CHAPTER IV
Before we proceed to examine the influence exerted by Vāmana upon subsequent writers, it will be useful for us sum up the results of Vāmana’s viewpoints of literary principles in his KLSV regarding alaṁkāra.

From him we get the concept of soul of poetry for the first time. He declares openly what really is the soul of poetry in his sutra ‘rśirātmā kāvyasya’. A question obviously arises, is Vāmana ignorant of the body of a poem. The answer will be a negative one. He knows well that his predecessors have already stated in clear terms in their works, what constitutes the body of poetry. So Vāmana does not mention it clearly though he indicates both word and

---

1. KLSV.1.2.6
meaning as the body. His famous commentator Gopendra Tippa Bhūpala also supports his views.

While stressing on rāṭti, he does not ignore the concept of alamkāra. The identification of alamkāra with ‘saundarya’ is the vital principle, so far the concept of alamkāra is concerned. Vāmana conceives of the alamkāras as attributes enhancing the beauty of poem. In his view it is not like common ornaments, bracelet, ear-rings etc. which can be removed and placed on the human body. So Vāmana comprehends alamkāra in a deeper sense which the later writers on alamkārasāstra explains very clearly in their works.

A number of writers follow Vāmana in the history of Sanskrit poetics. As mentioned earlier, a number of schools also developed in accordance with the emphasis laid by the different rhetoricians on different concepts. Whatever may be the school, the treatment of alamkāra is more or less present in case of almost each and every poetician. The rhetoricians of different schools express different views on the concept of alamkāra. Here an attempt is made to assess the similarities and dissimilarities of the views of later

2. kāvyāsabdoyam gunāalamkārasamkrtyayoh śabdārthayoh vartate, bhaktyā tu śabdārthamātravacanotra grhāyate,  vṛtti on KLSV.I.1.1

writers with those of Vāmana. As the scope of Sanskrit poetics is very wide, it is not possible to compare Vāmana with each and every writer. A comparative study is being presented here in this chapter with some of only renowned writers on poetics.

As we have seen in the foregoing pages, Vāmana covers a vast field of Sanskrit poetics, to which he richly contributes. His contribution paves the way for his successors to develop their theory. Almost all the poeticians who come after him exhibit his great impact not only in respect of the theory of rīti but also with regard to other concepts, either directly or indirectly. They develop the theory of alamkāra in the line of Vāmana, of course, with innovations.

The immediate follower of Vāmana is Rudrata, who belonged to the ninth century. Rudrata, though influenced by rasa theory, actually belongs to the alamkāra school. He devotes ten chapters for the treatment of alamkāra and it appears that he considers alamkāra to be an important element of poetry. The treatment of alamkāra is the distinguishing feature of Rudrata’s Kāvyālāmkaāra (RKL), which justifies its title. The treatment of alamkāras is elaborate and exhaustive in RKL which differentiates Rudrata from earlier writers like Vāmana.

Here, a comparison is presented in connection with particular alamkāras.

Vāmana and Rudraṭa

As a succeeding writer Rudraṭa is influenced by Vāmana. No poetician except Vāmana expressly makes distinction between śabdālamkāra and arthālamkāra. Rudraṭa, following Vāmana classifies the figures into two groups according to the relative prominence given to śabda and artha5.

While classifying the arthālamkāras, Rudraṭa takes into account four principles, vāstava (substantiality), aupamya (comparison) atisāya (exubercence) and śleṣa (paronomasia)6 while Vāmana considers aupamya as the only basis of all arthālamkāras. Rudraṭa thinks that comparison alone cannot be the substratum of all alamkāras. All the poeticians are in agreement with Rudraṭa except Vāmana who is unique in this regard7.

5. ibid. p. 62.
6. arthasyālamkāraḥ vāstavāmaupamyamātiśayāḥ ślesah / esāneva viśesa anye tu bhavanti niḥsesah // RKL. VII. 9
7. HSP (De). vol II. p.62
Rudrata conceives sahokti on the basis of two principles vastava and aupamya. But the idea of similitude is present in the exposition of both the variety of sahokti.

The most common figure upamā is also dealt by Rudrata very exhaustively. Like Vāmana, Rudrata also mentions kalpitopamā. But the treatment of this figure is totally different in RKL as it is a sub variety vākyopamā whereas in KLSV it is a variety of upamā. Apart from that, their definitions are also totally different.

Regarding the faults of upamā Rudrata mentions only four in contradiction to six of Vāmana.

In case of vakrokti alamkāra, there is a basic difference between Vāmana and Rudrata. Vāmana conceives vakrokti as an arthalamkāra while vakrokti is a s'abddlamkāra in RKL. Vakrokti of Vāmana where there is indication of things based upon similarity

8. AA. p. 260 and also
cf. bhavati yathārūpoarthah kurvannevaparam tathābhūtaṁ/ uktistasya samānā tena samamī yā sahoktiḥ sā// RKL. VII.13
and yo vā yena kriyate tathaiva bhavata ca tena tasyāpi/abhimānīlam yatkriyate samānadhanyā sahoktiḥ sā// RKL. VII. 15
also sā hi sahoktiryasyām prasiddhadurādhikakriyo yoarthāh/
tasya samānaksiya iti kathyeyānāh samaṁ tena// RKL. VIII. 99
9. sāmānyasabdābdo vaisāmyasambhāvo aprasidhiśca/ ityete
catvāro doṣa nasamyagupamāyāḥ // RKL. XI. 24
10. KLSV. IV. 3.8
corresponds to the *suksmalamkāra* of Rudrata which implies expression of a secondary sense of a word not related to the meaning (expressed) of that particular word\textsuperscript{11}.

Regarding the *miśra alamkāras*, Rudrata conceives it on the line of Vāmana. But Rudrata as a later writer in more elaborate. But what strikes most is that Rudrata names mixed figures as *samkara* or *samkīraṇa* in the same sense of *samārśti* of Vāmana. Rudrata’s variety of *miśra alamkāra* is innumerable but Vāmana’s *samsārśti* is only of two types, *upamārūpaka* and *utprekṣāvayava*. Rudrata classifies it according to the visibility and invisibility of constituent *alamkāras* in accordance with the combination milk and water and like rice and sesame\textsuperscript{12}.

\textsuperscript{11} yatrayuktimadaratho gamayati sabdo nijārthasambaddham/ arthāntaramupappatimaditi tatsamjāyate suksam// RKL. VII. 98
also, cf. ata eva sukṣavagamakaraṇātsukṣmamiti nāma. Namisādhu (commentator) on RKL .VII .98.

\textsuperscript{12} eṣām tu caturṇāmapi samkīrnāṇam syuraganitā bhedah/ tannāmāsteṣām lakṣaṇanmamāṃsau samYojyam//
and yogabāṣādetesām tilatandulavacca dughdajalavacca/
vyaktāvyaktamāṃtvasamkara utpadyate dvedhā// RKL. X.24-25
The scope of treatment of *arthāntaranyāsa* figure is also more wider in RKL than in KLSV. Rudrata also conceives *arthāntaranyāsa* based upon similarity (*aupamya*) but he presents it on the basis of similarity and dissimilarity. Both of these varieties have again two sub-varieties involving particular sentence supported by general sentence and vice-versa. The example\(^{13}\) of second division of dissimilarity is closer to Vāmana's *arthāntaranyāsa*. But Namisādhu, the famous commentator on RKL quoting Vāmana’s example of *arthāntaranyāsa*\(^{14}\) opines that the verse contains *arthāntaranyāsābhāsa* as the verse has no *aupamya*. But according to former rhetoricians, there is *arthāntaranyāsa* for placing or presenting two meanings\(^{15}\).

---

13. \(\text{हर्दयेना निर्विरानंभवाः} \text{नर्नंम सर्वांनंनिर्विर्ताया/} \text{इन्दुरापी} \text{ताथाहि मनाः} \text{खेदयतितरः प्रियाविरागः}\

14. \(\text{प्रियेनासम्ग्रथ्या} \text{विपक्षसान्निधवपाहितम} \text{वाक्ससी} \text{पिवरास्तानि} \text{स्राजां} \text{ना काचित्विजाहां} \text{जालविलाम} \text{वासंती हि प्रेम्नि} \text{गुणा} \text{ना} \text{वस्तुनि}\

15. \(\text{आथायम्} \text{को} \text{अलंकारह,} \text{याथा} \text{प्रियेना} \text{सम्ग्राथ्या} \text{ित्यादि} \text{नह्यत्रापुम्यसाध्वस्तियर्हान्तरन्यासाभहा} \text{सा} \text{तिरुमह,} \text{भामहादिमतेना} \text{त्वर्त्तान्तरन्यासा} \text{वा} \text{‘अर्थाद्वयस्या} \text{न्यासः} \text{सा} \text{अर्थान्तरन्यासाह’} \text{तित} \text{तदियालक्षणम्}.

Regarding the figure vyatireka, Vāmana states that upameya is superior to upamāna while Rudrāṇa opines that superiority may consist in both upamāna and upameya\textsuperscript{16}.

**Vāmana and Kuntaka**

Vāmana and Kuntaka belong to two different schools. Kuntaka, though does not have striking similarity with Vāmana, they share common idea in imparting vaicitrya or poetic charm to kavya through the alaṁkāras. For Kuntaka sālaṁkāra śabda and artha or embellished word and sense alone constitute poetry\textsuperscript{17} which is an echo of Vāmana’s famous saying ‘kāvyam grāhyam alaṁkārāt’. What is alaṁkāra in poetics goes by the name vakrokti in Kuntaka’s scheme.

\textsuperscript{16} yo guru upameye va tatpratipanthī ca doṣa upamāne vyastasamastanyastau tau vyatirekam tridhā kurutah//

RKL. VII. 86

and yo guru upamāne va tatpratipanthī ca doṣa upameya/

bhavatau yatra samastau sa vyatireko ayamanyastu//

ibid. VII. 89.

\textsuperscript{17} alaṁkṛtiralamkāryamapoddṛtya vivecyate/ taduṇāyatayā tattvam sālaṁkārasya kāvyatā// VJ. I. 6.
It is true that what Vāmana calls *vakrokti* has no connection with Kuntaka’s *vakrokti*. Vāmana’s *vakrokti* is mere an *arthālāmḵāra*, while Kuntaka’s *vakrokti* is sine-qua-non with the *alamkāras*. But he justifies the *alamkāras* are as such when they involve *vaicitrya*, *vakratva* or charmingness. That means *alamkāras* must possesse the peculiar charm of course along with fertile imagination of the poet\(^\text{18}\).

Apparently, it seems that Vāmana and Kuntaka have no similarity here. But one thing must be remembered that the charm or *vaicitrya* is ‘*Sauḍārya*’ for Vāmana. Vāmana calls *alamkāras* as beauty. Thus the charmingness or beauty forms the ultimate test of *alamkāra* in both Vāmana and Kuntaka. Even *rasavādin* like Mammaṭa opines that in the absence of suggested rasa, the poetic figure cause the *ukti vaicitrya* (charmingness of expression) and *alamkāra* it self is that charmingness\(^\text{19}\).

**Vāmana and Bhoja**

Bhoja is very much influenced by Vāmana in every aspect of *riti*, *guna doṣa* etc. Regarding *alamkāra*, the concept is borrowed from Vāmana but in the treatment of individual figures Vāmana has not contributed much, as Vāmana himself, has not treated them

\(^{18}\) HSP (De) . vol II. pp.188-189

\(^{19}\) ibid. p. 189
exhaustively. For Vāmana poetry is acceptable only because of *alamkāra*. That *alamkāra* is nothing but beauty. This beauty or *alamkāra* is to be attained by the avoidance of *doṣas* and employment of *gunaḥ* and *alamkāras*²⁰. Vāmana's concept of *alamkāra* corresponding to *kāvyāsobhākara dharma* of Daṇḍin is also similar to Bhoja's conception of *alamkāra*²¹. What Vāmana calls beauty is *viśiṣṭa* or *vicitra* for Bhoja and the *alamkāras* give that strikingness which is brought about through words and meanings²².

Dr. Raghavan points out that every sentence like ‘*dhumoyamagnēḥ*’ cannot be *alamkāra* if poetic beauty is absent there. But, Bhoja unlike Vāmana termed this beauty as ‘*vakrata*’ or ‘*vakroktī*’, which is an individual figure. In this point, Bhoja has resemblance to Bhaṭṭa. Bhoja in his *Śrīgāra Prakāśa* (Sr Pra) has clearly points out that the *alamkāras* are nothing but beauty²³.

There is an important topic on which Vāmana is followed by Bhoja and who even quotes two verses in this context. It is the

---

²⁰. KLSV. I.1.1-3
²¹. BSP. p. 637.
²². \[ \text{śabdebhyotraḥ padārthebhya upamādiḥ pratiyate/} \]
\[ \text{viśiṣṭoarthaj kavīnām sa ubhayalamkriyā matā//} \]
SKA. IV.1
²³. BSP. pp. 114-115
distinction between \textit{guna} and \textit{alamkāra}. Following Vāmana Bhoja also distinguishes \textit{guna}s from \textit{alamkāra} stating that the first to be the permanent while the later is impermanent Bhoja maintains that even though embellished with \textit{alamkāras}, a poetry should not be devoid of \textit{guna} as \textit{gunayoga} is more important than \textit{alamikārayoga}\textsuperscript{24}. Bhoja embodies two verses of Vāmana expressing the same view regarding the status of \textit{guna} and \textit{alamkāra} in a kavya. A kāvya, like the beauty of a woman endowed with \textit{guna}s, becomes relishable. Again, if it is decorated with ornament it becomes more relishable\textsuperscript{25}. With the two verses Bhoja adds another verse expressing his view about the employment of \textit{alamkāras} at the proper places for enhancing poetic beauty, just as body ornaments placed in the proper limb enhances the beauty of the body\textsuperscript{26}.

Among the \textit{alamkārās} Bhoja has named \textit{s'abda} and \textit{arthalamkāras} as \textit{bāhya} and \textit{ābhyanantaralamkāras}. Bhoja also conceives another type of \textit{alamkāra} \textit{bāhyābhyanantaralamkāras}. Bhoja takes a

\begin{align*}
\text{24.} & \quad \text{alamkṛtampi śravyam na kāvyam guṇavarajitam/} \\
& \quad \text{guṇayogastayormukhyo guṇālamkārayogāyōh// SKA. I. 59.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{25.} & \quad \text{KLSV. III. 1.2}\n\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{26.} & \quad \text{dirghapāṅgam nayanayugalam bhūṣayatyanjanaśri stuṅgabhagaou} \\
& \quad \text{prabhavati, kucavarcitum hārayaṣṭiḥ/} \\
& \quad \text{madhye ksāme vapuṣi labhate sthānakurapasalakṣāmih} \\
& \quad \text{śroṣālābimbe gurūṇi raśanāḍama śobhām bibharti// SKA. I. 160}
\end{align*}
number of examples from Vāmana. But he uses it under different context. The example of atiśayokti figure is shown as the example of śleṣa guna. Again, the example of kalpitopamā in Vāmana’s KLSV is shown to have a fault aprasiddhapomatvadoṣa. It is true that Vāmana has conceived kalpitopamā to be based on the imagination of the poet where standard of comparison and object of comparison are not popular among common people27. Though Bhoja has pointed out that particular fault in the verse udgarbhahūṇaramanā28 etc. which is also found in KLSV, he also clearly states that due to the presence of śṛṅgāra rasa it no longer becomes a fault29.

The concept of vakrokti by Vāmana seems to be an imaginative one. The later rhetoricians do not admit it. But Vāmana’s view could not escape from the sight of Bhoja. Speaking about

27. nanu kalpitāyā lokaprasiddhyābhāvat kathamupā
mānopameyaniyamaḥ , guṇabāhulyasyotkarsāpakārāsā
kalpanābhāyām KLSV .IV 2.2

28. The Verse is
udgarbhahūṇaramanāniramanopamardabhugonnatastananivesanibham himāṅgsoḥ/
bimbaṁ kathorabisakandakadāragauraivisṇoḥ padaṁ
prathamamagarakarairvyanakti//

29. āsyāṁ aprasiddhopametvena duṣanatveapi dvayorapi
śṛṅgāroddhipakatvasāmyāt guṇatvam. SKA. I. 150
lakṣaṇā, Bhoja says that lakṣaṇā is the life of vakrokti\textsuperscript{30}. But there is a difference between Vāmana and Bhoja. For Vāmana secondary signification based on similarity is vakrokti but for Bhoja all types of lakṣaṇā is the basis of vakrokti. According to a modern school Bhoja’s view is more acceptable than Vāmana as consideration of vakrokti on the basis of similarity is only baseless imagination\textsuperscript{31}.

Bhoja’s conception of yamaka is also an admixture of Daṇḍin’s and Vāmana’s concept\textsuperscript{32}. For Vāmana repetition of letters apart from the words having different meaning also constitute yamaka provided there is regulation of places\textsuperscript{33}. Bhoja also expresses the same view. The repetition of words having different meaning is yamaka for Bhoja. Bhoja unlike Vāmana points the repetition of letters in the concept yamaka\textsuperscript{34} whereas he opines that yamaka may occur repeatedly or at intervals.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{30} abhidheyabinapratitirlakṣaṇosyate/
saiṣā vidagdhavakroktijīvitam vṛttiriśyate\textbar Sr. Pr.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{31} HVJ . pp. 12-13
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{32} SKA. p. 292
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{33} padamanekārthamakṣaram va āṝttam sthānaniyamē yamakām. KLSV. IV. I
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{34} vibhinnārthaikarupayā ya vṛttivāraṇasaṁhateḥ/
avyapetavyapetṝtma yamakāṁ tannigadyate\textbar SKA. II. 58
\end{flushright}
Bhoja also takes an example from Vāmana’s KLSV which he quotes from Hariprobodha, a yamaka kavya, with reference to the enhancement of aksarayamaka while Bhoja quotes it as an example of suksmavyapeta yamaka as there is no of aksarayamaka in KLSV.

Vāmana and Mammaṭa

Mammaṭa occupies formost position among the rhetoricians in the history of Indian poetics. There is a basic difference between Vāmana and Mammaṭa as the former propagates rīti while the latter is a follower of rasa school. In spite of that Mammaṭa follows Vāmana in the treatment of certain concepts. There are also points where Mammaṭa criticises Vāmana.

In the treatment of vibhāvanā Vāmana and Mammaṭa expresses the same view, rather Mammaṭa quotes Vāmana’s definition verbatim i.e. appearance of effect even when there is denial of action35. In vyatireka also Mammaṭa is influenced by Vāmana which he defines as the superiority of object of comparison to the standard

35. kriyāyāḥ pratiśedhe api phalavyaktirvibhāvanā.

KP. X. 21

and kriyāpratiśedhe prasiddhatatphalavyaktirvibhāvanā.

KLSV. IV. 3. 13.
of comparison\textsuperscript{36}. But Mammaṭa is much more exhaustive and states as many as twenty four varieties of \textit{vyatireka}.

Regarding the treatment of \textit{prativastūpāmā} though Vāmana has directly not influenced on Mammaṭa, the latter borrows the example from Vāmana, which is an illustration of \textit{sūddhasādharmya prativastūpāmā}\textsuperscript{37}.

There are also some verses in Mammaṭa’s KP which are taken from Vāmana’s KLSV, though these verses are shown as illustrations of different figures in KP. The illustration of \textit{atiśayokti} in KLSV is an illustration of the figure \textit{sāmānya} in KP. But both the figures differ in their concepts\textsuperscript{38}. Again, the verse ‘\textit{nirabadhi ca nirāśrayam} etc.’\textsuperscript{39} is an illustration of \textit{samkara} of \textit{upamārūpaka} type in Vāmana’s KLSV, whereas Mammaṭa conceives it as pure \textit{rūpaka} of \textit{aśliṣṭa paramparita sūdha} type.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{36} \textit{upamānād yatanyasya vyatirekah sa eva saḥ.} KP. X. 105
\item \textit{and upameyasya gunātirekitvam vyatirekah.} KLSV. IV. 3.22
\item \textsuperscript{37} \textit{daivībhāvam gamitā parivārapadām} etc. KP. X.30.
\item \textsuperscript{38} \textit{malayajarasasvilipta tanāvo nava hāra} etc. KLSV. IV. 3.10
\item \textsuperscript{39} The verse runs as follows :
\texttt{nirabadhi ca nirāśrayam ca yasya sthitamani vartitakautukaprapaṇcam/}
\texttt{prathama iha bhavān sa kurmamurtirjayati caturdaśaloka vallikāṇḍah//}
\end{itemize}
Mammaṭa gives two definitions of *nidarsanā*. The second variety of *nidarsanā* where a particular action itself declares the relation between the cause and itself\(^{40}\) is very much reminiscent of Vāmana’s ‘kriyayeva svatadarthanvayakhyāpanām nidarsanām’ (KLSV. IV. 3.20). Mammaṭa even partly borrows the illustration, but *sambandha* (relation) in Vāmana regarding *nidarsanā* is *bodhanasambandha* while in Mammaṭa it is *kāryakāraṇasambandha*\(^ {41}\).

Again, Vāmana’s concept of *vakrokti* which is an unique in the realm of poetics takes a new shape in the hands of Mammaṭa. The indicated sense based on similarity is *vakrokti* in KLSV\(^ {42}\). But, this concept in Mammaṭa’s terminology may be called *lakṣaṇāṁśu laṅgha vāyaṅga pradhāna dhanvi*\(^ {43}\).

Like Vāmana Mammaṭa also conceives certain *alamkāradosas*. Vāmana mentions only *upamādōsas* while Mammaṭa mentions faults of both *alamkāras* pertaining to *sābda* and *artha*. The *upamādōsas* are more or less similar with Vāmana who follows Medhāvin. Mammaṭa even quotes from Vāmana for the illustration of faults. But he includes certain *upamādōsas* like superiority or inferiority in class, size in the general category of faults named

\(^{40}\) sva svahatvanvayasyoktiḥ kriyayeva ca sā aparā. KP. X. 26.

\(^{41}\) KP. pp. 85, 86, 87

\(^{42}\) KLSV. IV. 3. 8

\(^{43}\) VJ. p. XXIV
anucitārthatva (impropriety)\textsuperscript{44}. Likewise asādrśya (dissimilarity) also resolves into impropriety\textsuperscript{45}.

The most important point to be noted here in this context is the vehement criticism of Vāmana’s view on difference between guna and alamkāra by Mammaṭa. Vāmana opines that gunas create charm to the poetry and alamkāras enhance it. For Mammaṭa this concept is inconsistent. If all the gunas make a kāvya, then there are some rītis like gaudī and pāncālī where all the gunas are not present, a poetry having such style will not be designated as kāvya. If some of the qualities are sufficient to make a kāvya then the lines like ‘adravatra prajjvalatyagnih’ is not designated as poetry, though it possesses the quality ojas. Whereas in the lines like ‘svargaprāptiranan eva dehen’ etc.

\textsuperscript{44} upamāyāṁ upamānasya jātipramānagatanyunatvam adhikata va tādṛśi anucitārthatvam doṣaḥ.

KP. p. 227

\textsuperscript{45} asadṛṣyāsambhavāvapyupamāyāṁ anucitārthatā yameva paryavastyataḥ, ‘yathā grathnāmi kāvya sāśinam vitatārtharasmin.’

KP. X
though there is no guna, the lines are regarded as kāvya for having alamkāras like visēsokti and vyatireka\textsuperscript{46}.

In Kāmadhenu, the commentator clearly shows uselessness of Mammaṭa’s criticism. It is said in the Kāmadhenu that just as presence of suggested sense makes best poetry, subordination of expressed sense to the suggested sense makes middle type of poetry, the possibility of suggested sense makes the lower type of poetry, the presence of all gunas make vaidarbhi, presence of ojas and kānti makes gaudī and saukumārya and mādhurya makes pāncāli and the divisions of kāvyas are shown through the division of rīti. Vāmana has made the difference in excellence of rīti through the difference in gunas and the relishability of a poem depends upon

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[46.] yad api uktam- ‘kāvyasobhāyāh kartāro dharmāh gunāḥ, tadatisayahetavastu alamkāra’ iti, tadapi na uktam, yataḥ, kim samastaiḥ gunaiḥ kāvyavyavahāra utha katipayaiḥ? yadi samastaiḥ tat kathamasamastagunā gaudī pāncāli ca rītih kāvyasyatma? atha katipayaiḥ tat tat ‘adravatra prajjvalatyagniruccaiḥ prajyah pradyannulasastyesa dhumaḥ’ ityādau aujah pravṛtiṣu guṇesu satsu kāvyavyavahāraprāptiḥ ‘svargaprāptirnenaiva dehena varavarnini, asya radacchadarasau nyakkrotitaram sūddham’ itātatra ca visēsoktivyatirekau gunanirapeksan kāvyatva vyavahāra pravartaka. KP. VIII
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the excellence of riti. Hence, Mammaṭa’s criticism is not only irrelevant but also meaningless47.

Vāmana and Ruyyaka

Ruyyaka, though a staunch advocate of dhvani theory is greatly influenced by Vāmana. As a later rhetorician he discusses a number of poetic figures of speech but rejects Vāmana’s vakrokti and accepts Vamana’s vyājokti.

Ruyyaka, following the style of Vāmana plans his work Alamkārasarvasva (Alam. Sa) in sūtra and vṛtti form. Ruyyaka also takes up the alamkāra upamā first like Vāmana, as it is the basis of all figures of speech. He clearly mentions it in his vṛtti48. Vidyāchakravartin in his Sanjīvani commentary explains how the expression ‘the face is beautiful’ can be rendered in various ways to

47. tathāca paramate vyangasya prādhaṅyaye dhvaniruttamam kāvyam, guṇābhāve guṇibhūtavyangyam citramavaram kāvyamiti kāvyabhedaḥ kathitaḥ, tathātrāpi guṇasāmagraye vaidarbhī, avirodhi guṇantarānirodhena ojaḥ kāntibhūyesthatve gaudiya, mādhurya saukumāryaprācurye pāncācīti kāvyabhedaḥ kathyante. Kāmadhenu on KLSV. III. 1.4.

show the different figures of speech. Ruyyaka classifies *upama* in his own way. In spite of that he refers Vāmana’s division of *pūrnā* and *luptā*, though he does not mention his name directly. Ruyyaka’s third variety of *upamā bimbaprativimbabhāva* where common properties are expressed in different words but the properties in the *upamāna* are distinct from those of *upameyas* but based on similarity is closer to Vāmana’s *vākyarthavṛtti* variety of *upamā*. Ruyyaka also refers to the example of *vākyarthavṛtti* of Vāmana which is quoted from the *Raghuvaṃsām*. 

Jayaratha in his *Vimarsīnī* commentary vehemently criticises Vāmana’s view of considering *vākyarthavṛtti upamā* in that particular verse as it does not contain the smell of *vākyarthavṛtti*.

---

50. asyasya pūrnaluptvabhedaccirantaranaibahu vidhātvamuktam. Alam . Sar. p. 80
51. pandyoayamasārpitalambahāraḥ kṛptanāgarāgo haricandanena/ ābhati bālātaparaktasānuḥ sanirjharodgoaro ivādhrīrājah//
52. na ca atra bimbapratibimbabhāvasya viśayāntāram pradarśya vākyārthagatamupamāmaśankya guṇasāmyānāma ca turthaḥ prakāro vācyāḥ. yavata hi śādhāraṇadharamanibandhanamupamā svarupam, sa cātra dharāṁ nirdistānirdīstvena dvividhāḥ, nirdeśapakṣe cāsya traśividyamuktam, anirdeśapakṣe cāsya na vacitryam kimciditi na tadasrayam bhedajātamuktam. atasīcatra nirdiṣṭaḥ sādhāraṇadharmo vyavasthita iti ka nāma caturtaptāra kalpanā, vākyārthopama gandhoapyatra nāsti. Alam. Sar. p. 88
The concept of *upameyopamā* is almost same in all treatises of rhetoricians. But Ruyyaka is first to conceive its two varieties accordingly as the common characteristics is mentioned only once or separately. The first variety corresponds to Vāmana’s *upameyopamā*. The definition of both rhetorician convey the same idea. Ruyyaka even quotes Vāmana’s example of *upameyopamā* as the example of first variety in Alam. Sar.

In the treatment of *utpreksa* Ruyyaka elaborates the concept of *adhyavasāna* introduced by Vāmana for the first time. Ruyyaka is more extensive in the treatment of *utpreksa* with subtle classification of *jāti*, *guna* etc. Vāmana’s example of *utpreksa* ‘sa vah pāyād’ etc. is an illustration of *jātyutpreksa*. (poetic fancy based on class)

In the treatment of *vyatireka alamkāra* also Ruyyaka is more elaborate. He points out two varieties of *vyatireka* the first one where *upameya* excels over *upamāna* and another in which the difference between the two consists in inferiority of *upameya*. The first variety is the reflection of Vāmana’s concept of *vyatireka* where *upameya* is superior to *upamāna*.

---


54. bhedaprādhānye upamānadupameyasyādhikye viparyaye vā vyatirekaḥ. Alam. Sar. sūtra.29

55. upamīyasya guṇātirekitvam vyatirekah. KLSV. IV. 3.22
The scope of the definition of *sahokti* of Ruyyaka is wider than that of Vāmana. Ruyyaka classifies *sahokti* into different types. Vāmana’s illustration is included in one of the varieties based on *śleṣa* in Alam. Sar. In the fragment of verse taken from KLSV ‘astamś bhaśwānprayātaḥ saha ripubhirayam samhriyantām bālāṇi’. The word ‘prayātaḥ is *śliṣṭa* which indicates both setting of Sun and destruction of enemy. But the indication of relation between *upamāna* and *upameya* by the particle ‘saha’ is same in both.

Ruyyaka has quoted the definition of *virodha* verbatim from KLSV but actually the treatment is different in both. Ruyyaka conceives ten varieties of *virodha* indicating contradiction in *jāti*, *guna*, *dravya* and *kriya*. But here one point is to be noted that the example given by Vāmana is not accepted by Ruyyaka as that of *virodha*. Rather, the verse ‘sā bālā vayam etc.’ given by Vāmana as an example of *virodha* is an example of *asamgati* in Alam. Sar. But Vāmana is not aware of the figure *asamgati*. That’s why Ruyyaka has left the example.

Most of the earlier *ālamkārikas* are of the same opinion regarding *vibhāvanā alamkāra* as they define it as presence of effect without the presence of action (*kriyā*). Vāmana is no exception. But

---

56. KLSV. IV. 3.12 and Alam Sar. sūtra. 41
57. Alam. Sar. p. 457
58. KLSV. IV. 3.13
Ruyyaka for the first time, enjoins the term cause (karana) instead of kriyā\textsuperscript{59}, in order to make the definition acceptable to everyone as kriyā denotes kārya only by the grammarians.

The concept of parivṛtti is also same in both. But Ruyyaka adds the exchange of sama, nyuna and adhikā\textsuperscript{60}.

Ruyyaka has also taken some of the illustrations from Vāmana referred in a different sense. For example, the verse 'malayajaranaravilipatanavō' etc. which is an example of atiśayokti in KLSV is stated to be an illustration of sāmānyya. But there is no similarity between the two figures. Vāmana does not even mention the figure sāmānyya\textsuperscript{61}.

The verse 'aindram dhanuh' etc. is an illustration of second variety of ākṣepa figure in KLSV, whereas this verse is illustrated by Ruyyaka as an example of samāsokti inspired by upamā\textsuperscript{62}. Therefore, there is vast difference in the basic concept of the two figures.

Ruyyaka while dealing with viśeṣokti alamkāra criticises Vāmana’s view on that alamkāra. The definition of viśeṣokti that the confirmation of similarity resulting from the representation of the

\begin{itemize}
\item[59.] kāraṇābhāve kāryasyotpattirvibhāvanā. Alam. Sar. sūtra. 42
\item[60.] samanyunadhikāṁ samadhikanyunai vinimayaḥ parivṛttih.
\qquad Alam. Sar. sūtra. 62
\item[61.] Alam. Sar. p. 632
\item[62.] ibid. p. 335.
\end{itemize}
absence of only one quality in nothing but *rupaka*. Hence, it should not be regarded as a separate *alamkāra*. Of course Vāmana in his *Kavipriya* also hints at this point saying that this figure in almost all cases involves metaphor.

In the treatment of *vibhāvanā* Ruyyaka quotes a verse from *Kumārasambhava*. The verse runs as follows:

```
asambhṛtam maṇḍanamaṅgayastemāsavakhyamkaraṇam
madasya/
kāmsya puṣpavyatiriktamastrāṃ balyāt paramā sātha vayah prapede/
```

Ruyyaka asserts that there are four different figures present in the first and third feet of the verse, namely, *vibhābanā*, *visėsokti*, *rupaka* and *parināma*. Jayaratha in his *Vimarsini* identifies the *visėsokti* view as that of Vāmanīya. Samudrabandha another commentator on Alam. Sar. also expresses the same view.

---

63. *ya tu 'ekagunahānikalpanayām sāmyadādhya visėsokti' iti visėsoktirlaksitaśasmindarśane rūpakabheda eveti prthan na vacyā. Alam. Sar. p. 477*

64. *anye iti vāmanīyaḥ. Alam. Sar. p. 467*

65. *Alam. Sar. (with Sanjīvani). p. 125*
Vāmana and Viśvanātha

Viśvanātha is a rasavādin and is greatly influenced by Mammaṭa. In certain cases he also follows Ruuyaka. Therefore, comparison between Viśvanātha and Vāmana and again Viśvanātha and other writers like Ruuyaka and Mammaṭa becomes overlapping. Still there are certain exclusive points between Vāmana and Viśvanātha where they show sometimes similarity and sometimes dissimilarity.

As a later rhetorician Viśvanātha is more elaborate and concepts a certain figures of speech are wider in his case than those of Vāmana. For example, according to Sāhitya Darpana (SD) arthāntaranyāsa may occur in eight different situations viz. when a general statement is supported by a particular, or a particular by a general one and when an effect is justified by a cause and vice-versa, either under similarity or contrast\(^\text{66}\). Vāmana’s example of arthāntaranyāsa is an example of particular statement supported by a general statement.

The example of the figure sandeha is almost same, only the definitions given by two rhetoricians are different. Both Viśvanātha and Vāmana conceive it to be based on knowledge arising out of

\[\text{sāmānyam vā vīśeṣaṇa vīśeṣastena vā yadi, kāryam ca kāraṇenedam kāryena sa samarthyate sādharmyenetarenarthāntaranyāso aṣṭadhā tataḥ.} \quad \text{SD. X. 62.}\]
doubt (samsāya jñānasvarupa) when upameya is suspected to be upamāna there is sandeha. The samsāya should be charming (chamatkrtijanaka) and must be based on similarity\textsuperscript{67}. Viśvanātha gives three fold division according to the doubt present at different levels and its termination.

One of the examples of viśeṣokti of Vāmana ‘bhavanti yatrauṣadhayo rajanyāmtailapuraḥ suratapradīpah’ taken from the Kumārasambhavam is an example of adhikārūḍha vaiśīṣṭa pariṇāma in SD. Here in the line ‘ausadhayah’ is upameya, ‘pradīpah’ is upamāna. The prakṛta is removal of darkness. The lamps as identified with ausadhis subserves the purpose in hand which is the āropavisaya (subject to be imposed) and therefore there is pariṇāma. As the lamps are said to be unfed by oil, there is adhikārūḍhavaisista\textsuperscript{68}. P.V. Kane\textsuperscript{69} has clearly pointed out the inapplicability of the definition of pariṇāma in this line. Rather, he points out rūpaka in the line like Jagannātha. Though Vāmana conceives viśeṣokti, which he defines as the confirmation of similarity resulting from the representation of the

\begin{itemize}
\item[67.] upanāmopameyaḥmsayah sandeha.
\item[68.] SD (Kane). p. 127
\item[69.] ibid. p. 128
\end{itemize}
absence of only one quality, he sees almost rūpaka here, which he confirms in the Kavipriyā70.

Regarding apahnuti, the concept is similar. In both KLSV and SD there is denial of upameya by upamāna71. But in KLSV the upamāna and upameya are in the form of sentences (vākyārtharūpo)

In the treatment of atiśayokti alamkāra, there is no resemblance in the definitions. But, Vāmana’s example has affinity with one of the varieties of atiśayokti in SD. In fact, the first variety of Vāmana’s example72 of atiśayokti, taken from the Sisupālavadham (III.8) is a beautiful illustration of asambandhe sambandha, one of the five varieties of atiśayokti in SD73.

---

70. ekasya gunasya hāneh kalpanāyām seśai gunāissāmyām yattasya
dādhrya vīsesoktiḥ rūpakām cedam prayeneti.
Kavipriyā on KLSV. IV. 3.23

71. prakṛtam pratisiddhyānyasthāpanam syādapahnutiḥ. SD. X. 38
and samena vastuna anyāpalapo apahnutiḥ. KLSV. IV. 3.5.

72. The verse is :
ubhau yadi vyomni prthak patetamākāsāgaṅgā payasah pravāhau/
tenopamīyet tamālanilamāmuktamuktalatamasya vakṣah//

73. SD (Kane). p. 158.
In *vyājastuti* in KLSV there is praise in the form of blame\(^74\) whereas in SD, Visvānātha opines that there is *vyājastuti* even in blame in the garb of praise\(^75\). But one thing he has pointed out that when praise is understood from blame, that is called *vyājastuti* proper when blame is understood from apparent praise, it is *vyājarūpā stuti*\(^76\).

In *virodha alamkāra* Visvānātha and Vāmana convey the same basic concept. Vāmana opines that the contradiction in meaning, though not actually there is *virodha*. Visvānātha is also closer to Vāmana in the definition. But his conception is far wider when he says that when there is apparent contradiction amongst *jāti, dravya, guṇa, kriyā*, thereby showing ten varieties\(^77\).

74. sambhāvyavivisṭakarmākaraṇannindastotrārthaḥ *vyājastutih*. KLSV. IV. 3.24
75. uktā *vyājastutih* punah. nindāstutibhyāṁ vacyābhīyaṁ gamyatve stutinindayoh. SD. X. 60
76. nindayā stuteyargamyate vyājene stutiriti vyutpatyā *vyājastutih* stutyā nindayā gamytve *vyājarūpā* stuti. vṛtti on SD. X. 66
77. arthasya viruddhasyevaḥbhāṣatvam viruddhābhāṣatvam virodhaḥ, Kavipriyā on KLSV. IV. 3.12
and jātiscaturbhirjātyādyairgūṇo guṇadibhistribhiḥ, kriyā kriyādraidhyāṁ yad dravyena vā mithaḥ. viruddhamiva bhāṣate virodho asau dasakṛtih. SD. X. 68
But what is important in this case is that the verse given by Vāmana as an example of virodha78 is presented by Viśvanātha as the example of the figure asamgati, in which a cause and effect are shown as having different locations. Viśvanātha even distinguishes between virodha and asamgati very clearly.

Yathāsamkhyā is one of the ancient figures admitted by most of the ancient writers. Vamana calls it krama. Whatever may be the name, the concept is same in both KLSV and SD. Reference of objects made in the same order in which they have been already mentioned is yathāsamkhyā.

Vāmana and Jagannātha

Jagannātha is the most famous poetician among the later rhetoricians. Jagannātha and Vāmana belong to two different periods. Therefore, comparison between the two becomes sometimes impossible as their treatment of poetic concepts varies, especially in the treatment of alamkāras.

78. The verse runs as follows:

sā bālā vayamapragalvamanasaḥ sā stri vayam katarāh/
sā pinonnatimatpayodharayugam dhatte sakhedā vayamī//
sā ākṛanta jaghanasthalena gurūṇā gantum na śaktā vayamī/
dosairanyajanāśritairapatavo jataḥ sma itaydbhutam//
Jagannātha lays supreme importance on rasa and dhvani. But he does not minimise the importance of alaṁkāra. They are not mere rhetorical categories, but contributive to the very essence of poetic beauty. In fact his emphasis on alaṁkāra, even though being a rasadhvani theorist, is very interesting. Jagannātha’s poetic interpretation revolves round the basic conception of poetry ‘ramaṇīyatā’ or beauty, which has a close affinity with the concept of ‘saundarya’ of Vāmana. For Jagannātha poetry is ‘words expressing charming sense’. That charmingness is the criterion of a kāvya, which is also expressed in Vāmana’s view ‘poetry is acceptable only because of alaṁkāra’ and ‘alaṁkāra is nothing but beauty’. The individual alaṁkāras are instrumental in producing beauty in both Rasagangādhara (RG) and KLSV. But it must be remembered that the scope of Jagannātha’s ramaṇīyatā is wider. It includes within its scope the ‘iṣṭārtha’ of Daṇḍin, ‘saundarya’ of Vāmana and even ‘sahrdayaśāḥgyatā’ of Anandavardhana.

According to Jagannātha poetic figures are the source of charm. Charmingness forms the essential element in poetic figure. Jagannātha actually accepts Ruuyyaka’s theory of alaṁkāra which

79. PJ. p. 151
80. ramaṇīyartha pratipadakah śabdah kāvyam. RG. I
81. KLSV. I. I. 1 and I. 1.2.
82. PJ. p. 61-62
involves the ‘chamatkāra’, which is also called ‘hrdyatva’, ‘cārutva’, ‘saundarya’ etc.83

Regarding the individual alaṅkāras Jagannātha is not much influenced by Vāmana. Only in the case of viśesokti Vāmana is criticised by Jagannātha. What Vāmana calls viśesokti i.e. the confirmation of similarity resulting from the representation of absence of only one quality’ is not accepted by him. What is viśesokti for Vamana is rūpaka of ṅṛdhāropā type for Jagannātha. Vāmana’s example which is taken from Kumārasambhavam ‘bhavanti yatrouṣadhayo rajanyāmatalapuraḥ suratapradīpah’ where Jagannātha remarks that ‘tatha guṇadhikyakalpanāyāmapi tadeva (ṛdhāroparūpakameva) yathā ‘dharmaṃ vapusāṃbhuvī kārtavīryah’ ityadām etena ekaōūnā̄nyacayāḍi kalpanāyām sāmyadrāh m viśesānām iti viṣesalāmākāram lakṣyanto api pratyuktah’ Although Vāmana defines and illustrates, viśesokti he, of course considers almost rūpaka there, which he confirms in Kavipriya84.

In vyatireka also Vāmana and Jagannātha share the same concept. When the upameya excels the upamāna due to the association

83. HSP (De). vol II. p. 257.
84. SD. p. 240
of a particular quality it is vyatireka in RG\textsuperscript{85}. Here Vāmana also expresses the same view\textsuperscript{86}.

Here a comparison of some of the writers on poetics with Vāmana has been presented. It is not possible to compare each and every rhetorician after Vāmana with the latter. There are some minor rhetoricians who have hardly any material to compare or contrast with Vāmana particularly on the topic of alamkāra. It is true that there are vast scope in the comparative study of ruti with Vāmana, as he is the resource poetician in this respect. Every posterior rhetorician discusses this element of poetry with Vāmana’s conception in their mind. Regarding alamkāras, Vāmana himself is very concise in the treatment of individual alamkāras. Again, Vāmana is famous as ritivādin only. His view of alamkāra is not considered properly by some of the later rhetoricians.

Here it will not be out of context to point out certain topics on which Vāmana and other later rhetoricians share similarities and contrast regarding the treatment of alamkāra. Vāmana, who for the first time made the distinction between guna and alamkāra faces vehement criticism from later rhetoricians. Apart from Mammaṭa discussed earlier Hemacandra in his Kāvyānusāsana has clearly

\footnotesize{85. upamāṇa đ upameyasya guṇavīśeṣavatvenotkarṣaḥ vyatirekah. RG. I}

\footnotesize{86. upameyasya guṇātirekitvam. KLSV. IV. 3.22.}
pointed out fault in Vāmana's distinction. In Vāmana's concept gunas are inseparable attributes of poetry, while the alamkāras serve to heighten the charm already created by gunas. The difference between guna and alamkāra is beautifully expressed in the two verses in KLSV on the analogy of human virtues and ornaments. Vāmana regards both guna and alamkāra as the properties of word and meaning. Thus, they are not different in kind but different in degree only. Hemachandra criticises Vāmana. Hemachandra being follower of rasa and dhvani does not call a poetry until there is rasa. There are certain expressions like 'gatostamarko........etc.' where many of the gunas defined by Vāmanā are present but it cannot be called poetry. Again, there are certain verses like kaciccruta vārta etc. where the poetic figure utprekṣā is present along with certain unintended gunas it is regarded as poetry. Therefore, it becomes clear that gunas are dependant on rasa, while alamkāras are independent of rasa.

Hemachandra, though regards alamkāra as a promoter of sentiment, presents certain guidelines for using these alamkāras in a poem.

87. KAAS. pp. 78-74