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CONCLUSION

It has already been stated that the proclaimed necessity of the subjectwise study of Ast was the mother of invention of a recast by Dr. Dr. has taken great care to make the work capable of executing the purpose for which it has been given birth to. His daring attempt at the rearrangement of the sutras was in order to meet the changing needs of the hour. With the rising of the vernaculars to the status of spoken language, Sanskrit began to lose its hold on people as a medium of conversation and then came a time when Sanskrit became altogether a thing of acquisition. Of course the system of Ast was not defective. Yet Dr. knew that the age in which he flourished needed a method which could teach Sanskrit language more easily through the method of word formation. Consequently, the rewriting or rearrangement of the sutras of Ast became a crying need to render it useful for the purpose of teaching Sanskrit by the use of grammar. Thus the prakriya system of grammar envisaged by him responded well to the need of the hour and we are now to evaluate his work on the basis of this present study.
Before attempting the evaluation of the work of DK, one cannot ignore the fact that any initial attempt or creation can have certain drawbacks of its own owing to its inception being the first of its kind and hence while evaluating, it can enjoin the advantage of being given a margin for such drawbacks. It is the result of an evaluation, based on such a scheme of examination, that really matters. Rup examined in the above line of evaluation, can be ranked high among the similar attempts even without giving a margin to the drawbacks that characterise a new creation. It is to this conclusion that we arrive at when the evaluation of the same is attempted.

First of all let us examine as to how far the work has succeeded in achieving the purpose of presentation of rupas for which it has been framed. It is the Rup of DK, which for the first time in the history of Paninian grammar has given more stress to the various rupas with which the students of Sanskrit language are concerned. It brings before the student the different kinds of rupas which are necessary for the correct understanding of the
Sanskrit Language. As a medicated sweet given to the child, the rupas are readily presented with their grammatical details which are otherwise very difficult to understand directly from Ast. In the vibhaktyavatāra we find that the various declensional forms of different stems are narrated in detail. So also samāsāvatāra, taddhitavatāra, kṛdantavatāra etc. bear testimony to the success which he has attained in the presentation of rupas.

It can also be seen that DK not only presents the rupas, but he also draws our attention to the usage of these rupas. For example, in the vibhaktyavatāra he first of all deals with the various declensional forms of vrksasabaḍa and then gives the following verse in which the usage of the various declensional forms of vrksasabaḍa is shown.

\[
\text{vrksastisthati kanane kusimita vrksam latāsamsrita}
\]
\[
\text{vrksenabhihato gaje nipatito vrksaya deyan jalan}
\]
\[
\text{vrksadānaya manjarisabhināvam vrksasya sākhonnata}
\]
\[
\text{vrkae nidamidam kṛtam sakuninā he vrksa kim kampase} /^{2}\]

1. Vide Supra pp. 145 to 149
2. Rup F - I p. 36
So also in the same context while dealing with the usage of the vocative case forms of vrksasabda he says, 'sambodhanābhivyaktartham kecit hesabdam bhos-sahdam va prayunjate. Similarly he points out the stems ending in certain vowels and consonants as not in vogue.

Again while dealing with tinantarupas we find that they are dealt with in two major sections vi. Sārvadhatukapariccheda and Ārdhadhatukapariccheda. Though it is a defect that one cannot at a glance study the rupas of one and the same root in all the lakaras as they are scattered in the various prakaranas of the Sārvadhatukapariccheda and Ārdhadhatukapariccheda, one ought to admit the fact that DK is more practical. This is because in the Sārvadhatukapariccheda he deals with tinantarupas in the four lakaras, lat, lan, lot and vidhilī and it is only a fact that one can readily converse in Sanskrit language if he has mastered these four lakaras. Thus it can be pointed out that while educating the reader with the rupas of Sanskrit language, DK has shown his

3. Ibid p. 31
4. Vide supra p. 147 & 148
5. Vide supra pp. 72 & 73
originality by initially making him aware of the rupas which are the most necessary ones for achieving mastery over the language. 6

Further we find that it is in order to achieve the purpose of presentation of rupas that the rules of Ast are recast in Rup, rejecting their order found in Ast. This recasting of the rules of Ast is brought about by the subjectwise grouping of the rules of Ast. The originality and discriminative power of the author in this regard is wonderfully and explicitly exhibited in this work as in the presentation of apavadasutras and vikalpasutras and so on? The author deserves special applause for framing a recast since it is only on this path discovered and trodden by him first, that his successors could introduce modifications and amenities. Hence the exclusive credit for excavating a new style of treatment of the Paninian rules vis. the subjectwise grouping of them, goes to BK who thus got successors to imitate his new creation.

6. Vide Mahesh Dutt Sharma, 'Kāśikāvṛtti-vaiyākaraṇa-siddhāntakaumudyoḥ tulanātmakasadhyanoḥ' pp. 46 & 47

7. Vide supra pp. 129 & 130
Now let us turn our attention to the influence exerted by Rup on later recasts. It can be said without any doubt that whatever be the merits of later recasts, all those merits had their indebtedness to Rup. This is because Rup stands out singular by framing a new net work to the rules of Ast and their interpretation. DK has appended wherever necessary the vāra of KAT, īstis of PĀT, parībhāsas, unādisūtras, ganāpathas and ganasūtras. Not only that he has appended them in his work, but he has also made a selection of them. Hence all the vāras, īstis, parībhāsas etc. found in MBH do not get a place in Rup. The inclusion of these accessories in a single work, along with the rūpas of Sanskrit language and sūtras of PĀT is the singular achievement of DK. That PK or SK has got a separate prakarana for parībhāsas, unādisūtras, padavyavasthā and bhāvakarmapraṇāya is definitely a meritorious feature of the said works. Though Rup is lacking in this respect, it deserves mention that the idea for such separate prakaranas had their origin in Rup.

8. Vide supra pp. 296 to 320
9. Vide supra pp. 166 to 187
Hence the credit goes to the authors of later recasts only for enhancing the new style of treatment which had its discovery by DK himself.

Now we turn our attention to view DK as a vṛtti-kāra. There are many vṛttis written by the authors like Śvabhūti, Vyādi, Kuni, etc. But all these works are now available. The Kāśikāvṛtti of Jayāditya and Vāmana is a valuable work written in 7th century A.D. To quote the words of Winternitz, 'the admittedly best on account of brevity and clarity, commentary par excellence on the sutras of Panini is the Kāśikāvṛtti, the commentary of Jayāditya and Vāmana.'

After a careful study of Rup we can understand that the work is mainly based on this K. Though DK closely follows K in the interpretation and illustration of sutras, he has not blindly followed everything found in K. The altered version of the verse rudro... ..... with the words yuvayoh and āvayoh instead of yuṣmākam and asmākam found in the same verse in K throws light on the originality of the work.


11. Vide Supra pp. 255 to 257
A vr̥tti does not mean the mere division of the words of sutras. But it is supposed to do something more and should cite examples and counter-examples besides the completion of the original sutras by adding new words to it. We also get the popular verse:

\[
\text{padacchedāḥ padārthoktih vigrāho vākayajojanā /} \\
\text{purvapakṣasamādkhānam vyākhyaṇam pancalakṣaṇam // 13}
\]

While giving the vr̥tti of the sutras DK has adopted a style which is simple. There are numerous instances where he gives the padaccheda, padārthokti, and vigrāha of the sutras. For padārthokti and the like we get various instances in Rupa. The vr̥tti of the rule 'tulyāṇya-prayatnam'...

12. "na kevalam caṇapadānī vākhyāṇam vṛddhiḥ, at, aic'iti/ kim tarhi? udāharanam pratyudāharanam vākyādyahāraḥ ityastatsamuditam vākhyāṇam bhavati" (Mbh Vol.I prathama khanda p. 57)

13. Vide Sṛṣṭidhara, Vivṛti on Bhasavṛtti

14. Vide Supra pp. 120 to 130
savarnam' (1-1-9) is a good example of padarthokti.

To quote the same 'tulyasabdah sadyaparyayah, tulayā
sammitam tulyam; āsyam mukham, āsyat bhavam āsyam,
satvādīsthānam; prayatnah prayatanam; abhyantaraprayatnah
spratādirvarnagunah; tulyah āsyaprayatnah yasya varnasya
eya varnena saha sa samajātiyam prati savarnasamjñān
bhavatī / catvāra abhyantaraprayatnah savarnasamjnānā
māṣriyante - spratā, īsaspratā, vivrtatā, savrtatā
setī / bāhayaprayatnāstā na tathā / te tu vivāra - samvāra
svāsa - nāda ghosa - aghosa - alpaprāna - mahaprānācetyasta-
prakārah āntarataryā parīksopayoginah' 15 so also in the
rule 'ukālojhrasvādirghaplutah' (1-2-27) he says, 'u u u3
ityevam kālah ukālah; kālo mātrā; ekamātrikā-
dviṃstrikātmātrikā aco yathākramam hrasvādirghaplutā-
samjña bhavanti'. 16 In the rule 'sukhanāśikāvacanunāsikān'
(1-1-8) he explains sukhāśikā as sukhāshītā nāśikā
mukhanāśikā. 17 On the word 'pāthasāṅkhyā in the rule 'yathā-
sāṅkhyamanudecāh samānām' (1-3-10) he makes the comment
'sāṅkhyaśabdona kramo lakṣyate; samānām saṃsaṅkhyānām

15. Rup P = 1 p. 3
16. Ibid p. 3
17. Ibid p. 4
samaparipathitanam udesinamani desinam ca yathakramam  
uddesibhih anudesinah sambadhyante. \[18\] In the rule \textquote{arthavade}  
adhaturapratyayah…..(1-2-45) he gives the meaning of  
the word artha as \textquote{abhidheyavacanorthasabdhah}. \[19\] Rules are  
also provided with purvakasasamadhanam and vakyayojana. \[20\]  

Moreover the citation of verses meant for the explana-
nation of sutras, illustration of sutras and the discuss-
sion of topics related to the application of sutras is a  
complementary feature of this work. \[21\] It has won  
applause from later authors and has persuaded them to com-
pare other works with Rup in this respect. \[22\]  

While assessing the value of Rup, we have to  
turn our attention to its defects and drawbacks also which  
are already dealt with previously. \[23\] When we examine then  
it can be found that most of them are not peculiar to his  
work alone but a common feature of all recasts of Ast.  
This is most evident in the rearrangement of the rules of  
Ast. Everyone can suggest one’s own method of rearrangement

\[18\] Ibid p. 6.  
\[19\] Ibid p. 23  
\[20\] Vide Supra pp. 124 & 125 and 131 to 140  
\[21\] Vide Supra pp. 229 to 280  
\[22\] Vide Supra p. 229  
\[23\] Vide Supra pp. 65 to 79
and hence criticism in this regard can never be avoided. Again with regard to the later recasts which steadily strive for a better rearrangement of the rules of Ast from the previous recasts, it is likely that shortcomings may exceed in Rup. But it can be pointed out that only in comparison with later recasts, the rearrangement of rules in Rup becomes less meritorious. Therefore the credit of its first inception by BK empower us to nullify all the defects pointed out in this regard. Again even with regard to SK the most popular and well established recast of Ast, criticism is found in regard to the reshufflings of the sutras of Ast. 24 Again with regard to the presentation of Rupas and narration of prakriya for which this recasting of rules is made, we find that Rup is more simple and illustrative than SK. 25 Hence one can easily ignore the defects of Rup.

Over and above all it is to be noted that the work is meant for a preliminary study of Paninian grammar.

25. Vide Supra pp. 141 to 167 & p. 316
with main stress on the rupas and this purpose is more than fully achieved by DK. No doubt his work deserves to be regarded as a preliminary text for the study of grammar, a recognition which it had enjoyed before the advent of SK and its abridged editions like Madhyasiddhāntakaumudī and Laghusiddhāntakaumudī. Hence we have to pay homage to DK, the author of this work by reinstating the status which it once had in our motherland.