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CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORK

Rup is a unique attempt in the history of Sanskrit grammar by its novel treatment of Ast, quite different from the style existant upto that time. It is the first remodelling of Ast. Though not the most prominent among the various recasts of Ast, which in course of time came into existence, it is DK’s Rup that gave the start to a new treatment of Ast. It is this unique feature of Rup, which makes it a notable one from the earlier and later works of even illustrious authors in the field. Hence, in this chapter, we are concerned with the characteristic features of this work. The defects and drawbacks of the work, are also viewed here.

Among the two introductory verses in Rup, the second one is noteworthy while examining the characteristic features of this work.¹ In these verses DK pays homage to PAN and then refers to Buddha for purpose of salutation

1. yenaksarasamamnayamadhyagamya mahesvarat /
krsnam vyakaranam proktam tasmai paninaye namah //
sarvajnamanantagunam pranamsya balaprabodhanarthamidam /
rupavataramalpan sukalapamrjan karisyami // (p.1)
and states that his work is meant to give aid to the
beginners of grammar by providing them with a concise,
well-framed and straightforward exposition, of rupas or
accomplished forms, which is achieved, as we see, by re-
shuffling the sutras of Ast, and excluding grammatical in-
tricacies. Thus it can be seen that the foremost chara-
cpteristic feature of the work is that it is a remodelling
of Ast, to be more correct, the first of the kind. Certain
characteristic features of the work are, in one way or
other, related to this fact. Hence we are to discuss the
characteristic features of the work in a two-fold manner
viz. (1) Characteristics of the work as a recast of Ast
and (2) Salient features of the work in particular.

Characteristics of the work as a recast

Among the general characteristic features of the
work as a recast, we first notice that it is the first
remodelling of Ast. Secondly, we find that in it we get
a subjectwise grouping of the sutras of Ast. Lastly we
find that this rearrangement of the Ast, is meant for the
purpose of the accomplishment of pariniṣṭhitarūpa or the
final level of utterance and hence the work is chara-
cterised by the method of illustration found in it.
1. The first remodelling of Asti

The first notable feature of Rup is that it is in this work that we get for the first time in the history of Sanskrit grammar, a rearrangement of the sutras of PAN. This is secured by giving readily and regularly all the sutras that help to arrive at the accomplished form. It is, hence, quite evident that the order of the sutras of Ast cannot be maintained in this work. This must naturally block the easy understanding of the meanings of the sutras of Ast, since a Paninian rule is not self-sufficient by containing in itself all the words essential for the conveyance of its idea and moreover, many of the words for a rule are to be got mainly by anuvrtti from previous rules and rarely by apakāra from the succeeding rules. To a person who follows the order of the sutras in Ast this difficulty will not hence arise.

2. BK mentions the apakāra of the word vā for the rule kṣaṇāt (5-3-12) from the succeeding rule vā ha ca sūhardasi (5-3-13) Rup F - I p. 290
This unavoidable defect thus caused by changing the order of the rules of Ast, is wonderfully and cleverly rectified in Rup by giving first the sutras that are necessary for the anuvrtti of words for a sutra before interpreting the same. For example, before interpreting the rule 'svaujasamaat......'(4-1-2) DK gives the rules 'pratyayah' (3-1-1) 'parasca' (3-1-2), nyapratipadat (4-1-1), and says, 'ityanuvartaman ; svaujasamaat......'(4-1-2) and then only gives the meaning. The work abounds in such similar examples. Thus it can be seen that even by tilting the table of Ast, DK has succeeded in keeping in tact, the contents placed over there. The other characteristic features of this work owe their origin in one way or other to this wonderful treatment of Ast by DK.

2. Subjectwise grouping of the rules of Ast:

This is the foremost characteristic feature of a recast of Ast since, it is the subjectwise grouping of the sutras of Ast, that resulted in modelling them. It is worthy of mention here that the effort of the author in this regard is praiseworthy. That he was to divide his work into two major parts and to subdivide them into

3. Vide Part - I p.23
different avatāras and paricchedas, is, itself, the outcome of this subjectwise grouping. In samjñāvatāra we get samjñasutras and vidhisutras which in Ast are scattered in the first three padas. Thus the sutras scattered in the three padas of Ast are grouped in this avatāra, so as to teach the student the operation of pratyāhāra and savarnagrahana. So also in samhitāvatāra, we get six types of sandhis vis. tuksandhi, svarasandhi, prakrtisandhi, vyājanasandhi, visarjanīyasandhi and svādisandhi. From Ast or K, one cannot easily gather the sandhis because the rules of tuksandhi are scattered in the first pada of the sixth chapter and the third pada of the 8th chapter, the rules of svarasandhi in the first pada of the 6th chapter, some of the rules of both the halseandhi and visarjanīyasandhi in the third pada of the 8th chapter, those of the svādisandhi in the second and third pada of the 8th chapter and in the first pada of the 6th chapter. Thus it may be said that the subjectwise treatment of the rules of sandhi into six divisions by DK makes the study of these easier. This subjectwise grouping of rules is likewise evident in all the successive avatāras and paricchedas.
3. Method of illustration:

Another striking feature of Rup is seen in the mode of illustration of sutras. The accomplished forms are the main tenets of the work and it is in order to illustrate and point out a particular form that rules are introduced and interpreted in this work. We thus find that rules are given secondary importance as it were in this recast. To begin with the first avatarā, it is to illustrate the anpratyāhāra that the rules 'halantyam' (1-3-3) and 'ādirantarvamahēta' (1-1-71) etc. are taken by him for interpretation. Thus it is well evident that when Ast gives its stress on the grammatical rules which consequently make us aware of the rūpas, in Rup the situation is vice versa. The reader is first informed of a particular rūpa or form and the author turns his attention to narrate the process of formation of the same for which he has accidentally and unavoidably resort to the interpretation of the rules of Ast. This is indicated in the naming itself of the work as 'Rūpa-vatāra'. The originality of the work owes much to this factor.

4. Ibid p. 1 & 2
Salient features of the work in particular

Among the salient features of the work, when viewed particularly, the following are noteworthy. The fact that it is an abridgement of Ast, deserves mention first of all. The others viz. the emphasis it lays on the rupa of classical Sanskrit alone, the motive force of the work to educate a beginner, coherence of the work, the systematic classification of the subject matter noticed in it, the superb style of interpretation found in it, a mere reference made to certain rules of Ast and the citation of verses meant for the explanation and illustration of rules; all these give to Rup a place of its own, not only among the different recasts of Ast, but also in the realm of the study of Sanskrit grammar itself.

1. An abridgement of Ast:

Rup is characterised from the earlier works on Ast like K etc. in the fact that it is an abridgement of Ast. While remodelling Ast, DK has achieved the purpose of an abridgement of it also which is calculated for the benefit of the beginners of grammar. The fact that DK has made a selection of Paninian rules for his work has resulted
in making an abridged recast of it. After selecting the Paninian rules, he himself has grouped them under different headings to suit his purpose of the easy understanding of the parinisthitarupa or the final level of utterance. It can also be seen that the selection and omission of the rules of Ast in Rup is justifiable to a great extent since it paves the way for the novel treatment of the science of grammar. It is thus very clear that the selection and omission of the rules of Ast is a unique feature, which resulted in its abridgement as well as paved the way for its simplicity as opposed to the grammatical engrossment and enrichment of the work.

2. **Emphasis laid on the rupa of Classical Sanskrit alone**

Another characterizing feature of Rup among the recasts of Ast is the emphasis it lays on classical Sanskrit alone and it is that which actually resulted in the abridgement of Ast. DK's intention was to deal with the vocabulary of Classical Sanskrit. Therefore he deals with rules concerned with Classical Sanskrit alone.
and in his work rules dealing with Vedic Sanskrit, (except in certain rare instances) are omitted. The rules of the second pada of the first chapter, relating to svara except the three rules uccairudāttah (1-1-29), 'nicairanu-
udāttah' (1-1-30) and 'samāhāraḥ svaritah (1-1-31) which define udatta, anudatta and svarita respectively, have been omitted. So also the second pada of the 6th chapter of Ast which deals with svara has been completely omitted.

3. Motivated to educate the beginner:

The fact that the work is designed with the purpose of educating a beginner strikes one, as one of the characteristic features of this work. The access for a beginner to the realm of Sanskrit is made easy all through the composition of the work. In order to point out as to how, long and prolate vowels are enunciated, even though not enumerated in the Sivasutras, he introduces the rules

5. The sutras dealing with Vedic Sanskrit and selected by DK are:

1. 'śāpaśajñā' (6-3-63) P = I p.209
2. 'nāsyati'.............(3-1-51) P = II p.165
3. 'chandasi saha' (3-2-63) P = II p.221
He then enumerates the varieties of each and every vowel and consonant and then states that these varieties are comprehended by the letters enumerated in the fourteen Sivasutras. Contextually he enumerates the athanas and prayatnas also. Such is the simplicity of his narration that a beginner does never find any difficulty in understanding him.

Again while explaining the procedure of sandhi for the first time, he points out as to how the vowel 'a' in deva in the proximity of the word chatram gets tugāgama and the like, and how the combined form devacchatram is got. Then he makes a statement ‘ślistoccaranam kartavyam, devacchatram iti siddham bhavati.' It means that sandhi operations occur only when there is sāmhitā and hence one has to utter the letters of the combined form in their maximum proximity.

6. "katham punaranupadistā dirghādayo gṛhyante? savarnagrahanāt katham ......." (Rup p. 3.)

7. Rup Part I p. 7
Such a statement is in reminder of this fact already indicated by the name 'Samhitāvatāra' and it is well evident that the same is exclusively meant for a beginner.

4. Coherence of the work:

Another notable feature of the work, is its coherence which is maintained throughout the work and DK deserves special appreciation for it. Since the work is intended to give a readymade knowledge of grammatical formations and not the exposition of Pāṇi's Ast, DK gives individual introduction for almost all the sutras before interpreting the same. Never does he directly take a rule for interpretation without an introduction which is sometimes in the form of a question. Whatever the mode of introduction be, he never refrains from giving it. The work therefore begins with the sentence 'tatrādau tāvat pratyahārassastre samvyavahārajñāpanārtham anuvarnyate.' He points out that it is the pratyahāra that is taken by him first for explanation since it makes us familiar with the treatment of the

8. Rup Part - I p. 1
subject matter in this science of grammar. Thus after introducing the pratyāhāra, he says that an is the first one among the pratyāhāras. Arousing the anxiety of the student as to how it is obtained he brings the rule 'halantyaṃ' (1.3-3) to the stage with the rule 'upadese-janumāṣika it' (1.3-2) as its predecessor which is necessary for the anuvṛtti of the word upadese and it in 'halantyaṃ'. Thus the work from the beginning to the end seems to be a continuous narration of relevant facts and ideas, and we find that DK aims at the coherence of the work by means of this introductive style of interpretation.

5. **Systematic classification of the subject matter**:

Rup is remarkable for its systematic classification of the subject matter. The contents of Ast are dealt with in two major sections, the latter being named by him as 'dhatupratyayapañcika'. The principle underlying this two-fold division is the two-fold classification of padas into subjanta and tifanta which have got prati-padika and dhatu as their bases respectively. It can

9. Vide Supra p.34
be seen that the former part of the work is concerned with prātipadika and the latter is concerned with dhatu. In the first part of the work, immediately after dealing with the preliminary details of letters and their combination he deals with the operation that are related to prātipadika viz. the sup suffixes and feminine suffixes that are added to it, the taddhita suffixes that are added to the sup-inflected prātipadika and the composition of the sup-inflected prātipadikas to form different kinds of samasas. In the latter part the addition of the different suffixes like tin krt etc. to dhatu are dealt with. It can also be seen that the further subdivision of these parts into different avataaras and paricchedas, is also based on certain principles with which we are to deal with in the following chapter. 10

6. Superb style of interpretation:

Sukh is endowed with a superb style of interpretation which adheres to the need of the ‘bāla’, the beginner. The sutras are provided with a vṛtti which is very simple and straight-forward. DK while interpreting a rule, does not always care for brevity nor does he attempt to

10. Vide Infra pp. 98 to 116
introduce grammatical controversies. Hence he does not perplex the reader or demand strenuous effort from him to understand his work. Even, rules are repeatedly interpreted with a view to the easy understanding of the context. 11 We are to dwell on his style of interpretation as well as the interpretation of various rules in the following chapter. 12

7. *Mere reference to certain rules of Ast*

Another distinguishing feature of *Rup* is that in it we meet with the novelty of the mere mention of sutras without their interpretation by the author. Many a rule of Ast is mentioned in this work for the single purpose of the anuvrtti of words contained in it. So also certain sutras of Ast are referred to here to justify certain usages on the basis of similar usages found in the sutras. A detailed study of both kinds of these rules, is attempted in the following chapter. 13

11. Vide Infra pp. 128, 310 & 311
12. Vide Infra pp. 120 to 140
13. Vide Infra pp. 116 to 120
8. **Citation of verses:**

The citation of verses is a meritorious feature of Rup. DK has cited wherever he deems necessary, verses of his own as well as of others which help to illustrate and explain the sutras of PAN. This has won applause from later authors. In Gunaśagara’s commentary to Ṛṛṣiparunaga-kaṇṭakka, a Tamil work by Amiṭasāgara, we find that the verses in Ṛup are referred to as a complementary feature of this work.\(^{14}\) A brief survey of the verses cited in Ṛup is made in the coming chapter.\(^ {15}\)

Finally, it may be pointed out here that the author has indicated almost all the characteristic features of this work in the introductory verses:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yenākaśaranaśamanamadhigamyā mahēśvarat} & / \\
kṛtvanam vyākaranam proktam tasmāi pāṇinaye namah & // \\
\text{sarvajñānanantagunam pranamya bālaprabodhanārthamidam} & / \\
\text{ṛūpavatāramalpam sukalāpamṛjum karisyāmi} & //
\end{align*}
\]

The mention of the name of the work, "Ṛūpavatāra", in the verse shows that it is a remodelling of Aṣṭ in order to

\(^{14}\) Vide infra p. 229

\(^{15}\) Vide infra pp. 229 to 230
cater to the rupas and hence the main stress is laid here on rupas and not on the Paninian rules. The author has kept in his work, the grammatical spirit of Ast, to a great extent and it is indicated by saluting PAN as one who enunciated the science of grammar. The adjective 'alpan' to ṛupāvatāram in the verse, shows that the work is an abridged recast. The adjective sukalāpam hints at the coherence of the work as well as the systematic classification of the subject matter whereas the adjective ṛjun shows the simplicity and lucidity which characterises the interpretation of the rules. The part 'bāla- prabodhanārtham' marks it as one meant for a beginner, original in presentation, profuse in incorporating everything useful to the context and introducing all relevant details. All these characterise the work as one having a superb style of interpretation.

Defects and drawbacks

As common to any form of new invention or creation, ṿrup, the first recast of Ast, is also wanting in certain respects and it is not at all flawless. This imperfection is discernable most clearly when viewing the work as a
source for getting the knowledge of the contents of Ast. Secondly, one is inclined to charge him of over-enthusiasm while executing the purpose of the accomplishment of the rupas and one may find in his work a less meritorious method of re-arrangement of rules. Since the avowed aim of the author is not the exposition of Ast, only those defects, noted secondly, are more prominent. It can thus be pointed out that Rup is not free from defects and drawbacks which are being discussed now.

1. Omission of necessary rules:

It is only natural that Rup cannot comprehend all the rules of Ast since it is envisaged as an abridged recast of the same, by the author as stated in the latter part of the second introductory verse. The author has omitted almost all the rules relating to Vedic language and many other rules relating to Classical Sanskrit. Such kind of omission of rules cannot be regarded as defective since the same is a must for executing the purpose of the abridgement of Ast, even though Narayana Bhatta

16. 'rupavatāranalanam sukalapamṛjum karisyāmi' (P - I p.1)
17. Vide Infra p. 116 to 118
in his introductory verse to PS points out the omis-

sion itself of the rules of Ast as a major defect of

Rup. Here, we are therefore, concerned with the omis-
sion of only such rules of Ast which must have never
been excluded from Rup so as to suit the purpose of
creating even a simplified or abridged recast of Ast.

It can be pointed out that the omission of such rules
is really defective. For example, he has omitted
the two paribhāṣā rules 'tasminniti....' (1-1-66)

and 'tasmadityuttarasya' (1-1-67). These two rules
deal with the sense of the locative and ablative cases
used in sutras and generally these cases are not used
in the Sanskrit language in the sense taught by these
rules. Therefore, while dealing with the rule 'che ca'
(6-1-73) in the samhitāvatāra, where he first inter-
prets this rule, he ought to have mentioned the paribhāṣā
rule 'tasminniti.....' to explain the locative case
used in the word 'che'. But without giving any interpre-
tation or reference to this rule he gives the meaning
of the word 'che' as chakare parataḥ. 

18. '.................rupavatāre punah
kaumudyādisu cātra śūtramakhilam nastyeva.....'

(PS. P - I p.2)

19. Rup P - I P.6
So also while interpreting the rule ‘anasi ca’ (8-4-47) where the word ‘aca’ in the ablative case, is got by anuvratti, he gives the meaning of the word ‘aca’ as aca uttarsaya without making any reference to the pari-
hāsa rule ‘tasmad….’ Hence the reader may naturally find it difficult to know as to how the words ‘che’ and ‘aca’ could mean che paratah and aca uttarsaya respectively.

2. Shortcomings in the re-arrangement of the rules of Ast:

One major defect of the re-arrangement of the sutras, is that the process of adhikāra, anuvrtti and the technique of pūrvatrasiddham in Ast, are disturbed. Though the author has tried his maximum to avert this by readily giving the rules necessary for anuvrtti and giving reference to anidhatva; this defect is unavoidably seen in his work as well as in all other recasts, as a must since the process of adhikāra, anuvrtti and the technique of pūrvatrasiddham could be readily understood from the order of Ast alone. In addition to this, certain

20. Ibid p. 6
inaccuracies have crept in the rearrangement of the rules of Ast. They are pointed out now.

While dealing with tatpurusaśamāsā, he mentions the adhikāra rule 'vibhāṣā' (2-1-11) before the rule 'tatpurusah' (2-1-22) which is made optional on account of this adhikāra rule.²¹ It is noteworthy here that by this adhikāra rule, 'vibhāṣā', the two rules 'apapari... ....!' (2-1-12) and 'āvā... ....' (2-1-13) are also made optional. But he does not mention this adhikāra rule 'vibhāṣā' while dealing with these two rules in the avyayābhava section which comes before the tatpurusa section in his work.²² Even though this rule 'vibhāṣā' is not mentioned there, he interprets the said two rules (apapari...... & āvā... ....) to be optional. Hence one may naturally entertain a doubt as to how the function of these two rules becomes optional. Therefore he could have better mentioned the rule 'vibhāṣā' before the said two rules 'apapari....' and 'āvā....' which come in the avyayābhava section, than, before the rule 'tatpurusah' in the tatpurusa section. Or he could have at least made mention of the rule 'vibhāṣā' in both

²¹. Ibid p. 171
²². Ibid p. 169
the places since he always makes repetition of one and the same rule on several occasions. 23

So also in the vibhakti-avatāra he speaks of the contingency of the function of the paribhāṣā rule ‘ādeh parasya’ (1-1-54) while dealing with the rule ‘atō bhisa ais’ (7-1-9) and points out that the paribhāṣā rule ‘anekāśītsarvasya’ (1-1-55) operates in the said rule defeating the function of the paribhāṣā rule ‘ādeh parasya’ 24. To the reader of Rūp, there is no possibility of a doubt regarding the contingency of the function of the rule ‘ādeh parasya’ in the rule ‘atō bhisa ais’ since the author has not made mention of the rule ‘ādeh parasya’ earlier. Therefore, strictly speaking, this is not the proper context to present the rule ‘ādeh parasya’. Moreover quite early in the vyaṇja-ānanda of samhitā-avatāra itself, there was the context, for mention of the rule ‘ādeh parasya’, i.e., while dealing with the rule ‘udāsā sthāsathambhah…….’ (8-4-61). 25 It is by the function of the paribhāṣā rule ‘ādeh…………’

23. Vide Infra pp. 128, 310 & 311
24. Rūp F - I p. 33
25. Ibid p. 18
in the rule 'udah sthā... ...' that the purvasavarna taught by it, substitutes the initial letter 's' of the roots sthā and sthambh which occur after the upasarga 'ud'. But without mentioning the rule 'ādah parasya' in this context, he simply incorporates its meaning in the interpretation given to the rule 'udah......' And the reader is sure to find himself at a dismay, as to how such an idea is derived.

Again it is in the vibhaktyavatāra that he includes the rules 'bhuvādayo dhātavah' (1-3-1) and 'upasargah kriyāyoge' (1-4-59) which teach the term dhātu and upasarga, whereas quite early in the samhitāvatāra itself, he had dealt with the rules which are concerned with dhātu and upasarga. Hence, in samhitāvatāra itself, he could have rearranged these two samjñā rules before the rule 'ānī pararūpam' (6-1-94) which is concerned with the euphonic combination of dhātu and upasarga. These inaccuracies in the rearrangement of the rules of Ast, are definite to strike one while going through the work.

26. Ibid pp. 42 & 51
27. Ibid p. 10
3. Drawbacks in the presentation of rupas:

It has already been stated that the conception itself of the work by the author, was to present the rupas readily and regularly to the beginner of Sanskrit grammar and hence the author has tried his best and succeeded to a great extent in the task of presenting the rupas in their maximum number and in the easiest method of presentation. Yet the same too, cannot be pointed out to be free from fault. For example while dealing with the conjugation, he presents the tīmanta-rupas in the two categories of sārvadhātukalakāra and ārdhadhātukalakāra. He selects certain roots from the ten ganas and cites their rupas in the lakāra lat first, then in laṁ, next in lot and finally in vidhiliṅ. Then he passes on to the ārdhadhātukalakāras where also the rupas of roots selected from the ten ganas are given in the lakāra, asārlīṅ first. Then the rupas in the other laṁ, lakāras are given in the order of līṭ, lūt, lāṁ and lṛt. Therefore, to a student who tries to study the different rupas of the root bhu, it is the forms of other roots in the lakāra lat that follow the rupas of the root bhu.
in the latprakarana. Therefore he has to make a leap to the laṅprakarana wherein also he can get the forms of the root bhū in the lakāra laṅ only.

Thus he has to master the whole ten prakaranas in order to understand the different conjugational forms of a single root bhū. Hence, the difficulty in this kind of citation, is that the student gets puzzled with regard to the rūpas of one and the same root in all the lakāras as the same cannot be understood readily at one time from the work.

4. Lack of explanation:

Before interpreting a rule DK generally cites rules from which words are got by anuvṛtti in that particular rule. It is in this respect that we find lack of explanation. He gives the same remark ‘iti vartamāne’ in both circumstances where a rule is to be completely

28. Ṛṣipā I p. 8
29. Ibid p. 51
got by anuvṛtti as well as where one or two words of a particular rule is to be partially got by anuvṛtti.

For example the rule ‘ato dīrgho yānī’ (7-3-101) is completely got by anuvṛtti in the rule supi ca (7-3-102).

Here he says ‘ato dīrgho yānī iti vartamāne, supi ca....’.\(^{31}\)

But the word ‘ś’ alone of the rule ‘jāsah śi’ (7-1-17) is got by anuvṛtti in the rule ‘aśa āpah’ (7-1-18). Here too he says ‘jāsah śi iti vartamāne aśa āpah’.....’.\(^{32}\)

Hence the student cannot understand at a glance when a rule is to be completely or partially got by anuvṛtti.

So also he does not specify clearly as to whether a word is got by anuvṛtti or adhikāra making a synonymous usage of the expressions ‘ityanuvartamāne, iti vartamāne and ityadhikārya though technically there is difference between anuvṛtti and adhikāra. For example, before interpreting the rule ‘che ca’ (6-1-73) he says ‘hrasvasya piti kṛtī tuk’(6-1-71) sāṃhitāyām (6-1-72),

\(^{31}\) Ibid p. 33

\(^{32}\) Ibid p. 61
Here it is to be noted that the rule 'hrasvasya piti......' has got a specific meaning of its own and the word *hrasvasya* is taken from it for the rule 'che ca' by the technical process known as *anuvrtti* as expressed in the traditional maxim

'sūtresvadṛṣṭam padam sutrāntarādanuvartaniyam sarvatra'.

But the rule 'samhitāyām', being an *adhiro* rule, has no specific meaning of its own, and simply provides the word *samhitāyām* to many a latter rule among which the rule 'che ca' is also the one to be benefitted by the word. This kind of availability of a word in a rule is what is known by the technical process 'adhikāra'. Therefore, he could have stated clearly 'samhitāyām ityadhikāre hrasvasya ityanuvartamāne'. Hence the common usage 'ityanuvartamāne' points out lack of specification.

Moreover, when a change is to be effected in regard to the case or number of a word got by *anuvrtti* (i.e., *anuvrtti* along with *vacanaviparināma* or *vibhāktiviparināma*)

DK does not specifically mention the same, but gives the usual vague remark 'ityanuvartamāne'. For example the word

33. Ibid p. 6
34. Grammarians say: "adhikāro nāma uttarātra sambandhah"
'pratyayādīnām' of the rule 'āyaneśī...........(7-1-2)

is to be got by anuvṛtti, with the change of the plural
number into singular as 'pratyayādeśā', in the rule
'jhontah' (7-1-3) so as to qualify the word jhah. But
he does not speak of this vacanaviparītā and merely
says: "āyaneśīniyīyah phadakhyachaghāṃ pratyayādīnām
ityanuvartamāne jhontah........"35

5. Unnecessary explanation:

Quite different from the above, one meets with
certain instances in Rup where explanations, which are
not relevant or strictly essential, are given. For example,
in the Vibhaktivyavātāra, after dealing with the declensional
forms of the masculine stems ending in the vowel 'a', he
draws our attention to the base 'somāpa' which is a mas-
culine stem ending in 'a'. Before giving its declensional
forms he elaborates the derivation of the base somāpa
pointing out that the root pā with the upapada soma gets
the kṛt suffix, vic and to explain the same he deals with

35. Rup P = II p. 7
ten rules. Among these ten rules cited, some do not have their function in the base soma; even then he deals with the contingency of their function in the base. Thus only after dwelling too much on the derivation of the base soma at the expense of the patience of the reader, he turns to give its declensional forms. One is naturally prone to feel tiresome here. Instead of going into the details of the derivation of the base, he could have directly declined the rupas of the stem soma simply stating, अकरान्तहः pullिंगासोमापासबधः / sa ca somaśabdopapadāt pibatiḥdātoḥ vijantaḥ / tasmāt svādyutpattih i.e. sup suffices come after the base soma which is a masculine stem derived by the addition of the suffix vīc to the root pā with the upapada soma. This would have been more intelligible and relevant to the context. Here he may be charged of over enthusiasm in his endeavour.

36. अकरान्तहः pullिंगासोमापासबधः sa ca somaśabdopapadāt pibatiḥdātoḥ vijantaḥ / katham?........................

.................................................................
evam nispannāt somaśabdāt svādyutpattih /
(Rup P = I p. 42)
Similarly in order to deal with the declensional forms of feminine stems ending in 'I' he first narrates the declensional forms of the stem kartri, then he turns to deal with the feminine stems bhavati, yanti yati and bhavanti, all of which have forms alike those of kartri. He narrates the different rules by which the feminine suffix -īp occurs in these bases; so also he discusses whether numāgama is to operate in these bases or not. It is to be opined here that in a context, when the declensional forms of feminine stems ending in 'I' are to be narrated, the narration of the derivation of these 'I' stems does not seem necessary since the variant derivation of each of these stems does not in any way influence their declensional forms unfavourably so that they cannot be modelled like those of kartri. Hence instead of going into the details of the process of formation of these bases he could have made a statement like 'evam bhavatiyatiyanti bhavantiyadayah', after dealing with the declensional forms of the base kartri.

---

37. Rup P I pp. 67 & 68
It is to be remarked here that in a critical study the defects and drawbacks also deserve attention so as to make the criticism complete. Therefore though these defects are pointed out from the critical point of view, it has also to be admitted without any doubt that in the light of the merits of Rup, these defects can be simply ignored.