CHAPTER VI

THE ALĀMKĀRA DOCTRINE OF DANDIN

Origin and development of the doctrine. The alāmkāra doctrine in Sanskrit Poetics is perhaps as old as the theory on poetry itself. It is generally admitted that the study of poetry in Sanskrit began with some general principle of embellishment which referred to the expression in its various forms, its structural beauty, the faults which harmed its charm and the excellences which added thereto. The aesthetic judgement was based on the means of external decoration, the aesthetic delight was conceived objectively from the standpoint of external adornment which contributed to it. The question as to what constitutes poetry or the real poetic charm did not draw the attention of the earlier theorists like Dandin and Bhāmaha who confined their schemes mainly to what they called the body of poetry as distinct from its soul or the constituent element. The word and the sense it conveyed were considered to be the two chief elements which formed the body of poetry and the alāmkāras or the poetic figures were regarded as means of beautifying it.

2. Cp. K.A. I. 10; Bh.KAl. I. 23; it was Vāmāra who for the first time dealt with the question. He made riti the soul of poetry. It was only vaguely realised with reference to mārga by Dandin who regarded the gunas as its life-breath, and with reference to the figurative expression by Bhāmaha who proposed to take vakrokti as its underlying principle.
There might have been, long before Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha, a tradition which gave prominence to poetic embellishments, along with the poetic excellences and faults, and considered the alāṃkāras to be the principal elements of poetry. The tradition perhaps synchronised with the earlier form of rasa doctrine, and the two received inspiration and influence from each other. In Daṇḍin, we notice a well-developed form of the alāṃkāra tradition which fact indicates that its beginning dated much earlier than him. Unfortunately, we do not know of the numerous ācāryas who, according to Rājaśekhara, wrote on individual figures like anuprāsa, yamaka, citra, sābdadileśa, vāstava, uṇāmā, atidaya, arthaśleṣa and ubhayā-laṃkāra. In Daṇḍin, we visualise for the first time the self-conscious existence of the alāṃkāra doctrine, though we do not yet get in him a thoroughly critical system which we notice in later theorists. Some scholars, associating Daṇḍin solely with the riti theory, deny him a place in the alāṃkāra school or at least hesitate to regard him as a full-fledged alāṃkāra theorist. One of the reasons for this hesitation

3. Op. KA. I. 10; also op. Bhāmaha ( KAl. I. 15 ); it is significant that all theorists from Daṇḍin to Jaśanātha, irrespective of the school to which they belong, agree on taking the word and sense as constituting the body of poetry; op. ( besides Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha ), Vāmana ( I. 1. 1; vṛtti ); Rūdrata ( II. I ); Māmata ( KPr. I. 4 ); Viśvanātha ( SP. X. 1 ); Jaśanātha ( RS. p. 4 ); etc. In fact, the two elements form the central bond which links all the theories together.

4. See above, chap. I; Daṇḍin deals with all these poetic figures except vāstava which we find in Rūdrata.
appears to be that Bhāmahā who is undoubtedly a prominent ācārya of the alāṁkāra school, refutes bitterly the views of Dāṇḍin, or as some hold, Dāṇḍin makes vigorous attacks on Bhāmahā. But in fact, their opposition never refers to the general principle of alāṁkāra or its importance or otherwise, but it simply appertains to the question of admissibility of certain poetic figures as such or to problems not connected with the alāṁkāra doctrine. According to Dr. De, since "Dāṇḍin holds that it is not the poetic figures only, but several literary excellences that constitute the essence in the poetic manners or diction/ the realisation of which alone the essence of poetry lies," and puts marked emphasis on the mārga and its constituent excellences to which the alāṁkāra school is apparently indifferent, he should be placed, in the fundamental theoretic attitude, in the rīti school.

The view, however, is only partially acceptable. True that Dāṇḍin attaches considerable importance to the mārgas and the excellences constituting them and as such he is certainly a precursor of Vāmana, but it is also true that he gives an equally prominent place to the alāṁkāras in poetry. According to him, a good kāvyā should be embellished by the decorative devices which are technically called alāṁkāras. A critical examination of his doctrine shows that his conception of alāṁkāra is far wider than that of the guṇas which are included in

his comprehensive scheme of the alamkāras as the special
figures characterising particular poetic dictions. Not only
the prānas, but also the various forms of dramatic joints and
manners and the lakṣaṇas have been conceived by him within the
jurisdiction of the concept of alamkāra. It is also important
to note that the exhaustive treatment which Dāṇḍin gives to
this concept has not been accorded by him to any other topic.
The special emphasis which he puts on the alamkāras in poetry
is amply indicated by his dictum: taṁ śarīrāṁ ca kāvyānām
alamkārā ś ca darsitāṁ. Here he refers to the alamkāras along-
with the body of poetry, evidently as the principal element
thereof. He should be, therefore, regarded as an alamkāra
theorist with the same force with which he is associated with
the rīti school. In fact, he affiliates himself to both the
schools and it should be clearly understood that he cannot
be linked exclusively with either of them. And De himself
admits the fact that Dāṇḍin allies himself with the standpoint
of the alamkāra school inasmuch as he pays considerable
attention to the elaboration of poetic figures. But as we
have seen, this much is not sufficient to say of him.

After Dāṇḍin, Bhāmaśa, Udbhata and Rudrata occupy promi-
nent places in the development of the doctrine. Even though

6. His treatment of alamkāras (in 499 verses) is much more
elaborate and exhaustive than that of Bhāmaśa (Kal. II.
4-95; III, 1-56, numbering about 150 verses only).
8. Cp. also Kane; ESP. pp. 89-90.
an advocate of the alāmkāra theory, Bhāmaka was a bitter opponent of Daṇḍin. The opposition was probably due to the fact that while Daṇḍin admitted the element of svabhāvakti, along with that of vakrokti, in his conception of alāmkāra, Bhāmaka vehemently discarded the first and accepted only the second which according to him determined the soul of an alāmkāra.

Another point of difference between the two theorists is formed by Daṇḍin's predilection for the mārga-guṇa theory to which Bhāmaka shows utter indifference. Despite the difference in certain matters, both the writers follow the same fundamental principle. Later theorists like Udbhata and Rudraṭa generally follow Bhāmaka in point of policy and detail. Daṇḍin seems to have influenced Udbhata with regard to the oneness of guṇa and alāmkāra which view he is said to have held. Rudraṭa is the last great expositor of the alāmkāra school, strictly so-called. Though he deals with the rītī and rasā doctrines also, he is essentially an alāmkāra theorist. His treatment of alāmkāras is elaborate. He adds about thirty figures to the list of thirty-eight in Udbhata. He classifies figures into those of word and sense and divides the latter into the categories of vāstava, aupamya, atiśaya and śleṣa. His exposition of vakrokti is different from that of the earlier

9. HSP. II, p. 78.

10. See below; also cp. De: HSP. II, pp. 47-51.


theorists; it was finally accepted by almost all later writers, despite the different conception attributed to it in Vāmana and Kuntaka. After Rudraṭa, the school began to decline, and finally, losing its independent status, merged, along with the rīti school, into the predominant rasa-dhvani school, though there did come the writers who advocated the theory of alaṃkāra with the zeal and force of the earlier theorists. It is not perhaps correct to hold that the decline of the alaṃkāra system was hastened by the rise of the rival rīti doctrine, because the system well survived Vāmana, the greatest exponent of the rīti school, in Rudraṭa and others. Moreover, the rīti doctrine can never be regarded as antagonist to the alaṃkāra system.

With the steady rise of the dhvani theory, the concept of rasa was developed as the principal suggested element and it occupied the position of soul of poetry, with the result that both the poetical figures and excellences came to be subordinated to it. Of these, the excellences, being conceived as intimately related to soul, enjoyed a better position, while the figures were regarded merely as extraneous means of beauty and remained linked, as ornaments, with the body of poetry.

It was thought that the term alaṃkāra ( 'embellishment' ) presupposes the concept xx of alaṃkārya ( 'what is to be embellished' ); and as such, it must confine itself to the body and must

13. Cp. the author of Agni-P. ( 345. 2 ), Ruyyaka, Bhoja (I.2); Hemacandra (I), Vidyānātha, Vāgbhaṭa I ( I. 2), Jayadeva ( I. 7 ) and others.

not enter the arena of the soul of poetry. Thus, as external means of embellishment, the poetic figures could no longer be regarded as co-extensive with the discipline itself, as rasa had already established itself as the supreme fundamental principle, in relation to which the figures, along with the excellences, came to occupy a subordinate position as secondary elements of poetry.

However, the alāmākāra system left its indelible impression on the doctrines which co-existed with, and followed, it. The riti theory fully recognises its influence by according an important place to the elaborate treatment of poetic figures into their system. Even those writers who otherwise stand for the theories of rasa and dhvani, admit its great importance inasmuch as they devote considerable portion of their works to the systematic and elaborate discussion of the poetic figures.

Dandin’s conception of alāmākāra. As Dandin, a great advocate of the alāmākāra theory, considers the concept to be the principal element of poetry, he defines alāmākāras as the characteristic attributes which produce charm in poetry, and incorporates, in their vast scope, the excellences, the various forms of dramatic joints and manners and the lākṣaṇas. He virtually makes the concept ‘a wide berth’ which conveniently accommodates numerous other concepts. Vāmana also uses

15. Cp. Kṛ. VIII. k. 67; also cp. I. 1; 367. 1
17. Cp. KA. II. 1; 367.
the term alaṃkāra in its pervasive sense, but his wider sense has been conceived on a different line, and it is more comprehensive than Daṇḍin's conception even. According to him, alaṃkāra is the charm which makes a poem acceptable and which is attained by avoiding defects and employing the excellences and figures. He uses the term both as an abstract noun denoting 'embellishment' and possessing a vast enough scope and as a noun signifying 'the means of embellishment'. Daṇḍin's definition of alaṃkāra has been taken by him as a definition of his guṇa. The view of Lāhiri, therefore, that Daṇḍin's position in this respect 'is not fundamentally different from that of Vāmanā', is hardly tenable. Bhoja, improving upon Daṇḍin's theory in his own characteristic way, proposes to include, within the scope of the concept, the guṇas, rasas, bhāvas, rasābhāsas and prāsama etc.

A striking feature of Daṇḍin's conception of alaṃkāra is that he stamps the guṇas as special alaṃkāras which constitute the essential elements of particular poetic dictions and form the basis of their classification, while the poetic figures are termed by him as the alaṃkāras which are common to all the dictions or in other words, which characterise all poetic compositions. This should not, however, be taken to mean that...

21. SKS. V in SPr. he includes guṇas and rasas in alaṃkāras;
he attaches more importance to the gunas as essentials of a
good diction in poetry and assigns an inferior place to the
alamkāras as constituents of diction, both good and bad.
Dāṇḍin in fact nowhere expresses or implies such a relative
prominence of the gunas. His definition of alamkāra as the
characteristic element which produces charm in poetry establish-
es beyond doubt its superiority over the gunas. Equally
untenable for the same reason is the view of Dr. Lahiri that
Dāṇḍin makes the presence of gunas, and not of poetic figures,
the absolute condition of a good composition. As a matter
of fact, the alamkāras with their wider range conceiving the
their
gunas within fold enjoyed a better position in his scheme.
Nor is the view defensible that Dāṇḍin makes no distinct-
between the gunas and the alamkāras, because excepting
his inclusion of the former into the latter in the second
chapter, he has never confused the two terms. Again, as

op. Kane: HSP. p. 376.
22. Op. KA. II. 3 and Tarupa, Hrd. and hatna. thereon; also
op. Shoja (SKA. V) who quotes KA. II. 3 with the remark
that the gunas like ślesa etc. have been conceived as
alamkāras by Dāṇḍin. The fact is further evidenced by KA.
III. 137 and 141 where Dāṇḍin employs the term alamkāra
for dōsa becoming guna in a changed condition, implying
thereby the identity of alamkāra and guna.
23. De (HSP. II, pp. 82-4) holds the view.
26. Op. the use of the term guna to signify poetic excellences
in KA. I. 42; 76; 81; 100 and of the term alamkāra to
denote poetic figures in II. 7; 116; 214; 220; 237 etc.,
Dr. Lahiri remarks, 'while every guna is an alamkāra to Dandin, not every alamkāra is a guna', which fact indicates that the author did distinguish the two concepts. In fact, the tradition which differentiated the two was quite old; even Bharata treated them separately. Dandin, however, due to his peculiar standpoint, accommodates the two into one definition within a certain limit, for according to him, both of them are the properties which beautify a poetic composition. Dr. De remarks that 'Dandin practically foreshadows the rigid differentiation of guna and alamkāra of riti school', perhaps implying thereby that in pre-Dandin tradition, they formed basically one concept and that Dandin for the first time hinted indirectly at the difference between the two. But as noted above, the difference was traditional and Dandin, and following him, Udbhata and others, tried to efface the distinction, of course, within certain limits. As a reaction to this, Vāmana establishes their difference in definite terms. As a propounder of riti theory, he was obliged to give more prominence to gunas than to alamkāras and for this reason, he had to make a clear distinction between the two concepts, and according to him, while gunas constitute the elements which produce charm in a poetic composition, the alamkāras merely

also op. De: HSP. II, pp. 82-4.

27. JSR. pp. 57-3.
28. HSP. II, p. 84.
add to the charm. In other words, the guṇas form the
permanent properties of word and sense, whereas the alaṅkāras
are just transitory elements thereof. It purports that the
poetic charm cannot exist in the absence of the guṇas, but if
they are present, the poetic charm exists even in the absence
of the alaṅkāras. The divergence in the respective standpoints
of Daṇḍin and Vāmanā indicates the fact that the former did
not have that fervour for the rāti theory which the latter
cherished. Or the other hand, Daṇḍin had a definite predi-
lection for the theory of alaṅkāra. The dhvani theorists
and their followers accepted the viewpoint of Vāmanā, but they
did it only partially. They did regard guṇas as the permanent
properties of kāvyā and alaṅkāras as transitory ones. But
they did not accept word and sense as the āśraya ( container )
of the guṇas. They rather considered guṇas to be the properties
of rasa and conceived them as internal elements.

Principa! elements of poetic figures. When we admit
that alaṅkāras produce the poetic charm, the question naturally
arises as to what constitutes the poetic charm or what character-
istic attributes the poetic figures possess, causing them to
be the means of embellishing a kāvyā. The question draws

30. Cp. Ill. 1. 1-2. Taranā on Kā. ll. 1 refutes Vāmanā's
view and observes that the point of distinction is not
real, because by beautifying a kāvyā, just adding to
its beauty is meant.

31. Cp. Vāmanā Ill. 1. 1-3; also Udbhata in Bhāmaha-vṛtti;
cp. KPr. VIII. k. 67 vṛtti.

32. KPr. VIII. k. 66-7; I. k. 3f; SD. X. 1, vṛtti.
brings an object manifestly to our mind's eye. With this point of view, Daṇḍin regards the expression of the natural disposition also as a characteristic element of the poetic figure.

It is generally understood that by the term svabhāvokti, referred to along with vakrokti, Daṇḍin means merely the particular figure of that name which he exalts as the primary figure, barring which all other poetic figures, in his view, come into the sphere of vakrokti. But in fact, the element of svabhāvokti must be distinguished from that figure bearing that name, even if they are basically identical, because the term svabhāvokti, when it is employed in juxtaposition to a wider concept like vakrokti, must necessarily connote a similarly pervasive sense. There can be no doubt that the term vakrokti in Daṇḍin represents a concept wider than that of an individual poetic figure, and it has certainly been employed as an essential principle characterising the figures. It does not appear in him as an individual figure, as svabhāvokti does. Vāmana and Rudraṭa were the first to regard it as a specific poetic figure, to which precise and narrow signification it betook itself from a very broad sense. It is incorrect to think that the term vakrokti denotes an element, while the svabhāvokti

37. Ka. II. 8; op. Taruna, thereon. Also op. Mahimabhaṭṭa (V. RŚŚ. ed. p. 108); Hemacandra (explaining his viewpoint) and Māṇikyaśandra (on Kṛ. X. k. 111); for detail, op. V. Raghava: SCAS. pp. 113-5.

38. Ka. II. 8-13 and 363.
is merely a figure, for it does not appear to be sound that
all the figures excepting svabhāvokti were to Daṇḍin the differ-
ent forms of vakrokti. There are certainly some other
figures as well which are devoid of the element of vakrokti
and where the element of svabhāvokti is conspicuous by its
presence. In this connection, mention may be made of the figu-
res, hetu, sūkṣma, leda, āsis, yathāsaṃkhya, preyas and mā
bhāvika which contain in them the element of svabhāvokti
rather than that of vakrokti. Bhāmaha refers to these figures
except the last three as unpossessed of the charm/vakrokti.
In R̄ṣr̄aṭa's figures based on vāstava, the expression of the
natural disposition of a thing which lacks the elements of
simile, exaggeration and paronomasia, the element of sva-
bhāvokti is prominent. He has given in this group the figures
sahokti, jāti (svabhāvokti), yathāsaṃkhya, dipaka, pari-
VRTTI, hetu, vyatireka, sūkṣma and leda, from among those
treated by Daṇḍin.

Daṇḍin does not define the term vakrokti ( 'crooked
speech' ), which he regards as a characteristic element of
the figures. Bhāmaha, too, who mentions it many times,
does not define it. It appears that the concept was already

40. Nṛṣa on KA. II. 363 expresses the view and Dr. De ( ṢSP.
II, p. 85) follows it.
41. Cp. KA. II. 86-7; 92; III. 55; the last three figures
also can be held to be possessed of svabhāvokti element.
42. Cp. VIII. 10.
too well-known in their time to require elucidation. The meaning, 'crooked or ironical speech', appears in the verbal poetic figure defined by Rudrata and later theorists as a kind of pretended speech. In Vāmāna, however, it appears, as an ideal figure, in the form of metaphorical expression based on transference of sense (laksanā). We may understand Daṇḍin's vakrokti as the opposite of svabhāvokti. It is a certain peculiarity or charm of expression which implies a selection of words and turning up of ideas peculiar to poetry and abhorrent of matter-of-fact speech. Bhāmāha derives from Daṇḍin this conception of vakrokti, though his standpoint is different inasmuch as he regards it as the sole essential principle of the figures and discards the element of svabhāvokti. He rejects the figures hetu etc. for their being devoid of the element of vakrokti which in his opinion manifests the poetic sense and without which no embellishment of poetry is possible.

With regard to the respective viewpoints of Daṇḍin and Bhāmāha in this respect, Dr. Narendra observes that according to Bhāmāha natural depiction, too, is a kind of vakrokti, but Daṇḍin differentiates natural speech from the ironical one and regards the former as less important, it being just desirable.

43. Cp. KAl. II. 85-6 etc.
44. Rudrāta II. 13-7; ṚPr. IX. k. 78; SD. X.9.
46. KAl. I. 30; 36; he deals with svabhāvokti only in deference to tradition.
47. Cp. KAl. II. 85-6.
and not essential in poetry. The view, however, is not admissible, since Dandin's predilection for svabhāvokti is more than evident. Kuntaka develops, after Dandin and Bhāmaha, the idea of vakrokti and builds a peculiar theory of alamkāra on its basis. His vakrokti signifies the peculiar charm or strikingness which can be imparted to ordinary expression by poetic imagination. He uses the term as almost co-extensive with the concept of alamkāra and regards the poetic figures as various forms of vakrokti.

Besides these dominating elements, Dandin alludes to some other attributes also which in their position even as specific figures add to the charm of other poetic figures and thus constitute in a way the characteristic elements of some of them.

One of such elements is the idea of atisayokti which, according to him, is the expression of something special, transcending the limit of ordinary speech. He calls it a figure of highest class and regards it as an attribute which brightens up the charm of other poetic figures. Rudrata subscribes to the view by forming a separate group of figures based on atisaya, which includes utprekṣā, vibhāvanā, virodha, viśeṣa and...

48. Op.BKś. p. 187; Nagendra bases his view on KA. II. 13: kāvyasya any etad īsitaṁ, 'it is desirable in the kāvyas also', but read with the preceding line, sāstrostavya sāmrājyaṁ, it signifies the essentiality, and not merely desirability, of the figure in poetry. The force of 'āpi' also supports and strengthens the view.


50. KA. II. 220; op. Hṛd. and Ratna. also.
hetu, from among those dealt with by Dāṇḍin. Bhāmaḥa and, perhaps following him, Vāmana also, expressly admit the element of atīṣaya in the figure utpadekṣā. It is to be noted that the 'viśeṣadarsāṇa' (strikingness of expression) of Dāṇḍin in viśeṣokti and virodha is the same as the 'viśeṣāvivakṣā' of his atīṣayokti. Ānanda-vardhana, too, accepts atīṣayokti it this form, which according to him can be included in all poetic figures, as it has been successfully done by great poets for the purpose of producing charm in poetry. He also remarks that a poetic figure endowed with the charm of atīṣayokti, the essence of all poetic figures, becomes brilliant.

Abhinava-gupta takes atīṣayokti to be the generic property of all poetic figures, while Māmata regards it as their life-breath.

Dāṇḍin's conception of atīṣayokti appears to be slightly different from that of vakrokti; it is characterised prominently by the element of exaggeration, while in the vakrokti, the trait of irony enjoys the upper hand. According to Karmāśri-bhāna, Dāṇḍin's svabhāvakṣti, which is devoid of vakrokti element, is possessed of the trait of atīṣaya. The two concepts, however, are identical in connotation to a great extent;

51. Cp. Bh. KAl. II. 91; Vāmana IV. 3. 9.

52. Cp. Ka. II. 323; 333 and 214 respectively for the figures.

53. DhA. III. 37 ff.

54. Abhinava on DhA. III. 37 ff; KPr. X. 14; 50 f; a also cp. SD. X. 54-5 (sahokti figure which he admits only with the element of atīṣaya).
both of them consist in the transgression of the limit of worldly usage and imply a track extraordinary from the common path. It is perhaps for this reason that Bhāmaha calls atiśayoktī a vakroktī which gives, peculiarity to the sense. According to Kuntaka also, some kind of atiśaya is involved in vakroktī. The atiśaya in him is an essential element of the vicīṭa māra where strikingness of ironical speech prevails.

Śleṣa also has been referred to by Dāṇḍin as an element which, when employed with discrimination, enhances the grace of almost all figures of the vakroktī class. The author specially mentions some figures where śleṣa adds to their beauty. Such figures are upamā, rūpakā, ākeṣa and vyatireka as also dīpaka, arthāntaranyāsa, vyājastuti and virodha. There are still some other figures in Dāṇḍin like tulyayogītā and samāsoktī which involve double entendre. Bhaṭṭi and Bhāmaha recognise the accompaniment of śleṣa with upamā, sahoktī and hetu. According to Udbhāta, in cases of combination, śleṣa is stronger than the other figures with whom it is joined, to the extent even of dispelling their apprehension. There

55. Op. KA. II. 214; Bh.KAL. II. 31; Rudraṭa IX. 1-2.
56. KAL. II. 85.
59. Op. KA. II. 313; for the figure, cp. Ṣṭ II. 28; 29; 87; 114; 160, 170; 174; 186; 339; 345-6.
are, however, writers who do not admit its supremacy, or who even propose its inferiority. Dāṇḍin does not say anything in this regard, though he appears to imply śeṣa's relative prominence. Rudrāta regards it as an element underlying the vakrokti figure, and also forms a separate group of figures based on it. It fact, the śeṣa, on account of its comprehensive scope, occupies in Sanskrit Poetics an important place both as an individual figure and as an element beautifying other figures.

Though the idea of similitude ( aupaṃya ) has not been expressly mentioned as an element, yet the writer's treatment of the figure shows that he conceives it as an element which either assists or accompanies other figures. At least ten among its varieties are such as appear in the form of independent figures in the works of later theorists. Rūpaka, an important figure, has been expressly described by Dāṇḍin as a form of upaṃ where the difference is not expressed, but implied. Other figures which can be said to contain the aupaṃya element are vyatireka, samāsokti, utprekṣā, apahnu-ti, tulyayogītā, aprastutasādāṁśā and nidardana.

64. As De ( HSP. II, p. 73 ) points out, Vāmana is the first to take aupaṃya as the central principle. Bhuyyaka ( AS. p. 26 ) remarks that upaṃ on account of its manifold strikingness constitutes the primary element of the poetic figures.
The position of bhāvika is not very much clear, though its exposition indicates that, like svabhāvokti, it involves the implication of an aesthetic factor in the form of an excellence pervading the whole poetic composition and as such, it may be held to be an element which assists the figures in the realisation of poetic charm.

Bhoja, a staunch follower of Dāṇḍin, adds rasokti to the svabhāvokti and vakrokti of the latter, as an element which characterises all poetic compositions. In Dāṇḍin, however, the concept occupies a subordinate or rather insignificant place, as we would see below.

**Conception of individual figures.** There is divergence of opinion among Sanskrit theorists with regard to the exact nature and scope of the individual figures. We observe, more often than not, numerous conceptions of the same figure in different authors. While dealing with individual figures, we would have an occasion to refer to the various conceptions they developed in course of time. A typical example of how some of them underwent dynamic conceptual changes at the hands of different authors and figures.

---

65. See below for detail; also cp. De: HSP. II, p. 85.
66. Cp. II. 66; see below also.
67. Rudrata enumerates, besides these, samāsaya, anyokti, akeśa and sahokti (from among the figures present in Dāṇḍin) in this group.
68. KA. II. 364; cp. Ratna. thereon; also cp. De: SPSP. pp. 54-8; also see below.
of different authors is the figure ākṣepa which developed as many as six different conceptions in the course of the history of its development. In many cases, the conceptual difference is very slight and, therefore, negligible, though there are instances where the divergence is great and hence conspicuous. The difference sometimes has been caused by the divergence in respective viewpoints of the theorists, but the main cause of conceptual development is the gradual growth of figures and the consequent refining process which was carried to its extreme by Sanskrit rhetoricians, and an examination of their conceptual development in the writers of different schools or of the same school affords an interesting study. We propose to discuss the notable stages of conceptual development of the poetic figures dealt with in Dāṇḍin's work, in the following chapter.

Quantitative growth of poetic figures. Another special feature of the treatment of figures in Sanskrit Poetics is the ingenious process of their fine differentiation by way of dividing and sub-dividing them. The process has resulted into multiplication of individual figures on one hand and the growth of a large number of varieties and sub-varieties on the other. Figures have been classified into numerous species on the basis of different cases of their occurrence, the cases

70. See below; also cp. De: HSP. II, pp. 70-1.
71. Cp. also De: HSP. II, pp. 70-1.
72. Thus unanā is divided into about 33 forms, utprekṣā into
sometimes being very vague and hazardous. The minute analysis plays a more eventful part in the later theorists, though, of course, its seed was sown by earlier writers like Dandin, Udbhata and Rudra. Although Dandin wisely remarks that, if for some slight difference, a separate figure is to be framed, there can be no end to this limitless multiplication and that the varieties of different figures are beyond the scope of enumeration and discussion, yet he himself falls a prey to this deplorable tendency. It is perhaps Dandin who gives the largest varieties of simile numbering thirty-two. He classifies rūpaka into twenty forms, ākṣepa into twenty-four, hetu into sixteen and yamaka into more than fifty varieties. As the study of Poetic advances, the number of independent figures together with their varieties goes on increasing till it exceeds two hundred. The later theorists like Ruyyaka, Jayadeva and Annaya devote their whole works to the exclusive treatment of the figures.

In the steady growth of the number of figures and their species, the role played by the laksanās has been twofold. On one hand, a good number of them directly developed into independent figures and, on the other, some of them gave birth to

32, vyatireka into 48 and virodha into 10 by the pedantic theorists. The remark of Ānandavardhana (Dhā, I) that thousands of forms of figures have been invented and the process is on is interesting in this respect.

73. KA. II. 96; 368; also cp. Dev. HSP. II, p. 63.

74. Also cp. his figures diśaka having 12 forms, arthāntara-nyāsa, 8, vyatireka 10 and prāhhelikā with 16 varieties.
a large number of varieties in interaction with figures, as Abhinaya-vupta rightly observes.

Classification of poetic figures. Since, according to Dandin, the poetic figures embellish the body of poetry composed of word and sense, they decorate, by implication, the word and the idea conveyed thereby. On this basis, Dandin, perhaps for the first time, classifies specifically the figures into arthālaṅkāra and sabdālaṅkāra, according as they appertain to the idea and the word respectively, and treats them in separate chapters (II and III). Some later writers add a third class of figures called ubhayālaṅkāras which refer both to the word and sense.

The ideal figures, by virtue of their superiority over the verbal figures, have always engaged more attention of the theorists, and the favourite refining process has been more systematically pursued in this sphere. Dandin also naturally devotes greater attention and volume to this class of figures. He mentions in all thirty-five figures each consisting of numerous varieties. The multiplication of species is, as noted above, a special feature of his treatment of the figures, in

75. AB. pp. 390-1; 401; cp. V. Raghavan: SCAS. pp. 15-25; see below also.

76. KA. III. 186; also cp. I. 50 (but the interpretation of it is doubtful). Dr. De (ESP. II, p. 72) is hardly right when he says that the above classification obtained from Rudrata's time. In fact, Bhāmaha (cp. KA. I. 14-5), Udbhata (who treats his verbal figures first followed by the ideal figures) and Vāmana (cp. his vṛtti preceding IV. 1. 1. and IV. 2. 1) also know the distinction.
contrast to that of Bhāmaha and Vāmana, though in theory, he is wisely opposed to the endless differentiation which he regards both as impracticable and futile.

As to the further classification of ideal figures according to their essential characteristics, he seems to divide them into two broad categories of svabhāvokti and vakrokti, though we cannot precisely say which of the figures he means to include in the respective classes. However, as noted above, he probably means to accommodate hetu, sūkṣma, leṣa, yathāsaṃkhya, prayās, āśīs, bhāvika and svabhāvokti in his svabhāvokti class and the rest of the figures in his vakrokti group.

Rudrata groups the figures systematically under vastava (factuality), aunamya (similitude), atisaya (exaggeration) and śleṣa (double entendre). Ruyyaka suggests the classification based on similitude, incongruity, chain, logical inference, apprehension of hidden meaning and lastly communion of different figures. Later writers substantially follow this classification.

77. Ka. II. 1-2; 96; 368; also cp. fn. 73 above.
78. Rudrata VII. 9.