The Veda is divided into five parts — Vidhi, Mantra, Namadheya, Niṣedha and Arthavāda.¹

Vidhi is the most important part of Veda. There, that portion of the Veda, which makes known, intimates or enjoins a matter not known before by other means, is Vidhi (injunction).² And that injunction has a purpose or a function or a sense and it derives its meaning (artheravan) from its enjoining such a matter as is not established by, or does not accrue from, some other means or proof or authority. For example, the injunction ‘one desirous of heaven should offer the Agihotra’ and enjoins sacrifice, which is not established by any other means or proof and which possesses heaven as result.³

³ agnihotram juhuyāt, Ibid.
One should bring into existence that is he should realise heaven by means of the Aginhotra Sacrifice” – that is the meaning understood from the above Sentence.

Vidhi is four -fold viz. Utpatti Vidihi (injunction or origination or originative injunction), Viniyoga Vidhi (injunction of application or applicatory injunction), Adhikāra Vidhi (injunction of claim, qualification or competence), and Prayoga Vidhi (injunction of performance)⁴.

The Utpatti type of Vidhi (injunction) which indicates merely the general nature of a rite or action⁵, as in ‘He offers the Agnihotra’. And in this injunction the action expressed by the root is construed as instrument, the sense of the injunction being ‘One should bring into existence the desired object by means of the Agnihotra Sacrifice.’

⁴. vidhi ścaturvidha utpattividhi- viniyoga- vidhiradhikārvidhi- prayoga vidhi śceti, AS, p.10

⁵. tatra karmasvupamatrabodhako vidhirupattividhi, Ibid.
The injunction, which indicates or intimates or conveys the connection of a subsidiary with the principal matter is the Viniyogavidhi\(^6\), as the sentence 'He sacrifice with curds.' For, that injunction lays down the connection of curds, whose subsidiary character is understood by the instrumental case in which the word occurs, with the sacrifice, thus 'One should effect the sacrifice with curds.'

The injunction, which intimates speediness or promptness of performance is the 'Prayoga vidhi'\(^7\). And it is nothing but the main injunction, which has formed one syntactical whole with the sentences enjoining subsidiaries. For, Causing the performance of the main action along with its subsidiaries, it enjoins promptness of performance, otherwise called absence or avoidance of delay, because there is no authority to make delay.

The fourth type of Vidhi i.e. Adhikāravidhi is the injunction which intimates the ownership of the fruit to be

\(^6\) aṅgapradhānasāṁbandhabodhako vidhirviniyogvidhi, AS, p.10.

\(^7\) prayogprāśubhavabodhako vidhi prayog vidhi, AS, p.29
produced by the action. The ownership of the fruit to be produced by action means the state of the being the enjoyer of the fruit to be produced by action. And that injunction of qualification is of the form such as ‘One desirous of heaven should sacrifice’.

“Vidhi” (Injunction) is of three kinds: (1) “Apūrvavidhi”, (2) “Niyamavidhi” and (3) “Parisaṅkhyaśvidhi”.

(1) Of these the passage that enjoins an action that has not been laid down elsewhere is called an “Apūrvavidhi”. (lit the Injunction of something new); e.g., “Vṛihiṇ Prokṣati,” a passage occurring in connection with the Dārśa-Paurṇamāsa — without this passage, we could in no way have any idea of the washing of the corn to be employed in the sacrifice.

(2) The passage that restricts the procedure of a certain action laid down in another passage is called “Niyamavidhi (Restrictive Injunction)”, e.g. “Vṛihiṇavahantī, a passage also occurring in connection with the Dārśa Paurnamāsa. If we had not

8. karmajanyaphalasvamযবodhako vidhiradhiśkārvidhi, AS, p.29.
this passage, then, with reference to the Daśrca-Paurnamāsa, as threshing does for the removal of the chaff from the grain for the purpose of making the “Cake” mentioned in the original injunction, - so, in the same manner, we could also have recourse to the process of removing the chaff by tearing each grain by the nails; and hence in the latter case, as the work could be done by other means, threshing would not be necessarily required; and as such it could only have a partial application (optional with the tearing by the nails).

In the face, however, of the aforesaid injunction, Vṛihinavahanti - we have it distinctly laid down that the chaff is to as well as threshing, the restricting of the process to the latter alone is not reasonable.” Reply : Not so; because it is admitted that the be removed by threshing along; and the nail- process is set aside once for all. Objection: “Since the nail-process serves our purpose removal of the chaff by the process of threshing produces a certain Unseen Force (not attainable by the other process) in addition to the visible effect in the shape of the speedier removal of the chaff. this Unseen Force is added to the final effective Unseen Force,
through the original Apūrva of the sacrifice itself. Thus then, as without the Unseen Force brought about by the restriction, no final Apūrva would be possible, the restriction cannot be said to be purposeless.

(3) When two objects happen to be mentioned as equally applicable in a certain case, the passage that serves to preclude on then is called “Parisaṅkhyāvidhi”; e.g., in connection with the Čāyana, we read: “Iḷāmagṛbhāṇrasanāmṛtasyetyasvā bhidhānimādatte,” — Whereby the Mantra herein mentioned is found to ascertain to the holding of the horse’s reins. In the absence of this passage the Mantra merely mentioning the “holding of the reins” would find itself appertaining to the holding of the reins of the ass, by means of the “Living on” consisting of the capacity of the Mantra expressing merely the “holding of the reins.” When, however, we have the aforesaid injunction, we have it clearly laid down that the said Mantra is to be employed in holding the reins of the horse, and not those of the ass, — which latter is to be held silently (without any Mantra). Thus we find that the passage quoted sets aside the application of the Mantra with regard to the reins of the ass, which, together with the Mantra with regard to the reins of
the ass, which together with the reins of the horse, would, otherwise, be equally related to the Mantra question.

Chinnaswami in his *Tantrasiddhānta-Ratnāvali*, determines Vidhi (Injunction). Vidhi is one and first type of the five types of Veda. It is one of the prominent issues of the Mimamsa system. Chinnaswami, while determining Vidhi refers to the view of Naiyāyikas on Vidhi and then refutes the same. It is stated in the *Tantrasiddhānta-Ratnāvali* that Vidhi is the object stated by the suffixes like lin, let, lot tavya etc,\(^9\) and that Vidhi is of three types not related by undesired objects like the instrumentality of the desired objects and accomplished physical effort. Injunctive sentence ‘One desireous of heaven’ should performed darsapurnamasa sacrifice inspired a person in sacrifice.\(^{10}\)

The author of the *Tantrasiddhānta-Ratnāvali* also takes up the issue of Vidhi. In this connection, he first refutes the view of the Naiyāyikas.

---

9. tatra linletlottavyapratyayadibhirbhidhiyamanoartho vidhiḥ, TSR, p.5

10. TSR, p.5
According to the Naiyāyikas, Vidhi is in the form of three. They are Iśṭasadhanatva, Kṛtisādhytva and Aniṣṭananubandhitva.\textsuperscript{11}

According to the Naiyāyikas, Vidhi is not understandable by the suffixes liṅ etc. However this is not exceptable to the Mīmāṃsakas.

In the \textit{Tantrasiddhānta-Ratnāvali}, author Chinnaswami Sastri has not discussed Vidhi in detail. Moreover he has not mentioned the types of Vidhi as found in other works of Mīmāṃsā.

\textsuperscript{11} TSR, p.5.