CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Alamkārasarvasvā is one of the important works in Sanskrit Alamkāra literature. The work exclusively deals with the poetic figures (Alamkāras). In the treatment of poetic figures, the author shows a remarkable degree of insight and independence of judgement. This speciality of this work distinguishes its author from his predecessors. The value of this work may be judged from the fact that it exerts great influence on later writers on Alamkāra, for the views of the author of the Alamkārasarvasvā have been accepted as authoritative by almost all later writers.

1. Ruuyyaka—His Genealogy and Date:

Rājānaka Ruuyyaka, to whom the Alamkārasarvasvā is generally ascribed, was one of the reputed authors of Sanskrit Poetics. That he hailed from Kashmir is known from his Kashmirian title Rājānaka prefixed to his name. His another name was Rucaka.¹ His father's name was Rājānaka Tilaka² who,

¹ 'śrīrājānaka-ruuyakasya rājānaka-rucakāparāhāmno' lamkārasarvasvakṛtah, SL.col.p.97 'kāvyapraakāśasaṃketorucakenehalikhya't, RKS. Invocatory verse (no. 2), p.544. This name is also mentioned by Vidyācakravartin (SJ.pp. 1,232; SPN.Vol.II.pp. 402,433,453,455), Kumārasvāmin (RN.pp. 473,477,512,544) and Appaya Dikṣīta (CM.p.306), in connection with their reference to Ruuyyaka's views.

² 'rājānaka-tilakātmaja...śrīrājānaka-ruuyakasya',SL.col. p. 97.
Jayaratha informs us, wrote a commentary called Udbhataśāra or Udbhataśāra viveka on Udbhata, the author of the Kāvyalāṃkāra-sārasamgraha. Ruyyaka informs us that he learnt poetics from his father, and this fact is corroborated by Jayaratha who remarks that the author of the Alāmkārasaṃgraha generally followed the views of Rājānaka Tilaka. It appears, therefore, that Ruyyaka hailed from a highly learned family of Kashmir.

As regards the date of Ruyyaka there is little room for controversy. That he was later than Bilhana, Mahimabhaṭṭa and Mammata is corroborated by the facts that he quoted verses in the Alāmkārasaṃgraha from Bilhana's Vikramāṇkadevacarita written in 1085 AD; that he wrote a commentary on the Vyaktīviveka of Mahimabhaṭṭa who flourished in 1020-1100 AD, and on the Kāvyapraṅgāsa of Mammata, who is said to have flourished in the second half of the 11th century AD. Rājānaka Maṅkhaka who was a well-known Kashmirian author of the poem Śrīkāṇṭha-carita was a disciple of Ruyyaka. Maṅkhaka was a brother of

---

3 VS. pp. 146, 257.
4 jñātvā sṛītilakāt sarvālāṃkāropaniṣad rasam / kāvyapraṅgāsaṃketo rucakenēhā likhyate//RKS. Invocatory verse, p. 544.
5 etad eva rājānaka-tilakenāpy uktam...granthakṛc ca prāyas tanmatānuvartyeva. VS. p. 158.
6 AS. pp. 76 (VDC.I. 116), 81(Ibid.VII.6), 98(Ibid.VIII.9), 150(Ibid.I. 11-12. VII, 9-10), 151(Ibid.VII. 11).
7 According to Buhler; vide P.V.Kane, HSP. p. 284.
8 Vide P.V.Kane, HSP. p. 256; S.K.De, HSP. Vol.I. p. 142.
9 P.V.Kane, HSP. p. 274.
11 SC. XXV. 61.
Lanka or Alamkāra who was a minister under Jayasimha of Kashmir, who resigned from 1129-1150 AD. The Śīkāntha-carita of Māṅkhaka was composed, according to Buhler, between 1135 and 1145 AD; Ruyyaka was, therefore, a contemporary of Māṅkhaka from whose Śīkāntha-carita a few verses are quoted in the Alamkārasarvasva. Again, Māṇikyacandra refers to the Alamkārasarvasva in his Samketa commentary (on Mammaṭa's Kāvyaprakāśa) which is believed to have been composed in 1159-60 AD. So, Ruyyaka's literary career can be assigned to the second quarter of the 12th century A.D. and his Alamkārasarvasva may be taken to have been composed some time between 1135-1150 AD.

2. The Authorship of the Alamkārasarvasva.

The Alamkārasarvasva is a standard work in Sanskrit Alamkāra literature. The speciality of this work lies in its exclusive treatment of the nature and scope of individual poetic figures. The work is written in two parts—viz. Sūtra and Vṛtti, but there is a controversy regarding the authorship of the Vṛtti. The reason of this controversy is the discovery of variant readings in the invocatory verse of this work. The NSP ed. of the text along with Jayaratha's commentary reads the second

12 Ibid, XXV. 61.
17 P.V.Kane. HSP. p.285.
18 The question has been first raised by T.Gaṇapati Sāstrī. Vide AS(IS) Introduction, pp. I-III.
line of the invocatory verse (1) nījālaṃkāra-sūtrāṇāṃ vṛttya tātparyamucyate, and admits Ruuyyaka's authorship of both the sūtra and the vṛtti, while the TSS ed. of the text along with Samudrabandha's commentary reads (2) gurvalaṃkāra-sūtrāṇāṃ in the second line of the invocatory verse of this work, and there is at the end of this edition an additional verse¹⁹ which gives the name of the Vṛtti as Almaṅkārasarvasva (and not of the text which is called Almaṅkārasūtra) and the name of its author as Maṅkhaka, a minister of war and peace to the King of Kashmir.

Jayaratha, a Kashmirian commentator of the Almaṅkārasarvasva who flourishing within about seventyfive years of Ruuyyaka, accepts the first reading and ascribes the authorship of both Sūtra and Vṛtti to Ruuyyaka himself.²⁰ Jayaratha takes avowedly Ruuyyaka as the author, and refers to him as granthakṛt (i.e., author) in many places of his commentary.²¹ Jayaratha also remarks in many places on the corruptions and meddlings with the Vṛtti portion of the text.²² It is worth nothing that the first commentator does not raise any doubt about the dual authorship of the text.

¹⁹ iti maṅkhaka vitene kāśmiṃra-kātipa-sāndhivigrahikah / sukavimukhālaṃkāraṃ tadidamalaṃkārasarvasvam //, AS(Tb) p. 252.
²⁰ parakīyānāṃ sūtrāṇāṃ tātparya-kathanānabodhōpi syāditi bhāvah. tathā na kaiścidapi parairidrmedhi sutrani kṛtānītyapi dhvanitam, VS. p.3.
²¹ VS. pp.1, 15,20,24,33,36,41,44,55,63 etc.
Samudrabandha, a South Indian commentator, accepts the second reading.\(^{23}\) He wrote his commentary on the Vṛtti which is known to him by the name of \textit{Aλa mkārāsarasvav},\(^{24}\) and which, according to him, is written by Mānkha,\(^{25}\) while the original work of Ruyyaka is called \textit{Aλa mkārasutra}.

Thus, there are two distinct traditions, viz., North Indian and South Indian, regarding the authorship of the Sutra and the Vṛtti of the \textit{Aλa mkārāsarasvav}. But the South Indian tradition has been discarded by Dr. S.K.De, MM. P.V. Kane and Dr. R.C. Dwivedi. Dr. S.K.De rightly remarks - "the North Indian tradition, obtaining in Kashmir, to which place both Ruyyaka and Mankha belonged, seems to be authentic one; for the South Indian tradition is not uniform in this respect and does not always distinguish between the author of the Sutra and the Vṛtti respectively.\(^{26}\) Vidyācakravartin, a South Indian commentator of the \textit{Aλa mkārāsarasvav} and also a commentator of Mammatā's Kāvyaprakāśa, refers to Rucaka (Ruyyaka) as the author of the \textit{Aλa mkārāsarasvav} as a whole.\(^{27}\)

\(^{23}\) But Samudrabandha does not explain the word guru in the sense of preceptor, but explains - 'gurvityanena vivaksitaśya tātparyasyāvāntavyasya tātparyārati' VR. p.3

\(^{24}\) Loc. cit.

\(^{25}\) mahkhaka-nibandha-vivṛtau vihitāyāmiha samudrabandhana, SVR. p. 252.


\(^{27}\) rucakācaryopajñe sayamālāmkārasarasvav, SJ. p. 1. Vidyācakravartin accepts the phrase nījālāmkāra-sūtrānām and explains it as nījānām svēnaiva pranitānām alāmkāra-sūtrānām tātparyamucyate. Ibid. p. 3. Also vide SPN. Vol. II. pp. 402, 433, 453, 455.
Vidyānātha quotes a Śūtra of Ruṣyaka qualifying it to be a citation from the Alampkārasarvasva. Mallinātha, a South Indian commentator on Vidyādhara’s Ekāvali, does not distinguish between the author of the Śūtra and the Vṛtti, for both the Śūtra and the Vṛtti are quoted by him as the citations from the Alampkārasarvasva. Kumārasvāmin, Mallinātha’s son, in his commentary called Ratnāpana on Vidyānātha’s Pratāpa-rudrīyayaśobhūṣaṇa quotes the Śūtra and the Vṛtti by the name Rucaka (Ruṣyaka) and thereby attributes to him both the Śūtra and the Vṛtti. Appaya Dīkṣita, a noted South Indian writer, agrees with Vidyācakravartin, Vidyānātha, Mallinātha and Kumārasvāmin, and refers to Rucaka (Ruṣyaka) as the author of the Alampkārasarvasva as a whole. Jagannātha also ascribes

31 Cf. ‘ye tu udbhinna-vastunīgūham vyājokir iti vyājokty alampkāram prthah icchanti tesaṁ ihāpi vyājokter eva nāpahnutir iti rucaκādayaḥ, ČM.p.306. Udbhaṭa does not consider Vyājokti to be a distinct poetic figure, but following the view of Udbhaṭ-a, Ruṣyaka prima facie considers Apahnuti in the verse - ākṛṣyādāv amandagraham alakacayam vaktram āsajya vaktre kaṇṭhe lagnaḥ sukanthah prabhavati kucayor datta-gaḍhānga-saṅgaḥ / baddhāsaktir nimbate patati caranayor yaḥ sa tādrā priyo me bale lajjā nirastā nahi nahi śarale colakah kim trapākrt //, AS.p. 131. But according to the definition of Vyājokti given by Ruṣyaka, there is the figure Vyājokti in this verse. This view occurs in the Śūtra and Vṛtti of the AS. p.219. Also cf. evaṁ 'ākṛṣyāduḥ ityāduḥ ca lokātmavastvantara-prakṣependhibhina-priya-nīghanasyaiva vyākṣyarthatvat vyājokti reva na punara-paḥnutoḥ.VS.p.219. Also of ČM. pp.68 (Ibid. Vṛtti p.73), 381(Ibid, illustration p.80); KVL. pp.124-5 (AS. Śūtra & Vṛtti p.135), 132(Ibid. Vṛtti p.137), 138-39 (Ibid, Vṛtti p. 144-45).
both the Sūtra and the Vṛtti to the same author,\textsuperscript{32} for both the Sūtra and the Vṛtti are quoted by him as citations from the Alamkārasarvasva.

Further, if Maṅkhaka's authorship of the Vṛtti be admitted the other works, which are generally attributed to Ruuyyaka, should be attributed to Maṅkhaka,\textsuperscript{33} but no such positive evidence of Maṅkhaka's authorship of the Sāhityamīmāṃsā or the Vyktiviveka-vyākhyāna etc. is yet available.

More recently the question of Maṅkhaka's authorship of the Vṛtti is again raised by Dr. R. P. Dwivedi\textsuperscript{34} who himself says that he agrees with the editors of the TSS ed. Dr. Dwivedi argues (1) that Maṅkhaka's authorship of the Vṛtti is evident from Appaya Dīkṣita's citations, for Appaya Dīkṣita quotes the Sūtra by the name Ruuyyaka, while the Vṛtti is quoted by him by the name Maṅkhaka. But we see that the proposition of Dr. Dwivedi does not always hold good, because Appaya Dīkṣita quotes the Sūtra and the Vṛtti under the citation 'Alamkārasarvasva'.\textsuperscript{35} (2) Dr. Dwivedi contends that Vidyācakravartin admits the author of the Sūtra and the author of the Vṛtti to be two persons, but we have already showed that according to Vidyācakravartin, Ruuyyaka is the author of the work Alamkārasarvasva as a whole.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{33} Dr. R. P. Dwivedi ascribes the authorship of the VV to Maṅkhaka, vide VV. Introduction, p.26.
\textsuperscript{34} AS. Introduction, pp.(6)-(15).
\textsuperscript{35} CM. p.68 (AS. Sūtra & Vṛtti, p.135).
\textsuperscript{36} Loc. cit.
(3) Dr. Dwivedi argues that Madras Oriental MS admits Mañkhaka's authorship of the Vṛtti; but it is observed by Kumarī Jānaki that the said MS ascribes Mañkhaka's authorship of the Sūtra also. But this view is not accepted by Dr. Dwivedi.

(4) Dr. Dwivedi regards that South Indian tradition is more authentic than the North Indian tradition, because the writers of North India are always engaged in themselves contradicting the views of others. Dr. Dwivedi says that Appaya Dīkṣita preserves not only the South Indian tradition, but also the North Indian tradition. So the only place in the Citramimāṃsā in which Appaya Dīkṣita speaks of Mañkhaka's authorship of the Vṛtti is accepted by Dr. Dwivedi as the most important evidence. But Dr. De's remark 'the South Indian tradition is not always uniform' is more reliable.

(5) Dr. Dwivedi does not put much importance on the evidence of Jayaratha. On the strength of Jayaratha's remark that the Vṛtti-portion of the text has got unauthorised additions and alterations, Dr. Dwivedi argues that Jayaratha may not have formed an idea on the authorship of the work from the corrupted text; but it is to be noted that Jayaratha must have before him some MSS from which he has formed the idea that the same person is the author of the Sūtra as well as of the Vṛtti. Further, Jayaratha is nearer to Ruuyaka in respect of time and place. He seems to be more authoritative than Samudrabandha who happened to be far away from Ruuyaka in respect of time and place.

(6) Dr. Dwivedi puts forward another argument in favour of his contention that there is difference of opinion between the Sūtra-kāra and the Vṛtti-kāra with regard to classifying of the figure Punaruktavadābhāśa. The Sūtra-kāra, according to Dr. Dwivedi, considers this figure to be a figure of word, while the Vṛtti-kāra considers this to be a figure of sense. But it is to be noted that Ruyyaka puts emphasis on the grouping of the figures. The first Sūtra speaks of Paunaruktya group in which the Artha-paunaruktya stands first and the second Sūtra speaks of the fault of tautology (artha-paunaruktya), and as a direct corollary the figure Punaruktavadābhāśa comes first in this group, because, the Sūtra-kāra and Vṛtti-kāra appears to hold the view that the semblance of tautology (artha-punarukta) is not a fault, but an ornament of expression. 39

(7) Dr. Dwivedi raises another argument in favour of his contention that Šobhākara, a Kashmirian author of Alamkāra-ratnakara does not for a single time refer to the name of the Alamkāra-sarvasva or its author because he is also in doubt about the authorship of the Sūtra and the Vṛtti of this work; but it is to be remembered that the non-mention of a work or its author does not always prove that the critic is unaware of the name of the author or authors whom he criticises. Šobhākara does not mention the name of Ruyyaka intentionally, for he takes Ruyyaka

as his rival, and the non-mention of the name of the author or his work by a rival critic is often a custom in Sanskrit literary criticism.

As even in South Indian tradition outside Samudrabandha the Sūtra and the Vṛtti are ascribed to Ruyyaka, it is more reasonable to accept Ruyyaka's authorship of both the parts of the work. The remarks of Dr. S. K. De are worth quoting on this point: 'the testimony of Jayaratha, himself a Kashmirian, cannot be very well superseded by what the much later commentator Samudrabandha says in conformity to a tradition which itself is not unanimous. It is also significant that while Ruyyaka (and even Jayaratha) is quoted and discussed extensively by later writers on Poetics, Mankhaka is not cited as a writer on the subject except once by Appayya in his Citramimamsā.  

A tradition of Mankhaka's authorship of the Vṛtti has probably has arisen because Mankhaka was a disciple of Ruyyaka who quoted a few verses from Mankhaka's Śrīkanṭhacarita in the Alamkārasarasva. Mankhaka himself tells us that he was a brother of Lāmkaka or Alamkāra, a minister of peace and war (Sāndhi-vigrahika) under Jayasimha of Kashmir and, according to Kalhana, Mankhaka was made a minister of peace and war by Jayasimha of Kashmir. Mankhaka describes in his Śrīkanṭhacarita

41 SC. XXV, 30, 135.  
42 sāndhivigrahiko mānkhaḥ kāhyo'لامkārasodaraḥ / sākanthasyābhavatprāṣṭhah śrīkanṭhasya pratiṣṭhayā // , RT. VIII, 3354.
how after composing his poem he submitted it at the house of his brother Lāṅkaka (Alamkāra) to an assembly of learned scholars and officials among whom was present his guru Ruuyyaka who appreciated his disciple's poem. As this poem was highly appreciated by Ruuyyaka, it is not unlikely, therefore, that the guru in this way should quote five verses as illustrations in his work from the poem of his worthy disciple. The possibility of Maṅkhaka's hand in the Vṛtti of the Alamkārasarvasva cannot be ruled out altogether. P.V.Kane thinks that "Maṅkhaka took great pain to spread the fame of his master's work and in editing it afresh made some additions. It is probably in this way that a few verses from the Śrīkāntṭhacarita of Maṅkhaka got into the Alamkārasarvasva." Jayaratha's remarks on the corruptions and meddling of the Vṛtti also implies to the same fact. But it cannot be said that Maṅkhaka is the author of the Vṛtti, for all the evidences go in favour of Ruuyyaka's authorship of the Vṛtti. As except Samudrabandha, no Indian author ascribes the Vṛtti to Maṅkhaka, so it is more reasonable to accept Ruuyyaka's authorship of the both parts of this work.

3. Other Works of Ruuyyaka:

From Ruuyyaka's own reference and from the reference of Jayaratha we know that Ruuyyaka is an author of numerous work.

43 SC. XXV, 136-41.
44 SC. II, 49, V.23, VI.16, 70, C.10.
45 P.V.Kane, HSP. p.278.
A brief summary of each of these works is given below.

(1) **Alamkāramañjari** - The work is referred to by Ruuyaka himself in the **Alamkāraraśrasva**. It appears from the context that the author specially considers three types of Dhvani in this work, but it cannot be definitely said that it is an independent work or a scholium. This work is not mentioned by Jayaratha; as Ruuyaka's work, hence Dr. P. V. Kane doubts whether it is a work by Ruuyaka.

(2) **Alamkāravarāttika** - This is cited by Jayaratha as Ruuyaka's work. It appears from Jayaratha's citation that the work deals with poetic figures with their varieties and sub-varieties, but some of the varieties dealt with in this work are omitted in the AS, but it cannot be definitely said that whether it is an independent work or a commentary on some work.

(3) **Alamkārānuśarini** - It is cited by Jayaratha as Ruuyaka's work. This is also cited by Ratnakanṭha in his

---

46 The NSP ed. of the AS. reads the line - 'tatra rasaḍidhvani Alamkāramañjaryāṃ darśitaḥ', p.18; but TSS ed. of text reads 'Kālidāsaprabandhesu' p.10 in the place of 'Alamkāramañjaryāṃ'. This reading is accepted in the MCLD. ed. The commentators are silent on the reading. If the reading of TSS ed. be accepted to be correct, there is no place of Alamkāramañjari among Ruuyaka's works. But the reading of the NSP ed. is preferable. Had the reading been 'Kālidāsaprabandhesu', the VS. or the SJ. would have quoted verses from Kālidāsa's works exclusively.

47 VS. p.91.

48 Ibid, pp. 44, 73, 76.
comments on the Stutikusumānjali. Relying on the remarks of Ratnakaṇṭha Peterson and following him Aufrecht and Jacobi believe that it is a commentary on Jalhana's Somapālavilāsa. Jayaratha's citations indicate that the author deals with some poetic figures in that composition, but there is nothing in these citations to show that it is, in fact, a commentary or not.

(4) Kāvyaprakāśasāmketa - It is a published work. This work is referred to as Ruuyaka's work by Jayaratha in his Vimarśinī. It is a commentary on Mammaṭa's Kāvyaprakāśa. This commentary has been written by Ruuyaka before writing his Vyaktivivekavyākhyāna and Alamkārasarvasva, because this work is referred to by the author in the Vyaktivivekavyākhyāna. Ruuyaka's Sāmketa is regarded as the earliest commentary on the Kāvyaprakāśa, in this commentary Ruuyaka for the first time speaks of the joint authorship of the Kāvyaprakāśa. Ruuyaka does not agree with Mammaṭa in many points but he does not forget the duty of a commentator whose chief aim is to elucidate the author's views.

49 tathā hi kavi-vara-jahlanakṛte Somapalavilāse... asyārthaḥ śrī-rājānaka-ruca-k-viracitā-yamalāṃkārā-nusaripyām...SK.VIII. 19.
51 VS. p. 130.
52 esa granthogranthakṛtānena kathamapya-samāptatvāt pareṇa ca pūritāvaseṣāvāt dvikhaṇ-do'pyakhandatayā yadava-bhāsate tatra saṃghaṭanaiva sadhīḥ hetuḥ. RKS. p.591.
(5) **NāṭakamImāmsa** - This work is referred to by Ruyyaka himself as his own in his Vyaktivivekavyākhyāna a commentary on the Vyaktiviveka. The author appears to compose this work before writing his commentary on Vyaktiviveka. The work is not yet discovered, but as the name of this work implies, it probably deals with the rules of dramaturgy, but from the context in which the name of the work occurs in the Vyaktivivekavyākhyāna, it appears that the author considers in detail the poetic blemishes in that work.

(6) **Vyaktivivekavyākhyāna** - It is a commentary on Mahimabhatta's Vyaktiviveka. This commentary is only partially recovered. The name of the author is not given in the commentary but the commentator refers to his other works viz. Harṣacaritavārtika, SāhityaImāmsa and NāṭakamImāmsa in this commentary. These works are known to be the works of Ruyyaka, who himself refers to the former two works in his Alamkārasarasvāsa. Jayaratha also ascribes a commentary called Vyaktivivekavicāra to the author of the Alamkārasarasvāsa.

---

53 asya ca vidheya-vimarśasyānauantetara-prasiddhasa-lakṣya- patitvenaṁmahībhīr nāṭakamaṁmaṁsaṁyāṁ sāhityaṁmaṁsaṁyāṁ ca teṣu teṣu sthāneṣu prapañcaḥ pradarśita iti grantha-viṣṭara-bhayādīta evopṛamyate. VW.p. 286.

54 Ibid, also cf. etad asmābhīr harṣacaritavārtike vīṣṭrya pratipāditam īta evavāyam. VW.p. 351; also cf. p.393.

55 esāpi samastopāma-pratipādakā-vasaye'pi harṣacarita vārtike sāhityaṁmaṁsaṁyāṁ ca teṣu teṣu pradeśaṁudāhṛta... AS. p.77.

56 vācyasya pratīyamāṇena tādātmya-tadutpatty-abhāvādi neha pratanyata iti vyaktivivekavicāre hi mayaivaṁtad vitatya nirnītam iti bhāvaḥ. VS. p.16.
Hence we can presume that the Vyaktivivekavyākhyāna is a work by Ruyyaka. The Vyaktiviveka was written with the sole aim of proving that positing of suggestion (vyañjanā) as a function is useless. Mahimabhaṭṭa attempts to include all types of suggested sense (Dhāvani) under the domain of inference (anumāna) and severely criticises the Dhvānakara's views, but Ruyyaka defends the Dhvānakara from the unjust criticism of Mahimabhaṭṭa. The Vyaktivivekavyākhyāna is not only an important commentary for understanding Mahimabhaṭṭa's theory of inference, but it is important for placing the theory of Dhvāni on a strong foundation. Bīṣṇupada Bhattacharjee rightly remarks:

"At his hands the theory of Dhvāni, which, in spite of the remarkable exposition of Abhinavagupta had some points unexplained that might give rise to ambiguities, was given a new orientation. By confuting the adverse criticisms of Mahimabhaṭṭa, the strongest opponent of the Dhvāni theory, he served the cause of his school in a manner which no other theorist could have achieved and by so doing placed the Dhvāni theory in an unassailable position."58

(7) Sahṛdayalīlā - It is a published work of Ruyyaka. The purpose of this work is to give a description of an accomplished civic life arising from good-heartedness, which is the result of skill. The skill, however, arises from the knowledge

57 anumane'ntar-bhāvam sarvasyaiva dhvaneḥ prakāsyitum / vyativivekam kurute prāṇamya mahīmā parām vācam //, VV. 1.1.

of excellence, ornaments, youth and paraphernalia, hence, the work is divided into four chapters, called Ullkehas, viz., Guṇa, Alamkāra, Jīvita and Parikara. The first chapter describes the ten Guṇas, viz., rūpa, varṇa, prabhā etc. of charming ladies; the second speaks of various kinds of ornaments made of gold, pearl, stones etc; the third speaks of the youth which is the essence of charm; and the last treats of paraphernalia of beauty.

(8) Sāhityamīmāṃsā — It is a complete work dealing with all the topics of Poetics, but unfortunately the name of the author is not found in the beginning or at the end. The work is referred to by Ruyyaka himself as his own in the Alamkārasarvasva and the Vyaktivivekavyākhyāṇa. This work is also referred to by Jayaratha as Ruyyaka's work in the Vimarsinī. This work is cited by Vidyanātha without, however, mentioning the name of the author. The work consists of eight chapters dealing with all the topics on Poetics. It is noteworthy that the Sāhityamīmāṃsā does not speak of vyanjanāvṛtti but of tātparyavṛtti which gives rise to the realisation of Rasa, a view which

59 śrīmatam-utkarsaparijñānād vaidagdhyena sahṛdayatvānāgari tāsiddhiḥ. yuvatyādināmutkaro dehe guṇālamkāra- jīvita-parikarebhyah. SL. p.93.
60 AS. p.77.
61 VVV. p.286.
62 VS. p.160.
63 prapañcitam ca Sāhityamīmāṃsāyaśyaḥ śuktisrajah sukṛtināma-Kalpamakalpanti'. PRD.p.13.
64 A brief resume of this work is given by P.V.Kane, vide HSP. pp. 280-83.
65 apadārtho'pi vākyartho rasas tātparyavṛttitah. SM.p.85.
fundamentally differs from that of Ruyyaka who is a staunch advocate of the theory of Dhvani and the function of suggestion as is evident from his Alamkārasarvasva and Vyaktiviveka-vyākhyāna. But this apparent contradictory views do not altogether rule out the ascription of the authorship of Sāhitya-mīmāṃsā to Ruyyaka, although Dr.V.Raghavan raises doubt about Ruyyaka's authorship of this work.66 Dr.P.V.Kane explains away this contradiction of Ruyyaka's view by saying that Sāhitya-mīmāṃsā was composed by him (Ruyyaka) when the author was comparatively young and under the influence of Vakroktijivita, while the Alamkārasarvasva was composed when he was of mature intellect and had come completely under the influence of the Dhvanyāloka and Abhinavagupta.67

(9) Śrīkanṭhastava - This is cited by Ruyyaka as his own work from which three verses are quoted as illustrations. It seems to be a poetical work eulogising the greatness of Śiva.

66 V.Raghavan, BSP. p.94.
67 P.V.Kane, HSP. p.283.
68 The NSP ed. of the AS (p.23) reads 'udāharaṇam madiye śrīkanṭhastave'. while TSS ed.(p.15) reads 'mānkhīye' in the place 'madiye'. Samudrabandha reads 'madiye Śrīkanṭhacarite', Jayaratha is silent on the reading; Vidyācakravartin accepts the reading mānkhīye (which is given in the MC.ed.) and explains 'maṃkhākhyā-kavi-kartīke'. SJ. p.26). The reading of the TSS ed.is not preferable because it ascribes the authorship of the Vṛtti to Maṅkhaka. Had Maṅkhaka been the author of the Vṛtti, he would not write his name, it would have been written as 'madiye'. the alternative reading 'madiye śrīkanṭhacarite' is not also preferable, because the verses quoted for illustrations are not found in Maṅkhaka's SC. So the reading given in NSP ed. is preferable.
(10) Harṣacaritavārtika - This work is referred to as his own by Ruyyaka in the Alamkārasarvasva and in the Vyaktivekavyākhyāna. This is a commentary on Bāna's Harṣacarita. In his Vyaktivekavyākhyāna, Ruyyaka says that Bāna's works contain striking expression in many places. This commentary on the Harṣacarita is not yet discovered. It appears from Ruyyaka's statement that he analyses in detail the poetic figures in Bāna's expression in that commentary.

4. The Commentators on the Alamkārasarvasva:

The popularity of the Alamkārasarvasva as an authentic treatise on poetic figures is indicated by many commentaries on it. The Alamkārasarvasva has got four commentators.

(1) Alaka - Ratnakantha in his commentary Sāraśamuccaya on the Kāvyaprakāśa refers to one Alaka as a commentator on the Alamkārasarvasva. Rājaka Ananda in his Nidarsana commentary on the Kāvyaprakāśa tells us that Māmāṭa composed the Kāvyaprakāśa up to the figure Parikara and the rest was completed by Alaka. Dr. S.K. De says that Peterson identifies Alaka, a joint author of the Kāvyaprakāśa with Alaka, a commentator.

---

69 Loc. cit.
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72 uprekṣayām kriyāmatro kṣamamupapadyata ityutprekṣā- 
rupakametaparamarthataḥ. etdasmabhīmharṣacaritavārtike 
vistṛtya pratipaditam tata evavaseyam. VVV. p. 351.
74 Vide P.V. Kane, HSP. p. 271.
on the *Alamkārasarvasva*. But he expresses his doubt about this identification. 75 We also observe that this identification is not possible because Ruyyaka in his *Kāvyaprakāśasamketa* speaks of the dual authorship of the *Kāvyaprakāśa* and he comments up to the last verse. 76 Therefore Alaka, a continuator (if there be any) of the *Kāvyaprakāśa* is senior to Ruyyaka. So this Alaka, the continuator of the *Kāvyaprakāśa* cannot happen to be a commentator on the *Alamkārasarvasva*. Jayaratha also remains silent about this commentator. As this commentary is not discovered, nothing more can be said about it.

(2) Jayaratha - The name of Jayaratha's commentary on the *Alamkārasarvasva* is *Alamkārevimārśini*, and it is simply called *Vimārśini*. Jayaratha tells us that he was a son of Śrīśīra, who was a prime minister of Rājarāja. According to Jacobi, Rājarāja lived in 1203–1226 A.D. 78 Jayaratha also quotes a verse 79 in his *Vimārśini* from Jonaraja’s *Prthvīrajavijaya* which describes the exploit of great Chohan King Prthvīraja against Sahabuddin Ghor of Ghazni and died in 1193 A.D. This establishes that Jayaratha flourished in the first quarter of the 13th century A.D. 80

Jayaratha's commentary is a standard and learned one but his views have been quoted and criticised by Jagannatha. 81

---

76 RKS. p. 591.
77 VS. Col. p. 257.
79 yathā-prthvīrajavijaye-grṇadbhiḥ parayā bhaktya bāṅgaliṅgā-paramparāḥ / anarmadeva yat sainair niramīyata narmadā // , VS. p. 82.
80 P.V.Kane, HSP. p. 285.
81 RG. pp. 343, 369, 435, 474, 519 etc.
does not meekly follow the text of the *Alamkārasarvasva*, but gives critical comment and explanation of the text. The *Vimarsīnī* is useful for fixing many readings of the text and it is important for its numerous citations in which he includes almost all writers on Poetics who preceded him. The *Vimarsīnī* is useful for determining other works ascribed to Ruyyaka. Jayaratha also mentions some other works, such as *Alamkārasāra*, and the *Alamkārabhāṣya* which are not discovered. Ruyyaka has been strongly criticised by Śobhākara, the author of the *Alakāratānākara*, but Jayaratha in his turn, criticises Śobhākara and defends his author, Ruyyaka, and thus Jayaratha upholds the position of Ruyyaka. But sometimes he also criticises Ruyyaka's views. Jayaratha also writes a commentary called *Viveka* on Abhinava-Gupta's *Tantraloka*, a text on Kashmirian Saivaism.

(3) Samudrabandha – The name of Samudrabandha's commentary on the *Alamkārasarvasva* is called *Vivṛti* or *Vṛtti*. Samudrabandha tells us that he composed his commentary on the *Alamkārasarvasva* of Maṅkhaka under the patronage of Ravivarman, king of Kalamba in Kerala. There are numerous illustrative verses in

82 Cf. VS. pp. 26, 47, 63, 158, 125 etc.
85 Ibid, pp. 28 - 9, 89, 137, 188.
86 maṅkhukanibandhavivrtau vihitayāmiha samudrabandhena, p. 252.
87 VR. Invocatory verses, 1 - 2.
the commentary itself, which are composed in honour of his patron. Ravivarman was born in 1266-67 A.D. and became king in 1312-13 A.D. Therefore, Samudrabandha may be taken to have flourished towards the end of the 13th century and the beginning of the 14th century A.D.

Samudrabandha's commentary literally follows the text. The commentator shows his familiarity with almost all writers on Poetics preceding the author. He refers to the explanation of other commentators of the Alankārasarvasva and sometimes discusses the reading. He sums up five views about the special features of poetic theories. The speciality of Samudrabandha's commentary is that it explains the illustrative verses given by the author and also by himself.

(4) ŚrīVidyācakravartin - He was a court-poet of the Hoysala king Vallalla III who reigned from 1291 to 1342 A.D. So Vidyācakravartin may be taken to have flourished in the middle of the 14th century A.D.

Vidyācakravartin's commentary on the Alankārasarvasva is known as Sañjīvanī. He is also a commentator on Mammaṭa's

88 Cf. Ibid., pp. 48, 58, 76, 133 etc.
90 VR. pp. 55, 96, 145.
91 Ibid. p. 57.
92 iha vīśīṣṭau abārdhau kāvyam. tayośca vaiśīṣṭhyam dharmamukhena, vyāpāramukhena, vyānyamukkhena vetti trayah paksāh. adye'pyalamkarato guṇato vetti dvaividhyam. dvitīye'pi bhaṅgītavaiśīṣṭhyena bhogakṛttvenavitai dvaividhyam. iti pañcāṣu pakṣaṣu adyaḥ udbhātādādhibhirāṃikṛtaḥ, dvitīyo vāmanena, trītiyo vakroktiśivātakārena, caturtho bhaṭṭaṇāyakena, pañcamāḥ ānandavardhanena. Ibid. pp. 3-4.
Kāvyaprakāsa, and the name of his commentary on the Kāvyaprakāsa is Sampradāyaprakāśīnī. The Sañjīvanī is a standard commentary which faithfully explains the knotty points of the text and in several places he shows his originality as a thinker on poetics. He explains the figure of the illustrative verses and shows how the verse satisfies the definition of a particular poetic figure. The special feature that we find in the Sañjīvanī commentary is that the commentator faithfully quotes the Sūtra of the text, and at the end of his discussion of individual poetic figures he gives a resume of each and every individual poetic figure. The popularity of the Sañjīvanī is evident from the fact that later writers like Mallinātha, Kumarasavāmin and Appaya Dīkṣitā refer to the views of the Sañjīvanī.

5. The Scope of the Alamkārasarvasva.

The early writers on Poetics put emphasis on the Alamkāra. Alamkāra in their speculation is a wide concept. The term Alamkāra is used by them in the sense of principle of beauty, but at the same time it is also applied to the objective beauty of a poetic form realised by certain decorative means. Thus, in the speculation of earlier thinkers on poetry all formal beauty of poetry has been included under the wide scope of Alamkāra,
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which, in the words of Dr. V.Raghavan 'was an omnibus concept, comprehending all points of appeal in Kāvya, Guna, 'figure-Alamkāra', Rasa, Vṛttyāṅga, Sandhyāṅga and Laksāṇa'.

But in the speculation of Dhvanikāra, the wide concept of Alamkāra has exclusively been restricted to the poetic figures, a means of embellishment. The position of poetic figures which enjoy a paramount importance in the speculation of earlier thinkers has been relegated in the system of Dhvani, when Dhvani or more properly Rasadhvani has been established as the soul of poetry. The Dhvanikāra admits only those figures which are connected with the unexpressed element in the form of Rasa, and the figures which are not connected with the unexpressed, are, in the opinion of the Dhvanikāra, mere vāgvikalpas, and they should be included under the Citra-Kāvya, which, according to him, is not a poetry proper but an imitation of poetry. In this variety of poetry, poet's intention does not lie in the depiction of Rasa and the beauty in this type of poetry lies in its mere strikingness of sound and sense.

Ruyyaka as a follower of Dhvani school realises the deficiency of the Dhvanikāra's treatment of poetic figures because the cases, 'where the poet's obvious intention is not to awaken Rasa or anything else unexpressed, but simply to produce a strikingness (vaicitrya) in the form of an expressed poetic figures', should be acknowledged and analysed, for the poetic figures unconnected with the unexpressed have a significance for poetry which cannot be ignored.

98 BSP. p.291
99 tadevamalamkāra eva kāvye pradhānamiti prācyānām matam. AS. p.9.
100 S.K.De, VJ. Introduction, p. Xlix.
Ruyyaka recognises the Dhvanikāra’s threefold division of poetry viz., Dhvanikāvya, Gunībhūtavyāṅgya-kāvya and Citra-kāvya. As the first two divisions are already discussed in the Alāṃkāramaṅjarī and the Dhvanyāloka respectively, Ruyyaka proposes to undertake in the Alāṃkāratarvasva, the remaining Citra-kāvya which includes in its scope all poetic figures devoid of suggested element. The Dhvanikāra does not take into consideration all poetic figures in general, but only of those which are connected with the suggested Rasa. As the detailed discussion on the Citra-kāvya or poetic figure is omitted in the Dhvanyāloka, Ruyyaka, as a follower of the Dhvanikāra, attempts to make a supplement to the work of his great predecessor.

Ruyyaka implicitly takes the idea of 'vicchitti', (charm) brought about by the productive imagination of the poet to be the test of a poetic figure, and applies this test to the consideration of numerous poetic figures. This 'vicchitti' (special charm) is recognised by him as the most important differentia in the classification of poetic figures. The criterion of special charm is applied implicitly in the acceptance or denial of poetic figures recognised by earlier writers on Alāṃkāra. Ruyyaka tacitly omits from his list some poetic figures recognised already by his predecessors on the ground that the special charm essential for a poetic figure is wanting in them. Some of the poetic figures of different names of older writers appear to have been incorporated by Ruyyaka in some of the figures of Alāṃkāratarvasva, because the special charm is not different in these figures. Ruyyaka finds some new turns of expression which, not noticed by his predecessors, are appreciated by him as
poetic figures, because the special charm in these expressions is brought about by the imagination of the poet.

Ruyyaka draws materials from his predecessors, but he does not blindly follow their views; he modifies and improves the earlier opinions. Though he takes materials from all earlier authorities, yet he is more indebted to Udbhaṭa whom he calls alaṃkāra-tantraprajāpati. Ruyyaka does not mix the old and new schools of thought, but he acknowledges his indebtedness to both the schools.

Ruyyaka deliberately limits the field of his treatise to the treatment of poetic figures exclusively, and in their analysis he achieves a measure of precision and clarity rare in Sanskrit poetics. Ruyyaka exerts great influence to later writers on Alāṃkāra for his systematic and scientific analysis of poetic figures. In the Alāṃkārasarvasva, eighty poetic figures (of sound only four, and of sense seventysix) with their divisions and subdivisions are defined, analysed and illustrated. They are arranged and analysed on some general principles, and their underlying doctrine has been systematised. The definitions of most of the figures are fixed finally, and there is a little scope for improvement on them in later speculation. Therefore, Ruyyaka has been recognised as the most important author on Alāṃkāra—

ṇāmaṃkārika-samājāgragānya. 102
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