The number, classification and sequence of arthālaṃkāras

Alaṃkāra is described as 'kavipratibhānirvartya.' Pratibhā
is defined as 'prajñā nanavonmeṣaśālini pratibhā matā,' by Bhatta
Tauta. Abhinavagupta defines it as 'apūrvavastunirmānakṣamā prajñā.'
Pratibhā is the imagination of the poet. It is a creative power,
by which the poet perceives objects in new forms. Bhatta Tauta
and Abhinava have emphasized the subjective aspect of pratibhā.
Jagannātha defines pratibhā as 'kāvyaghatanānukūlaśabdārthopasthitih.'
He holds that pratibhā may be the result of the favour of some deity
or great person. It may also be acquired by vyutpatti and abhyāsa.
The imagination of the poet must be communicated to the reader.
Jagannātha's definition of pratibhā takes into account only the
presentation of imagination.

Boundless is the world of imagination, where non-existant
objects are perceived as existent and where lifeless objects are
endowed with life. In fact, it is impossible to measure this
world of imagination. The ancient rhetoricians, however, have
attempted to measure the immeasurable world of imagination by
prescribing alaṃkāras. Bharata had given only three arthālaṃkāras.
Ever since then, new alaṃkāras are added, so that the number reaches
one hundred and twenty three in Appayya's Kuvalayānanda. The number

of arthālamkāras treated by different rhetoricians is given below.
The list of arthālamkāras in the order in which they are treated by
different rhetoricians is given in Appendix I.

S.NO:	Rhetorician	Total No. of Arthālamkāras	S.NO	Rhetorician	Total No. of Arthālamkāras
1	Bharata	3	8	Ruyyaka	76
2	Bhāmaha	37	9	Sobhākara	103
3	Dandin	35	10	Vidyānātha	68
4	Udbhata	37	11	Visvanātha	77
5	Vāmana	31	12	Appayya	123
6	Rudrata	68	13	Jagannātha	70(incomplete)
7	Mammata	62			

It can be seen that rhetoricians like S'obhākara and Appayya have a
tendency to increase the number of alamkāras.   Jagannātha seems to
dislike this tendency and many a times shows his inclination towards
reducing the number of alankāras.   He thus says that Dipaka and
Tulyayogitā may be treated as two varieties of one figure.   In his
treatment of figures based on loka-nyaya also, he has cited opinions
declining the introduction of some new alamkāras.   He himself, however,
has admitted some new alamkāras like Udāharana, Lalita etc.   He is
thus inclined towards reducing the number of alamkāras on the one

Ubhayanyāsa, Bhrāntiman, Ākṣepa, Pratyanika, Dṛṣṭānta, Pūrva, Sahokti, Samuccaya, Sāmya and Smaraṇa.

3) <u>Figures based on atiśaya:</u> Pūrva, Viśeṣa, Utprekṣā, Vibhāvanā, Tadguṇa, Adhika, Virodha, Viṣama, Asaṃgati, Pihita, Vyāghāta and Ahetu.

4) <u>Figures based on śleṣa:</u> Aviśeṣa, Virodha, Adhika, Vakra, Vyāja, Ukti, Asaṃbhava, Avayava, Tattva and Virodhābhāsa.

Mammaṭa does not follow any system in the grouping of arthālaṃkāras or in the order in which they are taken for treatment. Ruyyaka divides the alaṃkāras into two groups: Śuddha and miśra. S'uddha arthālaṃkāras are divided into eight groups. Ruyyaka's classification is shown in Appendix II. Ruyyaka's classification is generally accepted by the writers succeeding him. Thus, Vidyādhara follows him. Vidyānātha divides arthālaṃkāras according as they possess for their suggested sense, Vastu, aupamya, rasa, or do not possess any distinct suggested sense. He then gives another classification according to which arthālaṃkāras are divided into the following nine groups: (1) Sādharmyamūla (2) adhyavasāyamūla (3) virodhamūla (4) vākyanyāyamūla (5) lokavyavahāramūla (6) tarkanyāyamūla (7) sṛkhalāvaicitryamūla (8) apahnavamūla (9) viśeṣaṇavaicitryamūla. Vidyādhara and Vidyānātha do not admit the figures based on cittavṛtti.

S'obhākara, Visvanātha and Appayya accept Ruyyaka's classification though they do not mention the principles of classification specifically. From the order in which the figures are treated, it can be said that they accept Ruyyaka's classification.   S'obhākara shows a definite tendency towards increasing the number of alankāras, and therefore differs much from Ruyyaka in assigning order to figures though he accepts Ruyyaka's grouping.   Visvanātha sometimes differs from Ruyyaka in assigning order to the groups and to the figures belonging to the same group.   He thus treats the figures based on tarka-nyāya after figures based on similarity.   Over and above the nine groups given by Ruyyaka, Appayya gives one more group consisting of the figures based on pramānas.

The treatment of arthālamkāras in Rasagangādhara shows that Jagannātha also follows Ruyyaka's classification.   He, however, does not systematically lay down the principles, before introducing each group.   The principles are specifically mentioned only at two places. Thus, the figures based on virodha are introduced with the remark- ' atha virodhamūlālamkārāh.'   At the end of the figure Vyāghāta, two views about the figures based on virodha are given.   Similarly, the figures based on srnkhalā are introduced with the remark - 'atha srnkhalāmūlālakārāh.'   This remark is followed by a discussion about

śṛkhalā.   At the end of the treatment of the figure Sāra, Jagannātha
establishes that śṛkhala does not deserve to be an independent
figure as it is a basic principle underlying the figures Kāraṇamālā,
Ekāvalī and Sāra.   The figures Upamā, Kāvyaliṅga, Yathāsamkhya and
Pratyanīka, which are the first figures of their groups, are introduced
without any remark showing the principles underlying these groups.
Neither is there any remark when the last figures of these groups
are treated.   The figures based on aupamya are subdivided into three
groups by Ruyyaka: (1) figures where bheda and abheda are equally
predominant, (2) figures where abheda is predominant and (3) figures
where bheda is predominant.   Figures from Upamā to Smarana come
under the first subdivision.   But nowhere in the treatment of these
figures bhedābhedapradhānya which is the principle governing the
subdivision is mentioned.   Rupaka, however, is introduced with the
remark — ' athābhedapradhānesu Rupakam tāvannirūpyate'.   Tulyayogitā
is again, introduced without any remark.   In explaining the
definition of Upamā, however, Jagannātha has said, 'evamabhedapradhānesvapi
Rupakāpḥruti_Parināma — Bhrāntimadullekhādisu, bhedapradhānesu
DrstāntaPrativastūpamādipaka tulyayogitādisu.....'   This remark shows
that figures like Tulyayogitā are bhedapradhāna according to Jagannātha.
In his introduction to Prativastūpamā, Jagannātha says: ' tatra
tāvatsādrśyasya yatra samskṛitā tatropametyuktam..... sādṛśyopa-

skrtasya vastvantarasya camatkāritāyāṃ bhedābhedānya- tarapradhānā anyělankārāśca.¹   This remark shows that the three subdivisions of figures based on aupamya are accepted by him.   The sequence of alamkāras also shows the same thing.   Like most of his predecessors, Jagannātha follows Ruyyaka in the grouping of figures and in assigning the order to the figures.   He, however, does not systematically mention the principles underlying the classification. At some places the principles are mentioned, at others they are not. It is indeed surprising that Jagannātha with all his precision and logical acumen, has not given to the classification the importance it deserves.

A comparison of Ruyyaka's classification with that of Rudrata is interesting as Jagannātha follows Ruyyaka's classification . Most of the figures treated by Rudrata as based on similarity are accepted by Ruyyaka as such.   Rudrata, however, treats the figures, Uttara, Pratīpa, Pratyanīka, and Samuccaya, as based on aupamya. Of these Uttara, Pratīpa and Pratyanīka are treated by Ruyyaka as based on loka-nyāya and Samuccaya as based on vākya-nyāya.   It must be added that Samuccaya is also treated as based on vāstva by Rudrata.

Most of the figures treated by Rudrata as based on atiśaya are treated by Ruyyaka as based on virodha. Rudrata treats the figure Utprekṣā as based on aupamya and atiśaya. Among figures based on aupamya, Utprekṣā is treated as a figure based on adhyavasāya by Ruyyaka for which he is criticized by Jagannatha. Almost all the figures based on Virodha contain atiśaya as their essence. Ruyyaka therefore, does not differ much from Rudrata when he treats the figures based on atiśaya as figures based on virodha.

The rhetoricians succeeding Rudrata have realized that abhedādhyavasāna is essential in most of the figures. The abhedādhyavasāna may be brought about either by atiśaya or by śleṣa. As atiśaya and śleṣa thus lie at the root of most of the figures, they are not accepted as principles for classifying the figures. The vyājaśleṣa (vyājastuti) of Rudrata is treated by Ruyyaka as a figure based on similarity.

The figures treated by Rudrata as based on vāstava include the figures Kāraṇamālā, Ekāvali and Sāra which are treated by Ruyyaka as based on śṛṅkhalā. Anumāna which is treated by Rudrata as based on vāstava, is treated by Ruyyaka as based on tarka-nyāya. Kāvyaliṅga

is not admitted by Rudrata. Rudrata's list of figures based on
vāstava also includes the figures Yathāsamkhya, Paryāya, Parivṛtti,
Parisamkhyā and Samuccaya, which are based on vākya-nyāya according to
Ruyyaka. The figures Arthāpatti, Vikalpa and Samādhi are not admitted
by Rudrata. The figures Milita and Uttara treated by Rudrata as
based on vāstava, are treated by Ruyyaka as based on loka-nyāya.
It must be said that loka-nyāya does not differ from vāstava. The
figure Tadguna, treated by Rudrata as based on atiśaya, is treated
by Ruyyaka as based on loka-nyāya. Atadguna is not given by
Rudrata. The figure Suksma treated by Rudrata as based on vāstava,
is treated by Ruyyaka as based on gūdhārthapratīti. The figures
Vyājokti, Vakrokti, and Bhāvika, treated by Ruyyaka as based on
gūdhārthapratīti are not given by Rudrata.

Rudrata defines vāstava as follows:
Vāstavamiti tajjñeyam kriyate vastusvarūpakathanam yat
Pustārthamaviparītam nirupamamanatiśayamaśleṣam.

A comparison of the classifications shows that the figures
treated by Rudrata as based on vāstava were analysed and śṛnkhalā,
tarka-nyāya, vākya-nyāya, loka-nyāya and gūdhārthapratīti evolved
as principles of classification out of the broad concept of vāstava.
The figures based on vāstava contain a realistic description of objects.

Interconnection, syntactical connection, and presentation in the manner of tarka are connected with the formal presentation of objects. Similarity and contrast come on the subjective side as they reveal the mental process preceding the expression. Alamkāras are different modes of expression and interconnection, syntactical connection and tarka-nyāya themselves are different modes of expression. They can be secured by abhyāsa. Figures based on loka-**nyāya** come as a result of nipuṇatā which is obtained from the observation of world, śāstras etc. However, Jagannātha's concept of pratibhā, shows that pratibhā may be the result of vy utpatti and abhyāsa also. Hence Jagannātha is justified when he says that all the figures should be kavipratibhānirvartya.

Ruyyaka is not clear when he subdivides the figures based on similarity. After the treatment of figures based on bhedābheda, and on abhedaprādhānya, Ruyyaka introduces the figures Tulyayogitā, Dīpaka, Prativastūpama and Nidarśana as figures where similarity is suggested. He remarks ' evamadhyavasāyāśrayamalamkāradvayamuktvā gamyamānaupamyāsrayā alamkāra idānīmucyante'. The figure Vyatireka is introduced with the remark- ' adhunābhedaprādhāny enālamkārakathanam'. Does this mean that the figures from Tulyayogitā to Nidarśana are not treated as bhedapradhāna by Ruyyaka ? Ruyyaka is not clear on this point.

Vidyanatha treats the figures from Tulyayogita to Sahokti as bhedapradhana.
Jagannatha seems to follow Vidyanatha when he says that the figures Tulyayogita,
Dipaka, Drstanta, Prativastupama etc. are bheda_pradhana. He also
follows Vidyanatha when he treats Arthantaranyasa as a figure based
on tarka-nyaya unlike Ruyyaka who treats it as based on similarity.

Ruyyaka's treatment of alamkaras is very systematic. He
takes up one group, treats all the alamkaras belonging to that group
and then proceeds towards the other group. He assigns order to
alamkaras coming under one and the same group also. The basic
alamkara, of each group or sub-group is treated first. Thus the
figures Upama, Rupaka and Virodha are treated first. The alamkaras
having a successive rise of similarity, abheda etc. are then treated.
Sometimes similar alamkaras are also treated together. Thus,
Parinama is treated after Rupaka. Sasamdeha, in which abheda is more
intensly apprehended is treated after Parinama. The abheda gradually
becomes more and more intense in the figures Bhrantiman, Ullekha and
Apahnuti which are then taken up for treatment. Sabdartha is
apprehended before vakyartha. Hence the figures Tulyayogita and
Dipaka, where the connection between two sabdarthas is apprehended,
are stated first and the figures Prativastupama and Drstanta where the
connection is apprehended between two vakyarthas, are then treated.

Another principle adopted in assigning order to figures coming under the same group is contradiction. Two figures, having contradictory characteristics are also treated together. Thus, Vinokti is treated after Sahokti, Viṣeṣokti after Vibhāvanā, Sama after Viṣama, Samuccaya after Vikalpa, Atadguṇa after Tadguṇa and Sāmānya after Milita. Some figures, where the above-mentioned principles are not applicable and which may be called miscellaneous, are then treated. Jagannātha mostly follows the order assigned by Ruyyaka.

It can be said that Jagannātha classifies arthālaṃkāras from another viewpoint also. Though Samāsokti, Aprastutapraśaṃsā, Rūpaka and Dīpaka are arthālaṃkāras, the suggested sense in these figures does not give rise to equal camatkāra. In Samāsokti and Aprastutapraśaṃsā, the suggested sense, though subordinate, is the source of strikingness; in figures like Rūpaka or Utprekṣā, it is not. All the arthālaṃkāras, therefore, can not be said to be alike. Jagannātha has classified such arthālaṃkāras in his classification of kāvya. A note on the classification of Kāvya will not be out of point. Accepting the Dhvani theory, Mammaṭa had classified kāvya into Uttama, Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya, and Avara. Instances of arthālaṃkāras like Samāsokti are instances of Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya according to Mammaṭa.

The kāvya, where strikingness arises only from figures of sense, is treated as Citra which is the lowest variety of kāvya and it is treated as equal to S'abdacitra where the charm arises only from figures of words. This classification was accepted by all the predecessors of Jagannātha. This classification, however, is unscientific. It is not proper to group all arthālamkāras under Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya because, the suggested sense in figures like Samāsokti is certainly more striking than that in figures like Rūpaka. Then again, the strikingness arising from figures of sense is certainly different from that arising from figures of word.

Jagannātha's classification of kāvya into Uttamottama, Uttama, Madhyama and Adhama, is based on the position of the suggested sense, which again is based on camatkāra. Jagannātha says that a fifth variety_Adhamādhama (where the strikingness of sense is absent) is also possible, but it is not taken into account as it is not covered by the general definition of kāvya. Jagannātha has defined kāvya as 'ramaṇīyārthapratipādakaḥ śabdaḥ kāvyam.' Again, in discussing the third kind of kāvya, Jagannātha says - ' na tādṛśosti kopi vācyārtho yo manāganāmpṣṭapratīyamāna eva svato ramaṇīyatāmādhātuṃ prabhavati'. This means that the vācyārtha, in order to be charming, must at least be slightly connected with the suggested sense.

The fifth variety is not given because the words in it do not convey a sense which is charming i.e. which is connected with the suggested sense. This shows that the charm in poetry arises only out of the suggested sense. The definition of alaṃkāra (prāgabhihitalakṣaṇasya kāvyātmano vyaṅgyasya ramaṇīyatāprayojakā alaṃkārā nirūpyante), also shows that the alaṃkāras should embellish the suggested sense, i.e. suggested rasa, vastu or alaṃkāras.

Jagannātha's Uttamottama variety comprises all genuine types of dhvani, including vastudhvani and alaṃkāradhvani. In Uttama kāvya, the suggested sense, though subordinate, is the source of camatkāra. Instances of figures like Samāsokti or Aprastutaprasaṃsā are instances of Uttama kāvya. The Madhyama kāvya is defined as 'yatra vyaṅgyacamatkārāsamānādhikaraṇo vācyacamatkārastattṛtiyam.' Instances of figures like Utprekṣā or Rūpaka are instances of Madhyama kāvya. The fourth variety is defined as 'yatrārthacamatkṛtyupaskṛtā śabdacamatkṛtiḥ pradhānam tadadhamam caturtham.'

Jagannātha's classification of Poetry improves upon the traditional classification. It is based on a clear understanding of the figures of sense. Jagannātha remarks ' anayoreva dvitīyatṛtiyabhedayorjāgarūkajāgarūkṣguṇībhūtavyaṅgyayoḥ praviṣṭam nikhilālaṃkārapradhānam kāvyam.' The instances of arthālaṃkāras are instances of

Uttama and Madhyama kāvya according to Jagannātha.   The classification
shows that arthālaṃkāras are superior to śabdālaṃkāras; it also shows
that Jagannātha broadly divides arthālaṃkāras into two classes: (1)
those in which the suggested sense, though subordinate is the source
of charm (2) those in which the suggested sense is subordinate and
is not the source of charm.   Mammaṭa's Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya kāvya
becomes/kāvya and a part of his Avara kāvya becomes Madhyama kāvya
Uttama
in this classification.   Jagannātha has described alaṃkāra as 'kaviprati -
bhānirvartya.'   In his definition of Upamā, and in the treatment of
other figures also, he has said that the alaṃkāra should be sundara,
or giving rise to camatkṛti.   Camatkṛti is defined as 'ānandaviśeṣaḥ
sahṛdayahṛdaya pramāṇakaḥ.'   This shows that alaṃkāras, which are the
results of poetic imagination should give rise to the realization of
aesthetic pleasure to the hearts of the appreciative readers.   The
imaginative poetry was treated as Madhyama in the traditional
classification.   Jagannātha analyses the alaṃkāras and shows that
instances of arthālaṃkāras can also be Uttama kāvya.