CHAPTER II
ALANKĀRYA AND ALANKĀRA IN KĀVYA
-- A Brief Historical Survey.

SECTION I.
The General Nature of Alankāras and Alankārya.

The two theories in Sanskrit Poetics namely, Diwāni and Vakrokti cannot be understood without knowing what alankārya is and what alankāra is. The problem of alankārya and alankāra does not appear to have been given the attention it deserves. So I intend discussing it here in detail: in three sections namely, (1) The General Nature of alankāras and alankārya; (2) Svabhāvoktī and (3) Recavādāti alankāras.

Alankārya, in ordinary sense, is the human body which is to be decorated and the alankāras are ornaments like neck-lace, bangles, ear-rings, etc., which go to adorn the body. In poetry s'abdā and artha are decorated, the alankāras are meant for s'abdā and artha according to the earlier rhetoricians. Anandavarāhīna admits that the poetic alankāras are meant to increase the beauty of s'abdārtha (or vēcārtha), but the soul of poetry is primarily rasa according to him. Alankāras should be used to enhance the beauty of rasa and the rasa should
not be obstructed by an excessive use of alankāras. The propriety or impropriety of alankāras depends on rasa, which is alankāra. To Kuntaka, alankāra and alankāra are not separate. They are distinguished to reveal their nature. There is no poetry without a striking alankāra. Alankāra does not belong to stāla and artha; it resides rather in poetic stāla and artha. 'Salankārasya Kāvyatā' is Kuntaka's principle of poetry. Vastu and Rasa are always alankāra and can never be alankāra. We will take a historical survey to understand the nature of alankāra and alankāra before the theories of Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka.

Bharata is the earliest rhetorician to define and illustrate poetic alankāras. But before Bharata, we find the term upamā in Pāṇini. Pāṇini has used the word to indicate sādṛśya (similarity).

\[\text{Upanānaṃ सामान्यन्यनै}^1\]

or

\[\text{Upanālं अक्षरादिभि, सामान्यतयोगे}^1\]

The upamānas show themselves in proper nouns like 'Ghanasvāma' wherein the similarity of the black colour with that of the sky, 'Ghana jva svāmā' is conveyed, or a proper usage of words like 'purasavyāghra' or

---

1. Astādhyāyi of Pāṇini - 2.1. 55,56.
'upama', where the similarity is indicated between the qualities of a tiger and a man, and the moon and a man. Upama can explain at times behaviour also. Take for example, 'putramivacarati putrīvati chātraṃ'. It always takes karma-vibhakti as seen in the statement 'ahrtamiva surakṣitam'.

The word upama used by Pāṇini denotes in a very general way the simple relation of similarity and does not indicate any connotation of beauty. The first man using the term upama with the connotation of beauty is Bharata. Bharata defines and explains four alankārae which belong to drama.

*Upama dīpaka -vāv kurre upkūt ūrālo lathal*


He does not divide them in s'abdālankāras and arthālankāras. Only one s'abdālankāra i.e. vamaka, he has given and the remaining three are arthālankāras.

Bharata gives five upamābhedaś which are nāṭakōś- 

Bharata's upama does not refer to mere similarity as

Tanini's does; but it is the poetic or aesthetic verisimilitude.

Bharata's idea is that upama may be found either in qualities or in actions.

The five varieties of upama given by Bharata are, pras'ama, nunda, kalpita, sadra, and kific-sadra. Pras'ama means to praise something comparing it with other similar and important thing as seen in the example, —

"प्रशांति! तव विशालार्थीं गुलोप अथुरायिना।
अविमिक्षा आस्थाय च प्रमौजनी भूलिते सहीमिष्ठमेव॥
(N S XVI, 41)

Nunda means to criticise a thing comparing it with some unwanted thing. The example given by Bharata is, —

"वसा त वर्गुणोऽवेदं सक्स्वे कविविशालिभि।
वने कफ्तलिकं कालीं दाववद्धाबिकं कुमङ्क॥
(N S. XVI, 47)

Kalpita is an imaginative comparison as seen in the stanza, —

क्षरोदी विनेत्रतिलकं वृक्षम अनुपरासनी।
मतिकुल विदयानस्री अदुभय इत्यवली॥
(XV, 47)

The mountains cannot move and so the comparison of moving elephants with the moving mountains is imaginative.
When the upameva itself is upanāna, it is called sadṛśaṁ upanā. The example is,—

"यदवथाय वृत्त कर्म वरदीभासांसंगिनिः।
सत्तेद वरदीवेच्छ रसादिति मानुरकेस्थिनः॥
(CN s XVI, 50)

Kīmcit-sadṛśaṁ upanā is slight similarity between upameva and upamāna as seen in,—

"समस्तप्रत्यययथेषधिनः समतीत्वं असस्त्वादेव अखी ममः॥
(CN s XVI, 51)

These are the five types of upamā. Bharata gives more importance to this alankāra because he has in mind the concept of beauty when he talks of only four alankāras. All these alankāras are based on similarity, the three arthālankāras based on arthasādṛśaṁ, i.e. the similarity of actions, qualities and appearance between the two things and the fourth sābdalankāra, i.e. yacaka is based on aksarasādṛśaṁ (similarity of syllables). "Gaurwva savayah" cannot be an example of the figure of speech upanā since there is no beauty or strikingness. Beauty lies only in art. Poetry is an art and the alankāras add beauty to this art. The principle of upanā implies identity of attributes. What usually is called an upamāna is imaginatively transformed into an upameva because of common attributes.

Rūpaka also is based on similarity. The principle of
The face less waddled as lotus and the teeth like buds as seen in the stanza,—

Dīpaka is the light illuminating the whole sentence.

By the employment of a common verb for more than one subject or vice versa, the close similarity of the various things or actions is strikingly hinted at. This element of suggested upāra makes it a separate alankāra. Beauty lies in the suggested simile (sarbhītopaṇa) only.

The vāmaka is a s'ābdalāṅkāra based on the pleasant similarity of jingling syllables. Bharata deals in more detail with vāmaka among these four s'āṅkāras. He divides it in ten varieties, viz., (1) pādānta-vāmaka, (2) kāṇāci-vāmaka, (3) samudra-vāmaka, (4) vikrānta-vāmaka, (5) caṅkāva-vāmaka, (6) sonāsta-vāmaka, (7) pedādā-vāmaka, (8) āmṛedita-vamaka, (9) caturvva-vasita-vāmaka, (10) mālā-vāmaka. Bharata gives great importance to vāmaka in drama, explaining it in detail, may be because it attracts the spectators immediately.
after hearing it, due to its alliteration and play of syllables. We are all familiar how a clever use of pun arrests the attention of listeners in the works of Stūdraka and Shakespeare.

For the first time, it is Bhāmaha who divides alankāras into s'abālankāras and arthālankāras. He calls s'abālankāra as saus'abdva and says it is different from arthavvutpattī, i.e. the beauty of saus'abdva or arthavvutpattī is the real poetry according to Bhāmaha. Here beauty in sound is enough for music but not for poetry. So accompanying the beauty in sound, the beauty in sense also must exist in good poetry. Bhāmaha says,—

Thus according to Bhāmaha the body of poetry will be saus'abdva and arthavvutpattī (or yaksṛta) will be the soul. Bhāmaha has not given details of yaksṛta because Bharata had already dealt with it exhaustively.

Alankāra is the principle of beauty for Bhāmaha. It is exclusively found in poetry and distinguishes poetry from stātra and vārta, or ordinary speech. So without alankāras there is no charm in poetry.
Alankāra, according to Bhāmaha, must be agrāmya, arthya, nyāvya and anākula. He emphasises vakrokti as the base underlying all other alankāras. The exaggeration or strikingness itself distinguishes poetry from gīśtra or vārtā. So poets must achieve this mode of expression. He rejects the alankāras like hetu, sūkṣma, lesa, etc., where there is no vakrokti. Strikingness is the soul of all alankāras, otherwise 'Caun iva savavah' can be cited as an example of the figure of speech upama.

3. According to Dr. K.C. Pandey, vakrokti is not a new discovery of Bhāmaha. It is Bharata's concept of lakṣana, a peculiar turn given to poetry by the power of imagination, which differentiates poetry from ordinary speech. He says, "It is this very lakṣana which is spoken of as vakrokti by Bhāmaha in his Kavyalankāra and is represented to be the most essential element of all poetic embellishments, which according to him, differentiate poetic expression from the ordinary". — Comparative Aesthetics, vol. I, p. 399. But this view is only a hypothesis.
There is a controversy among scholars whether दुर्गा accepts or rejects स्वभावरूप्त as an अलंकार. We will deal with स्वभावरूप्त and चालावदेक्ष अलंकार later on in section II and III of this Chapter.

अलंकार are the beautifying factor of poetry and they are infinite in number. So according to Dandin, whatever beautifies poetry is called अलंकार. It is the very nature of अलंकार, one and all, to infuse रेण or beauty into a subject, which is an important aspect of अर्थ to be free from vulgarity.

"काम्यं श्लोक्यस्य ध्यायते निविद्यात्
तथा अध्यायं तेनमं च नार निरुति भूयसा।"
(I, 62).

The word 'रेण' is loosely used here and not in a technical way. रेण is in the poetic अर्थ and this अर्थ is decorated by these अलंकार. All the अलंकार are meant to help this अर्थ which is अर्थमय.

Dandin modestly observes that the principle underlying the development of all the अलंकार is stated by the earlier rhetoricians, but his is the attempt to make them more intelligible.

5. "काव्यांशोऽभावान्तर्घनानिलव्य अर्थन्यप्रकटतों"

--- कृष्णदास 'e, II, 2.
He considers _svabhāvokti_ important calling it, 'ādyā _sā alankṛtī_. He divides the whole range of literature into _vakrokti_ and _svabhāvokti_. Poetry must contain, in other words, either imaginative _vastu-varnamā_ or _svabhāva-varnamā_.

The latter is simple and sweet, and at the same time fierce from _ātisāya_ (exaggeration); _vastu-varnamā_ is because of striking expression weak or purring; and exaggeration adds charm to it. Though _ātisāya_ is exaggerating all the _alakāras_, _vakrokti_ in particular becomes very charming by the use of _stile_ and exaggeration, is preserved best in the _vakrokti-vānmaṇa_. Dandin is thus aware that _svabhāva-varnamā_ or _vastu-varnamā_ occupies a doubly important place a _vakrokti_ in poetry.

Dandin divides alankāras into _śabdālakāras_ and _arthālakāras_. He deals with only two _śabdālakāras_ namely, _yanaka_ and _citra_. Like Bhartṛi, he deals with

---

6. According to the 'Rasa-vibhāga' of _Prabhakara-bhaṭṭa_, _ātisāya_ is the life of all the _alakāras_. He shows _ātisāya_ and _kāvya-lālaka_ even in _Gandharva-bhaṭṭa's_ example of _rasa-dhvani_ i.e. 'चुम्बितमाल योग्यति' --- (Ghāni-vālaka, 1', _vṛtti_ on kārīka 5').
Yamaka, popularizing art, gives many varieties of it. He devotes the whole second chapter to explain many artinalankaras. Like Bharata, he does not reject heti, suksra and lees as alankaras but he gives them a higher place saying that they are the best ornaments of poetic language.

"हेतु नृसिध्धे धुन्त च वाचानुवाचहुश्चनम्"

(C 11, 235)

Yamana places alankara very high. He clearly states, that it is a synonym for 'saundarya' i.e. beauty. And because of this beauty, poetry becomes charming and different from shastra and lokavarta.

"अक्षर् गाथमवस्त्यकाराय रूपांमित्रकृतम्"

By indication poetry is called only sahdartha, but sadartha includes all the factors of beauty in poetry like alankara,guna, etc.

For Yamana alankara is the principle of beauty in poetry, Dandin also considers alankara very important dividing the whole venmava into two rods i.e. expression, but Yamana's view is broader than that of Dandia. For Dandia alankara is sadhakha but Yamana calls it saundarya itself. The general meaning of
alankāra is beauty and upamādi alankāras are its particular details. These particular alankāras are extraordinary attributes of poetry which can be called s'obhā-dharmas.7 These particular alankāras are anitya and external and not nitya and internal like guṇas. Guṇas are the intrinsic attributes of aesthetic beauty. Vāmana is partial to the guṇas. For him poetry without excel­lences is like a beautiful, young, but barren, lady. Hence guṇas are an essential factor and alankāras are additional factor of beauty in poetry.8 Vāmana also is right, because a critic can distinguish guṇas and alankāras.

Vāmana deals with two s'abdalankāras, yamaka and aruprāsa, in a clear and systematic way. Among the arthālankāras, he deals with upamā in detail saying that, upamā is the underlying base for all the arthālankāras.

"अख्तिहिंदकाराणां मूलं सापेक्षिते तेन विचारिते।"

(4 2 1)

7. Rudrabhatta also calls alankāras as s'obhāḥatras.
8. For fuller implications of the concept of guṇas vis-à-vis alankāras, see chapter III where Anandavardhanas's and Kuntaka's treatment of guṇas and riti is discussed fully.
For the first time Vāmana shows that a big group of alankāras is based on upamya, and the same reason may be given to explain why Bharata explained only three arthālankāras and one s'abālankāra based on upamya. He might have included (remaining all the alankāras in these four alahkaras defined by him. Following Vāmana, that all alankāras are based on upamya (or sāīya), the later rhetoricians divided arthālankāras as based on upamya and yvatiṣeka. So the number of alankāras are on increasing and as Banar says alakāras are infinite. Bharata, the father of the alankāra tradition does not know atis'iva. Bhāmaha is the first to give atis'ivā the highest importance as underlying even the alankāras like upamā. Thus there are clearly two distinct traditions regarding the fundamental nature of the creative activity admitted as alankāras, whether it is atis'iva or upamā.

If we think that the poet provides an image and thus achieves beauty, the principle will be upamā. If we believe that the poet invents something by his fancy, we have the principle of atis'iva. Like upamā, accepted as a pramāna by all Āryanas, upamā also is entitled to claim the same place as that of a pramāna.
In fact Tarkikas do accept upamāṇa as a prarāṇa, though they restricted it to verifiable arguments. In poetry the poetic or beautiful upamāṇa is the nearest approximation to the sāstraic upamāṇa-pramāṇa and hence the preference of Vaiṣṇava, as mainly a sāstrakāra, for the principle of upamāṇa rather than atis'avya. But if the considerations of sāstra are given less importance in literary judgment, which is partly impressionistic, the emphasis has to shift from upamāṇa to atis'avya and that is actually happens in the treatment of both Anandavardhana and Kuntaka. They prefer Bhāskara's tradition to that of Vaiṣṇava.

Udbhāta does not divide alankāras into abādālankāras and arthālankāras, but he gives six groups or vargas of alankāras. Among the alankāras defined by him, four are abādālankāras, viz. punaruktavādabhāṣa, chhekananraga, anunprasā and lātānuprāsa. All the rest are arthālankāras. Among the four abādālankāras, three are anuprāsabhedas and the fourth also is based on repetition of words. Udbhāta gives much importance to alliteration. The whole concept of kāvavyṛti is developed in Udbhāta on the basis on anuprāsa. Anuprāsa is threefold and these three varieties, called vṛttas.
are based on the arrangement of the repeating syllables according to rasas. The three kāvyavṛttis are, parusā, upā-nāgarikā and grāmā. Parusā vṛtta is the arrangement of harsh syllables like 'ra' and 'śa' etc. which is preferred for the rasas like raunra and vīra. Upānāgarikā-vṛtta means the repetition of soft syllables, mostly the amnāsikas and the syllables like 'ga' 'da' etc. This vṛtta is compared with a cultured lady, kare is named as upānāgarikā. This vṛtta is helpful to the mechanism of delicate rasas like cīrānāra (of both types) and kārma etc. Grāmā or komāla vṛtta is the arrangement of very soft syllables. The frequent of 'lakāra' is seen in this vṛtta. This vṛtta also is useful for delicate rasas. Bābhata's concept of kāvyavṛttis is somewhat similar to Vāmana's concept of riti.

Among arthālāṅkāras, Bābhata gives importance to s'lesa. His is a new kind of enquiry, as he is not satisfied either with atis'ava of Phāma or upāna of Vāmana as the adequate principle of alāṅkāra. According to him s'lesa is the principle underlying all the alāṅkāras because it reveals the inner beauty of alāṅkāras. He takes these are from Dandān and shows in detail how s'lesa is the principal alāṅkāra when it
comes in union with any other alankāra. S'lesa is taken by Udbhata almost as the very secret of the poetic language. If stīlysya relates to the imagination of the poet, and if upamā relates to the creative expression of images, s'lesa broadly refers to the special linguistic invention of a poet.

Jdbhata ridicules the distinction between gunas and alankāras and says,

"संवाचनसुत्त्वः शौचिर्वितः, सम्बन्धसुत्त्वः वृद्धिदायः, मत्यकृतः गुणाद्वैकारणा भैरवः। ओऽस्मात्सङ्गीताः
सुसामुप्सौमादानीः योगाधिशा समवाचनसुत्त्वः स्यालितीति शून्य्कपापायाङ्गेऽथाय स्वतः॥

Guna and alankāra both are the beautifying factors of poetry; one of them, i.e. guna is intrinsic and inseparable while the other, i.e. alankāra is external and separable. But both of them are found together in poetry and both are meant to achieve aesthetic beauty, according to Udbhata. So there is no real distinction between gunas and alankāras. Guna and alankāras both are inseparable in the creative activity of the poet, hence they cannot be distinct. That is why Udbhata is right in saying that
they are inseparable.

Rudrata for the first time restricts the scope of vakrokti which was explained by Bhunaka as the underlying principle of all the alankaras. Vakrokti is a mere s'abdâlankâra for Rudrata. The field of s'leSa is widened by Dandin, who says it is present in all the alankaras: particularly vakrokti cannot be effected without s'leSa. Rudrata admits s'leSa as both s'abdâlankâra and arthâlankâra. He gives five s'abdâlankâras in all, viz. vakrokti, amuprâsa, varaka, s'leSa and citra. He deals in detail with citra showing several kinds of s'abdâcrocaSa in verse. He gives many yamakaprabhâyas saying that a poet should make use of yamaka with propriety and usually it should be used in epics.

"मुलीणलक्षमणे भुमार्गसाराभिधानम्

लदनु विस्तार्नीयं सर्वसिद्धं भूलो || 331||

(Kavyâlankâra, III, 55, cd).

This is borne by the fact that in mahakâvyas there is scope for the play of words in the descriptions of

9. Kammata criticises both Udbhata and Varama in the 8th chapter of his Kavyaprákâsa. He asks whether poetry contains all the punas or only a few of them? If it contains all the punas, how can sâudi and pâncâli riti be called as kavyâtna?
subjects like seasons, mountains, nature, etc. The sentiment does not suffer a damage if यान्त्रिक is used in these descriptions, but in other कव्यप्राचेश्वर like लक्ष्मीकाव्य, which is full of one particular रस, mostly सिन्धु, the रस does suffer by the use of यान्त्रिक. If रामायण is aware of this and says that the रामायण should be used with अन्तर्यात्म.

"सूति यमकम्बरोजं कम्बलोख्यस्ति।
धूर्तशिखरीशिखरीश्चयूः प्रणीतिविद्यि।"
(III, 59, ab).

Rudrata's division of सङ्ग्रह also is peculiar. He gives पदसङ्ग्रह, लिंगसङ्ग्रह, प्रकृतिसङ्ग्रह, प्रत्यवेसङ्ग्रह, सङ्ग्रह, वधार्थसङ्ग्रह, वाक्यसङ्ग्रह, भास्करसङ्ग्रह, etc. Thus सङ्ग्रह is given more importance as a सङ्ग्रहलक्षण than an अर्थलक्षण, showing the beauty of सङ्ग्रह in पद, प्रत्यवेस, वधार्थ, etc. Rudrata is showing in rare a link for a grammatical basis of classifying even the poetic shades of expression.

Rudrata brings all the अर्थलक्षणों under four heads, viz. (i) वाप्राय; (ii) सुप्राय, (iii) श्रीजय; and (iv) सङ्ग्रह. In वाप्राय group the अलक्षणों like जाति, i.e. स्वभावको, स्वको, स्वसी, स्वप्रस, विध्व, वस्तिसंक्षेप, दिपाक, वतीके, etc., are include.
In **rupayya** are included the alankāras based on sūdmya like upamā, utpreka, apahruji, rūpaka, samāsokti, arthāntaranāsa, etc. The atis'aya group contains alankāras like vis'esotpreka, vibhāvanā, etc. And the s'lesavarga contains vakrokti, vyājokti, virodihāsa, etc. which are based on punning.

**Vāhana** includes all arthālankāras in supārya group but **Dvāratā** divides them into four groups. Though at first sight Dvāratā appears to have gone a step ahead than his predecessors in dividing all alankāras under four heads, the fact remains that he was not a philosophical thinker. He did not add anything new as a general principle, but on the other hand he unquestionably gave an equal place to all the varied conclusions of the preceding writers. **Svabhāvokti and vakrokti** (or atis'aya) are self-contradictory principles as Phāmaka knew and Dvārak tried to explain in a different way. Upamā and atis'aya cannot both be accepted as separate principles because the essence of both ultimately is the creative novelty and beauty added by the poet to the subject as he finds in life or source-material. As far as s'lesa is concerned, it is more of a linguistic device than a principle admitting of
any logic. Rudrata thus cannot be of much help in throwing light on the general nature of alankāras.

Rudrata's commentator, Naśisādhu distinguishes alankāra from the alankārāva.

Thus the original śabdā is alankārya and a poetic turn given to it is alankāra according to Naśisādhu.

Rudrata's bhāvālankāra is novel and noteworthy. He gives two types of bhāvālankāra: one of them includes Anandavardhana's guṇibhūtavyangavakārya and another his vastudāvanī. The bhāva of a speaker is suggested in this alankāra. His examples of parikāra and samāsekti also contain some suggestion. So Rudrata is aware of vastudhāvanī which is vidhi-pratisedhātmaka but he includes it in alankāra called bhāva. 10

In Anandavardhana we find the threefold treatment of alankāras, viz.

---

10. Here the word bhāva appears to mean abhiprāya or the speaker's hidden intention and is not the same as bhāva which results in rasa.
1) Alankāras as the ornaments like kataka.

2) Striking vācvalankāras possessing vācya which is subordinate to vācya, making it gurūnta-yangvakārva.

3) Alankāravant where the beauty lies not in the suggested alankāra rather than in the other expressed alankāras.

Āravadvardhana docs not deal with upavāśa alankāras exhaustively saying that they are well known and already explained in detail by the earlier rhetoricians. It relates all the poetic concepts to rasa which is helped and enhanced by these poetic concepts. The alankāras also are used with rasaucitya but they are external attributes of poetry, like the ornaments kacchāla to body, which can be abandoned easily. The purpose of alankāra is to beautify alankāra, i.e. rasa.

Abhinavagupta in Locana shows that alankāra is different from alankāra and not the same as is admitted by all. In life also the body to be beautified is different from the ornaments which decorate it.

Abhinavagupta raises the *alankāras* above the level of external ornaments like kataka and says it is essential decoration like *kumkuma* to a lady. But there must be *aucitya* in the use of *alankāras*. Impropriety of *alankāras* spoils poetry and becomes laughable as the ornamental body of a sage.

According to Ācāryavardhana the *śabdālankāras* like *amprāsa* should not be used either in *sambhoga-s'ringāra* or in *vipralambha-s'ringāra*. S'ringāra is a very delicate sentiment and it is marred by *amprāsa*. Only *arthālankāras* which come automatically while dealing with s'ringāra, are acceptable. To use *yasaka* in s'ringāra-rasadhvapā, though a poet is quite capable of using *yasaka*, is a big flaw, particularly in *vipralambha-s'ringāra*. Dvani theory accepts *alankāras* for which no separate effort is needed and for a gifted poet they come in competition. The *alankāras* must always help *rasa* as in, —

"अलक्षणार्थस्मृतं भीष्मो वेदेन्तस्मृतो वेदोऽक्षुर-महाधर्मः।
प्रत्यक्षो ज्ञातस्य स्यद्य भवेदेन्तस्य तत्स्य स्मृतिः।
इत्यतः वेदान्तवर्गः स्यद्य नाथक्षुरस्य महाधर्मः।
(Śrāvakāla, I, 25)"

(Śākuntalā, I, 25)"
The bhramara-svabhāvokti and the vyaṭīrka alankāra are helping s'rajñāra rasa, suggesting Dusyanta's desire to kiss S'akuntalā. As the human body is, at times, decorated with the ornaments while at others it is bereft of alankāras; in the same way in poetry also at a proper place a poet must make use of figures of speech as subordinate to rasa helping it. And these alankāras should not in any way come in way of the main rasa. In one of the examples quoted by Ānandavardhana, a rūpaka is used in the first line. The poet would have continued it for the whole stanza but it would have spoiled the s'rajñāra rasa. So Ānandavardhana stresses the point of 'kāle ca evamanyāvakau' of the alankāras, and their being subordinate to the main rasa. 13

Ānandavardhana treats all the poetic concepts in relation with rasa and the concept of alankāra is not an exception to his treatment. Rasa alone is of primary

importance in poetry and all other concepts like सुन्दर सलाकार are subordinate to this main अर्थ in poetry making it more charming. In the division of ध्वनि, प्रत्येक ध्वनि gets the highest position.

Anandavardhana is aware together with the importance of रस also of the beauty of the अर्थालंकार like समासोक्ति, अक्षेत्र, व्यावस्थतूति, स्प्रस्तुताप्रसादाम्य, etc.; in which some suggested sense is involved. But the suggested sense here is not of primary importance because the beauty of व्रतालंकार is more striking than the suggested element.

रूपादेशाय विलोकनचरणम्
तथा सुक्तीं शास्त्रीय निशामुखम्
यथा समस्तं निशाकुप तथा
पुनःर्पय रागाद्ग्रहीत्य न वशितम्यः
(Dhv Vol I, p 201)

It is a beautiful Nature-description. The action of lovers is superimposed on the Night and the Moon, and the व्याप्तिकारिभवस of स्रत्चार रसा like लालितानुसार are described. No doubt, there is स्रत्चार रसा but it is not प्रधाना. The superimposition of the human activities, i.e. नायक-नायिक-व्यवहार on Nature objects, i.e. the figure of speech namely, समासोक्ति is more striking here. Therefore it is called गुनिकुत्तवयांग्रे-
kāvya. In dhvani kāvya, vastu, alankāra or rasa must be 
pradhāna and the vācya (abhidhā) must be subordinate to 
these suggested vastu, alankāra or rasa. In supabhūta-
vyan̄ga, the vācya alankāra is pradhāna and more striking 
and the suggested vastu or rasa is apradhāna (subordinate).

It is a beautiful example of ākṣepālankāra. The evening 
Twilight and the Day are the hero and the heroine in love. 
The beloved Sandhva is waiting eagerly with arms stretched 
close to her but as the Fate would have it, they are never 
united and hence the ākṣepālankāra which is more striking 
than the suggested vīpralambha-s'rangārā rasa or-real 
pāyakanāvikā-vyavahāra. 14 Similar is the case with other 
striking alankāras having some suggested sense.

Even if the vācyārtha is more striking than vyaśava-
vastu it is supabhūtavyan̄ga kāvya, i.e. poetry of sec-
dary importance, as in,—

14. According to Abhinavagupta it is not ākṣepālankāra 
but samasakti. He says, according to Vāmana Tris 
is ākṣepa but according to Bhāmaha it is samasakti, 
and Abhinavagupta agrees with Bhāmaha.
The *vastu*, that the lover entered the garden according to their *sanketa*, is suggested; but the *vāc-vārttaka* that, hearing the notes of the frightened flying birds, the limbs of the lady working in her house are thrilled, is more striking. Though Anandavardhana calls it *vibhūtasyayyakāvya* or poetry of second rate, he admits that it is equally good as *dhvanikāvya*. Several good stanzas in the famous works of the great poets are of this type.

Thus Anandavardhana is aware of the striking beauty of *alankāras*. He gives the highest place to *alankāra* in his *alankāradhvani*. When an *alankāra* is suggested by the power of word (*śabdāśakti-udbhava*) or by the power of sense (*arthaśakti-udbhava*), it is called *alankāradhvani*. The ordinary figures of speech like *upamā*, *rūpaka*, etc., become very important to be called *dhvanikāvya* when they are suggested and not expressed.

Anandavardhana's division of poetry into *uttama*, *madhyama* and *adhaśa* is dependent on the *prādhānyā* and *aprādhānyā* or *sphutatva* or *asphutatva* of *vyākṣya*.

In the stanza,—
there is a pun in the word 'jalaras'ā' to mean 'jalaras'ā'ī', a heap of dullness. But this vācālankāra is not suggestive of rūpakadhyāni, which suggests the beautiful, moon-like face of a lady. This rūme of mukhacandra is suggested by the expressed meaning; so the rūpakadhyāni is artham- s'akti-udbhava here. Similar is the case with other suggested alankāras like upamā, vyatireka, etc. illustrated by Ānandavardhana. 15

Ānandavardhana makes it clear that though the alankāras like dipaka suggest upamā by st'ābdas'akti or anuvyavaya, they cannot come under alankāradhyāni. The suggested alankāra is not beautiful and pradhāna in such alankāras, while vācālankāras themselves are beautiful.

Thus Ānandavardhana's treatment of alankāras is very broad. He wants to do justice to the alankāras which are really beautiful. Their beauty is revealed by the earlier rhetoricians. Ānandavardhana respects earlier scholars.

15. Dhvanīaloka, vṛtti on II, 27.
admitting the hidden beauty (prativāmūna) of alankāras like samāsokti, vyājasūti, etc.; but calls it the second-rate poetry because of the subordination of suggestion and strikingness of expression. If Anandavardhana would not have given the classification of sūnitbhūtavānava-kāvya, which he admits as equally good poetry as dhvani-kāvya, and alankārādhyāvani, a vast portion of good poetry would have been left from his theory; and his dhvani theory would have been applicable to only a small portion of poetry. If alankāras are used only for fascination, poetry is classified as lower (adhama) and alankāras get a very ordinary position like kātakādi.

It is a critic who judges a poem as first-rate, or the second-rate, or the third-rate; but before judging, he, like a true sāhradava, identifies himself with the poet and tries to understand the poet's vyākṣa or the main purpose of the poem. If the alankāras are overlaboured, the critic may admire the poet's skill as an artist but at the same time condemns the composer as the second-rate or the third-rate because his heart is not moved by it, while reading it. It is a case of alankāras used for their own sake and not for the development of rasa. In Sanskrit court poetry the cultivation of
alankāras, for their own sake, irrespective of their assistance to rasa, had become such a fad that Anandavardhana sounded a timely warning. But the truth remains that while rasa is felt to be the delight of an emotion, alankāra may sometimes be a merely worked-up artifice. A critic, one is not a rasika, may wrongly admire alankāras for their own sake; but a real rasika, worthy of that function, will distinguish between alankāras which contribute to rasa and consequently deserve admiration, and alankāras which do not add to rasa and consequently deserve condemnation. This is a very important distinction, very well underlined by Anandavardhana for the first time.

Abhinavagupta supports Anandavardhana. Though the earlier rhetoricians, like Udbhata, were aware of the beauty of suggested alankāras, they treated them as vācyālankāras and not as vyanālankāras. They were interested only in the treatment of alankāras while Anandavardhana's motive is to re-establish all these concepts of beauty in the light of rasa, which is suggested. Anandavardhana admits the countless number of alankāras and Abhinavagupta gives the reason.

"अलंकारणामनल्व प्रतिभानन्तरातः"
So Abhinavagupta is aware of the fact that the good alankāras depend on kāvīpratībhā after all.

Kuntaka has revived the old tradition of alankāra, headed by Bhāmaha. For Bhāmaha, vakrokti was the principle underlying all the alankāras. For kuntaka, vakrokti is the very life of poetry and the only artistic way of expression, embellishing poetic word and sense.

\[ उभावतावलयकार्यः तया पुनरावर्जनः \]
\[ अटलोपितरैकं वेदवर्षस्वरूपमाणीभाविनतिकृत्यादिति \]

(C V J I, 10)

The term alankāra refers primarily to the ornaments like kātaka because they enhance the beauty of the limbs, similarly by upacāra or secondary usage of a word, it refers to the figures of speech like utpākā and the poetic excellences, because they are beautifying elements of poetry. The name of kuntaka's book also was 'alankāra' as it discusses the beauty of poetry.¹⁶

Kuntaka's real opinion is that there is no distinction between alankārya and alankāra. They are separately discussed to reveal clearly the nature of poetic embellishments. There is no poetry without alankāra. Only sāule

¹⁶. Vakroktijīvita, vṛtti on I, 2.
and artha do not constitute poetry, but the śabda and the artha, embellished by the alankāras, constitute poetry. Hence the alankāras are appendages to poetry, rather they are its essential elements. Therefore śabda and artha together with vakrokti make beautiful poetry which can be enjoyed and appreciated by sahrdavas.

The alankāra is vastu and this vastu also must be equally beautiful, or else it shows the weakness in the poetic imagination. Kuntaka illustrates the example:

"भण नमसी भणमन्दिरानन्दस्निर्स्वरेणाकुले।
यदि अलीलोक्फङ्गिठि मन्दिसता तालि तन्द्रेष्य मेल।"

(C V J 18)

to show the unattractive vastu possessing mere jingling of syllables. According to Kuntaka, both alankāra and alakāra must be beautiful to constitute good poetry.

Vastu and Rasa are always alankāra and can never become alankāra, according to Kuntaka, therefore he rejects svabhāvokti and rasavadādi alankāras as alankāra and argues that they are alankāra. He will discuss the problem of svabhāvokti and rasavadādi alankāras later on in this chapter.

Kuntaka includes all alankāras under his tākyavakrama—

"नाच्यास्व वशुवशावली भिग्दात या, महानाथः।
सत्तास्तकारंगों सर्वं सर्वं वनस्पतिशालिन।"

(C V J 20)
The alankāras are found in a stanza or in a line. There are innumerable ways of expression and the expressions differ from poet to poet depending on the poet's power of imagination. This strikingness and novelty in expression comes by the use of alankāra. The theme (vastu), though often described by poets, becomes new and extraordinarily beautiful just by a touch of strikingness. The alankāras like aprastutapras'amsā, vyājastuti, paryāyokta etc. suggest some other vastu. In the vicitramārga such alankāras are necessary, which show the power of imagination and scholarship of the poet. The alankāras are used in chain in the vicitramārga. These alankāras, by their own beauty, reveal and enhance the beauty of alankārya.

"अत्र तदवदवल्लकाऋऽवलिमान्वितयान्नेत्यम्।
स्वाभाविकत्वान्तः स्थमलवद्कार्ये अवकाश तेऽति।"

(V.J.I, 37)

Thus according to Kuntaka alankāras are dependent on kavipratibha. Without the power of imagination, there is no striking alankāra, hence he says,—

"मयाप्रि दस्तवचावत्वकाराणाः सर्वेषा विविधाश्चात्
मेवच आयुः प्रलयः अत्याचारस्य विशेषस्तत्त्वस्तः
नूतनेन विना वर्णनातिरिक्तवस्तुनां भूषणामिषयः।"
If a gifted poet is inspired, his expressions will be more striking by the use of many alankāras. The use of alankāras shows the creative power of a poet and since the creative power is endless, the alankāras also are endless. The alankāras, for Kuntaka, are not just like katakādi or external decorations of s'abdārtha but they reveal intrinsic beauty of alankāra by their own beauty.

Unlike Anandavardhana, Kuntaka gives a higher place to alankāras in poetry, so much so as to say that, there is no poetry without alankāra. Anandavardhana gives a higher place to dhvanikāvya as compared to supībhūtavangvakāvya and a low place to citrakāvya. Though he admits that supībhūtavangvakāvya is beautiful, his preference is for the dhvanikāvya only. So according to him, poetic activity is at least productive of different categories of poetry, as it were, categories which are qualitatively higher and lower. This is exactly what Kuntaka is not prepared to accept. He cannot understand
how poetry-qua-poetry can be high or low. He can only admit that there is poetry or no poetry. When poetry is present, whatever the means responsible for that impression—such means are numerous indeed—one should give an equal importance to each manifestation thereof. Poets by nature or temperament are bound to write differently. There can thus be only kavimārgabhedas but there cannot be kāvyaabhedas. In this conclusion Kuntaka shows a very modern outlook and a clear grasp of literary criticism.

In Kuntaka's opinion, the parvāya in parvāvartārata becomes more striking by the use of alankāras. In,

```
"सत्तमस्य जो समानस्य कौ शुद्धमाणाः
नवं कही ननु भवेत् ख्यातिस्य पात्तम्या
इत्यागतं सत्ताति यो निल्लमुनमाथा
तवतु प्रकर्षितं परमुच्चतेऽसः"
```

the word 'mātanga' here is more striking; it conveys two meanings through the pun. On the one hand it refers to an elephant and on the other to a chāndāla. There is a shade of rūpakālankāra as the cāndalatva is superimposed on an elephant. So the parvāya word 'mātanga', which gives both sīlpa and rūpaka is the only fit word used here for an elephant. In all the varieties of vakrata, alankāras are necessary because there cannot be any beauty
or strikingness in poetry without alankaras

Following Bhāmaha, Kuntaka defines and illustrates dīpaka alankāra and, like Udbhata, remarks that dīpaka is called alankāra due to the suggested upāsā hidden in dīpaka; and a mere common verb illuminating many actions in a stanza cannot be called dīpaka.

In the third chapter of the Yakrokti-jīvite, Kuntaka defines and illustrates the alankāras like dīpaka, rūpaka, aprastutapras'amsā etc. In the treatment of these alankāras he follows the earlier rhetoricians, particularly Bhāmaha. Kuntaka's approach to literary criticism is more practical and not much theoretical, while Anandavardhana's approach is more theoretical and less practical. Anandavardhana is a philosopher to bring all the concepts under rasa, which primarily is the soul of poetry, and according to his theory alankāras should be used with rasa-acitya. 

Rasa is very important in poetry, without which there is no kavya and all other concepts including alankāra are subordinate to this rasa. Alankāras are external factors of poetry and not internal, so they do not get a very high position in Anandavardhana's theory. In Kuntaka's
theory, alankāras are very important and they get the highest position. Kuntaka illustrates many examples to show the beauty of alankāras, which reveal the beauty of alankāraya, making it more charming and adding their own beauty to it.

Kuntaka's practical criticism of poetry is more helpful for poets who are beginners. His way of displaying the beauty of alankāras as different from alankāraya—though in practice they cannot be distinguished theoretically, they are distinguished in order to show their nature—is just like a lesson given to a student in a very agreeable way to captivate the hearts of the readers. Though Kuntaka's theory, as a practical criticism, is more useful as kāvyaśāstra, it is neglected by later rhetoricians; and the school of Dhvani/ become more popular as it was followed by all later rhetoricians like Mammata, Ravyaka, Vidyānātha, etc., who consider alankāras as external means of decoration as katakādi are to the human body.

Mammata says that there is no kāvyāśāstra if there is no sphutālankāra. He accepts the necessity of eshuśa—alankāra in poetic expression. In actual practice, however, he has given great deal of space and shown great admiration
for the alankāras, in the ninth and the tenth chapters of his Kāvyanānattar's. This is true also of all later textbook writers like, Vidyanātha, Visvanātha and Jagarnātha. Ruyyaka devoted a whole work, Alankāresvara, to a systematic treatment of alankāras, though he was second to none in his regards for the dhvani theory. Ruyyaka, following Vāmana, gives importance to upama as the root of many alankāras based on similarity (sādṛśya) and says,—

"उपमेयः च प्रकारसार्वत्र सार्वानालकार्याः।
मूलातिम् प्रशमं निर्दिष्टः।"
(p 56, vāta on I. 11)

Ruyyaka’s commentator, Vidvācakra-vālin, illustrates all the alankāras based on sādṛśya with the remark that, all the alankāras help rasa directly or indirectly

"इति यावनदेवकारकोऽविवेचनाय विवेचनायतु। (वेदोऽलोकं)
स सर्वकष्टान्तः तस्मात नाति प्रत्यासिनं पञ्चारितेऽपः
पुनरादिवतातीताः।"
(Samājivāni, p 45)

Hammata characterises stābdalankāras and arthālankāras by the principle of anuvaya and vṛttiścena; while Ruyyaka’s characterisation is based on āśeśvāśavābhāva. Jagarathā explains Ruyyaka as—

"ननु युगलदृष्टिविवेचनाय वेदोऽलोकं विवेचनायतु।
सहस्यं कायिदर्शकं कायिदर्शकं कायिदर्शकं योक्ते
उत्तरं पुनर्वापि नाति प्रत्यासिनं न वाचाक्र्याः।"
Alankāra is strilingness (or vehicle). If it is found in s'abda, it is s'abdalankāra; and if it is found in artha, it is arthālankāra. Alankāra is not outside s'abda and artha but exists with s'abda and artha. Ornaments like kāraka and kundala can exist without the hand or the ear, but poetic embellishments cannot have separate existence apart from s'abda and artha.

Gokulanātha, a commentator of Mammata, says in his commentary, 'Vivarana' that, every arthālankāra contains vastudhvani.

"त न क वसुद्धानांनेयपरिष्कारं गुप्तसारं दिखावनं भोजनं
मैत्रिवं गवयं उत्तहारिकां तथाल्लगमम्
" (P 23, Satyasvati Bhavan Gour Chandra)

So all the arthālankāras are suggestive of some vēsa, and this is the distinguishing mark between the bare statement 'Cauh iva savayak', and an embellished poetic expression. Suggestion and caṇḍalankāras, i.e. the alankāra and the alankāra must go hand in hand as the soul and the body do.
A suggestive statement, bereft of gunas and alankāras like 'Gauh vāhikāh', cannot be called poetry. Nālika-candra in his commentary 'Sanketa' or the Kavyavāsa's says,

"यथास्तमिना अवभूतवेना अपातं शरीरमें आकष-पदिति अयपरिश्वेत न उत्तमि तथा ब्याह्नेनायसेने गुप्ताद्वारस्यारुपयत्तक्ष्यविव आपाति कव्यामार्थे-अयपदेश्यो न निगुणिष्ठाकर्तारे। तैन अवधिनिक-भुयाओऽ सहजभवेषः न काव्यता।"

Bhoja's treatment of alankāras is peculiar. He classifies alankāras into three groups; viz --

1) Alankāras belonging to s'abda, which he calls as bāhya or outer embellishments, and compares them with the actions like dressing, decorating, etc. These outer ornaments are like kātakādi.

2) Alankāras belonging to artha are inner or ābhyaṇtara like cleaning the teeth, cutting the nails, dressing the hair, etc., which are essential and more intimately related to the soul of poetry.

3) Alankāras belonging to both the s'abda and the artha, are bāhyābhyaṇtara like taking bath, applying kumkuma and sandal-paste, etc.
This comparison of alankāras with man's daily actions is novel in Sanskrit Poetics. In the Sarasvatīkāntabhāraṇa, he gives the ways of speech like jāli, satī, prahelikā, etc., as cābdalankāras. Bhoja includes gunas and rasas also under the category of alankāras, quoting Dandin that all the factors of beauty are called by the name alāṅkāra.

Jagannātha wants to justify the beauty of alankāras like sarasokti, so instead of dividing poetry into three classes he divides it in four categories. He calls Anandavardhana's sarībhūteyavāngavākāvya, uttama-kāvya, thus raising the status of alankāra. He further remarks that, because of its bad luck it gets a second rank though it is beautiful on account of the strikingness of alankāra in expression.

Some beautiful types of citrakāvya, where arthālankāras are beautifying the primary sense, are classified as madhyama-kāvya by Jagannātha, thus justifying the striking arthālankāras. All alankāras are striking and
this strikingness (camatkāra) in poetry, due to embellishments, is very important according to Jaganātha. He calls the fourth classification of poetry as low or adhara because it is the composition devoid of any beauty or strikingness. Only the crave for verbal puns and alliteration are seen in such compositions which are not worthy to be called poetry. Beautiful ideas devoid of *sanas and alankāras are not poetry according to Jaganātha. He criticizes Vāsanātha's definition of poetry. The word must convey beautiful sense, and the word conveying beautiful meaning must equally be striking and beautiful hence the necessity of *puna alankāras.

Thus the history of *alankāraśāstra reveals, how Vuntaka's thought had its direct or indirect influence in shaping the nature of Poetics itself. There is not a single book, besides the *dhvānyāloka, which exclusively treats of *dhaṇḍ. All the books that saw light of day after *śaṭhavardhāra and Vuntaka, accept the philosophical implications of *dhaṇḍ, as much as the practical method of Vuntaka. The two treatments are thus not contradictory but complementary of each other.

particularly arthālankāras pertain to kāvyas, in their own right and directly contribute to aesthetic delectation". — S.P. Bhattacaryya. 'Sasagānṝā - And its contribution to Poetics'. Journal of Indian Studies - Past And Present, Vol. V p. 154.
Svabhāvokti is a natural or graphic description of a thing (vastu-varnana). It is included in poetic embellishments because it is an imaginative description full of rasa, and not an ordinary vastu-varnana found in life or in science. The stanza, —

\[ सोऽपत्य कलिन्दः स्थूणाष्ट्यां भृगुनेन स । \\
शूरं मुस्कले प्रियेनापातनेन हुः सौमयम्। \]

though it describes the actions of a bull, cannot be said to illustrate the figure of speech svabhāvokti, due to the lack of charm in poetic imagination.

Bāna calls svabhāvokti by the term jāti and says that it should be devoid of vulgarity. The natural description is found in the works of great authors like Vallādaśa and Bāna, but it did not get prominent place in Sanskrit Poetics as an alankāra before Dandān. There is a controversy among the scholars on the problem whether Bhāskara accepts svabhāvokti as an alankāra or rejects it. Some scholars like Dr. Kane hold that Bhāskara rejects svabhāvokti as an alankāra as he rejects the alankāras, hetu,
sūksma and lesa because these do not contain vakrokti or strikingness. Dr. Raghavan is of opinion that though Bhāmaha emphasises vakrokti very much, he is aware of a beauty of natural description. This view seems to be acceptable since Bhāmaha neither completely rejects svabhāvokti nor does he accept it when he says,

"स्वभावाभिवर्द्धिय विधिक अपवश्यकता।"

(KA II, 93 ab)

The term 'kecut praśaksate' does not prove his non-acceptance of the same. He defines it as,

"अध्ययनाधिकारिणा विद्वाना विकृतिभिः, यथा।"

and illustrates,

"आश्चर्यशैक्षित बन्यनाधिकारिणा गा तारातिः देहेन दिप्न: सम्प्रायतावाच।"

According to Pandit Tatacarya Siromani, Bhatti calls svabhāvokti as vṛttā. He quotes the commentary - Javamangala giving the reading,

"तुल्यवद्यादिकं अवभ्यम्बमिना अवश्यपति।"

for Bhāmaha's text,

"तुल्यवद्यादिकं कि अवभ्यम्बमिना अवश्यपति।"

saying that Bhāmaha admits vṛttā or svabhāvokti as

---

1. 'Definition of Poetry or Kāvyā' - J.C.R. Mehta, vol III.

2. According to Dr. De Bhatti does not recognise - svabhāvokti. Javamangala's vṛttā is Mallinatha's vācayokti.
poetic embellishment. Tatacarya Sircsnam says that Idbhata and Kuntaka considered Bhārata as accepting svabhāvokti. Anyway, from the text of Bhārata, it is not very clear whether he accepts svabhāvokti as an alaṅkāra or just quotes the opinion of others who accept it. Dr. De remarks, —

"The reservation made with regard to svabhāvokti is not found in Bhāmaha. It cannot be said that, like Kuntaka, Bhāmaha entirely rejects it or mentions it with the guarded remark "itī kṣit pracaṅkṣate". In so far as natural description involves strikingness of expression, it would be admissible, but Bhāmaha would not then consider it separately; it would be included in the scope of his vakrokti as figurative expression."

Among Sanskrit rhetoricians, Dandin, for the first time, discusses in detail the figure of speech svabhāvokti or jāti in his Nāyikādarsa’s. He divides the whole literature into two parts, namely, the natural description and the artistic or striking description. He calls svabhāvokti as the first embellishment of poetry. He divides the natural description into four categories, (1) description of a class (jāti), (2) of actions (kriyā), of qualities (puna) and (4) of things (ārava). This division of svabhāvokti made by Dandin is grammatical. Further he says that such descriptions predominate in sūtra and

are desired even in poetry. But the natural description found in s'āstra is not poetic svabhāvokti, it is just lokavārtā or s'āstravārtā.

Yāmana discusses only the group of arthālankāras which is based on upama (or similarity). He does not explain svabhāvokti but his definition of the guna arthāvākti is applicable to svabhāvokti slankāras. The definition is—

\[
\text{वसूल्यम्भावसूक्तः मर्यादिति} \quad (\text{K A S V 3 2 13})
\]

According to Udbhata, only a description of activities of the young ones of animals and so on is called the figure of speech svabhāvokti. He gives the illustration where the actions of a young one of a deer are vividly described.

\[
\text{क्षण नन्दगृहितम् शून्याभिस्कृतं शुचं गुनं जुमन्} \\
\text{मोहितस्य श्रावनस्यानि भृगुकिंचित्त} \quad (\text{K A S V 4 4 6})
\]

Thus he limits the scope of svabhāvokti only to the description of the activities of animals.

Hudrata calls svabhāvokti by the name jāti and discusses under the group of the slankāras based on vārtava.

4. Dr. Raghavan, in his article, 'The History of Svabhāvokti in Sanskrit Poetics', says, "He uses the word svabhāvokti or jāti loosely when he says, 's'āstravasyeva sāmrajyam', he refers here to vārtā only. Some concepts of the Alandaśāstra, p. 96"
He defines it as:—

"संस्थानावस्थानाक्षियाँ यथो साध्य आदेशा भवातीं
लोकस्वरूपिणं तत्क्रियानमन्नुष्ठा आतीं." ॥

(K A VIII, 30)

Descriptions of things as they are and descriptions of the activities of human beings or animals which are well known are called the \textit{alankara jati}. The activities of a child, or a young, innocent lady, or the sports of birds and animals, if described, bring more charm to poetry.

"सिद्धमुख्यवनोदितारपरिपूर्ण्यं भूतातिमां प्राप्तमां
सा भवानस्याधिकृत्यमुखयुज्य किरिक्यन्तृ रस्या" ॥

(VIII, 31)

He gives two examples, the former of which describes the activities of a child while the latter describes a newly wedded bride, who is very bashful at the time of love-sports. The stanza describing the bride is,—

"हस्ति शुचिरं गाढःस्मृतं यस्मुक्मायुजः
स्थायिति लथा यत्पारगिस्मा भूसं परिचुक्मने
यदविन्हुस्य, तथा निर्देश्य कृत्यान्तरयुज्यस्युम्
रम्यायितारं तैत्यावा भनो भीयिन्या ज्ञूत्॥

(VII, 33)

Thus, after Dandin, do we find the importance given to this figure of speech and its detail treatment is found only in \textit{Rudrata}. 5

\textit{Rudrata's} commentator, Nanisadu, calls \textit{jati} as the best \textit{alankara} in the \textit{vastava} group of \textit{alankaras}.

---

5. Rudrata's commentator, Namisadu, calls \textit{jati} as the best \textit{alankara} in the \textit{vastava} group of \textit{alankaras}. 
According to Anandavardhana, all the alankāras should help rasa. He illustrates a stanza from the Sākuntala:

र-मचापका दृष्टि श्लेष्मास्य जरुरते क्षेत्रस्माध्यायी च वलासि भुजु अन्तिप्रक्षरि।
भूति ोथापुनल्या, विशलि मलितसविनिमधर्मर्य तत्तथावेयानमधुरं इत्यात्त्वं रक्तं श्लेष्मा॥

This is a pure example of svabhāvokti. The activities of a bee, like humming and flying very close around the face, are described very beautifully. Anandavardhana comments on it that, here the description of a bee (bhramara-svabhāvokti) is a figure of speech conducive to apāragarasa.

Kuntaka's treatment of svabhāvokti as an alankāra is unique in the history of Sanskrit poetics. He criticizes the earlier rhetoricians who consider svabhāvokti to be an alankāra, and asks them if svabhāvokti be an alankāra, what else can be the alankāra? When there occurs an alankāra, there must necessarily be some corresponding alankāra also, and except vastuvarna or svabhāvavarna what else is to be decorated in poetry? A beautiful natural description cannot be an embellishment,

it is to be embellished by other alankāras. Those who term it as alankāra are weak-minded and shirk to think discriminately.

An opponent may argue with Kuntaka, 'you yourself have said, 'sālankārasya kāvyaśva' and alankāra cannot be differentiated from alankāra, and now you are changing your own words calling svabhāvokti as alankāra, different from alankāra'. Kuntaka's reply is, 'yes, it is true, but poetry is analysed so that it may be understood completely, part by part, as a sentence is divided into varna, rāga, etc. though they are not separate from the sentence'.

Kuntaka's argument is, there is nothing in the world which is bereft of svabhāva. Without svabhāva, a thing whether animate or inanimate, will be nirupākhya like a flower of the sky (khepuṇa) or the son of a barren woman (vandhyāputra). By natural description we get accurate knowledge of the things described by a poet. A varṇa cannot be imagined by readers if its svabhāva is not described, and its knowledge will be like the knowledge of the horns of a rabbit. Hence svabhāvas-kathana (or svabhāvokti) is not alankāra, but alankāra. If svabhāvokti is taken to be an alankāra, the words of a cart-driver also will be called embellished 'sālankāra' because of his natural way of speaking.'
seems to have mistaken the nature of svabhāvokti alankāra. He takes svabhāva-varna to mean just an ordinary description found in common speech, devoid of any poetic fancy or imagination. He asks further: 'If the body itself is a means of the decoration, what else can be the thing to be decorated? One cannot climb one’s own shoulder; the same thing cannot be the ornament and the thing to be ornamented, as karādi is different from kātakādi even in ordinary life. So alankāra and alankāra are not one and the same. Everywhere in poetry we find vastusvabhāva-varna, and if it is called alankāra, there is no scope for other artha-lankāra like upasā, and if at all they occur, it will be the case of either samārasti or saṃsāra. If the difference between svabhāvokti and other alankāras is clear, it will be samārasti of alankāra; and if the difference is not clear, it will be saṃskāra of alankāra. So only two alankāra, namely, samārasti and saṃskāra will remain in poetry; and to define all other alankāra will be useless as they will not have any scope.

Kunṭaka concludes his argument against svabhāvokti.

7. "This carūta and agrāmyatā are involved in the very conception of the svabhāvokti alankāra and hence, Kunṭaka’s fear that the cart-driver’s talk also will become svabhāvokti is unfounded". — Dr. V. Raghavan, ‘The History of svabhāvokti in Sanskrit Poetics’. Some Concepts of the Alankāradāstā. p. 93
as alankāra saying, it is a mere waste to discuss about the alankāratra of svabhāvakāli, since it is proved to be the alankāra. When a thing is imagined by a poet as fit for poetic description, its nature itself becomes a beautiful kāvyas'amīra which attracts the hearts of connoisseurs.

Such a kāvyas'amīra is to be decorated by charming figures of speech and therefore, Kuntaka says; —

"अथि वहदस्थायंहर्वकारास्वाभिवर्णनं सुन्दरः। (V J I. 9)

and, — "उभावतानवर्षकै यो॥ (V J I. 10)

But at the same time Kuntaka cautions that the excessive use of the figures of speech like uparasa, rūpaka, etc. spoils the delicacy of svabhāvakāraṇa or rasāng. So the use of alankāras should be made very carefully by the poets; and the craze for them kills the beauty of kāvya.

He gives a beautiful analogy that a lady should not wear many ornaments at the time of her bath, at the time of love-sports, separation from her lover and at the time of religious vows etc. Her natural grace, on such occasions, will be more charming due to her natural delicacy. To quote Kuntaka,—

"तथाविद्याय तस्य यथायामोचित्त्वानुसारं सुपना-

घलकायोजनया भवितवयं। पत्तावस्तु विसैः

यत स्वाभाविकमौद्याभावया निविन्दितस्य न

भूयस्या रुपकायवर्षकर्द पञ्चाश्य कुत्स्ते। वस्तु-

स्वाभाविकमौद्याभावयो स्वरुपादिपर्याप्तत्वं भा"
Thus Kuntaka reveals great boldness in going against the accepted tradition to form his new and unique theory of svabhāvakti as alankāra; and this he did with such vehemence in order to show that his idea of vakrokti was the better key to the soul of poetry than that of āvānī as explained by Ānandavardhana.

It is very interesting to note that while Kuntaka denies svabhāvakti as an alankāra, Mahāmādhava eloquently defends it as an alankāra. In the second chapter of his Vyākrtiviveka, he explains, why svabhāvakti is called an arthālankāra when strikingness is the principle of all the alankāras. A vastu can be described generally or particularly. When it is described particularly, its nature (or svabhāva) is well known, and a poet has to use his power of imagination to make the natural description charming and fanciful, which is not the same as found in the ordinary speech or scientific language. Thus arthāsvabhāva, which is called an alankāra, is completely
dependent on kshipratibbha. Yashabhatta illustrates the starza, 'Grivabhansabhirnman ---', from Kalidasas's S'akuntala to show svabhavvokti alankara found in the works of great gifted poets. It seems that, provis svabhavvokti as an arthalankara, Yasaabhatta wants to criticise the view of Kuntaka, who holds svabhavvokti as the alankara and not as an alankara.

Though Kuntaka also is equally a believer in the primacy of Pratibbha underlying all alankaras, there is this diametrically opposite stand between the two because to Kuntaka, there is no kavyarthi which is not pratibhaprabhavita. For another reason we might note his close similarity to the philosophy of invani amended in his own way into the concept of kavyamagra. If naturally beautiful artha alone is kavyarthi, then Kuntaka is right. On the other hand, if an artha in poetry remains to become transformed into beauty by the imagination of the poet, then Yashabhatta will be right in calling svabhavvokti as alankara. The operation of pratibbha occurs not only before the act of creation but continues even during the creation itself as attested by several artists. Such being the case, it is very difficult to decide between those two views.

All the later rhetoricians follow the old tradition
and define and illustrate svabhāvokti as an arthālankāra. Huyyaka defines it as,—

"भूमि सतन्त्रवाचस्य सम्बन्धाणि स्वाभाविकितः" (A S 78)

He makes clear that a more vastuvarkana is not called the figure of speech svabhāvokti. If it is the case, the whole kavya will be called alankāra because there is no poetry without vastuvarkana. So he uses the word 'sikāma' in his definition of svabhāvokti which means the minute description of a thing. This minuteness is perceived only by poets by their power of imagination, and hence such descriptions are called poetic embellishments.3

Following Huyyaka, Vidyāśākṛtya defines the alankāra as,—

"काहैसाधिकारायं सवाम्वक्तस्य सम्बन्धाणि
स्वाभाविकितः" (Sanjivānī - p 202)

It is important to note that, Huyyaka for the first time

3. Hemacandra seems to borrow his definition of svabhāvokti from Huyyaka when he says,—

"इव प्रति स्वभावविनिलालमान नामवरका। नास्ते अनुमानमन्युवायः
स्वायत्। चर्मन्यस्वासाधीः \\\\चाँचिकोऽन्ते अतंकस्य।
कृत्यभावावस्थाय च अतं इव लक्ष्यतितरस्य सवाम्वक्तस्य
उपहित अत्यधिकाराः"

Even Śāṅkucandra, a commentator of Yāmātā, borrows it from Huyyaka.
shows the difference between svabhāvokti and bhāva alankāra. When a laukika thing is described, it is called svabhāvokti; and when an alankāra thing is described, it is called the alankāra bhāvika. Similarly he shows the difference between svabhāvokti and rasāvat alankāra. Thus we will consider later on.

Bhoja's treatment of svabhāvokti is noteworthy. In the Sarasvatīkāntōbhārana he shows the difference between svabhāvokti alankāra and the arthavyakti punc of Tāvuna.

If different natural activities according to the citation are described, they are called jāti. Thus svabhāvokti describes only a particular mood or situation; while arthavyakti, which Vāmana defines as, —

"वस्तुव्ययमाला कृतज्ञयमाहितिः" (K A-3 V. 3 = 13)

describes vāstu generally. The general nature of a thing in arthavyakti is pertaining to any time and situation, but svabhāvokti describes the things particularly or not generally. In the Śrīnāraṇṇapakāśa he shows the difference between vakrokti, svabhāvokti and rasākti.
Thus if we glance into the history of svabhāvokti alāṅkāra in Sanskrit Poetics, we find that Kuntaka alone defends it as alankāra going against the old tradition. His treatment of svabhāvokti has become novel and unique in Sanskrit Literary Criticism. Kuntaka, thus, proved to be a real critic thinking for himself independently to form his own theory. The later rhetoricians, being influenced by Kuntaka, dare not go against the old tradition and thus Kuntaka's theory is neglected.

The problem arises, what is artha according to Kuntaka and Ānandavardhana? Is it positively alankāra or not? If both agree that artha is alankāra, what about arthasvabhāvārāmanīyata? Can it be the part of alankāra or the part of alankāra? Does arthasvabhāvārāmanīyata include rasa or exclude it according to Kuntaka? What exactly is the distinction between two? Is the distinction only this much that, vastu–svabhāva relates to inanimate things or animals etc., and human characters alone are repositories of rasa. What applies to vastu must be applicable also to rasa or vyanaya.

The fact is, whatever is alankāra must be dhvani according to Ānandavardhana. When vṛttin is prāthama, it is alankāra, so it is dhvani. Alankāra also is dhvani.
when it is alankāra according to the Brāhmaṇa-sūtra-sū-nyāya. Vesa is always dhvani because it is invariably alankāra (except in rasavai alankāra). It is a pity that Ānandavardhana has not even once said much about vasti-svabhāva. But vastusvabhāva, when it is not vyānaya, will not be alankāra. Will it yet be beautiful? After it may not be as in, 'Gorapatiyana--', but when it is, it can only be an alankāra.

Now, when Kuntaka removes this fundamental postulation of Ānandavardhana of vyānaya-prādhānya, the position completely changes. Every vastu as alankāra must have its svabhāva accompanying it. Hence there is no question of its ever being an alankāra.

Thus we are brought to the very centre of the issue of the question what the soul of poetry is. Is it dhvani or is it something else? Kuntaka certainly does not say it is dhvani. It is vakrokti that is the soul as understood by him. If vakrokti is the soul, it no doubt excludes the beauty of dhvani, but it will not entail the logical corollary that, whatever is vyānaya or dhvani, is always beautiful. Here is the big difference in the ratio and structure itself, on fundamentals which lead to all the details of different treatments of the two authors.
CHAPTER II

SECTION III

RASAVADADI ALANKARAS.

The five figures of speech, namely, rasavat, prevas, urjasvin, udatto and samahita, come under the group of rasavadadi alankaras, which are based on different states of emotions. Bhama is the first rhetorician who discusses all the five figures of speech. He includes Bharata's rasas and bhavas under this group of alankaras. Anandavardhana thinks the treatment inadequate and one that does injustice to the concept of rasa. So he changed the whole concept and restricted the application of the term rasavadadi alankaras to a very few examples, where in out of two or three rasas, all simultaneously getting a place in a poem, one being felt prominent and the others secondary. Such secondary rasas functionally could be called an alankara, namely rasavat. Bhama's rasavat, where rasas are prominently felt, Anandavardhana calls rasadhvani and gives the highest place to it in poetry. Bhama's prevas is Anandavardhana's rasavat. Anandavardhana thinks that the same consideration of puni-bhutatva of bhavdis is there in the case of prevas also.
Kuntaka criticises both the theories of rasavat formed by Bhāmaha and his followers and Anandavardhana. According to him, rasa is always alankāra and it can never become alankāra. Rasa can never have a functional beauty, it can have only an existential beauty, according to Kuntaka. Let us take a historical survey to see a change in the theory of rasavat alankāras from Bhāmaha to Anandavardhana, and from Anandavardhana to Kuntaka.

Bhāmaha is the first rhetorician who illustrates all these five alankāras. He does not define them. Only rasavat he defines as,

"स्नवद्वाकेतिस्पष्टतेऽहारां रसवतः"
(क्र. ३, ६)

The definition shows that he includes all the rases under this alankāra. Whenever the rases are prominently dealt with in poetry, it is the case of rasavat alankāra, according to Bhāmaha. The examples given by Bhāmaha for rasavat is so corrupt that we cannot deduce anything from it. But his rasavat alankāra is the same as rasadhvari of Anandavardhana. All factors of beauty, according to Bhāmaha, are alankāra and hence, naturally
rasa also is included therein. Bhāmaha does not define preyas alankāra but he gives the illustration,—

To praise in sweet words to give expression to devotion or love is called preyas. Here Vidura's devotion and love for Lord Krishna is revealed in his words that the joy he experienced from Lord Krishna's visit was unique.

The figure of speech uriyasvin consists in proud and spirited words as seen in Karna's proud speech with the serpent, who had come for the second chance to kill Arjuna. He proudly tells him that, Karna does not use the same arrow twice.

Sāmāhitra is the sight of holy things at the beginning of the work to make sure of the success. Bhāmaha gives the illustration from 'Rājamitra';—

The sight of the great sage Narada was auspicious which assured the fruit of the efforts of the Kṣatriya ladies who were going to appease Parasūrāma to save the lives of their lovers.
Udātta is the praise of sublime, unique qualities of a person or the description of one's prosperity and wealth.

रामास विशालाक्षणा राजा गृहान्यानां राज्या यथा वनसपागमनः

क्राक्षी नस्तिनां राज्या यथा वनसपागमनः

Ramā's greatness is shown in this stanza, that, leaving the kingdom and luxurious life of the palace, he went to the forest, just to obey his father.

The glorious description is seen in the illustration,

भाष्यम् नवक्तमुन्यानीन्द्रीमष्ट यथा
शालीकान्तोपल-वर्णा विवेद वयस्मा अप्रेतं

These are the five figures of speech based on emotional states, illustrated by Bhāmaha without defining them.

Dandia both defines and illustrates them. Only the figure of speech rasavat shows the full development of rasas; while other four alankāras show only bhāvas, and not the developed rasas. Dandia defines prevas as,

प्रत्येकालयान्मति सुस्वायत्स्यथा सुस्वायत्स्यथा

and rasavat as,

रामास विशालाक्षणा राज्या यथा वनसपागमनः
रामास विशालाक्षणा राज्या यथा वनसपागमनः

प्रत्येकालयान्मति सुस्वायत्स्यथा सुस्वायत्स्यथा

(III, 11, 241)
When a bhāva is developed completely with the help of vibhāva, anubhāva and vyabhicāribhāva, it reaches the stage of rasa; and when this bhāva becomes rasa, it is called the figure of speech rasayati. As in,—

"शुचिवे तीत्य अंगन्तु यथा मे भवणं मद्यं
शेषवन्ती मथा (आधा कथयते) अन्नमालि।"
(K, II, 280)

The sibhāvabhāva rati is fully developed to reach the stage of śīraśā rasa and hence it is rasavadyukta. In prevas, there is love and devotion but it is not developed to the stage of rasa; and remains at the level of bhāva. Dandin gives examples of all the eight rasas of Bharata. He does not define urjasāna. He just says that the proud speeches should be known as urjasāna or a dignified speech. The definition of samāhita according to him is,—

"विद्वत्रायक्षमाण्या कार्यं देवनाशातु इति।
तत्साधनसमापत्तिः तदाधुन अमहिलम्।"
(K, II, 298)

The indication of good omens at the beginning of action to indicate the divine favour and aid is called samāhita. The expression of uncommonly great qualities or widespread glory of a person is called udāta alankāra.

"आश्ययम विद्वत्रायक्षमाण्यां युद्धशास्त्रमद्यं
उदात्तं नाम ते दाह्रवखुर्कारं अविचित्न।"
(K, II, 300)
Dandin gives a very beautiful example of udatta alankāra which describes the glory and wealth of Rāvana:

रत्नाभिनिर्मिति संयुक्तं रात्रेयेन रावणेन लक्षणं।
शाली शूर्वेष्यर्थः कृत्यादिवेदवेदवै तत्वं।

(4.3.302)

It was very difficult for Arjuna to find out Rāvana exactly when he visited Lankā. Because Rāvana was surrounded with hundreds of images, of his own, reflected in the walls decked with precious jewels. This is the example of the second type of udatta alankāra. Thus Dandin follows the footsteps of Bhāmaha but treats all the alankāras, except Ārijasvin, in detail with definitions and illustrations.

Vāmana defines only samāhita which is different from the sammhita alankāra of Bhāmaha and Dandin. When a thing, similar to a desired object, turns into the desired object itself, it is called samāhita alankāra.

‘तत्तदायेः तत्तद्यथा समाहितः’ [4.3.29]

The illustration explains the definition. In the stanza,-

‘तद्यथौ भौतिकान्तः पद्धतिकान्तः श्रूयनामार्गे, श्वेताश्रमर्गे अन्तमुखोऽद्वाराय।
पद्माश्रमबिभाषिता महुलकामे श्रवणीये वायुमात्रे भोजने।’
the similarity in the creeper and Urvasi is found by Pururavas. The creeper which he feels like Urvasi itself turns into Urvasi, therefore it is called sarvāhita alankāra. Thus according to Vāmana, sarvāhita alankāra is meant to be the obtaining of the desired thing out of a similar thing; and not the indication of good omens, as explained by Bhāmaha and Dandin. Vāmana defines only the alankāras based on similarity or evanamya. This may be the reason why he defined only the sarvāhita alankāra and not the other alankāras in the group of rasarāddi alankāras. The sarvāhita of Vāmana is based on satāra which turns a similar thing into the very object desired by a person.

According to Udbhata, prayas is the indication of sthāyībhāvas like rati, and others through yībhāva, anubhāva etc. Udbhata's opinion is that all the bhāvas are expressed by their own technical terms, i.e. they are svāsa-abda-vācya. So the word 'rati' expressed in a stanza, describes the sthāyībhāva rati. Ācandavārikāna criticises severely this 'svāsa-abda-vācya' theory of Udbhata. We will discuss it later on while dealing with the theory of rasa. Thus the bhāvakāvya is prayas and the rasakāvya is rasa, according to Udbhata.
definition of r&savat, Udbhata follows bharmaha, but he adds
his svast'abdaravya theory to the definition

"मन्नव्रूपितस्पषोदकारासादयम्।
वशिष्ट्यस्यायिसखर्मार्थव्याख्यानयोऽस्यस्मात्।

(K A S IV, 3)

Kāvya is alankāra and bhāva are alankāras in the
figure of speech praves. Pratihārendrāja, the commentator
of Udbhata, says, —

"पुनः च भावनायाय प्रेयराधिति उक्तम्।
अपदेशः अजः च भावामेवसचमाना कायामयकामिनी।

(comm on K A S IV, 2)

Here we see that unlike others, there is a theory which
indicates that whole kāvya is alankāra. But it is too
general and vague to consider the whole of kāvya as
alankāra. The theory does not show any awareness of the
points discussed by kuntaka.

Pratihārendrāja shows the awareness of the important-
ance of rasa as the life of poetry but he does not discuss
it, in order to respect Udbhata's theory.

"रसानां भावानां च अभ्यासोलिशयेभृत्तात् कि
फायास्यकारलमुलं कायसितत्वमिति न तावद्विना
चतुर्गृहस्वरस्याश्यां।

(comm on K A S IV, 5)

The उर्जस्वः alankāra of Udbhata is different from that of
Bharmaha and Dandin, and it is quite novel. The unusual
description of rasa and bhāva is called उर्जस्वः alankāra.
by Udbhata.

अनौपचारिक धृष्टान्तोज्ज्वलिता आमृतशास्त्राविशेषतः
भावना व रसान्तः य अन्य तत्त्वअथ मूलतः।

Amicita here means that which is unusual in a situation and not impropriety of rasa and bhāva which Anandavardhana calls the greatest poetic defect. For, Anandavardhana relates it to the poet's art of bringing unity of feeling out of diverse elements in a whole work; while Rāhī, is confined to a particular situation or an episode only.
The example for urjasavīn is,

“तथा कामोदस्य अनुस्य अथ विभागीरेः कुलार्जे
समश्रेणि समधुले कठेनापास्य सत्तपव्यम्॥

Here the great Lord Śiva is acting just as an ordinary human being, showing his passion for Pārvati before their marriage. It is not expected in the case of Lord Śiva, though possible in the case of ordinary human beings and hence the bhāva rati has risen beyond its normal degree and assumed an abnormal (anucita) intensity. According to Udbhata, the abnormal intensity is not just cādabhāva but it extends as far as rasa itself in the context of the Kumārasamābhāva. The expression, "कामोदस्य अनुस्यः"
is a svās'abdavācyya, which surely points towards it
Udbhata's *samāhita alankāra* also is completely different from that of Bhāma, Dandir, and even Yāmagha.

*Samāhita* is the prasa'ana or calming down of *rasa* or *bhāva*, or *rasābhāsa* or *bhāvābhāsa*. Udbhata gives the example,

"अथ अन्नो ऊर्जले शक्त्या विभ्रामबाह्यार्वान भ्रुवो, प्रतलु भुवनगांसं वेदायतेस्वरसुदुम्नोः।
-मरज्जतसदीपिने वसदिनि समाधिवतू
उद्सपद्यासीनिन्ति गिरिश, स्वाधिपूर्वकः।"

Here the cooling down of *s'rūgāra rasa* is seen. Being Lord Śiva, he was able to restrain himself, though the passion was excessively great seeing *pārvatī*’s romantic actions. Udbhata defines *samāhita* as,

"सर्वभावान्वेये, अन्यानुभावाने, शृद्धयुप सतास्माहिताभम्।"

There is a lowering down in the intensity of either *rasa* or *bhāva*, or *rasābhāsa* or *bhāvābhāsa* etc. His *samāhita* is exactly opposite to his *ūrjaśīva*. In *ūrjaśīvi alankāra*, we see the abnormal excitement of *rasa* or *bhāva*, and in *samāhita* there is cooling down of *rasa* and *bhāva*.

_Uddāta alankāra_ is the associated glory or greatness which is subordinate to the main theme of a starza.
Here the main theme is the steadfastness of the Himalaya. It is associated with the majestic greatness of Adhivāraha. This udātta description of Adhivāraha is subordinate to Himālaya-varnana. Pratihāraṇendraśa comments on it,

"अज दिभरत, कर्मेऽति वात्स्यार्थस्मृती संबन्धताः \nपराकृतेन्द्रीयोपक्रिया-क्रियकला-परिधिति- \nप्रकाशित-पहलुमिभूतमात्रांव्रतविअल्पिभूलम्."

The difference between udātta alankāra and rasavad-alankāra is that in rasasat, rasas are of primary importance and in udātta-varnana — though it contains qualities like valour etc. — the whole alankāra, i.e. the bhāva or rasa of the associated image, is subordinate to the main vastu.

Prof. Hiriyanna in his article, 'The Problem of the Rasavadalankāra' says,

"It should be added that this fact that a rasa may subserve another suggested element of poetry was not a new discovery of Anandavardhana or by any other later thinker. For Pūhrata (if not
some other early writer also) admits that he calls udāttalankāra, one of whose two varieties is based upon a recognition of that very fact. The rasa element is present in it, and yet it is distinguished by him from the rasavadalankāra, because that element is not of first importance there. 1

But what Prof. Hiriyanna seems to have missed is that the rasa of the main theme in the present context is one thing and the rasa imputed to the associated image of a long distant past is another thing. The udāttalankāra has reference only to the latter and cannot include the former also. Hence Anandavardhana has not simply borrowed Udbhata's udāttalankāra and changed its name into rasavadalankāra, but has added something of his own in his 'new scheme (Māmakīnāḥ Paksah)' of rasavadalankāra.

"वधपि रसवदलकं त्रावस्यान्वितेऽविशेषतः यासिन्धवाद्व अधानवलक्ष्याय भविष्यवद्यो भावाय भविष्यस्तेन निरुप्तं ज्ञातस्य रसदेवास्ते रसादेवलकार्यम् विषय- इति भाष्यानि: पक्ष:।"

(Dhv. vrtti on II, 5).

Thus according to Udbhata, only the rasavadalankāra shows the complete development of rasa which is prominent in a stanza, while other alankāras deal with bhāva or rasa-pras'āme; or anucita rasa or anucita bhāva; or spradhāna (subordinate) rasa.

1. All India Oriental Conference, Fifteenth Session p. 270
Anandavardhana differs from all these earlier writers whenever *rasa* occurs manifestly in a composition, Dhamaka, Dandin and Udbhata call it *rasavadalankāra*. They have not judged rightly the place of *rasa* in poetry, but Anandavardhana, however, justifies *rasa* and gives the highest place to it in poetry. *Rasa* is alākārya when it is predominant in a composition, and when it is subordinate to some other *vācyārtha* it is called *rasavadalankāra*. From the point of view of the poet this *vācyārtha* is 'Rājavīśāvaka bhakti-bhāva' or 'Devāviśāvaka ratibhāva', but from the point of view of the reader it is *vīra-rasa-dhvani* only. The subordinate rāsas become alākāras functionally.

This *rasavadalankāra* is of two kinds. The first is *suddha* (or pure), where one *rasa* unmixed with any other *rasa* or a figure of speech, is subordinate to the *vācyārtha*. In the example,—

```
(Dev. II, 5).
```

```
prasādmayam vācyārthāṁ vajradhānurṣaḥ dayā
dakṣyate tāmśvāsanaṁ rūpādhipatiḥ mābhavitah

(Dhv. II, 5).
```

This *rasavadalankāra* is of two kinds. The first is *suddha* (or pure), where one *rasa* unmixed with any other *rasa* or a figure of speech, is subordinate to the *vācyārtha*. In the example,—

```
prāksaṁāyaḥ prāśaṁāyāyaḥ prāśaṁāyāyaḥ

(Coll vol I, p 409)
The vacvārtha is cātu or the praise of the king from the point of view of the poet. This cātu or prayas from the poet’s way of looking or viṇa rasa from the reader’s point of view is the main subject of description and hence is alankāra. There is karuna rasa in the description of the wives of the enemies who are separated from their husbands. They are enjoying the love sports with their husbands in dreams but their sorrow is increased when they rise from sleep and find themselves lonely. This karuna rasa is subordinate to the main vācyartha, and therefore it is the case of sūdha rasavat alankāra.

The second kind of rasavat alankāra is called sankīrṇa, where one or more than one rasa, mixed with other figures of speech, are subordinate to the vacvārtha. For instance in,—

2. There is possibility of vipralambha-s'rnasa also, since it is not clear from the stanza whether the lovers of the ladies are dead or scattered here and there on account of their defeat. The sports in dream indicate the hope of reunion. Therefore vipralambha-s'rnasa is possible here.

3. The example cited by Anandavardhana for sūdha rasavat alankāra is the case of preyas alankāra according to the theory of Phāmaha. Because the soft feeling of admiration has been strikingly displayed.
The greatness of Śiva (Ś'iva-prabhāvatīs'ava) is vācārtha.
There is vipralambha-s'rngāra in the behaviour attributed to the s'āraṇjī of Ś'iva. Though the s'āraṇjī is touching the limbs of the ladies of Tripura, and embracing them to please them in love, like a guilty lover, the ladies are not reciprocating his love but they rather run away from him. So in the description of the ladies, karuna rasa is present. The fire of Ś'iva's arrow has spread around them and they cannot escape from it, though they are trying their best. There is ś'ileśa alaṅkāra in the stanza and the similarity between Agni and a lover is shown by a pun, so it is s'ilistopānā. Both the rasas, namely, karuna and ś'iva-vipralambha-s'rngāra, mixed with s'ilistopānā, are subordinate to the main vākyārtha, i.e. Ś'ivaprabhāvatīs'ava, which again leads to the enjoyment of vīra rasa with the reader, though from the poet's point of view it can be characterised as 'Devevaśayaka-rātibhāva'.

Karuna and vipralambha-s'rngāra are mimical rasas and cannot come together when one of them is predominant,
but here it is not a defect since both of them are subordinate to some other common 
vākyārtha. Moreover, the 
ās'reva for both the rasas is separate. For karuna rasa the 
ās'reva is Trīpura-ladies, and for vipralābha-s'rvapāra it is the ś'arāgna of Ś'iva.

Ānandavardhana gives examples only of rasavādālānaṅkāra but Abhinavagupta, in Locana, gives examples of bhāva-
lāṅkāra, bhāvābhāsālāṅkāra, etc.

An objection can be raised how rasādī, which really is alāṅkārya, can become alāṅkāra? Alāṅkāra is the means of decoration; how then can the alāṅkārya itself be the alāṅkāra? It cannot be decorated by itself. Ānandava-
rdhana is aware of this objection and replies that the rasādī here are subordinate and not predominant as in 
rasadhvani. When they are subordinate and beautifying something else, which is vākyārtha, they can be called alāṅkāras or cārūtvahctu on the analogy of other figures of speech like u pada. Therefore, poetry containing 
rasavādādī alāṅkāras, is classed under guñābūtavannya-
-kāvya like other figures of speech because the suggested 
vākyārtha is rendered more striking by the peculiar use of these rasas playing a role of alāṅkāras.

Abhinavagupta explains this point more clearly. The
emotional states (citavṛttis) are real ātman of poectry and hence rasāli-dhvam is real alankārva and the alankāras, inversely associated with body, decorate, if used properly, the alankārva itself.

The soulless body is a dead body and though decorated, it can in no way be attractive. Therefore, there is a necessity of alankārva. This alankārva must be appropriate; otherwise it will be like an ornamented body of a sage, which becomes an object of ridicule.

Not all compositions containing rasa are cases of rasavat alankāra. If a rasa is predominant, it becomes the soul, i.e. rasadhvam, and upamādi become its ornaments. Thus Ānandavardhana shows the distinction between rasadhvam and rasavadādi alankāras, based on prādhatya and aprādhatya of rasa.

Ānandavardhana refutes the view that if the inanimate objects be personified in poetic description and given the attributes of human feelings, it cannot be a case of rasavadālankāra. For Ānandavardhana, such a case is not only of rasavat alankāra, but a clear instance of rasadhvam.
According to the opponents, such examples cannot contain any rasa because the feelings like love, sorrow etc are the attributes of conscious and living beings, and not of inanimate objects like a tree and a river. So only the compositions containing the descriptions of the feelings of living beings are called rasavadalankāra. On the view is wrong according to Anandavardhana, because in poetry nothing can claim admission which has not at least a remote connection with a rasa, say by imputed human behaviour at least. What the others call acetana and hence nīrāsa also contains some kind of rataṇāta or other and hence will be sarasa. Once this is accepted, it follows that there is no scope left for other figures of speech like upama since every composition will have a touch of rasa. Every stanza will be the example of rasavat alankāra because the inanimate objects also are described as animate objects entertaining feelings like love. So these cases also will be included in rasavat-dādi, though they are full of rasa and can rightly be called rasadhvani. Anandavardhana quotes the examples like:

"तरुद्वालं शुचिमलिन्यं तत्र चारणीरणीति "

Anandavardhana quotes the examples like:
where the inanimate things like the river and the creeper are described behaving like animate objects. The *rasiya*, *viprelembha-s'irnasa*, is predominant in both the examples and other *alankaras* like *rupaka, utpreka*, etc., add more charm to the main *rasi*

Hence the stanza can be called the examples of *rasadhvani*. Thus the attribution of *cetanatva* on *acetana* also can go to form equally good poetry according to *Anandavardhana*.

*Anandavardhana* takes a bold step in going against the traditional theory of the figures of speech *rasavadadi*. *Kuntaka* takes a still bolder step in criticizing all the old theories, including that of *Anandavardhana*, to prove his own new theory of *rasavadadi* as *alankarya*, which can never be *alankaras*. *Vastusvabhava* or *vastusata-rasa* is not *alankara* but always *alankarya* according to *Kuntaka*. He has proved *vabhvavokti* to be *alankarya* and now he wants to prove *rasavat*, *prevas*, *urjasvin*, *udatta* and *sahashta* also to be *alankarya*.

The term *rasavat*, according to *Kuntaka*, does not indicate any *alankara* but only reveals its own nature. There is impropriety in calling *rasavat* to be *alankara*.

---

Alankārva is different from alankāra, and one cannot be the other. Rasa always is alankārva which should be decorated by other alankāras and itself cannot be both the means of decoration, i.e. alankāra and the thing to be decorated, i.e. alankārva. Kuntaka criticises all the ancient views about rasavat alankāra. In the definition, "रसवस्तुका मीलिःस्पृष्टिःसुद्दा मारिः" (Vat. on मा त्र्यं) of Bhamaha and Udbhata, Kuntaka notes two textual variants in the reading 'spasta', namely, 'spasti' and 'spastam', and criticises both the readings as neither of the two explains rasavat properly. If the compound, "दर्शितस्पस्त सुद्दा मारिः" is split in heuyuruhi-samasa aya, it points out poetry only and nothing else. And rasavat alankāra itself cannot be called poetry because embellishment is only a part of poetry and not the whole. If rasavat is alankāra, it cannot be the alankāra. Moreover, if the development of rasas is seen clearly in the composition, it reveals the nature of rasas like sūryākāra. The splitting of 'rasavadalankāra' as, 'rasavatākār kāvyasva alankārah' also is not proper, because the term 'alankār' for rasavat kāvyā is meaningless. If we say, 'rasaṇā asan alankārah' every poetry containing rasa will be rasavat alankāra, and rasa will never be alankārva.
The embellishments of rasakārya also cannot be called the figure of speech rasavat, because the knowledge of rasa will be primary and later we will know the alankāra. and 'rasayan alankāra' also will indicate nothing else but poerty itself. Thus Kuntaka proves that the term 'rasayan alankāra' itself is a contradiction in terms.

Kuntaka further takes Dandin's example of śṛṅgāra-rasavat-alankāra, i.e. "भूलौति चेत्य संगीतमुन्द ।" and says that there is no other vastu here, except love, which is to be decorated. Hence it is not an alankāra but it is alankārya.

Kuntaka criticises Udbhata's theory of svas'ābdavācvarasa and asks whether rasa is svas'ābdavācya or rasavat alankāra is svas'ābdavācya. If rasa is svas'ābdavācya, by mere utterance of the word 'śṛṅgāra', rasa can be enjoyed and thus by mere uttering the words, we will be able to enjoy the happiness and luxuries in the world.5
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Kuntaka criticises the definition of rasavat given by Dandin which is,

"स्त्रावलेम्भःसंदृक्यः"
or
"स्त्रावलेम्भंपेशल्कणः"
The very basis for rasa is kavya and it goes against the theory if kavya itself becomes kavyalankara. Rasadas'ala also indicates kavya only. Thus rasa cannot, in any way, become alankara because it is always alankara. There is an incongruity between the term rasadalankara and its sense (s'abdärtha-asangati).

If the term 'rasavat' is taken as 'rasaḥ vidyate rasva' it does not explain the meaning properly, because it indicates poetry only; and alankāra and alankāra cannot be the one and the same. If rasavat is split as 'rasavatah alankārah' there will be propriety in the word rasavat and its meaning. Kuntaka quotes the same two examples from the Vikramorvas'īya, which Anandavardhana quotes to show rasa in the description of inanimate objects like a river and a creeper. In these two examples, according to Kuntaka, the rasa and the alankāras can easily be known separately. So there is no incongruity in understanding the meaning of 'rasavat' as 'rasavatah alankārah'. Both the stanzas describe the
sentiment of love in separation. The rasa attributed to the river and the creeper is alankāra. The figure of speech namely, upama and rūpaka are the two alankāras of the śānta-raśa and hence they can be called rasavad-alankāras. According to Anandavardhana, these two illustrations will be the examples of rasadvani. The oṣṭhābhāva rati is developed through vilānavāci. The suggested rasa, virolaṁbha-s'raśa, predominates in both the stanzas and hence the rasa is alankāra. Then the rasa is predominant and alankāra it is rasadvanī according to Anandavardhana's theory.

After splitting rasavat alankāra/ṃ s'asti tat-purusa samāsa, Kuntaka splits it/in karmadharāya samāsa. and says that these two ways of explaining the term rasavat alankāra are admissible, but not completely correct to explain the alankāra rasavat. There is no intelligibility in the figure of speech rasavat, because poetry is always full of rasa. Rasa itself is the essence of poetry; and because of this, if its alankāra is called rasavat, there is no scope for other alankāras like upama, rūpaka etc. Wherever they occur in poetry, they will be called rasavat, so there is no room for them in
poetry. But in fact, the earlier rhetoricians have not accepted rasavat in the place of all these arthālakāras, otherwise they would not have defined them separately. Kuntaka does not agree with the view that in the case of animate objects, rasādiyarnana is rasavadalankāra; and in the case of inanimate objects rasādiyarnana leads to other arthālakāras like upamā, rūpaka etc. The rasa can be developed in inanimate objects also when they are described like animate objects and such examples can prove to be sarasa and sukumāra kavva if they take shape beneath the pen of great poets. Kuntaka agrees with Anandavardhana's point that if rasatva is not admitted in inanimate things, the vast portion of good poetry will be counted among nirasa kavva or bad poetry. Kuntaka accepts only this view of Anandavardhana about rasa. He refutes Anandavardhana's definition of rasavat alankāra.

As we have seen, according to Anandavardhana, rasa is called rasavadalankāra when it is subordinate to some other dominant sense (vākyārtha), which is the main theme of description and hence alankāra. Kuntaka does not admit this dual position of rasa. Rasa is always of primary importance and cannot be subordinate to anything else. He takes both the examples of Anandavardhana cited
for rasavadalankaṇṭa of two kinds, and points out the mistakes committed by him. In the example,

"ना न्यायविधिष्ठानयो नायायविधिष्ठानयो नायायविधिष्ठानयो नायायविधिष्ठानयो
गुढ़युक्तान्यो गुढ़युक्तान्यो गुढ़युक्तान्यो गुढ़युक्तान्यो"

Kuntaka objects to the identity of Lord Śiva's arrow of fire with a lover, trying to please the ladies of Tripura. The two things, namely, the s'arāṇi and a lover are quite opposed and their oneness cannot be imagined even in the case of God. The oneness of the two opposite things is accepted by sahrdayas only through pun. If this play of words is taken as a reality, a piece of a sweet-ball (modaka) also will be understood as poison by pun.

In addition to this, it is a big poetic flaw to bring together two opposite rasas, namely karuna and s'ruṣeṇa. Anandavardhana was aware that such an objection would be brought forward; so he has given justification that, both the rasas, though opposite, can come together because both of them are subordinate to some other vyākhyāti. They are not at all competing with each other for a primary place and their as'ṛava also is different. But this justification does not satisfy Kuntaka and therefore he does not admit the identity of two things with diametrically opposite natures, namely s'arāṇi and a lover.
Kuntaka admits the possibility of both the rasas, karuna and vipralambha-s'rangara. The main theme of the stanza, from the point of view of the poet is rājacāta and from the reader's point of view it is vīra-rasa of the king, and hence it is alankārya. The karuna rasa is subordinate to the vācyārthā hence it is the alankārya rasa, according to Anandavardhana. But Kuntaka takes karuna rasa to be the main theme of the stanza. He admits the possibility of vipralambha-s'rangara since it is not clear in the stanza whether the lovers are scattered here and there due to their defeat in the battle, and separated from their beloved for the time being. Whether or not is it clear whether they are dead in the battle. Though the ladies are conversing with their lovers in dream when they are awakened, their grief rises up to the summit when they realise the reality of their lovers no more being alive. So according to Kuntaka it is purely karuna rasa developed fully.
But according to Anandavardhana this karuna rasa in the stanza is not the main one, but a subordinate one. Yuntaka does not admit rasa being subordinate to anything else; it is always alankāra, according to him. So he finds fault with Anandavardhana. According to Yuntaka, in the two examples cited by Anandavardhana, the karuna rasa is the main alankāra. The two alankāra texts, parvāyokta and aprastutaprasāmsā, suggest different vākyārtha, which is not expressed (or vācyārtha), and this suggested vākyārtha is karuna rasa. This karuna rasa is vyasaya and pradhāna, hence it is alankāra. It cannot be gunicbhutevyānāya because the karuna rasa is not subordinate to any other vākyārtha. Moreover, the definition of Anandavardhana proves rasādi to be alaṅkāra and not the rasavat. Therefore rasavat is alaṅkāra and in the same way, pravas, tūrāśvin, udāṭta and sanāhitā also are alaṅkāra, and not the alaṅkāras.

Following Anandavardhana's view of avicitva,

Anānantāyātāt śanā tapasvabhiṣkṛto rātrārthānām

Kuntaka criticises the definition and illustration of
Uriyavina alankāra given by Udbhata, saying that though he is an eminent follower of Bharata, he has given inappropriate things as good examples of alankāra. But, it is shown that by the word 'ampaica', Jābbata means something beyond the nature limits and not improper. Kuntaka has not understood Jābbata properly, so he calls it a defect. Any way Uriyavina is alankāra because it is related with rasa and bhāva.

Kuntaka follows Bhāmaha, Dandin and Jābbata for the definitions of pravas, udātta and saṃśiita, and proves that they are, in fact, alankāra and other alankāras like upamā, rūpaka etc. decorate them.

Thus Kuntaka proves all these alankāras of earlier rhetoricians as alankāra and finally says, rasavat, if it is taken as alankāra, should be defined as, —

"स्मृतेन नल्ले तुप्पयम्।" C V J III, (5)

This definition is given by Kuntaka on the analogy of —

"किंतुवर्षन्तलः शास्त्रियः।"

The sarasa kāvya gives pleasure to the saordyves and the arthālankāras adding beauty to the rasa are called rasavat alankāras. The rasavat alankāra is the gem of

6. For a full explanation of this, see ante p. 114
all the alankāras and the very essence of poetry as it increases the beauty of rasa which is alanjārṇa.

Kuntaka gives the examples for rasavadalankāra,

(अपोढरथेन्त्र विन्योऽत्तरकं —— p 385

or ——

(चल्पादश्री टिकः स्नेषानि वंशिललिंगे —— etc. (v 5 p 386)

He comments on these that the alankāra ṛūkā, the superimposition of a lover on the moon and a honey bee, brings more charm to the stanzas making them carasa kārya. The stanza, 'अपोढरथेन्त्र---' is cited by Ānandevardhana for the second-rare poetry because the figure of speech samāsokti is more striking than the suggested emotion of love. Kuntaka cites it as the best specimen of poetry, because alankāras co-exist with primary rasa (alankāra). The alankāra itself brings the beauty of rasa and hence it cannot be included in the second division of poetry but it deserves the highest position. Thus Kuntaka moves Ānandevardhana to be wrong in thinking such examples as having secondary beauty. The personification (ṛūka) has become more charming in 'अपोढरथेन्त्र-' due to sīkṣa and striking adjectives. There is viṣkesana-vākṛtā and liṅga-vākṛtā.

In 'चल्पादश्री टिके' also the attribution of a lover
to a bee has become more charming. Both the examples add beauty to the srngāra-rama; therefore they can be called rasvart. In fact, Anandavardhana includes 'न्रागरस्ये धरी' in his rasadhvam, the highest and most delightful poetry. Kuntaka cites it for rasvart alankāra to show that Anandavardhana's rasadhvam and his own rasvart alankāra are equally beautiful to be called the best poetry. Practically, Kuntaka is correct. In both the examples, the srngāra rasa is attributed and there is no direct 'वृक्षाण्व-बाह्यवावलिन्य' in both the examples. There is a sort of inconsistency involved in Anandavardhana's practical discussion. Kuntaka has discovered it and tries to correct it, including both examples in rasadhvam alankāra, the best poetry according to Kuntaka. In both the examples, the attributed rasa can be suggested and never can be expressed. So like 'पञ्चरथम् तर्कः', 'उपरोक्तर्गुण' also must be included in vyavahāra. Anandavardhana can be justified only in one way that in 'पञ्चरथम् तर्कः', we know the context and that the intention of the dramatist is to describe Dusyanta's love for S'akuntala, and his desire to kiss her. Hence it is sambhore srngāra; but in 'उपरोक्तर्गुण', we do not know the context. It just may be the description of the first part of the moon-lit night. Therefore it is possible
that, somāsakti alankāra may be predominant if a poet's intention is not to describe any love matter but just a description of attractive natural phenomena. But Kuntaka may reply to this that, there would be no room at all for rasadhvani in muktakas, whose context is unknown.

When Kuntaka accepts these two examples for rasavat alankāra, an opponent may ask him why he rejects 'निजः हृदयम्: ' as the example of rasavat alankāra. Here is the attribution of rasa in this example also. Kuntaka frees himself from the objection, saying that he is not rejecting it as the example of rasavat alankāra, but he certainly does not admit vīpralembha sūrugraha therein.

The other subordinate alankāras in the main suggested rasavadalankāra cannot be rejected, according to Kuntaka. He gives the examples, —

"अनुविक्रिय देशस्मिन्यं नारिकूलित तिथिर्गति स्रीकीर्तिः।
कुसम्लकुलसरौतिकोप्यश्च रजसूर्दशुल मशाला।"

or — "प्रेमे धनु, पापुप्रत्याशे शरदीकोप्यश्च रजसूर्दशुल मशाला॥
प्रसोदयन्ति अनंतद्राकामिनं ताप सुर्दशुलाकारं यथा॥"

In these stanzas upamā, s'lesa, etc., are subordinate to the main suggested alankāra namely upakara, which is rasavat. Thus the sūrkara and samāstī of alankāras in the case of rasavat cannot be avoided. This rasavat alankāra, according to Kuntaka, is the best embellishment
of poetry, which proves sarasatva of nirasa padārthās, and hence it is appreciated by good critics. Pratibhā or intuition is the very soul of all the alankāras.

Among the later writers, Ruvyaka follows Anandavardhana for rasavat alankāra. For prevas etc. he prefers to follow the earlier rhetoricians. He defines rasavat as,—

"यत्र निबन्धनेन व्यापारलोकानित् रसवटतृः (७१४१ म् अ ८२)"

According to Ruvyaka, who is the follower of the अर्थनादी theoretical, there is a possibility that rasa may be felt in the creative function of the poet, and in such a case it may be termed as rasavat. In other words, rasavat of the poet could be distinguished from the rasa due to the sthāvibhāva etc. can be described.

Vidyācakravartin comments on the definition of rasavat of Ruvyaka as,—

"यत्र हि व्यापारलोकस्तेहि निबन्धादिव्यापारलोक मन्त्र रसोद सत्ता नवयायात् (दासजीवाणी, प २१४)"

Ruvyaka has observed a noteworthy point, showing the difference between Bhāmaha and Anandavardhana. If we follow Anandavardhana's rasavat alankāra, where rasa is subordinate to some other व्यक्तिव्रत, mostly prevas, there is no scope for Bhāmaha's uddita alankāra. If the
mahāpurusācarīta is predominant and rasa, bhāva subordinate to it, it will be a rasavat alankāra. Or else, if rasa is predominant and the mahāpurusācarīta is subordinate, it is rasadhvānīkāvya.

Ruyyaka gives the example of Ānandavardhana's s'uddha rasavat alankāra, viz.

```
कि अर्थात न मे महास्यार्थे चुना
```

but says that the karuna rasa is main in the stanza and the vipralambha s'ṛṇāra is subordinate and hence it is the rasavat alankāra.

```
अन्य वाक्यार्थपुरुषं चरणों रसं तत्त्वं अदुभुतसन्धिसंगमम्प्रायणं
```

This, however, goes against the theory of Ānandavardhana. The opposite rasa of karuna, i.e. vipralambha s'ṛṇāra cannot be subordinate to karuna rasa, when the ṛṣīraja for both the rasas is one and the same, i.e. the wishes of the enemies.

Ruyyaka distinguishes rasavat from svabhāvokti. When the nature of a vastu is described minutely, it is called svabhāvokti, and when it is the description of emotional states or cittavṛttis, subordinate to other vākyārtis,
it is rasavat.

Kammata does not treat this group under alankāras but includes in gati⚠️bhūtavangakāvya, because rasa, which is always suggested, is subordinate to some other māyavātha, which is more striking.

Bhoja includes rasa also in alankāra and distinguishes rasokti from svabhāvokti and vakrokti.

Vas'vanātha says that some call rasavat alankāra and some others alankāra by bhakti. But he refutes these views and follows Ṣanandavardhana.

It is interesting to note that Jaganratha left both the alankāras, svabhāvokti and rasavat out of consideration. It is only casually that he mentions them here and there, but does not deal separately in detail like other alankāras.

7. In the fifth chapter of the Kāvyaprakāśa he cites the examples of rasavat, preyas etc. under gati⚠️bhūtavangakāvya and says that, "सचे व स्पष्टदायक".

8. Prof. T.S. Nandi summarises the rasavadādi alankāras historically but does not deal with them critically, in his article, 'Rasavadādi Alankāravarga' - Vidyā - Jan. 1966, pp 59 - 78.
Thus we can see the change in the nature of rasavat alankāra in three different periods. From Bhāsana's time to Ānandavardhana's time, it was similar to Bharata's nātyarasa. Ānandavardhana changed its nature completely to make it kāvvarasa, distinguishing rasavat from Bharata's nātyarasa, which is the soul of poetry and is called rasadhvani by Ānandavardhana. Kuntaka took the boldest step to deny it as an alankāra and to prove its importance as an alankāra. But Kuntaka's theory of rasavat is completely neglected by later writers and Ānandavardhana's theory is followed mostly as seen in the history of Sanskrit Poetics.

The above survey shows that the question, whether rasa is alankāra or alankāra, has exercised the imagination of almost every important and original writer in Alankāras'āstra. The reason is perhaps to be sought in the fact that the Nātyasāstra's idea of rasa, as understood by pre-Ānandavardhana writers, was limited to emotive situations presented in the plot or story, and could be talked of as an alankāra of the vastu or plot, whereas in the interpretation of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta, rasa becomes a value and not an objective quality or embellishment, a āvāsa experience which itself was alankāra ordinary. But exceptionally, the objective
Rasa, as presented in the situation, could become subordinate to another rasa also presented by the situation itself. Hence the provision for rasavat alankāra was admitted by Ānandavardhana. But this meant the use of words conveying different things as the context varies. The importance of alankāras vis-a-vis rasa came to be under-rated, though in theory alankāras were there only to enhance the beauty of rasa.

This was felt as a great drawback by Kuntaka, who wanted to leave no loop-hole between abstract theory and concrete criticism. He found that in practical criticism, appreciation always centred round alankāras only because they were sarasa and alankāras, they could strictly be talked of as rasavat. Rasa could only be alankāra. This brought a measure of clarity to the Indian literary thought, and helped the progress of criticism. This may be taken as Kuntaka's positive contribution to the very intriguing question of rasa in relation to alankāra. Some of the modern scholars like David McCutchion⁹ are coming to realise the importance of the contribution of Kuntaka, to Sanskrit Poetics.

---xxx---

9. See Reportage - (Mysore Seminar.) 'Western and Indian Approaches to Literature' - Quest, winter 1966. PP 76-84