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I had written that śrīharṣa mahākavi has said in the 163rd, 164th and 165th shlokas in the 17th sarga of Naiṣada Mahākāvyam, that the kali was stopped in Naḻan’s kingdom through the sounds of padam, kramam and saṁhitā veda and in another 56 shlokas has described the various hurdles for kali.

In Naḻan’s kingdom, various sacrifices were held. There, homam was performed using ghee. The fragrance emanating from that inflicted grave pain to kali. Due to the smoke from that, Kali could not even open his eyes. Thus goes 166th shloka. Through this, the great poet conveys that the sacrifices are capable of preventing kali.

In the kingdom of Naḻan, all the households entertained guests. The guests were made to wash their feet before taken inside for partaking food. Because of that water, slush was formed in the entrances of the houses. Kali’s legs slipped due to that. Thus the poet explains that Kali cannot enter the houses where guests are served.

Because of the sacrifices held everywhere, Kali’s body was burnt. The cool breeze from the waves of the water bodies established by good people for the use of downtrodden, pierced the body of Kali and he felt that his body is getting cut to pieces. Hence, Kali struggled to enter. The sacrifices are known as iṣṭam. The social services such as establishing water bodies is known as pūrtam. The place where iṣṭam and pūrtam are there, Kali cannot enter. This is explained in the 168th shloka.

Since all the households performed tarpaṇam for the ancestors during appropriate times, the black sesame seeds were scattered. That created a fear of kālan in kali. Hence, Kali struggled to enter those places. Thus in the 169th shloka, the poet shows that kali will not enter the places where tarpaṇams are performed for the ancestors.

People took bath in various places in such a way that the twelve ‘tilakas’ / ‘ūrdhva puṇḍarams’ dissolve in that water. Such dissolved ūrdhva puṇḍarams appeared like swords that would cut the body of kali. Hence, Kali was scared of entering that place. Thus in 170th shloka, the poet indicates that the places where people adorn ūrdhva puṇḍarams are protected from kali.

Thus poet explains how kali and his friend dvāparan could not enter into the kingdom due to various righteous activities in shlokas upto 220.

It is customary for mīmāmsakās to praise the poems written by poets that convey righteous deeds as ‘smṛti-s’.

Thus mīmāmsakās have described the following shloka of Kāḻidāsā as Kāḻidāsa smṛti, in their books:

sadām hi sandehapadeṣu vastuṣu pramāṇamantaḥkaraṇapravṛttayaḥ

Thus, there is no bar in assuming the shlokas shown here as śrīharṣa smṛti.

Why this śrīharṣa smṛti does not talk about the vikṛti-s such as jaṭā and ghana while talking about various deeds that would act as remedy for kali, but talked only about padam, kramam and saṁhitā?

When I finished writing this, my friend visited me. He is the one who appears without fail whenever I am caught in a controversy.

He asked me on what I am writing and I showed the above.

He immediately said, “Keep aside the title śrīharṣa smṛti as mentioned by you. Why are you arguing even after quoting Prativādi Bhayaṅkaram Aṇṇan’s words which mentioned about Svāmi Deśikan as ‘jaṭā – varṇāccādyaneka prakāra - trayī - lakṣaṇoccāraṇe vyāsakalpaḥ’ and giving explanation to the above as ‘starting with jaṭā there are eight vikṛti-s to Vedas such as jaṭā, mālā, śikhā, rekhā, dvajaḥ, daṇḍaḥ, rathaḥ and ghanaḥ’”

I asked him, “For which veda these eight vikṛti-s are applicable?”

He asked in turn, “Is it not enough if we mention Veda in general? Why are you asking which Veda?”

I told him,

“I have been writing explanation for svastivācanam in yajur veda. I showed an example in yajur veda where Ghana changes the meaning of the original text. Hence, I want to make it clear that whatever I have said is about yajur veda only.

Yajur veda has a vikṛti jaṭā after kramam. But, we cannot say that the next vikṛti mālā is applicable to yajur veda. Taking this into account only, vyāsa śikṣā stops with grammar for jaṭā in yajur veda. Hence, we see in the olden literature that yajur vedins were praised about jaṭā scholars.

There is a saying also which states:

ṛg vedastu ghanāntassyāt yajur vedo jaṭāntakaḥ |

atarvā ca kramāntassyāt sāmavedaḥ padāntakaḥ ||

The meaning of this: Rig veda has all the vikṛti-s till ghanam. Yajur Veda has vikṛti only till jaṭā. Atarvana veda has only upto kramam. For Sama veda only pada is there.

While the fact is like this, can people who say that sampoorna veda saṁhitā-s are recited as ghanams from time immemorial explain what sampoorna denotes here?”

My friend intervened:

“Then, are you saying that there is no ghanam for yajur veda? You, yourself had mentioned in the previous articles that for practice ghanam can be recited for yajur veda. But, it is not appropriate for pārāyaṇam since there is a possibility that the meaning can get distorted. Now, you are saying that there is no ghanam for yajur veda. Why is this contradiction?”

I told him to be patient. I told him, “Our vedas has a glory that they are recited in a uniform manner from Himalayas to kumari. The exception for this is the differences in recitals in brāhmaṇam and āraṇyakam of yajur veda. But, saṁhitā is well protected due to the fence created by padam, kramam etc… Hence, we have a belief that there is no pāṭha bhedham in saṁhitā.

However, in Kanchipuram I had a surprise. During one Vaikasi brahmotsavam, Mahāvidvān Melpākkam śrimadubhayave Narasimhācāryasvāmi, who had learnt Vedas will all the ancillary text and who lived as pratyaksha patanjali, graced the occasion. I had also taken part in that.

I stood with humility in front of him. At that time he told me an information.

In the third kāṇḍam third praśnam sixth anuvākam, there is a method described to fill soma rasā-s in an order over a period of six days. In that the method followed during the first three days should be reversed for the last three days. People who observe in that manner, conquer this earthly world, sky and antariksham which is between earth and sky and after that they return to this earth. The sequence that appear in second pañcāśat that explains this has been recited by many of us as

abhijityaivemān lokān punarimaṁ lokaṁ pratyavarohanti

However, few people recite this as

abhijityaivemān lokān punarimaṁ lokaṁ pratyavarohati

After I heard this, I referred to the commentaries for this part. śrī Bhaṭṭa Bhāskhara has given meaning by assuming the plural form as pratyavarohanti

However, śrī Sāyaṇācarya says as ‘pratyavarūḍhān bhavati’. Hence, it appears as though he is accepting the singular form of the phrase as pratyavarohati.

There is no subject in this place, with which we can rightly deduce the correct form of the phrase. That has to be brought in. If one assumes a plural subject, then ‘pratyavarohanti’ will be correct. If one brings in singular subject, then ‘pratyavarohati’ will be correct.

Since there is no subject, there appears a pāṭha bhedham here and people recite in accordance with their tradition of learning.

Thus this pāṭha bhedham has appeared despite these vikṛti-s.

śrīmadubhayave Kāñci Padmavibhuṣaṇam Aṇṇāṅgarācārya Svāmi has mentioned about this difference in his book titled vedādhyayana sarvasvam. However, he did not mention about him supporting the plural form as accepted by śrī Bhaṭṭa Bhāskhara.

I was thinking that this is the only exception of pāṭha bhedham in saṁhitā.

During the year 1993-94, when I was in New Delhi, I was doing Veda pārāyaṇam along with Taiyār śrīmadubhayave Paṭṭappā Svāmi in the house of śrīmān Lakśmīkumāratātācārya Svāmi. I cannot do veda pārāyaṇam without seeing the book. That Svāmi did not mind my shortcoming and encouraged me.

The fifth anuvākam of first praśnam of fourth kāṇḍam starts with ‘vipājasāpṛthunā’. In this anuvākam, the mantras that need to be recited while making a mud pot that is used in sacrifice is mentioned.

In this the raw materials required for making the pot as mentioned in kalpa sūtrās should be mixed with mud along with water, made into a ball and should be handed over to the person who is making the pot while reciting three mantras.

In that the first half of the first mantra is:

sasṛṣṭāṁvvasubhīrudrairddhīraiḥ karmaṇyāṁ mṛdam |

‘mṛdam’ means ‘mud’ (soil). You need to understand that this occasion is when the mud is handed over.

During the pārāyaṇam. Taiyār Svāmi listened silently. After that he asked me to recite this half again. After that he said, “I wanted to confirm if you are reciting this as mṛdam. Here, many of us recite as mṛdam. However, in Nāvalpākkam tradition people recite the word as mradam”.

Thus, I came to know of one more difference in the recitation of samhita during 1993-94.

After that, Mahāvidvān śrīmadubhayave Nāvalpākkam Valayappeṭṭai Rāmānuja Tātācārya Svāmi, while talking about the student who came from North to learn vedas, mentioned that in ‘bharadvāja śikṣā’ it has been mentioned that mṛdam has to be recited as mradam and in accordance with that this difference should have come in Nāvalpākkam tradition.

vyāsa śikṣā is more popular and widely followed.

Though, bharadvāja śikṣā is not popular, since it is one angam of veda namely śikṣā, other vaideekas could not object to Nāvalpākkam tradition of reciting this as mradam. But, they recite according to their tradition as mṛdam.

Now that there is a controversy on ghanam, I bowed before the svami when I had recently been to Nāvalpākkam and sought his views.

At that time, he reminded me of bharadvāja śikṣā in accordance with which they recite mṛdam as mradam. In that śikṣā, ghana pārāyaṇam and its fruits are mentioned. Hence, if we say that there should not be ghana pārāyaṇam, then it means that we go against the śikṣā and thus he graced his views on this.