CHAPTER II

TITLE AND STYLE

1. A Critical Assessment of the Title of Ruuyaka's Work.

In his Vakroktijīvita Kuntaka suggests that a writer generally names his work in such a manner that the name itself gives the theme and the main idea of his work. The name Alamkārasarvasva given by Ruuyaka to his work is very significant, for the work deliberately confines the field of its discussion to the poetic figures and does not embrace all topics of literary criticism. The speciality of this work lies in its exclusive treatment of poetic figures.

We have seen that the position of expressed poetic figures is relegated in the system of Dhvani, for the Dhvanikāra has either condemned the expressed poetic figures as mere vāgvikalpa or considered them only as heightening the charm of the unexpressed in the form of Rasa in poetry. The expressed poetic figures are included by the Dhvanikāra in the Citra-Kāvya, which in his opinion, is not a poetry proper.

---

1 Cf. ātataṃ vastuṣu vaidagdhyaṃ kāvye kāmapi vakratām / pradhānasamvidhānānkanāmnapi kurute kaviḥ // VJ.IV. 24.
2 ananta hi vāgvikalpa tatprakārā evalamkārāḥ. DL.p.1156.
3 alamkāro hi vāhyāalamkārasāmyād aṅginas-cārutvahetur ucyate. Ibid. p. 487.
In spite of his adherence to the Dhvani-theory, Ruyyaka does not agree with the Dhvanikāra to his treatment of poetic figures, because Dhanikāra does not take into consideration all the poetic figures in general, but only of those which are connected with the unexpressed in the form of Rasa. But if the Dhvanikāra's views with regard to the poetic figures be accepted as authoritative, then the cases, where the poet does not want to depict Rasa or anything else unexpressed but intends to produce strikingness in the form of expressed poetic figures, would remain unexplained; for the figures unconnected with the unexpressed have significance in poetry. Hence, these cases should be acknowledged and analysed.

As a follower of the Dhvanikāra, Ruyyaka realises the deficiency of the Dhvanikāra's treatment of poetic figures. As this topic is omitted in the Dhvanyāloka, Ruyyaka finds an opportunity for supplementing the work of his great predecessor by giving an elaborate treatment of the expressed poetic figures. In the Alamkārasarvasva Ruyyaka 'undertakes to deal with the Citra-kavya, which, including in its scope all poetic figures devoid of suggestion, naturally covers an extensive field'.

Ruyyaka has before him numerous works on Alamkāra from which he derives enough materials for his work; but he appears

---

to have realised that none of these works is sufficient and satisfactory in the treatment of poetic figures, for the numerous problems relating to the poetic figures are left untouched in these works. Ruuyaka has written some independent works on Alamkāra and commented too on some works of earlier writers. From his own reference, and Jayaratha's citation in the Vimarsinī, it appears that some questions pertinent to poetic figures are discussed by Ruuyaka in these works. Since most of the questions relating to the poetic figures remain undiscussed in these works, Ruuyaka aims at writing a complete work on the poetic figures. Ruuyaka's consummate skill in the treatment of poetic figures is embodied in this work. In it, eighty independent poetic figures are defined, analysed and illustrated, and all the questions connected with the poetic figures are discussed in detail. The figures are arranged on some general principles and their underlying doctrines are systematically discussed. The work is carefully planned and systematically worked out. Though the work is small, yet in essence it surpasses all the earlier works of its author and those of his predecessors.

There is no reason to believe that by giving the name Alamkārasarvasva to this work Ruuyaka implies that Alamkāra (poetic figure) is the be-all and end-all in poetry, for

5 A list of Ruuyaka's works has been given by us in the Introduction.
according to him, all types of poetry are not embellished, but it is only the Citra-variety which is devoid of suggested element has poetic figures as its essence. A poetic figure, in the opinion of Ruuyaka, has no distinct entity but is dependent on the alamkārya in the form of sabda and artha. Ruuyaka, therefore, admits Kuntaka's theory of poetic figures. But Ruuyaka's acceptance of Kuntaka's view on poetic figures does not imply that he accepts Kuntaka's theory of poetry; for, according to Kuntaka, figurative expression alone constitutes poetry. Ruuyaka recognises Dhvanikāvya as the best type of poetry. But he does not agree with Ānandavardhana on the point that the expressed poetic figures are vāg-vikalpas, and that the Citra-Śāvyā which has poetic figures as its essence is an imitation of poetry. The author of the Alamkārasarvasva, we see, establishes that the expressed poetic figures have significance for poetry. Since Ruuyaka recognises Dhvanikāvya as the

7 iha vastusvabhāva-varpanamātram nālāmākāraḥ, tattve sati sarvam Kāvyam alamkāri syāt. AS. p.223.
8 citram tu śabdārthālāmākāra-svabhāvatayā jahutara-prabheted. Ibid. p.19.
10 sālāmākāraṣya alamkaraṇasaḥitasya sakalasya niraśtvayavasya sataḥ samudāyasya Kāvyatā Kavikarmatvam. tenalamkṛtasya Kāvyatvamiti sthitih, na punah Kāvyasyālāmākārayoga iti. VJ. p.7.
11 Cf... tac citram. na tanmukhyam Kāvyam. kavyānukāro hyasau. DL. p. 1219.
best type of poetry, it is, therefore, obvious that he does not admit poetic figures as the indispensable element of poetry as a whole.

Thus, by giving the title Alamkārasarvasva to his work, Ruyyaka appears to imply that he says almost everything he wants to say specially of his own contribution, and we find that whatever he wants to recast in his own way he has done. In this work, the nature and scope of almost all the figures are fixed, and no noticeable improvement and modification of the the major issues of the poetic figures are noticed in later writings. All later writers follow Ruyyaka's analysis of the poetic figures with an exception of Jagannātha who improves upon in some cases the views of Ruyyaka. The Alamkārasarvasva has long been regarded as the most authentic treatise on poetic figures. Therefore, Dr.Keith rightly remarks - "For a really systematic treatment, however, we must go to Ruyyaka of Kashmir, who, in addition to commenting on the Kāvyaprakaṣa of Mammaṭa and Allāṭa in the Kāvyaprakāṣasāmketa, wrote a number of other works, of which the chief is the Alamkārasarvasva, a treatise which was not seriously challenged until the appearance of the Rasagaṅgādhara of Jagannātha. Since the author's maturity of judgement in deciding the various questions relating to the poetic figures is well-reflected in this work the title Alamkārasarvasva given by Ruyyaka to his work is very appropriate.

12 A.B.Keith, CSL. p.140.
2. **Ruyyaka’s Style of writing**:

That the *Akalikarasarvasva* is written in the form of the Sūtra and the Vṛtti is stated by Ruyyaka himself in the invocatory verse of his work.¹³ The Sūtra consists of a short concise technical sentence¹⁴ and the Vṛtti is a prose explanation of what has been stated in the Sūtra.¹⁵

The method of writing the technical treatises in the form of the Sūtra was very popular in India for more than one reason. In the first place, the Sūtras could be easily committed to memory and easily remembered, and in the second, the Sūtra-form was convenient for saving space. Thus, the Sūtra-form was suitable for avoiding prolixity and arresting the attention of the readers to the essentials of the subject. Though the Sūtras were made concise and compact, care had been taken of the clarity which was not often sacrificed, yet there might be obscurity inevitable for the very nature of the Sūtras. So, in order to remove this obscurity of the Sūtras, it was the practice of the authors to subjoin a prose explanation (Vṛtti) to the Sūtras.

The style of writing the works on Poetics in the form of Sūtra and Vṛtti appears to be introduced for the first time by Vāmana who speaks of his style of writing in the invocatory verse of his *Kāvyalamkārasūtravṛtti*.¹⁶ Ruyyaka’s following of

---

¹³ *nījālaṃkārasūtrāṇāṃ vṛttyā tātparyamucyate.*
¹⁴ *alpākṣaram asamdīgdam sāravad viśvatomukham / samyak saṃṣucitārtham yat tat sūtramiti Kathyate //* Quoted in Kāmadhenu, p. 4. Gopendra Tripurahara says that this couplet is quoted from Bhāmaha, but it is not traced in Bhāmaha’s work.
¹⁵ *sūtramātrasya yā vyākhyā sā vṛttir abhidhiyate.* *Ibid, p.4.*
¹⁶ *kāvyalamkāra-sūtrāṇāṃ sveṣāṃ vṛttir vidhiyate.*
Vāmana's style is evinced from the invocatory verse of the Alāmākārasarvasva. 17 That Ruṣyaka has been influenced by Vāmana's style of writing is further confirmed by the fact that the former quotes directly two Sūtras 18 from the latter's work.

The Sūtras of the Alāmākārasarvasva are variously designated as Alāmākārasarvasva-śūtras, Sarvasva-śūtras 19 and Alāmākāra-śūtras. 20 Ruṣyaka formulates nearly eighty seven Sūtras 21 of which eighty one Śūtras define eighty poetic figures of word (four Śabdālāmākāras) and sense (seventy six Arthālāmākāras). Ruṣyaka draws materials for the most of his

---

17 nijālāmākāra-śūtrāṇām vṛttyā tātparyam ucyate.
18 Sūtras defining the figures Ananvaya and Virodha. Vide AS. pp.37 (KLSV.IV.iii. 14), 154(Ibid,IV.iii.12).
19 RN. p. 548.
20 AS. pp. 1, 256.
21 The number of Sūtras varies from edition to edition. In the NSP ed. there are eighty six Sūtras, the TSS ed. contains eighty six Sūtras, the MCLD. ed. contains eighty six, the MLBD ed. contains eighty seven Sūtras and Chow. ed. contains eighty seven Sūtras.

The NSP ed. does not accept the sentence - 'śabdapaunaruktyam vyāñjanamātra paunaruktyam svara-vyāñjasamudāya-paunaruktyam. ca.' to be a Śūtra but includes it in the Vṛtti. The TSS ed., the MCLD ed., the MLBD ed. include this sentence in the Vṛtti. Dr.R.C. Dwivedi (in the MLBD ed.) appears to hold this sentence to be a Śūtra. The Chow.ed. accept it to be a Śūtra. The SJ. which reads all the Sūtras of the AS., reads the above sentence as a Śūtra.

The NSP ed. and MLBD ed. read two Sūtras for the figure Paryāya, but TSS ed. MCLD.ed. and Chow. ed. do not read two Sūtras for this figures. The SJ. does not read two Sūtras for this figure.
Sūtras from the works of his predecessors. The Sūtras on Ananvaya and Virodha of the Alamkārasarvasva are quoted from Vāmana's Kāvyalamkārasūtravṛtti directly. The definitions of some of the figures of the Alamkārasarvasva are closely similar to those of Mammaṭa's Kāvyaprakāśa. It is obvious that the definitions of these figures are framed by Ruyyaka out of Mammaṭa's Kārikās, or quotes directly from Mammaṭa. In spite of his borrowing extensively from Mammaṭa's work, Ruyyaka's originality in the formulation of the Sūtras is beyond doubt. The meaning of Mammaṭa's Kārikās on the poetic figures not always intelligible and in most cases it is dependent on the Vṛtti. The meaning of Ruyyaka's Sūtras, on the other hand, is easily intelligible. These Sūtras are concise and compact, but they are simple and clear, and excepting a few cases where the technical terms are used, their meaning is not dependent on the Vṛtti. The different maxims, used by Ruyyaka in some of the Sūtras clearly bring out the meaning of what he wants to say. Though Sūtras generally become obscure for their conscienceness and compactness, yet Ruyyaka tries to remove this obscurity even from the Sūtras, and in this respect he achieves a considerable success. But because of consciousness and compactness, some Sūtras are linked up with the former ones and the missing link is supplied in the Vṛtti.

22 Citra, Sāra, Kāvyaliṅga, Anumāna, Samādhi, Mīlita, Sāmānaya, Uttarā, Vyājokti, Vakrokti etc.
23 Vide Arthāntaranyāśa, Vyājastuti Vibhāvanā, Viṣeṣokti Vicitra, Vikalpa, Ullekhā etc.
24 Cf. Utpreksā, Atisyokti, Anumāna, Arthāpatti etc.
25 eg. Tilatāṇḍula-nyāya, Kārṇāra-nyāya, Dandaṇḍapūpkā-nyāya etc.
26 Vide Dipaka, Drṣṭānta, Asapgati, Sama etc.
In the Vṛtti, the author gives a detailed discussion on the definition of individual poetic figures. He demarcates the scope of a poetic figure under discussion from the allied ones and of those in which there is possibility of mutual over-lapping. In the writings of earlier authorities this trait is conspicuous by its absence and in Mammaṭa it is found only in a few cases.\(^\text{27}\) The author of the Alamkārasarvasva discusses in the Vṛtti the divisions and sub-divisions of a poetic figure and then illustrates each of them. The illustrations are quoted from earlier literary works or works on Poetics; the existence of the poetic figure in question in the illustrations is analysed and justified. Ruyyaka also sometimes quotes counter-illustrations, analyses them and justifies his views. He does not always agree with his predecessors and sometimes criticises their views.\(^\text{28}\) Ruyyaka deals with the general question of the classification of the figures into those of sabda, of artha and of both, advances the theory of āśrayāśrayibhāva and criticises Mammaṭa's theory of anvaya-vyatireka.\(^\text{29}\) He classifies systematically all the figures of sense on some general principles like Sādṛṣya, Virodha etc.

From what we have discussed it appears that no question related to the poetic figures remains undiscussed in the Vṛtti of the Alamkārasarvasva. 'In analysing these questions Ruyyaka

\(^\text{27}\) Cg. Paryāya, Vyājokti, Uttara, Āsamgati, Bhrāntiṃān.
\(^\text{28}\) AS. pp. 43, 55, 80, 99, 124, 125, 126, 130, 136, 144, 151, 152, 156, 159, 160, 209, 219, 233, 250, 251, 255, 256, 257.
\(^\text{29}\) Ibid, pp. 256-7.
does not mix up the old and new Schools and treats both separately acknowledging his debt to both. He keeps the two attitudes apart and distinct in his work, the Alamkārasarvasva and is faithful to the spirit of both the Schools in his treatment of poetic figures. Ruuyaka has a critical insight and evinces his analytical power as well as independence of judgment. His critical analysis of various poetic figures is an important contribution to the study of the subject.

Ruuyaka writes his vṛtti in a lucid, concise yet vigorous style. Hence, language bears evidence of his self-confidence in the subject which is dealt with by him. But Ruuyaka's language is not always free from abstruseness. In some cases, the idea given in the vṛtti cannot be intelligible without the help of a commentary. Vidyācakravartin, therefore, remarks that the language of Ruuyaka is very difficult, obscure and unintelligible. The work is written in a language which is used by the Naiyāyikas who find pleasure in analysing the subject-matter by pointing out the vyāpti avyāpti etc. Dr. Pischel also holds the same opinion with regard to Ruuyaka's style when he says, 'Ruuyaka's chief work which is quoted very often by later rhetoricians is the Alamkārasarvasva, a very difficult work'. This charge cannot be altogether denied, because in some cases Ruuyaka's language is vague and dubious, particularly in the

30 K. Krishnamoorty, ESC. p.231.
31 śabdanyāsa viśamaviśamo durghaṭartha-vyavasthā / vyāptavyāpti-prakātanapaṭu-nyāyacarco gabhirah // ittham bhūnā rucaka-vacasaṃ vistarah karkaśo'yaṃ/ NTK. 132.
32 Pischel, RSRS. Introduction, p.28.
cases where philosophical terminologies are applied. But the chief merit of Ruyyaka's writing lies in its scientific analysis and systematic presentation of the subject, rare in earlier works. For his scientific approach to all the questions related to the poetic figures, Ruyyaka exerts great influence on later writers, almost all of whom regard Ruyyaka's views as authoritative and accept his analysis.

33 samśkepeneti. granthasya. na punar arthasya. tasya hi tathātvakathane teśām svarūpam eva kathitam na syāt. evam grantha-samśkepenāpi sarveśamālamkārānām vistarata eva yathāsambhavi svarūpamuktamiti prācyālamkāragranthe-bhyo'sya vailakṣanyamapi dhvanitam. tatra granthavista-rena-pyetat-svarūpasyanabhidhanāt. VS. p. 256.

34 In justifying the alamkāratva of Bhāvodaya Govinda Thakkura says, yady anyavacānaṃ vinā madvacāsi nādaraś tarhi kaścit prekṣāvan avaSYam brūyat. 'rasādina tulyanāyatvāt'. Vaidyanātha Tatsat identifies this prekṣāvan with the author of the AS. Vide KPRA, pp. 138–39.