CHAPTER III

RUYYAKA'S APPROACH TO THE VIEWS OF OTHER THEORISTS

Poetry is usually defined as a combination of word and sense, but this combination of word and sense is also found in ordinary linguistic expression; hence, it is necessary to find out the special feature on which the poetic expression differs from the ordinary linguistic expression. The question as to what constitutes this special feature of a poetic expression is answered by different writers on poetics from different angles.

Before starting the discussion on the poetic figures proper, Ruyyaka gives an introduction to his Alamkārasarvasva. In this introduction, he summarises the views of different writers with regard to their approach to the general issue of essential feature of poetry and their attitude towards the suggested sense (pratīyamāna artha). In his commentary on the Alamkārasarvasva Samudrabandha sums up different theories, on the basis of Ruyyaka's approach, with regard to the essential feature of poetry advanced by different authorities. The first theory approaches this question of the essential feature of poetry from the point of view of attribute (dharma); the adherents to this theory deal with the problem in two ways—giving emphasis either (1) on the poetic figure (Alamkāra) or (2) on the poetic excellence (Guṇa). The second theory approaches the problem from the point of view of function.
the upholders of this theory, again, approach the question in two ways, - giving emphasis either (3) on the strikingness of expression (bhañiti-vaičitya) or (4) on the function called enjoyment (bhoga-kṛttva). The fifth theory approaches the problem from the point of view of suggestion (vyaṅgya). Of these five theories, the first is followed by Udbhata and his followers, the second by Vāmana, the third by Kuntaka, the fourth by Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and the last by Ānandavardhana.¹

1. View-points of Bhāmaha, Udbhata and Rudraṭa:

Ruyyaka first takes up to explain the position of the theorists who put emphasis on the poetic figure. He opines that the ancient writers like Bhāmaha, Udbhata, Rudraṭa and Vāmana do not altogether deny the existence of suggested sense (pratīyamāna artha) in poetry, but they comprehend the suggested sense under the poetic figure as an adornment of expressed sense.² Ruyyaka means to say that these authorities do not take the suggested sense independently but, according

¹ iha viśiṣṭau śabdārthau kāvyam. tayoṣca vaśiṣṭhyāṁ dharmamukhena, vyāpāra-mukhena, vyāṅgya-mukhena vetti trayah pakṣāḥ. ādyeypy alamkārato guṇato vetti dvaividhyam. dvitiyepi bhañitivaicitryena bhogakṛttvena vetti dvaividhyam. iti pañcaśu pakṣesu adyaḥ udbhataśādhibhir-aṅgikṛtaḥ, dvitiyo vāmanena, tritiyo vakrokti-jīvitakāreṇa, caturtho bhattanāyakena, pañcamah ānandavardhanena. VR. p. 4.


AS. pp. 3-4.
to them, it is accessory to the expressed sense. That is, the suggested sense, according to them, is a means of embellishing the expressed sense. In his eagerness to substantiate his view, Ruyyaka refers to the poetic figures Paryāyokta, 3 Aprastuta-prāśamsā,4 Samāsokti,5 Ākṣepa,6 Vyājastuti,7 Upameyopama,8 Ananvaya9 etc. In each of these figures, there is an apprehension of suggested sense (i.e. suggested matter), but the suggested matter is not predominant in them, but it consists only in embellishing the expressed sense. In some of these figures, the expressed sense introduces the unexpressed in order to establish itself on a solid foundation; while in other figures, the expressed sense completely surrenders itself for the sake of the unexpressed sense.10

---


4 adhikārādapatasya vastuno'nyaṣya ya stutiḥ / aprastutapraśamsayeṣyam pratutārthānuśandhini // Ibid.V.8.

5 yatroke gamyate'nya'rthas-tatśamāna-śiśeṣaṇaḥ / sā samāsoktitr-uddiśta śaṅkṣiptārthatayā yathā // KL.II.79.

6 pratisedha āvṛṣṭasya yo viśeṣābhidhītasyā / ākṣepa iti tamaṃ sāntah śaṃsanti dvividham yathā // Ibid.II. 68.

7 śabdaśakti-svabhāvena yatra nindava gamyate / vastutastu stutiḥ śreṣṭhā vyājastutirasau matā // KLSS. V.9.


9 yatra tenaiva tasya śyād upamanopmeyatā / asadrāya-vasvākṣītas tamityāhūr ananvayam //KL.III.45; KLSS.VI. 4.

10 kvaciddhi vācyor'ṛthah sva-siddhaye paramaṃ pratiyāmānam artham akṣipati. kvacīcā svayam anupapadyāmānaḥ san pratiyāmāna evarte svaṃ samarpayati. tena yatra yādṛktatra tādṛgeva yojyamityarthāḥ. VS. p. 4.
figures Paryāyokta, Samāsokti, Ākṣepa etc. belong to the first group (svasiddhaye parākṣepa), while the figures like Aprastuta-prasāmsā, Vyājastuti, Upameyopama etc. belong to the second group (parārthe svasamarpaṇam). Therefore, Ruyyaka employs two types of Laksana in bringing out the characteristic feature of these poetic figures.  

Ānandavardhana shows that though there is an apprehension of suggested sense in all these figures, yet the suggested sense is not predominant, and as such they cannot be regarded as cases of Dhvani where the suggested sense is alone predominant. We find that in these poetic figures the expressed sense is more striking in comparison with the suggested sense, hence, these cases are brought under Guṇībhūta-vyāhgya by Ānandavardhana.

Similarly, there is an apprehension of suggested matter in the two kinds of Rudraṭa's Bhāvālaṃkāra. In the first variety of this figure, the expressed sense introduces the unexpressed in order to establish itself on a solid foundation, but the unexpressed matter becomes subservient to the expressed sense.

---

11 Vide K.P.Giri, CPIA. p. 27.
which is more striking than the unexpressed matter. Hence, Mammata quotes the illustrative verse of Rudrața's first variety of the Bhāvālamkāra as an illustration of Guṇībhūta-vyāngya. In the second variety of the Bhāvālamkāra, the expressed sense completely surrenders itself in favour of the unexpressed, but the unexpressed sense goes to embellish the expressed sense. Taking this illustration of the second variety of the Bhāvālamkāra, Abhinavagupta shows that it is not a case of Dhvani, only because the suggested sense (matter) is not predominant.

Ruyyaka observes that the earlier writers indirectly recognise apprehension of suggested similitude in the figures like Rūpaka, Dīpaka, Apahnuti, Tulyayogītā etc., for they say that the implied similarity in these figures enhance the beauty of the expressed sense. Thus, in the figure Rūpaka,
the comprehension simile in the background gives rise to the charm of the expressed sense; in Dīpaka, the comprehension of implied simile existing between the contextual and the non-contextual justifies the mode of expression comprised of the contextual and the non-contextual and thereby goes to heighten the beauty of the expressed sense. In Apahnuti, there is apprehension of Simile at the background, but it goes to impart charm to the expressed denial of the prakṛta and establishment of the aprakṛta in its place. In Tulyayogitā, the connexion between the two prakṛtas by the same attribute leads to the comprehension of Simile at the background, but the implied attribute, and thereby goes to augment the beauty of the expressed sense. Though the cognition of Simile is in the background of these figures, yet in none of these cases the implied Simile is predominant, and as such cannot be regarded as the cases of Alamkāradhvani. Similar is the case of


22 apahnutir abhīṣṭa ca kiñcid antargatopamā / Ibid, V.3.


Pratīyamānā Utpreksā, where the expressed content is embellished by the implied sambhāvanā.

The earlier writers recognise the existence of Rasa etc. in poetry, but they gave Rasa etc. a subsidiary position. Bhāmaha, Udbhata and Daṇḍin included Rasa, Bhāva etc. in the figures viz., Rasavat Preyah etc. In these figures, Rasa etc. are developed not for their own sake, but they heighten the beauty of the expressed thought. Therefore, according to these authorities, Rasa, Bhāva etc. are nothing but the means of beautification. But according to the Dhvani-theorists, when Rasa is primarily developed, it constitutes the soul of poetry.

25 Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana do not define or otherwise speak of Pratīyamānā Utpreksā. Udbhata says that Utpreksā is expressed when the words like iva etc. are mentioned, and thereby implies that when the words like iva etc. are not mentioned, the Utpreksā becomes implied (cf. vācyevadibhirucyate. KLSS. p. 345). The verse, cited by Udbhata as an illustration of Utpreksā, is shown by Pratīhārendrāja to be an example of Pratīyamānā Utpreksā. (Laghu, p. 345). Rudrata also does not speak of Pratīyamānā Utpreksā, although he gives an example of this (RKL. IX. 13).


Therefore, Ruyyaka rightly opines that the ancient authorities like Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa and others indirectly admit three kinds of suggested sense declared by the Dhvani-theorists.  

2. Vāmana's View:

In his approach to Vāmana's view towards the suggested sense, Ruyyaka says that Vāmana comprehends some aspect of the suggested sense under the poetic figure. In his attempt to justify his view, Ruyyaka refers to the poetic figure Vakrokti of Vāmana. Vāmana's Vakrokti is nothing but an Indication based on the idea of similarity (Gaunī-laksanā or Gaunī-vṛtti of the Dhvani-theorists). It appears, therefore, that Vāmana recognises the indicative sense apart from the denotative sense. Now, Laksanā to be valid, says Māmāta, must either be based on convention (rūḍhi) or on some purpose (prayojana), and in a Prayojanamūlā Laksanā, this prayojana is not directly expressed but is conveyed by the function of suggestion. But Vāmana, who has no idea of suggestion, thinks that this prayojana is conveyed by the function of Laksanā. As Laksanā


30 vāmanena tu sadṛṣya-nibandhanāyā lakṣaṇāyā vakrokti ālamkāratvām bruvatā kaścid dhvanibheda ālamkāratayai-voktaḥ. AS. pp. 8–9.

31 sadṛṣyaḥ-lakṣaṇā vakroktiḥ...unmīmīlam kālam sarasīnaḥ kairavam ca nimmīla muhurtat'. atra netra-dharmāv unmīlana-nimīlāne sadṛṣyād vikasa-saṃkocau lakṣaṇataḥ. KLSV. IV. iii. 8.

32 prayojanaṃ hi vyañjana-vyāpāra-gamyam eva. KP. p. 55.
has been regarded by Vāmana to be a poetic figure viz., Vakrokti, he naturally unknowingly recognises the suggested sense (viz. matter) based upon Lakṣaṇā. Hence, Ruyyaka rightly says that Vāmana tacitly admits some amount of suggested sense (Avivakṣita-vācyā, says Jayaratha) which is based on Lakṣaṇā. As Vāmana regards Vakrokti as a poetic figure, the Atyanta tiraskṛta-vācyā type (of the Avivakṣita-vācyā) of the suggested sense, in his view, is a means of embellishment of the expressed sense.  

The predecessors of Vāmana do not attempt to enquire the soul of poetry. To them, the body of poetry is more important. But Vāmana goes a step further as he is the pioneer in the field of probing into the soul of poetry. He believes that word and meaning constitute the body of poetry in which Rīti is the soul. The term Rīti, according to him, is a special arrangement of words, this speciality rests on Guṇa is that element which produces charm in poetry. Therefore, in Vāmana's opinion, a combination of different Guṇas makes a

33 dhvanyācāryānām gaṇya vṛttār lakṣaṇaṁantarbhāveneṣṭeḥ sādṛṣya-nibandhanā lakṣaṇā vakroky-ālamkāra iti pratha-yatā kaścid dhvāni-bheda lakṣaṇā-mūloʾtyanta-tiraskṛta vācyā-nāmālamkāratvenoktaḥ kāvyātmā-bhūtaḥ sannalāmākāryatvenāpi nāvadhārita iti yāvat. SJ.pp. 8-9.

34 kevalam guṇaviśiṣṭa-padaracanātmikā rītiḥ kāvyātmakatvenoktā. AS. p.9.


36 viśiṣṭa padaracanā rītih. višeṣo guṇātmā. Ibid, I.ii. 7-8.

37 kāvyasobhāyāḥ kartāro dharma guṇāḥ. Ibid, III.i. 1.
particular R̄iti which constitutes the soul of poetry.

Though Vāmana recognises R̄iti as the soul of poetry, yet he appears to have 'conceived poetry from a decidedly formal point of view'. Hence, his views are criticised by later writers. Ānandavardhana, however, pays compliment to Vāmana for having perceived, however, very dimly, the true nature of poetry, though he (Ānanda) does not accept Vāmana's peculiar theory of R̄iti as the soul of poetry.  

3. Views of Pre-dhvani Theorists on the Distinction between Guṇa and Alamkāra.

Though Bhāmaha speaks of three Guṇas viz., mādhurya, ojas and prasāda, yet, to him, the distinction between Guṇa and Alamkāra is of little theoretic importance. In Vāmana, we find a fuller treatment of Guṇa. He is the first known writer who brings out clearly the distinction between Guṇa and Alamkāra. In his opinion, Guṇas are elements which produce charm in poetry, while Alamkāras are those elements which serve to heighten the charm already produced by Guṇas. The Guṇas are considered as inseparable attribute of poetry; and this view implies that Alamkāras are separable. The Guṇas are, therefore, essential attributes of word and meaning, while Alamkāras are non-essential attributes.

38 P.C.Lahiri, GRG. p. 111.
39 asphuṭa-sphutitam kāvyam tattvam etad yathoditam / asaknuvadbhir vyākartum rītayaḥ sampravartitāḥ // DL. III. 46.
40 KL. II. 1-2.
41 kāvyā-sobhāyāḥ kartāro dharmā gunāḥ...tadatisaya-hetavas tvālamkāraḥ ... purve nityāḥ. KLSV.III. i. 1-3.
But Udbhata does not agree with Vamana. Udbhata's idea on Guna is not traceable in his Kavyalaṃkārasārasamgraha, but it is probable that he deals with Guna in his lost commentary Bhāmaha-vivaraṇa on Bhāmaha.\(^{42}\) Ruyyaka says that Udbhata does not regard any essential difference between Gunas and Alamkāras, the only difference admitted by Udbhata between Guna and Alamkāra is that their province is different, for according to Udbhata, Guna is an attribute belonging to the collection (Samghatana) as a whole, implying thereby that an Alamkāra is an attribute belonging to the word and the meaning.\(^{43}\)

Abhinavagupta also holds that Udbhata regards Guna as an attribute of collection.\(^{44}\) Vidyaṇātha and his commentator Kumārasvāmin accept Ruyyaka's view with regard to Udbhata's attitude towards the distinction between Guna and Alamkāra.\(^{45}\)

In the Kavyapratīta of Māmata, there is a quotation\(^ {46}\) (which is taken by Māmata for the purpose of refuting it)

\[^{42}\text{We know from Māṇikyacandra's citation that Udbhata, in his Bhāmaha-Vṛtti, criticises those who recognise distinction between Guna and Alamkāra. We shall quote Māṇikyacandra in the proper context.}\]

\[^{43}\text{ubdbhata-dibhis-tu gunā-alamkarakānaṁ prayaśāh sāmyameva sūcitam. viṣaya-mātreṇa bheda-pratipādanāt. samghataḥ samghatana- dharmatvena ceṣṭēḥ. AS. p.9.}\]

\[^{44}\text{samghaṭanāyā dharmā guṇā iti bhaṭṭodbhāṭadayaḥ. LC.p.721.}\]

\[^{45}\text{PRD. and RN. p. 390.}\]

\[^{46}\text{ojah prabhṛtīnām anuprāsō-pamādināṁ ca ubhayēśāmapi sama-vayāvṛttyā sthitiriti gaḍḍarikā-pravāheṇa esām bhedaḥ. MKS. Vol.II. p. 213.}\]
Manikyacandra says, is quoted from Udbhata's Bhāmahavṛtti (or Bhāmahavivarana), a lost commentary on Bhāmaha. According to this quotation, Udbhata regards both Guṇa and Alamkāras as beautifying elements, and as such there is no essential difference between the two, because both Guṇa and Alamkāra subsist in poetry through the relation of inherence. Though this view is slightly different from the view noticed by Ruyyaka, Vidyānātha and Kumarasvāmin, "still both the views agree on the main point that there is no essential difference between Alamkāra and Guṇa. And it is possible that both may be expressed by the same author in different contexts.

From what we have discussed, we find that Ruyyaka is justified in his approach to the views of the Pre-dhvani thinkers on poetry. The Pre-dhvani thinkers are mainly concerned with the expression - the vācyā and the vācaka, the word and the meaning, and hold that Alamkāra, Guṇa and even the suggested sense impart beauty to the expressed sense. According to Ruyyaka they are 'Alamkārakāras' in the proper sense of the term, as they think every element of poetry to be a means of beautification (Alamkāra) on which they put great emphasis. According to them, Alamkāra is the most important element and as such it is the only source of appeal in poetry. In his


48 N.D. Banahatti, KLSS. Notes, p. 158.

49 tadevam alamkārā eva kāvye pradhānam-iti prācyanam matam. AS. p. 9.
review of the views of Pre-dhvani thinkers on poetry, Ruyyaka closely follows Anandavardhana, Pratīhārendra-ja and Abhinavagupta. Ruyyaka is brief but eclectic.

4. Kuntaka's Views:

Though the suggested sense as the soul of poetry has been established by Anandavardhana, yet Kuntaka, the author of Vakrokti-jīvita does not recognise the independent existence of the suggested sense as the soul of poetry. Kuntaka appears to think that Dhvani cannot adequately explain the question of the essential feature of poetry, since it takes the assistance of the other element, the element of charm. So Kuntaka attempts to explain the question of the essential feature of poetry through the idea of Vaicitrya which causes extra-ordinary charm in poetry.

In his approach to Kuntaka's view on poetry, Ruyyaka points out that Kuntaka regards Vakrokti to be the most essential element of poetry and as such he regards it to be the soul of poetry. Vakrokti, according to Kuntaka, is a mode of expression in which charm is infused by the skill of the poet. Therefore, Vakrokti consists of a strikingness of expression, which is different from the established or common mode of expression such as we find in the words and ideas of science and scriptures. It is, therefore, a deviation from the established

50 Vide DL. pp.198 f, 586.
51 Vide Laghu, pp. 418-25.
54 prasiddhā-bhidhāna-vyatirekiṁī vicitrai-vābhidhā. Ibid. p. 22.
mode of speech for the purpose of attaining a certain strikingness or an imaginative turn of words and ideas peculiar to poetry\(^{55}\). Kuntaka says that embellished speech itself in its entirety is poetry\(^{56}\) and this embellishment consists in Vakrokti.\(^{57}\) Therefore, Vakrokti means Alamkāra in general\(^{58}\) in the wider sense of poetic beauty and it is the underlying principle of all poetic expressions. The Alamkāras, according to Kuntaka do not have any separate entity, but they are intrinsically blended up with the word and sense, for the sake of convenience, we speak of poetry and its Alamkāras, but, in fact, the two cannot be differentiated, for one cannot exist without the other. Kuntaka, therefore, finds fault with the common statement that Alamkāra belongs to poetry, for such a statement is likely to imply that poetry may exist without it.\(^{59}\) So, he says that an association of word and sense constitutes poetry. But he realises that each and every association of word and sense does not constitute poetry, but this association must have speciality


\(^{56}\) sa-alamkārasya-alamkarana-sahitasya sakalasya nirastāvaya-vasya sataḥ samudāyasya kavyatā kavikarmatvam. Ibid.p.7.

\(^{57}\) udbhāve-tavalamkāryau tayoh punar-alamkṛtih / vakroktireva ... //Ibid. I, 10.

\(^{58}\) vakroktih sakalā-alamkāra-sāmānyam. Ibid. p.53.

\(^{59}\) tenālamkṛtasya kavyatvam iti sthitāh, na punah kavyasyā-alamkāra-yoga iti. Ibid. p.7.
of being characterised by strikingness due to Vakrokti. He says that Vakrokti or Vakrāta created by the skill of the poet is of six main types, viz., Varna-vinyāsa-vakrāta, Pada-pūrvārdha-vakrāta, Pratyaya-vakrāta, Vākya-vakrāta, Prakaraṇa-vakrāta and Prabandha-vakrāta. Each of these varieties is again divided into many sub-varieties. As poetry is distinguished by Vakrokti, Kuntaka attempts to include in its wide scope, the accepted ideas of Gūna, Alamkāra (poetic figures), Rīti, Dhwani etc. His Vakrokti, therefore, forms the central principle of his poetic theory and he says that Vakrokti is the soul poetry.

Ruyyaka says that Kuntaka gives special emphasis on Vyāpāra, the skill of the poet. Jayaratha points out that Vakrokti is not possible unless the imaginative faculty of the poet works. We find Kuntaka speaking on different occasions about the source of the strikingness of expression emerges from the act of the imagination on the part of the poet. So the Vyāpāra or Kavi-vyāpāra or Kavi-kauśala or Kavi-pratibhā is declared by Kuntaka to be the supreme factor of poetic creation. Hence, Kuntaka gives ultimate emphasis on the operation of the genius of the poet and considers it to be source of characteristic charm of poetic expression.

---

60 sābdārthau kāvyam vācako vācyam ceti dvau sammilitau kāvyam. dvāvekam-iti vicitraivōktiḥ. Ibid. p.7.
61 vicitro yatra vakrokti-vacictryam jīvitāyate / Ibid.I.42.
62 vyāpārasya prādhānyaṃ ca kāvyasya pratipede. AS. p.9.
Kuntaka admits that the poetic figures are particular forms of speech, he finds yet a specific differentia in them, viz., vakrata or vaicitrya which consists in a peculiar turn of expression resulting in a characteristic strikingness and depending upon the act of the imagination on the part of the poet. Thus, Kuntaka maintains that forms of expression become poetic figures, if the fertile imagination of the poet lends charm to it. The elements, therefore, which go to make up the essence of poetic figures are strikingness effected by the act of imagination on the part of the poet. 'These two elements', in the words of Dr. S.K.De, 'which Kuntaka emphasised in general in poetic speech and consequently in all figurative expression, go together and form the sene qua non which converts a form of speech or mode of expression into poetic expression'. As poetry is always an embellished expression, the poetic figures are naturally part of it, for they are not adventitious or extraneous elements in poetry, just as the Dhvanikara and others thought, but they are inextricably blended up with word and sense, and cannot be detached without injuring the very nature of poetic expression.

66 S.K.De, VJ. Introduction, p. liv.
Hence, Kuntaka thinks that poetic figures need not have any connexion with the unexpressed Rasa, but allows them to stand on their own merit, for they do not borrow the power of appeal from elsewhere. He, however, includes the poetic figures under Vākya-vakrātā. 67

Kuntaka recognises three forms of suggestion of matter, poetic figure and Rasa recognised by the Dhvani school. 68 He recognises suggestion of matter in those cases of Vākya-vakrātā where the natural disposition of an object forms the theme, 69 suggestion of figures in some of poetic figures like Pratīyamāna Rūpaka, 70 Pratīyamāna Vyatireka, 71 and attempts to include Nidarsānā, Parivṛtti etc. in the scope of Pratīyamāna Upamā. 72 Similarly Kuntaka recognises Rasa 73 (which according to the Dhvanikāra is always suggested) as not being subordinate to any other element, and in this connexion he considers the figure Rasavat, where, in his opinion, Rasa is developed for its own sake and not for embellishing the expressed sense. The importance of Rasa in poetry is admitted by him in his treatment of Prakaraṇa-Vakrātā and Prabandha-Vakrātā. Though the three forms of suggestion of matter, poetic figure and Rasa are acknowledged by Kuntaka, yet they are comprehended as elements of

67 VJ. I.20 and chap.III.
69 VJ. III. 1.
70 Ibid. p. 187.
71 Ibid. p. 207.
73 Ibid. III. 7-8 and 11.
Vakrokti, for the imaginative faculty of the poet is directed in producing certain charm in expression through these elements, as he says that an expression cannot become a poetic expression devoid of strikingness imparted to it by creative imagination of the poet.

We have seen that Vakrokti has been given a prominent place in the scheme of Kuntaka. His doctrine of Vakrokti is a wide and all-pervading concept, and he includes in its scope all ideas of Dhvani. Thus, the Varṇadhvani of Ānandavardhana is brought under the variety of Varṇa-vinyāsa-vakrāṭa, Sabda-sakti-mūla-dhvani is brought under Paryāya-Vakrāṭa, a sub-class of Pada-pūrvārdha-Vakrāṭa, Arthāntara-saṃkramita-vācyā-dhvani is brought under Rūḍhi-Vaicitrya-Vakrāṭa, another sub-class of Pada-pūrvārdha-vakrāṭa, Atyanta-tiraskṛta-vācyā-dhvani is brought under Upacāra-Vakrāṭa, another sub-class of Pada-pūrvārdha-vakrāṭa. In this way other varieties of Dhvani are included in some of the varieties of Vakrokti. This fact leads Ruuyaka to remark that all ideas of Dhvani are incorporated by Kuntaka under Upacāra-vakrāṭa etc. This remark of Ruuyaka has been differently interpreted by different modern scholars.

We find that Kuntaka admits the existence of suggested sense in poetry, but he does not recognise it to be the most important element in poetry. Ānandavardhana holds that a poet's genius

74 In all these cases, the illustrations cited in the Dhvanyaloka are quoted by Kuntaka.
75 upacāra-vakratādibhiḥ samasto dvāni-pradaṇḍo svīkrtaḥ. AS. p.10.
works through the medium of Dhvani, hence he regards Dhvani to be the soul of poetry. But Kuntaka thinks that the activity of poet's genius is more comprehensive and it is not chained to Dhvani only, it may derive help from Guna, Alamkāra, RIti and Dhvani. The poet's genius is more important and its activity in Vakrokti is noticeable in numerous ways, and he regards strikingness of expression to be the soul of poetry and not the suggested sense. 77

5. Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka's View:

After summarising Kuntaka's views on the general question of the soul of poetry and his attitude towards the suggested sense, Ruyyaka passes on to survey Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka's view on poetry. Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka's work Hṛdayadarpana is lost, but the contents of his work are available from different sources. 78

In his approach to Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka's view towards the suggested sense, Ruyyaka says that Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka does not altogether deny what is called vyānjanā-vyāpāra by the Dhvani-theorists, but he accepts it as an element of prauḍhokti, as part of poetic power or Kavyāpāra. Therefore, he does not recognise the suggested sense as an essence of poetry, but maintains that the vyāpāra, poetic power, which makes the word and meaning subservient to itself, is exclusively important.

77 kevalam uktivaicitrya-jīvitam kāvyam, na vyāngyārthā-jīvitam iti tadiyām darsānam vyavasthitam. AS. p.10.
To Bhatta Nayaka, the vyāpāra is the most important thing in poetry, as he clearly distinguishes the province of poetry from that of the scriptures where the word is exclusively important, and from the mythology where the meaning is exclusively important; but in poetry word and meaning are subordinate to the vyāpāra, which, he implies, is the most important thing in poetry. The vyāpāra or function being the most important thing in poetry, Bhatta Nayaka postulates three different functions of word, viz., abhidha, bhāvakatva, and bhoga. The abhidha is not merely a function of denotation, but it includes indication in its scope. Thus, it embraces two functions, - the function of denotation, and that of indication; bhāvakatva is a power of generalisation which makes the vibhāvas as well as the sthāyibhāvas cognised in their general character without any reference to their specific proportion; and after Rasa is generalised it is relished by the connoisseurs by the third function called bhoga. Therefore, Bhatta Nayaka, Ruuyaka opines, puts ultimate emphasis on the relish of Rasa, relished through the function called bhoga which is completely distinct from and transcends the denotative and generalising functions of word.


Therefore, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's attitude towards suggested sense is similar to that of Kuntaka, for both the writers comprehend the suggested sense as an element of poetry and not as something all in all. Although Kuntaka and Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka put emphasis on the poetic power (kavi-vyāpāra), yet there seems to an apparent difference in their approaches. As Dr. V. Raghavan observes - 'The former's Kavi-vyāpāra leans towards the old writers' view and approaches from the expression-side arriving at Bhanitivaicitraya. But Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka's Kavi-vyāpāra is related by him to the Rasa, to the content school.  

6. The Dhvanikāra's Views:

Discussing the view-points of the writers who comprehended the suggested sense in the other elements of poetry, Ruyyaka takes up to explain the position of the Dhvanikāra, the pro-founder of the doctrine of Dhvani.

In his approach to the Dhvanikāra's view on the essential feature of poetry, Ruyyaka points out that the Dhvanikārāḥ declares the suggested sense or Vyāṅga artha to be the most important thing in poetry, and as such it constitutes the essence, i.e. the soul of poetry. This suggested sense is reached by the function of suggestion which is distinct from and transcends the functions of denotation, purport and indication recognised by earlier theorists.  

81 BSP. p.84(fn).

conveys a primary meaning of a word, but this function is incapable of showing connected meanings of the individual words of the whole sentence, so the power which leads us to comprehend the connexion among the meanings of constituent words in the sentence is called purport (tātparya). These two functions are sufficient to convey the literal sense of poetry, but on the incompatibility of the literal sense another function called Indication (lakṣaṇā) is taken recourse to, by which another meaning connected with the primary meaning is apprehended and thereby the apparent incompatibility of the meanings of the different words is removed. The Dhvani theorists maintain that the entire significance of poetry is not exhausted by the denotive and indicative senses. Therefore, they posit another function of word and sense, viz., vyañjana or suggestion, which gives us a deeper sense, never directly expressed, but depending upon the poet's purpose of employing the word in its obviously denoted or indicated senses. Therefore, the deeper sense, which is exclusively intended is unexpressed or suggested sense, can be arrived at by the process of suggestion. The function of suggestion is variously termed as dhvani (echoeine), dyotana (revealing) pratyāyana (acquiring), avagama (implication) etc. Ruyyaka points out that the vyañjana or suggestion being

a process is not the meaning of a sentence, but the thing communicated by the process of suggestion is the suggested sense (vyaṅga artha), which predominates over all other elements of poetry, because other elements such as Guṇa, Alamkāra etc. are mere means of embellishing this suggested sense, and receive their justification for employment as such from this inner content of poetry.

Ruyyaka says that a process or vyāpāra attains the nature of its own from the object accomplished by it, the process or vyāpāra, therefore, cannot become predominant per se, but it is said to be predominant only metaphorically, when the object accomplished by it, is predominant. The process (vyāpāra) is not taken into consideration without the reference to the object, on the contrary, the object accomplished by the process is taken into account for its being predominant. In this Ruyyaka appears to criticise the views of Kuntaka and Bhaṭṭa Nayaka, because both the writers regard vyāpāra or operation of the poet’s genius to be of supreme importance in poetry. However, the object, accomplished by the process of suggestion, is the suggested sense, which is of paramount importance in poetry and as such it is regarded by the Dhvanikāra to be the soul of poetry. As suggested sense is regarded as the soul, it has all the dominece of accepting the charm produced by Guṇas and Alamkāras. Hence, the Dhvanikāra has a sound logic in asserting

\[\text{84 vyāpārasya viṣayamukhena svarūpa-pratilambhāt-tatprādhānyena prādhānyat svarūpena viditātvabhāvād viṣayasyaiva samagra-bhara-sahiṣnutvam. tasmād viṣaya eva vyaṅga-māmā jīvitatvena vaktavyāh. AS. p.13.}\]
the suggested sense to be the soul of poetry. What is suggested in poetry may take the form of a matter (Vastu), or that of a poetic figure (Alamkāra) or that of emotional mode (Rasa). Though the Dhvanikāra admits these threefold aspect of suggested sense, yet he betrays his partiality for suggested emotional mode (Rada-dhvani). Expanding this view of the Dhvanikāra, Abhinavagupta maintains that Rasa-dhvani, in reality, constitutes the soul of poetry, and that Vastu-dhvani and Alamkāra-dhvani terminate ultimately to Rasa-dhvani. Since the suggested sense is regarded as the soul of poetry, the position of Guṇa and Alamkāra, recognised by earlier writers to be the most important elements in poetry, has been reduced to a subsidiary position; for the Guṇa and Alamkāra get their due place in augmenting the charm of the soul, by residing on it directly or residing on its parts, the expressed word and sense, which form the body of poetry. As Dr. S. K. De rightly observes:

'The previous speculation recognised that both Guṇa and Alamkāra imparted beauty to Poetry, but since they went no deeper than Sabda and Artha, expressed word and sense, they could not answer the vital question as to what in poetry they imparted beauty. The inability arose from their not realising that Guṇa and Alamkāra are relative terms, and that they must be related to a Guṇin and Alamkārya. The analogy is maintained

85 tena rasa eva vastuta ātmā. vastvalamkāra-dhvani tu sarvathā rasam prati paryāvasyete iti vācyād-utkṛṣṭau tāvityā-bhiprayeṇa 'dhvaniḥ kāvyasyātmeti' samānyeṇoktaḥ. LC. p. 155.

86 ye tamartham rasadi-lakṣaṇam āṅginām santam avalambante te guṇaḥ sāuryādivat. vācyā-vācaka-lakṣaṇāny-āṅgāni ye punas-tadāśritas-te'alamkārā mantavyāḥ kātakādivat. DL. p. 450.
that Poetry, like a man, has two separable constituents, body and soul. The Vācyā-vācaka, the form of poetry, the expressed word and sense, however important, constitutes its body or Sarīra... But the Dhvani-theorists found that behind the Vācyā-vācaka, the Sarīra of Poetry, the most important thing is the Sarīrin; behind what is directly or figuratively expressed by word and sense, the most essential thing in Poetry is what is unexpressed but distinctly suggested. This, in their opinion, is not Aṅga or Sarīra, body, but the Aṅgin, Sarīrin, Ātman or soul of Poetry.... This being clearly formulated that Poetry must have an Aṅgin, a Guṇin and Alamkārya, in order to have Guṇa and Alamkārya, the problem of differentiation of Guṇa and Alamkāra came, as a matter of course, to be solved. So long as the Sarīra or outward form of Poetry alone is accepted and everything recognised as its beautifying element, there can be no tangible difference between Guṇa and Alamkāra as fruitful concepts. If, on the other hand, the poetic sentiment involved in the composition is accepted as the Ātman or essence, distinct from the Sarīrin: (sic) there can be this differentiation that the Guṇas, like the qualities of a man's soul, pertain to the Aṅgin named Rasa, and the Alamkāras, like ornaments on a man's body, to the Aṅga called Vācyā-vācaka. Both the Guṇa and Alamkāra are, thus, interpreted in a new sense, and justified by being brought in effective relation with the underlying sentiment in a composition.87 Therefore, the views of older

writers, that Rasa being primarily developed is a means of embellishment, do not hold good, because Rasa being the soul is always embellished and it is unreasonable to hold that what is embellished is a means of embellishment. In Ānandavardhana's scheme, when Rasa is primarily developed, it constitutes the soul of poetry, but when Rasa is found to subserve another poetic element, another Rasa or Vastu, it may secondarily be called an Alamkāra. This is what happens in the case of Rasavat etc. Therefore, Ruyyaka points out that when the suggested sense becomes the principal content in poetry, it becomes the soul, and this analyses of the Dhvanikāra is accepted by the connoisseurs of poetry. As the function of suggestion is not equated or subsumed in the functions of denotation or of indication, so it is quite reasonable to accept the suggested sense conveyed by the function of suggestion to be soul of poetry.

7. Mahimabhaṭṭa's Attitude towards the Suggested Sense:

But in spite of the establishment of the suggested sense on a strong foundation by the Dhvani-theorists, Mahimabhaṭṭa does not accept the independent existence of the suggested sense and challenges the Dhvanikāra's doctrine of suggestion. He attempts to prove that all forms of so-called suggested sense are arrived at not by the function of suggestion but by


89 pradhānēnyatra vākyārthe yatrāṅgām tu rāṣādayah / kāvye tasminnalamkāro rasadīr-iti me matiḥ // DL.II.5.
the process of poetic inference. According to him, what is suggested sense is nothing but an inferred sense, for he argues that the expressed sense and the so-called suggested sense stand in the relation of liṅga and liṅgin (the middle and major terms) of a logical syllogism. But Ruyyaka ably discards this view of Mahimabhaṭṭa. According to Ruyyaka, every case of suggestion cannot be explained with the scheme of regular syllogisms, for a reason to be valid must stand either in the relation of identity (tādātmya) or of causality (tadutpatti) with the sādhya, but neither of the two relations can be shown to be subsisting in a case of suggestion. 90 There can be no identity between the suggested sense, and that which suggests (śabda and artha) for the suggested sense is essentially different from the expressed sense and comes out prominently by keeping the latter in a subordinate position; similarly the test of causality is not applicable, because in the case of suggestion the word and sense cannot be regarded as being caused by suggested sense, in the same way as the smoke, which proves the existence of fire, can be taken as being produced from the fire itself. So the process of suggestion cannot be explained by the process of inference and the suggested sense, communicated by the process of suggestion, cannot be equated with the inferred sense.

8. Ruyyaka's Adherence to the Dhvani-theory:

As the Dhvanikāra's view on poetry is based on sound logic,
and that none of the views advanced by different writers comes up to that of the Dhvanikāra, Ruyyaka accepts the Dhvanikāra's view without any hesitation.  

The Dhvanikāra classifies poetry into three types—viz., Dhvani-kāvyā, Guṇībhūta-vyaṅga-kāvyā and Citra-kāvyā according to the place occupied by the suggested idea in poetry. The Dhvani-kāvyā is that where the implicit idea is of paramount importance so far as the excellence or attractiveness is concerned; the Guṇībhūta-vyaṅga-kāvyā, as the name implies, is that where the suggested idea does not attain predominance, but becomes subordinate to the expressed sense; that is to say, the suggested sense plays a subordinate part in so far as it serves to embellish or emphasise the expressed sense; and the third class of poetry is called Citra-kāvyā which is completely devoid of suggested

91 asti tāvad vyaṅga-niṣṭho vyaṅjana-vyāpārah. Ibid, p. 16.  
92 cf. yatṛarthah śabdo va tamartham upasarjanikrtasyār-thau/ vyaṅktah kāvyavisēṣah sa dhvaniriti sūribhīḥ kathitah // DL. 1.13  
93 cf. prakārṇyo guṇībhūtavyaṅgyah kāvyasya dṛṣyate / yatra vyaṅgyānvaye vācyacārutvam syāt prakāraṣavat // Ibid, III. 34.
element but abounds in expressed poetic figures. These three types of poetry accepted by the Dhvani-theorists are recognised by Ruyyaka. Since the first two are already discussed in the Alamkāramañjari and Dhvanyāloka respectively, Ruyyaka aims at giving in his Alamkārasarvasva an elaborate treatment of the remaining citra-kāvya which includes in its scope all poetic figures devoid of suggestion.

94 cf. pradhāna-guṇabhāvabhyām vyaṅgyasyaivaṁ vyavasthitē / kāvye ubhe tatonyat taccitram abhidhiyate. citram sābdārthabhedena dvividham ca vyavasthitam / tatra kiṅcic chabadacitram vacyacitram atah param // Ibid, III. 41-42.

95 asti tāvad vyaṅgyaniśto vyaṅjana-vyāparah. tatra vyaṅgyasya prādhānyāprādhānyābhyām dhvani- gunībhūtavyaṅgyākhyau dvau kāvyabheda. vyaṅgyasy asphutatve. amkāratvena citrākhyau kāvyabhedaś triyāḥ. AS. p. 16.