PART III

OBSERVATIONS
CHAPTER VIII

RUPĀVATĀRA IN COMPARISON WITH KASIKA AND LATER RECasts

In this chapter a comparative study of Rupā in attempted with its earlier and later works. Since Rupā is a quite different attempt with respect to the earlier works on Ast, the merits and demerits of the same are to be discussed only in the background of these earlier works. The works of later authors who imbibed the idea of their creation from Rupā, also deserve a comparative study with it, so that the influence of Rupā on them can be brought out. Hence in this chapter let us turn our attention to a comparative study of Rupā mainly with K and SK which are respectively the most prominent ones among the earlier and later works on Ast.

Rupāvātāra in comparison with Kasiṣṭha

Rupā deserves special appreciation when studied in comparison with K. It is very clear that Rupā closely follow K in many respects. It is always to be borne in mind that the purpose of Rupā is not an exposition of PAN's rule but the composition of a preliminary text
for the beginners of Sanskrit grammar so as to make
the accomplished forms within their easy reach and hence
all that suit this purpose are taken from K, the source
of which is Ast itself.

Again K is the first one to explain all the Paninian
rules in the order of Ast and Rup is the first one which
explains the Paninian rules (though not all of them) in a
different order. This fact too is responsible for a
comparison of Rup with K. Therefore we now attempt a
comparative study of Rup with K based on the form of
sutras, their interpretation and illustration.

Form of sutras:

We find that Rup closely follows K with regard to
the form of sutras. Based on the yogavibhaga of certain
rules suggested by PAT, K treats those single rules to
be pairs of rules. In such cases it can be seen that
DK considers those sutras to be separate ones just as they
are given in K. For instance the pairs of rules aut &
acca sheh (7-3-118 & 119) 'pradayah & upasargah kriyayoga
(1-4-58 & 59), vibhāṣā & aparibhāṣārāṇe ca pāncamaṇā
tvā. (2-1-11 & 12) and hvasaṃprasarāṇaṃ & abhyastasya ca
(6-1-32 & 33) are treated as separate rules by DK as in K.¹

**Interpretation of rules:**

With regard to the interpretation of rules in Rup
& K, it deserves mention at the outset that all the rules
of Ast are interpreted in K whereas only 2381 of them
are interpreted in Rup.² Again when we view these rules
of Ast interpreted in Rup, it can be understood that a
great majority of them present similarity in interpretation
with K while some others give simplified or detailed
versions of the interpretation given in K and only a few
others expose slight difference in interpretation. In-
stances of all such varieties are detailed below.

1. **Rup** P - I pp. 44, 51, 171 & 169 and P - II p. 196
   'pradaṇa upasaraḥ kriyāvoge; vibhāṣaparibhāṣa-
   raṇe ca pāncamaṇā, hvasaṃprasarāṇaṃ abhyastasya ca
   283, 363 Vol. II p. 697 and Vol. III p. 239)

2. **Vide Appendix** pp 333 to 397
Similarity in interpretation:

The rules of Ast, interpreted in Rup and exhibiting similarity in the interpretation of the same with K, can be classed into two groups. The former group includes those rules the interpretation of which is exactly the same as given in K while in the latter group though there is a difference in wording the similarity in idea, is kept in tact. For instance rules like taparastathālaya (1-1-70) have exactly the same wording of K with regard to their interpretation given in Rup. But rules like 'īgyanah samprasaraṇam' (1-1-45), 'adarsanam lopah' (1-1-60) etc. found in Rup have similar interpretation with K in a different wording. It is to be repeated here that a great

3. Rup F - I p. 3

4. 'īgyo yanah sthāne bhūte bhāvi vā tasya samprasaraṇaṁ nityoṣaṁ samjña bhavati' (K under rule 1-1-45)

'yanah sthāne bhūte bhāvi vā ya ik sa samprasaraṇaṁ samjña bhavati' (Rup F - I p. 51)

'adarsanamaśravamanuuccaraṇaṁ upalabdhiraḥbhāvo varnavaṇṇaṁ ityanarthāntaram' etaih sabdaṁyorthobhiḥdhiyatā

tasya lopa iti iyaṁ samjña bhavati / arthasyaṁ samjña na sabdaṁya / prasaktasyadarsanam lopasaṁjñaṁ bhavati

(K under rule 1-1-60)

'varnavaṇṇaṁ adarsanam lopasaṁjñaṁ bhavati / kimadarsanam

adarsanam asravamanuuccaraṇaṁ upalabdhiraḥbhāvo varnavaṇṇaṁ itya

nastāntaram' etaih sabdaṁyorthobhiḥdhiyatā tasya

arthasya iyaṁ lopasaṁjñaṁ anena vidhiyatā' (Rup F-I p. 2)
majority of the rules in Rup are similar to K in interpretation.

Simplification or elaboration in interpretation:

In the case of certain rules, we find that the interpretation given by DK is the simplification of what is detailed in K under the said rules. For instance the rule 'halmantarah samyogah' (1-1-7) is interpreted in Rup as 'ajbhiravyavahitah halah samyogasamjnāh syuh'.

It can be seen that this is the simplified extract of the interpretation given in K, 'bhinnajatiyaira'bhiravyavahitah 'slistoccāritah...' halah samyogasamjnā bhavanti, samudayah samjñā / jatau cedam bahuvacanam tena dvayorbahunām ca samyogasamjnā siddhā bhavati.' Other rules like 'sasthī sthāneyoga' (1-1-49) can also be pointed out as examples for this.

At the same time we find that DK gives a more detailed explanation with regard to certain rules. For instance K simply gives the meaning of the rule 'ādārocchikaranam' (1-4-45) with a brief description of 'ādhāra.' But in Rup

5. Rup P I p. 8
6. Ibid p. 6
DK not only gives the meaning of the rule but also makes mention of the four types of adharas. He explains these four types and illustrates them.  

**Difference in interpretation:**

Though DK has closely followed K while interpreting the rules of Ast, rarely we meet with certain instances where there is difference in the interpretation given to the rules in Rup and K. A few instances of this kind are given below.

\[\text{arha kṛtyatrasca} \ (3-3-169)\]

\[\text{Rup interprets this rule as teaching the sense }\]
\[\text{‘arha’ to the Kṛt suffix tṛc and kṛtya suffixes. But in K it is stated that this rule by virtue of the word ca found in it, teaches the sense ‘arha’ not only to tṛc and kṛtya suffixes but also to the lakara liṅ. Thus Rup differs from K here in as much it does not mention the idea comprehended by the word ca, pointed out in K.}\]

---

7. **Rup** P = I p. 162 & vide Supra pp. 273 & 274

8. **Rup** P = II p. 247
dhaki lopah (4-1=133)

This rule enjoins the elision of the final letter of the base 'pitrasvar' when followed by the suffix dhak. Here it is to be noted that it is the suffix chan that is ordained to this base 'pitrasvar' by the rule 'pitrasvar-suschan' (4=1=132) and we do not get any rule ordaining the suffix dhak to this base pitrasvar. Hence it is pointed out in k that this rule (dhaki lopah) itself is the authority for the addition of the suffix dhak to the base pitrasvar since it speaks of the elision of the final letter of the base pitrasvar when followed by the suffix dhak.

DK while interpreting this rule expresses the same opinion. But he adds that the authority for the addition of the suffix dhak is to be sought in another way also. According to him the rule 'dhaki lopah' is to be split into two parts (yogavibhaga) one consisting of the word dhaki and other consisting of the word lopah. The former consisting of the single word dhaki along with the anuvratti of the

9. Ḫup F = I p. 226
word pitravasuh from the rule 'pitravasuschan' must be interpreted as teaching the suffix 'dhak' to the base pitravasnr. The latter part consisting of the single word lopah, along with the help of the word 'dhaki' of former split rule, and of the word pitravasuh got from the previous rule 'pitravasuschan', can be construed in such a way so as to teach the elision of the final letter of the base pitravasnr when followed by the suffix dhak. This is an innovation made by BK.

idamaasthamuh (5-3-24)

The rule idamaasthamuh enjoins to the base idam, the suffix thamu which is termed vibhakti by the rule 'pragdisoc vibhaktih(5-3-1). Here K points out that the final vowel 'u' in thamu helps the penultimate consonant 'm' from being designated as 'it'. If the suffix thamu were devoid of the final vowel 'u', 'm' would have been the final consonant of the suffix and hence it would have been designated as 'it' by the rule 'halantyam' (1-3-3). Hence it is said in K 'ukaro makaraparitrantarshah'.
DK draws an indication here. He states 'atra ukāro
makāraparitranārthaḥ / etadevokārakaranam jñāpakaṃ
da vibhaktau tussaḥ (1-3-4) ityasya anityatvasya; tena
kimot (5-3-12) ityatra takarasya itsamjñāḥ bhavati.10

According to him even if the consonant 'r' were the final
letter of the suffix 'thamu' termed vibhakti, it won't
got the designation 'it' by virtue of the rule 'na vibhaktau
tussaḥ' (1-3-4) by which the consonants, coming under
tavarga, 's' and 'm' in a suffix termed vibhakti, are
prohibited from being designated as 'it'. Hence the un-
necessary effort of providing the suffix with a final
vowel 'u', is to be understood as indicative of the fact
that the prohibition of itsamjñā to tavarga, 's' and 'm' by
the rule 'na vibhaktau tussaḥ' is anitya (i.e. not invariable)
and hence does not function in certain instances. The
itsamjñā by the rule 'na vibhaktau tussaḥ' being thus
anitya, the consonant 'm' in the suffix has got a chance
of being designated as 'it' if it were the final letter
of the suffix. If so, it will get elided by the rule

10. Rup P-I pp. 291 & 292
It is the indeclinable kva which is derived by the addition of the taddhita suffix 'at' to the base 'kim' by the rule 'kimot' (5=3=12). The suffix 'at' is termed vibhakti by the rule 'pragdiso vibhaktih' and hence its final consonant 't' ought to undergo the prohibition of 'itsamjñā'. It is therefore not under 'na vibhaktau tusmah' on the basis of the indication of anityatva of the rule 'na vibhaktau tusmah', the final consonant 't' of the suffix 'at' does not undergo 'itsamjñanisedha'. It therefore can be designated as 'it' and gets elided. Thereby the form kva can be arrived at.

cino luk (6=4=104)

This rule is interpreted in K as ordaining the elision, i.e., 'luk' of the suffix that occurs as latter to 'cin'.

'tasya lopah' (1=3=9) and one cannot attain the form

itham. Hence the consonant 'm' is provided with a final vowel 'u' to protect the same from 'itsamjñā' and consequent lopa.

DK cites an instance which is benefitted by this indication (jñāpanam).
which comes as the substitute of the suffix oli.¹¹ But in Rüp Dēk specifies that this rule teaches the elision of the suffix 'ta' occurring as latter to cin.¹² This is because the rule 'cinbhavakarmāṇaḥ' ordains the substitute cin in the place of oli only when oli is followed by the suffix 'ta' (ātmanepada = first person singular). Hence when followed by other dvīvacaṇa and bhāvacaṇa suffixes 'oli' gets replaced by other substitutes like 'sīc' and so on and thereby the ekavaṇa suffix 'ta' alone can occur as latter to cin. Hence Dēk interprets this rule as teaching the elision of the suffix 'ta'. Here we find that Dēk differs from 'K' in the interpretation of this rule by way of accurate specification.

³rphalabhajatrapaṣca & phanaṃ ca saptanām (6=4=122 & 125)

While interpreting these two rules which ordain the vowel 'e' as the substitute of the component vowel in

¹¹ 'cīna uttarasaṃ pratyayasya lugbhavati' (K under rule 6=4=104)
¹² 'cīna uttarasaṃ taprātyayasya lugbhavati, dvīvacaṇmādisu sījeva bhavati' (Rüp F = II p. 166)
roots like tr phal, etc., along with the abhyāsalopa of these roots, K cites as thenimitta for the same, lit which is kīt and kīt and thal which is set. But while dealing with these two rules, DK cites as nimitta lit which is kīt and thal which is set. He does not mention the nimitta viz. lit which is kīt.

oto gāryasya (8–3–20)

While interpreting this rule enjoining elision, K points out that the lopa enjoined as per this rule operates on the consonant 'y' whereas DK interprets this rule as enjoining the elision of two consonants 'y' and 'v'.

13. tr phala, bhaja, trpa ityoteseṣaṁghānasāta ekādeso bhavati abhyāsalopascasā liti kātti paratasthali ca seti (K under rule 6–42

14. tr phala bhaja trpa ityoteseṣaṁtaḥ sthāne ekādeso bhavati, abhyāsalopascasā kiti liti paratah thali ca seti (Rup P – II p. 126)

15. okārāduttarasaya yakārasaya lopo bhavati gāryasyācāryasya matena asi paratah (K under 8–3–20)

okārāduttarasayā padāntayoryakāravakārayoḥ lopo bhavatyasi parataḥ (Rup P – I p. 25)
It is from the words vyoḥ of the rule 'vyorlaghupraya-
thatarah.(8-1-18) that 'y' is got by anuvṛtti
for the rule 'oto gārgyasya' and since there is the mention
of both the consonants 'y' and 'v' in the part vyoḥ that
DK seems to interpret this rule as enjoining the elision
of both the consonants 'y' and 'v'.

Illustration of sutras and presentation of rupas:

In the second introductory verse to K we find that the
work is referred to as vyutpannarupasiddhi meaning that it
helps to arrive at the rupas by giving their vyupatti or
derivation. When we go through K we find that each
and every sutra is illustrated as part of interpretation.
Many a rule is provided with rupas which form their examples
and counter examples. But in Rup we find that DK gives
more importance to the citation of rupas and it is for
this purpose that the sutras of Ast are selected and inter-
preted in Rup. Hence when we make a comparison between

16. 'istupasahkhyaanavatī suddhaganā vivṛtagudhasutrārthā /
vyutpannarupasiddhīrīrtiśāman kāśikā nama //
K and Rup, it can be noticed that K is characterised by the illustration of sutras as part of interpretation while Rup is marked by the presentation of rūpas which accidentally help to illustrate the sutras.

We find that DK does not attempt to illustrate each and every sutra selected from Ast, since it is not for the illustration of sutras that rūpas are cited, but in order to present a rūpa and to point out its vyutpatti that a rule is interpreted. Hence we find that many rules like 'wipratisedhe param kāryam' (1-4=2) are not readily provided with their examples. So also DK takes such pains to narrate the prakriya and in this respect we find K is lacking comparatively. Further, DK presents the sutras not in their order found

17. Rup P = I p. 27
in Ast but in a different order which suits the presentation of rupas and narration of their vyutpatti (derivation). Therefore though in the introductory verses to K, the work is claimed to be vyutpannarupasiddhi, it is Rup which can be, more properly called 'vyutpannarupasiddhi.'

Here the remark of Narayana Bhatta is noteworthy. Referring to K he says, 'vyrttau caru na rupasiddhikathanā' and referring to Rup he says, 'rupāvatāre punah, kaumudādyādisu castra sūtramakhilam nāstayevas.' He means that in K the narration of the derivation of a rupa is not so meritorious. He does not find fault with Rup in this respect. Since the only one drawback in Rup pointed out by Narayana Bhatta is that it does not comprehend all the sūtras of Ast, one can understand that Narayana Bhatta gives recognition to the marvellous presentation of rupas in DK's work.

18. Vide Supra pp. 66 & 67
Rūpavatāra in comparison with other recasts
like Siddhānta Kaumudi

A comparison of Rup with the SK of BD may seem
nothing to an onlooker, since the former is the most
primitive form of a recast of Ast and the latter is the most
developed and systematically furnished form of the same.
But to a research student, such a comparison is very neces-
sary, informative and hence unavoidable, since the former
is the prototype of the latter. A comparative study of
the same with other recasts like Rupamāla, FK, PS which
represent the different stages in the development of the
recasts of Ast is also worth the effort. But it is
the comparative study of Rup with SK that matters, since
the former and the latter represent respectively, the ini-
tial and final stages of development of the prakriyā style
of treatment of Ast. Hence, after a comparative study
of Rup with K, we are attempting here a comparative
study of Rup mainly with SK and accidentally with other
recasts mentioned above.

The comparative study of Rup with SK and other
recasts is designed here with the purpose of bringing out the extent to which the former has influenced the latter. Hence we are to discuss the same in a manifold manner based on their contents, arrangement, interpretation of sutras and presentation of rupas.

Contents:

All the recasts of Ast have mainly the same i.e. the sutras of Ast, as their contents. But they differ from each other only in the number of sutras taken from Ast. DK selects for his work only 2381 sutras out of the nearly 4000 sutras of Ast, Vimalasaraswathy has taken about 2000 rules for his $\text{Rupamālā}$ while Ramachandra has completed his work PB taking 2470 rules though the physical dimension of the work is greater than $\text{Rup}$. All the sutras of Ast are taken for study only in two recasts viz. PS of $\text{Nārāyana Bhatta}$ and SK of BD.

Arrangement:

The sutras of Ast are arranged differently in the various recasts of Ast. It is to be borne in
mind that these different kinds of arrangement based on the subject-wise grouping of the sutras had their origin in Rup. In Rup, the sutras are dealt with in two separate parts which are subdivided into avatāras and paricchedas. Rūpamālā of Vimalasaraswathy is a single but short work consisting of ten sections called mālas. The Pk of Ramachandra and SK of BD are divided into two parts called pūrvārdha and uttarārdha. With regard to the contents of these two parts it can be seen that the same is also modelled on the two parts of Rup but modified according to the whims and fancies of the authors. PS of Nārayana Bhatta is divided into two parts called pūrvabhāga and uttarabhāga. But the arrangement of the topics dealt with in these two parts of PS is different from that of Rup and we find that the pūrvabhāga of PS consists of 17 sections called khandas and uttarabhāga three khandas.¹⁹ Now let us attempt a comparative study of the further subdivision of the two major parts as well as the contents of Rup with SK and other works.

¹⁹. Vide Supra pp. 35 & 36
The Purvabhaga of Rup is subdivided into 8 avataaras:
- samjñã, samhitã, vibhakti, avyaya, stripratyaya,
karaka, samasa and taddhita whereas the Purvartha of SK is
subdivided into 42 prakaranas dealing with 9 topics viz:
samjñã, paribhãsa, sandhi subanta, avyaya, stripratyaya,
karaka, samasa and taddhita.

Rup opens with the section named sanjñãvatara and SK
with the section sanjñaprakarana. DK does not include all
the sanjñã rules in sanjñãvatara. This is due to the
fact that the author has given more importance to the sanjñã
rules which are essential for the understanding of the
different types of sandhis discussed in the following
chapters and hence has included only such sanjñasutras in
this section. Therefore, he discusses the prãtipadika-
sanjñã, only while dealing with the declensions, para-
maipada, åtmamanipada, prathama, madhyama and uttama sanjñas
only in the second part of the work dealing with the roots.

20. Vide Supra pp. 82 & 83
DK is followed in this matter by later writers of
PK, PS and SK only with a difference that they add some
more samjñas like vṛddhi, guna, dhatu, nipaṭa, upasarga,
gāti, avasāna, saṃhita, pada, saṃyoga, laghu and guru
also to this section. This initial section dealing
with the samjñas is termed saṃjñāśālā in Rupaśālā,
saṃdhyuṣaṃjñāprakaraṇa in PK, saṃjñākhaṇḍa in PS
and saṃjñāprakaraṇa in SK. Of these the name saṃdhyuṣa-
ṣaṃjñāprakaraṇa given by Ramachandra to this section
seems more suitable.

In PK, PS and SK the first section dealing with
saṃjñas is followed by a section dealing with paribhasas
wherein the more important among the sutras in Asv,
which are in the form of postulates relating to the appli-
cation of sutras in general and hence called paribhasasūtras,
are explained. Though such a section is quite relevant
in a recast of Asv, we do not get in Rupa a section deal-
ing with paribhasasūtras in general. DK can never be
accused of the non-composition of the same since he in-
troduces these paribhasasūtras whenever their relevance
occurs in his work. For example while dealing with the vidhisutra 'hrasvasya piti kiti tuk' (7-1-71) in the beginning itself of samhitāvatāra which follows samjñāvatāra, he introduces the two paribhasasutras 'gaśthisthāneṣyog' (1-1-49) and 'adhyantau takitau' (1-1-46). So also other paribhāṣa rules like 'alontyasya' (1-1-52) 'vīpratisedhe param kāryan' (1-4-2) etc. are introduced in his work in places where they are necessary. Moreover the idea of the formation of a section giving preliminary details at the outset of the work, had its origin in Rūp by means of the formation of samjñāvatāra and it only got enhanced by later authors by the formation of an additional prakarana concerned with the paribhasasutras. Hence the non-composition of paribhāṣaprakarana cannot be regarded as a demerit of Rūp.

DK names the section dealing with sandhi as samhitāvatāra and divides the same into six sections as pointed out earlier. But in SK just as in FK, sandhi is dealt

21. Rūp P - I p. 6
22. Ibid pp. 24 & 27
23. Vide Supra p. 36
with in a four-fold manner, acsandhi, halsandhi, visargasandhi and svādisandhi. The formation of four sections dealing with sandhi as opposed to the six sections of the same in Rup is brought about by incorporating tuksandhi in halsandhi and prakrtibhāvasandhi in acsandhi. In the sandhikhandā of PS, after dealing with the rules relating to tuk and sut, acsandhi, prakrtibhāvasandhi, halsandhi and visargasandhi and svādisandhi are taken up in order by the author.

After dealing with sandhi, DK takes up declensions in the next section vibhaktyavatāra with the three subdivisions of ajanta stems into pulliṅga, striliṅga and napumsakaliṅga and with the four subdivisions of halanta stems into pulliṅga, striliṅga and napumsakaliṅga and aliṅga. The fourth subdivision viz. aliṅga, of halanta is peculiar to Rup. For, in PK declensions are dealt with in a section named svādiprakriyā with the three subdivisions of ajanta stems and halanta stems each into

24. Vide Supra p. 149
pulliṅga, strīliṅga and napumṣakaliṅga. In SK also, declensions are dealt with in six prakaranas of ajanta-pulliṅga, ajantastrīliṅga, ajantanapumṣakaliṅga, halanta-pulliṅga, halantastrīliṅga and halantanapumṣakaliṅga. However BD does not give a common name to these six sections dealing with declensions. In PK the section dealing with declensions is termed subvidhikhandā, but this section comes only much later after the 5 khandas named kṛt, tadchita, saṃśa, strīpratyaya and subarthā which are dealt in order after sandhikhandā.

The order of the next four sections in Rūp, i.e., strīpratyayāvatāra, kārakāvatāra, samāvātāra and taddhitāvatāra are followed by PK and SK with the only difference that in PK these sections are named strīpratyaya-prakaranā, vibhaktyarthapraśkarana, saṃśapraśkarana and taddhitapraśkarana whereas in SK they are termed as strīpratyaya-prakaranā, kārakapraśkarana, saṃśapraśkarana and taddhitapraśkarana.

In the strīpratyayāvatāra of Rūp and strīpratyaya-prakaranā of PK, we find that all the feminine suffixes
which lead to the formation of stripratyayantarupas are dealt with. In the stripratyayakhanda of FS and stripratyayapramarana of SK, all the rules of Ast dealing with feminine suffixes are included.

The section dealing with the sense of case endings viz. sup suffixes is named as kārakāvatāra in Rup, as vibhaktarthaka in FK, kārakapramarana in SK and subarthakhanda in FS. Of these the title subarthaha in FS seems more appropriate since in this section, as pointed out just above, it is the sense of sup suffixes that is dealt with. The naming of this section as vibhaktarthaka in FK is over-pervading since vibhakti includes not only sup suffixes but also tiṇi suffixes, the sense of which (tiṇi suffixes) is not dealt with here. 25 So also the names of this section as kārakāvatāra in Rup or kārakapramarana in SK is also defective since the meaning of sup suffixes include not only kāraka, but also, prātipadikārtha and sambandha in addition. As these two which are not comprehended by the word kāraka, are dealt with in this section, both the names kārakāvatāra and kārakapramarana are less comprehensive.

25. Vide the rule ‘vibhaktisca’(1-4-104) ‘suptiṣau pratyāhāra; supāḥ tiṇāca trini trini vibhakti-

csamjanasca bhavanti’ (Rup P = I p.29)
The section dealing with samāsa is divided into six by DK. Of these the first four sections deal with the four kinds of samāsas viz. avyayībhāva, tatpurusa, bahuvrīhi and dvandva and the latter two named samāsanta and alugādisamāsārayavidhi deal with the accessories of samāsas. But in PK, samāsas are dealt with in four sections dealing with the four kinds of samāsas and those, discussed as the accessories of samāsa under the two sections samāsanta and alugādisamāsārayavidhi in Rūp, are dealt with in the said four sections itself by Rama-chandra. In PS we find that compounds are dealt with in the samāsakhandā in the order of avyayībhāva, tatpurusa, bahuvrīhi, dvandva and aluk. The samāsantas relating to tatpurusa and bahuvrīhi are given at the end of the respective sections and general ones under the aluk section.

In SK we find that samāsas are dealt with in several prakāranas like, avyayībhāvasamāsa, tatpurusasamāsa, bahuvrīhīsamāsa, dvandvasamāsa, ekasena, sarvaśamāsasena, sarvaśamāsamanta, alukasena and samāsārayavidhi.

For the taddhitavatāra of Rūp, DK has selected rules dealing with taddhitas from the fourth and 5th adhyayas.
of Ast concerned with taddhita suffixes. DK has arranged them more or less in the same order in which they are found in Ast. Also he includes other sutras found necessary from other chapters of Ast in this section. In PK also the section dealing with taddhitas include sutras selected from 4th and 5th chapters of Ast and they are arranged in the same order of Ast. The entire taddhita section of Ast has been divided into 19 prakaranas in SK. It is clear that in the taddhita section, BD did not face any trouble in placing the sutras in the order of Ast, although he does include in it, as in Rup sutras found necessary from chapters other than the fourth and fifth chapters of Ast. In the taddhita-takhandas of FS also, the entire taddhita rules are dealt with. The purvabhaga of Rup, as well as purvvardha of PK and SK end with the taddhita section while in FS alone taddhita is dealt with much earlier. The order of the various topics discussed in the 17 khandas of FS are

- samjna, paribhaga, sandhi, krt, taddhita, samasa, stri-pratyaya, subarthna, subvidhi, atmanepadavibhaga, tin,
- larthavisesa, sannanta, yañanta, yañuk, subdhatu and nyaya.

It is clear that the purvabhaga of FS present a striking contrast to the purvabhaga of Rup.

26. Vide Appendix pp. 355-368
Uttarabhāga of Rup / Uttarārdha of SK

Uttarabhāga of Rup, titled as Dhatupratyayapancikā, deals with roots and suffixes like tī, krt etc. added to them. The uttarārdha of FK and SK is also concerned with the same. The topics dealt with in the three khandas coming under the uttarabhāga of PS, are dhatu, unādi and chandasa.

In Rup we find that tinantarupas of ten lakaras derived from certain roots coming under the ten ganas and occurring in the sense of kartr, karman, bhāva, and karmakartr, are dealt with in the two section called sarvadhatukapariccheda and ārdhadhatukapariccheda. Here there is the defect that the various rupas in the different lakaras of one and the same root are scattered over the different sub-sections coming under these two major sections. Hence one finds himself at a loss to gather the rupas of one and the same root in all the lakaras, at a time. This inconvenience is avoided in FK and SK wherein the tinantarupas of roots are dealt with in ten sections of ten ganas.

27. Vide Supra pp. 72 & 73 and 154 & 155
and in each section all the tinantarupas of a root in all the lakaras except the Vedic lakara let are discussed at a time itself. Thus we find that PK and SK deviate from Rup in the treatment of tinantarupas derived from roots coming under the ten ganas.

The tinantarupas derived from pratyayanta roots like samanata are dealt with in separate sections in Rup. In SK after the first ten sections dealing with tinantanas in the order of the ten ganas of roots, pratyayanta roots are dealt with in prakaranas concerned with nic, san, yañ, yañuk, nāmadātu, kandvādi, and pratyāsmā.

Another deviation from Rup in PK and SK is that separate sections viz. Ātmanopadaprakarana and Parasmaipada-prakarana are formed to deal with padavyayaśthā (the conditions when roots are to take parasmaipada termination or ātmanepada termination or both of them). But no such separate section is formed in Rup, though certain rules relating to parasmaipada and ātmanepada are included by

28. Vide Supra p. 156
DK in the सर्वदातुकपरिच्छेद and अर्धदातुकपरिच्छेद itself. So also two separate sections named भवाकर्मात्रिप्रकरणाः and कर्माकर्त्रःप्रकरणाः for dealing with तिं suffixes occurring in the sense of भाव, कर्म, and कर्मकर्त्र is formed in पक and सक while this too is also dealt with in the सर्वदातुकपरिच्छेद and अर्धदातुकपरिच्छेद itself by DK.

In रुप, the section dealing with the varieties of sense conveyed by तिं suffixes, is named तिंविभाक्यार्थम् by DK whereas the same is termed by BD as लक्षार्थम् prakarana which comes after कर्माकर्त्रःप्रकरणाः in सक. क्रद्दातावरत्तम् dealing with क्रद्दाता stems is one of the major sections in the second part of रुप with which the work ends. Though the उत्तरार्ध of सक also ends with the krdantaprkaranam the author appends at the end two more prkaranas viz. वैदिकस्वरप्रकृति and लिंगार्दसासनाः.

Finally it is clear from the above that the arrangement of the various topics in the two parts of पक and सक is modelled on the two parts of रुप. It can also be

29. Vide Supra pp. 155 & 156
noticed that it is Rs which among the various later recasts, deviates most from Rup. The more and more convenient methods adopted by the authors of these later recasts, seen in the presentation of tinantarupas, the discussion of all the sutras of Ast, forming of separate sections for dealing with paribhasas, padavyavastha, bhavakarmakarmakartprakriya etc. undoubtedly bring credit to those authors. But it is to be understood that when one pays homage to these authors for these innovations, DE too is being honoured since he is the discoverer of the idea of reshuffling the sutras of Ast which is the basis of all these innovations.

**Interpretation of sutras:**

With regard to the interpretation of rules in Rup and later recasts, it deserves mention that in Rup a rule is interpreted with a view to help the presentation of a rupa for which the rule is selected. Hence we find that one and the same rule is interpreted twice or thrice in Rup so as to help the derivation of rupas cited in different contexts. We get numerous instances of
this repeated interpretation of one and the same rule
in the pravabhaga of Rupa as well as its latter part.

Dpp. 30 Two examples are given below:

1. aco uniti (7-2-115):
   In ajantapullihga while dealing with the rupa sakhaya
   of the 'i' stem sakh and the rupa gauh of the 'o' stem 'go'.

2. liñsiçavatmanopade (1-2-11):
   While dealing with the rupas upaguhisista of the root 'guh'
   and muksista of the root 'muc' in the asirli çparakara and abhitta of the root 'bhid' in
   the luçprakara. 32

30. Vide Supra p. 123
31. Rupa P - I pp. 46 & 59
32. Rupa P - II pp. 115, 118 & 144
PK is influenced by Rup in this respect. There also we get repeated interpretation of a few sutras. They are given below:

1. देश पराः; \(\frac{1}{1-95}\) In haśanādi and haļaṇa-prakarana

2. अनुपलिखेतरवस्या; \(\frac{1}{1-35}\) In saṃjñapraṇaṇa and ajanta-prakarana

3. द्वारा (3-1-91); In the bhūdi section and kṛdanta section

4. वर्तवण्यास्व: \(\frac{1}{6-4-84}\) In ajanta-puliṅga-prakarana and stri-liṅga-prakarana

5. विजय: \(\frac{1}{8-3-15}\) In haśanādi and visargasandhī

6. 'कुपवहे'; \(\frac{1}{8-3-37}\) In haśanādi and visargasandhī

Quite in contrast, the aim of the presentation and derivation of rūpas is achieved in SK even without repeated interpretation of one and the same rule. When we get repeated interpretation of one and the same rule
in Rup, and PK, a rule is interpreted once only in SK and this interpretation satisfies the requirements of other ruṣas also cited elsewhere in the text. Once a rule is interpreted in SK, it is only referred to in other contexts. For example the rule ‘पुर्ववर्तसिद्धम्’ (8-2-1) is interpreted as ‘adhikāroyam tena sapādasaptā-dhyāyīṃ prati tripādyasidhā / tripādyāmaspi pūrvam prati param ‘सार्वसिद्धम सयत’/ in the samjñavatāra and it is only referred to in avādisandhi while dealing with the ruṣa ‘मनोरत्ना’ saying ‘iti rephalopā prāpte, ’पुर्ववर्तसिद्धम’ iti ro ri ityasyasidhchatvāt utvameva, ‘मनोरत्नाह’‘.33

Again with regard to the nature of interpretation of rules we find that the interpretation given in Rup is similar to that given in K. For example, the rule ‘पाग्रहचाहं…..(7-3-78) is interpreted in an elaborate way quite similar to what weget in K and it can be found

33. **SK P - I pp. 20, 169 & 170**
that there is difference only in wording. But the authors of later recasts adhere to the concise nature of interpretation. Hence PK interprets the rule as 'paghradinam kramat pibadayā adesāh syuhā siti' and BD interprets in SK as 'padinam pibadayah suritsamjnakasakāradau pratyaye pare' we meet with numerous other instances where later authors stick to the concise nature of interpretation.

Moreover in Rup even simple rules like 'utsadibhyon' (4-1-86) and 'svasucchah' (4-1-143), 'sivadibhyon (4-1-115) and 'godhaya dhra'k (4-1-129) are provided with vrtti which

---

34. 'pa ghra dhma stha ma dan drsi arti sarti sada sada ityetesam piba jighra dhama tistha mana yaccha pasya rocha dhau siya sida ityete adesa bhavanti siti paratah' (K)

'pa pane, ghra gandhopadane, dhma sabdagnisamyogayoh stha gatinivrtau, ma abhyase, dan dane, drsir preksane, gatau, sr gatau, sadl satane, sadl visaranagatya vasadanesu, ityetesam dhatunam yathasahkhyan piba, jighra, dhama, tistha, mana, yaccha, pasya, rocha, sdae, siya, sida, ityete adesa bhavanti sitpratyaye paratah' (Rup P -II p. 14)

35. **PK** P -II p. 110 & SK P -III p. 198

36. Vide Adya Prasada Misra, 'Prakriyākaumudīvimarsah' p. 25
gives their meaning fully. Quite differently in PK and SK we find that such rules, the meaning of which can be understood from the rules themselves are not provided with vṛtti. For example, in PK, rules like 'utsādibhyon', 'svasucchah', 'sivādibhyon', 'duskulāddhak' (4=1-142), 'halaśirātthak' (4=3-124), 'somāttyah'(4=2-30), 'agnerdhak'(4=2-33), 'pasādibhyo yah'(4=2-49), kramādibhyo vun (4=2-61), 'rathādyat' (4=3-121), khah sarvadhurāt (4=4-78) and 'sakatādān' (4=4-80) are not provided with vṛtti. In SK also we find that BD does not give any vṛtti to such rules and simply states 'spastam' or gives the examples alone. For example:

1. 'utsādibhyon' (4=1-36) : 'autesah'
2. 'svasucchah' (4=1-143) : 'svasriyah'
3. 'nicairanudāttah' (1=2-20) : spastam arvāh
4. 'jhalaṃ jhās jhasi' (8=4-53) : spastam
5. 'yusmadacādhyān' āhaso : spastam (7=1-27)
6. 'godhāya dhroak' (4=1-129) : gaudherah
7. 'ksatrād gah (4=1-138) : ksatriyah
In addition to the practice of giving meaning for each and every sutra, it can also be seen that DK pays attention to give a vivid description of the idea conveyed by the component words  

adhāra cartha etc. of sutras like  

adhārodhikaranam  

(1-4-45) carthe  

dvandvah (2-2-79) etc. It is also noteworthy that the explanation of four varieties of cartha by DK is very clear and discriminative than that given by BD. He very clearly elucidates cartha in which dvandvasamasa is enjoined and also gives the following verse which clearly explains itaretarayoga which is one among the four varieties of cartha:

itaretarayogastu bhinnasaṅghabhidhāyinām /
pratyekānca samūhasau samūhīsu samāpyate //

Finally in Rup we find that an introduction is given before presenting a rule or starting an avatāra.

38. Rup P-I pp. 186 & 187
39. Vide Supra pp. 60 & 61
For example he gives the introduction 'katham punaranupadiśā' dirghādayo grhyante? savarnagrahanat / katham?
and then only presents the rule 'anuditēsavarnasya......' (1-1-69) along with its vṛtti 40. So also at the outset
of stripratyaśavatāra DK says 'atha stripratyaśantah nir-
disyante / ke punah stripratyaśah? tap, ātap, cāp, āp, āip,
ālī, ālin; udi, ti ityete stripratyaśah' / prathasam
tāvat tap' and then starts with the sūtra 'ajādyatātastēp' 
(4-1-4). 41. But this method of introducing a rule or a
prakaraṇa is not found followed in later recasts like FK
or SK.

Rūpas cited:

Rūp as well as all the later recasts have given
great importance to the presentation of rūpas. Hence in
all these works many a'ṛūpa' is cited by way of illus-
tration of rules. Generally the rūpas cited in Rūp are
not orthodox in character though rarely we meet with

40. Rūp P = I p. 36

41. Ibid p. 132
instances like 'kramāya.........' and so on which are orthodox in nature. But PK emerges with the characteristic feature that almost all the rupas cited as illustration of the rule are orthodox and related to devas. Following PK, SK too cites similar type of rupas. For example, while citing the declensional forms of stems ending in vowels DK takes bases like vrksā, kavi, kāru, jāyā, etc. But in PK and SK we get bases like Rāma, Hari, Guru, Rāma, etc. which refer to Gods. The rupas given as examples in the kārakāvatāra also reveal this fact. A few examples are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sutra</th>
<th>Examples in Sup</th>
<th>Examples in PK &amp; SK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 'kramani dvitiyā'</td>
<td>kātam karoti 43</td>
<td>harim bhajati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Vide Supra p. 273
43. Ibid p. 146
2. Adhisīṁsthasān grāmanadhīsete adhisīte adhīstiṣṭhāti adhyāste va 44 va vaikuntham hariḥ

3. Upanvadhyyān grāmanupavasati upavasati anu- grāmananuvāsatī upasati adhi- grāmanadhīvasati ṛvasati āvasatī grāmanāvasatī 45 va vaikuntham hariḥ

4. Hīme anu 'ṣakatayanaṁ anu harīṁ surāṁ vaiyākaranaḥ 46

5. Upodhike ca' upa 'ṣakatayanaṁ upa harīṁ surāṁ vaiyākaranaḥ 47

We find that the PS of Narayanabhatta abounds in illustration. Apart from the general feature of the

44, 45, 46 & 47. Ibid p. 149
wealth of examples, under a particular sutra we find in P5 many more examples than those found in other works. Another feature of the rupas cited is that they are concerned with Lord Krsna.