CHAPTER V
RELATION OF ALAMKĀRA TO RASA

One of the fundamental questions in Sanskrit Poetics is the question of the relation of Alamkāra (poetic figures) to Rasa. Various writers belonging to different schools approach this question from different angles on account of their divergent views with regard to the essential feature of poetry. The Dhvani School occupies an important place in settling down this problem; but the points ignored by Ānandavardhana have been taken into consideration by Ruyyaka who attempts to reconcile the divergent views.

1. Rasa School:

Bharata, the author of the Nāṭyaśāstra, is principally concerned with dramaturgy, but he betrays his awareness of the various problems of Poetics in general. In his opinion the dramatic presentation is intended to produce the experience of Rasa. Since Bharata has assigned the most important place to Rasa, he is not ready to accept any meaning dramatic or poetic bereft of Rasa.¹ He considers Guṇa and Alamkāra along with allied topics such as Laksṇa² and Dosa. He sheds some light

¹ na hi rasādppte kaścid arthaḥpravartate. NS. VI. 31.
² V. Raghavan observes that some of the Laksṇas defined by Bharata attain the rank of Alamkāra in later Alamkāra works. Vide SCAS. pp. 1-46.
on the problem of the relation of these elements to Rasa. As Rasa has been given the most important place in his system, the elements of Guṇa, Alamkāra etc. are assigned to a subser-
vient position which are justified only in their relation to Rasa.\textsuperscript{3} The author of the Nāṭyaśāstra recognises four Alamkāras, viz. Upamā, Dīpaka, Rūpaka and Yamaka and maintains that these are embellishments of poetry.\textsuperscript{4} Bharata seems to consider these Alamkāras to be analogous to ordinary removable ornaments and as such they impart extra charm to Rasa. He points out that the figures viz. Upamā and Rūpaka are related to Rasa like Vīra, Rūdra and Adbhūta, Rūpaka and Dīpaka to Rasas like Śṛṅgāra.\textsuperscript{5} It is noticeable that Bharata does not point out the relation of Yamaka to any Rasa, and in this he is probably followed by Ānandavardhana.

2. Alamkāra School:

Bhāmaha enquires the principle of embellishment in poetic expression. To him, poetry is not only a fact or feeling, but an embellished form also.\textsuperscript{6} The means of embellishment, according to him, is no other than Alamkāra, to signify which he employs the term Vakrokti.\textsuperscript{7} His Vakrokti denotes the entire

\begin{itemize}
\item[3] evam ete hyalamkāra guṇa dosāśca kīrtitāḥ / prayogam eśāṁce punar vakṣyāmi rasa-saṁśrayam. NS. XVII. 106.
\item[4] kāvyasyaite hyalamkāraḥ. Ibid, XVII, 43.
\end{itemize}
assemblage of poetic figures like Anuprāsa, Upāmā and the like, and connotes a deviating strikingness of expression that underlies all poetic figures. Though Bhāmaha uses the term Vakrokti to signify the principle of embellishment, a close perusal of his Kavyālamkāra indicates that he lays great emphasis on poetic figures as means of embellishment. Bhāmaha is not ready to accept poetic expression devoid of poetic figures, for he points out, 'a lovely face of a lady does not shine bereft of ornaments', implying thereby that a poetic composition does not look charming devoid of poetic figures. Thus in Bhāmaha's scheme the most important place is assigned to the poetic figures or Alāṃkāras. Bhāmaha has some idea of Rasa, but Rasa has been relegated to a subordinate position in his work. Rasa has been treated by him as a means of embellishment like other poetic figures. So he includes Rasa in a particular poetic figure viz., Rasavat, where Rasa like Śrṅgāra etc. are clearly manifested. In his view Rasa are like Upāmā, Sasandeha etc., and embellish the expressed sense. Bhāmaha, thus, appears to believe that the poetic figures in general do not have any relation to Rasa, but Rasa on the other hand is nothing but an element of poetic figures.

8 saṁśā sarvaiva vakrokti anayārtho vibhāvyate / yatnōsyām kavinā kāryaḥ kōlaṃkāronaya vinā // KL.II.85.
10 He regards that the Mahākāvyā embodies different Rasa (1.21), and in the Akhyāyika there is love-in-separation (1.27). S.K. De doubts that Bhāmaha takes Rasa in its untechnical sense. (HSP.Vol.II. p. 109).
Udbhata is a follower of Bhāmaha. He recognises the essentiality of Alamkāra in poetry. Though his idea of Rasa is far advanced than that of his predecessors, he does not recognise the paramount importance of Rasa in poetry. Like Bhāmaha, he allows Rasa to be a means of embellishment, and includes Rasa, Bhāva, Rasā-bhāsa and Bhāvā-bhāsa under the particular poetic figures, viz., Rasavat, Preyaḥ, Urjasvin and Samāhita respectively. Thus, he considers Rasa etc. as elements of poetic figures which serve to embellish the expressed sense.

Though Rudrata elaborately discusses the Alamkāras, and the name Kāvyālamkāra given to his work implies his great partiality for Alamkāra, yet he assigns relatively greater importance to Rasa for the discussion to which he devotes four chapters. Rudrata declares that poetry should be endowed with Rasa. He appears to hold the view that depiction of Rasa is indispensible in poetry. But from Rudrata's independent treatment of Alamkāra and Rasa it is not possible to form an idea about his attitude towards the question of the relation of Alamkāra to Rasa, for unlike his predecessors he does not define Rasavat, nor does he include Rasa under Guṇa, although Namisādhu explains that the Alamkāras, like artificial ornaments, belong to the body of poetry in the form of word and sense, and Rasa etc. like charmingness are regarded as natural excellences.

12 KLSS. III. 2-7.
13 tasmāt tat kartavyam yatnena māhyāsā rasair yuktam / udvejanam eteṣam śāstravad evanyathā hi syat // RKL. XII. 2.
3. Rīti School:

Dāṇḍin is said to be the propounder of the Rīti School. In his Kāvyādarsā, though he recognises the necessity of beautifying principle in poetry, he does not like Bhāmaha regard the individual poetic figure as the sole means of beautification. He therefore, introduces two kinds of poetic diction called Mārga, viz. Vaidharbha and Gaudīya. Dāṇḍin shows his partiality for Vaidharbha mārga, the essence of which is said to consist in the employment of ten Guṇas. He defines Alamkāra as a quality that imparts beauty to poetry. He maintains that some of the Alamkāras are competent enough to differentiate these two types of diction. Dāṇḍin's idea of Rasa appears to be far advanced than that of Bhāmaha, for he expounds the eight Rasas recognised by Bharata. Dāṇḍin betrays his awareness of the theory of Rasa-realisation as is evident from such remarks - 'ratiḥ ēṅgāratām gataḥ', 'krodho rudratām gataḥ'. Nevertheless, he agrees with Bhāmaha so far as the status of Rasa in poetry is concerned. Rasa in all these instances occupies only a subsidiary status in the context of poetic figures, and he includes Rasa in the particular poetic figure viz. Rasavat. In his view, Rasa is developed not for its own sake but serves as means of decorating poetic speech. But he differs from Bhāmaha in this that, while

14 kāvyasya hi ēabdārthau ēārīram. tasya ca vakrokti-
vāstavādayah kaṭaka-kundalādaya iva krtrimā alamkārāḥ. 
rasāstu saundaryādaya iva sahajā gunāḥ iti. NSC: p.373.
15 KD. I. 40.
16 iti vaidharbha-mārgasya prānāḥ dasa guṇāḥ smṛtāḥ / 
Ibid. I. 42.
17 Ibid, II. 3.
18 Ibid, II. 28–92.
19 alamkāratayā smṛtam. Ibid, II. 287.
Bhāmaha includes Rasa in the poetic figures alone, Dāndin speaks of Rasa under Guṇa also. But it worth noting that like Bhāmaha Dāndin does not maintain any distinction between Guṇa and Alamkāra, for both are regarded by him as means of the same beautifying principle.

Vāmana does not recognise the essentiality of Alamkāra or poetic figures in poetry. To him, the essential element in poetry is Guṇa which constitute the essence of Rīti (Diction). Rīti, according to him, is the soul of poetry. The Guṇas are defined as those characteristics which produce charm in poetry: the Alamkāras, on the other hand, are such elements which serve to heighten the charm already produced by Guṇa. Guṇas are, therefore, essential for the creation of poetry, while Alamkāras, like ordinary ornaments, heighten the charm of poetry; and therefore, they are non-essential. Vāmana does not consider Rasa to be a poetic figure, but he includes Rasa in one of the essential features, viz. Guṇa called Kāntiguṇa, which renders brilliance to poetic diction. As charm produced by Guṇa is heightened by Alamkāra, so the charm produced by Rasa (which is Guṇa) is heightened by Alamkāra. This is the relation shown to exist between Alamkāras and Rasa in Vāmana’s theory. Hence, Vāmana does not define or otherwise mention the figure Rasavat.

20 madhuram rasavad vāci vastunyapi rasasthitih
 yena madhyante dhīmanto madhuneva madhuvrataḥ / Ibid, I.51.

21 pūrve guṇā nityāḥ. tair vinā kāvyā-sobhā-'n̥papatteṣaḥ.
 KLSV.III.i.2. On which Gopendra Tripurahara comments: pūrve guṇā nityā ityukteḥ punar alamkāraḥ anityā iti
gamyate eva. Kam, p. 84.

22 ḛipta-rasatvam kāntiḥ. ḛipta rasah śṛṅgāradayo yasya
da ḛipta-rasah. tasya bhavo ḛipta-raratvam kāntiḥ.
 KLSV.III.ii.15.
From what we have discussed, it is clear that the Pre-dhvani thinkers endeavour to analyse the formal beauty of poetry. Hence Rasa, which has been regarded as of paramount importance in poetry by Ānandavardhana in later times, has been given a subsidiary status by these thinkers. Rasa has been recognised as an element of poetic figure by Bhāmaha, Udbhāta and Daṇḍin, or as an aspect of Guṇa by Daṇḍin and Vāmana. It is, however, significant that Vāmana takes Alamkāra in the broad sense of poetic beauty, and the poetic figures are accepted by him to be an element of such beauty. The observation of Dr. S.K. De is very illuminating on this point: 'The Alamkāra, without the Guṇa, cannot of itself produce the beauty of a poem, but the latter can do so without the former. But Vāmana justifies at the same time the existence as such of the Alamkāra as an element of poetry, and supports a phase of poetry, which is indeed admitted by Ānandavardhana but not properly dealt with by him, and which is elaborated only by his follower Ruuyaka who, however, takes his inspiration on this point from the Vakroktijīvita-kāra'.

4. Dhvani School:

With the advent of the theory of Dhvani, an emphasis is found to be shifted from the extraneous elements of Alamkāra or Guṇa or Rīti to the inner content of poetry which is said to be represented by the unexpressed content called Dhvani. Ānandavardhana regards that this unexpressed or the suggested content constitutes the essence of poetry. In his view, the best type

---

23 SKDe, HSP. Vol. II. p. 100.
of poetry does not remain confined within the narrow limit imposed by the expression and the expressed. On the other hand, it transcend the limits and hints at the implicit of inexplicable charm. Though Ānandavardhana opines that the suggested content is of three aspects—viz., suggestion of matter (vastu), suggestion of a figure (Alamkāra) and suggestion of emotional mood (Rasa), yet he betrays his partiality for suggestion of Rasa or Rasadhvani.

The end of poetry is the awakening of Rasa in the heart of the connoisseur of poetry, and the word and sense, Guṇa and Alamkāra, Rīti and Vṛtti serve as means towards achieving this end. As they are regarded as means, their function in poetry is justified only in so far as they help in the awakening of Rasa. Thus, Rasa, which has been relegated to a subordinate position by including it in the poetic figure Rasavat (by Bhāmaha, Udbhata and Daṇḍin) or in the Guṇa called Kānti (by Vāmana) has been assigned to the most important place in the system of Dhvani. Ānandavardhana justifies the place of Guṇa and Alamkāra in their relation to Rasa. Thus, Guṇas are attributes of Rasa, the principal element of poetry. Just as the qualities like heroism in a man serve to indicate the greatness of the soul; similarly,


Guṇaśā like Mādhurya etc. help us in recognising the presence of Rasa in poetry. The Alamkāras, on the other hand, are related to the parts (aṅga) in the form of expressive word and expressed sense. Just as the ordinary ornaments like necklace, bangle etc. residing on the body enhance the beauty of the soul, similarly, the Alamkāras resting on the word and the sense ultimately beautify the soul which is Rasa. Ānandavardhana, thus, settles down the relative position of Guṇa and Alamkāra in Dhvanikāvya.

Though Ānandavardhana compares the Alamkāra with the ordinary ornaments, yet this analogy does not wholly reflect his view with regard to the question of the relation of Alamkāra to Rasa. In explaining the criterion as to which Alamkāras should be properly regarded as the means to the awakening of Rasa, Ānandavardhana lays down that a poetic figure or Alamkāra for the improvisation of which no separate effort is required on the part of the poet whose mind is completely absorbed in the contemplation of emotional mood, can be regarded as Alamkāra in the proper sense of the term.  

For Alamkāras are turns of expressing that convey the requisite meaning consisting of proper excitant (vibhāva), ensuant (anubhāva) and accessory (vyabhcāribhāva) that alone suggest Rasa. The poet's idea gushes forth spontaneously through these peculiar modes of expression, and as such, the Alamkāras are not external appendages, but they are organically connected with the body of poetry and help in the evocation of Rasa.

26 rasaśiptatayā yasya bandhaḥ sakyaكريyo bhavet / aprthṛg-yaśna-nirvartyah solamkāro dhvanau mataḥ // Ibid, II. 16.

The Alamkāras, which are not improvised along with the emotional mood itself, but by conscious thought of the poet, are regarded as extraneous elements. Therefore, Ānandavardhana does not allow such obscure figures like Yamaka, Ślesa etc. in Śṛṅgararasa, for they are brought into being not by emotional mood, but by the conscious thought taken recourse to by the poet in his endeavour to make a display of his craftsmanship, and as such they cannot become the body (aṅga) of Rasa. The poetic figures can become promoter of Rasa only when they are introduced with special care. Ānandavardhana lays down the principle that a poetic figure (1) must always be kept subservient to Rasa and must not be allowed to excel the charm of Rasa, (2) may be accepted or rejected according as it enhances.


29 This view of Ānandavardhana may appear to be contradictory to his own statement that the poetic figures are improvised effortlessly. But this apparent contradiction is removed by Dr.R.R.Mukherjee. cf. 'but the conflict vanishes to the discerning mind, when it is taken into consideration that the great expounder of the Doctrine of Dhvani is in favour of coalescence between thought and feeling, the unity of which is given expression to by the Imagery, brought forth by the poetic figure'. IPIA. p. 87.

30 DL.II. 18-19
or deters the development of Rasa, (3) should not be carried to its logical extreme, if the effect of Rasa is hampered thereby and (4) even if be carried to its logical extreme, it must be carefully kept subordinate to the principal Rasa. Thus, the figures, which appear naturally, effortlessly and in complete harmony with Rasa to be evoked, justify their title. The merely pretty figures, which have no profound organismic justification, are, however, analogous to removable ordinary ornaments.

Though the author of Dhvanyāloka establishes the paramount importance of Rasa, he admits that Rasa may sometimes become the case of poetic figure when it is developed not primarily but secondarily. When Rasa is primarily developed, it becomes the case of Rasadhvani, but when it is made subservient to another sense — expressed or suggested, it is regarded as a mere poetic figure like Upāmā or Rūpaka and the like. Because a poetic figure by its very nature forms a subsidiary category; it is what contributes to or enhances the beauty of something else.

Ānandavardhana does not altogether rule out the views of ancient writers like Bhāma, Udbhata and others who accept the inclusion of Rasa in the poetic figure called Rasavat. Ānandavardhana modifies the views of his esteemed predecessors and opines that when another sense is predominant Rasa becomes a poetic figure in Rasavat. As Rasa plays a subservient role in Rasavat, the cases of Rasavat etc. are included in the second class of poetry called Guṇībhūta-vyāhga-kāvya. In this class of poetry

---

31 pradhānena yatra vākyārthe yatraṅgam tu rasādayah/ kāvye tasmīn-alamkāro rasādir iti me maṭh// Ibid,II. 5.

are included all poetic figures in which a suggested matter or a suggested figure plays a subordinate part, in so far as it embellishes the expressed sense which is meant to predominate. Thus, in Samāsokti and the like, there is apprehension of suggested matter; in Dīpaka etc. of another suggested figure, but the suggested element is there only to embellish the expressed sense. Ānandavardhana admits that poetic figures are turns of expression and accepts Bhāmaśā's Vakrokti or Atiśayokti to be the essence of poetic figures. The expressed poetic figures, Ānandavardhana says, possess the peculiar charm only in their connexion with the suggested elements. But as the expressed sense in all these poetic figures is predominant, the suggested element serves only to emphasise or embellish it. Thus, Ānandavardhana accepts only those figures which are connected with the principal suggested element which, in most cases, takes the form of Rasa. The poetic figures, which possess peculiar charm only in connexion with the suggested element, are included in the second class of poetry called by the name Guṇībhūtavyaṅga. The poetic figures, other than which are devoid of or unconnected with the suggested


element, have only a pictorial effect and may be included in
the lowest kind of poetry called Citrakāvyā,\(^{34}\) which, accord-
ing to him, is not poetry proper but an imitation of poetry.\(^{35}\)
Ānandavardhana maintains for the sake of his theory that there
is no poetry in which there is no unexpressed element being
primary or secondary. The Citrakāvyā is admitted by him, however,
to the category of poetry because the poets, who are unfettered
in their modes of expression, have, as a matter of fact, been
found producing poetry of this kind, in which there is no inten-
tion of developing Rasa or anything else unexpressed, but which
is wholly taken up with the object of bringing about striking-
ness of sound and sense.\(^{36}\) Ānandavardhana, thus, settles down
the vexed question of the relation of Alamkāra to Rasa in the
Dhvanikāvyā. The Citrakāvyā which develops no Rasa has been con-
demned as imitation of poetry and is grudgingly admitted by him.

Though Ānandavardhana’s view has been accepted as authori-
tative by later writers, his view with regard to the Citrakāvyā,
that it is not a poetry proper but an imitation thereof, is not
accepted even by his followers. After Ānandavardhana Kuntaka
attempts to work out the importance of expressed poetic figures

\(^{34}\) na tanmukhyām kāvyam kāvyanukāro hyasau. Ibid, p. 1219.

\(^{35}\) na tāḍāk kāvyaprakāroṣṭi yatra rasādīnām apratītīh. kintu yadā rasa-bhāvadi-vivakṣā-śūnyāḥ kaviḥ śabdālamkā-
ram arthālamkāram vopanibadhnaḥ tadā tad-vivakṣāpekṣaḥā
rasādī-śūnyatārthasya parikalpyate. vivakṣoparūdhā eva
hi kāvyē śabdānam arthaḥ. vācyā-sāmarthya-vaśeṇa ca
kavi-vivakṣā-virahēpi tathāvidhe viṣaye rasādi-pratītī
bhavantī paridurbalā bhavatītyanēpi prakārenā
nīrasatvam parikalpya citra-viṣaye vyavasthāpyate.
Ibid, 1223.
and indicates their position in poetry. The followers of the Dhvani School have been greatly influenced by Kuntaka's analysis of poetic figures.

5. An Analysis of Kuntaka's View:

Kuntaka's Vakrokti, we have seen, implies a departure from the common and ordinary usage and is peculiar to the imagination of the poet. Vakrokti is held by him to be the possible embellishment of poetry. Vakrokti has been used by him as identical with the generic term Alamkāra, and as a principle it forms the essence of all poetic figures. He regards the poetic figures as aspects of Vakrokti and includes the whole domain of poetic figures under the province of Vākyavakrata. Kuntaka maintains that the poetic figures are particular forms of speech, a phase of expressed denotation. As the poetic figures are aspects of Vakrokti, they are intended only for producing strikingness in expression. Ānandavardhana, we have seen, accepts only those figures which help to the awakening of Rasa, or only those which, connected with the unexpressed element, possess peculiar charm; but the figures, which are in no way connected with the suggested element, are condemned by him as vāgvikalpas and they are included in the Citrakāvyya, which is not a poetry proper but an imitation thereof. To him the ornamental expression of poetry is detachable, external and non-essential. But Kuntaka justifies

37 Vide Supra, Chap. III.
38 vakroktiḥ sakalālamkāra-sāmānyaḥ. VJ. p.53.
40 abhidhāna-prakāraviśeṣa eva cālamkāraḥ. AS. p.9.
these poetic figures in poetry. According to him, they are particular forms of speech and as such cannot be detached from poetry, they have every right to be considered as essential feature. If the poetic imagination justifies them as the source of beauty, the question of their connexion with Rasa does not arise, for they have their own merit of giving delight to the heart of the appreciators. The poetic figures are not detachable from the expression, for Kuntaka maintains that poetry and its figures do not get any separate entity; it is for the sake of convenience of treatment we speak of poetry and its figures; but in fact, these cannot be differentiated, and cannot exist without the other. In his opinion embellished word and sense constitute poetry and the poetic figures are not external addition, but they are part and parcel of poetic expression. This analysis of poetic figures makes room for those compositions in poetry which are rendered brilliant through the poetic figures. Kuntaka's analysis of the poetic figures has been considered correct and accepted even by the adherents to the Dhvani School.

6. Followers of Dhvani School.

(a) Mammaṭa's Approach to this Question: Regarding the question of the relation of Alamkāra to Rasa, Mammaṭa generally follows the views of Ānandavardhana. Mammaṭa maintains that poetic figures help the principal existing Rasa through the

41 sālamkārasya-ālamkarāṇa-sahitasya sakalasya nirastāvayavasya sataḥ samudāyasya kāvyatā kavikarmatvam. tenā-alamkṛtaṣya kāvyatvam iti sthitih, na punah kāvyasy-ālamkāra-yogo iti. VJ. p. 7.
excellence of the parts consisting of word and sense.\textsuperscript{42} The poetic figures, therefore, have an indirect relation to Rasa, through their capacity of embellishing the expressive word and expressed sense and add its beauty. Mamma\textza, at the same time, admits that where Rasa is not present, the poetic figures and in mere strikingness of expression,\textsuperscript{43} and sometimes when Rasa is present, the poetic figures do not help it. Mamma\textza, therefore, admits that the poetic figures may have their own beauty without being related to Rasa. But Mamma\textza is also of opinion that the Citrak\textkya, which abounds in poetic figures, is an inferior type of poetry (avarak\textkya).

(b). An Analysis of Ruyyaka's Approach: Ruyyaka's approach to the question of the relation of Alamk\textra to Rasa is similar to that of \textanandavardhana on the one hand, and that of Kuntaka on the other. Endowed as he is with a refined taste for poetry and sound sense of values, Ruyyaka finds justification in \textanandavardhana's analysis of suggested sense (Dhvani) and indisputably accepts it. He agrees with \textanandavardhana that, the suggested content being primarily described constitutes the soul of poetry, and Rasa being primarily developed constitutes the soul of suggestive poetry. The poetic figures in the suggestive type of

\textsuperscript{42} upakurvanti tam santam ye\textgga-dv\textare\n\textj\textac\textcit / h\textr\textadivad alam\textkras tenupr\textr\textasopam\textadaya\n\texth / KP.VIII. 2. cf. his own explanation: ye v\textc\textac\textv\textac\texta-lak\textgan\text\textangati\texti\texta\texty-mukhena mukhena mukhena rasam sambhavinam upakurvanti te k\textn\text\textgh\textd\texty\texth-\textg\textd\textn\texth utkar\texts\text\textd\texth\n-dv\textare\n sar\texti\textriv\textdpy-upak\text\textk\textr\textk\texta h\textr\textd\texty\n\texti\textv-\textal\text\textkm\textk\texta. Ibid, p. 465.

\textsuperscript{43} yatra tu nasti rasas-tatroktivaicitrya-m\text\textma-tra- paryavas\\text\texta\\texty\\texti, kvacit tu santam api nopakurvanti. Ibid, p. 465.
poetry embellish the principal existing Rasa, through the excellence of the parts consisting of the expressor (word) and the expressed (sense). 44

But Ruyyaka is not prepared to go with the whole length with Anandavardhana, who condemns the expressed poetic figures, unconnected with Rasa or anything else unexpressed as merely different phases of speech itself (vāgvikalpas), and the Citrakāvya, which develops no Rasa but abounds in poetic figures, as an imitation of poetry and not a poetry proper. Ruyyaka appears to have realised the deficiency in Anandavardhana's treatment of these poetic figures; for there may arise cases where the poet's obvious intention is directed not to awaken Rasa or anything else unexpressed, but may be directed simply to produce a certain strikingness in the form of an expressed poetic figure. These cases are considered and given a place in poetry by Ruyyaka. It is observed by scholars 45 that the author of the Alampkārasarvasva takes his cue from Kuntaka in analysing these poetic figures. Kuntaka analyses poetic expression and finds that the essential value of poetic figures consists of a peculiar turn of expression which produces a certain charm. Ruyyaka maintains that a poetic figure consists of the charm of sound and sense, and this charm is brought about by the productive imagination of the poet. 46 Like Kuntaka, he is of the opinion that


the poetic figures do not have any separate existence from poetry, but they constitute poetic expression, and as such they are part and parcel of poetry itself. The poetic figures are, therefore, not analogous to ordinary removable ornaments like necklace ear-ring and the like; but as they are charm of sound and sense, they form the essence of poetic expression. The poetic figures, therefore, belong to poetry in their own right and directly contribute to aesthetic delectation. Ruuyyaka is never tired of repeating in essence that the poetic figures, being potent media of effecting consciousness of delectation, should bloom forth from the fountain head of the imagination of the poet. Therefore, he appears to believe that, as the poetic imagination justifies the poetic figures as the source of beauty, the question of their relation to Rasa or anything else unexpressed need not arise, for they are themselves sufficient for aesthetic delight. Since the poetic figure consists of charm of word and sense, the word and sense must not in every case be suppressed or subordinated to the suggestion of Rasa or anything else unexpressed, but they (word and sense) are of prime importance because of their practical use by the poet. The cognitive role of poetry should not be lost sight of.

46 tathā ca śabdārthayor vicchittir alamkārah. vicchitā ca kavi-pratibhollāsa-rūpavat ... VV. p. 353.


in the wake of the emotional—and emphasis, which is nothing unexpected in one who pleads for the reinstatement of vicāra and for the reorientation of old views on the sense content in the new channels, in a way which bears a marked similarity to the expressionism in modern Western literary criticism. The poetry rich in poetic figures cannot be condemned, in Ruyyaka's point of view, as an imitation of poetry, but it has every right to attain the status of poetry.

Now a question arises as to why Ruyyaka includes the instances of Guṇībhuṭa-vyaṅga-kāvyā in the Citrakāvyā. Taking cue from the author of the Dhvanyāloka, Ruyyaka gives emphasis on the predominant element in poetry. Ānandavardhana accepts excellence of charm (cāṛutvotkāra) to be the test of determining the predominance or the subordination of the expressed or the suggested sense. In the suggestive poetry, according to Ānandavardhana, the suggested sense is more attractive than the expressed one; and in the poetry of subordinated suggestion, the expressed sense is more charming than the suggested sense. The poetic figures, which, in connexion with the suggested element, possess peculiar charm, are included by Ānandavardhana in the second class of poetry called by the name Guṇībhuṭa-vyaṅga-kāvyā. In this class of poetry the unexpressed plays a subordinate part, in so far as it serves to emphasise or embellish

49 S.P.Bhattacharyya, SIP. p.10.
50 cāṛutvotkāra-nibandhana hi vācyā-vyaṅgaṛgyoḥ prādhānya-vivakṣā. DL. p. 207.
51 Loc. Cit.
the expressed. Thus, in Samāsokti, Dipaka, Rasavat etc. the expressed sense is meant to predominate and constitute the charm of the particular figure, the suggested sense being there only to emphasise or embellish it. In spite of admitting predominence of the expressed poetic figures in the figures under question, Ananda gives emphasis on the subordinate element in order to show the theoritic importance of the suggested sense. Though Ruyyaka refers to the subordination of the suggested sense in these figures, he includes these in the Citra-kavya. In this he follows Anandavardhana's view which states that, the designation of a class of poetry should go after the principal element (according to the maxim - prādhānyena vyapadesā bhavanti) and not the subordinate one. Ruyyaka's position is very clear. He does want to designate poetry after the subordinate element. He gives emphasis on the excellence of charm, which, according to him, is the deciding factor of giving designation to poetry. If the excellence of charm belongs exclusively to the suggested


content, the poetry is to be designated as Dhvani-kāvyā; if, on the other hand, the excellence of charm belongs exclusively to the expressed sense, or if the suggested sense stands on equal footing with the expressed sense so far as the charm is concerned, these cases are to be regarded as cases of poetic figures. This position of expressed poetic figures is admitted by Ānandavardhana himself, but these expressed poetic figures are included in the Guṇībhūta-vyaṅgya type of poetry. Therefore, Ruyyaka appears to believe that Guṇībhūta-vyaṅgya-kāvyā and Citra-kāvyā are not mutually exclusive in their scope; this view, which is implicit in Ruyyaka, has been explicitly stated by Jagannātha who criticises Mammata's commentator in this connexion. Ruyyaka appears to hold the view that mere touch of suggested element does not make an expression a poetic figure unless a certain charm is imparted to it by the imagination of the poet. Thus in the figure Sandeha or Bhrāntimān the suggested similarity does not make the doubt or error as a poetic doubt or poetic error. Therefore, he says that the underlying element of doubt or error must not only be due to similarity, but it should also be poetical. Jayaratha notes in this connexion that it is not the idea of similarity but the fact of the genius of the poet which gives it the status of a poetic figure.


56 sādṛṣya-hetukāpi bhrāntir vicchittiartham kavi-pratibho-tthapitaiva grhyate...evam...sāṃsāyēpi boddhavyam. AS. p. 58.
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Ruyyaka, therefore, establishes that the poetic figures, being connected or unconnected with Rasa, have significance for poetry which cannot be ignored. Dr. S. K. De rightly observes; 'The theory, which Ruyyaka thus elaborates after Kuntaka appears to have been definitely established in later writings.'

Though Ruyyaka accepts Kuntaka's analysis of poetic figures, yet he does not admit the figurative expression is the only poetic expression. Hence, he accepts indisputably Ānandavardhana's theory of Dhvani and maintains that Dhvanikāvya is the best type of poetry. The question of the real significance in poetry - the strikingness of imagery or the emotive experience, is elaborately discussed by Dr. R. R. Mukherjee. However, Ruyyaka makes an earnest attempt on his part to reconcile the views of the later writers with those of the earlier of which he is more sympathetic. He appears to accept tacitly the view of Vāmana who justifies the presence of poetic figures as an element of poetry and supports a phase of poetry the chief element of which is poetic figures. Thus in fact, poetry can be conveniently classified into two classes - sarasa and nīrāsa; the sarasa is the best type of poetry, but the nīrāsa type also cannot be discarded in so far as it consists of charm brought about by the imagination of the poet.
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