Mammata's approach to Gunas and Alamkaras is certainly new. The distinction which he laid between the two is not only convincing but also is in true perspective of the tradition. Mammata gives the number of Gunas 'Three only'. He has also discussed the role of Vyrtis in Kavya. Mammata has discussed six 'Sabdalamskaras' and many 'Arthalamskaras'.

Manikyacandra in his commentary Samketa lays stress on the importance of Gunas. These are a must for the poetry. The poetry without Alamkaras and with Gunas is possessing interest, while the vice-versa does not. The view of Bhamaha about the position of Gunas and Alamkaras in poetry is termed as wrong. The definition of Madhurya given by Bharata is 'Ativyapaka' because it includes the rude and insulting talks of the 'dear-ones' also. On the other hand the definition of Vamana is 'Avyapaka' because it leaves out the compound which may also have Madhurya. The definition of Mammata is only correct. Dandi's definition also does not suit well. Madhurya is not high, higher and highest in Karuna, Vipralambha, and Santa; but on the other hand it is present in excess in these. The definitions of Oja Gunta given by Bharata, Dandi and Vamana fall short of the target, because it is

1Samketa, p. 185.
2Ibid., p. 189. 'Bharatoktam tu ...... tulyatvāda- tivyapakam ...... vamanoktamavyaptam'.
found in those objects also which have not been described by these three.\footnote{Samketa, p. 189.} Similarly, the definition of 'Prasāda' Guṇa given by Bharata and Vāmana is also insufficient to cover its whole field.

The first four of the 'Guṇas' enumerated by Vāmana are included in 'Oja' or Florridity. Definitions of Bhoja, Daṇḍin, and Bharata have been quoted to show that all these four can be actually included in 'Oja' or Florridity.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 192-193.} While Madhurya has been admitted by Mammaṭa, Arthavyakti is included in Prasāda or Lucidity. Even according to Daṇḍī it can be included in Prasāda. Samāta according to Manikyaacandra can be included in the Vṛttis and there is no need to accept its separate entity. Kānti consisting in the brightness of the style is in no way a separate Guṇa because if it is 'Vaktṛṣroṭroh' then it cannot be included in 'Arthaguṇas' and if it is 'Aksaṇa' or imposition on another object then it is only the purpose of the speaker.\footnote{Ibid., p. 193.} Similarly, the position of Mammaṭa, in showing that out of Vāmana's 'Arthaguṇas' also, some can be included in the three guṇas accepted by Mammaṭa and some are only negation of the defects has been supported. The
theory of five gunas as propounded by some is also not acceptable to Maṇīkyacandra, because 'Audārya' and 'Samyata' can be included in first three gunas.

Srividyācakravartīn in his Sampradāyaprakāśini, holds that Māmata's definition of Gunaś is correct. Gunaś are in fact conducive to the maturity of Rasa. The difference between the Gunaś and Alamkaras is that Gunaś have unceasing existence with Rasa while the Alamkaras do not have. Alamkaras on the other hand do not contribute directly to the maturity of the Rasa, but do it through the medium of words and meanings; sometimes these even do not contribute towards the maturity of Rasa. The line of demarcation drawn by Vāmana between Gunaś and Alamkaras has been termed as incorrect. Madhurya is a guna, enjoying which the mind is lost. Oja has unceasing existence with Vīra Rasa. The Gunaś are only three as accepted by Māmata. The arguments are none else but the same as put forth by Māmata. There is of course no validity of accepting ten Arthagunaś because some of these can be included in the 'Sabdagunaś' while the others are merely negation of some defects. The rest of text is left without any new comments.

1Sāṅketa, p. 195. 'Gunaḥ pancityeke, tadasat'.
2Sampradāyaprakāśini, P. 169. 'Gunaśtvapṛthag-vṛttyāḥ'.
3Ibid., p. 170. 'Nirmanaskataiva jāyata'.
Bhattagopala in his Sahityacūḍāmaṇi has very clearly pointed out that guṇas are essential attributes of Rasa and not of the syllables, which are considered to be the parts of the body of poetry, while Rasa is soul.¹ 'Vaidarbhi', 'Riti' is the only Riti which can be the soul of poetry; because it possesses all the gunas.² Other 'Ritis' namely 'Gaurī' and 'Pāncāli' do not have all the gunas, and hence incapable of being the soul of the poetry. Only three 'Sabdagunās' are accepted but the definitions and examples of ten 'Sabdagunās' and ten 'Arthagunās' as accepted by others, have been given. But Bhattagopāla points out that this theory of three Guṇas was propounded by Bhāmaha and Bhoja on the other hand has accepted the number of Guṇas as twenty-four.³ The suitability of particular syllables for particular gunas has also been described.

Śrīdhara in his kavyaprabhā Viveka tells us that Guṇas or Embellishments are manifested with the manifestation of the poetry and co-exist with it, till it is, not finished. The difference between Guṇas and Alāṃkāras is not very distinct in the poetry because these two may have essential co-existence. However, the Guṇas have more important place

¹Sahityacūḍāmaṇi, p. 167. 'Rasādi dhvanivatmeveti'.
²Ibid., p. 177. 'Vaidarbhi kevalā kāvyasyātmāsyāt'.
³Ibid., p. 190. 'Rāja Bhojo guṇānaha vinsati- caturasca vamanodasa tatsuṛāṇaha yan triṇevā Bhāmaha'.

in poetry because even Alamkaras may depend on it. The same has been expressed in 'Kavyalamkara-sūtra-vṛtti', which is quoted in this commentary. Madhurya is just like the sweetness of sugar in the poetry there may be different types of poetry based on Metres and Syllables. Different syllables however, are capable of producing different types of Gunas. Number of Gunas is only three. Long compounds should be avoided in Sṛngāra, Karuṇa and Vipralamba.

Govinda Thakkura says that there are three main attributes of Gunas. (1) That these help in the maturity of Rasa (2) That they are the essential attributes of Rasa (Rasadharma) (3) These have essential co-existence with the Rasa. The definition given by Candīdasa of Gunas and Alamkaras has been criticized on the ground that it overlaps Sṛngāra etc. Three essential attributes of Alamkaras are like this; (1) These adorn the existing Rasa (2) These are the Vṛttis of existing Rasa (3) Sometimes adorn the Rasa i.e. not always, or these may exist even without the existence of Rasa. Vamanas stand on Gunas and Alamkaras has been criticized for its faults. Madhurya is a Guna which produces

---

1 Kav. Pr. Viveka, pp. 274-75.
2 Pradīpa, p. 383.
3 Ibid., p. 384. 'Candīdasa... taddhayuktam sṛngaratvādau dharmē-nātivyāpteḥ'.
4 Ibid., p. 386.
joy and completely overpowers the mind of the reader. 'Madhurya' is high, higher and heighest respectively in 'Karuna', 'Vipralambha' and 'Santa'. A burning state of mind is caused by Oja. 'Praśada' spreads like fire in the dry firewood. One special thing about Praśada is that it is suggestive in all the works and all the Rasas. Only three Gunas have been accepted, which the commentator thinks, are in fact Rasagunās, letters etc. are only their suggestive.

The suitability of particular letters for producing certain gunas is accepted and use of particular words for a particular Rasa is also advised.

Candidāsa in his commentary 'Dīpikā' has said that Guṇas are only Rasadharmā and help in the maturity of the Rasa. The helping in the maturity of the Rasa has been termed as their 'Pravṛtti'. This stand of Candidāsa has been challenged by Govinda Thakkura later on. The very existence of the poetry is controlled by the Guṇas, their existence and non-existence leads to the existence and non-existence of the poetry. But on the other hand the poetry do exist even in the absence of Alamkaras. Only the particular letters are suggestive of a particular Guna, all letters

\[1\text{Pradīpa, p. 394. 'Rasesyadhayatayā sarvāsau rancanāsu vyangytayā sthitā'.}
\[2\text{Ibid., p. 399. 'Vastuto rasagunā eva'.}
\[3\text{Dīpikā, p. 348.}
\[4\text{Ibid., p. 348. 'Kāvyaniyantīta sthitayāh tajjā- tiyayogavyavchchedenaiva kāvyatvāt'.}
cannot do this. But if seen from Indicative point of view, their existence is interdependent. Candida has criticized the stand of some 'Shydayacakravartin', probably an earlier commentator, on the nature of Guṇas in relation to letters. The Alamkāras on the other hand enhance the total effect of the poetry, just like the ornaments, enhancing the beauty of the body. But a dead body cannot have any beauty, so the soul of the poetry is Rasa. It is correct that sometimes the Alamkāras even though they exist in the poetry, do not help in the maturity of Rasa. The view of Vāmana, Dandī and others about Guṇas is not acceptable. The importance of the Rasa as sole important factor in poetry is supreme. The formation of poetry is done by Guṇas, they have been termed as 'Kāvyavahārā pravartakas'. Where there are no Guṇas it is the 'Alamkāras' which are 'Kāvyavahārāpravartakas'. The definition of Madhurya given is the old one, but it is only the wording which has been changed. The process of enjoyment of Rasa is repeated to show how the Guṇas are enjoyed. Bhamaha's definition of Madhurya is also defective because capability of being heard is the special attribute of Sabda and not Artha. The Oja Guṇa is present not only

1Dīpikā, p. 350.
2Ibid., p. 356.
3Ibid., p. 356. 'Gupabhavasthale-alamkārāṇam kāvyā-jīvatutā'.
4Ibid., p. 357.
in the Rasas like Bibhatsa etc. but also in Rasabhāsas similar is the case with Madhurya etc. In Hasya and Adbhuta both Madhurya and Oja are available but the description of how these are available has been given in 'Dhvanisiddhāntasaṅgraha' which is now lost. Following Anandavardhana he declares that by the example of firewood the preasive quality of Prasāda has been stressed, while the example of clean water shows its clear conceivability. The Prasāda Guna is in all works and all Rasas.

Mahēśvara Nyāyālaṃkāra in his commentary Ādarsā has supported Mammāta’s view about the distinction between Gūṇas and Alamkāras. The view of Bhāmaḥa etc. is not acceptable to him and he upholds the validity of Mammāta’s views, about the place of Gūṇas and Alamkāras in the poetry. He does not agree to fixing the number of Gūṇas as Ten. These are only three and all other Gūṇas, enumerated by others can be included in these. However, he has clearly come out with his support for the view that Rasa occupies the most important place in poetry.

Siddhācandragnā is of the view that the gūṇas have invariable concomitance with Rasa. The non-existence of Rasa would also mean the non-existence of Gūṇas. When Gūṇas are there in a poetry they do enhance its charm. Navīnas think that they being the factor of enhancement of charm of Rasa, are its essential characteristics 'Rasotkarsa hetutve sati

---

1 Ādarsā, p. 423.
Rasadharmatvasityāhū", 1 Alamkāras on the other hand can exist without Rasa and may not essentially enhance its charm, even if they exist. He has explained all the ten Śabda and Artha Guṇas though he favours the inclusion of only those Guṇas in the list which enhance the charm of poetry.

Nāgojībhāṭṭa opines that as Guṇas are essential characteristic of Rasa, so they occupy a prominent position in poetry. These depend mainly on 'Śabdas', 'Śabdāśītātvā'. With their existence they enhance the charm of the poetry while the Alamkāras do not. Alamkāras are not useful for Rasa directly, but are so indirectly, 'Te hi na Śakṣādrasopayoginah'. 2 Very often Alamkāras are 'Uddīpanas' but sometimes they may be 'Anubhāvas' as well 'Alamkārā hi vibhāvādyotkārśayanto bahudhoddīpanaḥ kvacidanubhāvāpi'. 3 The number of Guṇas is three because these are, the only stages of mind which produce nine kinds of Rasas for the spectators or readers 'Samajikāṇām navarasajanyatisro-avasthāh'. 4

Vāmanācarvya thinks that the Guṇas are the essential attributes of Rasa which is the soul of the poetry. These reside permanently in it. The view of Vāmana and Bhāmaha is not acceptable in this regard. Guṇas cannot be attributes

1Kav. Pr. Khandana, p. 53.
2Uddyota, p. 385.
3Ibid., p. 386.
4Ibid., p. 391.
of the body, because a dead body shall be devoid of any attribute "Sarirasya saurya\text{\textasciitilde} s\text{"na dharmah mṛta śrire abhāvādīti". The alamkāras sometimes enhance the charm of the poetry and not always, Uddyota has been quoted to show that the number of Guṇas is only three and not ten as accepted by Vāmāna. The use of different type of 'padaracana' in the poetic creation should be according to the circumstances.\(^2\)

\textit{sabdālamkāras}

Mammaṭā has described six sabdālamkāras. The commentators view about these are varying.

\textit{Manikyacandra} has defined two types of Kāku in connection with Vakrokti. These two types are (1) Sākaṅkaṅ (2) Nirakaṅkaṅ. The first type which is with some intention (abhipraya) cannot be Alamkāras. This is in fact a variety of 'Guṇibhūtavyāṅga'.\(^3\) Ānanda has been quoted to support the above assertion. But contrary to this some people think this is an essential attribute of reading (Pāṭha-dharma). This is also the view of Bharata. Still another section thinks that charm of 'Vakrokti' lies in speaking. Vāmāna thinks that Indication due to similarity is 'Vakrokti', "Vāmānastvasādṛṣyāllaksṅa vakroktītītī vakroktī lakṣṇamāha".

\(^1\)Balabodhini, p. 463.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 490.
\(^3\)Samketa, pp. 199-200.
In 'Yamaka' the repetition is of the same word which has been used earlier. In this 'Alamkara' there is negation of Punrukta doṣa. He supports Mammaṭa in his view that 'Śleśa' is a 'Śabdālamkāra'.¹ Because it cannot bear the change of words, so it cannot be included in 'Artha-alamkāras'. In 'Arthalamkāras' words can be changed but the essential thing is that the meaning should be same. As this is not applicable to 'Śleśa' so it is essentially a 'Śabdālamkāra' on all other 'Alamkaras' Mānīkya confines himself to mere brief explanations.

'Srīvidyācakravartin' after defining the 'Alamkāras' briefly shows that 'Vṛttyanuprāsa' is of three kinds, because of three kinds of Vṛttis. 'Latañuprāsa' is a 'Śabdānuprāsa'. Those who call it as pertaining to 'Artha' are wrong.² According to him Śleśa is essentially a 'Śabdālamkāra'³ like 'Anuprāsa' etc. He has given detailed explanation of the discussion on this point, otherwise his explanation is very brief.

Bhattacharja has given briefly in verse the summary of the IX Ullāsa, before actually explaining the 'Alamkāras'. While defining 'Anuprāsa' he declares that the repetition of

¹Sanjketa, p. 211. "Anvayavyatirekābhyām śabdā- lamkāreṇvātra".

²Sampradayaprakāśini, p. 208.

³Ibid., p. 230.
the meaning is a defect and repetition of vowels (svaras) is charmless, hence only the repetition of consonents is appropriate, which is there in 'Anuprasa'.

'Vṛtyānuprasa' is of three kinds, because of three types of Vṛttis; these very vṛttis have been termed as 'Ṛtis' by Vāmana and others. The ninth variety of Sleṣa is Mammaṭa's original contribution, while enumeration of all other eight varieties are in line of Rudrāṇa. He supports Mammaṭa in his view that Sleṣa is a 'Sabdālamkāra'.

Sridhara's view is that Alamkāras are of three kinds, these are (1) Based on prominence of words (2) Based on prominence of meanings and (3) based on the prominence of both. He gives importance to 'Sthāṇa-sadrṣya' in Anuprāsa and quotes 'Pāṇini' to show this. The different names of five types of Yamaka have been given by the commentator, who also gives the examples of all these, mainly following 'Kavyalamkāra-sūtra'. After defining both Sabda and Artha-Sleṣas, he asserts that 'Sleṣa' is 'Sabdālamkāra'.

Candidāsa has given detailed explanation of all the

2Ibid., p. 227.
3Kav. Pr. Viveka, p. 290. 'Alamkaras ca sabdartho-bhayaqaṭatvena bāhyā, abhyāntara, bāhyābhyantraśceti tri prakāraḥ'.
4Ibid., p. 308.
Sabdaśāṁkāras. *Vakrokti* is *Sabdaśāmkaṇa* because of 'Anvaya-Vyatireka'. Similar is the case with 'Vṛtāyunuprāsa' which he points out has also been included in 'Arthāśāmkaṇa'.

He has also supported Mammaṭa vehemently in his assertion that Śleśa is a 'Sabdaśāmkaṇa'. Cāṇḍīdaṇa has followed Rudrata while giving the varieties of 'Yamaka'. This is also the case in their examples.

Govinda Thakkura after defining *'Vakrokti'* has stated that 'Anuprāsa' is firstly of two kinds namely 'Varnānuprasah padānuprāsasāca'. The first is repetition of consonents, while in the second it is the repetition of 'Vācaka-padas'. He has given the easier definition of 'Lātānuprāsa' which is, 'Bhinnatātparyāṇyārthasaśabdasaḍāśyaśaśabdaṇuprāṣāja, su tu Lātānuprāsa'. He supports all the five varieties of 'Anuprāsa'. The explanation of the verse 'Sitakara' etc. cited as an example of Vṛttyanuprāsa has been criticized. Forty varieties of Yamaka have been counted. He agrees with Mammaṭa that 'Śleśa' is a Sabdaśāmkaṇa. Though 'Punaruktavādabhaṣa' is essentially an 'Alamkāra' pertaining to both words and meanings, hence its enumeration in both the categories is for facility.

Nāgoṭibhatta has mainly followed Govinda, but he

---

1Dīpikā, p. 376.
2Pradīpa, p. 407.
3Ibid., p. 414.
has further elaborated the points of discussion. लातानु-प्रासा and सलेचा have been proved as essentially साब्दालाम्कारास. Some essential qualities of यामका¹ have been quoted in a verse.

Siddhācandra Gani does not disagree at any point as far as the साब्दालाम्कारास are concerned. His explanation is very brief in this उलासा.

Bhimasena says that as some Rhetoricians have termed 'Vakrokti' as the soul of poetry, that is why माम्मतास has defined this figure of speech, first of all.² He has also explained the various points about लातानुप्रासा. He has quoted various opinions about the nomenclature of various varieties of यामका. He supports माम्मतास on the debatable points of 'Slesa' and 'Punruktavatadbhāsa'.

Mahesvara also does not after any new argument about the debatable points in the उलासा. माम्मतास’s stand is forcefully supported.

Vāmanacārya has mainly supported माम्मतास, but the charm of his commentary lies in presenting the views together, of all those who support माम्मतास. He has declared emphatically that 'Slesa' is a figure pertaining to 'words only.

This he does while describing Slesa Vakrokti.³ The additional

¹Prādipā, p. 413.
²Sudhāsaṅgara, p. 502.
³Balabodhini, p. 492.
reason he gives is that of Ślesa is conceived as 'Arthā-
lamkāra' then there will be no charm in it. He has suggested an amendment in the text of Karika describing 'Ślesa'.

Arthālamkāras

Mammaṭa has described 61 sabdālamkāras. Commentators have mainly confined themselves to explaining these figures of speech. As there are no theories of poetics which are involved in this connection, so there was very little scope of discussion. It is only Siddhicandra who makes effort to show how the number of figures of speech given can be reduced by including some of these under others. For instance he would include Asaṅgati, Viṣama and Vyāghata in Virodha. He would term 'Rūpaka' as 'Sabdālamkāra' and still include it in Arthālamkāras. Similarly Vāmanacārya though agrees to the total number of figures of speech given by Mammaṭa, yet he has included in these very Alamkāras about 50 'Alamkāras' accepted by others and not accepted by Mammaṭa.

There has not been any significant difference of opinion amongst the commentators as far as Arthālamkāras are concerned. Though there have been some very minor mootable points like the appropriateness of particular

---

1Balabodhinī, p. 516.
2Kav. Pr. Khandana, pp. 86-76.
3Ibid., p. 80.
examples or the definition of Alamkāras, yet there is near unanimity on this point. Taking this view, the detailed study of the commentaries on this point has been avoided. This would have only added to the volume of the thesis, without provision of any useful information. This is also in the line of Mammaṭa's theory who has given the adjective 'Analamkṛti punah kvāpi', in the definition of poetry.