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RUPĀVATĀRA - THE WORK

Rup, the prototype of the works in the prakriya style of treatment of Ast, is noteworthy for the convenience it provides in the study of the Sanskrit language with main reference to the Ast of PAN. In this chapter we are to discuss the origin, significance of the title and contents of the work. The aim and scope of the work, its sources and the commentaries on it are also dealt with here.

ORIGIN:

A brief survey of the different phases of study in the Paninian school up to the time of Rup is relevant here for tracing the origin of this prakriya work.

We know that the study of Ast was prevalent in India during the time of Itsing, a Chinese Traveller of the 7th century A.D., for he says that the Chinese students who came to learn Sanskrit were first made to study Ast and then only they were given tuition in other subjects.⁴

PAN composed his rules in the sutra style which is defined as one which brief but unambiguous, concise but comprehensive, impersonal and objective. This style

1. Vide Bharatayatra p.268
was the fashion of his age and was used for the doctrine
nation of various philosophical and liturgical texts.
PAH's style is more specialised than that of the other
treatises by its peculiarities like the process of
anuvrtti, adhikāra, technical terms, paribhasas, the
phenomenon of asidhatva etc. The Ast of PAN has been
rightly referred to by L. Bloomfield as 'a monumental work
of human intelligence' 2

Sanskrit has undergone tremendous changes in the inter-
vals which might have been sufficiently long, between the
composition of Ast and of the vartikas. For, we know that
language always tend to change. Even languages fortified
by the most scopeful grammar cannot escape this inexorable
process. And when numerous phonetic, semantic and syntactic
changes carried the language beyond the reaches of PAN, KATYĀJANA
of the 2nd century B.C. set himself to writing the vārs
to the rules of PAN. The vārs of KAT are meant to correct,
modify or supplement the rules of PAN wherever they were
or had become partially or totally inapplicable. S.K. Belvalkar
says that of the nearly 4000 sutras KAT noticed over 1500 in
about 4000 vārs. 3 KAT's purpose was not only to doubt the

2. Vide Language, p. 11
validity of the rules of PAN with reference to the language in use in his time and area but to give alternative modifications to the rules of PAN wherever necessary.

KAT was followed in his task by a vast number of writers but none of these successors are known to us otherwise than through quotations made by PATANJALI in his MAHABHARTA. The Mbh is written in a language which is rendered almost unique by the combination of simplicity and vigour, and consisting mainly of dialogues which impart to it an absorbing interest, saving it from the dryness that usually characterises a sastraic commentary. The stand-points of these two commentators KAT and PAT, are quite different. KAT, as a rule, introduces a modification whenever he finds a sutra insufficient. But, PAT's view of approach is entirely different. PAT first sees whether the Ast can be so construed as to yield the requisite meaning and proceeds to supplement or amend it only after being convinced that it cannot. Another important feature of the work is that it contains many maxims derived from day-to-day life in order to tackle problems relating to rules. PAN, KAT and PAT are considered to be the three sages of grammar(munitsrayam) and the tradition has nicknamed the system as trimuni-vyākaranam. With PAT the first period in the development of Sanskrit grammar comes to an end.
The K of Jayāditya and Vāmana of the 7th century A.D. marks the peak of the second phase in the development of the Paninian school. K is the fullest commentary available on the Ast in the same order, explaining every rule and clearly indicating all the anuvṛttis and giving numerous illustrations for each rule. It also often gives the vārṣa while discussing the rules. We get two commentaries on K, one Nyāsa of Jinendrabudhi of the 8th century A.D. and Padmanabhārj of Haradatta of the 9th century A.D. To this stage also belongs the Vākyapādiya of the 7th century A.D. in which an attempt is made to set up grammar as a system of philosophy. Kāiyata of the 10th century A.D. has written a commentary on Mbh, by name Pradīpa and with it the second phase in the development of Paninian school comes to an end.

The third phase begins with the prakṛti works in Sanskrit grammar. The main problem confronting the authors of the first and second phases was to explain threadbare the rules of Ast, to supplement shortcomings and to do away with its superfluousness. In other words their main objective was to bring about perfection of the Ast which they fully achieved. Nothing had been left untouched by the writers of grammar and hence there was no occasion for any creative work. Early in the first century A.D. we find in the
Kātantra grammar of Sarvavarman a subjectwise arrangement of rules. It will not be improper to say that the subjectwise treatment of the Kātantra grammar to some extent, influenced the students of grammar which paved the way to the development of prakṛtyā works in the Paninian school. The rules of Ast are arranged in such a manner that only after a careful study of Ast, one acquires knowledge of the various topics of grammar like sandhi, samāsa etc. Those who study a part of it, does not become proficient even in a single topic. For instance, the rules ordaining the various samāsas are given in the second chapter while the rules governing the samāśanta pratyayas are given in the fifth chapter and the rules dealing with the conditions of purvanipāta in samāsas are given in the third pada of the sixth chapter. Thus we see that various problems relating to samāsas are dealt with in different places. One should study at least six chapters to become proficient in samāsas. With the coming of Kātantra grammar there arose a trend among the students to turn towards it which enabled a subjectwise study. Hence in order to prevent these, the system of subjectwise treatment was later adopted by the followers of the Paninian school. The students of PAN, not satisfied with the exhaustive commentary of K which explained the rules in the order of Ast itself, made an
attempt to recast the sutras of Pan according to subjects treated therein to facilitate the study of the learner. The works of this phase, better known as prakriyā works, proved most suitable to the changing needs of the hour, because Sanskrit was no longer a spoken language and had long left its claim as such. These works distinguish themselves by changing the order of the sutras of Ast. The underlying motive of this change is to secure convenience in word formation as the ultimate purpose of grammar. Pan followed the technique of composing the general (utsarga) sutras followed by exceptional (apavāda) sutras to them, with many other techniques adopted therein. To the authors of the third phase, on the other hand, the formation of words was the primary consideration and they rearranged the rules of Ast under the grammatical topics like sandhi, karakas, samasas etc. The Rup of DK is the earliest work of this type. It is followed by later works like Rūpasālā of Vimalasarasvatī, Prakriyāratna of unknown authorship, PK of Ramacandra, PS of Narayana Bhatṭa and SK of BD. The SK of BD is the best work of this type which became the most popular of all the works of the Paninian system. But, at the same time it cannot be forgotten that it is the Rup of DK that laid the foundation-stone for the latter.
Aim and scope of the work:

The aim and scope of the work is explicitly mentioned by the author himself in the second one among the two introductory verses of the work. The verse runs as follows:

*sarvajñamanantanagunan pranamyā balaprabodhānārthamidam /
ṛūpaṇavatāramalpaṃ sukālapanrjum kariṣyāmi //*

In K though we get a detailed description of the rules of Ast, we find that these rules are dealt with in the order of Ast itself. Hence it was not an easy method, especially for the beginners of Sanskrit grammar, to arrive at the rupas or accomplished forms and to understand their prekriyā, since the sutras needed to get a particular form (ṛūpa), are scattered in the different chapters of Ast. Hence for the beginners of Sanskrit grammar (balanam) the author aims to bring within the limit of this work a concise, well-framed and straightforward exposition of rupas or accomplished forms, which is achieved as we see, by the rearrangement of the Paninian rules. We thus find that Rup is the first attempt in this field and as such, it has succeeded well by making the study of the Paninian grammar easier.

The title of the work:

DK has given a significant title to his work. Unlike
his illustrious predecessors in the grammatical field, DK was able to cut a profile of his own by viewing the Paninian rules from a quite different angle. In order to make the accomplished forms within the easy reach of the reader, he gave a new frame to the Paninian rules in which they are arranged to introduce the rupa or accomplished form, as easy as possible. Thus he gives more stress to the forms (rupas) than to the rules which help to arrive at them. It may be this factor which prompted him to give the title, 'Rupavatara' to his work. The compound word 'Rupavatara' can be explained as: rutanam avatarah rupavatara.

However, it cannot be ignored that the rupas are presented on the basis of the Paninian rules which also have no less an important role in his work. The different sections of Rup have got the sub-titles samjnavatara, samhitavatara, krdantavatara, etc. which also have the same significance.

The second part of Rup has got a sub-title as 'Dhatu-

pratyayapancika. According to the sense of the word,

4. 'rupavatara' means presentation of rupas. In a secondary sense, the work which deals with 'rupavatara' (i.e. presentation of rupas) can be designated as 'Rupavatara'
the title can mean a part or section in which the five
groups of suffixes that are added to roots are dealt with.
Hence it can be said that the second part is termed as
‘Dhatupratyayapancika’ as it deals with the five suffixes
tiṇ, san, nic yañ and krt which are added to roots.
A similar interpretation is given by Adyaprasadamisra.5
Rang makes a remark: "it goes by the name of Dhatupratyaya-
pancika, which means that it is a well-ordered exposition
of the roots of the language along with their formative
and inflectional suffixes as are found in the structure of
finite verbs and other primary derivatives."6

It seems that Dpp has got another title Tiñantasiromani,
for, at the end of the yañlukpariccheda of the second part
of Rup, we get the colophon ‘iti tiñantasiromanau yañluk-
paricchedah’.7 ‘Tiñantasiromani’ means ‘that which has
got tiñanta as the head-decorating gem’ and this title
is quite befitting to the second part of Rup i.e., Dpp, in

5. Vide Prakriyakaumudivimarsah: ‘tatra pāncikāsabdaprayogena
mayaivamaniyate yat tasmin prakarana pāncachā pratyaya
vihitān vartante/ tadyathā sudhadhātubhyo tiñkradbhedena
pratyayānām prakāradvayam / evam sapratyayadhātubhyo tiñ-
nyantasannantaṣyahantabhedena ca traidhamityevasṛitya
pāncanām pratyayānām nirdeṣena dhatupratyayapanciketyuktam’. p.12

6. Vide Preface to Rup P - II

7. P - II, p. 211
as much as all the various sections of the same except the
tenth one (krdantavatara), cite tinantarupas. Yudhisthira
Nimamsaka points out that in the index kept in the Adyar
Sanskrit Library, a manuscript of dhatupatha is mentioned
wherein we get a reference to a work by name "tishntasiromani:
"tishntasiromaniritya dhatavo likhyante". Since in the
second part of Rup, DK does not mention all the roots, but
only a select few of them coming under the ten ganas, this
reference can in all probability, be to the second part of
Rup.

Contents:
The work is divided into two sections purvabhaga and
uttarabhaga. The first part (purvabhaga) contains eight
sections which are termed as avantaras. They are samajnavatara,
sambitavatara, vibhaktyavatara, avyayavatara, strip ratified
vatara, karakavatara, samanavatara, and tadhavatara. The
second part named 'dhatuprathyayapancika' opens with a very
brief introductory section in which the purpose of the various
anubandhas in roots, lakaras and tih suffixes, as well as
the division of roots, into saka made and akasaka as also
into parasmaipadin, atsmopadin and ubhayapadin, are given

8. Vide Vyakaran Sastr Ka Itihas P - II p.116
mention. Then follows the ten sections śārvadhatukapariccheda, ārdhadhatukapariccheda, saṃnaptapariccheda, yañantapariccheda, yañukpariccheda, hetumānic (niñanta) pratyayamānapariccheda, subchātapariccheda, tīṅvibhaktyartha and kṛdantāvatāra.⁹

Pūrvabhāge:

1. Saṃjñāvatāra: After the two introductory verses the work rightly opens with the Mahesvarasutras which are inevitable for the understanding of pratyaharas. The different pratyaharas and a few samjñas are dealt with citing the relevant rules of Pan. Contextually phonetic matters like the various places of articulation and different modes of articulation of phonemes are also explained.

2. Saṁjñāvatāra: This deals with euphonic combination.

The six types of sandhis viz. tuksandhi, svarasandhi, prakrtisandhi, vyāñjanasandhi and visargasandhi are dealt with here.

9. The sections dealing with hetumānic (niñanta) and tīṅvibhaktyartha are not designated by him either as pariccheda or avatāra and he concludes these sections saying: "iti niñantaḥ"and "iti tīṅvibhaktyarthāḥ" (rup p. II pp. 227 & 241)
3. **Vibhaktyavatāra:** This avatāra deals with declensions classed into ājanta and halanta under which the masculine, feminine and neuter are given in order. A fourth variety, viz. 'aliṅga' is dealt with separately under the halanta section.

4. **Avayavatāra:** The indeclinables are dealt with here. The avyayas coming under ganas like cādi, svarādi etc. and the avyayas pertaining to the addition of certain krt and taddhita suffixes are enumerated.

5. **Strīpratuyavatāra:** Here the rules of Ast governing the pratyayyas like tap āp, ān, ān, ūn, ti are dealt with. Wherever necessary, rules other than those governing strīpratyayyas are also explained for the sake of word formation.

6. **Kāraṇavatāra:** This deals with the meaning of the case suffixes (subvibhakti) which convey kāraka relation. Though the avatāra is termed kāraṇavatāra, it is also concerned with the sense of prathamśvibhakti and saṃśvibhakti which do not convey any kāraka relation.

7. **Samasavatāra:** This avatāra deals with the compounds. There are six sections dealing with avyayibhāva, tatpurusa (including dvigu, karmadharaya and naṃsamaśa), bahuvarīhi, dvandva (including okasea) samasanta and alugadisamāśarayavidhi.
8. **Taddhitavatara:** Here the derivation of the nominal bases derived by the addition of secondary suffixes like \( \text{an} \), \( \text{ān} \), dhak etc., to words in different cases in construction, to certain verbs and indeclinables are dealt with. The rules relating to the taddhita suffixes are given in a sequence following their order in Asta.

**Dhatupratyayapancika:**
The ten sections of **Dpp** are:

1. **Sarvadhatukapariccheda:** This is concerned with the conjugation in the four lakaras \( \text{lat} \), \( \text{laṅ} \), \( \text{lot} \) and \( \text{vidhiliṅ} \). He illustrates each of these lakaras with certain roots selected from the ten ganas. The passives occurring in the above said four lakaras are also dealt with here.

2. **Aradhadhatukapariccheda:** This deals with the conjugation in the six lakaras \( \text{āśirliṅ} \), \( \text{līt} \), \( \text{luṅ} \), \( \text{lūt} \), \( \text{lraṅ} \) and \( \text{lṛt} \). Here also each lakara is dealt with reference to certain roots selected from the ten ganas. The passives occurring in the said six lakaras are also explained here.

3. **Sannantapariccheda:** Here the desiderative forms of roots by the addition of the suffix 'sān' are dealt with.

4. **Yaśpariccheda:** This deals with the formation of the parasmaipada intensives and frequentatives by the application
of the suffix \( ya^\ddot{a} \)

5. \( \textit{Ka\text{\textael}ukpariccheda} \): This is on the formation of the \( \text{atmanepada} \) intensives and frequentatives where the suffix \( ya^\ddot{a} \) gets elided.

6. \( \textit{Hetumannic} \): This section deals with the causatives formed from the roots by adding the suffix \( nic \) taught by the rule \( \text{\textquotesingle} \textit{hetumati ca\textquotesingle} \) (3-1-26).

7. \( \textit{Fratyayasalapariccheda} \): This deals with the rosary of suffixes that comes after the root by which we get forms like \( \text{bhuhusayati} \), \( \text{bh\text{\check{a}}vayisati} \), \( \text{bh\text{\check{a}}vayisayisati} \) etc.

8. \( \textit{Subdh\text{\check{a}}tupariccheda} \): Here the denominative verbs i.e. the verbs formed from nominal bases by adding suffixes like \( \text{kyac} \), \( \text{kyas} \) \( \text{kyan} \) etc. are given.

9. \( \textit{Tilvibhaktyartha} \): This deals with the sense of the moods and tenses.

10. \( \textit{Krdant\text{\check{a}}vat\check{a}ra} \): The primary suffixes like \( \text{satr} \), \( \text{nvul} \), \( \text{trc} \), \( \text{sn} \), \( \text{kta} \), \( \text{kvip} \) etc. added to roots giving rise to the primary nominal bases comprising the participles and verbal nouns, form the subject of this final section.
SOURCES:

Among the most important sources of the work, the Ast of PAN, the Paniniyasika, the Mbh of PAT, the VAK of Bhartrhari, the K of Jayaditya and Vamana, the Nyasa of Jinendrabhddhi, the Pradipta of Kaiyata and the Padamanjari of Haradatta deserve special mention.

Astithyayi of Panini

Ast of PAN is the main source of Rup from which rules are selected and reshuffled for adopting the prakriya method. Out of the 4000 rules of Ast about (2381) rules are taken for interpretation by DK. Almost all the Vedic rules and the rules relating to svara are omitted in the work.

Paniniyasika:

Two verses from the Paniniyasika are quoted in Rup:10 These two verses ‘hakaram .............’ and ‘astau...........’ deal with the places of articulation of sounds.11 In this respect we find that DK closely follows the Paniniyasika whereas later grammarians do not adhere to what is said in

10. Vide Paniniyasika, p. 2 & Rup P - 1 pp. 4 & 5
11. Vide Infra p. 230
Māhābhāṣya of Patañjali:

It is clear that DK has made a thorough study of MB for compiling his work. He has drawn a number of verses, nyayas and istics from it. All these are dealt with in the ensuing chapters. 13

Vākyapādiya of Bhartṛhari:

While interpreting the rules of Pan, DK rarely resorts to Vāk. We find that the 'vastupalaksanam..............' of Vāk, which deals with the nature of dravya is quoted in Rup. 14 So also the former half of the verse: 'nirvartyanca..............' dealing with the three varieties of karma is also adopted from Vāk. 15

Kaśika of Jayaditya and Vāmana:

It is worthy of mention that k is the foundation on

12. In sk while enumerating the places of articulation, BD speaks of only seven among those eight mentioned in Paniniyasika. He does not mention ursas as one among the places of articulation.

13. Vide infra chapters V, VI & VII

14. Vide Vāk bhuyodrayyasamuddeśa 3-4-3(p.75) &
Rup Part - I p.14

15. Vide Vāk sadhanasamuddeśa 3-7-45(p.82) &
Rup P - I p.146
which Rup is laid up. Thereby itself the study of Rup means the examination of its relation with K. No study of Rup can be possible without examining its relation with K. The present study itself makes this point clear.\(^{16}\)

**Nyasa of Jinendrabudhii:**

Nyasa has also its influence on Rup. While dealing with the aorist forms of the root kuṣ, DK cites the view of Jinendra, the author of Nyasa.\(^ {17}\) The verse: "prapāram ........................" mentioned in Nyasa under rule 1.1-14 is quoted in Rup.\(^ {18}\) So also the verse: "kvacit pravṛttih ........................" found quoted in Nyasa under the rule 3-3-1 is also given in Rup.\(^ {19}\)

**Pradīpa of Kāiyāta:**

The verse: "guna vrdhiguna ........................" of Kāiyāta seen in his Pradīpa is quoted in Rup while dealing with the rule 'jagatvicinnalītis' (7-3-85).\(^ {20}\)

**Padasanjarī of Haradatta:**

We know that DK was familiar with the Padasanjarī of Haradatta from his statement in Rup.\(^ {21}\) Moreover, the verse:

\(^ {16}\) Vide infra chapters VI, VII & VIII
\(^ {17}\) Vide supra p. 16
\(^ {18}\) Vide Infra p. 260.
\(^ {19}\) Vide Infra p. 261.
\(^ {20}\) Vide Pradīpa of Mbh under rule nedvasi kṛtī(7-2-8) & Rup P = II p. 165
\(^ {21}\) Vide Supra p. 16
The study of Rup was prevalent in Kerala. From ancient times itself this work was adopted in Kerala as a basic text for the study of Sanskrit grammar. It was the advent of the Sk of BD that put an end to the study of Rup.

We get three commentaries on the Rup from Kerala. They are 1. the Mivi of Saṅkara Varīyar, 2. the Tattvarthadipīka of a disciple of Narayana Bhatta, the author of FS and 3. a Malayalam commentary of unknown authorship. These commentaries themselves will suffice to prove the popularity of the work which it once enjoyed in Kerala.

Mivi

We know that the author of this commentary is Saṅkara Varīyar from the colophon: "iti pārasavakulatilakena sāṅkarāryena viracite nivīsamāke rūpavatāravyākhyāne astamah paricchedah." 23 Ullur S. Parameswara Iyer

22. Rup F - II p. 145
23. Vide the Nāt., No. 730, T.P. Vol. III
assigns this work to the 16th century A.D. \( ^{24} \) Though it is said that Sekhara Vāriyar of Desamaṅgalattu Vāriyam who was a friend of King Mañaveda of Calicut the commentator of Sūkasandesa, is the author of the work, Ullur S. Parameswara Iyer denies the same. He argues that there are no evidences to prove that Śaṅkara Vāriyar belonged to Desamaṅgalattu Vāriyam. He points out that Srikantaka Vāriyar, the commentator of Māgha, who belonged to Desamaṅgalattu Vāriyam does not refer to this Śaṅkara Vāriyar while mentioning his predecessors. Hence he says that the author of Mīvī cannot be assigned to a period before the commentator of Māgha. According to him the author of Mīvī might have lived in the 16th century A.D.

Yudhisthira Himamsaka refers to the author of Mīvī as Śaṅkararāma. \( ^{25} \) He says that the name Śaṅkara has been several times quoted by Nārāyana Bhaṭṭa in his Ps and if this reference is to the author of Mīvī then he must have lived before the 17th century A.D.

\( ^{24} \) Vide K.S.C. Vol. II pp. 409 & 410

\( ^{25} \) Vide Vyakaran Sastr Ka Itihās P-I pp. 482 & 483
We get six Mss. of this commentary from Kerala. Three of these Mss. deal with the first part of Rup. This commentary dealing with the first part of Rup, is accepted as Nīvī, though the name Nīvī is not mentioned in the following introductory verses found in these three Mss.

``
śrīganapataye namah / avighnamastu /
abhitrilokānāmāsāyatanavanti ye /
tebhyah kalyānahetubhyo bhūdevabhya namo namah
``

26. Vide Mss. Nos. 526A & 527 of T.C. Vol. III and 726 of T.T. Vol. III. It deserves mention that under the said Mss. Nos. seen in the T.C. and T.T. catalogues, the name of this commentary is wrongly given as Tattvārthadarśipīkā. For, in the introductory verses (quoted above) found in these Mss. we do not get the name 'Tattvārthadarśipīkā' whereas the name 'Tattvārthdarśipīkā' is mentioned in the entirely different introductory verses:

```

rupavatāratikām karoti tattvārthadarśipikām...
```

found in the Mss. of Tattvārthdarśipīkā (No. 302 T.P. & 525 T.C.)

27. Ullur gives the verses seen in the beginning of these three Mss. as the opening verses of Nīvī (Vide K.S.C. Vol. II 409 & 410)
abhigataśadabhijñapraṇāyopī svayam yah
prathamasamyasaṣajjadvāsaṇāvaśācitāṁ /
akalayadatihrdyaṁ sabdavidyānumodam
sa jayati navakirtih saṃmato dharmaṅkirtih //

amusya hrdi vārāhipratinidheḥ kṛtervyakṛtau
katham bhavati yogyata laghurapidrṇam maḍrṇam /
cirāṁmahadanugrahaḥihi tu labdhamāṇilavā
danumvaramahetave likhitayāmyaham kevalam //

atra rūpāyataśrasya pāthesu vividheśvapi
ekasayaiva prayatnoyamanuvṛtttyai vitanyate
granthārambhe maṅgalārtham granthakṛt
prasiddharasikatvāllaukikāsāryyā paramācāryam namasyati –
yenāksarasamāsāmyamitī–

In these verses the commentator first salutes Brahmins
and then pays tribute to DK whom he refers to as a
Buddhist who was originally a Brahmin. The commentator
also expresses here his intention to write a commentary
on Rup.

All these three Mas. are incomplete. In two of these

Mss. we get the colophon "iti samāsantaḥ" and "iti vyanjanasandhiḥ" respectively and the other ends with the part "tathā saktam:

ātmä buddhayā sametyārthāmano yuñkte vivaksayā / manah kāyāgnisāhanti sa prerayati mārūtam //

iti, taccā jñānam dvividham, samyaḥ mithyā ca / ubhaya- mapyetat brāhmanasabdams pravartayati tatra samyagjñānam.29

We also get a similar Ms. from the Oriental Manuscripts Library of Madras University.30 It begins with the same verses seen in the above Mss. and breaks off in the middle.

Among the six Mss. of the commentary Mīś, mentioned already, we find that three of them deal with the second part of Rūp.31 In one of these manuscripts we get the colophon: "iti pārasavakulatilakena saṅkarāryena virācita nīvisamjñāke rūpavatāravyākhyāne astamah paricchedah" wherein the name of the commentator as well as the commentary is mentioned.32

30. Vide Ms. No. 1573 M.C. Vol. X
32. Vide Supra p. 43
Tattvārthadīpikā

We get another commentary on Rup by name Tattvārthadīpikā. We get two Ms. of the work. Here we get the beginning as:

hariḥ / āriganapataye namah / āvighnamastu /

āvighnamastu śivayoh sucaritrāṅguram mahah
bandhujivacchavinibham bandhuram bandhurāṇamanam
natvā sarvasvakrtam nārāyanamamalacaritamācaryam
rūpāvatārātikām tattvārthadīpikām karoti kascit
prāripsitasya granthasyāvighnaparissamāptyaḥsvārtham
samuciteśtādevatārāpamācaryam pranamati - yenetyādina

One of these Ms. breaks off in the middle of ajantapullinga-prakarana. In the other Ms. we get the colophon:

'iti rūpāvatārātikāyam tattvārthadīpikāyamāstamah
paricchedah
ārīnārāyanakarunayttikā tattvārthadīpikā
samāptā parigrhnantu sajjanaḥ vītamsatsarah //

hariharahiranyagarbhebhyo namah //'

34. Vide Ms. No. 802, T.P. Vol. III
35. Vide Ms. No. 525, T.C. Vol. III
We know that the author of this commentary is a student of Narayana Bhatta from the two verses 'nātvā sarvasvākṛtam......' 'śrīnarāyanākārṇyat........' seen at the beginning and end respectively, of the work. 36 Vadakkumkur identifies the author of this work with Narayanan Namputiri of Valanallur also known as Madhom Namputiri. 37 But Ullur doubts the probability of this identification. 38

Malayalam commentary

We also get an anonymous Malayalam commentary on Rup. There are two Mss. which give the text of Rup along with this Malayalam Commentary. 39 One of these Mss. begin with the svarasandhi and breaks off in the middle of the taddhita section. 40 The other Ms. starts from the beginning of Rup and ends somewhere in the middle of the second part of Rup. 41

36. Vide Supra p. 48 & vide Kunjunni Raja, *Contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature* p. 152
40. Vide Mss. No. 523 T.C. Vol. III
41. Vide Mss. No. 524 A, T.C. Vol. III