Till the rise of the dhvanivāda propounded and established by Anundavardhana, poetics was confined to the treatment of guna, riti, dōṣa and alaṃkāra. Of these, alaṃkāra held the highest position and thus the whole discipline was named as Alaṃkārasāstra. But the establishment of the dhvanivāda or rasadhvanivāda brought about almost a revolutionary change in the field of poetics. Not only the conception of dōṣa, guna and riti underwent the change but the figures of speech also received a different treatment in the hands of later authors who started the new school. Among the rhetoricians of this new school, we may mention the names of Rudrata, Bhoja, Ruyyaka, Mamata, Vīvanātha and Jagannātha Vidyādharā and Vidyānātha also belong to this school. Everyone of these scholars takes the figures of speech from a new light. According to them alaṃkāra, guna etc. have no usefulness in poetry when taken independent of rasa. But they add to the beauty of poetry as the subordinate factor of rasa. Thus there is difference in the treatment of the alaṃkāras in later school from that in the works of early rhetoricians. Firstly, the division of the alaṃkāras as sebdālaṃkāra and arthaalaṃkāra and also the sub-divisions of arthaalaṃkāra in various
forms are made in these works. Though the earlier rhetoricians like Dandin etc. had indirectly mentioned the classification of saabdalasakara and arthalamkara, still it is Rudrata who makes a clear mention of this division and according to him the arthalamkaras are divided into four classes viz. vastava, aupsmya, atisaya and ane as already stated before.

\[ \text{arthayalamkarā vāstavasaupasyamatīseyālesāh} \]
\[ \text{esāmeva visesāh anyo tu bhavanti niḥsesāh. } \]

The rhetoricians of the new school arranged the arthalamkaras in a separate form and added a number of figures of speech which were not recognised by the authors of the pre-dhvani school. Of the new figures of speech added by them mention must be made of Karanamala, asaṅgati, visama, anumana, parimaṇkyā - which are directly or indirectly based on cause and effect relation.

KARANAMALA

It is stated in the third chapter, the figure of speech Karanamala is directly based on cause and effect relation as the name itself indicates. But this Karanamala is not at all mentioned in the works of early rhetoricians like Bhāmaha, Dandin etc.

In the works of the later rhetoricians however this figure is discussed with definition and illustration. Rudrata who divides all the figures into four sections includes Karanamala in the vāstava group. The definition of Karanamala given by him is:

Karanamala seya yatra yathā purvameti karanatom arthānām purvarthāḥ bhavatīdām sarvanevāti.²

Where among the subject matters stated, the former one becomes the cause of the latter, the figure of speech is called Karanamala. The illustration of the figure is:

vinayena bhavati guminām guminātī lokānurajyate sakalāḥ abhigamyate'nuraktāh saachāyo yuṣyate laksmya.³

The first stated here is vinaya or modesty which is the cause of the latter viz. guma. Next this guma is stated to be the cause of sakalalokānurajyana. Same is the case in the second part of the verse. So we see that in this figure of speech Karanamala there is a series of cause and in every case the results of the causes are present. So we can safely include this Karanamala in the group of the figures based on cause and effect relation. It is clear from the definition and illustration that in the case of this figure of speech the causal relation operates directly.

It is to be noted here that Rudrata includes the figure of speech Karanamala in the vāstava category. We can

² Kāvyālāṅkāra of Rudrata. Chap. VII Kār - 84.
³ Ibid. Kār - 85.
support it as totally justified. Rudraṭa defines Vāstava as -

Vāstavamiti tajjneyam kriyate vastuṣverūpyaKartheṇam yat. 4

That is known as vastava where there is description of the nature of the subject matter. In the case of Kāraṇamālā there is only a series of causes set skilfully. In order to differentiate 'Vāstava' from the other divisions viz. aupamya, atisāya and āleśa, Rudraṭa states that here there is no question of aupamya or similarity, atisāya and āleśa.

(quṣṭuṛthamaviparītām nirupamamamatiśayaśāleśam). 5

It should be admitted that the description of cause and effect relation is included in the description of the nature of a thing. So that Rudraṭa includes the figure of speech Kāraṇamālā in the Vāstava category of figure of speech is justified.

Ruyyaka the author of aḷaṁkāraśarvasva includes the figure of speech Kāraṇamālā in the category śṛṅkhalāvandhopaśīlā as in this case the causes are arranged in a śṛṅkhalā or chain. The definition of Kāraṇamālā given by Ruyyaka is -

Fūrvasya pūrvasyottarottaratāhutve kāraṇamālā. 6

When the subject stated former becomes the cause of the latter, the figure of speech is Kāraṇamālā. The illustration of this figure is -

4 Kāvyālaṁkāra of Rudraṭa. Chap. VII Kar - 10
5 Ibid.
Here in the first portion, jitendriyatva is described to be the cause of vinayaya and due to this vinayaya, gunaprakarga is gained. Same is the case in the last portion. So it is found that the 'Krama' or order in which the causes are set is skillful and brings the charm. For this reason Ruuyaka includes this figure in the group 'ćrīkhalāvandhopacita' for the strikingness in this case arises due to the setting of the causes in a chain.

It is apparent that in the figure of speech Kāraṇamālā as treated by Ruuyaka, the cause and effect relation operates directly.

It is true that chronologically there flourished many rhetoricians in the period between Rudraṭa and Ruuyaka i.e. between 10th to 12th century. Of them the names of Māmata, the author Kövyaprapaksā and of Bhoja, the author of Sarasvatikanthābharaṇa and Śrīkṛṣṇaprakāśā are worth mention. But here we are not going to discuss the treatment of the figures of speech based on a causal relation made by them as the treatment there bears no mark of originality. So far as the figure of speech Kāraṇamālā is concerned, the definition given by Māmata is just like that given by Rudraṭa and Ruuyaka — yathottaraṃ cet pūrvaṃ añc eto. Even the illustration

7 Alamkārasarvasvam by Ruuyaka. Page - 177.
8 Kövyaprapakṣā of Māmata - Chap. X Sūtra - 166.
is just the same as given by Rudrata and Ruyyaka. Bhoja however does not at all mention the figure of speech Kāraṇamāla. So we are perhaps justified in discussing the treatment of Ruyyaka after Rudrata for there is no other rhetorician worth mention except Bhoja and Mamata.

Visvanātha, the author of Sāhityadarpana is perhaps the most eminent rhetorician of the post-dhvani period. The definition of Kāraṇamāla given by Visvanātha is:

\[
\text{param param prati yadā pūrvapūrvasya hotaā} \quad \text{tadā kāraṇamāla ayāt.}
\]

Visvanātha however shows no such originality in defining this figure of speech. When the former statements become the cause of the latter ones the figure of speech is Kāraṇamāla. The illustration of Kāraṇamāla given by Visvanātha is:

\[
\text{srutam kṛtadhiyāṁ saṅgājāyate vinayāḥ ērūtāt} \quad \text{lokanurāgo vinayāṁna kim lokānurāgataḥ.}
\]

Learning comes from the association with the learned, learning is the cause of modesty and so on. Here the former is the cause of the latter. In this case the existence of the causal relation is prominent.

---

9 Sāhityadarpana of Visvanātha. Chap. 10 Kūr 77.
10 Ibid. Page 607.
Vidyādhara, the author of Ekāvalī is as stated before a contemporary of Visvanātha. The definition of Kāranamālā given by Vidyādhara is:

```
yadyatpurvaṁ tattad yathottaram cet kramaṁ
samārayati hetutvam bhavati ṭadā kāranamāleṣṭyālām-kaṁ.
```

The illustration of this figure of speech is:

```
vītaraṁ karūṇā tava kāranamālā vītaraṁ
sukṛtaṁya nivandhanam
sukṛtaḥetu yasyo yaśaṁ na kīṁ bhavatī vīra nṛsīṁha mahīpate.
```

This conception of Kāranamālā also is not at all different from that of other scholars mentioned above. The illustration also indicates that the former statements are described to be the cause of the latter ones.

The next remarkable rhetorician of the post-dhvani period is Appayya Dīksita. Though in his Citrasāṁsā Appayya mentions only a few figures of speech in which Kāranamālā is not mentioned but in his Kuvalayānanda, he mentions one hundred and twenty three figures of speech and in this work, the figure Kāranamālā is dealt with. The definition of Kāranamālā given by him is:

```
guṇaphal Kāranamālā syādyathāprikprāntaśaṅkaraṁ.
```

In this definition also there is no difference of conception from

---

11 Ekāvalī by Vidyādhara. Chap. 8 Kār - 45
12 Ekāvalī by Vidyādhara. Chap. 8.
13 Kuvalayānanda by Appayya Dīksita. Kār - 104.
that of the other rhetoricians, though the mode of expression is a little different in Kuvalayānanda. Specially the expression 'yathā prākṛṭaṅkāraṇaḥ' is totally new here, though the meaning of this expression – the former and the latter cause – is nothing original in the context of this figure of speech. The illustration of this figure is given by the verse –

\[ \text{nayena ārīṁ ārīyā tyāṃṣṭyāgena vipulāṁ yasyāḥ.}^{14} \]

In the Vṛttī, Appayya himself states that the figure of speech Kāraṇamālā may be of two types of which the first one is illustrated before. The illustration of the second type is given by Appayya as –

\[ \text{bhavanti narakāḥ pāpuḥ pāpuḥ dārīḍrasyābhavam dārīḍrasyamprādānena tasmādānāparo bhavet.}^{15} \]

Like Buyyaka, Jagannātha, the author of Rasagangādhara also includes the figure of speech Kāraṇamālā in the category – śrāṅkhālāmālā alaṅkārāḥ. According to him, when the former ones are related to the latter statements in a chain, or the latter ones to the former, that is śrāṅkhālā.

\[ \text{( panktirupena nivādāhāṃmarthānāṁ pūrvapūrvasyaottarottarasaṃ, uttarottarasaṅga va pūrvapūrvasmān sāmarṣṭam śrāṅkhālā.)}^{16} \]

That can be of various types – cause and effect relation, the relation of noun and adjective etc.

\[ \text{( tacco kāryakāraṇatāvivaśeṣaśeṣesyaśatādīnāśaṅkupam.)}^{17} \]

When in this śrāṅkhālā, the relation is cause and effect, the figure

15 Ibid.
16 Rasagangādhara of Jagannātha Chap. 2 Page – 461.
17 Ibid.
of speech is Karanamala. So Jagannatha defines it as—

saiva arunakalā anugunya

karyakaranabhāvarūpate karanamala. 18

Jagannatha also accepts two varieties of this alamkāra— the former ones are karaṇa and the latter ones are kārya—that is one type and the other is where the former ones are kārya and the latter ones are karaṇa. Next Jagannatha illustrates the two types of Karanamala by two verses respectively. The first one is—

labhyate punyair grhini manojña taya

suputrah paritah pavitrāh

spītām yābastaḥ samudeti nunan ;

tenāṣya nityaḥ khālu nākaloḥah

19

The illustration of the second type is—

svargāpavargau khālu daṇālaṃkārān

prasūte vipulaṃ samrddhiḥ

samrddhimalpetarabhāgadheyam ;

bhūgyam oṃ sūmbho tava padabhastih. 20

In the first illustration, the former statements are the cause of the latter ones; again, in the second statement, the former ones are effects and the latter are cause. Jagannatha however does not accept the illustration jitendriyatvam vinayasya karaṇam etc., given by scholars like Viśvanātha etc. for according to him there is dōsa in this verse.

18 Rasagangadhara of Jagannatha. Chap. 2 Page - 461.
19 Ibid. Anana - 2 Page - 461.
Whatever it may be, most of the eminent scholars of later period accept the figure of speech kāramāalā and discusses it with suitable illustrations and the treatment of this alamkāra in every case shows clearly the existence of causal relation.

**ASANGATI**

As it is stated in the third chapter, the figure of speech asangati is directly based on causal relation. This alamkāra is however not at all mentioned in the works of the early rhetoricians like Bhāmaḥa etc., But the rhetoricians of the later age mention this figure of speech.

Rudrata deals with the figure of speech asangati in the ninth chapter of his Kavyālāmākāra. He includes this figure in the group atisāya

\[
\text{( pūrvevīpa-atprekarbhekhamadgumādhi-ga-virodāh)
\text{visamāsaṅga-ti-pihi-viśīvēśa-va-viṣayā-viṣayā-nā-bhedāh)\text{21}}
\]

The definition of asangati given by Rudrata is

\[
\text{vispa-ṣte samākālaṃ kāraṇaṃ an-yatra kāryaṃ an-yatra
\text{yasyām-pa-labhya-ṣta viṣṇovāsaṅgatiḥ aṣeyam} \text{22}}
\]

21 Kavyālāmākāra of Rudrata. Chap. 9 Kār - 2
When in spite of the clear mention of the unity of time, the unity of place of the cause and effect is not described, i.e., the cause is existed in one place and the effect elsewhere, the figure of speech is called asangati. Here the fundamental rule of causation, i.e., the cause and the effect must exist in same place, is violated. Rudrata is however fully justified in including this figure in the 'atisaya' group as in this case some thing extraordinary is described and this description of extraordinary things is the fundamental conception of atisaya.

( yatrārthadharmaniyamah praciddhibādhāvyāpyayam
yatī, Kacīt kvacidatilokam sa syādityatīyastasya )

Here the charm of this figure of speech lies in the description of cause and effect existing in two places in order to bring out some strikingness. In the illustration, given by Rudrata, the cause 'āṅgapurana' exists in tanvī (beautiful young lady) and the effect "Kāmavardhana" exists in youngmen. But by this description, strikingness is bestowed to the expression. A question may arise here that the causal relation is mainly based on the actual nature of thing (vastuvārūpakathana) and thus this asangati must be included in the vāstavagroup. How is it, that Rudrata includes it in the atisaya group? The answer is that though the figure of speech asangati is related to the causal relation, still the actual charm of this figure lies not in the causal relation but in the description of the extraordinary

23 Kāvyālāmaka of Rudrata. Chap. 9 Kār - 1.
element which ultimately comes from the violation of the rule of causal relation. In the illustration given before, the extraordinary influence of love is described and this is ultimately stated by the description of difference of place of cause and effect. So we may safely support Rudrata, for including this asangati in the atisaya group, as it is the description of atisaya here that brings the strikingness.

Ruyyaka, the author of Alamkarasarvasva includes the figure of speech asangati directly in the category of the figures of speech based on causal relation. The definition of asangati given by him is -

tayostu bhinnadesatvasangatih.24

By the expression 'tayoh' he refers to 'karyakaranayoh' mentioned in the previous figure of speech "atisayokti"

(karyakaranayoh samakalatve purvaparyaviparyaye catisayoktih).25

Thus, when there is difference of place of the cause and effect, the figure of speech is asangati. In the Vrtti Ruyyaka himself makes the point clear -

Yaddesamayakaranam tadadesameva karyam drutam
nahi mahanasastho vahnih parvatadesastham chūmen janayati
Yadā tvanyadesastham karaṇamanyadesastham ca
karyamapibhadhyate tadocitasaṅgatinivruttresaṅgatyakhyo laṅkāraḥ.26

24 Alamkarasarvasva of Ruyyaka. Page - 263.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid. Page - 164.
Here Ruyyaka however gives the etymological meaning of the name asangati—ucitasangatinirvṛtteḥ. Ruyyaka also gives reason for including this figure in the Kāryakarana group—

sa ca viruddhakāryakaranaḥbhavyapraștāvādiḥa lakṣyate.\textsuperscript{26A}

The illustration of asangati given in the Alamkārasarvasva is—

prayah pathyaparādhiṃkhaḥ vīṣayino bhūpe bhavantyaḥ tmanā; nirdoṣasaścīvānabhajatayatimahāśilokāpavādaḥ varāh; vandyāḥ śālghyagunanātaeva vipine saṁtāṇgaḥḥājah param; bāhyo'yaṃ varaneva sevakaṇnaḥ dhiṃsvaravāthā maṇtrināh.\textsuperscript{27}

Here the cause 'pathyaparādhiṃkha' and, the effect 'upālambhabhavavīṣayaya' are existed in two different places (desā). The second illustration is—

sā vālā vayamayamagalbhavavasāḥ
sā stri vayam kātarāḥ; sā pāścimatimatpayodhara bharam dhatte sakheḍā vayam\textsuperscript{1}
sā klāntā jaghanaśthelana gurūnā gantuṁ
na saktā vayam dośairanyasamāritairairaṇatavo
jētāḥ sma ityadbhutam.\textsuperscript{28}

Mammata in the tenth chapter of Kāvyaprakāśa deals with the figure of speech asangati. He defines this figure as—

bhinnadesatayatantam kāryakaranaḥbhūtāḥ;
yugapadharmayoryatra khyātiḥ sa syādasangatiḥ.\textsuperscript{29}

Mammata however does not show originality in the definition of

\textsuperscript{26A} Alamkārasarvasva of Ruyyaka. Page - 164.
\textsuperscript{27} Alamkārasarvasva of Ruyyaka. Page - 164.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{29} Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammata. Chap. 10 Kār 124 Sūtra 191.
the figure of speech asangati. He illustrates asangati as —
jasāsa vanotāsā sa vaṃśā dhapatām ājanamā

dantakkhaam kāvole bahue vaṃśā savattinam.30

Here the cause of pain, dantakkhaam is in 'bahu' and the result pain is in 'savatti' (sapatni). So the place of cause and effect differs and the figure of speech is called 'asangati'. Mammata also in the vṛtti states the reason for the name 'asangati', as —

svabhāvotpannapa paraspara sangatityāgāt 'asangatih'.

In this case, the natural 'sangati' of the cause and effect is absent. Next Mammata establishes that though in the case of asangati, there is contradiction still it is not virodha as wherever there is contradiction, the figure is virodha or virodhābhāsa, but when the contradiction is concerned to the place of cause and effect, the figure of speech is asangati. This is clear in the vṛtti of Kavyaprakāsa —

esa ca virodhabadhini na virodhah, bhimādhāra-
tayaiva dvayoriha virodhitāyāh pratibhāsāt
virodhe tu virodhitvam ekāśrayaniṣṭhāmanuktāmah
paryavasitam apavādavisayaparihārenotsargaaya
vyavasthitech.31

31 Ibid. Page - 736.
Visvanātha in his Śāhityadārpana deals with the figure of speech asāṅgati in the tenth chapter of his work. His definition is stereotyped and even the illustration given by him was already cited by early rhetoricians. He defines asāṅgati as -

Kāryakāraṃyorbhinnadesātāyāmasāṅgatiḥ.  

The illustration is - sa vālē vayampragalbhamanasaḥ etc. The second illustration is -

sākrāntā jagahasthalena gurunā gantum  
na saktaḥ vyan  

desaīranyajenaśrayairpatavo jātāḥ sma  
ityadbhutam.  

Vidyādharā in his Ekāvāli defines asāṅgati as -

esāasāṅgatiruktē hetō kāryāya bhinnadesatvā.  

It is peculiar that Vidyādharā defines the figure visama in the same verse. So far as the conception of the figure asāṅgati is concerned, he however does not differ from other rhetoricians.

Appayya Dīksita in his Kuvalayānanda defines asāṅgati as -

viruddham bhinnadesatvām kāryahetvorasāṅgatī.  

In this conception, it is obvious, there is not so much originality.

---

32 Śāhityadārpana of Visvanātha. Chap. 10. Kār - 99  
33 The verse is in the Amaruśāsaka by the poet Amaru and quoted by Visvanātha as an illustration of 'asāṅgati'.  
34 Ekāvāli of Vidyādharā. Chap. VIII.  
The illustration of asangati is -

\[ \text{visam jaladharaih pitaam, murochitah pathikanganaah} \]

Here the cause 'visam' is related to 'jaladha' but its action 'murochā' is found in 'pathikāngana'. So it is explained in the commentary 'alāmākaraśandrika' - "atra visapānumurochayorbhinnadesātvam".

By using the adjective "viruddha" Appayya indicates that when the difference of place of the cause and effect (kāryakaraśayorbhinnadesātvam) does not give rise to contradiction, there is no scope of the figure of speech 'asangati'. Appayya, however mentions two different types of asangati -

\[ \text{anyatra karaniyasya tato'nyatra krtisva'sa} \]
\[ \text{anyatkarum pravrttasya tadviruddhaśtistathē} \]

Jagannātha however makes a scholastic discussion on the figure of speech asangati. He defines this figure as -

\[ \text{viruddaḥenapātato bhāṣebānam hetukāryayo-}
\text{rvaiyadhikaranyamasangatiḥ} \]

When the difference of place (vaiyadhikaranyam) of the cause and effect is apparently contradictory, the figure of speech is asangatiḥ. Like Appayya, Jagannātha also clearly states that if no contradiction arises due to the difference of place of cause and effect, there is no asangati. Thus in the verse -

---

36 Kuvalayānanda of Appayya Dīksita Kār - 85
37 Ibid. Kār - 86.
in spite of the existence of Vaiyadharanya of the cause 'cāpasparśana' etc and the effect 'svāpanāsā', there is no asāṅgati as there is no vīrodha or contradiction. Appayya however states that this contradiction may be in some cases be removed and this 'samādhana' gives rise to strikingness. This is clear in the commentary alaṃkāraśastraṇāka

(Kvaciśāṅgatyasaṃānādhāmanivahānena cārutātisāyāh). 40

But Jagannātha states clearly that this contradiction is always to be removed, i.e. this contradiction must not be actual, it is only apparent. (Viruddhānātātāhānīsaṃānām). The illustration of asāṅgati given in the Rasagangadāhara is -

sāṅgaiḥ sukumāraśaṅgaih sa Kusumānāṁ śriyam harati
prāharati hi kusumabāno jagatītalavartino yañah

This is an illustration of suddha asāṅgati. The verse -

drṣṭirṣaṅgārāśaṁ tyantaṁ śrutyaṇaparisaśiṁ,
mucyante bandhakāti keśāvavinita vaibhāṣai gatiṁ

is an illustration of asāṅgati joined with śāṣa (śāṣopapakāśita).

There is śāṣa in the word 'bandha'. According to the scholars like Ruyyaka etc. there must be some atiśayokti or description of something extraordinary on the part of the cause, unless the contradiction can not be removed. Jagannātha however does not accept this view. In the illustration - drṣṭirṣaṅgārāśaṁ tyantaṁ etc. there is no hyperbole or

40 Alāṃkāraśastraṇāka by Vaidyamāthasūri, a commentary on the figure asāṅgati. Page 109.
41 Rasagangadāhara of Jagannātha. Chap. 2 Page 440.
atisayoki, there is only superimposition (abhedaḥdyāvasānamātram) due to sālaṃsa. Still it is a case of asangati. Jagangatha criticises the view of Appayya in connection with the two other types of asangati and the illustration given by him.

Whatever it may be, the figure of speech asangati is treated by every scholar of the later period but the conception of this alamkāra is more or less the same in the works of all the rhetoricians.

VIBHAVANA:

It is discussed in the third chapter that the figure of speech vibhavana is directly based on kāryakaraṇabhava. In the fourth chapter of our work we have discussed how this figure vibhavana is dealt with in the early rhetorical works. We are now going to make a survey of the development of this alamkāra in the works of the post-dhvani school.

Rudraṭa includes the figure of speech vibhavana in the 'atisaya' group. The definition of Vibhavana given by him is -
That figure of speech is called vibhāvanā, where a thing is stated without the cause from which it is originated. Rudrata includes the figure in the atiśaya group as there can be no effect in the practical world without the actual cause behind it, but in this case something extraordinary is described, the effect having no cause to be originated from. The illustration of Vibhāvanā given by Rudrata is -

\[
\text{nihatatulamirabhah sphāranphuradurutarakbhedaprasareh}
\]

In this case by the expression - 'atailapūro' it is indicated that the 'taila', which is the cause of dīpa (lamp) is absent, still the effect dīpa is stated. Though in this verse the sun is described to be identical with the lamp and thus it is a case of the figure Parināma, still by the word 'atailapura' it becomes an illustration of Vibhāvanā. It is to be noted here that this type of figure of speech is described by Viśvanātha as a subdivision of Parināma. To illustrate the figure adhikārudhavaisistya Parināma he cites the verse -

\[
\text{bhavonti yatrausodhayo rajanyamatailapurah aur&tapradipah.}
\]

Here also the 'asadhās' are identical with the 'pradīpas' (lamps) though oil the cause of the lamp is absent. But Rudrata clearly states

---

42 Kevyālāṃkara of Rudrata. Chap. 9 Kār - 16.
43 Ibid. Kār - 17.
it as an illustrations of Vibhavana. Rudrata however mentions another
type of Vibhavana -

\[
yasyām tatha vikaraṣṭakāraṃ saṃpratam aṣṭāpratimāntaraṃ suvyaktāṁ
\]

prabhave vai vauvisene vibhavānā seyamāṇa tu. 44

The illustration of this type of Vibhavana is -

\[
yāyaḥ te sakhi saṃpratam aṣṭāpratimāntaraṃ satīḥ kimīyaṁ
\]

Kasmīdabha-vadaksāmādiyamadhumadālaśa drstīḥ. 45

In this case the 'vikarasa' viz. mantharatva (slowness) of the gait
and the 'alastva' of the look are stated in spite of the absence of
their cause viz. 'śrama' and 'madhumada'. Rudrata also states another
variety of Vibhavana -

\[
yasya yathātvam loke prasiddhāmerthasya vidyate tasmāt
\]

anyasyāpi tathātvam yasyāmu cyate sānyeyam. 46

He illustrates this variety by the verse -

\[
āphutamaparem nidrayah sarasvācaitanyakaranaṁ ipuṣāṁ
\]

aptañāṃdhyāninitām madaheturanāsavo laksāṇā. 47

The regular cause of 'acaitanyakarana' is nidrā (sleep), 'patāla' is
the cause of andhatva, āsava (liquor) is the cause of 'mada'
(intoxication). But in this particular verse these regular causes
are absent though the effects are stated. Rudrata mentions these
three types of Vibhavana. Though in these three cases, the effect is
stated in spite of the absence of the cause, still the difference is

44 Kāvyālāṅkāra of Rudrata. Chap. 9 Kār - 18.
that in the first case, the cause of an object is absent; in the second one, the cause of 'vikāra' is absent and in the third variety again the cause of 'dharma' is absent. Rudrata is however right in including this vibhāvanā in the 'atisāya' group as in this case something extraordinary is described. The definition of atisāya is given by Rudrata as:

yatārthadharmaniyamah praśiddhādhyādviparyayam yāti
akāśītvacidatilokam sa ayādityatisāyastasya.⁴⁸

So in 'atisāya' there must be some contradiction and at the same time there must be the description of something supernatural. In the case of vibhāvanā, there is definitely some contradiction as the effect is stated in spite of the absence of the cause, and at the same time something extraordinary is described by this violation of the rule of causation. So that Rudrata includes this vibhāvanā in the 'atisāya' category is totally justified.

Bhoja in his Sarasvatikanthabharana defines Vibhāvanā as:

prasiddhahstuvyavṛtya yatkineitkaranantaram
yatā svābhāvikān vāpi vibhāvyam sa vibhāvanā.⁴⁹

When due to the absence of the traditional cause, some other cause or some natural cause is to be thought out, the figure of speech is vibhāvanā. It is of various types as - śuddha, citra and vioitra.

⁴⁸ Kāvyālāmaka of Rudrata. Chap. 9. Kār - 1
Now the two principal varieties of vibhāvanā viz. Kāraṇaṭaravibhāvanā and svābhāvikatva vibhāvanā are again suddha and citra. Bhoja illustrates each variety of vibhāvanā. The illustration of suddha Kāraṇaṭaravibhāvanā is -

apitaksibakādambamāsamārṣpadāmalāmbarum
aprasāditaśukmatbajā jagadasimamaharan.

In this verse the traditional causes (prasiddhaḥstū) of Kṣiva etc. are absent but another cause the autumn is stated here. So it is a case of Kāraṇaṭaravibhāvanā. Svābhāvikatvavibhāvanā is illustrated by the verse -

ānākṣitīśitā drśṭirbhūremenāvarjita nātī
araṇjitarunassāyamadharastava sundarī
dārasvatikanṭhābharaṇa of Bhoja. Chap. 3 Ulus. 13. 50

Here the causes of asitatva etc. are absent and by this it is indicated that the asitatva etc are natural. So it is svābhāvikatva vibhāvanā.

Ruyyaka, in his Alamkārasarvasva includes vibhāvanā in the group of the figures based on Kāryakāraṇa-bhāva.

(Kāryakāraṇabhāvasūlute vibhāvanām tāvadāha ).

But at the same time this vibhāvanā comes under the category of the figures of speech based on virodha. So before mentioning the figure vibhāvanā, Ruyyaka states -

50 Sarasvatikanṭhābharaṇa of Bhoja. Chap. 3 Illus. 13
The definition of Vibhāvāṇā given by him is -

करणाभवेन कार्यस्योपत्तिर्विभावना। ॥

In the world we see that the existence of an effect is impossible without its cause preceding it. Otherwise, there will be a contradiction. But if by some special mode of expression, that is stated i.e. an effect without a cause is described, this is called Vibhāvāṇā. Here the actual cause exists definitely but by the style of expression it is described to be absent and the effect is stated to be related to some other cause. In the Vṛtti Ruyyaka states that in the definition of Vibhāvāṇā some scholars use the word Kriya instead of the word Karana. But Ruyyaka thinks that the result of a Kriya or action only is not the effect, dravya, guna etc also may be the cause of an effect. So the word Karana is used in general sense.

(ato viśeṣamanaṇaḥ sāṁyena kāraṇapadameveha nirdistiṃ).

The illustration of Vibhāvāṇā given by Ruyyaka is -

साम्भ्रतम् मन्दानमेंगयास्तेरनासावृक्ष्याम कारणाम्

madasya, kārasya purvavyatiriktastram būlyātraparam

sātha vayah prapede।

In this case in the second line the cause of mada vis. asava is absent and another cause viz. 'yauvana' (youth) is stated to be the cause of the effect 'mada'. The figure of speech Vibhāvāṇā like

---

53 Ibid. Page 158.
54 Kumārasambhavam by Kalidāsa. Canto - 1 St. 31 cited by Ruyyaka as an illustration of Vibhāvāṇā.
visesokti is of two types - uktanimitta (a cause of which, though other than the traditional cause, is stated) and anuktanimitta (of which no cause is mentioned). The illustration of the former one is given by the verse - asambhrtam etc. Anuktanimitt vibhavana is illustrated by the verse -

angalekhunakasaavasamalamhansaapinjeram  
analekatatanihambhomsahalekham ca bibhratim 55

In this case a natural cause (sahajatvam nimittam) is indicated.

The definition of Vibhavana given by Mammata is -

Kriyaah pratisedhe'pi phalavyaktirvibhavana. 56

If in spite of the absence of the action which is the cause, the result is present, the figure of speech is called Vibhavana. By the word Kriya Mammata however means 'cause'. It is stated clearly by Bhatta Vamanacarya in his commentary 'valavodhini' - Kriyate, nayati vyutpatty kriyasabdaah praasiddhakaranaparah. In the Pradipa and Udayota it is stated -

vaiyakaranamaste kriyavah heturiti kriyetyuktam  
vastutastu karanapratisedhe karyavacanam vibhavana. 57

The illustration of Vibhavana given by Mammata is -

KusumitalatabhirahatSpyadhatta rujamalikulairadastapi  
parivartate sma nalinileharibhiralolitapaghursta sa. 58

55 Alambkarasarvasva of Ruyyaka. Page - 159.
57 The Commentary Pradipa by Gobindathakura.
In this case the 'latohanana', 'bhramaradama' etc. which are causes of 'ruja', 'parivartana' etc respectively, are absent, still the results 'ruja' etc. are described. So it is a case of vibhāvāna.

In this case however a different cause viz. separation is indicated to bring out the effects 'ruja' etc. Maama however does not enter into detailed discussions on the figure of speech Vibhāvāna. He only gives the definition and a single illustration of this alaṅkāra.

Viśvanātha in the tenth chapter of his Sahityadarpana discusses the figure of speech Vibhāvāna. The definition of vibhāvāna as given by Viśvanātha is—

\[ \text{vikāraṁ viśvamataṁ kāryotpityaducyate} \]

In the figure of speech Vibhāvāna the effect is described to take place without its cause though there must be some other cause which is described to bring out the effect. Viśvanātha recognises two varieties of this Vibhāvāna on the basis of the mention and non-mention of this cause.

\[ ( \text{uktiṁakṣaṁivitaṁ dvidhā sa parikārtitaṁ}) \]

The verse—

\[ \text{ābhusana-manoharī vapurwasya subhravāy} \]

is an illustration of uktaṇaṁkṣita vibhāvāna. In this case, by the expressions 'ānāyaśa', 'āsanka' and 'abhūṣana' the causes of kṣatva, taralatva and manoharitva are described to be absent but at the same time.

---

60 Sahityadarpana of Viśvanātha. Chap. 10 Kār. - 87
time a different reason viz. 'vayah' is stated. So it is a case of uktanimitta vibhāvanā. If in the same verse we use the expression - 'vapurbhāti mṛgādrāh' instead of 'vapurvayasi subhrvabh' the figure of speech will be anuktanimita vibhāvanā. For, then the cause 'vayah' will be omitted. It is Viśvanātha who for the first time states clearly the two sub-divisions of Vibhāvanā. Among the scholars mentioned before some do not at all recognise any sub-division of the figure of speech Vibhāvanā.

Vidyādhara in the eighth chapter of his Ekavali defines Vibhāvanā as -

\[ \text{aṣati prasiddhahetau kāryotpattirvibhāvanā.} \]

Vidyādhara gives the illustration of vibhāvanā by the verse -

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{ayajñāh svarlokaḥ sukṛtamatapahkleṣasubhagam} \\
\text{sudhāsāraṁ nāmam phalakusumāścīrācharam} \\
\text{sāṃruṣyaṁ sāṁruṣyam viḍhirakhananāyūśasulabhā} \\
\text{mrśingha kaṇiṁdo nayumapathamasmākamagamā}.
\end{align*} \]

In this verse yajña tapahleśa etc. which are the causes of svarlokaḥ etc. are absent, still the results are stated to be present.

---

62 Ekavali by Vidyādhara. Chap. 8 Kār - 36.
The figure of speech vibhāvāna receives an elaborate treatment in the Kuvalāyanaṇanda of Appayya Dīkṣita. He defines this alaṃkāra as—

\[ \text{vibhāvāna vināpi syāt kāraṇam kāryajama ca.} \]

In this definition however there is no such originality. Like all other rhetoricians Appayya states here that if the effect is described to be originated in spite of the absence of the cause, the figure of speech is called vibhāvāna. The illustration of this alaṃkāra is—

\[ \text{apyāpya kārā rasāsāṅkaṁ raktam taccaranādīvakam.} \]

Here the effect 'raktatva' is described in spite of the absence of its cause 'īksaṇaśaṅkaṭatva'. There is no contradiction as the natural reddishness of the feet is described here.

\[ \text{(svābhāvikatvam virodhparihārah)} \]

In the vṛtti Appayya cites two other examples of vibhāvāna in each one of which the cause is absent but the effect is present. Next Appayya states another type of vibhāvāna where in spite of the lack of all the conditions of the hetu, the effect is present.

\[ \text{(hetunāmassaśaṅkaṁ kāryotpattīścā sa maṁ)} \]

The illustration of this type of vibhāvāna is—

\[ \text{astrāirātikṣaṃ kāthaisairjagajjayati samasthāḥ.} \]

In this case in the matter of the conquering of the world, the guna, sharpness etc. of the causes weapons are insufficient. In the vṛtti another example of this type of vibhāvāna is stated where the qualities of the causes are not sufficient to bring out the effect. It is to be

63 Kuvalāyanaṇanda of Appayya. Kār - 77.
65 Ibid. Kār - 78.
noted here that according to Dandin, this type of alamkāra is visēṣokti for he defines visēṣokti as:

\[
\text{viṣeṣadārsanāyavā ad viṣeṣokti rīṣyate. 66}
\]

But as the insufficiency of tīkṣṇatva etc. of the weapons in fact the absence of cause, so Appayya states this as a variety of vibhāvana

\[
(\text{asamābhīstū tīkṣṇatvādīvaiśākalyamapi kāraṇā – viṣeṣābhāvarūpanā ti vibhāvanā pradarsitā })^{67}
\]

The third type of Vibhāvana is mentioned by Appayya as:

\[
\text{Kāryotpattīśāya satyāpi pratibendhake.}{68}
\]

If in spite of the presence of the hindrance to the effect, it is present, the figure of speech is vibhāvana. In the example—

\[
\text{narendrāneva te rājandasatyaḥ dibhujāngamah—there is hindrance of mantra osadhi etc. still the effect sarpadamsa is present. Next Appayya states—}
\]

\[
\text{ākāraṇat kāryaṃsa caturthī syādviṣāna.}{69}
\]

If there is no cause at all still the effect is seen, the figure is the fourth type of vibhāvana. Appayya illustrates the verse—

\[
\text{sākṣādviṣeṣaṃ śaśāyamā mahādābhyutam. In this verse there is no cause of rising the tune of a lyre from the conch. Then the fifth variety of vibhāvana is stated—}
\]

\[
\text{viṣeṣadāṛśaḥ kāryasamāśamādītī rāśvārikaḥ.70}
\]

When the effect is described to be originated from a cause, contradictory to the effect, the figure of speech is called vibhāvana. The illustration

66 Kāvyādāra of Dandin. Chap. 2. Kār – 323
67 Kāvalayānanda on Kār – 73.
68 Kāvalayānanda Kār – 79.
70 Ibid. Kār – 81.
of this type of vibhāvanā is -

Śīlādhisukranaśtanviñā hanta samāpayati tām.

Here the cool rays cause 'samāpa' which is contradictory to it. The last and the sixth type of vibhāvanā is -

Kāryāt Kāranajāmāpi drstā kācidvibhāvanā. 71

When the cause is described to be originated from the effect; the figure of speech is the fourth type of vibhāvanā. The illustration of this type is -  yāsah payorāśirabhūt karakalpaśarastava.

In the vṛtti Appayya gives another example of this type of vibhāvanā -

-jātā, latā hi śaile jātā latāyām na jāyate śaileh
samprati tadviparītam kanakalatāyām giridvayam jātām. 72

Here giridvayam which is the cause of 'Kanakalatā' is described to be come out from the effect 'Kanakalatā' -

So it is seen that Appayya shows the greatest number of the variety of vibhāvanā though in the fundamental conception of vibhāvanā Appayya shows no such originality, but in the classification of this figure his discussion deserves the credit of throwing new light on this figure of speech.

Jagannātha defines vibhāvanā from the logical point of view. Though the fundamental conception does not differ so much, but the mode of expression in Jagannātha is purely logical. The definition given by him is -

71 Kuvalayānanda of Appayya Diksita. Kār - 82.
72 Vṛtti on the Karikā No. 82 of Kuvalayānanda.
Illustration No. 82 Page - 107.
When the effect is originated by some one different from the traditional cause, the figure of speech is vibhāvanā. This is stated in other words -
Kriyāḥ pratiśedhaśc phalaśvaktirbibhāvanā. The word Kriyā means cause. In the definition of Jagannātha, the expression -
Karanavyatirekaśanādhi karanyena kāryotpatti
indicates that though there may be apparent contradiction, it can be removed by the imagination of some other cause (Karanavyatireka).
Jagannātha illustrates vibhāvanā by the verse -
vinaiva sastrāṃ hṛdayāni yūnam vivekabhājaścāpi dārayantyah
anantāmyāsya avalavīlitalā jayanti nilabdhalasyoṣṭakeyah. 74
Here the cause of dārāna is sāstra which is absent, still the effect dārāna is stated and thus causes contradiction, but this contradiction is apparent as the actual cause here is 'Kāminīvīlāsa'. Next Jagannātha discusses critically the illustration given by him and shows how it is different from the figure of speech virodha. He states clearly the differentiating point of the two figures vibhāvanā and virodha -
Karanaśya nisedhena śādhyāmanah phalodayah
vibhāvanāyām abhātā virodho 'nyonyābadhanam. 75
According to Jagannātha, vibhāvanā is not in all cases related to atisāyokti. Only in a few cases, atisāyokti is at the root of vibhāvanā.
In the verse -
nirupādānasaścābhāramabhitteśvā tattvati
ejagācitraṇā namastasmā kalāśāghaye sūlīne 76
there is no atisāyokti at the root of vibhāvanā. A question may arise

73 Rasagangadhara of Jagannātha. Anana. 2 Page - 431.
74 Ibid. Page - 432.
75 Ibid. 76 Ibid.
here that at the time of creation there was nothing else except God, so there is no scope of vibhāvanā, what to speak of whether it is based on atisāyokti or not. The answer is that here the creation is not described by the post, but he describes here the painting of the potrait in form of the world by the God.

utra hi bhagavatāh sakāśat kevalasya jagata utpattima
kavaraṁhipretā Kintu jagadṛṣṭasya citrasya. 77

This citra is depicted but its upādānas (causes) māsāharitās etc are absent. Thus it is a case of vibhāvanā but it is not based on atisāyokti. So it is established that vibhāvana must not always be based on atisāyokti as stated by Ruyyaka in his Alakāraśarvasva. By this discussion Jagannātha rejects also the arguments of Jayarātha who in his commentary 'Alakāraśarvasūni' supports Ruyyaka that in the verse nirūpādānasambhāra etc. there is no atisāyoktyanuprāhitatva indeed but in fact there is no vibhāvana at all.

nirūpādānasambhārasabhittāveva tantvate
jagacoitram nāmaśremai kalāśāghaśya sāline
ityatra tu jagata upādānāvivrāhenaiva bhagavat-
kāryaśya vāstavatvāsvibhāvaniva nāstīti
kasyātisāyoktyanuprāhitatvam synt. 78

Then Jagannātha criticises the classification of vibhāvanā made by Appayya and next he expresses his own view —

iyam ca vibhāvanā uvidhiṃ uktanīmutaṃ uktanimitte ca. 79

77 Vyātti on the figure Vibhāvanā by Jagannātha. Chap. 2* Page 433.
78 Alakāraśarvasūni, a commentary on Alakāraśarvasva by Jayarātha.
Commentary on the figure Vibhāvanā. Page — 159.
Of these two types of vibhāvāna, the second one, viz. anuktānimitta is illustrated by the verse - vinaiva sastram etc. The illustration of uktānimitta-vibhāvāna is:

\[
yadadhi vibhasa.thavandiau yaunamuddiyaya candravedanāyāh
dahanam vinaiva tadadhi yunām hydayāni dahyante.\]

In this vibhāvāna, the cause of the effect 'dāha' is stated by the expression - 'yaunam'. Here also Jagannātha criticises the view of Ruyyaka who states that in the verse -

\[
\text{aasabhittam mandanamangayasteh etc}\]

inspite of the absence of the cause 'sava', the effect 'mada' (intoxication) is present and is related to a different cause - 'yaunam' and thus it is an illustration of uktānimitta-vibhāvāna. He argues that the figure of speech vibhāvāna is based on virodha or contradiction. This contradiction will flash like the lightning and brings the charmingness. But in the example cited by Ruyyaka the word 'yaunam' which is stated to be the cause of 'mada' is verbally mentioned and thus, there is not a touch of contradiction. So Jagannātha does not recognise this as a case of vibhāvāna.

Whatever it may be, the figure of speech vibhāvāna is treated with so much importance by almost everyone of the later rhetoricians. Most of them discuss the minute details of this alaṃkāra with critical outlook and throw new lights on the conception of this figure. This vibhāvāna is however most important among the figures of speech directly based on cause and effect relation. So we also have discussed elaborately the development and treatment of this alaṃkāra in the works of different rhetoricians. It is evident from this discussion that the causal relation is so prominent in this figure of speech and whatever change and modification of conception

may be, the fundamental basis on the causal relation is just the same in
the treatment of this alamkāra in all the rhetorical works.

**VIṢEṢOKTI:**

The figure of speech viṣeṣokti as it is stated in the
fourth chapter of this work is closely related to the figure of speech
vibhāvaṇā. But in the works of the early rhetoricians, these two figures
are not related. Rudrata, the author of Kāvyālaṃkāra however does not at
all mention the figure of speech viṣeṣokti. The first treatment of this
alamkāra, among the later rhetorical works is found in the Kavyaparākṣaṇa
of Mammata. In this work we find the two figures vibhāvaṇa and viṣeṣokti
side by side.

Mammata in his Kavyaprakṣaṇa defines viṣeṣokti as —

vīṣeṣoktirakṣardesa kārṇeṣu phalavacah. 82

When in spite of the assemblage of the causes, the effect is not stated,
the figure of speech is called viṣeṣokti. The word 'akṣardesa' means
'militesa' (in spite of assemblage). But this viṣeṣokti is of three
types - anuktaṃmita, uktaṃmita and anīntyaṃmita. The first
variety is illustrated by the verse —

nidrānivṛttāvadite dyutatne : sakhiya dvarapada pariṣṭe
āśthākṛtālasarakaḥ bhujange cecāla nālingaṃasthīgamena sa. 83

---

82 Kavyaprakṣaṇa of Mammata. Chap. 10.
83 Ibid. Illus. 474 Sūtra 163.
Here in spite of the assemblage of the causes 'śayanavātī' 'śuryodaya' etc. the effect 'ālinganaparityāga' is not stated. But in this case, the reason of not stating the effect ('Kārasyākathānam') is not mentioned. So it is an illustration of anukṣaṇaṁiti vīsesokti. The illustration of the anukṣaṇaṁiti vīsesokti is -

\[
\text{Kārpaṇa iva dagdho'pi sāktiṁ yo jane jane,}
\]

\[
nāmō'śravāravāravāya tasmāi mākarakstave.\]

Here the effect 'śaktidhranā' is not stated in spite of the presence of the cause 'śāriradāha'. But the reason of this non-stating of the effect is mentioned by the word 'āvāyavāyāya'. So it is ukṣaṇaṁiti vīsesokti. The third type of vīsesokti is illustrated by the verse -

\[
\text{sa ekastrīṇi jayati jagati kusumāyudhah,}
\]

\[
haraṭāpi tarumā yasya śāmabhūna na balem hṛtām.}\]

Here the cause tarumāraṇa is present still the effect balaharana is not stated. But the cause of this omitting of the effect is not easy to think out. It can be known only by the knowledge of the śāstras.

Thus it is clear that Mammata defines vīsesokti to be directly based on cause and effect relation. It is shown in the fourth chapter that the conception of this figure of speech has been changed from age to age in the works of different rhetoricians. In the early stage it was not directly related to the cause and effect relation. But in course of change and modification of conception, this figure of speech as treated in the works of later rhetoricians, has come in close contact with the causal relation. So we see in Kavyaprakāsa the existence of causal relation at the root of this figure of speech vīsesokti.

84 Balāraṇāyaṇa of Rājaśekhara. Act. 3 quoted by Mammata to illustrate vīsesokti in chap. 10 Kar No. 475.
Bhoja in the tenth chapter of his Sarasvatī-Kapṭhābharana deals with the figure of speech visesokti. But it should be accepted that the Sarasvatīkantābharana is nothing but an encyclopaedia and thus in this book only the views of former rhetoricians are stated. So we can not expect so much originality in the treatment of the subjects in this work. In the case of the figure of speech visesokti also we see the same thing. Here Bhoja however states the view of Dandin with minute details. The definition also follows that of Dandin word by word. Bhoja defines visesokti as

\[
\text{gunajātikriyādiḥ yatra vaikalyadarsanam}
\]
\[
vīsesadarsanāyaiva sā vīsesoktirisyate.
\]

Next Bhoja states

\[
\text{pratyetavye'bhidhaye ṣa sā vīsesasya kārane}
\]
\[
\text{vaikalyadarsanāṃpi kvacidapyupapadyate.}
\]

By the expression - 'gunajātikriyā-dinā' the four varieties of visesokti are indicated. The illustration of visesokti by punavaikalya is -

\[
\text{na kathoram na va tīkenmayudhāṃ puspadhanvanah}
\]
\[
tathāpi jīteva-bhūdamaṇa bhuvanatrāyaṁ.
\]

In this verse the expression - 'na kathoram na va tīkenam' indicates the insufficiency (vaikalya) of the qualities of the cause 'āyudha'. Still the effect, conquering the three worlds is stated and thus the extraordinary power of 'Puspadhanva' is established. The illustration of jativaikalya is -

---

86 Sarasvatīkantābharana of Bhoja. Chapter - 4, Kār. - 70.
88 Ibid. Kār - 165.
Here the jāti of the lady is insufficient to cause 'tapobhanga', still by this 'tapobhanga' the excess of beauty of the lady is indicated (varanātyāyā rūpatisayah pratiyate). The variety of vīśeṣokti by kriyāvaiyakalya is illustrated by the verse:

na vaddhā bhūkutismāpi ephurīto radanacchā dah na ca raktābhavaddratirjitaḥ ca dvigataṁ kulam. 90

In this verse, in spite of the absence of the kriya 'bhūkutanga' etc. the effect of conquering the enemies is described. By this the valor and glory of the king is indicated. By the word 'ādi', in the expression 'gūnajātikriyādīnāṁ', dravya vaiyakalya is indicated. The illustration of this is:

na rathā na ca matāṅga na haya na ca pattayāḥ
strīmāpamsādrṣṭyaśvāya jīyate jagatām. trayam. 91

Here the objects 'ratha' matāṅga etc. are absent but the result, the conquering the three worlds is present. In some cases there is vaiyakalya or insufficiency in the object which is the cause. In the example:

ekācakrakro ratāḥ yantā vikalā viśama hayaḥ
ākramatyaśvāma tjasāvī tathāpyarko jagatāyam 92

the objects ratha etc. which are causes, are present no doubt, but there is insufficiency like 'ekācakratva' 'vikatā' etc in every one of them.

89 Sarasvatīkāntābhāraṇa of Bhoja. Chap. 4 Karī - 166
90 Ibid. Karī - 167.
91 Ibid. Karī - 168.
92 Ibid. Karī - 169.
It is peculiar to note that Bhoja follows Dandin in the treatment of the figure of speech vīsesokti. Not only in the definition and classification but in the illustrations also he quotes the same verses cited by Dandin. Next Bhoja mentions another type of Vīsesokti where in spite of the absence of insufficiency ( avaikalyanāpi ) by the contact and non-contact of object, something extraordinary is stated. The verse -

\[ \text{ayam taya rathaksobhadāsenaṁ nipidhitah} \]
\[ \text{ekah krti ārīreśāhānśāmasaṁgā mahu bharaḥ} \]

is cited as an illustration of this type of vīsesokti.

So it is found that Bhoja does not show so much originality in the treatment of the figure of speech vīsesokti.

As it is discussed before, Ruuyaka includes the figure Vibhaṅga in the category of the figures of speech based on contradiction and causal relation. He mentions vīsesokti immediately after Vibhaṅga as Vīsesokti is just the opposite to this Vibhaṅga. The definition of Vīsesokti given by him is -

\[ \text{Karanaśāmagye karyamutpattirvīsesoktaḥ.} \]

In this world the assemblage of causes invariably produces the effect. But when in spite of this assemblage, the effect is not produced, in order to convey some special meaning the figure of speech is vīsesokta. It is of two types - uktanimitta and anuktanimitta. Māmatā recognizes

---

93 Vikramorväṣṭi of Kālidāsa. Act. 3 Verse - 11
a third variety – acintyanimittā. But Ruyyaka does not accept this division. According to him this acintyanimittā is included in the anuktaamittā which is of two types cintyanimittā and acintyanimittā. Then Ruyyaka gives illustration of the first variety of vīseśokti by the verse –

Karpura iva dagdho’pi saktigāno jate jane
namo’tstavārāvīrya’ya tasmāi kusmadhanave.

This is a pet example of vīseśokti, cited by Māmata also. The illustration of cintyanimittā vīseśokti is –

āhuto’pi sahāyaśamityuktva vimuktaedropi
gantumā api pathikā saṅkocam naiva śīthilayati.

In this verse the calling etc. which are the causes of ‘saṅkocasāthilīkāra’ are present still there is no ‘saṅkocasāthilīkāra’. This is due to the dream of the beloved one. Thus the cause is not stated here but it is to be thought out. So this is an example of cintyanimittā vīseśokti.

It is to be mentioned here that this particular variety of vīseśokti with the particular illustration is discussed by Anandavardhana in the first Uddyota of his Dhvanyaloka. In order to show the existence of a suggested sense in this figure he states that in this case there is no doubt a suggested sense but there is no strikingness or charm of speech due to that suggested meaning

( vyāngyasya prakaranaśamprathyāt pratītiṁataṁ na tu
tatpratīti-nimittā kāśiocāravatvaspattir āt ).

95 acintyanimittā tvamuktaemittāiva. anuktaaya ca cintyacentyayena


96 Alākaraśarvasva of Ruyyaka. Page - 161.

In order to realize the reason of the absence of the effect 'sāmkocasi-thilikara' the suggested meaning must be appreciated. So according to Anandavardhana it is not a case of dhvani as the primary sense is prominent here and adds to the charm than the suggested sense which only helps the realization of the primary sense.

The third variety of viśesokti viz. saṁtyanimitta is illustrated by Ruyyaka as –

\[
\text{sa ekastrīṇi jayati jaganti kusumayuddhah}
\]
\[
\text{haratāpi tanum yasya saṁbhāna na hṛtēm balaṃ.} 98
\]

This is also a famous example of viśesokti. Here in spite of tamuharana the result 'balaharana' is not stated. But in this case, the reason of the absence of the result is not mentioned and it is also impossible to think out that reason. So it is saṁtyanimitta viśesokti. In some cases the absence of the effect is described with the presence of some contradictory effect. In the figure vibhāvanā also the absence of the cause is sometimes stated by the presence of some contradictory cause. Thus in the verse –

\[
yah kaumararahah sa eva hi varastā eva caitrakṣapaste-
\]
\[
\text{cōmillatāmaratāsurabhayah praudah kadosbānilah}
\]
\[
\text{sācaīvāmi tathāpi tatra suratavyāparaiśāvivadhau}
\]
\[
\text{revarōdhau vētasītaratale cetah saṁitkentate} 99
\]

there is 'sandhasaśākara' of vibhāvanā and viśesokti. For, by the expression – yah kaumararaha etc. the contradictory to the cause of anxiety is stated. Thus it is a case of vibhāvanā. Again, the result:

98 Alemkarasarvasva of Ruyyaka Page 161.
99 Ibid. Page 162.
'êtah samut kanthati', which is contradictory to the causes 'yah kaumāraharah' etc. is stated and then it is undoubtedly a case of visēsokti. There is no argument in any side stronger than the other. So we must accept here 'sandeha samkara'. Ruyyaka however boldly rejects the view of those who states - 'ekagunahānikalpanāyām visēsoktih' as it is according to Ruyyaka a variety of Rūpaka.

Visvanātha in the tenth chapter of Sahityadarpana defines visēsokti as -

sati hetau phalābhāve visēsoktistatāhā dvidhā.\(^{100}\)

In this definition also there is no originality. Following the footsteps of his predecessors Visvanātha also states when the cause is present still the effect is absent, the figure of speech is visēsokti. This visēsokti is according to Visvanātha of two types - uktanimittā and anuktanimittā. The illustration of uktanimitta visēsokti is -

dhanino'pi nirumādā yuvano'pi na caṅcalaḥ
prabhavo'pyapramattāste mahāmahīmaśalināh.\(^{101}\)

Here wealth, youth etc. which are the causes of 'mada' (excitement) and restlessness etc. are present still the effects mada caṅcalya etc. are not stated. If we read - 'kiyantah satī bhūtāḥ' instead of the last portion - 'mahāmahīmaśalināh' it will be an illustration of anuktanimitta visēsokti, for, in that case, 'mahāmahīma' which is stated to be the reason of the absence of the results mada etc., is omitted.

\(^{100}\) Sahityadarpana of Visvanātha. Chap. 10 Kaṭ - 38.
\(^{101}\) Ibid. Page - 596.
Visvanātha however does not mention the variety acintyanāmitā for according to him it is a division of the anuktanāmitā visēṣokti. Here the pet example -

sa aksarini jayati jaganti kusumāyudhah etc

is cited by Visvanātha. Like Ruyyaka Visvanātha also cites the example yah kaumararaha etc and states it as an illustration of sandhē-
samkara of vibhāvana and visēṣokti.

Appayya Dīkṣita in his Kuvalayānanda defines visēṣokti as -

śānta kāryajanirvisēṣoktiṁ sati puskalakārane

The illustration of visēṣokti given by him is -

hṛdi enahkṣaya nabhut śaradīpe jvalatysi.

In the Vṛttī another illustration is cited -

anurāgavātī sandhā āhārvaśatapurāṇaṁ
dhāvagatiścitra tathāpina samagamah.

It is however an example of uktanāmitā visēṣokti as the reason 'daivagati' is mentioned here.

The treatment of the figure of speech visēṣokti made by Jagannātha is so scholastic. Though there is not so much difference in the fundamental conception from that of other scholars still the mode of discussion in Rasagangadhara is so critical and logical. Jagannātha defines visēṣokti as -

prasyātākāranāpakośāśaśāśadhipikaranyena

vāṁśaṁāṁ kārṇamūtpattirvisēṣoktiṁ.

\[102\] Kuvalayānanda of Appayya Dīkṣita. Kāṇ. 83
\[103\] Ibid.
\[104\] Rasagangadhara of Jagannātha. Anana = 2 Page 437.
When the absence of the production of the effect is described along with the presence of the assemblage of the traditional causes, the figure of speech is višeokti. Here in spite of the presence of the causes, the absence of the effect gives rise to contradiction as the presence of causes invariably produces the traditional effect. But this contradiction is apparent, as there must be some insufficiency ( vaikalya ) of some cause other than the traditional one and the absence of the effect is described to be due to this insufficiency. Jagannatha illustrates višeokti by the verse -

\[
\text{upanişadah paripītā gītāpi ca hanta matipatham nītā}
\]

\[\text{na hā vidhuvadā mānasasadanādvahiyāti} 105\]

Here in spite of the existence of the knowledge of the Upaniṣada, the effect detachment is not stated as there is 'pratibandha' of 'ṛgadhiḥkya'.

It is an illustration of anuktanimitta višeokti as there is no mention of the 'pratibandha' (obstacle) which is the reason of the absence of the effect. Jagannatha gives here another example of višeokti -

\[
\text{pratipalamakhiḥ llokaṁartymukham praviṣato nirikṣyayāpi}
\]

\[\text{hā hatakam cittamidam viramatā nādyāpi viśayebhayāḥ} 106\]

Here also in spite of the knowledge of the transitoriness of the world, the effect detachment is not stated, but the reason is not mentioned. If we use the expression 'raγandham cittamidam' instead of 'hā hatakam cittamidam' it will be an illustration of anuktanimitta višeokti as the reason ragandhatva is mentioned here. Jagannatha however does not accept

105 Rasagangadhara of Jagannatha. Page 437.
106 Ibid.
the variety acintyanimitta which is stated as a variety in the figure of speech visesokti by other rhetoricians. The illustration of this acintyanimitta visesokti is given by them by the verse -

sa ekastrini jayati jaganti kusumayudhah etc.

The difference of acintyanimitta from anuktanimitta according to them is that in the first case, the reason must be there but it should be thought out, but in anuktanimitta the reason is not at all mentioned. Next Jagannatha discusses critically different views of his predecessors regarding visesokti.

From the above discussion it is clear that the conception about the two figures vibhavana and visesokti has not changed so much in the works of the later rhetoricians though minor modifications in the definition and classification are present. But it is evident that the existence of causal relation at the root of charm of these two figures is accepted by every rhetorician.

VIROUDA:

The figure of speech virodha is a so important figure in the rhetorical works and almost all the rhetoricians have discussed this alamkara elaborately.
In the Kavyalankara of Rudrata, the figure of speech virodha is discussed in the ninth chapter. Rudrata, however, includes this figure in the 'Atisaya' group. The definition of virodha given by him is:

\[
yasmind ravyndSi&m parsparasa sarvatha viruddha
ekatvavasitham samakaloch bhatat sa virodhah.\]

When there is the existence of different contradictory objects at the same place in the same time, the figure of speech is called virodha. Rudrata, however, is justified in including the figure virodha in the 'Atisaya' group as in this figure the assemblage of contradictory objects are described, which is practically impossible. But when this description of contradictory objects leads to some extraordinary charm of the poetry, it is regarded as a figure of speech virodha. This description of extraordinary element is the soul of atisaya. Rudrata defines atisaya as:

\[
yatrar thấtdhermaniyamah prasiddhībādhādvi-paryayam yāti
kādīt kvacidatilokam sa syādityatisayastasya.\]

So it is clear that virodha is based on this atisaya. Next Rudrata states the varieties of virodha:

\[
asya sajātiyamā vidhiyamānasya santi catvāraḥ
bhedastamāmanah pāhra tvanē tasmānas.\]

Thus, there may be contradiction of two objects - it is 'dravyavirodha'. The contradiction of two qualities is 'gunavirodha'. In the same way, the contradiction of 'Kriyā' and 'Jāti' is 'Kriyāvirodha' and 'Jāti-virodha' respectively. These four types of virodha are called sajātiya virodha.

107 Kavyalankara of Rudrata. Chap. 9 Kār - 30.
108 Ibid. Kār - 1
There are again five varieties of vi\=at\=i\=ya virodha. When there is contradiction of dravya and guna, guna and jati and so on, it is vi\=at\=i\=ya virodha. The contradiction of dravya and jati is not possible, so this vi\=at\=i\=ya virodha is of five types instead of six. Rudrata again states another classification of virodha -

\[
yatr\=avasya bhav\=i yayoh saj\=atiyayorbhavedekah
ekatra virodhavatostyorabhavo'yamanyastu.\]

This is again of four types according to guna jati dravya and kriya. Thus virodha is of thirteen types. Rudrata illustrates all these varieties one by one.

It is to be noted here that in the figure of speech virodha as defined and classified and illustrated by Rudrata, there is no connection with cause and effect relation. Still we have discussed it here as this figure is originally based on causal relation and in the works of other rhetoricians the existence of this causal relation is prominent.

Ma\=m\=ma\=ta in the tenth chapter of his K\=avyaprak\=asa defines the figure of speech virodha -

\[
virodha so\'virodha'pi viruddhatvena yadvacah.\]

When in spite of the absence of actual contradiction, two things are described to be contradictory, the figure of speech is called virodha or virod\=ab\=h\=asa. The classification of virodha made by Ma\=m\=ma\=ta is -

110. K\=avyal\=asik\=a of Rudrata. Chap. 9 K\=\=ara - 33.
111 K\=avyaprak\=asa of Ma\=m\=ma\=ta. Chap. 10. Sutra - 166.
These ten varieties of virodha viz. jātivirodha with jāti guna kriyā and dravya, the contradiction of guna with guṇa, kriyā and dravya and the contradiction of kriyā with kriyā and dravya and the contradiction of dravya with another dravya (object) are illustrated by Mammeta one by one. In the treatment of virodha made by Mammeta also, the causal relation is not prominent.

Ruyyaka includes the figure of speech virodha in the group of the figures of speech based on contradiction.

( etatprastāvāna virodhagarbhoh laśākāravargah prakriyate ).

The definition of virodha given by him is:

viruddhabhasatvaravā virodhah.

Where there is apparent contradiction, the figure of speech is called virodha. In this figure, the four elements, jāti, guṇa, kriyā and dravya are stated in contradiction to each other. According to Ruyyaka, the contradiction in this case must always be apparent, otherwise there will be ‘doṣa’. Then Ruyyaka states the classifications of this alaṃkāra in the Vṛttti. There may be ten varieties of virodha just as it is stated by other scholars like Mammeta etc. Then an illustration is given by Ruyyaka -

paricchedātītah sakalavacanānahāvavisayah

vivekapradhvamadupacitamahāmahoghahahano

vikāraṃ ko’pyantarjaḥayati ca tāpam ca kurute.
In this verse the two contradictory actions - Jadikarana and Tapakarana are stated but this contradiction is to be removed by the realization of the meaning 'vastuseundaryanaprapito'. Ruyyaka also gives another illustration by the verse -

```
ayam varamako nilaya iti ratnakara iti
srita smritistatantaritamobhirjalanidhih
ka evam janite nijakaputikotaragatam
ksanadenam te sattimimakaranopasyati munih
```

In this verse the object jalanidhi and the action 'pahan' are contradictory. But this contradiction is to be removed by the realization of the extraordinary power of the sage. Ruyyaka states in his vritti that in the case of the figure virodha the contradiction exists in the same 'visaya' or 'adhikarana' but if this contradiction exists in different 'adhikaranas', the figure of speech is called asangati

```
(scavisayatve cayamisya visaya-bhede tvaseagati).
```

Bhoja in his Sarasvatikanthabharana however accepts asangati as a variety of virodha. The definition of virodha given by him is -

```
virodhastu padartham paramparamasangatih.
```

Where there is inconsistency between the objects, the figure of speech is virodha. This virodha is of four types - asangati, pratyanikan, adhikam and vigamah. Next Bhoja however states two different types of virodha - saddha and grathita

```
(tesu virodhab saddho grathitasa).
```

---

117 Ibid. Page 156.
118 Sarasvatikanthabharana of Bhoja Chap. 3 Kār 24.
The illustration of **suddha** is -

kva yuvatilmardavan kva ca mahahavadarunata
kva ca valayi kara kva karidentajamustirasih
kva ca navayaunam kva kusumayudhianihaprahata

_leva lelasvicostitaviruddhamaho latitem._ 120

Grathitavirodha is illustrated by the verse - **digvāśa** yadi etc. 121

Then Bhoja states with suitable illustrations the four sub-divisions of virodha viz. asamgati, pratyanika, adhika and vissma. In each case Bhoja shows how the contradiction operates.

It is found that in the definition of virodha given by

Mamata, Bhoja and Ruyyaka, there is no clear mention of the causal relation. It is Visvanatha who for the first time makes the point clear and determines the position of Karyakaranabhava in the figure of speech virodha.

The definition of virodha given by Visvanatha is -

**jātiścaturbirjātyādyāyārgamā tanaśhisbhistibilāh**

kriya kriyādravyābhyāy Yadravyam dravyena va mitah

**viruddhima bhāṣa** virodho sau dasākritih. 122

By the expression - **'viruddhima bhāṣa'** Visvanatha indicates that the contradiction in the case of the figure virodha must be apparent and

---

120 Sarasvatikanthabharana of Bhoja. Chap. 3 Illus. no. 60 Page 340.
121 Digvāśa yadi tattkisanyā dhanusaśastraśya kim bhahana
bhāsmāthāsya kīrṇignā yadi ca sarām paridvēstā kim
ityanyonyaviruddhaścītītādām pāyāmmājāvāminā

Sarasvatikanthabharana. Chap. 3 Illus. 61.
122 Sahityadarpana of Visvanatha. Chap. 10 Kar 89.
it can be removed by the appreciation of the actual meaning. Now, to explain the nature of this virodha he states - jātiṣṭhūrtthīh etc.

The verse -

_tava viraha malayamaruddavānalah sairuco'pi sṛṣmānah_

_hydayamalirutamapi bhinte ; malinīdalamapi nidāgharavirayasah_

illustrates the four types of virodha viz. jāti virodha gunavirodha etc. Now, it is to be noted here that in the expression tāva viraha 'malayamaruddavānalah' the two things malayamarut and davanalah are contradictory.

But if we think the matter critically, it will be found that in fact in the case of dṛavyavirodha also there is an underlying causal relation. In the expression - 'malayamaruddavānalah' the actual meaning is - malayamarut acts as davanala. The malayamarut is the cause of davanalah which is in fact contradictory. The quality of the cause malayamarut is coolness but it produces the effect davanalah which is of the totally opposite quality. But according to the rule of causation the qualities of the cause come to the effect i.e. the qualities of the cause and the effect must be the same.

(kāraṇagunātmakatvāt kāryasyā)

This fundamental rule of causation is violated in the figure of speech virodha. In the case of gunavirodha, kriyavirodha and jāti virodha we see the same thing. So the figure virodha is basically related to the causal relation. Viśvanātha gives illustration of each variety of virodha and discusses how contradiction operates there and what is the 'sāṅgadhanā' of that contradiction. Next Viśvanātha differentiates the
figure virodha from vibhāvana and visesokti. In the figure vibhāvana, the contradiction arises by the absence of the cause, in spite of the presence of the effect and in the figure visesokti, it is just the opposite. But in the case of the figure of speech virodha both the elements are stated to be contradictory.

( Vibhāvanāyāṁ karaṇābhāvenopanibadhyamānāvat
karyameva bhāyatvena pratiyate ;
Vīsesoktau caṁ karaṇābhāvena karaṇamova ;
iha tu anyonyam dvayorapi bhāyatvenim bhedaḥ )

Vidyādhara in the eighth chapter of Ekavali includes the figure of speech virodha in the group of the figures based on contradiction and gives the definition of this figure.

( vilāsaśavirodhagarbhāṁ brūno'laṁkāraavargamadhuṁ tu :
sphurati virodhābhāse bhavati virodhābhido daśedhā )

In this definition of virodha also it is clearly mentioned that the contradiction here must be apparent. According to Vidyādhara also this virodha is of ten varieties.

Appayya Dīkṣita in his Kuvalayānanda defines virodha as -

ābhāsatve virodhāsya virodhābhāsa iyate.  

In this definition however there is no originality of conception. The illustration of virodha is - vināpi tauti śāhreṇa vakaṣojau tava hārinau.

---

125 Sahityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha. Vṛtti on Kṛ 89 Page - 599.
126 Ekavali of Vidyādhara. Chap. 8 Kṛ - 33.
127 There is also a different reading - ābhāsatvam.
128 Kuvalayānanda of Appayya. Kṛ - 76.
The treatment of the figure of speech virodha in the Rasagangadhara of Jagannatha is so logical and elaborate. Jagannatha defines virodha as:

\[ \text{ekādhikaranasambhadhatvena pratipādanam sat} \]

When two objects related to the same adhikarana are stated to be not related, the figure of speech is called virodha. Now, to describe a thing as it is not actually so, is a mistake. So Jagannatha states a second definition:

\[ \text{ekādhikaranasambhadhatvena pratipādanam sah} \]

Virodha however is of two types - prarūḍhah and aprarūḍhah. The first one is a case of doṣa and the second one is of alamkāra. Jagannatha discusses the etymological meaning of the name virodhābhāsa -

\[ \text{a śadbhāsa ityābhāsaḥ virodhābhāsaḥ śast} \]

In the Rasagangadhara also the ten varieties of virodha are recognised. Among jāti, gūna, kriya and dravya, Jagannatha states that kriya is neither 'sūdha bhūvanā' as accepted by the grammarians nor 'spandarūpa' as accepted by the logicians but - the special 'vyāpāra' or action indicated by respective roots (dhatu) is meant here by the word kriya.

The illustration of virodha is given by Jagannatha as:

\[ \text{kusumāṇi saraṁ mṛṣalajalanyopī kālaśaśkarakaśnyābhuvaḥ} \]
\[ \text{sudrāḥ dahanāyate sma rākṣa bhāvanākāśmatbhāvatpayodhib} \]

Here there is contradiction of dravya etc. but this is to be removed by the appreciation of the meaning the pangs of separation of the lady.
Jagarnātha goes into minute and detailed discussion on the conception of virodha and refutes the views of other scholars in this connection. He also shows with suitable arguments the difference of the figure virodha from other alāṃkāras.

**VISĀMA:**

The figure of speech visāma is closely related to the figure virodha. In the works of the early rhetoricians however these two are joined together. Bhamaha Udbhata etc do not accept visāma as a separate alāṃkāra, but the conception of this figure is included by them in the figure virodha.

In the later rhetorical works however visāma is accepted as a separate alāṃkāra. Rudraṭa in the ninth chapter of Kavyālāṃkāra discusses the figure visāma immediately after the figure virodha. The definition of visāma given by him is:

\[
\text{kāryasya kāraṇasya ca yatra virodhah parasparam gunayoh}
\]
\[
tadvātākriyavatathāvā samjñayeteti tadvisāmaṃ
\]

When the qualities or actions of the cause and effect are contradictory, the figure of speech is visāma. But according to the rule of causation the quality and action of the cause and effect must be the same, they can.

---

133 Kavyālāṃkāra of Rudraṭa. Chap. 9 Kar - 45.
never be contradictory. There lies the extraordinary (stīṣayatva) of this figure and for this reason Rudrata includes this figure in the atīṣaya group. For this extraordinary meaning the contradiction is removed. The illustration of viṣama given by him is –

airikarikumbhidārāṇarudhir-arunādārūndataṁ khaḍgat

vasuḥdāhipate dhavaluṁ känte ca yasā babhūva tava. 134

Here the qualities of the cause Khadhga are 'arunatva' and 'dārunatva' but the qualities of the effect 'yasā' are dhavaluva and käntatva. So the qualities of the cause and the effect are contradictory. By the verse –

anandamamandanimman kvaivalyadalalocane dadāsi tvaṁ

virahastvayāṁ devitāyāṁ sandarśitaṁ saciṁ me 135

the contradiction of kriyā or action of the cause and effect is illustrated. So it is obvious that the existence of cause and effect relation is prominent in the figure of speech viṣama.

Mamatha in the tenth chapter of his Kavyaprakāśa recognises the figure of speech viṣama side by side with the figure virodha. The definition of viṣama given by him is –

kvacidyadativaḥdharmāyāṁ āleso ghatanāmyat

kartaḥ kavyapalavatātiparvanarthasāya ēṣadhavet

gunakriyābhyaṁ kāryasya kāraṇasya gunakriya

kremena ca viruddha yat sa esa viṣamo mātah. 136

When two things extremely opposite are stated to be related, when the subject undertaken does not give not only the expected result due to the

135 Ibid. Kar – 47.
destruction of the action but also causes an 'anartha', and when the qualities and actions of the cause and effect become contradictory, the figure of speech is called visama. This definition itself however indicates the four varieties of visama. The first one is when two things extremely opposite are related. The illustration of this variety is—

\[ \text{āśīrśādapi mṛdvaṅgī kveyaṃgantāloha}\]

\[ \text{ayāḥ kva ca kubālaṅkaraśā madhāmālaḥ.} \]  

By the two words kva it is indicated that the co-existence of these two opposite things is totally impossible. But in this verse the description of these two opposite things brings the charm and thus it is a case of the figure of speech visama. The second type of visama is when the expected result of the action is absent and another unsatisfactory result takes place. The illustration of this type is—

\[ \text{siṃhhikāsata santrastāḥ saśāḥ sitāśānāśāritāḥ} \]

\[ \text{jagrāsa śārājyaḥ tatra tamānyāḥ siṃhhikāsutoḥ} \]  

Here the devouring by the siṃhhikāsuta which is practically 'anartha' takes place. The third type of visama is where the quality of the cause and the effect are contradictory. This variety of visama is illustrated by Māmāta as—

\[ \text{sadyāḥ karasparśamāvāpya citras raṇe raṇe yasya} \]

\[ \text{kṛpānabhaḥ tāmalanī itā saradindupādu yaśastrilokāhaḥraṇaḥ prasūte} \]  

In this verse the quality of the cause kṛpānabhaḥ is tāmalanī but the quality of the effect yaśas is saradindupādu. So the two qualities nīlatva and pānduta of the cause and the effect respectively differ.

137 Kavyaprakāsa of Māmāta. Chap. 10. Illus. 537.
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When the kriyā or action of the cause and the effect are contradictory that is the fourth variety of visama. This is illustrated by Maumata by the verse—

\[
\text{Anandamandamimam kuvalayadalocane dadasi tvam}
\]

\[
virahastvayaiva janitastapayitaram sariram me
\]

In this case the two actions 'anandadāna' and 'sariratāpasa' are contradictory. This verse is cited as an illustration of visama by Rudrata also.

It is to be noted that the cause and effect relation is so prominent in the figure of speech visama. In fact the actual charm of this figure depends on the violation of the law of causation.

Bhoja, the author of Sarasvatīkantābharaṇa however as it is stated before accepts visama as a variety of the figure of speech virodha. According to him, if there is contradiction of whatever kind it may be, the figure of speech may be called virodha. Now, according to the nature of contradiction, this virodha is divided into a few classes. Thus four types of virodha are accepted by Bhoja—asaṅgati, pratyanik, adhika and visama. The illustration of this visama is given by him by the verse—

\[
dīsimalikalakabhangatesa gatastraivyadvadhukarnatamalapallavaḥ
cakara yasyāḥvaradhūmasānceyamalīmasahā suklataram bhavadyaṣah
\]

141 asaṅgatih pratyanikamadhikam visamaśca sah—
142 This verse is found in the Introductory verses of Kadambarī.
Verse No. 18. It is cited by Bhoja as an illustration of visama. Illus. No. 65.
Buyyaka in his Alankārasarvasva discusses viṣā ma in connection with the figures of speech based on contradiction.

( virodhaprastāvena laksanam )

The definition of viṣā ma given by him is -

vrūpākṛṣṇaṁ naṁthayor upaṭṭhitāṁ vīrūpā
dvayaṁ ca viṣaṁ.

It is a general rule of causation that the effect is produced according to the qualities of the cause, i.e. the qualities of the cause and the effect are the same. But when it is found that the effect is produced just opposite to the cause that is a variety of viṣā ma. Again, when one going to accomplish an action, not only meets failure, but also faces a mischief, it will be the second type of viṣā ma. Where again two things extremely different take place, that is the third variety of viṣā ma. Buyyaka illustrates the three varieties one by one. The example of the first one is -

sadyaḥ karapersasm āvāpya citram rana rana yaśaya kṛpañalekha

taṃlaṇīla sarindupāṇu yaśastrilokābhavanām prasūte.

It is however a famous example of viṣā ma and we have discussed it before how the cause taṃlaṇīla kṛpañalekha produces the effect sarindupāṇu yaśasya. So the qualities of the cause and the effect are different. Thus, this verse is an example of viṣā ma. The illustration of the second variety of viṣā ma is -

tīrthāntaraśu malapankavatīrvihaya
dīvyaśtanāstanubhītah sahasā labhante

vārānasi tvayi tu muktakalevarāṇaṁ labhostu

suśrūpā yastapunarbhavaya

The third variety is illustrated by the verse -
Visvanatha defines visama as:

\[ \text{guna kriya va cet} \quad \text{syatam viruddha hotukaryayah} \]

\[ \text{yadvarabhdha vaipilaryamanarthasya ca sambhayah} \]

\[ \text{virupayoh sanighatana ya ca tedvisamam natem} \]

This definition however follows that given by Mamata so far as the conception is concerned but in the mode of expression there is definitely originality. Like the definitions of other scholars, the definition of Visvanatha also includes the four types of visama. The first variety is when the gona or quality of the cause and the effect differs. Visvanatha illustrates this type of visama by the verse -

\[ \text{asadah karaaparoam etc.} \]

which is a famous example of visama cited by almost every rhetorician. We have discussed before how the cause tamalana krapanakaha produces the effect yashah the quality of which is panduta and thus due to the contradiction of the qualities of the cause and the effect, the verse is an example of the first variety of visama. The second type of visama is when the kriya of action of the cause and the effect is contradictory. The illustration of this variety is illustrated by Visvanatha by the verse -

\[ \text{anandamamandam etc.} \]

which is also cited by many scholars as the
illustration of visama. The third variety of visama is when the action undertaken meets failure and a mischief takes place. Visvanātha illustrates this as-

\[\text{āyaṁ rataṅkarōmbodhirityasevi dhanāsaya} \]
\[\text{dhanam dūreṣtu vedanamopūri kṣara-vārūbhīḥ}. \]

Here the expected thing wealth is not gained moreover the face is filled with saline water. By the example-

\[\text{kva vanam taruvalkabhuṣanam nrpalakamih} \]
\[\text{kva mahendravandita niyataḥ pratikūlavartino} \]
\[\text{bata dhātuscaritaḥ suduḥsaham}. \]

Here the two things the forest and the nagaralakṣaṇi are contradictory.

Vidyādhara in his Ekavali defines the figure visama along with the figure of speech asangati. The definition given by him is-

\[\text{visāmaṁ virūpāghatanaṁ visādānaśākṣānyabhiṣṭayorjanamānaṁ} \]

In this definition also there is no such originality. The conception is the same as that of Visvanātha. That Vidyādhara defines asangati and visama in the same karika is perhaps due to the fact that contradiction or viroda is at the root of both the figures of speech.

Appayya Dīksita also in his Kuvalayañānda deals with asangati and visama side by side. He defines various types of visama in different karikās. The first variety of visama is defined as-

\[\text{visāmaṁ vamyaṁ yatra ghatanaṁ nanurūpayah} \]

When two objects totally different are stated, the figure of speech is-
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called visama. The illustration of this type of visama is -

\[ \text{kveyam sārīmārvanga kva tāvarmadanajvarah.} \]

The second type of visama is -

\[ \text{virupākṣārvotpatīpattirparam visamam matam.} \]

When the effect is contradictory to the cause that is the second type of visama. This variety is illustrated by the verse -

\[ \text{kīrtiṃ praśīte dhavalam śyama tava krpanīkā.} \]

Here the cause krpanīkā is śyama but the effect kīrti produced by this cause is 'dhavala' (white) i.e. it is contradictory to the quality of the cause. The third type of visama is defined by Appayya as -

\[ \text{anisāvapvavāptīsca tadiśārthasamudāyam.} \]

The illustration of this variety is -

\[ \text{bhūksyasaśyā himānjunāśa drṣṭvāvahustena bhākṣitaḥ.} \]

Then in the Vṛtti Appayya gives different examples of 'istālātha' and anistaprāpti in various cases. In the treatment of the figure of speech visama made by Appayya the causal relation is verbally mentioned and operates directly only in the case of the second variety of visama as defined and illustrated in the Kuvalayānanda.

The treatment of the figure of speech visama in the

Rasagaṅgādhara of Jagannātha is so scientific and bears the mark of originality. The definition of visama given by him is -

\[ \text{anārātṛtrupasamyagṛho visamam.} \]

---

Then he discusses the derivative meaning of the word anurūpa in the definition. The word anurūpa is formed by an avyayībhaṇa compound in the sense of 'yogyatā'. Then by the compound with 'na' the meaning is 'yogyatārahitaṃ'. Next Jagannātha discusses the word 'samsarga'. This samsarga is of two types - utpattīlakṣaṇaḥ and samyogādilakṣaṇaḥ. Now, the ayogyatā or ananurūpa of the utpattīlakṣaṇa samsarga can be when the qualities of the effect are contradictory to the qualities of the cause. The ananurūpa of the samyogādilakṣaṇa samsarga occurs when from the cause definite to produce the expected result, some mischief is produced. So by the definition ananurūpasaṃsarga viṣama - Jagannātha states all the varieties of viṣama so concisely. The illustration of the first variety is -

ṣaṃtalaharicandrajagannābhasvadanaśāṃbhujānayadharitevato
nirmaryādprasaśāsahāmbudbhah, Udāhavadayaṃ deva
tvattah kathā parasmolbanapravayaśahana, jvalājālakulo
mahāsaṃ ganaḥ.

In this case from the cause possessing the qualities like madhuryasāya etc is produced the effect having the contradictory quality pratapa. So there is the ananurūpa of the causal relation. Next Jagannātha discusses with minute details the second variety of viṣama. So it is clear that in the treatment of the figure viṣama made by Jagannātha the causal relation operates only partially. Of the two types of 'samsarga' mentioned by him, the first one is based on the cause and effect relation, but the second type of 'samsarga' is beyond the range of it.
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159 Ibid.
From the thorough discussion on the figure of speech visama undertaken here, it is obvious that the causal relation plays an important part in the case of this figure of speech. Almost all the scholars who mentioned this alamkara, accepted the existence of causal relation in connection with this figure. So we are fully justified in including this figure in the group of alamkaras based on cause and effect relation. But it should be mentioned here that visama is not solely based on causal relation. Only one factor of this figure is related to the cause and effect relation. Thus all the rhetoricians mention one variety of visama based directly on cause and effect relation. But other varieties are beyond the range of this causal relation.

ARTHANTARANYASA:

The figure of speech arthāntaranyasa is included in the category of the figures of speech based on cause and effect relation. As it is stated before, in the figure arthāntaranyasa one thing is stated to support another. But there must be some cause by which something is supported by another. This relation between the statement to be supported and the one by which it is supported, may be of various types. Vyasa in his Sahityadarpana mentions these types of relation. But no rhetorician of the early stage mentions this point clearly.
Among the scholars of the later period, Rudrata does not clearly mention the different types of relation between the statement to be supported and the statement which supports. He accepts only one relation between these two viz. समानविसेसभाव. The definition given by him will make the point clear. He defines अभ्यास as -

\[
\text{धर्मप्रेक्षाविलीसम समानविसेसभाव नानावधिधे तत्सद्ध्याय।}
\]

यात्रा साध्यानितरामन्यायेन वर्त्तान्यायोऽसः.

In fact according to Rudrata the figure of speech अभ्यास is based on similarity or 'सुप्रमा', he includes this figure in the 'सुप्रमा' group. So he states that the statement to be supported and the one which supports must be सुप्रमा and सुप्रमा. When in order to support some सुप्रमा, particular or general, another सुप्रमा, particular or general is stated, the figure of speech is अभ्यास. The illustration of अभ्यास given by Rudrata is -

\[
\text{तुष्कानमपि मेघानाम नालानमपि दिनादते चयेम।}
\]

\[
\text{उपकर्तम हि समार्थेन भवति महात्म महादेवम्।}
\]

In this verse 'चयेम' of the clouds is a particular statement which is supported by the general one 'उपकर्तम' of the great. In order to illustrate a general statement to be supported by a particular one Rudrata illustrates the verse -

\[
\text{सकलमिदं सुखादुधंकम भवति यथावसेनं तत्सद्ध्या।}
\]

\[
\text{समायंतिरां तरुणिमाधिकाणातदीनि रत्नकालसा।}
\]

These two are examples of अभ्यास by 'सुप्रमा'. Next Rudrata.
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gives the examples of arthāntaranyāsa by 'vaidharmya'. This type of arthāntaranyāsa is defined by him as -

\[
\text{pūrvavadabhidhāyaikam visēmasāmānyayordvitiyam tu t}
\]

\[
\text{atra siddhayabhidhadyadviparitena yatra so'nyo'ya. 163}
\]

So it is found that in the figure arthāntaranyāsa as Rudrata defines it, there is no connection with the cause and effect relation.

The treatment of the figure arthāntaranyāsa made by Maṇmata also shows no connection with the cause and effect relation. He defines this figure as -

\[
\text{samānyam va visesa va yadanyena samarthya}
\]

\[
yattu so'arthantaranyasah sadharmyenetarena va. 164
\]

This definition is not at all different from that given by Maṇmata so far as the fundamental conception is concerned, but there is difference in the mode of expression. Maṇmata is more clear and scientific in defining this figure. When a general statement is supported by a particular one by sadharmya or vaidharmya or a particular statement is supported by a general one, by 'sadharmya' or 'vaidharmya' that is arthāntaranyāsa.

So there are five varieties of this arthāntaranyāsa. Though Maṇmata does not mention these four types, by the four illustrations given by him he indicates this classification. He illustrates the first variety by the verse -

\[
nijedosayuktamāntamasamātisundarameva bhāti viparitam
\]

\[
pasyati pustaphatah sāsīsuhṛam sāṃkhamapi pītan. 165
\]
In this verse the general statement—nijadosa etc. is supported by the particular statement—the yellow colour of the white conch to the 'pittopahatah'. There are other illustrations of the other varieties of arthantaranyasa. In the definition of this figure in the Kavyaprakasa, it is evident that the existence of the causal relation is not mentioned.

Bhoja in his Sarasvatikanthabharana defines arthantaranyasa according to the derivative explanation of the word "arthantaranyasa".

The definition is—

\[
\text{jneyah so'arthantaranyaso vastu prastutya kincana} \]

\[
tatsadhanasmarthasya nyaso yo'nyasya vastunah.\]

When after stating a thing, another thing is stated to support it, the figure of speech is called arthantaranyasa. Then Bhoja states that this statement of another object may be by 'sadharmya' in some cases, in some cases again, by 'vaidharmya' and 'vaiparitya' in others. Bhoja classifies this alamkara on the basis of this factor. The first variety is illustrated by Bhoja as—

\[
\text{payemcah paritapam harantyate sarinam} \]

\[
nanvātmalābho mahatām paraśukhopasantaye.}\]

In this verse, the nature of the great is stated to support, the meaning 'paritapaharanam' by the clouds. The example of arthantaranyasa by 'vaidharmya' is—

---
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It is clear from the above discussion that the existence of causal relation in the case of the figure of speech arthantaranyasa is not at all mentioned by the rhetoricians like Ruirata, Bhoja and Mamata though the underlying causal relation is accepted by them as they recognise the samanyavisesabhava which is the cause of the samarthyasamarthakabhava i.e. when one statement is supported by another, there must be some cause of this, the samanyavisesabhava is that cause.

Ruyyaka is the first rhetorician who recognises verbally the existence of causal relation in the case of the figure of speech arthantaranyasa. The definition of this figure given by him is -

samanyavisesakaryakaranabhavabhavanirdistapraprakrtasamarthanamarthantaranyasyah.

When something stated is supported by another statement particular or general, cause or effect, the figure of speech is called arthantaranyasa.

From this definition it is clear that arthantaranyasa is of various types. A general statement supported by a particular one and a particular supported by a general are the the two varieties of arthantaranyasa. Again, the cause is supported by the effect and the effect is supported by the cause - thus, there are another two types of arthantaranyasa. These four varieties again

170 Alamkarasarvaevs of Ruyyaka. Page - 139.
can be sadhannya or vaidharmya and so the figure of speech has eight varieties.

There can be other varieties of this alamkāra according to the mention and non-mention of the word 'hi' or according to the position of the statement which supports i.e. whether it is mentioned first or last. But Ruyyaka does not accept these varieties as there is no strikingness or 'vaicitrya'. Then Ruyyaka gives examples of each variety one by one. The verse -

| anantasratnaprabhavasya yasya himam na saubhāgyavilopī jātah |
| eko hi doṣo gunasamipāte nimajjatindōh kiranesvivāṅkāh |

is an example of arthāntaranyāsa where a particular idea is supported by a general one. The verse -

| sahasā vidādhiṭa na kriyaśāvivekah parāmaśpadām padam |
| vrnta hi vimaśyakārīnaś gunalubdhāḥ svayamava sāmpadāḥ |

is an example where the cause sahasā vidādhiṭa na kriyā etc is supported by the effect 'sāmpadvarana'. By the verse -

| prthvī sthirā bhava bhujāgama dhāraṇyainām tvam kumāraṇaḥ |
| taśiśam dvitayam dādhithāḥ dikkunjarāḥ kuruta tatttritasva |
| didhirāṇa devaḥ karati harakārmaśmakatajayaḥ |

Ruyyaka illustrates the variety of arthāntaranyāsa where an effect is supported by the cause.

So it is evident that in the treatment of the figure of speech arthāntaranyāsa by Ruyyaka the existence of causal relation is so prominent and so it is verbally mentioned.
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Visvanātha in the tenth chapter of his Sahityadarpana deals elaborately with the figure of speech arthaṁtaraṇyāsa. The definition given by him is

sāmānyaḥ vā viśeṣaḥ viśeṣaḥstena vā yadi
kāryaṇaḥ kāraṇaṇadaṁ kāryena ca sāmānyataḥ
śādharmyaḥ tareṇa arthaṁtaraṇyāsaḥ stūdhā tathā.174

So far as the conception is concerned, the definition of Visvanātha and that of Ruyyaka are not different but the mode of expression in the definition of Visvanātha is more clear. He states in the clearest way that when a general idea is supported by a particular one, or vice-versa and a cause is supported by the effect or vice-versa the figure of speech is arthaṁtaraṇyāsa. All these varieties again, are twofold according to śādharma and vaidharmya. Next Visvanātha gives examples of these eight varieties of arthaṁtaraṇyāsa. The verse -

brhat-saḥāyaḥ kāryaṇaḥ kṣodhiyāni gacchati
sambhūtābhodhimabhyyeti maṇhaṇayā nagāpana.175

is an illustration where a general idea is supported by the particular one. The verse -

yavadarthaṁpadāṁ vācanevaṇḍaṇya maṇhaṇayā
vīraṇaḥ maṇhaṇayā prakṛtyā mitabhasināḥ

illustrates the particular idea to be supported by the general one. To illustrate the effect to be supported by the cause Visvanātha cites the verse prthvī athirā bhava etc. cited by Ruyyaka. In the verse 'sahāṁ vīrasyākārīta na kriyān' etc. the cause vīraṇyakārītanā is
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supported by the effect 'sampaqvarana'. All these are examples of
arthantasatyasa by 'sudharmya'. Next Visvanatha gives examples of
arthantasatyasa by 'vaidharmya'.

Appayya Dikshita in his Kuvalayananda deals with the
figure arthantasatyasa but he does not however mention the existence
of causal relation in connection with this figure of speech. By the
definition -

uktiarthantasatyasa syat samayavisasayah

he states that this figure is based on samayavisasah (the rela-
tion of general and particular) i.e. when a general idea is supported
by a particular one and vice-versa, the figure of speech is arthant-
satyasa. It is mysterious to note that he totally omits the point
of causal relation while his predecessors like Ruyyaka, Visvanatha etc.
clearly mention the existence of causal relation in the case of this
tamkara. In the Karika Appayya gives two examples of arthantasatyasa
the first one illustrating the particular statement to be supported by
the general and the second one illustrating a general statement being
supported by a particular one.

Jagannatha defines arthantasatyasa as -

samayena visesasya visesena samayasya va
yatstamthanam tadarthantasatyasa.

177 Kuvalayananda of Appayya Dikshita. Kér - 122
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In this case however Jagannatha shows no originality though in the
definition of almost all the figures of speech his treatment is so
scientific. According to him the 'prakṛta' (the statement to be
described) may it be general or particular, is supported by the
aprastuta (meaning other than the meaning to be described), parti-
cular or general

\[
\text{tatra prakṛtyah sāmānyavīśeṣayoh samarthyatvam,}
\]
\[
aprakṛtyavrīśeṣasāmānyayoh sāmarthakatvam,prayāso drṣyate .}
\]

That is again by 'śadharmya' or 'vaidharmya'. Jagannatha discusses with
examples the minute details how the subject-matter in hand is supported
by sāmānyavīśeṣabhāva by some other statement. But Jagannatha does not
mention the existence of Kāryakāramabhāva in this connection, as the
cause supported by the effect or effect supported by the cause is in
fact according to him, included in the figure of speech Kavyalinga.

\[
\text{yathū kāraṇena kāryasya kāryasya kāraṇasya}
\]
\[
\text{samartheṇa ityapi bhedaṃvamārthāntaranyāsas-}
\]
\[
\text{ayālākṣāravasvakāro nyārūpayat, tanna, tasya}
\]
\[
kāvyalingavīśeṣayatvāt .}
\]

So it is to be noted that the existence of causal
relation is verbally mentioned in the case of the figure of speech
arthāntaranyāsa only by Ruyyaka and Visvamītha. No other scholar
mentions this point though the indirect influence of causal relation
is definitely there in every case of arthāntaranyāsa, as it is stated
before.
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The figure of speech aprastutaprasamsa can be included as it is stated before in the group of the figures of speech based on cause and effect relation. Aprastutaprasamsa as the name indicates is the description of the meaning other than the actual subject matter in hand, and by this description of 'aprastuta' the prastuta is indicated. The relation between the prastuta and the aprastuta can be cause and effect or general and particular. Thus the figure aprastutaprasamsa comes partly under the group of the figures of speech based on cause and effect relation.

It is curious to note that Rudrata in his Kavyalamkāra does not at all mention the figure aprastutaprasamsa though many other minor alamkāras are mentioned by him.

Bhoja in his Sarasvatikanthabharana defines aprastutaprasamsa as:

apastutaprasamsa ayādastotavyasya yā stutih
kutopi hotoryacya ca pratycalya ca sooyate. 181

When one thing that is in fact astotavya i.e. which is not worthy of praise, is praised for some reason, the figure of speech is aprastutaprasamsa. Bhoja takes the word aprastuta in the sense of astotavya or nindita (not praiseworthy) and the word prasamsa in

181 Sarasvatikanthabharana of Bhoja. Chap. 4 Kar - 52.
the lexical meaning viz. praise. According to Bhoja this aprastuta-
prasamsa may be 'vācyā' and 'pratyetavya'. There can be another classi-
fication of this figure -

sā tu dharmaṁ karṣanāṁ pṛayaṁ yatamabadhaya
svabhīpṛayaśrāiddhyā ca jayāṁneha drāṣṭe.182

This classification is according to the cause of the astotavyatva i.e.
when a thing is 'astotavya' or nindita (reproachable) it may be due
to the 'bāda' of 'dharma' 'artha' etc. Thus there can be the
'aprastutaprasamsa' by dharma-bāda, 'arthabāda', 'kāmabāda' etc.
Each of these can be vācyā and pratyetavya. Bhoja gives examples of
all these varieties one by one.

In the treatment of the figure of speech aprastutaprasamsa of
the Kavyaprakaśa of Mammata, the existence of cause and effect relation
is verbally mentioned. The definition of aprastutaprasamsa given by
him is -

aprastutaprasamsa ya sa Gaiva prastutārāya.183

Mammata however takes the word prasamsa in the derivative sense of the
term and thus according to him this word means statement or descrip-
tion (abhidhāna). So when something aprkaranika (other than the
actual subject matter to be described) is described and by this the
prkaranika sense is indicated, the figure of speech is aprastutaprasamsa.
Now if the prkaranika is to be indicated by the aprkaranika, there
must be some relation between these two. Mammata mentions five.

182 Sarasvatīkāntabhārana of Bhoja. Chap. 4 Kār - 53.
183 Kavyaprakāsa of Mammata. Chap. 10 Kār - 98.
divisions of this figure according to the nature of this relation

\[ \text{kārye nimitte sāmānya viśesa prastute sati} \]
\[ \text{tadanyasya vacastulāyē tulyasyeti ca pañcadhā.} \]^{184}

When the prākaraṇika effect is indicated by the aprākaraṇika cause
i.e. when the relation of the prākaraṇika and aprākaraṇika is cause
and effect, that is the first variety of aprāstutaprasaṁsā. The
illustration of this type of aprāstutaprasaṁsā is

\[ \text{yātā kim na mālanti sundari pumaścintā tvaya maṭkṛte} \]
\[ \text{no kāyā nitarām krasō kathayātayan sabāpe mayi} \]
\[ \text{lajjāmantharatāraṇaka nipatapitāsurā cākṣusē} \]
\[ \text{drṣṭvā māṣi hasitena bhāvīmaraṇotsahastvā sucitā.} \]^{185}

Here the effect "prasthānanivṛttā" is suggested by the description of
the aprākaraṇika cause 'priyābhāvīmarṇanam'. Again, the verse-

\[ \text{rājanrājasatu na pāṭhayati mām devyōpī tūṣām sthitāḥ} \]
\[ \text{kubje bhojaya mām kumārasciṣvijñānādyopī kim bhujyate} \]
\[ \text{itthām nāthe śūkastavārībhavane mukto’dhvasain pariṣarāt} \]
\[ \text{citrasṭhānavalokya śūnyavābhāvekaikamābhāgate} \]^{186}

is an illustration of the second type of aprāstutaprasaṁsā where the
cause viz. your enemies have fled, is suggested by the description of
the effect. Next Mammata gives illustrations of the two varieties of
aprāstutaprasaṁsā where the general idea is suggested by the particular
aprākaraṇika one and a particular statement is indicated by the

\[ \text{Kāvyaprakāśā of Mamata. Chap. 10 Kūr - 99.} \]
\[ \text{The verse is found in the Amaruśatka and cited by Mamata} \]
\[ \text{in the Kāvyaprakāśā. Chap. 10 Illus. No. 439.} \]
\[ \text{Kāvyaprakāśā of Mamata. Illus. No. 440 Page - 620.} \]
description of a general one respectively. The fifth variety of this figure as stated by Mammata is again of three varieties. These three are śāṣeshetuka, śāṃśoktihetuka and śādreyamātrahetuka. Mammata illustrates all these varieties also.

From the above discussions it is clear that according to Mammata the position of causal relation in the case of the figure of speech aprastutaprasāmsa is so important and it is verbally mentioned by him though it should be admitted that the influence of this causal relation on this figure is only partial as it is discussed before.

Ruyyaka in his Alakārasarvasva defines aprastutaprasāmsa as -

apraṣṭutaṁśāṁśāṁśataṁvīśeṣabhāve kāryakāraṇabhāve
cā prastutaprasāmsa.\textsuperscript{187}

When the prastuta is stated by the aprastuta by śāṁśāṁśāṁśa, the figure of speech is aprastutaprasāmsa. kāryakāraṇabhāva and sarūpya. But if there is no relation between the prastuta and aprastuta, one cannot be suggested from the other. This relation again can be of three types mentioned before. In the case of śāṁśāṁśāṁśa, there can be two types, śāmāṇya is suggested by the viśeṣa and viśeṣa by the śāmāṇya. The causal relation also in the same way gives rise to the two varieties of aprastutaprasāmsa.

In the case of sarūpya there are two varieties according to śādharma.
and 'vaidhraya'. The verse —

tannatthi kimpi pahano pahano pakappam jan na nisaghārāne

amavara agamanāsīlānā kālāphānāsā pahijjam 188

is an illustration of aprastutapratamśa where the particular is suggested by the general. Of the general statement being suggested by the particular is the illustration —

etattaya mukhātīkṣayatamalīniṃpatre kameś vārīno

yamuktānirīrīyanāvamāṣa sa jadih ənryavuyadasmadapi

aṅguylagerralakhukriyāpraviloyināyāpame sanaistrotadīya

gato hahetyanudinā niḍrāti nāntah śuca 189

The two varieties of arthāntaranyāsa based on causal relation are illustrated by Ruyyaka. The first variety i.e. where the prastuta kārīya is suggested by the aprastuta, kārāṇa, is illustrated by the verse —

paśyāmeth kimiyām prapadyata iti sthāryam mayālaṃbhitaḥ

kiṃ māmālapātītyayan khalu śatāh kopastāyayaśāritaḥ

ityanyavilakṣadṛṣṭicature tasmānavasthāntare

savyājya hemal mayā dharthihaṃ bāṣoṣṭu muktastayo 190

Here the prastuta effect maṇanivrutti is suggested by the description of the aprākāraṇīka cause of the same. The second variety is illustrated by the verse —

indurlipta ivājanena jaditā dṛṣṭiṃgaṇāmiva

prasārārūnīnava vidrumaraṇaḥ syāmeva hemprasbhaḥ

kārkuṇāka kalayāni kokilavahūṣuṇānaṃviva prastutam

sītāyāḥ purataśca nantā śākhdham bārhaḥ saṃgaraḥ iva. 191

188 Alankārasarvasva of Ruyyaka Page 133.
189 Ibid.
190 Ibid. Page 134.
191 Ibid.
In this case the prastuta cause the extraordinary beauty of Sītā is indicated by the description of the effect. So it is a case of the second type of aprastutaprasāmasa. A question may arise here, the verse -

\[ "yena lambalakah  sāsrah  karaṇghatārunastanah  \\
\text{akāri bhagavalo}y  \text{gajasuravadhūjanah}! \]

and also the verse -

\[ "\text{cakrabhighataprasabhājñayava} \text{cakāra} \text{yo rāhuvedhūja}gaya \\
\text{āliṅganoddāmavilāsaṁyam} \text{rata}āsvāvāv  \text{cumbanasātraśeṣam}! \]

which are the illustrations of paryayokta can be included in the figure of speech aprastutaprasāmasa as in these two verses the cause is suggested by the description of the effect. Then how can these verses be the cases of paryayokta? Where ever the cause is suggested by the effect, the effect may be either prastuta or aprastuta. When the effect also is prasuta like the cause, the figure of speech is paryayokta. In the verses quoted above, the descriptions of gajavadhū and rāhuvedhū are aprastuta. In fact in these verses the descriptions of the effects are more charming than that of the causes. So those are not the cases of aprastutaprasāmasa where again the cause is prastuta but the effect is aprastuta, the figure is included in the aprastutaprasāmasa. Here, the kārana, beauty of the face is more striking than the aprastuta effect nājanālāpita etc. In this connection Ruyyaka refutes the view of Mammata who cites the verse rājengrājasutā etc. as an illustration of aprastutaprasāmasa. But according to Mammata, this is a case of paryayokta, for the distinction of paryayokta and aprastutaprasāmasa is clearly shown by him before. Next Ruyyaka discusses with examples, the varieties of aprastutaprasāmasa by 'vaidharmya'.

So it is clear that in the treatment of the figure aprastutaprasamsa in the Alankarasarvasva, the existence of cause and effect relation is so prominent and is mentioned verbally with so much importance.

The definition of aprastutaprasamsa given by Visvanatha in his Sahityadarpana is so clearest. He defines this figure as:

\[ \text{kvavidviseah samayati samanyam va visesaah} \]
\[ \text{karyamnimitam kuryado hetoratha samat samam} \]
\[ \text{aprastutat prastutanedgamyate parasadha tatah} \]
\[ \text{aprastutaprasamsa ayat}. \]

So far as the conception is concerned, this definition bears no such originality. Like Suyyaka, Visvanatha also recognises five varieties of this alankara. The first one where a particular statement is suggested by a general one, is illustrated by the verse:

\[ \text{padhatam yadutthaya mudhunmedhirohati} \]
\[ \text{svasthdevapamepi dehinastadvara rajah} \]

Here the prastuta particular statement - the dust is superior to un is suggested by the general statement. The verse:

\[ \text{sragnyam yadi jivitashah haraye kim nihita na hanti maa} \]
\[ \text{visamagamartam kvacidhavedamartam vish visamadvareccha} \]

is an illustration of a general statement to be supported by the particular aprastuta one. The illustration of a cause being suggested by the effect is - indurlipta ivadhjena jadita drstih etc. This verse is cited by Suyyaka also to illustrate this particular variety of:

194 Raghuvamsam of Kalidasa. Cited by Visvanatha as an illustration of Aprastutaprasamsa.
aprástutaprasamsa. Here the prastuta cause, the beauty of the face is suggested by the aprastuta effect the anjénaüaptva of the moon etc.

The illustration of aprastutaprasamsa where the prastuta effect is indicated by the aprastuta cause is given by Visvanátha by the verse:

-gacchamiti mayoktayá mrgastra niśvasamudre kinnam { tyaktvä tiryagavéksya vágakalusháikena mám oaksusá } adya-prema madarpitam priyásakhivndt tavya badhyatá

mittham anehavivardhito mrgásíhah sotprásamabhágitah. 195

In this case the prastuta effect 'gaman a' is indicated by the description of the aprastuta cause. Next Visvanátha discusses with examples other varieties of the álámksra but he shows no such originality in the treatment.

Vidyádhara in his Ekávali defines the figure aprastutaprasamsa but his definition also is so stereotyped. The definition given by him is:

śaṁnyaviséṣate ve sarpye karyakarane tv ca aprastutaprasamsa nirdháta prastuta-sya gamyate 196

The existence of causal relation in this figure is verbally mention in this definition also.

Appayya Dikṣita follows Kambáta word by word in defining the figure of speech aprastutaprasamsa. The definition given by him is:

aprástutaprasamsa svat và sayatra prastutásraya. 197

195 Sahityadarpaṇa of Visvanátha. Chap. 10
196 Ekávali of Vidyádhara. Chap. 8 Kár - 27
197 Kuvalayánanda of Appayya Dikṣita. Kár - 66
When the description of an aprastuta meaning leads to the appreciation of the prastuta meaning, the figure of speech is called aprastutaprasamsa. Now, there must be some relation between the prastuta and the aprastuta. This relation may be, according to Appayya, of three varieties - sarupya, samayaviscabhavah, and kanyakaranabhava. Then Appayya discusses with illustrations the various types of aprastutaprasmasa but there is no such originality in this treatment. It is to be noted here that Appayya Diksita in his Citramitam includes this figure aprastutaprasamsa in the group of the figures based on upama. But in Kuvalayamanda however he accepts the existence of causal relation in the case of this figure of speech.

Jagannatha defines aprastutaprasamsa as:

apraotutena vyavaharena sadraiyodivaksyamuprakara-
nyutamprakaraena prastutavyavahare yatra prasaayate
aprastutaprasamsa. 198

When prastutavyavahara is indicated by the aprastutavyavahara by one of the relations like sadraiyya etc, the figure of speech is called aprastutaprasamsa. According to Jagannatha, the word prasamsa means mere description, not praise

( prasamsanam ca varnamamatra na tu stutih )

Jagannatha also accepts five varieties of this figure. The first one is when a sadra prastuta is suggested by the aprastuta. The second and third varieties are based on causal relation and the fourth and the

198 Rasagangadharas of Jagannatha. "Ima", 2 Page - 482.
fifth are based on samanyavisesabhava. Then Jagannatha discusses the first variety with illustrations. The second variety i.e. the cause being suggested by the effect is illustrated by the verse -

kin brūmastava viratām vayamabh yaṣaṇidharākhandala
kridākundalitahhrū sonenayane darsanalaḥ paśyati
nābhūsahratasājājītaillilustakālasevābhavanvindhyakṣaṁ-
dharaṇagāmāvadananagohāsambandhino bhūrubhū.

Here the cause 'aripalāyana' is indicated by the description of the effect. Thus the effect being suggested by the aprastuta cause is illustrated by Jagannatha by the verse -

srstih srstikṛtā purā kila prajātāmu jagaṁmandalam
tvam candētya nirdayan dahasi yajjīvalatālaṁ karāh
sārāsamūmalocano ranabhāvi prastūtakāmādhuma

Janīmo bhavatā na hantā vidito dīliḥharēvallabhā.

It is said that in this verse the cause here is aprastuta, then another example is cited to illustrate the aprastuta cause suggesting the effect -

ānāmya valgavacanaivinivāritēpi rosātpravātumudite
mayi dūrācānam bāla karāṅgulinesāvacāyadvena
kriyābhādālāsāsmanuṣu rurodhā mārgam.

In this verse the aprastuta effect pravāmānivṛtti is suggested by the description of the aprastuta cause. Next Jagannatha discusses critically other varieties of aprastutapravāsa with illustrations.

---

200 Ibid.
201 Ibid.
It is clear that the existence of cause and effect relation in the figure of speech aprastutaprasamsa is recognised by almost all the scholars of the later period. So we are justified in discussing this figure under the group of the figures based on cause and effect relation.

The figures of speech discussed above are directly based on cause and effect relation. It is established in the third chapter of this work how the figures of speech based on inference deserve mention in the category of the figures of speech based on cause and effect relation. Among these alamkāras hetu, anumāna etc are important.

But older rhetoricians like Bhāmaha, Udbhata etc did not discuss these alamkāras. Bhāmaha does not even recognise hetu as an alamkāra as there is no 'vakrokti' in this figure of speech

\[ \text{( hetusā śūkṣmo lešo'tha nālaṃkārataya nataḥ) } \]
\[ \text{samudāyābhidhānasya vakroktyanabhidhānataḥ) } \]

for according to him this vakrokti is the soul of the figures of speech and there can be, no alamkāra without it

\[ \text{( Ko'lamkāro'neya vina) } \]

Dandin however mentions the figure of speech hetu and discusses it in details. But other scholars of the early period do not at all mention the figures like 'hetu' 'anumāna' etc.

202 Kavyālaṃkāra of Bhāmaha. Chap. 2 Kār - 86.
203 Ibid. Kār - 85.
Among the scholars of the later period, Rudrata mentions the figure 'hetu' in the seventh chapter of his Kavyalampaka. He includes 'hetu' in the 'वास्तव' group. The definition of this alamkara given by him is:

\[
\text{Hetumata saha hetorabhidham bhedakrdbhedyatra}
\]

'\text{aloaka hetuh sydanyabhayah prthagbhutah}' \text{204}

Here by the word 'hetu' Rudrata means cause and thus 'hetumata' means effect. When the cause is stated along with the effect with 'abheda' the figure of speech is called hetu and this alamkara is different from other figures of speech. The illustration of this figure is:

\[
\text{aviralekamalavikasa sakalalimadaśa kokilenaṇḍaḥ}
\]

\[
\text{ramydyameti sampat lokotkantha karah kālah.} \text{205}
\]

The cause kālah (vasantah) is stated with the effects 'aviralekamalavikasa' etc.

The treatment of the figure hetu in the Sarasvatikantabharana of Bhoja is elaborate and bears the marks of originality. The definition of the word hetu is given by him as:

\[
\text{kriyayeh karanam hetuh.} \text{206}
\]

We have discussed in the third chapter how 'hetu' means cause in general. Now when this cause or kāraṇa is related to some object or action etc. we give it the name kāraṇa but when it is related to some knowledge, i.e. when it is the cause of some knowledge we call it hetu or līfiga or jñāpaka.

Dandin in his Kavyadarśa mentions this point - 'kāraṇakājaṃpaka u hetu' \text{207}

\begin{itemize}
  \item 204 Kavyalampaka of Rudrata. Chap. 7 Kār - 82
  \item 205 Ibid. Kār - 83
  \item 206 Sarasvatikantabharana of Bhoja. Chap. 3 Kār - 12.
  \item 207 Kavyadarśa of Dandin. Chap. 2 Kār - 235
\end{itemize}
Bhoja however accepts four varieties of hetu:

- kūraka jñāpakaśca saḥ
- abhāvaścitrahetuścā caturvidha ihegaste.208

This kūraka hetu again is of six types:

- yah pravṛttiṁ nivṛttiṁ ca prayuktim cāntara viśān
- udāsino'pi vā kuryāt kūrakam tatpracāgatē.209

Bhoja discusses with illustrations all these varieties of kūraka hetu. The second type of hetu viz. jñāpaka hetu is according to Bhoja of a few varieties:

- dviṭīya ca tyāja ca caturthī septamī ca yam |
- kriyānāvistamāsaśte lakṣaṇam jñāpakaśca saḥ 210

All these varieties are illustrated by Bhoja. The third variety viz. abhāva hetu is of four types - prāgabhāvaḥ, pradhvaṁśabhaṁvaḥ, itareṣārābhāvaḥ and atyantābhāvaḥ. There may be other varieties like ghatabhāva paṭabhāva etc. but divisions in this way are numerous.

(abhāvaḥ prāgabhāvaḥdibhedeneha caturvidhaḥ
ghatabhāvaḥ dibhedaḥ tu tasya samkhyā na vidyate ).211

Next Bhoja illustrates these four varieties of abhāva hetu. Like Dandin, Bhoja also recognise that there are numerous varieties of citra hetu,

(virduraśrayah sahaḥ kāryānantarajastathā
yukto na yukta ityevamāsakhyeyācitrahetavah ).212

and discusses each variety with suitable illustrations. It is clear that in the treatment of the figure 'hetu' Bhoja follows the footsteps of Dandin.

208 Sarasvatīkāntābherana of Bhoja. Chap. 5 Kār. - 12.
212 Ibid. Kār. - 16.
But this figure 'hetu' is not at all mentioned by Moimaata though many other minor alāmkarās are mentioned by him. Ruyyaka in his 'alamkarasārvasvā' also does not mention the figure of speech hetu.

Viśvanātha in his Sahityadārpana mentions the figure hetu but it seems he does not at all gives importance to this alāmkarā. The definition of hetu given by him is —

abhādenabhidhi heturhetumata saha.213

Hetu is named as 'abhidhāhetu' also in the Sahityadārpana. When the hetu is described to be identical to the hetumat i.e., effect, the figure of speech is hetu or abhidhāhetu. The illustration of this alāmkarā is — tārṇyasya viśeṣah ... etc.

Appayya Dīksita in his Kuvalayāmānda mentions the figure of speech hetu and defines it as —

hetorhetumata sārdhāt vārunam hetorucyate.214

The illustration is given by the verse — asvudeti sitāmsurūmacchedāya — subhruvāṃ. Here the rising of the moon is the cause and the 'mūnaccheda' is the effect. Both these are stated together. In the vṛtti Appayya gives another illustration —

eṣa te vidrumacchāyo marumārga ivādharah
kasaya no tanute tanvi pipāṣākutilam manah.215

Next another type of hetu is mentioned by him —

hetuhetumatarnikyam hetum kecit pracākṣet.216

---

213 Sahityadārpana of Viśvanātha. Chap. 10 Kar - 831.
But by the word 'keolt' he indicates that it is the opinion of other scholars. In this case the illustration is - laksmivilasa vidusam kataksavantakaprabhoh.

**ANUMANA**

The figure of speech anumana is based on lingalingibhava which is in fact a variety of causal relation as it is established in the third chapter. This anumana is however not mentioned in the works of the early rhetoricians but in the later age, it is accepted as a separate alankara by almost all the rhetoricians.

Rudrata in his Kavyalankara deals with this figure of speech in the seventh chapter. He includes this figure in the vastava group. The definition of anumana given by him is -

\[ \text{vastu paroksha yasmin sadhyamapanyasya sadhakam tasya punaranyadupanyasyedviparitam caitadanumaman} \]

When the sadhya (subject to be inferred) is stated first and then the sadhaka cause (by which something is inferred) is stated, the figure of speech is called anumana. Again, just the opposite to it viz. the description of sadhaka first and then of the sadhya.

217 Kavyalankara of Rudrata Chap. 7 Kar - 56.
is also a case of anumāṇa. Rudrata is justified in including this figure in the vastava group as in this case there is in fact description of some object. A question may arise here, that mere the statement of sādhyā and sādhana can not be an alamkāra. Thus, the statement parvato vahnimān dhumāit is by no means a figure of speech. In fact by inclusion of anumāṇa in the vastava group Rudrata gives answer to this problem. Vastava is defined by him as

vastavaniti tajjneyam kriyate vastuvarupakathamam yat

Here by the word 'pustārtham' it is indicated that if the description of a thing is striking then only it may be called the figure of speech vastava. In this way, in anumāṇa also, if the description of sādhyā and sādhana is striking, we may call it the figure of speech anumāṇa. In the statements like parvato vahnimān dhumāit etc. there is no strikingness. So we can not call it a figure of speech. So says Namiśādhu in his commentary on the figure of speech anumāṇa -

vastavalaksanaiva pustārthasya pariḥrτatvadagniratra

The illustration of anumāṇa given by Rudrata is -

sāvajñānāsanavājanam patito' sipādayostasyān

In this case the sādhyā pādaṇatana is stated first and then the sādhaka 'lalāṭagatayavakarasatilakapaknti' is stated. The illustration

218 Kavyalāmākāra of Rudrata. Chap. 7 Kār - 10
219 Commentary on Rudratālāmākāra by Namiśādhu.
220 Kavyalāmākāra of Rudrata. Chap. 7 Kār - 57.
of the second variety of anumāna i.e. where the śādhaka is stated first and then the śādyya is

vacanamupacārakarhaka dūreduṣṭaśamanāśasanā śākalam

idamadya mayi tatha te yathāśi nunam priye kupita. 221

Here the 'śādhaka vacana' etc are stated first and then the śādyya kūpitatvā is stated. Rudrata states other varieties of this figure of speech -

yatra bāliyāk kāramāloko yābhūtameva bhūtamiti

bhūviti vṛ tu tathānyaśākyāyaśa tadṛṇyadenumāna 222

He discusses with illustrations these varieties of anumāna.

Mammata discusses the figure of speech anumāna from purely logical point of view. The definition of this alaṅkāra given by him is - anumānam taduktai yat śādyasādhanayorvacyaḥ. 223

Anumāna is the description of the śādyya and sādhana. Now, in the vṛtti he explains the words śādyya and sādhana from logical standpoint. ( paksadharmayavayavistirekivatvatirūpa hetuḥ sādhanam ). 224

According to the logicians, hetu has three qualities - paksadharmatva, sapakṣavṛttitva and vipakṣavyavṛttatvam. These three are mentioned by Mammata in his definition of sādhana or hetu. By the word paksadharmatvam, he mentions the first quality, the second is indicated by the word anvayitva and by the expression vyastirekīta he suggests the quality vipakṣavyavṛttatvā. Again, the word śādyya is

221 Kāvyālakāra of Rudrata. Chap. 7 Kār - 58
222 Ibid. Kār - 59
223 Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammata. Chap. 10. Sutra - 117
224 Vṛtti on Kāvyaprakāśa by Mammata. Page - 696.
also defined by him as - dhanamini ayogayavaccheda vyapakaya sadhyatvam.
So it is found that the treatment of the figure of speech anumana in 
the Kavyaprakasa is so logical. The illustration of anumana given 
by Mamata is -

\[
\text{yatra ita leharicalalacaladso vyaprayanti bhrumam} \\
\text{yat tatraiva patanti sahtamanam marmasaaro murgandh} \\
\text{taccakriktaapamancitacarapremhatkerah kroheno} \\
\text{dhuvatyogata eva sasanadhara saitya sadasa amara.}^{225}
\]

Here in the first half the sadhana is stated and the sadhya in the 
last portion. Mamata rejects the view of Rudrata who accepts 
divisions of anumana on the basis of whether the sadhya is mentioned 
first or the sadhaka. According to Mamata there is no strikingness 
in this classification.

Bhoja in his Saravatikantabharana defines anumana as -
\[
\text{lingadyaliingino jnanamananam tudoyate} \\
purvvasachasvasunaha drstam samayatasca yat.^{226}
\]

Anumana is the knowledge of the 'lingi' ( sadhya ) from the 'linga' 
(hetu). This anumana is of three types - purvavat, esavat and 
aminayatah drata. This anumana again is divided into two varieties 
according to 'phala' and 'anumgaryakarana'. Then Bhoja illustrates 
the varieties of anumana. In the example -

\[
praviralavilolajaladah kutajrjunanipasurbhivanavatah \\
yamayatah kalo hanta hatan pathikagehinah^{227}
\]

\[^{225} \text{Kavyaprakasa of Mamata. Chap. 10.}\]
\[^{226} \text{Sarasvatikantabharana of Bhoja. Chap. 3 Kar - 47.}\]
\[^{227} \text{Ibid. Illus. 151.}\]
effect is inferred from the cause. The effect death of the separated ladies is inferred from the cause rainy season. The verse

sāvajñānamāgyaṃ sattumāṃ paṭitaḥ sī pādayastasyāḥ
kathemanyathā lañāṣa yavakarāṣṭikapākantirān

is an example of the cause being inferred from the effect. Where neither a cause nor an effect but only an 'avinābhava' is inferred, it is an illustration of śāmāyato drīṣṭam. In the verse

gajjante ke mehā phulla nīva pamaddā morā
nāṭ candujjo vāsiranto halā paṭto

the roaring of clouds etc. which are invariably present with the rainy season, suggest the rainy season. Then Bhoja discusses with suitable examples other varieties of the figure of speech anumāna.

It is to be noted here that in the treatment of the figure anumāna in the Sarvatīkāntaḥbhārana the existence of cause and effect relation is so prominent. Though it is a case of inference, still Bhoja states that here cause is inferred from the effect or the effect is inferred from the cause.

Ruyyaka in his ālākāraśarvasva includes the figure anumāna in the group of figures - tarkānyāśāraya for logical theory is at the base of this ālākāra. The definition of anumāna is

sādhyaśādhananirdeśaṃ anumāna

228 Sarvatīkāntaḥbhārana of Bhoja. Chap. 3 Illus. 152.
229 Ibid. Illus. 153.
When the hetu or linga having the three qualities - paksadharmastva, anvayitva and vyatirekita, is stated to suggest the knowledge of sadhya, the figure of speech is called anumana. Now, the logical conception of anumana is just the same. What is the difference of logical anumana and poetical anumana? Ruyyaka gives the answer -

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{vichrittiviseasadstra\text{-}trarthad\text{-}dayaniyah} \\
& \text{anyatha\ tarkanum\text{-}an\ tkim\ vailaks\text{-}an\ yah.}
\end{align*}
\]

The illustration of anumana given by Ruyyaka is -

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{yatha\ randhra\ vyomase\ ala\text{-}jala\text{-}adhatum\ sthagayati} \\
& \text{spulisingan\ ru\text{-}pan\ dadhati\ ca\ yatha\ kitum\ anayah} \\
& \text{yatha\ vidyuj\text{-}aloj\text{-}valan\ aparinig\text{-}aca\ kakuthastath\ } \\
& \text{many\ lag\text{-}na\ pathikatar\ ukha\ de\ smaradavah.}
\end{align*}
\]

Here the dhuma sphulinga etc. which are the hetu or linga of fire indicate the sadhya fire stated by the word 'dava'. As there is vicchitti or strikingness, it is different from logical inference. This example of Anumana is however based on rupa. Ruyyaka gives another illustration where the anumana is suddha.

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{( yatra\ ita\ lahar\text{-}cal\text{-}alad\text{-}r\text{-}o\ vya\text{-}parayanti\ bhruvan) } \\
& \text{yattatru\ ita\ pat\text{-}ti\ san\text{-}tatam\ iti\ marga\text{-}pr\text{-}o\ marganah} \\
& \text{taocak\text{-}rakta\text{-}apa\text{-}ma\text{-}cit\text{-}asa\text{-}pra\text{-}nikhat\text{-}arah\ krodhano} \\
& \text{dhavatya\ grata\ eva\ san\text{-}sam\ text{-}arah\ satyam\ sad\text{-}sam\ smar\text{-}ah.}
\end{align*}
\]

Here however the sadhya and sadhana are stated without being related to some other figure of speech. In this case, the diction of the poet brings the strikingness. Then Ruyyaka shows the difference.

\[\text{251 Alek\text{-}karas\text{-}arasa\text{-}swa of Ruyyaka. Page - 184.}\]
\[\text{232 Ibid.}\]
among the figures anumāna, Kavyalinga and arthāntaranyāga. Between two statements, there may be pratyāyapratyāyakabhāva or saṃarthya-samarthakabhāva. When an unknown thing is established, there is pratyāyapratyāyakabhāva and when a known object is established, there is saṃarthya-samarthakabhāva. In the first case, the figure of speech is anumāna. In the case of saṃarthya-samarthakabhāva, if the relation between the samarthya (object to be supported) and the samarthaka (by which something is supposed) is cause and effect, the figure of speech is Kavyalinga, but if the relation is general and particular, the figure of speech is arthāntaranyāga.

Visvanātha in his Sahityadarpana mentions the figure of immediately after the figure Kavyalinga. The definition of this alamkāra given by him is -

anumāna tu biśchittya jñānam saḍhyasya sādhanat. 233

There is no originality in the definition but by the word biśchittya in the definition he clearly distinguishes poetic inference from logical inference. In logical inference however there is no biśchitti or strikingness. The illustration of anumāna given by Visvanātha is -

jānīmehe'ya hrdi sārāsākṣayāvirajate'ntah priyavaktraścandrah
tatkāntijaleśc praṃśtistādānagesvāpāndā kulaṃālaścuṣipadme. 234

Here the strikingness comes through the figure rūpaka underlying the

233 Sahityadarpana of Visvanātha. Chap. 10. Kār - 82

234 Ibid.
anumana. In the verse—

\[ \text{yatra patatyabalanānā drśtrimisitān patanti tatra sarāh.} \]

however the strikingness arises through the mode of expression of the poet.

Vidyādhara in his Ekāvalī defines anumāna as—

\[ \text{anumatamanumānasidān yatrastrānādhvasādhama kathita.} \]

The illustration of this figure is—

\[ \text{nārasiṇha mahipala vidmasta mākaračvajenā} \]
\[ \text{margunastava sanjātāh katham sumanaso'nyathā.} \]

Appayya Diksita in his Kuvālayamanda mentions the figure anumāna. Jayadeva in his Candraāloka does not mention this alaṁkāra but Appayya after discussing the hundred figures of speech mentioned by Jayadeva, refers to a few alaṁkāras based on the different pramānas. In this connection the figure of speech anumāna is mentioned which is based on the pramāṇa-inference. The illustration of anumāna given by him is—yathā randhram etc. This verse is cited by Ruyyaka also as an example of anumāna. This anumāna is related to Rūpaka. Next Appayya gives illustrations of anumāna related to atisāyokti and also of sūddhānumāna.

---

235 Śāhityadarpāna of Viśvanātha. Chap. 10.
Jagannatha defines anumana as anumitikaranaanumana. 236

Anumana is the cause of anumiti. This anumiti is defined by
Jagannatha as-

\[ \text{anumititvam} \ \text{sanminnoti} \ \text{nāmaasakaśkaraśakaśko jātiviseah} \]

From the logical viewpoint he gives another definition of anumati-
\[ \text{vyāptiprakārakahapēdhatātmaśayajayaśajñānam} \ \text{vanumitih} \]

Anumana is the cause of this particular type of knowledge. This is
however general inference. If it leads to strikingness due to the
diction of the talented poet, it is the figure of speech anumana.
The illustration of this alāṅkāra given by Jagannatha is-
\[ \text{tasminmenivatātahatadadhāre} \ \text{pūre mīśalopavidhānādakte} \]
\[ \text{sādyo viyukta} \ \text{divasāvavānam} \ \text{kokāh sāsokā} \ \text{kathayanti nityam} \]

Then Jagannatha goes into pedantic discussion on minute details of
the figure of speech anumana. We are not going to mention that in
this connection.

It is discussed before that cause may be of various types-
cause of an object, of an action, of a knowledge etc. In the first
two cases we give the name Kārma and in the latter case, we name it
as hetu or linga. In the figures of speech asaṅgati, vibhāvaṁ etc.
the cause is Kārma and the relation is Kāryakāraṇabhava. But in the
case of hetu, anumāna and Kavyalīṅga the cause is named as hetu or
linga. We have discussed the treatment of the figures of hetu and
anumāna. Now we shall trace the development of the figure of speech
Kavyalīṅga.

236 Rasagangadhara of Jagannatha, Page - 475. Chap. '2.'
237 Ibid.
KĀVYALINGA:

The figure of speech Kāvyalinga, as the name itself indicates, is based on inference. The word linga means the cause of knowledge, e.g., when the existence of fire is inferred, the smoke is the cause of inference. Among the scholars of early stage, only Udbhaṭa mentions the figure of speech Kāvyalinga or Kāvyahetu.

Among the later rhetoricians, Rudraṭa does not at all mention the figure Kāvyalinga though the other two alamkāras hetu and anumāna based on inference are mentioned by him.

Mammata in the tenth chapter of his Kavyaprkasā deals with the figure Kāvyalinga. The definition of this alamkāra given by him is -

Kāvyalinga hetorvākyapadarthata.

The description of the linga or hetu is Kāvyalinga. This description may be by three ways, and thus Kāvyalinga may be of three types - vākyārthatā, anekapadārthatā, and ekapadārthatā. In order to differentiate this linga from logical 'linga' Mammata names it as Kāvyalinga. So says, Bhattacharīya in his commentary 'bālavodhini' -

Kāvyabhimasam lingam kāvyalingam
tarkāstrātrāchitālingavāvartanāya kāvyapadam.

239 Commentary on Kavyaprkasā by Bhattacharīya.
   - Com. on the figure Kāvyalinga. Page 67
In sāstralinga there is no strikingness but in the Kāvyalinga, the description of the linga or hetu brings out charm. Then Mammata illustrates different types of Kāvyalinga. The first variety is illustrated by the verse -

\[
vapahpādurbhāvādanumātātāyānājanmānīpura
\]

\[
pūrānaṇaṃprāyaprākṣātāyāṃbhavaniṃprāṇatavān
\]

nāmaṁmuktāhānsaṃpratyaśahātanuravgraṇāntibhūk

mahēśaḥkṣaṇāvyaṁtadidaṃaparādhadvayaṁpān

Thus ekapadārthathā and ekapadārthathā also are illustrated by him.

Bhoja in his Sarasvatīkṛṣṇabhārana does not mention the figure Kāvyalinga though hetu and ānumāna are discussed by him in details.

Ruyyaka includes the figure of speech Kāvyalinga in the figures based on logical reasoning ( tarkanyāyārṣaṇa ). The definition of Kāvyalinga given by him is

hetorvākyapadārthathā kāvyalingam.

In this definition however, there is no such originality. Ruyyaka also differentiates clearly Kāvyalinga from sāstralinga by the word Kēvya. ( tarkavālakṣṇyārthaṃ kāvyagraḥāṇam ). Next Ruyyaka illustrates all the divisions of the particular figure of speech.

---

240 Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammata. Chap. 10. Illus.
The treatment of the figure Kāvyalinga in the Sahityadarpana of Visvanātha is worth mention in this connection. Though the definition

hetorvākyapatārthatve kāvyalinga nigadyate

does not bear the make of originality, still the discussion on this alamkāra undertaken by him throws new light on the conception of this alamkāra. At first Visvanātha illustrates the three varieties of Kāvyalinga. Then he criticizes the opinion of Mammata who includes the particular type of the figure of speech arthāntaranyāsa where the relation between the samarthya and samarthaka is cause and effect relation, in the figure of speech Kāvyalinga. For this reason, the factor of causal relation is not at all mentioned by Mammata in the definition of arthāntaranyāsa. He accepts only the relation of particular and general in this connection

( śāmānyo va viśeṣo va tadanyena samarthyate )

The cases where the relation between the samarthaka and samarthya is Kāryakāra are included in the figure of speech Kāvyalinga. It is explained in the commentary Uddota -

Kāraṇena kāryaṁ kāryena kāraṇaṁya va samarthanam
tu kāvyalingasya viśeṣah
Samarthyasamarthakayoḥ śāmānyavisesabhāvasambandhe'yam
taditaraśambandhe kāvyalingasmityahhyupagamati

Visvanātha however does not accept this view of Mammata. For according to him hetu is of three types - JVāpeka, nippadaka and

242 Sahityadarpana of Visvanātha. Chap. 10 Kar - 81
243 Kāvyaprakāsa of Mammata. Chap. 10 Sutra 109
244 Uddota, a Commentary on Kāvyaprakāsa.
samarthaka. Among them, the jāapaḥa hetu is related to the figure of speech anumāṇa, nippadaka is related to Kāvyalinga and samarthaka is to arthāntaranyāsa. So the two alamkāras arthāntaranyāsa and Kāvyalinga are totally two different figures of speech, the arthāntaranyāsa be it related to the causal relation, cannot be included in the Kāvyalinga alamkāra. Visvaṇātha also states, that strikingness is the root of the figure of speech. Logical hetu differs from the figure of speech hetu on this point. So when only the description of the hetu brings out 'vaicitrya' or strikingness, we can name it Kāvyalinga. So the verse

na dhatte śirasā gāṅgām bhūmibhārabhiyā harah
tvādvajirājajirīdahūtadhūlīhī pāñkīla hi. sa

is not an example of Kāvyalinga as there is no strikingness due to the mentioning of the hetu by the word 'hi'.

Vidyādhara in his Ekāvalī defines Kāvyalinga as

vākyārtha yadi heturbhavati padartho visesanadvārā
dviyidham kathayanti tadalamkāram kāvyalingamiti 245

This definition however bears no mark of originality. In the commentary Taralā this Kāvyalinga is differentiated from the figure of speech 'anumāṇa' — nedanumāṇam jñāpyajñāpakaḥvābhavāt.

In the case of anumāṇa, the relation between the sādhya and sādhana is jñāpyajñāpaka. But in Kāvyalinga however it is not jñāpyajñāpaka, it is rather niṣpadyanapadaka. This Kāvyalinga is different from arthāntaranyāsa and drstānta also.

245 Ekāvalī of Vidyādhara. Chap. 8. Kār - 49
Appayya Diksita in his Kuvalayananda defines Kavyalinga in a totally different way - 

samarthaniyasyartha kavyalingam samarthanam

Kavyalinga is the supporting of an object to be supported. The illustration of this figure is given by him as -

jito'si manda! Kandarpa! maccitte'sti trilocsanah.

Here Kandarpajaya is practically an impossible task, for this reason it is supported by the sentence - maccitte'sti trilocsanah.

In order to differentiate it from the figure of speech arthantaranyasa Appayya explains in the vrtti the meaning of the word samarthaniya as 'samarthanasaapeksha'. In arthantaranyasa, one thing is stated first and then another is described to support it but in Kavyalinga the object stated deserves the support otherwise it can not stand at all. As we have found in the example cited before the statement 'jito'si kandarpa' seems to be absurd unless it is supported by the second statement. So it is 'samarthanasaapeksha'. The Appayya discusses with suitable examples padarthahetuka kavyalinga which again may be ekapadarthahetuka and anekapadarthahetuka. So it is found that Appayya discusses the figure of speech Kavyalinga from a new standpoint. In his treatment however the logical meaning of the word linga is not at all existing. In the vrtti he clearly mentions this point -

vyaptidharmatadi saapeksonaiyayikubhimatalinga-
vyavartanaya kavyavidesanam.

246 Kuvalayananda of Appayya Diksita. Kair 121.
247 Vrtti on Kuvalayananda on the Kair No. 121.
Jagannatha in his Rasagangadhaara defines Kavyalinga as anumiti karatvavem samanyavisepabhavabhyam canalingitva prakrarthopadakatvavem vivakaito'rthah Kavyalingam. He discusses critically the views of other rhetoricians like Ruyyaka and Appayya Diksita. Jagannatha's classification of Kavyalinga also is different from that of other scholars. He at first divides this figure into two classes - ouvantarthatva and tihantarthatva. Then this ouvantarthatva again is of two types - sabdantarahavisesita-sarira and siddhakasubantartharupa. There are many other minor varieties of this figure of speech accepted by Jagannatha.

The above mentioned figures of speech are directly related to the cause and effect relation. The last three viz. hetu amumana and kavyalinga are based on inference which again is basically related to the causal relation as we have discussed before. So all the figures of speech mentioned above are directly related to the cause and effect relation.

There is another set of alamkaras which are some way or other related to the cause and effect relation, but the causal relation does not operate here directly. The figures of speech upamà, Rupa Ulekha Vyatireka etc can be included in this group. We have discussed in the third chapter how the cause and effect relation operates there indirectly. Now we are going to discuss how these figures of speech are treated in the works of the rhetoricians of later age.

It is discussed in the fourth chapter how the figure of speech upamā plays an important role in Sanskrit literature as well as in Sanskrit rhetorics. Due to this extraordinary influence of this particular figure, conception about this alamkāra has changed from age to age. Different scholars have thrown light from different viewpoint on this alamkāra. We have discussed in the fourth chapter how this upamā is treated in the works of the early rhetoricians. Now, we shall discuss how the conception of upamā has undergone modification and change in the works of later rhetoricians.

Rudrata in his Kavyālakśāra divides the whole range of the figures of speech into four principal sections - vastava, aupamya, atisaya and slesa. The second section includes all the figures that are based on similarity. The word aupamya is defined by him as:

\[
\text{samvak pratipādayītum avastuvato vastuv tātsamānamāti} \\
\text{vastvantaramahidhīyavaktā yaamāśata aupamyan.}^{249}
\]

When in order to establish the exact nature of a thing, a similar thing is stated by the speaker, that is aupamya. This aupamya is at the root of a vast number of figures of speech. Rudrata mentions twenty one alamkārās that are based on aupamya. Upamā is one of

249 Kavyālakśāra of Rudrata. Chap. 8. Kar - 1
of these figures. The definition of Upama given by Rudrata is:

ubhayasamamamekanigundadi siddham bhavadyathakatra
arthemyatra tetathatsaddhyate itisopama tredha. 250

When the upamana and the upameya have one common attribute, the figure of speech is upama. This upama is of three types - vakyopama, samasopama and pratyeyopama. Next Rudrata mentions other varieties of Upama with suitable illustrations in each case.

Vakyopama is where the upama is stated by a sentence. This is of six varieties. The first one is illustrated by the verse -
kamalamiva caruvadanam mrnalamiva komalam bhujayugalam

It is to be noted here that this upama as discussed and illustrated by Rudrata there is apparently no connection with the cause and effect relation. But if we think deeply we shall see that there is an underlying cause and effect relation in the figure of speech upama. If we discuss the illustration Kamalamiva caruvadanam etc. we shall find that the face and the lotus are compared due to the common attribute 'carutva', again the arms and the stalk of the lotus are described to be similar due to Komalatva existing in both the upamana and upameya. Thus carutva, komalatva etc. are in fact the causes of the similarity, and the description of the similarity i.e. Kamalamiva vadanan etc. are the effects. So we see that the existence of cause and effect relation must be accepted in the figure of speech upama. It is true in all the cases of upama.

251 Ibid. Kar - 6.
Bhoja in his Sarasvatikanthabharana deals with the figure of speech upama in the fourth chapter where he discusses the figures based on both sound and sense (ubhayalamkaras). A question may arise here that almost all the rhetoricians former or later includes upama in the arthalamkara group as this figure is based purely on sense. So how is it that Bhoja states it to be an 'ubhayalamkara'? According to Bhoja the upamya or similarity is in fact suggested by some words like iva etc. and again in some cases the upama is arthi i.e. based purely on sense. For this reason Bhoja accepts this as an ubhayalamkara. So he says -

\[ \text{sahebhoyo yah padarthabhya upamadih pratiyate} \]
\[ \text{visisto'rtah kavinam tu ubhayalamkriyah priyah.} \]

The definition of upama is given by Bhoja as -

\[ \text{prasiddheranurodhena yah paraasparamarthayoh} \]
\[ \text{bhuyo'vayasamayogyogah sehopama mat.} \]

When there is a relation of similarity of form between the upamana and upamaya, it is called upama. Then in the example 'Kumadamiva mukham' the face and the kumuda are described to be similar and thus we can state it as upama. But by the expression - prasiddheranurodhena, Bhoja states that in the example cited above, there is no upama for only when there is traditional similarity we can call it upama. There is no tradition of upama between the face and the kumuda. So the example - Kumadamiva mukham is not a case of upama. An example will make the point clear. It is a tradition to set the earring in the ear and the bangle on the wrist. Now if one wears the particular

---

252 Sarasvatikanthabharana of Bhoja. Chap. 4 Kar - 1
253 Ibid. Kar - 4.
ornaments in other places they will not definitely bring the charm however beautiful they may be. The break of tradition is the cause of the lack of charmingness here. In the same way, the similarity of Kumuda and the face is not traditional. So this similarity does not bring out strikingness and thus it is not an alāṅkāra. Then Bhoja mentions different varieties of Upamā. The first classification is abhidhiyamāna and pratiyamāna. These again are three fold - pada, vākya and prapañca. These three again have eight varieties and thus there are twenty four sub-divisions of upamā. Bhoja discusses with suitable illustrations each of all these varieties. It is to be noted here that Bhoja accepts the third variety of Upamā viz. prapañcappamā which is not at all accepted by other scholars.

He defines this prapañcappamā as -

\[ \text{yatroktibhangya vākyartho sadṛṣyamavagamyate} \]
\[ \text{vākyarthe sadṛṣyamavagamyate sa prapañcopamesyate.} \]

When by some particular mode of expression, the similarity is suggested, the figure of speech is called prapañcappamā. It is also a notable factor that the sub-divisions of prapañcappamā viz. samastopama, ekadesopama, mahopama and raśanopama which again can be prakṛtarūpa and vikṛta, are recognised as separate figures of speech in the works of other rhetoricians like Mammata etc. Thus ananvaya, upameyopama etc. are according to Bhoja, divisions of upama where as they are accepted as separate alāṅkāra in the Kavyapraakāsa. Bhoja accepts some peculiar varieties of upama viz. utpadyopama viparyāsopama etc. which are not mentioned by other scholars. Viparyāsopama

however is mentioned by Dandin only and it is recognised as a separate figure of speech pratipa by later rhetoricians. Whatever it may be, it is clear from the above discussion that due to the great influence and varieties of usage of upama the rhetoricians express different opinions about the varieties of sub-divisions of this figure of speech.

In the Kavyaprakāśa of Mamata we have almost a final shape of the conception of the figure upama. The definition of upama given by Mamata is - "sādharmyam upama bhede." In this definition however the keynote of upama is hinted at by the scholar. He states the word sādharmya instead of śādraya, for there is a minute distinction between śādraya and sādharmya. It is stated by Paramāṇandadesakravartibhattachāryya in his Vistarīka -

śādrayaṣya pratiyogyupamāṇaṃ anyogupameyam
asya ca sādharmyaṣya upamāṇamupameyam ca dvāvayanyoginān

This is explained by Bhaṭṭavāmana -

yāḥ sādharmasādharmapratiyogyikah upamāṇopame-
yobhayanyogikah saśādharmasyanityucyate
yaśo upamāṇapratiyogyikah upameṣṭaṃyogikah saśādharmah
sa śādṛṣyamityucyate iti sādharmyasaśādṛṣyaorbhedaḥ

So by using the word sādharmya Mamata includes both the upama - śruti and arthi. This sādharmya of upamāna and upameya is called

255 Kavyaprakāśa of Mamata. Chap. 10 Sutra 125.
256 The Commentary Vistarīka by Paramāṇanda Chakravarti, on the Sutra - 125 of Kavyaprakāśa.
257 The Commentary Būlavodhini by Bhaṭṭavāmana. Page 541.
upama in case there is bheda or distinction. If there would be no distinction, it would be anuvaya. In fact, wherever there is similarity in some factor, there must be dissimilarities in other cases. The face and the moon is definitely dissimilar in all other factors, only in the point of charmingness (śālādakatva) these two are similar. There can be no comparison unless there is difference in some way or other. Two identical things are never compared. The moon is not compared to the moon itself or the face to the face. The knowledge of the existence of difference must be there in the knowledge of similarity between two objects. This point is hinted at by Mammata by the word 'bheda'. Mammata at first recognises two principal divisions of upama - purṇa and lupta.258 The first one viz. purṇa is of two varieties - ārauti and ārthi.259 When the words denoting upama viz. iva, yatha etc. are verbally mentioned, it is ārauti upama, but when the sadrāya is suggested by words like tulya etc. it is ārthi upama. These ārauti and ārthi again may be of three types - vākyaga, saṁsāga and taddhitaga.260 Mammata discusses with illustrations each and every variety of purṇopama. Luptopama however is of five varieties for there can be no ārauti taddhitaga upama if the common attribute is omitted. The other two varieties vākyaga and saṁsāga due to the 'lopa' of upamāna upameya or sādharaṇa dharma (the common attribute) are again of many types and thus luptopama is of nineteen varieties.

258 Purṇa lupta ca - Kavyaprakāsa. Chap. 10. Sutra 126.
The other varieties of upama accepted by Rudrata etc., viz., melopama, raśnopama etc., are not recognised by Mamata as there can be hundreds of varieties of this type and these are practically included in the varieties stated before.

( evaśvidhavaicitryasahasraśabhasambhavāt uktabhedānatikramaśca )

Ananvaya which is accepted by Bhoja as a variety of prapancopama is recognised by Mamata as a separate figure of speech.

Ruyyaka in his alāmkārasarvasva defines upama as:

upamānopacanasvaṇyoḥ sādharmye bhedābhedatulyatvā upamā.  

This conception is not so different from that of Mamata. The expression - bhedābhedatulyatva means that in the case of upamā, the similarity and difference of the upamāna and the upameya will be in equal degree. It is indicated in the definition of Mamata also. In the figure of speech vyatireka, the dissimilarity is more prominent than the similarity. In the case of rūpaka again, the sense of similarity is more prominent. But in the figure upama, the sense of similarity and difference is equal.

( avyayastulyatvā yathāṣyaṃ ).

Ruyyaka accepts the various subdivisions of upama viz. pūrṇā luptā etc. But he mentions another classification of upama. The common attribute ( sādharanāḥ dharmāḥ ) is sometimes stated as anugami ( sādharanadharmasya kvacidanugāmitayayākaruyena nirdesāḥ ).

The illustration in this case is -

261 Kavyaprakāśā of Mamata. Chap. 10. Page 261
262 Alāmkārasarvasva of Ruyyaka. Page - 31
263 Ibid.
264 Ibid. page 33
prabhāmahatyā sikhayeṣvā dipastriṃgayeṣvā triṅgaṣvāsa margaḥ
samskārayateyevā girī manīśi tayā sa pūtaco vibhūsitaḥ.

Here the common attributes - pūtacatva and vibhūsitatva are the same
in upamāna and upameya; and are stated once. In some cases, the
common attribute is stated separately in ‘vastuprativastu’ relation.

In the verse -

yāntyā mahurvalitakadharasāmānā tadāvṛttavṛnta
satapatrebhān vahantyā
digūho’mritena ca visena ca pakamalāksyā
gāghō nikhāta iva me hṛdaye kātaṣeḥ — — — — —

the attributes valitatva and āvṛttatva are different but are related
in vastuprativastubbhāva. So it is also a case of upamā. So it is
stated —

vastuprativastubbhāvenaakramāṅdeśe'pi saiva. 265

In the illustration -
padyayōmśarpita kṛptāṅga-ga haricandanena
abhāti bālaśeṣeṣeṣaṁ saṁjñhajharagūra ivādrijāh266

the relation is pratibimba. Ruyyaka also accepts anuvaya, upameyopamā as separate figures of speech.

The definition of upamā given by Viśvanātha is —
sānyam vucyamavaidharmāṁ vucyakya upamā dvayoh. 267

The conception however bears no mark of originality. The classification
of this figure also follows that of Mammatā. The single point of

265 Alāṅkārasarvasva of Ruyyaka. Page = 94.
266 Ibid. Page = 34.
difference is that Viśvanātha accepts twenty one varieties of luptopama instead of the nineteen accepted by Mammata.

The definition of upama given by Vidyādhara in his Ekāvälī is -

vilasati sati sādharmye syāṇūpamāṇopameyayorupamā.

His classification also is stereotyped.

Appayya Dīkṣita in his Citramāmsā pays utmost importance to the figure of speech upamā. He states a good many members of alamkāras as different manifestations of the same upamā. As the same actress in different attires plays different roles, thus upamā also in different forms assumes different names like rūpaṇa, ullekha, smaranam etc. Due to this extraordinary influence of upamā Appayya discusses this figure in details. He defines this figure as -

upamāṇopameyatvayorupameyatvayorupamayorarthayodvayoh

hṛdayam sādharmyasupametyucyate kāvyavedibhih. 268

Appayya explains critically each and every word of this definition and in this connection differentiates this upamā from other figures of speech. Appayya also criticises with learned arguments the definitions of upamā given by other rhetoricians. Upamā is stated to be of two types - pūrṇā and luptā. These two varieties are also discussed with suitable illustrations and minor subdivisions. The divisions of pūrṇā into āravatā and ārthi and their minor subdivisions...
by Samasta et al. are also criticised by Appayya. He does not accept the divisions of luptopama also mentioned by other rhetoricians. He rather divides luptopama into eight varieties - vācakalupta, dharmaḻupta, vācakopamaṇyalupta, dharmaṇalupta, vācakopamaṇyalupta, dharmaṇalupta, vācakalupta, upamaṇalupta and dharmaṇvācakalupta. Every one of these varieties are discussed with suitable illustrations by Appayya. In short, Appayya exerts all his attention in the treatment of the figure of speech upama in the Citramīmamsā. In the Kuvalayānanda however his treatment of the figure upama though elaborate but so stereotyped.

Here upama is defined as -

\[ \text{upama yatra sadāyalakṣaṁrutullasati dvayoḥ.} \]

By the expression - 'sadāyalakṣaṁrutullasati dvayoḥ' Appayya indicates that similarity of the two objects must be striking, otherwise it would not be named as upama. In the Citramīmamsā he uses the word 'hrdayam' to express this conception. The illustration of upama in the Kuvalayānanda is -

\[ \text{hamśiva krena te kirtih svargaṅgavagāhate.} \]

Here the upameya fame and the upamana hamsa are described to be similar due to the common factor svargaṅgavagāhena. It is an illustration of pūrṇopama as the upameya, upamaya, the common attribute and the word iva denoting similarity are present here. In the Kuvalayānanda also Appayya mentions eight varieties of luptopama -

\[ \text{varyopamaṇadharmaṇamupamaṇvācakasya ca} \]
\[ \text{ekadītyanupāḍānairbhimna luptopamaṇṭaḥ.} \]

270 Ibid.
He illustrates all these varieties one by one. In the Kavyalayānanda, however, Appayya does not enter into scholastic discussion on the figure of speech upamā.

Jagannātha in his Rasagangādhara defines upamā as—

sādrayam sunderaṃ vākyārthopakārakam upamālakrtih.

The word sundera is explained as—saundaryam ca samātkāryādhāyakatvam.

As in the case of other figures of speech discussed before in the case of upamā also Jagannātha enters into pedantic discussion on the conception of this figure. He criticises the view of Appayya expressed in the Citramāṇasā. In the classification of the figure upamā however Jagannātha accepts the views of his predecessors, he only mentions some other divisions of upamā. Whatever it may be, we are not mentioning here the elaborate discussion on the figure upamā in this connection, for it will not help us in the present context viz. the discussion on causal relation as the root of the figures of speech.

Rūpaka:

The figure of speech Rūpaka as the name itself indicates is superimposition of one thing on the other. Now, when a completely different thing is superimposed on another, there must be some cause of this superimposition. Thus, in the expression—mukhacandrama sothata,

the face and the moon are two different things altogether; still these two are described to be identical. In fact the charmingness of the face and the moon is the common attribute on the basis of which these two are described to be identical. So the charmingness is the cause of the superimposition. A question may arise here, in the example mukhām candramive, the face and the moon are described to be similar due to the charmingness but in the case of rūpaka also, the same charmingness is the cause of āropap or superimposition. In fact in these two cases there is difference of degree only. In the case of upamā, due to the charmingness, the sameness of the two things is described, but in the case of rūpaka due to the extraordinary sameness, the two things are described to be identical.

This rūpaka is defined by Rudrata as:

\[ \text{yatra gunānām āvāye satyupamānopamayorabhidā} \]
\[ \text{ā-vivaksaśitaśaṇmāṇya kalpyata iti rūpakām prathaman.} \] 273

Where the upamāna and the upameya are described to be identical due to the similarity of guna but the general attribute is not stated. The example of āropap is called rūpaka.

\[ \text{ā-vivaksaśitaśaṇmāṇya } \]

The illustration of rūpaka is given by Rudrata as:

\[ \text{sākṣādeva bhavānvismurbhārūyā lakṣmiriva ca te} \]
\[ \text{nānyadbhūtaśrjā ārṣastā loke mithunamādrīm.} \] 274

Here the upamāna visnu and the upameya 'bhavān' are identical again.

---

the upameya bhāryā and upamāna bhāṣā are identical. But the common attribute is not mentioned. Due to extraordinary sameness of these upamāna and upameya they are described identical. Rudrata recognises another variety of the figure of speech rūpaka -

uparjarjanupameyaḥ kṛtvā tu samāsamatayorubhayah
yatāc prayujyate tadārūpakaṁ saṁayāt samāsoktaḥ.\(^{275}\)

Next Rudrata states the classifications of rūpaka. The above mentioned two types of rūpaka viz. vākyarūpaka and saṁsarūpaka are divided into three classes - savayava, niravayava and saṁkīrṇa. Again, there is another division of the above varieties - this is the division into saṁmastavīsaya and ekadasi.\(^{276}\)

Rudrata defines savayavarūpaka as -

tābhayasyāvayavanāṁanyam tadvadeva yatkriyate tat savayavam.\(^{277}\)

When all the parts ( savayava ) of both the upamāna and upameya are described to be identical, the figure of speech is called savayava rūpaka. The illustration will make the point clear -

lalanaḥ saroruhīnāya kamalāni mukhaṇi kesara irdaśaṇāḥ
adharairdalaśa taśaṁ navabisanālēni bāhulataḥ.\(^{278}\)

Here the upameya 'lalanaḥ' and the upamāna 'saroruhīnāya' are stated to be identical along with the parts or limbs - mukha, dasāṇa, adhara and bāhulata described to be identical to 'kamalā' 'kesara' 'dala' and 'bisanāla' respectively. So it is a case of savayavarūpaka.


\(^{276}\) Dvayamapi punardvidhītatsamastavi - sayahkadesītaya,


\(^{278}\) Ibid. Kār - 43.
This śāvayavarūpaka again is of a few types - sahaja, śhīrya and ubhaya. The definition of niravayavarūpaka is ¬
muktvavavavivakṣām virdhīyate yattu tattu niravavavem bhevati. When there is no intention of describing the parts or the limbs of the upamāna and upameya, the figure of speech is niravayavarūpaka. This is of four varieties - suddha, mālā, rasana and paramparita. Rudrata illustrates each of all these varieties.

Mammatā in his Kavyaprakāṣa defines rūpaka as -
tadrūpakaśabhadho ya upamāṇopameyayoh. There is no originality in this definition. But in the vṛtī Mammatā states - atisāmyāt anapanhutabhedayo. By this he perhaps expresses the keynote of upamā. In fact the face and the moon are two different things altogether. How then the moon is superimposed on the face? The cause is stated by Mammatā in the expression - atisāmyāt. Due to extraordinary sameness of the upamāna and upameya, these two are stated to be identical. So it is stated in the Pradīpa -
abhedo bhedāropah, bijā tu tatratisāmyam. So the existence of causal relation in the figure of speech rūpaka is clear. The use of the fifth case-ending in the word "atisāmyāt" indicates that 'atisāmya' is the cause of hetu of the superimposition.

The fifth case-ending here is according to the rule - 'vibhāṣa guṇastriyāṃ' where the word 'hetu' comes by 'anuvṛtti'. Again, by the expression.

279 Kavyālāmkaṇa of Rudrata. Chap. 8. Kār - 46
280 Kavyaprakāṣa of Mammatā. Chap. 10 Sutra - 139
281 Pradīpa, a commentary on the Kavyaprakāṣa.
enapanhutabhedayoh, it is indicated that in the case of Ṛūpaka, though the upamaṇa and upameya are stated identical, the sense of bheda or difference is present there. When we say mukhacandra, we are definitely aware that the face and the moon are two different things. In the figure of speech atisayokti, the difference is totally omitted, but in Ṛūpaka, the sense of difference must exist in spite of the superimposition. The classifications of Ṛūpaka made by Bhamma are so stereotyped.

Bhoja in his Sarasvatikanṭhābharana discusses the figure of speech Ṛūpaka from a new point of view. The definition of Ṛūpaka given by him is -

\[
yadopamaṇaśabdānāṁ gaunavṛttivyapāśrayāt
\]

upameya bhavedvṛttistādā tadrūpakan vidūḥ

In fact the upamaṇa 'candra' etc. by the primary meaning of the term cannot be identical to the upameya 'face' etc. So according to Bhoja, the upamaṇa words are in fact used to indicate the upameya taking the secondary sense ( gaunavṛttivyapāśrayāt ) and this figure of speech is called Ṛūpaka. The classification of the figure of speech Ṛūpaka by Bhoja bears the marks of originality. He at first divided Ṛūpaka into three types - śabdābhūyistha, artha- bhūyistha and ubhayābhūyistha. Of these the first variety again is of two types - prakṛta, and vikṛta. There again the prakṛta śabdābhūyistha is of four varieties. Bhoja discusses with illustrations

283 Sarasvatikanṭhābharana of Bhoja. Chap. 4 Kūr 24
each of all these varieties. The viśrta sadabdābhūiyiṣṭha also is of four types. It is to be noted that in all the cases, the primary meaning of the upamāṇa words has become subordinate and the words are used in a secondary sense (gaunārtta). Thus in the example -

pāṇipadānāṁ bhūpānāṁ saṁkocayuitumāte
tvātpradānakaṁsandrāṁmarcīṣaṁ kundanirnālaṁ

the upamāṇa words padma etc. are used in the sense - padmaṁva, candra iva, etc. The artha-bhūiyiṣṭha rūpaka again may be an ignorantāna and anāgipradhāna. The anāgipradhāna is of four varieties - samasta, asamasta, yukta and ayukta.285 Ehoja illustrates and discusses all these varieties. The anāgipradhāna is of four types —

( bhedānāgipradhānayo ca ute ruyavāşrayām
saḥajāḥrāyatadyogatadvāṃṣayād pratyakṣāte ) .287

The variety sadārthabhūiyiṣṭha also has many sub-divisions mentioned and illustrated by Ehoja. This type of classification of the figure of speech rūpaka is not mentioned by any other rhetorician. Ehoja shows his originality in the division of this figure of speech.

Ruyyaka in his Ālāmkārasarasvasva includes the figure of speech rūpaka in the group 'abhedapradhāṇya'. The definition of rūpaka given by him is -

abhedapradhāṇye ārope ārope aroṣiṣayāṇapakhave rūpokam.288


286 Samastāṁ ca samastāṁ ca yuktāṁ ca yuktāṁ eva ca
castrdhāṅgi-pradhānam eva dārthabhūiyiṣṭharūpakaṁ
Sarasvati. Chap. 4 Kūr - 29.


By the expression - 'abheda-pradhānaye' it indicated that the bheda or difference definitely exists there though the prominence here is of abheda. The word araṇa is explained by him in the vṛttī as - anyatvayavyāpe āropah. Anyastā means the subject matter in hand (prakṛta). So the superimposition of the aprakṛta candra etc. on the prakṛta is called rūpaka. Then rūpaka is differentiated from apraṇa -

\[ \text{tasya vīśayavisayavastavdhatvādvidvayasyāpahave paśmutih.} \]

Next Ruyyaka states the classifications of rūpaka -

\[ \text{idem tu niravayavaḥ sāvayavaḥ paramparitamiti trividham.} \]

The first variety viz. niravayava rūpaka again is of two types -

kevala rūpaka and mālā rūpaka. The second and the third variety i.e. sāvayava rūpaka and paramparita rūpaka have two and four varieties respectively and thus there can be eight varieties of the figure of speech rūpaka. Ruyyaka illustrates all these varieties one by one.

Viśvanātha in his Sahityadarpana defines rūpaka as -

rupakam rūpitaropādviṣaye nirapahave.

There is also another reading - rūpakam rūpitaropā vīṣaye nīrapahave.

Ramacarana Tarkavāgiśa in his commentary alaṃkāravivarāṇam accepts the second reading. He states -

aṭra rūpitaropāditī paṃcanyantapāthah prāmēdikah

arthāsāṅgaṭeh Prathamantapāsthatu ramanīyah.

289 Alaṃkārasārvasva of Ruyyaka. Page 44.
290 Ibid. Page 45.
292 Alaṃkāravivarāṇam by Ramacarana Tarkavāgiśa,
a commentary on Sahityadarpana.
Whatever it may be, the figure of speech rūpaka is according to Visvanātha, the superimposition of the rūpita i.e. upāmeṣa on the viṣaya i.e. upameṣa which is not omitted (nirapahnae). By the expression ‘rūpita’ Visvanātha differentiates rūpaka from parināma, and by the expression nirapahnae, from apahnuti. Next the classifications of the figure of speech rūpaka are stated but this classification shows no originality. In fact the classification of rūpaka in the Sāhityadarpāṇa is almost the same as that in the Alāmākāraśarvasva of Ruyyaka. All the varieties are illustrated by Visvanātha. But the variety adhikārūḍhavaisistyarūpaka mentioned by any other scholar. When in the rūpaka some extra attribute is superimposed, the figure can be called adhikārūḍhavaisistyarūpaka. The illustration of this variety is:

\[ \text{idam vaktraś adāśvahitakalākah suhādharah } \]
\[ \text{sudhāśvādharasācira parinataḥ vimbhāmanah } \]
\[ \text{ime netre rātrindivemachakasobhe kuvalaye } \]
\[ \text{tanuśvayamānānām jalaḥḥiravagyāne sukhatarah.} \]

Here the words virahitakaluṇkāh etc. the extra vaisiṣṭya i.e. the extraordinary beauty of the face is indicated.

The treatment of the figure rūpaka in the Ekāvalī of Vidyadhara is so stereotyped. He defines this figure as:

\[ \text{tadrūpaka mārope yatrēppannuyate na visayah.} \]

293 Sāhityadarpāṇa of Visvanātha. Chap. 10.
Appayya Diksita in his Kuvalayamanda defines rūpaka as visayabhedatādrupyanjanaṁ visayasya yat rūpakam.\textsuperscript{294}

When the Upāśāna is stated to be superimposed on the upamaṇa, the figure of speech is called rūpaka. Appayya states three varieties of this alamkāra.\textsuperscript{295} He illustrates all these varieties. In fact Appayya exerts his full attention in the discussion of the figure rūpaka in his Citramimamsa. Here he defines rūpaka as -

āropavisyasya syādatiḥtiḥtarūpamah
uparāṇjakarmāropānyamānum tādrūpakaṁ matam\textsuperscript{296}

By the expression 'āropavisyasya' he differentiates rūpaka from atisayokti and utprekṣā and by the expression - 'atiḥtiḥtarūpamah' it is indicated that this figure is different from 'sasandeha' 'apahnuti' etc. In this work Appayya not only establishes his own view but also rejects the views of other scholars like Bhoja etc. to strengthen his view. So far as the classification of this figure is concerned, Appayya follows the footsteps of his predecessors. He gives illustration of the eight varieties of rūpaka mentioned by him but at the same time he recognises that rūpaka is in fact of numerous varieties and only a few examples are stated here to make the things clear.\textsuperscript{297}

\textsuperscript{294} Kuvalayamanda of Appayya Diksita. Kār - 17.
\textsuperscript{295} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{296} Citramimamsa of Appayya. Page - 52.
\textsuperscript{297} Aperyanto vikalpanaṁ rūpakośeyoryatāṁ
dinmatram darśataṁ dhiraśīrṣuḥmanumṇīyatāṁ

Kāvyāloka.
Jagannatha in his Rasagangadhara includes the figure of speech Rupaka in the group - abhedapradhanya. This alamkara is defined by him as -

\[ \text{upameyatavacchedakaparakaraneupameya-sabdāmnāsīyamana} \]

rupamānata-tadātmyan rupaken tadevopakaraka-katvarisāistamalamkāreṇa.

The tadātmya or identicalness of the upamāna mentioned by words with the upamāna is rupaka. As in the case of other figures of speech in the rupaka also Jagannatha discusses the subject from the logical point of view. In order to differentiate rupaka from apanūti, bhṛantimāna etc. the expression - 'upameyatavacchedakaparakarane' is used. Then Jagannatha justifies one by one each word of the definition. Next by scholastic arguments Jagannatha discusses minutely the definitions of rupaka given by other scholars and rejects them to establish his own definition. We are not entering into that detailed discussion at present for it will not help us to show the development of the conception about the figure of speech rupaka nor it will show the existence of cause and effect relation in this figure of speech. The classification of rupaka made by Jagannatha is however not so different from that of Visvanātha etc.

From the discussion on the figure of speech rupaka it is clear that the influence of causal relation is not at all direct in this alamkāra. But it cannot be totally rejected that the causal relation operates indirectly in this figure of speech. This is also an
important factor to be noted that the conception of the figure of speech *rupaka* has not changed so much in the works of the later rhetoricians from that of the scholars of early age.

**ULLEKHA**

It is discussed in the third chapter how the causal relation operates in the case of the figure of speech *ullekha*. But this *ullekha* is not recognised as a separate figure of speech in the works of the early rhetoricians. Even some of the scholars of the post-dhvani school do not recognise this *alambāra*. Thus Rudrata, Bhoja and Mamta do not at all mention this *alambāra*. It is Viśvanātha who for the first time gives the figure *ullekha*. He defines this figure as:

\[
\text{kvacidbhedādgrahitāṁ viṣayāṁ tathā kvacit ekasya ekadhā ulekhō yath sa ulekhō isyate.}
\]

When due to the difference of *grahītya* and *viṣaya*, the same object is stated in various forms, the figure of speech is called *ullekha*. The illustration of this *alambāra* is given by Viśvanātha as:

\[
priya iti gopādhubhibhiśūrīti vṛddhahārdhīśa iti devah nārāyaṇa iti bhaktairbrahmetyagahi yogīḥ śrīdevah.
\]

---

It is an illustration of *grahitrbheda* for by different persons like *gopabadhu, vrddha* etc. the same 'deva' is taken as *priyah, srih* etc.

The example - *gambhiryena samudro'si gauravenäsi parvatah* - illustrates the second type of *Ullekha* due to *visayatheda*, for the same person is 'samudra' and 'parvata' on account of the two different qualities - 'gambhirya' and 'gaurata'. It is clear from this discussion that causal relation operates though indirectly in this case. The main factor here, the 'anekadhollekhā' (stating in various forms), must have some reason behind it otherwise a single object can not be described in various ways. This reason is stated by *Viśvanātha* by the expression - *kvacidbhodāgrahtīrṭhānām visayānām tathā kvacit.* By the fifth case-ending in the word 'bhedat' it is indicated that it is the hetu or cause and the *anekadhā Ullekhā* is the result.

The treatment of the figure *Ullekha* in the *Citramānasa* of *Appayya Dīkṣita* shows no such originality. He defines this *alāmāra* as

*nimitabhodādekasya vasumno yadenekadā*

*ullekhanāsānekaṃ tamullekham prasaktā. 301*

*Appayya* states two varieties of this figure - *suddha* and *alaṅkārāntarasāṃskāra.* 302 The first variety is illustrated as

301 *Citramānasa* of *Appayya*. Page - 77.

302 Dvividheśayasaull ekhah

*śuddha'لامکارانتاراسانكیر्मि"* 302

*Citramānasa* Page - 78.
Here by different persons Krsna was found in different forms but here there is no connection with any other figure of speech. So it is suddha ull'ekha. But when this Ullekha brings the charm being related to some other alankāra, it is called saśkīrṇa. It may be related to rūpaka or atisyayokti or any other figure of speech.

Appayya illustrates Ullekha in all these cases. The treatment of this figure in the Kuvalayāṇanda of Appayya is so stereotyped. The only deviation is that here he gives two definitions of Ullekha: in two Kārikās according to the two divisions - grahītrbheda and visayabheda. The first definition is -

\[ bahubhibahudhollekhādekasyöllekhā āsyātē \]  

The second variety is stated as -

\[ ekena. bahudhollekhā'pyassu visayabhedatah. \]  

The illustrations of these two with the sub-divisions of these two with the sub-divisions - suddha and saśkīrṇa are given by Appayya.

Jagannātha in his Rasagangadāhara defines Ullekha as -

\[ ekasya vastuno nimittasādyenekalgrhṛtrbhiranekapakārakeṇa grahanam taudullekhāh \]  

The fundamental conception of Jagannātha is however not so much different from that of other scholars. Then Jagannātha enters into

---

303 Citramānam of Appayya. Page - 78.
305 Ibid. Kār - 23.
306 Rasagangadāhara of Jagannātha. Anu. 2 Page 270.
detailed discussion on each word of his definition and rejects after
critical discussion the views of other scholars. He illustrates the
varieties of samākīrṇa uḷēkha and uḍḍa uḷēkha.

**VYATIREKA**

The cause and effect relation operates indirectly in the
figure of speech Vyatireka, as it is stated in the third chapter.
In this figure, the difference (bheda) of the upamāna and upameya
is stated sometimes in the form of the superiority or inferiority of
the upamāna from the upameya. The fundamental conception of Vyatireka
has not however changed in the later works from that in the early
rhetorical works, though due to the difference of the mode of
expression, the definitions have changed in different rhetorical
works.

Rudrata gives two definitions of Vyatireka according to
the two varieties of this figure. The first definition is:

\[ \text{yo gūna upameya vyātattpratipanthi ca doṣa upamāne} \]
\[ \text{vyastasamastanyastau tau vyatirekan tridhā kurutah.} \]

Here the difference occurs due to the existence of some gūna in the
upameya and the opposite doṣa in the upamāna. The second variety is

---

just the opposite - yo guna upamāne vā tatvratipenthī ca doṣa upameye bhavato yatra samastau sa vyatireko'yananyastu.\\

Phoja defines vyatireka as -

śabdopātta práti te vā sādāye vaśtunordvayoh bhedābhādhanaḥ bhedaśe vyatirekaśca kathaye.\\

When the similarity between two objects is verbally mentioned or is indicated between these two is called vyatireka. Though Phoja does not mention the words upamāna and upameya, still by the expression - śabdopātta práti te vā sādāye - it is indicated that the two things must be similar. Phoja states six divisions of Vyatireka -

sva-jātīvyaktyupadhibhīṣyokohayabhīḍa ca saḥ sādāyādvaisādāyasoca bhimāḥ śodābhājaya-te.\\

The definition of Vyatireka given in the Alamkārasarvasva of Ruyyaka -

bheda-prādhānya upamānād upameyasya adhiṣṭhikya viparyaya vā vyatirekāḥ -

conveys the same idea. When the difference between the upamāna and upameya is prominent and the difference occurs due to the adhiṣṭhika or the opposite i.e. nyunatā (superiority or inferiority) of the upameya to the upamāna, Ruyyaka illustrates both the varieties.

310 Ibid. Kār.-
Mammata defines Vyatireka as -
\[ \text{upamānādyadanyya vyatirekah sa eva sah.} \]

Mammata, however states verbally the word 'hetu' in the case of this figure of speech. While classifying Vyatireka, he states -
\[ \text{hetvovuktāvanuktām treye sāmye nivedite} \]
\[ \text{sabhārthaḥbhāsmakṣipte śīlāḥ taḥvatrīrāc taḥ.} \]

Thus Mammata states the largest number of Vyatireka.

In the Sahityadrāpana, Vyatireka is defined as -
\[ \text{ādhikṣayupamasyayopamānānyūmatāthavā vyatirekah.} \]

Here also to classify Vyatireka Visvanātha states -
\[ \text{eka ukte hetau nokte sa ca tridhā.} \]

Here he verbally mentions the word hetu.

Appayya Dīksīta in his Gitrasāmāna does not discuss the figure Vyatireka but in the Kuvalayānanda he defines Vyatireka as -
\[ \text{vyatireko visesaścedupamānapowyayyaḥ.} \]

This visesa may be ādhikṣa (superiority) or nyūmatā of the upamāna or upamāya. The illustration of vyatireka is -
\[ \text{sālā ivonmatāḥ santah kintu prakrtikomāloḥ.} \]

Here the difference between the upamāna 'sālā' and the upamāya 'santah' is the quality prakrtikomalatva of the upamāya.

---

312 Kāvyaprakāsa of Mammata. Chap. 10. Sūtra - 159.
The figure of speech Vyatireka is defined in the Rasagangadhara as:

\[ \text{upamānānapamōyaṃ gaññavisessavattvenokarso vyatirekāh.} \]

It is to be noted here that Jagannātha does not accept Vyatireka in the nyūnātā (inferiority) of the upamāna.

\[ \text{(ādhiṅkagunavattvam| upamānagatāpārakaramātraṁ va na vyatirekāsarupam tayorupamayotkaraṁ kṣepamantarenānundaratvat.)} \]

Almost all the scholars recognise the figure Vyatireka both in superiority and inferiority of the upamāna to the upameya, but Jagannātha rejects this view, for according to him there is no charm unless some extra quality on the part of the upameya is described. He criticises the views of Appayya and Ruyyaka who accept Vyatireka in nyūnātā. He discusses the illustration cited by Appayya as an example of nyūnātavaparyavasāyī vyatirekā and states that here in fact the avoiding of the upamā (upamālāmkāra-dūrikaranamātrameva) brings the charm, not the Vyatireka. By this Jagannātha establishes that there can be no Vyatireka in the inferiority of the upameya. He supports the definition of Māmāta who states ‘ādhiṅkamātram Vyatirekāh’. Jagannātha accepts four varieties of this alamkāra but his predecessors like Viśvanātha etc. recognise as it is stated before, twenty four varieties of this figure of speech.

316 Rasagangadhara of Jagannātha. Page 346.
317 Ibid. Page 347.
The figure of speech Atisayokti as the name itself indicates, is the description of something surpassing the world. How, this surpassing may be by various ways; there may be the description of 'abheda' where there is practically difference, or the sequence of causal relation may be violated and so on. Of these the cases, where the order of the causal relation is violated, come under the realm of the group of figures we are discussing in our work. In the works of the early rhetoricians however, these factors are not verbally mentioned, but in the later rhetorical works these factors by which atisaya occurs are mentioned. We shall however discuss here the figure so far as it related to the cause and effect relation.

Mammata defines the figure of speech atisayokti as:

\[ \text{Mammata defines the figure of speech atisayokti as } \]
\[ \text{nigīrśādhyavasānam tu prakṛteṣya pareṇa yat } \]
\[ \text{prastutasya yadanyatvam yadyarthoktau ca kalpanam } \]
\[ \text{kāryakārnayoryasā paurvāparyaviparyah } \]
\[ \text{vijneyātisayoktih sa.} \]

Here it is mentioned clearly that the paurvāparyaviparyā (the violation of the sequence) of the cause and effect relation is at the basis of a variety of atisayokti. There are other varieties of this figure, no doubt but we are not going to discuss them here as they are out of

---

range of causal relation. The verse -
hrdayamadhisthitamadau mālatyāḥ kusumāḥpūrabānena
caramī samāvivallabha lokaavasayam tvaya bhadata

is an example of atisāyokti where the effect is stated before the cause, and by this the extraordinary power of producing the effect on the part of the cause is indicated. So it is found that the figure of speech atisāyokti comes partly under the cause and effect relation and partly it is beyond the range of causal relation.

Ruyyaka in his Alamkāraarvasva includes the figure atisāyokti in the group of figure based on cause and effect relation
(atisāyoktau laksitayamapi kaścit prabhedaḥ
kāryakaranabhavaprabhavāvahyate)

The definition of this figure given by Ruyyaka is -
kāryakaraṇayoh samakālatve paurṇāṃ paryavipāyate ca-atisāyoktiḥ.

According to this definition the figure atisāyokti is directly and fully based on the causal relation. It is a general rule of causation that the cause invariably precedes the effect and the effect invariably follows the cause. But when in order to describe some speciality, the opposite of this order is stated, that is atisāyokti. According to Ruyyaka this is of two varieties and both of these are discussed with suitable illustrations by him.

319 Kavyaprabhā of Nāmāta. Chap.10 Illus. 452.
320 Alamkāraarvasva of Ruyyaka, Page - 162.
321 Ibid. Page - 163.
In the treatment of the figure of speech atisayokti in the Sāhityadarpana of Viśvanātha, the connection with the cause and effect relation is partial. In the definition -

siḍḍhate dhūpaśāśayātisayokṭīśyaktirnigadyate,\textsuperscript{322}

there is no mention of the causal relation. But Viśvanātha accepts five varieties of this figure of which the last one is based on cause and effect relation. This is -

paurvāparyātyayoh kāryahetvoh.\textsuperscript{323}

Appayya Dīkṣita in his Kuvalayānanda recognises a few types of atisayokti of which the last three varieties are directly based on causal relation. Of these one is defined as -

akramātisayokti syād saḥatve hetukaṃyayoh.\textsuperscript{324}

When the hetu and kārya – cause and the effect occur simultaneously, the figure is called akramātisayokti. The illustration of this variety is -

ālinganti samam deva śīrāsās paraśās tē.\textsuperscript{325}

The variety - ’capalātisayokti‘ is when the effect occurs even at the mention or reference (prasakti) of the cause (capalātisayoktistu kārya haṃprasaktiye) .\textsuperscript{326} Appayya makes it clear by the illustration - yāśāmityude tasyā velayābhavādūrāṅkā. Here merely the mention of the departure causes the thinness of the lady. Atyantātisayoktistu paurvāparyāvyāhatikrame\textsuperscript{327} is the definition of the last variety.

\textsuperscript{322} Sāhityadarpana of Viśvanātha. Chap. 10 Kār - 44
\textsuperscript{323} Ibid. Kār - 45
\textsuperscript{324} Kuvalayānanda of Appayya. Kār – 41.
\textsuperscript{325} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{326} Ibid. Kār - 42
\textsuperscript{327} Ibid. Kār - 43.
Here the sequence of the cause and effect is stated as just the reverse. The example of this variety is:

\[ \text{agre nāno gatah pasādamanitā priyena sā.} \]

The cause of the effect manabhanga here is the 'anumaya' but this cause is stated later and the effect is stated before. It should be mentioned here that Appayya mentions other varieties of atisayokti, but we are not discussing them here as they have no direct connection with the cause and effect relation.

Jagannātha in the second anana of Rasagangādhara defines atisayokti as:

\[ \text{visayinā visayasya nigaranamatisayah tasyoktih.} \]

In this definition also there is no direct connection with the causal relation though it will be revealed by critical discussion that his 'visayasya nigaranā' must have some cause and that is the extraordinary similarity of the prastuta and aprastuta and for this reason the prastuta is totally devoured by the aprastuta. But it must be admitted that in this case, the strikingness of the figure lies neither in the causal relation nor the appreciation of the cause and effect relation is essential for the strikingness of this figure. Jagannātha however does not accept the sub-division of atisayokti which is based on causal relation, as accepted by other scholars.
There are many other figures of speech which are indirectly connected with the causal relation but we are not going to discuss them as the relation is so remote there and this type of connection with the causal relation is to be found in every mode of expression. We shall discuss in the next chapter how the causal relation operates everywhere in the world. In fact the whole world is in a chain of cause and effect relation. We have discussed in the present chapter only those alamkāras where the existence of causal relation is to be noted clearly, may the influence be direct or indirect. On the basis of this standpoint the figures are discussed in two groups according to the direct and indirect influence of the cause and effect relation. In the second case i.e. where the influence of causal relation is indirect, it seems apparently that there is no connection with the causal relation as in the cases of Upāsmā rūpeka etc. but it is established with suitable arguments that here also the existence of causal relation is to be noted clearly.