CHAPTER V
SWAMI DAYANANDA AND MODERN PERSONALITIES
Swami Dayananda as a builder of nation, was simply majestic, at once magnificent and magnificent. The past preachers like Shankara, Ramanuja, Vivekananda, Vallabha, St. Kabir and Nanak and others talked tall and gossiped high about Atma-Paramatma and Pakriti (God, Matter and Soul). They never uttered a single word about the unity of India. It was Dayananda who first of all realised the importance of unity among Hindus. At the time he came in the field of actual work, he saw Hindus divided into so many creeds, sects, methods of worship and Gods.

Dayananda, therefore, thought very seriously about this particular weakness of the Hindu community and made up his mind to unite all the Hindus in one common string. Because unity is pre-requisite to build up a nation. Without unity the task of building up a nation is impossible. And the unity was only possible if there be one God, one religion, one scripture, one caste, one method of worship and one language. He devised a six-fold scheme and preached it to Hindu community right up to the very close of his valuable life. The six-fold scheme is this :- (1) Only one God that is "Aum" (2) Only one religion "Vedic religion" (3) Only one scripture "Veda"  (4) One caste "Arya" (5) Only one method of worship "Sandhya" (6) Only one language "Hindi".

Dayananda first of all placed this most practical scheme before the mass and the class. As such Dayananda can rightly be called the father, may the grand father of the builders of nation in India. He was the eye of realism rather than idealism. Idealism does not at all help to build up one nation. Hindus, today are fallen, disunited weak and more dead than alive because they have not yet accepted this six-fold scheme of Dayananda. But shall have to accept this path today or tommorrow, Hindus if all they want to rise once again. There is no way other than this. The more delay they cause, the more heavy price they shall have to pay for it.
Mahatama Gandhi said, "among the many rich legacies that Swami Dayananda left to us his unequivocal pronouncement against untouchability is undoubtedly one" (I). "He was one of the most ardent prophets of reconstruction and of national organisation".

With this word, the great French Savant Romain Rolland3 paid his rich tribute to Maharishi Swami Dayananda Saraswati the founder of the Arya Samaj. It was not only Romain Rolland, who had such high regard for the great rishi but there were countless others, both in India and abroad who had the same opinion about him. Some of our own great leaders like Mahatama Gandhi, Lokmanya Tilak, Rabindra Nath Tagore, Lala Rajpat Rai and others also had accepted him as one of the greatest Social and Religious reformers of this century, it is a pity that inspite of great contribution that Swai dayananda made in the revival of our all religions, culture and traditions very few people in India fully understand the part that he played in creating a new and dynamic socio-religious order in this country. Many people have rightly described him as a great revolutionary. Some think of him only as a religious and social reformer. But in reality he was the harbinger of new era in India’s Social Political scene, as it was he who first of all advocate establishment of complete independence for his country. During life time he had shown us the path to build a new, strong and united India. He was a pioneer in the field of social construction and was a great advocated of women’s emancipation. He had enunciated certain principles which at a later stage, became the corner stone of our constitutinal structure. Almost all the main features of his programme for the reconstruction of a new and united India have been incorporated in our constitution. He had never believed in dogmatism of any kind, and was totally opposed to blind faith whether in religion or in politics. He had full faith in the personality of men and therefore wanted every body to think for himself and act according to his own conscience. No other religious or social reformer has done so to awaken the moral consciousness of the people during the last one hundred years as Maharishi Dayananda Saraswati had done. His was a life of dedication and service and his offered everything that he had at the alter of his motherland.
Dayananda and B.G. Tilak as Vedic scholars:

Tilak by his Vedic scholarship Championed the cause of Vedic antiquities in his book the *Orion* (1893). *The Arctic home* (1903) of the Aryans and the unfinished Vedic chronology and *Vedanta*.

Jyotishes are attributed to him. On the strength of the philosophy, history and religion, he developed the theory of Aryans race as living in the polar religions against the original Aryan home in Central Asia, Southern Russia, etc. His great stature as a Vedic scholar rings unabated. Tilak’s “the home in the *Vedas* is a classical work which explains much that is now inexplicable in the old literature and might recreate to the learners the physical origins if not the actual physical environment of the old Aryan World.

Dayananda and Tilak belong to opposite camps. Tilak was a conservative Hindu while Dayananda advocated militant reformation. Dayananda used the word swaraj earlier than Tilak and it acquired a different connotation in thier hands. For Dayananda Swarajya means full autonomy of independence, ie Swarajya before the *Mahabharata* war which implies the period of decline. He advocated monarchism and used to mention the names of various kings from the Yudhisthira to Yashpala in his *Stvartha Prakasha*. The period of these kings implies swaraj in his opinion. He drew his inspiration from *Manusmriti* in his concept of ideal polity and village was a vast organisation.

On the other hand Tilak equated Maratha conception of swaraj which were under the Maratha rule as distinguished from the provinces ruled by the Mughals. Further it also connotes the self-government as prevalent in the colonies during the home rule days. He stood for the retention of the king, Emperor in his theory of home rule or swaraj. Tilak was receptive to the new economic and political ideal of western thinkers. He was not a suporter of ruralism associated with Dayananda.
Dayananda used the term Swaraj, he limited it to political context in the sense of political independence by praising its virtues. He has nothing to do of the Swaraj which is the virtue of the soul. The moral meaning of Swaraj as self-restraint is to be found in the thought of Gandhiji.

Swaraj is a vedic word and Swarat or Swaraj occurred in the vedic literature. Viewed from the linguistic point it means politically rulership, political power or autonomy. In the period of the *Upnishads* it is used conventionally as the spiritual eminence achieved by a person. He was also a person to have attained complete rulership in a metaphorical sense. A person with spiritual knowledge has to attain the political God of power and universal domination. Knowledge was highly praised. The grammatical and philosophical basis does not furnish proof for spiritual and metaphysical rulership of Swaraj in these days. It is to be observed that Tilak gave a moral and spiritual implication of the term on few occasions. Another way of stating is that the common use of the word Swaraj has been adopted by Tilak, Gandhiji and later Indian thinkers.

The vedic literature has been the source of information for most of science. The main problem is concerned with the interpretation, on account of the antiquity of language and also of the difficulty in deciphering the symbolism used there in.

As well as Swami Dayananda holds that all scientific truths can be found in the *Vedas*. More of it is discussed in proper places of the thesis. The necessity of carrying out the intensive study of the *Veda* is attributed to both of them.
Tilak draws his conception of Swaraj from Maratha conception of Shivaji's Swaraj as distinguished from those of the Mughals. Tilak equated Swaraj with some form of self government as found in the colonies during the home rule or Swaraj. Tilak was in favour of the retention of the king, Emperor. He had a keen sense of western system. He was not a ruralist as Dayananda. Dayananda's Swaraj had a political implication. He has praised the value of Swaraj. According to Dayananda, concept of Swaraj was political rather than moral or spiritual. Tilak, on the other hand, used the moral meaning of Swaraj as the virtue of soul on some occasions, the moral meaning of Swaraj as self restraint has been emphasised in the writing of Gandhi also.

Their leadership was intellectual in character. Both appeal to some of the moral and spiritual tradition of the country. They have succeeded in creating public opinion in their favour mostly by intellectual means.

**Dayananda and Vivekananda:**

Like Dayananda, Vivekananda wanted to do something positive in the world. The language of Dayananda is plain and simple—Vivekananda's language is more inspired and eloquent. Both are orators. Both are Sanyasis and of divine power by abrogation. They renounced the mundane world and achieved fame in a superlative degree.

Both defended the fundamental principles of ancient Hindu Religion in consonance with the findings of modern sciences.

Both have robust constitution as aids to their leadership. Dayananda impressed the masses through his immense physical strength. Likewise, Swami Vivekananda hypnotised the audience by his charmed physique. Though he was not an atheletic like Dayananda he had a magnetic Sweetness and yogic powers.
Vivekananda championed, the cause of vedantic theory and claims of power of Hindu text, Hinduism by his Chicago lecture. Dayananda's took his stand only on the *Vedas* and criticised the *Puranas*.

Dayananda was a critic of several Hindu malpractices Vivekananda was not a reformer in the strict sense. His emphasis was on construction. His leadership was not controverted in the same way as that of Dayananda.

Both were contemplative saints and were above commotion associated with leadership. Dayananda challenged orthodox public opinion for his own conviction.

Both were inquisitive in the technics of perfecting their own spiritual personalities than in enacting the leadership. The institutional leadership of both was detected in the foundation of the Arya Samaj and Ram Krishna Mission.

Vivekananda met James, Max Muller, Paul Deussen, Royce and discussed with them the significance of spiritual monism. He had many disciples from the west. Dayananda's activity was confined to northern India.

**Dayananda and M.K Gandhi:**

Gandhi lacked the physical leadership which was required for Dayananda and Vivekananda. He did not possess the profound learning of the *Vedas* and ancient Sanskrit texts which was a great asset to Dayananda. Gandhi's oratory was limited.
Gandhi used the power of journalism to increase his leadership. His Young India was the Bible of the rising Indian Nationalism. Gandhi was a moral and political leader of the masses, Dayananda adopted Shastartha and disputations with different groups of people in his numerous tours. He was not so much concerned with Satyagraha and journalism as with Vedic lectures and social reforms. Like Dayananda, Gandhi’s leadership was based on self-abrogation. No temptation and no threats could over come him. Both wore simple dress and were vegetarians.

Both were absolutely devoted to truth. Both were against untouchability. Gandhi was influenced by Thorean, Tolstoy and Biblical teachings. Dayananda was absolutely free from such influences. Both show the influence of moral and spiritual forces in moulding public opinion in India.

Swami longed for the freedom of India. The idea of self-government was originated with him. He was a patriot to the backbone. Gandhiji gave full fruition in 1947, when India become independent.

Dayananda was a Sanyasi of Sankarite order of the Dandis directed Gandhi was house holder, who become a practioner of asceticism and Brahmacharya. Both found difficulties in their earlier career and became great figures. Gandhi belonged to Vaishya community and smacked of influence if Jainism and Ballavacharya sect of Vaishnavism. Dayananda belonged to Saiva sect Brahmans who were well versed in vedic rituals. He allowed the righteousness of animal killing by following the Saivaiti tradition in his first Satyarth Prakash. Later he changed at into non-violeece under the influence of Jainism.

Gandhi came of a family that became Prime Minister of several Rajput rulers. He was quite aware of tradition of passive resistance in Kathiawar. It became his political methodology. Dayananda had no intent in political matters. The political condition under the British had some impact on him. In political theory, he was a simple commentator of Manu’s laws. He thought of converting the Rajput Rajas into vedic religion and made an attack on concept of Hinduism.
Dayananda and Shri Aurobindro:

Shri Aurobindo has made enough contribution to Indian nationalism to the interpretation and glorification of Indian culture, to the study of the Vedas, the Upanishads and the Gita, to Indian Philosophic thought, to Yoga and to spirituality as a whole.

Shri Aurobindo studied sanskrit after coming to India. He had enough knowledge in English, French, Latin, Greek, Italian and German. Swami Dayananda knew Sanskrit and Hindi only. Aurobindo probed the intuitive heights of the Vedic Rishis in addition to the study of the Upanishads and Gita.

Commentary on the Vedas - both wrote commentaries on the Vedas. Aurobindo’s writing on the secret of Veda reveals ideas undreamt of spiritual truths which normally are supposed to the later discoveries. Though western writers and their echoing Indian admirers had desired into the ear of the world that the Vedas were the bablings of infant humanity. Aurobindo harked back from these naive interpretations and also from the Mimamsaka theories that Vedas merely advocated ritualistic sacrifices. Madhavacharya of Udiipi had clearly indicated in his Rig Bhashya that every vedic mantra had a triple meaning the physical, the Psychological and the spiritual. Shri Aurobindo plunged into the atmosphere of the intuitionistic age of the Rishis and found for us a key to the secret of the Vedas and the Upanishads. He even gave a commentary on the Gita. Dayananda’s writting was not as extensive as those of Shri Aurobindo. About Dayananda’s vedism he observes Dayananda has no doubt found the key to the Vedas through his unique system of interpretation. It is for us to use and open the portals of vedic wisdom.
Aurobindo’s nationalism is not limited to a partial or limited creed. He is different from organised and regimented nationalism of Italy and Germany. It is a step of international one in the social and political evolution of men. It has to be transcended by a religion of humanity. But in Dayananda nationalism did not even stand on the Hindu scriptures. Hindu nationalism received impetus from him. Aurobindo as a leader of Bengal Swadeshi movement was interested in the problem of Swaraj (self-government).

Aurobindo was a champion of freedom and wants to transcended determinism. Following the tradition of Yoga he pleads for the urgency of transformation of the lower ones. Swami Dayananda once observed “India must have independence for self government is better than foreign rule however benevolent. I need make no secret of the fact that I pray daily and fervently for the deliverance of India from alien authority”.

This was in reply to the request of the Viceroy Lord North Brook who exorted Swamiji to beg of God for the continuance of British rule in India. The iconoclastic Dayananda had outright rejected the Puranas and the Tantras, but Shri Auribindro defended them. Dayananda has more affinities with Neitzche than Aurobindo has Neitzche’s criticism of the Bible has its parallel in Dayananda’s stricture against the Puranas. Aurobindo gave character sketches of Bankim Chandra, Tilak and Dayananda in a calm and balanced way.

Both are supporters of Yoga Sadhana. Aurobindo has contributed to this field by his writings about the synthesis of Yoga but more so by the technique of integral Yoga. It is different from the traditional system associated with sage Patanjali. Dayananda practised Yoga, believed in the supremacy of the spirit, his last utterances at the point of his death reveal his spiritual personality. Moreover he was a Sanyasi—the ideal man of Hindu tradition who had abandoned last and money and had put on serenity. He popularised the Yoga Sadhana in a traditional manner.
Revivalism was associated with him at the time of the glory of western Imperialism and Christianity, Hindu public opinion was in his favour when he criticised Christianity and Islam. Similarly the reign of Muslims in India before the British matters little for Shri Aurobindo. The optimism and gospel of actionism which Dayananda had for the youthful sections were to be found in Shri Aurobondo.

Dayananda established a sect which provided an institutional basis to his leadership. Similarly Aurobindo Ashram and Aurobindo Centre at Pondicherry were responsible for the success of his mission on earth.

**Dayananda and Raja Ram Mohan Roy:**

Both pay homage to the *Vedas* but Dayananda surpasses Raja Ram Mohan Roy in his commitment to the *Vedas*. He deviated from the traditional definition of the corpus literature which is regarded as the *Veda*. In Interpretation of the Vedic verses there is difference. Raja Ram Mohan Roy turned to the *Upanishads* for inspiration. Dayananda, at first, included within the *Vedas* both concept of self attainment Dayananda repudiated his views.

Raja Ram Mohan Roy accepted the authority of the *Vedas* as interpreted by the exegetics and apologetics of ancient Hinduism. Dayananda challenged the interpretation of Sayana and Mahidharra and did not consider any other commentary as binding on anyone. Dayananda advanced his own interpretation which is at variance with the traditional and modern approaches to the *Vedas*. His is monotheistic since Vedic God is only one, though there are many Semi-Gods.

Dayananda restricted the word revelation to the 4 *Vedas*. It was total as they contain the fullness of the truth; theological, Ethics, Social, Governmental and Scientific. It is true for all places and all times it also encompasses all possible knowledge.
Revelation engaged the attention of the Bengali reformers since the time of Raja Ram Mohan Roy. They rejected all claims to exclusive revelation by any religion. They accepted the truths of other region, they borrowed freely from different scriptures for their inspiration and their religious services. It was carried to greatest lenghts. Roy’s interpretation is monistic since the Supreme God is only one, though there are many Semi-Gods.

**On Social, Political and Economic reforms :**

Dayananda and Roy had common ideas in social, religious, matters. He strongly opposed some of the aspects that were launched by Roy such as English education, Christian teachings, Islamic changes in Hindu philosophy. Roy would not partake food cooked by a non Brahman, kept on his body until his death sacred thread, observed caste regulations. He approved the Shaiva marriage according to tantric rites. It amounts to such saying : “Do as we say but do not do as we do.” He could not make his reform felt in Bengali samaj. He cared little for challenging the British Raj, the Sickening Scene of economic exploitation of the Indians by the British. He belonged to the middle class who reaped some benifit from contact with the British.

Dayananda was a profound scholar in Sanskrit. He has no knowledge of English. His watch word is “Back to the Vedas”. With this slogan he reformed the Hindful society. Ram Mohan Roy is interested more in the Upanishads than the Vedas. Roy is simply known as the father of Indian Rennaissance. The social and religious reforms initiated by him earned for him this title. On the other hand, the social and religious awakenings brought by Dayananda continues to attract the people with the title of Luther of India.

**Swami Dayananda and Keshab Chandra Sen :**

They had personal contacts. It is not much known that Swami Dayananda “went so far as to invite a conference of the representatives of all religions on the occasion of the Delhi Durbar in 1877”. Keshab Chandra Sen, Sir Syed Ahmad, etc. responded to the invitation although the proposal was premature and did not bear fruit.
Keshab paid frequent visit to Swami during his visit in Calcutta. He had great regard for him inspite of differences in religious beliefs. They had a discussion on the doctrine of the trans-migration of souls. At the request of Keshab, Dayananda delivered lectures on the superiority of Vedic religion. Swami Dayananda was present at the anniversary celebration of the Brahma Samaj of Calcutta. At the suggestion of Keshab he delivered lectures in Hindi and discontinued Sanskrit. He took to wearing clothes, coat and sandle in public and private life. He also wore a bordered dhoti, drabed himself with a sheet and put on shoes.

Keshab expressed regret at Swami’s ignorance of English. The Swami in reply observed that he too was sorry as Keshab Chandra’s ignorance of Sanskrit which content enlightened faith of the Aryan nation. Obedience to Divine will and the teleological argument were common to both.

Both Dayananda and Keshab had a burning passion for reform. Both have common features in monotheism, criticism of Hindu polytheism and Idol worship. He incorporated many Christian concepts, Upanishadic ideas and Islamic concept of Equality in his doctrine but Dayananda was hostile to these elements. He conveyed to the people prestige of a monk for preaching against the life of a householder. Keshab could not touch the feelings of Hindu heart to the level as did Dayananda.

Dayananda and B.R. Ambedkar:

Dayananda and Ambedkar were poles apart in their commentary of the Purusha Sukta of the Vedas. To Dayananda the Rig-Veda is divine revelation. Its problem is that of right interpretation in sociological and political context. He holds that the Shudras were subordinated by the Aryan invaders. They too belong to the Aryan race. The Purusha Sukta the Vedic charts for the subordinate status of the Shudras is regarded by Ambedkar as a later interpolation. The Rig-Veda speaks of the Indo-Aryans nation grown out of the fusion of the five tribes something ignored by the Sukta. By logical argument, grammar and linguistics Dayananda later proved that he (the best and most prominent) like the mouth is a Brahman. He is not to be determined by truth.
Ambedkar thought that the vedic time was crude and primitive. The Sukta was not a function of social ethics but it was inspired by the wilful degradation of the Shudras.

To Dayananda’s social ethics and ideal society are enshrined in the Vedas. To Ambedkar both are dynamic concepts both are discovered by the march of history itself. Dayananda was guided by the golden age of the Vedas in the rebuiding of India.

A few similarities can be noticed in thier rejection of birth as status of society. Both condemned the Brahmans and their orthodoxy.

Both were great masters in thier own disciplines. Ambedkar’s methological competence was vast. Dayananda’s theological and linguistic power’s were admirable.

They harnessed thier intellectual power in worthwhile causes of building a better society.

Ambedkar, the author of who were the shudras was the untouchable who become a great leader for social justice;

Dyananda, the author of Satyarth Prakash was a Brahman by birth was dissatisfied with the decadence of Hinduism, wanted to put its glories with point. Their final interpretation were on the argument for caste by birth.

Dyananda and Ambedkar were great names in the Social history of India in the modern age. They stood poles apart in their theory of Hindu caste Ambedkar in his preface to who were the Shudras’ has gone his own interpretation of the Purusha-Sukta and challenged the Arya Samajists.
Swami Dayananda and Modern Personalities

The orthodox Pandits developed the caste ideology with the sanction of purusha-sukta/Hymn to the cosmic man of the *Veda*. According to the *Rig-Veda* reference, the four varnas are said to be produced from different parts of the cosmic Purusha in a primevals sacrifice. The Gods, animals, the sky, the earth and the seasons are produced from the sacrifice. The division of security with 4 classes is an essential part of the cosmogony and the social hierarchy was sanctioned by the shukta.

Manu’s Dharmastra propounded the theory than belonging to is the result of karma in a previous life. The nature of the mixture of gunas-Sattva, Rajas and Tamas assigns him at birth to a particular varna. Thus it supports the orthodox theory of Varnas. The two middle varnas-Kshatriyas and Vaishyas do not figure prominently in the varna discussion.

To Dayananda the *Rig-Veda* as an integral parts of the samhitas is not of human composition. The sacred text in the sacred language reflects divine teaching, ideal social as also historical time, beginning of creation. The varna order reins supreme in Aryavarta. He proves that the text is above suspicion. It is of universal and eternal validity.

Ambedkar being a historian made use of vedic material seeks to explain the origin of shudras and thier degeneration. *Veda* is the production of thier forefathers which perpetuate the caste privilege. To him the text and the shukta are not only sacred but also primitive and crude from the view point of social philosophy.

Dayananda deals with purusha shukta in his introduction to the commentary on the *Rig-Veda* and *Satyarth Prakash*. God is the indwelling spirit, all pervading spirit. He is the creator of the *Veda* and far exceeds the cosmic reality. The universe is built up from the 21 constituent elements of the Sankhya and it has seven concentric circles. He takes the hymn as a myth and the mythology is irrational and immoral.
According to Ambedkar also it is a myth of the theory of the origin of
the universe like other myths of the Egyptian and Semitic ones. It is a mere
fancy for amusing the children. It gives a hint of the historical
problem of the origin of the Shudras. Dayananda made revisions in his inter-
pretations of the shuktas in the commentary on the Yajur-Veda and
second edition of Satyarth Prakash. Later varna implies a hierarchy of
quality not to determined by birth. The order as found in the shukta was in
fact the order existing in vedic times, and that is the normative ideal order
for all times.

Ambekar was of the opinion that these verses differ from the rest of
the hymn. The stanza contains a mandatory injunction from the creator
regarding the constitution of 4 classes of a society. The injunction became a
mould of Arayan society (except by Buddha).

Again he offers observation that the Rig-Veda contains other
cosmogonies which did not mention the four Varnas but spoke of the
creation of men and of Manu as the progenitor of the human race. The
division of the labour is converted to the rigid occupational categories.
The Rig-Veda mentions the Indo-Aryan nation as growing out of the
assimilation of five tribes. This is simply ignored by the Shuktas.

In the latter part of the book Ambekar concludes that there were only
three varnas (the shudras were the first Kshatriyas) in the Rig-Veda and in
the Brahmanas. The reference to the varnas in the shukta is incongruous and
contradictory. It proves that it is was an interpretation by his canons of
historical criticism and language criticism. Western vedic scholars like Cole
Brookes, Max Muller and Weser are quoted to establish his point. It is
further enriched by its absence from other editions, freedom taken with the
text body.
He notes the differences between stanzas 11-12 and be rest of the sukta to prove his stand not that these were four varnas from the very beginning of the Aryan society.

We now come to the frame works of thier thoughts and methods of argumentation as found in thier treatment of the shuktta.

Dayananda was quite clear about the infallibility of the Vedas, the blue print of the ideal society, description of the Vedic Golden Age. He has nothing to do with the study of the Vedas in a comparative and historical way. It cannot reveal any information about the Vedas.

The only way in which he needed in discussing a vedic text is. What is the meaning of a particular text. He follows 2 tools :- (1) The tools of grammar and linguistic perfected by the sage Panini, (2) Logical reasoning, God’s word is by definition free from contradiction. Any interpretation involving contradiction must be wrong in interpreting shuktta, Dayananda holds that Arya cannot be connected with mukham. Mukham means foremost qualities and not the mouth.

As it refers to all times, past, present and the future according to the grammatical rule of Panini’s Astadhyayi-3.4.6. This arguments justify the translation in the creation of God, he who is (the best and most prominent like) the mouth is a Brahman.

For Ambeekar the Veda is but a vulgar historical text. It is primitive, myth and legend. It gives some data about the historical society of vedic times. The text is compared by ordinary mortals and the myth was mortivated of human desires.
Since the text is a human composition and not a word for word revelation, he clarified the social data. The historian in his works he made comparison of the vedic data with other data of the same topic; compare them with those found in later works, stories found in other cultures of the same antiquity. By his comparison he is the opinion that Purusha shukta did not reflect the condition of the vedic times. Since the text a human composition and not a word for word revelation, he clarified the social data. The historian in his works has made comparison of the vedic data with other data of the same topic; compare them with those found in later works, stories found in other cultures of the same antiquity. By his comparison he is the opinion that Purusha shukta did not reflect the condition of the vedic times.

Again Ambedkar by his theoretical and sociological angle scrutinizes the text. The basic objection of Ambedkar to the shukta is that it elevates the real to the states of the ideal. To make the real order into a static form is opposed to all morality. Social ethics is dynamic and changes with the very process of history. The purposes of the shukta was inspired by an alterior class motive and not by a function of social ethics for the degradation of the shudra.

They were inspired by thier fundamental conception of social ethics and ideal society. For Dayananda both are static and enshrined in the Vedas in Vedic term. For Ambedkar both are dynamic concepts. It must be noted that Dayananda was not a static conservative. The frame of his reference is a static one, because of God revelation. He was a reformer in as much as he tried to rebuild ideal society of yore from the ruins of Hinduism. His goal is to realise blue print of the golden age of the future in the light of the golden age of the past.
A few similarities can be detected in their treatment of the shukta. Both reject the assignment to social status by birth. Both accept in different ways, the morality and necessity of social mobility for the individual. Both occurred the Brahmans of perpetuating the varna based on birth. They challenged the traditional doctrines and structures of orthodoxy. Dayananda being a Brahman by birth offended orthodoxy in five points of his doctrine in 1881, in a council of orthodox pandits. He denied the full authority of the Brahmans. Ambedkar was an untouchable by birth, was beyond the structure of orthodoxy. There is a basic passion for social reforming them. They were to treat masters in their disciplines. Ambedkar’s historical and sociological competence were vast. Dayananda’s linguistic and theological proves were praiseworthy. Both excite our admiration. Their works are for the most part essentially an integral part of that very activity. Yet their works cannot be taken to be scholarly works.

The author of who were the shudras and editor of Bahish Krit Bharat (the excommunicated India) taught for social justice of the down trodden section of the people—the greatest emancipator of the 60 million untouchables. He was the great architect of the Indian constitution. The author of Satyarth Prakash was a Brahman of the Shaivaites sect attempted to abolish caste barrier. Ambedkar wanted to show that the shukta which mentions shudras had to be proved to be a fake fabrication. Their analysis is not so much with academic interest as with the worth while cause of building a better society.

Swami Dayananda and Martin Luther-A Comparative Study:

Swami Dayananda has been called the Martin Luther of India by scholars in this field. Like Luther he fought against the Popes and Challenges all the organised sects and churches for monopoly of religion, corruption in the name of religion and exploited the common people. In the second part of the Satyarth Prakash he criticised the irrational and unfounded notions of Indian religious concepts and foreign religious teaching for establishing vedic monotheism, moral purity, social equality and justice.
As he was travelling in different parts of India for the preaching he attacks and plots tooks place in many cases. With the zeal and enthusiasm of st. Paul and Martin Luther combined the asserted the Vedas are infallible and contained all kinds of knowledge. He admires endeavoured to make his stay comfortable by special arrangments. The society he had said must be reformed according to Vedic law but there was not translation of vedic way intelligible in style to be common man. His aim was to place his interpretation of Vedic, i.e. Satyarth Prakash in the hand of the people. Each section of Hindus should have free access to the truth of the Vedas. Like Luther what he suggested to others to had proved himself. This is greatest gift to the people by the Arya Samajists in the 4th century. He completed the writing of Vedas in his commentary in Hindi and takes wrote other books. They can be compared to Luther’s translation of the Bible (old and new Testaments) in German language.

The objections by the orthodox Hindus schools, Jainas, Muslims, and Christians did not stop the progress of the teaching, this success in the Shastrarhas and invitations by the elites for his lecture made his followers willing to contest the court cases rather than to forsake the truth. He was prepared for dangers of all truths.

The incarnations with which the temples were properly adorned were offensive and thrown out. But his faith had not been in vain. He had a tussle with Rao Narain Singh of Rai Baraoli for his remark on Ganga Snan, Tika wearing, etc. He hired 3 assasinier to vindicate the same but the plot failed. He told Thakur Kishen Singh “Be of Good Cheers, God is my protector”.

He commends rational arguments. The minds of the people in Punjab, Haryana, Rajputana and Bombay were ready for his preaching. There were territories of Arya samajists in Mauritius, South Africa also we are convinced that protestant movement of Luther in Europe can be favourably compared with the Arya Samaj works in India.
Advocates of Grihastha or Domestic life:

In his opinion family life is a veritable paradise on earth. Society is best an enlarged reflex of domestic life. A bad family cannot produce a good citizen. Marriage is the starting point. No one has said greater stress on the importance of domestic reform than Dayananda. A good marriage system must result in bliss and happiness. So far, there is a affinity between Dayananda and Luther although there were born in different centuries. Martin Luther did much to cause married life to be honoured and affords many opportunities it affords to serve God and Man. Family life, was to him a measures to serve God and glorify his name. But unlike Luther Dayananda thinks that monastic life had special virtue. He himself is a monk or Yogi. But they are of the same opinion that Gods call each one into His service, the plough boy as much as the prince. One must accept the task entrusted to him or hereby God and rejoice in it.

When Luther died as a sequel of his broken health and austeries he practised while in the monastery one of his friend asked; will you die trusting the Gospel, you have preached? A whispered but emphatic, yes was the last word that proceeded from his mouth.

In the death of Swami Dayananda in Jodhpur, the word of Swamiji “Let they will be done, O Father”. After altering these words his soul fluttered away into the heavens.

Dr. K. Jayaswal, a renowned Historian and Antiquarian has observed “He gave freedom to be soul of the Hindu, as Luther did unto the European. And he forged that freedom from inside that is from Hindu Literature itself.”
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2. My observation, Some of the modern Indian thinkers raised the status of Sanyasi in their lives.

3. Vide Supra Chapter II.
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9. The *Pioneer* in Varanasi characterised Dayananda as the Luther of India for the first time. Vide supra chapter I.

10. Most of the points are developed by me from my comparative studies. Martin Luther belongs to the 16th century in Germany. His works mark the freedom of Man from the spiritual dictatorship of Roman Catholic Church and the Papacy. Modernity in Europe is counted from 1475 onwards. From Indian view point, modern period is equated with the British period.