CHAPTER VI

NEW POETIC FIGURES RECOGNISED BY RUYYAKA

Test of the New Poetic figure

Ruyyaka, we have seen, considers that strikingness or special charm (vicchitti) brought about by the creative imagination of the poet forms the sine qua non of a poetic figure. This special charm is taken by him to be the test of a poetic figure and this test is applied by him to the consideration of numerous poetic figures. This special charm, thus, "stands as an important differentia upon which one figure distinguishes itself from another". A poetic figure, in Ruyyaka's scheme, enjoys an independent status only when the poetic charm in it is distinct from that of another. A poetic figure, again, may derive its charm from another figure-element and in these cases, according to Ruyyaka, whose charm is produced and that which produces the charm are to be considered separate figures.

Since the forms of expression are infinitely varied owing to the infinite scope of poetic imagination, there emerges new turns of expression in poetry by the productive imagination of the poet. The author of the Alamkārasarvasva finds out some

1 vicchitti—antaratvam eva hi sarveśām alamkāraṇām bhedahetuh. VS. p. 61.
2 alamkārāntara-vicchittyaśrayenāpy-ayam alamkāre nidarsanīyāḥ. AS. p. 62.
new turns of expression, applies the test of poetic charm to them and finding that these turns of expression stand in the test of strikingness, he maintains that these individual expressions deserve to attain the status of independent poetic figures, for the poetic charm in these individual poetic figures is widely distinct from that of the figures already recognised. The peculiar charm, in these expressions which find recognition as distinct poetic figures in Ruyyaka's scheme, is not probably noticed by earlier writers, or the special charm lent to these figures is regarded by them as not separate from that of other figures admitted by them. Hence, the essential features of these new poetic figures are clearly brought out in Alāmākārarasārvavā and they are ably differentiated from their allied ones.

The poetic figures discovered for the first time in the Alāmākārarasārvavā are only four in number. They are Parināma, Ullekhā, Vicitra and Vikalpa. According to their nature, these figures are included by Ruyyaka under different groups of poetic figures.

1. Parināma

(a) Definition of Parināma and its analysis: The predecessors of Ruyyaka do not mention Parināma as a poetic figure. Neither Ruyyaka nor any of his commentators informs us that this figure is for the first time introduced in the Alāmākārarasārvavā. Since this figure is not found in earlier extant works, Ruyyaka has been accepted here to be a discoverer of this figure.
The figure Parināma is classed in the sub-group called Āropa-garbha in the regular system of classification of poetic figures adopted by Ruyyaka and by later writers who follow him. The special feature of this sub-group consist in the superimposition of the aprakṛta (viṣayin) on the prakṛta (viṣaya), and this superimposition tends to the identification of the aprakṛta with the prakṛta.

The figure Parināma, which, according to the Alamkārasarvasva, occurs when the object superimposed becomes useful to the subject of description for a contextual purpose, is variously analysed by different writers. The object superimposed is the non-contextual object, i.e. the aprakṛta or viṣayin, and the subject of description is the prakṛta or viṣaya. The aprakṛta becomes useful to the prakṛta being identified with the prakṛta and the special purpose of this identification lies in helping the prakṛta for accomplishing a contextual purpose. Hence, the prakṛta is transformed into the aprakṛta in this figure. In making the prakṛta to be competent to accomplish the contextual purpose, the aprakṛta superimposes its behaviour on the prakṛta, the prakṛta thus passing over into the behaviour of the aprakṛta accomplishes the contextual purpose. As the prakṛta being transformed into the aprakṛta accomplishes the contextual purpose, the name Parināma given to this figure is significant.

4 āropayamāṇasya prakṛtopayogitve parināmaḥ. AS. p.51.
(b) Distinction between Parināma and Rūpaka: The figure Parināma that finds recognition to be a poetic figure for the first time in Ruyyaka's scheme bears a close affinity to the figure Rūpaka, because both the figures are characterised by the superimposition of the aprakṛta on the prakṛta and there is apprehension of identity between the two. In his eagerness to justify the separate entity of the figure Parināma, Ruyyaka distinguishes it from the figure Rūpaka. In Rūpaka, as the name implies, the aprakṛta tinges or colours the prakṛta by superimposing its form on it.\(^7\) The attribution of the form of the aprakṛta on the prakṛta enhances the excellence and superiority of the prakṛta, but the aprakṛta is of no use to the prakṛta for the accomplishment of the contextual purpose. As in the example *mukha-candrena viraha-tāpah śāmyati* the superimposition of the moon on the face shows that the particular face is so beautiful that in it all the charming feature of the moon are noticed. Thus the superimposition of the moon (aprakṛta) on the face (prakṛta) culminates in distinguishing the particular face from the ordinary ones, and in this lies the charm of superimposition in Rūpaka. But the moon is of no use to the face for accomplishing the purpose of cooling down the warmth of passion.\(^8\) But in Parināma on the other hand, the aprakṛta does not only colour the prakṛta, but being identified with the prakṛta becomes useful to the prakṛta for the accomplishment of the contextual purpose. The prakṛta in this figure

---

\(^7\) viṣayinā viṣayasya rūpavataḥ karanaḍ rūpakaṃ. AS. p.44.

\(^8\) 'mukha-candrena viraha-tāpah śāmyati' ityādāvapi rūpakam-evā. na caivam candrābheda-pratītau viraha-tāpasyāmākatvā-sambhavaḥ. abhedā-pratītāḥ-āhāryatvena mukhatvasyā-tiraskāreṇa viṣeṣyataḥ bhanena ca tattvasaṃbhavaḥ. UD. p.45.
cannot by itself accomplish the contextual purpose. Therefore, the aprakṛta superimposes its behaviour on the prakṛta, and when they are identified, the prakṛta passes over into the behaviour of the aprakṛta. Thus the prakṛta becomes competent for accomplishing the contextual purpose. Therefore, the aprakṛta is useful to the prakṛta in helping it to have connexion with the contextual purpose. In the example 'tasmai saumitri-maitri mayam upahṛtavān ātaram nāvikāya; the prakṛta is friendship (maitri) which has been presented by Rāma to the boatman, Guha for crossing the river Ganges, but the friendship in its own nature cannot serve the purpose of crossing the river for which ferry-fee (ātara) is necessary. So, the ferry-fee which is the aprakṛta superimposes its behaviour on the friendship in order to help it in accomplishing the purpose of crossing the river. The prakṛta friendship, thus, assuming the behaviour of the ferry-fee becomes competent to accomplish the purpose of crossing the river Ganges. Thus the aprakṛta ferry-fee is useful to the prakṛta friendship being identified with the latter. The utility of the aprakṛta to the prakṛta for

9 prakṛtam aprakṛta-vyavahāra-visiṣṭatayā-vatiṣṭhate. VS. p. 51. ato vyavahārāntam āropah. na tu rūpa-samāropam-mātram. SJ. p. 54.

10 The complete verse is -

a contextual purpose constitutes the special charm in Parināma, and this special charm of this figure distinguishes it from Rūpaka.

(c) Distinction between Parināma and Samāsokti: In Samāsokti also the aprakṛta is useful to the prakṛta for the accomplishment of the contextual actions for unless the behaviour of the aprakṛta is superimposed on the prakṛta, the prakṛta cannot accomplish the action mentioned in the context. The figure Parināma has, therefore, a close resemblance to the figure Samāsokti where also the aprakṛta attributes its behaviour to the prakṛta in order to enable it to accomplish the contextual action, but the aprakṛta does not cover the form of the prakṛta as in Rūpaka, for in the example "upoḍha-rāgena vilolatārakam," etc. the behaviour of hero and heroine (aprakṛta) is attributed to the moon and the night (prakṛta) and assuming the behaviour of hero and heroine, the moon and the night accomplish the purpose of the enjoyment of love. But Parināma is distinct from Samāsokti on the ground that the aprakṛta in Samāsokti is not mentioned in words, but is implied; while in

12 yathā samāsoktau cāropamāṇasya prakṛto-payuktatvam. prakṛta-siddhyartham evāprakṛta-sya āksepāt. āropamāṇamapi tatra prakṛtā-vaccheda-katvena sthitam na puñar ācchā-dakatvena. VS. pp. 52-3.

13 samāsoktau cāropamāṇasya prakṛto-payuktatvam. prakṛta-siddhyartham evāprakṛta-sya āksepāt. āropamāṇamapi tatra prakṛtā-vaccheda-katvena sthitam na puñar ācchā-dakatvena. VS. pp. 52-3.

14 upodharagena vilolatārakam tathā grhītam śāśina niśāmekham / yathā samastam timirāmśukam tathā purdpi rāgād galitam na lakṣitam // AS. p. 101. This verse is also quoted by Anandavardhana as an illustration of Samāsokti. Vide DL. p. 201.
Parināma both the prakṛta and the aprakṛta are mentioned in words, and because of identity one is transformed into the other.\textsuperscript{15}

(d) Unique feature of Parināma: Showing the distinction\textsuperscript{16} between propriety (aucitya) and utility (upayogitva), Jayaratha remarks that the utility of the aprakṛta is the unique feature in Parināma, and in other figures like Upamā, Utpreksā and Rūpaka there is just only propriety of the aprakṛta and not utility.\textsuperscript{17} Ruyyaka, Jayaratha continues, clearly shows his awareness of the distinction existing between propriety and utility while distinguishing Lāṭānuprāsa from Ananvaya.\textsuperscript{18} Jayaratha also criticises those who regard the utility of the aprakṛta in other figures, and it is, in his opinion, is due to their inability to understand the difference lying between propriety and utility.\textsuperscript{19} As the prakṛta cannot be competent to accomplish the

\textsuperscript{15}kevalaṁ tatra (samāsoktau) viñyasyaiva prayogah. viṣayiṇe gamyamānatvāt. iha (parināme) tu dvayaḥ apiyabhidhānam tādāmyāt tayoḥ pariṇāmitvām. AS. p. 52.

\textsuperscript{16}aucityam hi siddhasya sataḥ prakṛtārtho-palambhakaṁ bhavati. upayogah punah siddhāveva prakṛtārtho-hetutām bhajate ityanayor mahān bhedaḥ. VS. p. 52.

\textsuperscript{17}evam atra prakaraṇo-payogitvābhavād ityā-ropyaṁ añgaṁśyopayoga iti cānvaya-vyatirekābhhyām prakṛto-payogitvasyā-sādhāraṇatvām darśitam. asādhāraḥ-natvasya hi dharmasya tattva-vyavasthāpakaṁ vaktāvādakatvām lakṣaṇatvām. Ibid, p. 51.

\textsuperscript{18}ananvaye ca sabdaikyam aucityād ānuṣaṅgikam / asmiṁstām lāṭānuprāse sākṣādeva prayojakam // ityatraikāsayaiva sabdaikasya-aucitya-payogābhyyāṁ bheda uktāḥ. Ibid, p. 52.

\textsuperscript{19}atacāucitya-payogayor-bhedam ajānadbhiḥ sarvatraiva prakṛto-payogitvām anyair-yaduktaṁ tadayuktām. Ibid, p. 52.
contextual purpose without the attribution of the behaviour of the aprakṛta to it, the usefulness of the aprakṛta to the prakṛta for the contextual purpose is the essential and unique feature of Parināma. Therefore, the special charm that consists in the utility of the aprakṛta for the contextual purpose justifies us in accepting Parināma to be counted as an independent poetic figure.

Though the prakṛta in Parināma is transformed into the aprakṛta, yet the prakṛta does not lose its original form, for if the prakṛta is not seen because of transformation, then it is not possible for us to ascertain that the prakṛta accomplishes the contextual purpose. So the retaining of form (rūpa) is necessary for the prakṛta, but the prakṛta assumes only the behaviour of the aprakṛta.

(e) The figure Parināma is distinct from Parināma of Sākhya:

Apprehending a question that the figure Parināma is not distinct from Parināma recognised in the Sāmkhya system of philosophy, where also Parināma is recognised, and it is said to occur when a thing leaving aside its own quality assumes the quality of another, although it does not lose its original form, Ruuyyaka points out that the figure Parināma is distinct

---


21 jahad-dharmantaram pūrvam upādatte yadā hyayam / tattvād-apracyuto dharmī pariṇāmaḥ sa ucyate // Quoted in VS. p. 52.
from Parināma recognised in the Saṃkhya philosophy, because in the figure Parināma the aprakṛta becomes useful to the prakṛta for the contextual purpose; while Parināma of the Saṃkhya philosophy does not possess such special charm.

(f) Varieties of Parināma: Ruyyaka admits two varieties of Parināma according to the prakṛta and the aprakṛta remain with or without apposition, i.e. samānādhikaraṇa and vyadhikaraṇa. The verse 'tīrtva bhūteśa-mauli' etc. mentioned above illustrates the first variety where the prakṛta maitri and the aprakṛta ātara are in the same case. The second variety is illustrated in the verse:

atha paktrimatām upeyibadbhiḥ
sarasair-vakrapathāśritair vacobhiḥ /
kṣitibhartur upāyanām cakāra
prathamam tatparatas turamgamādyaiḥ //

This verse describes that a person willing to call at the king made the present to him in the form of speech. A person going to visit the king generally takes present along with him, but here the person concerned gave the speech to the king. The speech in its own nature cannot accomplish the purpose of calling at the king, so the present superimposes its qualities on the speech, which in its turn passing over into the qualities of the present accomplishes the purpose of calling at the


23 AS. p. 53.
king.

So the present is useful to the speech in helping it in accomplishing the contextual purpose. Here the prakṛta (vaccabhiḥ) and the aprakṛta (upāyanan) are given in different cases.

(g) Earlier Writers' attitude towards Parināma: The predecessors of Ruyyyaka do not mention parināma as a poetic figure. In Udbhata's illustration of Samasta-rūpaka the peculiar trait of prakṛtopayogitva is noticed. It appears, therefore, that the earlier writers do not admit prakṛtopoyogitva to be an important differentia. Nāgēśa, the follower of Mammaṭa, rejects the claim of Parināma to be counted as a distinct poetic figure, for he thinks that the prakṛtopayogitva does not contribute any special charm to expression and the element of charm in Parināma is not separate from that of Rūpaka.

(h) Ruyyyaka's influence on later Writers: The later writers, however, extend their recognition to Ruyyyaka's claim

---

24 rājasamghaṭane tūpāyanam ucitam. taccātra vacorūpam iti vacasām vyadhikaranopāyanarūpatvena parināmaḥ.  
Ibid, p. 53.

25 jyotnāmbunendu-kumbhena tārā-kusuma śāritam / kramaśo rātri-kanyābhīr-vyomodyānam asicyata // KLSS. p. 269

26 yattu āropyaṃño yatra viṣayātmatayaiva prakṛta-kāryopayogī na svātamtryena sa parināmah. atra ca viṣayābhedaḥ āropyaṃne upayuyyate. rūpake tu naivam iti viṣeṣah. 'vadanendunā tanvī smara-tāpam vilumpati' ityādi udāharaṇam. atra hi smara-tāpa-māṣana-sāmarthyaṁ mukhāḥ-manaivendoḥ. grīṣma-saṃtāpa-hārakatvāt ramaṇīya- 
śobhā-dhāravāc cendur-viṣayatayo-pātta iti daksinātyāḥ. 

---

24 king. So the present is useful to the speech in helping it in accomplishing the contextual purpose. Here the prakṛta (vaccabhiḥ) and the aprakṛta (upāyanan) are given in different cases.

(g) Earlier Writers' attitude towards Parināma: The predecessors of Ruyyyaka do not mention parināma as a poetic figure. In Udbhata's illustration of Samasta-rūpaka the peculiar trait of prakṛtopayogitva is noticed. It appears, therefore, that the earlier writers do not admit prakṛtopayogitva to be an important differentia. Nāgēśa, the follower of Mammaṭa, rejects the claim of Parināma to be counted as a distinct poetic figure, for he thinks that the prakṛtopayogitva does not contribute any special charm to expression and the element of charm in Parināma is not separate from that of Rūpaka.

(h) Ruyyyaka's influence on later Writers: The later writers, however, extend their recognition to Ruyyyaka's claim
of Parināma to be counted as a separate poetic figure and they agree with Ruyyaka on the point that prakṛtopayogitva constitutes the special charm of this figure. But they are not unanimous and divided among themselves into two groups in considering the question whether the prakṛta is transformed into the aprakṛta or the aprakṛta is transformed into the prakṛta. Hence, they interpret Ruyyaka's definition of Parināma in various ways. The first group maintains that the prakṛta is transformed into the aprakṛta in Parināma, while the second group maintains that the aprakṛta is transformed into the prakṛta. The first group, we have just seen, is represented by Ruyyaka himself, and he is followed by Śobhākara, Vidyādhara and his commentator Mallinātha, Vidyanātha and his commentator Kumarasvāmin. The second group is represented by writers like Vidyānātha, Appaya Dīkṣita and Jagannātha. Śobhākara interprets the word prakṛtopayogitva


29 yatra prakṛtakāryo-payogitayā viṣayo viṣayyatmanā pariṇamatī sa pariṇāma-laṁkāraḥ. TR. p. 233.

30 āropyaṁāṇasya-āropaviśayatmatayā sthitam / prakṛtasyo-payogitve pariṇāma udāhṛtaḥ // PRD. p. 452.

31 atah prakṛtam anapaghata-svarūpam evā-ropyaṁāṇatmanā pariṇamatī pariṇāma-laṁkāra ityarthah. RN. p. 452.

32 āropyaṁāṇasya-āropaviśayatmatayā pariṇamanat pariṇāmah. SD.25.


34 viṣayī yatra viṣayatmatayaiva prakṛto-payogī na svātantryena sa pariṇāmaḥ. RG. p. 329.
as 'prakṛte prastāve upayogitva', and says that action pertaining to the aprakṛta is accomplished by the prakṛta. Vidyādhara analyses prakṛtopayoga as prakṛta-kāryopayoga. Vidyānātha is not very clear on this point, but he appears to accept prakṛtopayoga as prakaraṇārtha.

Appaya Dīkṣita interprets the word prakṛtopayogitva in the sense of prakṛta-kāryopayogitva, and accepts Pariṇāma in the cases where the aprakṛta serves the contextual action in the form of prakṛta and, according to him, when the aprakṛta in its own nature cannot serve the contextual action, but being identified with the prakṛta serves the contextual action, there is Pariṇāma. He cites the same verse 'tīrtvā bhūtesa' etc. with the reading upakṛtavān instead of upahṛtavān, and prakṛta-kārya, according to him, is Guhopakāraka. He has explained this verse as satisfying his own definition.  

(i) Criticism of Ruṇyaka’s view by Appaya Dīkṣita and Jagannātha:

Appaya Dīkṣita criticises Ruṇyaka’s failure of giving an accurate definition and exposition of Pariṇāma, and attempts to show that Ruṇyaka’s definition of Pariṇāma is vitiated by the fallacy of ativyāpti in the figures Rūpaka, Bhrāntimāna, Apaṃghnuta, Atiśayokti and Anumāna, and it is vitiated by the fallacy of avyāpti in the figures Dṛṣṭānta and Saṃkīrṇa Pariṇāma.

______________________________


Jagannātha also passes the same remark with regard to Ruuyaka's view on Parināma. He argues if the prakṛtopayoga in Ruuyaka's definition be taken in the sense of prakṛta-kārye upayoga, then the definition given in the Alamkārasarvasva would be vitiated by the fallacy of too wide definition, because the verse 'dāse kṛtagasi' etc. cited in the Alamkārasarvasva as an illustration of Rūpaka will be treated as illustrating Parināma, for here the prakṛta pulakāṅkura is identified with the aprakṛta kañṭaka so that it can accomplish the action of pāda-khedana; and if the prakṛtopayoga be taken in the sense that the aprakṛta being identified with the prakṛta serves the purpose, then the definition of Parināma given by Ruuyaka will be regarded to be vitiated by the fallacy of impossibility, for in the verse 'atha paktrimatām' etc., the aprakṛta upāyana can by itself serve the purpose of calling at the king, and it need not be identified with the prakṛta vacabhiḥ.39

(j) A critical assessment of Ruuyaka's view: But Ruuyaka seems to take the word prakṛtopayogitva neither in the sense 'prakṛta kārye upayoga', nor does he admit that the aprakṛta being transformed into the prakṛta serves the purpose. But he appears to take prakṛtopayogitva in the sense that the aprakṛta is useful to the prakṛta for the contextual purpose.

38 The complete verse is -

dāse kṛtagasi bhavatyucitah prabhūpām
pādaprahaṛa iti śundari naṃsi dūye //
udyat-kaṭhora-pulakāṅkura-kañṭakāgraı̄r
yat khidyate tava padam naṃ sā vyathā me // AS. p.41.
39 RG. pp. 332-34.
The contextual purpose may be expressed or implied. Thus, in the verse dāse kṛṭāgasi etc. the piercing of the foot brought about by the thorn (aprakṛta) is, in the view of Ruṣyaka, not a contextual purpose, but the contextual purpose is the removal of the wounded pride of a lady. Therefore, Viśvanātha rightly says that it is not an illustration of Pariṇāma but that of Rūpaka.\(^4\) The superimposition of kaṇṭaka on the pulakāṁkura intensifies the kheda and thereby serves to enhance the charm of prakṛta. Therefore, we see that Ruṣyaka’s definition of Pariṇāma is not vitiated by the fallacy of ativyāpti. Nor can we find the fallacy of impossibility in Ruṣyaka’s definition, for in the verse 'atha paktrimatām' etc. the prakṛta is speech which by itself cannot serve the purpose of calling at the king. So the aprakṛta (upāyana) by superimposing its qualities on the prakṛta (vacas) becomes useful to the latter for accomplishing the purpose of calling at the king.

Further, the poet always intends to show the relation of the prakṛta with the prakaraṇārtha, because he always wants to justify his subject of description (prakṛta); as the subject of description in its own nature cannot be connected with the contextual purpose or prakaraṇārtha, the poet brings another thing i.e. the aprakṛta for the aid of his prakṛta, and thus, the aprakṛta is useful for the prakṛta for accomplishing a contextual purpose.

Moreover, in the regular system of classification of poetic figures adopted by Ruyyaka and followed by most of the later writers, the figures from Rūpaka to Atiśayokti form a separate class, and in the figures of this class we find a gradual change of the prakṛta to the aprakṛta. As the figure Pariṇāma comes after Rūpaka, it is a direct corollary that the prakṛta changes into the aprakṛta and not the aprakṛta into the prakṛta. Again, the proposition, that the aprakṛta in its own nature cannot accomplish the contextual action but being identified with the prakṛta accomplishes it, implies that the prakṛta in its own nature can accomplish the contextual action. When the prakṛta in its own nature can accomplish the contextual action then why the poet unnecessarily brings the aprakṛta for helping the prakṛta. If it be accepted that the aprakṛta is brought by the poet only for enhancing the beauty of the prakṛta, then in that case it will not be a case of Pariṇāma but it would be regarded as a case of Rūpaka. So it is logical and reasonable to hold that the prakṛta undergoes transformation in to the aprakṛta.

2. Ullekha:

(a) Definition of Ullekha and its analysis: Ullekha is the next poetic figure introduced by Ruyyaka for the first time. This figure consists in the apprehension of an object in various ways owing to different factors. The object of description in this figure must have manifold qualities which

\[41\] Vide Supra, Chap. IV.

\[42\] ekasyāpi nimittavaśād anekadhā grahaṇam Ullekhaḥ. AS. p. 58.
facilitate the perceiver or perceivers to apprehend one and the same thing in different ways. As the manifold qualities of an object are represented in this figure, the name Ullekha given to this figure is appropriate.\(^43\) The apprehension of a thing in diverse ways is possible because of varied attitude such as taste, purpose and intelligence of the perceiver or perceivers. In order to show his view backed by sound authority, the learned author of the Alamkārasarvasva quotes a dictum\(^44\) from the Pratyabhijñā system of philosophy,\(^45\) which states that apprehension of one and the same thing arisen from the consideration of the various attitudes according to taste, purpose and intelligence of the perceivers. Ruuyaka says that these three may be applied jointly or separately.\(^46\)

The figure Ullekha is illustrated in the passage -

'yastapavanam iti munibhiḥ, kāmāyatanam iti veśyābhhiḥ, samgīta-sāleti lāsakaiḥ etc.'\(^47\) Here the country called Śrīkāntha-janapada is one, but is apprehended as a sacred grove by the ascetics, a temple of love by the courtesans, a music hall by the dancers from their taste and purpose.

---

\(^43\) yatraikam vastvanekadhā gṛhyate sa rūpayāhulgo-


\(^44\) yathāruṣci yathārthitvam yathā-vyutpati bhidyate /

abhāsopyarthā ekasmin-anusamdhaṇa-sādhite //

AS. p. 59.

\(^45\) uktam iti Śrīpratyabhijñāyām. VS. p. 59.

\(^46\) rucyarthitvā-vyutpattayaḥ ca prāyasāḥ samasta-vyastā
yojayitum sākyan-te. AS. p. 59.

\(^47\) HC. pp. 43-4.
(b) Ullekha and other figures: The figure Ullekha is not mentioned by writers earlier than Ruyyaka. But from Ruyyaka's treatment of this figure it appears that the earlier authorities consider that the figure Ullekha is not found by itself, but according to them, it is always associated with some other figure like Rūpaka, Bhrāntimān, Atisayokti, Śleṣa etc. In his eagerness to establish the distinct status of the figure Ullekha, Ruyyaka contradistinguishes Ullekha from these figures.

(c) Distinction of Ullekha from Rupaka: In Rupaka, the idea of identity between the two things is not spontaneous, but the identity is brought about by a conscious act of volition, because the perceiver is always conscious of the distinction between the two things. As in the example 'mukha-candra' where the perceiver is conscious of the distinction between the face and the moon, but their identity is brought about by the conscious act of volition; while in Ullekha the knowledge of identity

48 In Bhoja's SKA. (p.172) the name Ullekha as a ubhayā- lamkāra is found in between Satulyagītā and Sasohokti. Dr.V.Raghavan holds in his BSP. (p.380) that Bhoja regarded Ullekha to be an ubhayālamkāra. But we find that in the discussion proper Bhoja defines and illustrates the figure Leśa (SK. IV.58, p. 205) in between the two figures mentioned above. Bhoja does not define Ullekha as a poetic figure, but Ullekha found in the SKA. appears to be a misprint for Leśa.

49 Daṇḍin in his KD.(II.85) illustrates viruddharupaka with the verse - 'gāmbhīryeṇa samudro'si gauravenāsi parvatah' etc. which is cited by Viśvanātha as an illustration of Viṣaya-bhedā Ullekha. Commenting on this verse under the KD, Premacandra says - viśvanāthādayastu ekaśya prastutasya gāmbhīryādviṣayabhedāne anekadhollekhād ullekhamāṃkāro'yan ityāhuh' (MP. p.140). Daṇḍin, therefore, does not recognise the special feature that constitutes the figure Ullekha.
of the two things is spontaneous, as the perceivers are not 
conscious of the distinction between two things. In the exam-
ple 'yastapavanam' etc. the perceivers are not conscious of the 
distinction between Srikanthajanapada and tapovana etc. but 
knowledge of identity between the two is spontaneous to them. 
Ruyyaka admits that the figure Ullekha is found associated with 
Rupaka, and that case is to be considered as commixture of 
Rupaka and Ullekha, but the commixture of Rupaka and Ullekha 
does not obliterate the separate existence of Ullekha, because 
commixture is admitted of two or more figures. If Ullekha is 
not accepted as a separate figure then how can it be commixed 
with Rupaka? Hence, it is proper to admit Ullekha as a separate 
figure.

(d) Distinction of Ullekha from Bhrantimān: Though the 
knowledge of identity between two things is spontaneous and as 
such requires no aid of volition in Bhrantimān, yet the figure 
Ullekha cannot be included in Bhrantimān, because in Bhrantimān 
the identity of two things is caused by the illusion of the per-
severe and in it one thing is not apprehended in different ways 
from difference of attitudes of the perceiver; while in Ullekha

50 janapade hi tapvanatvādayo dharmā nisargata eva santi, 
itarathā nollekha rūpakatvā-patteḥ. SJ. p. 59.

51 yadatra vastutas-tadrūpatāyāḥ sambhavah. yatra tu 
rūpakam vyavasthitam tatra ced iyam api bhāṅgih 
sambhāvini tat-samkaro'stu. na tvetāvata-syābhāvah 
sakyate vaktum. tatasca na doṣoḥ kaścit. AS. p.60. 
na kevalam anygāmāra-viviktoyam evāsya viṣayo 
yavadyatrāpi rūpakālamkāra-yogo'sti tatrāpyaḥ 
sambhavati. VS. p. 60.
the knowledge of identity between two things is not based on the illusion of the perceivers, but the thing is really so to them. Besides, the apprehension of an object in different ways through the attitudes of the perceivers is an extra element in Ullekha, for in the example of Ullekha given above, the perceivers are not in illusion but they apprehend the same Śrīkaṇṭhajananapada in different ways from their difference of attitudes. Even if this figure is found in combination with the figure Bhantiman, there is possibility of a commixture of Ullekha and Bhantiman, even in that case the need of recognising Ullekha as a distinct figure is not obviated for the reason given above.

(e) Distinction of Ullekha from Atiṣayokti: Although one thing is poetically stated to be different though there is, in reality, no difference in the Abhede bheda type of Atisayokti, as in the example 'maggia-laddhammi' etc. where the same face of the lady-love is stated to be different for different kinds of kissing, yet the figure Ullekha cannot be included in this type of Atiṣayokti, because difference of perceivers is not essential and as such does not impart any charm to Atiṣayokti.

---

52 anekadhā-grhaṇākhyasyā-pūrvaṇyā-tiṣayasyā-bhāvāt. tad dhētukatvāc-casyaṃkarasya. AS. p.61. na na anekadhā-grhaṇarūpaṃ vaicitram bhrāntimati lākṣaṇam. iha tu lākṣaṇam eva. SJ. p.60.


54 grahīṭr-bhedākhyena viṣaya-vibhāgenā-nekadhātvo-ṭtāṅkanāt tasya ca vicchittyantara-rūpavāt sarvathā nāśyāntarabhāvah śākyakriya iti niṣcayaḥ. AS. p. 61. na hyatiṣayoktau grahīṭr-bhedopayogah. atra punar upayoga iti nātiṣayoktimatram etat. SJ. p.60.
while in Ullekha difference of perseveres is essential, as in the example ‘yastapavanam iti’ etc. one thing is apprehended by different perseveres in different ways.

(f) Special feature of Ullekha: Therefore, an apprehension of an object in different ways by different perseveres constitutes the special charm in Ullekha, which differentiates it from other figures.

Though the figure Ullekha is found in combination with other figures as in the example of Ullekha given above, yet a pure illustration of this figure is not wanting in poetry, as in the verse ‘nara ano iti’ etc. where the Lord is one but He is apprehended as Nārāyaṇa, Śrīballabha etc. by old agers, by young girls etc. respectively because of their difference of attitudes.

Sometimes one and the same thing is described in different ways on account of the difference of viṣaya, although there are not many perseveres. This is illustrated in the passage ‘gururvacasi, pṛthurāsi, arjuna yaśasi’ etc. Here the words guru, pṛthu, arjuna etc. are paronomistic and the figure Ullekha is based on Śleśa, but the charm of this passage lies not on Śleśa, but in the description of one person (Puspabhūti) in different ways. Even if the view that ‘Śleśa is stronger than and thus dispelling the notion of the accompanying figure’ be accepted, then the existence of Ullekha as a separate figure

55 nārāyaṇa iti pariṇata-vayobhiḥ
dīr-aśa iti tarunibhiḥ/
badbhūḥ punah kautūhalena
evameva satyāpitah /// (Sanskrit) AS. p. 61.

56 anekadhatva-nimittam tu vicchittyin-taram atra dr̥yate. 
Ibid, 61.
cannot be denied, because the figure whose beauty is dispelled by Śleṣa should be accepted as a separate figure. Though the figure Ullekha even being associated with Śleṣa from which it derives its charm, yet there are some cases where there is no Śleṣa, there is Ullekha.

Thus Ruyyaka rules out the notion that the figure Ullekha is not found by itself, but it is always associated with some other figures from which it derives its charm. Thus, the special charm that constitutes this figure being the apprehension of an object in different ways justifies us in regarding Ullekha as an independent figure.

(g) Varieties of Ullekha: Ruyyaka speaks of the two varieties of this figure according to the basis of the difference of perseveres and of the difference of objects.

(h) Ruyyaka's influence on later Writers: From what we have discussed, we find that Ruyyaka is very clear in his definition and exposition of this figure. The later writers extend recognition to this figure and they follow Ruyyaka almost in verbatim in making their definitions and exposition of this figure.

---

57 ṛtāpi sva∪pēnā-vidyamānasya bādhā-sambhavād badha evollekha-sadbhāve līṃgam. SJ. p.61.
58 yadevaṃ-vidhe viśaya śleṣābhāve/pi vicchitti-sadbhāvah. tasmād evam adāvullekha eva śreyān. AS. p.62.
Nāgasā and Viśvesvara do not admit Ullekha to be considered as a separate figure, but they attempt to include it in the figure Aṭisāyokti. But Ruyyaka's exposition of this figure which is accepted by later writers, clearly shows that the figure Ullekha cannot be subsumed in any other figure.

3. Vicitra.

(a) Definition if Vicitra and its analysis: The next poetic figure to receive recognition for the first time at the hand of Ruyyaka is Vicitra which is based on incongruity (virodha). The figure Vicitra occurs when an effort made (by a person) with a view to achieving a result apposed to the cause.

An effort is generally made by a person to obtain by means of a particular act a result follows from that act, but when an effort is made by a person with a view to obtaining a result which is directly opposite to what generally follows from that act, there is apprehension of wonder, which constitutes the special charm of this figure.

The figure Vicitra is illustrated in the verse 'unnatyai namati prabhum' etc. One who desires elevation (unnati) generally

---

61 'gurur-vacasya-rjuno'yam kīrtau bhiṣmaḥ śārāsane' ityātrāpiyam eva (atiśayoktireva). atra śleṣa-saṃkīrhṇeyam ityanyat. etenedṛṣesu viṣayesu ullekha-laṃkāro'yam atirikta iti keśāmcit uktiḥ parāsta. UD. p. 87.
62 etaddhi granthakṛtaivā-bhinavatvenoktam. VS. p.169.
goes up, but a servant wishing for elevation goes down (on his knees before his master). This is exactly the reverse of what he wishes and causes wonder to us.

(b) Earlier writers' attitude towards Vicitra: The writers earlier than Ruuyaka do not mention Vicitra as a poetic figure. Rudraṭa and following him Mammaṭa and Ruuyaka admit Viṣama as a poetic figure, but Rudraṭa and Mammaṭa appear to think that special feature of Vicitra is not distinct from that of Viṣma.

(c) Distinction of Vicitra from Viṣama (1): Thus apprehending an objection that the figure Vicitra cannot be considered to be an independent figure, but can be included in the first variety of Viṣama, where also the effect does not follow the cause, Ruuyaka points out that, in Vicitra, the apprehension of the denial of the cause is followed by the understanding of the effect being opposed to the cause, while in the first variety of Viṣama the apprehension of the effect being opposed to the cause is followed by the understanding of the denial of the cause. In the example 'unnatyai namati prabhūm' what we first understand is that, bowing down cannot be the cause of becoming elevated, and then we understand that elevation cannot be the effect of bowing down, being opposed to it, while in the example of Viṣama 'tamaḷanīlā saradindu pāṇḍu yasas-trilokābharanam prasūte' what we first apprehend is that brightness is an effect opposed to the cause and then we apprehend that blue sword cannot be the cause of bright fame.  

Jayaratha

66 Vidyādhāra (EV.p.306) and Mallinātha (TR.p.307) explain Ruuyaka's view very clearly.
points out that though the distinction between the figures Viṣama and Vicitra is very clear, inasmuch as in Viṣama an opposite effect is produced in its own accord, while in Vicitra, an effort is made by some person to produce the opposite result, yet the nuance between these two figures put forward by the author has strengthened his position to regard Vicitra to be an independent poetic figure.67

(d) Ruyyaka's influence on later writers: Ruyyaka's new poetic figure Vicitra has been accepted by all later writers without any hesitation. The nature of this figure appears to have been fixed in the hand of Ruyyaka, for no much deviation from the Alamkārasarvasva in the definition and exposition of this figure is noticeable in later speculation.

Nāgēśa, however, does not admit Vicitra to be considered as a separate figure. He wants to include it in the figure Viṣama and says that the vaiṣamya-pratīti in Vicitra is not distinct from that of Viṣama.69 As the general principle of Alamkāra demands a separate charm of a special type of each and every poetic figure, Ruyyaka appears to hold that difference of charm is caused in the figures from the difference of apprehension.

67 yadyapi viṣame virūpasya kāryasya svayam evo-tpattir- 

iha ca tanniśpattaye prayatna iti sthito'pyanayoh

sphuṭo bhedas-tathāpi granthaṅrū Viṣesā-paripoṣanā-

yaiva sūksmekṣikā-gamyo bheda'yaṃ uktaḥ. VS.p. 169.

68 Jayadeva, CL. V.82; Vidyādhara, EV. p.306; Vidyānātha,

PRD. p.512, Viṣvanātha, SD. p.51; Appaya Dīkṣita, KVL.


69 evam iṣṭa-siddhyartham-iṣṭaiśīṇā kriyāmānam iṣṭa-

vīparīta-yatācārānam api viṣamaṃ eva...vācyā-pratīti-

velīyam yoga-vaiṣamya-pratītah. etanātra vicitrālamkāraḥ

pṛthagityapāstam. UD. p. 181.
As the apprehension of the relation of the cause and the effect in Vicitra is different from that of Viṣama, it is reasonable to accept Vicitra to be counted as an independent poetic figure.

4. Vikalpa.

(a) Definition of Vikalpa and its analysis: The next poetic figure introduced in the Alampāraśārvasva is Vikalpa. Ruyyaka himself, and he is supported by Jayaratha, claims that this figure is for the first time introduced in the Alampāraśārvasva. This figure is based on Tarka-nyāya group.

The figure Vikalpa consists in the representation of the charming opposition between two objects of equal force. In this figure two opposite objects of equal marks and as such of equal force are described as existing in one place, but as the two objects are opposed to each other, they are not to be resorted to at the same time; as a result any one of the two alternatives is to be resorted to. Hence the name Vikalpa given to this figure is appropriate.

Ruyyaka maintains that the strikingness that constitutes this figure consists in its involving an implied comparison.

---


71 tylya-bala-virodho vikalpaḥ. AS. p. 198.

72 viruddhayos-tulya-pramāṇa-viṣiṣṭatvāt tulya-balayor ekatra yugaprat viruddhatvād eva yaugapadyā- sambhāve vikalpaḥ. Ibid. p. 198.

between the two objects described. The opposition between the two objects, according to Ruuyaka may be real or may be brought about by the imagination of the poet.

As an illustration of the figure Vikalpa Ruuyaka quotes the passage 'namantu ārāmśi dhanūṃśi vā karaṇapūri-kriyantāṃ ajñī: mauro vā' etc. from Bāga's Harṣacarita. Now bending of the heads and that of the bows are respectively the marks of peace and war. It is possible for a rival king to have recourse to both peace and war, but as there is opposition between the two, it is impossible for a rival king to have recourse to both peace and war at the same time. Hence the opposition between the two terminates in leading him to resort to any one of the two possible alternatives. In this example, the implied comparison between peace and war is based on their common property of bending (namana) which is common both to the heads and the bows.

Ruuyaka points out that there is a special charm in this figure when the resemblance is based on Śleṣa. The line 'yuṣmākam kurutāṁ bhavārti-śamanāṁ netre tanur vā hareḥ' illustrates Vikalpa based on Śleṣa. Here the eyes and the body of Great Hari are described to have equal force as they are capable of effecting the cure of worldly distress. The
implied resemblance between the eyes and the body is based on Śleṣa, inasmuch as the properties such as pranāyinī, spardhini, tāvatī become common both to the eyes and the body, as they are capable of double constructions. Ruṣyaka points out that the particle 'vā' in the example does not denote 'and' (conjunction) but 'or' (alternative). Replying to an objection that there is no Vikalpa in this verse as there is no opposition between the eyes and the body, Ruṣyaka says that separate mention of the eyes, although they are parts of body, conveys the idea of their rivaling with the body in destroying the worldly distress, otherwise separate mention of the eyes does not serve any purpose. Thereby Ruṣyaka regards that the opposition between two things brought about by the imagination of the poet may also constitute this figure.

(b) Earlier writers' attitude towards Vikalpa: The earlier writers have not mentioned Vikalpa to be a poetic figure. They appear to hold, as Nāgėśa observes that the figure is not distinct from the figure Sandeha, but from Ruṣyaka's statement it appears that the earlier writers do not find any distinct charm in that turn of expression and want to include Vikalpa under Samuccaya.

79 linga-Śleṣasya vacana-Śleṣasya cātra drṣteḥ. AS. p.200. (They are neuter duels or feminine singulares, hence there is Śleṣa in gender and number).


82 UD. p. 44.

(c) Distinction of Vikalpa from Samdeha and Samuccaya:

But the figure Vikalpa cannot be included in the figure Samdeha or Samuccaya. In Vikalpa there is no relation of upamana and upameya of the two things described, for in the example 'namantu sramsi dhanumsi va' there is no relation of upamana and upameya between the heads and the bows, for we cannot say that head is upameya and bow is upamana or vice versa. Here opposition between two things is represented, but in Samdeha we get the relation of upamana and upameya between the two objects. It cannot be said that Vikalpa is included in Samuccaya, for Ruyyaka shows that the figure Vikalpa is opposite to Samuccaya. In Samuccaya two things are found in one place at the same time and they are related through conjunction; while in Vikalpa two things cannot be resorted to at the same time as there is opposition between them. 84

(d) Ruyyaka's influence on later writers: The later writers, however, acknowledge Ruyyaka's claim that Vikalpa should be considered as an independent figure. 85 Sobhakara accepts Ruyyaka's view however with slight modification. Ruyyaka does not explicitly speak of the paksik-prapti in Vikalpa, but Sobhakara clarifies Ruyyaka by explicitly stating that one of the two alternatives is resorted to in Vikalpa. 86

---

84 sumuccaye dvayor api yugapad-avasthānam iha tvanyatheyasya tat-pratipakṣa-bhūtatvam. VS. p.200.
does not admit implied resemblance between the two things described to be essential in Vikalpa, but Jayaratha and Jagannātha criticise those who do not regard implied resemblance between the two things described. They maintain that option between two things devoid of implied resemblance should be considered as option only and not a poetic figure.

(e) Jagannātha's and Nāgēsa's criticism on Ruyyaka's View:

Jagannātha, however, does not agree with Ruyyaka on the point that the opposition between the two objects may be imaginary, but, according to him, the opposition between the two objects must be real. Hence he does not admit Vikalpa in the verse 'bhakti-prahva-vilokana' etc, but according to him the figure in the verse is upamā, for the particle 'vā' in 'netre tanur vā hareḥ' is used here in the sense of 'iva'. But Ruyyaka's explanation of the figure in this verse is not based on weak reasoning. However, Ruyyaka and Jagannatha consider the figure in the verse from different angles. Nāgēsa attempts to reject the figure Vikalpa on the ground that it does not enhance the charm.

87 In the verse -

nindantu nīti-nipūpā yadi vā stuvantu / lakṣmīh parāpatatu gacchatu vā yatheṣṭam //
adyai vā marañam astu yugāntare vā / nyāyyāt pathaḥ pravicalanti padaṃ na dhīrāḥ //
Sōbhākara accepts the figure Vikalpa.


to the subject of description, as the general definition of Alamkāra given by Mammaṭa is not applicable to it. 90

(f) Critical assessment of Ruuyaka's view: But according to Ruuyaka, the real vikalpa is, of course, unpoetical, and the implied resemblance between the two things described enhances the charm which makes the unpoetical vikalpa in to poetic figure. Rightly does Dr. S. K. De remarks "These unpoetical figures, however, may be strengthened by another figure-element subser­vent to them. The figure Vikalpa for instance...has been re ected by the followers of Mammata (of. Uddyota p. 29) but Ruuyaka maintains that the strikingness which constitutes this figure in its involving an upama...concerning such cases in which it is necessary to have another figure-element added to procure a poetic figure, that whose charm is produced and that which produces the charm are to be considered separate alamkaras..." 91 Therefore, the separate existence of Vikalpa cannot be denied, for the separate charm in it is not wanting.

Ruuyaka's achievement:

Thus, we have seen that Ruuyaka has made a detailed discussion of these new poetic figures and he has ably drawn the line of demarcation of the scope of these figures from their allied ones and their mutual overlapping, and he has achieved a considerable success in establishing the existence of these poetic figure introduced by him.

90 UD. p. 44.
91 VJ. Introduction, p. lvi.