

The Veda

The Veda forms the core doctrine of Indic Spiritualism. The Veda is an ancient legacy shared by humankind [see *Divine Initiation*]. It is still the earliest existing text of Spiritualism. The Veda, Tao, Torah, Testament, Koran etc. belong to all humanity. Knowing this, India has always had a plurality of religious cultures.

The word Veda refers to the ideology that we see with our third eye. Vid means to see. To see is to have darshan or view of the Divine. It can also mean that we have a legitimate perspective of philosophy. The Latin word Vid - to see, originates from the Sanskrit word Veda. The English language like many other European languages can trace its ancestry to Sanskrit. Due to this, they are clumped together as the Indo – European languages.

Indeed, the Vedic history [including Greek and Chinese philosophies] is the earliest history of humankind. The Veda is the oldest Spiritual literature we have.

The Vedas are based on the monist [advaita] ideology [cf. *Divine Initiation*]. Advaita or monism defines that there is nothing else than the Divine God. In Vedism and its derivative ideologies i.e. Agamism, Tantricism etc. there is the belief that anything aside from Advaita or monism can never be philosophically or mathematically correct. In traditional Indic perspectives even Buddhism is another Agama. Therefore Buddhism is known as the Bauddha Agama.

Friedrich Max Muller, a colonial Orientologist, embarked on the study of comparative religion and hastily misread the Veda to accord with his ideas of the evolutionary principles of social Darwinism. Since then, Orientologists have been writing on how the Veda is the original example of proto or primitive religion. This is false has been proven by the monographs *Divine Initiation* and *Third Eye of the Buddhist* [2001].

The word Veda denotes sacred knowledge. The Veda is also known as Shruti or the Amnaya. The word Shruti means “heard” or “revealed.” The word Amnaya approximately means “that which has come down as tradition.” The Vedas are traditionally understood as “Apaurusheya.” The word Apuarasheya has been wrongly translated as super-human. Apaurusheya simply means “before the notion of Purusha or Creation” and therefore refers to the doctrine of Brahman. The word Brahman comes from the root Brh. In Sanskrit this root simply means “to ever grow”. In other words, it denotes infinity - the idea of infinity as the substratum of all. The Veda holds that the infinite or Absolute is the basis of Creation. This Absolute is God in other religions. This term Brahman itself should explain to academic scholarship that the Veda is a monistic or advaita science.

The Veda is not written in a simple, thematic form. It has left the theme to be read as per the allowed, philosophically valid interpretations. It is therefore the most important Indic literature. It is difficult to read the meaning of the Vedic hymns due to the athematic structure. It is even more difficult for a novice in Sanskrit. This is a basic reason why scholarship is still dependant on Max Muller. It simply does not have the expertise to read higher Sanskrit. This is unfortunate as we have entered a new millennium and the Orientologists are left behind.

A look into any of the four Vedas shows us that the Veda is describing a philosophy of its own through its presentation of its Divinities. These Divinities seems to be common between all cultures. Indeed, as said in *Divine Initiation*, from the Nordic countries near the North Pole to New Zealand [Maoris and the rest of the Pacific Islanders] near the South all were holding to similar Divinities. This shows that they were not adhering to animism, pantheism, shamanism etc. but a monist or advaita ideology.

In the last few centuries the philosophers [especially the so-called German philosophers] in their haste to disprove God [Schopenhauer - Nietzsche] embarked on the idea of a material, self-manifesting world. To support this view they started rewriting the history of religion. In the process they rewrote most of Theology to accord with the ideas of social Darwinism and social anthropology. Friedrich Max Muller was the pioneer in this field – fathering the science of Comparative Religion.

However if we take some time to look at these ancient recensions and their artefacts [idols etc.] all over the world they do not actually tally with the findings and write-ups of these early scholars ie. Muller, Weber, etc. These scholars decided that early men must have been supplicating the forces of nature and thus made figurines out of trees etc. However on closer examination one can see that Spiritualists of the ancient world used pictorial representations – analogous to writing. These pictorial representations are different from the archetypes that Carl G. Jung describes in his works of analytical psychology [cf. *Divine Initiation & Third Eye of the Buddhist*]

Why look closer at the Veda? The Veda is the best preserved of the ancient spiritual literatures. In fact it has been amply preserved. Volumes of texts have been written and are much easier to read and understand than other texts such as those of the Celts or Scandinavians or even American Indians and such cultures where there is no writing. Iran too has a well preserved recension of the Veda known as the Avestha. It is almost the same as the Veda in value and meaning. The Chinese too have their Veda as the Book of Ode.

Let us then take a look at the content of the Veda. The Veda is composed of many hymns. These hymns are addressed to the various Divinities i.e. Dyaus, Indra, Agni, Varuna, Mitra, Vishnu, Shiva, Aditi etc. These Divinities are the same as those of the Europeans. Dyaus, the main Indic Divinity, is known as Zeus to the Greeks. The Divinity Indra has been variously called Thor, Loki etc, in Scandinavia. The word Thor is another redaction of the word Tvastr. In the Scandinavian ideology and narrative Tvastr was reconciled as Thor. Even in sound Tvastr and Thor are not that far off. The Scandinavian Divinity Loki is also found amongst the Indic Divinities. The word Loki is derived from the word Loka Indra [Loka - world and Indra - the Powerful, Mighty etc.]. Similarly Agni was known as Hephaestus to the Greeks. Varuna the Divinity who denotes consciousness is known as Ouranos to the Greeks. The planet Uranus is named after him. Aditi of the Veda is not far off from Aphrodite of the Greeks. Vishnu is Rashnu to the Iranians and their Avestha.

These lists never end and therefore it is easy to conclude on the commonality of the civilisations. This list can also be extracted out of the ancient Chinese civilisation. The Goddess Kuan Yin has the same philosophical meaning as the Goddess Durga [cf. *Divine Initiation*]. The Yellow Emperor of China is analogous to Rudra in the Veda. Manu is the same as Confucius of China. This itself proves that the ancient world was a connected whole and it is very unlikely that humankind existed in isolation as contemporary historians believe. This is only a very rough simple sample.

In study of languages too one can see the commonality of language and grammar. Latin has about 6,000 words in common with Sanskrit. To linguists this reveals that they are actually the same language. Linguists hold that if two languages have more than a few hundred words in common they can be clumped together as one language. Latin and Sanskrit then can only be the same language that due to antiquity metamorphosed to become individual languages. In fact the reason for the distinction between Sanskrit and Latin is one of a minor difference in philosophy. It is due to this that the European Languages are akin and related to Sanskrit. Closer inspection of the English language shows that it seems to be a direct derivative of Sanskrit - unlike what the last century Social Darwinists or Anthropologists such as Max Muller want us to believe. All this warrants more study. Contemporary scholarship depends too much on last century's colonial hatred. It is due to this that Theology and Orientology are unable to move forward in the study of any religion.

With this fresh reading of the Veda one can see that the Veda is a very profound legacy of humankind. In India the Veda has been and is revered as the core of Spiritual science. The contents of the Veda reflect a monist or advaitin [never dualistic] ideology. To prove their hypotheses the colonial scholars, especially Max Muller, rewrote Vedic history to suit their limitations and sense of superiority. This is clearly visible in his writings as a historian. Max Muller also predates Socio-psychology, Psychology, and Sociology [in its developed forms] and was indeed limited as a scholar. All these are factors that contributed to his shortcomings. One cannot seriously take his views on the Veda, Theology or Orientology as fact.

Coming back to the Veda, there are four major recensions of the Veda. The primary is understood to be the Rig Veda. The others are the Yajur, Sama and Atharva Vedas. The word Rig comes from the Sanskrit Rik. The word Rik, becoming Rig by Sanskrit rules of grammar, means the “praise” or “laudation.” The Rig Veda is composed of 1,717 hymns. Each hymn is known as a Sukta. The Rig Veda is simply a collection or anthology of hymns. These hymns contain all the formulae for understanding the various interpretations of monism or the advaita science. The Rig holds all possible enumerations of valid ideology that ever can be composed. It offers in these hymns not only these valid ideologies and the possibilities that allow us to compose valid systems but also gives us the multitude of ways in which humankind can worship the Divine. Therefore it allots so many hymns to so many Divinities that it is confusing to a neophyte. It challenges our intelligence.

The Rig Veda is composed of ten parts known as Mandalas. The hymns or Suktas are composed in various metres. Each metre is made up of 24 to 104 syllables. In ancient times there were 21 recensions or Sakhas of the Rig Veda. The word Sakha means “branch.” However, today only six are prevalent. They are known as the Sakala, Bashkala, Ashvalayana, Sankayana, Mandukyana and Aitareya.

The Yajur Veda is a Veda imparting the praxis of Vedic thought. In other words, the practices are encased in this redaction of the Veda - how to understand the monist or advaita idea of meditation etc. It has two branches – the Krishna [Black] and Shukla [White] Yajur Veda. There were 101 recensions within the Krishna Yajur Veda and 17 for the Shukla [White] Yajur Veda. There are only few extant versions of the Krishna Yajur Veda. These Sakhas are – Taittiriya, Kathaka, Maitrayani, and Kapishtala. The extant recensions of the Shukla Yajur Veda are known as the Madhyandina and Kanva Sakhas. The Krishna portion of the Yajur Veda has commentaries to go with it. The Shukla version does not have these commentaries and has only what is called Mantras. This Veda also has some prose passages within it. The Krishna portion elucidates the Tantric ideology. The Shukla portion elucidate on Yoga.

The Sama Veda imparts ritualistic knowledge. Only 75 verses are different from the Rig Veda and the rest of the hymns are in common. The Sama Veda is sung in certain tunes at the time of rites and rituals. There are three extant recensions of the Sama Veda. They are the Kautuma, Ranayaneeya, and Jaimineeya. The Kautuma recension has the Mantra and Brahmana portions. Mantras are subdivided into the Purvavarhika and the Uttara Archika.

The last and most infamous Veda with Orientologists is the Atharva Veda. They mistake it for a lesser Veda. They see its presentation as a primitive cry of a simple minded civilisation. Due to this Orientology has ascribed it to the Dravidians etc., thinking that the Dravidians are a lesser race. This merely reflects the racist views perpetuated by Orientology in the name of Anthropology and Social Darwinism. The Dravidians are neither a lesser race nor the Atharva Veda a simplistic cry of a barbaric primitive. The entire idea of what is popularly known as Kashmiri Shaivism or Trika is derived from this Veda.

The Atharva Veda explains the rituals and their underlying meaning. It explains the Tantric aspects known as Shantika, Paushtika and Abhicharaka Vidyas i.e. cure for disease, gains, etc. Two American scholars of last century, Whitney and Lanman, translated the Atharva Veda. It is a massive work of about 6,000 verses consisting of 731 hymns grouped into 20 books. Some of the hymns are common to the other three Vedas. Since the hymns are seemingly worshipping for material benefits, the simple-minded Orientologists concluded on the lesser value of this Veda. There were originally nine recensions. Today only the Paipadalada and Saunaka Sakhas are extant.

The Mahabharata in narrative style holds that it is the Great Sage Vyasa, popularly called Veda Vyasa, who codified the four Vedas. The narrative states that Veda Vyasa taught these sciences to his disciples Paila, Vaisampayana, Jaimini, Sumantu and his grandson Sukarma. It is in this manner that India remembers the propagation of the Vedic science. Though there are differences in iteration and pronunciation of the Vedas, the core ideology and philosophy is retained until today.

Each Sakha has commentary material – all precise to the measure of a single phoneme. It has been preserved with great care. The amplificatory materials of these Sakhas are the Samhitas, Upanishads, Sutras and Aranyakas. The Vedas can also be classed into two broad categories - the Karma Khanda and the Jnana Kanda. A kanda denotes a portion. The Karma portion is to help us overcome the Karmas and attain the Heavens or Svarga, and the Jnana or Gnostic portion or Kanda is to help us attain immortality, Nirvana or Moksha.

The Vedas are classed as mainly Mantras and Brahmana. The Brahmana portion is the commentaries on the Mantras. Mantras are of various types. There the Rik mantras – which are made up of Padas or which are composed in metres such as Gayatri consisting of 24 syllables, Ushnik composing 28 syllables, Anustubh consisting of 32 syllables etc. These Mantras are set to the musical scale and are called Sama Mantras. Music in the Vedas has seven notes. There is another category of Mantras that is independent of these classifications. They are the Mantras of the Yajur Veda.

The Brahmanas too are classed under three categories. These are known as Vidhis, Arthavada and the Vedanta Vakyas. Vidhis are of three kinds. Those that deal with the nature of Karma or a ritual are one class. The second class is those which explain the meaning of sacrifices etc. The third class explains the results of those materials which were used in the Karma. These texts are known as the Shrauta Kalpa. The end portions of the Brahmanas are known as the Upanishads.

The Vedas are recited in the following five ways: Mula, Pada, Krama, Jata and Ghana. These various ways of reciting mantras are in accordance with the science of mantras as explained in the Pratinshika Vivarana, Pratinshika Laghu Vritti, Tantra Aloka or other Tantric and Agamic texts. The underlying principles are given by Brispati, Katayana, Nandikeshvara, BritraHari, AbhinavaGupta, etc. They are precisely preserved in the context of the whole mantra science. It is on understanding the underlying principles of Pada Artha or Vak Artha etc. that one can understand the science of mantras.

Due to its complexity, Friedrich Max Muller could not grasp its meaning and concluded with the rest of the Orientologists that it was mere primitive babblings. This is because the complexity of the mathematics of these mantras is beyond the ken of these men of the past. It also requires the study of mantra Siksha. The Sikshas are attributed to Sage Panini. They deal with the science of Vedic phonetics and aspects of phonology or pitches of the vowels and the consonants as – Udatta, Audatta, Svarita, Prachya, Hrshva, Dirgha, Pluta etc.

The Vedas have been preserved precisely, as has the Testament etc. To explain the importance of sound, the verse in the Testament: John 1 etc. and Genesis in the Old Testament – “In the beginning

there was the word and the word was with God and the word was God,” will help a person not knowing the Sanskrit language.

The unique aspect of the Veda is that it merely preserves in formulaic fashion the relevant concepts. It doesn't offer any interpretation. It offers itself as a worship book and offers keys into understanding the higher metaphysics. In its presentation of all the 330,000 Divinities it has foreseen all the mathematically possible combinations of valid ideologies. It is due to this that the Veda itself becomes a sacred work worthy of worship. Thus in India the Veda is acclaimed as the highest work of learning. Not understanding mathematics or philosophy, the Orientologists simply decry the Veda in the fashion of Friedrich Max Muller.

As the Veda offers all the valid tools, there are certain correct ways of understanding it. The primary interpretation is as offered by the Mahabharata. The Mahabharata is a narrative that offers all mathematical possibilities in preserving this Spiritual science. This is presented simplistically as Mantras. In the Mantras are the values of all these mathematical calculations. Therefore the Mahabharata says it contains all knowledge. The Mahabharata holds the complete reading of the Veda. This is denoted by Veda Vyasa. The pith of the Vedic ideology is attributed to Adhi Shankara. This has been known as Vedanta. It is due to this that Adhi Shankara has been attributed as the most profound icon of Vedism.

There is a parallel reading of the Veda denoted by the Sage Agastya. It is also a very early redaction. This is still extant as Tamil Shaivism in the South of India. The Tamil Shaivites re-read the four recensions of the Vedas and are upholding its gist as Tamil Shaivism. This has been vogue for many millennia [from the time of the Mohenjodaro and Harappan civilisations or what is also known as the Indus Valley civilisation]. This can be read as the fifth Veda.

Buddhism is also accounted this way in traditional India. Buddhism is not seen as separate ideology. Not because the Hindus have a mental habit of clumping things together to gain supremacy, but because it is a fact in the study of Indic Spiritualism. Buddhism is nothing other than its parent, Vedism. It is a restatement of the idea of Brahman. The Vedas are based on the notion of Brahman – however Buddhism is based on the notion that this Brahman or Absolute is Sunya or the Void. Buddhism holds that Brahman has to be Sunya [Void] if it is to be a transcendental substratum that can be the basis of the world reality or our world experience [Please read *Third Eye of the Buddhist* for a background understanding of Eastern Spiritualism if one is not to carry forward the blunders of Max Muller]. Similarly the Vaishnavas too hold that the ultimate Brahman is nothing other than Vishnu [please read the *Divine Initiation* to have a good understanding of the Divinities in Vedism different from the hate perpetuated by Friedrich Max Muller in the name religion].

It is in this light that the Uttara Shaivas, or what is popularly known today as the Kashmiri Shaivas, highlighted their ideology. In the Uttara Shaivas, Shiva becomes the eminent One. He is the Brahman or Maheshvara. This is what is popularly known as the Trika school. The Trika school is not a writing outside the Veda. They are all adherents of the Veda. For a discussion of the variant and faulty view perpetuated by Alexis Sanderson please read the Shri Kali article on Kashmiri Shaivism [Please feel free to download this article as it is important for practitioners of Shaivism to understand the correct reading as the misreading only allows fiction in the name of Spiritualism].

There are many more Agamas and Tantras, all based on valid principles and philosophies. Therefore the contemporary claim that one is a “follower of Trika” etc. is totally false. In India correctly the Veda forms the basic rubrics from which one interprets as per one's philosophical inclination. If one upholds Vedanta then one reads one's philosophy as per the Vedanta ideology. Similarly if one belongs to the Buddhist understanding one reads as per the validity of the Buddhist ideology. In this manner one reads the various Vedic ideologies as per one's inclination [karma] but

never based on race, caste, or geographical location. Veda Vyasa himself is described as the son of a fisherwoman. If one is aware of the history of Vedism, one can see that the people of Nepal are not Caucasoid - as is the majority of India. Nor are the people of Cambodia or the Tantric Indonesia of the past. Therefore Kashmiri Shaivism is not an apt term to describe this form of Shaivism. Furthermore, Agamas were never confined to the subcontinent of India. There were Agamas in Cambodia as depicted by the Angkor Watt. Similarly there were Agamas in Java and Bali, Indonesia as can be even seen today.

The Shaktas read the Divine Brahman as the “Yin” or “She”, worshipping the feminine aspect as the highest value. Therefore they interpret their science to accord with the Goddess. There are no “suffragette monists” as pointed out by Sir John Woodroffe almost a century ago - “An American Orientologist critic of the doctrine has described it as a worthless system a mere feminisation of orthodox Vedanta – a doctrine teaching the primacy of the female and thus fit only for ‘suffragette monists’. It is absurd criticism of this kind which makes the Hindu sometimes wonder whether the European even has the capacity to understand his beliefs.” [Sakti and Sakta p.18, Chapter 1]:

Since this is the case, there is no reason to take Orientology seriously. They perpetuate the sad, hate-filled ideology of Friedrich Max Muller and offer total misreading of Vedic history. Max Muller could never read the Veda as he did not understand the Vedic jargon. God knows how he could justify his history of religion or how he could come up with the idea of comparative religion. He was a messed-up personality with no knowledge of the Veda or the Vedic science – hence a contemporary person’s problems in understanding these ancient ideologies.

Since the Veda forms the backdrop rubrics, then the correct way to interpret the Indic ideologies is simply by studying the Veda and from there arriving at the various sub-readings i.e. Agama, Tantra, Bauddha etc. The failure to do this gives rise to all the ambiguity that Orientologists face in offering an interpretation of the Indic science. [See the sad statements offered by Alexis Sanderson, Padoux etc. on how Bhagavan Shri Abhinavagupta or the Malinivijayottara Tantra etc. carries faulty lacunae.] The failure of contemporary scholarship can be clearly seen in their statements. Please read the *Divine Initiation* and *Third Eye of the Buddhist* for further clarification on these views.

With this the false claims that “I am following Trika” falls apart. In India one followed a Vedic Sakha and then followed the metaphysics as offered by a specific reading. Thus the Trikas basically followed the Atharva Veda. Others i.e. the Vedantins followed another set of Vedas. It is only ignorance that leads one to claim “I am Trika practitioner” etc. Unfortunately today’s orthodoxy - which almost was sent to oblivion under Colonial rule - also claims this same blunder.