INTRODUCTION
I. Background

The history of Alamkāra literature in Sanskrit is one of at least long two thousand years, if not longer from the beginning of the Vedas. Although there are ample evidences to prove that the Rṣis of the Vedas were quite familiar with the use of figures of speech, it cannot be asserted that there was the existence of the Sanskrit-poetics as a science. Perhaps those were mere poetic fancies, the application of which was quite spontaneous and considered as inseparable parts of expressions bearing no necessary relation to the theoretical tenets of a science. P. S. 1. Shastrin, in an article under the caption "Figures of speech in Rgveda", established the use of following figures of speech in the Rgveda – Upamā (10.71.4., 8.34.9., ...), Eūpaka (1.50.1, 9.72.2., ...), Atiśayokti (4.1.9., 4.2.19., ...), Utprekṣā (2.4.6., 4.7.3., ...), Vibhāvanā (1.164.3D., 10.34.9., ...), Viśeṣokti (1.74.7, 10.71.4.), Ullekha (1.164.46., 1.177.1., ...), Paryāyokti (8.61.22., 9.2.1., ...), Bhrāntimān (4.16.10), Atādguna (7.28.1), Vijardhābhāsa (6.59.6., 1.152.3., ...), Ākṣepa (7.55.3), Nidarsana (5.78.4), Aprastutapraśāmsā (10.71.4., 10.71.5., ...), Anavaya (7.55.4., 10.114.4., ...), Arthāntaranyāsa (1.17.9., 10.86.4.),


Kāvyalīṅga (2.33.4., 7.4.5., ...), Svabhāvokti (5.86.4., 1.58.5., ...), Samāsokti (1.79.4., 1.36.3., ...), Bhāvika (1.22.20, 3.21.) and Śṛṣa (4.13.2., 4.41.8., ...). H. D. Velankar, Abel Bergaigne, V.V. Sowani and a few other scholars also have shown the uses of figures of speech in the Vedas. Yāskācāryya, author of the Niruktā, mentions a definition of Upamā as propounded by his predecessor Gārgyā. He had some discussions on the characters of Upamāṇa also.

However, the definite span of time from Bharata to latest writers, is no less than a period of two thousand years. But we cannot put the Ālāṃkārikas in a definite chronological order owing to the lack of necessary historical information. Perhaps an apathy towards this mundane world discouraged these ancient Indian writers to write on their own life and supply us with historical data.


relating to them. Bhatā's Nāṭyaśāstra, the oldest extant work on dramaturgy, possesses discussions on literary criticism and figures of speech in particular. He is placed sometime around the beginning of the Christian era. Though it is not certain, how long did the Nāṭyaśāstra take to come to its present form, it is certain that Bharata had been regarded as the founder of the Nāṭyaśāstra before Kālidāsa flourished. After that a vacuum of about seven hundred years is noticed. It is most probable that, in this period, there were many Ālambārikas, whose works are lost in oblivion. The following order, after Bharata, is widely accepted by the present-day scholars: Daṇḍin, Bhāmaha, Udbhata, Bhattanāyaka, Vāmana, Rudraṭa, Mukula, Prāthārendrāṇa, Ānandavardhana, Mahimabhaṭṭa, Kuntaka, Abhinavagupta, Sauddhaḍan, Vabhata (generally known as Vāgbhata-I), Vāgbhata (II), Ruyyaka, Bhōjarāja, Mammaṭa, Hemacandra, Keśabamiśra, Piṇḍavarsa, Vidyānātha, Viśva-nātha, Govindaṭhakkura, Appaya Dīkṣita and Jagannātha. It is a great question as to who is earlier, — Bhāmaha or Daṇḍin? Tussle went on for a long time among scholars — some putting Bhāmaha as earlier and others setting it at naught. How many nights did the scholars spend unslept in search of

7. See H.S.P. (Kane), pp. 39ff. For the dates of later critics consult H.S.P. (Kane), H.S.P. (De) and H.S.I. (Dasgupta and De).

8. See Introduction p.16, of Vamanāchārya Jhalkikar's edition of the Kavyaprakāśa. However, Rudraṭa is placed there before Vāmana. This is hard to accept.
grounds for putting one earlier or later or how many arguments and sharp counter arguments were there — is a difficult task to find out. We think that final decision is yet to be drawn, since arguments on both the sides are weighty and reasonable. Prof. Pāthak, Prof. A.B. Keith, M.M. P.V. Kane and others place Daṇḍin before Bhāmaha, whereas Dr. Jacobi, Prof. Raṅgācārya and others are inclined to place Bhāmaha before Daṇḍin.

Daṇḍin, author of the Kāvyādārśa, is generally placed in the 6th century A.D. He is an exponent of Alamkāra school and is attached with the school of Style also. He dealt with the figures of speech relating to ideas in Chapter II in his work.

Bhāmaha, author of the Kāvyālāṃkāra, belongs to the Alamkāra school. His date is approximately the same as Daṇḍin’s.

Udbhāta, who is placed in about 800 A.D., is author of the Kāvyālāṃkārasārasaṃgraha, which deals with the figures of speech only. He holds a high position among the exponents of Alamkāra school. He is credited with another work called Bhāmahavivaraṇa, a commentary on

Bhamaha's Kavyalamkara. Probably he wrote a commentary on the Natyasastra of Bharata too.

That Bhattanayaka, author of the Hridayadarpana, flourished between 935-985 A.D., is established by Mr. T.R. Cintamanl in an article under the caption 'Fragments of Bhattanayaka'. He is believed to have flourished after Anandavardhana and before Abhinavagupta.

We hear of two Vamanas—one as the joint author of the Kasika, a Commentary on the Astadhyayi of Pani and the other as the author of the Kavyalambkarasutramrtti. If these two Vamanas are identical, then he should be placed around 800 A.D. Otherwise, the Alamanika Vamana is to be placed before the 10th century A.D., since he is mentioned by Pratiharendura. Vamana is the most predominant among the defenders of Riti school. Certain almost proverbial statements like "kavyam grahyam alamkarat", "Saundaryam alamkaraah", "ritir atma kavyasya", in the

10. R. Gnoli claims to have discovered from Kafierkoth (in Pakistan) a fragmentary manuscript of Udabha's commentary on the Kavyalambkara. See his work, Udabha's Commentary on the Kavyalambkara of Bhamaha, Rome, 1962.
14. See K.A.S.S. (Banhatti), p. 90:
'ya ca ukta bhattavamanena-laksanayam hi ...' etc.
17. K.A.S.V. (Basu), I. II. 6, p. 35.
sphere of Sanskrit Alamkāraśāstra came from his pen. He admits the existence of Alamkāra but not in the conventional meaning. It is useful to note that he is said to be the earliest writer to take into account the 'Quint essence' (Ātmā) of poetry.

Rudrāta, author of the Kāvyālamkāra in sixteen chapters, placed in about 850 A.D. He is also a follower of the Alamkāra school.

After Rudrāta, appears the most prominent among the Sanskrit Alamkārikas — Ānandavardhana. His Dhvanikārikās mention that the theory of Dvani i.e. suggestion, as the essence of poetry, was formulated before by his predecessors. Though the term Dvani is used in works like Mahābhāṣya, in the sense of 'Sphota', nowhere is it mentioned as the essence of poetry, so far as the extant works are concerned, before Ānandavardhana appeared in this field. In fact, Ānandavardhana gave the final authoritative shape to the Dvani theory, the origin of which is lost in obscurity. Dhvanikāra stands on a high pedestal because he treads not in the beaten track of Guna or Rīti but penetrates into the kernel of the literary art which hardly exists in the formal and apparent processes of ornamentation. Ānandavardhana's work, generally known as Dhvanyāloka, was apparently named Kāvyāloka and Sahādayāloka also. Abhinavagupta's Commentary, Locana, on the Dhvanyāloka, is widely known and can rightly claim the status of an original work.

Mukulabhaṭṭa's Abhidārvttimātrkā, though smaller in bulk, is a significant work on the first two powers of words, namely, Abhidā and Laksanā. Mukulabhaṭṭa is dated 925 A.D.

Another noteworthy name is Kṣemendra (around 1000 A.D.). In his Aucityavicāracarcā, he proclaimed 'Aucitya' (propriety) to be the essence of literature.

After Mukulabhaṭṭa, another big personality in the field of Sanskrit literary criticism, is Kuntaka or Kuntala. The very title of his work, viz., Vakroktijīvīta, indicates the school of which he is the exponent.

Bhoja’s Sarasvatīkanthābharaṇa is, as opposed to Abhidārvttimātrkā, a voluminous work with less originality. Bhoja belonged to the first half of the 11th century A.D.

Māmata is author of the Kāvyaprakāśa in ten Ullāsas. His work, though a synthesis of the works of his predecessors, possesses much originality and justifiedly claims a high position in this domain. He is greatly influenced by the Dhvani school of Ālaṃkārikas. The single work, like a present-day compendium contains almost all the topics of Sanskrit poetics and can supply us ready-made solutions, obviously of a high order, in an abridged form.

After Māmata we should mention the names of Ruyyaka (1150 A.D.), author of the Ālaṃkāra-sarvasva, Vidyādhara (1300 A.D.), author of the Ekāvalī, Vidyānātha (1325 A.D.), author of the Pratāparudra-yaśōbhūṣaṇa,
Visvanātha, author of the Sāhityadārpana, Appaya Dīkṣita, author of the Citramīmāṃsa, Kuvalayānanda and Vṛttivārtika and Pandītarāja Jagannātha, author of the Rasa-gaṅgādhara. Of them, Visvanātha enjoyed perhaps the highest popularity, particularly in Bengal. His Sāhityadārpana obviously followed the methods of the Kāvyaprakāśa of Mamāta. The remarkable innovation we notice is that he added a chapter on dramaturgy also. The most noteworthy contribution of Visvanātha is perhaps his extremely lucid exposition of the highly difficult theory of Rasa. As regards Appaya Dīkṣita and Jagannātha, we shall discuss them later on. Even after Jagannātha, the flow of composing works on Alamkāraśāstra continued for further two hundred years at least. Of them, Visveśvara Pandīta, Acyutarāya and a few others deserve mention in this connection. Even in the 19th century, we find Candrakānta Tarkālāmkaṇa, a Bengalee Ālamkārika, writing a treatise on Sanskrit poetics, entitled Alamkārasūtra.

We have mentioned the names and probable dates of the prominent Ālamkārikas. In this connection it would be useful to show the formation of schools that prevail in this domain. There lies a great controversy among the Ālamkārikas with regard to the question — what constitutes the quint essence of literature, and in fact, the formation of schools is based on this point primarily. A few maintained Alamkāra to be the quint essence of literature, others the Riti (Diction) and some again Dhvani (Suggestion) or more particularly the esthetic relish. It is again interesting to note that a good number of Ālamkārikas cannot be assigned
to a particular school, since their works record a variety of tenets and do not stick to any particular one.

However, five schools in Sanskrit poetics, have been generally admitted. They are — (1) the Rasa school, (2) the Alankāra school, (3) the Rāti School, (4) the Vakrokti school and (5) the Dhvani school.

(1) The Rasa school: Bharata is said to be the earliest champion of this school in so far as he is the first person, known until now, who spoke of the Rasa as the 'sine quanon' of the dramatic art.

(2) The Alankāra school: Bhāmaha is associated with this group and generally he is said to be the exponent of this school. Udbhata, Rudraṇa and a few others belong to this school.

(3) The Rāti school: Though the name of Vāmana is heard as the exponent of this school, we see Daṇḍin clearly emphasizing the Mārgas, the same which is styled as Rāti by Vāmana. However, it is Vāmana, who, for the first time, spoke of Atman or the quint essence of literature and assigned that position to Rāti.

(4) The Vakrokti school: Kuntaka's name is associated with this school. According to him, Vakrokti or the striking

19. "na hi rasād rte kaścid arthāḥ pravartate".
Nātyaśāstra (G.O.S.), Vol.I, Ch.VI, pp. 273-274.
mode of expression, is the quint essence of the literature.

(5) The Dhvani school: Ānandavardhana is the exponent of this school. Almost all the post-Dhvani writers, on Sanskrit poetics were highly influenced by this school. In fact, except a few anti-Dhvani writers like Mahimabhatta, who included Dhvani in 'Anumāna', almost all literary critics, who flourished after Abhinavagupta, belonged to the school of Dhvani.

It may now be asked — to which school did Appaya Dīksita belong? Unlike Ānandavardhana and others, Appaya Dīksita did not compose a work on the theory of Dhvani exclusively. On the contrary, his two works on poetics deal with the figures of speech primarily and attach a great importance to the same and this may push him to the Alamkāra school. But from an analysis of the contents of his works, it would be quite clear that our author belongs to the Dhvani school of poetics. Thus, the definition of Dhvani (kāvya) as given in the Citramāṇa, attaching the status of the first-rate literary composition to Dhvani- (kāvya), or more particularly, giving the first position

21. Read:

'sabdārthan sahitau vakrakavivyāpāraśālinī /
bandhē vyāvasthitau kāvyam tadvidāhlādakārini //'

Vakroktijīvita I.7., p. 7.

and the commentary thereon by the author — 'vakro yo'sau sāstrādiprasiddhasabdārthopanivanthayātirekā satprakāra-vakratāviṣīśtāh kavivyāpāras tatkriyākramāh...' etc.


Also read, I. 8, I. 9, I. 10 and the explanation by the author thereon; pp. 15ff.
to it (though not mentioned in words — but clearly indicated),
admittance of figures like Rasavat, Preyas, Urjasvat etc. in
the Kuvalayānanda, and a few other points undoubtedly put
our author in the group of Dhvānivādins. It should must
however be admitted that the schools of Sanskrit Ālāmākārikas
had some common frontiers also and very often they are found
to be intermingled with each other. Thus, since Rasadhwani
is one of the three varieties of Dhvāni, (the other two being
Vastu and Ālāmākāra), the Dhvāni-theory is only an extention
of the Rasa-theory, originally propounded by Bharata in
dramaturgy. Similarly, Guṇa and Ālāmākāra have a legitimate
place in the system of Dhvāni and Rasa. Riti also is closed
to Dhvāni and as such the Riti-vāda is often called
'Asphuṭadhvānivāda' and this is based on the following
Kārikā of Dhvānya-loka —

"asphuṭasphuritaṃ kāvyatattvam etad yathoditam /
asaknuvadbhir vyākartoḥ rītayah sampravartitāḥ //"
III. 52.

It is a fact that even the Dhvānivādins could not totally
ignore the role of figures of speech in literature, so much
so that Appaya Dīkṣita, though a champion of the theory of
suggestion and classifying literature accordingly, devoted
both the Kuvalayānanda and Citramāṁsā to figures of
speech only.
II. Emergence of Appaya Dīkṣita in the Field of Literary Criticism.

The exact date of Appaya Dīkṣita's very difficult to determine. Perhaps, as with regard to the question, viz., how many works did our author compose, this question also has been made more complicated by the fact that there were no less than four Appaya Dīkṣitas in three generations.

The name of our author is spelt differently. In the last but one verse and the colophon of the Kuvalayānanda, the author himself used the form 'Appa'. But the forms 'Appaya' or 'Appayya' also are frequently used in works on literary criticism. Krishnamachariar, in this context, points out that 'Appa' was the original name and honorific

22. See H.S.P. (De), p. 223, foot note No. 1, where the author refers to Raghavan's article in the Proceeding of the All-India Oriental Conference X, Tirupati, 1941, pp. 176-180. MM. P.V. Kane also in his History of Sanskrit poetics refers to this article of Dr. Raghavan but says that Raghavan has shown that there were three persons named Appaya Dīkṣita in the same family in three generations. See H.S.P. (Kane), p. 309. However, we could not collect a copy of the same and as such could not check it.

Also see, New Catalogus Catalogorum, edited by Raghavan, p. 284, where the author refers to the same article of his own.

23. "amum kuvalayānandam akarod appadīkṣitaḥ/
    niyogād veṅkaṭapater nirupādikṛpanidheḥ //
    Kuvalayānanda, verse No. 171, p. 188;
and "... appadīkṣitasya kṛtih kuvalayānandaḥ samāptah"
    Kuvalayānanda, Colophon, p. 188.
'ayya' was added to it in recognition of his greatness as a literary prodigy. 24 S.K. De in his History of Sanskrit Poetics (p. 223) maintains that another form is 'Apya'. The exact language he uses is this: "we find the author himself using the forms Appa or Apya of his name in his Kuvalayânanda". But the edition of the Kuvalayânanda at our disposal reads 'Appa' only. We are not sure whether any manuscript or edition bears the form 'Apya'.

Y. Mahalinga Shastrin cites two verses of Śivānanda-yogīndra, author of the Appayadīksitenāravijaya, of which one gives us the necessary information with regard to the nativity and the time of birth of Appaya Diksita whereas the other supplies us with a valuable horoscope of our author. The two verses run thus:

"vinātattvaṃsamkhyaśātasītaklisamābhāk pramāti ca varṣe kanyāmāse'athā kṛṣṇapratimatithiyute apyuttara-prosthāpade / kanyālagne 'drikanyāpatir amitādayāśevadhir vaidikēśu śrīdevyai prāgyāthoktaṁ samajani hi samīpe'ctra kācinagaryyāḥ" //

"lagne raviṇḍusūtayor makare ca māndau māne śaśīṇyātha vrṣe raviṇe ca rāhau / cāpe gurou ksitisute mithume tulāyām suke śikhīnyaligate śubhalagna evam //"

However, calculations from the planetary positions in the Rāsīs as shown by Shastrin, place Appaya Dīkṣita between 1554-1626 A.D. Scholars like MM. P.V. Kane, also are inclined to place him in the same period. Historical researches also point a date around the same period. But Y. Mahalinga Shastrin vehemently opposes this date, namely, 1554-1626 A.D. on the ground that the horoscope as mentioned above is a forged one and he is inclined to place Appaya Dīkṣita in 1520 to 1593 A.D. But MM. P.V. Kane sticks to the generally accepted date of 1554-1626 A.D. since the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candra</th>
<th>Sani and Rāhu</th>
<th>Kuja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāsi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māndi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ketu</td>
<td>Sukra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. See H.S.P. (Kane), pp. 307-309.
Also see, H.S.P. (De), p.222, where the authors draws his conclusion thus:

"We may thus assign him to the third and fourth quarters of the 16th century; and as he was alive in the time of Veṅkaṭa I, he may have lived into the beginning of the 17th century.

Also see, Dr. A.L. Gangopādhyāya, Contribution of Appaya Dīkṣita to Indian Poetics, pp. 8-9.

28. For a detailed discussion on this point, see H.S.P. (Kane) pp. 307-309, H.S.P. (De), pp. 222-223.


30. See H.S.P. (Kane), p. 308.
arguments adduced by Shastri are not unquestionable and since the well-known antagonism between Jainatha and Appaya Diksita and the personal attacks of the former on the latter can be explained more satisfactorily if this date be accepted and since a large number of traditional stories are there to prove that both Appaya Diksita and Jagamatha were contemporaneous or at least both of them were simultaneously alive for a few years.

As per the last quarter of the verse 'vinatatajña' etc., already cited, we come to know that Appaya Diksita hailed from the city of Kânchi. The same line, however, has an alternative reading and runs thus — "samajani virinçi-șapuryyām ..." etc. From the colophon of the Kuvalayānanda, it is known, that Appaya Diksita was a Brahmin and was an Advaitin. The colophon runs thus:

iti śrīmadādvaitavidyācāryaśrīmadādvijakula-
jaladhiakustubhasrīraṅgarājadhvarīndra-
varadasañor appadiksitasya kṛtīk kuvalayā-
nandah samāptah'. (Kuvalayānanda, p. 188).

From the above colophon, we come to know that Varada was the father of Appaya Diksita. But Krishnamachariar points out that 'srīraṅgarājadhvarīndravaraśaṅaḥ' is a wrong reading for 'srīraṅgarājadhvarivarasāñoḥ' and thus the name of Appaya Diksita's father should be taken as Raṅgarāja. In


a few works 'dvijakula' has been read as 'bhāradvājakula'
and thereby prescribes 'Bhāradvāja-gotra' for Appaya Dīksita.
Appaya Dīksita had a long life of not less than seventy-two
or seventy-three years. There is a verse, going under the
name of Appaya Dīksita, which runs thus:

\[
vayāmsi mama saptater upari naiva bhoge sprhā
data kimcēd aham arthaye śivapādaṃ diśrkṣe param
\]

According to which Appaya Dīksita made a statement of his
age as above seventy and expressed his apathy towards this
mundane and worldly enjoyments. J.C. Misra cites a verse

32. A.L. Gangopadhyaya — 'Contribution of Appaya Dīksita to
Indian Poetics', p.8. However, the exact source or the
edition of the work, the author used, has not been
mentioned there.

34. S.K. De, History of Sanskrit Poetics, p. 222, foot note
7 (73 years).

18, says that this verse occurs in the Introduction to
Appaya Dīksita's Siddhānta-lesā-saṃgraha. The verse,
however, could not be traced in Jīvananda Vidyāsāgar's
dition of the Siddhānta-lesā-saṃgraha.

36. Hindi Citramimamsa, Introduction, p.17. The verse runs
thus:

'yaṣṭum visvajitā yatā paricharam sarve buḍhā nirjita
bhaṭṭojipramukhāḥ sa pañcita jagannātho'pi nistārītāh/
pūrve'rdhe carane dvisaptatitamasyaśābdaśya sad visvajit
yājī yaśe' ca cidambare svam abhajaj jyotīḥ satām
pas yatām' //
of Balakavi, author of the Nalacaritam, according to whom Appaya Dikṣita had a life of seventy-two years. It is said that Appaya Dikṣita spent his last part of life in Vārāṇasī. The famous hearsay with regard to Appaya Dikṣita's question and the extempore answer from Jagannātha, who with his face covered by a cloth was lying on a cot with his muslim concubine, near the steps of the river Bhāgirathī, is perhaps known to all and hence we refrain from reproducing that story. It is said that Jagannātha was outcast from the society by Appaya Dikṣita for keeping that muslim concubine. We shall speak of the personal attacks and frequent unwarranted criticisms by Jagannātha on Appaya Dikṣita later on.
III. Works of Appaya Dīkṣita in the Field of Sanskrit Poetics.

Tradition ascribes more than a hundred works to Appaya Dīkṣita. But it is very difficult to find out the exact number of works which came from the pen of this Appaya Dīkṣita. As we have noted earlier, this question has been made more complicated by the fact that there were no less than three or four Appaya Dīkṣitas in three generations. The name of our Appaya Dīkṣita's brother is Appayya Dīkṣita, a name, by which our author also is mentioned in many places. He was also an Ālāmkārīka and had to his credit a work named Ālāmkāratilaka. It is most probable that a few out of more than a hundred works came from the pen of other Appaya Dīkṣitas. Catalogus Catalogorum of Aufrecht mentions sixty-six works to his name. The New Catalogus Catalogorum of Raghavan, however, mentions sixty-two works to the credit of our Appaya Dīkṣita. These works on different subjects prove the vast range of knowledge that Appaya Dīkṣita possessed. Dr. A.L. Gangopadhyaya, in his 'Contribution of Appaya Dīkṣita to Indian Poetics' gives an exhaustive list of the available texts of Appaya Dīkṣita. But a few discrepancies are noticed there. For example, the author

37. Cf. "śrīmad-dīkṣītaiś caturdīkṣātām 104 granthāḥ prāṇītā iti śrūyate".

38. See H.S.P. (De), p. 225.


40. New Catalogus Catalogorum (Raghavan), pp. 264-266.

41. Contribution of Appaya Dīkṣita to Indian Poetics, pp. 9-10.
mentions only nineteen available devotional texts against his own statement of "28 devotional compositions of Appaya." Again, Naksatradāvāvalī has been mentioned as a work on grammar, but the same is included in the list of works on Pūrvamīmāṃsā too. He does not clarify whether there are two books under the same name like the Sarasvatikanthābharanā of Bhoja. The name Naksatradāvāvalī does not sound like the name of a grammatical treatise. Aufrecht, in his Catalogus Catalogorum mentions Tīnantaśesasamgraha only as a work on grammar and Naksatradāvāvalī, which is stated to be probably the same work entitled Vādanaksatramālikā as a work on Vedānta.

Only three works of Appaya Dīksita come under the purview of Sanskrit poetics. The three works are — Vṛttivārtika, Citramīmāṃsā and Kuvalayānanda. M. Haraprasad Shastri mentions another work on Alamkāra (primarily on semantics) by the same author. The work is Laksya-lakṣāṇa-samgraha. It is a short work dealing with Laksāṇa. The contents, according to him, have been mostly taken from Candrāloka; a few new Ślokas have been composed. Shastrin mentions, — the object of the work is to help young beginners in understanding rightly the Alamkāra-sāstra. We are,

42. Ibid., p. 10.
43. Ibid., p. 10.
44. See Catalogus Catalogorum, pp. 22-24.
however, not sure, whether this work really comes from the pen of our Appaya Dīksita.

Asutosh Bhattacharyya, supplies us with a list of works composed by Appaya Dīksita. He also mentions four works on Alamkāra-śāstra. But the fourth one is Nāma-Sangrahāmālā, other three being the well-known Citramāṃśa, Vṛttivārtika and Kuvalayānanda. But Aufrrecht in his Catalogus Catalogorum, puts this work under the category of lexicon. The name Nāma-sangrahāmālā sounds better as a work on lexicon than a work on Alamkāra.

47 S.K. De. says that Appaya Dīksita appears to have written another work on Alamkāra, named Laksana-ratnāvali on the Laksanas of Rūpaka. But the authorship has not been firmly established still now.

Vṛttivārtika, Citramāṃśa and Kuvalayānanda — perhaps this is the chronological order. There is no definite proof with regard to Vṛttivārtika’s being the first composition; but it is conjectured to be so. That the Kuvalayānanda was composed after the Citramāṃśa, can be asserted safely; since the Kuvalayānanda mentions the Citramāṃśa thrice and refers to the Citramāṃśa to certain points. Thus the middle position is of the Citramāṃśa. We shall have discussions on the Citramāṃśa

later on. Now a very brief analysis of the contents of the other two works, viz. Vṛttivārtika and Kuvalayānanda, is being given.

Vṛttivārtika is a short treatise on semantics. Available printed texts have two topics — one is Abhidhā i.e., the primary meaning and the other is Laksanā i.e., the indication. A third topic, namely, the suggestion, which is expected after this, is wanting. From one of the benedictory verses where the three functions, viz. Abhidhā, Laksanā and Vṛtti are compared to the three eyes of Lord Siva and is maintained that Sarasvatī reveals this universe by the three powers of words, it appears as most probable that Appaya Dīkṣīta dealt with the third power of words also. But unfortunately, that portion is lost in oblivion.

However, in the section on Abhidhā, discussions on the three varieties of Abhidhā, namely, Rūḍhi, Yoga and Yogarūḍhi, are met with in broad details. In the second section, Laksanā with divisions and sub-divisions, is dealt with.

Kuvalayānanda is a work on Sanskrit poetics with highest number of figures of speech but least amount of originality. This elementary treatise is directly based

48. Cf. 'visvam prakāśayantī vyūpārair laksanābhidhiḥ śādā naṁ naiḥ / nayanair iva hāramūrtir vibudhopasyā trasvatī jayati //
Vṛttivārtika, p. 1.

49. Cf. "alapkāreṣu bālānāṁ avagāhanasiddhayē /
lalītaḥ kriyate teṣāṁ laksyenālaksanasamgrahah //"
Kuvalayānanda, Upodghata, verse No.4, p. 2.
on Jayadeva's Candrāloka. Appaya Dīkṣita himself admits this frankly —

\[ \text{yesam candrāloke dhṛyante lakṣyadalaksanāslokaḥ} / \]
\[ \text{prāyas ta eva tesām itaresāṁ tvabhinvā viracyante} // \]

Kuvalayānanda deals with Arthaḥalākāras only. MM. P.V. 51
Kane holds that a few Sābbalākāras, as seen in some printed editions, are interpolations from the Kāvyavilāsa of Ciraṇīva Bhaṭṭācārya. Following are the figures of speech, that we find in this work — Upamā, Ananvaya, Upameyopamā, Pratīpa, Rūpaka, Pariṇāma, Ullekha, Smṛti, Ebrānti, Sandeha, Apsamuti, Utprēkṣā, Atiśayokti, Tulay-yogītā, Dīpaka (Āvrttitiddpaka, Mālādīpaka and Kākakādīpaka, noted in the text, seem to be the mere varieties of Dīpaka), Pratīvastūpamā, Drṣṭānta, Nidaraṇā, Vyātireka, Sahokti, Vinokti, Samāsokti, Parikara, Parikarāṃkura, Śleṣa, Aprastuṭha-praśaṃśa, Prastutāṃkura, Paryāyokti, Vyājastuti, Vyājanindā, Ākṣepa, Virodhābhāsa, Vibhāvanā, Viśeṣokti, Asambhava, Asamgati, Viṣama, sama, Vicitra, Aōhika, Alpa, Anyonya, Viṣeṣa, Vyāghata, Kāraṇamalā, Brāvalī, Sāra, Yathāsaṃkhya, Paryāya, Parivṛtti, Parisamkhya, Vikalpa, Samuccaya, Samādhi, Pratyāhāra, Kāvyārhāpatti, Kāvyalīngā, Arthaṃtaranāyāsa, Vikasvarā, Pratikhoṭti, Ṣambhāvanā, Mithyādyavasiti, Lalita, Praharṣana, Viśādana, Uḷaśa, Avajñā, Anujñā, Leśā, Mudrā, Ratnāvalī, Tadguna, Purvarūpa, Atadguna, Anuguna, Mīlita, Samānya, Unmīlita, Viṣeṣaka, Uttara, Śūkṣma, Piḥita, Vyājokti, Gūḍhokti, Vyātīkoti, Mukti, Lokokti, Chekokti, Vacokti, Svabhāvokti, Bhāvika, Udāttā, Atyukti, Nirukti, Pratīṣedha, Vidhi, Hetu, Rasavat,

Preyas, Urjasvat, Samahita, Bhavodaya, BhavaSamdhii, Bhavasabala, PratyakSa, Anumana, Upamana, SabdapramaSa, Smrti, Atmatustipramana, Smrti, Arthapatti, Anupalabdhi, Sambhava and Aitihya (115 in total). In addition to these, there are Samprasti and Samkara (with its five varieties) consisting in two types of amalgamation of figures. It is, however, difficult to appreciate any genuine distinction between Kavyarthapatti and Arthapatti as noted in the Kuvalayanaanda.

In comparison with the Citramimamsa, the Kuvalayanaanda is a very simple work, mostly free from detailed arguments and counter-arguments. The eleven figures of speech, discussed in full, in the Citramimamsa, cover one hundred pages of the N.S.P. Edition; whereas the same figures, not in number only, cover only 350 lines (i.e. approximately 13 pages) in the Kuvalayanaanda. Three figures, viz. Sandeha, Bhranti and Smrti, are defined in a single hemistich only. In fact, we find nothing new in the Kuvalayanaanda from what we find in the Citramimamsa — of course, with regard to the discussions on the figures of speech which are common to both the two works. We wonder, how, after composing a most learned treatise like the Citramimamsa, could our author Appaya Dikshita switch his endeavour to a simple work like the Kuvalayanaanda.
IV. The Citramāṃsa — an Analysis of Its Contents.

A. Division of Kāvyas.

Most of the available printed texts of the Citramāṃsa contain discussions on twelve figures of speech. Discussion of the twelfth figure, viz. Atisāyokti, is however not available in full. Figures discussed are as follows: — Upamā, Upameyopamā, Ananvaya, Samaraṇa, Rūpakā, Parināma, Sasandeha, Bhrāntimān, Ullekha, Apahmuti, Utpreksā and Atisāyokti. But before the author starts writing on the main content, he adds, by way of a prelude, a discussion on the division of Kāvyas. In this respect, Appaya Dīkṣita treads in the beaten track and it is very difficult for us to issue a certificate of originality in this respect.

However, he divides Kāvyas into three varieties — Dhvani (Suggestion), Guṇībūtavyāṅga (with Suggestion as Subordinate) and Citra (Embellished). We do not find any reason why doe not find any reason why does a sokhal like Hem Haraprasad Shastrin in the Preface to his 'A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection under the care of Asiatic Society of Bengal', p. CCCXIII, state — "The author admits two classes of Kāvyas, — dhvani and guṇībūtavyāṅga, and rejects the third, viz. citra of Kāvyaprakāśa." It is not so that the manuscripts preserved in that 'Society' contain such a statement, since we have seen all the manuscripts of the Citramāṃsa preserved there but could not trace it. Moreover, the very title of the text, namely, Citramāṃsa, directly hints at the subject-matter of the work, which again necessarily indicates the admittance of Citra by the author. Definition of the first variety as given by him is this: 'yatra vācyātisāyi vyaṅgaḥ sa dhvaniḥ' (p.1).
Two illustrations have been given of this variety and by his hair-splitting arguments, he establishes the existence of suggestion in them. The two illustrations are — "sthitah kṣanam ..." etc. (p. 1), and "nihśesacryutacandana ..." etc. (p. 2). The second variety, viz., the Guniñbhūtavyaṅga is defined thus : 'yatra vyāṅgaṁ vācyanātisāyi tad guṇībhūta-vyaṅgam' (p. 3). Here also there are two examples; one begins with 'gacchāmyaccyuta' (p. 3) and the other with 'praharavirataṁ' (p. 4). The third variety, viz., the Citra has been defined in the following words: 'yad avyaṅgaṁ api cāru tac citram' (p. 4). This Citra again, is sub-divided into three — namely, Śabdacitra, Artha-citra and Udbhayacitra. All these three varieties are exemplified with one single verse each, which follow thus — 'navapalāśa' etc. (p. 4), 'sa chinnamūla' etc. (p. 4), and 'varāhaḥ kalyāṇam' (p. 4) etc. In all these illustrations, Appaya Dīksita pointed out the existence of necessary characteristic of the particular type of Kāvya by offering adequate grounds.

52 Though like Māmmata and a few other Alamkārikas, Appaya Dīksita does not categorically mention here that there exists a difference of quality or charm in the three varieties of Kāvya, still, from the order of mentioning the varieties, it is indicated that he also admits the first position of the Dhvani, the second position of the Guniñbhūtavyaṅga, and the third position of Citra. We may here recall the principle of 'abhyarhitatva', which is a common phenomenon in Indian society.

52. See Kavyaprasa, Ullāsa-I, 4 od and 5.
Appaya Dīksita uses the adjunct 'cāru' in the definition of Citra, and, logically speaking, this has to be adjuncted in all the varieties of Citra without any gradation in the quality. But actually Appaya Dīksita made a clearest distinction between Šabdacitra and Arthacitra. The first one is mostly insipid, whereas the second not; — This is his opinion. cf. 'śabdacitrasya pṛāyo mīrasatvān nātyantaḥ tad ādriyante kavyaḥ, na vā tatra vicāraniyam ativopalabhata iti ...' (p. 4). Thus, herealso, we notice another gradation, in which the Arthacitra is lifted one step above. Thus Jagannātha, having followed Appaya Dīksita's path, admitted four varieties of Kāvyā, namely, Uttamottama, Uttama, Madhyama and Adhama and put Arthacitra and Šabdacitra under the category of Madhyama and Adhama respectively.

Ālaṃkārikas are found unanimous on the point that Citra is a third grade Kāvyā ('avara', 'adhama'). But why? 'ālekhlmatrátvāt' ('since it is like a mere picture'), 'kevalavācyavācakavācitryamātrāśrayena' ('since it possesses charminess in the expression and the expressive word only'), 'āścaryakārītvāt' ('since it possesses strikingness') — such are the statements of prominent Ālaṃkārikas for the designation 'Citra' and all of them relegate it to the most inferior position. Author of the Dhvanyāloka even

53. See Kāvyapratikāsa, Ullāsa I. 5cd and Vṛttī thereon.
54. Locana on Dhvanyāloka I. 13. p. 34.
goes further as he states that this is not Kāvya at all but a mere imitation of the same. But we differ from the above-mentioned idea. In a few cases it may be noticed that even the Citra possesses a lot of charm and dares to compete any illustration of a first-grade Kāvya. Some striking examples of the figure Svabhāvokti as found in available literature, may be specially mentioned in this respect. Dr. K.N. Jha, in an article under the caption 'Is Citrakāvya always a lower grade of poetry' has cited a few examples, which, though considered bereft of suggestion and thereby put under the category of Citra, can well be compared with the first grade Kāvya. For example, he cites the verse beginning with 'sañcārini dīpasikheva' (Raghuvasa, VI. 57), which though according to the traditionist is an instance of Citra, or at best of the Gunībhūtavyangya, possesses no less charm than that of the verse 'sthitah ksanam pakṣmasu ...' etc. (Kumārasambhaṇa, V. 24), which is considered an instance of Dhvanikāvya.

The use of different 'vandhas' in the Citrakāvya, also, is nothing but the sign of a taste for variety. Ramrupa Pathaka, in the introduction to his Citrakāvya-kautukam, has established the existence of this taste in almost all the spheres of fine arts and literature. Thus, in music, we find the terms like 'Veni', 'Urmi' etc.; in Vedic rites, the injunction of making an altar in the

57. See Dhvanyāloka, III, 43 and Vṛtti thereon, p. 220.
form of a 'śyena' bird; in the chanting of the Vedas, the various ways of reciting like 'Dhvaśa', 'Jaṭā', 'Mālā' etc.; in the science of architecture, the use of different forms like chariot (as noticed in the temple of Konarak) etc. If these are not blamed for, why then the use of different 'vandhas' be put under the category of third grade Kāvya? What has to be considered only, we think, is to see whether there exists Rasa or not.

While most of the literary critics divide Citra into two, our author admits three sub-divisions, namely, Arthacitra, Ubbhayacitra and Sabdacitra. Positions of the varieties of Kāvya, according to Appaya Dīkṣita, may be shown in the following chart —

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kāvya</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dhvani</td>
<td>Gunībhūtavyaṅgya</td>
<td>Citra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arthacitra</th>
<th>Ubbhayacitra</th>
<th>Sabdacitra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

The term Dhvani is of a very old origin. Grammarians like Patañjali, Bharṭṛhari and others have used this term many a time in their works in the sense of Sphota or the Eternal Word from which meaning follows. The concept of Sphota again is of a much older origin. Pāṇini, in his Aṣṭādhyāyī, refers to a predecessor named Sphotaṇya in the rule 'avāṅ sphotaṇayanasya' (6. 1. 123). In any way, whether mentioned by the term Sphota or by Dhvani, Dhvani means that which is suggested. The Sanskrit literary critics also accept this term and frequently use this in their works in
the sense of a literary composition having suggestion. Thus, 'suggestion' and 'having suggestion' — both these two ideas are referred to by the term Dhvani in the domain of Sanskrit poetics. Now, since the existence of suggestion is a great desideratum for a literary composition, Ālambārikas began to use the term 'Dhvani' in the sense of 'Uttama-kāvya' i.e., a first-grade-kāvya, where the expressed sense is subordinated by suggestion. Our Appaya Dīkṣita also follows the path and uses the term Dhvani in that very sense. In the verse 'sthitāḥ ksanam' etc. (p.1), the condition befitting the state of meditation, is suggested by the description of the natural movement of the first rain-drops on the body of Pārvatī, which is expressed in words and which is less striking than the suggested one. In the verse 'niḥsaṭacyutacandanaṃ' etc. (p. 2), also, the suggested sense, viz. dalliance of the messenger with the lover of the heroine, is more striking than the expressed sense, which is given in the manner of a mere statement of fact, namely, 'you went to the tank for a bath and not to that lover'.

In the verse 'pṛaharāviratam' etc. (p. 4), the expressed sense, namely, the prevention of lover from his journey, is well-supported by the suggested sense, viz., that the girl cannot bear her life any longer after the expiry of the entire day and hence it is an illustration of the Guṇḍbhūtavyaṅga type of Kāvya.

The word 'Citra' has many a meaning. This word, in connection with a variety of Kāvya, was used by Ānandaśvarādana

---

60. Dhvanyāloka:
for the first time. However, in the definition of Citra as given by Appaya Dīksita, the expression 'avyāṅgṛyaṃ' has to be understood as 'sphuṭapratītya-mārtharatharatam' as said by Mammaṭā, since whether distinct or indistinct, suggestion is an indispensable factor for all the varieties of literary composition, deserving the status of a Kāvya.

Jagannātha, the most prolific writer on Sanskrit poetics and the most famous critic of Appaya Dīksita, raises objection on almost all the points of Appaya Dīksita and rejects them by his sharp and cogent arguments, attended by literary appeal which again is intermingled with logic coming from the head of a Naiyāyika on the shoulder of a great poet. Thus Appaya Dīksita admits the verse 'niḥsācyutacandanam' etc. (p. 2), as an example of Dhvani. But Jagannātha refutes the grounds by which the former establishes Rasadhvani in that verse. In other words, Jagannātha raises objection with regard to the process of establishing the Dhvani in it. Thus, fruition

"pradhānagnunabhāvyabhāyaṁ vyāṅgasyaivaṁ vyavasthitē / kāvye ubbe tato'nyad yat tac citram abhidhiyate //"  
III. 42, p. 220.

"citram sabdārthabhedena dvivichāṛ ca vyavasthitam / tatra kiṁcī chabdacitram vācyacitram atāḥ param //  
III. 43, p. 220.

"rasabhāvādvīṣayavivākṣavirāhe sati / alaṁkāranibandho yah sa citrāvīṣayo mataḥ //"  
Vṛtti under III, 43, p. 221.

61. Kāvyaprakāśa (Gadkar), Vṛtti under I. 5 cd, p. 6.
of the adjuncts like 'nīlīsācayutacandana' etc. as shown by our author, cannot hold good, since the interpretation suffers from two broad defects, namely, going against the established doctrine of Dhvani and want of cogency in arguments. That the adjuncts in a Dhvanikāvya must be so ambiguous as may be connected alike with the primary or secondary meaning and the suggested one — is a condition for a Dhvanikāvya and if the 'asādhārapya' i.e. exclusiveness, of the adjuncts is said to be the characteristic of Dhvani, then it should be taken as a case of inference and not Dhvani. The explanation which Appaya Dīksita supplies us with, opens the scope of this contradiction. Moreover, the suggested idea, viz., messengers going to the hero purposely for a secret dalliance, as mentioned by Appaya Dīksita, does not require any power of suggestion. Thus, going to the heroine's lover can well be understood by means of adopting 'viparītalakṣanā', which again is quite understandable from the expression like 'tata' etc. The secret dalliance also, through 'arthāpatti', can be presumed from the heroine's attitude towards her husband. The expression 'adhama' also, hints at that point. Again, the suggestion, viz. the erotic sentiment, in this verse, is only an explanatory to the primary sense and thus it should better be considered a case of subordinated suggestion. Similarly, Appaya Dīksita's instances of Cudībhūta-vyāngya and Udbhayacitra also were criticised by Jagannātha. For a detailed discussion on the criticism of Jagannātha against our author vide V.A. Ramaswamy Sastri's 'Jagannātha Pandita'.

After the prelude to his work, Appaya Dīksita takes up the different figures of speech as noted below.

B. Upama

In the realm of figures of speech, Upama occupies the most prominent place. Almost all the Ālāmkārikas have discussed this figure with much care and critical analysis. This figure can be traced back even to the time of the Vedas, if not from the very beginning of human civilisation. Yāskācārya, author of the Nirukta mentions a definition of Upamā as propounded by his predecessor Gārgya. The grammarians, the Naiyāyikas, the Ālāmkārikas and many others have admitted the existence and significance of Upamā — but from their respective standpoint. Most of the figures of speech involving similarity are based on it; or in other words, a large number of figures are but mere aspects of Upamā. This is also a commonly accepted view. In Appaya Dīksita's Citramāṃśā too, this Upamā occupies an important place. Appaya Dīksita goes one step further and discovers Upamā as the root of all figures of speech. A most significant and beautiful comment on the role of Upamā is made by our author Appaya Dīksita —

\[
\text{upamaikā sālūṣī samprāpta citrakhūmikābhedaν /} \\
\text{rañjayati kāvyaraṅge nṛtyantī tadvidāṁ otaṁ /} \\
\] (p. 5)

63. 'yad atat tatsadrśam iti gārgyaha

With a little change in the process of ornamentation, this Upamā assumes different forms and are named differently. To establish, that in all figures based on similarity, Upamā alone is the sole reality which assumes the appearances of divergent figures, Appaya presents as many as twenty-two examples of different figures, all of which owe their origin to an illustration of Upamā. The figures are - Upameyopamā, Ananvaya, Pratīpa, Smaraṇa, Rūpaka, Pariṇāma, Sandeha, Bhrāntimān, Ulekhā, Apahna, Utpreksā, Atisāyokti, Tulīyāyogitā, Dīpaka, Prativastūpamā, Drśṭānta, Nidāraṇā, Vyatireka, Sahokti, Samāsokti, Śleṣa, and Aprastutaprasāmsa. It may be noted here that the idea met in the verse 'upamāikā 'śailūśi' etc. (p. 5) and the explanation thereof appear to be an echo of what has been said by Vidyācakravartin, a prominent commentator of the Alamkāra-sarvasva of Ruyyaka, much beforehand. How closely Appaya Dīkṣita followed Vidyācakravartin would be shown later (Ch. VI) from a comparative study between their approaches. However, having established his statement that Upamā is the seed of all figures, Appaya Dīkṣita makes another excellent comment which runs thus:

\[\text{tad idaṁ citraṁ viśvam brahma jñānād iva upamā jñānāt /} \\
\text{jñātaṁ bhavatītyādeu nirūpyate nikhilabheda saḥ sa} // \\
\text{(p. 5).} \\

This Upamā has been defined variedly by different Ālāmkarikas. Before giving his own definition, Appaya Dīkṣita at first mentions the definitions given by his predecessors and then criticises where necessary. His hair-splitting criticism is that of a learned pandit, versed in

64. See Sañjīvanī under Ālāmkarasa-rvasva, Sūtra 11, p.36.
almost all the Shastras like grammar, philosophy and so on. Again, before criticising the views of his predecessors, he, first of all, reproduces their definitions, then presents arguments in favour of those definitions as formulated and discussed by the respective author and thereafter establishes futility and invalidity of those arguments which passed as correct and flawless so far.

However, in connection with the definition and division of Upamā a large number of citations from a good number of predecessors have been noticed by us. A few of those citations are made verbatim whereas a few others are not. Again, sometimes the sources are mentioned by name and at times not. Bhūmaka, Daṇḍin, Vāmana, Rudraṭa, Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Bhoja, Mammaṭa, author of the Alamkārasarvasva (Mānkhaṭa ?), author of the Kāvyā-loka (Daṇḍinś?), Vidyānātha, Vidyācakravartin, — thus

65. Whether the Alamkāra-sarvasva on the 'alamkārasūtras' of Ruyyaka was composed by Mānkhuṭa (or Mānkhaṭa) or Ruyyaka himself is yet to be decided with certainty. From a reference to Mānkhaṭa in p. 10 of our text, it appears that Appaya Dīksita seems to have believed Mānkhaṭa to be the author of Alamkāra-sarvasva. Also see our Ch. VI, on this point.

66. From one of the two references to Kāvyāloka (pp. 27-28 and p. 53) it appears that our author most probably, referred to the Kāvyādarsa of Daṇḍin by the name 'Kāvyāloka'. Details have been discussed in Ch. VI.
almost all the prominent predecessors of Appaya Dīksita have been frequently mentioned by our author. Moreover, the exact source of a few citations and opinions, as given, could not be traced by us. After a long and scholastic criticism of the definitions, offered by his predecessors, we meet with Appaya Dīksita’s own view on Upamā which runs thus —

vyāpāro upamānākhyo bhaved yadi vivakṣitah /
kriyāniśpattiparyantam upamālakṛtis tu sā // (p.14)

It means that the figure Upamā is admitted where the description of similarity is desired to culminate in comparison. This definition, according to Appaya Dīksita is free from all defects. Thus, it would not be too wide with regard to Vyatireka, for, in Vyatireka there exists the points of dissimilarity also. In Ananvaya also, it would not be faulty of being too wide, since this figure (i.e. Ananvaya) is characterised by its power of suggesting incomparability. This has been supported by Appaya Dīksita by citing views of the celebrated Ālankārikas like Bhūmaha and others. However, Appaya Dīksita still raises doubts in this definition with reference to certain examples but removes them with sharp arguments and in the long run offers an alternative definition in the following words —

nirūpyamāṇaṁ kavinā sādṛśyaṁ svātmano na cet /
pratīṣedham upādāya paryavasyati sopamā // (p. 17)

The aforesaid definitions have been summed up in the following words —

upamitikriyāniśpattimat sādṛśyavaranam upamā (p.17)
svanīśedhāparyavasāyī sādṛśyavaranam upamā (p. 17)
But the two definitions as stated above are given in general. From the standpoint of an Alamkāra strictly, two other adjuncts have to be connected here. The two adjuncts are — 'aduṣṭam' and 'avyaṅgyam'; i.e. Upamā as a figure of speech must be devoid of all sorts of poetic flaws and different from a suggested sense. Thus the definitions would run thus: 'upamitikriyānishpattimat aduṣṭam avyaṅgyam sādṛśyavarṇanam upamā' or 'svāniśedhāparāyavāsāyī aduṣṭam avyaṅgyam sādṛśyavarṇanam upamā'. According to Appaya Dīkṣita, the above mentioned definition is free from all types of shortcomings and consists of necessary properties and characteristics of Upamā. In the Kuvalayānanda, however, this figure has been defined in a simple manner where the definition runs thus — "upamā yatra sādṛṣyaalaksanīr ullasati tvayoh". The divisions and sub-divisions of Upamā have been discussed in broad details in the Citramimamsā.

Among the later Alamkārikas, who criticised Appaya Dīkṣita, the name of Panditarūja Jagannātha is the most prominent. In his Rasagangādharā and Citramimamsākhandana, he finds fault with almost all the adjuncts, used by Appaya Dīkṣita in his definition. V.A. Ramaswamy Sastri in his "Jāgannātha Pandita" has offered us an elaborate discussion on the criticism of Jagannātha against Appaya Dīkṣita's definition and classification of Upamā and hence we refrain from reproducing the same here. We have followed the same method in the discussion on other figures also. Nāgeśabhaṭṭa,

67. Kuvalayānanda, verse No. 6, p. 3.
Visēṣvara and others also discuss Appaya Dīksita's definition and classification of Upamā.

C. Upameyopama

The figure Upameyopamā occupies the second position in the Citramāṃśa. Generally, in the Alamkāra-texts, the figure Ananvaya holds the second position in order and the figure Upameyopamā comes after that. But our author Appaya

70. For details see our Ch. VII.

Also, Alamkāra-sarvasva, Sūtra No.12 — Ananvaya, p. 39.

Sūtra No.13 — Upameyopamā, p. 40.

Also see, Sāhitya-darpana X, where Ananvaya precedes the figure Upameyopamā. We should mention here that in the Sāhitya-darpana, the figure Ananvaya occupies the fourth position in group of Arthālāmākāras, since, two other figures, viz., Raśanopamā and Malopamā have intervened between Upamā and Ananvaya. But this does not go against our contention, since, what we want to say is that the figure Ananvaya precedes the figure Upameyopamā in this work on poetics also. Moreover, if Malopamā and Raśanopamā be taken as mere varieties of Upamā, as noticed in the numbering of the figures by MM. P.V. Kane in his edition of the Sāhitya-darpana, p. 111, then, no such question arises at all.
Diksita breaks this generally accepted order and puts the figure Ananvaya in the third position, leaving the second position for Upameyopama. Perhaps the reason behind it is this: The idea of similarity in the figure Upameyopama, obtained by means of the mutual change of position between the Upamāna and the Upameya, appears more prominently than that of the same in the figure Ananvaya obtained by means of the comparison of a thing with its own self. This is why Upameyopama is closer to Upamā and Ananvaya remains at a bit distance. In the Kuvalayānanda, which, however, as we have already noted, is an elementary work on poetics, though composed later than the Citramānasā, Appaya Diksita revives the generally accepted order. 72 It would not be out of context to mention here that Appaya Diksita cites a definition of Upameyopama which is based on the Kavyālāmkāra of Bhāmaha and it is this Kavyālāmkāra, where Upameyopama proceeds Ananvaya, although a few other figures have crept in between them. However, after rejecting the definition, which, as we have just noted, is based on Bhāmaha's Kavyālāmkāra, Appaya Diksita offers his own definition which runs thus —

\[
\text{anyonyenopamā bodhya vyaktyā vṛttyantareṇa vā /} \\
\text{ekadharmāśrayā yā syāt sopameyopamā mātā // (P. 38)}
\]

Here two Vṛttis are counted, namely, Abhidhā and Vyājana. Laksanā is not a separate Vṛtti according to the old


73. See the order in the figures of speech in his Kāvyālāmkāra — Upameyopama (III. 37), Sahokti (III. 39), Parivrātti (III. 41), Sasandeha (III. 43) and Ananvaya (III. 45).
grammarians. Ānandavardhana, author of the Dhvanyāloka, also follows this path of the old grammarians and classified 'artha' into 'vācyā' and 'pratīyamāna'. Nāgeśa also, in his Paramalaghumāṇḍuṣā, clearly refutes the claim of Lakṣaṇā as a separate vṛtti.

One may not misunderstand us that we are stating that our author does not admit the separate entity of Lakṣaṇā as a vṛtti. In his Vṛttivārtika, Appaya Dīksita has elaborately dealt with this Lakṣaṇā. But, here, in this context, he does not count this — this is what we want to say. Appaya Dīksita shows the necessity of all the adjuncts of the definition very clearly. But the above mentioned definition, according to him, is only a definition leading to the state of the phenomenon of Upameyopamā and the definition which is not too wide and is applicable everywhere should be taken as follows:—

74. Cf. Dhvanyāloka, I. 2.
75. Cf. "tan na. sātī tātparye 'sarve sarvārthavācaka' iti bhāṣyād. lakṣaṇāyā abhāvāt. vṛttidvāyā vacchedakadvaya-kalpane gauravāt. jaghanyavṛttikalpaṇāyā anvāyyatvāc ca. katham tarhi gāṅgādipadāt tīrāpratyaybāḥ bhrānto'si, sātī tātparye 'sarve sarvārthavācaka' iti bhāṣyāyam eva gṛhāṇā.

... tatra gāṅgādipadānam pravāhādau prasiddhāṃ akṣitih, tīrādau cāprasiddhāti kim anupapannam.

manu 'sarve sarvārthavācaka' iti ced bruṣe tarhi ghāṭadāt paṭaṇaprayāyah kim na syād iti cen na. sātī tātparye ityukta:tāt tātparyābhāvād iti gṛhāṇa."

Paramalaghumāṇḍuṣā, pp. 20-22.

76. See Vṛttivārtika, the first three verses in p. 1. and the discussion on Lakṣaṇā in pp. 18-29.
Jagamātha, in his usual way, raised questions on various points of the definition given by Appaya Dīksita. Visvēsvara, author of the Alamkāra-kaustubha, also, has criticised Appaya Dīksita's views with regard to this figure. For a detailed discussion on this point vide our Chapter VII.

D. Ananvaya

Ananvaya is the third figure in the Citramāṁśa of Appaya Dīksita. As we have noted earlier, here, Appaya Dīksita breaks the generally accepted order and puts this figure in the third position. Like the first and the second, viz., Upamā and Upameyopamā, this figure also is based on comparison. Usually the Upamāna and the Upameya, are two different things; since, the 'upamānopameyabhūva' necessarily involves similarity, which again is unanimously accepted as 'tadbhinnatve sati tadgatahūyodharmavattvam',

77 ('possession of an attribute of something excessively though basically different from the same'). Vāskācārya, author of the Nirukta, hints clearly at the superiority of the Upamāna to the Upameya. The idea of superiority is


78. cf. 'tad āsāṁ karma ṣayasa vā guṇena prakhyaśatamena vā kanīyāmsaḥ vāprakhyātāṁ vopamiminē'.

possible only when there are two separate things. The two different suffixes added after the root 'mā' with the prefix 'upa', also prove the separate entity of these two things, namely, the Upamāna and the Upameya. But here, in this figure of speech, we see that the same thing occupies the position of both these two, which seems to be an impossibility and it is this hypothetical process of ornamentation that this figure consists in. However, in his usual way, Appaya Dīksita cites a generally accepted definition of Ananvaya and then finds out imperfection in it and afterwards offers his desired definition which runs thus:

svasya svenopāmā yā syād anugāmyekadhamikā /
anvarthanāmadheyoyam ananvaya itīritah // (p. 42)

He maintains that this definition leads to the state of the phenomenon of Ananvaya. The actual definition of this figure can be met with in the definition given by Bhāmaha. Moreover, the expression 'anvarthanāmadheyoyam' is not an intrinsic part of the definition — says Appaya Dīksita. But the same has been used to indicate that the name 'Ananvaya' attains its exact connotation only when the property also remains identical.

Appaya Dīksita cites the verse 'adya yā mama govinda ...' etc. as an illustration of the suggestion of the figure Ananvaya. But Jagannātha has severely criticised him on this point and finds out contradiction in Appaya Dīksita's own previous statement in the section on Upamā. Vide V.A. Ramaswamy's 'Jagannātha Pandita'.

79. upa - √mā + lyut = upamāna.

upa - √mā + yat = upameya.
The figure Smarana is not of a very old origin. Alamkarikas like Daṇḍin, Bhāmaha, Udbhata and Vāmana do not define it. But the later Alamkarikas deal with it with much care and gave it a status of a figure of speech. Among the figures, Appaya Dīkṣita discussed in the Citramīmāṃsa, Smarana occupies the fourth position. The order runs thus - Upamā, Upameyopama, Ananvaya and Smarana. Out of these four, in the first two figures, the sense of distinction between the Upamāna and the Upameya remains, although the two are compared for their similarity on a particular property. The third figure, i.e., Ananvaya, is based on similarity in identity. Now Appaya Dīkṣita starts to write on a figure which is based on similarity but has no reference to the question of identity or otherwise. In the context of Smarana, Appaya Dīkṣita does not refer to any opinion of his predecessors. The definition as given by him is this:

\[
\text{smṛtih sādṛṣyamūlā yā vastvantarasamāśraya} / \\
\text{smaranālamkārthiḥ sā syād avyāgyatvaviśeṣita} // (p.43)
\]

Indian philosophers have much discussion on the topic of Smṛti. It is a type of knowledge which is born of mental impression (Samskāra), or to speak it more exactly, a particular type of mental impression called

80. See Bhāṣā-pariccheda, pp. 477-480 or Tarkasamgraha, p. 57.

'bhāvanā'. Appaya Dīksita says that this figure is based on similarity invariably. Thus, if any reminiscence is roused not through similarity but through anxiety, constant thinking etc., that cannot constitute the figure Smaranā. Although Viśvanātha in his Sāhityadarpana mentions a view of Rāghavānanda Mahāpātra, who holds that this figure may be based on a reminiscence arising out of a dissimilar object also, Appaya Dīksita, following the path of his predecessors, emphatically speaks of Smaranā as based on similarity. This idea has been firmly established in last portion of the section on Smaranā.


83. "rāghavānandamahāpātraḥ tu vaisāḍrṣyāḥ smṛtim api smaranālaṁkāram icchanti. tatrodāharanam teṣām eva yathā — sirīsamārvī girīṣu prapeḍe ... ... //" X. under Sūtra No. 27, p. 22.

84. Cf. Ruyyaka's definition of this figure, — 'saḍrṣānubhāvāḥ vastvantarasmrtecī saṃraṇam' and the Sarvasva — 'saḍṛṣyāṃ vinā tu smṛtir nāyan alaṁkāraḥ' thereon. Aḥāṃkāra-sarvasva, p. 41.

Also compare, Sāhityadarpanā X. 27, p. 22, 'saḍrṣānubhāvāḥ vastusmrtecī saṃraṇam ucyate', and Kāvyaprakāśa (Gaḍkar) X, Kārikā No.46 abc, p. 109, 'yathānubhavam arthaṣva ṛṣṭe tatsadrṣe smrtecī anubhute / smaraṇam'.

xliii
Thus, in the verse 'atyunuccah paritah' etc., reminiscence is not based on similarity and hence figure Samaranâ has not been admitted. Thus he says —

stüyamânahūsambandhino bhūbhrd-bhujasya smṛtir
na sādṛṣyaṃuleti, nātra samaranālamkārah. (p. 44).

Again, in the verse 'sa tatheti' etc., since the reminiscence is roused through meditation, no figure is admitted there. Appaya Diksita says:

atra cintāmūlā smṛtih. vicchittivisesabhāvān
na kaścid alamkārah. etad ubhayavyāpttyarthan
sādṛṣyaṃuleti viśesanaṃ. (p. 44).

Jagannâtha Pândita, however, has found out many a fault in the definition given by our author. For details, vide V.A. Ramaswamy's 'Jagannâtha Pândita'.

F. Rûpaka

In the list of figures of speech, discussed in the Citramîmansâ, Rûpaka occupies the fifth position. In fact, this figure tops the list of figures in which identity predominates. Figure Rûpaka is of a very old origin. Leaving aside its uses in the Vedas, Bharata, the oldest literary critic mentions this figure among the only

four figures noted by him in his Nāṭyaśāstra. 66 S.K. De notes that it is noteworthy that the Vedānta-sūtra makes a direct use of the term 'rupaka' in the technical sense (I. 4. 1). He also refers to Appaya Dīksita's remarks in the Citramāṁsā on this Vedānta-sūtra. Appaya Dīksita, following the path of his predecessors like Dāṇḍin, Bhāmaha, and practically all the Alamkārikas, has a detailed discussion on this figure. Here also as in the case of discussing other figures of speech, Appaya Dīksita cites the opinions of a good number of his predecessors like Dāṇḍin, Bhoja, Mammaṭa, Vidyādhara, Vidyānātha and author of one Kāvyāloka at different points of discussion. A few of the citations are not mentioned by name although cited verbatim. The definition of this figure as given in the Citramāṁsā, is this:

bimbāvīśīṣṭe niridīṣṭe viṣaye yādyanihmute /
uparāṇjakatām eti viṣāyī rūpakaṇ taṇā // (p. 48).

Appaya Dīksita admits eight broad varieties of Rūpaka and says that the divisions and sub-divisions of the two figures, namely, Rūpaka and Upamā, are numerous. In this context, he cites a verse, the source of which, according to him, is the Kāvyāloka. But identification of this work is still in dispute. However, the verse in

66. "upamā dīpakaṇ caiva yamakam rūpakaṇ tathā /
    kāvyasyaite hyalamkārās catvārah parikirtitāh //" (16. 41).

87. History of Sanskrit Poetics (De), p. 9, footnote No.1.
88. For an exhaustive list of the citations from Appaya Dīksita's predecessors, vide our Chapter VI.
89. p. 53.
question, seems to have been quoted from the Kavyadarśa of Daṇḍin, with a variant reading of the initial word of the first quarter and of the last word of the second quarter. Appaya Dīksita, though like Mammaṭa, admits the eight-fold broad division of Rūpaka, still, the division as shown by our author, has a more satisfactory order than that of Mammaṭa, who, as in a good number of cases, lacks in a systematic method in this respect, which ought to have been adopted by an Alamkārika of his stand.

Appaya Dīksita's definition of Rūpaka has been severely criticised by Paṇḍitāja Jagamātha. A detailed discussion on this point has been made by V.A. Ramaswamy Sastri.

We may note here a peculiar remark, made by our author in the context of this figure. While criticising the definition of Rūpaka, offered by Bhoja in his Sarasvati-kāṇṭhābharana, on the point of accepting 'Lakṣāṇā', Appaya Dīksita says that not only is positional proximity (samsargamaryādā) enough for this purpose, but also the definition would suffer from the fallacy of being too narrow to cover the cases of Rūpaka, based on Pure Superimponent Indication. In this connection, he refers to the opinion of a person, who is not mentioned by name. However, the opinion, as stated there, is this:

yat tu āyur gṛttam ityāda ut vichittiviseṣā-
darsānāc chuddhasāropalaksanāsthale na
kaścid alamkāra iti. (p. 47).

90. For a detailed discussion on this reference, made by our author, vide our Chapter VI.

91. Cf. Mammaṭa's division of Rūpaka, where Samastavastu-vigaya variety has been mentioned at first, though contd ....
But Appaya Dīksita disagrees with this opinion and says:

\begin{quote}
\textit{tad ayuktam. gaur vāhika ityādau vichittivisesā-}
darśanena gaunsaśāropalakṣanāsthales'pyalamkāratvā-
\textit{bhāvaprasaṅgāt} \\
\end{quote}

(P. 47).

It must, however, be admitted that strikingness and a figure of speech go hand in hand. If there be no particular strikingness in an expression, there is no figure of speech. Thus, it is not correct to say, as Appaya Dīksita does, that in the expression 'gaur vāhika', there is no strikingness and still there has been a figure of speech. Again, the argument, that a figure of speech has to be admitted here on the mere ground that in similar cases (e.g., 'netrānandena candreṇa ....') there has been a figure of speech, is difficult to appreciate. Further, the example 'gaur vāhika' does not appear to have much affinity with the example beginning with 'netrānandena candreṇa', which has been referred to by Appaya Dīksita in this context where strikingness has been admitted.

G. Parināma

In the Āṣṭāṅga Mīmāṃsā, the figure Parināma has been discussed just after the figure Rūpaka, since, these two figures are closely associated with each other. It is in this order that the two figures occur in most of the Alamkāra works. Earlier Alamkārikas like Daṇḍin, Bhāmaha and Mammaṭa did not recognise this figure. It is the the same is one of the sub-divisions of 'Saṅga' variety.

See Kāvyaprakāśa X. 7. p. 48.
author of the Alamkārasarvasva, who for the first time gave it a status of a figure of speech. Later Alamkarikas, however, attached much importance to this figure and had dealt with it with much care and critical acumen. But with regard to the exact nature of this figure, there had been a great confusion among the Alamkarikas dealing with the same. As in the discussion of other figures of speech, here also, Appaya Dīkṣita cites the views of a good number of his predecessors. Thus, citations, occasionally verbatim, from the Alamkārasarvasva, the Alamkārasarvasva-niṣkṛṣṭārthakārikā, the Ekāvalī, the Pratāparudrayasobhūsana and others have been made on different points of discussion. So far as Parināma is concerned, Appaya Dīkṣita seems to accept the position of Ruyyaka, who defines the figure as —

"āropyamānasya prakṛtopayogitve parināmah" 93

In this definition of Parināma, some, however, discover a contradiction between Ruyyaka's definition, cited above, and his subsequent statement — "prakṛtam āropyamā纳斯atvena parinamath". But the contradiction is more apparent than real. How the 'prakṛta' can transform into the 'aprapakṛta' and at the same time remain 'prakṛta' (without which 'prakṛtopayogita' does not have any meaning), has

92. See Sāhityadarpaṇa (Kane), pp. 125-26 on this point.
93. Alamkāra-sarvasva, Sūtra No. 16, p. 50.
94. Alamkāra-sarvasva, under Sūtra No. 16, p. 51.
been rightly pointed out by Kumari S. S. Janaki. The 'prakṛta' transforms into the 'aprakṛta' in the sense that the attribute ('dharma') of the 'aprakṛta' enters into the body of the 'prakṛta'. Retention of the body of the 'prakṛta' is necessary so as to make 'prakṛtopayogitva' meaningful.

Thus, in the figure Parināma, the superimposition of the non-contextual on the contextual matches well with the actual point of description. This is what is meant by 'āropyaṁāṇasya prakṛtopayogitvam'. At the same time it is the contextual which transforms into the non-contextual, which is superimposed on the former. Thus, in the example 'tīrtvā bhūtesā ...' etc. (p. 57), the idea of fare for crossing has been superimposed on friendship with Lākaśmaṇa. This superimposition is very matching in so far as fare is actually payable to the boat-man. However, it is the contextual, viz., the friendship, which transforms into the non-contextual, viz., the fare for crossing. Appaya Dīkṣita seems to have followed Ruyyaka very closely and accordingly, defined Parināma as follows —

yatāropyaṁāṇam kiṁcit kāryopayogitvena nibhāṁyamāṇam svatas tasya tādāpayogitvāsambhavāḥ prakṛtāt-matāpattim apeksate tatraiva parināmāṅgikāraṁ. (p. 55)

In fact, Appaya Dīkṣita does not clarify his position regarding the definition of this figure in the manner adopted in the case of other figures of speech. However,

95. See Introduction, pp. 81-82 in her edition of the Alaṅkāra-sarvasva of Ruyyaka.
he established cogency of his statement by sharp arguments backed by the rules of grammar. Further, to make his statement more explicit and avoid a few discrepancies that may be questioned, Appaya Dīkṣita says —

prakṛtātmaneṣyatra prakṛtaśabdād visayaṃstrapara iti nodāhrta-parināmāvyāptih upayogitvā ca prakṛtāgamakaryam prati vivaekṣitam (p. 56)

He suggests the readers to explain the definition of this figure, given by Viśyānātha, also, in the same manner.

Appaya Dīkṣita's criticism on Viśyādhara's illustration of Parināmadhvani has itself been criticised by Pandit Jagannātha in usual manner. For an elaborate discussion on this point, one should consult V.A. Ramaswamy's Jagannātha Jāta.

H. Sasandeha

The figure Sasandeha occupies the seventh position in order in the Citramimamsā. This figure has been named Sandeha by the Alāmkārikas like Vāmana, Ruyyaka, Viśyādhara and Viṣvanātha. But our author, Appaya Dīkṣita, does not follow this path and names it Sasandeha in accordance with the naming by Daṇḍin, Udbhata, Mammaṭa and others. In our opinion, the first name, i.e., Sandeha, is more appropriate than the latter one, since, the generally accepted norm of naming a figure is by way of referring to a particular
characteristic and not by means of expressing the idea of 'possession'. Thus we find Upama, Ullekha, Utprekṣā, Apahnuti and so on and not Sopāmā, Sollekha, Sotprekṣā, Sāpahnuti and the like, involving expressions of 'possession' like 'sa', 'matup' etc. V. Jhalkikar, in his Bālabodhini, a commentary on the Kavyaprakāśa of Mamma Udyota on the same work, who, however, seems to justify the name Sasandehā by analysing it in the following words—

sandhehena sāha (involving doubt) viṣayatayā
tadvisistah (having doubt as its theme) iti sasandehāḥ.

But there too, the question, namely, why then the figure Upama etc., are not named Sopamā etc., still remains.

However, the definition of Sasandehā, given by Appaya Dikṣita, in this—

buddhiḥ sarvātmanānyākṣepinārthasaṃprasyā / saṃprasyamālā varthasāpry sandhehālamkṛttir mata // (p.62)

This definition given by him strictly follows the rules of philosophical technicalities and puts this figure out of the scope of the figures like Vikalpa and others. The generally accepted definitions, where the fifth case-ending in the expression 'sāmyāt' has been used, do not clearly indicate whether that fifth case-ending is used in the sense of result or in the sense of cause. A few other flaws also have been noticed there by the author. Suggestion of Sasandehā has been illustrated by two verses with adequate explanations in detail.

96. Kavyaprakāśa (Jhalkikar), Commentary Bālabodhini under X. 92, p. 589.
With regard to the division of Sasandeha, Appaya Dīksita remains silent. Apparently, in this respect, he would admit the generally accepted three-fold classification of this figure.

Since in Ramaswamy's work, we find no discussion on the criticism of Jagannātha against Appaya Dīksita with regard to the figure Sasandeha, we propose to mention a few important points of the divergence of opinions of these two stalwarts of Sanskrit poetics regarding this figure. Thus, in the Citramāṁsā, Appaya Dīksita maintains that the definition, as given by his predecessors, would be too narrow to cover the example like 'asyāḥ sargavidhān' etc. (p. 62), since, it lacks in the possession of (a knowledge) resting in many ideas, because, plurality rests only in the moon etc., possessing an attribute connected with doubt and everywhere the attribute, namely, the state

97. Cf. Sāhityadarpana, X, Kārika No. 35 cd and 36 ab. Kāvyaprakāśa, X, Kārika No. 6 cd. Though this figure is broadly divided into two, namely, 'bhedoktau' i.e. when the difference between the Upamāna and the Upameya is mentioned and 'tadanuktau' i.e. when such difference is not mentioned, still, since, the second variety has two sub-divisions, namely, 'with a characteristic belonging to the Upamāna mentioned' and 'with a characteristic belonging to the Upameya mentioned', of which the first one is named as 'niścayagarbha' and the second 'niścayānta', practically we have three varieties here also.
of being the creator of (that) woman, the subject of description, remains 'one' only. But Jagannātha in his Citramāmsākhandana undoes this view and proves that obviously there exists a knowledge resting in many ideas and hence no question of being too narrow arises at all.

Again, Jagannātha maintains, the definition of the predecessors has no fault and thus all the criticisms, that have been showered by Appaya Dīksita on his predecessors, are useless.

Appaya Dīksita cites two illustrations of the suggestion of Sasandēha. The two verses are 'kañcit kāñcananagaurāṅgim' etc. (p. 63) and 'darpane ca' etc. (p. 63). He also shows arguments in favour of admitting suggestion in them. But Jagannātha says that the arguments, offered by Appaya Dīksita, are good for nothing and would be taken as ridiculous by the persons acquainted with the theory of Dhvani.

I. Bṛṇātimān

Bṛṇātimān is the eighth figure in the Citramāmsā of Appaya Dīksita. Since this figure is closely connected with the figure Sasandēha, discussion on Bṛṇātimān follows just after that. In Sasandēha there exists a 'doubted identity'; whereas in Bṛṇātimān, a 'mistaken identity'

100. Ibid., p. 31. 'tad etad dhvanitattvajñair upahasaniyam'. 
forms the nucleus. As we have noted earlier, the suffix 'matup' in the name of this figure also, is, to some extent, misleading, since the name 'Bhrántimān' means 'having an error' and since, an error, in practice, cannot reside in a figure. What is meant here is this: This figure arises out of an occasional experience of a mistaken identity and it is this misconception that causes the enhancement and ornamentation in an expression and particularises it from a mere statement of similarity. Jagannātha takes notice of this flaw in the name of this figure and attempts to justify it as a secondary one. Primarily, it is the Kāvya, which is Bhrántimān. Older Ālaṃkārīkas like Bhāmaha, Udbhāta and Vāmana do not recognise this figure. Daṇḍin's Mohopama bears close resemblance to this figure. It is interesting to note that Appaya Dīkṣita, in his Kuvalayānanda, names this figure Bhrānti as Bhoja did in his

101. Rasagaṅgādhara, p. 266.

"bhṛántimān ālaṃkāra iti vyavahāras tvaupacārikāḥ.
tathā cānuḥ —
pramātrantaradīr bhrāntirūpā yasmīm anūdyate /
sa bhṛántimān iti khyāto'laṃkāre tvaupacārikāḥ //”


"sāśityutprekṣya tanvaṅgi tvamanukhaṁ tvamanukhasayā /
indum apanudhāvāṁityesā mahopama smṛte //”

Read :

"mohō bhṛántih. ...... arvācinānāṁ mate atra bhṛántimān ālaṃkāraḥ."

Commentary Prabhā of Rangācharya
Reddi Shastri, p. 129.
Sarasvatīkāntabhārāṇa. Appaya Dīkṣita does not mention or cite any opinion of his predecessors in the discussion on this figure. However, the definition, as given by him, is this:

kavisammataśāḍryād viṣaye pihitātmanī /
āropyaṁaṇānubhavō yatra sa bhrāntimān mataḥ // (p. 44)

Since there is no question of rejecting others' opinions, discussion on this figure is almost free from all sorts of logical arguments.

Definition of Bhrāntimān has been criticised by Jagannātha in his usual way. Appaya Dīkṣita maintained that the expression 'pihitātmanī' in the definition, has been added to exclude the figure Rūpaka from the range of this figure. But Jagannātha holds that, it is not so that in Rūpaka, the knowledge of the 'āropyaṁaṇā' (i.e. Upamāṇa) is described, but it is mere derived. Again, Appaya Dīkṣita cites the verse 'śīñjānair mānjariśī' etc. as an illustration of Bhrāntimān, where charm arises out of gradual presentation of errors belonging to different agents. But Jagannātha finds out a lot of faults there also.

J. Ullekha

Figure Ullekha attained the status of a figure of speech in the hand of Ruyyaka for the first time. Vidyādhara,

103. See Citramāṁsakhandāna, p. 33.
104. Ibid., p. 34.
Viswanātha and our author deal with it with much care and critical acumen. Generally, in the discussion on the figures of speech, Appaya Dīksita cites the definitions or opinions of his predecessors as the prima facie view and later on offers his desired definition. But in the case of Ullekha, he starts verily with his own definition without mentioning others' opinions. However, the definition as given by him, bears a close similarity with the definitions formulated by Ruyyaka and by Vidyādhara.

Appaya Dīksita says:

nimmattabhedād ekasya vastuno yad anekadhā / ullekhanam anekena tam ullekham pracakṣate // (p.65)

This figure may immerge from two different sources, namely, difference of perceivers and difference of the objects.

In the definition, given by Viswanātha, this point is clearly mentioned. But Appaya Dīksita defines the second separately in the following words —

grahitrabhedahave'pi visayāsrayabhedatah / ekasyānekaḥdhollekham apyullekham pracakṣate // (p. 68)

Figure Ullekha generally possesses an association

105. Alamkāra-sarvasva, Sūtra No. 19, p. 58.
"ekasyāpi nimmattvaśād anekadā grahanam ullekhah".

"tattannimmattabhedād ekam anekair anekadhā yatra / ullikhyate sa dhīrair ullekhah kathyate'nvartah //"

"kvacid bhedād grahitrām visayānām tathā kvacit / ekasyānekaḥdhollekhāḥ yaḥ sa ullekhā ucyate //"
with the figures Rūpaka, Bhrāntimān, Atisayokti and Śīleśa. This was noticed by Ruuyaka in his Alamkāra-sarvasva, and Kumari S.S. Janaki justifiedly points out that Appaya Dīkṣita had taken this cue from Ruuyaka and accepted the varieties, viz., Śūdra and Saṃkīrṇa, relating to this figure.

Jagannātha, in his Citramāṇasakhāṇḍana, criticises Appaya Dīkṣita's finding of the fallacy of being too wide with regard to figure Apāmuta relating to the verse 'kāntyā candraṁ viduḥ' etc. (p. 66), since, two varieties, viz., Śūdra and Saṃkīrṇa, have been admitted by the author himself and since, the verse in question, can easily be taken as an example of the admixture with the figure Apāmuta. Moreover, if the adjunct 'nīsddhā想起来' be taken so as to avert the fallacy of being too wide with regard to this type of examples of Apāmuta, then there would remain no way to avert the same fallacy with regard to the verse 'kapāle mārjarāḥ' etc. (p. 64) noted as an example of Bhrāntimān.

K. Apāmuta

Apāmuta is the tenth figure of speech dealt with by Appaya Dīkṣita in his Citramāṇa. The definition as given by him

111. Pp. 35-36.
is this:

prakṛtasya niśedhena yaḥ anyatvaprakalpanam /
   sāmyad apahnutṁ vākyabhedabhedaḥavatī āvidhā // (p.69)

There are two points in this definition. The first one is 'prakṛtaniśedha' (i.e. denial of the object under description) and the other is 'anyatvakalpana' (i.e. establishment of a thing other than the object under description). The figures Bhrāntimān and Apahnuti are closed to each other and the former should immediately precede the latter. But it is very interesting to note that the figure Ullekha has intervened in between these two figures in our Citramāmāya. The same has been noticed in the Alamkārāsarasvāsa of Ruyyaka, the Sāhityadārpana of Viśvanātha and the like.

Kumari S.S. Janaki refers to Jayaratha's objection with regard to this anomalous order of the figures of speech in her 'Alamkārāsarasvāsa of Ruyyaka.'

In the figure Rūpaka, the object of comparison is considered to be something else; but there is no denial. In the figure Aksēka, only denial is there. But it is the figure Apahnuti, where both these two characteristics appear as wedded together. The adjunct 'sāmyāt' is necessary for averting the fallacy of being too wide with regard to the figure Atisayokti. Thus, having followed the path of his predecessors like Bhāmaha, Udbhāta, Vamana and

113. See Kāvyālamkāra, III. 21, p. 62.
114. See Kāvyālamkāra-sāra-samgraha, V. 3, p. 62.
115. See Kāvyālamkāra-sūtra-vṛtti, IV. 3, 5, p. 57.
Rudrā, Appāya Dīkṣita emphatically speaks of similarity at the basis of this figure. But Daṇḍin, however, is less interested in admitting this.

In a large number of works on Sanskrit poetics like the Kāvyādārsa of Daṇḍin, the Kāvyaprakāsā of Mammata, the Pratāparudrayāsobhūsaṇa of Viḍyānātha, and the Sāhityadārpaṇa of Viśvanātha, the definition of Apahnuti has been given with the use of a verb involving the suffix 'ktvā' or 'lyap'. But our author categorically mentions that it would lead to difficulty in respect of admitting a variety of Apahnuti where the denial is preceeded by superimposition. The sūtra 'saṃnakartṛkayoḥ pūrvakāle' (Pa: 3. 4. 21), of which the whole body runs thus — saṃnakartṛkayoḥ dhātvarthayoḥ pūrvakāle viḍyāmānād dhātoḥ ktvā syāt — means, that if there be a single agent connected with two different roots, suffix 'ktvā' is added after the root, of which the function takes place beforehand. The suffix 'lyap' also stands for the same, the only peculiarity being its having a prefix in the root. Now, if the definition is formed with the gerund and runs as 'niśādhyā... etc., and is taken in its strictly grammatical sense, then, the denial must have to preceede the superimposition and

116. See Kāvyālaṃkāra, VIII. 57, p. 276.
117. Cf. Daṇḍin's definition of this figure in Kāvyādārsa II. 304, p. 278. "apahnutir apahnutya kiṃcid anyārthaḍarsānam".
118. II. 304, p. 278.
119. X. 10 ab, p. 53 (Gadkar's Edition).
120. P. 276.
121. X. 38 ab, p. 28.
thus, the variety, where superimposition preceeds the
denial, can by no means be admitted. That our Appaya
Dīkṣita is ever conscious of the grammatical technicalities,
is clearly indicated by such statements. Appaya Dīkṣita's
drawing a clear-cut distinction between the two methods of
conveying negation, viz., by 'viśayāsatyaṭvapratipāḍaka'
words and by 'viśayāsatyaṭvaparyavasayin' words, also, is
another example of the cautious use of words by our author.

Apahnuti is divided thus: There are two varieties
of Apahnuti, viz., where there are separate sentences and
where there is one sentence. Again, this figure is divided
on another ground, namely, where superimposition preceeds
denial and vice versa. The division, namely, 'having
separate sentences', emerges in three ways, viz., by direct
negation 'man' etc., by presenting as 'others' opinion'
and by suggestion. The variety, namely, where is one
sentence only, takes form in two ways, viz., by the use of
words denoting falsehood of the object under description
and by the use of words ultimately conveying the falsehood
of the object. Viśwanātha, in his Sāhityadarpaṇa mentions
another variety of this figure. He says —

gopaniyam kamaparthe dyotayitvā kathaṣcana //
yadi śleṣeṇānyatā vānyathayet sāpyapahnutih //
i.e. That is also Apahnuti, where, having somehow given
expression to something, which ought to have been kept a
secret, one construes his words differently, either by means
of paranomasia or otherwise.

122. X. 38 cd and 39 ab, p. 28.
The denial in Apahnuti practically establishes similarity between the two, viz., the Upamāna and the Upameya. A few Ālāṁkārikas admit Apahnuti in those cases also where the similarity is described to express denial. In this context, Appaya Dīkṣita cites the opinion of Ruṣyaka.

Jagannātha in his Citramīmāṃśakhaṇḍana, criticises the illustration of the suggestion of Apahnuti as given in the Citramīmāṃśa. The arguments, Jagannātha presents, have been discussed in details in Ramaswamy's work.

L. Utpreksā

Among the figures of speech, discussed in full, in the Citramīmāṃśa, Utpreksā holds the last position. As we have tried to establish later on by a thorough analysis of the contents, references made by later Ālāṁkārikas and absence of mention of this figure in the Citramīmāṃśa-khaṇḍana, Marmapракāśā and others, this figure seems to be an interpolation. However, all of the available printed texts and a good number of manuscripts, preserved in different libraries of India and abroad, contain this figure. In comparison to other figures of speech, except Upamā, this figure has been discussed very elaborately. The Kāvyādāraśa of Dāndin, the Kāvyapraṅgaśa of Mammaṭa, the

123. Citramīmāṃśa, p. 71.
125. See our Introduction, Chapter V.
Alamkārasarvasva of Ruyyaka, the Candrāloka of Jayadeva and the Pratāparudrayosobhūṣana of Vidyānātha have been frequently cited by our author in course of discussion on this figure. Except Ruyyaka, who uses the term 'ādhyāvasāya' in the definition of Utpreksā, most of the Alamkārikas have used 'sambhāvanā' as its essential factor. Our author, Appaya Dīkṣita, also seems to have admitted this. This is clear from his treatment of this figure, though he does not use the very term 'sambhāvanā'. Thus, the definition as given by him, is this —

yatānyadharmasambandhād anyatvenopatarkitam/
pракṛtam hi bhavet prajñās tām utprekṣāṁ pracaksate //

(p. 73)

Perhaps, it would not be out of context to mention here that Ruyyaka has divided 'ādhyāvasāya' into two types, viz., 'siddha' and 'ādhyā', and notes that the second variety of 'ādhyāvasāya' is at times mentioned by the words

126. Alamkāra-sarvasva, 22, p. 66.
"ādhyāvasāye vyāparaprādhānye utprekṣā".

127. Cf. "lokātikrāntaviśayā bhāvabhāvabhīmānatāḥ /
sambhāvaneyam utprekṣā"
— Kāvyālāmkāra-sāra-samgraha of Udbhāta,
III. 4, abo, p. 47.
"sambhāvanam athotprekṣā prakṛtasya samena yat".
— Kāvyapraṅga of Mammata, X, Kārikā No. 6 ab, p. 45 (Gadkari's edition).
"bhavet sambhāvanotprekṣā prakṛtasya parātmanā".
— Sāhityadarpaha X, Kārikā No. 40 ab, p. 29.
(Kane's edition).

128. Al Aphkāra-sarvasva, Vṛtti under Sūtra No. 22, p. 68.
like 'sambhāvana', 'ūha', 'abhimūna' and 'utprekṣa'.

In the classification of Utprekṣa, Appaya Dīkṣita presents the division of the same as given by Ruyyaka, Vidyanātha and others and says that endless varieties of this figure may indeed be conceived of on various grounds. However, Appaya Dīkṣita maintains that a few varieties of this figure, as shown by the predecessors, do not possess charm and hence should be excluded from list of varieties of this figure.

M. Atiśayokti

In the Citramāṃsā, the figure Atiśayokti has not been dealt with in full. This figure also seems to be an

129. It is interesting to note that M. Seshagiri Shastri in his Report on a Search for Sanskrit and Tamil Manuscripts for the year 1893-94, No.2, maintains that the manuscript, Entry No.12879, in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, ends with the figure Atiśayokti. He has cited the colophon of that manuscript also, which runs thus:

"iti śrīmadappayadīkṣitakṛtau citramāṃsāyām
atiśayoktyalamāṅkāraprakaraṇam". (p. 229)

But from the citation (p. 229), made by Sastrin, of the ending portion of the same manuscript, it is seen that the manuscript ends in the same place where the N.S.P. edition and a few other editions also end in.
interpolation. Not only a good number of manuscripts, but one available printed text also, do not contain this figure. In some of the manuscripts, as well as in the same printed text, there is a list of figures, which are dealt with in the Citramāṃsaṇa. That list also omits this figure and ends in Utpreksa. A few other evidences are there to prove that there is every possibility of its being an interpolated one. We have tried to establish this later on. The finishing verse, namely, 'appardha' etc., also, is a spurious one. However, Appaṇa Dīksita, in his usual way, begins with a definition of this figure, as given by his predecessor, Vidyānātha, though he does not mention his name and it breaks off in the middle of the discussion on that definition.

It would not be out of context to mention here that in the Kuvalayānanda, this figure has been dealt with in broad detail. But there also, the definition of this figure has not been given. Only many a variety, namely, Rūpakātisayokti, Sāpahnavātisayokti, Bhekapātisayokti, Sambandhātisayokti, Akramātisayokti, Capiḍātisayokti and Atyantātisayokti, have been mentioned along with their definitions and illustrations. This point has been noticed by Vaidyanātha, author of the commentary Alaṅkāracandrīka on the Kuvalayānanda, who, however, attempts to supply us with a definition in the following words —


131. "upamā sahopameyopamayātānānanvayaḥ smaranam / rūpakaparinatisamsayabhṛntimadullekhaniraḥnavaḥ //”

132. See our Introduction, Chapter V.
In the Citramāṇyaśā, however, Appaya Dīkṣita mentions the four-fold division of this figure as admitted by his predecessor; but his desired classification has not come down to us.

133. Alamkāraścandikā, under Kārika No. 42, p. 45.
V. Probable Spurious Portions in the Citramāṃsa

The Citramāṃsa is an incomplete treatise on the figures of speech. In almost all the printed editions and also in some manuscripts lying in different libraries of India and abroad, there is a verse at the end of this work. The verse runs thus:

apyardhacitramāṃsa na mude kasya māṃsalā /
anūrur iva gharmaṃsor ardhendur iva dhūrjaṭeh //

(p. 102)

This means: though incomplete, the Citramāṃsa causes delight to all, like Aruna to the sun or the crescent moon to Lord Śiva.

Now, the question arises: who is the author of this verse? Is it Appaya Dīksita himself? Does it indicate that the work was deliberately left incomplete?

A group of scholars maintain that this verse is authentic. Only a few figures of speech which deserve critical analysis would be treated in this Citramāṃsa with this intention in view Appaya Dīksita proceeded towards the composition of this work and after an elaborate and exhaustive analysis of a few figures of speech (viz. Upama, Upameyopama, Rūpaka, Ananyaya, Smaraṇa, Parināma, Sasandeha, Bhrāntimān, Ulekhā, Aparān, Uparekṣa and Atiságokti) accompanied by sharp and cogent arguments in the rejection of others' opinion

and establishment of his desired conclusions, he apparently did not feel any urge for further continuation of the work and adding an ending verse, namely, the verse beginning with 'apyardhacitramīmāṃsā', he left this book unfinished.

A few other scholars, although of the same opinion with regard to the authorship of this verse, differ in respect of the bulk of the composition. In the beginning of Citramīmāṃsā, Appaya Dīkṣita declares that he is going to deal with the Arthālaṃkāras only and not Sabdaśa laṃkāras because they are mostly insipid; poets do not respect them and they do not possess matters deserving much consideration. Thus half the portion in the field of figures is his subject of discussion, and Appaya Dīkṣita, in fact, discussed all the figures of speech belonging to the Arthacitra group. A lot of evidences are there in favour of this contention. We have the following statement on the section on Utprekeṣā — "A few other varieties of this figure on the basis of another ground would be shown in the section on Samāsokti". Again, we have in the section on Upama: "That the scope of Śleṣa is different from other figures would be shown in that section".

135. Ibid., p. 9.
136. "Sabdacitraśya prāyo nirasaṭvān nātyantam tad ādriyante kavyayaḥ, na vā tatra vicāraṇīyam ativopalabhyata iti sabdaśicitramāṃśam apahāyārthacitramīmāṃsā prasannavistirnā prastūyate". (P. 4).
137. P. 96.
Similarly, in the section on Utpreksā, we have: "More would be considered in the section on the figure Nidarsāna". The points referred to in the above statements are not available in the extant work. These references, thus, clearly indicate that a valuable portion of this book is lost in oblivion and that portion is not of a little length. However, the aforesaid scholars are certain that the verse 'apyaradha ...', came from the pen of Appaya Dīkṣita. But the word 'ardha' does not bear the same implication as mentioned before. Here it is not an indication of incompletion but just to remind us of Appaya Dīkṣita's words that half the portion only in the field of the figure of speech, i.e., Arthacitra only, is to be touched by him in this work. Thus, this verse can be rightly interpreted and connected with the prior statement of Appaya Dīkṣita — "Saśādacitrasya prāyo nīrasatvāt ...." etc. (P. 4).

Opinions of two groups of scholars have been presented above. On this point our view is different. The verse in question, is not composed by our author but comes from a later hand. The following are the questions that we would like to put to the first group of scholars.

Leaving a work unfinished is not a very good or appreciable deed, or, at least, not to be spoken of with a full-throated voice as is done here. An author is supposed to be apologetic in case he is bound to leave his work unfinished. How is it, that Appaya Dīkṣita is quite desperate in proclaiming

139. p. 99
"though half-finished, my work will cause delight to all..."
and so on. Nowhere have we met with a case where the work is incomplete and yet the author proceeds to speak high of it. This has no psychological basis.

Moreover, a good number of manuscripts, such as, the manuscripts preserved in the Tanjore Mahārājā Sarfoji's Sarasvatī Mahāl Library, 140 the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, 141 the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 142 do not include this verse and end in Utpreksā.

The aforesaid reference to the figure Śyeṣa, which is wanting in the extant work, in the chapter on Upamā, indicates that a portion of this work is lost. Here, we refrain from mentioning the other two references to the figures Samāsokti and Nidārsana, since those two references are found in the chapter on Utpreksā, which we consider to be an interpolation. We shall try to prove this by evidences later on.

Again, in the Kuvalayānanda, which is generally accepted to be Appaya Dīksita's last attempt on poetics, there

142. See Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collections of Manuscripts deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. XII, entry Nos. 177, 178.
are three references to the Citramīmāṃsa. The references are to the figures Ślesa, Prastutālakāra and Arthāntaranyāsa, which are, at present, not available in the text. Thus, that at least three figures are lost, can be spoken of without the least shade of doubt and this leads us to think that the same may be the case with a few others too.

Both the Citramīmāṃsa and the Kuvalayānanda have the same subject matter, namely, the Arthacitra. The Sabdācitra portion in the Kuvalayānanda, is an interpolation. The interpolated portion consists of a chapter from Ciranjīva Bhattācārya's Kāvyavilāsa. It is unlikely that before the completion of Citramīmāṃsa, the work in hand, Appaya Dīkṣita attempted to compose another work on the same subject. This may happen in the case of compositions of poems or novels, but unlikely in the case of Shastras, particularly of the same subject-matter. Thus Appaya Dīkṣita must have written the Kuvalayānanda after the Citramīmāṃsa and hence there is no scope for thinking that while writing the Kuvalayānanda he thought of putting certain points in the Citramīmāṃsa but did not have the opportunity to do so later on. In other words, the relevant portions in the Citramīmāṃsa are most probably lost.

143. (i) "etadvivecanam tu citramīmāṃsāyām drastavyam" (p. 78).
(ii) "vastutastwya eva dhvanir iti vyavasthāpiṣam citramīmāṃsāyam". (pp. 85-86).
(iii) "prapaścas citramīmāṃsāyām drastavyah" (p. 133).

144. See H.S.P. (DeJ, p. 223, foot-note No. 3.
Appaya Dīkṣita had a long life of 72 or 73 years.

It is difficult to think that he could not complete the Citramīmāṃsa owing to sudden death.

Even if it be admitted that Appaya Dīkṣita deliberately left the work incomplete, he would have at least completed the figure Atiśayokti and would not leave it half the way.

Against the conjecture of the second group of scholars, mentioned before, these are the arguments. Generally, the first or the last portion of a manuscript are mutilated. How is it that the last verse is available while a few sections of the middle portion are lost. As a case of accident, this might have been accepted in a single case; but the verse is found in a large number of manuscripts.

Moreover, Appaya Dīkṣita has made it clear in the very beginning that he is going to deal with the figures that are related to ideas only (i.e. 'Arthacitra'). Had that desire been fulfilled, he would not mention his work as half

145. See H. S. P. (De), p. 222, foot note No. 7 (73 years) and History of Classical Sanskrit Literature of Krishnamachariar, p. 226 (72 years).

146. Cf. "vītanomi vīpulavisāyāṁ viśādārthām arthacitra-

mīmāṃsām". (p. 1).

and "... sābdacitraṁśām apahyarthacitrāmīmāṃśa prasa-
nnavistirṇā prastūyate". (p. 4)
finished; since that half portion only was his project. At least, our author would have refrained from using a misleading expression like 'ardhacitramāṃśa.' Even a single figure of speech may be, and in fact it happened to be so in the case of Laksana-ratnāvalī, the subject-matter of the entire work. Thus, the conjecture of the second group of scholars also seems to be lacking in adequate strength.

The only conclusion that can be drawn in the present circumstances is that the verse in question is a spurious one.

Another point of doubt arises. Does the present Citramāṃśa possess more interpolations in addition to the noted verse beginning with 'apyardhacitramāṃśa'? Statements found in different works and some other external evidences hint at the fact that the extant text (i.e. the text, ending in the middle of Atiṣayokti) of the Citramāṃśa contains spurious portions. A chart of some of the manuscripts preserved in different libraries and the available printed texts along with a note on their ending in different places, may help us in this matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSS Preserved in</th>
<th>Entry No. in the Catalogue</th>
<th>Ending in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India Office Library,</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>Ātha atiṣayokti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London.</td>
<td></td>
<td>uṇamā sahopameyopama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...... // āpayardha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>citramāṃśa ... //</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

147. See H.S.P. (De), p. 225.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSS Preserved in</th>
<th>Entry No. in the Cat:</th>
<th>Ending in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library of the Mahā-raja of Tanjore</td>
<td>5223</td>
<td>'Iti apahnutiprakaranam'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do</td>
<td>5224</td>
<td>Utpreksāprakaranam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do</td>
<td>5225</td>
<td>-Do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adyar Library</td>
<td>30I, 47</td>
<td>-Do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do</td>
<td>30J, 6</td>
<td>Pariṇāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do</td>
<td>30K, 30</td>
<td>Utpreksā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiatic Society, Calcutta</td>
<td>4874</td>
<td>Last part of Utpreksā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do</td>
<td>4875</td>
<td>-Do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do</td>
<td>4876</td>
<td>Rūpaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do</td>
<td>4877</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental MSS, Library, Madras</td>
<td>12879</td>
<td>Middle of Atisyayoktalamkāra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


153. S. Kuppuswami Shastri, author of the Catalogue (mentioned in the footnote No. 152) maintains (p. 8657) that this manuscript continues to the "end of the Atisyayoktalamkāra" and he refers to M. Seshagiri Sastrī's Report on a contd ......
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental MSS Library, Madras</td>
<td>12880</td>
<td>Utpreksa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do -</td>
<td>12881</td>
<td>- Do -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do -</td>
<td>12882</td>
<td>Sasandeha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do -</td>
<td>12883</td>
<td>Rūpaka, incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.O.R.I. 154</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Middle of Utpreksa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRINTED EDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edited by</th>
<th>Ending in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pt. Sivādatta</td>
<td>Middle of Atisayokti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. P. Sukla</td>
<td>- Do -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. C. Misra</td>
<td>- Do -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramashastri Tailanga</td>
<td>End of Utpreksa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Search for Sanskrit and Tamil Manuscripts, No.2, p.82 and pp. 228-230, entry No.34. We have, however, seen the Report and have found that Mr. Shastrin remarks (p.82) it as: "The manuscript ends with the Atisāyoktyaṃkāra". He has cited the colophon also (p.230). The colophon clearly notes: "Here ends the section on the figure Atisāyokti". But from the ending portion of the manuscript (which also has been cited by Mr. Shastrin) it appears that this manuscript also ends in the same place where most of the edited texts end in. From the content of the available texts, it becomes quite clear that the work breaks off in the middle of Atisayokti. The same is applicable with regard to this manuscript also.

We may notice here that there is no harmony in the ending marks of this work. A good number of manuscripts end in the middle of Utpreṣā. The candrika Commentary also supports this — "Utpreṣāpranṭhanantaram citramīṃṣāḥ na kvāpi ēṣyate". In a few of the manuscripts there is a list of figures, which runs thus:

upamā sahopameyopamayāṭāhanantavayaḥ smaraṇam /
rūpaṇapatīnatisāṃṣayabhrāntimadullekhaṇirapahnavotpreṣāḥ//

This ends in Utpreṣā and omits Atiśayokti. On the grounds stated above, one may think that the text from the beginning to the middle or end of Utpreṣā is original and the portion on Atiśayokti is spurious.

But we would like to retreat one step more. To us it appears even the chapter on Utpreṣā is spurious. What happened probably is this: Appaya, in his Citramīṃṣā, had discussions on many other figures which were lost at a time not very far from the time of their composition. After that it was handled by many hands and interpolations continued to creep in even after that.

Thus, Jagannātha, a contemporary of Appaya Dikṣita, had most probably in his hand a text of the Citramīṃṣā ending in Apahmuti. In his Citramīṃṣakhaṇḍana, he criticised Appaya's work from the beginning to the end of Apahmuti. No figure, whether prominent or not, escaped his fiery criticism. Had he found the Citramīṃṣā comprising of the prominent figures Ślesā, Arthāntaranyāṣa, Prastuta, and the like, it is difficult to believe that we would remain deprived of finding criticisms on those figures of speech
from his pen. Hence we surmise the loss took place at an early stage.

Nāgāsaṁbhaṭṭa, who again contradicted Jagannātha in many places in his commentary Marmaprakāśa on the Rasa-gaṅgādhara, found the text up to the end of Apahnuti.

The Citramāṃsādōśadhikāra, authorship of which is still uncertain, also ends in Apahnuti.

It seems, that afterwards the text was handled by some other hand and Vaiḍyanaṭha, author of the Commentary Candrika, found it as ending in Utprekaṣā. Even after that, interpolations, continued to creep in. At this time the figure Aṭiśayokti, although in its incomplete form, was added. Most of the printed editions of the Citramāṃsā now contain this portion also.

Again, the commentary Sudhā of Dharānanda on the Citramāṃsā continues a little even after the portion of Aṭiśayokti available in some of the printed texts. What is indicated here is that, Dharānanda had a text of the Citramāṃsā which did not end in the same place as we find in some of the printed texts. This commentary omits the verse beginning with 'apyaradha-citramāṃsā'. Thus earlier commentators found it ending in Apahnuti, the later like Vaiḍyanaṭha in Utprekaṣā and the latest in the middle or end of Aṭiśayokti.

156. Cf. "yadyapyutprekaṣāgranthānantaram citramāṃsā na kvāpi āryate tathāpyayam āśaya unnīyate". Candrika on the Kuvalayānanda, p. 78.
Unlike Jagannātha who composed even the illustrations for his Rasagaṅgādāhara, Appaya Dīkṣita cited illustrations from varied sources proving his acquaintance with a wide range of Sanskrit literature. From the beginning to the middle of Atiśayokti, there are thirty-five verses cited from the Naiṣadha-carita of Śrīhara and it is curious to note that of them thirty-one verses are credited to the account of the figure Utprekaśa (from the beginning to figure Apahnuti there are two verses only and in the figure Atiśayokti, which is incomplete, there are the rest two). It seems to us that the author of this spurious portion, had in his hand, the Naiṣadha-carita which is noted for abounding in figures of speech and treated as a storehouse for illustrations by literary critics and wherever he needed a verse for illustration, he opened the Naiṣadha-carita and put it in the text. He felt no urge to make it more attractive by quoting verses from different Kāvyas. But this urge does not escape our eyes in the cases of other figures of speech.

It is very difficult to find out any distinction between the original and spurious portions in respect of language, style etc. since, the mode of dealing with a subject matter relating to shastras, remains the least changed in most cases. Such a change is noticeable in literary texts in particular.
VI. Appaya Dīkṣita and the Ālaṃkārika: Predecessors Mentioned by Him.

Appaya Dīkṣita refers to a good number of his predecessors in the field of Sanskrit poetics and cites their views. The Citramāṁsā, in this respect, serves as an important document to the student of Sanskrit poetics. In some cases, however, earlier authors or sources have not been mentioned by name. The extent of his acquaintance with earlier literary critics will be clear from the chart given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Relevant text</th>
<th>Author/Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upamā</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Candra iva mukham ... evam uktānekālamkāra vivartaviyam upamā.</td>
<td>Vidyācakravartin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>asyās tāvad evam laksanām áhuḥ -- upamānopome-yatvayogyayoh '//'</td>
<td>Not mentioned by name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>'sādharmyam upamā bhede - dīti kavyaprāṣi-koktalaksane ...</td>
<td>Sañjivanī under Śītra No. 11 Alam. Sarva, p. 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>yat tu vidyānāthena laksanām uktam -- 'svatahśiddhena ...</td>
<td>Author could not be traced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>uktam hi cakravartin -- yādāyam upamānāṃśo ... // yadā punar ayam ... //</td>
<td>Kāvyapraśikā (= Kāvyapraśī of Mammata) X. 1. p. 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vidyanātha, Pratāpa rudrīya, p. 254.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cakravartin (= Vidyācakravartin), Alam. Sarva. Nişkṣṭārthākārika, 36 & 37, p. 5 (of Appendix No. I of Alam. Sarvasva)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upama</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ślesasya ... nopametimāṇḍhakādibhir abhyupe-yate.</td>
<td>Maṅkhaka (taken as the author of the Alāṃkāra-sarvasvā) Alam. Sarva. under Sūtra 33, p.127.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yat tu rudraṝena ... 'sphuṭam arthāḷāṅkāra-vetā ...'//</td>
<td>Rudrata, Kavyālāṃkāra, 4.32. p.117.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>sansāṛṣṭiṃśaktarat prthag granthakṛtām ...</td>
<td>Vidyanātha, Not mentioned by name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>yat tu sarasvatikāntah-bharaṇoktaṃ lakṣaṇam -- 'prasiddher anurodhena...//'</td>
<td>Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa (of Bhoja), IV.5, p.399.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>āhūṣ ca tasya tad eva phalaṃ bhāmaḥādayah -- 'yatra tenaiva tasya...//'</td>
<td>Bhāma. K. A. III.45 p.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ata eva varṇyamānapapi ... alāṃkārasarvasvā-kārūdayayo vaddanti.</td>
<td>Author of the Alāṃkāra-sarvāsva, Alam. Sarva. under Sūtra 12, p.39.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| No. | Upamā | 16. | 17 bhrāntimadādikam api-upta-māmādhye paripārayataḥ dāndinā tattvākhyānapo-metyādāsavyavahāraḥ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>imam eva viśeṣam abhi-pretya kāvyapraκāsikā- dilakṣāneṣu ... yatnaḥ kṛto ...</td>
<td>Kāvyapraκāsikā (=Kavyapraκāsā of Mammata). K.P.X, Vyāti under Sūtra 1, p. 34.</td>
<td>Daṇḍin: Not mentioned by name. K.D.I.95, p. 101.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>bhrāntimadādikam api-upta-māmādhye paripārayataḥ dāndinā tattvākhyānapo-metyādāsavyavahāraḥ ...</td>
<td>Daṇḍin. Based on K.P.X - 1-4 pp. 34-44. Not a verbatim citation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>tadāhuḥ 'niṣṭhūto-dgīryavāntādi ... /'</td>
<td>Kāvyapraκāsikā (=Kavyapraκāsā of Mammata). K.P.X.1-4, pp.34-44.</td>
<td>Kāvyāloka (could not be traced).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>kāvyapraκāsikākāraκādibhis tu pūrṇāyaḥ saṃvidhāḥ ... pradArsitāḥ.</td>
<td>Based on K.P.X - 1-4 pp. 34-44. Not a verbatim citation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>yaḍāhuḥ 'pūrṇā luptā ... (5 verses)</td>
<td>Kāvyapraκāsikā (=Kavyapraκāsā of Mammata). K.P.X.1-4, pp.34-44.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ye cānye kāvyālokaśīpa-</td>
<td>Kāvyapraκāsikā (=Kavyapraκāsā of Mammata). K.P.X.1-4, pp.34-44.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>māyām prakārayabhṛdā darśitaṁ te ...</td>
<td>Based on K.P.X - 1-4 pp. 34-44. Not a verbatim citation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>pādācāryaḥ 'yadyapi rasabhāvādīr artho dhvanyā-māna eva ......'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1.24 kāvyapraκāsikākāraκādibhis tu pūrṇāyaḥ saṃvidhāḥ ... pradArsitāḥ. Based on K.P.X - 1-4 pp. 34-44. Not a verbatim citation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>nyūnatvam ... saḍ dosān āhuḥ.</td>
<td>Based on K.A.S.V., 4.2.8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>kecit tu kālapurasa-lojārthādibhedam api dosāṃ āhuḥ.</td>
<td>Author not mentioned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upāme-yopāma 35</td>
<td>upamānapameyatvam ... ...... prakīrtītā //</td>
<td>Based on Bhāmaha's Kāvyālaṅkāra. Not a verbatim citation. K.A.III.37, p. 67.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anan- vaya</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>laksanamātram tu 'yatra tenaiva tasya syāt' iti bhāmahoktam anusandheyam</td>
<td>Bhāmaha. K.A. III. 45. p. 69.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>yat tu sarasvatikanṭhabha rāṅkotm laksanam — 'yadopamānaśabdānām.../'</td>
<td>Sarasvatikanṭhābharana of Bhoja. IV. 24. p. 413.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>yat tu 'āyur gūrtam' ityādau ... prasāṅgāt.</td>
<td>Could not be traced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>'Netrāṇandena' ityādau hetvalāṃkāra iti mate...</td>
<td>Author not mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>tatrāpi rūpakam ityekāvalikārādimate ...</td>
<td>Kāvalī of Vidyādhara p.212.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūpaka</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>uktam hi kāvyāloke — 'aparanto vikalpānām ... //</td>
<td>Kāvyāloka (Could not be traced. But bears close similarity with the Kāvyādarsa of Daṇḍin. K.D.II.36, pp.171-72).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>atrāhuh. āropya-mānasasya prakṛtātmanopayogitve parināma ...</td>
<td>Alamkāra-sarvasva. Not mentioned by name. Based on the Vṛtti under Sūtra No.16 of the Alam. Sarva. p.51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>āropavisyayataya ...// iti vidyānāthalakṣanam</td>
<td>Vidyaḥchara. Ekāvalī. III. p.110. Not a verbatim citation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>vidyaḥcharenāpi visayi-nāḥ svarūpena ... pari-nāmo'ngākṛtah. Jadāha - 'tām pariṇāmam ... //</td>
<td>Stated to be of Vidyaḥnātha; but could not be traced in Pratāparudrīya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>vidyaṇāthena tūdāhṛtam 'esa śāmyaī vas tāpo ••••'•••• katham //</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pari-</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>te hi 'rājapadaani sevaya'</td>
<td>The ancient ('prācināh')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāma.</td>
<td>ityatra...vyan janāyā-</td>
<td>— not mentioned by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>para iti manyante.</td>
<td>name.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>tatra rūpaka prakṛtam...</td>
<td>Vidyačakravartin. Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>...cakravitānāyathiva</td>
<td>on Sañjīvuni under Alam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tayor vailaksanyam</td>
<td>Sarva. Sūtra No.16, p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>varṇitam.</td>
<td>51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>uktam ca - 'visayya-</td>
<td>Vidyačakravartin, Alam-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kāram āropya ///'</td>
<td>kārasarvasvanīskṛtar-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'yada tu ...... ...</td>
<td>thakārika. Verse No.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>........ maṭah ///'.</td>
<td>&amp; 23. p.4 of Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.1 in the Alam. Sarva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commonly accepted. Cf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visvanath's Sāhitya-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasan-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>trividhās cāyam sasan-</td>
<td>Author of the Alam-Sarva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deha.</td>
<td>deha ... iti vadanti.</td>
<td>Vṛtti under Sūtra No.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p.75. Not mentioned by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Author of the Alam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarva. Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by name. Vṛtti under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sūtra No. 33, p. 132.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ullekha 69</td>
<td>kecit tu ... ityāhuh.</td>
<td>Author of the Alam-Sarva.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vṛtti under Sūtra No.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p.75. Not mentioned by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Author of the Alam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarva. Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by name. Vṛtti under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sūtra No. 33, p. 132.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apah-</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>kecit tu sādṛṣyavyaktaye</td>
<td>Author of the Alam-Sarva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuti.</td>
<td>apalnavavat ......</td>
<td>Not mentioned by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vādanti, yathāhuh -</td>
<td>name. Vṛtti under</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'sādṛṣyavyaktaye ......</td>
<td>Sūtra No. 33, p. 132.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...... apalmutih ///'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>udāharanti ca - 'ākṛṣ-</td>
<td>Author of the Alam-Sarva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yādāvamandagraham ...</td>
<td>Not mentioned by name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...... ///</td>
<td>Vṛtti under Sūtra No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33, p. 131.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apah-</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>atredam apahmutation kathana-</td>
<td>Udabha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>ye tu-udbhinnavastu-nigdhanam vyajektir iti</td>
<td>Rucaka and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>... rucakadayya.</td>
<td>Others = Ruyyaka and others, Alam, Sarva,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76, p. 199.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>dandi tvapahunay sadhar-</td>
<td>Dandin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>myamulatvaniyam anadrtya ... udikahara =</td>
<td>K.D. II. 304, 305 and 307, pp. 278-280.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'apahnutir apahnytayaa...//</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 verses).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>amum eva vibhagam abhi-pretya cakravartinoktam-</td>
<td>Chakravartin = Vidyacakra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eksha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

157. Unfortunately we could not get a copy of Rucaka's Kavya-prakasha-samketa, published by Sivaprasad Bhattacharyya in Calcutta Oriental Journal, Vol. II, and therefore cannot say whether this view of Rucaka really exists there. As regards Rucaka's other works like Alamkaranusarini (see H.S.P. - Kane, p.279) we have no information whether these books have ever been published.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utpr. 73</td>
<td>dançiñapívaśabdásyot-</td>
<td>Dançin, K.D. II. 234.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksā.</td>
<td>preksávyañjakañtvam</td>
<td>p. 236.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>'uktam - 'many e...&quot;</td>
<td>Mammatā. Not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>teṣu hi 'yadyarthoktān</td>
<td>by name. K.P.X.14,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>ca kalpanam' ityatisayok</td>
<td>p. 63.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-tyalamkāraviṣayesu...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>'sambhāvanam yadīsthām</td>
<td>Jayadeva’s Candrāloka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>syād ityūho'nyasya siddha</td>
<td>V, Karikā No.48, p.78.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ye'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>76-</td>
<td>ata eva 'līmpatīva ...</td>
<td>Dançin, K.D. II. 230.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>...habhah 'ityutpreksām</td>
<td>pp. 232-33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>udāhṛtvatā dandinā ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>'kartā yadyupāmañam...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>anigkṛtas ca... alam-</td>
<td>Author of the Alam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>kārasvarasvakṛta ...</td>
<td>Sarva. Alam. Sarva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>adhyavasāyaḥ.</td>
<td>Vṛtti under Sutra No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>ayam eva pakso daṇḍio-</td>
<td>22, pp. 72-73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>'bhimaṭaḥ, ṣaḍāha -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>'anyathaiwa .... /&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(3 verses).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>kāvyaprakāṣikākārasyā-</td>
<td>Author of the Kāvya-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>pyayam eva ... kṛtām.</td>
<td>prakāṣikā = Kāvya-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>prakāṣā, K.P.X.6. p.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>kāvyaprakāśikākāreṇāpi dharmasvarūpotprekṣodāharayeṣu ... āśritaḥ.</td>
<td>Author of the Kāvyaprakāśika = K.P., K.P. X.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vyrtti under Sūtra No. 6, p. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>alamkārasarvasvaktettham asya vibhāgaḥ pradarśītaḥ</td>
<td>Author of the Alam. Sarva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alam. Sarva. Vyrtti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>under Sūtra No. 22, pp. 66-80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>vidyānāthenapunah ... darśītaḥ</td>
<td>Vidyānātha. Pratāparudrīya, pp. 278-289.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vidyānātha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>athavā vidyānāthokta-prakāreṇa ... na cintanīyah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>gamyotprekṣasu jati-dravyasvarūpotprekṣe sambhavato... iti abhi-</td>
<td>Someone — not mentioned by name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>alamkārasarvasvaktarasya tu na sambhavata iti pakṣaḥ. uktam ca 'prāyaś cātra ... sambhavati.'</td>
<td>Author of the Alam. Sarva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>ata eva — 'piyusa-praśtri... /// ityatra rūpakam angīkrtam.</td>
<td>Alam. Sarva. Under Sūtra No. 15, p. 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utprekṣa.</td>
<td>Prataparudrīya, p. 278.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>'yatānāya dharmasaman-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dhāt' ... sarvair api</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>... vyavahārtavat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>ata eva alamkārasarvas-</td>
<td>Author of the Alam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seka ... /' ityatra ...</td>
<td>Under Sutra No. 22, p. 78.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>yat tu sarvasvakṛta</td>
<td>Author of the Alam. Sarva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>evam - 'pūrnendoh ...</td>
<td>Alam. Sarva. Under Sutra No. 20, p. 64. Not mentioned by name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>... /' ... ityapi drasṭavāyam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>visayasyānupādānād ...</td>
<td>Prataparudrīya, p. 287.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>... // iti lakṣaṇam uktvā</td>
<td>Not mentioned by name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cāturvidhāyaṃ varṇayanti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the chart given above, a few noteworthy points have been noticed by us. Thus, in cases of citations from his predecessors' works or mentioning their opinions, Appaya Dīkṣita, generally mentions the source or the author by name. In a few cases, though citations are not mentioned by name, Appaya Dīkṣita lets the readers understand that he is quoting from some others' works by the expressions like 'abhimaṭam kesaṃcit', 'tad ānuḥ', 'yaḍāha', 'prācīnāḥ praḍārśi-tah', 'ityuktam', 'atṛānuḥ', and 'keciḥ ānuḥ'. But in the section on Upema, while establishing that, the idea contained
in the expression 'the face is beautiful' can be rendered in different ways so as to illustrate various figures of speech based on similarly, Appaya Dīksita seems to make an almost verbatim citation from Vidyācakravartin's Saṇjīvanī, a famous commentary on the Alamkārasarvasva of Ruyyaka, but neither mentions the source nor the author by name nor hints that the same is a citation from other's work. How closely Appaya Dīksita follows Vidyācakravartin, would be quite clear from a comparison between their presentations to figures based on similarity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saṇjīvanī</th>
<th>Citramāṇṣā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. mukham candra ivetyupamā</td>
<td>candra iva mukham iti sādṛṣya-varṇanam tāvād upamā. (No. 1 in the Citramāṇṣā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. mukham mukham ivetyanvayah</td>
<td>mukham mukham ivetyanvayah (No.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. mukham candra iva sa tad ivetyupameyopamā</td>
<td>candra iva mukham mukham iva (No.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ċṛṣṭvā mukham candram anusmaramīti smarāṇam</td>
<td>candram ċṛṣṭvā mukham (No.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. mukham eva candra iti rūpakam.</td>
<td>mukham eva candra iti rūpakam (No.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. mukhaacamrendra tāpah śāmyatīti parināmāḥ</td>
<td>mukhaacamrendra tāpah śāmyatīti parināmāḥ (No.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. kim candra āhosvin mukham iti sandehāḥ</td>
<td>kim idam mukham utāho candraḥ iti sandehāḥ (No.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. mukham candra iti cakorā nandantīti bhrāntimān</td>
<td>candra iti cakorās tanmukham anu-dhavanti iti bhrāntimān (No.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. candra eva na mukham iti apalmutih.</td>
<td>candro'yaḥ na mukham ityapahna-vah (No.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sañjīvani</em></td>
<td><em>Citramāṁsā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. mūnām candra ityutpreksā.</td>
<td>mūnām candram ityutpreksā. (No.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. candram pāsyaṃtyatīsayoktih</td>
<td>candro'yaṃ ityatisayoktih (No.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. asyaṃ prāvṛṣi mukham candrabimbaṃ ca vicchāryan ityekā tulyayogitā.</td>
<td>mukhena candrakamale nirjite iti tulyayogitā (No.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. śāradī ranyam iti tvan, idaṃ ca tac ca ramyam iti dīpakaṃ.</td>
<td>nīśi candraś tvanmukhaṃ ca hrṣyati iti dīpakaṃ... (No.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. mukham eva ramyaṃ candra eva hrāya iti prativastūpamaś</td>
<td>tvanmukha evāhaṃ rajyāmi candra eva cakororajyate iti prati- vastūpamaś. (No.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. bhuvi mukhaṃ divi candra iti drṣṭantaḥ.</td>
<td>divi candro bhuvī tvanmukham iti drṣṭantaḥ. (No.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. mukhaḍuṣaṇaṃ candramasose malinikaraṇaṃ iti nidasana.</td>
<td>mukham candraśriyaṃ bibharti iti nidasana. (No.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. candrād adhikāṃ mukhaṃ mukhaḥ adhikaś candra iti vyatirekaḥ.</td>
<td>nīṣkalanāṃ mukhaṃ candrād atiricyate iti vyatirekaḥ (No.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. candrena saha mukham iti sahoktiḥ.</td>
<td>tvanmukhena samāṃ candro nīsāsu hrṣyati iti sahoktiḥ. (No.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. na muhena vina candras samācināṃ iti vinoktiḥ.</td>
<td>(Not mentioned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. kalabhīrūmaṃ mukham iti samāsoktiḥ.</td>
<td>mukham netrāṅkarucirā śīta-jyotsnopaśobhitam iti samāsoktiḥ (No.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. kalabhīruṃau mukha- candrāviti śeṣaḥ.</td>
<td>abjena sadraṃ vaktraḥ larināhitāsaktinā iti śeṣaḥ. (No.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, the following statements of Appaya Dīksita, viz., "saivoktibhangībhedenānekeśālaṃkārabhayām bhaṣyate" and "evam uktānekeśālaṃkāravivartavatīyam upama", have close resemblance to the statement made by Vidyācakravartin in this respect. Cf. "ittham svaprakāravacitryeśa sādṛṣya-vichittivicesatmanā...nānālaṃkāranidānahūta..." etc. But this also has not been mentioned by name.

Another noteworthy point to be mentioned here is this: whether the Alāṃkārasarvasva on Ruyyaka's 'alāṃkārasūtras' was written by Mankhuka or Ruyyaka himself, is open to dispute. It is, however, clear from the present text of the Citramīmāṃsā, that Appaya Dīksita seems to believe Mankhuka to be the author of the Alāṃkārasarvasva.

Mammata's text on poetics is widely known as the Kāvyāprakāśa. Many a time, in the Citramīmāṃsā, this work

158. Sanjīvanī under Sūtra No. 11, p. 36.
159. See H.S.P. (Kane), pp. 277-79.
has been referred to by the name Kāvyaparakāśikā. We are not certain whether any manuscript bears the name by which Appaya Dīkṣita refers to this work.

There are two references (pp. 27-28 and p. 53) to a work Kāvyāloka by name in the Citramāṃśā. This Kāvyāloka, mentioned by Appaya Dīkṣita, cannot be the Kāvyāloka of Haripraśāda, son of Gaṅgeśwara, composed in 1728 A.D. in 7 Prakāśās, nor does it appear to be the Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana, which also, at times, is mentioned by the same name. However, we have noticed a peculiar point in this respect. The citation in one of the two cases in question is almost identical with a verse in the Kavyādarsa of Daṇḍin. Thus, the Kāvyāloka, as Appaya Dīkṣita says, runs thus —

"aparyanto vikalpāṇāṁ rūpakopamayor yataḥ /
dimātraṁ dasītam dhīrair anuktam anumāyatām //

(P.53)

Whereas in the Kavyādarsa of Daṇḍin, we find the verse as —

"na paryanto vikalpāṇāṁ rūpakopamayor atataḥ /
dimātraṁ dasītam dhīrair anuktam anumāyatām //

(K.D. II. 96)

The change, that we notice, is in the initial word, better to say, in the initial letter and theretoo, the meaning remains exactly the same. In one case, there has been a Manitaṭpuruṣa compound (aparyantah), whereas in the other it is a Supsupa compound (naparyantah) or no compound at all (na paryantah). Another change is in the last word of

160. See H.S.P. (Kane), Index of authors and works, pp. 393-94.
the second quarter which reads 'yatāḥ' in place of 'atāḥ',
the change in the meaning being ultimately insignificant.
Obviously, the verse in question, has either been quoted
from the Kāvyādārṣā of Daṇḍin or from one Kāvyāloka, now
lost, which in its turn, quoted the verse from Daṇḍin.
The second possibility can hardly be endorsed. It is difficult
to believe that Appaya Dīkaṇṭa would give Kāvyāloka as the
source of a verse which exists in such a well-known, authen-
tic and ancient work as Daṇḍin’s Kāvyādārṣā. It may be
recalled here that the Kāvyādārṣā of Daṇḍin had a few other
names also. Thus, Kāvyalakṣaṇa is another name for the
Kāvyādārṣā. So the question remains whether Kāvyāloka was
another name of Kāvyādārṣā. Dharmadeva of Sudha also takes the verse
to be of Daṇḍin.

The other reference to the Kāvyāloka runs thus —
"ya cānaye kāvyāloka-dīśu-pamāyan prakārabheda đarātās te
sarve teṣe veva āṛṣātāvyah". (pp. 27-28). Since the statement
bears no citation from the text and since its content is
of a general character, it is difficult to find out whether
this reference also fingers at the same Kāvyādārṣā of Daṇḍin
or not.

____________________________________
VII. Appaya Dīksita and his followers in the Field of Sanskrit Poetics.

Appaya Dīksita himself belongs to the later group (in fact, the last but one among the prominent writers of Sanskrit poetics) of Ālamkārikas and as such, his influence in the domain of Sanskrit literary criticism, is insignificant. The only stalwart in this field, who succeeds Appaya Dīksita, is Pañcitarūja Jagannātha. But it is only the hot exchange and contradiction offered by Jagannātha against our author, which a reader faces and thus the influence of Appaya Dīksita on Jagannātha should better be considered to be a negative one. Notwithstanding the heaps of abuses showered on Appaya Dīksita, Jagannātha leaves no stone unturned to find fault with each of the topics, nay each of the expressions, so to say, to be found in Appaya Dīksita’s works on poetics. The Citra-mīmāṃsā-khaṇḍana, in particular, deserves special mention in this respect. Thus, Appaya Dīksita’s illustrations of Dhvanikāvya, Guṇībhūta-vyaṅga-kāvya and Udbhayaritra-kāvya, definition of the figure Upamā, classification of Uptopamā, illustration of Vācakaluptopamā, varieties of Upamā, definition of Upameyopamā, illustration of suggestion from the figure Ananvaya, definition of Smarana and Rūpaka, illustration of Rūpaka in ‘vaiyadhikaranya’ (wrongly quoted by Jagannātha as an illustration of Parināma in ‘vaiyadhikaranya’), criticism of Vidyādharā’s illustration of suggestion from the figure Parināma and the illustration of suggestion from Apahnuti and a lot more have been criticised by Jagannātha in his Citramīmāṃsākhaṇḍana as well as in Rasagaṅgādharā. In many a case, Nāgāśabhatta has tried...
to refute Jagannātha's criticism and thereby defend Appaya Dīksita's views. All these have been discussed in detail by V.A. Ramaswamy in his famous work 'Jagannātha Paññita'.

Among the successors of Appaya Dīksita, Śrikrṣṇakavi (probably 17th century A.D.), author of the Mandārmarandacampū, was highly influenced by Appaya Dīksita. In a good number of cases, he almost copies the definitions from the Citramāmsā and the Kuvalayānanda. For example, the definition of Rūpaka has been given in the Mandārmarandacampū in the following words —

bimbāvisiṣṭe visaye na tirohitarūpini /
āropaviṣayibhūtam rūpakam coparaṇjakam //
tad rūpakam matam . . . . . . . . // (p. 118)

The close similarity which it bears with the definition of the same in the Citramāmsā is quite clear (For the definition offered by Appaya Dīksita, see p. 48 of our text).

Appaya Dīksita states that the expression 'vastvan-tara' used in his definition of Smaraṇa is significant, since it includes all types of reminiscence irrespective of whether it is similar or dissimilar. Following his path, Śrikrṣṇakavi also included the expression 'anyasmaraṇa' in the definition of Smaraṇa. 
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161. See Krishnamachariar, History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, p. 783.
162. Citramāmsā, p. 43.
163. "sadṛsānubhavād anyasmaraṇaṃ smeṭir igyate"

Mandārmarandacampū, p. 60.
similarity between the two definitions of Bhrāntī (entitled as Bhrāntimān by Appaya Dīkṣita) to be met with in these two works, we think it enough to cite them and put one after the other.

kavisammatasāḍṛṣ्याद viṣaye pihitātmani /
āropyaṁāṇāsyānubhavo yatra sa bhrāntimān mataḥ //
(Citramāṁsā, p. 64)

tirohite ca viṣaye sāḍṛṣ्यात kavisammatāt /
viṣeṣyāvṛttivisayājānām bhrāntir itīryate //
(Mandāramarandacampū, p. 117)

Srikṛṣṇa kavi’s definition of Parināma also has a close affinity to Appaya Dīkṣita’s definition of Parināma. We deem it needless to explain and establish the conformity between the two definitions of Utprēkṣā in the respective works. A mere citation of the two will serve the purpose in this respect.

yatrānyadharmasambandhād anyatvenopatarkitam /
prakṛtam hi bhavet prājñās tām utprēkṣām pracaksate //
(Citramāṁsā, p. 73)

avarṣyadharmasambandhād varnye sambhāvanā bhavet /
anyatvena mato utprēkṣā vācyā gamyeti sa dvidhā //
(Mandāramarandacampū, p. 122)

The Kuvalayānanda also had some influence of the Mandāramarandacampū. For example, the definition of Ananvaya

164. Cf. "prakṛtasyopayogitvād viṣayātmatayā bhavet /
āropyaṁāno viṣayī parināmās tadā mataḥ //"
(Mandāramarandacampū, p. 120)

With the definition of the same in our Citramāṁsā, p. 55.
in the Mandāramarandacampū exactly follows the definition of the same in the Kuvalayānanda. The definition of Upameyopama also has been borrowed from the Kuvalayānanda.

Another work, which has discussions on Appaya Dīkṣita's views is the Alamkāra-kaustubha of Viśvesvāra Paṇḍita (beginning of the 18th century A.D.), son of Lakṣmīdhara. The mode of discussions on individual figures there remains the least changed from that in the Citramāṁṣā.

With a view to find fault with the predecessors' opinions, Appaya Dīkṣita cites the definition of Upamā offered by Vidyānātha. The definition is as follows —

'svataḥ-siddhena bhinnena sammatena ca ācharmaṇaḥ /
śāmyam anyena varnyasya vacyam ced ekadopama'// (p.7)

Appaya Dīkṣita says that the expression 'svataḥ-siddhena' here is useless, since it fails to exclude the figure Utprekaṣa as was desired by the author. In this context, he

165. 'upamānopameyatvaḥ yad ekasyaiva vastunāḥ'//

(Kuvalayānanda, p. 9)

and

'ekasyaivopamānopameyatve vastuṇo yadi /
ananvayah . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . //'

(Mandāramarandacampū, p. 118).

166. 'paryāyena āvayos tac ced upameyopamaḥ matā'//

(Kuvalayānanda, p. 10)

and

'upamānopameyatve paryāyena āvayor yadi /
sopameyopama . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . //'

(Mandāramarandacampū, p. 120)

167. See Krishnamachariar, History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, p. 768.
cites the verse 'na nityam asmin ...' etc. (p. 8); the verse, that was considered an illustration of Utprekaṇa by Vidyānātha himself. Appaya Dīksita says that the standard of comparison in this verse is obviously an established fact and thus there remains no scope of averting the fallacy of being too wide with regard to Utprekaṇa. If it be maintained that, here, in the verse in question, the moon is poetically fancied in respect of its descend on earth, then the question of being too narrow to cover a few cases of Upama as noticed in the verse 'candrabimbād iva' etc. (p. 8) since, though poison and fire are real by their existence, the statement of the moon and the sandal as their origin is surely a feat of poetic imagination. Here Viṣvesvara maintains that both these two faults as mentioned by Appaya Dīksita, do not occur at all in the verses concerned. In the former, the moon as descended on earth is mere an imagination of poet and in the latter, the state of being poison with the disc of the moon as its origin, is not the determining property of the standard of comparison.

Appaya Dīksita cites the verse 'ubhau yadi' etc. (p. 8), as an illustration of Upama. But Viṣvesvara points out that the verse is widely accepted as an illustration of Atisayokti and not Upama. We have discussed this point by citing the opinion of Mallinātha, in the section — Appaya Dīksita's style and a few noteworthy features of the Citramāṇamsa, in this Introduction.

168. Alamkārakauṭubha; p. 12.
Appaya Dīkṣita holds that the expression 'bhinnena' (mentioned in the definition of Upamā offered by Vidyānātha) though capable of excluding the figure Ananvaya, is not able to avert the fallacy of being too narrow to cover a few cases of Upamā as noticed in 'anantaratnaprabhavasya yasya' etc. (p. 8); since, in this verse the particular qualities and blemishes are included in the general qualities and blemishes. If however it is maintained that the distinction of the Upamāna from the Upameya consists in the distinction of the determining property of the Upamāna which is different from the determining property of the Upameya, that also, according to Appaya Dīkṣita, is unjustified; since, in that case, the definition would suffer from being too narrow to cover the examples of Rasānopamā as noticed in 'anavaratakanakakavitarāṇa' etc. (p. 8). Moreover, the term 'ekadā' also turns to be redundant as the exclusion of Upameyopamā is established by the very adjunct 'bhinnena'. If it be maintained that the difference of Upamāna from the Upameya consists in its being characterised by an attribute which is distinct per se from the determining property of the Upameya in question, that too, according to Appaya Dīkṣita, would not be proper, since, the definition would suffer from being too narrow to cover a few cases of Upamā, based on objects which are virtually identical, as noticed in the verses 'upādaade tasya' etc. and 'dvāram dvāram atan' etc. (both in p. 9) and the like. (For arguments offered by Appaya Dīkṣita, see our text, p. 9). But Viṣvesvāra says

that — what is Upamāna here, is not identical with what is Upameya; because there is a temporal difference between the two. Thus, the Upameya happens to be 'you, the expected donor of the present' and the Upamāna happens to be 'you, the donor of the past'. Thus says Viśveśvara

"upamānatavatvacchedakatāparyāptadyadikaranasyopame-
yatavacchedakatāparyāptyanadikaranatvasya vivakṣitavat, 'tvam tādro bhava' ityatra kālādikrtabhedavivakṣaya tādabhāvat. anyathopamātvasyaivaśānupatthē. tatha ca, etatkālo-
tarakālālarittis tvam etatkālīnatvatsaṅgī
bhava ityarthah, ekasmin eva kāle tatt-
āsāryavidhane siddhasāghanapatthē."
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Appaya Dīksita holds that the expression 'dharma-
tah', used in the definition in question with a view to excluding the figure Slea, also fails to serve the purpose, since, in the examples like 'sakalakalam' etc. (p. 9), which are instances of the figure Slea, commonness in property can easily be noticed. The problem cannot be solved by saying that let 'sakalakalam' etc. be considered a case of Upamā if there exists commonness in property, since, the question, namely, had it not been so if there existed mere commonness in verbal expression, still remains unanswered. In fact, the figure Upamā is admitted only where similarity is found with regard to an expression in the

171. Citramīmāṁsa, pp. 9ff.
form of a significant name. For example Appaya Dīkṣita cites the verse 'yathā prahlādanāc candraḥ' etc. (p. 9), where Upamā has been admitted.

But according to Visvesvāra all these charges are uncalled for, since the expression 'dharmataḥ' is used to denote that the figure Upamā should be counted only where there exists similarity in respect of well-known qualities etc., and not elsewhere. Moreover, since the term 'sammatena' (used in the definition in question) is enough for excluding the standards of comparison which are not agreeable to the poets, the term 'dharma' in the expression 'dharmataḥ' is obviously desired to mean the similarity which is other than the similarity of verbal expression.

What has been said by Viḍyānātha, namely, the expression 'anyena varṇyasya' is used to exclude the figure Pratipa, is, according to Appaya Dīkṣita, useless; since, the definition would then suffer from being too narrow to cover the cases of Samuccitopamā as noticed in 'itāraṇyapi raksāmsi' (p. 11) etc. If the idea is that of similarity with something somehow virtually different from the contextual irrespective of whether it is actually contextual or non-contextual, then also in Pratipa where owing to the superb qualities even the Upamā seems to be improper, the definition would be too wide. In this connection Appaya Dīkṣita cites the verse beginning with 'aham eva guruḥ' (p. 11) and justifies his stand.

173. Citramāṃsā, p. 11.
But according to Visvesvara, this is not tenable, since the term 'an\(\text{ya}\)' means that which is not desired to be the subject of description as qualified by the attributes, different from what constitutes the Upam\(\text{ā}na\).

Again, what does the expression 'anyena var\(\text{ṇ}y\)asya sāmyaṃ vācyam' mean — is the question put by Appaya Dīksita. He himself suggests three possibilities — (1) similarity pertaining to the subject of comparison having a counter-entity from other, (2) similarity determined by both the standard and subject of comparison attained through somehow and (3) similarity pertaining to the subject of comparison. According to our author, these possibilities suffer from the faults of being too narrow or too wide and the futility of the term 'anyena' respectively.

Visvesvara says that all these probable blemishes can be averted if the meaning of the expression 'anyena var\(\text{ṇ}y\)asya sāmyaṃ vācyam' is taken as the description of the Upam\(\text{ā}na\) being the substratum of similarity, of which the other (i.e., the standard of comparison) is the Pratiyogin (as mentioned by Appaya Dīksita himself).

The expression 'sarasi\(\text{j\}a\)m idam ānanaṃ ca tasyāḥ ...' etc. (p. 11) and the verse beginning with 'tadvalgunā yugapad ...' etc. (p. 12), though possess some type of ornamentation, Appaya Dīksita prescribes Upam\(\text{ā}na\) for the first

---

174. Alak\(\text{ā}\)rakaustubha, pp. 15-16.
175. Citram\(\text{ā}\)m\(\text{a\}\)msa, pp. 11-12.
176. Alak\(\text{ā}\)rakaustubha, p. 16.
one and Upameyopamā for the second. This anomaly has been rightly pointed out by Visvesvara.

Again, Appaya Dikṣita says that the term 'ekadā' in the definition in question would lead to the fallacy of being too narrow as in the case of 'jyotsneva nayanānandah ...' etc. (p. 12); since, the similarity here is established in diverse ways. But Visvesvara firmly holds that obviously the implication of the term holds good in this verse also and thus the criticism of Appaya Dikṣita against Vidyānātha in this respect is like criticising one having forgotten one's own stand. But we think that Visvesvara's criticism of Appaya Dikṣita on this point, is not very clear. It is difficult to appreciate how the implication of the term 'ekadā' holds good in the verse in question. Actually there are three different comparisons, based on three standards of comparison and three common properties, the Upameya remaining the same, making it an instance of Malopamā, as maintained by Appaya Dikṣita.

Similarly, what has been maintained by our author of the Citramāmsā, namely, the definition of Vidyānātha suffers from being too narrow to cover the cases of Parasparopamā as noticed in the verse beginning with 'rajobhiḥ syandanodāhūtaḥ' (p. 8), is, according to Visvesvara,

177. Ibid., p. 18-19
181. Alamkārakaustubha, p. 19
unjustified, since, the verse in question possess two
different Upamās, each having all the characteristics of
an Upamā.

It may however be pointed out that a case of
Parasparopamā can hardly be equalised with a case of a mere
existence of two similies. In the verse in question, the
idea contained in 'bhūvas tālam vyoma iva kurvan' and that
in 'vyoma bhūtalam iva kurvan' form one unique combination
so as to effectively depict the picture of the battle-field
whereas in case of two similies, the two ideas keep their
separate entity.

Appaya Dīksita holds that the inclusion of the
term 'vācyam' in the definition of Upamā offered by Vidyā-
nātha with a view to excluding the suggested Upamā is also
unjustified; since, in the instances like 'na padmām mukham
evedam ..' etc. (p. 12), where the similarity is not
expressed, the definition would be found too narrow. Here
Visvesvara rightly points out that the verse in question
is not at all a case of Upamā, but the figure is Apahmuti.
In a like manner, criticisms of Appaya Dīksita against
Vidyānātha on other points also have been attacked by
Visvesvara.

Appaya Dīksita cites the definition of Upamā offered
by the author of Sarasvatīkaṇṭhaḥbharana and criticises it.
However, the definition is this :

183. Alāmārakaustubha, p. 19
prasaiddher anurodhena ya parasparam arthayoh / 
bhūyo'vayavasāmānyayogah sehopamā mata // (p. 13)

Appaya Dīkṣita says, since the definition includes the term 'prasiddheḥ' it would be noticed too narrow to cover the similies where the standard of comparison is not based on poetic convention. For example, our author cites the verses 'sasāñjur aśvakṣunyānām ...' etc. (p. 13), 'udgarbhāhunatarunātamañopamaṃda ...' etc. (pp. 13-14) and the expression 'sadyo munditamattahūnaiciprapasparāhi nāraṅgakam' (p. 14). Visvēśvara says that the fault here, as noticed by Appaya Dīkṣita, is mere an apparent one, since, the expression 'sāmānyayogah' in the definition indicates a mere common property and since the expression 'prasiddher anurodhena' means that which is not against the convention. Thus, in connection with the verse 'udgarba ...' etc., Visvēśvara says that it is not so that the breasts of Hūna girls are not well-known per se. But the state of being a standard of comparison with regard to that may not be well-known. Still, since the absence of being the standard of comparison is not well-known either, it does not go against the convention and thus no fault is involved here.

With regard to the definition of Upamā offered by Appaya Dīkṣita in the Citramiṃāṇsā, Visvēśvara cites the opinions of one Nyāyapaṇcānana and the author of the

184. Ibid., pp. 21-22.
185. p. 17.
Rasagaṅgādhara, who have vehemently criticised the definition as we find in the Citramāṃsā. In a few cases he has also pointed out a few unwarranted attacks made by them against Appaya Dīkṣita.

Discussion on the figure Upamā covers a wide range (pp. 4-167) in the printed text of the Alamkārakaustubha and we can only mention some salient points therein. However, on the points of the criticism against the definition of Upamā offered by Appaya Dīkṣita, almost all the points have been touched. As regards division of the figure, only a few important points are noted below.

Appaya Dīkṣita admits Upamā with the elision of common property in the cases of reduplication like 'paṭupatū'. He maintains that the expression 'paṭupatū' means 'paṭusādṛśā' (i.e. acting like a skilled one, though not actually so). But Viśvesvara includes it in the variety of Upamā with the elision of the common property in a compound. He strengthens his standpoint by mentioning the use of grammatical functions like the restoration of the corresponding masculine form ('puṃvadhbāva'), and of being finally accented ('antodāttatva').

---

187. Citramāṃsā, p. 27.
188. Alamkārakaustubha, p. 106.
of expressive in a compound. Viśveśvara rightly points out that the former is redundant if the latter be admitted, since 'kokilālāpinī' etc., are cases of Upapadatatpurūsa compound.

Author of the Citramīmāṁsā admits Upamā with the elision of the common property and the expressive word in a Tadāhitasuffix also and accordingly he cites the verse 'urmām yam sevanānānām ...' etc. (p.23), as its illustration. Here Viśveśvara cites the opinion from an unnamed source, according to whom, such an elision does not exist at all in the verse in question. However, Viśveśvara does not categorically clarify his stand in this respect.

Appaya Dīksita cites the verse 'cirād visāhe tāpam ...' etc. (p. 59), as an illustration of the suggestion of Pariśāma. But Pāṇḍitārāja Jagannātha tried to establish that suggestion did not exist in the verse in question. Viśveśvara, however, defends Appaya Dīksita in this respect and attacks the criticism of Jagannātha against Appaya Dīksita. He supports his stand by citing Mammata’s opinion in this regard.

Viśveśvara refutes Appaya Dīksita’s contention

190. Alamkārakaustubha, pp. 116-119.
191. P. 23.
192. Alamkārakaustubha, pp. 133-134.
194. Ibid., p. 172.
195. See Citramīmāṁsā, p. 42.
since it is not possible to compare an object to its own self, Ananvaya results in the preclusion of the possibility of a different standard of comparison. In fact, maintains Visveśvara, there is no such impossibility, if the speaker intends so. This is why the ancients maintain that Ananvaya is based on the poet's intention of establishing that the object does not bear similarity to anything else ('asādṛṣṭya-vivakṣa') and not the preclusion of a different standard of comparison ('upamāṅanta-ravyāvṛtti'). Visveśvara quotes the opinion of Nyāyapancanana, according to whom the purport of Ananvaya is to express the poet's intention of showing the excellence of the subject of description arising out of its incomparability. It is, however, difficult to draw a clear-cut distinction between the two. 'Upamāṅanta-ravyāvṛtti' is not virtually different from 'asādṛṣṭya-vivakṣa'. When it is said that that an object does not have a corresponding standard of comparison, the speaker obviously intends to convey its excellence.

Similarly, with regard to other figures of speech also, a lot of discussions, sometimes against and sometimes in support of Appaya Dīkṣita, are met with. Of them, a few are noted below.

Appaya Dīkṣita cites the verse 'tvadalekhye ...' etc. (p. 72), as an example of the suggestion of Apahnuti. He says: "The idea viz. this is not an ordinary man but the lotus-eyed, — has been suggested by some girl

196. Citramāṁśa, p. 72.
through the painting of the disc and the Garuḍa bird."
But Jagannātha tried to refute his opinion. According to
him, that it is the Pundarīkākṣa (i.e. the lotus-eyed Viṣṇu)
may be suggested from the painting of the disc etc., but
this may not necessarily suggest that he is not an ordinary
man. Here Viśvesvara clarifies the intention of Appaya
Dīkṣita mentioning that what is intended by the author of
the Citramimāṃsa is that unless the ordinary persons are
negated, establishment of Pundarīkākṣa cannot be suggested
in the verse in question.

In the section on Ullekha, Appaya Dīkṣita, in his
Citramimāṃsa clearly defines the second variety of this
figure, as admitted by some of his predecessors. But
Visvesvara says that it is hard to accept such a variety
as distinguished from the first one. This opinion of
Visvesvara, however, goes against the tradition.

197. Alamkārakaustubha, pp. 238-239.
198. P. 68:
"grahīṭbhedābhāvā'pi visayāsrayabhedataḥ /
ekasyānekaadholekham apyullekham pracaksate //"
"pūrvatra grahīṭbhedenānekačātvollekhaḥ, iha
tu visayābhedeṇa."
Also, Viśvanātha, Sāhityadarpāna, X, Kārikā No. 37,
p. 27
"kvacid bhedād grahīṭpām visayānām tathā kvacit /
ekasyānekaadholekho yah sa ullekha isyate //"
The definition of Sasandeha offered by Visvesvara bears close similarity with the definition of the same offered by Appaya Diksita in his Citramimamsa. Let us cite both the definitions and show the closest similarity therein:

sanyad aprakrtarthasya ya dhir anavacharama /
prakrtarthashraya tajnah sasmandha sa isyate
(Citramimamsa, p. 60)

prakrte tadanyavigaya sadrasyajnaajanyah yah /
buddhir niscayabhinna tam acakhyuh sasamdeham //
(Alamkarakaustubha, p. 196).

Besides the above mentioned discussions and criticisms relating to the Citramimamsa, in many places of Alamkarakaustubha of Visvesvara Appaya Diksita was referred to, sometimes mentioned by name and sometimes not, somewhere for criticism and somewhere for defence.

201. S.K. De, in the list of anonymous works, supplies us with an information that another work, Kavya-laksana-vicara, cites the Citramimamsa of our author. But we could not collect a copy of the same work and as such no discussion relating to that work can be given here.

The very fact that Appaya Dīkṣita composed a large number of works covering various Shastras, speaks of his vast range of scholarship. Apart from the fact that Appaya Dīkṣita was well acquainted with vast range of Sanskrit Kāvyā literature which he utilised in the Citramīmāṃsa by way of setting examples in connection with various points relating to Alamkāra Shāstra, his vast knowledge of different shastras like the systems of philosophy, grammar and the like, becomes clear to one who goes through the Citramīmāṃsa. Any work, dealing with a subject like the definitions and illustrations of figures of speech (e.g. the Kāvyālāmākārasārvasamgraha of Udbhata) leaves very little scope for showing one’s scholarship in different shastras, in comparison with a work dealing with philosophy or the like. Yet, the Citramīmāṃsa is, however, an exception in this respect. We see that one must have to be well-acquainted with a large number of shastras, if one wants to fully understand and appreciate this small and yet an unfinished work on Alamkāra Shāstra, but which appears as an epitome of a varied Shastras. Many a time, readers must face a lot of probabilities, offered by our author, which are presented in a language that strictly follows the track of the Nyāya philosophy.

That our author had a thorough knowledge of the Alamkāra Shāstra, has been shown in the previous chapter, under the caption ‘Appaya Dīkṣita and the Alamkārika Predecessors Mentioned by Him’, by giving a chart of
of citations, made by him from a large number, nay almost all the works of his predecessors.

Appaya Dīkṣita supplies us with a huge number of examples. But many of them are borrowed from his predecessors. A.B. Gajendragadkar, in the Introduction to his edition of Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammāta, notes that this tendency might be an apathy towards taking trouble of hunting out new examples.

In many a place Appaya Dīkṣita cites the Sūtras of Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī in support of his statements. Furthermore, he, with a view to explaining those Sūtras, cites from the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali, or from the commentary of Kaiyata. Thus, while supplying us with the examples of varieties of the Elliptical Upamā, he offers the word 'kākatāliyam' and cites the Sūtra 'samāsāc ca tadvīśayit' (p. 22). Then again, he cites the author of the Vṛtti (p. 22), the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali (p. 22) and the Uddyota of Kaiyata (p. 22) also. Again, while giving an illustration of the Upamā, with the word expressive of property elided, Appaya Dīkṣita cites the Sūtra 'lummanuṣye' (p. 23). He does not forget to mention the 'Adhikārasūtra' 'ive pratikṛtita' (p. 23) also. In other cases, on various points, Appaya Dīkṣita cites the following Sūtras also — "saptanyupamānapūrṇapadasya" (p. 23), "tatra tasyeva" (p. 25), "tena tulyam kriyā ca dvatih" (p. 25), "prakāre guṇavacanasaya" (p. 27), "karmadhārayavad uttareṣu" (p. 27).
and "upamitam vyāghρudibhiḥ sāmānyāprayoge" (p. 23 and 55). The Vārttika, namely, "ivena nityasamaśo vibhaktyalopah purvapadapraṅktisvaratvam ca" (p. 25) also, has been cited by him. The relevant points will be clear from the translation of the text.

Our author is very particular about grammatical technicalities. Most of the predecessors of Appaya Dīkṣita, defined the figure Apahnuti with the use of a verb involving the suffix 'ktvā' or 'lyap'. But our author categorically mentions that this would lead to difficulty in respect of admitting a variety of Apahnuti where the denial is preceded by superimposition, since, the use of the suffix 'ktvā' is regulated by the Śūtra 'samānakaryakarṇō pūrvakāle' (Pa: 3.4. 21), which clearly mentions that

203. This vārtika is seen in the Siddhāntakaumudi under the Śūtra "supo dhātuprātipadike" (Pa. 2.4.71; Bhattoji's Serial No.650). The Siddhāntakaumudi, however, omits the expressions 'nitya' and 'pūrvapadapraṅktisvaratvam ca', whereas the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali omits the expression 'nityasamaśah'. See Siddhāntakaumudi, Vol.II, p.5 and Mahābhāṣya, Vol.I, p.359.

204. Cf. Kāvyādāraśa, II. 304 a, p. 278

"apahnutir apahnutya kiścid anyārthasūcanam /"
Kāvyapraṅkāśa, X, 10 ab, p. 53

"prakṛtaṃ yan nisidhyate sā tvapahnutih"
Pratāparudrīya, p. 276.

"nisidhyā viṣayaṃ sāmyād anyārope hyapahnutih".
Sāhityadarpana, X, 38 ab, p. 28.

"prakṛtaṃ pratisidhyānyasthāpanam syād apahnutih".
the suffix should be added only after the root, the function of which takes place before the other (see our Translation also). Thus says Appaya Dīksita:

"... ktvāpratyayena laksanaṃ noktaṃ. vaṣyaśāṃcādārane āropamūrvakāpahavne avyāptiprasangat." (p. 70)

Only a confirmed grammarian can make such a statement.

Classification of Upamā, Utpreksā and many other figures bears ample evidences of Utpreksā Appaya Dīksita's knowledge of grammar.

Again, in giving the examples of Utpreksā pertaining to a cause, a few statements like "saiṣā sthātī ityatra pañcamī hetutvapratiṣṭhāni" (p. 92), "... satvēpratyayohetutvapratiṣṭhānakāh" (p. 92), "phalato'nutpatanāhetutvapratiṣṭhānakāh" etc. (p. 92), made by Appaya Dīksita, relate to the concept of Hetu in Sanskrit grammar. In another place, viz., "sakhyaśātiṣabdasaya karmārthakasyaṇantasya saṃānādhiṣṭhānāh" etc. (p. 93), our author refers to the suffix 'iya' prescribed by Pāṇini in the sense of action (karman). How cleverly, Appaya Dīksita uses Bhaṭṭoji Dīksita's statement "phalam apiha hetuḥ" (p. 94) to strengthen his desired end, is clearly noticed in his attempt at establishing the fact that there exists the figure Utpreksā pertaining to a result in the verse beginning with 'asyai va sargānāh'(p. 94):

"atra hastalekhiṣṭaya sarojaśāttve karaṇavi-bhaktisadbhāve'pi na sā vidhātakartaka-
sarojaśārṣṭigatahastalekhatvaprakāśanam prati
hetutvenotprekṣyate, kintu tatprakṣanārtham sarojasprstir hastalekhakaranam iti tatprakṣanam eva phalatvenotprekṣyam." (p. 94)

Appaya Dīksita's statement — "brahmaṇaśātāṃ bhojya-tām ityatra pradhānam atilānghyopasarjane kriyanvayaparya-vasānam, saṃkhyāya bhojanānvaṇyogayatvāt" (p. 77) has a clear bearing on the grammatical maxim "uttarapadartha-pradhāns tatpuruṣaḥ" of which the case in question is an exception. According to the aforesaid maxim 'bhojana' (entertainment by a feast) ought to have been connected with 'sata' (the number hundred). This being an impossibility, 'bhojana' has to be connected with 'bṛāhmaṇa' (Brahmins). Needless to say that the reason for this is nothing but usage.

In the context of the definition of the figure Sasandeha, Appaya Dīksita discusses the meaning of the word 'vā', contained in the expression 'vārthasprk' in the definition, with a critical analysis exhibiting his knowledge of semantics.

An idea of our author's acquaintance with Yāska's Nirukta can be had from the citation "bhavapradhānam ākhyātam". (p.76)

---

205. Nirukta, I. 1. I. 10, p. 7. In the Citramīṃśa, however, part of the Sūtra, which was deemed necessary for the context, has been cited. The rest, not cited, is this: 'sattvapradhānāni nāmāni'.

Appaya Dīkṣita refers to the Purva-mīmāṃśa philosophy in a good number of cases. Thus, in support of his own statement that there is no such rule in the science of literary criticism that every figure should have a separate scope of its own, he mentions the Mīmāṃsaka-standpoint as well.

"nāpyayam vākyavītsammatāḥ śāstrīyanyāyah pade juhotityādīnām iyottarārdhe juhotityādīnām āhavaniyāsāstrādīviviktavāsyaābhāve'pi savīgayatvamātreṇa pratiṣṭhitatvāt." (p. 10)

Let us try to explain what exactly the above-noted citation contains: The role of Soma in the Soma-sacrifice is very prominent. The Soma has to be purchased from market in exchange of a cow, which is named 'Somakrayanī'. When this cow is being sent to the market, an oblation has to be made in the place of the seventh foot-step of that cow. Here, 'pada' means that seventh foot-step. Since no fire exists at that place, a piece of gold, which possesses the quality of fire, has to be placed there. Now 'pade juhoti'

Uttarārdha

Altar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foot-steps of the cow</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pāda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

at that place, a piece of gold, which possesses the quality of fire, has to be placed there. Now 'pade juhoti'
means 'saptama-gospade juhoti'. After this function, when 'uttarārdhe juhoti' is pronounced, that relates to the original altar. Both these two directions are connected with the 'Āhavanīya' fire. In spite of that, separate entities of these two, have been admitted through their mention with two different 'vichī's.

It is clear, that only a person, well-versed in the science of applied Mīmāṁsā, can make such a statement.

Again, while establishing, that the definition of Upamā, offered by him, does not involve the fallacy of being too wide with regard to Ananwaya, Appaya Dīkṣita takes resort to the Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā text with a view to strengthening his standpoint.

"tatrāpi svena svasya sādṛṣyasya sādṛṣāntara- vyavacchede rudraroḍana-vapotkhananādyarthathā- vāde’sadarthasya nindāstutyor iva dvāramātra- tayā varṇyamāṇatvenopamitikriyāyā anispattah." (P.14)

That sound and sense are wedded together, has been maintained in the Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā. Appaya Dīkṣita cites the Sūtra 'autpattikas tu śabdasyārthena sambandhah' (1.1.5) in that

206. Cf. "sat padāṇyatitya saptamaṃ paryupaviśanti".
— Srautasūtra of Kātyāyana, VII. 6. 15.
207. Sāvarabhaṣya on the Mīmāṁsā-sūtra No.1.2.1, p. 105.
208. Mīmāṁsāsūtra No.1.1.5. The entire sutra is this:
"autpattikas tu śabdasyārthena sambandhās tasya jñānam upadeśo 'vyatirekas cārthe 'nupalabdhe tat pramāṇam bādaraśyānasyaṃ apekṣatvāt." (P. 23).
connection with an example of the Complete Simile, where properties remain in conformity. That the rule 'savisēṣeṣaṁ hi vidhiniṣedhau sati visēṣye bāche visēṣeṇam upasaṁkrāmatāḥ' prevails in the Pūrva-mīmāṁsā Shastra and has nothing to do with regard to the Ālaṁkāra Shastra, has been mentioned by Appaya Dīkṣita in the discussion on the figure Anānaya (p. 41). In a few other cases also, he cites the rules from this Mīmāṁsā philosophy. Thus, the citation "visvajit sarvapṛṣṭho'tirātraḥ" (p. 52), or a reference to some rites relating to an 'ānga', as contained in the expression — "vaikṛtaptadhānavidhineva prākṛtatadāṅgakālaṇāpvidheḥ" (p. 52), or a similar reference to sacrificial rites in the expression — "āṅgapradhānagocarapratyekavidhkālaṇēva sarvāṅgavisistaptadhānagocaraprāyogavidheḥ" (p. 52) as well as in the expression "visistavidhineva visēṣeṇavīsēṣya-vīdhiṅām" (p. 53), exhibit Appaya Dīkṣita's close acquaintance with the Mīmāṁsā-shastra.

Our author cites the verse "sthitāḥ kṣanam ..." etc. (p. 1), from the Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa as an illustration of 'Dhvāk' and shows by citing the verse "nāsaṁgra- 209 nyastamanāyaḥ" etc. (p. 1) that the posture, in which Pārvatī was in her meditation, is strictly in accordance with what has been stated by the Yoga philosophers.

The figure Upamā, in fact, is the basis of almost all the figures of speech. This has been clearly mentioned

209. Exact source of the verse could not be traced. A similar verse has been noticed in Gherandasamhitā, II. 9. 45.
by our author. Appaya Dīkṣita comments — "evam uktānekālaṁkāravivartavatīyam upamā" (p. 5). The idea, contained in the expression 'vivarta' is a very important concept of the Vedanta philosophy, where this means the manifestation of Brahman through the worldly existence.

A good number of citations from the Sārīraka of Bādarāyaṇa like "ānumāṇikam apyeśām iti cet na sārīra- rūpakavīnyastagdhīter āravishati ca" (p. 54) and "ya evāsau tapati tam udgītham upāśita" (p. 59) prove our author's thorough knowledge of this branch of Indian philosophy.

The very approach of Appaya Dīkṣita in discussing the figures of speech, betrays the style of the Nyāya philosophy.

A few citations like, "samākrūnto balavatā...... bhaujāṅgīṁ kadacana" (p. 61) and "jayena labhyate lakṣmīr maranena surāṅganā" (p. 61) reveal Appaya Dīkṣita's acquaintance with polity.

A large number of popular maxims like the 'Brāhmaṇa-Śramaṇa-nyāya' (p. 7), 'Tatkratunyāya' (p. 55) and others, also, have been quoted by Appaya Dīkṣita.

211. Vedāntadarsāna, under Sūtra No. 4.1.6, p. 364.
IX. Appaya Dīkṣita's Style and a Few Noteworthy Features of the Citramīmāṃsā.

From a thorough analysis of the text, a few distinctive features of Appaya Dīkṣita's style can be noticed. As we have noted earlier, the style or mode of composing a work on literary criticism, particularly dealing with a subject like the figures of speech only, has remained more or less unchanged in the history of Sanskrit poetics consisting as it does in definitions, their expositions and illustrations. Still, a few peculiarities of the Citramīmāṃsā in this regard, would not escape one's eyes while going through the text.

The purpose of giving examples is to unfold the points contained in the definition so as to make the readers understand the (exact nature of) the topic in question. Appaya Dīkṣita supplies us with a lot of examples, where, for the purpose of clarifying his own standpoint, he thinks this necessary. Thus, while establishing the cogency of including the epithet 'hrdayam' in the definition of Upama, as propounded by his predecessors, he states that mere similarity does not give birth to a figure of speech and he cites as many as twelve examples (p. 6) for this purpose. Similarly, he takes recourse to twenty-two examples (p. 5) to establish that the same Upama, contained in expression 'candra iva mukham', can be transformed into many a figure. But this may not lead one to think that Appaya Dīkṣita

212. See Chapter V of this Introduction.
suffers from over-exemplification. In fact, he is very moderate, if not miser, in giving illustrations. Thus, in a single verse, five varieties of Upamā, with the elision of the common property, have been shown (p. 25). Similarly, six varieties of the complete Upamā (p. 25), seven varieties of Upamā with the elision of the expressive word (p. 26) and six varieties of the elliptical Upamā (p. 27) have been exemplified with a single verse in each case.

Merely an example is not enough for unfolding the character of a definition. Showing the conformity of the definition with the examples (Lakṣaṇasārgati) is a must in this respect and our author is quite appreciable in this task, imposed on him. It is hard to forget how beautifully he justified the existence of suggestion in the description of the first rain-drops, rolling down on Pārvatī’s person, in the verse 'sthitāḥ kṣaṇam pakṣāmasu’ etc. (pp. 1-2). Explanation of the verse ‘niḥsācyutacandanaṁ stanataṁ’ etc. (pp. 2-3) also deserves special mention in this respect. Notwithstanding that Jagannātha discovered logical incongruity in the aforesaid interpretation, there is no denying the fact that the explanation bears marks of minute observation.

The Citramāṁsā is written in a lucid style. The reader does not face any serious difficulty in going through the text and following the main content. Generally, predecessors’ views are cited at first. Then, in short sentences, clarifications of their views are given. After that, the author, with his sharp and cogent arguments, criticises and finds faults with the predecessors’ opinions
and proves futility and untenability of those definitions. Then follow his desired definition and illustrations thereof. This is the order. In all the stages, language remains lucid and quite understandable. However, quite in a number of cases, the mode of argumentation is that of a matured Naiyāyika. Here, the reader may face a bit difficulty. However, it does not become impossible for him to grasp the idea. A few examples of such Naiyāyika-technicalities, requiring elaboration, are given below —

"parasparapratikṣeṣapakavikalpārthena vākāreṇa hi ya parasparapratiyogikatvaviśiṣṭopapā tadviṣaya-vṛttyantaranirapekṣavyaktibodhyā tadviṣayavyaktinirapekṣavṛttyantarabodhyā vā bhavati sopameyopameti paryavasyati." (p.39).

"asyaḥ sargavidehau ityudāharaṇe parasparapratikṣeṣapakakanāṅkoṭisamāśrayatvābhāve'pi tatha-bhūtanānādharmirūpārthasamaśrayatvasattvān nāvyāptir iti sarvam avaśātām." (p.63).

"nanu viṣayapratipādaśakavlakṣaṇasya viṣayatāvacchedakapakāreṇa viṣayapratipādaśakasyā-bhāvo vivakṣitaḥ, uralprabhavatvam tu na payodhārayor viṣayatāvacchedakam aneka-sādhārāṇatvād iti cet ......" etc. (p.102).

No doubt the author could have presented the ideas in an easier and clearer language; but so far as the norms of those days were concerned, statements like these were quite expected.
In many cases, while defining the figures, Appaya Dīksita presents a general definition in the beginning and then presents the definition which strictly follows the science of poetics. Thus, in the case of Upamā, the general definition is given as —

"upamitikriyāṇiśattimat sādṛṣyaavarranam upama" or "svanisechāparyavasāyi sādṛṣyaavarranam upama" (p. 17), whereas, for the definition conforming to the science of poetics, the adjuncts, viz., 'adūsta' and 'avyāṅga' are suggested (p. 17). Similarly, in the case of Rūpaka also, the adjunct 'avyāṅga' has been prescribed for a definition following the science of poetics (p. 49). So also, the definition of Upameyopama has been given in the following words: 'anyonyenopamā bodhya vyaktyā vrtyantareṇa va /
ekādhamāśrayā ya syat sopameyopamā mañā //°' (p. 38)

And our author adds — "idam tūpameyopamātvapravprayakṣaṃ lakṣaṇam" (p. 39) and "anugatānaṭiprasaktalaksanam tu —
sādṛṣya tṛṭīyasya ..." etc. (pp. 39-40).

Though Appaya Dīksita was a versatile genius and his critical acumen was visible in all the spheres he touched, yet, he was primarily a scholar (Sāstravit) and then a literary critic (Ālamkarika). His profound knowledge of grammar and other sastras, has been shown before. At the same time, he knows that Alaṃkāra primarily needs charm, without which its status is not properly established. Hence says our author — 'a lot of divisions and sub-divisions of the figures, which are admitted by his predecessors and a

213. See Chapter VIII.
lot more, which can be admitted, are practically useless'. of, "sābdāśāstravyutpattikausalapradarśanamātrapravojano nātīvālamkāraśāstre vyutpādyatām arhati" (p. 27).

Our author is very much conscious of the use of grammatical technicalities. How clearly he states that the use of the suffix 'ktvā', used in some of the definitions of Apahmuti, would lead to the fallacy of being too narrow to cover the variety of Apahmuti, where superimposition precedes denial, has been noted by us under the figure Apahmuti.

Our author's power of minute observation of the implications of crucial adjuncts, used in the definitions offered by his predecessors, may be noticed in the following cases. Thus, 'viṣayāsatyatvaparyavasāyī' and 'viṣayāsatyatvapratipādaka' — have two different implications, has been taken into consideration by him. That the expression 'gaunavṛttivapāravāyāt' used in the definition of Rūpaka, offered by the author of the Sarasvatīkānta-bhāraṇa, only leaves ample scope for doubt, has been established by our author in the following words —

"mukham candra ityatra laksanaya pravartamānaṁ
candrastvaṁ kena nimittana pravarteta. mukhā-
tvena va, mukhāsādhāraṇakāntivīśeṣaṇa va,
candrastvena va, candrāsādhāraṇakāntivīśeṣaṇa
va, mukhacandrōbhayanugatakāntisāmānyena va,
mukhagatacandrasādṛṣṭyaṇa va." (p.46)

Similarly, while stating that the expression 'sāmyam anyena

214. See Chapter IV(K).
varṇyasya vācyam', used in the definition of Upamā, offered by Vidyānātha, can be interpreted in three ways and practically none of them is faultless, our author says —

"anyena varṇyasya sāmyam vācyam iti ko'ṛthāḥ?
kim anyapratiyogikatvena varṇyagataḥ sāmyam
vācyam iti, kim vā yathākathām cid varṇyā-
vārṇyabhayanirūpitam sāmyam vācyam athavā
varṇyānuyogikatvena sāmyam vācyam iti."

(p.11)

His power of minute observation is noticeable in the explanation under the verses "sthitāḥ kṣaṇam" etc. (p. 1) "nihśeṣacyutacandanaṁ" etc. (p. 2) and many other verses also.

In some cases, a prima facie view is cited; a possible refutation of the same has been offered; a counter-argument against the latter has been set and so on until the actual prima facie position is firmly set only to be refuted by our author’s conclusive arguments. Reference may thus be made, in particular, to his discourse on Upamā.

This shows our author’s argumentative mind and logical acumen.

It must however be admitted that a few unwarranted attacks against other critics, by our author, have been noticed by us. Thus, according to Appaya Dīkṣita, the definition of Upamā, offered by Vidyānātha, suffers from the fallacy of being too narrow to cover a case of Upamā, where the standard of comparison is a mere fancy of the poet, as is seen in the verse beginning with 'ubhau yaḍī
vyom" (p. 6). In fact, the verse in question, is an illustration of the figure Atisyayokti and cannot be taken as a case of Upamā, and as such, no question of being too narrow arises in this respect, since, the very 'upamiti-kriyāniśpatti', which has been taken by Appaya Dīkṣita himself, as a part and parcel of the definition of Upamā, does not exist in that verse at all. Moreover, after a few pages (in p. 16), our author himself admits that this verse should be taken as a case of Atisyayokti and thus makes a self-contradictory statement.

"ubhau yadi vyommi prathamāpūvanā ityādau
lakṣanābhāvo na dosah... kimtu
tatrātisayoktiviseṣo'lamkāraḥ."  (p.16)

Mallinātha, while commenting on the verse, occurring in the Sisupālavadham of Māgha, has admitted the figure Atisyayokti in this verse.

Again, the two expressions "sarasi jāma idam ānanaṁ
ca" etc. (p. 11) and "tadāvalgunā yugapad urmiṣitena" etc. (p. 12) bear exactly the same type of ornamentation and as such should have come under the purview of the same figure; yet, Appaya Dīkṣita prescribes Upamā for the first one and Upameyopama for the second. Here also, the propriety of his position is questionable.

215. Cf. "atra vyomno gaṅgāpravāhadyāvasambandhe'pi
sambhāvanāyam sambhāhakathānaṁ atisayoktiḥ,
tad etat pūṣpaṁ pravālopahitaṁ yadi syāt ityā-
dyudāhṛtyālamkārasarvasvākāraḥ spaṭīcakāra."

- Commentary of Mallinātha under Sīṣu.

III. 8 (p. 108).
Appaya Dīkṣita admits the figure Tattvākhyānopañmā in the verse 'na padmam mukham evedam' etc. (p. 12). In fact, the verse in question, is a case of the figure Bhrāntāpahnutī. Our author, in his Kuvalayānanda, himself admitted Bhrāntāpahnutī in a similar verse and said — "Dāndin, however, admitted 'Tattvākhyānopañmā, a variety (of Upamā), in this (verse)". From this, it is clearly indicated that the view of our author is not identical with that of Dāndin (cf. the expression 'ād' in Appaya Dīkṣita's text). However, it appears to us that Appaya Dīkṣita referred to Tattvākhyānopañmā in connection with Bhrāntāpahnutī apparently owing to the fact that 'tattvākhyāna' involves removal of 'bhrānti' (error) as in the verse 'na padmam' etc.

The verse 'puṣpam pravālopahitam' etc. (p. 16), has been accepted by Appaya Dīkṣita as a case of Utpādyopañmā. But the figure here, as in the case of the verse 'ubhau yadi vyomani' etc., is Atisāyokti. Mallinātha and others also have admitted the figure Atisāyokti in the verse in question. Still, if one wants to admit the figure Upamā in the verse 'puṣpam pravālopahitam' etc., then the same has to be admitted in the case of 'ubhau yadi vyomani' etc., also and in this respect, the contradiction made by Appaya Dīkṣita himself, in admitting Atisāyokti in the same, would remain intact.

216. See Kuvalayānanda, under Kārikā No. 21, p. 28.
218. Cf. "atra puṣpapravālopah muktāvidṛumayaś ca

contd ....
Appaya Diksita cites the verse beginning with 'brthā mama' (pp. 26-27) for the purpose of illustrating several varieties of Upamā with elision of its different components. Thus, according to our author, the expressions 'sruto'sti tena kim samaḥ' is an example of Upamā with the elision of the standard of comparison in a sentence. Similarly, the expression 'tatsama' is an instance of Upamā with the elision of the standard of comparison in a compound. It is, however, difficult to understand, how the standard of comparison is dropped here; since, 'maheśwara' though not mentioned, is clearly referred to by the pronouns 'tena' and 'tat'. It appears to us that, Appaya Diksita has considered it to be a case of 'Luptā' ('elision'), only because the standard of comparison, namely, 'maheśwara', is not mentioned by name. This would remind us Mammata's example of 'gour ayan' as a case of 'Sadhyavasānā Laksānā' where the 'visaya' has been claimed to be dropped inspite of the fact that it has been referred to by the pronoun 'ayan'.

The verse 'bhagyabhavat karastho'pi ...' etc. (p. 31) has been cited as an example of the blemish, entitled 'Prakramabhaṁga' ('Break of Order') arising out of the

218. (contd. from pre-page)
asambanda'pi sambandho tyā atisayoktiḥ'.
Commentary Sañjīvanī under Kumārasambhava I. 44.

219. See Vṛtti under Kārīka 7 abc, p. 17.
divergence in gender or number. Appaya Dīksita says that, here, in the verse, the word 'cyutah' in the masculine goes with 'karasthāh' ('padārthāh') as its property whereas 'cyutam' in the neuter goes with 'cintāratnam'. As there are two words in two different genders, the property varies with two different substantives, and hence, strictly speaking, it is a case of two properties. In one case, the property is 'vācyā' i.e., 'expressed' ('cyutah'); in the other, it is 'pratityamāna' i.e. 'suggested' ('cyutam'). It is this minute analysis of the common property that leads to 'Bhagnapraśramaṇā' as understood by Appaya Dīksita. In the fitness of things it must be admitted that the concept of 'sādhāraṇa dharma', i.e., 'common property', as generally understood, does not hold here, because the basic idea, common to 'cyutah' (qualifying 'karasthāh padārthāh') and 'cyutam' (qualifying 'cintāratnam') is the same. Hence, even in the variation of gender, as in the present case, the simile stands, because of the presence of common property. But it involves 'Bhagnapraśramaṇā' as explained above.

Appaya Dīksita considers the verse 'vāgarthāviva' etc. (cited in p. 18) to be an example of Rasadhvani (stated in p. 28, 11. 20-21). But it is difficult to admit this, since, the deep conjugal love between Umā and Mahēśvara has been subordinated here to the main idea of the poet’s devotion. Moreover, Appaya Dīksita himself stated a few pages before (p. 18) that the verse in question should not be considered a case of Dhvani or Guṇībhūtavyāṅga
('tatāpi na dhvanigunībhūtavyāṅgyavyavahāraḥ' — p.18).

One would however like to point out that the verse in question cannot be taken a case of a Rasadhvani for want of predominance of love between UmA and Maheśvara, since this sentiment of love has been presented here as subordinated to the poet's devotion to the lord of Universe; it is hardly possible to deny Gunībhūtavyāṅgya here. The Upamā in 'Vagarthāviva' etc. leaves an additional charm to the verse.

It is well known that strikingness or charm is the first and foremost condition for attaining the designation of a figure of speech. If there be no particular strikingness in an expression, there is no 'alamkāra'. Thus, one cannot say that even if there be no charmingness (in a particular expression), there may be a figure of speech. It is curious to note that even in such cases Appaya Dīkṣita admits an Alamkāra. Thus, our author says that it would be unjustified if one says that there exists no figure of speech in the expression 'ayur ghrātam' on the mere ground that it possess no charm. See 'The Citramīmāṃsa — an analysis of its contents' in this Introduction. But it is difficult to agree with Appaya Dīkṣita on this point. The very role of an Alamkāra is to embellish the language comprising of sounds and ideas. This embellishment depends on the strikingness of the expression concerned without which there cannot be an Alamkāra.
X. Manuscripts and Editions of the Citramīmāṃsa

The Citramīmāṃsa of Appaya Dīksita was a very popular work and this has led to the availability of a large number of manuscripts in various parts of India. In comparison with other manuscripts of the works on Sanskrit poetics, these are almost of a modern age, since Appaya Dīksita's date is fixed in the middle of the sixteenth century A.D. This is also a cause why we receive a lot of fresh manuscripts of Appaya Dīksita's works. Catalogus Catalogorum of Aufrecht and the descriptive catalogues of Sanskrit manuscripts, preserved in different libraries in India and abroad, inform us of the existence of plenty of manuscripts of Appaya Dīksita's works, particularly the Citramīmāṃsa, from Kashmir to Kanyakumari and Bengal to Bombay and even outside the boundary of India like in Nepal. Thus, the Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras, the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, the


library of the Mahārājā of Tanjore, the Adyar Library, the India Office Library and Records, London, and many others preserve a good number of manuscripts of this Citramīmāṃsā.

In our edition, we have consulted two manuscripts — one from the India office library and Records, London, and the other from the library of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta. Detailed information of these two manuscripts would be given later on.

Editions

So far, four editions of the Citramīmāṃsā have come to our notice. They are — (1) The Nirṇaya Sāgar Press edition by Pandit Sivadatta and W.L.S. Paṇḍīkar, (2) K.P. Śukla’s edition, (3) J.C. Misra’s edition (entitled as Hindi Citramīmāṃsā) and (4) Rāmasāstrī Tailang’s edition — a reprint from the Pandit, a Sanskrit journal.

1. The Nirṇaya Sāgar Press edition was published


225. See A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Adyar Library, Part II, entry Nos. 30E, 30J & 30K.

several times (1893, 1907, 1926). It was edited by Pandit Sivadatta and Wasudev Laxman Shastrī Panṣikar. Four manuscripts appear to have been used in the process of colation; but unfortunately, nowhere in this edition, we find the necessary information of those manuscripts. What we find are only the statements like 'ka-pustake nāsti', 'kha-gayoh', and so on. But these statements are practically useless when we are not able to know which manuscripts were used by the editors. There is no foreword, no introduction, no commentary, no index and practically nothing that is required for a critical text. It is not so that a few pages are lost. It is not so that the bookbinders, out of carelessness, did not include that portion at the time of binding, since, the number of format clearly shows that the first four pages only (2 title pages in Sanskrit and English each) are the part of the first format. This edition contains also the Citramāṁsākhandana of Jagannātha along with the Commentary Māmaprakāśa by Nāgāṣṭha.

2. Kalika Prasad Shukla's edition contains the commentary Sudhā by Dharānanda. It was published from Benaras (Banīvihar Varanasi). It contains an introduction of eleven pages, an elaborate contents and an index of verses. Names of different works and authors, mentioned in the text as well as in the commentary Sudhā, have been

227. Thus, format No. 2 in page 9, format No. 3 in page 21, format No. 4 in page 33 and so on.

mentioned in the bibliography. This edition is dated Vikram Samvat 2002 i.e. 1945-46 A.D. Critical notes by the editor in several places have added an extra value to this edition.

3. J.C. Misra's edition was published in the Kashi Sanskrit Series (No. 207) by the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series office, Varanasi-I in 1971. It consists of the text, the commentary Sudhā of Dharānanda and an exhaustive Hindi commentary, Bhāratī by name, by the editor himself. There is a valuable long Hindi introduction of thirty-two pages. It contains an elaborate contents and an index of verses found in the text as well as in the commentary Sudhā.

4. Rāmaśāstrī Tailang's edition was first published in the Sanskrit journal, Pandit by name (XIII, 1891). Later on (1948), there was a reprint from the journal which was published from Kāśi. The editor had in his hand three manuscripts; one from Jaypur, the other from Varanasi and another written in Andhra script. The editor was a professor of literature in the Kāśirājakīyapradhāna Sanskṛta Pāthasāla. This edition contains an introduction of two pages. Foot-notes are frequently met with in complicated places. A noteworthy point to be mentioned here is that, this edition ends in the figure Utpreksā and does not contain the figure Atisayokti at all and the well-known verse — 'apyārdhacitrāmāṃsā na mude kasya māṃsālā' etc., also. There is a list of figures of speech, dealt with in the Citramāṃsā. The editor says that the reason as to why the rest of the Citramāṃsā is not available, cannot be determined.
XI. Commentaries on the Citramimāṣa

So far, we have been able to know of four commentaries on the Citramimāṣa.

1. The Suḍhā by Dharānanda — This is the most popular and widely used commentary on the Citramimāṣa. Dharānanda, author of this commentary, was the son of Rāmabala of Vasāṭhē gotra and the grandson of Thākura. He was a disciple of Paramānanda and was born in Bharatapura.

2. It is interesting to note that this commentary continues even after the text available at present. Thus, the Mīrnaya Sāgara Press edition, the Hindi edition by J.C. Misra and another edition by K.P. Sukla, end in the middle of the figure Atiśayokti. The last line before the finishing verse, i.e., 'apyardha citramimāṣa' etc., is this — "śūrupyanibhandhanasamāskṛtyuddharaṇeṣu cātivyāptih" (p. 102). But the commentator proceeds furthermore and supplies us with the definition of the figure Atiśayokti and establishes utility of each and every word contained in that definition. Again, we see, that the commentator questions the ground for the four-fold division of this figure as admitted by the predecessors.

Furthermore, the commentary does not contain any explanation on the finishing verse i.e., 'apyardha...' etc.

228. See the colophon of the Commentary, p. 420 of the Hindi Citramimāṣa.

229. See Hindi Citramimāṣa, pp. 417-419.
Opinions of the later Alamkārika have been oftly mentioned in the commentary and this has added an extra value to it.

2. The Citramīṃsā-gūḍārtha-prakāśikā by Balakṛṣṇa Payagunde — A manuscript, beginning with a discussion on the definition of Upamā, is found in the library of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta. It contains eight folios only, of which again, the first folio has been lost. This commentary does not appear to have covered the entire text, since, how can a manuscript of eight folios and even then written in big letters, only, can be a 'Gūḍārtha-prakāśikā' of a work of more than a hundred printed pages in the novel-size Mirnaya-Sagara-Press edition. But we have noticed that at the end of the manuscript, — 'iti citramīṃsāyāṃ gūḍārtha-prakāśikā paripūrṇā', has been written clearly. However, it did not appear to be much valuable to us. The manuscript is dated Samvat 1840 i.e. 1783-'84 A.D.

3. Citraloka — This commentary has been mentioned by S.K. De, according to whom the same is preserved in the Sanskrit College, Benaras.

4. Bhāratī, a Hindi commentary by J.C. Miśra, professor, Barauni Thermal Inter-College — This commentary has been given in the commentator's own edition of the Citramīṃsā
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along with the Commentary Sudhā by Dharanānanda. To speak the truth, that at times the words of this commentary are so close to that of the text that they become unhelpful to the understanding of the original. Thus, for example, —

"ślesavittika abheda ke adhyavasāya se labdha sādhāranadharmasampatti ke dvārā ślesa ke bādhaka upamān ā hai." (H.C.M., p. 53).

"svayam svārūpa se varṇa ke dvārā ya avarṇa ke dvārā kahīn varṇa se kahīn anya se yādi tad artha kā bodh ho tab ati utkṛṣṭa guṇatva se upamānabhāva bhi asahamāna ke upamānāta kalpanātmaka pratīpa alamkāra mēp ativyāpti doṣa hoga." (H.C.M., p.58).

"anyathā nīcatalva ādihetuka svābhika maunādi mēn duḥkhādi kā hetuvidi se utprekṣāna ki asāmāṇjasāyapattī hōgi." (H.C.M., p.332).

Again, in a few cases, this has been noticed by us that this commentary does not follow the text faithfully. It follows the commentary Sudhā, rather the text. Thus on page 334 (Hindi Edition), both the Sudhā and Bhāratī read 'pratyantaveṣṭana', whereas the text runs as 'paryantaveṣṭana'. Again, in another case, the Sanskrit text reads — "ito gatā sā kva gatā na jāne / grham gatā me hṛdayaṃ gatā vā", which is read in the Sudhā as "ito gatā sā kva gatā vanaṃ gatā vā ..." etc. Commentary Bhāratī also without taking any notice of the text, explains it in the following words — "yahān..."
se gāi to kahān gayī, jāngala me ..." etc. It may happen so that the author of the commentary Sudhā, had in his hand a text of the Citramīmāṃsa, which had variant readings in those particular cases and hence, he had commented on them accordingly. But why the commentary Bhārati does not conform to the text, given in the same edition, remains unexplainable still now.
The following edition of the text of the Citramimāṃsā has been prepared on the basis of the following manuscripts and printed texts:

1. 'ka' = A manuscript, preserved in the India Office Library and Records, London. It is mentioned in the Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office, London, Part III, by J. Eggeling, Entry No. 1172, Ms. No. 764a. However, author of the Catalogue has mentioned this manuscript to be a manual of rhetoric by an unknown author, presumably because, nowhere in the manuscript, name of the author occurs. We have managed to collect a reader-printer copy of the said manuscript from that institution. The manuscript is in a fairly good condition and clearly readable form. There are seventy-four folios written on both sides in this manuscript, of which folio No. 58 is wanting. Probable date of this manuscript, as maintained by Eggeling, is the 17th century A.D. It was copied by one Visvamātha. The script is Devanāgarī. Size is $10\frac{1}{2}$" x $3\frac{1}{2}$". Though manuscript material is not mentioned in the catalogue, it appears from the size that the material is paper, since, the manuscript written on palm-leaf are generally much less in breadth. However, there are 9-10 lines in a page. Letters vary from 39-50 approximately.

The manuscript begins with 'abhivandya candra-śekharam ādyam ...' etc. and breaks off in the middle of
the figure Atisayokti with the words — 'sārūpyanibandhānāprastutapraśamsodāharaṇesu cātivyāptih'. The list of figures of speech, namely,

upamā sahopameyopamayāthānanvayah smaranam /
rūpakapariniṇatīsāyabhṛantimadullekhanihmutipraeksā //

and the well known verse beginning with 'apyarāha' are found here. The text contained in the manuscript is, on the whole, correct.

2. 'kha' = A manuscript, preserved in the library of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, (Ms. No. 2334, entry No. in the Cat. 4875). Script is Devānāgri. There are forty-five folios written on both sides. Size is 11" x 3 3/4". Lines a page vary from 10-12. Letter a line vary from 52-62 (approximately). Material is country made paper. Colour is yellowish. Scripts of this manuscript are very small and the gap between the lines very meagre. At times, the lines are so oddly curved that it becomes very difficult to read the line properly. Moreover, in a few cases, a few words and sometimes a few lines are found to be dropped or repeated. The manuscript though profusely corrupt, greatly helped us by giving the correct reading in certain crucial cases. The manuscript dates Samvat 1666 i.e. 1609-10 A.D.

A few noteworthy palaeographical peculiarities of this manuscript are mentioned below :-

(i) 'bha' appears like 'ma'.

(ii) In many cases a sign like 'visarga' (:) has been put instead of double stroke.
(iii) 'ga' appears like 'bha' or 'ma' in many places.

(iv) In most cases, distinction between 'ba' and 'va', has not been maintained.

3. 'ga' = Ramasastri Tailang's edition of the Citramimansa. It is a reprint from the Pandit. For details see Chapter X of this Introduction.

4. 'gha' = The Nirmaya Sagar Press edition (1926). For details, see Chapter X of this Introduction.