CHAPTER IV

THE TREATMENT OF THE FIGURES OF SPEECH BASED ON
KĀRYAKĀRANABHĀVA IN EARLY RHETORICAL WORKS

It is stated in the previous chapter that the sense of cause and effect is at the root of a vast number of figures of speech. We are now going to discuss these figures based on causal relation one by one and trace their development in the works of different rhetoricians.

As discussed in the first chapter, the whole range of alamkārasastra can be divided into two schools - the earlier school i.e. the alamkāra school and the later school i.e. dhvani school.

So far as the earlier school is concerned, we can mention the names of a few rhetoricians. They are Bhāmaha, Udbhata, Dandin and Vāmana. Though there are other minor rhetoricians also, belonging to this alamkāra school, but we are not going to count them as there is no mark of originality in these works in the treatment of the figures of speech. So we shall discuss the figures of speech based on cause and effect relation as treated in the works of the four rhetoricians mentioned above.

1 The Kavyālāṃkāra of Bhāmaha, the Alamkārasaṅgraha of Udbhata, the Kavyādarsa of Dandin, the Kavyālāṃkārasūtra of Vāmana.
Bhāmaha, who is called the father of Sanskrit poetics recognizes thirty-six figures of speech based on sense (*arthālambāra*). Among them some are based on causal relation. But Bhāmaha does not at all mention the figures of speech like Kāranamāla, asāngati etc which are stated in the 3rd chapter to be directly based on cause and effect relation. Udbhata, though belonging to the old school bears marks of originality in the treatment of the figures of speech and his idea of a few figures gives clue to the modern idea of these particular figures of speech. But Udbhata also does not mention the figures Kāranamāla and asāngati. Dandin and Vāmana also does not mention these two figures of speech.

It is stated in the third chapter how causal relation prevails in some other figures of speech also. These are

**Vibhāvanā, Vidosokti, Virodha, arthāntara-rānyasa aprastutapraśāmisū** etc.

These figures of speech are however directly based on causal relation and these are discussed by almost all the rhetoricians of early stage.

**Vibhāvanā**

The figure of speech Vibhāvanā as discussed in the third chapter can be easily classified under the category of the figures of speech where causal relation operates prominently. Bhāmaha however discusses this Vibhāvanā with definition and illustration in the second chapter of his Kavyālambāra. The definition of Vibhāvanā given by Bhāmaha is —
Where the action is negatived but the result of that action is present the figure of speech is known as vibhāvāṇa provided an explanation is easy (samādhaṁ sukare sati). The illustration of Vibhūvāna is apītamātā sikhino etc.

The peacocks are intoxicated but they have not drunk. Here the cause of intoxication viz. drinking is absent but the result intoxication is present. But here the actual cause of intoxication is not far to seek. In this verse rainy season is described and the peacocks are intoxicated due to happiness. In other cases also the reason is this. It is to be noted here that in the definition of Vibhūvāna given by Bhāma, there is no direct mention of the words hetu or kārana and kārya or the effect as is shown in the definition given by Viśvanātha etc. (vibhāvāna vinā hetuṁ kāryotpattir yaduṁ yate). But the word 'kriyā' in the expression "Kriyāḥ pratisedho" means nothing but cause. In fact the cause may be of various types - it may be a dravya (an object) or a guna (a quality) or a kriyā or a jāti.

\[
\text{(dravyādiśādhūrāṇāṁ nirvyāpārasādhūrāṇāṁ ca hetutvam.)}
\]

---

2 Kāvyālaṁkāra of Bhāma. Chap. II. Kār. 77
3 Apīlamātāṁ sikhina disomutkanthindakulāṁ
   nipo'viliptaśūrebhirbhraśrastakalūsāṁ jaleṁ
5 Siddhāntakāumudī; Vṛtti by Bhāṭṭaji Dīkṣita. Sūtra 2:3:23.
Of these four Bhāmaha mentions only one, i.e. action of kriya as cause or hetu and in the illustration also the action is described to be negated, but this action or kriya is above all the causes. The effect or kārya though not verbally mentioned is indicated by the expression tatphalasya vibhāvanā.

This 'phala' is nothing but the effect of the action or kriya stated above. So it is clear that though the two words karaṇa and kārya are absent in the definition given by Bhāmaha, the sense of cause and effect relation prevails here. The definition of cause as discussed in the third chapter is

anyathāśiddhiṁyasya niyatā pūrvavṛttiṁ karaṇatvam bhavet. 6

The event which is 'niyatapūrvavṛtti' of the effect i.e. which is unfailingly followed by the effect and which is different from anyathāśiddha, 7 is karaṇa or cause. So karaṇa must be followed by kārya or in other words there can be no kārya except there is a proper karaṇa preceding it. This primary rule of causation is at the root of the figure of speech vibhāvanā. In this figure this correlation of cause and effect is stated to be negated by means of some skilful poetic expression. The charm of this figure lies in the omission of the actual cause in spite of the presence of the effect. So it is clear that in

6 Bhāsāpariccheda by Viśvanātha Nyāyaśāstaṇana. Kār 16.
7 In the Bhāsāpariccheda Viśvanātha Nyāyaśāstaṇana recognizes five varieties of anyathāśiddha.

Yena saha pūrvabhavaḥ: Karaṇamadāya va yaśya
anyāḥ pratī pūrvabhāve jñāte yatraṁ pūrvabhāvavijñānam
janакā prati pūrvavartitāmaṇaparijnāyāḥ na yaśya gṛhyāte
yatiriktaṁ thāpī bhavenniyatāvasya kāryapūrvabhāvino

If Vibhavam as stated by Bhama, the existence of causal relation is prominent.

Udbhata, the author of Kavyalankarasarasamgraha follows the footsteps of Bhama in defining the figure of speech Vibhavam. The definition of this figure given by him is -

Kriyayah pratiyedhe yatapthalamya vibhavanam
jneya vibhavanairvasaum samadhau sulebhe sati. 8

Where the action is not found but its result is stated, the figure of speech is known as vibhavam in case the actual cause is not far to seek. In fact a contradiction arises when the result of the cause is stated but the cause itself is absent. ’Samadi’ is ’samadhana’ or ’parihara’ of the contradiction. The illustration of vibhavam given by Udbhata is -

angalakasamirasamulambhanapunarman;
analaktakaratrambhamsathradam ca vibhratim. 9

Here the result pinjaratva is stated but the absence of the cause is indicated by the expression - akasirma etc. As it is stated before that Bhama as well as Udbhata mentions the negation of only one type of cause viz. Kriya (Kriyayah pratiyedhe). So the cause negated here is Kasmaurasamulambhana.

8 Kavyalankarasarasamgraha of Udbhata, Chap. II Kar - 9(32).
9 Ibid. Kar 11. page 41.
The conception of Vibhāvanā in Dandin is not so much different that in other rhetorical works. But Dandin goes one step further to state that in the case of Vibhāvanā the well-known cause (prasiddhahetu) is absent and the effect is described to take place due to some other natural cause. Bhamaha and Udbhata simply say that in vibhāvanā the cause is negatived, but in fact the result can by no means take place if there is at all no cause preceding it. So Dandin makes it clear that only the well-known cause is described to be absent but the effect is related to some other cause. The illustration of vibhāvanā given by Dandin is:

apītakṣīvākāsamvanasaṃsāṃtyāmalāmyaram:
aprasāditaudhāṃvya jagadāśīṃsānpharam.11

Here the actual causes drinking etc. are absent and another cause viz. the autumn is stated to be the cause of the effects intoxication etc. described here. The second illustration is

anesūjitāsitādṛṣṭir bhūrānāvajjita nata:
anesūjo'ruṣaṇāyaṃ adharastra samāndari.12

This is an illustration of svabhāvikatavibhāvanā. The first one is of Kāraṇāntaravibhāvanā for these a different cause is stated. Though Dandin does not specially mention the two classifications of vibhāvanā but by the two separate examples he suggests two types of vibhāvanā.

11 Ibid. Kār 200.
12 Ibid. Kār 201.
In the case of apitakṣīvākādāsa etc. a separate cause, autumn, is stated and in the case of ananjita etc., as there is no other visible cause, the natural cause is stated. This is indicated by the expression—

yatrasvābhāvīkatvāṃ vā vībhāvantāṁ a vībhāvantā.  

In the verse—

vaktram nisargasurahhi vapuravyājasundaram;

skāraṇaripuṣcadro nirnimitasahrt amaraḥ.

the cause is directly stated by the words 'nisarga' etc. So it is clear that the figure of speech vībhāvanā as discussed by Dandin is directly based on causal relation.

Vāmana however shows no such originality in the treatment of the figure of speech Vībhāvanā. The definition of Vībhāvanā given by Vāmana is—

Kriyāpratigedhe prasiddha-tatphalāvyaktir vībhāvanā.  

Where the action is negatived but its well-known result occurs, that figure of speech is called vībhāvanā. This definition has no difference to that given by Bhāmaha and Udbhata. The definition given by Dandin shows a little difference in the mode of expression, still the fundamental conception is just the same. It is to be noted that a minor peculiarity in the definition of Vāmana is that he says the well-known result (prasiddhaphala) occurs in spite of the absence of the cause where as Dandin states that in spite of the absence of the well-known cause (prasiddhahetu) the result takes place. Thus Vāmana uses the

word presiddha on the part of the result (phala) but Bandin used it with the cause. The illustration of Vibhāvanā is—
apyasaśajjanaśāṅgataya na vasatyena vaikram:
saksaśaśuddhasu hṛdayeṣu manīcinām.  

VISEŚOKTI:

In later rhetorical works the figure of speech visēśokti is closely connected with vibhāvanā. Viśvanātha, Jagannātha et al mention these two figures side by side. According to them, where the effect is present but the cause is omitted, the figure of speech is called vibhāvanā.

(vibhāvanā vinā hetum kāryotpattir yaduṣayate).  
The case of visēśokti is just the opposite. When the cause is present but the action is absent the figure of speech is called visēśokti.

(Sati hetau phalabhavah visēśoktiḥ - Viśvanātha).  
But in the early rhetorical works the two figures vibhāvanā and visēśokti are not related to each other. Thus, in the Kavyālāmākāra of Bhāmaha, vibhāvanā is mentioned in the second chapter whereas visēśokti is mentioned in the third chapter. There is also difference of conception in the case of the two figures. The definition of visēśokti given by Bhāmaha is—

ekadesayā vigama ya guruṁtarasamāsthitih;
visēśopraṇāyāya viseśoktir mātā yathā.  

17 Ibid. Kār - 68.  
18 Kavyālāmākāra of Bhāmaha, Chap. III Kār-23 Page 143.
When the loss of one element, another survives to enhance the superiority of an object, the figure of speech is known as viśeṣokti.

The illustration of this figure of speech given by Pāṇini is -

\[ \text{ekastrīṇī jayati jagante Kusumāṇḍhah} \]

\[ \text{haratāpi tanum āya sambhumā na hṛtam balam}. \]

Generally, tanuḥaraṇa is the cause of balaharana. But in the above example, strength of cupid is not destroyed by Śambhu though the body is destroyed by him. So it is found that in this figure of speech the sense of cause and effect is prominent. There is no doubt that in this figure as defined by Viśvanātha etc. the causal relation operates directly for the definition itself mentions the words hetu and phala (effect). But in the definition of this figure as stated by early rhetoricians, the cause and effect relation is not so verbally mentioned. It is only suggested. Thus, in the definition of Pāṇini - ekadesasya vigae etc., when one element, be it the actual cause or not, is omitted and another survives the alaokara is called viśeṣokti. But the example given by the earlier rhetoricians clearly states the existence of causal relation. In the example - ekastrīṇī etc. it is found that the special charm of this verse is that the strength of cupid is not destroyed by Śambhu i.e. the effect is present but tanuḥaraṇa which is generally the cause of balaharana is absent -

\[ \text{( haratāpi tanum āya sambhumā na hṛtam balam)}. \]

The definition of *viseṣokti* given by Udbhata is -

*yat sūmagṛ耶'pi saktīnām phalānupattivandhanam. Viṣeṣasyābhidhītsātpratipadiciveṣoktirucyate.*

Where in spite of the presence of all causes in fact, the result is absent, that is known as *viseṣokti* in case some speciality is understandable by this (*viṣeṣasyābhidhītsātah*). This conception of *viseṣokti* is not different from that given by Bhāṣāhā, only there is some deviation in the mode of expression. Bhāṣāhā states it as -

«ekadesāṇyā vigame yā guṇāntarasāṣṭhitih!»

Where as Udbhata says -

*yat sūmagṛ耶'pi saktīnām phalānupattivandhanam.

In the definition of *viseṣokti* given by Udbhata, the sense of cause and effect is more prominent than that of Bhāṣāhā. Udbhata states in the clearest term that where the assemblage of causes (*saktīnām sūmagṛ耶*) is present still the result is absent the figure of speech is *viseṣokti*.

The conception of the figure of speech in the Kāvyādāsā of Dandin is a little different from that in the works of Bhāṣāhā and Udbhata. The definition of *viseṣokti* given by Dandin is -

*guna-jātik-riyādīnāṃ yuttu vaikalyadārāmānām; viṣeṣadārsanaudyāvā uṇa viṣeṣoktirucyate.*

When in order to show some speciality in description the vikalatva or anupayogita of guṇa, jāti, kriyā and dravya is presented, that is *viseṣokti*. The illustration of this figure is -

*na kathoraṇa vā tiṣeṣamāyudham puṣpadhanvanam; tathāpi jītāmevaśādāsaḥ bhuvanastrayam.*

20 Kāvyālaṁkārayāsāgraaha of Udbhata, Chap. V. Kār - 4 (55).
22 Ibid. Kār - 324.
Here the 'akathoratva' and atikṣenatva - the two qualities of the weapon are 'anupayogi' i.e. incapable of producing the effect viz the conquest of the three worlds. Thus in the second example 'jātivaiṣayya' is illustrated.

\[ \text{na devukanyaka nāpi gandharvakulasambhava} \]
\[ \text{tathāpyeṣa tapobhangaṃ vidhātum vedhasopalam.}^{23} \]

Here the jāti of the lady is not capable of producing one effect viz. ‘tapobhanga’. Again, in the third verse -

\[ \text{na vaddhā bhrūkutir nāpi sphurito daśanacchadah.} \]
\[ \text{na ca raktabhavā dṛṣṭir jitaṃca dviṣatam balam.}^{24} \]

in spite of the vaikalya or anupayogītva of the 'Krīyā', the effect viz. conquering the enemies is described. Thus, the verse -

\[ \text{na rathā na ca mātadgān na hayaḥ na ca pattayaḥ:} \]
\[ \text{ṣrīnāmopāngadṛśtyaiva jīyate jagatāṃ tryam.}^{25} \]

is an example of dravyavaicitra. Bāndin however shows so much originality in the definition and classification of the figure of speech viśeṣokti.

According to other rhetoricians like Bhūma and Udbhāta, when the effect is absent in spite of the presence of the cause, that is viśeṣokti but Bāndin defines it in a totally different way - when the cause is not capable of producing the effect, still the effect is present, that is viśeṣokti. So the fundamental conception is different in Bāndin. The four types of viśeṣokti as illustrated by Bāndin are also new in Bāndin for no other scholars former or later mention these four classifications.

24 Ibid. Kār 326.
25 Ibid. Kār 327.
The definition given by Dandin also has no similarity to those given by later rhetoricians like Hammata and Visvanatha. The definition of this figure given by Hammata is:

\[
\text{vīsesoktirākhandeṣaṃ kāraṇeṣu phalāvakṣaḥ.}
\]

Where the causes are intact still the effect is absent, that is called vīsesoktī. The conception of Visvanātha also is the same as it is discussed above. But both these conceptions of Vīsesoktī are identical to that of Udbhata and not to that of Dandin. So in the whole range of poetics Dandin however has the original idea about vīsesoktī. It should be admitted that in the treatment of vīsesoktī in the Kavyadarśa, the causal relation operates clearly. In all the cases of 'vaikalya', viz. gunavaikalya, kriyāvaikalya, jāti vaikalya etc. the cause is not efficient or adequate for producing the effect.

Vāmana, the author of Kāvyālakāraśūtra defines vīsesoktī in order to differentiate it from vyatireka. He however shows much originality in defining vīsesoktī as:

\[
ekagunahānikalpanāyaṃ saṃyadārthahṃ vīsesoktih.\]

When at the loss of one attribute, there is similarity with the other elements, that is vīsesoktī. Vāmana illustrates this figure as:

\[
\text{bhaavanti yatraasadhayo rajanyaātatailapurāḥ suratapradīpah.}
\]

This is taken from the verse describing the mountain Himalaya in the Kumārasambhava by Kālidāsa. Here the 'āgadhīs' have similarity with the suratapradīpas i.e. they accomplish the function of suratapradīpas.

26 Kāvyaparākṣa of Hammata. Chap. 10 Sūtra - 163.
27 Kāvyālakāra of Vāmana. Adhikaraṇa 4, Chap. 3, Sūtra - 23.
28 Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa. Canto 1, 31. 10.
only there is absence of the element 'tailapūrṇatva'. But it should be noted here that this tailapūrṇatva is the cause of the light of the lamp. So here the absence of the cause is indicated though the result of the cause is stated. In fact in the figure of speech viśeṣokti as Vāmana defines it, the description of similarity is prominent, in spite of the loss of one element. Thus in the example - bhavantī yatrāṇadhayo etc. the osadhis are described to be similar to the turātapradīpas even though there is absence of the element tailapūrṇatva. Thus in other examples like - hastī hi jaṅgamam durgam. etc. the elephant is compared to the fort, only there is absence of a single element indicated by the word 'jaṅgama'. The causal relation is however, indirectly involved here, still the existence of it is not to be overlooked in this case.

This conception of the figure of speech viśeṣokti has no similarity with that of other rhetoricians. It is to be noted here that the figure of speech viśeṣokti as illustrated by Vāmana is nothing but the figure of speech adhikārūḍhavaiṣṭiyaparināma of the later rhetoricians like Viśvanātha etc. Though there is no similarity in definition, still the fundamental conception and also the illustration prove that the viśeṣokti of Vāmana is similar to a particular sub-division of the figure of speech parināma of later period.

VIRODHA

After the two figures of speech vibhavanā and viśeṣokti, we can mention the figures of speech virodha and visama as directly based on cause and effect relation. These two figures virodha and visama are mentioned by Huyyaka in the group—

virodhagarlo'lmakāravargāh ( satapraśāvēna virodhagarlo'lmakārvagā prakriyate.)

The fundamental meaning of the word virodha is contradiction. In the figure of speech virodha as defined and illustrated by the rhetoricians, it is found that there is viparyāsa or anyathābham of the cause and effect relation. According to the logicians one of the principal conceptions about causal relation is that the gunas or attributes belonging to the cause must be transferred to the effect. Thus, the attributes of the cause and the effect must be the same. An example may be cited to make the point clear. The tantu (fibre) is the cause of Paṭa (cloth). So the quality of tantu viz. tanturupa or the colour of the fibre (cause) is equal to the colour of the cloth (effect). Where the colour of the fibre is red, the colour of the cloth is also originally red. So it is said in the Sākhyaśākikā—

Kāraṇagunatmakatvāt Kāryasya 31 etc as it is discussed in the third chapter.

But this fundamental rule of causal relation is seemed to be violated in the figure of speech virodha. The special charm of virodha is that here the action quality etc. of cause and effect are described not to be equal.

Where in order to bring out some excellence (visesabhidhanaya) an action contrary to one's own quality or action is described the figure of speech is called virodha. Bhamaha illustrates virodha as -

upantarudhopavanacchayasita api dhurasau;
viduradesanapi vah santapayati vidvishai.

Here, the Yoke (dhuhri) is stated to be cool but its action is just the opposite i.e. it burns the enemies in distant lands. So the excellence of this figure lies in the deviation of the rule of causation. A question may arise here, contradiction or virodha is fundamentally a dose everywhere. Specially in speech the existence of virodha is regarded as a discredit of the speaker. So how can this very virodha be regarded as a figure of speech? Bhamaha suggests one answer by the expression -

'visesabhidhanaya. Virodha or contradiction in speech may be regarded as figure of speech only when the description of this contradiction brings out some excellence or strikingness of the expression. In the example of Bhamaha quoted above, the description of the coolness of the yoke and of its nature of burning the enemies contradict each other. But by this description the sovereignty of the king is indicated. Thus the contradiction here is regarded as a figure of speech.

Following the footsteps of Bhamaha Udbhata also defines virodha as -

When the poet describes a thing contradictory to the guna or kriya, the figure of speech is virodha. Udbhata illustrates this figure as -

Yadva mam kim karanyesa vaca layati vimayah:

bhavayah krtyamakarah kvedha tajesi patavam.

Here the skill in penance is contradictory to the body of the lady. This is an illustration of gunavirodha. Thus kriyavirodha and dravyavirodha can be illustrated. It is to be noted here that the conception of the figure of speech virodha in the works of early rhetoricians differs from that of the later scholars. In fact the definitions of Brhamaka Udbhata etc. are not so clear but the illustrations given by them make it clear that the conception of the figure of speech concerned is not at all identical to that of later age.

It is true that neither Brhamaka nor Udbhata verbally mentions the relation of cause and effect, still the inner meaning of the definition reveals the existence of causal relation and the illustrations also support this.

Dandin shows no such originality in the treatment of the figure of speech virodha. He defines it as -

viruddhanam padarthanam yatra sadsarga-darsanam:

vyasa darsanayaiva savirodham urte yatha.

When in order to show some excellence, two or many contradictory objects are brought together, that is called virodha. So far as the definition is concerned, the conception of virodha is not different from that of Bhāmaha or Uḍūṭha, but the commentary shows that Dandin goes one step further to state that the contradiction in this case should be apparent and this apparent contradiction may be removed later by the appreciation of the actual meaning.

$$ (\text{viruddhanam} \text{ sāsārgastattvato na samāhavatī} \text{ viruddhānām} )$$

$$ \text{vastuto virodhābhave} \text{ vyā-patato viruddhatvena pratibhāsmāna-}$$
$$ \text{nāmyarthab, spaṅāntaktaṃ prakāśakaṭa − virodhah so virodhepi}$$
$$ \text{viruddhatvena yadvaccāḥ.} \text{)36}$$

Next Dandin gives six examples of various types of virodha. The first example is -

$$ \text{Kūjitam rājaḥāṇaṃ vardhatē magasānējulam;}$$
$$ \text{Kāiyate ca mayūrāṇam rutamukrāntasauṣṭavah.} \text{37}$$

Here the two contradictory actions vṛddhi and kṣaya in vardhate and kāiyate are described at the same time. But this contradiction is apparent as the autumn is described here and it is sure that in autumn the ganders are generally glad and they quack and the notes of the peacocks stop. In other examples of virodha given by Dandin the contradiction is apparent.

In the treatment of Dandin however the relation of cause and effect is far to trace. Only in one type of virodha mentioned by him viz. Kriyāvirodha the causal relation is prominent. In the

36 The commentary on Kāvyādāraṇa by Premaandra Tārkavāgīśa.
37 Kāvyādāraṇa of Dandin Chap. II Kār 334.
The figure of speech virodha as defined by Vāmana is—

\[ \text{viruddhābhāsatvā virodhay.} \]

When there is an apparent contradiction in meaning the figure of speech is called virodha. Though the definition of Vāmana is so concise; the fundamental conception of virodha is not however different from that found in the work of Dandin. Vāmana gives illustration of virodha by the verse—

\[ \text{pītum pānaidam etc.} \]

Here the contradiction arises as the cause and effect, the drinking of liquor and intoxication of the mind are stated not to exist in the same adhikarana. According to the primary rule of causation there must be the unity of place of the cause and effect. Due to the violation of this rule the contradiction arises here. But this contradiction must be apparent and it may be removed by the appreciation of the actual meaning. In the example cited above the apparent contradiction is removed as here the depth of love for the beloved is described.

Among the early rhetoricians it is Vāmana who mentions clearly that in the figure of speech virodha the contradiction must be apparent by the expression—

\[ \text{viruddhābhāsatvā. Neither Phāṇḍya nor Udbhata.} \]

---

38 *mrṇālavāhu rambhoru padmotpalambhāsānam, api te rūpamasmākām tanvi tāpaya kalpate—Kavyādarśa of Dandin Chap.-2, Kār.-337.

indicates this point. Dandin also in his definition of virodha does not mention this point though by the examples he indirectly hints at this point. So the full credit lies to Vamana in throwing a new light upon this figure of speech.

It is to be noted here that the two verses cited by Vamana as examples of virodha i.e. pitam pānemīdam etc and sa vālā etc. are illustrations of the figure of speech 'Asangati' as defined by Viśvanātha. Vamana does not mention 'asangati' as a figure of speech but mysteriously however the two illustrations of asangati or later period are mentioned by him in connection with the figure virodha. Vamana includes these two verses into the figure of speech virodha as there is vyadhikaranya of cause and effect i.e. the cause and effect do not exist in the same adhikaraṇa (container) here. But Viśvanātha states in the clearest terms that when there is vyadhikaranya of cause and effect, the figure of speech is 'asangati'

( Kūryakāraṇayor bhinnadesātyāmasaṅgatīḥ ).

But as Vamana does not recognise asangati as a separate figure of speech he includes these two verses in the figure virodha as there is contradiction in same way or other, for according to the general rule of causation, the cause and effect must exist in the same container.

41 Sa bālā vayamapragalbhavacassah sa stri vayam kātaraḥ
Sa pinonnatimatpayodharayugam dhatte sakheda vayam
Sakrāntā jaghamasthalena guruṇā gantum na saktā vayam
doṣairanyajamāritairapatavo jātāh ama ityaddhutan
Amaruśatakam. Ślokā 34

42 Sahityadarpana of Viśvanātha. Chap. X. Kār - 90.
This virodha as defined and illustrated by Yamuna, can be easily classified under the group of the figures based on cause and effect relation. In the illustration of virodha — पिताम पानम etc., the result मत्तत (intoxication) and the cause पिताम पानम (drinking of the liquor) are prominent. In the second illustration — सावला etc., the causes वलत्वा etc., and the effects 'प्रागद्वारो' etc. are clearly mentioned.

In the works of later rhetoricians visa. Visvanatha etc., another figure of speech named Visama is mentioned. This visama also is based on cause and effect relation. The definition of visama as given in the Sahityadarpana is—

\[ \text{गुणां क्रियां वा सत्यां विरुध्दे हेतुकर्ययायः} \]

\[ \text{यादर्भद्वाय साप्तहल्यमानरथाया का सम्भवना} \]

\[ \text{विरुध्याय संघन्तना वा का तद्विसामम मतम.} \]

Here the sense of cause and effect is predominantly mentioned in the definition. But in the works of early rhetoricians i.e. Bhāmeha, Udbhata, Yamana and Dandin, the figure of speech Visama is not separately mentioned. Here the conception of the figure of speech virodha includes both the figures visama and virodha. It is true that the viruddhatva of 'हेतुकेय' (cause and effect) is only one factor of visama and this single factor is included in virodha of early works. The other factors i.e.

\[ \text{यादार्भद्वाय साप्तहल्यमानरथाया का सम्भवना वा} \]

are not at all mentioned in earlier rhetorical works.

The figure of speech arthāntaranyāsa can be mentioned to be based on cause and effect relation. The definition of arthāntaranyāsa is—

sāmānyam vā visēṣeṇa visesastena vā yadi;
kāryaṃ kāraṇomadā kāreyaṃ sa samarthystē;
sādharnetaresvarthāntarānyaseṣātāhatah.

Here Viśvanātha verbally mentions the existence of causal relation in the case of the figure arthāntaranyāsa. But in the works of early rhetoricians viz. Bhamaha, Udbhata, Dandin etc. the existence of causal relation is not so prominent. Bhamaha, in the second chapter of Kāvyālaṃkāra defines this figure as—

upanyayāsamanyamya yadarthasyoditātṛte;

jaeyah socarthāntaryāsah pūrvārthānu-gato yathā.

The description of an idea other than one already said in substantiation of the latter is arthāntaranyāsa. This conception of the figure of speech arthāntaranyāsa does not differ far from the conception of later rhetoricians. The slight modification made in this conception by later rhetoricians is that they mention specially that in arthāntaranyāsa a general statement is supported by a particular one and vice-versa, and a cause by the effect or the effect by the cause. So Viśvanātha defines it as—

sāmānyam vā visēṣeṇa visesastena vā yadi etc.

In fact in the figure of speech arthāntaranyāsa as the name itself suggests a statement is confirmed or supported by another. This support

44 Śāhityadarpāna of Viśvanātha. Chap. X Kār 80.
may be of various types. This is clear in the definition of Visvanātha only. The relation between the statement to be supported and that one which supports, may be Sāmānvyāvisēṣaabhāva or Kāryakāraṇabhbāva. Thus the case of arthāntaranyāśa comes, though partly, under the realm of cause and effect relation. We have already discussed in details in the third chapter of our book how all the cases of arthāntaranyāśa may be stated to be included in the group of the figures of speech based on cause and effect relation.

Udbhata in his Kāvyālaṅkārasārasaṃgraha defines arthāntaranyāśa as-

samarthakasya purvam yadvacānyāya ca prasthataḥ

viparyayena vā yatasyādhiśabdojñyātyathāpi vā

jñeyah so'arthāntaranyāyaḥ. 46

This conception of arthāntaranyāśa is not different from the later one in subject matter though there is so much difference so far as the expression is concerned. The illustration of the figure of speech given by Udbhata is-

-tannāsti yanna kurute lokhatyanta-kiyikāḥ

esa Sarbo'pi bhagavān vaṭubhūya esa vaṭate. 47

Here the second statement is supported by the former one. The sense samartḥyasamarthaka is indicated by the word 'hi.' But, in the figure of speech aprastutapraśaṇāśa also, one idea is confirmed by another and such is the case of drṣṭānta also. In order to differentiate arthāntaranyāśa from aprastutapraśaṇāḥ and drṣṭānta Udbhata mentions in

47 Kāvyālaṅkārasārasaṃgraha of Udbhata. Chap. - 2 Illustration No. 3.
the clearest term the distinctive mark of arthāntaranyāsa —
prakṛtārthasamarthanat aprastutaspratisesaaya

drṣṭaṁ tātāca prthrākṣṭhitah.

48

Though both in aprastutaspratīsa and arthāntaranyāsa one idea is stated in connection with another, still, in arthāntaranyāsa a prakṛta meaning (the actual subject matter concerned) is supported by another, where as the case of aprastutaspratīsa is just the opposite i.e. here the prastuta meaning is not mentioned at all and it is only suggested by the aprastuta one.

Dandin, the author of Kavyādāśa defines the figure of speech arthāntaranyāsa in a so scientific way —

joṣyāḥ sotrthāntaranyāsa vastra prastutya kīrtanya

tatsaḥhanasaamarthasya nyāso yo'nyasya vastunah.

49

That is called arthāntaranyāsa where the matter in hand (prastuta) is justified by another of a similar type. This conception of the figure arthāntaranyāsa is identical with that of the later scholars. This definition also suggests the meaning of the name arthāntaranyāsa — nyāso yo'nyasya vastunah. According to Dandin this arthāntaranyāsa is of eight types: — i) visvasyāpi ii) visesastha iii) śiśaviddha, iv) virodhavān v) ayuktakūri vi) yuktatāma vii) yuktāyuktā viii) viparyaya. All these eight types are illustrated by Dandin. In every example one idea is justified by another similar idea. The single point of difference in the conception in Dandin from modern

48 Kavyālaṁkārasaṅgraha of Udbhata Chap. 2 Kār - 5 (28).
49 Kavyādāśa of Dandin Chap. II Kār - 169.
scholars is that Dandin states generally that one idea is justified by another whereas later rhetoricians go one step further to mention specially that a general idea is justified by a particular one and a cause by the effect and vice versa. But the eight varieties of Arthântaranyâsa mentioned by Dandin are totally new in the Kâvyadarśa. No other scholar, former or later mentions all these varieties of this figure of speech.

The treatment of the figures of speech made by Vâmana is totally different from that of all other rhetoricians. Though the fundamental conception does not differ in most cases, still the process of arrangement of the figures of speech are new in Vâmana.

The figure of speech arthântaranyâsa is defined by Vâmana as -

\[ uktasiddhyâi vastumōrthântarasâaiva \\
nyâsanararthântaranyâsa\].

In order to justify a meaning already stated reference of a second meaning is called arthântaranyâsa. This conception of arthântaranyâsa is more or less same in the works of older rhetoricians and also of modern rhetoricians. The illustration of this figure given by Vâmana is -

\[ priyena saṃgrathya etc.\].

It is to be noted here that the figure of speech arthântaranyâsa as discussed in the works of the older rhetoricians, the sense of cause and effect relation is not so prominent and is not at all verbally mentioned. Though the indirect influence of it is not to be overlooked.

51 Priyena saṃgrathya vipakṣa saṃdibhâvayuktâm vâk śasi pîvraśastaka srajam na kâcidvijahem jâlîvîlûm vâsante hi premâni guṇâ na vâstuni

Kirâttarjuniyam Canto - 8. Sl. 37
As it is stated in the third chapter, the figure of speech aprastutaprasāṁśā just as the figure arthāntaranyāśa is partly based on cause and effect relation. In this figure, a matter which is not related to the actual subject matter concerned, is described and by this description, the actual matter ( prastuta ) is indicated. Now, these two factors, prastuta and aprastuta must have a relation between them. This relation is cause and effect in some cases and in some cases it is the general and particular relation ( Sāmānyaviśeṣabhāva ). So the cases where the relation between the prastuta and aprastuta is cause and effect, come under the group of the figures based on causal relation. The sense of cause and effect prevails here directly.

Bhamaha discusses the figure of speech 'apratutaprasāṁśā' with suitable illustration in his Kavyālakāra. This figure of speech as suggested by the name is description of an idea not relevant to the context. The definition of aprastutaprasāṁśā given by Bhamaha makes this point clear -

\[ \text{adhikārādāpetasya vastūno'nyasya yā stutih, aprastutaprasāṁśeti sū caivam kathyate yathā.} \]

This definition is in fact not different from that given by the modern scholars but the expression 'adhikārādāpetasya' is quite new in Bhamaha. The meaning of this expression is an idea other than the relevant one. Later rhetoricians like Viśvanātha etc. express this idea by the term 'apratutta'. Bhamaha suffices it to say that aprastutaprasāṁśā is

52 Kavyālakāra of Bhamaha. Chap. 3 Kār - 29.
description of an idea other than the relevant one but later scholars go one step further to make it clear that the relevant object or the object to be described (prastuta) is suggested by the description of the irrelevant one (aprastuta) and these two objects, i.e. the prastuta and the aprastuta have a relation of Kāryakāraṇabhāva or Sāmānyavīseśabhāva between them. Thus, a general idea is suggested by the description of a particular one and vice-versa or, a cause is suggested by the effect and vice-versa. Thus the definition of aprastutaprāsāmsā given by Viśvanātha is -

Kvaocd viśeṣah sāmānyat sāmānyam va viśeṣatah etc.  

So it is found that in the figure of speech aprastutaprāsāmsā as treated in the works of early rhetoricians, the causal relation is not so prominent.

The definition of the figure of speech 'aprastutaprāsāmsā' given by Uḍdbhata is same as that given by Bhāmaha. Uḍdbhata defines this figure as -

adhikārādapatetaya vaatuno'nyasya ya stutih
aprastuta-prāsāmsayam prastutārthaśnunvandhini.  

Here in the first portion there is no deviation from the definition of Bhāmaha. But Uḍdbhata modifies his definition by the expression - 'prastutārthaśnunvandhini'. According to Bhāmaha, aprastutaprasāmsā is

53 Kvaocdiśeṣah sāmānyat sāmānyam va višeṣatah
Kāryānimitāca kāryakā ko hetoratha samat saجام aprastutat prastuttacca samyate prakadhih tatah  / /
Sāḥityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha Chap. 10 Kār - 77

simply the description of an idea not relevant to the contact, but
Udbhata goes one step further to state that this description of the
aprastuta meaning must have some connection with the contextual meaning
(prakrtartha). Here the definition of Udbhata comes closer to that
of later rhetoricians who state that the 'prastuta' meaning and the
'aprastuta' meaning are connected by cause and effect relation or
general and particular relation. By the expression 'prakrtarthaavandhini'
Udbhata hints at this point. The illustration of aprastutaprasmāṇa given
by Udbhata is -

yānti svadehesu jārāmamāprāptopahōktrkhaḥ
phalapuspardhāhinārjo'pi durgadesā-vanāriyāḥ

Here all this described is aprastuta and conveys the prastuta sense
that Parvati's beauty will die away not having found any enjoyer in
this ascetic life.

Dandin defines aprastutaprasāṇā as -
aprastutaprasāṇā ayādaprakrāntesu ya stutih

The figure of speech aprastutaprasāṇā is laudation of something
else not stated (aprakṛnta or aprastuta). This definition is
not so different from that of other scholars. But the illustration
of this figure of speech given by Dandin

sukham jīvanti harinā vanesvaparasevinan etc.

suggests that aprastutaprasāṇā is not only the description of the

57 Sukham jīvanti harinā vanesvaparasevinan / amnirayatnasulebhhiṃsarabhrākuraśibhiḥ //
Kāvyādarā of Dandin. Chap. 2 Kār - 341.
aprastuta as stated by other scholars but also it indicates the demerits
of the prastuta at the same time. Here is the deviation of the concep-
tion of Dandin from that of later rhetoricians. Though later rhetori-
cians like Visvanātha illustrate the case of "prastutaninda" by
'aprastulaprasāsa' in the verse -

dhanyāh khalu vane vātah kalharasprasāśitaḥ etc. 58

but there is no indication that aprastutaprasāsa is always 'prastutaninda'
by the stuti or praise of the aprastuta. But in the case of Dandin,
the very conception of the figure of speech aprastutaprasāsa lies on
this point. In fact Dandin takes the word 'prasāsa' in the sense as
it is generally used in language viz. in the sense of 'praise'. But
later rhetoricians like Visvanātha Māmata etc. take the word 'prasāsa'
in the etymological sense of the term i.e. description or statement.

So according to them in the figure of speech aprastutaprasāsa there
is merely the description of the aprastuta in order to indicate the
prastuta, whereas according to Dandin in aprastutaprasāsa the
aprastuta or subject matter not relevant to the context, is praised
in order to indicate the demerits of the actual subject matter in hand.
Though Dandin does not verbally mention this point, still, the word
stutih in his definition and also the illustration given by him make
this point clear.

58  dhanyāh khalu vane vātah kahlarasprasāśitaḥ
Rāmamindivarasyaṇam ye aprāntyanivaritaḥ //
Sahityadarpana of Visvanātha.
Chap. 10  Page - 582.
It is to be noted here that the figure of speech aprastutaprasāma as defined and illustrated by early rhetoricians specially by Dandin has no connection with the cause and effect relation, still we have included it under the group of the figures of speech based on causal relation, because in the modified form as in the works of later scholars it is definitely connected though partly, with the cause and effect relation as discussed in the third chapter.

The treatment of the figure of speech aprastutaprasāma in the Kavyālāṃkārasūtra of Vāmana is quite different from other scholars. Vāmana states this figure as a variety of Upamā for, there is certainly a sense of similarity in this alamkāra. Immediately before aprastutaprasāma Vāmana mentions fāmasokti in which the ‘upameya’ is implied ( amuktau samasaktih ). In order to differentiate this from aprastutaprasāma the ‘latter is defined as -

\[ \text{kiñciduktavaprasutaprasāma} \]

Though in both the cases two similar objects are stated, still in Samāsakti the Upameya is understood, whereas in aprastutaprasāma the upameya or prastuta ( subject matter to be described ) is suggested by ‘linga’. This is stated by Vāmana himself in his commentary

\[ \text{Upameyasyā kiñcidilingamātrārṇokau samānavastunyasa-} \]

\[ \text{prastutaprasāma} \]

This definition of aprastutaprasāma given by Vāmana is thus different

60 Ibid. Sūtra - 4
61 Ibid. Page - 57.
from that given by other scholars. Older rhetoricians, like Bhāsa, Udbhata or Dandin state it as the description of an object not relevant to the context, but Vyāsana puts the matter from a different point of view. He states that the contextual meaning (prastuta or upameya) is suggested by a linga i.e., the aprastuta. Here Vyāsana comes closer to the modern rhetoricians who state that in the figure aprastutaprasamsa the prastuta is indicated by the aprastuta (aprashtat prastutancaamyate... etc.).

By the expression lingamātreṇa in this commentary, Vyāsana probably suggests that upameya and upasāna must be linked in Kāryakaranabhāva or sāmānyavīteṣeśabhāva. The illustration of aprastutaprasamsa given by Vyāsana is:

lavanyasindhuraparalva hi keyamatra
yatrotpalāni saśinā saha saśplavante
Unmajjati dviradakumbhatī ca yatra
yatūpāra kadalikāndamālarṇādānā. 63

Here all these are descriptions of objects irrelevant to the context but these suggest the contextual meaning.

The figures of speech discussed above are directly based on cause and effect relation. But it is stated in the third chapter that the figures of speech like ‘hetu’, ‘anumāna’ and ‘kāvyaliṅga’ which are directly based on inference, can be included in the group of the figures of speech based on causal relation.

62 Śāntyadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha. Chap. X. Kār. 77
Among these, the figure anumāna is not at all mentioned in the works of early rhetoricians. But the figure ‘hetu’ though not accepted by Bhāṣā is discussed by Dāṇḍin.

Bṛha does not accept ‘hetu’ as a figure of speech as there is no vakrokti or strikingness of expression. He clearly states:

hetuṣcā sūkṣmaleso’tha nūlaṃkāraya suṣṭah
samudāyabhidhānaśya vakroktyanabhidhānateḥ.

Thus according to him in the figures of speech hetu sūkṣma and leśa there is mere statement of facts. In this context he states that in the illustrations like

‘gato’stamarko bhūtinduryānti vāśya pakṣineḥ etc there is no poetry at all, ( ityevamādi kiś kāvyam vārtāmenāṃ pracaśat). So Bhāṣā does not recognise these three figures for there can be no figure of speech except vakrokti ( yatno’yaṃ kavinā kāryaḥ ko’laṃkāro’nayū vinā ).

Udbhata however mentions the figure of speech hetu but he names it as Kāvyahetu. He defines this figure as

‘ārutsam ekam yadanyatra smṛteramubhavasya vēḥ hetuṣuḥ pratipadyeta kāvyalingaṃ taducyate.’

65 Ibid. Kār - 87
66 Ibid. Kār - 85
67 Kavyālaṅkārasārasaṅgraha of Udbhata. Chap. 6 Kār - 7 (74) Page 61.
When one thing heard, becomes the cause of calling to mind or experiencing some other thing, the figure of speech is called काव्यलिङ्ग. It is to be noted here that at the first stage while giving the list of the figures of speech, Udbhata mentions this figure as 'Kavyahetu', whereas while defining this figure he names it as 'Kavyalinga'. From this it is suggested that by the word 'hetu' Udbhata mentions only the 'जुःपकर्ते'. This जुःपकर्ते is concerned with anumāna only.

According to the logicians, 'hetu' and 'liṅga' are synonymous though in daily use the hetu is used in the sense of cause i.e. 'कारकर्ते' also. Whatever it may be, Udbhata takes the words 'hetu' and 'liṅga' as synonymous and defines काव्यलिङ्ग or काव्यहेतु as गुरुसमाकि यदान्यत्र etc. It is to be noted here that Udbhata names this figure as काव्यहेतु or काव्यलिङ्ग in order to differentiate it from 'साध्र्यलिङ्ग' (logical 'hetu'). The काव्यहेतु does not belong to insipid composition just as साधर्यलिङ्ग but it always belongs to compositions rich in rasa or sentiment. The illustration of काव्यहेतु is -

चायेवा तवा सेण्णकान्तेऽकिन्दिकान्ज्वलि एते. 68

Though Udbhata states काव्यहेतु and काव्यलिङ्ग as the same figure of speech later rhetoricians like Visvaśātha etc. take काव्यलिङ्ग and hetu as two separate figures of speech. We shall discuss it later.

68 Chāyevā tavā sāṣāṇkānteḥ kīnḍiṣakānteḥ kīnḍiṣaṁ jāvaḷā / vibhūṣākatanādeṣān darsāyaṁ tuṇoti mām / Kāvyālakārasārasāgraha of Udbhata.
Chapter - 6. Illus. 8
Dandin makes elaborate discussion on the figure of speech hetu. To refute the opinion of Bhamaha who does not accept the figures like hetu, sukama etc. Dandin establishes -

hetusca sukamalesu ca vacanuttamabhusanas.  

Among these, the figure hetu is discussed with much importance but mysteriously however, Dandin does not give any definition of this figure of speech. He only states that 'hetu' is mainly of two types - 'Karakajnapakau hetu'. These two again are of various types.

Dandin gives the conception of all these types by illustrations only. The first illustration of 'hetu' given by Dandin is -

_ayamandolitapraudhasandanadrumalayavan_

_utpadayati sarvasya priti maalamayantaruh._

This is an illustration of 'Karakahetu'. The 'malaya' breezes are the cause of the creating of pleasure of all. In the second illustration -

_candanarayanamadhuyasansyamalayanjharan_

_pathikamabhavaya pavana yamupadhistah._

Dandin states that 'hetu' can not only be 'sadhaka' but also it may be 'abhava'. Here the breeze is the cause of the absence of the travellers. So it is 'abhavahetu'.

Then Dandin states the verses like gato'atamarkah, bhunturyanti vasa ya paksinah etc. as illustrations of 'jnapaka hetu' for here the evening is indicated by the statements like the setting
of the sun, rising of the moon etc. Next Dandin illustrates varieties of 'bhāvarūpahetu' and 'abhāvahetu'. Then he shows examples of the varieties of 'citrahetu' viz. 'dūrakāryahetu', 'kāryasahejahetu', 'kārayantarejahetu', 'ayuktakāryahetu' and 'yuktakārya'. Thus, it is found that the figure of speech 'hetu' is dealt with by Dandin with minute details though his predecessors do not give so much importance to this particular figure of speech.

Vāmana however does not at all mention the figure of speech 'hetu'.

The figure of speech Kavyalinga however is not accepted by Bhāma, Dandin and Vāmana. According to Udbhata Kavyahetu and Kavyalinga are same alamkāra though by later rhetoricians these are recognised as separate figures of speech.

The above mentioned figures of speech are directly based on cause and effect relation. But there is another group of alamkāra where causal relation operates indirectly. We have discussed in the third chapter how causal relation operates, in the cases of 'Upama', 'Rūpaka', 'Ullākha', 'Nidarsana' etc. Now we are going to discuss how these figures of speech are dealt with in the early rhetorical works.
Upama is considered to be the most important among all the figures of speech. It is the oldest type of embellishment used by the poets. In the Vedic texts, where other figures of speech were more or less rare, Upama is used here and there, somewhere to make the statements clear and mostly to embellish the statements. Thus, in the hymn -

"sa nay piteva sūnave' gne supayano bhava
sacasa'vā na svastaya" 73

the Upama is used to clarify the statement. Again in the hymn -

'suryo devimusam rocammanam:
maryo na yoṣāmachyeti pascat
yatra naro devyan-yagani:
vitanvate prati bhadrāya bhadrāya" 74

Upama is used to embellish the statement. In the whole realm of Vedic literature the use of the figure of speech Upama is very frequent. In later ages also, if we make a survey of the Sanskrit literature, we shall find that the number of the uses of the figure of speech Upama is larger than that of other figures of speech. According to some scholars, Upama is the original figure of speech and other figures are off shoots of this alamkāra. Appayya Dīksita in his Citramānasa states in the clearest term that Upama is the only figure of speech and this very figure shows itself in various forms in various cases and then we give different names to it as Rupaka Ulpka, Samascti etc.

73 Bhgvedasamhitā. Mandala - 1. Sūkta - 1 Mantra - 9
74 Ibid. Sūkta - 115, Mantra - 2
He compares Upama with an actress ( sailusī ) who plays different roles clad in different attires and enchants the audience.

(Upamaikā sailusī sampraptā citrabhumikābhedān
ranjaya kāvyarange nṛtyanti tadvidem cetah ). 75

Due to this importance of Upama all the rhetoricians former or later mention this figure of speech. Even Bharata, who accepts only four figures of speech, defines, illustrates and classifies Upama. He gives much importance to this figure of speech. While mentioning the names of the alāmākāras, he at first mentions Upama

(Upama dipakā caiva rūpakaṃ yamakaṃ tathā;
Kāvyasyaithe hālamkārācetvārāh purākṛātīn ). 76

In spite of the fact that there are numerous figures of speech, Bharata mentions only Upama, Rūpaka, Dipaka and Yamaka. This he did either to suggest that in dramatic works only these four figures of speech should be used to produce charm or that the remaining figures of speech are the off-shoots of these four. The question now arises how it is that Bharata mentions Upama and Rūpaka separately though sadrśya or similarity lies at the root of both. The only reply to this question is that the relation between Upamaṇa and Upameya in Upama is similarity which is prominent, whereas as in the case of Rūpaka, the relation is 'abheda'. The former one is poetical similarity and the latter is poetical superimposition. Thus Abhinavagupta says in his Abhinavabhārati -

---

75 Citramimāśā by Appayya Dīksita. Chap. 1 Page - 1
Thus, in Rūpaka, the two (the upāma and the upameya) are identified in one whole. So Bharata is justified in mentioning these two (upamā and Rūpaka) as separate figures of speech.

The definition of Upamā given by Bharata is:

\[ \text{Upamā nāma adhyātma sājñātā gunākrtti samāsāraya.} \]

As the Natyasastra of Bharata is the first available work on poetics, this definition of Bharata expresses the first conception of the figure of speech Upamā. It is to be noted here that the fundamental conception of Upama has not changed far in later age from that of Bharata. Upama is based on similarity or sāḍrāya of 'guna' and 'ākṛti'.

This very conception is presented in more or less modified form in the works of later rhetoricians. In the figure of speech Upamā as Bharata defines it, there is apparently no relation with the cause and effect relation. Upamā is based on sāḍrāya. But if we discuss the point critically, we shall see that the causal relation operates though indirectly in the figure Upamā. In this abhāsākara, one thing is compared to another, but there must be some reason for this comparison; similarity is that cause. Due to similarity, one thing is compared to

---

77 Abhinavabhārati by Abhinavagupta. Commentary on the Kār - 40 Chap. 16 of the Natyasastra.

78 Natyasastra of Bharata. Chap. 16 Kar 41 Page 521.
another. Therefore, similarity is the cause and the comparison is the effect. Bharata indicates this point by the expression - साद्रयेनोपामियाते.

By the use of the third case-ending in साद्रयेना, he indicates, that here is 'hetu tritiya' and साद्रया is the hetu or cause. The existence of the causal relation in the figure of speech उपमण्या may be proved from another point of view. Bharata mentions five varieties of उपमण्या —

प्रसादाय गाव्यानाम कालङ्का साद्रया तथा
किंचित्का साद्रया याह्य निर्याण देवाधिकानां.

This classification is based on the result of the comparison i.e. when the comparison renders the sense of praise, the upamā is "प्रसादोपामण्या". Thus, when the result of the comparison is censure or reproach, the upamā is "निन्दोपामण्या". So it is clear that the comparison is the cause and praise or reproach is the effect. Thus, in the figure of speech upamā as defined and classified by Bharata, there is a sense of cause and effect relation.

This classification of उपमण्या however, differs from that of later rhetoricians. Even Bhāmaha, who is till now considered to be the immediate follower of Bharata, does not follow this method of classification. He only accepts the three varieties in order to show respect to his predecessors. Bharata gives suitable illustrations of each variety mentioned by him. The illustration of प्रसादोपामण्या is —

79 Nātyasāstra of Bharata. Chap. 16 Kār. 46.
Bharata recognises another classification of Upama on the basis of the number of Upana and Upameya.

Bhūmaha, the author of Kāvyālaṃkāra is called the father of the alaṃkāra school. He discusses the figure of speech Upama with much importance. The definition of Upama given by Bhūmaha is -

viruddhenopamoahena dosakālikyādibhīh
upameyasaya yat gūnayaṃ gurāleaṇa sopamā.

Bhūmaha's definition of Upama deserves a special note. It is he, who points out the Keynote of Upama as an alaṃkāra. The upamaṇa and Upameya are totally different from each other. This distinction (bheda) is neither 'svagata', nor sajātiya, but it is the 'vijātiyabheda' which forms the very nucleus of Upama. This is indicated by Bhūmaha by the expression - viruddhenopamāṇena.

The similarity is with respect to the 'dharma' and not to the 'dharmin' and thus, due to this similarity of 'dharma', the two dharmas are held as similar. The similarity of 'dharma' in an illustrious...
upama should be nice and intelligible only through the faculty of mind. The later rhetoricians have no doubt given the definition of Upama in a scientific manner and differentiated it from other figures of speech but unfortunately however they did not mark this distinctive point and thus the whole credit belongs to Bhāmaha. It is on this account that Jayamangalā in his commentary on Bhāttikāvya has referred to this type of definition.\textsuperscript{83} After defining the figure of speech Upama, Bhāmaha states the words that express sādṛṣṭa viz. 'yathā' and 'iva'. The illustration of Upama given by Bhāmaha is -

durvākāndamiva śyāmaḥ tanvi śyāmalata yathā.\textsuperscript{84}

Here the slim body is compared to the śyāma creeper, the word 'iva' expresses similarity. In some cases without the words 'as' and 'like' similarity is expressed by component (samsāsa). In the example -

Kamalapatrakā lāsākavādaneti ca\textsuperscript{85}

the compounds express the meaning that the eyes of the lady are compared to the lotus and face to the moon. Thus, by the use of the suffix 'vat' similarity is expressed

(vatimūpi kriyāsānyām tadvadavābhidiyante).\textsuperscript{86}

According to Bhāmaha, 'prativastūpama' also is based on similarity. So he includes it in the figure of speech Upama. The definition of 'prativastūpama' is -

\textsuperscript{83} Jayamangalā by Jayamangalāśūri - Commentary on the Bhāttikāvya al. 31. Canto - 10. Page - 300-301.
\textsuperscript{84} Kavyālākāra of Bhāmaha. Chap. 2 Kār - 31. Page - 80
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid. Kār - 32.
\textsuperscript{86} Ibid. Kār - 33.
Bhāmaha mentions only three divisions of Upamā. These are 'nindā', 'prāsaṇa' and 'ācikhyāsā'.

( 

Bhāmaha states that these three divisions are recognised by rhetoricians older than Bhāmaha though any trace of the works of such rhetoricians except Bharata is not available so far. Bhāmaha does not make elaborate discussions on these divisions of Upamā, he only accepts them. But that some other scholars accept divisions like 'mālopanā' etc is not recognised by Bhāmaha.

Bhāmaha discusses with much importance the seven doas of Upamā viz. hīnātā, asambhava, lingavacanabheda etc. He states that these seven doas are declared by Medhāvin. It is peculiar to note that Bharata does not at all mention the point of doas of Upamā while his follower Bhāmaha gives so much importance to it. He not only mentions the names of the doas but also by giving suitable illustration in each case discusses how the doa operates there.

It is to be noted that in the definition of Upamā given by Bhāmaha there is apparently no connection with the cause and effect relation. But by the expression - 'gunaśeṣena' the existence
of causal relation is indicated. The similarity of Upamâna with the Upamâna is called Upamâ. But in fact, the Upamâna and Upamâna are two different things altogether. So there must be some cause of similarity. There must be some small common quality on the basis of which one thing can be compared to the other. Thus in the illustration of Upamâ given by Bhâmaha—

\[ \text{durvâkândamiva syâma takvi ayamâla yathā,} \]

the upamâna lady and the upamâna ayamâla are quite different objects. But due to the single common attribute ayamâta, these two are compared. Thus the cause of comparison is ayamâta and the comparison itself is the effect. So there is definitely an underlying causal relation in the figure of speech upama as discussed by Bhâmaha.

The treatment of the figure of speech upama is something new in Udbhâta. The definition of this alâkâra given by Udbhâta is—

\[ \text{yaceto hâri sadharmam upamânopanmayoh} \]
\[ \text{mitho vibhinnakalâdi abdayor upamâ tu tat.} \]

Here Udbhâta throws light on some important points of Upamâ which were not at all hinted at before. Udbhâta says that 'cetohâri sadharmyam' is Upamâ. Similarity of two objects is Upamâ, but it can not be considered as a figure of speech so far as there is no 'cetohâritva' or charmingness. That is to say, upamâna or similarity becomes a

---

91 Kâvyâlaâkhâra Prasâsâra of Udbhâta.

Chap. 1 Kâr - 15 Page - 17.
figure of speech only when it adds to the poetic charm. Thus, in
the expression 'gauriva gavaya' there is comparison no doubt, still
it is not an alamkāra as there is no strikingness in this expression.

That an ideal Upama is comparison between totally different
objects is indicated by the expression - 'vibhinnakālaśīdabdayoh'.
So, the conception of Upama is so modified and developed in the
Kāvyalakāraśāsana-graha of Udāha and he is followed by later
rhetoricians. Next Udāha discusses the particulars about Upama and
mentions its sub-divisions. This discussion on Upama is followed by
Vīśvanātha in later age, but none of the older rhetoricians discuss
the particulars about Upama so broadly and scientifically. This dis-
cussion includes the uses of the words like 'yatha' 'iva' etc. Next
Udāha illustrates each variety of Upama. At first he gives, two illus-
trations of 'sampūṇa śruti upama'—the first one illustrates
the use of 'yatha' and the second one of 'iva'. Thus he illustrates
all the varieties of upama one by one.

It should be admitted here that the figure as discussed by
Udāha has however no connection with the cause and effect relation.
Though the very conception of Upama has an underlying sense of causal
relation, as it is stated before, still Udāha, in his definition and
illustration does not at all indicate this point.
In the second chapter of Kāvyādāra, Dandin deals with the figures of speech based on sense ( arthālakāras ). Of these, Upama is mentioned immediately after 'svabhāvokti'. It seems that Svabhāvokti is different from 'Vakrokti' and for this reason it is mentioned first and then the other figures of speech based on Vakrokti are mentioned of which Upama is the most important. So Dandin deals with this alamkāra so broadly and he devotes as many as fifty Kārikās to the discussion of this figure. The definition of Upama given by Dandin is -

\[ \text{yathākathāncait sādhrayaṃ yatrodbhutaṃ prayāyaṃ.} \]

\[ \text{upamaśā sā taavyāḥ prapañcayam nidarśyate.} \]  

This is however a stereotyped definition and nothing new is hinted at here by Dandin. Just following the footsteps of his predecessors, Dandin states where some charming similarity due to comparison of two objects is manifested, that is Upama. Bhāṣāsa and Udbhata while defining Upama throw some new light on the conception of Upama, but unfortunately, however, Dandin is satisfied by giving simply a superficial idea on Upama in his definition. The cause and effect relation also is not at all prominent in the definition given by him. But Dandin gives attention to the classification of the figure of speech Upama. It is he, who mentions the largest number of the varieties of Upama. He discusses every one of these varieties with suitable example. At first dhamopama is mentioned with example and Dandin gives account for the name -

\[ \text{saśāttulyaḥdharmapradarṣaṇat.} \]

93 Ibid. Kār 15.
In this type of Upamā, the common attribute is directly shown. The example of this Upamā is

\[ \text{ambhorūhamivātāma muge karatalam tava}. \]

Here the common attribute 'ātāmratva' is verbally mentioned.

'Rejiyamiva te vaktram inetre nilotpale iva', is a case of vastūpamaa for here the common attribute is implied.

Next Dandin discusses the variety - viparyāsopama. The reason for the name is given by Dandin himself -

\[ \text{sā prasiddhiviparyāsād viparyāsopamasyate}. \]

This is called viparyāsopama as there is description of something which is contrary to the general tradition. In the example -

\[ \text{tavānjanamivonnidr amaravindamabhu&it i,} \]

the face is upamāna and the lotus is the upameya. But the tradition is that the lotus etc. are held as Upamāna and face etc. are generally described as upameya. But here there is violation of that tradition.

It is to be noted here that viparyāsopama which is called a variety of upamā by Dandin is not at all mentioned by later rhetoricians but the figure of speech 'pratipa' accepted by them is nothing but this viparyāsopama. Thus while defining the figure 'pratipa' Viśvanātha says -

\[ \text{prasiddhaayopamāanyakopameyatvaprapalpanam}. \]

So we see that in later age viparyāsopama is no more a variety of

---

95 Ibid. Kar - 16.
96 Ibid. Kar - 17.
97 Ibid.
Upamā but an independent figure of speech having a separate designation.
The figure anyonyopama as defined and illustrated by Dandin appears as
Upameyopama in later age. Here also Dandin accounts for the name -
anyonyotkaraśamsini. 99

As in this case each of the Upamāna and Upamaya contributes to each
others excellence. Next Dandin defines and illustrates 'niyamopama'
which is totally a new figure of speech not at all mentioned by rheto-
ricians older than Dandin nor by scholars of later age. It is so
named as here similarity with any other thing is excluded.

( anyasyāmyavayavyṣṭiṃīyaś ca niyamopama ). 100

Just like niyamopamā, anyamopama also is a figure of speech mentioned
only by Dandin. No other scholar former or later mentions it.

Samuccayopama, atisayopama and utprekṣitopama also are the new
sub-divisions of upamā mentioned by Dandin only. Other scholars
accept atisayopama and utprekṣitopama as separate figures of speech
named atisāyokti and utpreka respectively. Dandin though mentions
these two figures separately, accepts also the above mentioned two
varieties of Upamā. The next variety 'adbhutopama' is nothing but
"asambande eambandharyai atisāyokti" of later period. The variety
'schopama' as defined and illustrated by Dandin seems to appear as a
separate figure of speech named 'bhūtiniṃś' of the scholars of later
age. Thus, samśayopama and nirnayopama presented themselves in later
period as the independent figures 'sandeha' and 'nisṛṣaya' respectively.

99 Kavyāchāra of Dandin. Chap. 2 Kār. 18.
The two figures alesopama and samanopama are nothing but the figure 'alesa' but while 'alesopama', is the source of arthaslesa, 'samanopama' presents itself as sabdaslesa. Following the process of Bharata, Dandin classifies upama according to the sense it conveys, i.e. when reproach is understood, the figure of speech is 'nirapama', and where praise is described, the figure is 'prasamsopama'. In the same way, 'acikhyasopama' also is named. These and many other varieties of Upama are mentioned by Dandin some of which are accepted as separate figures of speech by later rhetoricians some again are accepted as varieties of Upama though the names are changed in some cases.

Next Dandin, following the method of Bhamaha, mentions the doses of Upama -

na lingagacane bhime na hindhjkatapi va
Upamadusesanayalam yatrodvega na phimata.

But at the same time he states in the clearest term that these are not faults at all when they do not produce 'Udvega' of the learned. That is to say mere the presence of the difference of number and gender (bhinnalingata) etc. will not be regarded as doses provided they do not disturb the realization of poetic beauty. In this point the conception of Dandin is more modified than that of Bhamaha. Bhamaha mentions the doses and illustrates the verses where these doses occur, but Dandin illustrates also the cases where 'bhinnalingata' etc. are not doses at all. In this case, Dandin deserves the special credit

101 Kavyadarsa of Dandin. Chap. 2 Kār 51.
to throw a new light on the conception of dasaḥ. This very idea in connection to the dasas has developed in later period. Mamāta in his Kavyaprakāśa clearly says - 'mukhyarthatirdosah'. 102 The so-called dasas can not be actually regarded as dasas so far as they do not disturb the meaning of the expression. It is true that Mamāta is a staunch follower of the Rasadhvani school and thus he indicates rasa by the term 'mukhya' (rasaṁca mukhyah). 103 for according to him— rasa or sentiment is the principal factor of poetry. Whatever it may be, the later rhetoricians are indebted to Dandin for the very clue regarding the conception of dasa.

Next Dandin gives a list of words denoting Upama. These are iva, yathā etc. Here Dandin follows the footsteps of Udbhata.

Vāmana in the Kavyālakṣaṇasūtra defines the figure of speech Upamā as —
Upamānopameyasya gunalesātaḥ sāmyasupama. 104
The similarity on a particular quality of the Upamāna and the Upameya is called Upamā. By the expression — gunalesātaḥ it is suggested that there is difference in all other points. Thus in the example — mukhamcabdraiva the Upameya mukha and the Upamāna candra are totally two different things. But on the ground of the single common attribute — āhladakatva (charmingness), these two are described to be similar. Vāmana recognises a few divisions of Upamā on the basis of the

102 Kavyaprakāśa of Mamāta. Chap. 7 Sūtra - 71 Page 263.
103 Ibid.
104 Kavyālakṣaṇasūtra of Vāmana. Adhikareṇa. - 3 Chap. 2.
sense conveyed by the comparison. Bharata in his *Kātyāyanaśāstra* accepts this type of classification of Upamā. But while Bharata accepts five varieties of Upamā, Vāmana recognises only three types—stutinindātātvākhyanesu.

Thus when by the comparison praise is suggested, the Upamā is stuti, again when ninda or reproach is suggested it is nindopamā. Some is the third variety. Vāmana recognises six cases of Upamā viz. hinaṇa etc.

Rūpaka:

As it is stated in the third chapter, the figure of speech Rūpaka is based on Kāryakārama as the causal relation operates here indirectly. In the figure of speech Rūpaka, there is superimposition (āropa) of one on the other. Thus, in the example—mukhacandrā sobhate, the face is described to be identical to the moon. But there must be some cause of this superimposition. The extraordinary sameness or similarity of the face and the moon is the cause of it and the superimposition itself is the effect or result. So the discussion of the figure of speech Rūpaka is not at all irrelevant in connection with the figures of speech based on causal relation.

105 Kāvyālakārasūtra of Vāmana. Adhikarana - 3 Chap. 2.
Like the figure Upama, the Rupaka also is discussed with so much importance by all the rhetoricians former or later. Even Bharata deals with this alamkara among the four figures of speech mentioned by him. The definition of Rupaka given by Bharata is peculiar -

\[ \text{nānādravyaṇārūgādyair yadoupasyaṇgūrṣrayam} \]
\[ \text{Rupanirvarṇanāyuktam tadrupakasāmani antarāma.}\]

Bharata gives also another definition of Rupaka:

\[ \text{suvikalpena racitam tulyāvyayavālaksanam} \]
\[ \text{kincit sadrūyasampannam yadrupam rupakam tu tat.}\]

None of these two definitions is accepted by later scholars, though the fundamental conception viz. Rupaka is based on sadrśya is accepted in a modified form. But the main point, that there is 'āropa' or 'abheda' or superimposition in Rupaka is not hinted at by Bharata.

The illustration of Rupaka given by Bharata is -

\[ \text{padmanāsthāh kumudaprabhasā etc.}\]

Bhamaha in his Kavyalamkara mentions thirty six figures of speech of which Rupaka is mentioned at the very outset. It is peculiar to note that Bharata and later rhetoricians also mention Upamā first and then Rupaka is mentioned by them. But this order is not maintained by Bhamaha. In his Kavyalamkara Rupaka is mentioned first and then Upama is mentioned. The definition of Rupaka given by Bhamaha is -

\[ \text{Upamaena yat tatvam upameyasya rupyate} \]
\[ \text{gunānam samatān drstaw rupakam āna tadvadūb.}\]

106 Hātyāśāstra of Bharata, Chapter 16 Kār 57 Page 325
107 Ibid. Kār 56
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This conception of rūpaka is accepted by later rhetoricians. The definition of rūpaka given by Bhāṣā is so much scientific and modified than that given by Bharata. Bhāṣā points out the very keynote of rūpaka. The fundamental point about this figure of speech is superimposition (āropa) i.e. the characteristics of Upamāna are imposed on the Upameya. Bhāṣā mentions this point for the first time in his definition - Upamāñena yat tatvam upameyasya rūppate, and later rhetoricians are indebted to Bhāṣā for this conception.

It is to be noted here that the existence of cause and effect relation is prominent in the definition of Bhāṣā. The figure of speech rūpaka as defined by Bhāṣā is imposition of the characteristics of Upamāna upon the Upameya. But there must be some cause of this imposition. Bhāṣā states this reason in clearest terms - guppanām samatāṃ ārtya. On the consideration of the sameness or similarity of the qualities of Upamāna and Upameya, the characteristics of one is imposed on the other. So here the sameness of qualities is the cause and āropa or superimposition is the effect.

Bhāṣā makes two classifications of rūpaka - samastavastuvīavyaya and ekadesavivarti.110 Next Bhāṣā gives illustrations of these two types of rūpaka. Bharata however mentions no sub-division of rūpaka but the classification of rūpaka made by Bhāṣā is followed by later rhetoricians though some other types of rūpaka are also mentioned by them.

110 Samastavastuvīvyayamekadesavivarti ca /
dvichā rūpakamuddistetattaccocyate yatha //
Kāvyālañkāra of Bhāṣā. Chap. 2 Kār. 22.
The treatment of the figure rūpaka is quite original in the Kavyālāmākaraśārasamgraha of Udbhata. The definition of rūpaka given by Udbhata is:

\[ \text{snutya sambandhavirāhāyat padena padāntaran} \]
\[ \text{gунavrttipradhānena yużyate rūpakaṃ tu tat} \]

This definition throws a new light on the conception of the figure of speech rūpaka. Bharata and Bhemaha stated that mere superimposition of the upādana on the upādeya is rūpaka, but Udbhata thinks on the matter from a different point of view. According to him when the direct relation of two terms is impossible (snutya samvandhavirāhāt), and a term is connected with another in a subsidiary relation,

(-gunavrttipradhānena yużyate) the figure of speech is rūpaka. Here Udbhata mentions the point of gunāvṛttit i.e., secondary meaning which was later on an important point of discussion in poetics. None before Udbhata mentions the existence of a secondary function of words specially in the case of alākāra. So the conception of the figure of rūpaka is so scientific and deserves so much attention of the critics who deal with figure of speech. In fact in the expression ‘mukhacandra’, the face is described to be identical with the moon. But it is practically impossible if we take the primary meaning of the terms (ṣrutī). So we must take some secondary meaning and then the meaning of the word ‘candra’ is not moon but a thing having the qualities same as the qualities of the moon. Then the relation of the two terms ‘mukha’ and ‘candra’ is possible. Thus we see that in every
case of rūpaka, the relation is not possible until the secondary meaning is accepted. The treatment of the figure of speech rūpaka in this light is quite original in Udbhata.

Like Bhāmaha, Udbhata also accepts two sub-divisions of rūpaka - samastavastuvisaya and ekadesāvivartī. He illustrates each variety. Bhāmaha only gives examples of these two types of rūpaka but Udbhata gives definitions also. The definition of Samastavastuvisaya is sāndhastasya etc. The definition of ekadesāvivartī is ekadesavivartī sayat parasāpeṇa rupanāt.

Dandin in his Kavyādarsa defines rūpaka immediately after Upama. The definition of rūpaka given by him is -

Upamaiva tirobhūtaḥ sā̤hā rūpakamamayate.

The two figures of speech Upama and rūpaka are the same. Only in the case of rūpaka, the difference between the Upama and upameya disappear. The figure of speech Upama is based on samānya or similarity, but at the same time there must be some difference between the objects compared. Thus, in the example 'mukham candra iva', there is no doubt difference between the face and the moon, still on the basis of the common factor 'āhlādakatva (charmingness), the face is compared to the moon. But in the case of rūpaka this difference between the face

112 Samastavastuvisayayamkekadesāvivartī - Kavyālaṅkāraśārasāgraha I.
113 Vandhastasya yateh srutya - Kavyālaṅkāraśārasāgraha Chap - 1.
and the moon disappears and these two things are described to be identical due to the extraordinary sameness (सतिन्यायतः)\textsuperscript{116} of them. For this reason Dandin defines रुपाका as - उपास्मा तिरोमुतात्मेदा etc. Next Dandin gives a few examples of रुपाका that are respectively illustrations of 'व्यासतरुपाका', 'साक्तारुपाका', 'अवयावरुपाका' etc. It is true that Dandin does not verbally mention the classifications, but the various types of illustrations given by him give the conception of different types of रुपाका. In the cases of अवयावरुपाका, युक्तरुपाका, अयुतरुपाका, वियावरुपाका, अवियावरुपाका, विरुद्धरुपाका etc. Dandin mentions the names of the divisions and also gives definitions with appropriate illustrations. It is peculiar to note that the वेदलूक्ते of Dandin is nothing but the figure of speech उल्लेखा of later period. The very illustration of वेदलूक्ते -

\begin{quote}
सामुद्रस्य सामुद्रसी गौरवनसि परवताः इति।
\end{quote}

is cited by later scholars like \textit{विश्वानाथ} as the example of उल्लेखा. Dandin gives reason of the name 'वेदलूक्ते' -

\begin{quote}
सामुद्रस्य सामुद्रस्य त्रातो हेतूभिः सागारः \\
\end{quote}

Later scholars however state two types of उल्लेखा due to the two different factors - ग्रहितुभेदा and विसयभेदा. The verse cited above is the case of विसयभेदा. Due to the two different qualities,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{116} कौव्यप्रकाससि (वृत्तिः परिभाषा) of \textit{कौव्यप्रकाससि}. Chap-10. \textit{वृत्तिः on the figure रुपाका}. Page - 593.
\item \textsuperscript{117} गौम्भिर्येन्द्रम्यम्या सूम्योपदाति गौरवनसि परवताः कौव्यादाराः. Chap. 2 कृ - 85.
\item \textsuperscript{118} कौव्यादाराः. Chap. 2 कृ - 86.
\item \textsuperscript{119} क्वचिद्भेदाद्ग्रथितेन्त्रैं विसयाभेदान्त्मैसत्तत्च क्वचित्ते सामयोक्तेन \\
\textit{कस्य} काछ्यतेहेक्यथाकर्मणि यह सामयोक्तेन इत्यते। \textit{सहित्यदर्पणम्}. Chap. 10 कृ - 53.
\end{itemize}
gravity and majesty, the same person is described to be identical with two different objects - the ocean and the mountain. In fact Dandin does not recognize the figure Ullekhā and includes the bases like gembhiryaṇa samudraśi etc. in the figure of speech rūpakā as there is superimposition due to some special reason. There are other subdivisions of rūpakā discussed by Dandin with suitable illustrations. But it should be noted here that no other rhetorician former or later mentions so many varieties of rūpakā. Some of these like heturūpakā as discussed above, are accepted as independent figures of speech by later rhetoricians.

Vāmana however shows no such originality in the treatment given of the figure of speech rūpakā. The definition of rūpakā by him is -

Upamānenopameyaya gūnasamāyā tatvēropo rūpakā. 120

Rūpakā is superimposition due to the sameness of the qualities of the Upamāna and the Upameya. The illustration of rūpakā is -

iyan gehe lakṣāṇir etc. 121

Vāmana however mentions no subdivision of rūpakā.

It is stated in the third chapter that the figure of speech Ullekhā can be mentioned in the group of the alamkāras where the causal relation operates indirectly. But this Ullekhā is however an alamkāra

---

121 Iyan gehe lakṣāṇirīyaṃsatavartimayānyoraprayasāvayāṁ sparso vapṣāi vahalāsandanaśravah //
ayāḥ kanthe bānāḥ śishāramāraṇo sauktikasah //
kimasyāḥ no prayaṇo yadparamāśāmyastu virahah //

Kāvyālāmākārasūtra Page 58.
Quoted from Uttarārāmāsarita of Bhavabhūti. Cant. 1. Sl. 39.
of later origin. The scholars of the early school of poetics viz. Bhamaha, Udbhata, Dandin and Vaman do not at all mention this particular figure of speech. Still it is discussed before that this Ullakha was recognised by Dandin though not as a separate alankara but as a sub-division of the figure of speech rupaka. But the name Ullakha was not at all mentioned by him, rather he named it as 'heturupaka'.

**Vyatireka**

The figure of speech vyatireka is based on cause and effect relation, though the relation operates here indirectly. The conception about Vyatireka has not however changed in later poetics from that in early rhetorics. Bhamaha in the second chapter of Kavyalankara defines vyatireka. The definition of this figure given him is:

\[ \text{Upamanavato'rthasya javaśeśamidarsanam} \]
\[ \text{vyatirekam tāmicchanti viśeśapādanād yathā} \]

Where the Upameya is described to be superior (to the Upamana) in order to bring out some excellence, the figure of speech is called vyatireka. The example of vyatireka given by him is:

\[ \text{aitasite pakṣamavati netre te tāmrarājini} \]
\[ \text{ekāntasubharasyāme tu pundarikāsitotpale} \]

Here the Upameya eyes are stated to be superior to the Upamana lotuses for the eyes are both white and black but the lotuses are solely white.

122 Kavyalankara of Bhamaha. Chap. 2 Kar - 75.
123 Ibid. Kar 76.
or solely black. The description of the superiority on the part of the Upameya is to state the extraordinary beauty of the Upameya viz. eyes.

In the figure of speech vyatireka as Bhūmaha states it there is apparently no existence of causal relation. But the expression - 'viśeṣanidarsanam' - description of superiority on the part of the upamāya indicates the existence of causal relation. The superiority of the Upamāna to the Upameya is stated. But there must be some cause of this superiority. In the example sitasita etc. the 'sitāsitātva' of the 'eyes' is the cause of superiority. The description of the superiority itself is the effect. If we proceed one step further we shall see that this description of superiority again is the cause of the statement of some special beauty of the upamāya. So the cause and effect relation operates in the case of the figure of speech vyatireka.

Udbhāta in the second chapter of Kāvyālāṃkāraśāstrasāgrahā deals with the figure of speech vyatireka. The definition of vyatireka given by him is -

\[
\text{viśeṣa\text{āpādana} yat syāḥ upamānopa\text{meyaya}yoh} \\
\text{nimittādṛṣṭi\text{āpādaha} vyatireka dvīdhā tu saṁ.}^{124}
\]

The statement of the superiority of upamāna or upameya (over upamāna or upameya respectively) is vyatireka. It is of two kinds according

---

124 Kāvyālāṃkāraśāstrasāgrahā of Udbhāta. Chap. 2 Kār - 6(29).
as the reason (of the superiority) is stated or not. That is in one type of vyatireka the reason is not stated. Of this type, the verse - सा गौरी सिखराम गत्वा etc. is stated as illustration.

The verse - पद्मम ओ निष्ठिरकम etc. illustrates the second type of vyatireka.

In the definition of Udbhata however the existence of causal relation is so clear. He verbally mentions cause by the expression - निमित्तानुशिष्टिष्ठब्याम etc. The definition as well as the classification of vyatireka given by Udbhata is the same as that found in the works of later rhetoricians. The only difference is that in the definition of विपणत्था etc it is stated clearly there should be superiority or inferiority on the part of the upameya (अधिकायमुपजयाया उपमानमुन्यनातात्त्वात) while Udbhata simply states it as - 'विचिद्धपदात्रम'.

Dandin defines vyatireka as -

साधपत्ते प्रतिते वा सूरये वस्तुः द्वयोऽऽ तत्र यद भेदकथानम् vyatirekaḥ sa kathyate

Where in spite of the similarity of the Upamāna and Upameyā either expressed in words or indicated the difference between these two

125 सा गौरी सिखराम गत्वा दादासमं तपाख्रेम राहुपिताप्रभास्य द्वरकयियांति दुरस्तास्थाम काव्यालक्षणां. Chap. 2. Illus. 7.
126 पद्मम ओ निष्ठिरकाम दिन्यो चौद्राम ओ निष्प्रभाम अपुराण्यायेन सतात उक्षेन अह्नेप्रकर्वति। काव्यालक्षणारसास्यांग्राहः Chap. 2. Illus. 8.
127 साहित्यदार्पणा of विपणत्था. Chap. 10 कार - 71.
128 काव्यस्मार्क of Dandin. Chap. 2. कार - 180.
(Upamāṇa and Upameya) is stated, that is called vyatireka. Now, this difference (bheda or vaisādṛṣṭya) may be of two types — either the Upameya may be superior to the Upamāṇa or it may be inferior to it. This is not however made clear in the definition of Dandin but later scholars clearly discuss this point. The illustration of vyatireka given by Dandin is:

\[ \text{dhaireyaśeṣayaśadhirṣayasyaśubhāntaḥ} \]
\[ \text{gnaistulocat bhedaastu vapsaivedrānaṃ} \]

Here, there is similarity between the king and the ocean in respect of the qualities but in respect of physical factor there is difference between the two. This is according to Dandin 'śakavyatireka' for here the point of difference viz. the beauty of the body is described to be existed only in the Upamāṇa, viz. king. In the case of 'ubhayavyatireka' the differentiating factors exist in both Upamāṇa and Upameya. Here Dandin illustrates the verse - abhinna belau etc. In this case the two differentiating factors - añjanasaṅkāsatvam and cāmiṅkardyutimattvam exist in Upamāṇa and Upameya respectively.

Next Dandin discusses saśīla vyatireka which is again of two types — 'saṃpekaś' and 'saheṣuka'. In all these above mentioned types of Vyatireka, the similarity is expressed by words (sabdopatta). Now Dandin shows the varieties of vyatireka where the similarity is implied. In the two sub-divisions - sadāvyatireka and sajāṭīya vyatireka the similarity is merely indicated.

In the definition of Dandin also the cause-and-effect relation is not prominent. But by the expression - 'bheda-kathana' it is indicated that there must be some cause of this description difference. So the causal relation operates here indirectly.

Vāmana in his Kavyālāṁkāra defines vyatireka in the most clear and concise way. The definition of this figure given by him is - upameyasya guṇatirekitvaṁ vyatirekah. The superiority of the qualities of the Upameya is vyatireka. He illustrates vyatireka by the verse -

satyas herina avakayafā prāpanneubhagā. mukho tā sanām saīnah kātu sa kalēnkavisubtāh

Here the face and the moon, the Upameya and Upāmāna respectively are similar, but the extra qualification of the Upameya face is that it is stainless. There is another type of vyatireka where the qualities are not mentioned.

The figures of speech atisayokti, utprekṣa, apahnuti, bhṛṅtimaṇḍ etc also can be discussed under the head of the figures of speech based on Kāryakūranabhāva. for, in these cases the cause and effect relation operates indirectly.

130 Kavyālāṁkāra-sūtra of Vāmana. Adhi. 4. Chap. 3 Sūtra 22.
131 Ibid. Page - 64.
Among these figures, atisayokti is discussed with so much importance specially by later rhetoricians and it is also to be noted that in the later rhetorical works the causal relation is directly mentioned in this figure of speech. Thus Viśvanātha states, while discussing the classifications of this alāmāra, - paurvāparyātyayah kārṣyhetvoh etc. When the order of cause and effect is violated, i.e. the effect comes before the cause and this exception of the order brings a special charm, it can be taken as a sub-division of the figure of speech atisayokti. But in other cases of atisayokti, there is no connection with the cause and effect relation. Thus the other four types of atisayokti - bhedaṣyabheda etc. are beyond the range of causal relation. It is true that in these cases also, the existence of causal relation can be established. The figure of speech atisayokti itself as defined by Viśvanātha etc - siddhāvat e adhyavaśeṣayatātisayoktirnigadhyate is based on cause and effect relation for the word adhyavaśeṣa means visayanigaranēbhedapratipattirvisayinodhyavaśayeh. Now this 'visayanigaraṇa' or devouring or disappearance of the actual subject matter in hand must have some cause behind it, and thus this alāmāra is connected with the causal relation. Still,

133 bhelepyahedah sambandhe’śāmbandhaśadvaparyayau 
paurvāparyātyayah kārṣyhetvoh aś peṭhādha tataḥ. 
134 Sahityadarpana. Chap. 10 Kār - 64.
135 Sahityadarpana of Viśvanātha. Chap. 10 Vṛtti on the Kār No. 64 Page - 552.
the existence of causal relation in this manner is essential in every form of expression. In this world everything is bound somehow or other with the chain of cause and effect relation. We shall discuss it later in the sixth chapter. In the present chapter however we are discussing with the figures of speech where the existence of causal relation is verbally mentioned or its indirect existence is somehow indicated. From this point of view the figure of speech atisayokti comes partly under the causal relation (when it is due to the violation of the order of cause and effect) but partly, it is beyond the range of causal relation. Whatever it may be, we shall make here a brief survey about the figure atisayokti as found in the early rhetorical works.

Bhamaha gives so much importance to the figure of speech atisayokti. He defines this figure as -

nimitato vaco yatta lokātīkrāntagocaram
manyate atisāyoktīś tum alaṃkārata yatā. 136

A statement which for some reason refers to an idea surpassing the ordinary experience (lokātīkrāntagocaram) is known as atisayokti. Here Bhamaha mentions clearly that there must be some reason for the description of this extra-ordinary idea. He verbally mentions 'nimitato'. But Bhamaha does not mention the various sub-divisions of atisayokti.

Udbhata does not show originality in the definition of atisayokti. Following the footsteps of Bhāmaṇa he defines this figure as:

\[ \text{nimitta yatta vaco lokātikrāntaścaram} \]
\[ \text{manyantā' tisayoktim tām alamkāratāya budhāh.} \]

But Udbhata deserves the credit for his classification of the figure atisayokti. He mentions four types of this figure:

1. bhedanānyātavamanyatra nānātvaṁ yatra bhāhyate
2. tathā saṁbhāvyānaṁarthaṁbhāṅghe' tisayokte naï
3. Kāryakārenānyatra paurvāparyaviparyat
4. āśubhāväṁ samālambya bhāhyate ao'pi purvayat.

The first variety arises due to imposing sameness where there is difference in reality. The second type is imagining difference where there is actually no difference. The third variety is describing some imaginary thing which is practically impossible.

The fourth one arises due to the reversion of cause and effect to show the quickness of effect. Thus we see that the fourth type of atisayokti is directly connected with the causal relation.

This classification of atisayokti is however accepted by later scholars. Next Udbhata gives four suitable examples of these four types of atisayokti.

137 Kavyālaṅkāraśāraśāraṇaḥ of Udbhata. Chap. 2 Kār - 11 (34).
138 Ibid. Kār 12-13 (35-36)
Bandin defines atisayokti as:

\[ \text{vivakṣayā viśeṣasya lokasaṁsitāvartini} \]
\[ \text{asaṅvatisayoktiḥ svādālmākārottaṁ yathā} \]

Here Bandin does not show originality in the conception of atisayokti, but following the footsteps of Bhamaha and Udbhata he states that description surpassing the natural limits of a particular object is called atisayokti and this is an excellent figure of speech. Then he gives a few illustrations of atisayokti in every one of which something supernatural is described. In the definition of Bandin however there is no connection with the cause and effect relation.

The definition of atisayokti given by Vāmana is:

\[ \text{sambhāvyadharmaḥ daśa-karṣakaśaṅtiṣayoktiḥ} \]

This definition however is not so stereotyped as the other three definitions mentioned above, though the fundamental conception does not differ so much. Vāmana gives two illustrations of this figure of speech.

As it is stated above, the figures of speech like apahnuti, bhṛṇṭimūṇ etc are connected though indirectly with the causal relation. The figure apahnuti is as defined by later scholars:

\[ \text{Kāvyādarsa of Dandin. Chap. 2 Kār – 214} \]
\[ \text{Kāvyālaṁkāra-ūttra of Vāmana. Adhikaraṇa - 4. Chap. 3 Sūtra 10.} \]
prakṛtaṁ pratisidhyānyastāpenaṁ syādapahnutih

When in order to conceal the subject matter in hand, another thing is described the alāmākara is called apahnuti. Now, this apahnava or concealment of the facts must have some reason behind it. But the existence of cause and effect relation in this way can be established in every mode of expression. Thus in the figure of speech bhrūntimān also the cause and effect relation operates. Bhrūntimān is defined by Visvānātha as -

śāmyādatasmiṁstadvuddhiḥ bhrūntimān pratibhotthita.

Here the fifth case-ending in 'śāmyāt' is 'hetau' and it indicates that this 'atasaṁ tudvuddhiḥ' or taking a thing as another is due to the similarity (śāmyāt) of them. So the similarity is the cause here and the description of a thing as it is not, is the effect. So the existence of causal relation is not far to seek in this case. Still the development of these figures is not shown in the present chapter for in these figures of speech the actual charm lies not in the existence of causal relation but in the sense of similarity underlying them. It is true that in some of these cases, we can not realise the proper meaning of the expression until we realise the cause and effect relation operating there. But in fact the cause and effect relation underlies in every mode of expression as there is nothing in the world that is not bound with causal relation. In the figures of speech discussed above, the causal relation is prominent. Though in the figures like -

142 Ibid. Kar - 52.
virodha, aprastutapratadāśa etc. the cause and effect relation
operates indirectly, still the proper appreciation of the
alāṃkāra depends upon the realisation of the causal relation.
So we have discussed the development of these figures in this
chapter. But the cases of aprahnuti, bhṛntimān etc. are a little
different. Here the causal relation neither gives the actual
charm of the alāṃkāra nor the realisation of its indirect existence
is essential for the appreciation of the alāṃkāra. So, the
developments of these figures are not discussed in this work.