The first trace of alamkāra is found in the Nātyaśāstra of Bharata. The Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana also shows signs of acquaintance with alamkāraśāstra among the sixty four arts (Caturṣaṣṭhī Kālā).
Among these arts, 'prahelika, natakākhyāvākāśāraṇam, 'kavyaṃśaśāraṇam', kriyākalpa etc are mentioned. This 'kriyākalpa' is interpreted by Jayamangala as Kavyālakāra. But we meet with no handbook of alamkāra as an independent discipline before the Kavyalakāra of Bhāmaha.

The Nātyaśāstra of Bharata no doubt mentions four figures of speech viz. upama, rūpaka, dīpaka and yaśaka but Bharata's discussion on figures of speech is only contextual. The Nātyaśāstra is in fact a treatise on dramaturgy. So it is quite natural that there is little scope for discussion on figures of speech. Only while discussing 'vācika' abhinaya, Bharata mentions four figures of speech which are suitable for the context. So it is not proper to think that figures of speech receive full treatment in the work of Bharata. The mention of only four figures of speech of course does not suggest that Bharata did not know any other alamkāra.

---

1 Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana. Chapter III Sūtra - 16.
2 Upama dīpakaḥ caiva rūpakaḥ yamake tathā
Kavyaśāstra hyalaśācarāśatvāraḥ parikūrtitāḥ //
Nātyaśāstra of Bharata. Chap. 16. Kar 40
3 Bharata mentions four types of abhinaya:
śūngiko vācikasci cabinet ṣāhūrāyaḥ sātvikastathā //
jñayastvābhinaḥo vīprācaturdhā parikūrtitāḥ //
Nātyaśāstra Chap. VIII Kār 10.
But he mentions four alaṅkāras because these four figures generally appear in dramatic composition. In fact Nātaka and Kavya are two separate branches of literature. So the technics and factors bestowing charm are separate in these two types of literature. Thus it is obvious that the figures of speech, metrics etc. that add to the beauty of poetry, may be of no use in drama, even in some cases they mar the beauty of drama. This is stated by Bharata in connection with describing the metrics. Bharata mentions those 'chanda's only that are used in drama. There are no doubt many other metrics also but they are not discussed by Bharata as they do not add to the charmingness of the drama.

\( \text{sanyānyāyapi vr̥ttāni yanyakāṁha pindaśaḥ/ mā ca tāṁ pravojyāni hatośbhānī tāṁ hi.} \) ¹ This is true in the case of the figures of speech also. There may be various figures of speech but all of them are not suitable in drama. So Bharata mentions only those alaṅkāras that are used in dramatic composition.

The first systematic treatment of the figures of speech is met with in Bhāmaha. The Kavyalaṅkāra of Bhāmaha is the first available work on poetics in the proper sense of the term. But it is evident that the Kavyalaṅkāra is not the first work on poetics as a full-fledged discipline. Bhāmaha himself refers to the names of a few rhetoricians and rhetorical works preceding him. Thus Rāmasūrya is one of the predecessors of Bhāmaha though his work Acyutottara mentioned by Bhāmaha⁵ is missing. That Bhāmaha's work is not the first one of poetics as an independent discipline is sure from the accuracy and the systematic

---

¹ Nātyaśāstra of Bharata.
⁵ Nāmaḥdēvarthagamabhīram yakavaṇapadesinī prahelikā sū ṛṣita rāmasūrya Acyutottare

and scientific treatment of the subjects in Kavyalankara. A first undertaking can never bear the signs of such fineness of treatment. Some preceding works are certainly lost to us. The number of the figures of speech also indicates this point. Bharata mentions only four figures whereas the number of the figures of speech in Bhama is thirty eight.

So says Dr. Raghavan in his book - 'Some concepts of Alamkarastra' - "The evolution of Alamkara from three in Bharata to what we have in Bhama is an interesting study, but the gap is all in darkness. We feel that in that stage of the history of Alamkara the concepts of Laksana and the merging of most of it in Alamkara is a big chapter. According to Prof. Bismupada Bhattacharyay, a good number of later alamkaraasatully tally with some kavyalaksana mentioned by Bharata and the definitions given by later rhetoricians are almost the same as in Nalysastra.

Whatever it may be, the alamkarastra so far available starts from Bhama. Then Udbhata, Dandin, Vaama etc are significant figures to give the alamkarastra the shape of a full-fledged discipline. All of these thinkers have thrown new light upon the conception of alamkaraa and thus, modifications and developments of conception are noticed in the works of different scholars.

Anandavardhana however brings a revolutionary change in the field of poetics by his Dhwani theory according to which 'dhwani' or pratiyamanartha (suggested meaning) is the soul of poetry and

6 Some concepts of Alamkarastra. Dr. Raghavan. P. 43.
7 Alamkarastra Bhumaika - Prof. Bismupada Bhattacharyay, Chap-4. P. 37.
8 "Kavyasyatma dhvani" - Dhvayaloka by Anandavardhana. Chap. P. 35.
alāmākāra, guna etc are subsidiary to this dhvani. This fully new conception about the alāmākāra guna etc gives Dhyānikāra the most important position in the field of poetics. Thus Dr. P.V. Kane says -

The Dhyānaloka is an epoch making work in the history of Alāmākāra literature. It occupies the same position in the Alāmākāraśāstra as Panini's sūtras in grammar and the Vedānta Sūtras in Vedānta. So says Jagannātha in his Rasaśāṅgādhara that Dhyānaloka settled the principles to be followed in poetics ( Dhyānikrtasmālāmākārikasamāvyasyavasthapakatvat ). Almost all the rhetoricians who flourished after Dhyānikāra were greatly influenced by this dhvani theory. Māmata, Visvanātha, Ruyyaka, Jagannātha all were supporters of this Rasadhvani theory. They discussed the figures of speech no doubt, but with secondary importance.

So it is found that the range of alāmākārasāstra extends from Bharata down to Jagannātha. Still modifications and changes of idea about the figures of speech are noticed in age to age.

In the works of older rhetoricians like Bhāmaha Dandin etc there is no division of the figures of speech, even the primary distinction of sabdālāmākāra and arthālāmākāra is not mentioned by them. Both Bhāmaha and Udbhata arranges the figures in a few groups but the division of sabdālāmākāra and arthālāmākāra is not clearly mentioned in this grouping. But it should be admitted here that though Udbhata does not verbally mention the division, the arrangement of the figures of speech made by him indicates that he was aware of the division of sabdālāmākāra and

9 History of Alāmākāra Literature by P.V. Kane. Introduction, Page - lvii
10 Rasagaṅgādhara by Jagannātha.
arthālāmukārā. Udbhata arranges the figures of speech as punarukta-
vadābhbhaśaṃ chekānuprāṣa eva ca etc. The figure punaruktavadābhbhaśa is however a Ubhayālāmukāra i.e. it is based on both sabda (word) and sense (artha). Udbhata very skillfully mentions this figure at the outset and then the figures chekānuprāṣa, anuprāṣa and lātānuprāṣa, which are based on sabda (sabdālāmukāras) are mentioned. Next Udbhata states the figures of speech rūpaka, upama, dipaka etc which are based on sense, i.e. arthālāmukāras. Thus the very arrangement of the figures in Ubhayālāmukāra, sabdālāmukāra and arthālāmukāra respectively indicates that Udbhata was aware of the classifications of the alamkāras, though he does not verbally mention it. Later rhetoricians like Viśvaṇātha, Kṛṣṇyaka etc follow Udbhata in the arrangement of the figures of speech. Viśvaṇātha mentions punaruktavadābhbhaśa first and then the sabdālāmukāras like anuprāṣa, yamaka etc. are mentioned and next he states the arthālāmukāras like rūpaka etc. Kṛṣṇyaka also arranges the figures in the same manner.

If we make a critical survey of the Kavyādārā of Dandin, we shall find that he too does not verbally mention the division of sabdālāmukāra and arthālāmukāra, but the classification is indicated in this work also. In the first chapter of Kavyādārā, while discussing the poetic merit 'Madhurya' Dandin states - madhurāṃ rasavat vaci vastunyapi rasasthitī. Then in connection of 'vaci rasasthitī' he discusses

11 Punaruktavadābhbhaśam chekānuprāṣa eva ca
  anuprāṣa dīpakaṃ rūpakaṃ catuḥ
  upama dipaka caiva prativastūpama tethā
  ityeta evālāmukāraṃ vacām kaiśiciduddārthāḥ //

Kavyālāmukārasārasamgraha of Udbhata
  Chap 1, Kar 1-2.

the figures of speech anuprāsa and yamaka. Then in the second chapter he deals with the figures of speech based on sense. So, it is evident that though Dandin does not clearly mention the two sets of alāmākara as śabdālāmākara and arthālāmākara, yet by showing the distinction between 'vāgrasa' and 'vasturasa' he has given sufficient suggestions of it.

If we discuss the Kāvyālāmākārasūtra of Vāmana critically, it will be clear that Vāmana also indicates the classification of figures into śabda and ārtha. Though in the sutras Vāmana does not clearly mention this division but the arrangement of the figures clearly indicates this division. The first chapter of the fourth 'adhikaraṇa' consists of mainly two figures - yamaka and anuprāsa, both of which are śabdālāmākaras. The second and the third chapters of the fourth 'adhikaraṇa' consist of other alāmākaras each of which is based on sense. Moreover, the vṛtti which is composed by Vāmana himself clearly states the distinction between śabdālāmākara and arthālāmākara. In the beginning of the first chapter, the vṛtti is - tatra śabdālāmākaraṃ dvau yamakānu-prāsa etc. And again, in the beginning of the second chapter the vṛtti is - sampratyarthālāmākārāṇāṃ prastāvah etc. So it is found that Udṛṣṭa, Dandin and Vāmana indicate the division of śabdālāmākara and arthālāmākara though none of them verbally mentions this classification. In this case the full credit lies to Rudrata who for the first time classifies the figures of speech in two groups - śabdālāmākara and

---

13 The definition of Yamaka is -
- padamanākārthamakāram. cāvṛttām sthānaniyāme yamakaṃ -
- Kāvyālāmākārasūtra. Adhika - 4, Chap-1, Sūtra 1

14 Kāvyālāmākārasūtra of Vāmana. Adhikaraṇa - 4, Chap-1, Page - 42.

15 Ibid.
arthālāmkaṇā. In the second chapter he states -
vakroktiranupraśo yamakam śabdasūryā payan citram
śabdasyālāmkaṇāḥ śabdasvārthaśāpi so'rvastu. 16
Then again while discussing the figures based on sense he states
clearly - arthāyalāmkaṇāḥ vāstavam etc. 17 Thus it is Rudrata who
for the first time makes the clearest distinction of alamkāras into
śabdālāmkaṇā and arthālāmkaṇā. So says Dr. S.K. De - Udbhata and others
nowhere treats clearly of the distinction between śabdālāmkaṇā and
arthālāmkaṇā although such a distinction is implied, but Rudrata
classifies the figures clearly in two groups according to the relative
prominence of word and sense. 18

Anandavardhana does not however mention the division of
śabdālāmkaṇā and arthālāmkaṇā: But Mamata, Viśvanātha and other
supporters of the dhvani theory clearly mention this primary distinction
of the figures of speech. It is however interesting to note that Jaganna-
nātha in his Rasagangādhara does not discuss the śabdālāmkaṇā at all.
While going to discuss the figures of speech he only says -
sthānya prāgabhijitalakṣamasya kavyātmāno vyāgyaṇya
ramanīyataprayojakā alamkārā nirūpyante, 19
and then he begins with the figure of speech upama. There is not trace
of the śabdālāmkaṇā. But when he discusses the four types of Kavya
he admits śabdālāmkaṇā or śabdacamatkṛti, for, the fourth type of Kavya
is based on this śabdacamakṛti. Again, he accepts
śabdāsaktinīśalāmkaṇāradhavani and illustrates it but while discussing
the figures of speech he mysteriously enough omits it.

18 History of Sanskrit Poetics by Dr. S.K. Dey.
As it is stated above, the distinction of śabdālāmākāra and arthālāmākāra is somehow or other mentioned by almost all the rhetoricians. But any systematic division of the arthālāmākāras is not made before Rudrata. Though Bhāmaha and Udbhata arranges the figures into a few groups yet the reason behind such grouping is more or less inexplicable. Dandin and Vāmana do not mention any division or grouping of the arthālāmākāras. In this matter the full credit lies to Rudrata who for the first time arranges the arthālāmākāras into four groups viz. vāstava, aupamya, atisaya and ślesa. (arthayālāmākāra vāstavasupamya-matis'ayah ślesāh: caēcā eva višēsā anye tu bhavati niḥsāsāh 20) Then Rudrata divides all the familiar figures of speech into these four classes. In the seventh chapter of his work he discusses the figures of speech coming under the head vāstava. In the eighth chapter, the figures of aupamya group are dealt with. The ninth one deals with the figures of the atisaya group and the tenth one with those of the ślesa group. Thus Rudrata is the pioneer in the field of the division of the figures of speech based on sense. It is true that in some cases Rudrata's classification is not so scientific still as a first undertaking, his work certainly deserves credit.

After Rudrata the following rhetoricians do not accept the division of arthālāmākāra made by Rudrata, nor they mention any other division of the figures based on sense. Dhvanikāra does not at all mention any division of the figures. Mammata mentions the primary distinction of śabdālāmākāra and arthālāmākāra but in the discussion of the arthālāmākāras he mentions no division or classification though in other minor topics his discussion is minute and elaborate.

Rayyaka, the author of *Alamkarasarvasva* however throws a new light on the treatment of *alamkāra* by making a new classification of the arthālakāras. He divides arthālakāras into a few groups viz. bhedabhedatulya, abhedapradhāna, ganyamānapanyasraya, bhodapradhāna, vīsesavichittīmūla, virodhagarbha, kāryakāranabhāvasūla, ārthakāra- līvandhopacīta, tarkanyāsraya, vākyanyāsūla, lokanyāsūraya and gūḍhārthapratitipaśa. All the familiar figures of speech are included in these groups. These divisions of arthālakāra made by Rayyaka, bear the mark of originality no doubt but it is striking that no other rhetorician after Rayyaka follows this way of treatment of the arthālakāras. Only Vidyādhara in his *Ekāvāli* follows the footsteps of Rayyaka in the classification of the figures of speech. Viśvanātha however mentions no division of the figures of speech based on sense. Appayya Dīkṣita in his *Kuvalayanandada* does not mention any division of the arthālakāras but at the concluding portion of his work he mentions some new figures of speech based on different "pramāna"s accepted by different schools of Philosophy. There are 'Pratyakṣālakāra' based on the factor 'Pratyakṣa', anumānālakāra, upamānalakāra, sābdapramānalakāra, sārtyalamārāra, ārtyalamārāra, arthāpattyalamārāra, ampalabdhyalamārāra, sambhavalamārāra and alīthyalamārāra. So says Amṛṭanandayogin in his *Alamkarasamgraha* - atha pramānalakārān kathyaṁ sāmpatān kramat... Next he states different figures of speech based on different 'pramānas' accepted by different schools of philosophy (pratyakṣaṁekam cārvakān kaṇḍadasugatau punah etc).
If we consider the arthālāmākāra from a critical point of view, we shall find that ultimately all the familiar figures of speech may be divided into three main groups—the figures of speech based on upamā or sādṛṣya, figures of speech based on pratyakṣa and those based on Kāryakāraṇa-bhava or cause and effect relation. Thus, upamā, rūpaka, utprekṣa, saṃsaṅkṣipta and many other figures can be included in the first group i.e., figures of speech based on sādṛṣya as the similarity is somehow or other at the root of charm in all these figures of speech. Thus, in some figures of speech pratyakṣa is at the root of charm. In the case of a large number of figures of speech Kāryakāraṇa-bhava prevails. Now, the knowledge of this cause and effect relation can be by two ways—sometimes it is by inference and in other cases, it can be by perception. Thus, in the figures like hetum, anumāṇa etc., the relation is hetuhetumad. But in the cases of the figures of speech like Kāranamala, Vibhāvanā, vīsesokti etc., the relation is Kāryakāraṇa.

Appayya Dīksita in his Citramāmsā discusses elaborately how sādṛṣya or similarity is at the root of almost all the figures of speech. So we shall discuss here only how cause and effect relation also exerts its influence on a vast number of alamkāras. Thus we shall confine our discussion in the figures of speech based on the cause and effect relation.