CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION
SECTION 1

The Plan of the Present Work:

*Alaṅkāraśāstra* means ‘a discipline to study the beauty in literary art.’ Beauty in literary art is created by the literary artist through different arrangements in language at various levels of language. This arrangement gives rise to various figures of speech such as phonetic figurativeness, lexical figurativeness, grammatical figurativeness, figurativeness in the sentence, contextual figurativeness, figurativeness of composition. A literary artist creates a distinct language to express his art-form. As a matter of fact, literature can never ignore Philosophy. Philosophy means *Darśana* or Vision. Vision connotes the conception or vision of the entire creation at large. And this word ‘Vision’ in itself generates questions regarding the human life. So, literature can never be away from human life. As a matter of fact, it is born in human mind itself. Thus, a literary art-form is a reflexion of human life.

The new survey of universal knowledge in Encyclopaedia Britannica (Volume 20, P.114) says:

"Is it possible to define what we mean by science? Perhaps not, for science is one of the major activities of our minds, in this sense resembling art, religion or philosophy. None of these can be understood unless we consider them in relation to their past history. Science may perhaps be regarded as a mood in which we consider our world."

Thus, the study of beauty in literary art (*Alaṅkāraśāstra*) addresses itself to the following two questions:

1. How is a Literary Art-form created?
2. How is a Literary Art-form enjoyed aesthetically?
The different schools of thought seem to have been engaged in answering these questions in their own way.

By “Art of literary criticism”- we mean here these two questions and their answers.

In literature we find narration of facts and a philosophy of life working behind that narration.

Works of art have been thought of in two different ways. According to modern view - the artist is a special or even abnormal kind of man, endowed with a peculiar emotional sensibility which enables him to see what we call beauty and create his world of art. He does it because he is given with a genius.

In an ideal art, the artist tries to aesthetically improve upon nature. For the rest, the truth of work of art is held to be its truth to an external world which we call facts. When nature and beauty are harmonized, such type of creation called ‘the world of art’ takes place. Any form of literature is an art-form. To know an art-form is to know the soul of an art-form. This is why in Indian tradition the question which is put prominently is what is the soul of a literary art-form?

There are many answers to this question, Kuntaka (950 A.D.) however, says in his Vakroktijīvita (VJ) that the soul of poetry is an artistic turn of speech (Vakrokti).

He says, vakrokti is that mode of expression which is called ‘vaidagdhyabhāṅga bhaniti’ or an artistic mode of expression.

In the words of Kuntaka :

\[ ubhāvetāvalaṁkāryau tayoh punaralaṁkṛtāḥ | \]
\[ vakroktireva vaidagdhyabhāṅga bhanitirucyate || \]

(VJ. C-1. V.10.P.20)

Tr. : Both these (word and meaning) are the adorned and further their adornment exists in poetic skill that is called as :

‘artistic turn of speech.’
Vakrokti is a striking mode of speech, which differs from the plain, matter of fact, ordinary mode of speech. It is this distinguishing characteristic of kāvyā which brings in the special charm.

Thus, we find that Sanskrit traditions are very much aware of this fact that literary language has to be distinguished from ordinary language.

The view of Kuntaka on poetry too is that it is a poetic speech which is not an ordinary common speech, but is some thing different form that, which produces aesthetic pleasure in the mind of connoisseurs (Sahādayas).

The theme can be discussed step-by-step as follows:

Importance of the Study:

The present study aims at the study of beauty in literature in the light of the Alaṅkārśāstra (i.e. poetics). It explores the possibility of reconstructing a model of artistic creativity and relishing. This kind of approach has been going on across the globe. But little success has been achieved yet. It has not been possible to provide a universal model to any literary art for various reasons such as the resource endowment position, levels of various experience, philosophy and other relevant aspects of ordinary world. Given the above parameters, it is but natural to attempt a universal model of art-analysis.

Aim and Objective of the Study:

The principal aim of this study is to examine the model of literary criticism in regard to the main aspect of the contribution of Kuntaka and this study also wants to trace the source of the literary theory of Kuntaka. For literary criticism, such study is important as it will provide a universal tool to evaluate a literary art-form.

Finally, an attempt will be made here to show the relevance of doctrine of Alaṅkāra in the context of the analysis of literary style with the help of methods
provided by stylistics. Thus, in this dissertation an attempt is also made for a comparative study for modern stylistics and Sanskrit Poetics with special reference to Kuntaka’s Vakrokti vīta. According to Kuntaka’s theory vakrokti is the soul or essence of poetry.

Keeping in mind the subject matter of the study and to draw some conclusions therefrom, the following objectives are set forth:

1. To go into the process of creation of a literary art-form.
2. To go into the process of enjoying that art-form.

Scope of the Study:

Naturally, the purpose is to highlight the traditional models of creativity and aesthetic pleasure. Kuntaka identified those traditional models and he declares that his work contains new findings on the analysis of literary art not covered by his former writers on the Alaṅkāraś āstra.

Methodology:

We have already stated that Kuntaka (950 A.D.) advocates that the soul of poetry is vakrokti (artistic turn of speech). The following method is employed by him in analysing his theory of poetry:

1. The technique of structural function.
2. The splitting of the elements of the language of an art-form which make his poetry. For this analysis, he identifies two elements in the structure of a literary art-form:
   i) Alaṅkāras or adornments and
   ii) Alaṅkārya or adorned subject.
3. In reality the adornment and the adorned, together form an indivisible unity and unitedly constitute poetry.
4. This kind of analysis is used in the science of language. Hence, some of the scholars have said that Kuntaka has based his analysis on that of grammarians.
Purpose of an Art-form :

It is well known that the study of literature helps develop moral character in our society. That is why, literature is studied since ancient times.

Kuntaka says -

dharmādisādhanopāyaḥ sukumārakramoditaḥ
kāvyabandho' bhijātānāṁ hṛdayāhlādakārakah ||

(VJ.C-1.V-3.P.3)

Tr. : A poetic composition created with an eye to beauty is not only a means for the inculcation of values like righteousness, but also a delight to the hearts of the elite.

(VJT.C-1.V-3.P.289)

Other purpose of selection of this topic, is the utility related to instruction in values of human behaviour.

Kuntaka says -

vyavahāraparispandasauṇḍaryāṁ vyavahāribhiḥ

saṅkāvyādhipamādeva nūtanaucityamāpyate ||

(VJ.C-1.V-4 P.4)

Tr. : Participants in the affairs of life can come to appreciate the beauty of life-activity in a new light, viz. an appropriate pattern imposed by the poet, only by means of good poetry.

(VJT.C-1.V-4 P.290)

He further says that :

kaṭūkaśadha va cacchāstrāmovidyāvyādhināśanāṁ

ahllādyam rata kāvyamavivekagadāpahāṁ ||

(VJ.C-1 V.5/Ex-7.P.5)

Tr. : Scientific writing frees one from the disease of ignorance, like bitter medicine. But poetry removes the same ailment like sweet nectar.

(VJT.C-1.V-5/Ex-7.P.291)

Hypothesis of the Study :

To achieve the objectives of this study the following hypothesis is formulated :
As hinted before, the present study aims at generating insight into developing the principles and process of human resource development. This aspect has not been given adequate emphasis in the study of literature so far.

Limitations of the Study:

The data before Kuntaka are of ancient time and hence all cannot be verified in actuality. Nevertheless, the universal parts can throw light on building a universal theory of Art-experience.

* * * * *
SECTION 2

The History of Sanskrit Literature:

Sanskrit literature has a history of five thousand years. The oldest literature known to humanity is in Sanskrit. Sanskrit has three phases: 1. Vedic 2. Classical and 3. Modern. The oldest record of Vedic Sanskrit is the Rgveda. The Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata represent the best of the classical period and the Sanskrit continues to be the medium of artistic expression even to-day. The medieval period starting from the Christian era up to the 15th Century A.D. abounds in analytical literature.

Sanskrit literature has touched every aspect of human life and therefore on each and every topic there are texts in Sanskrit. There are texts on sciences and literatures of all kinds. Sanskrit literature in this way is a treasure house of a highly cultural society. Naturally, Philosophy was very early a subject of literary activity in India.

On one hand the literary artists kept on writing in Sanskrit and on the other philosophers and literary critics kept on formulating a science of literary criticism from very ancient times. Right from Bharata to Jagannatha, we find a number of theoreticians who gave thought to developing their own theories of creating and enjoying a literary art-form. These texts are called Alaṅkāraśāstra texts.

They deal with various aspects of literature in a systematic manner. In India poetics is a fully developed discipline of thought in Sanskrit. "It discusses topics like the nature, aims, divisions and constituent elements of poetry, the intellectual equipments necessary for a poet, various levels of meanings in poetry and the nature of the aesthetic experience generated by it. It is thus, a rich storehouse of many original ideas having a bearing on modern disciplines like linguistics, semantics, philosophy, aesthetics, stylistics and practical criticism. The value of Sanskrit poetics from historical and comparative stand-point can hardly be exaggerated in the modern context."

1. Rajendra C. Dr., "A Study of Muhimabhațța's Vyaktiveka", (Published by Author himself), University of Calicut, 1991, P. 9.
“Sanskrit poetics has a long history stretching from unknown beginnings up to
the modern times. It is not clear when poetics took shape as a distinct discipline.
Rājaśekhara, in his Kāvyamīmāṁsā gives a mythical account of the genesis of
Kāvyapuruṣa. Kāvyapuruṣa a personification of poetry. He describes Kāvyapuruṣa
as born of Goddess Sarasvatī and as having instructed seventeen students borne by
his will, in the various aspects of poetics. For example, Bharata, Nandikeśvara,
Suvarnanābha and Kucumāra who are mentioned by Rājaśekhara have been identified
as historical personages having actual connection with poetics and allied topics. Thus,
Bharata is traditionally regarded as the author of Nāṭyaśāstra, a treatise on
dramaturgy, poetics and kindred subjects. Nandikeśvara has been presumed to be the
author of the work called Abhinayadarpaṇa. However, a part from such fragmentary
information, nothing definite is known about the origin of poetics.”¹

“The strikingly beautiful poetic passages in the Rgveda seem to presuppose a
highly refined poetic taste. We see in Yaska’s Nirukta a systematic attempt to classify
the Vedic Upamā. Similarly, grammarians like Paṇini and Patañjali have subjected
the concept of Upamā to analysis. Such attempts can be regarded as the prototype of
later poetics, especially in view of the fact that the grammatical norms are made use
of for the classification of poetic figures. However, the fact remains that a work
dealing with poetics is yet to be found in the Vedic period. Nor do we find reference
to poetics in earlier works like the Chāndogya-Upanisad. Āpastamba, Dharmasūtra,
Yājñavalkyasūrti and Viṣṇupurāṇa which casually enumerate the various branches
of knowledge. From all these, it is reasonable to conclude that, though poetic
speculations might have begun at a very early period, poetics took shape as a definite
discipline of thought only at a comparatively later date, probably at the beginnings of
the Christian era.”²

1. Ibid Pp. 9-10.
2. Ibid P. 10.
“Thus the word ‘Poetics’ stands for Alāṅkāraśāstra which deals with over-all discussion of form, nature and essence of a literary piece. Centuries have passed, but no comprehensive definition of poetry or kāvyā\textsuperscript{1} or a literary art-form has been enlivened either in the east from Bharata upto Jagannātha or in the west from Plato till today.

1. “One thing should be noted here the word kāvyā in Sanskrit does not have the meaning that the word poetry in English has. In English poetry means verse only, but in Sanskrit kāvyā means not only poetical composition inverse but also dramas, proses, champus, fictions, paintings etc. ‘The term ‘literature’ is often used in English to express the broader sense and the term poetry is used in a very much restricted sense to mean only the literary composition in verse. But the term ‘kāvyā’ in Sanskrit criticism to cover all fields of the type of fine arts based on words and meanings.’ (Tarafder Dhirendra Nath, “Style, Stylistics and the Schools of Rītus”, (Ph.D. Thesis). University of Poona, Pune, 1987, P. 2).

[Here are given almost chronologically the definitions of kāvyā as expounded by different rhetoricians.]

According to Bhāmaha
(a) “śabdārthau sahitau kāvyam” (kāvyālaṅkāra 1.16)

(b) Daṇḍin says in his Kāvyādarsa:

“gadyaṁ padyaṁ ca miśraṁ ca tattrividhaiva vyavasthitam |”
(kāvyādarsa 1.11)

(c) Ācārya Vāmana says:

“kāvyaiṁ gadyaiṁ padyaiṁ ca” (kāvyālaṅkārasūtravṛtti 1.3.21)

(d) Rudraṭa (835-875 A.D. or before 900 A.D.)

\textit{nunu sabdārthau kāvyaiṁ sabdastātrārthavānanaṇekavidhāḥ}

\textit{varyṇṇaṁ samudāyaḥ sa ca bhinnāḥ pāñcadhāabhatāt ||}
(kāvyālaṅkāra 2.1)

(e) Ānandavardhana (Period of literary activity 860-890 A.D.)

\textit{kāvyasyātmā dhvanirīti bhudhairyāḥ samāmnātapūrvāḥ}

(Dhāvanyāloka 1.1)
Nevertheless, many have made attempts in that direction since good old age. In their attempts no doubt, they have been able to identity the various components of poetry such as *Rasa* (Sentiment), *Alaṅkāra* (Figure of speech), *Guṇa* (Excellence), *Riti* (Style), *Dhvani* (suggestion), *Vākrokti* (Indirect mode of expression), *Auśitya* (Propriety), *Anumāṇa* (Inference), *Camataṅkṛiti* (Charm) and *Ramanīyatā* (Beauty) etc.

(f) Bhoja (1st half of the 11th century A.D.)

\[ \text{nirdoṣaṁ guṇavat kāvyamalaṅkārairalaṅkṛtaṁ |} \\
\text{rasānvitāṁ kaviḥ kurvan kīrtiṁ prītiṁ ca vindati |} \\
\]

(Sarasvatīkaṇṭhaḥbharaṇa 1.2)

(g) Mammaṭa (C. between 1050-1100 A.D.)

\[ \text{tadadoṣau sabdhārthau saṅguṇāvanalaṅkṛtiḥ punah kvapi} \]

(kāvyapraṅkāśa 1.4)

(h) Hemacandra (1088-1172 A.D.)

\[ \text{adoṣau saṅguṇau sālaṅkārau ca sabdhārthau kāvyamā} \]

(P.16)

(i) Vāgbhaṭa (1st half of the 12th Cent. at least, 1123-1156 A.D.)

\[ \text{sādhu - sabdhārtha - sandarbha - guṇālaṅkārdbhūṣitam |} \\
\text{sphuṭa - rīti - rasopetāṁ kāvyāṁ kūrviṁ kīrtaye |} \\
\]

(Vāgbhatālaṅkār 1.2)

(j) Jayadeva (must be, at least between 1200-1250 A.D.)

\[ \text{nirdoṣā lakṣṇavatī sarītirguṇabhūṣitā |} \\
\text{sālaṅkāra - rasāneka - vṛttivark - kāvyanāmabhāk |} \\
\]

(Candrāloka 1.7)

(k) Vidyānātha (13th - 14th Centuries A.D.)

\[ \text{guṇālaṅkārasahitaṁ sabdhārthau doṣavarjitau} |} \\
\text{gadaya padyobhavamayaṁ kāvyamā kāvyavido viduḥ |} \\
\]

(Prataparūdrayaśobhūṣaṇa P.42)
But there was no unanimous opinion regarding the prominence of these components to the definition of poetry.”¹

(I) Viśvanātha (1300 - 1380 A.D.)

$vākyāṁ rasātmkaṁ kāvyāṁ doṣāstasyāpakarṣakāḥ$

(Sāhityadarpaṇa 1.3)

(m) Jagannātha (17th Cent. A.D. literary activities between 1620 and 1660 A.D.)

$ramaṇīyārtha - pratipādakaḥ sabadaḥ kavyam (rasa) ]$

[ Above all definitions of kāvyā are quoted from Daṇḍin’s kāvyādarśa, (ed.) by Bhattacharya Rampada and Dr. Banerjee Satya Ranjan, (Revised and enlarged second edition), The Sanskrit Book Depot, Calcutta, 1974, Introduction, Pp. xxi - xxii]

SECTION 3

General Survey of Different Schools of Indian Poetics:

There are several schools of Sanskrit Poetics. “Bharata tried to define poetry in terms of Rasa; Bhamaha tried to do so in terms of Alamkara; Danj in pleaded for Gun being the most prominent factor to define kavya. Vāmana advocated that Riti is the soul of poetry, while Ānandavardhana proposed that Dhvani is the soul of poetry. Kuntaka pointed out that Vakrokti is the essence of poetry. According to Kṣemendra it is the Aucitya element in a piece of literary work that is the most prominent one. Similarly, Viśveśvara Kavicandra defined Kavya in the terms of Camākāritā (Charm) and Jagannātha in the terms of Ramanīyata (Beauty). Because of these difference of opinions different schools came into existence.”

According to the Samudrabandha; there are five schools in Sanskrit poetics.

There are —

1. The Alamkāra school.
2. The Guṇa school.
3. The Vakrokti school.
4. The Bhojakata school.
5. The Dhvani school.

According to the modern writers, there are eight different schools or sampradāyas of Indian poetics such as 1. The Rasa school of Bharatamuni 2. The Alamkāra school of Bhamaha 3. The Guṇa school of Danj in. 4. The Riti school of Vāmana 5. The Dhvani school of Ānandavardhana 6. The Vakrokti school of Kuntaka 7. The Anumāna theory of Mahimabhaṭṭa and 8. The Aucitya theory of Kṣemendra.”

A brief survey of these schools have been given as below:

1. The School of *Rasa* (Sentiment):

The school of *Rasa* was expounded by Bharatamuni. Among these eight schools of Sanskrit poetics, the most important school is the *Rasa sampradāya* (school of sentiment). According to the advocates of this school, *Rasa* is the soul of poetry. He refuted the taint of the poetry and he also accepted ten excellences or diction which were previously mentioned by the author of the *Nātyaśāstra*. When a drama is preformed by the ingenious actors in accompaniment with music and clever histrianic devices and them the minds of the spectators automatically come in contact with the actors and they appear to have forgotten the difference among time, place and persons and this rapidly transforms itself into a feeling of absolute pleasure which is called *Rasa*.

2. The School of *Alamkāra* (Figure of Speech):

"Ācārya Bhāmaha, the writer of *Kāvyālaṃkāra*, is the exponent of this school. There were many followers of this school. According to the followers of this school, *Alamkāra* (figure of speech) is the most essential element in *kāvyā* (Poetry)."¹

According to Bhāmaha,

*rūpakādiralamkārastasyānyairbahudhoditaḥ |

na kāntamapi nirbhūsam vibhāti vanitāmukham ||²  (kāvyalaṅkāra 1.13)

"A lady would look charming when she would be adorned with ornaments."

Bhāmaha classified Alamkāras into two main classes, namely, *Śabdālaṃkāra* and *Arthālaṃkāra.*³ "The Alamkāravādins accepted the two types of Alamkāras. But they were highly interested in inventing new figures of speech (*Alamkāras*) on the

---

¹. Ibid Pp. 15-16.
basis of logic and grammar and naming them in a scholastic way. So, the number of A\l\`{a}m\k{\k{a}}ras were increasing day by day. Bharata mentioned only four names of A\l\`{a}m\k{\k{a}}ras, viz. upam\`{a}, r\`{u}paka, d\`{i}paka and yama\k{\k{a}}. Bh\`{a}maha mentioned many more than Bharata. Da\n\d\'\i n added few more. But V\`{a}mana tried to trim down the number of A\l\`{a}m\k{\k{a}}ras. At last, the A\l\`{a}m\k{\k{a}}ras reached the number one hundred and thirty three as described by Appayadixita in his kuvalay\`{a}nanda.”

3. The School of Gu\n\`{a} (Excellence):

“Da\n\d\'\i n was the exponent of the school of Gu\n\`{a}. According to some modern scholars, however it is not a separate school at all. Their attitude towards Gu\n\`{a} is that the concepts of Gu\n\`{a} and R\`{i}t\`{i} are so intertwined with each other that R\`{i}t\`{i} is inseparable from Gu\n\`{a}.” According to Bharata Gu\n\`{a}s are ten in number, namely, \`{S}\`{e}\l\`{a} (contactness), Pras\`{a}\`{a}da (perspicacity), Samat\`{a} (evenness), M\`{a}dhurya (sweetness), Sukum\`{a}r\`{a}t\`{a} (delivery), Arthavyakti (lucidity), Ud\`{a}ratva (excitedness), ojas (strength), k\`{a}nti (grace) and sam\`{a}dhi (metaphoric transfer). “But Bh\`{a}maha recognised only three. Da\n\d\'\i n mentioned ten Gu\n\`{a}s in his k\`{a}vy\`{a}dar\`{a} but he could not make any classification of Gu\n\`{a}s. V\`{a}mana is the first to classify into two categories, namely \`{S}\`{a}bdag\`{u}na and Arthag\`{u}na on the basis of sound and meaning respectively. Among the critics of the last group, Bhojadeva accepted that Gu\n\`{a}s have two main divisions, but again mentioned twenty four names separately for each of the division, Vi\"{v}se\"{v}ara Kav\`{i}c\`{a}ndra (1330 A.D.), the author of Camat\`{a}\`{k}arakandrika accepted twenty three Gu\n\`{a}s in his treatise.”

“Nevertheless the name of the Gu\n\`{a}s remain same as those of Da\n\d\'\i n. V\`{a}mana has made a clear differentiation between the Gu\n\`{a} and A\l\`{a}m\k{\k{a}}ras. According to V\`{a}mana R\`{i}t\`{i} is the soul of poetry and the soul of R\`{i}t\`{i} is Gu\n\`{a}.”

1. Ibid P. 17.
2. Ibid P. 19.
4. The School of *Rīti* (Style) :

The school of *Rīti* was expounded by Vāmana who talked in terms of the soul of poetry. According to the advocates of this school *Rīti* (style) is the soul of poetry.

5. The School of *Dhvani* (Suggestion) :

"Ānandavardhana, the author of the *Dhvanyālōka*, appeared in the scene with his theory of *Dhvani*. According to Ānandavardhana *Dhvani*, is the soul of poetry. That theory was epoch-making theory in literary criticism, because of a very intelligent analysis of the suggestive potentiality of helping the development of a new out-look of the poets in respect of the content of their poetic composition."\(^1\)

"The central idea of *Dhvani* theory is that words have the capacity of conveying sense with the three-fold function and consequently express a three-fold sense. These three functions are *Abhidhā* (denotation), *Lakṣanā* (indication) and *Vyañjanā* (suggestion). The function of *Vyañjanā* (suggestion) operates when other two (i.e. *Abhidhā* and *Lakṣanā*) function have exhausted their capabilities of expression."\(^2\)

*Dhvani* is divided into three different varieties on the basis of the suggested sense or idea, namely *Vastu* (matter of fact), *Alaṁkāra* (figure of speech) and *Rasa* (sentiment) and they are again divided into some sub-varieties.

6. The *Anumāna* Theory (Inference) :

"Mahimabhaṭṭa, the author of *Vyākātiprīveka*, is the exponent of the theory of *Anumāna* (inference). He criticized his predecessors in the new light of logic (*Nyāya*). According to his theory, the principle of suggestion is a variety of inference (*Anumāna*). According to him, the concept of suggestion (*Vyañjanā*) propounded by the advocates of *Dhvani* theory, is *kāvyānumitī*, the process by which another sense is revealed by

\(^1\) Ibid P. 22.

\(^2\) Ibid P. 23.
the expressed sense, or by a sense inferred from it connectedly."1 But his theory could not get much important place in the history of literary criticism due to the lack of competent adherents.

7. The Theory of Ausiya (Propriety):

"Kṣemendra, was the expounder of the theory of Ausiya (propriety or appropriateness). He was the author of Ausiyavicārācā, in which he explained his views towards the definition of kāvyā or poetry."2 "According to Kṣemendra, Ausiya is the condition of being appropriate or suitable, when things suit each other well and match properly, they may be said to be proper or appropriate. Such matching or fitting or propriety is called Ausiya. There are twenty seven types of application of Ausiya those have been described by him which are used in kāvyā."3

They are as follows:

"Word (Pada), Sentence (Vākya), the sense of composition as whole (Prabandhārtha), literary excellence (Guṇas), figures of speech (Alāmkāras), sentiment (Rasa), the employment of verb (Kriyā), the use of case (Kāraka), the gender (Līṅga), number (Vacana), adjective (Viśeṣa), prefix (Upasarga), indeclinable (Nipāta), tense (Kāla), place (Deśa), family (Kula), vow (Vṛata), truth (Tattva), existence (Sattva), intention (Abhiprāya), nature (Svabhāva), winding up of sense (Śārāsaṅgraha), brilliance (Pratibhā), condition (Avasthā), judgement (Vicāra), nomenclature (Nāma) and benediction (Āśīrvacana). These twenty seven kāvyāṅgas (factor of kāvyā) have already been defined with examples by Kṣemendra in his Ausiyavicārācā. to prove the essentiality of appropriateness in kāvyā."4

1. Ibid P.32.
2. Ibid P.34.
3. Ibid Pp.36-37.
8. The School of Vakrokti:

Kuntaka, was the exponent of a new school named Vakrokti school. He was the author of famous book VJ. He flourished after Ānandhavardhana. According to Kuntaka’s theory Vakrokti is one of the Alamkāras and that it is the basic feature of all Alamkāras. The text establishes that Vakrokti or curved (figurative) utterance is the essence of poetic language. An analysis and examination of the theory of Vakrokti will be attempted in present work.

“Except these eight school, two more theories are found in Indian Literary criticism namely, ‘Camatkāra’ theory of ‘Viśveśvara Kavicandra’ and ‘Ramanīyatā’ theory of ‘Paṇḍitrāja Jagannātha. According to Viśveśvara Kavicandra ‘Camatkāra’ (charmness or wonderfulness) is the soul of poetry. The Ramanīyatā theory of Jagannātha recognised that ‘Kāvya’ is composed of words, having the wonderful meaning in it (ramanīyārtha pratipadakah śabdakah kāvyam).”

The urge of expression of the feelings and emotion deeprooted in the subconscious states of psyche finds it exposition in several forms of creativity viz. literature, paintings, music and several other forms of art. It is this urges that compelled the caveman to sketch a byson or running horse or the walls of his dwelling cave or to move his limbs (rythmically or without rythm) with some strange sounds articulated. With the gradual passage of time, mankind become more and more civilized and tried to have justifications for each and every action and to regulate the actions to some extent, so as to enhance the standard of the same. But the urge had remained the same and mankind could never really afford to give up the instructive expression of his emotion. The seed of artistic creativity which was lying at core of his heart, slowly and steadily came into manifestation. The basic expressions were into three different plains, painting and music being the primitive most, which was followed by literature with the development of language.

1. Ibid P.38.
Hence, Kuntaka and his art of literary criticism has been trying to manifest from the ordinary world up to how we can get aesthetic enjoyment in literature. Such type of manifestation will be attempted in the following chapter.