Ruyyaka accepts strikingness or special charm brought about by the productive imagination of the poet as the essence of a poetic figure. This strikingness or special charm is taken up as the basis upon which the independent status of a poetic figure or its difference from another is examined by him. According to Ruyyaka, a figure which does not involve strikingness cannot attain the status of a poetic figure; similarly, a poetic figure, the charm of which is not distinct from that of another, should not be considered as an independent poetic figure.

Though Ruyyaka derives much material for his work from his predecessors, he does not follow them blindly. He extends recognition only those figures of earlier writers which involve strikingness, but certain figures found in earlier works are omitted by him on the ground that they do not possess strikingness essential for a poetic figure. Moreover, certain figures introduced by earlier writers are not separately dealt with by him in so far as the distinction of charm required for an independent poetic figure is wanting in them, and as such they do not have independent status. These figures are, as a matter of fact, included in those recognised by Ruyyaka. The figures which are tacitly omitted by Ruyyaka in the Alamkārasarvasva are enumerated here.
Upamārūpaka — Bhamaha defines and illustrates an independent figure named Upamārūpaka. This figure occurs when the upameya is apprehended as being identified with the upamāna. As an illustration of this figure Bhamaha cites the verse:

```
samagra-gaganāyāma-mānadaṇḍo rathāṅginah /
pādo jayati siddhasrī-mukhendu-navadarpāṇah //
```

Here the superimposition of the sky on the extension is the cause of identifying the foot with the measuring-rod, and the superimposition of the face on the moon becomes the cause of identifying the foot with the fresh mirror. This verse is capable of being explained as an illustration of Paramparita-rūpaka. This analysis of the illustration of Bhamaha’s Upamārūpaka shows that it does not involve separate charm from that of Rūpaka. Daṇḍin, however, accepts Upamā-rūpaka as a variety of Rūpaka, but it is different in substance from the same figure of Bhamaha, for he understands that similarity between upamāna and upameya constitutes this figure.

Vāmana accepts Upamārūpaka, but according to him, it is a kind of Samsṛṣṭi. Vāmana’s illustrative verse is capable of being explained as an illustration of Paramparita-rūpaka. Hence, Gopendra Tripurahara, the commentator on Vāmana remarks that Upamārūpaka is considered by others as a Paramparita-rupaka. Here the commentator alludes to Mammata who quotes

```
upamānena tadbhāvam-upameyasya sādhayat /
yam vadaty-upamām-etad upamārūpakam yathā // KL.III.35.
```

1 upamānena tadbhāvam-upameyasya sādhayat / yam vadaty-upamām-etad upamārūpakam yathā // KL.III.35.
2 KD. II. 88 & 358.
4 niravadhi ca nirāśrayam ca yasya sthitam-anivartita-kautuka-prapañcam / prathama iha bhavān sa kūrma-mūrtir-jayati caturdaśa-lokaballī-kandā. //
5 Kām. p. 187.
Vāmana's illustrative verse of Upamārūpaka for illustrating Paramparitarūpaka. Since the charm involved in this figure is not separate from that of Rūpaka, the later writers including Ruuyyaka rightly deny the independent existence of this figure.

Utpreksāvayava - Bhāmaha recognises a figure named Utpreksāvayava in which some idea of Utpreksā is found combined with Śleṣa and Rūpaka. As an illustration is this figure Bhāmaha cites the verse:

\[
tulyodayā-vasānatvād gateśtam prati bhāsvati / 
vāsāya vāsaraḥ klānto viśatīva tamo-gṛham //
\]

Here there is Śleṣa in 'astam', Rūpaka in 'tamogṛham' and Utpreksā in viśatīva (Day being an insentient object cannot become the agent of the action, hence Utpreksā lies in attributing 'kartṛtva' to the inanimate Day). As the figures Śleṣa and Rūpaka are subservient to Utpreksā, there is angāṅgibhāva Saṅkara.

Vāmana accepts this figure, but he holds that it is a kind of Samsṛṣṭi. According to him this figure occurs when other figures like Upamā, Rūpaka etc. become subordinate to Utpreksā.

Vāmana's illustrative verse:

6 KP. p. 604.
7 Śliṣṭasya-rthena samyukāḥ kiñcid utpreksāyānvitāḥ / rūpakārthena ca punar utpreksāvayavo yathā // KL.III.47.
8 KLSV. IV. iii. 31.
9 utprekṣā-hetur-utpreksāvayavaḥ. utpreksāyā hetur utpreksāvayavaḥ. avayāva-sābdō hyārambhakām lakṣayati. Ibid, IV.iii. 33.
Angulibhira kesa-samcaya samnigrohaya

Timiram maricibhih

Kudmalikrta-saroja-locanam cumbativa

RajanÌ-mukham ÌaÌ / //

is quoted by Ruyyaka himself for the illustration of aNangibhava-sankara. 10 Daàåî and Bhoja, however, hold that Utprek̄śayava is a variety of Utprek̄śa. 11 Since the charm involved in this figure is not distinct from that of SaNkara, Ruyyaka does not recognise its independent existence.

Samàhita — The figure Samàhita of Bhàmaha and Dandin is different in essence from the same figure of Ruyyaka. Bhàmaha does not define this figure but refers to a work named Rajamitra from where an illustration is quoted. Bhàmaha's verse is:

samàhitam ràjamitre yathà kàsatriya-yositam /
rama-prasaktyai yantiNåm puro'drâyata nàradañh //

The verse says that when Parmàuràma was ready to annihilate the whole Kàsatriya race, the wives of the Kàsatriyas were going to propitiate him, but did not know how Parmàuràma would be propitiated. On the way, by chance, they found Nàrada who suggested them the way for the propitiation of Parmàuràma. 1

From this illustration it appears that Bhàmaha regards Samàhita in the cases where the description of a situation in

10 AS. p. 248.
12 KL.III. 10.
13 Ràjvamśa Sahày, AIV. p. 860.
which the achievements of an object is facilitated by the fortuitous occurrence of some particular circumstances. Daṇḍin’s Samāhita occurs when an act already undertaken by some one is being done by nature through attainment of another cause capable of doing it.\textsuperscript{14} The figure Samāhita of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin appears to be equivalent to the figure Samādhi of Mammaṭa and Ruyyaka.

Vāmana and Udbhāta recognise a figure named Samāhita, but both the authors conceive it something absolutely different from the same figure of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin on the one hand, and from that of Ruyyaka, on the other. The figure Samāhita of Vāmana occurs when the upameya is represented as attaining the form of the upamāna,\textsuperscript{15} i.e. in it the upameya is poetically fancied to be the upamāna. This definition of Vāmana seems to bear a close affinity to the nature of Utpreksā where also a thing of description is poetically fancied to be the upamāna, as it involves a state of suspense with greater bias towards the upamāna. As an illustration of this figure Vāmana cites the verse –

\begin{verbatim}
tanvī megha-jalārdra-pallavatayā
dhautā-dhревā-śrubhiḥ
śūnyeva-bharanaiḥ svakāla-virahād
visrānta-puṣpodgamaḥ /
cintāmaunam ivāśritā madhu-liḥām
śabdair-vinā laksyate
candī mam-avadhūya pādapatitam
jātānutāpeva sā // 16
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{14} kāṇcid ārabhamāṇasaḥ kāryam daivavaśat punah / tat-sādhnā-samāpattir-yā tadāhuḥ samāhitam // KD.II.298.

\textsuperscript{15} yat-sādṛṣyāṃ tat-sampattiḥ samāhitaḥ. yasya vastunāḥ sādṛṣyam grhyate tasya vastunāḥ sampattiḥ samāhitam. KLSV. IV.iii. 29.

\textsuperscript{16} Vikrama, IV. 38.
In this verse the creeper is poetically fancied to be Urvaśī and it involves a state of suspense to Pururavas with a greater bias towards Urvaśī. The analysis of the definition and illustration put forward by Vāmana clearly shows that it is capable of being comprehended in the figure Utpreksā of Ruyyaka.

Udbhata's Samāhita is completely different from the same figure of the earlier writers. Udbhata recognises Samāhita in the cases where the quelling (prasāma) of Rasa, Bhāva, Rasābhāsa and Bhāvābhāsa is delineated as the main content of poetry.17 Udbhata's Samāhita is mutatis mutandis accepted by Ruyyaka.

Āvṛtti - Daṇḍin defines a figure named Āvṛtti which possesses three aspects, viz., repetition of sense, repetition of word and repetition of both word and sense.18 Daṇḍin himself says that Āvṛtti has a close affinity to the figure Dīpaka. Bhoja considers these three aspects of repetition to be the varieties of Dīpaka,19 and he is followed by Appaya Dīkṣita.20 But Āvṛtti is not capable of being included in Dīpaka where, in one and the same sentence, the prastuta and the aprastuta are connected with the same dharma and thus suggesting their mutual similarity, while in Āvṛtti things are not represented as existing in the relation of the prastuta and the aprastuta, nor is there any suggestion of mutual similarity between the two objects.

17 KLSS. IV. 7 (p.360).
18 KD. II. 116.
Later writers refuse to accept Āvṛtti as a poetic figure.
Since the charm essential for a poetic figure is wanting in repetition, Ruyyaka rightly omits this figure in the Alamkāra-sarvasva.

Hetu - Bhāmaha admits Vakrokti as an essential element of a poetic figure and refuses to recognise Hetu, Sūkṣma and Leśa as poetic figures on the ground that they do not involve Vakrokti. 21 Daṇḍin appears to criticise this view of Bhāmaha and declares that they are beautiful ornaments of speech. 22 From Daṇḍin’s treatment of this figure and the illustrations, it appears that he includes Karakahetu and jñāpakahetu in this figure. In the Karakahetu, the cause produces the effect and jñāpakahetu is that in which the cause indicates the effect.

It is interesting to note that Udbhata does not speak of Hetu, but includes Hetu in his Kāvyahetu. Later writers like Kiammata, Ruyyaka and others include Daṇḍin’s Karakahetu in Kāvyalinū and jñāpakahetu in Anumāna. 23 It appears, therefore, that Ruyyaka does not deny the status of Daṇḍin’s Hetu, but makes two figures out of Daṇḍin’s one figure Hetu.

But the figure Hetu of Rudrata is different in essence from the same figure of Daṇḍin, on the one hand, and Rudrata’s

21 hetuṣ ca sūkṣmo leśo’tha nālāmkārataya mataḥ / samudāyā-bhidhānasya vakroktv-anabhidhānataḥ // KL.II.86.
22 hetuṣ ca sūksma-leśau ca vācām uttama-bhūṣanam/ kāraka-jñāpakau hetū tau caheka-vidhā tathā // KD.II.23b.
23 yatra tu vākyārtho hetustatra hetu-pratipādakam antarena hetutvāyo-panyakṣe kāvyalīṅgam; also, tatra pratyāyya-pratyāyaka-bhāve’numānam. AS.p. 186.
Hetu, on the other. According to Rudrata, the figure Hetu consists in the statement of the cause as identical with the effect. As an illustration of this figure, Rudrata quotes the verse:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{avirala-kamala-vikāsaḥ} \\
\text{sakalā-limadāś-ca kokilānanaḥ} \\
\text{ramyo'yaṃ eti sampratī} \\
\text{lokoṭkaṇṭhakarāḥ kālaḥ.}
\end{align*}
\]

Here kāla (vasanta-kāla) is the cause and its effects are blooming of lotuses etc., thus the cause and effects are identified.

Mammatā rejects Rudrata's Hetu in clear terms for, in his opinion, Hetu does not deserve to be called a poetic figure in so far as the strikingness essential for a poetic figure is wanting in it; and if the identification of the cause with the effect, Mammatā continues, were to constitute a poetic figure, then the metaphorical expression like 'āyur gr̥tam' (as Namisādhu quotes) would have to be regarded as an illustration of Hetu which is absurd. Mammatā, thus, revives the memory of Bhāmaha. Mammatā is of the opinion that poetical Hetu is something different from the identity of the cause and the effect which underlies Rudrata's Hetu. But rejecting Rudrata's Hetu, he strangely includes Rudrata's Hetu under the figure Kāvyaliṅga. But Mammatā's criticism on Rudrata's Hetu deserves

---

24 Hetumataḥ saha hetor-abhidhānam abhedakarād bhaved yātra sōlamkāro hetuḥ syād anyebhyāṁ prthṣag-bhūtah. RKL. VII. 82.

25 'Hetumataḥ saha hetor-abhidhānam-abhedato hetuḥ' iti hetvalamkāro'tra na laksitah. 'āyur gr̥tam' ityādirūpaṁ hyeṣa na bhūṣaṇatam kādācid arhati, vaicitryā-bhāvāt ...na tu hetvalamkāra-kalpanayeti pūrvo-ktaṁ kāvyaliṅgam eva hetuḥ. KP. p. 706.
consideration, for when the absence of charm is accepted in the examples (ayur grtam) of so-called Hetu, it does not seem proper to include it in the Kāvyalinga. Rudrata's Hetu is not capable of being included in Mammaṭa's (and Ruyyaka's) Kāvyalinga, for in Kāvyalinga the cause embodies the meaning conveyed by a sentence or by a word, but in Rudrata's Hetu, the cause is represented to be identical with the effect.

The verse 'avirala-kamala-vikāsaḥ' etc. furnished by Rudrata as an illustration of Hetu seems to involve poetic charm since in it the cause and the effect are represented as occurring simultaneously, though the expression 'ayur grtam' lacks the charm (like sthānur vā puruṣo vā). The illustrative verse of Rudrata's Hetu is capable of being explained as an illustration of Ruyyaka's fifth variety of Atiśayokti where the effect is described as occurring simultaneously with the causes and in the verse in question the effect, the blooming of lotus etc. are described as occurring simultaneously with the cause, the spring. Though in his commentary on Mammaṭa, Ruyyaka closely follows the author, yet his silence about Rudrata's Hetu in the Alamkāra-sarvasva appears to indicate that he wants to include it in the fifth variety of Atiśayokti in which he adds kārya-kāraṇayoh samakālītva on Mammaṭa's paurvāparya-viparjaya. Nañgeśa also holds that the illustration of Rudrata's Hetu may be treated as an instance of Paryāyokta or Atiśayokti.

26 vaicitryā-bhāvāditi - gaune hyupacāre sādṛśya-sampratīyād vaicitryam. na tu śuddhe, tad-viparyayāt. RKS. p. 587.
27 UD. pp. 165-6.
Leśa - Though Bhāmaha refuses to accept Leśa as a poetic figure, yet Daṇḍin recognises it. According to Daṇḍin, Leśa is of two varieties: in the first variety, the form of a thing, revealing itself though only a little, is concealed, and in the second variety, a thing is either praised or condemned in the guise of condemnation or praise. It is interesting to note that Daṇḍin does not speak of Vyājokti and his first variety or Leśa appears to be same as Vyājokti of Ruuyyaka, and the second variety of Daṇḍin's Leśa appears to be same as Ruuyyaka's Vyājastuti.

The figure Leśa has also been admitted by Rudrata. According to him, this figure consists in representing a quality to be a fault and a fault to be a quality. Bhoja and later writers like Appaya Dīkṣita and Jagannātha follow Rudrata. Bhoja regards Leśa to be same as Vyājastuti and cites Daṇḍin's illustration of the second variety of Leśa. Appaya Dīkṣita and Jagannātha admit Leśa to be combined with Vyājastuti.

The tacit omission of Leśa defined by Ruuyyaka indicates that he does not find any separate charm in Leśa, for the two varieties of Daṇḍin's Leśa is capable of being comprehended in Vyājokti and Vyājastuti, and Rudrata's Leśa is in the Vyājastuti. Nāgesā, however, suggests that the figure Leśa is a variety of Viśeṣa.

28 leśa leśena nirbhinna-vasturūpa-nigūhanam / KD.II.2.5. 
29 leśam eke vidur-nindāṁ stutim vā leśataḥ kṛtāṁ / 
Ibid, II. 268. 
30 doṣibhavo yasmin guṇasya doṣasya vā guṇībhāvaḥ . 
abhidhīyaṁ tathāvidha-karma-nimittāṁ sa leśaḥ syāt / 
RKL. VII. 100. 
31 SKA. III. 58. 
32 KVL. p. 229. 
33 RG. p. 690. 
34 UD. p. 201.
Aśīḥ - Aśīḥ is one of the nāṭya-lakṣāṇas of Bharata. Bhāmaha mentions it rather doubtfully as a poetic figure as he says that it is held by some as alamkāra. Dāndin, on the other hand, claims it to be a poetic figure. Aśīḥ, according to Dāndin, consists in the description of expressed desire or some one or in the utterance of benediction. It is significant that Kuntaka finds fault with those who regard Aśīḥ as a poetic figure and, to him, it is the thing to be embellished. The tacit omission of Aśīḥ in the Alamkārasarvasva indicates that Ruyyaka does not admit it as a poetic figure, in so far as the charm essential for a poetic figure is absent in it. This is the reason why Māṇikyacandra does not recognise Aśīḥ as a poetic figure but considers it as an important aspect of Bhāvadhvani.

Prahelikā - Bhāmaha alludes to one Rāmaśarma speaking of Prahelikā (conundrum) in his Acyutottara. Prahelikā is a serious composition possessing varied constituent meanings as well as tricks of Yamaka. Bhāmaha appears to have despised Prahelikā as it is of no importance in poetry. Hence, he does

35 NS. XVI. 28.
36 KL. III. 55.
37 अश्र नाम-भिलाषिते वस्तुन्य-सामसनाः यथा / KD. II.357.
38 VJ. p. 221.
39 याम एमकारो विचित्र्याविशेषत्कात्व-भाव-नाबहुविकार-विशेष भावते MP. p. 299.
40 अश्व नामकाराहृ प्रियोक-मात्रत्वात् नेहनात्मकह्याभावते भावाभवनांव / MKS. Vol. II.p.43.
41 नाहा-धात्वसिं गम्भिर यामका-व्यापदेशिनि / prahelikā sā hyuditā rāmasārma-cyutottare // KL. II.14.
not illustrate it. But Daśita recognizes the importance of Prahelekās when he declares that these are entertainments in social gatherings for contest with the rivals.\\footnote{42} Daśita defines and illustrates sixteen kinds of Prahelekā. Rudrata defines Prahelekā,\\footnote{43} but he appears to have minimised the importance of Prahelekā to be considered as a poetic figure, for his commentator remarks that Prahelekā is not a poetic figure, but it is nothing but a play of words.\\footnote{44} Bhoja deals with Prahelekā in detail.\\footnote{45} Since Prahelekās are not easily understandable and the appreciators do not find any delight in these tricks of composition, the later writers exclude them from their scheme of poetic figures. Viśvanātha, however, mentions and discusses Prahelekā, but he also does not give Prahelekā the status of a poetic figure inasmuch as it is detrimental to the relish of Rasa.\\footnote{46}

Vakrokti - Vāmana's Vakrokti is different in essence from the same figure of other writers. He defines Vakrokti in a peculiar manner. He accepts Vakrokti to be a figure of sense, and this figure occurs where the indicated sense is based on the

idea of similarity. It is, thus, essentially a metaphorical mode of speech and is distinct from the Vakrokti of earlier writers. Vāmana's Vakrokti is not accepted by later writers. Ruuyyaka himself remarks that it is nothing but a kind (Avivakṣita-vācyā says Jayaratha) of Dhvani.

Viśeṣokti - Bhāmaha and Dandin define Viśeṣokti, but they are not explicit in their definitions. In their view, the figure Viśeṣokti consists in the pre-sentation of an effect in spite of the presence of a defective cause. This figure defined by Bhāmaha and Dandin is very close to Ruuyyaka's Vibhāvanā.

Vāmana understands Viśeṣokti in a different light altogether. To him this figure is based on similarity and in it the upameya is lacking some one quality of the upamana, but the other quality or qualities are similar. Out of Vamana's many illustrations of Viśeṣokti one is this --

dyutam hi nāma puruṣasyā-simḥāsanaṁ rājayam. Here kingdom is superimposed on gambling and there is identification of the two, and the charm in this passage lies in this identification. This analysis of the passage shows that it is capable of being

47  sādṛṣyāllakṣaṇā vokroktih. KLSV. IV.iii.8.
48  Vide supra, Chap. III.
49  ekadesāsya vigame yā guṇantara-saṃsthitih / viśeṣa-praṭhanāyā-sau viśeṣoktir-matā yathā // KL II.23.
50  guṇa-jaṭi-kiṛyādīnāṁ yattu vaikalya-darśanām / viśeṣa-darśanāyaiva sā viśeṣoktir-īṣyate // KD II. 323.
51  eka-gunahāni-kalpaṇāyāṁ sāmya-dārṣṭhyām viśeṣoktih. (sutra) ......geśaṁ-guṇaiḥ sāmyam (vṛtti). KLSV. IV.iii. 23.
explained as an illustration of Rūpaka. Vāmana himself admits that his Viṣeṣokti has some features of Rūpaka. Ruyyaka himself criticises Vāmana's failure of giving an appropriate definition and remarks that Vāmana's Viṣeṣokti is, indeed, a variety of Rūpaka and it does not deserve to enjoy the status of an independent poetic figure. Jagannātha agrees with Ruyyaka.

Ākṣepa — Vāmana's Ākṣepa is different in essence from the same figure of earlier or later writers. Vāmana defines Ākṣepa as the repudiation of the upamāna. The upamāna is rejected for the purpose of indicating that it is useless in the presence of the upamāna. A close scrutiny of this figure shows that it is equivalent to Pratīpa of Ruyyaka. Vamana adds another explanation which indicates that this figure may also occur when the upamāna is only hinted at. As an illustration of this kind of Ākṣepa, Vāmana quotes the verse:

aindram dhanuḥ pāṇḍu-payoḍharena
sarad dadhānā-rdra-nakhakṣṭā-bham /
prasādayantī skalaṅkam āndum
tāpam raver abhyadhikām cakāra //

Here the behaviour of the nayika, nayaka and pratināyaka is superimposed on the Autumn, the Moon and the Sun respectively.

52 ṛūpakam cedam; prāyeneti. Ibid, IV.iii. 23.
53 'yā tu eva-gunahāni-kalpanāyām sāmya-dārdhyam viṣeṣoktith' iti viṣeṣoktir-laksitā sāsmin darsāne ṛuṇaka-bhedā eveti pṛthag na vācyā. ĀS. p. 162.
54 RG. pp. 589-90.
55 upamāṇā-kṣepacā-kṣepah.
upamāṇasyā-kṣepah pratiṣedha upamāṇā-kṣepah. tulya-kāryārthasya naiṣarthakya-vivakṣāyām ... upamāṇasyā-kṣepataḥ pratipattir-ityaṭi. KLSV.IV.iii. 27.
Ruyyaka himself examines this verse, following, however, the view of Abhinavagupta, and holds that it is an instance of Upamāṇuprāṇitā Samāsokti. As the charms of the both kinds of Ākṣepea are not distinct from that of the Pratīpa and Samāsokti, Ruyyaka does not find any aesthetic justification behind the admission of Vāmana's Ākṣepea to be considered as a separate figure.

Bhāva — Rudrata defines a figure named Bhāva. It is of two kinds. In the first variety of Bhāva, the change of appearance of a person described produced by an invariable cause suggests the intention of that person. The second variety of Bhāva is considered by Rudrata in the cases where expressed sense suggests the intention of the person described and this intended sense becomes quite opposite to the expressed sense. The figure is called Bhāva because the intended sense of a person is here ascertained. In these two kinds of Bhavālāṃkāra, there is existence of the suggested sense, but the suggested sense does not predominate over the expressed sense. The illustration of the first kind of Bhāva is

57 AS. pp. 117-18.
58 RKL. VII. 38.
59 Ibid, VII. 40.
60 prathama-bhāve vikāra-lakṣaṇena kāryena vikāravato bhiprāyo yathā gamyate tathā svajanakena saha pratibandhas' ceti gamakasya janyata-sti. ... dvitiya-bhāve hi vaktur-abhiprāya-rūpam arthāntaram vākyena gamyate. NSC. p. 209.
furnished in the verse:
\[ \text{grāmataruṇāṃ taruṇyā navavāṅjulamaṅjarīsanāthakaram /} \\
\text{paśyantyā bhavati muhurnitarām malīna mukhac-čhāyā //} \\
\]
which is quoted by Mammaṭa as an illustration of Gunḍībhūta-vyāngya.\(^{61}\) The illustration of the second kind of Bhāva is furnished in the verse:
\[ \text{ekākinī yadabalā taruṇī tathāha -} \\
\text{masmin grīhe gṛhapatiś ca gato videśam /} \\
\text{kim yācase tadiha vāsam iyaṃ varakī} \\
\text{svasṛur-mamā-ndhabādhīrā nanu mūḍha pāntha //} \\
\]
which is quoted by Abhinavagupta (as an illustration of the first kind of Bhavālamkāra) for showing that Rudrata's Bhavālamkāra is not a case of Dhvani only because the suggested sense is not predominant.\(^{62}\) Ruyyaka also observes that Rudrata includes suggestion of matter in these two kinds of Bhavālamkāra where the suggested matter (vastu) is not predominant but embellishes the expressed sense.\(^{63}\)

A critical examination of the illustration of the first kind of Bhavālamkāra reveals the fact that the sight of the youth (which is the cause) and paleness of the face of the young girl (which is the effect) are described here as occurring at the same time. The first variety of Bhavālamkāra, therefore, is capable of being included in the fifth variety of

\(^{61}\) KP. p. 21.  
\(^{62}\) LC. p. 259.  
\(^{63}\) AS. p. 6.  
\(^{64}\) janakībhūta-darsāna-samakālatayā kāryasya mukhacchāyā- mālīnyasya kathanād atigayoktir ālāmkāraḥ. UC. p. 14.
Ruyyaka's Atisayokti. where the cause is supposed to take place simultaneously with the effect. This is probably the reason why Ruyyaka does not recognise the first kind of Rudrata's Bhāva as a separate figure. The illustration of the second kind of Bhāva is cited by Ruyyaka as an illustration of the figure Uttara where a question is inferred from an answer. In the illustration 'ekākinī yadavālā' etc. the expressed answer is more striking than the suggested matter. Since the second kind of Bhāva is not distinct from Uttara from the point of view of charm, Ruyyaka tacitly omits it. of Rudrata's successors no rhetorician except Bhoja recognises Bhāva as a figure.

Paryāya - The poetic figure Paryāya of Rudrata is of two varieties. The first variety of this figure is completely different in essence from the same figure of Ruyyaka. Rudrata's first variety of Paryāya consists in the presentation of a sense which is capable of conveying the intended sense but not similar with the expressed sense, and the relation of cause and effect subsisting between these two senses is not present. The example of Paryāya is efforded in the verse -

rājañ jahāsi nidrāṁ ripubandī- nibida- nigaḍa-śabdena /
tenaiva yad antaritaḥ sa kalakalo bandivṛndasya //

66 SKA. III. 42.
67 vastu vivakṣita-vastu- pratipādana-śaktam asadṛṣam tasya/
yad ajanakam-ajanyam vā tatkathanam yat sa paryāyam //
RKL. VII. 42.
Here the expressed sense 'king's getting up from bed on hearing the jingle of the shackles of the wives of the enemies' suggests that the king has conquered the enemies and imprisoned their wives. The analysis of the definition and illustration of Paryāya put forward by Rudrata shows that Rudrata's Paryāya is nothing but the figure Paryāyokta of later writers. Though Rudrata rules out the relation of cause and effect in his definition, yet his illustration bears the relation of cause and effect. In the illustration, the conquest of the enemies is the cause and the imprisonment of their wives is the effect. Since the charm involved in this figure is not different from that of Paryāyokta, it is not accepted by Ruuyaka as a separate figure. The second variety of Paryāya is, however, accepted by Ruuyaka.

Sūkṣma - Though Sūkṣma is an older poetic figure admitted by Daṇḍin, yet Rudrata's Sūkṣma is completely different in essence from the same figure of Daṇḍin, Mammapa and Ruuyaka. The figure Sūkṣma as defined by Rudrata occurs when a word, which conveys an unsuitable sense, brings into comprehension a suitable and allied sense. In the illustration of Sūkṣma 'ādau paśyati buddhi' (the intellect looks first) cited by Rudrata, the buddhi being insentient cannot be the agent of the

---

69 yatvā-yuktimad artho gamayati sabdo
   nijārtha-sambaddham / arthaśāntaram
   upapattimad ititatsaṃjāyate sūkṣmam // RKL.VII.98.
70 ādau paśyati buddhir-vyavasayo'kṣa-hinam ārabhate /
   dhairyam vyṛūḍha-mahā-bharam utsāhaḥ sādhayatyaartham //
   Ibid, VII. pp.
verb seeing, hence the meaning of the word buddhi being incompatible brings into comprehension the sense of buddhimān. But an examination of this figure reveals the fact that it is nothing but an indication (Lakṣana), which on the incompatibility of the primary sense gives us a further secondary but allied sense. Sūkṣma of Rudraṭa is not accepted by Ruyyaka to be considered as a poetic figure in so far as the charm essential for a poetic figure is wanting in it.

Avasara - Rudraṭa defines a figure named Avasara which consists in poet's attempt to exalt an object under consideration by making some object subordinate to it.71 An example of this figure is furnished in the verse.

tad idam aranyam yasmin daśaratha-vacanā-nupālana-vyasanī /
nivasan bāhusahāyas-cakāra raksāh-kṣayaṁ rāmaḥ // 72 Rudrata does not define the figure Udātta recognised by his predecessors, but from his definition and illustration of Avasara, it appears that it is equivalent to the second variety of Udbhāṭa's Udātta.61 Ruyyaka and Mammata define Udātta(2), and both the authors quote the above verse for illustration. Ruyyaka's view on Udātta(2) is, however, different from that of Mammata.

Mata - Rudraṭa defines a figure named Mata which occurs when the speaker by stating a well-known upameya, puts forward an upamana of his own choice.73 Rudrata points out that there

71 arthāntaram utkṛṣṭām sarasām yadi vopalakṣaṇām kriyate / arthasya tad-abhidhāna-prasaṅgato yatra so'vasaraḥ // RKL. VII. 103.

72 Ibid, VII. 104.

73 tan-matam iti yatroktva vakta-nyamatena siddham upameyam / brūyad atho-pamānaṁ tathā viśiṣṭaṁ svamata-siddham // RKL. VIII. 69.
must be similarity between the upameya and the upamāṇa. From this definition it appears that the thing which is accepted as upameya by others is accepted as upamāṇa by the speaker, for the upameya is apprehended as false and the upamāṇa as true. Thus, there is sādhyaadhyavasāya, The mind of the speaker involves a state of suspense with a greater bias towards the upamāṇa. The figure Mata of Rudrata appears to have a close affinity to Ruyyaka's Utprekṣā where an upameya is fancied to be something else. An illustration of this figure is given in the verse:

```
madirā-mada-bhara-pātalam
alikula-nilālakā-lidhammillam /
taruṇī-mukham iti yad idam
kathayati lokāḥ samasto'yaṃ //
manye'ham indur eṣa śpuṭam
udaye'ruṇa-rucih sthitaiḥ pascāt /
udaya-girau charma-parair
niśā-tamobhir gṛhīta iva //
```

Here the face (upameya) is fancied to be the moon (upamāṇa), which is again fancied to be captured by the darkness of night. This analysis of the definition and illustration of Rudrata Mata shows that it is capable of being comprehended under the figure Utprekṣā of later writers. Hence, Bhoja does not regard Mata as a separate figure but includes it under Utprekṣā. 74

Anyokti - Rudrata defines a figure named Anyokti where an upameya is suggested from the description of an upamāṇa. 75

---

74 mataṁ ceti na bhidyante tāny utprekṣā-svarūpataḥ / SKA. IV. 53.
75 asamāṇa-viśeṣaṇam api yatra samānetivṛttaṁ upameyam / uktena gamyate param upamāñneti sā-nyoktiḥ // RKL.VIII.74.
Rudrata maintains that the višeṣaṇás in Anyokti may be or may not be common, but there is some behaviour which must be common to both the upamāna and the upameya. An example of this figure is furnished in the verse:

Muktvā salila-haṃsam vikasita-
kamalojjvalam sarah sarasam /
baka-lulita-jalām palvalam
abhilasasi sakhe na haṃso'si //

Here the description of the swan and the crane suggests a good man and a wicked man, a good man does not desire mixing with the wicked. This analysis of Anyokti shows that it is not different in essence from Aprastutaprasāṃśā of Ruyyaka. It is interesting to note that Rudrata does not define Aprastuta-prāṃśā, and the illustration put forward by Rudrata is a good example of Aprastuta-prāṃśā of Sarūpya type. Hence S.S. Sukthankar remarks: 'Rudrata was more explicit when he named the figure (Aprastuta-prāṃśā) as Anyokti. But, for reason unknown, the name Anyokti could not grow popular and we find successive writers Mammaṭa, Ruyyaka, Visvantha, Appaya Dīkṣita (Kuvalayānanda) and Jagannātha sticking to the name Aprastutaprasāṃśā, though in the broad sense of a statement of the aprastuta.

Ubhayanyāsa — Rudrata defines a figure named Ubhayanyāsa which, he maintains, is distinct from Upamā, and in it the common property is stated in two ways. As an illustration of Ubhayanyāsa, Rudrata quotes the verse:

76 api-sabdat kincit-samana—visesanatve'pi kvapi bhavatiti sucyate iti. NSC. p. 285.
77 KP. Notes, p. 92.
78 samanyav-apyarthau sphutum upamayah svarupato'petau / nirdisyate yasminn-ubhayanyasah sa vijneyah // RKL.VIII. 85.
Here 'the great men' are upameyas, 'the trees' are upamānas and the common property is rarity. Rudrata does not speak of Prativastūpamā which has already been accepted by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin to be a variety of Upamā; but this variety of Upamā is broad enough to comprehend the figure Drṣṭānta also. But Udbhata is the first writer to mark off the two figures - Prativastūpamā and Drṣṭānta - one from another. From the definition and illustration of Udbhayanyāsa, it appears that it is same as Prativastūpamā of later writers. But Bhoja wants to include Rudrata's Udbhayanyāsa under Arthāntaranyāsa. The illustration quoted above may be explained as an illustration of Arthāntaranyāsa if we take the first sentence as a particular statement and the second sentence as a general statement. There is thus a samarthya-samarthaka-bhāva and it satisfies the requirements of Arthāntaranyāsa. But Rudrata does not speak of samarthya-samarthaka-bhāva in this figure, but, to him, two sentences refer to particular facts or both to generalities, and the motif of Udbhayanyāsa is to show the similarity. Since the charm involved in this figure is not distinct from Prativastūpamā (or Arthāntaranyāsa), Ruuyaka does not recognise the separate entity of this figure.

Pūrva — The figure Pūrva is not defined by Rudrata's predecessors. This figure is discovered for the first time by Rudrata. This figure appears once in aupamya group and again in his atidaya group. The figure Pūrva of the aupamya group is regarded in the

---

79 KL. II. 34
80 KD. II. 46
81 SKA. IV. 71.
cases where two things which generally appear simultaneously or one after another, are described as appearing violating law of sequence. An examination of this definition reveals the fact that this figure is based on the inversion of the sequence of causation, as the effect is described here as occurring even prior to the cause. An example of this figure is furnished in the verse:

\[
\text{kåle jaladakula-kula-daśadiśi} \\
\text{pūrvaṃ viyogini-vadanam /} \\
\text{galad-avirala-salilabharam} \\
\text{paścād upajāyate gaganam //}
\]

In the rainy season, the cloud in the sky showers rain. The cloud in the sky generally excites the love of a lady in separation and it causes tears in her eyes, but the sequence of the cause and effect is inverted here. The tears of the lady in separation are poetically described as dropping down even prior to the showering of rain with a view to indicating unbearable range of separation.

The figure Pūrva of the atiśaya group occurs when the effect is described as occurring prior to the cause. Though Rudrata admits relation of the upamāna and the upameya being the basis of Pūrva belonging to the aupamya group, yet there is no fundamental difference between the two figures.

---

82 yatraikavidhāv-arthau jayete yau tayor apūrvasya / abhidhānāṃ pṛag-bhavataḥ sato bhidhiyeta tat pūrvaṃ // RKL. VIII. 97.


84 yatra-tiprabalataya vivakṣyate pūrvaṃ eva janyasya / pradurbhāvaḥ paścāj-janakasya tu tad bhavet pūrvaṃ // RKL. IX. 3.
The analysis of the definitions and illustration of the figure Purva reveals the fact that both are based on the inversion of the sequence of the cause and effect. Therefore, this figure is capable of being comprehended under the fifth variety of Ruuyaka's Atiśayokti where an effect is described as appearing simultaneously or prior to the cause. Since the charm involved in Purva is not distinct from that of the figure Atiśayokti, Ruuyaka does not find justification behind the admission of Purva to be considered as a separate figure.

Sāmya - Rudrata introduces a poetic figure, which is not found in the writings of earlier rhetoricians, named Sāmya. It is of two kinds. Sāmya(1) occurs when the upameya becomes similar with the upamāna on the basis of some common property, such as quality, action etc. An example of the first kind of Sāmya is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{abhisara ramanaṁ kim imāṁ} \\
\text{diṣṭam aindrim ākulaṁ vilokayasi /} \\
\text{śaśīnāḥ karoti kāryaṁ sakalaṁ} \\
\text{mukham eva te mugdhe //}
\end{align*}
\]

Here the face which is the upameya is represented as capable of serving the purpose of the moon which is the upamāna. When the upameya can do the job of the upamāna, the latter becomes useless. This analysis of the illustration of Sāmya shows that it is capable of being comprehended under the first variety of Ruuyaka's Pratīpa. Bhoja accepts Rudrata's Sāmya and puts under it all the figures such as Drṣṭāntokti, Prapaṇcokti and Prativastūkti in

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{arthā-kriyāya yasminn-upamānasayaiti sāmyam-upameyam /} \\
\text{tat-sāmāṇya-gunādīmika-kāraṇayā tad bhavet sāmyam //} \\
\text{RKL. VIII. 105.}
\end{align*}
\]
which similarity is implied. Dr. V. Raghavan says 'In Rudrata it (Sāmya) is a small idea. Bhoja enlarged its scope and put under it all those figures which are not Upamā or Rūpaka but in which Aupamya is suggested'.

Sāmya(II) of Rudrata occurs when the poet with a view to show a close resemblance between the upamāna and the upameya, assigns to upameya some special quality which exalts it. This variety of Sāmya appears to be same as Ruyyaka's Vyatireka 'where the upameya is poetically shown to excel the upamana'. The tacit omission of Rudrata's Sāmya in the Alamkārasarvasva indicates that Ruyyaka does not find any separate charm in this figure.

Pihita - Rudrata introduces another new poetic figure named Pihita. This figure occurs when an object possessing a quality of inferior degree is obscured by another object having the same quality of a superior degree. This special feature of Pihita appears to be same as Ruyyaka's (and Mammaṭa's) Milita, where

86 SKA. IV. 34-35.
87 BSP. p. 388.
90 yatra-tiprabalataya guṇaḥ samānādhikaram-asamānām / arthāntaram pidadhyaḥ āvirbhūtam api tat pihitam // RKL. IX. 50.
also an object of superior quality is obscured by an object of inferior quality. Bhoja wants to include Rudraṭa's Pihita, Tadguṇa and Atadguṇa under Mīlita, but according to Ruyyaka and Mammaṭa Tadguṇa and Atadguṇa are to be considered as separate figures because of their distinct charm. It is, however, noticeable that Rudraṭa's Pihita and the first variety of Tadguṇa are very similar, and they are different from Ruyyaka's (and Mammaṭa's) Mīlita. As there is no separate charm in Pihita or Tadguṇa(1) from that of Mīlita, separate existence of Pihita is denied to it.

Vyāghāta and Ahetu - Rudraṭa is the first to conceive the two figures - Vyāghāta and Ahetu, but they are not different in essence from one another. Both the figures are seen to be based on incongruity and in both the effect is not produced in spite of the presence of powerful cause. The feature of these two figures is not different from the figure Viśeṣokti, where also the effect is not produced in spite of the presence of the cause. Since the charm involved in these figures is not different from that of the figure Viśeṣokti, Ruyyaka does not find any aesthetic justification behind the admission of Vyāghāta and Ahetu of Rudraṭa to be considered as distinct figures. Bhoja, however, accepts Ahetu as a separate figure.

91 SKA. III. 41.
92 yasmin eka-guṇānām-arthānām yogalakṣya-rūpānām / sāmsargena nānātvam lakṣyate tadguṇah sa iti // RKL.IX.22.
93 anyair-apratihatam api kāraṇam utpādanam na kāryasya / yasminn-abhidhighyeta vyāghātaḥ sa iti viññeyāḥ // Ibid, IX. 52.
94 balavati vikāra-hetau satyapi naivopayacchati vikāram / yasminn-arthāḥ sthairyāṃ-mantavyo'sāv-ahetur iti // Ibid, IX.54.
95 SKA. III. 18.
Bhoja's treatment of Alamkara is very curious. He deals with the largest number of Sabdalamkaras mentioned by any writers on Alamkara. His Sabdalamkaras are twentyfour in number, but the number of his Arthalamkaras is surprisingly limited and a love of uniformity (which is seen also in the subdivision of the individual Alamkaras) probably leads him to enumerate them also as twentyfour in number, which is also the number of his Ubhayalamkaras.

The twentyfour Sabdalamkaras enumerated by Bhoja are - Jati, Gati, Riti, Vr̩tti, Chaya, Mudra, Ukti, Yukti, Bhaniti, Gumphana, Sayya, Pathiti, Yamaka, Slesa, Anuprasa, Citra, Vakovakya, Prahelika, Gudha, Prasnottara, Abhidheya, Sravya, Preksya and Abhineya. Bhoja's conception of these Alamkaras is open to serious objection. Dr. V. Raghavan examines all the Sabdalamkaras of Bhoja and remarks that there is almost nothing in Kavya which is not Alamkara to him. 96

Ruyyaka, we have already seen, 97 accepts only the well-known Sabdalamkaras viz., Anuprasa, Yamaka and Citra, admitted in earlier Alamkara works, but out of Bhoja's twentyfour Sabdalamkaras the remaining twentyone are excluded by Ruyyaka on the obvious reason that they do not deserve to attain the status of Alamkara as Dr. V. Raghavan shows that some of them do not involve charm, some are different forms of Kavya itself. 98

Bhoja borrows almost all the Arthalamkaras of his predecessors, but most of them are included in his twentyfour Arthalamkaras or Ubhayalamkaras. 99 The new Arthalamkaras conceived by Bhoja are Sambhava and six pramanalamkaras. The pramanalamkaras are -

96 Vide BSP. pp. 354-73
97 Supra, Chap. IV.
98 Vide BSP. p. 372
99 SKA. IV.
Pratyaksa, Anumana, Agama (or Apatavacana), Upamana, Arthapatti and Abhava.

Bhoja's Sambhava-alamkāra is almost like Utpreksā in definition and illustrations. Ruuyaka does not find any aesthetic justification in admitting Sambhava as a separate figure. Out of six pramāṇalamkāras Arthapatti is the only accepted figure in the Alamkārasarvasva, and the rest of the pramāṇalamkāras are omitted by Ruuyaka on the ground that the charm essential for a poetic figure is wanting in them.

Udātta(2) - The figure Udātta(2) is defined and illustrated by Ruuyaka himself, but his view with regard to the independent existence of this figure is not positive. This figure consists in poet's attempt to exalt the matter under consideration by making the actions of the great subordinate to it. When the actions of the great are described, it naturally consists of the suggestion of Rasa, but as Rasa is not primarily developed and holds a subordinate position, Rasa does not attain the status of Rasa-dhvani, but becomes a case of Udatta. In the verse:

tadidam arapyam yasmin daśaratha-vacanānupālana vyasanī / nivasanān bāhusahāyas cakāra rakṣah kṣayam rāmak//

100 prabhūta-karaṇā-locāt syād-evam-iti sambhavah. SKA.III.25.
101 Megh, I. 23, 49, 54.
102 SKA. III. 45-54.
103 arthapattiś-ca vākyā-vidām nyāya iti taj-jātiyatvenēḥ-bhidhānām. AS. p. 197.
104 While distinguishing the Alamkāras Anumāna and Kāvyalinga from Tarkānumāna and Tarkahetu, Ruuyaka says that the later two are not considered as poetic figures as they do not involve charm (AS.p.185); and it appears that Ruuyaka rejects the Pramāṇalamkāras on the same ground.
105 aṅgabhūta-mahāpuruśa-caritam ca. AS. p. 231.
The action of Rāma, viz., extermination of the demons are described for exalting the forest, the matter of description. As the action refers to Rāma’s extirpation on the demons, there is presentation of Vīrarasa which however becomes subordinate to the forest. So the figure Udātta(2) in essence is not different from the figure Rasavat. The writers belonging to the Alamkāra school hold that when Rasa is primarily developed, the figure is Rasavat, but when Rasa is subordinate to some other matter, the figure is Udātta of the second variety; but the Dhvani school holds that when Rasa is primarily developed there is Rasa-dhvani, and when Rasa is subservient to some other matter, there is Rasavad alamkāra. The figure Udātta(2) in which Rasa subserves another thing is naturally subsumed in Rasavat as the charm of the two figures is not distinct. Hence, according to Ruuyaka, there is no place of Udātta(2) in the Dhvani system of thought. Ruuyaka, thus, appears to criticise the writers belonging to the Dhvani school, who accept Udatta(2) to be a distinct poetic figure. Kumarasvāmin also observes that Ruuyaka does not accept Udatta(2) as distinct from Rasavat.

From what we have discussed we find that Ruuyaka excludes more or less fifty figures admitted by his predecessors. We have seen that most of the figures possess strikingness essential for a poetic figure, but the strikingness in them is not different from that of the figures recognised by Ruuyaka. Therefore, they

106 na cātra vīro rasaḥ, tasyeyehāṅgatvāt. KP. p. 68b.
108 tadā dvitiyo-dattasya viṣayaeva nāstīti sarvasva- hṛdayam. RN. p. 568.
are included in the figures which are recognised by Ruuyaka and Mammaṭa. Some of Rudraṭa's figures such as Avasara, Pihita etc. are accepted by changing the name. The figures completely rejected by Ruuyaka are Daṇḍin's Āvṛtti, Āśīḥ, Praheilikā: Vāmana’s Vakrokti; Bhoja's twentyone peculiar Sabdālāṃkāras, Sambhava, and Pramāṇālāṃkāras excepting Arthāpatti and Rudraṭa's Sūkṣma. It is interesting to note that none of the figures accepted by Udbhāṭa and Mammaṭa is excluded by Ruuyaka in the Alamkārasarvasva, although Ruuyaka differs from them on many points.

But the figures Kāvyaliṅga and Yathāsaṃkhya admitted by Mammaṭa and Ruuyaka are rejected by Jayaratha on the ground that the charm is lacking in them. Jagannātha appears to follow Jayaratha in rejecting these two figures.

Later writers like Sōbhākara, Vidyādhara, Vidyānātha, Viśvanātha and Jagannātha follow Mammaṭa and Ruuyaka, for the figures omitted by Mammaṭa and Ruuyaka are not allowed by them excepting one or two. Viśvanātha accepts Rudraṭa's Hetu as a distinct figure apart from Kāvyaliṅga or Atiśayokti. Jagannātha accepts Rudraṭa's Leśā as distinct from Vyājastuti. Besides introducing many new figures Jayadeva in his Candraloka and Appaya Dīkṣita in his Kuvalayānanda extend recognition to the older figures which are omitted by Ruuyaka and Mammaṭa. Nāgēśa holds

---

111 Viśvanātha accepts Rudraṭa's Hetu (SD.X.64) and conceives a new poetic figure named Niścaya (X.39), but P.V.Kane remarks that in certain cases Hetu of Viśvanātha will be first variety of Atiśayokti (SD.Notes, p.230) and Niścaya is included in Bhrāntimān (Ibid, p. 141).
112 R.G. p. 690.
that of these older figures and the new ones accepted by these two writers some are included in the figures recognised by Mammaṭa, some are to be regarded as the varieties of Guṇibhūta-vyaṅgya while others do not enjoy the status of poetic figure because of the absence of charm, or they do not enhance the beauty of Rasa.  

Dr. Anantalal Gangopadhyay examines the new poetic figures introduced by Appaya Dīkṣita and shows that many of these poetic figures are capable of being included in the figures recognised by older writers.

---

113 Uddyota, pp. 30, 43, 68, 70, 96, 116, 119, 126 etc.