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READING OF THE SŪTRAS AND VĀRTIKAS IN RŪPĀVATĀRA

We now turn our attention to the sutras and vārtikas found in the Rūp which present slight variations from the same found in earlier grammatical works. The sutras in Rūp are discussed in this chapter with regard to the variations in their readings from earlier works whereas vārtikas are discussed with reference to the extent to which they follow or differ from the earlier works.

Readings of the Sutras

The text of Ast has always been a source of inspiration for study not only for its contents but also for its verbal form which to a certain extent get variations in Mbh, K and the recasts of Ast like Rūp, PK, PS, SK etc. We now examine the altered versions of the text of Ast found in Rūp.

The readings of the sutras in Rūp differ in many cases with that of the text of Ast. These variant readings
can be grouped on the basis of the mode of variation. In one group the difference in reading relates to the addition, omission or variation of words. In another group the variation in reading relates to the component letters of the roots mentioned in the sutras. In yet another group the variation in reading of the sutras is mainly brought about either by the operation or non-operation of sandhi rules.

**Difference in reading involving addition, omission or variation of words:**

**Sutra 1-1-5:** Mbh reads the rule as 'kiñiti ca' wherein the letter 'k' occurs once only. But under the rule 'glāgīsthasca kauh' (3-2-139) PAT speaks of the two kakaras that occur in this rule, "kakāre gakarascartvabhūto nir-disyate =kiñiti ceti?" Rūp gives the same reading as Mbh by mentioning 'k' once and while explaining the forms glāsanuh, jianuh, sthāsanuh, bhūsanuh, says 'giścāyaṃ pratyayo na kit ś tena stha ikarādeso bhavati' kāṭica ityātṛāpi

---

gakarascartvabhūto nirdisyate, tena guṇo na bhavati.²

K reads the rule as 'kkiñiti ca' wherein two kakaras are given.

Sutra 2-3-5: In Mbh and K this rule is read as 'kālādhumoratyantrasmyoge' where as Rup reads the rule as 'kālādhumoratyantrasmyoge dvitiyā'.³ The addition of the word dvitiyā in this rule when the same can be got by anuvṛtti from the previous rule karmani dvitiyā (2-3-2) may be to avoid the anuvṛtti of the word trtiyā from the previous rule 'trtiyā ca....'(2-3-3) and it can be pointed out that the same is not necessary to achieve the said purpose. This is because the absence of the anuvṛtti of the word trtiyā from the rule 2-3-3 to the rule 2-3-4 and 5 can be inferred on the basis of the fact that the next rule apavarge trtiyā (2-3-6) has got the

2. Rup P - II pp. 16 & 234

3. It is to be noted here that in the Ms. of Rup (No.368) found in the Oriental Ms. Library, Govt.Sanskrit College, Tripūrānthurā the rule is read as 'kālādhumoratyantyasmyoge'. The above variation is pointed out as per the reading in the printed text (Rup P - I p.146).
word tritiya in it and if the word tritiya were to be got by anuvrtti from the rule 2-3-3 to 2-3-4 & 5, the same can be got by anuvrtti in the rule 2-3-6 also and there is no necessity of the mention of the word tritiya in apavarga tritiya (2-3-6). Hence the addition of the word dvitiya in 2-3-5 found in Rup is not essential to prevent the anuvrtti of the word tritiya from the previous rule and the word dvitiya can be got by anuvrtti in 'kaladhvanor.... (2-3-5) from 'karmani dvitiya'(2-3-2).

Thus by the addition of the word dvitiya, Rup makes the reading more explanatory as opposed to the concise nature of a sutra well-known from the verse beginning with "alpaksaramasandigdham.................."

Sutra 2-3-32: K reads this rule as 'karane ca stokalpa-krochrakatipasyasatyavacanasya'. Nbbh does not comment on this sutra. Rup omits the part 'karane ca' and
gives the reading of the rule as 'stokālpakroccha-
katipayasyasatvavacanasya'\(^4\). However the word karane
is included by DK while giving the vṛtti of this rule.
The word karane cannot be said to have got by the ordinary
mode of anuvṛtti since the same is not seen in the just
previous rules. Hence as per the reading of Rup one
has to explain the connection of the word karane in this
rule only by virtue of a special kind of anuvṛtti techni-
cally known as mandukapaluti from the distant previous rule
'kartṛkarasyaostṛtiya' (2-3-18). Since the reading of
the rule in Rup demands the strenuous effort of mandukapaluti
for getting the connection of the word karane in the rule,
the reading presented by K seems more acceptable.

\(^4\) 'stoka alpa krocha katipaya ityetebhyosatvavacanebhyah
karane kārake pañcamī vibhaktirbhavati' (P - I pp.201 &
202) The reading of the rule given in the printed text
differs from that of the Ms. of Rup\(^2\) in the
Oriental Manuscripts Library, Govt. Sanskrit College,
Tripunithura, Kerala where it is given as 'karane ca
stokālpakrocchakatipayasyasatvavacanasasya'.
Sūtra 3-1-111: K and Rup read this rule as 'i ca khanah' according to which the root khan gets the suffix kyap and the substitution by the vowel 'i' in the place of its final consonant 'n'. PAT suggests the reading 'i ca khanah'. He contends that the form kheyam which is to be derived by this rule can well be obtained even if the substitute enjoined by the rule be the short vowel 'i' instead of 'i'.

Sūtra 3-2-54: K reads this rule as 'saktau hastikapātayoh' whereas Rup given the rule as 'saktau hastikavatayoh' wherein we find the word kavata in the place of 'kapata' in K. Mbh does not give this rule. However the word kavata or kapata denote the same sense and hence the variant reading in Rup does not affect the meaning of the rule. PS follows the reading of this rule found in Rup.

5. Rup P - II p. 251
6. "dirghoccaranam kimartham? na 'i ca khanah ityeuvacyeta/
   kā rupasiddhiḥ? kheyam/ adgumena siddham.......... 
   tasmād 'i ca khanah' ityeva vaktavyam /" (Mbh Vol. II pp. 133 & 134)
7. Rup P - II p. 268
8. PS P - I p. 124
Sutra 4-3-34: Mbh and K read this rule as 'sravistha-

phalgunyanuradhasvatitisisyapunarvasu hastavisakhæasathà-
bahulàlluk' whereas Rup read anuradha for anuradha in
the rule. In PS also we get the same reading.

9. Rup P = I p. 234
10. PS P = III p. 51
11. Rup P = I p. 245
12. PS P = III p. 77
Anurādhā or Anurādha is the name of a star and hence the variation in reading in Rup does not affect the sense of the rule.

Sūtra 4-3-103: K reads this rule as 'kāsyapakausikābhyām raibhyāṃ ninih'. Mbh does not explain this rule.

Though Dk omits the word raibhyāṃ in the reading of the rule, he takes the words Kāsyapa and Kausika as denoting rei while giving the meaning of the rule. Hence the variant reading in Rup does not effect any change in meaning.

Sūtra 4-3-143: Mbh reads this rule as 'mayadvaitayor bhāsayamabhaksaścchādanayoh' wherein the word abhaksa occurs.

But K and Rup read the rule with the word abhakṣya in the place of abhaksa. Anyhow abhakṣya is used to denote the sense conveyed by the expression abhaksa and hence the variant reading in K and Rup does not bring about any change.

13. 'kāsyapakausikasabdābhyaṃ raibhyāṃ proktārthena
   minipratyayo bhavati' (Rup P - I p. 251)
14. In Mbh this rule is numbered as 4-3-142 .
15. Rup P - I p. 254
in the idea conveyed by the rule.

Sūtra 4-4-20: K reads the rule as ‘ktrermamnityam’ which means that the bases ending with the suffix ‘ktri’ enjoined by the rule ‘dvitah ktriḥ’ (3-3-38) gets the suffix sap. Mbh reads the rule as ‘trermamnityam’ which is followed in Rup also. Though the suffix ‘ktri’ is referred to in Mbh & Rup as ‘tri’ devoid of the anubandha ‘k’, there is no difference in the meaning of these two readings.

Sūtra 5-1-66: In K this rule is read as ‘dandādibhyah’ which ordains the suffix ‘yat’ taken by anuvṛtti from the previous rule ‘sārśaḥcāḍāyacca’ (5-1-65). This rule is not seen in Mbh. But in Mbh under the rule acca yat (3-1-97) there is an indication that it is yat which is applied to dandādi. Rup reads the rule as ‘dandādibhyo yah’.

16. Ibid p. 257
17. ‘taddhito vā punaresha bhaviṣyati vadhamarhati vadhyaḥ’ (Vol. II p. 130) The Pradīpa and Udyota on this Bhasya passage is also noteworthy here:
‘vadhamarhati / dandādibhya iti yatpratyayah’(Pradīpa)
’yatpratyaya iti/ etena dandādibhya ya iti vṛtti-pātha etadbhāṣyaviruddha ’ iti bhāvah’
18. Rup F = I p. 269
Since the word yat can be got by anuvrtti from the previous rule, the insertion of the word yah in this rule is treated as an interpolation by some commentators. 19

Sūtra 5-3-5: MBh reads this rule as 'etadon' which enjoins the substitute 'an' in the place of 'etad'. But K and Rup read the rule as 'etados' by which it is the substitute 'as' which replaces the base 'etad'. 20 It is here noteworthy that both the substitutes 'an' and 'as' serve the same purpose in as much as both become sarvadesa by the force of the rule 'anekāsaṁsarvasya' (1-1-35) the former on the basis of anekālta and the latter on the basis of sitva. 21

19. "'dandadibhyah' dandadibhye ya iti pathe ya iti praksiptan" (Ast edited by Kesararajarsikramadācār, p. 59. Footnote = 4)

20. Rup P I p. 289

21. Kātyāyaṇa speaks of these two readings under the said rule: 'iha kecit asam pathanti kecit asam / tatrottara-pekṣo vicāraḥ' (Pradīpa on MBh Vol II p. 600)
Sūtra 6-1-124: This rule is read as 'indre ca nityam' in K and Rup. Mbh gives a variant reading as 'indre ca' omitting the word nityam. In Fraudhamanorama BD accepts the reading found in Mbh and speaks of the reading 'indre ca nityam' as defective.

Sūtra 6-3-13: Mbh and K read this rule as 'bandhe ca vibhāsā' whereas Rup alone gives a variant reading as 'bandhe vibhāsā' omitting the word ca. This rule enjoins the optional non-elision of the locative case suffixes 'ni, os & sup' of the pūrvapada when followed by the uttarapada 'bandha'.

22. Rup P = I p. 13

23. "ārambhāśamartthāṇṇityamidam 'indre ca nityam' iti pāṭhasātu bhāṣyāśamātāt vādūpaksitāh" (p123)

24. Rup P = I p. 204
Sutra 7-1-24: K reads this rule as 'ardusanaaspurudamsone-
hasam ca' where we get the consonant 's' in the base
purudams. But in the reading of the rule in Rup, we
find 's' instead of 's', by mentioning the base as purudams.25
Mbh does not explain this rule.

Variation in roots:

In Mbh, K, Rup etc. roots mentioned in certain sutras
present slight variations. They are now being discussed.

Sutra 1-2-61: In Mbh we get the reading of this rule as
'indhibhavatibhyan ca' which is given in Rup also.26 In
K the root 'indhi' is read as 'Indhi' as per the reading
'indhibhavatibhyan ca'.

Sutra 1-2-24: In this sūtra, Rup mentions the root
'lumā' without the vowel 'i' prescribed by the var 'istikpau
 dhātunīrdeśe' and reads the rule as 'vānclumortasca'.27

25. Rup P = I p. 53
26. Rup P = II pp. 119 & 127
27. Ibid p. 300
Mbh and K read the sutra as 'vañcilūcyrtasca' where the root 'lunç' is mentioned with the vowel 'i' which gets the substitute 'y' (yan) by the rule 'iko yanaci'. This sutra is not mentioned in Mbh. It is at the end of the Kāśya passage under the rule 'puñah ktwā ca' (1-2-22) that we get this reading of the rule 1-2-24.28 However the mention of the root without the vowel 'i' in Rup does not bring about any change in the form to be derived from it.

Sūtra 3-1-90: Mbh and K mention this root as 'raj' by giving the reading 'kusirajoh prācēm syan parasaipadam ca'. Rup reads this root as 'ranj' giving the rule as 'kusiranjoh......'.29

Sūtra 3-2-155: Rup reads this rule as 'jalpabiksa-kuttalunthavrñah śākan' wherein we get the root 'luntha'.

29. Rup P - II p. 107
But K reads the root as lunta by giving the rule as *jalpabhiksa-kutta-lunta-yamah sakan* 30 Mbh does not comment on this rule.

**Sutra 7.2.46:** K mentions the root *v* in this sūtra read as *samnayam bhrtr-vrj-hāri-sa-hita-pida* Mbh does not have this rule.

**Sutra 7.2.163:** K mentions the root *nas* in this rule with the reading *inmasi* *......* Rup mentions the root as *nas* and reads the rule as *inmasi* *......* 32 Mbh does not comment on this rule.

**Sutra 7.2.60:** K mentions the root *klp* in this sūtra

30. Ibid. p. 287
31. Ibid. p. 267
32. Ibid. p. 287
which is read as 'tāṣi ca kṛpayā'. Mbh under the sūtra 'na vṛddhīyaho........' (7-2-59) notes a var 'catusṭāṣiklpi- 
grahanaṇarthakṣyam ca' which refers to this rule and in this var FAT refers to this root as 'kṛpayā'. Quite dif-
ferent from this, Rup mentions this root as 'kṛpayā' giving the reading 'tāṣi ca kṛpayā'.

Sūtra 7-4-95: K mentions the root 'dr' in this sūtra, 
atsaṃdrṭvarapraṇamradastrapasams'. But Rup gives the root with the lengthened vowel, as dr. This rule is not seen in Mbh.

Sūtra 8-4-34: Mbh and K mention the root ṭyāyi in this rule read as 'na bhavhpukamigamipyāyivepam'. Rup gives the root as ṭyāyi without the lengthening of the vowel, 'i'.

33. Ibid p. 176
34. Ibid p. 217
35. Rup P-I p. 32
Variation caused by optional sandhisutras:

It is to be noted that sandhi rules like ‘padāntādāvā’ (6-1-76) which are optional bring about variation in the reading of a number of Paniniyan sutras found in K and Rup. We find that such variations are caused by the operation and non-operation of optional sandhisutras, on the sutras of Ast found in these works. A few examples of the same are pointed out below.

Sūtra 1-2-27: The sandhisutra, ‘jhayoḥṇ-yataraśyām’ (8-4-62) optionally enjoins pūrvasavarna as a substitute of the consonant ‘h’ when preceded by the consonants coming under the pratyāhāra ‘jhay’. Nbh and Rup read the rule 1-2-27 as ‘ukālōjhṛasvadīrghap半utah’ wherein the initial consonant ‘h’ of hrasva is substituted by the pūrvasavarna ‘jh’ by the function of the said optional rule. But K gives the reading ‘ukālōj hṛasvadīrghap半utah’ wherein the consonant ‘h’ of hrasva is not substituted by the pūrvasavarna optionally enjoined by the rule ‘jhayo......’

36. Ibid p. 3
Sūtra 3-1-115: The rule 'anaci ca' (8-4-47) teaches an optional reduplication of the consonants grouped under the pratyāhāra 'yar' and preceded by vowels. By the optional function of this rule, we get two different readings of the rule 3-1-115. In K this rule is read as 'bhidyodhauyade' wherein the consonant 'dh' occurring after 'o' gets doubled as dh dh by the rule 8-4-47 and the former one among them is replaced by 'd' as per the rule 'jhalam jas jhasi' (8-4-53). Rup reads the rule as 'bhidyodhauyade' where 'dh' is not doubled, owing to the non-operation of the optional rule 8-4-47. 37

Sūtra 4-1-55: The var 'otvosthayassamāse va pararūparā pararūparā' vaktavyam read under the rule 'tāl pararūparā' (6-1-94) in Nā, optionally enjoins pararūpa i.e. 'o' as ekādesa in the place of the vowel 'a' and the following diphthong o which is the initial letter of the base ṛtu or ostha. In the reading of the rule 'nāsikodarosthajanghādanta-karmasrīgacca' (4-1-55) found in Rup we notice that

37. Rup P - II p. 252
this pararūpā 'o' has come as ekādesa in the place of the vowel 'a' of udara and 'o' of ostha. But in Mbh and K this rule is read as 'nasikodarauṣṭha.........' wherein we find that the substitution by the pararūpa 'o' has not functioned owing to the optional nature of the var and hence the 'a' of udara and 'o' of ostha are replaced by the vṛddhi vowel 'au' as per the rule vṛddhiirecī (6-1-88).

Sūtra 5-4-117: The rule 'va padāntasya' (3-4-59) optionally enjoins parasavarna as substitute of anusvāra occurring at the end of a pada and followed by the consonants grouped under the pratyāhāra 'yay'. As per this optional rule, we get two variant readings of the rule 5-4-117. In Rup this rule is read as 'antarbhahyāncalomnah' wherein the anusvāra occurring as the final of the compound word

38. Rup. p. 142
antARBahIBHYaM is replaced by the PARASaVarna n. But
K reads the rule as 'antARBahIBHYaM ca lomnaH' whereas
PARASaVarna does not function on the ANUsvara of antar-
BAHBHYaM.

Sutra 7-3-36: The sUtra 'yARONuNASIKENNASIKo va'
(8-4-45) optionally enjoins nasals as substitutes of con-
sonants coming under the pratyahara 'yAr' and followed by
nasal sounds. The function of this optional rule is
clear in the reading of the rule 7-3-36 found in K. K
reads this rule as 'ArTIrBIrlIRIKnUYIKMAYATAM puNINAU
wherein the consonant g of pug is replaced by the nasal
sound h. But Rup reads this rule as 'ArTIrBIrlIRIKnUYI-
KMAYATAM puNINAU' wherein the g of pug, though fo-
llowed by the nasal sound n is not substituted by the nasal
sound owing to the optional nature of the sandhi sUtra
'yARONuNASIKENNASIKo va'.

39. Ibid p. 200
40. Rup F-II p. 46
Sūtra 7-4-41: The sandhi rule ‘padāntāvā’ (6-1-76) enjoins optionally the augment ‘t’ to the final long vowel ӯ of a pada when followed by the consonant ch. Mbh reads the rule 7-4-41 as ‘sacchoranyatarasyām’ wherein the vowel ӯ of ‘sā’ gets the augment ‘t’ by the operation of the optional sandhi rule quoted first (6-1-76) and the augment ‘t’ has changed into ‘c’ by the rule ‘stōścunā śchuh’ (8-4-40). K & Rūp read the rule as ‘sacchoranyatarasyām’ wherein the vowel ӯ does not get the augment ‘t’ owing to the non-operation of the optional sandhisūtra ‘padāntāvā.....’ 41

It is between Mbh and K that we get the maximum number of variations in the readings of the rules of Ast. Most of these have been classified and discussed by Kielhorn in his ‘Notes on the Mahābhāṣya’. 42 They come under four categories namely 1. Yogavibhāga where a sūtra of PAN is

41. Ibid p. 281

split up into two, 2. one or more words added to the original text of a *sūtra*, 3. the wording of *sūtras* altered otherwise than by the addition of one or more words and 4. whole *sūtras* added to the original text of *Aṣṭ*. It is possible to know that in every one of these cases the change is brought by incorporating wholly or partly into the *sūtras* certain *vāra* or *Pāṭ*’s observations or changing the form taking his suggestions. In his *Notes on the Mahābhāṣya* Kielhorn notices 58 such instances of variation in the reading of the rules found in *śāstra* and *K*.* Rup* closely following *K* in almost all respects, presents exactly the same readings given in *K* for the text of *Aṣṭ* with regard to these 58 instances noted by Kielhorn.
Vartikas of Sṛṇavatāra

A study of the vartikas shows that the work closely follows K in that respect also. There are more or less 450 vars in Rup. Of these, about 150 vars are adopted from Mbh without any change and are just the same found in K while about 105 vars are adopted from K differing from Mbh. The rest of the vars in Rup present minute variations from those of K. However it can be seen that these variations are merely verbal in nature and hence do not affect the sense. We also find certain rare instances where Rup follows Mbh differing from K. Based on the vars of K and Mbh, the vars found in Rup are discussed in a three-fold manner.

1. Vartikas adopted from Rāṣikāī

It has been already stated that about 105 vars of Rup are adopted from K differing from Mbh. They are being discussed now.

Mbh under the rule 3-1-112 gives the var 'samasca bahulam' which means that the root bhūna when preceded by
the upasarga 'sam' gets the suffix 'kyap' optionally.

The idea of this var is given in a different wording in K and Rup as 'sampurvardibhana'.

A similar instance is cited here:

Mbh (under rule 6-3-21):

'sasthiprakarane vāgḍikṣasyaādibhyo
yuktidandaharesu upasaṅkhyaṇam'

K and Rup:

'sasthiprakarane vāgḍikṣasyaādibhyo yuktidanda-
haresu yathāsaṅkhyaṃ alugvaktavyah'

Sometimes we find that the vars refuted by PAT are found adopted in K and Rup. For instance: In Mbh under the rule kāṭrkaranayostṛtyā (2-3-18) we get the var 'ṛṛtyāvidhāne prakṛtyādibhya upasaṅkhyaṇam'. PAT re-
futes this var since the instances of this var are got

---

43. Rup P = II p. 251
44. Rup P = I p. 205
by the rule 2-3-18 itself. K adopts this var and reads it under the same rule, as 'tṛṣṭyāvidhāne prakṛtyādinaṁ upasanākhyānanam'. Rūp also adopts this var with the reading 'tṛṣṭyāvidhāne prakṛtyādibhyā upasanākhyānanam'.

In some cases, Rūp follows the vars of K but these vars are not at all seen in Mbh. It is evident here that Rūp has adopted them as vars since they are treated to be so in K. For instance, in K under 2-4-17 we get two vars 'akārāntottarapado dviguh striyāṁ bhāsyate' & 'pātrādibhyah pratisedho vaktavyah'. In Mbh rule 2-4-17 is not explained and we do not get these two vars there. But Rūp has adopted them from K. A few vars which are found in K and Rūp but not seen in Mbh are listed below:

1. 'svasurasyokarākaraalopaṇa vaktavyah'
2. 'satasaḥsaṣrau pareneti vaktavyam'

---

45. Ibid p. 150 & 151
46. Ibid p. 177
47. K under rule 4-1-68 & Rūp P - I p. 144
48. K under rule 2-1-39 & Rūp P - I p. 174
3. 'yamācceti vaktavyam

4. 'gunañibhyo grāmajvaktavyah

5. 'ādesaceti vaktavyam' & 'avodhasoropasca

6. 'samśiduhughibhyo veiti vaktavyam

7. 'panau srjeryadvaktavyah' & 'samavapūrvvāccā

8. 'sahitapidameh samjnayaum

9. 'bhavatesceti vaktavyam

10. 'bhage ca dārericvaktvam

11. 'vyadhheh samprasāranam kuracca vaktavyah

12. 'śradantaroṣāpurasargavadvṛttih

'sradantaroṣāpurasargavadvṛttirvaktyah)

While explaining certain rules Mahabhaṣya suggests certain amendments. These modifications of PAT are given as vers

49. K under rule 4-1-85 & Ṛup P - I p. 222

50. K under rule 4-2-37 & Ṛup P - I pp. 233 & 234

51. K under rule 4-3-38 & Ṛup P - I pp. 243 & 244

52. K under rule 3-1-109 & Ṛup P - II p. 251

53. K under rule 3-1-110 & Ṛup P - II p. 251

54. K under rule 3-1-134 & Ṛup P - II p. 256

55. K under rule 3-1-143 & Ṛup P - II p. 258

56. Kunder rule 3-2-41 & Ṛup P - II p. 266

57. K under rule 3-2-162 & Ṛup P - II p. 287

58. Kunder rule 3-3-106 &

59. Ṛup P - II p. 295
in K and Rup. For instance under the rule 3-4-42 FAT says:- ‘atyalpamidamucye ate anāmiti anāmavatinagarinām ceti vaktavyam’ sannām, sannavatāḥ sannagarayah’. Here FAT points out that as per the rule 3-4-42 the prohibition of stutya excludes nam alone and opines that this exclusion is to be more comprehensive, i.e. the prohibition should exclude not only nam but also navati and nagari. This statement of FAT is given as var in K and Rup. K reads the var as ‘anāmavatinagarināmiti vaktavyam’ under the same rule and Rup reads it as ‘anāmavatinagarināmiti vācyam’. 60

Similarly in K and Rup we get the following vars; but when we go through Mbh it can be seen that they are originally the statements of FAT amending the idea of the rules.

1. ‘vergro vaktavyah’ 61

60. Rup P - I p. 16
61. Mbh & K under rule 5-4-119 and Rup P - I p. 194
While discussing certain sutras, PAT cites the views of other grammarians and we find that such views cited in Nbh are treated as vars in K and Rup. For example in the passage 'apara āha - akārārayoh prayoge pratisechho neti vaktavyam' under the rule 2-3-66, PAT cites a view of other grammarians and the same is read as a var in K and Rup in the form 'akārārayoh stripratyārayoh prayoge neti vaktavyam.' Two more vars in K and Rup which are likewise based on the views cited in the Nbh, are mentioned below:

1. upādeśavāpakṣasaṅgatikaranamitrīkaranapathisvīti vācyam

---

62. Mbh & K under rule 4-1-97 and Rup P = I pp223 & 224
63. Mbh & K under rule 4-2-129 and Rup P = I p. 242
64. Mbh & K under rule 7-2-29 and Rup P = II p. 280
65. Rup P = I p. 160
66. K on rule 1-3-25
'upāddeva papūjasaṅghatikaranamitrakarana-pathisviti vaktavyam'

MBh on rule 1-3-25: 'apara āha = upāddeva papūjasaṅga-

2. 'saṟvapatipadikebhya ityeke'

MBh on rule 3-1-11: 'apara āha = saṟvapatipadikebhya

ācāre kibvā vaktavyah'

In certain instances MBh explains the meaning of the rules in such a way that they help to refute the modifications of the rules suggested by KAT. Such explanations of KAT in regard to the meaning of the rules are given in the form of a var in K. Such vars are adopted by DK in his work. MBh refutes the modification 'āmodovyasana-

kriyasya' suggested by KAT by explaining the idea of the part 'anāsyaviharane' of the rule 'āmodnāsyaviharane'(1-3-20), as 'iha ānō donāsya itiyatā siddham / soyamevam siddhe

sati yadvaharanagrahanam karoti tasyaitprayojanam =

āsyaviharanamānānakriyādapi yathā syāt' and this explanation.

67. RuP P = II p. 79

68. K on rule 3-1-11 and RuP P = II p. 232
is given as a var in K under the same rule as

\[ \text{'asyaviharasanamakriyadapi pratisedho vaktavyah'} \]

Replacing the word vaktavyah with bhavati, Rup adopts this var. \(^{69}\)

In certain other instances K supplements the vars of Mbh. It is this modified var that is followed by Rup. For example, under the rule 5-2-107 Mbh gives the var 'nagāccha'. K supplements the var as 'nagapāmsu-pandubhyasceti vaktavyam'. Here Rup has followed K. \(^{70}\)

Sometimes K omits certain words in the vars in Mbh and such vars are adopted by Rup. For example, in Mbh under the rule 6-3-3 we get the var 'pumśanujā janusandho vikṛtāsā iti ca'. The word vikṛtāsā in the var is omitted by K which gives the var as 'pumśanujō janusandha iti vaktavyam'. Rup adopts this reading of K. \(^{71}\)

---

69. \(\text{Rup} \ P \ - \ II \ p. \ 29\)
70. \(\text{Rup} \ P \ - \ I \ p. \ 285\)
71. \(\text{Ibid} \ p. \ 202\)
There are some more vars in K and Rup wherein we find that certain words originally found in the vars of Mbh are omitted. They are:

1. Mbh on rule 4-3-23 'agraḥaṇaścāddimac smṛtah:
   K and Rup 'agraḥaṇaścāddimac' (ādi omitted) 72

2. Mbh on rule 4-2-43 'gajasahāyaḥbhyaṃ ca:
   K and Rup 'gajasaceti vaktavyam'. It may also be noted here that though the word 'sahāya' is omitted, it is included in the rule 4-2-43 itself which is read in K and Rup as 'gramajanaśabandhusahāyabhyaṃstal' 73.

3. Mbh on rule 3-2-8: 'bahuḥ tani:
   K & Rup 'bahuḥ chandasiti vaktavyam'. Though the word 'tani' denoting saṃjña and chandas is omitted, it is replaced by the word chandas and hence only a part of the idea conveyed by the word 'tani' is omitted here. 74

We meet with certain instances wherein the vars given in K and Rup are actually Bhāṣya passages explaining the vars. For instance, the var 'akṣaṇābhāvyam' in Mbh under

---

72. Ibid p. 245
73. Ibid p. 234
74. Rup P - II p. 261
rule 6-119 is followed by the Bhasya passage 'akṣaṇādūhinyām
vrddhiravaktavyā'. We find that this passage is read
as a var. in K and Rup. Similar instances are given
below:

1. Passage in Nbh = 'otvoṣṭhayoh samāse vā pararūpam
vaktavyam' on the var 'otvoṣṭhayoh samāse vā'
(6-1-94) K & Rup 'otvoṣṭhayoh samāse vā pararūpam
vaktavyam'.

2. Passage in Nbh = 'tattathaisca gunaiḥ saṣṭhī
samasyata iti vaktavyam' on the var 'tattathaisca
gunaiḥ' (2-2-8) K on rule 2-2-9 & Rup 'tattathaisca
gunaiḥ saṣṭhī samasyata iti vaktavyam'.

3. Passage on Nbh = 'ivaṇa saha samāso vibhaktyalopah
purvapadaparakṛtisvaratvam ca vaktavyam' on the var
'ivaṇa vibhaktyalopah purvapadaparakṛtisvaratvam ca.'

---

75. Rup P = I p. 10
76. Ibid p. 10
77. Ibid p. 174
(2-2-18) K & Rup 'ivaṇa saha samāso vibhaktyalopaḥ
   purvapadaprakrtisvaratvam eva vaktavyam

4. Passage on Mbh - 'jyotirudgamane iti vaktavyam' on
   the var 'jyotisamudgamane' (1-3-40)
   K & Rup 'jyodirudgamana iti vaktavyam'

5. Passage on Mbh - 'prādibhyo dhātujaśya bahuvrihīr-
   vaktavyah / uttarapadasya eva lopo vaktavyah'
   on the var 'prādibhyo dhātujaśya va' (2-2-24)
   K and Rup 'prādibhyo dhātujaśyottarapadasya lopasca
   eva bahuvrihīr vaktavyah'

Certain vars in K and Rup are based on the idea of
the Bhāṣya passage following the vars. In the passage
"evam tarhi yogavībhāgah kariṣyate - kṛtyāṇām
prayogō saṣṭhī na bhavatīt", PAT speaks of the yogavībhāga
of the rule 'kṛtyāṇām kartaṇi va' (2-3-71). The rule
as a single yoga means 'ubhayapraptau kṛtye kartaṇi saṣṭhī'

78. Ibid p. 161
79. Rup P - II p. 13
80. Rup P - I p. 183
va bhavati'. As the result of the yogavibhaga the idea additionally got is 'ubhayapraptau kṛtye saṣṭhyāḥ pratisedho bhavati'. K does not speak of this yogavibhaga, but taking the idea additionally got by the yogavibhaga reads a var in the form 'ubhayapraptau kṛtye saṣṭhyāḥ pratisedho vaktavyah'. Rup adopts this var of K.

In certain cases we find that a single var in Mbh is given as two or three vars in K and Rup. For instance in Mbh under rule 4-3-60 we get the var 'samānasya tādādesca adhyātmādibhyas ca'. K gives this as three different vars 'samānasya tādādesca', 'samānāsabdatthan vaktavyah', 'tādādesca' and 'adhyātmādibhyas ca'. Following K, Rup also gives the three vars with slight difference in the form as 'adhyātmādibhya upasankhyānam', 'samānāsca than vaktavyah', and 'tādādesca'.

31. Ibid p. 160
32. Ibid p. 247
Certain vars in Rup closely follow Mbh varying from what is found in K. Thus it is clear that DK has adopted vars from Mbh also. For instance, the rule 5-2-122 PAT cites the var 'sitosnatrprobhystanna sahate' which enjoins a taddhita suffix tā in the sense of 'tanna sahate'. He then gives two more vars 'himācceluh', 'vātātsamūhe ca'. By virtue of the nipata 'ca' found in these vars, PAT comprehends the sense 'tanna sahate' in these two vars from the var 'sitosna...'. Following Mbh, DK gives these two vars with the same reading. He then makes the remark 'cādasahanepi' and thus admits the view of PAT that the nipata 'ca' comprehends the sense 'tanna sahate' from the var 'sitosna...'. K gives the var 'sitosna......' but reads the latter in a different manner as 'tanna sahata iti himācceluh' 'vātātsamūhe ca' and

---

88. Ibid p. 287
'vātam na sahata iti ca'. Similar instances are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mbh &amp; Rup</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 'kārakārhanām ca kāracatve'</td>
<td>'kārakārhanām kāracatve saptami vaktavyā'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-3-36)§4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 'akārakārhanām cākāracatve'</td>
<td>'akārakārhanām akāracatve saptami vaktavyā'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-3-36)§5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 'tadviparyāse ca'</td>
<td>'tadviparyāse ca saptami vaktavyā'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-3-36)§6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vartikas which differ from Mahābhāṣya and Kāśīka:

Here we deal with certain vārs which differ from Mbh and K as well. Under rule 6-1-89 Mbh gives the vārs, 'pravatsatārakambelavasanānānām carne' and 'ṁnadasaṁbhyaṁ ca'. K also gives these two vārs as 'pravatsatārakambelavasanānānam vṛddhirvaktavyā' and 'ṁnadasaṁbhyaṁ vṛddhirvaktavyā'.

§4, §5 & §6 - Ibid p. 163
Quite differently DK combines these two varas into a single one as* ‘pravatsatarakambalavasanasaranaśarasana’.

In Mbh under rule 3-4-45 there is the vara

‘yaronunäsike pratyaye bhäsäyäm nityavacanam’. K gives the vara as ‘yaronunäsike pratyaye bhäsäyäm nityavacanam kartavyam’. DK specifies the suffix mentioned in it to be taddhita suffix and reads the vara as ‘yaronunäsike taddhitapratyaye parataḥ bhäsäyäm nityamiti vaktavyam’.

Here the deviation from Mbh and K can be seen as a specification only and it does not contradict the idea of the vara given in Mbh and K since the examples given in Mbh and K justify this specification.

Under rule 6-4-84 FAT cites the vara ‘varṣabhūpunar-bhvasca’ and explains that in the rule ‘varṣabhūvasca’ (6-4-34) which deals with the pratipadika varṣabhu, mention of the pratipadika punarbhū is also to be made. On the basis of this statement K draws a vara in the form

87. Ibid p. 10
88. Ibid p. 17
In MBH under the rule 5-2-122 we get a var 'sarvatramayasya' which means that the suffix vini comes after the word amaya both in chandas and bhasa. K adopts this var from MBH with the reading 'sarvatramayasyayopasankhyayanam'. Rup reads the var differently as 'amayasyopasankhyayanam' omitting the word sarvatra. The reason for this may be that DK as a rule omits the rules relating to Vedas and deals with words of the Classical Sanskrit only.

Under the rules RTA iddhatoh (7-1-100), 'upadhayasa' (7-1-101) and udosthayapurvasya (7-1-102) which are taken combinedly for explanation in MBH, we get a statement 'itvotvabhyan guṇavrddhi bhavato vipratisedhena'.

---

89. Ibid p. 56
90. Ibid p. 287
But K gives it as a var with the same reading under the rule 7-1-102. Though Rup has followed K by accepting the same as var, it makes a slight deviation in the form of a specification of vipratisedha to be purvavipratisedha. Rup thus reads the var as 'itvotvabhyam gunavrddhi purvavipratisedhena'.

In Mbh under the rule 3-2-1 we get a var 'silikāmibhakṣyācaribhyo nah purvapadaprakṛtisvaratvam ca'. K gives the same reading except for the addition of the word vaktavyam at the end. Different from these two, Rup notes the var as 'silikāmibhakṣyācaribhyo nah' omitting the part 'purvapadaprakṛtisvaratvam ca'. The reason may be that the omitted part deals with the accent of the Vedic words and he has omitted almost all the rules relating to Vedas.

Under the rule 3-3-108 we get the var 'inaśajādibhyah' in Mbh and K. This var enjoins the suffix in to the

1. Rup F = II p. 30
2. Ibid p. 259
roots aja and the like. But Rup reads the \textit{var} as 'inajadibhyah' by which it is the suffix 'in' that is enjoined to the root 'aja'. Though there is thus a difference in the suffix enjoined by Rup from that of Mbh and K, it is noteworthy here that the resultant form ājhī etc. can be derived by the addition of the suffix in or in. The anubandha 'n' or 'n' too does not make no difference in the form ājhī etc. since both these bring upadāvadādi to the root by the force of the rule 'ata upādāyāh' (7-2-116).

Finally, certain vars refuted by PAT and omitted by K are found adopted by DK in his work. For instance, in Mbh under the rule 1-3-7 we get the var 'ira upasānkhyānam' meaning that the part 'ir' in roots is to be deemed as 'it'. The next var 'avayavagrahamātsiddham' refutes the above var since 'i' and 'r' can individually get itsāṃjña. Following Mbh, K too does not mention this var. But Rup has accepted the var with the reading 'ira itsāṃjña vacya' by mentioning the same
with reference to the root 'driś' in 'lupprakarana'.

In Nāṭ under the rule vano ra ca (4-1-7),
there is a var 'ravidhāne bahuvrīherupasānkhyaṇam,
pratigīddhatvā' which means that the feminine suffix
āpī and the substitute 'ṛ' ordained optionally by the
said rule must be optionally enjoined to the bahuvrīhi
compound, ending in 'van'. FAT refutes this var
since by virtue of the word 'anyatarasyāṁ' in the rule
'dabūbhāḥbhīṣanyatarasyāṁ' (4-1-13), bahuvrīhi compounds
ending in 'van' can get optionally the feminine suffix
āpī and the substitute 'ṛ'.

227

94. Ibid p. 148

95. "vakayati dābubhābhīṣanyatarasyāmitatratranyatarasyāṁ
grahanasya prayojanam dāppratisedbhīṣyāṁ mukte
ābravapi yathā syatamiti"
(Nāṭ on rule 4-1-7)
view of PAT. Without mentioning the purpose served by the word anyatarasyām while interpreting the rule 'dābubhābhyaṁ.............' DK quite differently reads under the rule 4-1-7 a var in the form 'bahuvrīhau va' in order to secure the same purpose.97