CHAPTER V

The Vedavedikā

I. Introduction
II. Sectionwise survey with critical remarks
III. Conclusion
IV. Foot-Notes
The *Vedavedikā* is a monograph on the *Krṣṇa-Yajurveda*. It has been published with Satavalekar edition of *Yajurveda*. \(^1\) Daivarata himself has edited the *Krṣṇa-Yajurveda* independently and the work was published by BHU-Varanasi.\(^2\) It is understood\(^3\) that the monograph was to be published with his own edition, but it was published much earlier with Satavalekar’s edition.

Accordingly, in the Satavalekar’s edition, the *sūktas* are arranged on the basis of the *Sārasvata-pāṭha* of the *Taittirīya sākhā*. Daivarata’s edition, on the other hand, takes also into account the *sūktas* found in the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* and the *Taittirīya Āranyaka*, both belonging to the same school. These additional *sūktas*, found in the *Brāhmaṇas* and *Āranyakas*, are then arranged at their appropriate places in the body of *Sāmhitā* with the clues furnished by Baudhāyana, Āpastamba and Hiranyakesi-Grhya-Sūtras. In Satavalekar’s edition, the *sūktas* are arranged in terms of *kāṇḍa*, *prapāṭhaka* and *anuvāka*; but in Daivarata’s edition they are arranged in terms of *kāṇḍa*, *prāśna*, and *anuvāka*. The additional *sūktas*, culled by Daivarata from the said *Brāhmaṇa* and the said *Āranyaka*, need not be taken as interpolations. In the long tradition of the *Krṣṇa-Yajurveda-Sāmhitā*, these *sūktas* might have been separated from the original collection but retraced in the *Brāhmaṇa* and the *Āranyaka*. Daivarata’s edition may, therefore, be looked upon as a restoration of the original *Krṣṇa-Yajurveda-Sāmhitā*.\(^4\)

Thus, the edition of full-fledged *Krṣṇa-Yajurveda-Sāmhitā* is an original and magnificent contribution of Daivarata to Vedic lore; and the *Vedavedikā* is a complementary work to that edition.
Moreover, the topics in the monograph are related to the Vedas also in general. The origin, compilation and the authenticity of the Vedas have been discussed. And the author, while propounding his arguments, relies upon internal evidences.

Thus, a very brief critical survey of the topics which are dealt with in the monograph is given below:

I - The scriptures viz. Rigveda and others are the laws of the Lord

Daivarata introduces the monograph with the declaration that the Vedas are indeed the laws of the Lord, by following which great sages have practised various kinds of tapas and have reached the foremost goal of mankind. Therefore, he opines that studying the Vedas and following the path taught by them as well as preaching the wisdom of those scriptures, are very necessary.

II- Brähmanas are explanatory repetitions of the mantras.

According to the author, Brähmanas Ṛranyakas and Upanisads are also part and parcel of the Vedas as they are Anuvādakas of the mantras.

III The Vedas are the supreme pramāṇa.

The Vedas are the oldest documents of the experience of those great sages like Vasistha. Even Western thinkers who belong to different faiths and religions, and in our own land, ‘Jains’ and others who do not accept their authority, have followed the path, preached by the Vedas, to achieve the human goal. Therefore, the author declares, the Vedas should be
followed by all. They are the ultimate source of concepts related to *adhyātma*. Hence, Vedic *pramāṇa* is the supreme source and it is to be relied-upon by all who seek to achieve the realisation of the highest Reality.

**IV and V - Mantras are manifested form of Brahmān.**

Daivarata, in these sections, deals with the origin of the *Vedas* and their true nature. Thus, according to him, they were in the state of unmanifestedness in the beginning and when the process of creation of the universe began, they also took manifested form through *Śabda-tanmātra*. When they were in the unmanifested form, they had been mingled with the highest Reality and had no name and form. When they got manifested with the evolution of this universe, they also created with name and form like the whole universe in full of subjects and objects which are known through name and form only. Moreover, the *Vedas* were in the form of knowledge and wisdom when they were in the unmanifested form and also thus are full of wisdom in the manifested state in the form of *Śabda*.

He further explains the subtle relation of the *Vedas* with *Paramātman* and with logical arguments proves that they are the only *pramāṇa* to know the true nature of that supreme Spirit. Thus, according to the text, *Paramātman*, who is in the Paternal status to all beings, performed *Sarvahuta*-sacrifice in which he offered himself as the oblation and after that he remained only in the form of *Chandah-puruṣa*. "That Puruṣa, without being born manifested in many forms". - says the author, quoting a *mantra*.\(^5\) Further, that primordial being created this universe through *Vāk*. Thus, *Vāk* is the primordial cause of this universe\(^6\) and he manifested in the form of


Vāk also—that is in the form of metrical Vedic forms like Gayatri and etc.\(^7\). Thus the Vedas which were unmanifested became manifested and are the primordial cause of this creation and they are all-pervading and omniscient.

Further, Daivarata, brilliantly establishes that such Vedas are true means of knowledge in respect of Paramātman, by a series of arguments in a Śāṅkara-bhāṣya style.

**Critical remarks on these sections.**

1) Daivarata's arguments in the matters mentioned above are not unreasonable. They had been proved with appropriate internal evidences. 2) Sometimes he depends upon 'bhāṣya'-style for his argumentation which certainly convinces any reader. One such sample can be quoted. The following purva-pakṣa and subsequent uttara-pakṣa can be noted. *Purva-pakṣa:*—When the Vedas themselves are the true manifested form of Paramātman, how can they be the pramāṇa to know Paramātman? Is it right then, that one describing one's own self is a pramāṇa?

*Uttara pakṣa:*—Yes, the Vedas are the only pramāṇa in respect of Paramātman even though they are the 'manifested form' of Paramātman. Because, he, who only knows the inner experience, could express himself; the Vedas could only express the true nature of Paramātman as Paramātman only knows the true nature of Himself.

In the Vedavedikā such logical arguments are continuously propounded by the author to establish his conclusions.
VI-Perception of the Vedas (to human beings)

Daivarata, who himself was a mantradrastr, explains, in this section, as to how the Vedas could be perceived. The gist of the matter is: The Vedas are not directly perceivable or receivable by any one and Brahman preaches them not just like Lord Krṣṇa preached Gītā to Arjuna in person. As a matter of fact, the Vedas do arise continuously from Brahman. However, they cannot be heard or received by all, because all are not capable of hearing them. Then how could the Veda-mantras be received? Daivarata answers this question and declares that those who abandon everything including the innermost soul in the form of oblation in what is called Sarvahuta— sacrifice and whose state of mind, speech and action are completely retired and turned towards the highest Reality are able to receive or hear the mantras arising out of that highest Reality. Thus, perception of mantras is the prominent characteristic of being a rishi or sage. He substantiates his explanation with scriptural evidences.

The author, as mentioned above, was a mantradrastr of this century and hence whatever he tells in this matter is reliable. Moreover, he proves his contention with proper evidences. Thus, the text of the section stands on sound basis.

VII-The Apauruseyatva of the Vedas

Every Vedic hymn or even every Vedic rik is chanted with the name of the rishi to whom that hymn or the rik belongs, but it does not mean that the hymn or the rik is composed or written by that rishi. In other words mantras are not human-compositions, even-though every rik in the Vedas is related
to a *risī*. However, the *risī* is only a seer of the *mantras* unlike a poet who composes verses in Classical Sanskrit. The argument is supported by internal evidence, that is from the *Vedas* themselves. The *Vedas* are inseparably united with *Paramātman* when they were unmanifested before this universe was created and evolved. And when the process of creation commenced they also started arising out of *Paramātman*, that too with ease like air coming out of the human body while breathing. Also, the process of arising of the *Vedas* is continuous and unending. Hence, the scope of the *Vedas* is immeasurable and one can not delimit the scope of the *Vedas* to only those portions which were sighted by our ancient seers and known as the *Vedas*. Thus, the *Vedas* which were sighted by our ancient seers and handed over to us through the ages are only a small part if the bulk is compared with the heap of the *mantras* which are continuously and uninterruptedly arising out of that supreme Spirit. Only a small portion of Vedic *mantras* were sighted by seers and much more remains unsighted. Therefore, it is said “Anantā vai *vedāḥ*” Therefore, Daivarata draws the conclusion from the above arguments that new Vedic *mantras* can be sighted anywhere and at any time if the receiving end is trained with *tapas* and the other conditions are fulfilled as mentioned in the previous section.

The author propounds strong arguments which are fully supported by internal evidence from the scriptures and hence, the conclusion he draws becomes naturally sound. He has proved thus, that the *Vedas* are ‘*apauruseya*’ and ‘*ananta*’ with convincing arguments.
VIII The Vedas form one unit and are unique.

The Vedas are meant for the welfare of mankind. It is evident that they are in the form of words and naturally words express the meaning through which knowledge arises. The author, thus, finds two forms in them, viz; words and the resultant knowledge. Further, he points out their different classifications which were made from different view-points and ultimately concludes that they form one unit and are unique in spite of all classifications.

The Vedas are classified into four-fold division on the basis of the form in which they have expressed or they belong to different priests in the institution of sacrifice according to Pūrvamīmāṃsā, like Hotr, Adhvaryu, Udgātṛ and Brahma'. Also they are classified into two-fold division viz,- Samhitā and Brāhmaṇa, again on the basis of the form in which they have been expressed, and sometimes on the basis of the subject-matter which they express.

Moreover, innumerable deities do preside over the hymns in the Vedas like Indra, Agni, Sūrya among others. Then the Vedas are classified into manifold divisions from the point of view of the deities presiding over them. Thus, the author points out various classifications of the Vedas but rejects those classifications by quoting many examples and giving logical arguments and proves that the Vedas form one unit and are unique.

The Vedas form one unit though they are classified into four, viz- Rigveda, Yajurveda, Sāmaveda, and Atharvaveda. Whatever may be the reason for such a classification, but they are not fundamentally different as their origin is common. Tree is one and stem, leaves, flowers and fruits are
only the different parts of the tree. Also, the vital force is one but it is
called 'prāṇa', 'apāṇa', 'vyāna' and so on, because of its different functions.
Likewise, the Veda is one but it is classified because of its different forms,
purposes and the like. The author advocates this belief by illustrations and
his view is supported by Vedic evidence itself which he quotes successfully. 10
Hence, his arguments hold water and certainly stand scrutiny.

IX Were the Vedas divided by Vyāsa?

From the present topic onwards, Daivarata debates on some funda-
mental topics pertaining to the Vedas in general and to the Yajurveda in
particular. Here, in this topic, he raises the question as to whether 'Vyāsa'
edited or divided the Vedas from one into four, viz. Rigveda, Yajurveda,
Sāmaveda and Atharvaveda:

1) But Daivarata rejects this belief. He argues that there is no evidence,
either internal or external, in the long tradition of the Vedas that Vyāsa did
divide the Vedas. Sākala, in the tradition of the Rigveda; Kānya, Madhyandina
in the tradition of Sukla Yajurveda; Taittīrya and Maitrāyanīya in respect of
Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda; Rāṇāyaniya, Kauthumiya and Jaiminīya in respect of
Samaveda; and Saunaka in the tradition of Atharvaveda are well known names.
If Vyāsa had really divided the Vedas his name also would have been re-
corded some where in the long tradition. Also, there is no necessity of mak-
ing division as the Rigveda, the Yajurveda and the Sāmavedas are the collec-
tion of such mantras, the special characteristics of which are intrinsic and
such characteristics themselves lead to specific divisions.
2) The following statements in the *Upanīṣads*, and *Brāhmaṇas* show clearly that the *Vedas* did have specific divisions:

i) "Rggaṭha kumbhya tanmitam" (Ai. Br. III-6-4) ii) 'Asya mahato bhūtasya nisśvasitmetadyad ṛgvedah' (Br. Up. II-4-10) iii) "Tatra para ṛgvedo yajurvedah". (Mund. Up. I-1-5)

If Vyāsa had edited and divided the *Vedas*, he should have lived before the era of the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upanīṣads* and accepting this is inconsistent. If he had lived after the said era, in both the ways, Vyāsa has no part in the edition of the *Vedas*.

3) If really Vyāsa had divided and compiled the *Vedas*, his name also should have occupied in the esteemed line of those well known commentators and interpreters of the *Vedas* like Śākala and others.

This section is a clear indication of showing Daivarata’s real zeal of research and his logic is really forceful and the topic needs further research.

**X Yajurveda - Characteristics, recensions and its prominence**

Daivarata takes up topics which are directly related to the *Yajurveda* after a brief survey of some topics which are related to Vedic literature in general.

1) According to Yāśka, the word Yajus from which the name *Yajurveda* is formed, has the origin in the root ‘Yaj’ and it is supported by a *Rigvedic mantra*11— says Daivarata and thus, defines *Yajurveda* as the *Veda* which mainly promotes ‘sacrifice’ and belongs to *Adhvaryu* priest.
2) The *Yajurveda* is pre-eminent among the *Vedas* and it is principal *Veda* according to the author as it propounds all the sacrifices and the chief purpose of the *Vedas* is sacrifice and plenty of *riks* support this view along with other scriptural texts other than the *Vedas* like the *Bhagavad-gītā*.\(^{12}\)

3) *Vyāhṛtis* and *pranava*, the secret symbol of ‘*Paramātman*,’ are the true essence of the *Vedas*. But *Vyāhṛtis*, according to Daivarata, are in the form of *Yajus* from the view-point of metres and they, along with that secret seed-letter *pranavāksara* are widely employed in all the Vedic rites like deep meditations, sacrifices and muttering of *mantras*. Therefore, *Vyāhṛtis* and *pranava* with the aspect of *Yajus* pervade all the *Vedas* and thus, all the *Vedas* indeed possess the characteristic of ‘*Yajus*’ and any kind of performance of Vedic rituals, sacrifices and “*mantras*” employed in those Vedic acts have a close contact with the *Yajurveda*. Innumerable references from the *Vedas* and others are quoted in support.\(^{13}\) Thus, the *Yajurveda* is pre-eminent and pervades all other divisions of the *Vedas*.

4) The tradition admits that the *Yajurveda* has more than hundred recensions.\(^{14}\) However, the number is restricted to two only *Krṣṇa* and *Śukla*. And these two recensions are further divided into many traditional schools called ‘*śākhās*’. "*Taittiriya-śākha*” is one such “*śākhā*” of the *Krṣṇa-Yajurveda*.

The author has argued that *vyāhṛtis* are having the characteristics of *yajus* from the metrical point of view. But he did not prove with illustrations as to how they are having those characteristics. The reader has been thus,
kept in the dark. Remaining points of arguments in this section are also not acceptable completely as the author argues regarding the pre-eminence of the *Yajurveda* on the basis of only *vyāhṛtis* and *pranava* which are, according to him, the true essence of all the *Vedas*. Moreover, he interprets the "*mantras*" in the *Rigveda* in an altogether different way from the traditional way of interpretations which certainly go on the line of Vedic acts whereas the author here, while presenting the argument in favour of the *Yajurveda* follows the line of traditional interpretation.

XI *Taittirīya śākha of Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda* and its traditional reading:

Here, in this section, the author examines the salient features of "*Sārasvata-pātha*" or the traditional reading of the *Taittirīya śākha* of the *Yajurveda*. Also he debates on many other topics related to the *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda*. And he has trained all his arguments against "*Sārasvata-pātha*" and brilliantly imposes the necessity of a new compilation and edition of the *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda*. The following survey of arguments and counter-arguments will certainly convince his objective to any reader:

1) *Kṛṣṇa* and *Sukla* are the two recensions of the *Yajurveda* as mentioned in the previous section. Daivarata explains and argues as to how the names are given to them and what they indicate. The *Sārasvata-pātha* of the *Taittirīya samhitā* is called *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda*; because, says Daivarata, it is impure or not free from flaws. Hence, it is called *Kṛṣṇa* and the word ‘*Kṛṣṇa*’ itself signifies the same. On the other hand, ‘*Kāṇva*’ and ‘*Mādhyanā-pāthas*’ of the *Sukla-Yajurveda* are pure and bright hence the word *Sukla* is
given to those two pāthas. Daivarata enlists the flaws thus: i) According to
the Vedic tradition one should not study the Vedas without mentioning the
name of the seer and the metre of a particular 'rik' or mantra. But in the
Sārasvata-pātha nowhere the rīṣi and chandās are mentioned and it leads thus,
to a 'dosa' called 'yatayāmatā'. ii) Also, 'Samhitā-mantras' and 'Brahmana-man-
tras' are commingled in the 'Sarasvata-pātha' unlike in the Sukla-Yajurveda
where 'Samhitā-mantras' and 'Brāhmaṇa-mantras' are not commingled and
read separately.

The first one is evident that "Sārasvata-pātha", according to the Vedic
tradition, yields to "yatayāmatā-dosa". Second flaw, which is highlighted
by the author, is further explained with live illustrations from the "Sārasvata-
pātha" of the Krṣṇa-Yajurveda which has three independent books -Samhitā,
Brāhmaṇa and Āranyaka. Samhitā is that book which is a compilation of man-
tras in metrical forms of riks and yajus. "Brāhmaṇa-book" is the collection
of 'Brāhmaṇa-mantras' which are in prose order and are Vidhivākyas'. This
is the established tradition in other recensions of the Yajurveda and in other
Vedas like the Rigveda. Here, in the Sārasvata-pātha, "Samhitā-book" is
commingled with 'Brāhmaṇa-mantras' with 'Samhitā-mantras of riks and yajus
and "Brahmana-book" is commingled with "Samhitā-mantras with Brāhmaṇa-
mantras. So is the "Āranyaka-book" which is also commingled with Samhitā-
mantras,- thus illustrates the author.

Moreover, Daivarata summarises the points which are made in defence
of the Sārasvata-pātha and subsequently he refutes them and appeals for a
pure reading of the Taistirīya-sākhā.
1) First point in defence of the *Śarasvata-pāṭha* is based on a legend or mythological note.\[^{18}\] The brief hints of the story are as follows: Great sage Durvāsas was singing *Sāman* in the court of *Brahmā*. Goddess *Śarasvatī* laughed at him while he was singing. Durvāsas cursed her that she should be born in the human womb. She begged him and he permitted her to be born in an elite family. Then she was born in the family of Atri. In course of time she married a learned man and gave birth to a child named Vidyānidhi. *Śarasvatī* herself taught all the *Vedas*, when her husband failed to teach her son, along with the secret of preserving the life-force without having the trouble from hunger and thirst. Then that *Śarasvata*, the son of *Śarasvatī*, was practising intense penance in Kurukṣetra where many sages had surrendered to him seeking refuge from the drought. *Śarasvata* protected them by his grace. But when they were free from the natural calamity they had forgotten the *Vedas* they had studied earlier and again they approached *Śarasvata*. The legend goes further and admits that, then that great sage preached sixty-four thousand *Vedas* to them. And it is said in the legend that the number of sages who had approached *Śarasvata* was also exactly twenty-four thousand. Further it is admitted in the legend that the *Taittirīya sākha* is one among those sixty-four thousand *Vedas* taught and it was taught commingling *Samhitā-mantras* with *Brāhmaṇa-mantras* unlike all other *Vedas* taught. Hence, the sages, those who had been taught ‘*Taittirīya-sākha*’ were filled with doubt and with fear asked sage *Śarasvata* regarding the uncommon feature of the *Veda*. *Śarasvata* vowed that the *Veda* which he taught them commingling *mantras* and without precedence of *risīs* and *chandas* was a right recension. Sages ultimately went to *Brahmā* and he
admitted that the *Sārasvata-pāṭha*, as it was preached by *Sārasvata*, is the authentic one.

2) Another point which was raised in defence of the *Sārasvata-pāṭha* can be summarised in the following way: One verse is read in the *Saunaka-carana-vyūha-paribhāṣā* which defends the reading of *Sārasvata-pāṭha*. The verse is as follows:

   "Trigunam pathyate yatra mantra-brāhmanayoh saha 1
   Yajurvedah sa vijñeyah śesāḥ sākhāntaraḥ smṛtah 11"
   (Sau. car. vyu. pari-2)

Thus, according to *Saunaka-carana-vyūha-paribhāṣā*, which is referred to by the present author along with the legend in *Saṁskāra-ratnamālā*, admits the reading of commingling of mantras in *Sārasvata-pāṭha* with the traditional way of interpretation.

Daivarata, in spite of such traditional sanction to the *Sārasvata-pāṭha*, argues against the traditional view and refutes them. As pointed out previously, the salient features of his arguments can be summarised in the following way -

1) The *Sārasvata-pāṭha* incurs "yatayāmaṭadāsa" even though some legendary note supports it and sanctions it as authentic.

2) "Saṁhitā-mantras" can be read with *Brāhmaṇa-mantras* in the proportion three to one respectively - thus says the verse in the *Saunaka-carana-vyūha-paribhāṣā* in respect of the *Yajurveda*. However, Daivarata accepts the authority of *Saunaka* b: the interpretation of the verse quoted above is not acceptable to him. Thus according to Daivarata "Saṁhitā" and "Brāhmaṇa" mantras are be read in such a way that there should be an order. Every
`anuvāka' or `prasna' of 'Samhitā-mantras should be followed by those 'Brahmana-mantras' which are related to Vedic injunctions and to the respective Samhitā portions. By following this order, there is no violation of the traditional view that 'Yajurveda' is to be read with 'Samhitā' and 'Brahmana-mantras'. At present, the Sārvasvata-pātha is only commingled with 'Samhitā and Brahmana' mantras but not with regular order.

Moreover, the Bhaudhāyana-Grhya-Sūtra and some other texts on the subject prescribe "Vedavrata-s" - Vedic rites related to the study of the Vedas and according to the directions of those texts, the Yajurveda should be studied in the order of five "kānda-risis" and those Vedic rites are also based on the "kānda-risis". Those Vedic rituals and the study of the Yajurveda are prescribed simultaneously in the Veda-vrata-s. But the Sārvasvata-pātha of the Yajurveda does not provide the way of study and practice of the rites prescribed in the "Grhya-sūtras" and other texts. "Thus, on the basis of "Grhya-sūtras" the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda is to be re-edited" - says the author and new compilation of the mantras and related Brāhmaṇas is necessary corresponding to the "five kānda-risis".

XII - Rishi - Chandas-Devatā of the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda

Daivarata has debated upon risis, chandas and devatās of the mantras of the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda at good length in the Vedavedikā.

I Rsis :- The Vedas are innumerable but they can be available only through the seers of Vedic mantras. Hence, without the seer, even though he did not create them, there would be no possibility of we having the Vedic mantras and there lies the importance of the risis.
There are five kanda risis, viz., Prajāpati, Saumya, Agni, Vaisvadeva, and Svāyambhuva; they are accepted as the seers of the 'Yajurveda-mantras'. However, in the midst of the five kandas-there are the mantras which are also found in the Rigveda where specific riṣis of those respective mantras are mentioned. Here, the author once again deviates from the tradition and argues that the mantras, which are found elsewhere and the riṣis of them mentioned doubtlessly in one of the authentic texts of the tradition, do not belong to different riṣis though there is the slightest difference in the words of the ‘mantras’ read in different Vedas. This view of the author is supported by the evidence which the author has referred to in his work. Thus, he quotes from the “Sukla-Yajurveda-kāśīya-sarvānukrama-sūtra and on the basis of this evidence, riṣi means not only the seer of the mantras but the term is used in the sense of one who recalls the mantra and employs it in a different Veda. Prajāpati or any other kanda-riṣi is only the riṣi in that sense in respect of some mantras which were present in other Vedas and registered with the name of seer who had sighted those mantras. Daivarata has many such examples of riks of the Yajurveda which are found in the Rigveda with the seer’s name admitted.

In this way, generally, the riṣis of the Yajurveda-mantras are those five kānda-riṣis; but exceptionally, some mantras should be chanted with the respective riṣis mentioned elsewhere like in the Rigveda.

II- Chandas: It is evident that chandas is the principal factor of the Vedic mantras. There are Riṅ-mantras in the midst of ‘Yajur-mantras’ and thus, Vedic metres like ‘Gāyatri’, ‘Tristubh are the chandas of those Riṅ-mantras which are present in the Yajurveda and the author has enlisted some Riṅ-
mantras which are in specific metres. 23

Moreover, according to Daivarata, even the Yajur-mantras are also in the metrical form and the author refutes the argument of one traditional school according to which Yajus are not in the metrical form and they are in prose order. The traditional argument is based on the statement that “aniyatāksarapadāni yajūṇīḥ bhavantī”. But on the other hand, the author argues that yajus even with single alphabets are also in metrical form only, as the Veda itself declares in respect of ‘pranava’ of which the metre is ‘daivī-gāyatrī’. 24

Thus, Daivarata is of the opinion that there is no mantra, whether it is rik or yajus, which is not in the metrical form and he not only speaks theoretically but translates his theory into reality in his new compilation of ‘Yajurveda-mantras’ in the book ‘Mūla-Yajurveda-Samhitā’.

III-Devatā :- The author debates on the presiding deities of the mantras in the Yajurveda and argues that whether or not deities are declared, every mantra has its own presiding deity in the Yajurveda also as it is the case with mantras of the Rigveda. According to the author some mantras suggest the presiding deities directly and one can easily know because the mantras praise the deity with the very name of that deity. Moreover, “Some other mantras, which do not specify the deities, should be examined and the deities, presiding over them should be found”- says the author on the basis of the maxim “Yāllīṅgāṁ sā devatā”. 25

Whatever is said in respect of the traditional reading of the Tāṣṭāyīya sākha and devatā of the mantras of the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda, as a matter of fact,
stand on the firm footing of reason and it certainly tastes bitter to the thinkers on the traditional lines. The value of the arguments lies always in the practicability remaining in the form of a dogma, but in this respect also the author is victorious as he has given re-orientation to the Krishna-Yajurveda and edited the "Mūla-Yajurveda-Samhitā" which is more scientifically compiled.

Conclusion

The Vedavedikā is an important contribution of Daivarata to Sanskrit literature in general and Vedic study in particular. The Sarasvata pātha of the Taittirīya Krṣṇa Yajurveda is thoroughly examined by Daivarata and he suggests a most scientific reading of the "Taittirīya-samhitā". The work is presented in forceful prose with penetrating dialectics. The arguments and counter-arguments do naturally lead to the conclusion which is certainly convincing throughout the book. Authentic and appropriate references from relevant scriptures, which are quoted in support of his arguments, make the work of immense importance and value. Moreover, every point of argument is illustrated by the author. Thus Daivarata shows himself to be a convincing debater and to be bold enough to go against the age-old beliefs. His arguments do open new areas of research for all serious students of Vedic literature in general and of the Yajurveda in particular.
IV FOOT NOTES

1) An edition of Krishna Yajurveda Samhita was brought out by Vasanta Shripad Sathvalekar in the year of 1957. That edition is considered to be a standard one.

2) The title of the edition, under which it was published by BHU Sanskrit series - Varanasi, is “Mula-yajurveda-samhita” and the year of publication was 1973.

3) The monograph has an appendix at the end of the text which contains the whole scheme of the arrangement of the ‘Suktas’ in Yajurveda. The arrangement of ‘Suktas’ in “Mula-Yajurveda-Samhita” is identical to the arrangement of suktas suggested in the appendix. Thus, it is evident that the whole scheme of arrangement of the ‘Suktas’ was prepared when “Vedavedika” was published along with Satvalekar edition. But the only thing that the manuscript of the text of Yajurveda-Samhita on the line of that appendix was not prepared or if prepared, the publisher was not available to publish the work. In between, the ‘Vedavedika’ was published along with Satvalekar-edition with the consent of the author, as conveys Dr. G.S.Shastry, and the monograph was handed over to BHU-Varanasi while they had accepted to publish ‘Mula-Yajurveda Samhita, but it was not inserted with Mula-Yajurveda-Samhita as the monograph was already published-says Dr. G.S. Shastry -who is a grand-son of Daivarata.

4) Preface to the Mula-Yajurveda-Samhita by Dr. S.Bhattacarya

5) Vaj.Yaj-Sam 31-19

6) R.V. 1-96-1

7) Ibid X-90-9

9) Tai. Brah. II-8-8-5
11) R.V. X-71-11
12) R.V. X-90-10 Gita -IV-28
    iv) Mundaka Up. II-2-6
14) i) "Yajurvedasya sadasitirbhedah bhavanti" - Carana-pa
    ii) "Yajurekasatadhvakam sakhanam tu
        satenatha yajurvedamathakarot" (Ku. Purana-49-51)
15) Vedavedika - page -24
16) "Yo ha va avidita -arseya-chando-daivata-brahmanena mantrena yajate yajayati
    va-adhyapayati va Yatayamanyasya chandansi bhavanti sthanum varchati,
    garte va patyate, pramiyate va papiyan bhavati tasmadetani mantre vidyat" -
    Chandoga Brahmana
17) The following are the illustrations quoted by the author -thus-
1) Some ‘Prasnas’ in “Samhita-Book” contain riks -with yajus -e.g. Tai. Sam IV-6-1
2) Some ‘Prasnas’ contain brahmanas- e.g. Tai. Sam-prapathaka-6
3) Some ‘Prasnas’ contain rik-mantras-e.g.Tai-Sam IV-2-1
4) Some portions are in the form of brahmana-mantras e.g. Tai. Sam II/5/1-6
5) Some portions are commingled with both ‘riks’ and ‘yajus’ e.g. IV-1-1.
6) Some portions are commingled with ‘rk-mantra’ ‘yajus’ and ‘brahmana-mantra’- e.g. Tai. Sam III-1-1
18) The legend is quoted from ‘Samskara-ratna-mata’ as the author mentioned in Vedavedika page -25.
19) “Prayoga-tilaka”-as quoted in Vedavedika page 38.

20) "...Acaryo vai brahmeti Kande Kande vratacarya ... Bau. Gr. Sn III-2-1-5

Also, - Prajapatyam va samnyam capyagneyam vaisvadevikam

Svayambhuvam pancamam syat pratikandam vratam caret II

“proyogatilakan”

quoted by the author in Vedavedika page 38

21) Vedavedika pag 43

22) One such example among many is to be quoted thus:

“Manastoke tsnaye........” R.V. I-114-8

“Manastoke ......Tai.Sem. IV-5-10-6

“Manastoke ..... Vaj.Sam.16-16

The risi of the mantra mentioned above according to the Rigveda -is kutsa and therefore, the seer of the same mantra can not be a different one when the same mantra is repeated in some other place.

23) Author quotes few mantras which are in Gayatri metre -Vedavedika page 47

24) “Yajurmantranamapi chando niyamah astyaiva, ekaksaramarabhya

yajuschandah pravrttam, Tatha ca pingalaschandah sutram-

“Chandah Gayatri Daivyekam i i Ato eva ‘om’

Pratyekaksarasya pranava mantrasya yajusam daivi gayatri chando nirdistam...”

Vedavedika page 48. Also, Narayana-Upanisad(19-33) which clearly says that ‘gayatri’ is the metre of “Pranavaksara”.

25 R.V. Sarvanukramani (I-1-39)