \textit{Vid} : to exist or to be (\textit{Divādi}, \textit{Anit})—\textit{Vidyate}.

(c) \textit{Vid} : to discriminate (\textit{Rudhādi}, \textit{Anit})—\textit{Vinte}.

(d) \textit{Vid} : to obtain or acquire (\textit{Tudādi}, \textit{Set})—\textit{Vindati} or \textit{Vindate}.

But to this list another fifth root can be added. The Dhātu-pātha reads \textit{Vid} in the sense of \textit{Cetana}, \textit{Ākhyāna}, and \textit{Nivāsa}, (\textit{Curādi}, \textit{Set})—\textit{Vedayati} or \textit{Vedayate}. It means 'to make known, communicate, inform, apprise, tell or teach'. For instance, we have the following verse:

\textit{वेदायं श्वानवेद्यत }  

\textit{(S. K.)}

Thus the Vedas are so called as all men or women know all true sciences in or through them, or as all true sciences exist in them, or as men become learned by studying them.¹

The following explanation of the word Veda, which is given by orthodox people is also based upon these derivations:

(1) \textit{विशाले जापने तथ्यन् वा एव: धर्मविवृत्तार्थ इति वेदा: }  

\textit{(Br. Pratiśakhya)}

1. Cf. वेदि सर्वाणि शास्त्राणि गर्वत्तत्स्य न विख्याति ।
\begin{enumerate}
\item वित धर्म सदा संह: तेषु पूज्यं च किञ्चि \textit{II 1 II}\n\item सत्यां विख्याते जाने वेदि विख्ये विवारणे ।
\end{enumerate}
\begin{enumerate}
\item विख्ये विख्ये प्राती ध्यमुदुःकर्मणिः कमात् \textit{II 2 II}\n\end{enumerate}

This stanza also describes different \textit{Vikaraṇas},
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The word Veda or its root *Vid* has commonly been found in almost all languages of the Indo-European family. For instance, Latin has the word *Videre*; A. S. *Witan*; Goth. *Vait*; and English *Wit*. The undermentioned English words have also their origin in the root *Vid*:

"wit, wise, wisdom, witch, wizard, provide, vision, idea, visage, visor, revise, supervise, evidence, invidious, review, survey, view, device, visit, etc."

**THE VEDA—THE WORD OF GOD**

The Vedas are four in number: the Rgveda, the Yajurveda, the Sāmaveda and the Atharvaveda. The Aryas consider them to be the word of God. All Hindus are unanimous in regarding the Vedas as God-revealed. According to them God revealed His knowledge to mankind in the beginning of creation, in order to guide man in all matters, religious as well as secular, during his sojourn on earth. This position is quite understandable. God could not have, it is argued, waited for giving His dispensation to mankind several thousands of years after the appearance of man on this earth. Thus the claims made by the Jews, the Christians and the Muslims, that the Bible and the Quran were the words of God, cannot be sustained. Leaving aside other reasons, one main ground for the rejection of this claim is that the earlier societies could not have been deprived of the benefit of Divine Guidance at the beginning of the creation of mankind. Hence the revelation of the Vedas (Divine Knowledge) in the very beginning is quite reasonable. The reasonableness and the desirability of Divine Guidance have successfully and logically been established by Dayānanda in all his works. The interested reader is advised to read them with profit.

The authors of almost all the ancient Sanskrit works, available in more than 1000 texts even now, pay the highest homage to the Vedas. These religious and secular works in their turn have won the admiration of many Sanskrit scholars of the West. The authors of these works maintain the divine origin of the four Vedas.

Two kinds of evidence, internal and external, can be adduced to prove or disprove the proposition whether the Vedas are revealed,
INTERNAL EVIDENCE

Internal evidence, again, can be of two kinds: one referring to the claims preferred by the books themselves, the validity or the futility of their claims to be judged by the consistency or the inconsistency of what is urged; and the other, the quality of the stuff preserved. As regards the first, we have seen already that the Vedas do lay claims to the position of a revealed work and profess to have directly proceeded from divine source.

There are, according to the European scholars, traces in the Vedas of a belief, and data for the propounding of the theory, that all the Vedas did not come into existence at one and the same time, but even if there were such traces, they could not shake the position of the Vedas as revealed books. There are, so far as we can say, no contradictory statements in the Vedas, which must discredit even a secular book in the eyes of the critics. The following citations from the Vedas themselves clearly establish that the Vedas do profess the claim—

1. तत्सार्थ यजात सर्व्वभूताः ऋष्मा सागम्य ज्ञिते ।
   ज्ञात्व तत्सार्थ यजुस्मायायत।
   [From that adorable God, the Rg-, the Sama-, the Chandas- (i.e. the Atharva) and the Yajurveda were produced.]
   (RV. X.90.13), (YV. XXXI.7)

2. यज्ञार्थ चो ध्यात्मक यजुर्यमायायन ।
   सामान्य यथा तोषाय सर्व्वभूतिः रूपस्तम्भ ।
   तस्मां तं ब्रह्म कतम: सत्यदेव स:।
   [Who is that Great Being who revealed the Rgveda, the Yajurveda, the Samaveda and the Atharvaveda? He is the Supreme Spirit who has created the universe and sustains it.]
   (AV X.7.20)

Similarly we get the following verse which clearly supports this proposition—

3. कालाथेः समयवल्ल यजु: काल्यजायत।
   कालेन्द्रयमज्जजो देवोहो व्रत चानिष्ठत:।
   (AV. XIX.54.5)

Citations can be multiplied from the Vedas themselves.

As regards the quality of the teachings of the Vedas, we can simply say that the Vedas, inculcating the worship of one Holy, Just and Merciful
God, laying down a strict code of morality, and being scrupulously free from absurd theories and outrageous speculations, are the revelation of God, His word, His cherished message to His children below.

If revelation, in the sense in which it is taken by all believers in revelation, were a possibility, the Vedas will undoubtedly stand supreme and undisputably claim that high position. For God is just and perfect, and revelation is the one, the chief form in which He shows His mercy and love for mankind, it must have been given in the beginning and God should not have had any reason to alter His former decree or stand in need of a second, third and fourth revelation to perfect His first message, i.e. revelation. A faith in revelation compels one, by a logical necessity, to accept the Vedas as the real revelation, for the Vedas are the oldest books claiming to be the word of God. It must be a strange sort of love and mercy which should have kept mankind, in their infancy, without a guide, philosopher, and friend, when they required it most, and should have kept them waiting for thousands of years till some instructions were sent down to guide them in this strange land where they had fallen down from paradise.

Seers are not Authors:

The idea suggested by some critics that the Seers whose names appear in the Vedas, alongwith the metres &c., were the authors of the Vedas, will be critically examined later on at the proper place. It would suffice here to state that they were 'seers', not 'composers' of the stanzas. They simply saw or realised the sense of the Mantras. The following stanza clearly states this—

4. यज्ञन वाचः यज्ञोमाययन्
तामन्विकिन्यत् अभिवत् प्रज्जिज्ञाम्।
तामामृत्या व्यवहः पुर्बा
ते सप्तरेखा अभि सं नवले॥

[The wise discovered it (i.e, speech) placed in the (hearts of ) the Seers.] (RV. X.71.3)

Here the last clause Tam Sapta Rebha Abhi-Sannahavante deserves particular notice and it has been explained by H.H. Wilson as: “The previous words refer to the diffusion of learning; those who have studied the Vedas have afterwards taught it to the others.”
Again the phrase *Rṣisu Praśātam* in this verse clearly establishes the fact that the ‘speech’, i.e. the Divine Speech, entered the hearts of the Seers (in the beginning of creation). This means the Seers (who are not composers) are the Divinely inspired people. For this reason they were called ‘seers’ and not the authors.

Yāska explains the word *Rṣi* as *Rṣīth Darśanāt*.

There are many more verses in the Vedas which, in no uncertain terms, declare the Vedas to have proceeded from God.

**EXTERNAL EVIDENCE**

The external evidence that the followers of the Vedas adduce in favour of their view is not of an historical nature, such as has been given by the defenders of the Bible, in their attempt to prove the Bible to be the word of God. Nor is it based upon the historical evidence of the other kind, such as given in favour of the Quran, for which a divine source is claimed on the ground that its apparent and ostensible author was quite unlettered and did not know B from a battle door, and consequently, the Quran, full of lofty teachings and couched in sublime language, could not but have proceeded from a divine source. No such evidence is possible for the Vedas and we think it better for the Vedas that they do not depend upon such evidence for the maintenance of their authority.

The external evidence which can be given in favour of the exalted position of the Vedas is of persons whose sincerity and scholarship the world has admitted, and whose flight of imagination the enlightened races of the world are struggling to follow. Considered from strictly logical point of view, the evidence of these men may not be conclusive and may not convince the logical sceptic. But the whole body of ancient writers of the sacred and secular literature of the Hindus, declaring with one voice the superhuman origin of the Vedas and bowing like one man before their authority, is a fact which possesses special significance for a Hindu.

It will require a whole volume to quote, in full, the evidence, the Seers of yore bore in favour of the Vedas. The following few representative citations from the massive Sanskrit literature will clearly bear powerful testimony to the undisputed authority of the Vedas and pay due homage to their divine sanctity—

The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* says:

1. एवं वा प्रागेऽस्य महत्त्वं ज्ञातां निःश्वचित्तने लेवः यदृ ग्रहिवः यजुर्वेदः साम-वेदोपत्ताति:ः।
[ O Maitreyi! the Rgveda, the Yajurveda, the Samaveda and the Atharvaveda are (like) the breath of that Supreme Being. ]

(SB. XIV.5.4.10)

2. प्राणे: र्गवेदो यायोयजुबेद: सृष्टिसमवेदः।
[ The RV. from Agni, the YV. from Vayu and the SV. from Strya were produced. ]

(SB. XI.5.8.3)

Similarly the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa says:

र्गवेद एवानेरवायत यजुवेदो वायो: सामवेद अहिव्यात्।

(AB. XXV.7)

The author of the Nirukta says:

1. पुल्लविधानित्यवात् कर्मस्यपत्तिर्यन्तो वेदेः।
[ The human knowledge is non-eternal. Hence the Mantras containing accomplishment of the actions are found in the Vedas. ]

(N. I.2)

2. नियमवाचोपक्षयो नियतानुपूर्वयो भवित।

(N. I.16)

Pāṇini and Patañjali, the two great grammarians of India, also hold the view that the Vedas are not of human origin, while the Śākhas, e.g. Kāthaka, &c., have human authorship. The difference between the man-made and the God-revealed works is expressed by the following two aphorisms:

1. क्लेन प्राप्ते।
2. तेन प्रोक्तम्।

(P. IV.3.113) (P. IV.3.101)

Patañjali in his commentary of the above-quoted second aphorism says:

या तस्मान्वानुपूर्वो साविनित्य। तस्मा नेत्राष्टितम् प्रवत्ति काठक कालापर्क मोदं पंपण्यायकमित।

(P. IV.3.101)

[The particular arrangement of words in (the man-made works e.g.) Kāthaka, &c., is non-eternal while the same is eternal in the Vedas which are the words of God. ]

(P. IV.3.101)

Again he says:

स्यरो नियत प्राध्यमायो बाहस्मस्य। वर्णानुपूर्वो खलवानयेन नियतस्य
बाहस्मस्य।
The Svaras (accents) and the particular arrangement of words in the Vedas are eternal, i.e. they are God-revealed. (MB. V.2.53)

The Taittiriya Brahmana says:

1. प्रजापति: सोमराजानसुज्ज तः स्त्रो वेष्ठ ग्रामकृयत॥
   [ Prajāpati created king Soma and afterwards the triple Vedas were created. ]
   (TB. III.10)

2. नावेतुवक्षमनुते तं देवयमरतम्॥
   [ He who does not know the Vedas, does not know Him who is Great. ]
   (TB. XII.9)

The Chāndogya Upaniṣad asserts what has been said by the Śatapatha:

1. तस्य तत्तुयानान्तरसाध्यः प्राप्तन्त्रु॥ प्रत्येकः कः रूपः यज्ञविवि सामान्याविविष्णुत्॥
   [ From them, so heated (i.e. inspired), He drew forth their essence, from Agni, Ṛc; from Vāyu, Yajus, and from Aditya, Sama. ]

2. तेष्यस्ततेस्त्यः कः वेष्ठ प्रजापत॥
   [ From these three (Seers) being heated (i.e. inspired by God) the three Vedas were produced. ]

The Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad states:

1. स सत्य वाच तनसात्मानं वर्षमं कुतुम्भजु॥ यद्विनं खिलं कः सः तत्तुयाविवि सामान्यविविष्णुत॥
   [ By that speech and that soul, He created all this, the Rg., the Yajur, the Samans and the Chandas (Atharvans). ]

2. वास्त्य महत्र नृसत्य निवाससिंधुसत्य ययः हर्सवेदः……..॥
   [ These RV. (etc.) are the breathings of the Mighty Lord. ]

The Smṛtis (i.e. Law Books) also echo the same sentiment:

1. प्रवर्तवायुरविव्यस्तु तद्द्रश्च स्तनात्मकः॥
   [ This RV. (etc.) are the breathings of the Mighty Lord. ]
[The triple Veda, RV., YV. and SV., is eternal and the Lord revealed it through Agni, Vāyu and Ravi (i.e. the Seers).]

(MS. I.23)

Manu again says:

1. विद्वेदन्त्वध्यायः वेदः श्रावः सनातनः


The Veda is the eternal eye of the mankind and it is Asakya (beyond human creation) and Aprameya (i.e. not easy to be understood).

(Manu XII.95)

3. वेदोऽक्षिलो धर्ममूलं स्वतीतीले च तत्त्वाद्


Dharma rests on the whole Veda; ............ Manu states that all Dharma which has been propounded by him is contained in the Veda, the whole of which is true knowledge. A man should determine his Dharma by the authority of the Veda.

4. चाँदुर्वृंथं ब्रह्मो लोकः चत्वाररावाधः: पृथकः


(XII.97)

5. सेनापत्यं च राज्यं च वषेणेनृत्वमेव च


(XII.150)

The poet philosopher Vyāsa repeats this idea in the Śāntiparva of his Mahābhārata:

अनाविनियमान नित्यं भागृहृष्टा स्वयंमुच्या

ग्रामी वेदस्यी विध्या यतः सर्वं प्रवृफ्य: ॥

[The Self-born God revealed the Divine Speech in the form of the Veda which has no beginning and end and is hence eternal.]  (232.34)
The authors of the Darṣanas, rigorous logicians as they were, humbly acknowledged the infallibility of the Vedas.

Kaṇāda, the author of the Vaiśeṣika system of Philosophy, says:

\[ \text{तद्वचनात् आम्नायस्य प्रामाण्यम्} \]

[ The Vedas being His words are authoritative. ]

In this aphorism the word \text{Tat} (i.e. that) refers to God. It is clearly stated by all commentators. For instance, Śaṅkara Miśra writes on this word:

\[ \text{तद्वचनात्-तेनेववेचरेण प्रणयनात्; आम्नायस्य-वेवस्य, प्रामाण्यम्} \] (I. 1.3)

Udayana also corroborates it in his \text{Kīraṇavali Prakāśa}:

\[ \text{तेनेवचरेण वचनात् प्रणयनात् आम्नायस्य प्रामाण्यम्} \]

In the same way Gautama, the author of the Nyāya System of Philosophy, recognises the Vedas to be authoritative in the following aphorisms:

1. \[ \text{मन्द्रायुद्धप्रामाण्यवचः तत्रामाण्यस्यमश्चप्रामाण्यात्} \]

2. \[ \text{अत्यामाण्याशः} \]

Vātsyāyana, the commentator of the above book, explains this aphorism:

\[ \text{य एवश्च वेदाश्चानां क्षयः प्रवक्तारशः त एवायुद्धप्रमृतीजन्मम्} \]

\(\text{NB. II.1.67}\)

Kapila, the author of Śāńkhya system of Philosophy, admits the Vedas to be the word of God:

1. \[ \text{प्रयोवेरवर्तव तकस्तु: पुस्तवामालात्} \]

[ The Vedas are not human creation. No man is their author. ] (V. 46)

2. \[ \text{निजशक्तिवचिववते; स्वतः प्रामाण्यम्} \]

[ The Vedas are authoritative by themselves as they have been revealed by His own power. ] (V. 51)
The same notion has been repeated in the Mīmāṃsā Bhāṣya by Kumārila:

काधुः सर्गवाहाद्वात् अग्निश्वेत्येत्र वेद्य हि ति।  

The Mīmāṃsā confirms this view:

वेदवहे ज धवेष प्राताःधायम्भ।

[ The Veda is authority in the matter of Dharma. ]

Patañjali's view in the Yoga Darśana is:

स पूर्वाचारण्य गुरुः कात्यायनवेश्वरात्।

[ Verily he is the teacher of the ancients as He is not bound by time. ]

Vācaspati Miśra corroborates this view:

तथा साध्युद्वतः गृहोदयेष्वरोहपि वेदराजः ईववर्ग्न्योः।

Vyāsa, the author of the Vedānta, openly declares:

शास्त्रोस्तवतः।

[ The Supreme Being is the origin of the Vedas. ]

The great Śaṅkara comments upon it:

न हिंदुस्तः सात्तत्त्व स्त्रेवदोहिलक्षणत्य सर्वन्तुमानित्वतत्य सर्वस्यांत्वतः।

प्रते नित्यस्व।

[ Hence the Veda is eternal. ]

The following aphorisms from the Mīmāṃsā fully discuss this topic and decide finally that the Vedas are superhuman:

नित्यस्तु स्याद्वर्ण्यस्तु परायंत्वतः।

वेदवारीके सन्निकर्तु दुर्गुप्ताय। (I. 1.18)

उपत्निमुः शच्चुपुर्ववत्तस्म। (I. 1.27)

शङ्क्या नववचनात्। (I. 1.29)

अस्त्रस्तु नववचनात्। (I. 1.30)
Kumārila sums up his comments upon the last noted aphorism as:

तत्तोऽनं वर्णणम् गुणमेवत् तत्वावधिनिजिंकंते: । न पुनः स्वातंस्वेयं कविचवदि प्रवाहोन्द्वेता वेदानामस्मिति: । कल्ल: स्वात: । तत्त्वादूक्षरामायावत् अपीतोहेतु वेदम् हि भावः: । एवं च पूर्वस्वेय वेदानाशेषस्वस्य सिद्धनात् तद्विये पुनः प्रपत्तो न करण्या: ।

In the Bhasya of Sañkhya-yana Śrauta Sūtra we find:

कर्म वेदस्य प्राप्तायम् ? अपोक्लेप्यताः ।

The Purāṇas are generally discarded as full of absurdities but to us they do not seem to form an exception to the rule: there is the soul of good in everything. They are at this day the source of inspiration to thousands of Hindus who have never read or heard a line from the Vedas. The evidence of the Purāṇas, therefore, is not without its value in admitting and proclaiming the divine origin of the Vedas, more so, because the Purāṇas are believed to be responsible for having displaced the Vedas.

The Viṣṇu Purāṇa says:

गायत्र च कृतचर्चेत भूतसाम रघनारम् ।

प्रविन्योलमयम् यथात् निर्ममे प्रस्मात् सुखाल ।

[ From 'His Eastern mouth Brahmā formed the Gayatrap, the R̄eas, Trīrvatsama, Rathantara &c., and Yajur &c., from His Southern mouth and so on. ]

1. Brahmā here means God to whom all the four directions are known and visible. Hence He is called four-faced or multi-faced (RV. X.81.3). The Creator as pervader of the Universe is known as Hiranyagarbha, Paramēṣthin or Brahma as He encompasses the whole material world. His four faces metaphorically represent His Omnipresence and Omniscience.

It is also popularly understood that Brahmā sprang up from the navel of Viṣṇu and Viṣṇu is regarded to be reclining under waters with his consort Lakṣmī. The Purāṇas took this metaphor and personification (Contd.)
The Bhāgavata Purāṇa observes:

[Once, the Vedas sprang from the four-faced Creator, as he meditated.]

Similarly, Skanda Svāmī, Durga, Bhartṛhari, Udayana, Vācaspati, Vĳñāna Bhikṣu and all other scholars share this view.

Our aim to present and quote all the representative authors of Sanskrit literature is to show to the reader that the Veda commanded the highest position in the world literature because of its being the word of God.

THE GREATNESS OF THE VEDA

If what has been said above is not strong and sufficient enough to satisfy a non-believer, regarding the essentiality and possibility of revelation and also the revealed character of the Vedas, it must have at least made it amply evident that the Vedas occupy the highest position in the sacred literature of the Hindus and have for thousands of years past been their infallible guide in all the matters, religious as well as secular. We finish this topic by again citing a few lines from the law books:

1. बैद्रो बुधः तस्य मूलं प्रणवः। (वोधवनं धर्मसूत्र)
2. बैद्र एव द्विजातिनां मनोयोगस्य: परः। (धातवलय)
3. वेदाधिष्ठितं च राज्यं च उपवने उपवेच च।
   सर्वप्रतीति स वेदाधिष्ठितमुव्रृहत्ति। (मनु)
4. नान्ति वेदान्तं परं शास्त्रं नान्ति मातु: समो गुहः। (अर्थ)

(Contd. from page xxvii)

too far in the domain of religion, but a peep into the Vedas will clearly show that it is nothing but a partial statement of the theory of creation mentioned in the Vedas. “Viṣṇu resting under the water with Lakṣmi” simply means the All-pervading Lord with His all-powerful dignity, controlling the entire matter in fluid condition. “Brahmā sprang forth from the navel” only indicates that Viṣṇu came to be called Hiranyagarbha.

It will now appear that the theory of Brahmā’s authorship of the Vedas does not clash with the views of other sages, including Dayānanda, as it simply implies the divine authorship of the Veda.
It would be unwise for us to finish the topic without mentioning here the school of thought of the non-orthodox scholars.

Here, however, in the beginning it must be stated that when we call the four Vedas four books, we must not understand the statement literally. If a book means a work written by one man, implying unity of time and ideas, well, the Vedas are far from being books. They are rather compilations, composed of several books which can be individually distinguished from each other. The form in which the Samhitā of the Ṛgveda has come down to us clearly shows that the different hymns were composed long before they were brought together and systematically arranged. That the different portions of the Samhitā represent chronologically different stages, follows from various indications of language, vocabulary, style, grammar, metre and lastly ideas. As in the Hebrew book of Psalms, so also here, songs which had been composed at widely separated periods of times were united at some time in a collection, and ascribed to (some) famous personages of prehistoric times, preferably to the earliest ancestors of those families in which the songs in question were handed down. The names of the singers or Seers (i.e. prophets) who, as the Indians say, 'visioned these hymns' are mentioned, partly in the Brāhmaṇas, partly in separate lists of authors (i.e. Anukramaṇīs) connected with the Vedāṅga literature.

Thus we see that the above discussed view of the orthodox people, which has a long and continuous stream of tradition behind it, is not shared by the European scholarship. The tradition has its own beauty and charm while the modern thought weighs every thing in its own way.
CHAPTER V

THE DIVISION OF THE VEDAS

INTERNAL EVIDENCE

Dayananda, like all other ancient scholars, says that the Vedas are four in number: the Ṛgveda, the Yajurveda, the Samaveda and the Atharvaveda. According to him this four-fold division is eternal and not man-made. Jñāna, Karma, Upāsana, and Vijnāna are the distinct subjects of these four Vedas respectively. The following are the etymological explanations of the titles of the Vedas:

1. क्षत्रिन-रसत्वनि, पवारिनौं गुणकरमिष्कादन्तर जनया सा शब्दः।
2. वज्रित येन (मनुष्याः ईश्वरं धार्मिकान्तिविद्वद्वा) पूजयति, जिलपदिङ्गानसंगतिकरणं च कुर्चित तत् यथा:।
3. स्मरति कर्माणी इति साम।
4. यति: वारतिकम् तत्राविवेधः। (N. XI.18) and also चार्नांसे (बुद्धां) संघाराहिन्य सम्पादते येन सोऽस्वेकः।

We have given these explanations to include the four main types of subject-matter given by Dayananda pertaining to each Veda:

Vijnāna (i.e. realisation of knowledge), Karma (i.e. action), Upāsana (i.e. communion with God) and Jñāna (i.e. absolute knowledge).

That is to say, the Ṛgveda deals with Vijnāna, the Yajurveda with religious activities, the Samaveda with worship and the Atharvaveda with all types of specific sciences.

Many scholars like Durga, Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara and Mahidhara are of the opinion that originally there was one Veda—undivided—which was produced by Brahmā in the beginning. Later on, in the Dvāpara (Silver) age the same one Veda was split into four parts by the great sage Vyāsa. It is strange to note that for this they have not adduced any authority.
This assertion is wholly wrong as we have already cited some verses from the Vedas themselves which enumerated separately four Vedas:

1. तस्मात् यज्ञात् सर्वहृद्: श्रुव: सामानि जस्विरे।
   \(\text{गर्भाधिर्विति जस्विरे तस्मात् यनुस्तत्सवादनायत} II\)
   \(\text{(RV. X.90.9)}\)

2. यस्मादृत्रो ग्रामात्नम् यशुर्यहमामायस।
   सामानि यथं तोमान्यश्वांति रसो युक्तम् II
   \(\text{(YV. XXXI.7)}\)

Similarly in Atharvaveda (IV.35.6 and XIX.9.12) we come across the word \textit{Veda} in plural number which clearly implies that the Vedas were four in number even in the beginning. The above-cited verses clearly mention the four names of the Vedas separately.

**EXTERNAL EVIDENCE**

Again the following quotations expressly mention the Vedas separately:

1. एष वा श्रवेद्य महूलो मूलस्य निष्पत्तिमेतद् यद् श्रुवेदो यजुवेदः: साम- वेदोध्वरांत्रि:।
   \(\text{(SB. XIV.5.4.10)}\)

2. Also in Gopatha (I. 3.1) the names of the four Vedas occur along with the phrase \textit{Sarvān ca Vedan} (i.e. all the Vedas).

3. यदनमुरणम्: सांस्किरि यज्ञान्ति: यजन्ति सामानि: स्तुवतिन्त।
   \(\text{(N. XIII.7)}\)

4. श्रुवतिन्: सांसकिरि यज्ञान्ति: यजन्ति सामानि: स्तुवतिन्त च्यविन्ति।
   \(\text{(Kāthaka Sāṃ. XXX.7)}\)

5. तत्तवारा श्रुवेदो यजुवेदं: सामवेदोध्वरवेदं: शिशा कक्षे व्याकरण निष्कर्ष च्यवो ज्योतिषम।
   \(\text{(MU. I.I.5)}\)

6. The above-cited verses from Manu I.23, and others.

7. वदवारे वेदो: सांहा: तत्त्वस्य: धर्माया: एकस्मतम्भर्याशायाः: सहस्रवाम्: सामवेदो: एकविन्दिनिः चाहुवच नवाधाययर्वो वेदो:।
   \(\text{(Mahābhāṣya)}\)

8. नामवेदविनोत्तर्य नामवेदविनोत्तरिण।
   नासामवेदविदुः: शास्त्रेश्वरं प्रमोदितम्। II
   \(\text{(Rāmāyaṇa IV,3.28)}\)

When we find that all these works, which are sufficiently earlier than Vyāsa, declare openly the existence of four Vedas separately and also when the Vedas themselves proclaim that the Vedas are four in number, the
contention of Durga and Mahidhara that the original one Veda was divided into four by Vyāsa cannot be accepted. It is also evident from this statement of Durga and Mahidhara that they were quite ignorant of a popular conception about the Veda. This ignorance is the cause of their wrong interpretation of the Vedas.

There are a few European scholars who maintain that the number of the Vedas is limited to three only. The original cause of this illusion, however, lies with the Hindus themselves, though they are not to blame, if others will not or cannot rightly understand them.

The mistake has evidently been caused by a misunderstanding of Manu and other seers of yore:

1. प्रथनवायुरिवस्त्रूतः वर्यं शहा सनातनम्।
   दुयोहं वास्तिन्वधर्मं श्रुयंजुः सामलक्षणम्॥
   [From Agni, Vāyu and Ravi (Sun) He drew forth for the accomplishment of sacrifice, the eternal triple Veda distinguished as Rk, Yajus, and Śāman. (Muir)] (M. I.23)

2. त्रयोऽत विभागः क्रृतं यज्ञिष मामार्न। (SB. IV.6.7.1)

3. स एतां त्रयीं विद्याप्रयत्तत्। (CHU)

We have, by numerous citations, already proved beyond doubt that the Vedas were four in the beginning also. But the European scholars could not rightly understand the word Traya (triple) in these quotations. Manu, as well as other authorities, do not mean to limit the number of the Vedas to three, but simply speak of the three-fold science embodied in them. For instance, the SB (IV.6.7.1) cited above in part (1) and also the Chandogya Upanisad in part (3) above clearly mention that the names Rk, Yajur and Śama here mean three sciences and not the names of the Vedas. The Māṁśā again confirms this interpretation in the following:

तेताः मृगु यज्ञायाये नावैव-व्यवस्था। (II.1.65)
नमितिः सामाया। (II.1.66)
शैवे यज्ञः सब्यः। (II.1.67)

Thus this triple division is based on the three sciences dealt with in the four Vedas. Not to speak of all the Hindu scholars supporting this view, it is strongly confirmed by Prof. H. Kern, who says:

“When the Hindus speak of the three Vedas, they mean that there is a triple Veda consisting (1) of recited verses (Rich),
(2) of verses, sung (Sāman), and (3) of formulas in prose (Yajus); all these words being comprehended under the name of 'Mantras'. Altogether independent of the three sorts of Mantras is the number of collections of them. Though there were a hundred collections of Mantras, the Veda is, and remains, threefold. It does not need to be proved that we must know that principle on which any distribution proceeds before we can deduce any conclusion from numbers."

Thus it is consequently nothing but short-sightedness to limit the number of the Vedic collections to three. The Atharvaveda is as much a Veda as any of the other three. Its subject-matter is identical with and considerably similar to the Rgveda. We have cited the above internal and external evidence to show that the Atharvaveda equally and rightly claims the same position as the other three Vedas.
CHAPTER VI
DEFINITION OF THE VEDAS

SAYANA'S FAULTY VIEW

The great commentator of the Vedas—Sāyaṇa—who lived and wrote at a time when the sun of the Vedic traditions had long set, defines the Veda as मन्त्रभागात्मकः शब्दसिद्धिवेदः, and then he adds that निदर्शय लक्षणम्, i.e., the definition of the Veda as the sum of Mantras and Brāhmaṇas is a faultless one. Then he refers to the Yajña Paribhaṣa of Āpastamba, where the “name of the Veda is given to the Mantras and Brāhmaṇas.” But this definition of the Veda given by Sāyaṇa is ridiculous as he could not discriminate between the Mantra portion and the Brāhmaṇa portion. This fact he himself has admitted.

Sāyaṇa’s definition is based on the following statement of Kātyāyana:

मन्त्रभागात्मकः वेदवाक्यवेदः ।

DAYĀNANDA’S VIEW

But Dayānanda was the first among the modern scholars to explode this view and to demonstrate that the Saṁhitās only formed the Vedas and they alone were to be regarded as eternal, and infallible, as Vedas in fact. The Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads themselves profess to be mere parasites of the Vedas and devote themselves respectively to the elucidation of the ritualistic and the philosophical portions of the Vedas. No Saṁhitā, on the other hand, professes to hang upon any other Saṁhitā as its parasite and devote itself to explain any portion of the others. Hence, Dayānanda says:

न सांहिकानां वेदसंगत भवितमेवति । कृतः? पुराणेष्ठिहाससंबंधत्वात् वेदवाक्यायानात् ऋषिविशिष्टत्वात् ब्रह्मविरोहितत्वात् काल्याणमिलने: ऋषिविशि: वेदसंगतां प्रस्बीकृतत्वात् मनुष्यविनिर्दिष्टत्वात् वेदेष्व॥
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The Brāhmaṇas do not deserve to be called by the name of the Veda because they have been given the names of the Purāṇa and Itihāsa; they are elucidations of the Vedas and are not the words of God but merely the works of the seers and the products of human intellect; also because all sages other than Kātyāyana have refused to call them by the name of Veda.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SAMHITAS AND BRAHMANAS

This is quite true that there are no stories in the Vedas. The Brāhmaṇas do contain narratives of human beings, while the Vedas are free from stories and tales:

1. देवासुरा: संवत्र भ्रातम्
2. सदेव सोम्य इदमः प्रासीवत्

(CHU)

It must be pointed out here that some scholars have tried to deduce some historical detail from the Samhītas but no story, beginning with "There was etc." and "There lived once, etc.", such as are of common occurrence in the Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads, has been found in the Vedas (Samhītas) even by the Europeans, who always smell out history in every nook and corner of a literature.

Tradition plays a great part in clearing up matters such as we are now discussing and all the evidence derived from this source is in favour of the view that the Samhītas only form the Vedas proper. Patañjali, the great grammarian, always quotes from the Samhītas to illustrate the special rules applicable to Vedic Sanskrit without quoting a single line or phrase from the Upaniṣads or Brāhmaṇas; his non-Vedic illustrations include passages from both the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads:

（MB）

Moreover, the Brāhmaṇas are the explanatory books on the Vedas. Here the Vedic stanzas are repeated and explained later on. Hence the Brāhmaṇas are the glosses on the Vedas. How can commentary be given
the same position as the original one! For instance, while explaining the *Yajurveda* verse *tryâyuṣam*, etc. (III.62), the *Satapatha* says:

1. वजः व चतुः: जमपदिनः। यदैव जगत् पश्यति, भ्रमो भ्रमुः। तस्मात्
   चतुः: जमपदिनः। यदैव जगत् पश्यति, (SB. VIII.1) कस्यपो व नूर्मः। (SB. VII.5)

2. इक्ष्वाकूजः इति। वृषद्धिव तदष्टः। यवाह इक्ष्वाकूजः। यो वृषद्धिव वधर्षि तसे
   जायते तस्मि तदष्ट, सविवाँ वे वेदां प्रसविवत। सविवाँ-प्रसूति। (SB. I.7)

Here we clearly find that the Vedic stanzas are being explained. Thus the Brāhmaṇas are merely a commentary on the Veda.

The very title of these books, i.e. Brāhmaṇa, indicates that these works are not the Vedas. Brahma means here Veda and their explanatory books are called Brāhmaṇas. The following instances may again prove it:

(a) The first verse of the *Yajurveda* is explained in the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* (I.7.1).

(b) The *Ṛgveda* verse (I.24.3) has been explained in the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* (I.16).

(c) The first verse of the *Sāmaveda* is explained in the *Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa* (XI.2.3).

Moreover, the four Vedas are the revealed books; they are words of God; but the Brāhmaṇas are human creation and were composed by sages.

As the Brāhmaṇas are man-made works, they contain criticism of other similar works. Sometimes they contain statements contradictory to each other. It clearly shows that they cannot be given the title of the Veda.

The accent plays essential part in the language of the Vedas while the same is lacking in the Brāhmaṇas.

The author of the *Mahābhāṣya* clearly declares that the Brāhmaṇa works were composed by the Brāhmaṇa seers who understood the four Vedas for the elucidation of the original text:
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Kātyāyana, on whose authority Sāyaṇa includes the Brāhmaṇas in the Vedas, clearly distinguishes between the two in the following verse:

\[\text{प्रोक्तारो वेदेषु (I.18) प्रश्नकार भाषेषु (I.19)}\]

In these quotations Kātyāyana himself creates distinction between the Veda and the Brāhmaṇa which he calls as Bhāṣya.

The evidence of Yāska, the author of the Nirukta, goes to establish the fact that the Brāhmaṇas are beyond the scope of the word Veda. He always quotes from the Vedas as *rṣigaṇa* and the Brāhmaṇas are quoted separately as ‘Brāhmaṇa’:

\[\text{इन्यपि निगमो बवक्ति} \ (V.3.3-4, 5.4, 8.9)\]

\[\text{इति ब्रह्मणम्} \ (VII.12, XIII.10)\]

Yāska often disregards or shows a bit of contempt to Brāhmaṇas, but he has reverence for the Vedas always:

\[\text{भृष्णक्तवादेन ति ब्रह्मणानि ववक्ति} \ (N. VII.24)\]

He again quotes self-contradictory statement from the Brāhmaṇas, to which no stress or importance is to be attached. He says:

\[\text{पृथ्वीपी ब्रेशवान् संवासौ ब्रेशवान्: ब्राह्मणो ब्रेशवान्: इति} \ \ (N. VII.24)\]

The following quotation from Yāska states in clear terms that only the Mantras were revealed, and the tradition of oral transmission refers only to them:

\[\text{साक्षात्कृत्यं ज्ञयो वपूणु:: तेकविरेख्य: ब्राह्मणात्कृत्यं संतखान् संभाषु:} \ (N I.20)\]

According to him, the Brāhmaṇas repeat what has already been ordained by the Mantras for the fuller explanation:

\[\text{यथेत्त ब्राह्मणो उपस्थता ब्रह्मणी} \ \ (N, I.16)\]

The Brāhmaṇas are, therefore, *uditatāvda* (i.e. repetition of what has already been ordained) and cannot claim the position of the original Veda,
Jaimini, the author of Mīmāṃsā, confirms this view by saying:

\[
\text{तत्त्वज्ञानं समारोपयेत्} \quad \text{(XXXII)}
\]

\[
\text{शर्ये ब्राह्मणश्च:} \quad \text{(3.1.2)}
\]

\[
\text{प्राताम्यस्य ब्रह्मस्वत्वम्} \quad \text{(3.1.3)}
\]

In Gopatha Brāhmaṇa itself the Brāhmaṇas are separately stated from the Vedas:

\[
\text{इन्द्र सर्ववेदः लम्बाणः} \quad \text{!}
\]

Paṇini, the great grammarian, has treated the Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas as different from each other in the following aphorisms:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{हितीया ब्राह्मणे} & \quad \text{(P. II.3.60)} \\
\text{चतुर्थयेव बहुलं छन्दसि} & \quad \text{(P. II.3.62)} \\
\text{पुराणप्रोक्तेऽऽहिष्णु ब्राह्मणकलेखः} & \quad \text{(P. IV.3.105)}
\end{align*}
\]

The last aphorism quoted above shows that the Brāhmaṇas and Kalpas which are the works of the ancient sages, Brahmā, etc., are Vedic glosses only. And for this reason they have been given the names of Purāṇa (and Itiḥāsa). If in these aphorisms the intention had been to call the Chandas and the Brāhmaṇas by the name Veda, the use of the word chandas in the above-mentioned aphorism would be meaningless, because the term Brāhmaṇa (which in that case would include the term chandas) had been already used in the first aphorism cited above. Thus it is clear that Paṇini does not give the name of the Veda to Brāhmaṇas.

Moreover, the Brāhmaṇas and Upanisads are full of quotations from the Sambhātas, the latter, though quoting from one another, do not quote a single line from the former.

In the light of this overwhelming evidence nothing but over-adulteration and misdirected sense of reverence can lead one to place any other work on the same level as the Vedas. If the Vedas are looked upon as the revelation, it is a positive insult to them to give to any human book, however sublime and excellent, the same reverence as to them.

And none of the ancient masters has gone so far off, except Kātyāyana, whose position must be accounted for by his excessive reverence for all that facilitated the study of the Vedas.
CHAPTER VII

VEDAS INTERPRETED : A CRITICAL SURVEY

[He, who does not know the Vedas, does not know him, who is great.]

Before we proceed to appreciate and form an estimate of the value of Dayānanda's interpretation of the Vedas, it would be quite logical to furnish an account of all efforts, made so far right from the Vedic period down to the age of Dayānanda in the sphere of understanding the Vedic texts. It will give us an opportunity to comprehend and critically examine the various types of interpretations offered by different translators at different times and under different circumstances.

INSPIRED SAGES

In the beginning, there were inspired sages who understood the Vedas, without being explained to them by any teacher or preceptor. They understood the purport of the Mantras without anybody's help, as the Vedas were revealed to them. We have already dealt, at greater length, this topic. Thus, there was no need of any gloss or exegesis during this period for them. Well-deserved homage is paid by Mr. R. T. H. Griffith to the Brahmins who committed the Vedas to memory and thus preserved them in their pristine purity.

Mr. Griffith says:

"These four Vedas are considered to be of divine origin and to have existed from all eternity. The ṛṣis, or the great poets to whom the hymns are ascribed, were merely inspired seers who saw or received them by sight and directly from the Supreme Creator. In accordance with this belief these sacred books have been preserved and handed with the most reverential care from generation to generation."

(Translation of the Rgveda, Introduction)

From this it is clear that in the beginning there was no necessity of any gloss and exegesis for the understanding of the Vedas. The seers
understood them by insight. This fact has been clearly brought forth in
his work, *Nirukta*, by Yāska in unambiguous terms:

```
साक्षात्त्वकत्वार्थम् अस्मि बमूः। तेजस्वर्यो असाक्षात्त्वकत्वार्थम् उपदेशान् मन्नान्
सप्रायुः। उपदेशाय न्यायलोकाने विलम्बपृणयेम् प्रत्येस समासातिः। येवं व
वेशाच्यैः स।
```
(N. I.20)

Here it is definitely stated that Dharma (the Vedas) revealed
itself to the seers. They handed it down by oral tradition (*upadeśa*) to
their descendants to whom Dharma (the Veda) did not manifest itself. The
others who declined (in understanding the Veda) by oral transmission
compiled this book (the *Nighaṇṭu*) and the other Vedāṅgas for fuller
understanding.

From this evidence we know that in the Samhitā-period, the purport
of the Vedas was not obscure or difficult for the people to comprehend
because the Vedas were revealed to them or taught to them (the younger
generation) by those who knew them by insight. It is also a reason that
the Vedic terminology was popularly known at that time. The spoken
language at that time was not much distinct from the Vedic tongue.

During the course of time, gradually the later generations began to
decline in intellect. I feel at this stage the internal comparative method
was followed by them, where the words or context were not very clear.
For instance, the word ‘Aditi’ has been used to denote a number of
meanings in the Vedas. The confusion in such cases was natural. But
if we refer rightly to Vedic text, we can easily come across such verses
where various significances of this word are hinted upon:

```
प्रविभीताँ नदिनिश्चिताः श्रीममन्तिरधिः स पिता स पुजः।
विश्वेषेऽविनिः प्रत्यज्ञानम् प्रविभीतिजातिमवसितन्तन्तः॥
```
(RV. I.6.16.5)

Here we get the various meanings of the word ‘Aditi’.

It is beyond doubt that the Vedas themselves explain many contro-
versial points. Does the worshipper invoke God or various elements of
nature? To this query, the Veda replies:

```
तदेवान्तितदाहितज्ञास्वतः वायुस्तु यत्रामः।
तदेव शुचिन तद् श्रुतः ता श्रापः स प्रज्ञानयति॥
```
[ Even He is Agni, He is Āditya, He is Vāyu, He is Candramas ;
He is Śukra, He is Brahma, He is Āpa, He is Prajāpati.]
(YV. XXX.1)
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They call Him Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Agni and He is beautifully-winged Garutmān (Sun). He is One. Sages call Him by many names, viz. Agni, Yama, Mātariśvan.

Such verses are really internal interpretations of the Vedic texts and should be taken even now as the key to the interpretation of all apparently polytheistic expressions in the Vedas.

It served really as a keynote for interpreting the Vedas for Dayānanda, according to whom there is only one Supreme Being described in the Vedas and Agni, Indra, etc., are merely His different names expressing different qualities of the Supreme Lord.

PADA TEXTS

The creation of the Pada texts had twofold purpose first the preservation of the sanctity of Vedic text, and secondly to make the Vedic text clear and lucid by expounding the compounds, or by showing the position of accent on individual words and by inserting avagraha in the joint words. Prof. A. A. Macdonell maintains that the ancient sages adopted steps for preserving the Vedic texts with the faithfulness unique in history. Briefly stated, those steps were: (1) analysis of the whole text into words called Pada-pātha; (2) Krama-pātha, i.e. reading every word twice, connected with both the preceding word and the word that follows; (3) the woven text or Jaṭā-pātha stating each of the combinations three times, the second time in reverse order; and (4) the climax of this precaution was reached in what was called Ghana-pātha in which the order of words is ab, ba, abe, eba, abe; be, cb, bed, etc.

All these varieties of texts were learnt by heart and thus they preserved the sacred texts and helped to a great extent in understanding the exact significance of the text. The advantage of the Pada text in the sphere of the better understanding of the Vedic text has been accepted by Yāska in the following quotation:

प्रवासायप्रत्येकं श्रद्धा मुद्दोऽहि इति।
प्रवेशेऽस्त्यंख्याती नामकरणम्। तत्सानावृह्वणितः।
प्रवासायत्वः। इति।
स्वतंस्रवस्यो विमोचने। तत्सानावृह्वणित॥

(N. I.17)
Explaining the last sentence here Durga adds—

These authors of the Pada texts were quite familiar with all etymological principles and grammatical formations; because a layman who is a stranger to grammatical principles (even in the absence of grammatical works) cannot expound the compounds and disjoin words. It was the first attempt towards the understanding of the Veda Mantras. The authors of the Pada texts did not feel any necessity of writing a regular and running commentary on the Vedas. This fact shows that people at that time were not very much far off from the sages to whom Dharma manifested itself (सङ्कर्त्तिर्दधर्मानानं).

THE ŚĀKHĀS (RECESSIONS)

It is quite well known that the 1,127 recensions of the Vedas are the Vedic exegesis. These recensions explain away the obscure words of the Vedas by substituting simpler words in different recensions differently. For instance, मन्त्रिविवं शरायम् I (RV. X.71.6) has been modified as मन्त्रिविवं शरायम् in the Taittiriya Āraṇyaka (I. 3). चातुर्यश्च यवधाय (YV. I.18) has been simplified in the Kaṇva recension as हिन्नते यवधाय (I. 6.2.3). This shows that recensions contain simplified texts of the original Veda.

Instances can be multiplied. But it is certain that the recensions are helpful only to a little extent. The study of various recensions of the Vedic texts involves very hard labour, resulting in scanty utility. But the explanatory aspect of these recensions has been admitted by Veṅkaṭa Mādhava in the Rgbhāṣya Anukramaṇī:

(प. 77)

THE BRAHMĀNA WORKS

The word Brāhmaṇa means first a single explanation given by a priest or a doctor of the science of Sacrifice upon any point of the ritual; secondly it means a collection of such utterances and discussions in book form.
If we go over to the Brāhmaṇas and bring together all those passages which contain explanations of Samhitā texts or derivations of words, we shall have before us a large mass of material, which will prove to be an important contribution to the Vedic interpretation. Even to critical European scholars, such explanatory references found in the Brāhmaṇas have proved of much use to determine the meanings of words which are otherwise ambiguous or unintelligible.

The fact deserves notice that wherever we come across explanations of words and the Vedic verses, we find them invariably based on etymological meanings. Sometimes, no doubt, narratives of human beings and other legends are quoted here and there, but they are very few. Thousands of Vedic words have been critically examined and etymologically explained.

We must learn one thing from the explanations of the Vedic words given in the Brāhmaṇas that the Vedic words possess general sense and are not conventional or rūḍhīs. This topic we shall deal at a proper place later on. Here it is sufficient to state that all the Vedic words according to the Brāhmaṇas denote general sense and not particular, i.e., they indicate only derivative significance. For instance, while explaining the following stanza from the Yajurveda:

\[
\text{व्यायुञ्ज जमदग्ने: कस्यस्य व्यायुञ्जस्} \]

the Satapatha says:

\[
\text{चक्रुःसःस्मदयनि: त्रिविष: | यदने जगत् पश्चात् | ग्रहो मनु| तस्माच्छक्षु: जमदग्नि: | (SB. VIII.1)}
\]

\[
\text{क्षयो वें कृमेन: | ग्राणो वें कृमेन: | (SB. VII.5)}
\]

Again the first verse of the Yajurveda इथे स्वैसः etc., has been explained as:

\[
\text{इथे स्वैसः—बुधधर्म तदाद् | यदाहु इथे स्वैसः श्रवणै त्विति | यो बृहदार्थसमी जायते तस्मै तदाद् | सविता वें देखानां प्रसविता | सवित्र्य-प्रसविता: | (SB. I.7)}
\]

Sometimes Brāhmaṇas explain obscure words by offering simpler synonyms:

\[
\text{श्चाहु वें ग्राणात्: | प्रश्रत् राजन: | (SB. XIII.1)}
\]

\[
\text{राष्ट्रवा प्रक्षेमेन्य: | (SB.)}
\]
Similarly Vedic metaphors have also been explained frequently:

\[ \text{pratīṣṭhātāḥ: \ sva\ dūśāntamābhāṣyāt, \ vidhītasya\ śāhū: \ । \ uvācāsānye\ । \ tāmasya\ būtava\ rohitaḥ\ mūlātmaṁyāt. \ tāṣṭyavat\ ye: \ pravṝmadvāśīśyāt \ tāntaramābhāṣyāt\ । \ (AB. III.33.34) \]

\[ \text{pratīṣṭhātāḥ: \ sva\ sūryaśāt\ gṛhāntam\ । \ (SB. X.2)} \]

Yāska, the author of the *Nirukta*, frequently quotes passages from the Brahmanaś in support of his own etymological explanations of the Vedic words.

Here we must understand that the Brahmana works are not regular commentaries on the Vedas. The main theme of these voluminous books is the Sacrifice (*yajña*) from which all discussions start and on which every thing hinges.

**PRATIŠĀKHYAS AND ANUKRAMĀNIS**

The *Pratiśākhya* works are also an attempt in the same direction, though they relate more to the text and orthography than to the regular interpretation. Works like the *Sarvanukramaṇi* of Kātyāyana and the *Brhaddevatā* are important from the point of view of the preservation of the text only indirectly serving the purpose of Vedic interpretation.

**THE NIGHĀNTU AND THE NIRUKTA**

The first and foremost distinct attempt to interpret the Vedic texts is the *Nirukta* of Yāska than which no older work of the type is known today. The *Nirukta* is a super-commentary on the *Nighāntus*. The *Nighāntus* are five lists of words which are divided into three sections. The first section (the *Nighāntuka Kāṇḍa*) consists of three lists in which Vedic words are collected under certain ideas. For instance, there are quoted 21 names for earth, etc. That is, the first section contains lists of synonyms; the second section (Naigama) contains a list of ambiguous and particularly obscure words of the Vedas; while the third section (Daivata) gives a classification of the Devatas according to three regions, i.e. the earth, the atmosphere and the heaven. Vedic exegesis probably began with the compilation of such glossaries; the composition of commentaries on those glossaries, after the style of our *Nirukta*, with explanations of difficult Vedic verses interwoven, was a definite step in the development of the Vedic interpretation.

Tradition erroneously ascribes the *Nighāntu* also to Yāska. In reality, however, Yāska himself says that the *Nighāntu* (*imam grantham*)
was composed by the descendants of the ancient sages \textit{(avare)} for the easier understanding of the transmitted texts. \hfill (N. I.20)

It is quite certain that Yāska had many predecessors and his work, though surely very old and the oldest existing Vedic exegetic work, can nevertheless only be regarded as the last, perhaps also the most perfect production of the literature of the Vedaṅga Nirukta.

We must remember that although this work is very old, and also that no older work than this is extant in this sphere, yet it is far removed in age and spirit from the period of the Samhitās. This is quite evident from the fact that it makes twofold distinction while explaining the significance of words, i.e., it distinguishes between the use of words regarding their meanings prevalent in the Vedic language and in the spoken one. This shows a gap of many centuries between the period of revelation of the Vedas and that of Yāska. Thus for example in the section of \textit{nipātas} (i.e. particles) he says:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{हेवेति भाषायाम् च उपमयम् व्यायाम् च। प्रतिविध्रुवेदम् हेवेति।}
\textbf{नेति प्रतिविधार्थो भाषायाम्। उपमयम् व्यायाम्।}
\end{quote}

Here the distinction between the language of the Vedas and the language of daily speech in vogue at the time of Yāska is clearly hinted upon. The spoken language at that time was sufficiently different from the Vedic speech. The long elapse of time is the only justification for this.

This fact is again proved beyond doubt from the evidence of Kautsya who maintains that the Vedas do not convey or possess any meaning:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{ग्रंव निरवर्धका मन्त्रः।}
[ The Mantras have no sense. ] \hfill (N. I.15)
\end{quote}

To support his contention he advances arguments which clearly indicate the remoteness of Yāska’s period from that of the Vedas when the sages did not feel any ambiguity in the Vedic text. The following are a few arguments given by Kautsya:

\begin{enumerate}
\item The statements (in the Vedas) have certain fixed words and fixed order of words.
\item The Brāhmaṇaś endow the Mantras with forms; thus—'Spread thyself widely out' \textit{(YV. I.22)}; 'and so he spreads' \textit{(SB. I.3.6.8)}.
\end{enumerate}
(c) They speak what is incompatible; thus, "Protect him, plant", "axe, do not injure him," thus he speaks while striking.

(d) Their contents are self-contradictory as "There was but one Rudra and no second", and again "There are countless, thousands of Rudras on earth". So also "Indra, thou hast been born without a foe", and again "Indra vanquished a hundred armies at once."

(e) A person is ordained to do an act with which he is already acquainted; thus, "address the hymn to the Fire which is being kindled". (This is said by the Adhvaryu to the Hotá).

(f) The significance of the Mantra is obscure on account of the words like amyak (RV. I.16.93), yadṛśmin (RV. V.44.8), jarayani (RV. VI.12.4), kaṇuka (RV. VIII.66.4).

The last argument is a positive proof, establishing a fact that the tradition could not remain intact till Yaska's time. To meet these objections Yaska says:

(a) The Mantras have a sense, for their words are the same (as those in the ordinary language).

(b) The fixity of words and their order is also found in the case of our daily language, e.g., indragni, pitaputrau.

(c) The Mantras being endowed with form by Brahmāyas cannot be a valid argument because the Brahmāyas repeat what has actually been already told by the Mantras.

(d) As for the enjoining of something impracticable, it depends on the statements of the Vedas, whether an act is hiṅsā or ahiṅsā.

(e) The contents of the Mantras are not self-contradictory. Such phrases occur in ordinary language: 'this Brahmāya is without a rival', 'the king has no enemy'.

(a) प्रयंबनं: शब्दसमानायात्। (N. 1.16)
(b) यथो एतत् नियतवाचीपूजायो नियतानुप्रव्यों प्रवस्तिह इति। लोकर्क्षेष्येतु—इन्द्रात्मी, विनितधारितो। (N. 1.16)
(c) उत्तानुवात: स प्रवित्। (N. 1.16)
(d) यथो एततवृपन्नायं प्रविद्धं—इत्याभायवचनात् अहिंसा प्रतीयते। (N. 1.16)
(e) लोकर्क्षेष्येतु असपत्नोंयं बाह्यपोषनमिष्यो राजेन्ति। (N. 1.16)
(f) As for the ordaining of something with which a man is already familiar, people are likewise greeted by their names, though they already knew them.

(g) As for the obscure significance of Vedic words, it is the fault of the post that the blind does not behold it; it is the man’s fault. More knowledge is required for this purpose.

From this discussion, it is quite clear that in the days of Yāska, the sense of the Vedic hymns became obscure. One thing is also evident from Kautsa’s statements that he held the Vedas in reverence and he admitted the efficacy of the Mantras. He only maintained that the Vedas have no significance.

There is again a point which invites our notice. When the Vedic glossaries in the form of Nighaṇṭus were compiled, it was not thought desirable to add a commentary to these lists of words; because people could have needed only a very little help for understanding the Vedic text. This help was provided by the Nighaṇṭu without any commentary on it. But the time rolled on till the necessity of appending scientific and exhaustive commentaries was felt. When Yāska wrote his commentary, the Nighaṇṭus were regarded a poor help in the understanding of the Vedic text.

Prof. A. A. Macdonell thinks that Yāska did not possess a continuous tradition from the time “when the Vedic hymns were composed.” The gap between the poets and Yāska must have been considerable. No doubt we find it amply proved by the divergences of opinion among his predecessors as quoted by him. Thus one of these, by the name Aurnavabha, interprets the word nāsatya as an epithet of Āsvins, as “True and False”; another Āgrayana, as “Leaders of Truth” (satyasya pravetilrau), while Yāska himself thinks it may mean “nose-born” (nāsika prabhavau).

Yāska, moreover, mentions several different schools of interpretations, each of which explained difficulties in accordance with its own particular theory. Yāska’s own interpretations, which in all cases of doubt

(f) यथो एतत् जानन्त संस्कारत ज्ञानसमिवाक्ये ।
   पुष्पायायः स भवति । प्रौढः प्रविष्टः प्रशस्ते ॥
   (N. I.16)
are based on etymology, are evidently often merely conjectural, for he frequently gives several interpretations of a word. Thus he explains the epithet jata-vedas in as many as five different ways.

But all this is due to the fact that Yaska flourished at the time which was quite far away from the ancient seers.

Whether there was any regular tradition of the Vedic interpretations preserved throughout the period which must have elapsed between the Mantras on the one hand and the Nirukta on the other, it is very difficult to decide in the present condition of the Vedic studies. Though, Europeans may not regard Yaska as infallible, still they cannot altogether neglect the precious help they receive from him.

The position of Yaska as an interpreter of the Vedas, is very high. It is beyond doubt that he occupies a place which no other commentator can dream of. His contribution is solid and based on scientific method of interpreting the Vedas. He is unrivalled in this domain. All commentators of all times to come, including Europeans, cannot move a step further without the help of the hidden treasure of the Nirukta, which is a source of inspiration to all. Roth, the founder of Philology, is erroneous in comparing Yaska with Sayâna and Mahidhara who could not properly follow and understand precisely what Yaska had said, yet who tried their best to follow into the footsteps of this great scholar of the Vedic learning. Yaska’s explanations are based on etymology and tradition. It is wrong to say that Yaska had no regard for traditional interpretation. He always quotes from the Brahmaṇas to support his derivative explanations. Even Roth himself has had to admit the greatness of Yaska over all other commentators:

“He (Yaska) too is a learned interpreter, who works with materials which his predecessors had collected but he possesses an incalculable advantage, in point of time, over those compilers of detailed and continuous commentaries and belongs to quite a different period, viz., when Sanskrit was still undergoing a process of natural growth.”

We are also not prepared to accept that Yaska’s explanations are quite conjectural and not based on the Vedic traditions. Although there are a few cases where the derivations offered by Yaska appear to be fanciful (which, if we study them deeply, will undoubtedly prove to be right ones), still in a large number of cases Yaska’s remarks are followed by iti ha brahmaṇam or iti vijñayate, which clearly indicates that the author possesses some basic traditions in support of which
he quotes passages. All these quotations could be traced but for the non-availability of the many Brahmanaş and the Śakhas. The Brahmanaş citations in the *Nirukta* have been collected and identified by Gupe.¹

A cursory reading of the *Nirukta* reveals that the Vedic studies were very popular at that time. The Vedas were read with great interest and devotion and a number of controversies regarding their meanings were current. Sometimes we find that the scholars held views quite opposed to each other. Therefore, we find that several older interpreters of the Vedas, both classes and individuals, are frequently mentioned by Yāśka. But unfortunately none of their works are available now-a-days. The following are the schools of the Vedic interpreters referred to in the *Nirukta*:

1. The Nairuktas

Of these, the Nairukta is the most general name, meaning thereby the old expounders of the Veda of the same type as Yāśka himself. The Nairukta school takes its stand on etymological derivations. They say that all nouns are derived from the verbal roots:

\[
\text{नामान्यावाच्यातत्वानि शाकटान्यनि नैशक्तसमयश्च} \tag{N. I.11}
\]

["All nouns are derived from the roots", thus says Śakaṭayana, and this is the view of the etymologists (the Nairuktas).]

But some grammarians (perhaps including Paṇini) and Gārgya maintain that *na sarvāni* (N. I.11), i.e. "not all", i.e. there are some nouns, e.g. *rūḍhis*, which are not derivative.

2. Vaiyākaraṇas

Yāśka also mentions his difference of opinion from the Vaiyākaraṇas (the grammarians) in the explanation of a Vedic stanza:

\[
\text{चत्वारि वाकू परिमिता पदानि} \tag{RV. I.164.45}
\]

According to the Nairuktas, the phrase, 'four-fold words', means 'Ṛg, Yajur, Sāma and the worldly usage'. But "the nouns, verbs, *upasargas* and *nīpatas* (prefixes and particles) are the four kinds of words" according to the Grammarians. (N. XIII.9)

¹ See "Bhandarkar Commemorative Volume".
3. Ārṣa

The third school is called Ārṣa. They explain the “four words” as bṛāṇār, and the Three Great Sayings (Mahāvyāhṛtis), i.e. bhūḥ, bhuvah and svah. (N. XIII.9)

4. The Yājñikas

According to the Yājñikas, i.e. the ritualists, the Mantras, Kalpas, Brāhmaṇas and the daily usages are the four kinds of words referred to in the Nirukta. (XIII. 9)

In addition to the exposition of the Veda in the stricter sense, there existed also liturgical interpretations of numerous passages such as we find in the Brāhmaṇas and other various treatises, in which it was attempted to bring the letter of the received text into harmony with the existing ceremonial. Such liturgical interpretations are called by Yaska, those of the Yājñikas. These Yājñikas in addition to an instance cited above have been referred to in the following cases:

(a) In the Nirukta (V.11) a Vedic verse एष्या प्रलिङ्ग (RV. VIII. 74.4) has been explained. According to Yājñikas here, the phrase sarānsi trīṇaṭ (i.e. thirty lakes) means trīṇaṭ ukthapatrāṇi (i.e. thirty uktha-patrāṇa) while according to the Nairuktas it refers to:

त्रिशतः अपरस्यस्य प्रहोरस्य; त्रिशतः पूर्वपल्लवः।

(b) According to the Yājñikas, a Mantra where no Devāta has been specified (anirdiṣṭa-devata) belongs to a Devāta of the Sacrifice or of the part of the Sacrifice. In other cases all Mantras have Prajāpati as their Devāta. But the Nairuktas accept nārā-sansa as Devāta in such cases:

यद्वेष्ट: स यतो यज्ञसि वा तद्वेष्टवत् स्वातः। प्रायथ्यव यज्ञसि प्राज्ञपश्य।

इति याज्ञिकः: नारासंसास्य इति नैवेक्तः। ॥ (N. VII.4)

(c) Anumati and rāka are synonyms of paurṇāṁśi (i.e. the full-moon night), while according to the Nairuktas they are devapatnīs (N. XI.29) (i.e. consorts of Gods).

(d) Similarly sinivalī and kuhū are amāvasyā (i.e. the moonless night) according to the Yājñikas but the Nairuktas take them to mean devapatnīs. (N. XI.31.32)
(e) *Gau* is *dharma-dhuk* according to the *Yajñikas* but the same is “the thuddering of the clouds” according to the *Nairuktas.*

\[(N. XI.41)\]

Similar is in the case of the word *dhenu.*

\[(N. XI.43)\]

5. The Ātmaprāvadāś

According to this school, the utterances of the cattle, musical instruments, animals and of the Ātma (i.e. human beings) are four types of words.

\[(N. XIII.9)\]

6. The Parivrājakas

This sect is referred to by *Yaska* while explaining the following Vedic stanza:

\[\text{रविकोष्ठ} निक्कर्तमाविशेष।\]

Here the Parivrājakas (the Samnyāsins) explain it as “A man with too many offsprings courts calamities” (रविकोष्ठ: क्रृष्णमावधते) while the Nairuktas interpret the word *nir-gṛtī* as “the earth” and the word *bahu prajāh* as “plenty of clouds”, i.e. the whole verse according to the Nairuktas refers to *varṣa-karma.*

\[(N. II.1)\]

7. The Pūrva-Yājñikas

A school of the Pūrva-Yājñikas also existed which appears to mean the “earlier liturgists”. According to them, the word *vaishvanara* means the “Āditya” (i.e. the sun), while *Yaska* takes it in the sense of the “terrestrial fire”.

\[(N. 7.22)\]

The following few schools mentioned in the *Nirukta* more frequently are very important so far as the Vedic interpretation is concerned.

8. The Ākhyāna Samaya

Here the word *samaya* denotes the idea of a sect or tradition \[(N. I.11)\]. While determining the form or appearance of the Devatās, *Yaska* refers to this school in the following words:

\[\text{यथा वा पुश्पविधानानेव सतं कर्मन्तम द्वेये रङ्गुः।}\]

\[\text{यथा यन्त्रो यज्ञानन्त्र्य एव चायक्ष्यानात्मव।} \]

\[(N. VII.7)\]

While discussing the appearances of the Devatās, *Yaska* offers four views: (1) that the Devatās have human forms or they are personal (Puruṣa Vidha); (2) they are impersonal (A-puruṣa Vidha); (3) they are
of both the types; (4) the fourth view is that which has been quoted above and according to this theory the Devatas may be personal sentient beings but they are manifested in the impersonal forms of Agni, Sūrya, etc., which are their "Karma-Ātmās", as the yajamana is a sentient person and he is manifested in his yajña—the sphere of his activities.

In the opinion of Yāska, there is One Supreme Being and all other Devatas are His limbs only:

एकस्यात्मनो श्रवे देवा: प्रायुप्ति प्रविश्यि (N. VII.4)

In addition to the above quotation, the word भ्राक्ष्यन has been used in the Nirukta seven times in the following contexts:

(a) Yāska explaining the verse:

यो जात एव प्रथमो समस्यानो ............. स जनास हर्षः (RV. II.12.1)

writes the following words:

अन्तः: कृद्यार्थः योगित्सांक्ष्यायामायांसंदुःक्ता।

[ Having visualised the (real) sense (of the Mantra) the seer takes delight (in finding) an भ्राक्ष्यन (i.e. symbolic story) associated with it.]

By this statement Yāska appears to convey that "the legends are associated with the Mantras." This is the cause of the metaphorical descriptions which we come across in the Vedas.

(b) The same sentence has been repeated in the Nirukta (X.46) under the verse:

एक: चुरणः त समुद्रम सिवेय (RV. X.14.4)

In the following places we come across the reference to भ्राक्ष्यन:

(c) अष्टर्विशः । सृगवः ।

साध्यायहि देवार्ग: इति नाशकः । वितर इत्यायांक्षम् ॥

[ The Atharvāṇas or Bhrigus are the Devatas of aerial region according to the Nairuktas while they are pitaras according to Ākhyana. ] (N. XI.19)

(d) देवगुणी इस्तेष भ्राह्ता पणिचिः प्रासुरः समूदः ।

इत्यायांक्षम् ॥ (N. XI.25)

[ "The witch sent by Indra had a talk with the panis." It is an Ākhyana. ]
(e) In *Nirukta* (XII. 41), Sādhyas are celestial beings according to the Nairuktas, while they are the Devatas of the earlier ages according to Ākhyana.

(N. XII.41)

(f) While explaining a verse (*RV*. I.8.16.1) from the *Rgveda*, Yaska quotes an Ākhyana:

\[
\text{प्राकर्ष्य उप्र प्रविनावदिवेनामिभ्रस्ता । तामसिक्षी प्रसुःतु । इवत्वास्यायनम् ।}
\]

[Usa, arrested by Aditya (i.e. sun), invoked Aśvins who rescued her. It is a (metaphorical) legend. ]

(N. V.21)

(g) Yaska explained (in the *Nirukta* (XI.34)) a verse from the *Rgveda* (X.10.14). Here he refers to an Ākhyana:

\[
\text{यम्या यम्य चक्मेः । तां प्रत्याचस्य । इवत्वास्यायनम् ।}
\]

[There is an Ākhyāna that Yami (i.e. the night) requested Yama (i.e. the day) for intercourse. Yama did not accept.] (N. XI.34)

It is a (metaphorical) legend. Here Yama and Yami are figuratively described as brother and sister. The Vedic verse denounces their marriage. According to the Nairukta (X.19) Yami is the thundering sound of the lightning. The roar of the lightning has been figuratively described as a cry of an amorous woman. The natural phenomenon has been explained poetically and symbolically by the Ākhyānist. We must remember the already quoted words of Yaska regarding these legends:

\[
\text{अध्ये: वृद्धास्य प्रीतिवसत्वास्यायनस्यूक्ता ।}
\]

[The seer finds pleasure in giving a tinge of tale to what he has perceived and realised.] (N. X.10)

9. The Aitiḥāśikas

The Aitiḥāśikas are generally referred to while noticing differences in the conception of the Vedic Devatas. As interpreters they take the euhemeristic view, according to which the gods of mythology were generally deified mortals and their deeds the amplification in imagination of human acts. We shall discuss this topic separately later on.

10. The Naidānas

According to some scholars the mode of interpretation adopted by the Naidānas is akin to that of the Aitiḥāśikas. By this, we may
probably understand that this method of explanation referred to the origin of the words and conceptions, to occasions which were in a certain sense historical. But Durga explains this term as निदानस्मित प्रावृत्तिः, तद्विद्य नैदानाः, i.e. the Nidāna is a book; persons who know it are called the Naidānas.

But we think that the Naidāna school was akin to the Nairukt; as because from the Nirukta, where the view of this school is mentioned twice, it is clear in the following contexts that they were etymologists and not Aitihāsikas (i.e. historians).

(a) In the Nirukta (VI.9), the word syāla has been explained as syālah āsāṃnah sahyogena iti naidānāḥ.

Here the word has been etymologically explained by the Naidānas.

(b) The word sāma is explained by this school as कृष्ण समं मेने हिं नैदानाः: (N. VII.12). Here too the Naidānas are quoted for their etymological explanation and nowhere else in the Nirukta these Naidānas are referred to.

Thus we can safely say that according to the Nirukta, there were ten schools of interpreters of the Veda during the time of Yāska.

In addition to these schools of thought, Yāska mentioned the following individual authorities by name in the Nirukta who were regarded as interpreters of the Vedas:

1. Āgrāyaṇa
2. Aupamanyava
3. Aurnavabha
4. Krauṣṭuki
5. Gālava
6. Carma Śiras
7. Taitiki
8. Śatavalakṣa
9. Śākapūrī
10. Son of Śākapūrī
11. Sthulaśththivi
12. Kathakya
13. Audumbarāyaṇa
14. Gargya
15. Gargyāyaṇi
16. Śakalya
17. Śakaṭayana
18. Kautsa

IMPORTANCE OF THE AITIHĀSIKA SCHOOL

Yāska attaches great importance to the method of interpretation (of the Veda) adopted by the Aitihāsikas (i.e. the historians). This view has been mentioned side by side with the Nairuktas, almost in all cases. It can be legitimately presumed that the Aitihāsika method was next to the
Nairuktas in importance and popularity. Yaska refers to them or quotes their view showing contrast with the Nairuktas in the following words:

1. हस्येतिहासिकाः—इति नेत्रकतः।
2. तत्रतत्त्वामालकतः।
3. तदविद्वादनी एषा अतर्घति।

The difference between these two views is that the words, which according to the Aitihasikas are "proper nouns" indicating some persons or things or places, are common nouns according to the Nairuktas who depend upon the general sense or quality expressed by etymological method. To illustrate this difference and to show what sort of explanations and interpretations are attempted in the Nirukta, we cite below a passage from the Nirukta (II.16) which refers to the meaning of the word *vrtra*:

तत् को यूँः ? येघं इति नेत्रकतः। त्वास्त्रेऽसुर हस्येतिहासिकाः। यष्ठं च ज्योतिष्ठर निमित्तामालकमणी वर्षकर्म नायते। त्वोपमाणं युद्धवर्णं वस्तित। प्रतिहतुन्तु
खलु मन्तवर्णं ब्रह्मवायवसत। विवृत्वा शरीरस्य नानाति निवारथायन्नक्कार।
तत्समन् हुते प्रस्त्यविन्ते प्रापः।

["Who was *Vṛtra*?" “A cloud”, say the Nairuktas (etymologists); “An asura, son of Tvaṣṭr,” say the Aitihasikas (story-tellers); the fall of rain arises from the mingling of the waters and of lightning. This is figuratively depicted as a conflict. The hymns and the Brahmanas describe *vṛtra* as a serpent: by the expansion of his body, he blocked up the streams. When he was destroyed, the waters flowed forth. ]

(N. II.16)

From this statement it is quite evident that Yaska did not share the view of the Aitihāsikas. Because the Nairuktas hold that the Vedas which are revealed works and eternal do not contain stories of the mortal beings. Therefore, he gives derivation of every word, including the so-called proper nouns, e.g. *Vṛtra* and *Indra*, which according to the Nairukta school are ‘a cloud’ and ‘the thunderbolt’. The phrase in the above-quoted citation, त्वोपमाणं युद्धवर्णं वस्तित, clearly points out that all these tales are figurative and denote some natural or spiritual aspect.

Instances can be multiplied but paucity of space does not permit too exhaustive a treatment. The following are the other places where Yaska has referred to the interpretations of the story-tellers; of course, Yaska has his own interpretation based on etymological derivations there also;
Now we give below a few principles (which Yaska enumerates) upon which the Nairuktas base their interpretation of the Vedic words:

(a) नामायाध्यात्मात्मानि हूति शाक्तायतो नेत्ततसमयशु। (N. I.12)

That is, all Vedic words are derivative or *yaugika*. Thus according to him no word in the Veda is *riṇīti*, i.e. conventional or proper noun. They indicate a general sense given by the etymology. Thus there is no scope for historians to smell a story here. Some scholars, taking into view a good number of explanations given by Yaska, wrongly conclude that Yaska was not sure about the meanings of words and thus he had no tradition behind. It is not just to say that Yaska who quotes Brāhmaṇas (*iti ha viṇāyate*) to support his view invariably had no tradition behind. The tentative explanations given by him cover the views of all schools because the Vedic words have no restricted meanings. The scope of the Veda is very vast and wide. Hence we are told in the *Manusmṛti*:

\[ \text{(MS. XII.100)} \]

\[ \text{(MS. XII.97)} \]

Thus the sphere of the Vedic conception is unlimited and unrestricted. The Vedic words have general application. Hence Yaska himself says:

(b) Yaska further declares that if we do not adhere to the *Nirukta* or its theory of interpretation, no clear idea of the Veda can be rightly understood. The study of the *Nirukta* leads to the right interpretation of the Vedas. He says:

\[ \text{(N. I.16)} \]

\[ \text{(N. I.17)} \]
(c) Yāska does not accept the existence of tales or legends in the Vedas. We have discussed this point above. The following citations deserve notice here:

तत्तत्त्वाय युद्धवर्णः स्वतः

"The war descriptions are merely figurative," i.e., these statements do not depict any reality. The cause of adopting such figurative method is:

अहं दृष्ट्यावतरेः प्रतितत्वत्वायाः स्वतः युद्धवर्णः

Skandasvami in his commentary on the Nirukta (II. 78) says:

एवमात्मानहुः पत्क्षरणं जड़माते निविष्यु च पत्क्षर्यं योजना कर्त्त्वयाः। एव शास्त्रं सिद्धांतं। प्राप्तारिको मन्त्रावधायानसम्य।।

That is, the legendary method followed in the Mantras is only figurative. In reality eternity (of the Veda) is the view of the Nairuktas.

Similarly in the Niruktasamuccaya (p. 71) we are told:

प्राप्तारिको मन्त्रावधायानसम्य।।

Durga also remarks:

युद्धवर्णं प्रतिनिधित्वाः सर्वश्राकारो हि निर्यविविधस्तब्याः। तदर्थाय प्रतिपत्तिः मुघणमेववेशपरकालाः।।

[ Here the Itihasa does not express any meaning. Its aim is to teach some moral to those who accept their meaning. ]

(d) Yāska does not attach too much importance to the case-endings and accents. The etymologist must give a sensible interpretation. He should aim at the meaning even at the cost of case-endings and accents. He says:

प्रयों निर्थयः परीक्षेत।

यथाय विलहतः सामसवेत।

कपासुतुस्तकृतः नाम स्याद। दृष्ट्यात्म तु स्वयं।

पद्वथयं प्रयम्या वा।

(e) In the Nirukta (V. 21) the word मासकृत्ति occurring in the Rgveda (I. 7.23.3) has been interpreted as मा + कृत (i.e. maker of months) and also as मा-सकृत्ति (i.e. once me). This shows that Yāska does not adhere too much to the Pada text. His aim is to give the exact and real meaning.
(f) Yāska does not always adhere to the theory that the linga (i.e. the word occurring in the Mantra) is the Devāta. The implied sense of the word is also regarded as Devāta in a Mantra. In the Nirukta (IX.11) a ratha (the word which does not occur in the Mantra) is accepted as its Devāta because it is conveyed by the word vanaspati there.

(g) In his commentary on the Nirukta, Skandasvāmi declares that every Mantra has triple sense—ādhyātmika, adhidaivika and ādhiyaśākika. He says:

सर्ववसनेव सर्वं मन्त्रं योजनय्या। कुसः ? स्यनेत्र भाष्यकारेऽसर्वं-
मन्त्राणां त्रिप्रकारो विवेधस्स्पर्शानाय “प्रथम वाचः गुणफलमाह।”

(N. I.20)

इति यज्ञीयानां पुष्पफलवेत्र प्रतिद्वानात्।

(N. VII.5)

(h) Tarka as a seer:

We cannot leave this topic without citing the following passage from the twelfth section of the 13th Chapter of the Nirukta, which implies antiquity of the Mantras and the necessary qualifications for interpreting them:

अयं मन्त्रायं चिन्तः अय्यं वृद्धिस्तः। अधि अधितो तर्कः। न तु पुष्पफलेऽसर्वं-
निवेद्यतः। प्रकरणशात् एवं तु निवेद्यतेः। न भौतु प्रत्यक्षेऽतथा—अनौऽ।
अतपसोः वा पारोपपविवेतु तु खतु वेदितुः पूर्वोऽविवेदः यस्यो भवति।
इति पुरस्तात्। मनुष्याः वा क्षीरोश्कामस्तु देवानां अभवन्। को न अधि: प्रविधिते
इति। तेभः एतत् तर्कमूळः प्रवश्यः। मन्त्रायं चिन्तः स्तर्पमेऽप्याशः।
तत्मात्
यदेन कष्ट्यानां चानानामहृत्यपूर्वते तदृ भवति।

(N. XIII 12)

[ The reflective deduction of the sense of the Mantras is effected by the help of oral tradition and reasoning. The Mantras are not to be interpreted as isolated but according to their contexts, for a person, who is not a seer or a devotee, has no intuitive insight into their meaning. We have said before that among those who are versed in tradition, he who is more learned deserves specific praise. When the Rṣis (seers) were ascending, men inquired of the gods, “Who shall be seer (Rṣi) ?” The gods gave them for a seer, (the science of) reasoning; the act of deducting by reflection the sense of the hymns. Therefore, whatever meaning any learned man deduces by reasoning possesses authority equal to Rṣis. ]
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Roth regards the 13th Chapter of the Nirukta, where this passage occurs, as a work of some author subsequent to Yāśka. But there is sufficient proof to establish that the ancients definitely admitted the necessity of Reason in the determination of religious truth of the interpretation of important or obscure scriptural texts. From this passage it is quite clear that the inductive method of interpretation was fully known to the ancients, including Yāśka.

PĀṆINI AND PATAṆJALI

No doubt, Yāśka refers to some grammarians in his work and there had been many grammarians before Yāśka, but their works could not survive. Pāṇini’s greatAstādhyāyī perhaps eclipsed all of them. Patanjali mentions 18 aims of studying grammar; one of them is the safe preservation of the Vedas: स्ताय वेदानमवेय व्याकरणम्. But still Pāṇini’s grammer mainly deals with the classical Sanskrit, i.e. the language spoken in the higher circles of the society of his period. He also treats Vedic forms as only irregularities or where they differ from the spoken language. He also states that the “subjunctive” (let) was used in the Vedic language only.

Dayānanda has quoted a few aphorisms from Pāṇini in his Bhūmikā to show the treatment of Vedic words as given by this great sage.

Pāṇini’s Astādhyāyī on occasions beyond number clearly admits all the principles of interpreting the Vedas which have been laid down by Yāśka.

Yāśka says, यथार्थ विभक्ति: संवत्सरपि, while Pāṇini echoes the same things as बहुलं च चारि सत्यवयो महत्तमस्. The author of the Mahābhāṣya (Patañjali) elucidates these aphorisms in the following verse:

सूतिः प्रफळो तंतुराणां कालवृत्तवित्रुख्यानां च ।
व्याकरणिष्ठिष्ठाति शास्त्रवहनेष्ठास्लिदिति बहुत्रूढ़िनः।

Thus we come to the maxim which Yāśka gives in the Nirukta: प्रथम विभिन्न च परस्परमित्रतः संस्कारानाधितेऽवरस्य, i.e., the interpreter should always attach importance to the sense and he should not care for the particular grammatical formations, because the logical interpretation is the supreme aim.

THE PURVAMIMĀMSA

It is one of the six systems of philosophy of ancient India. Its aim, in the words of Colebrooke, is “the interpretation of the Vedas”. Soma Nātha also says in his work, the Mayakhamala:

“Its purpose is to determine the sense of the Revealed Speech.”
But in reality the Pūrvaṁmaṇḍaṅga does not interpret the Vedic text in the manner of a commentary. It only lays down rules and canons for the proper application of the liturgical texts and for the ascertainment of the relative position and importance of the texts where they are mutually inconsistent. The following quotation is a fine specimen of the rules and canons which are laid down by the Mīmāṃsākās for this purpose:

[Direct mention, a mere indicatory mark, a sentence, context, order, or place of mention and etymology; when any of these circumstances referring to the same text leads to inconsistent conclusions, every following circumstance is weaker than every preceding one, and therefore must yield to it.]

PREDECESSORS OF SAYANA

There were 16 interpreters of the Vedic texts who flourished before the advent of the great commentator Sāyaṇa. From a cursory study of their works it becomes quite evident that the vital and all inclusive method of interpretation adopted by Yāska and his predecessors was long forgotten now. The predecessors of Sāyaṇa took it for granted that the whole Vedic text meant nothing but rituals. It was a wrong notion, under which these writers toiled hard and produced commentaries referring to nothing but the sacrificial process. Yāska did not cherish this false notion. His explanations are general and adhidaivika. We never come across a single instance from the Nirukta where explanation of a particular text refers to the ritual performance. Thus we find that gradually the significance of the Vedas was made narrower and narrower.

The following 16 commentators preceded Sāyaṇa:

1. Skandasmṛti
2. Durga (in the commentary of the Nirukta)
3. Udgīthā
4. Harīsmṛti (in the Śatapatha)
5. Urvāsta (Yajurveda Bhāṣya)
6. Vararuci (in the Niruktasamuccaya)
7. Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara (Taittiriya Samhitā & Taittiriya Bhāṣya)
8. Veṅkaṭa Madhava (Ṛg Bhāṣya)
9. Ātmānanda (Asya Vamiya Bhāṣya)
10. Ānanda Tīrtha (40 hymns of the Ṛgveda)
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11. Śatrughna (in Mantra Dūpika)
12. Guṇaviṣṇu (Chandogya Mantra Bhāṣya)
13. Madhava (Sāmaveda)
14. Bharatavāmi (Sāmaveda)
15. Devapala (in the Bhāṣya of (Laugakṣi Gṛhya)
16. Anandabodha (Kārva Śakha)

To this list Nara Sinh Yati is to be added (Jayalīṛtha Tīkā and Chalāri Tīkā).

17. Sāyāna (Ṛg, Sāma, Atharva and Kārva Śakha).

1 & 2. Skandasvāmi and Durga

The earliest commentary available on the Rgveda, after Yaska, was written by Skandasvāmi, who was also the author of a commentary on the Nirukta. Durga’s Bhāṣya on the Nirukta is also very popular. Both these scholars can rightly claim a very high place among the interpreters of the Vedas.

The following few points, related to the method of interpreting the Vedic text, are common to both of them. These are the basic principles, which were shown by Yaska (quoted by us above) and which were gradually forgotten or neglected by the later writers of the Vedic commentaries.

(a) According to Yaska all the hymns or Mantras have triple meanings. They should and can be interpreted to denote the three types of significance, i.e., the āl̄yātmika, ādhiḍaivaika and ādhiyañjaika. Skanda and Durga, both hold this view and they clearly express this fundamental principle in unambiguous terms.

Skanda says:

सर्वार्द्धोऽनि च सर्व मन्त्र योजनाय:। कुत्। । स्वयमव भाववेकरण विद्याक्षर्य विविधस्य सममेन्त्राणि प्रवसानाय ॥ अर्थ वाचः पुष्पकल्पस्य (N. I.25) इति यज्ञोऽर्थे पुष्पकल्पवेन प्रतिक्रियोऽनि ॥ (SK. N. VII.5; Bhāṣya III, pp. 36,37)

[ All Mantras are to be interpreted according to all systems of philosophy; because the Bhāṣyakāra (Yaska) himself has declared that all Mantras imply three meanings, as he has stated that sense is the flower and fruit of the (revealed) speech, i.e., the yajñas, etc., are the puspaphalas (of the Vedic words). ]

Similarly Durga echoes the same purport in more explicit terms:

तत् तव सन्त प्रतिवन्यायमः प्रायोगवद्यम भविष्यत्वमः। त एवे वक्तुरुपायवशात् प्रयात्यस्य प्रश्नमयी श्रजसे मन्त्र:। न हीनेशु प्रवर्त्येयस्मादवार्हणमिति। सहारेन हीनेशु
Interpretations of the Mantras vary corresponding to the various applications. (The sense) of the Mantras changes in accordance with the intention of the user because the power of expression (of the hymns) has never been restricted. They have unlimited implications and are hard to be fully comprehended. As a good or a better horseman makes a horse good or better, so the Mantras denote good or better senses when they are handled by a learned or a more learned interpreter.

Thus the explanations of words given in this treatise are only indicative and suggestive of other meanings. They have the adhyatmika, adhidaivika and adhiyajika applications. Therefore, whatever meaning appears to be reasonable (pertaining to any category of the above-mentioned meanings) should be accepted as right. None should find fault here.

Again on page 211, he writes: प्रकरणमालमेवमुपवर्तित अध्यकारण, i.e., “the Bhāṣyakāra (Yāska) has shown only the way (of interpretations).”

Again in the Nirukta (VII. 6) Durga repeats the same theme in different words.

These two citations from Skanda and Durga make it quite clear that the system and the procedure of interpreting hymns in the above-noted three systems, which were very common with Yāska, have come down to Skanda and Durga also. Both these scholars have clearly declared here that the Mantras are to be interpreted in three different manners. But we shall see later on that this tradition or convention of the earlier Vedic scholars could not reach Sāyaṇa, the great commentator of the Vedas who interpreted the Vedas only according to Mīmāṃsaka school.

(b) The other common point between Skanda and Durga is that they accept the principle that svara (accent) and samāskāra (particular grammatical formations) should not be much adhered to while explaining a word or stanza. It is only the sense which should play a predominant role here. Durga says:

(i) एवं व्याकरणेष्ठि लक्षणप्रदाने सति प्रयत्नोऽिनो लोपागमो विपरितारथ शब्दानां बुद्ध:। कृष्णु निकृष्टे यद्यप्राधान्ये ॥ (N. II.2; Tīkā, p. 102)
Skanda also shares this view and adds:

हिम्मयम् यथम्वृत्तिकन्यि-निमित्तो यथा प्रतीतं हित्वेबर्तमाणः।

[Conventional (rūdhi) meanings are impossible (in the Vedas). Hence attempt should be made to discover the derivative sense.]

(N. I.15; Tikā, p. 92)

The same principle has been followed by Durga in the Tikā (pp. 276, 324). All this goes to show that in explaining the Vedas conventional method should not be followed but care should be taken to adopt the method of etymological explanation.

(c) The third point of similarity between these two scholars is that both of them accept the view of the Nirukta that the Vedas do not contain any human story or any other story. They are followers of the Nairukta school referred to already.

3. Udgītha (687)

He is also a follower of the Nirukta school and his Bhaṣya is similar to that of Skanda. He also accepts the yaugikavāda. Following the method of the etymologists, he interprets the word यज्ञ as रश्म while explaining the verse (RV. X.82.3) यथा सप्तक्षेपिनः पर एकमाहः।

4. Harṣiyāmi

He was a pupil of Skanda and accepts his teacher's views. He did not write any commentary on a Saṁhitā but only on the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, which has come down to us only in one fragmentary manuscript. We have cited above from this MS (p. 2) a passage showing that the Śākhās are the glosses of the Vedas.

5. Uvaṭa

His Bhaṣya on the Yajurveda is chiefly adhiyajña but in the following places we get the “triple meanings”:

YV. VII. 42, YV. X, 16, YV, XXXIII, 74.
6. **Vararuci**

He is the author of the *Niruktasamuccaya*, which is only available in quotations by Skanda. He also declares that निरूक्तशिलपुरोच्चचनम् मन्त्रा निरुक्तशास्त्रः, i.e., “the Mantras are to be explained in accordance with the Nairukta school.”

7. **Bhaṭṭabhaśkara (11th century A.D.)**

He wrote commentaries on the *Taittiriya Saṁhitā*, the *Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa* and the *Taittiriya Aranyaka*. His style is akin to that of Sayāṇa. We come across some very interesting derivative meanings of some words given in the *Taittiriya Samhitā*:

(a) गाबो = गातार:।

(b) यज्ञ = परसामायम्।

(c) क्षीवलसम् = इन्सरस्।

He accepts the principle of interchange in accent and grammatical formations, e.g., case-endings.

8. **Veṅkaṭa Mādhava**

He wrote a Bhāṣya on the *Ṛgveda* and follows the Yajñika school. His commentary is very brief. His Bhāṣya is full of informations regarding accents, etc. A comprehensive commentary by Mādhava on the *Ṛgveda* has been published from Adyar.

9. **Ātmananda (1200-1300 V. E.)**

He wrote an exhaustive commentary on a hymn beginning with the verse *Asya Vamtiya*. He refers to Skanda and others (on p. 3) and says that they interpreted Vedas on the lines of Yājnikas but he would give the adhyatmika interpretations only. Again on p. 60 he writes:

प्रधियतसिद्धाद्विद्यायम् । निरूक्तशिलपुरोच्चचनम्।

इवंद्व भाष्यमाध्यमासस्विद्यायम् । न च सिद्धविद्यायां विरोध:।

[ The Bhāṣyas of Skanda, etc., are adhyāyāna (i.e. contain liturgical explanations) while the sphere of the *Nirukta* is adhidaivata (i.e. pertaining to physical forces). But this commentary of ours is adhyātma (i.e. refers to the self or soul).]

According to him, the word अग्नि means अग्निः, i.e., Supreme Being.
10. Anandatirtha (1255-1335 V.E.)

He wrote a commentary on the first 40 hymns of the Rgveda. Jayatirtha added a gloss to this commentary and this gloss has been again elucidated by another commentary called "Chalari" by Narasimhapati. Here Viṣṇu is the chief God and all Mantras are addressed to him.

Anandatirtha and Jayatirtha accept the triple significance of the Mantras. The latter clearly writes:

निष्कल्पवाच्यां बाह्यकर्मकर्मसंभवं। उपनिषदवाच्यां माध्यमकर्मसंभवं। विशेषवस्त्रवे वेदान्तां वैमाण्डः।

(p. 6)

In the Chalari Tika also we get such remarks in the similar words.

Rāghavendra Yati followed this principle in his Mantrartha Maitiṣjarī and remarked:

ग्राम्याविहीतवत्तपत्तमयां प्राध्यामपरस्तेन च इत्येवं प्रत्यपरस्तयं व्याख्यातानि।

(p. 2)

Here the Mantras have been explained in the above-said three ways. Again he supports his interpretation by adding the following remarks:

विष्णु: सर्वत्रसार्थीतिपादः सर्वेदानां विशेषवस्त्रवस्तः।

Viṣṇu (i.e. the Omnipresent and All Pervading Soul) is the main theme of all the Vedas as all the Vedas lead to the realisation of the Omnipresent Lord (Viṣṇu).

It deserves notice here that all the post-Yāska interpreters of the Vedas, including Saṅga, explained the Vedas only in the liturgical sense, except Atnāṇanda and Anandatirtha to whom the entire credit of preserving the process of triple Vedic interpretation goes. Only these two scholars continued the old tradition of adhyatmika explanation, in spite of the fact that their sphere was very limited and they interpreted only a very small part of the Veda.

11. Śatrughna

He is the author of the Mantrartha-Dipikā. He follows the method of etymological explanation and shares the view that the Vedas contain three kinds of significance in every verse. The following citation shows that the Supreme Being who is One without a second is worshipped and glorified by various names in the Vedas:

यः बेव: पुष्चः परमात्मास्यस्यन्योजनातः तत्तव प्रशांसार्थ नानास्वप्नाभ्यां तद्गतिः।

"समेतमिति" यः पुष्चः उक्तः स परमात्मास्य व्याख्येयः।

(p. 250)
12. Guṇaviśṇu

He is the follower of the Mīmāṃsā school and all Mantras according to him refer to some sacrificial aspect. On page 116 of his Chandogya-mantrabhāṣya, he states: विनियोगो जहायने, i.e., the Mantra has its application to the Brahmayājī, and it is the only instance where he has shown a little departure from the traditional application.

13. Mādhava

He wrote commentary on the Samaveda.

14. Bharatāsvāmī (1350 V. E.)

He, like Mādhava, wrote commentary on the Samaveda. Both these commentators have the same notions about the Vedic interpretation. For instance, they explained the word *atri* as *adana-śīla* on pp. 17 and 61 respectively.

15. Devapāla

He explained and interpreted a few Vedic stanzas, quoted in the commentary of Laugākṣigīthyasutra. On pages 27, 55, 57 and 60, he accepted the *adhyātmika* and *adhidaivika* significance of the Vedas. Hence he interpreted the words Indra and Āditya as Supreme Lord.

Besides the above-mentioned predecessors of Śāyaṇa, the following minor Bhāṣyakāras also deserve a little notice here:

16. Ānandahodha (*Kauṇa Śākhā*)

17. Anantācārīya (*Yajurmaiijari*)

18. Mudgala (*Paraskaramantrabhāṣya*)

19. Veṅkaṭeśa (*Taittirīya Samhita*)

From this critical examination of these Vedic commentaries, it is quite evident that the predecessors of Śāyaṇa maintained and preserved the old tradition of interpreting hymns in the ‘Triple-Process’. Unfortunately this time-honoured tradition could not reach Śāyaṇa, the great interpreter of the Vedas, who gave invariably sacrificial explanations everywhere.

**ĀCĀRYA ŚAYAṆA**

The most important contributions to the Vedic exegesis (after Yāska) were made by the great Śāyaṇa, who wrote Bhāṣyas on all the four Vedas. His *Vedārthaprakāśa* is a regular commentary on the *Rgveda*, and has a very informative and learned introduction.
In this commentary, the author has paraphrased each and every word in the text. All grammatical peculiarities, along with etymological derivations of obscure words, are given at proper places. He has also explained the liturgical application of each and every verse. It is unfortunate that Sāyaṇa believed that the entire Vedic text is related to yajñas or rituals. He has therefore taken special pains to explain each and every verse in accordance with the ritualistic school. Even the secular hymns have been shown possessing some sacrificial applications. He openly declared that the Vedas have no other purpose than sacrifices:

शाख्याश्च यज्ञेषु प्राचायणल व्याक्तः पुरा।
यज्ञोत्तवोऽन्तरायायस्वेदे व्याकरिष्यते॥

Thus his scope of interpretation is very narrow and limited. Yāska has never restricted the Vedas to one particular view or at least to the Ādhiyājñīka school. We have proved above that Skanda and Durga admitted the triple process of interpretation of the Vedas.

Sāyaṇa was the minister of Bukka Raya, the king of Vijayanagar (now in ruins) near Hampi on the Tungabhadra river. Bukka and Harihara were brothers and founded the empire of Vijayanagar about the middle of the 14th century A.D. It was under their patronage that Sāyaṇa and his brother Madhava, who was regarded as Guru by the princes, did all their literary activities. Sāyaṇa’s other works are:

(a) Commentary on Aitareya Brāhmaṇa
(b) Commentary on Aitareya Āranyaka
(c) Commentary on Taittiriya Samhita

Professor Macdonell has pointed out some principles of modern criticism which according to him would have been entertained by Sāyaṇa while interpreting the Vedas. These rules of higher criticism ought to have been adopted and followed. Thus the commentary of Sāyaṇa, viewed from this standpoint, is full of defects, and this cannot be denied. But before criticising Sāyaṇa on this point, we must take into consideration the basic idea of Vedic conception held by the author. It would be unfair to criticise him without properly understanding him. To Sāyaṇa, the Veda was a holy book—a store-house of wisdom, secular and philosophical, whose authority was not to be questioned. Every word of it was sacred and consequently it was not possible for him to apply the rules of modern criticism to it.
From the critical examination of his commentary we can safely say that no living tradition relating to Vedic interpretation has reached Sāyaṇa. In case an obscure word occurs, he is indefinite about its meanings. He would propose more than one significance without giving his preference. Sometimes he connects verb with a subject without agreement in point of person or number. He also believes in धातुनामनेकार्यदर्शन, i.e., a root has more than one meaning. This principle has been adopted by him times without number to serve his purpose. Like Yāska, he depends chiefly upon the derivative meaning. He finds no hesitation to add a word or words to make the sense complete.

He invariably quotes passages from the Sarvanukramaṇī, the Brhaddevata, Brāhmaṇas and Āraṇyakas. Wherever possible he cites from the Nirukta in the words: अनिष्कत्वम्.

There is great self-contradiction in Sāyaṇa, regarding the Vedic legends. In his Upodghaṭa he refuted his opponent, who criticised the Vedic text as full of human legends and stories and thus it could not be regarded as revealed and eternal, by saying that the Vedas did not contain human and other tales. The Vedic words are used to denote general sense, i.e., these words are not proper nouns but are common nouns implying common quality of a person or a thing. In support of his theory, he cited a few aphorisms from the Mīmāṃsā, e.g., परस्तु श्रूतिसामाल्य-मात्स्य; आश्वेय श्रद्धानात्; उक्तमु शल्वूर्वत्वम्; quoted by us already. Then he proceeds to explain the significance of the so-called historical words or proper nouns by taking their etymological derivative sense. Thus according to him, the Vedas do not contain tales or myths. But it is a strange feature that he forgets all at once this forcibly established theory, while actually he comments upon the Vedic text. This self-contradiction is very hard to reconcile. Not only this, but he explains the so-called Vedic myths in the light of later Paurāṇika ideas with whose influence, of course, he is strongly imbued. Thus Paurāṇika influence is sometimes too much to be found in him. Thus while explaining the occasion of certain hymns, Sāyaṇa quotes legends which are absolutely unrelated to and incongruous with the spirit of the hymns. One instance I would cite here, which will indicate that the sense of the hymns was altogether forgotten or not completely comprehended. In hymn X.121 the last words of every verse are कर्मं देवाय हृदिया विरीमि, which literally mean: “What God should we adore with an offering?” It is a natural and simple question or a yearning of the human heart to search after that God who is the origin of this universe, the first seed and the shaper of all life.
and is one without a second (एक धातुत्). There is a natural desire in every human heart to know that Un-knowable.

Now Śāyaṇa explains this word kasmāi and the hymn in a Paurāṇika way. Here he remarks: ‘क शब्दानिवेश्याप्रजापतिधेवत, i.e., the god Prajāpatis is expressed by the word ka here. As we already pointed out, every hymn, every verse, must have a reference to a sacrifice and thus must have a deity according to him. For this purpose he goes as far as to discover a deity where none exists. He, therefore, raised the most ordinary things, e.g., stones, drums, grass and axe, to the artificial rank of deities. Following this principle Śāyaṇa here, neglecting altogether the real sense of the whole hymn and the deep yearning of the devotee or a poet for the unknown God, raises the interrogative pronoun itself to the rank of deity and admits a god ka or ‘who?’ In his commentary he gives the following introductory remarks to this hymn:

अत कि शब्दानिवेश्याप्रजापतिधेवत् प्रजापति वर्तति। यहा सूक्ष्मतय कामयते इति कः।
का: प्रजापति। यहा क सूचयें। तदूपस्वत् क हृतहुयः। अतः का कथितम्।
संस्कृत: प्रजापति: मर्या महत्व: तुष्य: प्रदय: धर्म: क दोषाम्: स्मारितम्।
यदीवः स्ववीचिः अहं कः स्मारितम्। तदेव तव: स्ववेचि। अतः कारणात् कः इति
प्रजापतिराजायते।

Thus we see here four different explanations attributed to the word ka.

The notion, that the Vedas were written simply for the sake of sacrifices and that whatever interpretation is fit for sacrifices can be assigned to these hymns, has vitiated the whole system of Vedic exegesis in India.

As every thing looks yellow to a jaundiced person, so Śāyaṇa smells sacrifices in every word of the Veda. The very ordinary words which have not even the remotest sense of sacrificial acts, e.g., jana, manusya, jantu, nara, rī, mātra, etc., (which mean a man or group of men) have been explained as Yajamana, i.e., a sacrificer. For instance:

(a) RV. I.60.4 सानुषेऽऽयजपानात्वै
(b) RV. I.68.4 मनोरम्येऽयजस्वात्पायाध्यवस्त्य
(c) RV. I.128.1 मनुः: मनुष्यस्य यजमानस्य
(d) RV. I.140.12 जनानः: यजमानात्वै
(e) RV. V.16.2 जनानानानामः: यजमानानानामः
(f) RV. I.31.15 विसामः: यजमानानानाणाम यजानानामः
(g) RV. III.8.5 तरः: कर्मणानेतारः: प्रजापतिवियः
How strange it is that Śāyāna finds every man in this world as a sacrificer due to the wrong conception that the Vedas mean only ritual's!

We have proved above beyond doubt that Yaska, Skanda, Durga, Ātmānanda, Jayatirtha and other commentators clearly admitted that every verse in the Veda had three types of significance, i.e., pertaining to Soul (or the Supreme Soul), elements and yajñas. But the scope of Śāyāna is entirely limited and narrow as he miserably neglected two major aspects of the Vedic interpretation and only the Yājñika process has been imposed on every verse. We cite below a few instances from Śāyāna which will clearly show that the words Agni and Indra therein cannot mean sacrificial fire because of the qualifying adjectives which lead us to the conclusion that they imply some Omniscient Power:

(a) नृणां नृत्समोनिस।

(b) यज्ञिन विध्रयम।

(c) वर्ण्दु हिजन्यानम्।

(d) यज्ञिन सुरोहितम्।

(e) हर्षं विध्यज्ञितम्।

(f) युवा कविरमितीजः।....इतः।

(g) उवं हि राजा वर्णरचयाः।

(h) याने।....ब्रजि वजेद भाषुः।

MERITS OF ŚAYANA

Here we have pointed out some defects in Śāyāna’s interpretation. But this is not all. The other side of the picture is yet to be painted. Let us imagine what the condition of the Vedic scholarship would have been today, had there not been the Vedic (thaprakāśa) of Śāyāna. This great interpreter of the Veda belonging to the 14th century has left no word unexplained, however obscure it may be. It would be better if we cite below a few words from Prof. M. Müller’s preface to the Vedic Hymns:

“It is well known to them who have followed my literary publications that I never entertained any exaggerated opinion as to the value of the traditional interpretation of the Veda, handed down in the theological schools of India and preserved to us in the great commentary of Śāyāna. More than twenty years ago, when it required more courage to speak out than now, I expressed my opinion on that subject in no ambiguous language and was blamed for it by some of them who now speak of
Sāyāna as a mere drag, in the progress of Vedic scholarship. Even a drag, however, is sometimes more conducive to the safe advancement of learning than a whip: and those who recollect the history of Vedic scholarship during the last five and twenty years know best that with all its faults and weaknesses, Sāyāna’s commentary was a sine qua non for a scholar-like study of Rgveda. I do not wonder that others who have more recently entered on that study are inclined to speak disparagingly of the scholastic interpretations of Sāyāna. They hardly know how much we all owe to his guidance in effecting our first entrance into this fortress of Vedic language and Vedic religion and how much even they, without being aware of it, are indebted to that Indian Eustathius. I do not withdraw an opinion which I expressed many years ago and for which I was much blamed at that time, that Sāyāna in many cases teaches us how the Veda ought not to be, rather than how it ought to be understood. But for all that, who does not know how much assistance may be derived from a first translation, even though it is imperfect; nay, how often the very mistakes of our predecessors help us in finding the right track? If now we can walk without Sāyāna we ought to bear in mind that five and twenty years ago, we could not have made even our first steps, we could never at least have gained a firm footing without his leading strings. If, therefore, we can now see further than he could, let us not forget that we are standing on his shoulders.”

This is all right. Sāyāna fills a gap in the history of the Vedic interpretation which otherwise would have remained unfilled. Pischel and Geldner assign a positive value to this great commentator. He often hints the right meaning of a word. For instance, the word purīṣa means ‘water’. Roth, who believed that any European exegetist can understand and interpret the Veda better than an Indian—reminds that all Indian interpreters explain the word purīṣa as ‘water’, whereas the word actually means ‘land’. But this statement is open to challenge. Undoubtedly Sāyāna, in a number of cases, paraphrases this word as udaka, i.e. water; but in RV. X. 27.21 the word पूरीताः (Abl, Sing., from purīṣa) has been translated as पूरकाः मण्डलाः. Here Sāyāna is still more forward than Roth. Purīṣa means ‘orb, circle’, and here it is used to denote

1. I doubt this very much even today.
the word मण्डल, 'a region, domain, land, earth', as opposed to the 'sea' or 'ocean'. Again in the Taittirīya Samhitā (IV. 3.1) Śaṅkara remarks: दुरोधश्चत्व न गहाविनताः स्वतवत्. Thus we find that the meaning which Roth assigns to the word पुरिशा was well known to the Indian scholar and was accounted for in a more reasonable way. While explaining the verse from the Nadi Sūkta of the Rgveda, Yāska (N. II.22) interprets the word पुरिशा as पौरणते: or पूरयते:, i.e., it is derived from the root प्र, to protect or to complete. Yāska also takes it in the sense of water on the authority of the Nightaṇṭu (I. 12).

Śaṅkara prefaced each hymn by specification of its seer or रशि: of the deity or deities to whom it is addressed; of the rhythmical structure of the several stanzas and of the viniyoga, the application of the hymn, or of portion of it, to the religious rites at which they are to be repeated.

He mentions several schools and works but does not throw any light upon the exact sources of information which he employs in his works. Thus he refers to the following:

(a) Bhaṭṭabhāskara Miśra (b) Skandasvāmi
(c) Kapardisvāmi (d) The Nairuktas
(e) The Aitihāsikas (f) The Purāṇikas
(g) The Śabdikas (h) The Sampradāyavidas
(i) The Ātmavidas (j) Brddhaśāsanam
(k) Purvaḥśaṣṭhikāras (l) Apare, etc.

MAHIDHARA

Mahidhara was equally an important commentator on the Yajurveda; but from his Bhāṣya it is quite evident that he was a Vāma Margi and believed in the Tantrika school of ritualists. It is useless to quote here a number of instances as the following one instance will convince the reader that something was seriously wrong with him. While explaining the Mantra (IV. XXIII.19) गणपतिः गणपतिः गणपतिः, etc., he remarks:

'Here the word गणपति means a horse'. Then he adds: महिद्धो वज्ञानस्य परी यज्ञशास्त्रोपय अवस्थामध्यस्तत्वसम्बन्धो शेते। शायरात् सत्यात् है प्रवः......

...... अयंतरः।
"The wife of the sacrificer, in the presence of all the priests, lies with the horse nearby and then she addresses the horse and requests him....."

Thus Mahidhara interprets this and the following nine verses in words which are not reproducible even in the semi-obscurity of a learned European language. Here Mahidhara deserves all censure for going too far to translate the word ganapati (i.e. Lord of multitudes) in the sense of a horse—which has no support in the entire Sanskrit language. For comparison I give below the English rendering of Dayānanda's Bhaṣya here:

"We invoke Thee, O Lord and Protector of the numerous orders; who art also the Lord of all that is dear and near to us—of all the treasures and precious objects (e.g. knowledge and wealth). Thou pervadest (this world)."

We feel, when we see that a very well-known and simple word, like ganapati, has been interpreted as 'horse', that Mahidhara's mind was not free from ill-conceived pre-notions against Vedic teaching. Actuated by such grossly erroneous ideas, he wrote whatever he could. He ought to have read and consulted the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa in this connection before he proceeded to comment upon such Mantras.

DAYĀNANDA AS THE INTERPRETER OF THE VEDAS

We have already discussed and critically examined all the interpreters of the Vedas, whose works have come down to us. All of them deserve praise for their scholarly Vedic exegesis. But Dayānanda, who was a great son of India, possessed spiritual insight, which enabled him to peep deeply into the Vedic lore. He was an inspired seer. He was a profound scholar whose equal India could not produce after the great Śaṅkara. It was left to him, once more, during modern times, to show the way to the world, regarding the method of the proper and correct understanding of the Vedas. Dayānanda, whose biographical detailed character we have

1. Cf. : प्रजापति: वे जनमति: । सौरसमेत: । कपड़ वा ग्राहः ।
विधि इतरे पता: । सातस्पक्तत् रुपं वर्ण ह्रदयः ॥
(SB. XIII.2.11) and (SB. XIV.15.16.17)
Also : राष्ट्रमान्येष: । (SB. XIII.2.11)
Again : इत्यवर्ते वा लक्ष: । (SB. XIII.3.8.8)
dealt with in Appendix I (pp. 462-488), lived from 1824 to 1883 and devoted his whole life to the propagation of the Vedic knowledge.

**Style**

His translation of the Vedas is always preceded by a full analysis of each and every word, along with the grammatical and etymological explanation. Then follows the meaning of every word, then explanation of the whole, and finally the commentary and its general purport as he understood it.

All this was done in Sanskrit, which has been translated into Hindi in full, for him by the Panditadas, employed for this purpose. It was one of the boldest acts of his life to have issued a translation of the Vedas in Hindi, the national language of India, since this translation had never been attempted before. This fact should be the best proof of the transparency and honesty of his motives.

**Obscurity of the Veda**

Before we go further to critically assess the value of Dayananda's translation, it must be borne in mind that it was not a child's play to comprehend the Vedas in the real sense, much less to interpret them, at the time when no oral or written tradition could reach us from prehistoric days. In 1869 when Prof. M. Müller brought to light the first edition of his *Vedic Hymns (Part I)*, he described his hard labour as one of “deciphering”, and it is not a strange thing that he repeated the same feeling in the same words after more than 20 years, when he published the second and the revised edition of the same work. He remarked:

“I hold that they (i.e. the first translators) ought to be called decipherers.”

His adversaries ridiculed him on publishing a translation of the Vedas. According to them this work ought to have been attempted in the next century. Prof. M. Müller referring to his opponents (a whole host of German scholars) again remarked:

“There is another point also on which I am quite willing to admit that my adversaries are right. ‘No one who knows anything about the Veda’, they say, ‘would think of attempting a

translation of it at present. A translation of the *Rgveda* is a task for the next century.”¹

At another place, he says:

“If by translation we mean a complete, satisfactory and final translation of the whole *Rgveda*, I should feel inclined to go even further than Prof. Von Roth. Not only shall we have to wait till the next century for such a work but I doubt whether we shall ever obtain it.”²

Here M. Müller compares his own translation of the 165th hymn of the first Mandala of the *Rgveda* with that of Professor Von Roth, and concludes that a comparison like this:

“... will disclose the unsettled state of Vedic scholarship, but the more fully this fact is acknowledged, the better. I believe, it will be for the progress of our studies. They (i.e. European interpretations of the Vedas) have suffered more than anything else from the baneful positivism which has done so much harm in hieroglyphic and cuneiform researches. That the same words and names should be interpreted differently from year to year is perfectly intelligible to every one who is familiar with the nature of the decipherments. What has seriously injured the credit of the studies is that the latest decipherments have always been represented as final and unchangeable ........ When we come to really difficult passages, the Vedic hymns often require a far greater effort of divination than the hymns addressed to Egyptian or Babylonian deities.

The Veda, I feel convinced, will occupy scholars for centuries to come and maintain its position as the most ancient of books in the library of mankind.”³

**Baneful Positivism**

Professor M. Müller undoubtedly voices the general feelings and a crying grievance when he complains of the “baneful positivism” of the European scholars as to interpretations which are little better than hypothetical conjectures. The findings of the European scholars regarding

2. Ibid., p. xxi.
3. Ibid., p. xxxi.
the Vedic civilisation and culture are based upon these interpretations where “the same words and names” are interpreted differently from year to year and thus they cannot be regarded as conclusive. Sometimes these scholars have given their verdict by judging these ancient civilisations by Christian or other modern standards. They at once forget that all standards are mutable and are modified and reformed before their own eyes.

We are undoubtedly grateful to these European scholars for the time and hard toil they have put in on Vedic research. Coming generations of India, who would devote themselves to the study and interpretation of the Vedas, would derive great inspiration from these researches which are so valuable and needed.

But we cannot help remarking that their hasty conclusions as to the worth of the Vedic religion and culture have done a great and unnecessary harm by creating a mass of prejudice against the Vedas in the minds of the Hindus. The Missionary propagandists made a good use of it and condemned the Vedas in the positive terms at their command. They quoted these translations and consequently educated Indians began to reject the Vedas and accepted Christian thoughts—though not (in some cases) Christian religion.

Dayānanda Stem in the Tide

Śvāmī Dayānanda stood up and made up his mind to stem the powerful flow of anti-Vedic current by interpreting the Vedas in the style which he called ārṣa (i.e. the style of the seers).

A Christian Missionary writes about Dayānanda in the following words:

“..........He devoted himself entirely to the study of the Vedas from his 11th year and thus he is more practically conversant with them than most, if not all, of the great Pandits of Benaras, who generally know them only at second-hand or even less. At any rate, and this is the most remarkable feature distinguishing him from other Pandits, he is an independent student of the Vedas, and free from the trammels of traditional interpretation. The standard commentary of Sāyānā is held of little account by him. It can be no wonder, therefore, that his Vedic studies, conducted in that spirit, led him to the conviction that almost the whole of the (comparatively) modern Hinduism is
in entire and irreconcilable contradiction with the Vedas and the Hinduism of Vedic times, about 2,000 years ago. Being of an active character, he determined not to keep his conviction to himself, but to impart it to his countrymen and try to effect an entire reform of Hindu Society.\textsuperscript{11}

Thus we see that Dayānanda was not an ordinary interpreter of the Vedas, like Sayana, etc., who have no definite aim and object and whose visions were narrow and dominated by the Paurāṇika influence and notions. His study of the Vedas was independent and was conducted in a spirit of the highest reverence too.

He was an inspired soul, who visualised the Vedas with the rational conception of the Ṛṣis who were depicted by Yāska as साश्वतन्त्रत्वमयाः, i.e., "to whom Dharma revealed itself." He saw the light and he refuted all anti-Vedic thoughts in the Hindu society and also criticised all the Vedic interpretations, which were based on Paurāṇika myths, quite unknown during the Vedic age. Sayana's commentary and all modern Vedic exegesis based on or influenced by Sayana, i.e., modern European translations of the Vedas, were severely criticised by him. He showed that the conclusions of modern scholars, envisaged in Sayana's commentary, were faulty and often effected by their conscious or unconscious Christian prejudices. In any case, in the words of modern scholars, e.g., M. Müller and Roth, all modern (Indian as well as European) translations of the Vedas are provisional. Svāmi Dayānanda did not know any of the European languages, not even English. His criticism of M. Müller, etc., in his commentaries is therefore based on information supplied to him by friends knowing English.

\textbf{Peculiarities of Dayānanda's Translation}

The following are the few aspects of Dayānanda's interpretation of the Vedas:

(1) The background of his Bhasya is the sincere conception that the Vedas are the words of God. Hence they contain pure and absolute knowledge.

(2) The words used in the classical Sanskrit, greatly differ, as regards their meaning, from the words used in the Vedic language. We

\textsuperscript{1} A. F. R. H., from \textit{The Christian Intelligencer}, Calcutta, March, 1870, p. 70.
should not interpret the Veda taking in view the current sense of the words in ordinary language.

(3) According to him, all Vedic words have derivative or etymological sense. The Vedas know no rūḍhī words (i.e. words with conventional sense). All words denote derivative and general sense. They are derived from the roots. Thus he does not take into consideration the worldly sense of the words. For instance, the word aḍhī generally means 'a serpent'; but in the Veda it signifies 'a cloud' (vide Yāska).

(4) Following in the footsteps of Yāska, he also believes that the Vedic words are used in the Vedas to denote triple significance of the Mantras, i.e., adhyātmiṇa, adhidaivika and adhiyājñīka.

(5) The Padā texts of the Mantras have not always been adhered to. The Vedic sense is more important than the man-made Pāḍhas. As we have shown above, Yāska himself has not adhered to the Pāḍa text. In the Nirukta (V. 21), Yāska divides the word māsakrūt (in RV. I. 105.18) in two ways: (i) mās + kṛūt and (ii) mā + sakrūt. Yāska attaches importance to the sense and not to the grammatical formations, so does Dayānanda believe. Yāska says:

अर्थनित्य: परीक्षेत् । न संस्कारमाध्यमेत् ।

Patanjali, the author of the Mahabhaṣya, also says:

न लक्षणेन पदकारं अनुवर्यः । पदकारे: नाम लक्षणमनुवर्यं ॥

(MB. III.1.103)

(6) Dayānanda follows the school of the etymologists, i.e., the Nairuktaś. Hence he does not believe that the Veda contains narratives or reference to historical personages. Undoubtedly all descriptions are symbolic and figurative as Yāska says:

तत्कौ बृहत्? मेघ इति नैकृतः । त्वास्पदस्युर इत्ये निर्देशातिक्षातः । अपां च व्याख्यायेऽविशेषावकृष्टं वाक्षमूर्तं जायते । तत्रोपमायेन गुरुवर्यं प्रभवति ॥

(N. II.16)

(7) According to Dayānanda, Devata means the subject-matter of the Mantra, or a hymn. All words signifying a Devata, e.g., Agni, Varuṇa and Indra, are the names of One Supreme Lord. There is only one Supreme Being described in the Vedas and Agni, Vayu, etc., are merely His different names indicating His most important attributes.
This matter is really set at rest by the well-known verse of the Rgveda:

\[ \text{He is One, sages call Him by many names, e.g., Agni, Yama and Matarisvan.} \]

This discovery, made again in the 19th century by Dayananda, has, in India at any rate, brought about a revolution in the method of interpretation applied to the Vedas. This view is evidently based upon one important grammatical distinction. Dayananda urged that the words used in the Vedas are employed in their etymological sense and undoubtedly this slight distinction in outlook has gone a great way in clearing up many difficulties and exonerating the Vedas from the charge of polytheism, and other theisms, invented and fastened upon them by the Western scholars.

(8) The \textit{yajña} does not mean only a material sacrifice, i.e., to offer something into the fire. Dayananda here is supported by the entire scripture of the Hindus where it is clearly stated that ‘any noble and unselfish act’ is called a \textit{yajña}. The Śatapatha clearly says:

\[ \text{वष्णो व वेष्ठलम करम्} \]  
\[ \text{(SB. 1.7.1.5)} \]

The fourth chapter of the Bhagavadgītā describes all aspects of the \textit{yajña}:

(a) \[ \text{एवं ब्रह्मविद्या भव चित्ता ब्रह्मविद्या मुखे} \]  
\[ \text{(Gītā)} \]

(b) \[ \text{भैरवानु हृदयमयान् यज्ञान् मानयते: परस्पर} \]  
\[ \text{(Gītā)} \]

\textbf{YAUGIKAVĀDA}

Now let us examine the theory that the Vedas contain only \textit{yaugika} words, as it is accepted by Dayananda.

(a) Distinction between the Vedic and the \textit{laukika} words is clearly indicated by the fact that Patañjali, the author of the \textit{Maha-bhāṣya}, makes two separate categories of these two types of words. He declares:

\[ \text{केवल शास्त्रामु लोकिकामां विविधानानु च} \]

Then he further remarks:

\[ \text{नेन्द्रमार्च हृदिन्वार्च} \]
Thus, he states in unambiguous terms that there are the Vedic words (which are \textit{yaugika}) and the \textit{rudhi} words (i.e. words used in the world to express conventional meaning).

Thus, Patañjali draws a line of demarcation between the Vedic and \textit{laukika} words.

It becomes more lucid and clear when we compare the meaning of some words which are common in both the languages.

(i) According to \textit{Nighaṅṭu} (III.15), the word \textit{kāvya} is a common noun being a synonym of \textit{medhāvin} (i.e. the intelligent), while in the common language it is a proper noun, i.e., the name of a sage.

(ii) \textit{Ahi} means a ‘cloud’ in the \textit{Nirukta}, while it is a synonym of serpent in the common language.

(iii) According to the \textit{Nighaṅṭu} (I.12) and the \textit{Nirukta} (II.22), the word \textit{purisha} in the Vedas means ‘water’, while it denotes ‘human excreta’ in ordinary Sanskrit.

(iv) \textit{Kaṇva}, \textit{vēna}, \textit{grīsa} and \textit{uṣik} are proper nouns in the common language, denoting some persons, while all these are synonyms of \textit{medhāvin} (according to \textit{Nighaṅṭu}, III.15) in the Vedas.

(v) The word \textit{Kuravaḥ} (plural of \textit{kuru}) means ‘doers’, i.e. ‘performing priests’ (see \textit{Nighaṅṭu}, III.18), while the same indicates persons or countries belonging to Kuru family in common Sanskrit.

Instances can be multiplied but paucity of space does not permit. This evidence clearly establishes the fact that it is not proper and reasonable to interpret Vedas on the basis of the classical Sanskrit. Sāyana and Mahīdhara could not understand this fact and hence they committed mistakes. Dayānanda’s interpretation is an attempt in this direction.

\textbf{Evidence of Yāśka and Patañjali}

The first canon of the interpretation of the Vedic terms, which is laid down by Yāśka, the author of \textit{Nirukta}, is that the Vedic terms are all \textit{yaugika} (i.e. have derivative sense). They signify the meaning of the root together with the modification, affected by affixes. In fact, the structural elements out of which the word is compounded afford the whole and the only clue to the true signification of the words. The fourth section of the first chapter of the \textit{Nirukta} opens with a discussion on this very subject, in which Yāśka, Gargya, Śaṅkṛayana and all other grammarians and etymologists declare that the Vedic words are all \textit{yaugika}. But Yāśka and Śaṅkṛayana maintain that \textit{rudhi} terms are also \textit{yaugika} in as much as
they were originally formed from the roots; but Gargya holds that only the *ruḍhi* terms are not *yaugika*:

‘नामायङ्गायांतराजग्नि’ इति शाक्तचिन्ता नेत्रसमस्मयश्रवः। ‘न सर्बायत्सिः’ गायणं व्याख्यानार्थो धृतं। तदु रव स्वरसंकारी समथियं प्रारंभितसेन गुणेनास्तिको स्वातांशः।

This section concludes with a refutation of the opinion of Gargya, establishing it as true that all terms, whether Vedic or *laukika*, are *yaugika*.

Patañjali also expresses the same opinion and distinguishes the Vedic terms from *ruḍhi* terms by the designation of Naigama (i.e. Vedic). He says:

नाम च ग्राहुमात्रं निरुत्ते।
व्याकरणे शक्तस्य च तौक्षम्॥

And a line before this:

नागमहर्षिकं हि गुसाधु। नागमार्चु हर्षिदवर्ष।

The sense of all this is that all the ancient Rṣis were of opinion that all the Vedic terms are derivative and denote general sense.

To an unprejudiced mind, the correctness of this law will never be doubtful. For, independently of the authority of the *Nirukta*, the very antiquity of the Vedas is a clear proof of its words being *yaugika*. Even Professor M. Müller is compelled to confess, at least concerning certain portions of the Vedas, that their words are *yaugika*. Says he:

“But there is a charm in these primitive strains discoverable in no other class of poetry. Every word retains something of its radical meaning; every epithet tells; every thought in spite of the most intricate and abrupt expressions, is, if we once disentangle it, true, correct and complete.”

*(History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 553)*

Further again he adds:

“Names..............are to be found in the Vedas, as it were, in a still fluid state. They never appear as *appellatives*, nor yet as *proper* nouns; they are organic, not yet broken or smoothed down.”  *(Ibid, p. 755)*

Can there be any thing clearer than this? The terms occurring in the Vedas are *yaugika*, because “they never appear as appellatives, nor yet as proper names,” and because “every word retains something of its radical meaning.”
INTERNAL EVIDENCE

Now let us examine the theory of Yaugikism in the light of the Vedic literature:

(i) **Vedas**: The internal evidence from the Vedas indicates that the Vedic words are *yaugika*:

(a) In *RV. I.12.9* Agni is called as कगि, बुहृत्यति and युधा. If we take the word *agni* as *rūḍhi* it means only 'fire' which cannot be a कगि, बुहृत्यति and युधा. Hence we have to interpret these words etymologically.

(b) Similarly वा०.० has the epithets of कगि, etc., in *RV. II. 28.1*.

(c) In *RV. I.48.4* the word कगि has been used as an adjective by adding a suffix denoting superlative degree as कग०. In *RV VII.79.3*, the word गन्ध is used as गन्धतः.

It is possible only if we take all words as derivatives denoting radical sense.

(d) Even the Vedic text contains etymological explanations of the words:

- व१वनमचर्चकानाम् (RV. VIII.96.4)
- असन्ततालब्धिनी (RV. VIII.5.31)

(e) In *RV. I.164.46* Agni has been called as Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa and Matarisva. How can it be possible if we do not accept these words denoting general sense?

(ii) **Bṛāhmaṇas**: We need not give evidence in detail from the Bṛāhmaṇas in this connection as they abound in etymological explanations. Every word has been explained therein by giving their radical sense:

(a) प्रभृवनाविभूहं सब्जमरणावतम् (SB. IV, 1.5.16)

(b) प्ररतुवाते हि तौ लोकान्

 ज्योतिव च रसेन्व च (BD. VII.127)

(c) प्रश्वन्नो यत्प्रस्ववाते संवैः रसेनायः

 ज्योतिवान् (N. XII.1)
(d) तद्वद्वधर्यः तस्करसुः ।

(SB. VI.1.3.6)

(e) Agni is explained in SB. VI.1.11.

Similarly see:

(GP. 1.7) for Angiras.
(SB. I.8.2.7) for Anuyāja.
(JU. I.20.4) for Antarikṣa.
(SB. XIV.6.11.2) for Indra.
(SB. X.1.1.5) for Graha.
(SB. XIV.5.5.18) for Puruṣa.
(GB. I.3) for Bhṛgu etc.

(iii) Nirukta : The Nirukta aims at giving all the possible etymological explanations of all words. Yāska has made it compulsory for the Nairuktas to offer every possible derivation:

न लेव न निरूप्यात् । भ्रवेयत्यः परीक्षेत् ।

न संस्कारानविवेतु ।

(N. 1)

Yāska goes as far as to say that even the laukika words are vaugika. Hence he explains them also:

इदमप्रितर्थ गृहः एतत्सात् एव ।

(N. IV.13)

(iv) Mimamsakas : In the undermentioned citation from the Mimamsā Bhaṣya we are directed to explain the Vedic words including those of raṭhs in accordance with the grammar and the Nirukta:

(a) विद्यमानोस्खलः प्रमावलोक्याविषिः नोपतम्यते। निगमविशेषार्थायामयक्षेन धातुतोऽयः कल्पविवेत्।

(MDB. 1.2.41)

(b) शमयतीति शमिता। योगिक एव शब्दः।

(MDB. III.7.29)

Here we are told that the meanings are to be determined from the roots:

धातुतोऽयः कल्पविवेत्।

(v) Skanda and Durga : These two foremost commentators of Yāska in the following citations clearly tell us that the etymological explanations of words are highly essential to show that the words have comprehensive and unlimited scope of expression. If we accept only the conventional fixed sense, it will restrict their power of expression.
(a) Skanda says:

एवं नाता सर्वनामनामालयात्तत्व प्रतिपादितस्वरूपः ततु सिद्धं?
उच्चते शब्दानि: तत्स्यार्थस्वरूपः प्रथ्यायः । । । (p. 92)

(b) Durga also says:

स्वभावाते हि स्वदीदा क्षिप्यालेविद्व फाँचिदेव क्षिप्यामुखाक्ष्यास्विधितः निबोधनः। । । (p. 64)

Durga also tells us that the various explanations given in the Nirukta do not indicate, as European scholars think now-a-days, that Yāska is uncertain about the definite meanings of the words as no tradition could reach him; but these different meanings imply the unrestricted power of expression of the words. He says:

प्राचीनोपीतकस्य वि विचारे ब्रह्मचा यथा यास्कोपासामवस्विधाने
विपरितार्थाते सप्तोस्तो प्रस्तृताथोवत्तदज्ञ प्रवर्तति संविधि। । । (N. 1.20)

(vi) Different meanings at different places: Now we shall give below a brief list of words, which will show that one and the same word is interpreted by different scholars in different sense at different places. It is possible only if we admit that the Vedic words are not conventional but give radical sense based on the various original roots. This is the cause why Vedic words express different meanings and also why Yāska gave different significances of one and the same word:

(a) Agni : एक परमात्मा (Supreme Being) (Sāyaṇa, AV. II.1.4)
   - A Brāhmaṇa (Sāyaṇa, SB. I.4.2.2)
   - Lightning (Durga, p. 363)
   - The Veda, Omniscient (Sandhyā Bhāṣya, pp. 14,55,60)
   - Supreme Lord (Śrī Kaṇṭha, Śrī Bhāṣya, p. 3)
   - Viśṇu, i.e. Omnipresent (Rāghavendra Yati, pp. 8,23)

(b) Āpaḥ : Does not mean ‘water’ but from the root ap ‘to pervade’ : Omnipresent (Skanda, RV. I.91.1)
   - Supreme Soul (Sandhyā Bhāṣya, pp. 45,46,47,163,171)
   - Cows (SNB. XII.1-3)
   - Atmospherical region (Skanda, RV. I.52.12)
   - Milk (Śatrughna, p. 184)
(c) **Indra** : Air (Durga, p. 710)
   - : Sūrya or Supreme Lord (Śatrughna, pp. 90, 133)
   - : God (Jayatirtha, p. 22)
   - : Glorious group of Maruts (Skanda, *RV* I.6.8)
   - : God (Śaīyāṇa, *RV* X.92.8)
   - : A rich trader (Śaīyāṇa, *AV* III.15.1)

(d) **Rātri** : Supreme soul (Sandhyā Bhaṣya, pp. 42,135)

(e) **Savita** : Many meanings, e.g. Agni, Varuṇa, Vayu, sacrifice, thunderbolt, sun, moon, mind, soul or a man (*Jaimini Upaniṣad Brahmaṇa*, p. 152)
   - : God (Sandhyā Bhaṣya, pp. 42,135)
   - : A sacrificer according to Śakapūṇi (Skanda, *RV* I.34.10 ; I.95.7)

We have a very long list of such words. The reproduction of the whole list will require a separate volume. The comparative study of this brief list of words will surely convince the unprejudiced reader to understand that the Vedic words are *yaugika* and thus possess a flexible character of expression.

(vii) **Aitihāsikas** : Śaīyāṇa, Mahīdhara and other authors of the *Veda Bhaṣyas*, who interpreted in accordance with the Aitihāsika view by following the *rudāḥ* method, had to adopt in large number of cases the process of *yaugika* interpretation as there was no other way out. No obscure cases could be explained without resorting to the *yaugika* method.

Śaīyāṇa interprets:

(a) **Aśvalī** : व्यापनशोलः प्राचीनः (i.e. the sun, and not a horse, as it conventionally means) *(RV* I.164.2)

(b) **Adityāḥ** : परमेश्वरः (i.e. God and not the sun) *(RV* I.164.21)

(c) **Indra** : वर्जितः (i.e. cloud and not the king of gods) *(RV* I.164.33)

(d) **Bhrāta** : परोपकारः (i.e. one who does good to others, and not a brother, as it ordinarily means) *(RV* I.170.4)
Thus we see that *yaugika* method is the only scientific way of interpreting the Vedas. The entire Vedic literature admits the superiority of this method. It has the support of Yaska, Patanjali and all the Brahmanas. Skanda, Durga and all other ancient interpreters base their explanations on this method.

**SUPERIORITY OF DAYANANDA’S BHĀSYA**

Swami Dayananda employed the scientific method of interpretation based on the Nairukta school throughout his Vedic exegesis. It has many advantages. A few Indian scholars and all European scholars offer bitter criticism against the Vedic teaching. They are very easily removed through the medium of this interpretation. Agni, Varuṇa, Aditya, Mātariśva and Indra may mean anything in different contexts but they also mean Supreme Being (Brahma), described under different names. They are different names of one Lord. The discovery of this method, which was in vogue in Yaska’s age, is quite new in modern times and it has brought about a new revolution in understanding the Vedic theme. In order that no doubt may be left concerning the monotheistic worship of the ancient Aryans, we quote from the *Nirukta*:

\[
\text{माहामायादेवताया एक एव भाषा बहुधा स्तुते । दृश्यात्मानोऽन्ये देवः}
\text{प्रत्यक्षानि स्वर्णः।} \quad (N. VII.4)
\]

[One Supreme Soul is variously praised, on account of His Omnipotence. Other Devatas are but *pratyāṅgas* (i.e., various manifestations) of this one Supreme Soul.]

From this, it is quite clear that Dayananda’s interpretation of the Vedas, based on etymological method, has a sound support in Yaska and the Brahmanas.
It will be reasonable if a few citations from the Vedas themselves are given below in support of the theory that there was monotheism, i.e., worship of One Lord. It will clearly justify Dayānanda’s stand:

(a) एक सद्व विक्रोज़ व्यवस्थितं यथेत्प्रायारिषवानामः ।

[ He is One; sages call Him by many names, e.g., Agni, Yama, Matarīśvā. ]

(RV. I.164.46)

(b) प्रागे वृद्धिणि तथ जातिभवे देव स्वाहामे तन्त्र नामा ।

[ Many are Thy names O Agni, Immortal, God, Divine, Jata-vedas. ]

(RV. III.20.3)

(c) इन्द्रे मायाचि पुरुषप ईषते ।

[ Indra moves multiform, in His wonderful creation. ]

(RV. VI.47.18)

(d) तदेवानि दधातिविस्ताद्वां वायुस्वरुपम वस्त्रमाः ।

तदेव गृहम तदु बृह ता ग्रामः स प्रजापति ।

[ Even He is Agni, He is Aditya, He is Vayu, He is Candramas; He is Sukra, He is Brahma, He is Äpa, He is Prajāpati. ]

(YV. XXXII.1)

(e) सोक्ष्यया स ब्रह्म: स श्रद्व: स महाबें ।

सोक्ष्य: स उ वृयः स उ एव महायमः: ।

[ He is Aryamā, He is Varuṇa, He is Rudra, He is Mahādeva. ]

(AV. XIII.4.4)

[ He is Agni, He is Sūrya, He is verily Maha Yama. ]

(AV. XIII.4.5)

(f) न द्वितीयो न द्रव्ययमयौ नान्यथयते ।

न एक्ष्यो न वट्ठ: सत्तानान्यथयते ।

नात्त्वभो न नवमो दस्यमो नान्यथयते ।

स एव एक्ष्यो एक्ष्यो एक्ष्यो ।

सत्तव्य भारिध्ये देवा एक्ष्यो महालित ।

[ Neither second, nor third, nor yet fourth, is He called. He is called neither fifth, nor sixth, nor yet seventh. He is called neither eighth, nor ninth, nor yet tenth. He is the Sole, the Absolute One, the One alone. In Him all gods become simple and One. ]

(AV. XIII.4.14-21)
Nothing can be clearer than this. All these quotations will convince the reader that the ancient Aryans worshipped only one God. Thus Dayânanda's interpretation which establishes this fact before the scholars must be admitted as a very good attempt for understanding the purport of the Vedic teaching.

It will be well to quote here from an article by Aurobindo Ghosh on the interpretation of the Vedas by Dayânanda:

"What is the main positive issue in this matter? An interpretation of the Veda must stand or fall by its central conception of the Vedic religion and the amount of support given to it by the intrinsic evidence of the Veda itself. Here Dayânanda's view is quite clear; its foundation inexpugnable. The Vedic Hymns are chanted to One Deity under many names, names which are used, and even designed, to express His qualities and powers. Was this conception of Dayânanda's arbitrary conceit, fetched out of his own too ingenious imagination? Not at all; it is the explicit statement of the Veda itself. 'One Existent, Sages, not the ignorant, mind you, but the Seers, men of direct knowledge, speak of in many ways, as Indra and Yama, as Mātariśvan, as Agni.' The Vedic Rishis ought surely to have known something about their religion, more, let us hope, than Roth or Max Müller; and this is what they knew.

"We are aware, how modern scholars twist away from the evidence. This Hymn, they say, was a later production, this loftier ideal, which it expresses with so clear a force rose up, somehow in the later Aryan mind or was borrowed by them from their Dravidian enemies. But throughout the Veda, we have confirmatory Hymns and expressions; Agni or Indra or any other is expressly hymned as One with all other gods. Agni contains all other Divine Powers within himself, the Maruts are described as 'all the gods', one Deity is addressed by the names of others as well as His own, or most commonly He is given, as Lord and King of the Universe, attributes only appropriate to the Supreme Deity. Ah: but that cannot mean, ought not to mean, must not mean, the worship of the One. Let us invent a new word, call it 'Henotheism', and suppose that the Rishis did not really believe Indra or Agni to be the Supreme Deity, but treated any god and every god as such for the nonce, perhaps, that he might feel..."
the more flattered and lend a more gracious ear for so hyperbolic a compliment, but why should not the foundation of Vedic thought be natural monotheism rather than this new-fangled monstrosity of henotheism? Well, because primitive barbarians could not possibly have risen to such high conceptions and if you allow them to have so risen, you imperil our theory of evolutionary stages of human development, and you destroy our whole idea about the sense of the Vedic Hymns and their place in the history of mankind. Truth must hide herself, commonsense must disappear from the field, so that a theory may flourish: I ask, in this point, and it is the fundamental point, who deals most straightforwardly with the text, Dayânanda or the Western scholars?

"But if this fundamental point of Dayânanda's is granted, if the character given by the Vedic Rishis themselves to their gods is admitted, we are bound, whenever the hymn speaks of Agni or another, to see behind that Name present always to the thought of the Rishi, the One Supreme Deity or else one of His Powers with its attendant qualities or workings. Immediately the whole character of the Veda is fixed in the sense, Dayânanda gave to it; the merely ritual, mythological, polytheistic interpretation of Śāyaṇa collapses, the metrological and naturalistic European interpretation collapses. We have, instead, a real Scripture, one of the world's sacred books and the Divine word of a lofty and noble Religion.

"All the rest of Dayânanda's theory arises logically out of this fundamental conception. If the Names of the God-heads express qualities of the One God-head, and it is these which the Rishis adored, and towards which they directed their aspiration, then there must inevitably be in the Veda a large part of psychology of Divine Nature, psychology of the relations of man with God and a constant indication of the law governing man's God-ward conduct. Dayânanda asserts the presence of such an ethical element; he finds in the Veda, the law of life given by God to the human beings. And if the Vedic God-heads express the Powers of the Supreme Deity, who is the Creator, Ruler and Father of the Universe, then there must inevitably be in the Veda a large part of cosmology, the law of creation and of cosmos. Dayânanda asserts the presence of such a cosmic element; he finds in the
Veda, the secrets of creation and the law of Nature by which Omniscient governs the world.

"Neither Western Scholarship, nor ritualistic learning has succeeded in eliminating the psychological and ethical value of the Hymns, but they have both tended in different degrees to minimise it. Western scholars minimise, because they feel uneasy, whenever ideas that are not primitive seem to insist on their presence in these primeval utterances; they do not hesitate openly to abandon in certain passages, interpretations which they adopt in others and which are admittedly necessitated by their own philological and critical reasoning; because, if admitted always, they would often involve in deep and subtle psychological conceptions which cannot have occurred to primitive minds! Sayanā minimises, because his theory of Vedic discipline was not ethical righteousness with a moral and spiritual result, but mechanical performance of ritual with a material reward. But in spite of these efforts of suppression, the lofty ideas of the Vedas will reveal themselves in strange contrast to its alleged burden of fantastic naturalism or dull ritualism. The Vedic God-heads are constantly hymned as Masters of Wisdom, Power, Purity; Purifiers, Healers of grief and evil; Destroyers of sin and falsehood; Warriors for the Truth; constantly the Rishis pray to them for healing and purification, to be made, seers of knowledge, possessors of the truth, to be upheld in the Divine Law, to be assisted and armed with strength, manhood and energy. Dayānanda has brought this idea of Divine right and truth, into the Veda: the Veda is as much, and more, a book of Divine Law as Hebrew Bible or Zoroastrian Avesta.

"The Cosmic element is not less conspicuous in the Veda. The Rishis speak always of the worlds, the firm laws that govern them, the Divine working in the cosmos. But Dayānanda goes further: he affirms that the truths of modern physical science are discoverable in the hymns. Here we have the sole point of fundamental principle about which there can be any justifiable misgivings. I confess my incompetence to advance any settled opinion in the matter. But this much needs to be said that his idea is increasingly supported by the recent trend of knowledge about the ancient world. The ancient civilization did possess secrets of science, some of which modern knowledge
INTRODUCTION

has recovered, extended and made more rich and precise, but others are even now not recovered. There is then nothing fantastic in Dayānanda's idea that the Veda contains truths of science as well as truths of religion. I will even add my own conviction that Veda contains other truths of a Science the modern world does not at all possess, and in that case Dayānanda has rather understated than overstated the depth and range of the Vedic Wisdom.

"Objection has also been made to his philological and etymological method by which he arrived at his results, especially in his dealings with the names of the God-heads. But this objection, I feel certain, is an error due to our introduction of modern ideas about language into our study of this ancient tongue. We, moderns, use words as counters, without any memory or appreciation of their original sense: when we speak, we speak, we think of the object spoken of, not at all of the expressive word, which is to us a dead and brute thing, mere coin of verbal currency, with no value of its own. In early language the word was, on the contrary, a living thing with essential powers of signification; its root-meanings were remembered because they were still in use; its wealth of force was vividly present to the mind of the speaker. We say 'wolf' and think only of the animal; and any other sound would have served our purpose as well, given the convention of its usage; the ancient said "tearer" and had that significance present to them. We say agni and think of fire, the word is of no other use to us; to the ancients, agni means other things besides, and only because one or more of its root-meanings was applied to the physical object fire. Our words are carefully limited to one or two senses; theirs were capable of a great number, and it was quite easy for them, if they so chose to use a word like Agni, Varuṇa or Vāyu as sound-index of a great number of connected and complex ideas, a key word. It cannot be doubted that the Vedic Rishis did take advantage of this greater potentiality of their language, note their dealings with such words as gau and chandra. The Nirukta bears evidence to this capacity, and in the Brāhmaṇas and Upanishads we find the memory of this free and symbolic use of words still subsisting.

"Certainly Dayānanda had not the advantage that a comparative study of language gives to the European scholars, but he stands
justified by the substance of Veda itself, by logic and reason, and by our growing knowledge of the past of mankind. The Veda does hymn "The One - Deity - Of - Many - Names - And - Powers"; it does celebrate the Divine Law and man's aspiration to fulfil it; it does purport to give us the law of cosmos.

"On the question of revelation, suffice it to say that here too, Dayānanda was perfectly logical and it is quite grotesque to charge him with insincerity, because he held to and proclaimed the doctrine. There are always three fundamental entities which we have to know if we would understand existence at all, God, Nature and the Soul. If, as Dayānanda held on strong enough grounds, the Veda reveals to us God, reveals to us the law of Nature, reveals to us the relations of the Soul to God and Nature, what is it but Revelation of Divine Truth? And if, as Dayānanda held, it reveals them to us with a perfect truth, flawlessly, he might well hold it for an infallible Scripture. The rest is a question of the method of revelation, of Divine dealings with our race, of man's psychology and possibilities. Modern thought, affirming Nature and Law, but denying God, denied also the possibility of revelation, but so also has it denied many things, which a more modern thought is very busy re-affirming; we cannot demand of a great mind that it shall make itself a slave to vulgarly received opinion or the transient dogmas; the very essence of its greatness is this that it looks beyond, that it sees deeper."

VALUE OF INTERPRETATION

Thus we see that the method of the Vedic interpretation, discovered by Dayānanda after hundreds of centuries and which had been in vogue (before the birth of Sāyaṇa, Skanda, etc.) during the time of Yāska, is a scientific one. It is based on the etymological and grammatical explanations of the hymns. He realised that the root-meanings of the words must be first sought and then applied, always keeping in view the context. Thus he was able to translate with the help of the ancient works, e.g., the Nirukta, the Brāhmaṇas, the Āśpadhyāyi and others, written by ancient sages. It is quite absurd, as we have already proved by quoting a number of evidences from the authentic works, to try to paraphrase the Vedic hymns according to the terminology of the Classical Sanskrit as some of the authors did. It is equally unreasonable to study the Veda under the light of the later Paurāṇika works. Sāyaṇa could not do without applying Paurāṇika influence over him.
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HIS PLACE AMONG THE INTERPRETERS

Dayānanda did whatever he could and he deserves indeed our unstinted admiration. None can claim infallibility for his interpretation, nor did he. But “his honesty of purpose is clearly written on every page of his work,” in that, unlike most of the European translators of the Veda (Max Müller and a few others excepted), he has not contented himself with giving his own empirical view of the text, but in almost every case has supported it with reasons and explanations and often by quotations from ancient authors, credited with a better and deeper knowledge of the Vedas, on account of the nearness of their time to the Vedic period of Indian civilization.

Speaking of his own efforts to understand and then translate the Vedas for the public, Prof. Max Müller says that it is a mere beginning, “a mere contribution towards the better understanding of the Vedic hymns,” and he felt convinced that on many points his translation was liable to correction and to be replaced sooner or later by a more satisfactory one. He further remarks:

“There are, as all Vedic scholars know, whole verses which as yet yield no sense whatever. There are words the meaning of which we can guess.”

(SBE, vol. XXXII, Vedic Hymns, part I, p. 32)

Thus all that we claim for Dayānanda’s translation of the Vedas is that, from the Hindu point of view, it is the best and the most scholarly translation of that ancient Scripture, so far given to the public; yet, that Dayānanda has only shown the way to the coming generation how to approach the Vedas, how to interpret them. It would take centuries of hard labour and tireless scholarship before anything like a complete and thoroughly satisfactory translation of the Vedas could be made. Generations of learned Aryans will have to devote their lives to the study of the Vedas in a spirit of reverent devotion and with a determination to master all their riddles and difficulties, before these ancient Scriptures yield up even a fraction of their treasures of beauty and truth.

We would like to conclude this discussion by quoting a few lines from Aurobindo Ghosh, whose impartiality and independence of view cannot be questioned and who has given full support to the line of interpretation adopted by the great sage Dayānanda, for the assessment of the value of his translation:

“In the matter of Vedic interpretation, I am convinced that, whatever may be the final, complete interpretation, Dayānanda
will be honoured as the first discoverer of the right clues. Amidst chaos and obscurity of old ignorance and age-long misunderstanding, his was the eye of direct vision that pierced to the truth and fastened on that which was essential. He has found the keys of the doors that time had closed and rent asunder the seals of the imprisoned Fountain.”*

* A strong support is given indirectly by some impartial European scholars to Dayānanda’s interpretation of the Veda by admitting that the Vedas inculcate worship of one God.

(1) Ernest Wood writes:
“In the eyes of the Hindus, there is but one Supreme God. This was stated long ago in the Rig Veda in the following words, Ekam sad-viprāh bahudha vadanti” which may be translated as ‘The sages name The One Being variously.’”

(An Englishman Defends Mother India, p. 128)

(2) W.D. Brown, an English Scholar writes in his book, Superiority of the Vedic Religion:
“It (Vedic Religion) recognises but one God. It is a thoroughly scientific religion, where religion and science meet hand in hand. Here Theology is based upon Science and Philosophy.”

(3) Jacolliat, a French savant, author of The Bible in India, wrote thus in his book about the Vedas:
“Astonishing fact! The Hindu Revelation (i.e. Veda) is of all revelations the only one whose ideas are in perfect harmony with modern science.”

Finally we can say that whatever view may be taken by the Vedic scholars who will appear in the field in later years, we have not the least doubt that they shall have to recognise and appreciate the method of the Vedic interpretation adopted by Dayānanda.
The amount of obloquy and persecution, to which Dayananda was exposed in his life-time, may be gathered from the fact that numerous attempts were made on his life by the orthodox Hindus and Muslims; assassins were hired to kill him; missiles were thrown at him during his lectures and disputations; he was called a hired emissary of the Christians, an apostate, an atheist, and so on. The spirit in which he met this fierce opposition may be judged from the following anecdotes which we cull from Madame Blavatsky’s account of him in her book, *The Caves and Jungles of Hindustan*.

“One is inclined to think”, says Madame Blavatsky, “that this wonderful Hindu bears a charmed life, so careless is he of raising the worst human passions, which are so dangerous in India. At Benaras, a worshipper of the Shiva, feeling sure that his cobra, trained purposely for the mysteries of a Shivaite pagoda, would at once make an end of the offender’s life, triumphantly exclaimed: ‘Let this god Vasuki (the snake god) himself show which of us is right!’

“Dayananda jerked off the cobra twisting round his leg, and with a single vigorous movement crushed his reptile’s head. ‘Let him do so’, he quietly assented, ‘your god has been too slow. It is I who have decided the dispute. Now go!’ added he, addressing the crowd, ‘and tell everyone how easily perish all false gods’. Truly, a marble statue could not be less moved by the raging wrath of the crowd. We saw him once at work. He sent away all his faithful followers, and forbade them either to watch over him or to defend him, and stood alone before the infuriated crowd, facing calmly the monster, ready to spring upon him and tear him to pieces.”

In the same work, Madame Blavatsky pays the following compliment to his learning and scholarship:

“It is perfectly certain that India never saw a more learned Sanskrit scholar, a deeper metaphysician, a more wonderful
orator, and a more fearless denunciator of any evil, than Dayananda, since the time of Shankaracharya."

Another testimony to his erudition, and we have finished our account of the Swami's life. This is an unwilling admission of his great powers by his opponents among the orthodox Hindus; we give it in the words of Professor Max Müller:

"At a large convocation at Calcutta, about 300 Pandits from Gauḍa, Navadvipa, and Kashi discussed the orthodoxy of his opinions ......... But, although the decision was adverse, the writer of the report adds: the mass of young Hindus are not Sanskrit scholars and it is no wonder that they should be won over by hundreds to Dayananda's views, enforced as they are by an oratorical power of the highest order and a determined will-force that breaks down all opposition."

(Biographical Essays, pp. 179-80)

His death elicited the highest tributes from all classes of people—Indian and non-Indian, Hindus, Musalmans, Christians and Parsis. The greatest among his contemporaries wrote or spoke of him in the highest terms and deplored his early death: of those we may mention the late Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, the greatest 19th century leader of the Muslims of India; Colonel Olcott, President of the Theosophical Society, and Madame Blavatsky, its founder. But the most characteristic tribute came from Professor Max Müller, who compared him with Dr. Pursey, of England, and wrote remarkably eulogistic notice of the man and his work.

"Deeply read in theological literature of his country.......he was opposed to many of the abuses that had crept in, as he well knew, during the later periods of the religious growth of India, and of which, and is now well known, no trace can be found in the ancient sacred texts of the Brāhmaṇas, the Vedas....... In his public disputations with the most learned Pandits at Benaras and elsewhere, he was generally supposed to have been victorious, though often the aid of the police had to be called in to protect him from the blows of his conquered foes."

1. The famous founder of the Vedantic school of Indian thought, who flourished around 860 A.D.

We give here, as a fitting conclusion to this chapter, a few passages from a long tribute which appeared in the official organ of the Theosophical Society, *The Theosophist*:

"A master spirit has passed away from India, Pandit Dayananda Sarasvati ... ... is gone; the irrepressible, energetic reformer, whose mighty voice and passionate eloquence for the last few years raised thousands of people in India from lethargic indifference and stupor into active patriotism, is no more ... ..."

"*De Mortuis Nil Nisi Bonum.* All our differences have been burnt with the body......We remember only the grand virtues and noble qualities of our former colleague and teacher, and late antagonist. We bear in mind but his life-long devotion to the cause of Aryan regeneration; his ardent love for the grand philosophy of his forefathers; his relentless, untiring zeal in the work of the projected social and religious reform; and it is with unfeigned sorrow that we now hasten to join the ranks of his many mourners. In him, India has lost one of her noblest sons. A patriot in the true sense of the word, Swami Dayananda laboured from his earliest years for the recovery of the lost treasures of Indian intellect. His zeal for the reformation of his motherland was exceeded only by his unbounded learning. Whatever might be said as to his interpretations of the sacred writings, there can be but one opinion as to his knowledge of Sanskrit, and the impetus to the study of both received at his hands. There are a few towns and but one province, namely Madras, that Pandit Dayananda did not visit in furtherance of his missionary work, and fewer still where he has not left the impress of his remarkable mind behind him. He threw, as it were, a bombshell in the midst of the stagnant masses of degenerated Hinduism, and fired with love for the teachings of the Rishis and Vedic learning the hearts of all who were drawn within the influence of his eloquent oratory. Certainly there was no better or no grander orator in Hindi and Sanskrit than Dayananda, throughout the length and breadth of this land."

An soon as the sad rumour was confirmed, Colonel Olcott, who was then at Cawnpore, paid a public tribute to the Swami’s memory. He said:

"Whatever might have been rights or wrongs in the controversy, and whatever other Pandits or Orientalists could say against
the Swami, there was no room for two opinions as to his energetic patriotism or of the nationalising influence exerted upon his followers. In Pandit Dayānanda Sarasvati, there was a total absence of anything like degrading sycophancy and toadyism towards foreigners from interested motives."

Again:

"Truly, however heretical and blasphemous might have appeared his religious radicalism in the sight of old orthodox Brahminism, still the teachings and Vedic doctrines promulgated by him were a thousand times more consonant with Shruti or even Smriti than the doctrines taught by all other native Samajas put together. If he merged the old idols into One Living Being, Ishwara, as being only the attributes and powers of the latter, he yet had never attempted the folly of forcing down the throats of his followers the hybrid compound of a Durga-Moses, Christ-and-Koran, and Buddha-Chaitanya mixture of the modern reformers. The Arya Samaj rites certainly make the nearest approach to the real Vedic national religion."

In the words of Romain Rolland (A.D. 1886-1944):

"Indian religious thought raised a purely Indian Samaj against Keshab’s Brahmó Samaj and against all attempt at westernisation, even during his lifetime, and at its head was a personality of the highest order, Dayanand Saraswati (1824-1883).

"This man with the nature of a lion is one of those, whom Europe is too apt to forget when she judges India, but whom she will probably be forced to remember to her cost; for he was that rare combination, a thinker of action with a genius for leadership.

"For fifteen years this son of a rich Brahmin, despoiled of everything and subsisting on alms, wandered as a Sadhu clad in the saffron robe along the roads of India. At length about 1860 he found at Muttra an old Guru even more implacable than himself in his condemnation of all weakness and his hatred of superstition, a “sannyasi” blind from infancy and from the age of eleven quite alone in the world, a learned man, a terrible man, Swámi Virjanand Saraswati. Dayanand
put himself under his 'discipline', which in its old literal seventeenth century sense scarred his flesh as well as his spirit. Dayanand served this untamable and indomitable man for two and a half years as his pupil. It is therefore mere justice to remember that his subsequent course of action was simply the fulfilment of the will for the stern blind man. When they separated Virjanand extracted from him the promise that he would consecrate his life to the annihilation of the heresies that had crept into the Pauranic (old) faith to re-establish the ancient religious methods of the age before Buddha, and to disseminate the truth.

"Dayanand immediately began to preach in Northern India, but unlike the benign men of God who open all heaven before the eyes of their hearers he was a hero of the Iliad or of the Gita with the athletic strength of a Hercules, who thundered against all forms of thought other than his own, the only true one. He was so successful that in five years Northern India was completely changed. During these five years his life was attempted four or five times—sometimes by poison. Once a fanatic threw a cobra at his face in the name of Shiva, but he caught it and crushed it. It was impossible to get the better of him; for he possessed an unrivalled knowledge of Sanskrit and the Vedas, while the burning vehemence of his words brought his adversaries to naught. They likened him to a flood. Never since Sankara had such a prophet of Vedism appeared. The orthodox Brahmins, completely overwhelmed, appealed from him to Benares, their Rome. Dayanand went there fearlessly, and undertook in November, 1869, a Homeric contest. Before millions of assailants, all eager to bring him to his knees, he argued for hours together alone against three hundred pandits,—the whole front line and the reserve of Hindu orthodoxy. He proved that the Vedant as practised was diametrically opposed to the primitive Vedas. He claimed that he was going back to the true Word, the pure Law of two thousand years earlier. They had not the patience to hear him out. He was hooted down and excommunicated. A void was created round him, but the echo of such a combat in the style of the Mahabharata spread throughout the country, so that his name became famous over the whole of India. Dayanand was not a man to come to an understanding with
religious philosophers imbued with Western ideas. His national Indian theism, its steel faith forged from the pure metal of the Vedas alone, had nothing in common with theirs, tinged as it was with modern doubt, which denied the infallibility of the Vedas and the doctrine of transmigration. Its (Arya Samaj’s) spontaneous and impassioned success in contrast to the slight reverberations of Keshab’s Brahmo Samaj, shows the degree to which Dayanand’s stern teachings corresponded to the thought of his country and to the first stirrings of Indian nationalism, to which he contributed.

“The enthusiastic reception accorded to the thunderous champion of the Vedas, a Vedist belonging to a great race and penetrated with the sacred writings of ancient India and with her heroic spirit, is then easily explained. He alone hurled the defiance of India against her invaders. Dayanand declared war on Christianity and his heavy massive sword cleft it asunder with scant reference to the scope or exactitude of his blows.

“Dayanand had no greater regard for the Koran and the Puranas, and trampled underfoot the body of Brahmin orthodoxy. He had no pity for any of his fellow countrymen, past or present, who had contributed in any way to the thousand-year decadence of India, at one time the mistress of the world. He was a ruthless critic of all who, according to him, had falsified or profaned the true Vedic religion. He was a Luther fighting against his own misled and misguided Church of Rome; and his first care was to throw open wells of the holy books, so that for the first time his people could come to them and drink for themselves. He wrote commentaries on the Vedas in the vernacular—it was in truth an epoch-making date for India, when a Brahmin not only acknowledged that all human beings have the right to know the Vedas, whose study had been previously prohibited by orthodox Brahmans, but insisted that their study and propaganda was the duty of every Arya.

“Dayanand transfused into the languid body of India his own formidable energy, his certainty, his lion’s blood. His words rang with heroic power. He reminded the secular passivity of a people, too prone to bow to fate, that the soul is free
and that action is the generator of destiny. He set the example of a complete clearance of all the encumbering growth of privilege and prejudice by a series of hatchet blows. With regard to questions of fact he went further than the Brahmo Samaj, and even further than the Ramakrishna Mission ventures today.

“His creation, the Arya Samaj, postulates in principle equal justice for all men and all nations, together with equality of the sexes. It repudiates a hereditary caste-system, and only recognises professions or guilds, suitable to the complementary aptitudes of men in society; religion was to have no part in these divisions, but only the service of the state, which assesses the tasks to be performed. The State alone, if it considers it for the good of the community, can raise or degrade a man from one caste to another by way of reward or punishment. Dayanand wished every man to have the opportunity to acquire as much knowledge as would enable him to raise himself in the social scale as high as he was able. Above all he would not tolerate the abominable injustice of the existence of untouchable, and nobody has been a more ardent champion of their outraged rights. They were admitted to the Arya Samaj on the basis of equality; for the Aryas are not a caste. ‘The Aryas are all men of superior principles; and the Dasyus are they who lead a life of wickedness and sin’.

“Dayanand was no less generous and no less bold in his crusade to improve the condition of women, a deplorable one in India. He revolted against the abuses from which they suffered, recalling that in the heroic age they occupied in the home and in society a position at least equal to men. They ought to have equal education, according to him, and supreme control in marriage over household matters including the finances. Dayanand in fact claimed equal rights in marriage for men and women and though he regarded marriage as indissoluble, he admitted the marriage of widows.

“I have said enough about this rough Sannyasi with the soul of a leader, to show how great an uplifter of the peoples he
was in fact the most vigorous force of the immediate and present action in India at the moment of the rebirth and reawakening of the national consciousness. He was one of the most ardent prophets of reconstruction and of national organization. I feel that it was he who kept the Vigil.”

I. Romain Rolland, Ramakrishna. It is also cited in Dayanand Commemoration Volume, Ajmer 1933, p. 325 ff.
Om! May (God) protect us both (preceptor and pupil or the author and the reader) simultaneously; may He give us enjoyments; may we attain strength together; may our learning be luminous and dignified; may we never harm each other.

May there be peace (to all from external material objects); may there be peace (from ourselves); may there be peace (from Divine Wrath).

(1) Having made obeisance to Supreme Being (Brahman), who has no beginning or end, the creator of the universe, unborn, eternal, the highest reality and whose perpetual knowledge, called the Vedas (i.e. the Knowledge par excellence), upholds the Law (nigama) and destroys the unrighteousness and is blemishless, beneficial to the world and bestower of good fortunes on humanity, I, being desirous of explaining and interpreting the Vedas, compose this great commentary (bhasya).

The word भाष्य, from the root भास्य ‘to speak’ with भाष्य means an exposition, gloss or commentary as in the word Veda-भाष्य, especially a commentary that explains Sutras or aphorism, by words with comments of its own.

Cf. सूत्रांणि वर्णते यज्ञ पदः: सूत्रानुसरितं।
स्वपन्नको च वर्णने भाष्यं भाष्यविको विद्वः।

The word भाष्य, from the root भास्य ‘to speak’ with भाष्य means an exposition, gloss or commentary as in the word Veda-भाष्य, especially a commentary that explains Sutras or aphorism, by words with comments of its own.

Cf. सूत्रांणि वर्णते यज्ञ पदः: सूत्रानुसरितं।
स्वपन्नको च वर्णने भाष्यं भाष्यविको विद्वः।

The word भाष्य, from the root भास्य ‘to speak’ with भाष्य means an exposition, gloss or commentary as in the word Veda-भाष्य, especially a commentary that explains Sutras or aphorism, by words with comments of its own.

Cf. सूत्रांणि वर्णते यज्ञ पदः: सूत्रानुसरितं।
स्वपन्नको च वर्णने भाष्यं भाष्यविको विद्वः।

(Śisupalavadha, II. 24)
(2) I commenced this great commentary on Sunday, the first day of the bright half of the lunar month of Bhādrapada in the year (Vikrama Era) 1933.

(3) Let the noble people (lit. sinless—अन्तः+अघ) know that this commentary has been composed by one, in whose name the word Ananda (i.e. compassion) shines after the word Daya (i.e. bliss) which is realised only by the self, and after this word Sarasvati (i.e. learning) dwells (as if Sarasvati lives) under divine shelter doing good to all. He is celebrated for his noble virtues and Vedic studies.

(4) By the grace of God, may I accomplish this Vedic commentary for the benefit of all men, giving the right and correct interpretation, based on rightly valid proof.

(5) I shall lucidly explain here the meaning of the Vedic stanzas in Sanskrit as well as in Prākrta (i.e. the language of common people, ↔ Hindi) and this will satisfy all desires.

(2) कालारामायुजनेवे पारमाससे लिते वले।
प्रियप्रायोनित्यवारे पारभारस्मे कुलो मया।

According to the नाम of अंकनान्तायाय (i.e. figures are written from right to left) the phrase कालारामायुजनेवे gives 1933. The words काल, राम, अंक and अघ denote 3, 3, 9 and 1 respectively.

(3) ब्राह्मणो ब्राह्मणो ब्राह्मणो: स्वात्मकविता;
सर्वस्तरप्राप्त विस्रावत हिता होमारण।
इवं स्वात्मकवित्व प्रत्यवयाने ब्राह्मनाभेदस्येव
प्राप्त विरवित्वा आयं रामकतिमति विवाहवस्ययात।

It is very common with the Sanskrit writers that they give their names in this manner : cf. (a) “हिरण्यद्वृः कृतमाप्न प्रचक्षते।” (Śiṣṭapālavadha I).
(b) पुष्प: रघुजेशु रुचिरितिः। कृतमाप्न राजपूर्व:। (Śakuntala, II. 14).

Shri Ghasi Ram wrongly translates this verse: “Let the virtuous know that this work has been composed by one whose name (Dayānanda Saraswati) is synonymous with noble qualities and Vedic study etc.”

(4) मनुष्येऽयो हितार्थव सत्यार्थ सत्य्मानम्।
ईवराजपदे वेद-साध्यं विधीते।

(5) संस्कृत-प्राकृताभ्यं यतु प्राथ्यायायमविवं शृष्टम्।
सत्यार्थवर्तनं चात विषयस्ते कामयुक्त मया।
(6) I shall explain the *mantras* by following the ancient method of interpretation of the Aryan saints and seers (i.e. *Munis* and *Rsis*) and not otherwise (i.e. the method which was followed by Sāyaṇa and others).

(7-8) This (commentary) will frustrate and foil all blemishes of modern commentaries and glosses, casting a slur upon and grossly misinterpreting the Vedas and will reveal the ancient and accurate meaning of the Vedic lore.

May this attempt (of mine) be successful by the grace of Lord.

---

(6) आर्यायों मुनियों या व्याख्यारीति: सत्ततती।
तत्समाधिकित्य मन्त्रार्थं विधायते तु नायथा।

The distinction between a *muni* and a *rśi* can be explained thus; *rśi* is an inspired poet or sage or a singer of sacred hymns. They are the Seers of the Vedic hymns. Cf. क्रवयो मन्त्रार्थार्थत: त: क्रवयेवैनानात्। According to Yāska, यस्य वाक्यं स क्रवी: i.e. they are the persons to whom the Vedic hymns were revealed i.e. Seers (e.g., हुरस, विसित्थ, अत्ति, अगलं etc.). *Muni* (सन इन उक्तं, *Unādi*. 4.122) is a sage, a holy man, saint, devotee or an ascetic.

Cf. (a) मुनीनामप्रायं व्यासः। (Gītā, X. 37)
(b) हुःवेदविनिकरकः कुसेष विगतस्त्रूः।
वीरतानविकरकः स्तस्तधः; मुनिनिलयते।
(Gītā, II. 56)

(7) वेनाधुलिकाः: ये दीकाः: बेदजुकाः।
वोष: सब विनिशप्य:—अन्यथायां-विवर्णाः।

(8) सत्तायाः प्रकाश्वते बेदानां यः सत्तातः।
ईश्वरस्य सहस्येन प्रम्यनोऽऽ हरिः प्रतिपूर्तिः।
LORD'S PRAYER

(1) O Lord! Creator (of this universe), ward off all ills and evils (from us) and bestow upon us only what is good (for us).  (YV. XXX. 3)

Explanation

O God, Thou art all-existence, all-intelligence, and all-bliss, most merciful, possessed of infinite knowledge, bestower of knowledge and science (Deva) illuminer of the whole universe—the Sun etc., revealer of the knowledge, bestower of all joys, (Savita)—creator of the whole universe. Do Thou dispel far away our all miseries and all evil properties and surround us and graciously provide us with that happiness which is absolutely free from all pains and which through the attainment of real knowledge leads to prosperity in this life and to final beatitude in the next stage. Do Thou chase away all evil obstacles from this work of composing commentary on the Vedas, even before, they could occur.

O Supreme Brahman! be compassionate unto us and bestow upon what is good, such as sound health (lit. body), discrimination, (willing) co-operation (of others), efficiency and the light of the true knowledge etc. May we (be able to) write, through Thy favour, this significantly correct commentary on Thy work—the Vedas, which may shine forth with radiance of true knowledge and also have the support of all proofs e.g., direct perception, &c. May this all, by Thy grace, be beneficial for the whole humanity. Be kind to ordain, O God, that people may hold this commentary in the highest faith and show the utmost regards for this. Om! (YV. XXX. 3)

(1) विश्ववीणि देव सविदेविनान् परामुख ।
    यद् भवं तन्मु भासु म्। (YV. XXX. 3)

Also occurs in RV: V. 82. 5.

The word Savita is derived from the root सव (to stimulate) with शुचि. It means stimulator, generator or creator. The Nirukta explains this word as सविता सम्बुध्या प्रसविता (X. 31). According to the Nirukta, it also means the Sun आदित्यस्वत्व सवितृण्यते (X. 32). In nearly half of its occurrences, the name is accompanied by Deva when it means "the stimulator or creator God." In one stanza (RV. III.62.10) he is besought to stimulate thoughts of worshippers who desire to think of the glory of the Creator. This is the celebrated, Gayatri mantra, which is also called the Guru mantra. The Sun is also a great stimulator of life and motion in the world.
(2) Obeisance to God, the greatest and the most high, who governs
the whole (universe and all times) past, present and future and who is the
absolute bliss* (free from the slightest trace of pain). (AV. X. 23.4.1)

(3) We offer homage to God, the most excellent and the most high,
whose feet are the earth, whose abdomen is the atmospheric region
(antārīkṣa) and who has formed the uppermost region, illumined by solar
rays (divam) as the head. (AV. X. 23.4.32)

(4) Deepest reverence to Lord, the most high and preeminent, whose
eyes are the Sun and the Moon, renewed again and again and who has
created fire as the mouth. (AV. X. 23.4.33)

---

The word स्वरूप has been translated here as 'bliss'. According to the
Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta, the following meanings can be ascribed to
this word:

I. 'Heavenly region or the Sun' : साधारणानुतरणि वस्तु विश्वचारित्वं
च (Nirukta, II.13); स्वरूपम्। नाम:। गो:। बिन्दुः। नमः
इति वस्तु साधारणानि। (Nighaṇṭu, I.4); स्वरूपयिद्य भवति सु अरणं:
(Nirukta, II.14, IV.4).

II. 'Water'. It is given in the names of water. (See Nighaṇṭu I.12).

III. 'Heaven, paradise', as in स्वरूपम्। In classical literature it is
very common "स्वरूपम्" etc. (Amarakoṣa).

IV. The sky, Ether.

V. 'The space above the Sun or between the Sun and the polar
star'.

VI. The third भास्वतः.

VII. Radiance or glow.

VIII. 'Bliss, free from the slightest trace of pain'
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VIII. 'Bliss, free from the slightest trace of pain'
(5) Adorations to the Supreme Being, whose in-breathings and out-breathings are the air, whose eyes are illuminating rays (aṅgirasas)* and who has made the directions as the organ of hearing. (AV. X. 23.4.34)

Explanation

Our deepest homage to the highest and the greatest God, Who rules over the entire universe and also over the times past, present and future; i.e., Lord of all and is beyond the limitations of times; Whose character is absolute and decayless joy; where there is no slightest tinge of pain i.e., God full of supreme bliss. (2)

(5)  यथूः वाचः प्राणाशुनो वचसुविरुपसोंडभवन्।
    विभो वर्षके पुजानीस्तम्भे वृहत्यां प्रणांणे नमः॥
(AV X. 23. 4. 34)

* The word Aṅgirasas is derived from अज् गरस, (अशि इश्क्यु Uṇādi, IV.235). According to the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa it is from ‘अज्जार’; “बेग्जारा आसन्त तेरफोसाभावम्”. So the Nirukta (III.17) explains the word as ‘अज्जारिय कन्या:। अंगिराय अंहना अर्थम्’. Aṅgirasas is also an epithet of Agni. Etymologically it is connected with Agni. For instance:

(a)  यद्वुः हतये त्वमने मटर करिधवति।
    तवेल्लखा सत्यमित्रः॥ (RV. I.1.6)

(b)  उवामहः सहस्त्रनमित्रः। (RV. V.11.6)

Thus it means fiery rays or illuminating rays. In Vedic literature, we also come across adjectives like अगिरसस: (i.e., very rapid), especially like Agni, devouring everything.

Ralph T.H. Griffith translates these stanzas as follows:

2. "Worship to loftiest Brahma, Lord of what hath been and what shall be;
   To him who rules the universe and heavenly light is all his own.” (AV. X. 23.4.1).

3. "Be reverence paid to him, that highest Brahma, whose base is earth, his belly air, who made the sky to be his head.” (AV. X 23.4.32).

4. Homage to highest Brahma, him whose eye is the Sun and the Moon who groweth young and new again, Him who made Agni for his mouth.” (AV X. 23.4.33).

5. Homage to highest Brahma, Him whose two life-breathings were the wind;
   The Aṅgirasas his sight; Who made the regions be his means of sense. (AV. X. 23.4.34).
The earth is His feet \( (prama) \), the cause of real knowledge, (i.e., people living on earth acquire knowledge). The space between the sun and the earth is His belly and Who has made the sky, illumined by solar rays, as His head. (3).

To Him—whose eyes are the sun and the moon, which renewed again and again in the beginning of creation and who has made fire as His mouth. (4).

The continuous adorations to the greatest Supreme Being of infinite knowledge whose two vital breathings \( (prana \) and \( apana) \) are the entire wind, whose eyes are the angirasas i.e., the illuminating rays: (vide Nirukta, III. 17) and who formed the directions \( ditah \) as the cause of all activities. (5).

(6) May we adore with oblations, the blissful Lord of creatures \( (kasmai) \) the giver of spiritual knowledge, of power and prowess and Whose commandments all the learned people ‘devah’ acknowledge, Whose shelter is salvation and disregard of Whom is (misery and) death. \( (YV. \ XXV. \ 13) \)

\begin{quote}
* अज्ञात: अज्ञात: अज्ञाता: । \( (Nirukta, \ III. \ 17) \)
(6) \begin{align*}
\text{व अज्ञुयते बलुका यथा विषयं उपासते श्रिमाते यथे देवा: 1} \\
\text{यथा उत्यमुत्ते यथा मूल्य: कर्मेन देवाय हुविष्णव विशेषं ॥} \\
\end{align*}
\( (YV. \ XXV. \ 13) \)
\end{quote}

\( RV. \ X. \ 121.2 \): The first part of the second line is difficult. Prof. M. Müller translates it thus: "Whose shadow is immortality, whose shadow is death." The meaning may be that His cold shadow (his displeasure or ignorance of him) is death while the shadow or knowledge of His bright glory makes His devotees immortal.

Griffith renders this verse:

"Giver of vital breath, of power and vigour, he, whose commandment all the Gods acknowledge;

The Lord of death, whose shade is life immortal. What God shall we adore with our oblation?"

The word \( (kasmai) \) may be interrogative pronoun, but Dayānanda, on the authority of the \( Satapatha Brahmana \) says that it means \( prajapti \) or \( suksma-vr̥tu \). Cf. "प्रजापतिवर्मः" \( (Satapatha, \ VII. \ 3) \).

"\( kā \)" also means happiness or joy as in \( nāka \) which is explained thus: "न कृष्णन्ति नृः वांच; न अर्ष यत्र।" Yāska says "कमिति सूक्ष्माम्, तत्प्रतिविधिं प्रतिविद्धेत्" \( (Nirukta, \ II.14) \).
(7) May (there be) peace in the celestial region, may there be peace in the intermediate regions, may there be peace on the earth, may waters and herbs (bring) peace (to us); may trees be peaceful, may all learned people (Vīśeṇdevaḥ) bring peace (to us); may the Vedic lore (propagate) peace (in the world); May all things be (source of) peace to us; may peace bestow peace on all and may that peace come to me also. (YV. XXXVI. 17)

(8) From whatsoever region Thou desirest, make us fearless thence; grant happiness to our off-springs (praḷa) and security, to our animals. (YV. XXXVI. 22)

(7) छो: शालितीर्तिरिस्वातिति: पूर्विवेश शालितरापमः शालितेश्वर्यः शालितः ।
बनस्वर्यः शालितवर्णिद्रवः शालितः; सबः शालितः; सबःःशालितः; सा सा
शालितेष्ठितः ॥ (YV. XXXVI. 17)

Cf.: The nearly similar verse in Atharvaveda (XIX. 9.14) is also found which ends differently:

पूर्विवेश शालित्वर्तिशालितैः; शालितरापः शालितेश्वर्यः शालितवन्यश्वरः;
शालितिक्षाः में देवः; शालितः; सबः में देवः; शालितः; शालितः; शालितः; । ततःः
शालितः; सबः शालितः; सबः शालितः; यदिह घोरे यदिह कुरु यदिह पुणः तदात्मानम
tिच्छवं सबे
से
मस्तः नः ॥

Sāyaṇa and others translate the words Vīśeṇdevaḥ as ‘all gods’. But Dayānanda takes in the sense of ‘the learned men’. "विस्मितो हि देवा “(SB). This is derived from विस्मित “विस्मितो हि देवा “(P. III. 1.134) i.e., donor, imparter of joy or happiness, conqueror, illuminator. Yāska also states the same thing, “प्रः कीर्तिनः कीर्तिनः कीर्तिनः कीर्तिनः “(Nirukta VII.15). In the commentary, Durga adds “इह तु रसमयो बहुवचनोनुवचने इति विशेष: “(XII. 38).

(8) यतो यत: सुमोहिते ततों नी अभवे कु छ ।
शः: कु छ प्रजायःभामेऽः न: पुरुषः ॥ (YV. XXXVI. 22)

Griffith renders it as follows:

"From whatsoever trouble Thou desirest, give us safety thence. Give to our children happiness and to our beasts security."

From this translation, it is clear that the words “यतो यत: “ give the sense of “from whatsoever trouble." But Dayānanda says “यतो यतो वेषाल त्वं समीहिते
जगवक्षमणिनारायणे वेदया करोपि “ i.e., “from whatsoever region in which you desire to plant and maintain a world." The second interpretation is better. God, who is all merciful never desires trouble for his devotees.
(9) Wherein, the Reas, Samans and Yajur-verses, like spokes in the hub of a car, are inserted (pratiṣṭhīrāh) and wherein all the knowledge of creatures is inwoven, may that mind of mine be moved by right resolve.

(YV., XXXIV. 5)

Explanation

(ya atmada) He, who is the giver of knowledge and wisdom; (balada) the bestower of nourishment, integrity, prowess and firmness upon the body, bodily organs, vital airs (praṇa), the soul and the mind; (yasya-) whom (vīve devaḥ) i.e. all the learned worship and whose commandments they acknowledge; (yasya chaya-) whose shelter (i.e. favour) is salvation and

According to Dayānanda प्रजापत्य: and प्रजा: are in ablative case, i.e., May we have no fear from men and animals inhabiting any regions. But I preferred the dative case, i.e., give happiness to our off-springs and animals. Both the interpretations are correct.

The word praṇi is from प्रजा: to be born or produced. It means (i) off-spring, progeny, issue, children, brood (of animals). Cf. प्रजांशत्रकांशात्रस्म (Raghuvamśa, II. 73), प्रजाः पृथुङ्कन्ताय (I. 7), प्रजाः: पृथुङ्कन्ताय (Pāraskara); (ii) posterity, descendants; (iii) a creature; (iv) subjects, people, mankind. cf: नत्त्र: सप्रजा: प्रजा: and also प्रजा: सवा हव तत्सचित्वा (Śakuntālā). प्रजाः विनाभायानात् रक्षणात् मरणात् अपि। स पिता पितातरस्तो केवल ज्ञातेतं (Raghuvamśa). See also Manusmrīti, I. 8; III. 42, and Yājñavalkya-Smṛti, I. 269.

(9) यस्मात् ऋषी: साम यज्ञोपि यक्षम प्रतिपदता रघुपत्राविवाहा।

वर्षेण विषुता दस्योमोत प्रजान्मि तन्मेव भनः: गितसं हृदपरमः (YV. XXXIV. 5)

Rcah यस्ते (सत्तो) +विपु (U. II. 57) हृद्वार यस्ते सुदेशत यथा सा i.e., by which we praise =Rgveda. Pratiṣṭhītāḥ—प्रति + सवा + क (Panini, III. 2.102 and VII. 2.35= are established or included. Arah—यस्ते to go + क (P. III. 1.135)=spokes.

Cittam—विरुद्ध to know + क (P. III. 2.102)=Knowledge or thought.

Otam—“आ+वेष (सत्तो सत्ताने) + क” (P. III. 2.102) =strung, woven, sewn with thread across.

Śiva-sankalpa—प्रजा: सत्त्वो वस्त्र तदुधार्य (P. II. 2.24.)=having righteous or auspicious intention.
whose disregard or want of protection is death, i.e., the cause of birth and
death; (kasmrai-) for this KA i.e., lord of creatures, may we offer oblations.
"Prajapati is verily ka" (is stated in the Satapatha-Brâhmaṇa, VII. 3).* May
we constantly adore with offerings of love and devotion the Blissful
Supreme God. (6)

(Dyauḥ Śāntih) O Almighty Lord, may the shining firmament, the
intermediate region, the earth, water, herbs, plants, Viśva Devaḥ i.e., all the
learned, the Vedic Lore and the entire universe, through Thy favour and our
devotion unto Thee be peaceful, safe and secure for ever. They may
be favourable to us so that we may (be able to) write this Vedic commentary
with ease.

O God, elevate us as well as the whole world, in every way, by this
universal elevation and afford us best help of knowledge, discrimination,
wisdom and health. (7)

(Yatoyataḥ) O God, make us fearless from all those regions, wherein
it is Thy will to plant and maintain a world. In this way, may we have no
fear, through your favour, from any quarter in any way. (san-nah kuru-)
Similarly may we get rid of all fears from men and animals living
there. Grant us security from all regions, as well as from men and beasts
inhabiting there and through your favour, accomplish us with the bliss of
righteousness, riches, enjoyments and final liberations. (8)

(Yasmin Ṛcāḥ) O Glorious Lord, O Ocean of mercy! the mind where
Ṛcas (Ṛgveda), Sāmans (Sāmaveda) and Yajur-verses (Yajurveda) are firmly
established and where real and true knowledge of salvation resides. (yasmin
cittam-) In which men’s knowledge (cittam)† in the from of memory
is held in, like pearls by the thread. Where and like what (are they inter­
woven ?). Like spokes in the hub of a car they are held in. May that

* "प्रजापतिकेषः" (ŚP., VII. 3).
† The word cittam (meaning knowledge) has already been
explained. According to the Amara-kośa it means heart or mind. Cf. :
चित्तं तु केतो उच्चवं स्वालं हृद्यानां मनः”.

But in the Vedic literature it has both the meanings, mind as well
as knowledge. Yāska, explaining the Mantra “न नूमलिति” etc. (R V II. 10.1)
says, “अन्यथा चित्तमित्वृक्षारिः चित्तं चेतां” i.e., mind of another person may
waver. (Nirukta, I. 6). But the Nighaṇṭu reads it in the synonyms of
praṇā. See Nighaṇṭu III. 9. Yāska (IX. 33. 1) also says: “चित्तानि =
प्रजातिः” Dayānanda takes the word citta here in the sense of “knowledge.”
mind of mine, by your grace, be moved by noble resolve and adhere to only what is good and thus be enlightened with (light of) truth so that the accurate commentary of the Vedas may come into light. O Omniscient Lord! you know all and everything. Be gracious to us so that we, without impediments, may be able to make this Vedic commentary correct and complete and to preach and propagate your glory and the true interpretation of the Vedas. Having gone through this, may all of us acquire all the noblest qualities. May you bestow upon us this favour. With this purpose (in view) I offer this prayer to you. Be gracious soon so that this all-beneficial attempt may be successfully accomplished. (9)
THE ORIGIN OF THE VEDAS

(1) "From that universally adored (Sarva-hutaḥ) and omnipresent (Yajña=Viṣṇu) God, Rgveda and Sāmaveda were born: from that (God), Atharvaveda was produced; the Yajurveda was born from it." YV. XXXI.7

(1) 
तत्सत्तयासर्वनिश्चयायाख्याताम् तथा सामवेदायः
र्ग्वेदाय विस्मयातः सामवेदाय नतिस्तरमीलो अवायतुः.

(YV. XXXI. 7)

"Yajña". This word is translated by all Europeans as ‘sacrifice’. Prof. Macdonell renders this verse as below:

"From that sacrifice, completely offered, were born the hymns and the chants; the metres were born from it; the sacrificial formula was born from it."

Griffith evidently could not accept this wrong rendering. He improved upon but could not find the right interpretation. I cite below his translation also:

"From that great General Sacrifice, Rcas and Sāma hymns were born; Therefrom were spells and charms produced, the Yajus had its birth from it."

Sayaṇa in his Upodgīha clearly says: "तत्सत्तयाविस्मयातः सामवेदायः सामवेदाय नतिस्तरमीलो अवायतुः" etc., i.e., "from that adorable and universally invoked God." Thus according to Sayaṇa the word yajña here means ‘adorable God’ and not “sacrifice” as it is interpreted by Europeans.

The word yajña is from the root यज् (वेद्यज्ञमात्रिकरणदानेऽय) to sacrifice, to adore, honour or revere or to dedicate or give. Thus it has both the meanings, ‘sacrifice’ as well as ‘adorable one’. If we take the context into consideration, the meaning of sacrifice has no justification here. Vedas were not born from any sacrifice. They were revealed by God for the accomplishment of yajñas.

Cf. "अद्वित्य यज्ञसिद्धयम्य ऋषयज् सामलक्षणूः" (Manusmṛti)

(contd.)
Sāyaṇa’s interpretation of the word यज्ञ is better and is based on etymology. Dayānanda goes a step further and cites the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in order to support his etymological meaning. “यज्ञो विवेदः” (ŚB I 1.1.13) i.e., “यज्ञ is verily Viṣṇu.” Viṣṇu means Omni-present God “वेदं सर्वं समानाति वर्णं स विदित” i.e. Viṣṇu is so called as He pervades the whole universe.

Sarvahutah—सर्वं + √हू (वानरवति: आदिने बैलयेक) + क (P. III. 2.102) i.e., universally worshipped or adored.

“Rcah” = √च्छ to praise + किप (U. II. 57). किपतिस्तुविति यथा सा (by which we praise). It denotes Rigveda.

Samāni—√तो(लाम) + मिन्न (U. IV. 153). Yāsaka in the Nirukta explains it as follows: “सम लिम्बितमुद्व, अस्मेवाः, कुज्जा सम मेणे इति नैदानाः.” (Nirukta, VII. 12). According to this, the following are the etymological meanings of the word समा : (i) मल लिम्बितमुद्व i.e. Sāma is so called as it is mixed with Rcas. (ii) अस्मेवाः √असू(तत्त्व) to throw i.e., Sāma is thrown in the Rcas. ‘प्रपितंशील गितं तुं क्षत्र भवति।’ (Durgā). (iii) ‘स्मेवाः √तो (अन्त कर्मणि) As the Samagana is a final item in a sacrifice. (iv) ‘क्षत्र समेण मेणे इति नैदानाः’. Yāsaka cites here the views of Naidanas who say that Sāma is equal to Rcas.

“Chandansi”—Macdonell interprets it as “metres”, i.e., metres were born from it. Griffith translates it as ‘spells and charms’ and adds, ‘probably those of the later collections of the Atharvaveda’. But according to Dayānanda it refers to Atharvaveda. He says: “वेदांमि गायः वादिफऽदेवस्य तंत्रवत् पुनर्महत्वात् इति पदं च नृत्यस्यववेदववेदववेदति आयति।” i.e., The Vedas contain various metres—Gāyatri &c but not withstanding this, the word Chandansi (metres) is used to indicate that the Atharvaveda was revealed by God.

The word (chandansi is derived from √च्छि (आह्वक्ष) + क्षत्र (U. IV. 186,219). The worshipper rejoices in reciting the chandansi. In the Nighaṇṭu (III. 4), it is explained क्षत्रवति कर्मणि i.e., by which we worship. Yāska says: “ख्यातिि ख्यातिन्” (VII. 12).

“Yajus”—√यज् + उस (U. II. 115). Yāska also says: “यज्ञम ज्ञाते” (N. VII.12) i.e., from याज्ञ to worship or adore. Yajurveda.
(2) "Tell me who is that Divine Being, from whom the Rgveda (Rcas) was produced (lit. 'hewed off'), from whom the Yajurveda was brought to light (lit. 'chipped'), whose hairs are Sama-verses and His mouth the Atharvaṅgiras? (He is) Skambha (i.e. All sustaining God)." (AV. X. 7.20)

Explanation

(Tasmāt yajñāt) From that Supreme and Perfect Being (Para-Brahman), who possesses the attributes of Self-existence, Consciousness and Bliss (sat, cit, ananda), who is Omnipotent and universally adored, were born the Rgveda, Yajurveda, Samaveda and Atharvaveda (Chandāsī). That is to say that four Vedas were revealed by Him alone.

The word 'sarva-hutaḥ' can also be taken as an adjective, (qualifying) the Vedas. Vedas are sarva-hutaḥ, as they also are worthy of acceptance by all.

The two verbs 'jaṁire and ajāyata' (both meaning 'produced') are used to denote that the Vedas contain numerous sciences. Similarly the twice repeated pronoun "tasmāt" (from him) emphasises (the fact) that God alone is the revealer of the Vedas.

All the Vedas contain various metres—Gāyatrī &c.; not withstanding this—the word "Chandāsī" (metres) denotes that the fourth Veda—the Atharvaveda—was also produced (by God).

According to the Satapatha-Brahmana (where it is stated that "verily Viṣṇu is yajña" (I. 1.2.13); the word yajña means "Viṣṇu". Now Viṣṇu is God as the attribute of creating the whole universe can be applicable to God alone and none else. "Viṣṇu created this (visible and invisible) world, and He supports the threefold world." (YV. V. 15).†.

The word "Skambha" is derived from the root स्कम्भस् to create, to stop, impede or restrain or to stop. Thus it means =support, prop, stay, i.e., God, who supports all. All other words in this verse have already been explained.

* सर्वं हृदयसदानं पहोऽयोंयायः सत्वत्वतः:
† यजो वेदं विष्णु: (SB I. 1.1.13)
‡ Yajur Veda: इवेदं विष्णुविचयने वेदा निन्धये पदम् (YV V. 15).
He is called Viṣṇu as He pervades the mobile and immobile world.¹

**Explanation**

"Tasmāt" Who is that Divine Being, the Almighty and the Supreme Brahman, by whom the Rgveda, Yajurveda, Samaveda, and Atharvaveda were brought to light? Similarly (who is He?) whose mouth—the foremost part—is the Atharvaveda; hair—the Samaveda; the heart—the Yajurveda and the life breath, the Rgveda? In this way it is a figure of speech, called Metaphor. Tell me by Whom four Vedas were produced. It is a question. The answer to which is, "Be it known to you that He is Skambha—the all sustaining Lord."

Now this must be accepted that no other Deva than the all sustaining Lord is the author of the Vedas. The Saapatha clearly states (XIV. 5.4.11) that "the Rgveda, the Yajurveda, Samaveda and Atharvāngiras are like the breath of that Greatest Being."*

Here Yajñavalkya says, "O Maitreyī, let it be known that the four Vedas—the Rgveda &c.—came out of God who transcends even space, like the breath easily and naturally." As breath goes out of the body and again goes into it; so the Vedas are revealed and withdrawn again by God (at the time of creation and dissolution). (2)

Some one might object here, 'How could the Vedas, which are consisted of sounds (i.e. words) only be produced by God who possesses no bodily organs (nir-avayava)? Here we say; "This objection is untenable in connection with the Almighty." He always has the power of acting without (the help of) all such instruments as the mouth, the vital breath &c. Moreover, as at the time of reflection, we, in our mind, pronounce words and ask and answer questions (without using our external bodily organs) so we must believe that the same is true of God also. In his work, the Almighty never requires help of any body or any thing. True, that we do need aids and helps in our undertakings, but such is not the case with Lord. When the incorporeal (lit-limbless) God has created the entire cosoms (lit-world), what objection there can be raised to His having revealed the Vedas. God has created extremely surprising objects in this world, whose composition is as subtle and fine as that of the Vedas.

(The pūrva-pakṣī i.e., the objector may retort here saying that the similarity between the world and the Vedas is not true) because no one except God has the power to create the universe, but in the case of the composition

* Cf. एवं भा ब्रह्मचर्य महती पूर्वस्य निःस्वविधेयतत्वाद् यथा कस्मिदे यजुवेदः सामवेदोध्यायः । (ŚP XIV. 5-4.11)
of the Vedas, men might have had the power to compose them just as they have power to write other books. Here our contention is that men have become able to compose books, only after studying the Vedas of Divine authorship and not otherwise. None can become learned without self-study (paṭhāna) and receiving instructions (stravaṇa) from others. As now-a-days men acquire knowledge by reading some treatise (śāstra), receiving (līt. hearing) oral instructions and observing the (worldly) events. It can be explained by the following (example). Suppose a human child is kept in absolutely lonely place upto his death, being provided (of course) with food and drink etc., but never holding the slightest talk with him by means of speech. As that child would not achieve the smallest knowledge worth the name, and as the wild human beings of the great forests behave like beasts until they receive instructions (upadeśa) from others, so all human-beings would have behaved (like beasts) from the commencement of the creation upto the present day, had not they received instructions through the Vedas. Not to speak of them, then their possessing of the power of composing books.

(The pūrva-pakṣi i.e., the objector again retorts and says that) this statement is not acceptable. God has granted men innate knowledge (svabhāvika-jñānam). This is superior to all bookish knowledge. Without this it is impossible to know the relation between the Vedic words and their imports. By developing that (innate knowledge) men would be able to write books. Hence, it is useless to believe in the Divine authorship of the Vedas.

At this point we ask: Has not God granted this innate knowledge to the child, who was brought in seclusion without providing any instruction as mentioned above or to the wild dweller of dense forest? And how is it that we, too, do not become learned without receiving (proper) education and without studying the Vedas? It is, therefore, concluded that mere innate knowledge is of no avail to a man without instruction and self-study. As men write books after acquiring multiform knowledge from the learned (teachers) and by studying the works of the learned, so all men, ultimately have to depend on Divine knowledge.

Moreover, in the beginning of the creation, there was no system of learning and teaching, nor there was any book (available to be read). Consequently none could possibly acquire knowledge (vidyā-sambhava) without receiving instructions from God. Hence, no man was able to write a book then. Men are not independent in the matter of empirical knowledge (naimittika-jñāna) and the mere innate knowledge is insufficient for the acquisition of knowledge (vidyā-prāpti) in general. What has been
said that innate knowledge is superior (to all and is self-sufficient) is absurd. As it falls in the category of instruments (śūdhana köpi) like the eye and as the eye is powerless to do anything without the co-operation of the mind, so innate knowledge is also too weak to acquire any thing without the help of the Divine knowledge and the learning of the learned men.

“What was God’s motive in revealing the Vedas?"

This question is to be answered by another counter-question. “What could be His motive in not revealing the Vedas?”

“We do not know how to answer this (counter) question” will be (the plausible) reply from the objector.

“It is truly so. Now you listen what object God has in revealing the Vedas.”

Q. “Is God’s knowledge infinite or is it not so?”
A. “It is so.”

Q. “What is its advantage?”
A. “It is for His own benefit (svartha).”

Q. “Is not God, benevolent to others?”
A. “He does good to others. But what of that?”

This shows that the aim of knowledge is self-interest as well as of others. Had not God employed His knowledge for our instruction, it would have been futile in one respect. God has established the utility of His knowledge, by imparting it to us in the form of the Vedas. God, like a father, is the most merciful. As a father always cherishes compassion for his off-springs, so God, most mercifully revealed the Vedas for the benefit of entire mankind. Had he not done so, the eternal gross ignorance (andhapañamparā) would have been in vogue and thus men, being unable to accomplish righteousness (dharma), prosperity (artha), enjoyments (kama) and salvation (mokṣa), would have (ultimately) been deprived of the Supreme Bliss. When God, most compassionately created bulbous roots, fruits and herbs etc. for the happiness of the created beings, why should He not have revealed (lit. imparted instruction) the Vedic knowledge, which embodies all sciences and bring to light all kinds of pleasures. The amount of happiness, which one feels in enjoying (lit. in acquiring-prāptya) all the best things of the universe cannot be compared with one thousandth part of the pleasure, which a learned man experiences. It is, therefore, definitely decided that the Vedic instructions (Veda-upadēsa) are divine.
Q. Whence did God procure the writing materials e.g. pen, inkpot etc. for scribing the books of the Vedas?

A. Here our explanation is:

It is surprisingly (aha-haha) a formidable (lit. great, Mahati) objection, raised by you. As God created this universe without the assistance of bodily organs e.g. the hands, the feet etc. and also without the help of all instruments and materials, as wood, clay etc. so the Vedas were also revealed. You should raise no objection regarding the composition of the Vedas by Omnipotent God. But (remember) He did not reveal the Vedas in shape of books in the beginning (of the creation).

Q. In what form then?

A. In the form of (the inspired) knowledge.

Q. In whose consciousness (were they revealed)?

A. To the consciousness of Agni, Vāyu, Āditya and Āngirasa.

Q. But they (Agni, Vāyu, Āditya and Āngirasa i.e. Fire, Air, Sun and Light) are inanimate things, devoid of consciousness.

A. This is not so. In human bodies, they were human beings (born) in the beginning of creation.*

Q. How is it?

A. No inanimate object can perform an act of intelligence. Where the primary meaning (of a word) is incompatible, it is the sphere of lakṣaṇa (i.e. Indication).† For instance, if a credible person were to tell another that the bed-steads were crying

* Sayāṇa also corroborates, “नीवविषेषरिविवाक्षाविवि: बेदानुमुन्दास्तिः र्खात्” ( क्रम-भाष्यप्रवद्धतं : )।

† Cf. : मुखवाक्षाबध्ये ततू-युक्तो यावाक्षः प्रतीते।

क्षे: प्रयोजनावः वापि क्षणाश्चित्तर्पित।।

(Sāhityadarpāṇa)

i.e. where the Expressed meaning of a word is incompatible with the context, we take secondary sense by lakṣaṇa i.e. Indication.
There are three powers of words (शब्दावलितत्वस्य) to signify different meaning of all words, i.e., Abhidha, Lakṣaṇa and Vyājanā. Abhidha is also called Mukhyā-vṛtti i.e. the Primary power; which is defined as :

“तत्र संविदांतान्तय बोधनार्थात्मादिधयाः” (Sāhityadarpana. II)

Abhidha or the Primary power conveys to the understanding the meaning which belongs to the word by convention (sanketa). Abhidha expresses the conventional meaning of a word. This sanketa or convention is also fourfold as Jāti, Guṇa, Dravya and Kriyā.

The second power is called Lakṣaṇa or Indication. It is defined as :

“मूख्यार्थायां ततै योगे यथायोगय: प्रतीतयते । 
रूढः प्रयोजनात् बापि लक्षणार्थाधिकारायति” (Sāhityadarpana II)

When the primary meaning of a word is incompatible (with the rest of the sentence), this power of Indication is communicated (to the word); whereby another meaning (than the Expressed one) connected therewith becomes apprehended, either through usage—(Ṛudhi) or through some motive (Prayoja).

The sentence “कलिंगः साहसिकः” is an example in Ṛudhilakṣaṇa. It means : “Kalinga i.e. (Orissa) is rash”. But the quality of rashness is found in sentient beings only. Thus the primary meaning of the word Kalinga is inappropriate here. This is “मूख्यार्थ वाच”. Hence, the word Kalinga causes us to think of the men, residing in the country ; this meaning is connected with the primary meaning “country”.

To take another example “पक्षायो घोषः” or “herd-station on the Gaṅgā.” The word Gaṅgā primarily signifies a “stream of water”. But this meaning is inappropriate here as a herd-station cannot be built over a mass of water. Thus there is मूख्यार्थवाच. This incompatibility leads us to think of the bank, which is connected with itself (Gaṅgā) by relation of proximity. Thus there is “Tad-yoga”.

(Contd.)
The light of knowledge possibly shines in human beings alone. Here we cite the following authority (from the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* in support of this):—

(Contd. from page 19)

This power of a word by which we understand “men” from the word *Kalinga* and “Bank” from the word *Gaigā* is called “Lakṣaṇa”.

The first example is based on convention i.e. Rudhi and the second one on purpose i.e. Prayojana. This *Lakṣaṇa* has eighty varieties according to the Rhetoricians.

The third power of words is *Vyañjana*. Its simple definition is as follows:

“विरतताविभिदायाय यथायथो बोधने परः।
सा वृत्ति: व्याज्ञाना नाम शब्दस्थायाविभूत्य च च।” (Sahityadarpana)

When Denotation (*Abhidhā*) and other powers cease after discharging their function, that function of a word or its sense etc. by which a further meaning is conveyed is what is called *Vyañjana* i.e. Suggestion.

This *Vyañjana* is twofold (1) that which is based upon a word’s power of Denotation i.e. *Abhīdha-mūla* and (2) which is based upon its power of Indication (*Lakṣaṇa-mūla*).

In *Lakṣaṇa-mūla* *Vyañjanā* we may take the example of “गंगेश्वरः” (i.e. a herd-station on the Gaṅga). Here the power of Denotation ceases after denoting the meaning of “a mass of water”, and when the power of Indication ceases after conveying the meaning of the “bank”, then that power by which the excess of coolness and purity is conveyed, is called “Suggestion or *Vyañjana*” based upon “Indication”.

We have explained here very concisely the three Powers of words. The interested reader may refer to the Kavyaprakāśa or Sahityadarpanā. This brief explanation given here will help the reader in understanding our text.

* This is to say that we should interpret here Agni, Vāyu, Aditya and Āṅgiras as Proper Nouns denoting four seers, called by these four names. They were human beings. These words do not signify here inanimate objects of nature—Fire, Air, Sun and Light.
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(3) From them, when they meditated, were produced the three Vedas: from Agni was produced the Rgveda, from Vayu, the Yajurveda, and from Surya, the Samaveda.

God inspired their consciousness and the Vedas were revealed through them.

Q. This is really true. We infer (from your statement) that God gave them knowledge and they composed the Vedas with the help of this knowledge.

A. Do not take it in that sense. In what form did God give them knowledge?

Q. In the form of the Vedas.

A. Was that knowledge divine or was it their own?

Q. Surely it was God's.

A. Then, who did compose the Vedas? God or they?

Q. God composed them as they (the Vedas) are His own knowledge: (lit. they were composed by Him whose knowledge they are).

A. Then why have you raised objection and say that they (Agni and others) composed them?

Q. To come to the definite conclusion.*

Q. Is God just or partial?

A. He is just.

Q. Why, then, did He reveal the Vedas to the hearts of four persons only and why not to the hearts of all mankind?

A. This does not indicate that God has even the slightest partiality. On the contrary, it clearly brings to light the exact justice of the

(3) "तेष्वे: तेष्वेय: तमी वेदां अजायत।
अनं: जयधेत: वायो: साजुवेद: सूर्याति सानवेद: ।" (अप. XI. 5.2.3)

* These questions and answers are not really so. Here the objector and the demonstrator of truth are represented by the words question and answer i.e. the question stands for objector and the answer for demonstrator of truth.

Mark the convincing method of discussion. How remarkably has the author advanced arguments and the objector himself admits truth,
just God. Justice signifies to award fruit strictly in accordance with one's action. Be it known to you that only these (four sages) possessed previous (birth)—merits (pūrva-punya). Hence it was quite reasonable that the Vedas were revealed to their hearts only.

Q. But they were born in the beginning of the creation. Whence did they acquire these previous merits ?

A. Here we say that all worldly souls (jīvas) are without beginning in their nature. Their actions and this great effect i.e. the universe are too without beginning, like an eternal flow of stream. We shall establish their eternal nature by adducing proofs later on.*

Q. Has God composed (verses) in metres—such as Gāyatrī and others also ?

A. Why this doubt ? Does God lack in the knowledge of composing metres e.g. Gāyatrī and others ? He is Omniscient and knows this science as well as all others. Hence, this objection is baseless.

Q. Tradition (Aitihya) says that the four-faced Brahman composed the Vedas.

A. Do not say so. The Aitihya i.e. the Traditional testimony is included in "Oral Evidence" i.e. (Śabda-pramāṇa). Ācārya

* Here text is not very clear. "सबें जीवं: स्वभूतोपनादय: । तेनां कर्मोऽस तेषां कार्यं जगत्र्य प्रवाहेण एव अनाधितं साति" and the Hindi version given by Panditas is contrary to the Sanskrit text.

We have technically followed the Sanskrit text in our English rendering. But the underlying idea is still obscure. In order to make it more lucid we offer the following explanation:—

"Jīvas, their actions and this great effect (kāryarūpa) i.e. (jagat), these three things are Anādi. But this Anāditva has some distinct aspects. Souls and Nature (i.e. Jīvas and Mula-prakṛti) are without beginning (anādi), in their nature. They are eternal. But the actions and this universe (which is an effect of Mula-prakṛti i.e. the Original Nature) are also called eternal in the sence that they are like the members of a series which has no beginning and which flows on continuously like an eternal current of a river. Technically this eternal aspect is called as प्रवाहेण अनाधि. Ātma and Mula-prakṛti are eternal by nature."
Gautama in his treatise on logic (Nyāya-Śastra) defines it as (4) “A statement of a credible person” and adds that (5) “Traditional testimony is also an oral evidence.” In his commentary on this aphorism (Sūtra), Vātsyāyana, the commentator says, (6) “Āpta (a credible man) is he who has realised the truth and who being desirous of instructing others, represents the facts to them as personally visualised by him. Āpti means realisation of truth (about a thing) and ‘Āpta’ is a person who possesses this.”

Consequently, the truthful tradition only is accepted as “Aīthīya”, (i.e. a Traditional evidence) and not a false (or ambiguous) statement. Hence, that Aīthīya (Testimony of Tradition) is acceptable which stands the test of truth (Satya-praṇāṇa) and is a statement of a credible person and not that which is contrary (to truth). A false (tradition), like the ravings of a mad man is (not acceptable). Similarly (the tradition) that Vyāsa or other sages (Rṣis) composed the Vedas is also false. The modern (Navīna)* books of the Purāṇas or the Tantras (which contain such false tales) are of no avail and worth.

Q. Why should not we accept that the Mantras (Vedic stanzas) and Sūktas (the Vedic hymns) were composed by those Rṣis, whose names are mentioned over them?

A. Do not say so. Even Brahman and others have studied and learnt the Vedas from others. The Śvetāsvatara and other Upaniṣads contain passages (saying):—

(4) “आत्मोपबंधः मध्यः” (Nyāya. I. 1.7)
(5) “शब्द ईतिहासित्वादि” (Nyāya. II. 2.2)
(6) “आप्त- खबु साक्षात्काराधमो वचाच्चर्चार्थम् विवर्णपमवया प्रमुख उपवेस्ते। साक्षात्कारर्थमयंस्थि; तया प्रवर्तिते इत्यादि।” (Nyāya-bhāṣya. I. 1.7)

* According to Dayānanda, there are two types of the Purāṇas; (I) Navīna and (II) Prācina. The modern eighteen Purāṇas e.g. Viṣṇu-Purāṇa and Agni Purāṇa, contain false stories. They are included in the first category of Navīna Purāṇas. The second category of ancient Purāṇas includes Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa &c. The evidence of these ancient Purāṇas, is acceptable.
(7) “He who creates Brahman (i.e. ब्रह्म) first and then verily sends forth the Vedas to him.” (SV. VI. 18)

The Vedas were known to Brahman and others when Rṣis (Marīci and others) were not born. Manu says:

(8) “He (God) milked (i.e. caused them to be revealed) from Agni, Vāyu, and Ravi, the three (fold) eternal Veda (Brahma) by name Rg, Yajur and Sāma for the accomplishment of sacrifices (Yajñas).” (Manu I.23)

Again:

(9) “Kavi, the son of Aṅgiras taught his fathers (pitīn, i.e. elders).” (Manu II. 151)

When Brahman himself learnt the Vedas from Agni and others, (then) what have we to say about Vyāsa etc.?

Q. Why are the Ṛgveda and other Saṁhitās ascribed two names viz. Veda and Śruti?

A. Because each of these names denotes distinct significance. The word Veda is derived from the (four) roots, i.e. “Vida” to know, “Vida” to exist, “Vidṛ” to obtain, and “Vida” to think, by adding a suffix ज्ञ (i.e. ज) in the sense of Instrumental and Locative cases, in accordance with the aphorism:

(10) “Halaśca”. (P. III. 3.121)

(7) “ये वे ब्रह्मण विदाग्धि पुर्वम्।
ये वे बेदोऽधि प्रहिणोति तस्मा॥” (SV. VI. 18)

Here the verb praḥiṇoti (प्र+ऍ V.P.) ordinarily means (1) to send forth, propel, (2) to throw, discharge, shoot. Cf: विनाशात् तत्र वृक्ष्य रक्षास्य नाहोपल्य स्रोत्याय। (RV. XV. 21)

In this passage it means “to give” or “to send forth”.

(8) “अनविदायुद्धुभ्यं बयं ब्रह्म सणातनम्।
कुवेह यज-सिद्धमयूर्मम्-सामलक्षणम्॥।” (MS. I. 23)

(9) “प्राधारापायम विनेतुर शिषुऽर्गिणस: कोषः।” (MS. II. 151)

(10) “हलश्च” (P. III. 3.121) On this aphorism Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita writes:

“हलश्च घञ्जो ध्यातृ। घर्षाद:। रसनेन योनिनिदिस्मन् इति रामः। अवपुषयतेनेन
श्रावातिध्यायामः॥।” (Contd.)
Similarly the word Śruti is formed from the root √sru (to hear) with suffix तिन (ति) in the (sense of) Instrumental case. The Vedas are so called as all men know all true sciences in or through them or as all true sciences in (Contd. from page 24)

Here the author gives two examples, Rāma and Apāmārga in Locative and Instrumental cases respectively. Similarly our author explains the word Veda from four different roots in the sense of these two non-relations i.e. Locative and Instrumental.

i.e. According to Dayānanda the word “Veda” is derived from the following four roots :-

(a) विद्य नाने (अवादिगणे परस्मेवदे, सेट्) यथा-वेति।
(b) विद्य सत्तायामू (विधादिआतमनेपदेदिनित्) यथा-विद्यते।
(c) विद्य विचारणे (वधावैगणे आतमेनेपदेदित्) यथा-विद्यते।
(d) विवलू लाभे (खुदाविणे उभयवक्षीय: लेप्ट धातु:) यथा-विद्यति, विद्यते।

But there is another (fifth) root in Dhatupātha from which we can get the word Veda. The root √विद्य वेतना�难过विवासेत् is mentioned in Tenth Conjugation as Set in Atmanepada.

This root means :-to make known, communicate, inform, apprise, tell or teach, expound as it is in the verse :-

“वेदाय विदयववदय” (विदान-कौशिक)

The following verse illustrates the root in some of its conjugations :-

“वेदित सत्ताया शास्त्रवाणी गर्भस्तेय न विद्यते।
विद्य धार्म सदा सत्ताया: तेषु पुनां च विद्यति ॥”

cf. also :-

“सत्तायां-विद्यते, साने-वेति, विद्ये-विचारणे।
विद्यते विद्यति-प्राप्ति, यथा युक्त र्वनेदित्व फळात् ॥”

This stanza also describes different Vikaraṇas in different roots.

(cf : Latin — v i d c o ; A.S. Witan ;
Goth — v a i t ; English—wit)

Prof. A.A. Meconell’s Vedic Grammar is very poor in this respect. He gives only two roots instead of five. (√vid—to know and √vid to obtain).
The word Veda has been used in ancient literature with two different accentuations i.e. “adi-udatta” and “anta-udatta”. The “adi-udatta” “Veda” word (in Nominative, Singular) has been used in the Rigveda 15 times as “वेदः” (RV. I. 73.5 ; III, 53.14. etc.) and once in Instrumental case as in “वेदों—रावणस्थिति हि वेदोंमथाय:। वेदेन—वेदायोगप्रधान्यन् हि साधयः” (RV. VIII. 19.5.) : in Yajurveda and Atharvaveda we come across its use with anta-udatta which is not found in the Rigveda ; as “वेदः” (YV II. 21 ; AV. VII. 28.1).

Panini enumerates this word in two different Ganas i.e. in ओषधीवि (VI. 1.160) and in वृक्षवि (VI. 1. 203).

It is interesting to note that this word is etymologically explained in the following Vedic Texts :—

(a) “वेदं वेदं अवरुणो वितं वेदविविद्यत। तत्तदार्य वेदवात्।” (TS. 1.4.20)
(b) “वेदं: वेदंध्यो निलायत। तां वेदाद्विविद्यस्त। वेदेन वेदं विनिदु:। पुरविवीम्।” (TB. III. 3.9.69)

These uses are from the root विद (to obtain).

Bhaṭṭabhaṣkara in his commentary on TS explains as follows :—

“विद्यते-सम्पर्क-तेजस्तिः करणे च:। ओषधीविविद्यं अन्तोत्पत्तम्।”

(c) Anandatīrtha in his Viṣṇuṭattvaniṃśaṇa cites a stanza showing the derivation of this word :—

“नेद्राणां नातुवां, वेदं हि एव एवं वेदविद्यत। तत्तात्त्वः: वेदं हि विद्यताध्वृत्तिः।”

(d) In Āyurveda :—

“अधुरसिन्दु विद्यतेजन त भास्विविद्यं-हर्याकुः।’’ (SST. 1. 14)

(Contd.)
by any body in his corporeal body. Because they were revealed by God Who has no bodily organs. Agni, Vāyu, Aditya and Āngirasa are His instruments for revealing the Vedas of Divine authorship. This must be clearly known to you. The relation between the Vedic words and their objects is also divine as He is the Home of all sciences.

It has, therefore, been proved that the Vedas or Śrutis were revealed by God through Agni, Vāyu, Ravi and Āngirasa, who were men in corporeal form.

(Contd. from page 26)

Here the author appears to have accepted the suffix used in Instrumental or Locative senses.

The Commentator Ulhana derives it from the roots $\sqrt{\text{Vid}}$ (to exist), $\sqrt{\text{Vida}}$ (to know), $\sqrt{\text{Vida}}$ (to think) and $\sqrt{\text{Vid}}$ (to obtain) as:

\begin{quote}
“आयुरस्त्रय स्थाप्तेद्विक्षिते—स्मि, विख्ययते—माययेत्येव, विख्ययते—विख्ययेत्येव या...।
आयुरनेन विख्यति—प्राग्नति होयक्षेतः ॥”
\end{quote}

(e) “तत्रायुथ्व्ययति होयक्षेतः ।” (Caraka XXX. 20)

(f) Abhinavagupta in his Nāṭyaśāstra :

\begin{quote}
“नाट्यस्य वेदं सत्ता लाभो विचारस्य यथा !
तत्त्वाद्यस्य वेद सब्बेनीश्चये ॥” (I. 1)
\end{quote}

(g) Medhātithi in his commentary on Manu :

\begin{quote}
“विन्त्वन्त्यन्नम्प्रमाणवेदं एवलक्षणमयमस्माविविष्यति वेदः ।”
\end{quote}

(h) Kapādisvāmī writes :

\begin{quote}
“निष्केष्यस्तहारणि कर्माणि प्रावद्वयति वेदः ।” (APB. I. 33)
\end{quote}

Svāmī Hari Prasāda’s view that the word Veda cannot be derived from the above noted four roots is wrong. The above noted citations clearly prove the derivations of this word from these four (or five) roots.
THE DATE OF THE VEDAS

Q. How many years have elapsed since the Vedas were revealed?

A. One Vṛnda (i.e. Arab) ninety six crores, eight lacs, fifty two thousands, nine hundreds and seventy six years (i.e. 1,96,08,52,976 years) have passed and the current year is the seventy seventh (1,96,08,52,977th year).* The equal number of years has passed in the current Kalpa since the creation.

Q. How do you ascertain that only so many years (and not more or less) have elapsed?

A. We ascertain it, because in the current creation (i.e. Kalpa) the seventh “Manvantara” called “Vaivasvat” is running. Six “Manvantaras” have already passed before this. These seven “Manus” (or Manvantaras) are styled as Svayambhuva, Svārociṣa, Auttami, Tāmasa, Raivata, Cakṣuṣa and Vaivasvata. The coming seven Manus are Śāvaru &c. All these, put together, make fourteen Manvantaras.

The duration of one Manvantara is seventy one “Caturyugis” (i.e. four Yugas). These fourteen (Manvantaras) make one day of Brahman. One thousand “Catur-yugis” are the length of a day of Brahman. The night of Brahman is of the same duration. The period of cosmos is called ‘day’ and the time of dissolution is termed as ‘night’.

In the present day of Brahman, six Manus have elapsed. The seventh Manvantara, called the Vaivasvata is running. During this

* It refers to 1933 Vikrama Era when the author wrote this work. According to Śrī Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, this calculation omits seven Sandhis, intervening each Manvantara. To get the correct total, one must add period of ‘seven’ Sandhis (1728000×7 =) 12096000 years to above mentioned total. It would give us correct total of 1972948976 years. I also agree with him. Otherwise we shall not get Brāhma day, consisting of one thousand Caturyugas which is clearly accepted by Svāmī Dayānanda here in original. Detailed calculation is given in our notes.
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(seventh Manvantara) the 28th Kali-yuga is passing on. Four thousands nine hundreds and seventy six years (4976) have already rolled by in the present Kali age. The current year is the seventy seventh (i.e. 4977) which the Āryas call the Saṃvat 1933 according to the Vikrama Era. Here we cite below the authority of Manu:—

(1) “Now listen the brief (description) of the duration of a day and night of Brahman and of all the ages (of the universe) in their respective order.”

(2) “Four thousands (i.e. 4000) years (of the Devas) make the “Krta” age. Sandhīya* (the preceding twilight) consists of so many hundred years (i.e. 400) and Sandhīya-āṁśa, (the succeeding twilight) is of the same number (of years i.e. 400).

(3) “In other three ages (i.e. Treta, Dvāpara and Kali) with their Sandhīyas and Sandhīya-āṁsas (i.e. the preceding and succeeding twilights) the thousands and the hundreds are (diminished) by deducting one in each.”

(1) “श्राहस्य तु अपाहस्य यत्रप्रमाणं समासत:।
एकाकशो युगानां तु कमास्तस्तनिवोधत॥”

(2) “चत्वारीश्च सहस्त्राणि चर्माणि यथाकालं युगमः।
तस्य ताबच्छाती सह्या, सन्ध्याग्रां तपाविद्य: ॥”

* The words Sandhīya and Sandhīya-āṁs are explained by Kullūka Bhaṭṭa here as “युगानां पूर्वा सन्ध्या, उत्तरस्य सन्ध्यांशः: ॥”

cf. तत्रप्रमाण: सते: सन्ध्या पूर्वां तत्रासाधीयते।
सन्ध्यायस्तकदया ततानुस्तो युगपल्लवः हि: यः।।
सन्ध्यासन्ध्यासायोरनतयः कालो युगस्ततम्।
युगाः स तु विशेष: कुत्तेराहास्यः।। (VP विश्व्य पराणो)

cf. बिल्भे: वर्षासहस्त्राद्र उक्तेराहस्यसस्तनम्।
चतुर्युमां द्वारायम्: तत्रिमां निवोध से॥ (VP)

cf. बुद्धासा तस्मान्यत्रा च चतुर्युमां युगश्च।
युगपरास्तया हिंसितान्नर्युगः हुस:॥ (SS. I. 15)

(3) “इतःरेषु सन्ध्यायेऽव सन्ध्यांश्येऽव च चिंतुः।
एकापयेन वर्तंते सहस्त्राणि गताःच ॥”
(4) "These four (human) ages, which we have just enumerated, make one age of the gods (Devas) consisting of twelve thousand years (12,000)."

(5) "The sum total of one thousand (1000) ages of the Devas (i.e. 1000 Catur-Yugas) makes one day of Brahman and His night is also of the same duration."

(6) "Those, who understand that the holy day of Brahman, ends with the expiry of 1,000 Yugas (i.e. Catur-Yugas) of the gods and His night is also of the same length, are indeed experts in (the calculation of) days and nights."

(7) "The above described age or Yuga of the Devas, which consists of 12,000 (divine) years, when multiplied by 71 is called here as one Manvantara.*

In the Bhagvad-gītā the same thing has been explained very briefly yet lucidly in the following one verse :—

"सहस्रयुगपर्ययः युगाबहु: विदु:।
रावित युगसहस्त्रां तेज्होररात्रिबिद्व: जना:।। (BG. VIII 17)

(7) "The above described age or Yuga of the Devas, which consists of 12,000 (divine) years, when multiplied by 71 is called here as one Manvantara.*

In the Surya-Siddhānta, the Manvantara is described in more simple words, as :—

"युगानां सप्तति: शेखा मनवस्तःरथमहोवते।। (I. 18)

We are further told here that after every Manvantara, there is 'jala-plava' over the earth. the duration of which is similar to the age of the Kṛīta.

cf. "हृददच्छास्यंस्सस्यात् विन्य: प्रेक्षो जलपाय:।। (SS)"
(8) "These Manvantaras are countless. The creation and the
dissolution (of the world) are also (numberless). They are, as it
were, sportings of the Most High (Parameśthin) who creates it
again and again.* (MS. I. 68-73 and 79, 80)

(8) “स्रावश्यकश्चर्याः स्य: संहार एव स।।
कोषिन्वपत्तत् कृतेत् परस्मेश्च युन: पुन: । पुनः ॥” (MS. I. 68-73, 79-80)

* In the above cited last verse, Manu says that the workings of
God are beyond human calculations. He is eternal and His functions are
also eternal and beyond human imagination.

The sportive character of God is also described in the śārīrika
Sūtra, as :—

“तीलामुनी तीलाक्षवप्य ।” (VDD. II. 1.33)

The cycle of creation is eternal and endless.

cf. “युगान्तरायस्मसी धाता यथापुरविकृतवत् ।” (RV. X. 191.3)

Here the word "Yatha-purvar" deserves notice.

This calculation of the Brahman's Day and Night is very popular
in Indian Astronomy.

We have already quoted verses from the Sūrya-siddhānta, Manu-smṛti
and Bhagavad-gītā, which clearly explain the theory. Yāśka in his Nirukta
(XIV. 4) refers to this calculation and explains the gradual evolution of
this universe :—

“युगसहस्रं राति: । तो एतो अन्तरायाभाजलं परिष्करते । स कालस्तवेत-
वर्तवृत्तिः।”

“युगसहस्रवर्तममहायवधामि विव: ।
राति: युगसहस्रातः तेषोहरायवि जनाः ॥”

This calculation is also found in the Mahābhārata (Śantiparva—231)
and also in the Sūrya-siddhānta.

Dayānanda has mentioned here names of a few Manus, which have
already elapsed. The names of the succeeding Manvantaras have been
omitted. They are enumerated here in full :—

1. Sva'yambhuva, 2. Svārociśa, 3. Aūtama, 4. Tāmasa,

The Viśu Purāṇa also enumerates in detail all these aspects of the
creation. We have already cited a few verses from this work.
The terms e.g. the Day of Brahman and the Night of Brahman, have been coined for measuring time and they are easy to be comprehended. In this way the calculation of the age of creation and dissolution of the world and also of the Vedic revelation becomes very easy. A Manvantara is so termed as with the change of a Manvantara there is a slight (kiñcit) modification (paravartana) in the causitive qualities of the creation (Naimittika guṇas).

Following is the system of calculation here:

(9) "Eka=1, Data=10, Śata=100, Sahasra=1000, Ayuta=10000, Lakṣa=100000, Niyuta=10.000.000, Koṭi=10.000.000, Arbuda=100.000.000;"

(10) "Vṛnda=1.000.000.000, Kharva=10.000.000.000, Nikharva=100.000.000.000, Śankha=1.000.000.000.000, Padma=10.000.000.000.000, Sagara=100.000.000.000.000, Antya=1.000.000.000.000.000, Madhya=10.000.000.000.000.000, Parardhya=100.000.000.000.000.000, and so on multiplying by 10 respectively."

This enumeration is according to the Sūrya-Sidhānta &c.

(11) "Thou art (O God) the Measurer of Sahasra and the Creator of Sahasra." (YV. XV. 65)

(12) "Sahasra is verily Sarva (i.e. all Viśva) and Thou art the Giver of Sarva." (SP. VII. 5.2.13)

* Sri Ghasi Ram M. A., LL. B. translates the phrase “नैमित्तिकगुणानामवि पयापरस्तनम्” as follows:

"Modifications occur in the external arrangement of creation." It is wholly wrong. The words नैमित्तिक गुणानाम do not mean "external arrangement." ‘Guṇas’ denote “qualities” and ‘Naimittika’ means pertaining to some ‘nimitta’ i.e. cause. Moreover in his translation he omits the word “kiñcit” i.e. “slight”.

(9) “एकं दशं शतं चतुर्थं सहस्रम् तथा।
लक्षं च पौर्णमिदं क्षीरतस्वेतं च ॥”

(10) “युक्तं खचं निष्कर्षं शाक्तं: पद्मं च सागरं।
अन्तं सहस्रं परार्धं च वस्मुद्यं यथाकालं ॥” (Reference not traceable)

(11) “सहस्रस्य प्रयात्म सहस्रस्य प्रतिमात्मसि ॥” (YV. XV. 65)

(12) “सम्भवं संहस्तं, समवत्सदातसि ॥” (SP. VII. 5.2.13)
Here the word *Sarva* is the name of the whole world, as well as of the time. As God is the Measure (Pramā) and Reckoner (Pratimā) of the universe, where Day and Night (of Brahman) are consisted of one thousand *Mahā-yugas*. Hence, the *Mantra* occurs in general sense (described above).*

The treatises on Astronomical science describe the daily rotations of time (e.g. daily movements and changes—*Tithi*, *Nakṣatra* and *Grahas*).†

* The author means to say here that the calculation of Brahman's Day and Night has its origin in the Vedic texts. The world is called *Sahasra* because its existence and dissolution (i.e. Brahman's Day and Brahman's Night) consist of 1000 *Mahā-yugas* or *Catur-yugas* each.

Dayānanda is original in his Vedic interpretations. No other commentator so far has given this scientific interpretation of this *Mantra*. He really is a *Ṛṣi*.

Yudhishthira Mimāṁsaka proposes a correction in the original Sanskrit text as “*Sahasra*” in place of “*Sarvā*” on the basis of “Hindi version”. I do not agree. Dayānanda wrote or dictated the Sanskrit text only. Hindi rendering was done by some Panditas which is often wrong and contradictory.

† Sri Ghasi Ram wrongly translates the sentence “*व्योतिष् शास्त्रे प्रतिविनियन्तरितिना*” as “works on astronomical sciences lay down rules for daily observances”.

Here the word “*carya*” is derived from the root √*car* (to move), “*carya*” therefore means progress or rotation. All planets and stars show daily rotations which are calculated in the works on Astronomical science.

In order to elucidate this point I cite below a few instances from Sanskrit literature showing the root √*car*, used in the sense of “to walk, move, go about, roam, or wander”:

(a) “*नख्यत्राभुतिर्यथिष्ठयो मन्त्रमन्त्रं चरति ।*” *(Ś. I. 15)*

(b) “*इद्विशालो हि चरताम् ।*” *(BG. II. 67)*

(c) “*सत्यं त्वं साधु नाचरः ।*” *(RV. I. 76)*

In Astronomical works “*Car*” is also used as noun. This has undermentioned meanings:

(I) The planet Mars i.e. *Mangala*.

(II) Hence *Tuesday*.

(III) The seventh *Karaṇa* in Astrology.
The Aryas have clearly calculated and calculate even today according to Mathematical science the divisions of time from $Kṣaṇa$ (i.e. $4/5$th of a second) upto $Kalpa$ and $Kalpānta$. This (calculation) is repeatedly pronounced daily (in the beginning of their all religious or secular undertakings) and is known (to all).

Therefore, all men must accept this firmly established doctrine ($vyavasthā$) (regarding the date of the Vedic revelation) and should accept none else; because, the Aryas repeat (the following) formula daily:

(13) "Om, Tat-Sat. I performed or (will) perform this (act) in the second quarter ($Prāhara$-$ardha$) of the Day of Brahma, in the first quarter of the 28th Kali age of the $Vaivasvata-Manvantara$ in such and such year, solstice, season, month and fortnight ($pākṣa$), on such and such day, under such and such constellation, and at such and such moment of the Sun’s entrance into a Zodical sign and at such an hour."

This (formula) is a matter of daily routine (lit. known) to all the Aryas—young or old—and this tradition (lit. History or $Itihāsa$) is prevalent everywhere in India ($Āryavarta$) in an identical form. Hence it is impossible for any one to set aside this firmly established doctrine ($vyavasthā$). This (fact) therefore must be clearly understood.

(Contd. from page 33)

(IV) The $Karṇās$, taken collectively.

(V) The difference of time between two Meridians.

(VI) The first, fourth, seventh and tenth Signs of the Zodiac.

The interested reader may refer to the books on Astronomy here and will come across numberless instances there: $Caryā$ also means in Astronomy:

(i) a course.

(ii) a motion as in $Rāhu$-$caryā$.

In $Tapā$-$caryā$ it means a “practice”.

(13) “अमृत तत् सत्। श्री प्रभुप्रहरायं वेदस्तत्तस्य तत्तेव विषयति।
कल्याणेऽवस्थतीति।कल्याणेऽवस्थतीति।
स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं स्वरूपायं
THE DATE OF THE VEDAS

We shall explain Yugas in more detail later on.*

* It will be read with interest, the detailed calculation of the Day of Brahman, given below according to Manu and the Suryasiddhanta:

**Note**: 360 human years = 1 year of the Devas.

1. Duration of Kṛtyuga ... 4000 (years of the Devas)
2. Duration of Tretāyuga ... 3000 -do-
3. Duration of Dwāpara ... 2000 -do-
4. Duration of Kaliyuga ... 1000 -do-

Total 10000 Divine years

The intervals between the preceding and succeeding Yugas are called Sandhyā and Sandhyāṃsa. (Sandhyā is a preceding twilight and Sandhyāṃsa, a succeeding twilight)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (a) Sandhyā of Kṛtyuga 400 (years of the Devas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Sandhyāṃsa of Kṛtyuga 400 -do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (a) Sandhyā of Tretāyuga 300 -do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Sandhyāṃsa of Tretāyuga 300 -do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (a) Sandhyā of Dwāpara 200 -do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Sandhyāṃsa of Dwāpara 200 -do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (a) Sandhyā of Kaliyuga 100 -do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Sandhyāṃsa of Kaliyuga 100 -do-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 2000

The grand total would be:

Duration of 4 Yugas 10000
Duration of Sandhis 2000

Total 12000 (years of the Devas)

Thus these 12000 years of all Yugas are styled as one Caturyugi or one Mahāyuga.

Following are the human years of this Caturyugi or Mahāyuga:

360 human days or one human year = one day of the Devas.
360 human years = one year of the Devas.

(Contd.)
(Contd. from page 35)

(a) Now $12000 \times 360 = 4,320,000$ human years which make the duration of a Caturyugi or Mahayuga according to our calculation.

(b) 1000 such Caturyugis make one Day of Brahman.  
Thus  
$12000 \times 1000 = 12000000$ years of Devas.  
or  
$4320000 \times 1000 = 4320000000$ human years.

(c) A Day of Brahman $= 12000000$ years of the Devas.  
or  
Day of Brahman $= 4320000000$ human years.

We can come to the same conclusion by the following calculation also which is more lucid and simple:—

$71 \text{ Caturyugis} = 1 \text{ Manvantara.}$  
$14 \text{ Manvantaras} = 1 \text{ Day of Brahman.}$

While calculating the duration of 14 Manvantaras, we must add 15 Sandhis of jalapalas (one in the beginning and one at the end of each Manvantara). Each jalapala or Sandhi is equal to a Krtayuga.

(a) 1 Manvantara $= 71 \text{ Caturyugas}$ or  
$4320000 \times 71 = 306,720,000$ human years.

(b) 14 Manvantaras $= 306,720,000 \times 14 = 4294,080,000$ human years.

(c) 15 Sandhis of Manvantaras; equal to the age of Krtayuga i.e.  
$1,728,000 \times 15 = 25,920,000$ human years.

Now we sum up as follows:—

1. Duration of 14 Manvantaras ... 4,294,080,000  
2. Duration of 15 Sandhis ... 25,920,000  
3. Total duration of Brahman's day or grand total ... 4,320,000,000  

Note:—One day of Brahman consists of 1000 Caturyugis because $71 \times 14 = 994$. To this if we add 6 Caturyugis, the duration of 15 Sandhis we get 1000 Caturyugis. 15 Sandhis are equal to the duration of Caturyugis. Manu, Dayananda and the author of Surya-siddhanta accept this calculation i.e. $71 \times 14 = 994 + 6 = 1000$).  

(Contd.)
The duration of the Night of Brahman is equal to His day.

Thus:

- **Brahman's Day**: 4,320,000,000 years
- **Brahman's Night**: 4,320,000,000 years

Total: 8,640,000,000 years

In order to come to the date of the Vedic revelation as described above in the text by our author, we must take into consideration the following verses from the *Suryasiddhānta*:

“कल्पदर्शनाचन मनवः वद्वसत्तः सतस्मयः।
वेष्वस्वतमनह स्मनः: युगानां विधिनो गतः॥
अवस्तेवशात्युगादसात्यात्मेतत्तृत्तं युगम॥” (I. 22-23)

i.e. In this *Kalpa* or Day of Brahman six *Manus* with (their 7) *Sandhis* have elapsed. In the present *Vaivasvata Manvantara* 27 *Caturyugās* have also passed. The 28th *Kṛtayuga* also rolled by. Śrī Dayānanda wrote this book in the *Kali* age which is the 28th one in the current *Manvantara*.

The author of the *Suryasiddhānta*, further calculates years up to the period when he wrote his work (i.e. at the end of the *Kṛtayuga*):

“वषयमुनां तु सप्तीयषय: कालं तस्मिनिर्मितं: सह।
कल्पदर्शिनाश्चार्य वेष्वस्वतमनोतस्तथा॥
युगानं विधिनं यतं तथा कृतयुगं स्विन्यम। ।
प्राह्य गुरूस्तेस्तत्कालं पूर्वोंस्तं विव्यस्तवथम॥
सुर्यचतुर्विन्यामया ज्ञेयं कृतस्याते गता अभि। ।
ख-चतुरुक्त-यमित्रायिन-शार-रहस्य-निषायकरा:॥” (*Suryasiddhānta*)

According to this calculation, at the end of the 28th *Kṛtayuga* in this *Vaivasvata Manvantara* 1,953,720,000 solar years elapsed (when the *Suryasiddhānta* was written according to its author.

Thus to get the correct total of passed human years (when the work was written by our author (1933 V.E.), we must add the duration of passed 7 *Sandhis* \((1728000 \times 7 = 12096000)\) years to the above stated passed years \(1960852976 \div 12096000 = 1972948976\). It is exact
From these arguments (lit. statement) it is quite evident that the contention of European Professors Max Muller, Wilson &c that the Vedas are of human and not of divine origin and also their verdict that the Vedas were composed 2400 or 2900 or 3000 or 3100 years back, are based on delusion. Similarly, the similar versions of the Vernacular commentators of the Vedas are also erroneous.

(Contd. from page 37)

calculation of the past years. Similarly we have to add the period of 8 future (bhoga) Sandhis \(1728000 \times 8 = 13824000\) to the total (given by our author) of coming years and this will give us correct total \((233327024 + 13824000 = 2347051024)\). Thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Suddha Bhukta-kāla} & = 1972948976 \\
\text{Suddha Bhogya-kāla} & = 2347051024
\end{align*}
\]

Total \(4320000000= (1000 \text{ Caturyugas or a Day of Brahman or a Kalpa})\).

Our author in his Sanskrit text (and also in Hindhi version) clearly states that the date of the Vedas is the same as that of the creation. He does not give different dates for creation and of revelation. —

\text{cf: जितने वर्ष अभी ऊपर गिन आये हैं उतने ही वर्ष वेदों की और जगत की उत्पत्ति में भी हो चुके हैं। (Rgvedādi-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā. page 29).}
THE PERPETUITY OF THE VEDAS

As the Vedas are revealed (lit. produced) by God, their eternity is self-evident (svatāḥ) because all His powers are eternal.

Here some may object that the eternity of the Vedas cannot be established as they are consisted of words and words, like a pitcher, are effects (i.e. things created or fashioned). As a pitcher is a created thing (i.e. effect) so is a word. The words being non-perpetual, the Vedas should be confessed to be so. But this cannot be accepted so, because words are two-fold (1) eternal and (2) non-eternal (i.e. effects). The relations of words and imports, existing in the knowledge of Supreme Self must (naturally) be eternal; but those words which dwell in ours (i.e. in human knowledge) are effects (i.e. non-eternal). As all His powers must be eternal, so His knowledge and acts are eternal, inherently innate and beginningless. As the Vedas are knowledge of such a Being, their non-eternity is not tenable (i.e. they cannot be called effects or non-eternal like a pitcher).

Q. How can you accept eternity of the Vedas, as there were no books in existence for (the acts of) learning and teaching (at the time) when this entire universe stood dissolved and disintegrated in its original (lit. causal) form and when all gross effects were non-existent?

A. This (objection) is possible with respect to the things e.g. books, paper, ink &c and also with respect to our (human) actions only but not in other respects (i.e. in case of Divine acts and powers). We observe the Vedas to be eternal as they are a part of God’s knowledge.

Moreover, non-eternity of the Vedas cannot be established, simply on the ground that all books (employed) in learning and teaching are non-eternal, as they perpetually exist as a part of

* Cf. (a) “तत्स्यैवत्तत्स्य महते प्रूताय निःश्वतात्मात्वं धर्मेभो धर्मेव: सामवेजोयवण: ॥” (YV. XXXIV. 5)
(b) “वस्तुस्न: सामयज्जोग:” प्रतिक्षिता रक्षामनसवाराः ॥ (YV. XXXIV. 5)
God's knowledge. The relations of words, letters and meanings in the Vedas in this Kalpa are the same as they were in the past and they will remain similar in future also; because God's knowledge is eternal and infallible. Hence it is said in the Rigveda:

(1) "The Creator made the Sun and the Moon just in the same manner as He had created them before." (RV. X.190.3)

This is to say: here the words 'the Sun and the Moon (in the verse) are synecdoche (upalaksana) for the whole class.* The meaning is that the plan of the creation of the Sun and the Moon is the same in the present Kalpa as it was in God's knowledge in the previous Kalpa. Because God's knowledge is unchangeable and (hence) is not liable to increase or decrease. The same fact must be admitted in respect of the Vedas as they are consisted of His knowledge.

Now we cite a few quotations from the Grammatical treatise etc. as evidence to prove the eternity of the Vedas. Sage Patañjali, the author of the Mahābhāṣya, says:

(2) "Words are eternal. Eternal words must consist of perpetual (Kūṭastha) and changelessly immoveable letters, which are not liable to elision (apāya), augmentation and substitution (upajana-vikāras)." (MB. I)

---

(1) "सूर्यादेशमसि ध्याति यथापूर्वमस्कर्षयत्।०॥" (RV. X. 190.3)
* Upalaksana means: "स्वप्रतिवाक्तलेदति स्वेतप्रतिवाक्तलिभयम्।०॥" i.e. implying something that has not been expressed actually; Implication of something in addition or any similar object where only one is mentioned. Synecdoche of a part for the whole, of an individual for the species or of a quality for that where the quality exists. "सर्वप्रतिवाक्तलिभयमपूर्वकलिभयम।०॥"

(SK. on P. II. 4.80)

(2) "निव: शाया। नितेशु शायेः कृतवेदविवचारिभिः। भविषयम्, अनवायोपविवाचारिमि:।० इति।०॥" (MB. I)

Here Upajana means Āgama described as "निर्वचितवाच्यम:." Vikāra indicates change or substitution. "शायवाच्य:।०॥"
This statement frequently occurs in the Mahābhāṣya from the first Āhnikā onwards. Moreover:—

3. “The word or sound (Śabda) is that which is grasped through the ear, understood by the intellect, made manifest by being pronounced and of which free space or vacuity is the substratum.”

(M.B. I)

This (observation) occurs in the commentary on the aphorism, “महाभाष्य”. It means that all words, whether Vaidika (found in the Vedas) or Laukika (used in the world by mankind) are eternal, because these words are consisted of letters which are perpetual, immovable and are not subject to elisions, augmentation or variation. Words are imperishable as there is no Apāya (disappearance) or Lopa (i.e. elision) or augmentation (Upajana) or Vikara (substitution).

Q. How can it be justified when there are (definite) rules or injunctions for Apāya (elision) &c in the Gaṇapatha, Astādhyayi and the Mahābhāṣya?

A. To this objection, retorts the author of the Mahābhāṣya (as follows):—

4. “Complete words are substituted by complete words; according to Pāṇini, the son of Dākṣi. The eternalness of words can never be established if the change takes place in one portion (Eka-dēsa) only.” (M.B.)

---

3. “शब्दविलिङ्ग: रुपिनिद्वारा: प्रयोगेनाविविधतिः आकाशवेश: शब्दः”

(M.B. I)

The word Śabda is derived from the root, √Śabd (X.U. शब्दवत्) to speak, to sound or make noise with suffix Ghaṇ. Śabda means sound, the object of the sense of hearing and property of Ākāśa,

cf. (a) “अपातमन: ओषध्यमण्ड: गूणम: पवि विमानम विगाहमन:” (R. XIII. 1)

(b) “आयुर्विवेय: तु विज्ञान: शब्दो वैस्तविको गूण:” (N.S.M)

(c) “धृतिविश्वगुणा या स्वित्रता धार्य: विश्वम्” (S. I. I)

The Logicians describe “Śabda” as “आकाशवेश: शब्दः” (ND)

4. “सेवा सर्वविदेशा दक्षिणपञ्चम्य पाणिने:।
एकवेदशालिकारे तु नित्यतं नोपवहते॥” (M.B)
That is to say: complete sets (of letters) are replaced by other complete sets i.e. specific groups are substituted for specific groups. For instance "वेषपार: अभवत्" this group (of letters) is used in place of another group "वेषपार: गम् इ सु इ सु श्र. शिय इ लिपियि".

It is erroneous to think that in this later group "अमु, इ, उ, श, प, इ, ए" are elided respectively from "गम्, इ, सु, श्र, लिपियि" in the (former) group; because it has been said (in the above quotation) that the change does not take place in a portion only. In the opinion of Acarya Pāṇini, the son of Dākṣiṇa, the perpetuity of words (or sounds) would not be possible if elision, augmentation and variation were to be admitted to a portion only. Similar is the case when "At" is augmented or 'BHū' is converted into 'BHO'. The definition of a word (or sound) is that which is perceived with the organ of hearing, grasped by intellect, made manifest by pronunciation and of which space is the substratum (Deśa or Adhikarana). This definition of word also proves that the word is positively eternal. The effort made in uttering (a letter) and the act of hearing (the same) ceases to exist after (the particular) moment. The author of the Mahābhāṣya says:—

(5) The speech resides in one (particular) letter (which is being pronounced) at a time. (MB. I)

According to Pāṇini’s Grammar, the sentence “वेषपार: अभवत्” is accomplished in the following manner:—

“पर+ गम्” अर्थ “अन्ततावलोकनारसविनित्तेकु इ” (P. III. 2.48) इवनेन “इ”। "दिस्वामस्वापि दे: लोपः।"

"Abhayat" is from the root √Bhu with suffix श्र and लिपि. The श्र is from "कर्ति श्र" (P. III. 1. 68)

(5) "पूक्कर्णवाचनिनी वाल्।" (MB)

To elucidate clearly this point we may cite below a few quotations from some authentic works:—

(a) "अथ श्रवणावलोकितस्य । ... ... अथ गौरिणयः कः श्रवः कि यत्थ श्रावणसाहायुगुलकादिविश्वार्थरूपसः श्रवः कि नेत्रवाहः। इव्यम् नाम तत्, ... ... कर्ति श्रवः कि येनलक्षणितं साहायुगुलकादिविश्वार्थरूपाणिनां साधनायो वचनस्य स श्रवः। अथवा प्रतिति-पदार्थो लोकं वचनं श्रवं हनुवणेहि। तद् यथा—श्रवं कुरुण, मां श्रवं काष्ठोः, श्रावकार्यं भाषणं हि वचनं कुरुवेनेहि। तत्तत् यथाय श्रवं। ॥" (MB. I. 1.1)

(b) "प्रधानज्ञातप्रक्षेत्रप्रायद्वाधिकारकस्य श्रवणं वचनित्त व्यवहारः।" (KP. 1)

(c) स च श्रवणात्मकः। श्रवक्ष नियमः सकलहृदयप्रत्यावरणन्तमः अस्त्रीयिते। तत् श्रवणः वचनितमः श्रवः। (Śarabodhini)
The act of utterance terminates with the pronunciation of a particular letter. Hence the action of speech and not the word (or sound) is non-eternal.

Q. The word comes into existence and also perishes, like the action of speech. i.e. When pronounced, it comes into existence and if not pronounced, it does not exist. How can it be, then, eternal?

A. A word, like space (Ākāsa) pre-exists but in the absence of means, it remains unmanifested. But it becomes manifest by the action of speech and breath (Prāṇa i.e. Śvāsa or vital airs). For instance, in the word “gauḥ” when the action of speech is on ‘g’, it does not exist on ‘au’ and while it is on ‘au’ it has nothing to do with “visarga.” Thus the action of speech and the act of pronunciation only have elision and augmentation and not the word itself which is indivisible, uniform and available everywhere. Neither the pronunciation nor the hearing (of a word) is possible if there are no acts of speech and air. Consequently the words are eternal like Space or Aether (Ākāsa). Thus according to Grammatical science, all words are eternal and what to speak of the Vedic words!

Similarly the sage Jaimini has also established the perpetuity of words. (He says) :

(6) “It (word) is verily eternal as it is manifested for the sake of others.” (MD. I. 1.18)

This aphorism means as follows :

Here the word “verily (tu)” is used to remove all doubts regarding the non-eternalness of words. Being imperishable, the word is eternal; because, its manifestation is for the sake of others. The purpose of manifestation or pronunciation is to communicate information to another. Thus the word is not non-eternal. Otherwise, the perception (Abhijñā) that “such and such was the import or cannotation of the word” is not possible by means of a perishable word.* This is tenable only if words are admitted

(6) “नित्यश्च स्वात्त् वर्णनस्य पराध्येभ्याः” (MD. I. 1.18)

* Here the word “Abhijñā” means “Abhijñāna” or “Prati-abhijñā.” It indicates ‘recognition’. “Abhijñāna” is a combination of “Anubhava” of direct perception and of “Smṛti” or recollection, a sort of direct perception, assisted by memory; as when we say, “This is the same man I saw yesterday.” (Contd.)
to be eternal. (In that case) both, the signifier (i.e. the word) and the thing signified are existent. That is why many speakers are able to pronounce simultaneously the same word “COW” at different places and are also able to utter it at different times.

Thus, Jaimini has advanced a number of arguments in support of (the theory of) eternalness of words.

Moreover, the sage Kaṇḍāda, the author of the “Vaiśeṣika” aphorism also says:

(7) “The Vedas are authentic because they are His word.”

(VD. I. 1.3)

This is to say that all men should admit the authority of the four Vedas because they enjoin the performances of Dharma as duty and also because they are the word of God and thus eternal.

Similarly, the sage Gautama also says in his Nyāyaśāstra:

(8) “Its authenticity is like that of the Mantras and Ayurveda (i.e. Science of Medicine) because the credibility of the Āptas (i.e. trustworthy persons) is (quite natural).”

(ND. II. 1.68)

(Contd. from page 43)

(सोष्य यो दृश्यो नरः; “Anubhava” or direct perception leading to the identification expressed by “Ayam” and memory leading to the past reference expressed by “Saḥ.”

cf. “अभिभावकः सूक्तः” (P. III. 2.112)

“स्मृतिबोधिर्युपपदे मूलतन्त्रेन सूक्तः। स्मरसि कृपा: सूक्तेऽवस्त्याम्:।”

(Siddhānta-kaumudi)

(7) “सत् वनासामाय्यस्य प्रामाण्यम्।”

(VD. I. 1.3)

(8) “मन्त्रप्राप्तं प्रामाण्यस्य तत्वात्माण्यः। अतः प्रामाण्यात्।”

(ND. II. 1.68)

This aphorism has been explained by Vātsyāyana in his commentary as follows:

“कि पुनरुपवृत्तं प्रामाण्यम्। पुनरुपवृत्तं नोपपरिवर्तते। “हेद हृद्या इत्यमित्तिष्ठति, हेदं वर्जितस्य विनेत्ति अहतिः” इति तथ्यानुत्तोणानां तथाम्।—तयायत।—अविभेदः।

मन्त्रप्राप्तं व विविधानानां प्रतिपुर्वकानां प्रयोगोद्भावं तथामान्। अतः—प्रामाण्यस्य कि पुनरुपवृत्तं प्रामाण्यस्य। कि पुनरुपवृत्तं प्रामाण्यम्। साक्षात्कुलधम्मव, भूतह, ध्यानादिविन्या। अतः: खलु साक्षात्कुलधम्मवः।”

(Contd.)
The significance is that all men should admit the authenticity of these Vedas, which are eternal and are "the Word of God." Why so? Because all the credible (Aptas), great Yogins, Brahman &c who were righteous, free from all defects such as deception and treachery, merciful, preceptors of truth, masters of learning (lit. gone across) have admitted the authenticity of the Vedas in the same manner as that of the Mantras and the Ayurveda.*

(S Contd. from page 44)

Sudarśana further explains it:

"तत्—तय शास्त्रयः-वेदशास्त्रयः प्रामाण्य सिद्धम्—अप्तप्रामाण्यात्—वायुयोपदेशकानामातानां प्रामाण्यात्—मन्त्रायुवेधार्थविभिन्न सुवर्णयः॥

The "Anumāna-Prakṛtyā" is like this:

'बेदशास्त्रयः प्रामाण्यः (प्रतिच्छ.), अप्तप्रामाण्यात् (हेतु), मन्त्रायुवेधार्थविभिन्न (हुष्टन्)॥'

Dayānanda accepts the explanation given by Vatsyāyana and has clarified this Sutra accordingly. Vācaspati Miśra advances another reason in support of this theory:

"When we accept the sayings of the worldly (Aptas) credible persons as authoritative, there is no reason why the Words of God, Who is the ultimate source of knowledge should not be taken as credible."

This aphorism can independently be explained as under:

"तत्—तय बेदशास्त्रयः (विखिलस्थिततः चाव.) प्रामाण्य सिद्धम्। किमित् मन्त्रायुवेधार्थविभिन्न। मन्त्रायुवेधार्थविभिन्न, प्रतिच्छ. य आयुवेधार्थविभिन्न। तत्र हेतुस्तु अप्तप्रामाण्यात् आत्म: प्रामाण्येन स्वस्वहृतविभावः॥"

This is to say that the authoritativeness of the Vedas as a whole is established like the Ayurveda, which has been expounded in some Mantras. Here the reason is that all trustworthy people accept the authority of the Vedas.

* Here the word "Mantra", according to Dayānanda means 'Vicāra' and not Mantras (spells and charms) used against Bhutas and Fretas as accepted by Vātsyāyana in the previous quotation. Hence the author says:

"मन्त्रायुवेधार्थविभिन्न।"

But Vātsyāyana in his commentary upon this aphorism takes the word Mantra in the sense of a charm, spell, or incantation as in "सोज्ञस्मिन्

(Contd.)
Just as one considers Mantras, revealing factual principles of material science, to be true and authoritative, when their truth is (experimentally) established; and just as one on finding that the use of medicines, prescribed in one particular part of the Ayurveda, removes disease, comes to have faith on the similar part of the same, similarly on ascertaining (the truth of) a proposition stated in one part of the Vedas by direct perception (Pratyakṣa) one ought to have faith (Pramanīyam) in the contents of the remaining portions of the Vedas which describe subjects beyond (the range of) Direct Cognition. The sage Vatsyāyana has also stated to this effect in his commentary on this aphorism. He says:

(Contd. from page 45)

वात्स्यायनः (DK. 54) and "अवधित्यो हि मण्डलाध्योवयों प्रश्नः 11" Hence Vatsyāyana says: "समप्रवाहं च विशेष तात्तत्त्तित्तेकदायानां प्रयोगः" (ND. II. 1.68)

The word Mantra is from the root √/Mantr (10. A.) to consult, deliberate, ponder over, hold consultation or take counsel with suffix "ac". It is used in the following meanings:

(I) A Vedic hymn. It is of 3 types:—it is called Re if metrical and intended to be loudly recited; Yajur—if in prose, muttered in a low tone and Sāman—if being metrical, it is intended for singing (गीतिषु सामाख्य) ।

(II) A Vedic text including Samhitā.

(III) A charm or spell.

(IV) Consultation, deliberation, counsel, advice, resolution, plan.

cf. (a) ‘तब्यं संबोलमन्त्रस्य 1’ (R. I. 20)
(b) "मन: प्रतिविन्दं तस्य बयूङ यथा मन्त्रिं: 11" (R. XVII. 50)
(c) See also Pañcatantra. (2.182)
(d) Manu-Smṛti (VII. 58).

(V) Secret plan or consultation, a secret.

(VI) Policy, statesmanship.

The meaning taken by Dayānanda here falls in the fourth, fifth or sixth categories. We must note here the Vedic Text also:—

"समाने मनः समिति: समानः 1" (AV) etc.
(9) “This inference (Anumāna) is (drawn) from the identity of Seers and expositors. (That is to say that) the same trustworthy persons, who are Seers and expositors of the Vedas, are also the Seers and expositors of the Āyurveda, etc. Thus it is inferred that the Vedas are as much authentic as the Medical Science (Āyurveda). Hence it has been argued that the words of the Vedas are of eternal authority; because they are accepted to be such by the trustworthy persons”. (ND. II. 1. 68)

The implied sense (of this passage) is that as the word of a creditable person is authoritative, so the Vedas should also be accepted as authentic; because they are also the Words of the Most perfectly trustworthy God and their authoritativeness has been admitted by all trustworthy persons. Hence briefly speaking, eternalness of the Vedas is (rightly) proved (by the fact that) they are God’s knowledge.

Here, the sage Patañjali also refers to this topic in his Yogasāstra:—

(10) “He is the Preceptor of the ancients also as He is not determined by time.” (YD. I. 1.26)

God is the teacher of all,—of the ancients who were born in the beginning of creation e.g. Agni, Vayu, Āditya, Āṅgiras, Brahma etc.—of the moderns, like ourselves—and of the persons, who are yet to be born in future. (God is called Guru) because he proclaims (grñati) or instructs the truthful objects by means of the Vedas.* He is eternal for all times, because

(9) “क्रज्ञ-प्रवक्तासामान्याःप्रज्ञतः। यो विभाषणं तत्त्वाद: प्रवक्तःश्रवणं तैः प्रमाणं तद्विज्ञ-प्रवक्तासामान्याः। तद्विज्ञ-प्रवक्तासामान्याः। (Vatsyāyana=ND. II. 1.68)

(10) “स पूज्यामपि श्रुत: कालेवायवङ्कुरात्।” (YD. I. 1. 26)

* God is called Guru, the Preceptor. The word Guru is derived from the root गृह (9. P.) to announce, speak, utter, proclaim. cf : (R. X. 63). “Gṛñati iti Gṛuruḥ”. This also means to invoke as in ‘नामापि नाम गृह्यामशुद्धवत् कल्यात्में। (MVC. VII. 15)

It is also used in the sense “to praise or extol” as “कैविन्द्र भोता: प्राप्तसत्वो गृह्यित्।” (BG. XI. 21) and also see Bhaṭṭikāvya. (VIII. 77)

Here our author takes this word in the first sense.

(Contd.)
He is not affected by the process of time, (Kala-gater-apraC1t). God is never touched by the afflictions of ignorance and sinful acts or their impressions (vßanasas). In Him, there is absolutely the highest eternal and innate knowledge. The Vedas, being His words, are eternal and full of truth.

Similarly in the fifth Chapter of the Sankhya-Çastra, Acarya Kapila says:—

(11) "(The Vedas) having been revealed by His own power, have their self—authoritative character." (SD. V. 51)

This means that the self-authoritative and eternal character of the Vedas must be accepted as they have been brought to light by inseparably supreme power of God.

(Contd. from page 47)

The word "Guru" is used in the following meanings:—

(a) Father, न केवलं तब गुरुरेवपापितं।

(b) Forefather or ancestor. (URC. V. 28)

(c) Any venerable person, an elderly man or relative.

(d) A teacher or preceptor, particularly a religious teacher, spiritual preceptor. cf. "ती गुरु: गुरुपर्नी च श्रीत्वा प्रतिनन्दन्त:।" (R. I. 57)

(e) Technically, a "Guru" is one, who performs the purificatory ceremonies over a boy and instructs him in the Vedas:—

(f) A lord, head ruler:—

(g) Name of Vighaspati.

(h) The planet Jupiter.

(i) The lunar asterism called Pußya.

(j) Name of Drona or of Prabhakara. (MD.)

(k) The Supreme Spirit.

(11) "शब्रमाण्येऽव: स्वत: प्रामाण्यम्।" (SD. V. 51)
On this subject, the sage Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana Vyāsa also says in his Vedānta-śāstra:

(12) “He is the Spring (source) of all Śāstras (Vedas)” (V.D.D. I. 1.3)

The import of this (aphorism) is that Brahman is the original cause of the Rg and the other Vedas, which are the magnified (Upānīdhita) repository of numberless sciences, and illuminate all objects like a lamp and thus He possesses (the title of) Omniscient. It is impossible to attribute authorship of such Śāstras as the Rg and the other Vedas, which are the home of entire universal knowledge (Sarvajña-guṇa-anvitasya) to some one else than the Omniscient God. It is very well known in the world that the particular person, who expounds in detail a particular science knows much more than what he writes (in his treatise) as Pāṇini in (the realm of) grammatical science. Ācārya Śaṅkara while explaining this aphorism has (clearly) stated:

(13) “It is only to explain partly what he (the author) knows. He knows much more than that. This (point) is so well established in the world that it needs no (further) clarification.” (V.D.D)

Thus it is concluded that the Śāstra, (attributed) to Omniscient God must be eternal and must contain knowledge of all and every thing.

Moreover, in the same chapter (of the Vedānta) there is another aphorism:

(14) “For this very reason (the Vedas) are eternal.” (V.D.D. 1.3.29)

This is to say that all men must believe the established fact, that the Vedas are self-authoritative and repositories of all sciences as they have been proclaimed by God and have also the eternal character (nitya-dharma). They (the Vedas) are eternal as they remain changeless and true through all the ages. No other (external) evidence is admissible (svākhyate) to prove the authoritiveness of the Vedas. Other proofs are corroborative evidence (sakṣi). Like the Sun, the Vedas carry their own authority (with them). As the Sun, being Self-illuminated, illumines all objects in the world—both great and small—the mountains as well as the motes (trasareṇu); similarly the Vedas being illuminated by themselves, cast their light on all sciences.

(12) “शास्त्रयोगित्वालात् !” (V.D.D. I. 1.3)

(13) “अयङ्केश्वर्यकथि स ततोपाधिकतरबिहान इति सिद्धे लोके किमु वकल्यभ ।”

(वेदान्तगान्ये) (V.D.D.)

(14) “अत एव च नित्यत्वम् !” (V.D.D. 1.3.29)
Hence, to prove His own existence, as it were, and also to establish the fact that the Vedas were revealed by Him, God reveals (the undermentioned Mantra as) authority:—

(15) "The Self-Born, Omnipresent (Paribhū) God overspreads all. He is entirely a Spirit with no corporeal form (sukram-akayam) and (thus) woundless, tendenless and muscleless, Pure and Sinless. He is Omniscient (kavi), Inward Controller of all (Mansi), and the Ruler of all. He has from all eternity been teaching the true knowledge of things (through the revelation of the Vedas.)"

(YV. xxxx. 8)

The purport of the stanza is:—

God, as explained above, is omnipresent and pervades all things on all sides (pariyagaz = paritah i.e. all sides, agaz i.e. pervades). There is not a single atom wherein He does not exist. That Supreme Spirit (Brahman) is all energy (sukra=ārya)† by which this whole universe is created and it

(15) "स पर्याप्तः द्रव्यायमामामसामायमाम शुद्धम्यामामिद्यम । कविमृत्योऽर्थः सः श्रव्यः यथात्त्थलोऽर्थः यथावर्गशालावस्तीम । समायम ।" (YV. XXXX. 8)

† The word Sukra is explained by Yāska in the Nirukta (VIII. 12) as पुष्कर् सुकर
In the Nighantu it is included in the list of words denoting Water. (I. 12)

This word can be derived from the root सुक्र (सुक्र) It has the following meaning:

(a) Bright, radiant, shining. cf. : शुक्रेशस: (Rg. VIII. 6.8)
Durgācārya says here, "शुक्रेशस: , शुक्रपाद: ।"
(b) White, pure.
(c) The planet Venus; cf : "Sukra-asta."
(d) Name of the preceptor of Asuras.
(e) Name of Agni.
(f) Name of a plant called Citraka.
(g) Semen, Virile, cf :

"पुस्मादु पुलोदिकथे शुक्रे ।
स्त्री प्रयत्निकथे रिल्ल्या ।" (Manu)

Our author takes this word here in the sense of ‘vīrya’ i.e. semen and this here means ‘God’s creative energy’.
possesses eternal and mighty potency. He is free from the ties of the threefolds
body (kaya), the gross, the subtle and the causal. Even an atom (paramana)
cannot penetrate Him (lit. make hole in Him = chidram kartum). Thus being
impregnable He is woundless (abraham), He is free from all bounds of arteries
or veins (asnaviram), hence boundless and unveiled. He is untouched by
all defects e.g. ignorance (suddham). Sins cannot reach Him and His
actions are never sinful (apapa-viddham). He is Omniscient (Kavi)*. He

* Kavi : It is here an epithet of God. कवि: √कृ (सांने) + ह, (U. IV. 139) or √कृ (गायन्य) + ईण कवि or च्या (पादविचे) + ईण = कवि।
Here we cite below a few lines from the Nirukta :—

(a) "भेदायो कवि: | काण्यवृत्तो परिति | कवतेरवै।" (N. XII. 13)
(b) "कवि: काण्यवृत्त। अथवा कवते: धातो: गययवस्य। कविति:। कवति= गहर्यस्वो निलयम। किजु-कवितवातैः प्रासावोतु-प्रबुदति=जनयति।" (Durgacarya XII. 13)
(c) "कवि कहमात्? काण्यवृत्त इत्यादि कमते:। कबाते: या गतिकमणः इवव
हुष्मु। कावाते=दूरं गतं वर्षं संसारादिकाकार्यं विज्ञानसत्य। यदा कवतेतस्तव कविति=गतास=गहर्यस्वो निलयम। अवगताः वा सबः स्वदयः जाता। कवचितु
कबाते: पास्वकमणः ! असिन एव नामकयं सवःकारी कविरुष्यते।" (Commentary of Skanda on Nirukta)

Dayananda has interpreted this word in the sense of “One who
knows every thing i.e. Omniscient.” This meaning is clearly accepted by
Skandasvamin in his previous quotation.

In the Vedic literature God is often described as Kavi i.e. the Poet
and the Vedas as His immortal poems. cf :

(a) "अतः सत्तान न जहाँति अति सत्तान न मुक्ति।
पश्य वेदवस्य काण्यं न समार न जीवते॥" (AV, X. 8.32)
(b) "अतिन्तुःता कविक फुँ:।" (RV. I. 1. 5)
(c) "कवि पुराणमुक्तातन्तरम्।" (BG. VIII. 9)

See Manu Smrti (II. 4) also.

Maniśi : The Inward Controller or the Knower of all minds.
मनलः+ईष। (according to Shakalavali वर्तमान कायम् = सत्या = एव) (MB) and the
termination "Ini" ordained by (P. V. 2. 116) or √मन् (अवबोधने) +ईषः
(U. IV. 26) or "ईष (सती)+टाप=ईष। मनलः: ईषा+इति॥ (P. III. 3. 103 ;
(Contd.)
knows as a pure witness (what transpires in the) minds of all (created beings) (Maṇḍiṣṭ). He is Over Lord of all i.e. Ruler of all (Paribhā). He is Self-Existent and is without the three causes e.g. the instrumental, the material and the general (Svayamāṇi). He is the Father of all – but of Him, the other generator there is none. By His own might He is ever present. God, the Supreme Self as described above is all Existence (Sat) all Consciousness (Cit) and all Bliss (Ananda). He has been teaching the true knowledge of things to all His subjects (sama-prajñā) through the revelation of the Vedas, in the beginning of creation. Whenever He creates the world, the gracious God reveals (lit. instructs) the Vedas, which contain all sciences for the benefit of all the created beings (prajñābhyāḥ).

Hence, everybody should admit that the Vedas are eternal. The Vedas are His knowledge. God’s knowledge is always unchanged and uniform.

As it has been decided on the scriptural evidence that the Vedas are eternal; so is true on reason also. For instance, ‘something’ cannot come out of ‘nothing’ and ‘nothing’ cannot produce ‘something’. That thing alone which exists (at present) will remain in future. According to this maxim, the eternalness of the Vedas must be admitted. Because, a thing (i.e. a tree) which has no root, can never have branches. (To cherish contrary view, would be) like discerning the marriage of a sterile woman’s son. If she has a son, she cannot be sterile. If she has no son, none can see his marriage. Similar view is also applicable here. If God does not possess eternal knowledge, how can He reveal knowledge to other? If God does not impart knowledge (to mankind) no one would be able to attain knowledge and perception (dārśana). For, nothing can sprout, if it has no root. Nothing is seen in this world, which has come into existence without a cause. What we state here is (based upon) the actual and direct (Sakṣat-anubhava) experience of all men. We retain impression of that thing alone which is

(Contd. from p. 51)

IV. 1.4). One who controls mind. The word Gati means ‘तां गमने प्राप्तिरक्षिति’. Hence, “the Knower of minds.”

cf. : “येनकर्माध्ययति मनोविषयः ।” (YV.)

and also,

“मनोविषयः सति गृहेषु देवताः ।” (KS. V)

or

“मानवीय मनोविषयाः ।” (R. I)

In the Vedic literature, it also indicates “a singer or praiser.”
related to our direct cognition (*Pratyakṣa-anubhava*) and our memory and knowledge are due to these impressions. This alone causes (in us) inclination and aversion (to a thing). It cannot be otherwise. For instance, one who studies Sanskrit, he alone gets impression of this language and not of other and one who reads the Modern Indian language, retains impression of that language only and of no other. In this way, no one would have been able to acquire experience in any branch of knowledge, if God had not imparted instructions and teachings (to mankind) in the beginning of creation. In the absence of such experience, there can be no impression (*Samskāra*) and without impression, there can be no rememberance and without rememberance, there can be no knowledge or even the semblance of it.

Q. But how is it so? Men have natural inclination towards actions. In their (natural) activities, they experience pleasure and pain. During the course of time gradually they will develop (their stock of) knowledge (*vidyā-vṛddhi*). Then why should we accept that the Vedas were revealed by God?

A. Here we say. This has been refuted while discussing the origin of the Vedas. It has been decided there that even now no one can achieve knowledge or can develop it without getting instructions from others. Similarly there can be no progress in learning and knowledge if man does not receive instructions from God in the form of the Vedas as already illustrated by (the example) of a child, kept (in forest) without instruction and (also by the example of) a forest-dweller. (It has been shown there) that such a child or the forester could neither achieve knowledge nor learn the use of human speech without instruction—then leave the question of acquiring knowledge (through experience). Hence, the knowledge contained in the Vedas which has come down to us from God is certainly eternal like all His attributes. The epithets, the attributes and the actions of an eternal substance must be eternal by themselves as their substratum itself is eternal. The name, the attributes and the actions have no independent existence: they need a seat or a substratum as they depend on some thing else (i.e. substratum). They are non-eternal, if their substratum is non-eternal. The eternal substance has no production or dissolution. Production signifies a specific combination of separate elements. Dissolution means separation of the caused products (into their component parts). It is (only) a negation of combination (*Sanghata-abhava*). Dissolution is (the state of) imperception. God being changeless and uniform has not even a touch of combination or separation (*Samyoga-vigya*).
Here we cite an aphorism from the sage Kaṇāda as an authority (in support of this proposition):

(16) “The Eternal is that which Exists (Sat) and is uncaused (Akarana-vat).” (VD. IV.4.1)

This means that an effect which has cause and exists is non-eternal as it did not exist before its production. The substance which is not an effect of (a cause) but always exists as cause of others is however called eternal. Whatever is caused by combination, postulates (the existence of) an agent or producer. If the producer is an effect of combination, he also has its producer and so on “Ad infinitum.” That, which itself is the result of combination, can possess no power of combining atoms in Prakṛti, as these atoms are subtler than itself. The subtler thing (i.e. atoms) is the Ātma (i.e. pervader) of the grosser one, because the subtler can penetrate into the grosser thing as fire penetrates into iron. As fire because of its subtlety penetrates into hard and gross iron and separates its component parts from one another, similarly the water on account of its subtler character having entered into (gross) earth and its particles can combine them into a ball or disjoin them from one another. But these conjunctions and disjunctions cannot touch God who is All-Pervading. Consequently He has power to bring about conjunction and disjunction (i.e. creation and dissolution) according to the Law. This cannot be otherwise. As we, being within the range of (this Law of) conjunction and disjunction are powerless to combine or separate atoms in Prakṛti; so would have been (the case) with God, if He also had been (within that sphere). He, from whom all combinations and separations proceed, is not under their control. Because He is the ultimate original cause of all conjunctions and disjunctions. The commencement of combination and dissolution is impossible without the Ultimate (First) cause.

As the Vedas have been revealed by and always exist in the knowledge of God, Who is the Ultimate (original First) cause of all conjunctions and disjunctions, Who is changeless by character, Who is unborn, without beginning and eternal and Who has perpetual power, their truthfulness of knowledge and eternity are established.
THE CONTENTS OF THE VEDAS

The Vedas deal with the four (main) types of the subject matter e.g. (1) Vĳñāna* (i.e. realisation of knowledge), (2) Karma (i.e. action in general), (3) Upāsana (i.e. communion with God) and (4) Jñāna (i.e. knowledge). Here, the first topic viz Vĳñāna is the most imperative of all. It means the direct perception or realisation of all things—from God down to a—(blade of) grass. Here, also the realisation of God occupies the foremost rank as He is the primary theme of all the Vedas because God is the chief most and the highest of all the entities. We cite here the following pieces of evidence:

(1) "I tell thee briefly (O Naciketaṇ) that "OM" is the only word, which all the Vedas repeatedly proclaim, for (whose attainment)

* The word Vĳñāna has been translated by some scholars as, "Philosophy or Metaphysics" (Ghasi Ram). But it is wrong. Dayānada himself explains it as:

"परंपरागतार्थयो ज्ञेयस्यनिर्देशनास्ति व्यमानवात्"

According to this statement Vĳñāna means "realisation of knowledge." The word Vĳñāna is explained by Apte in the following manner:

(I) Knowledge, wisdom, intelligence (PT. I. 24 and V. 3) cf.: "Vĳñāna + Maya-Kośa."

(II) Discrimination.

(III) Skill, Proficiency, (Prayoga-Vĳñāna). (S. I. 2)

(IV) Worldly knowledge or knowledge derived from worldly experience (opposed to Jñāna which is knowledge of Brahman; "जानें ते ध्वनिर्विक्षिप्त विज्ञानाम्पर्यंत:"

BG. VII. 2, 3. 41). The whole Seventh Chapter of Gita explains this.

But our author takes us to the stage which is the ultimate goal of human knowledge i.e. the knowledge of the Supreme Soul.

(1) "सर्व वेदा विनम्रमामयति,
तत्वाति सर्वोमथ च यद्व वर्णित ।
यदिष्टि कार्यं च चरिति
तले पदं संप्रदेशं प्रत्येकोमित्येत् ।" (KTU. II. 15)
all penances are observed and desirous of what they lead a life of celibacy (Brahmacarya).” (KTU. II.15)

(2) “The sacred syllable \textit{OM} denotes Him.” (YD. I. 1. 27)

(3) “\textit{OM} is \textit{(the name of)} Omnipresent God.” (YV. XXXX. 17)

(4) “\textit{OM} is \textit{(the designation of)} Brahman.” (TĀ. VII. 8)

(5) “(There are two types of knowledge \textit{(Vidya)}. One is \textit{Apara} i.e. the Rgveda, the Yajurveda, the Sāmaveda, the Atharvaveda, Śikṣā (Phonetics), Kalpa (i.e. Ritual science), Grammar, Etymology, Metrics and Astronomy.

Now the \textit{Para} is that by which that Imperishable \textit{(Akṣara)} is apprehended.

Men of resolute wisdom discern Him; who is invisible, incapable of being grasped or comprehended, having no family or caste (\textit{Agotram. Avarnam}), without organs of sight and hearing, without hands and feet, eternal, all pervading, omnipresent, the most subtle, immutable and the origin of all beings.”

(MUU. I. 5. 6)

All these citations mean that—“O Naciketas, (\textit{Sarve Vedas}) the highest seat or stage which is called Final Emancipation (\textit{Mokṣa}) to be obtained by the realisation of the Supreme Soul, is \textit{OM} (i.e. communion with God). It is all bliss and free from all pains. \textit{Pranava} i.e. the syllable \textit{OM} denotes Him and God is its expressed significance (\textit{Vācya}). \textit{OM} is the name of God. All the Vedas have, Brahman—the Most High (\textit{Mukhya Pratipādiya}) as their chief topic. The word \textit{Āmanati} is from the root \textit{Mna} (to practise) with prefix ‘Ā’. (\textit{Tapānsi} etc.) All austerities and righteous deeds pertain to His realisation. (\textit{Yat Icchāntah}). Here the word “Brahmacarya” implies (\textit{Upalakṣaṇa}) all the four stages of human life e.g. the life of a religious student as well as those of a house-holder, an ascetic and a teacher who has renounced the world. The object of all these practices is the attainment of Brahman.

(2) “तत्स्य वाचकः प्रणवः I” (YD. I. 1. 27)

(3) “अोःर्म ख श्रवः I” (YA. XXXX. 17)

(4) “भोमिति श्रवः I” (TĀ. VII. 8)

(5) “तत्तत्त्वापि रेभेदे गुह्वेदे: दासवेदोऽवेष्वेदे: शिष्या कल्पो व्याकरण निरहं श्रवाच्योत्तितिइ। अय परा यथा तत्स्तात्त्वविज्ञात्तम ॥ ॥ तत्तत्त्ववृत्तस्य वृत्तान्तेऽवेष्वेदे: ॥ ॥ स्त्रीलिङ्ग: तत्तत्त्वविज्ञातः निर्मिति विभू महत्तवः सद्यं श्रवाच्यो चतवयं यदू भूत्योगति परिश्रमिति गीतः: ॥ ॥” (MUU. I. 5. 6).
The learned, desire to have an access to Him by concentrating (their mind) upon Him and variously proclaim (His glory). I. Yama, O Naciketas, tell thee briefly that seat is this Brahman.

There are two kinds of Vidya (i.e. knowledge) in the Vedas—“Apara and Para”. That Vidya or knowledge by which we know precisely all (material) things—from earth and a blade of grass to Prakṛti, and understand their right use, is called Apara and that by which one knows Brahman, Who is Omnipotent and Invisible etc. is styled as Para. It is also inferred that Para is higher than Apara.

Moreover, (the following stanza supports this view):

(6) The learned always turn their eyes to the lofty place of Viṣṇu (i.e. Mokṣa), spread like an eye in the Dyaus (i.e. luminous region)." (RV. I. 22.20)

(6) "विष्णु विद्वानसदीयोः परमं पुद्रम् सत्यं पश्चाति सृवयः। निवृते च ब्रह्मात्मकः।" (RV. I. 22. 20)

The above English rendering of the stanza is mine. According to Dayānanda it can be translated as follows:

"The learned look forward at all times for that Supreme seat (Parama Padam) of Viṣṇu (called Mokṣa) (who pervades all space) as the eye pervades the solar light (i.e. the space filled by the Sun’s rays).” (RV. I. 22.20)

Here the author has translated the word Pada (i.e. seat) as Mokṣa. Mokṣa is called a seat or a stage, because it is obtained by communion with God at the end of human life. The word Pada is derived from the root √Pad i.e. Padaniyam or Prapaniyam, i.e. a seat or stage which is to be obtained by the learned.

Author means to say that this final emancipation is nothing but the attainment of God. Hence it is described here as "Paramam Padam of Viṣṇu". This Mokṣa is again described as “Ātataṃ” as the Final Emancipation is not limited by space or time. It can be achieved by all devotees every where and always because God is Viṣṇu (i.e. all pervading).

The word Pada is used in Sanskrit to denote this meaning (Sthāna-Padavi) also. (Pada=√Pad+Ac). I cite below a few extracts from the classical literature where this word Pada means a rank or position or place or station:

(a) "अवधिरः पदम्।" (NS. X)
(b) "संवर्त्या प्राणिनकत्वम् पदमाप्पतित्वम्।" (MM. I) (Contd.)
This means that the learned (Sūris) see at all times that highest seat of all pervading God (Viṣṇu) which is called Final Emancipation (Mokṣa) and which is obtained by all men by adopting all the best possible means, and it is absolutely all bliss. It extends to all places i.e. it is not restricted by space, time and by any other matter. As God is all pervading (Viṣṇu) by His character. His seat is obtainable by all at all places, Here the simile is given that as the sphere of the eye-sight is (the entire) space filled by the solar light so (devotees are capable of achieving that seat of Mokṣa everywhere as God exists at all places). Mokṣa being the highest possible object of human desire, the wise aspire to obtain it. Hence, the Vedas accord a special treatment to it.

Vyāsa also offers an aphorism on this topic in his Vedānta Sūtras:

(7) “He (Brahman) is the Theme (of the Vedas) because the applicability (of the text lies in Him).” (VD I. 1.4)

Here the idea is that God is regularly explained by the Vedas, at some places by indirect expressions and at others by indication or suggestion (Paramparaya).

Hence, God is the ultimate theme of the Vedas.

This can further be supported by (the following stanza from) the Yajurveda:

(Contd. from p. 57)

(c) “यात्रेयेव गृहिणीपवं युक्तयः।” (S. IV. 17)
(d) “शचिये दियता गृहिणीपवे।” (S. IV. 18)
(e) “सतां हि सत्वेन्द्रप्येव बरसुः।” (S. I. 22)
(f) अपेक्षेप्तो एवथः।” (MK. I)
(g) Please see also:

DK. 162; KUS. VI. 72, III. 4 and R. II. 50, XI. 82.

(7) “तत्तु सत्त्वयायत्।” (VD. I. 1.4)

Here “Samanvaya” means “applicability”. cf:

“न च सत्त्वानां पदानां ब्रह्मस्वरूपविषये निरच्छे समन्वयस्वरूपात्तलपना युक्तच।” (Śārīrika Bhaṣya)
(8) "That Supreme Being, than Whom no other and greater is born, Who penetrates the whole universe and Who, being the Lord of creatures, remains and sports with them, creates and (gives luster to) the three luminaries (the Sun, fire and electricity). From Him originate the sixteen digits*, which He unites with created beings." (YV. VIII. 36)

This is to say that no other superior object exists to Supreme Being (Para Brahman). Prajapati is a name of God as He is the main-stay of all creatures. He (Prajapati i.e. the Lord of created beings) pervades (Aviveśa) all the regions. Being the Bestower of Supreme Bliss on all beings He has filled and illumined all the worlds with three lights—the Sun, the fire and electricity. He has generated the sixteen Kalas i.e. digits or they exist in Him. Hence He is called Šodasti.

(8) "वस्माद जात: वरेण अन्यो भविष्ट 
य अविवेशां सुवनानि विषयः।
प्रजापति: प्रजायो सप्त गुरुणः 
श्रीणि ज्वैतर्यां स्थूते स पौडशिः॥” (YV. VIII. 36)

This verse may be translated as:
"Than whom there is none other born more mighty, Who hath pervaded all existing creatures—Prajāpati, rejoicing in his off-springs, he Šodasti, maintains the three great lustres." (Griffith)

Here three lustres may mean Agni, Vāyu, Sūrya or Fire, wind, Sun or Fire, lightening and Sun.

* The sixteen digits (Šodasti Kalas) are enumerated to Sukeśa by Pippalāda as follows:

"इहैवावत् सर्वे सौम्य ! स: पुरवो महिमस्वेताः सोदश कला: प्रमावित: 
स प्राणमश्वेत: प्राणत्व! खं बायं चोत्तः। श्रुति-विविधनिहः भन: अनन्त । अन्नादः 
ब्रोय तयो मन्तः: कर्म लोका लोके नाम च इ’” (PU. VI. 2.4)

i.e. "To him he then said: ‘Even here within the body, O friend, is that Person in whom they say the sixteen parts arise.

He created life (Prāṇa) ; from life, faith (Śraddhā), ether, wind, light, water, earth, sense-faculty (Indriya), mind, food ; from food, virility, austerity, the Vedas, action, place and name.” (PU. VI. 2.4)
God is, therefore, the supreme object of the Vedas. The Maṇḍūkya-Upaniṣad also states:

(9) “OM is an immortal syllable and this entire (world) is His manifestation.” (MUU. I. 1)

This means: He is Akṣara whose name is OM. That Brahman is called Akṣara because He never perishes and also because He pervades the movable and immovable world. All the Vedas and the Scriptures and also the entire creation chiefly explain Him. Hence He must be accepted as the basic theme (of the Vedas).

Moreover, it is not logical to prefer secondary sense to the primary one; because it is in accordance with the authoritative dictum of the Maha-bhāṣya, the grammatical commentary that “the accomplishment of an action with the help of primary sense should be preferred where both—primary as well as secondary—meanings are available.”

Accordingly we should give preference to the primary meaning i.e. God while interpreting the Vedas because the chief object of the Vedic teaching is the attainment of God.

All men, therefore, should follow the Vedic instructions and append their activities (in the realm of Action, Meditation and Knowledge—Dharma, Upāsanā, Jñāna) with glorification of God so that they may attain success and accomplishment in (material and spiritual) matters concerning this life or life after death by doing good to others according to their capacity.

The second subject-matter (of the Vedas) is called Karma-Kāṇḍa (i.e. topic of action). It is entirely full of (various) activities. Without this, learning or knowledge would remain incomplete; because the internal or mental activities are closely related to the external or physical functions. This Karma-Kāṇḍa (i.e. department of action) is multifold. But its chief varieties are only two. One aims at the accomplishment of the supreme object of human existence i.e. the achievement of Mokṣa through the performance of God’s praise, prayer and meditation, obedience and resignation to His will, righteous deeds and knowledge.

The other type of action is undertaken with a view to acquire riches and secure enjoyments by performing righteous deeds and thus to accomplish

(9) “ओमिस्येतकःरः। इव सर्वं तत्स्योपव्याख्यानम्।” (MUU. I. 1)

* “प्रधानप्रधानयोः प्रधाने कार्यंस्मर्थय: ।” (MB)
success in the worldly affairs. When action is performed with the absolute object of obtaining God, it is called *Niśkama* (i.e. desireless or disattached action) and it has the noblest yield as it is endowed with eternal bliss. When it is performed with the sole object of securing wealth and enjoyment, resulting in worldly pleasure, it is styled as *Sakama* (i.e. an action attached to worldly desire); because it is mingled with the tasting of the birth and death. In the first category are included the activities of (various) sacrifices (*yajñas*)—from the *Agnihotra* to the *Asvamedha*—where one has to offer oblations (consisted of) ingredients, duly refined and clarified which contain fragrant, sweet, tonic and curative properties, into the fire, for the purification of air and the rain-water. Such sacrifices (*Yajñas*) bring happiness to the whole world.

In the second category, are included such actions as the procurement of food-stuffs, cloth and manufacture of conveyances, machines, tools and implements etc. which are performed for the accomplishment of the regulated social order. Mostly these actions result in personal and individual joys only.

Here we are supported by (the following) evidence from the *Pūrva Mīmāṃsā*:

(10) “As ingredients, their purificatory measures and the actions (in the sacrifices) are for the benefit of all others, statements asserting certain objects are only explanatory or laudatory ones,”

*(MD. IV. 3.1)*

(11) “The purificatory process for ingredients which are only for (sacrificial) activities, results in qualitative performance of the sacrifice (*Kratu-Dharma)*.”

*(MD. IV. 3.8)*

(10) “इत्यादिकारकमुः परायम्यात् फलधृतिर्याकारः त्यात्” *(MD. IV. 3.1)*

(11) “इत्यादिकारकार्यात्पदसाधन:्यात्-द्यम्: स्वातः हि” *(MD. IV. 3.8)*

Here the word “*Arthavada*” is very technical. The word “*Artha*” means: “object, purpose, wealth, context or substance”. The “*Arthavada*” denotes the following meanings:

(a) Declaration of any purpose.

(b) Affirmation, declaratory assertion, an explanatory remark, speech or assertion having a certain object, a sentence.

It often recommends a *Vidhi* or a precept by stating the good arising from its proper observance and the evils arising from its omission, and also by adducing historical instances in its support.

*(Contd.)*
The import of these aphorisms is that the duty of the performer of a Sacrifice (Yajña) is three-fold, e.g. the procurement of ingredients, their purification (saṃskāra) and the actual performance (karma). The above mentioned ingredients are of four kinds i.e. (I) fragrant (II) sweet (III) tonic and (IV) curative. The purificatory process relating to them (ingredients) must be adopted for the accomplishment of the best and meritorious results. For instance, with a view to prepare a good soup or sauce (stūpa = sū + pa + ka in the sense of ghañ) fragrant ghee is poured into a Jāla (lit. span) and fried upon the fire till it emits smoke; the ladle is thrust into the kettle containing the soup or curry and opening of the vessel is closed and the soup is moved about with it. Then the smoke like vapour arises before which being as condensed as fragrant liquid and mixing with the entire soup makes it nutritious, delicious and sweet-smelling. Similarly, vapours arising from a Yajña purify the atmosphere (lit. air) and the rain-water. Thus it is for the good of the whole world. Hence it has been stated in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa:

(Contd. from p. 61)

\[\text{cf.} \quad \text{“सुतितिलियापरक्रियालय इथियवाय: इ” (ND.)} \]
\[\text{“प्रकरणप्रतिपालय तत्र तत्र प्रशस्तनमयवाय: इ”} \]

According to Laugaki, it is of three kinds:

’nुयवाय, विरोधे स्थान अनुवादोवाधारिते इ’

पूलायवायवाहानान्तान्त अर्थावििवाचा मत: इ’

Here the last kind includes many varieties.

(c) One of the six means of finding out the “Tatparya” (real aim and object) of any work.

(d) Praise or eulogy.

\[\text{cf.} \quad \text{“अर्थाविए एष्य: इ देवंतु से कवित्क कवय: इ”} (URC. I)} \]

Our author interprets these Sūtras as “फलश्वरि: अवन्ह सि \nअर्थाविएन्यविवरणाय भवति इ” which is not very clear. The word Artha-vāda has been explained by us above. According to Dayānanda, no specific purpose or object can be attributed to any Yajña. The real object of such performances is the benefit of the whole universe. Hence Yajñas are included by our author in Niśkāma actions (i.e. actions detached from desire). He is always original in his laudable interpretations.
(12) "A Yajña, which is performed by a learned man in the prescribed manner, conduces (to the happiness) of all mankind (janata)."

(AB. I. 2)

Here "janata" (i.e. mankind) means all men (without any distinction). The Yajña brings happiness to all men alike if a learned performer consumes duly purified ingredients in fire in the aforesaid manner. As it aims only at others' benefit, Yajña results in the universal good. Hence statements indicating specific aims are merely laudatory ones. The real object (of a Yajña) is to ward off evils.

The purity of the performing people and the refinement of ingredients used in sacrificial performances should be taken as "Kratu-Dharma" (i.e. essentials of Yajñas). Sacred and beneficial results (dharms) are brought forth only in this very manner and not otherwise (from a Yajña).

It is supported by the following evidence:

(13) "Smoke or vapours are produced from fire, from smoke, the clouds; from clouds, the rain or (in short) from fire all these things are produced. Hence, they are called as Tapojas (i.e. born of heat or fire)."

(SB. V. 3)

The import is that from fire, smoke and vapour are brought forth. When this fire penetrates into trees, medicinal herbs, water and other substances and disintegrates the solid objects, it separates juice from them. These (juices) then reduced to levity and being borne up by the air soar up to the sky. The liquid part therein is called vapour and the hard substance is earthly one. The smoke, therefore, is the name given to the combination of both the particles. When such a smoke reaches the higher regions, and thus watery vapours grow in abundance there, it produces clouds. From these masses of clouds in the air, the rain begins to fall. Hence from fire alone (Agneḥ-eva) are generated all herbs and plants like barley. From them is produced food, from food, semen and from semen the bodies (of all living being).

(12) "यज्ञोपदित तस्यं जनताः यथे विविधानं होता भवति।" (AB. I. 2)

(13) "अग्नेन घुमो जावते, ध्वसाद्वर्धम् न्यूनिः। अग्नेश्च एता जावते।
तस्मात् आह तपोजा हि।" (SB. V. 3)
The same subject has been stated in the *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad*:

(14) "From that Soul (Ātman), variably ether (or space-ākāśa) arose, from ether, wind; from wind, fire; from fire, water; from water, the earth; from the earth, herbs; from herbs, food; from food, semen; from semen, the person (Puruṣa).

This, verily, is the person that consists of the essence of food." *(TU. I. 2.)*

(15) "He performed austerity (Tapas). Having performed austerity he understood that Brahman is food. For truly, indeed, beings here are born from food, when born, they live by food, on deceasing, they enter into food." *(TU. II. 3.)*

Here food is called ‘Brahman’ (the great) as it is the chief cause of (the continuance of) life. All living beings draw happiness from pure food, water and air and not if they are impure.

There are two kinds of efforts (for the purification of all these things). One is ‘Divine’ and the other ‘human’. God has created this fiery (orb of) the Sun, sweet fragrance and the flowers. The Sun is ceaselessly busy in drawing up juices from (all things) in the world. But as the fragrant and bad smelling qualities are mixed up with these juices, the water and air that come into contact with them are, because of this combination of sweet and bad odour, rendered into an indifferent quality where there are both desirable as well as undesirable elements. Consequently the quality of plants, food, seed and bodies also becomes comparatively inferior because they are produced from such a rain water. Because of their middling quality, (all human) virtues e.g. strength, intellect, valour, prowess, perseverance, bravery grow mediocre. Because it is a philosophical doctrine that as is the cause so is the effect.

For this we cannot blame the Divine creation. Because bad smell and other defects are man-made and should be ascribed to human creation. As man is the author of bad odour and other defects, it is, therefore, obligatory for him to remove them. It is a divine ordinance that one ought to speak the truth and ought not to tell lies. He, who transgresses it, becomes a sinner and suffers afflictions in accordance with the law and order.

(14) “तत्समाह एकस्मात्त आत्मन आकासः सम्पूर्ण आकासायत्” वाय: बायोरिनि:, अमेदाय:, अत्रूष्यः वृक्षेश्वरो वृक्षेश्वरः, अवालोकतान्यः पुरस्तः स वा एष्मूलक्ष्योपदेशमयः।” *(व्रह्माणास्वलि 2) (TU. I. 2)*

(15) “स तपोज्ञात्पत्त। तपस्त्तथा अत्यन्त्र श्रवण्ति श्वासनात। अन्तर्यद्युष्म खातु इवदानि भूसि जायन्ते। अन्ते जातानि जीविति। अथ भ्रात्रमयस्विभुशिति।” *(TU. II. 3)*
of God. Similarly God has ordained that man ought to perform a Yajña. Whoever violates this, commits sin and suffers pain, because he omits an action of universal good.

The greater the number of men and other animals gathered together at one particular place, the greater is the amount of bad smell. God’s creation is not its cause. Because it is a result of crowding together of a huge number of men and other animals. Sometimes men for their own pleasure, accumulate elephants and other animals at one particular place and the excessively offensive smell, caused by this must be ascribed to men’s pleasure-seeking-activities. In this manner, the entire bad odour which pollutes the air and the rain-water is caused by human agency. Hence it becomes obligatory for men that they should remove it also.

Of all living beings men alone can discriminate between the good and the evil (lit. benefit and harm). Thinking or realisation (Vicāra or Manana) is the characteristic of a man’s manhood.*

Of all embodied living beings, God has created men alone who possess mind (Manasvin i.e. having mind) and thus have the capacity of discrimination. By a particular combination of atoms (Paramāṇu-saṁyoga) He has created human organs; which have the capacity of acquiring knowledge (lit. abode of knowledge). Hence men alone and no other animals have power of discrimination between good and evil (Dharma and Adharma) and of doing righteous and leaving unrighteous actions.

That is why all men should perform Yajñas for universal benefit.†

* Author says: “मनव-विचारस्तु-योगाल मनुष्यः”।

Here the following explanation of the word ‘Manuṣya’ given by Yāska deserves notice:—

“मनुष्यः कर्मात् मर्या कर्मणि सीध्याति। यन्त्रयमानेन सूक्ष्मः। मनस्तिति: पुनर्मतसीमाइ। मनोद्शयः। मनुष्यो वा।” (N. II. 3)

† Rṣi Dayānanda in emphatic terms makes it clear that “Yajña” is an obligatory act on the part of a man. A man must perform sacrifice for universal advantage. It has no selfish end. The word “Yajña” is from the root ‘√ya’ to sacrifice, to worship with sacrifice.

The Bhagavad-Gītā clearly states that performance of a Yajña is essential and unavoidable:— (Contd.)
i.e. "In ancient days, Brahmadeva created living beings together with Yajña and said to them: "By means of this (Yajña) may you grow, may this be to you a "Kama-dhenu" (i.e. something which fulfils all desires)."

"Those good men, who part-take of what remains after the performance of the Yajña, are redeemed from all sins. But those, who (without performing the Yajña) cook (food) for themselves only, such sinful persons eat only sin." (1)

"Know (that) the origin of Action is from the Brahma (that is, the Vedas) and this Brahma (the Vedas) has sprung out of the Brahman (God); therefore (know that) the All-Pervading Brahman is always 'primarily worshipped' in the "Yajña"." (EG III)

Lord Krishṇa condemns a man who wastes his life without performing Yajñas for universal benefit:

"एवं प्रवृत्तं च चाकं नातुयूलतंति हय: ।
अधायुरितिद्वारायो भोजय पानं स जीवितं ॥ ॥" (BG. III)

i.e. "The life of that man who does not move the cycle (of action) which has thus been started (for the maintenance of the world) is sinful; and the existence of this slave of the senses, O Arjuna, is worthless." (BG. III)

A Yajña must be performed without any personal desire. In the Mahābhārata we read:

"व्यो धार्मस्कपण्य यज्ञोऽवस्यान वानमिति ।
यशो यक्ष्य्य इयेव यो व्यक्यवल्पयः ॥" (MB, Śānti) (Contd.)
“Yajña is an act which is done with no selfish motive.”

(MB. Śānti)

The undermentioned citations from the Chāndogya Upaniṣad may be read with benefit:

(a) “वयो धर्मसङ्गम यज्ञोपययम नानानंतित्” (CHU. II. 23.1)

(b) “यद्य यत्न्वेभवे सवं पुनानि तस्मादेव यजःः” (CHU. IV. 16.1)

The universal character of Yajña is eulogised in our ancient literature. All beneficial activities e.g. patriotism, devotion to God, attainment of knowledge for others’ benefit, life of celibacy, harmlessness to others, development of social order, protection of orphans and shelterless people are included in this Yajña. The following extracts from authoritative books will establish this fact beyond doubt:

(a) “यदृ यज् इत्याच्चते श्रद्धार्थ्येव तद्” (CHU. VIII. 5.1)

(b) “वेन श्रद्धा तवं यज्ञ: ।” (BU. I. 5.17)

(c) “अह्म बह्यः अह्म यज्ञः ।” (KTU. II)

(d) “अहं भक्तुं यज्ञ: ।” (BG. IX. 16)

(e) “तिष्ठानं यज्ञं तनुस्वे ।” (TU. II. 5.1)

(f) “यज्ञो विष्णु: प्रजापतिः ।” (MTU. VI. 16)

(g) “यज् येन बेद्वा बिव गताः ।” (MBNU. XXI. 2)

The selfless person perceives a Sacrifice (Yajña) going on within himself:

(i) “स्वर्णरे यज्ञं परिबर्तनामि ।” (PNU. II)

(ii) “शरीरं यज्ञः ।” (MBNU. XX. 12)

(iii) “वाच्चं वतस्य होताः । वर्षेय वतस्य अच्यूर्यः । प्राणो वं वतस्य उद्वगाता । मनो वं यज्ञम भ्रा ।” (BU. III. 1-6)

(iv) “तस्मयं बिषुयो यज्ञसात्रा यज्ञमात: । भ्रा फलात: । शरीरतिथिः वेदव: । शोभानि वहिः । वेद: शिखा: । हृदयं यूप: । काम लाम्बर्यं । भन्तु: । तपोवनिः । दयमाभिषिक्त: । विष्णु वाक्य होता: । प्राण उद्वगाता: । वच्छर्यः: । मनो वहि: । श्रीमनुषोऽयावत् त्रिपयते सा श्रीला: । यश्नमाति तदु हृति: । यत् पिष्काद तदस्य श्रीमनुषनम् ।” (MBNU. LXXX.) (Contd.)
Human body is described as the hermitage of “Seven Sages” who perform sacrifices:

“सत्त ऋषय: प्रतिहता: सरोरे सत्त रक्षिति सदयमादम ।”

(BU; YV. XXXIV. 55)

According to the Bhagavad-Gītā God created men with sacrifice:

“सह यज्ञ: प्रजान: सुष्क्ता पुरुषोऽच प्रजापतिः ।”

(BG. III. 10)

The universal aspect of a Yajna is highly praised in the Vedic literature also:

(I) “अध्वरो वे यज्ञः ।” (SB. I. 2.4.5 ; I. 4.1.38)

(II) “यजो वे नमः ।” (YV. XIII. 8 ; SB. VII. 4.1.30)

(III) “यजो वे मुनयः ।” (YV. XVIII, 42)

(IV) “यजो वे सर्वरिणि पूजनानि मुनिनिः ।” (SB. IX. 4.1.11)

(V) “यजो ममः ।” (YV. XI. 7)

(VI) “यजो वा मृतस्य योनि: ।” (YV. XI. 6)

(VII) “यजो वे महिमा ।” (YV. XI. 6 ; SB. VI. 3.1.18)

(VIII) “यजो वे स्वः ।” (YV. I. 11)

(IX) “यजो वे मुनयः ।” (YV. XII. 67)

(X) “यजो वे बेदार्थम कर्मः ।” (YV. I. 5 ; SB. I. 7.1.5)

(XI) “यजो वे जिनो यजों ति सर्वरिणि पूजनानि विषालिः ।” (SB. VIII. 7.3)

(XII) “यजो वे मूननस्य नारिः ।” (TB. III. 9.5.5)

(XIII) “यजो वा अविस्वः ।” (TB. VI. 4.5)

The selfish people (i.e. non-sacrificers are condemned in the following stanza:

“अयज्ञेन: सन्नात: प्रेतिमीमवः ।” (RV. X. 33.4)

i.e. “Even the charitable people who have no sacrificial activities go to ruin.” cf:

(XIV) “पराविश्वज्ञाः वन्दुरूपं इत्यर्थविश्वानो यज्ञविमस्य स्वर्गमाना: ।” (RV. I. 33.5)

(XV) “प्राप्त्य पारं नवत्य नायानावपि कर्मवर्तमानोऽवायुतः ।” (RV. I. 121.13)

(XVI) “अविश्वियो हृदयमही प्रविष्ठः ।” (AV. XII. 2.37)

Thus an “A-yajña” is deprecated in harsh terms. Ancient Aryans were known for their selfless charitable outlook towards all living beings.

(Contd.)
Q. How can it rightly be said that a Yajña is performed for others' benefit; when the fragrant substances e.g. musk etc. are reduced to ashes by being thrown into fire? These good things can serve more beneficial purpose, if they are given to men etc. to eat and be utilized otherwise, than being burnt in sacrificial fire. Then what is the advantage of performing a Yajña?

A. Here we say that nothing is ever utterly perishable. Annihilation (vinaśa) means merely the passing of an object from perceptible state into an imperceptible one.*

Q. How many kinds of perception do you accept?

A. I admit eight types of cognition (Darśana).

Q. What are they?

A. I accept (the following) eight means of cognition (e.g. :— (1) Sense Perception (Pratyakṣa), (2) Inference (Anumāna), (3) Analogy (Upamāna), (4) Verbal Evidence (Śabda), (5) Tradition (Aitihya), (6) Circumstantial Implication (Arthapatti), (7) Probability (Sambhava), (8) Non-existence (Abhava).

Ācārya Gautama in his Nyaya Sutra defines them as follows:—

(16) “Sense perception (Pratyakṣa) is that truly unerring and determined knowledge which is derived from the contact of a sense organ with its object.” (ND. I. 1.4)

(Contd. from page 68)

Dayānanda here stresses upon the fact that Yajña is performed only for universal benefit. We have quoted here a good number of instances showing the importance of a Yajña. The interested reader may see (RV. II. 26.1 ; VII. 6.3 ; VIII. 70.11 ; and AV. XI. 2.23 ; and also Nirukta X. 26 ; RV. X. 81.5). Instances can be multiplied. We have, due to economy of space, not given here the English renderings of these citations which are quite simple and lucid.

* cf. “अच्यतानीति भूतानि ध्वरतिमध्यानि भारत।
अच्यतनिध्ननांत्यं तत्र का परिवेदना II” (BG. II. 28)

(16) “इतिन्यानंसैलक्ष्यं ज्ञानस्यपदेशसम्बन्धितारिष्यसायात्मकं प्रत्यक्षम् I”

(ND. I. 1.4)
(17) "Now the Inference (Anumāna) which is based on Sense-Perception is three-fold: (I) Parva-vat (Inference of the effect from the cause), (II) Seśa-vat (i.e. Inference of cause from the effect), (III) Samanyato-dṛṣṭa (i.e. an Inference neither deduced from the relation of cause to the effect nor from that of effect to the cause.)"

(ND. I. 1.5)

(18) "To establish fact on its resemblance to another object is called Analogy i.e. Upamāna."

(ND. I. 1.6)

(19) "The authoritative instruction is called Śabda (i.e. Verbal Evidence)."

(ND. I. 1.7)

According to this I accept the eight types of Cognition. Here the Pratyakṣa is that true and invariably precise knowledge, which is deduced from the contact of sense-organs with their objects. For example, by looking at from close quarter (we get right cognition) that he is a human being and nothing else. The inference based on cause and effect is Anumāna. For example on seeing the son it is concluded that he had a father. Knowledge based on similarity is called Upamāna. For example, Deva Datta resembles Yajña Datta. This instruction is based on analogy. By Śabda (i.e. Verbal Authority) the conviction regarding the seen or unseen objects is obtained. For example, "the statement that salvation is obtained by knowledge."

(Gautama again says in his NyāyaSūtra) as:—

(20) "Not four only. The Aītīhya (Tradition), Arthāpatti (Presumption), Sambhava (Probability), and Abhāva (Non-existence) are also (means of) cognition."

(ND. II. 2. 1)

(21) "Śabda includes Aītīhya; and Anumāna includes Arthāpatti, Sambhava and Abhāva."

(ND. II. 2. 2)

These two aphorisms are briefly explained here. The Aītīhya (Tradition) is accepted only when it is supported by Verbal Evidence from a
trust worthy person. For instance, “there was a war between *Devas* and *Asuras*”. *Arthāpatiti* is the Circumstantial Presumption. For instance, the statement that “the rain falls when there are clouds” conveys indirectly that “it does not rain when there are no clouds”. *Sambhava* means possibility of a thing by some mean or at a particular place. For example, the statement that “parents beget off-springs” is a possible one. But if some one says that the hair of moustache of Kumbhakarana stood erect four Kośas and the length of his nose was 16 Kośas, (he cannot be relied upon) because of his impossible and consequently false statement. *Abhava* is Non-existence of an object at particular place and time. Some one asks a person to bring a pitcher. When he does not perceive the pitcher there, he gets cognition that the pitcher is not there by means of Non-existence (*Abhava*). He fetches it from the place where it exists.

This is a concise explanation of *Pratyakṣa* etc.

In this manner I accept eight sources of Cognition. Without accepting them, none can achieve success in the affairs of this world and of the next world.

(Imagine) some one thoroughly reduces a clod of earth to powder and throws it up high into the sky with the might of his arm in a violent wind. Here destruction (*nāsa*) of the clod is not (actual but) a figurative one (*Upacaryate*) because the clod has become only imperceptible to the eyes (and has not actually ceased to exist). The word “*nāsa*” is derived from the root ‘*NaS*’ to become invisible with suffix (*ghan*). Consequently the word “*nāsa*” denotes disappearance i.e. a stage when a thing becomes imperceptible to the sense-organs. Moreover, when atoms (of a substance) are disjoined and separated, they are not seen by eyes as they are beyond Sense-Perception. When they join each other again and assume the character of a gross state, they become visible, because a gross substance alone is perceptible to sense-organs. When a substance is so continuously divided and subdivided that it becomes impossible to divide it further, those (last and final) divisions are termed as *Paramāṇus* (atoms). They thus subdivided become imperceptible but continue to exist in the void space.

Similarly, when a thing is put into fire it is disintegrated and continues to exist in some other region. It never ceases to exist. In this manner, the fragrant ingredients which are potent in removing all defects such as offensive odour, when are consumed in fire, they purify the air as well as the rain-water. When they are pure and free from defects, they bring about happiness and benefit to the entire creation.

For this reason, performance of a *Yajña* is obligatory.
Q. If the sole aim of a Sacrifice is the purification of air and the rain-water, (it is useless to perform a Sacrifice as) this object can be achieved by keeping fragrant articles at dwelling places. What is the advantage of this whole fuss?

A. No, this will not do. In this manner, the impure air (inside the house) can not become lighter and thus would not ascend into the sky, but would continue to remain where it exists and thus would not create vacuum for the external purer air to come in. Moreover, the disease-averting purpose can also not be achieved because of the simultaneous existence of pure and foul air (in the house side by side).

When in the house, fragrant and similar other substances be consumed in the fire, the air due to the heat expands, grows lighter and goes up higher into the sky. At this, the pure air would get vacuum to run in from all the four directions. As by this process the space inside the house is surcharged with pure air, it has disease-destroying effect also.

(Moreover) the air, carrying the atoms of fragrant ingredients by a Yajña would ascend into the higher regions and would purify the rain-water as well as also it would enhance the amount of rain. By this (pure rain) herbs etc., also become pure (i.e. qualitative). By and by the world is restored to immense happiness. It is beyond all doubts. This aim cannot be achieved by making the air fragrant without its contact with fire.

Hence, the performance of Yajña is decidedly beneficial.

Moreover, when a person consumes fragrant articles in the sacrificial fire, the wind carrying the (sweet) smell comes in contact with the nose-organ of a person sitting at a very far off place. He, then (at a distant station) realises the existence of the fragrant wind. From this, it is inferred that good or bad odour is vafted away by the blowing breeze. When it (fragrant air) has reached the remote region (and left the place where the Sacrifice was performed), it ceases to have contact with the smell-organ there. Here, men of immature wisdom wrongly conclude that the fragrance has perished. But they do not understand that the fragrant substances which were burnt in fire, do actually exist in the air in other (higher) region. Thus there are other multiformed purposes of sacrificial performances which the wise people can rightly comprehend by proper thinking.

Q. If the purpose of performing a Sacrifice be only this much, it can be achieved by burning ingredients in fire. Then what is the use of chanting of the Veda-Mantras in that act?
A. (To meet this objection) we say that it has its own purpose to serve.

Q. What is that?

A. As we perform a *Yajña* with our hands, perceive it with our eyes and feel (its sensational touch) with our skin, so we recite the Vedic hymns with our tongue with a view to glorify, invoke and offer our prayers unto God. (Through them) we comprehend the purpose of the Sacrifice (also). Their repeated recitation preserves the Vedic Text and makes us realise God's existence. We are (indirectly) instructed that all acts should be preceded by prayers to God. The recitation of the Vedic hymns in the Sacrifice is done only to offer these prayers throughout all its stages.

Q. What objection is there if (passages from) some other (sacred) books than the Vedas are chanted there?

A. The above stated aim cannot be gained by reciting some other texts, because they, not being revealed by God, are not absolutely true. It must be admitted that whatever and wherever a truth is to be found, it is originated from the Vedas. Whatever false is there, it is outside the Vedas and God is not its source. On this topic Manu says:

(22) “O Lord, (Manu) thou alone art conversant with the duties (*Kāryas*) and real meanings of the Vedas which are the words of unimaginable, unknowable and Self-existent God.” *(M. I. 3)*

(23) “The four *Varṇas* (castes), the three regions, the four *Āṣramas* (stages of human life), and the Past, the Future and the Present, are all accomplished by means of the Vedas.” *(MS. XII. 97)*

(24) “The eternal science of the Vedas upholds the whole creation and is a medium of securing bliss for the living beings; hence I admit its highest place.” *(MS. XII. 99)*

---

(22) “स्वेतको ह्रास्य सर्वत्र स्वयं स्वयं स्वयं सङ्कुचः।
अविद्यायाम्ब्रह्मायं कार्य-तत्साधिते दशोऽऽऽ दशोऽऽऽ।” *(M. I.3)*

(23) “धनुर्मायं तथेऽर्थः च स्वयं स्वयं स्वयं सङ्कुचः।
युध्यास्य शस्यायं सङ्कुचः शस्यायं सङ्कुचः।” *(MS. XII. 97)*

(24) “विमोऽस्य सर्वसूक्ष्मानि वेदाणि सत्त्वातन्त्र ।
तस्मादेति परं मन्ये द्वितीयोरस्य साद्यम्।” *(MS. XII. 99)*
Q. Is it essential for the performance of a Sacrifice (Yajña) to prepare a sacrificial altar (Vedi) by digging the earth, (construct a Yajña-tala), (procure) the sacrificial vessels e.g. Pratita etc., and Kusa grass and (to appoint) Sacrificial priests (Ritviṣ)?

A. Here our contention is that whatever is essential and reasonable that must be done and nothing else. For instance, by digging the ground, a Vedi is to be prepared. Fire kindled there, becomes powerful. Things thrown into it, becoming at once disintegrated ascend into the sky. Moreover, by preparing these various types of Vedis such as triangular, quadrangular, circular and falcon-shaped, the knowledge of Geometry is acquired. As the particular number of bricks is required for the particular type of the Vedi, Science of Mathematics is also learnt by this.

* Prof. A.A. Mecdonell in his “INDIA’S PAST” says:

“The beginnings of geometry go back to a period of high antiquity in India, for a considerable amount of geometrical knowledge is to be found in the Śulva-Sūtras, or ‘String Rules’, which from a part of the general Vedic ritual (Kalpa) Sūtra works. These give the rules for the laying out of the sacrificial ground, for the construction of the fire-altars, and other arrangements necessary for the performance of the single great sacrifices. The design of the sacrificial ground with its most important constituent parts made the construction of right angles, squares, and circles, as well as the transformation of plane figures into others of equal area, a matter of necessity. To sacrificial experts it was of the utmost moment that the measurement of the sacrificial ground by means of cords (Śulva), stretched between stakes, should be carried out accurately according to rule. These practical requirements resulted in a considerable aggregate of geometrical knowledge, including the Pythagorean proposition (worked out in Euclid 1.47). Thus the ritual experts understood how to transform rectangles into squares, squares into circles, as well as vice versa. It is probable that such geometrical knowledge based on practical operations goes back even to the time of the Vedic hymns.” (Page. 192)

Prof. A.B. Kieth also confirms this view in his famous work “A History of Sanskrit Literature”; — (Contd.)
Similarly other things serve their own purposes. But some say that "the placing of a Pranita in a particular way produces religious merit (Punya) and to place it in any other way brings sin". This statement is imaginary and false; because there is no cause of sin. (Hence there is no sin). Whatever, is essential for the accomplishment of a Sacrifice and is reasonable, that must be provided; because if these things or acts are left aside, there can be no success.

(Contd. from page 74)

"In one sphere, however, distinctly interesting results were attained in geometry as a result of the care taken in the measurement of altars. These results are enshrined in the Cudvastutras, works which are of the late Sutra period, possibly of c. 200 B.C., though this is mere guesswork. They are concerned with the construction of squares and rectangles; the relation of the diagonal to the sides; the equivalence of rectangles and squares; and the construction of equivalent squares and circles." (Page 517)
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DEVATĀS

Q. What is denoted by the word “Devatā” in a Sacrifice?

A. Those objects, which are stated in the Vedas (are called Devatās).

The pieces of evidence are as follows:

1. “Agni is Devatā, Vata is Devatā, Sūrya is Devatā, Candramas is Devatā, Vasus are Devatās, Rudras are Devatās, Adityas are Devatās, Maruts are Devatās, Viśvedevas are Devatās, Brhaspati is Devatā, Indra is Devatā and Varuna is Devatā.” (YV. XIV. 20)

Here, in the realm of ritualism (Karma-kanda), the word Devatā denotes the “Vedic Mantras”. Vedic stanzas (composed in) metres such as Gayatṛī etc. are given the names of Agni Devatā and others. They are accepted here; because they expound the various methods of doing a ritual act. The stanza, which reveals the significance of the word of Agni is styled to have Agni as its Devatā. Similarly, the Mantras explaining the meanings of the words, Vata, Sūrya, Candramas, Varuna, Vasus, Rudras, Adityas, Maruts, Viśvedevas, Brhaspati and Indra are called to possess these substances for their Devatās; because these Mantras elucidate all such words and in them we get references to these substances made by most creditable authority of God.

On this point, Acārya Yāska in his Nirukta observes:

2. “The Vedas contain Mantras (which explain) the accomplishment of actions.” (N. I. 2)

3. “The Daivata (chapter) is so called as it contains appellations of Devatās to whom primary praise is offered.”

(1) “अभिनिष्ठेवतुता वातों देवता सर्वे देवता चतुर्व्यष्टम देवता वसवे देवता हुदा देवतास्तीतिया देवता महादेवेदेवा देवता ध्रुवावन्तिभेष्यदेवता वसवे देवता ।” (YV. XIV, 20)

(2) “कर्मसम्पत्तिमयों ये ई ।” (N. I. 2)

(3) “�वताते देवतम । तथ्यानि नामानि प्राधान्यस्तुतीनां देवतानां तद्‌वातिभियायावकाशे । तेषा देवतोपरिनीता। यत्काम अविवर्त्यां देवायामचार्यामिच्छन् स्थुत्य प्रयुक्ते, तद्‌वत्‌ स मनो भयति ।

सर्विविधा कृतं परिकृतं प्रत्यक्षात्‌ आयतिमिश्रयां ॥” (N. VII. 1)
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DEVATAS

Here is the detailed examination of the Devatás:

When a Seer desirous of a particular object praises a Devata (i.e. a Mantra, knowing it as) possessing that object, that Mantra is said to have that (particular) Devata. Such Mantras (ścas) are of three kinds (I) those whose meaning is direct, (II) those where the meaning is indirect and (III) those relating to spiritual science.\(^*\) \((N.\ VII.\ 1)\)

\[* These passages from the Nirukta cited by our author in support of his view that “the Vedic Mantras are the Devatás,” have been translated here above by us in accordance with his interpretation. This dynamical rendering is worth-appreciation. We also write below the traditional translation of these passages. All commentators, including Durga, have accepted it :-

"Now the Daivata Kāṇḍa: They style this (chapter) as Daivata as it contains appellations (of deities) to whom primary praise is offered (i.e. a list of words beginning with Agni and ending with Devapati).

Now follows the detailed test of Devatás.

When a Seer desirous of (achieving) a particular object glorifies a particular Devatā (a deity) knowing him as possessor of that (desired) substance (Arthapati) (with a Mantra) that stanza (Mantra) is said to have that particular Devatā." \((N.\ VII.\ 1)\)

The well known commentator Durgācārya explains these passages as follows :-

(s) \("यानि नामानि प्राध्यायतुलीनमस्म्याविनं देवपत्यन्तनां देवतानां तदेवं प्रकरणप्रस्थेवमचार्यं भावते | नित्या हीणमेत्यस्मि प्रकर्षणसंस्त्रीयितम्।।
... यानि नामानि प्राध्यायतुलीनमस्म्याविनं देवतानां तदेवं प्रकरणम्।।"

i.e. “In short a chapter containing appellations of Devatás to whom primary praise is offered is called Daivata.”

(b) \("दत्त-अबिष्टतु, कामयानम: श्रविः, यद्यं देवतामिनिश्चितप्रयासं, अर्थपरंपर-अर्थानित्वात्मस्तं इद्यमुख्यं अमुन्या देवताय: प्रसादेनाश्मुक्षायत्वं पति:।।
(Contd.)\)
We according to this interpretation of Durgācārya have translated the above passages in the foot note here. Yāska divides Devatās in three categories (I) Pratyakṣa-kiṣṭa, (II) Parokṣa-kiṣṭa, (III) Ādhyātmikyas.

These three titles of Devatās have been translated by us here as (I) the Mantras, having clear meaning, (II) Mantras, where the meaning is not obvious, (III) and Mantras containing spiritual science. But this interpretation is not in accordance with what Yāska has said. He defines these terms as follows:

(a) "परीक्षकः सविस्वः नामविधिकिः गुणवते प्रथमपदविकायताः" i.e. Rcasa which contain words used in all cases and verbs used in Third Person are called 'परीक्षकः'.

(b) प्रवदलिता मध्यपदयोगोदर्बनिति चतुनाश्ना ॥ i.e. Mantras containing Pronoun "Tvam" in Second Person are termed as प्रवदलिता. ॥

(c) "उत्तमपदयोगा अहंतिति चतुनाश्ना ॥" i.e. Ādhyātmikya Mantras are those which contain First Personal Pronoun "Aham".

But Dayānanda seems to have not followed the traditional translation or the definitions of these terms given by Yāska himself. We may add here that this topic has a number of intricate problems and controversies. No book including Sarvaṃukramanis and Bṛhaddevata can give final verdict on this topic. Hence Veṅkaṭa Madhava, the commentator of Rgveda has clearly shown his helplessness to give final word in the matter of "Devata-vāda" in his Devatāmukramani:

"देवतात्तत्वविधानं खल्ला तपस्सा भवेत् ।
शक्ये तत् विद्वामिनः वापातैश्च भाविनुप्ते ॥"

Only the Seers like Vasiṣṭa and Dayānanda can rightly ascertain the Devata of a particular stanza or hymn as is clear from the undernoted citation from the Bṛhaddevata:— (Contd.)
That is to say when a Vedic Stanza comprehensively describes the methods of securing success and accomplishment in all actions (beginning with) Agni-Hotra (Fire Sacrifice) to Asva-medha (a Sacrifice for protection of Rashtra or nation) or actions which promote arts and other sciences, that Mantra is technically styled as “Devata”. Similarly when a Mantra describes actions leading to “Release” or Union with God, it as well as its import is also called a Devata. Now we say what a Devata is. The Devatās enjoying the primary praise (i.e. forming the chief subject matter) are called Daivatas. The names of substances (Arthās) occurring in a Mantra serve as a mark or indication of a Devatā. For instance in the following Mantra of the Yajurveda, the word Agni occurs:

(4) “I set Agni, the Envoy, in the front. I eulogise Him as the bearer of the oblations. May He cause the Devas (i.e. the learned) to sit here.” (YV. XXII. 17)

Here the word Agni is an indication or a mark (to which Devata, this stanza belongs). What is its significance? Wherever a Devatā is spoken of (i.e. is to be determined), there we should take into consideration the mark or indication, occurring in a Mantra i.e. the name of a substance, occurring in a stanza is the Devatā of that Mantra.

A part of the test (of finding out) Devatā (in a Mantra) has already been explained; the rest will be elucidated now. God is (here) Seer—the All Observer. When He, desirous of imparting instructions about a Devatā (i.e. an object) which possesses particular qualities (Arthapatyam-Arthasya Svāmitvam) describes its properties, that Mantra is said to have

(Contd. from page 78)

“न प्रत्यक्षप्रचुरंरति मन्त्रं”

“योऽतो दाहिनेष द्वेन बुद्धा, बाहुभुन्येन तपसा नियोष्येऽः! II
उपासात: हृत्तनो देवता: II” (BD. VIII. 129, 130)

i.e. “Only the Seer can rightly understand the Vedic text.” “These Devatās (i.e. subject matters) of stanzas can be determined by a person who is strong in meditation, Brahmacarya and other austerities. Mere learning has no power to solve this question.”

(4) “अष्टि हुँस पुरोद्धे ह्य्यातुदलवशेऽः
देवाभिःश्चैववच्छाशिवृ” (YV. XXII. 17)

It also occurs in RV. VIII. 44.3.
that object as its Devata. Moreover, the Mantra itself which lucidly explains or reveals a certain object, is also given the name of Devata. The word Reas is derived from the root “śRk” to praise. Reas have been given the term of “Devata” because the learned eulogise and explain through them all true sciences.

These revealed Mantras are of three kinds (I) Parokṣa kṛtas i.e. those Mantras where meaning is not obvious, (II) the Pratyakṣa kṛtas i.e. where the meaning is quite obvious, and (III) Ādhyatmikyas i.e. those Mantras which describe the spiritual science—the soul and the all pervading God.*

These Reas in ritual or action-portion (Karma-Kāṇḍa) of the Vedas are denoted by the word Devata.

(Yāska further says in his NIRUKTA) :—

(5) “Now we give a test of finding out Devatās in the Mantras where they are not expressly specified. These Mantras belong to the Devatā of the Yaṭīa (where they are recited) or that of its component part. According to the Yaṭīnikas, Mantras not used

* The definitions of these technical words, in accordance with Yāska have already been given in our foot-note.

(5) “तं वेजनारित्वदेवतामहातम्यं देवसूचिरीक्षा ।
इदं ब्राह्मणाः प्राचीनकर्मीभवति ।
अध्यायकां प्राचीनकर्मीभवति ।
नारायणमेव इति भवति ।
अध्यायकाः प्राचीनकर्मीभवति ।
अध्यायं ब्रह्मणं भवति ।
कस्तं ब्रह्मणं भवति ।
अध्यायं ब्रह्मणं भवति ।
नारायणं भवति ।
अध्यायं ब्रह्मणं भवति ।
कस्तं ब्रह्मणं भवति ।
अध्यायं ब्रह्मणं भवति ।
नारायणं भवति ।
अध्यायं ब्रह्मणं ।
नारायणं ।
अध्यायं ।
नारायणं ।
अध्यायं ।
नारायणं ।
अध्यायं ।
नारायणं ।
अध्यायं ।
नारायणं ।
अध्यायं ।
नारायणं ।
अध्यायं ।
नारायणं ।
अध्यायं ।
नारायणं ।
अध्यायं ।
नारायणं ।
अध्यायं ।
नारायणं ।
अध्यायं ।
नारायणं ।
अध्यायं ।

Here some words are technical and need explanation. The author of the NIRUKTA means to say that it is not very easy to determine a Devatā in those stanzas where it is not expressly specified or indicated. He, therefore, gives some alternative suggestions for determining Devatā in such cases. According to him, “Anādiṣṭa Devatā-mantras” (stanzas with obscure unexpressed Devatās) may be assigned to the undermentioned Devatās :—

(1) Devatā of the Sacrifice or that of its component part. That is to say that Devatā can be determined with reference to the context. For instance, if a Stanza is recited in particular Sacrifice, the Devatā of the Sacrifice should be deemed as the Devatā of that Stanza.

(Contd.)