Chapter VIII
Conclusion

Jagannātha - Poet and Critic

(In the foregoing pages, we have made a detailed study in
the aesthetic principles of criticism of Panditarāja Jagannātha
and his poetical works) Now we shall try here to summarise his
outstanding achievement as a poet and literary critic. In assess-
ing him as a poet, we should remember that Panditarāja was both
poet and literary critic and these two separate faculties were
combined in him like other celebrated writers on ālaṁkārāśāstra
like Bhāmaha, Dandin and Abhinavagupta whose stray compositions
are pointers to their creative merit. To appreciate the true
spirit of the literary works of these writers, a clear knowledge
of the comprehensive interpretation of their aesthetic theories
is essential. Similarly in the assessment of Jagannātha as a
poet, we should remember this rare gift of combination of two
faculties - creative and appreciative which went in a long way
to make him a great poet too, side by side with his importance as
the tallest in the Indian literary criticism.

(Jagannātha was undoubtedly a versatile genius). He en-
riched the field of Sanskrit poetry by his unique contribution.
His claim to greatness is based on his bold attempt to rise above
his time thereby lifting Sanskrit poetry from artificiality and
decadance into which it had descended. The essential greatness
of his works is the nobility and the loftiness of theme. Indeed
Panditarāja made a bold attempt to give Sanskrit poetry a prestige position in the age of vernacular and Persian. He possessed an excellent poetic gift of rich esemplastic imagination and a high soaring poetic fancy of extraordinary order. The writer as a poet is conscious of his great creative power and he, like Bhababhūti, says in a self-conscious and self-confident tone in his Rasagangādhara, 'I have given here new illustrations of poetry from my own pen and not that of others. Is the smell of flower taken even mentally by the mask-deer capable of producing Kasturi?' (Rasagangādhara, Introductory verse 6). No one can deny that Jagannātha is justified in making such a proud statement. As a critic he holds the view that genius is the sole requisite of a poet and he amply satisfies this condition. Apart from his genius he had a thorough education and grounding in everything that goes to make one great scholar and truly inspired poet. The list of subjects he learnt as mentioned in the introductory verse of his Rasagangādhara enabled him to become a Kavi-pandita in the true sense of the term. His mastery over these subjects enabled him to imbibe the true spirit of that age of polemics. The study of the rhetorical works from Bharata to Appaya Dikṣita was done critically by him, for he, on many occasions he differed with the opinions of his predecessors. He also did not neglect the poetical works of Hindi poets. He read Bihāri and other popular Hindi poets of his time.

(Jagannātha's poetic genius is that of a lyrical poet.) He has written some of the finest lyric poems in Sanskrit poetry. His poems dealing with devotional themes are the superb examples of his vision and rhetorics both. Though they are minor poems,
they are noble creations in Sanskrit literature and can rank equal to the best of Sankaracharya Bana and Mayura. Panditaraja's Gangabhaari is very popular in India and every student of Sanskrit stotra-literature is familiar with it. Equally famous are his Amrtalahari, Sudhalahari and Korunalahari. They are the beautiful devotional poems whose merit is universally acknowledged. But employment of devotional theories may not be an index to literary quality; for, there are different values for the devotee and for the critic. Devotional poetry comes within the purview of literary appreciation only when it is not mere extravagant laudation. Dr De rightly remarks, 'But when these devout utterances represent a professional effort and not born gift, a systematic exposition of religious emotions and ideas and not their automatic fusion in an instinctively poetical and devotional personality, they seldom reach the true accent of great religious poems.' Jagannatha's devotional lyrics show a fusion of fervent religious sentiment and highest aesthetic quality and the poet is undoubtedly is one of the loftiest and spontaneous stotra-writers in the history of Sanskrit literature.

Another important contribution of Panditaraja to the history of Sanskrit literature is his didactic poetry. The Prastavikavilasa and many other anyoktis constitute his didactic poetry which provides a good deal of moral and ethical doctrines. They are, however, not mere catalogue of moral utterances. The style of these verses are interestingly known as anyapadesa or

oblique instruction. The moral is concealed in the garb of describing some other objects or in making it apparently addressed to some persons other than are meant. These works testify Panditatarāja's power of observation and his unique worldly wisdom.

(Equally notable contribution of the poet is his erotic poetry. The Śṛngāravilāsa represents a finest specimen of his erotic poetry. Though somewhat overloaded and presented within the limit of a self-standing stanza, the charm of these stanzas consists in richness of theme in its emotional appeal and grace. In these verses, the poet gives miniature pictures of love in its moments and moods of delicate subtleties. Jagannātha, of course, is not so great a poet in the sense as Kālidāsa is; but he can be easily compared with Amaru and Hāla in the depiction of love. In the Śṛngāravilāsa, the sentiment of love is defined, analysed and classified industriously in all its moods and situations. Such procedure was highly attractive in poetry of that medieval scholastic age when Bihāri and other Hindi poets of Riti School depicted love in its various aspects. Judged by his own conception of poetry, Jagannātha shows himself a talented poet. In the depiction various sentiments or rasas, he has evinced much of calibre. Though he cannot be compared with Kālidāsa or Bhavabhūti in the depiction of acute agony of feeling, but nevertheless also could build up situation to give aesthetic pleasure in the minds of the responsive critics. In Sanskrit sentimental poetry, Panditatarāja's poetry will remain as one of the finest creations on account of its delicacy of thought, splendour and appropriate expression. But the most remarkable feature of him as a poet is that he can adapt his language to the topic he describes. He has a great command
over language and is a master of style and expression. He has fully adjusted his language to the demands of his subject and we notice a happy wedding between senses and sound in a good many stanzas of his lyrical poems. In these poems, the poet has adapted his language in such a manner that the sound is echo to the senses. Thus we see that there is, indeed, a spirit which animates the poetry of Jagannātha - the spirit which is essentially a spirit of delight which is calculated to create a new hope and cheers for Sanskrit poetry in the midst of sweet vernacular and Persian poetry.

Having said so much about him as a poet, we shall now try to make an appraisal of Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja as a critic. He belonged to the last part of the scholastic age. He is the last stalwart among the Sanskrit rhetoricians and critics and he still remains the last and the tallest. He comes to the field of Sanskrit criticism in the modern age when Sanskrit poetics had almost crossed the last stage of development. His age is marked by elaboration rather than creation. The chief function of the critics of the period consists in summarizing the views of the ancient writers in a systematic form with further fine distinctions and hair-splitting subdivisions. The various concepts of alāṃkāra-śāstra were already thoroughly discussed with arguments and counter argument from the time of Bharata and were set forth by different rhetoricians. Paṇḍitarāja is the last representative of this tradition, he states the views of ancient writers and on many occasion he presents them in a more lucid manner than they are presented by their originators. But his success lies not in their summary and elaboration but in proper evaluation of the
views of his predecessors. So in many cases the ancient writers hardly get his unqualified support. For example, he has vehemently criticised the views of Visvanāth, Mammata, Ruyyaka and Appaya Diksita.

(The concept of the soul of poetry was already come into existence.) Poetry was judged from different point of view by the critics of different schools. A comprehensive view of poetry should make a reference to all its aspects. But as a matter of fact Sanskrit rhetoricians before Jagannātha instead of attempting any co-ordination and harmonization of various aspects are found to lay emphasis on this or that single aspect of poetry according to the tradition to which they belonged. Jagannātha tries to come to a synthetic view about the conception of poetry. He makes a point of departure as a literary critic by defining poetry as words conveying charming sense. The concept of charmingness or ramaniyatā is a novel one in the history of Sanskrit criticism. It cannot be equated with rasa, guna, alaṁkāra or any other concepts laid down by his predecessors. It has a broader sense and includes within it all principles of Sanskrit poetics. Obviously Panditaraṇā makes a beautiful synthesis of a member of *values* in this very concept of ramaniyatā which revolutionises all standards of criticism.

Dr N. N. Chaudhury² has associated the name of Jagannātha with sabdaprādhānya-prasthāna on the plea that he lays marked emphasis on sabda and presumably he connects his name with Dandin

---

2. Kāvyatattvasamikṣā, p.5.
who defines Kāvya as groups of words characterised by a happy idea. But while Dandin is regarded as a propounder of both of the alāmkāra and rīti school, Panḍitarāja does not affiliate himself to any one of them exclusively. Despite his marked emphasis on śabda in poetry, he is out and out a supporter of the rasa-cum-dhvani theory as advocated by Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta. He accepts the suggested sense as the soul of poetry. But unlike other Dhvani theorists, he does not reject that class of poetry as non-Kāvya where there is no suggestion of rasa.

Taking ramaṇiyata (charmingness) as the criterion of poetry, Panḍitarāja divides it into four classes. His first variety, namely, uttamottama is the dhvani-kāvya per excellence where sound and sense, subordinating themselves, suggest a beautiful sense. When the suggested sense is rendered secondary but is still charming on account of expression in beautiful alāmkāra, then this is an instance of uttama-kāvya. The third variety of poetry will include those Kāvyas where the charm of the expressed sense is on equal footing with the charm of suggested sense. This, Jagannātha calls the madhyama Kāvya. We have his fourth variety of Kāvya where the charm of sound embellished by the charm of sense is the principal one. Thus our writer is obviously guided by the principle of charmingness in his hierarchy and so rules out the possibility of the fifth variety having charm of sound but devoid of the charm of sense.

As an exponent of beauty (ramaṇiyata) in poetry, Jagannātha gives poetry a definite footing making the concept its life-principle. He gives it a fine exposition and elucidates all
other concepts of poetry on the basis of this very principle of ramaṇi縠atā. He points out the relationship of ramaṇi縠atā with all other concepts of literary criticism and this is the most remarkable contribution of Jagannātha to the history of Sanskrit poetics. There are some scholars who hold the view that Pandita-raja cannot claim originality in this definition; this definition, according to these scholars reminds us Dandin's definition of poetry (cf. sarīram tāvadiṣṭḥārtha-vyabacinnā padāvālī, Kāvyā-darsā, 1.10). Again, according to these scholars ramaṇi縠atā is a term which is unfamiliar in Indian poetics. As Prof. S. P. Bhattacharyee remarks - 'In Indian poetics, rasa, guṇa, dosa and alamkāra are treated. Nowhere in this laksana nor its vṛtti is this requisites directly complied with. Ramaṇi縠atā, no doubt, is a jāti (genus) but it is not a rudhi in the śāstra (term with strictly defined connotation). In reply to the remark of the learned scholar, it may be said that Jagannātha ventures to suggest a unique synthesis of all aesthetic principles and to connote this uniqueness, a distinct term has been coined by him. As an aesthetician, he believes that literature is an art and primary duty of all arts is to exercise aesthetic joy in ideal readers. In the history of Sanskrit criticism, the concepts like rīti, guṇa and alamkāra etc. have been shown individually to be too narrow to include the whole gamut of aesthetic experience which is the essence of all literature. Even exclusive pursuit of either dhvani or rasa impoverises the field of literary composition. Poetry is an aesthetic expression where form and matter together

constitute the harmonious unity, and rasa, guna and alamkāra become the integral part of such an aesthetic presentation which gives rise to a super normal pleasure. Such a pleasure is unique because it cannot be compared with any other pleasure in life. As in music harmony is the soul of its charmingness, so in poetry also harmony of sense and sound, proportion, excellent qualities and emotions etc. should not be neglected. Over emphasis on one of these elements mars the beauty of a literary composition. This is the main point which Panditarāja is driving at in his discussions. He, however, raises serious objections against the definitions of Mammata and Visvanātha which provide an interesting study in the history of Sanskrit criticism. Visvanātha's definition of Kāvya is more or less subjective just like swarupa laksana of Brahma in the Advaita system. The definition of Kāvya as given by Mammata is more or less a description of Kavya, but not a logical one. Panditarāja, on the other hand, noticing defects in both the definitions offers a definition of Kāvya which more or less resembles the tatastha laksana of Brahma as given in the Advaita system. So his new definition has been much more comprehensive to include within itself all classes of literary products, high and low.

Jagannātha's treatment of rasa is very commendable. Though he does not mention rasa as the soul of poetry in his definition, he implies by his analysis that it is of supreme if not sole importance in poetry. Jagannātha's interpretation gives the final shape to it which is the crowning phase of Indian Aesthetics. Apart from his own view, he has presented the views of others including those of classists like Lollata, Sankuka, Bhaṭṭanāyaka and Abhinavagupta. In stating the view of Abhinavagupta, Panditarāja bases
the theory on Vedanta metaphysics. Dr K. C. Pandey has criticised Jagannātha Pāṇḍitarāja for interpreting Abhinava’s Aesthetic Theory in the light of Vedanta philosophy. But according to us, Dr Pandey has missed the condition of Jagannātha’s time. Saiva philosophy became obsolete in Jagannātha’s time. In order to base theory of Abhinava on a familiar metaphysical reality, he has had to graft it on a new system of metaphysical thought. Jagannātha’s ignorance is not responsible for this grafting. But the predilection of his age for Vedanta philosophy of Ādvaita school has compelled Jagannātha to do so. The net result of this grafting has not been very happy. So he has suggested a new theory of his own to suit the purpose.

Pāṇḍitarāja’s exposition of rasa, however, is not based on the drama but on poetry. In his exposition of individual rasa, he has succeeded in illustrating finely rasas from the aesthetic point of view. Regarding the number of rasas, Pāṇḍitarāja is faithful to the tradition and accordingly he accepts nine rasas of Bharata with Śānta. He does not recognise Bhakti as a separate rasa but includes in bhāva only. His obedience to the tradition, particularly to Bharata can be well imagined from his own statement that Bharata alone is guide in the recognition of a particular as a sthāyin or Vyabhicārin (RG, p. 56). However, his treatment of rasas and bhāvas is illuminating and original. He approaches the problem with a scientific and analytical mind and analyses

4. Indian Aesthetics, p. 139.
rasas and bhāvas from the aesthetic point of view. This must be regarded as one of his most notable contributions to the science of poetry in general and to the concept of rasa in particular.

His treatment of guna presents an interesting study in Sanskrit poetics. Though he is an original writer, sometimes he goes to controvert the views of new school of thought and supports the old critics. Thus the Dvani theorists accepted the gunas as the properties of rasa and not as that of word and sense. They also reduced ten gunas into three only—mādhurya, ojas and prāsāda. Jagannātha, on the other hand, does not consider the gunas as the properties of rasa. They are, to him, the properties of word, sense, rasa and composition as accepted by Dandin, Vāmana and Bhoja.5 He also introduces the Vedanta metaphysics in his conception of guna. According to the Advaitic conception of the soul, it is devoid of quality and similar is the case with rasa, the soul of poetry. He establishes by his argument that the gunas as the properties of sabda, artha, rasa and rasacana in conformity with the views of the old poeticians. Dr Raghavan6 has held the view that Jagannātha, giving his modified view on gunas accepts the view which makes gunas only three in number. But to us, it appears that he shows his leaning towards the ten gunas propounded by the ancients and accordingly offers his own definition which removes vagueness about their conception. He also improves upon them by making slight changes in their expositions. Thus in the history of Sanskrit poetics, Vāmana brought a marked change in the conception of guna over Dandin and Pandītarāja does the same or rather

5. Dr S. Bhaduri, Rasagargādhara, p.140.
greater yeoman's service to this theory of gunas by removing vagueness in Vāmana's discussion of this topic.

Jagannātha's treatment of alāmkāras implies that he considered the concept as the essential element in poetry, though, of course, he does not explicitly declare it. He is the only critic among the later writers on poetics who upheld the function of alāmkāras as supplements to the aesthetic beauty in poetry. In this respect, he makes a bold attempt to deviate from the standpoint of the Dhvāni school of Ānandavardhana. With the emergence of dhvāni-cum-rasa theory, the role of alāmkāras as beautifying principle in poetry came to be neglected. Panditarāja establishes by his convincing argument that the artha-alāmkāras in poetry directly contribute to the aesthetic beauty by supplementing the suggestive function. His division of poetry into four varieties signifies that he accepts the alāmkāras as an element which beautifies poetry and brings all alāmkāra-pradhāna-kāvyas under the uttama and madhyama varieties. His important contribution to the theory is that he gives a lucid exposition of the concept of alāmkāra and makes a specific attempt to emphasize that beauty or ramanīyata is the underlying principle of all alāmkāras and his conception of poetry is connected with this vital and universal principle.

Another special feature of his treatment of the concept of alāmkāra is that he widens its scope to include some new alāmkāras within the established alāmkāras and he accepts paryāyokta and aprastutapraśamsā as uttamottama kāvyas. He also does not brand all those ornate expressions having samāsokti and some other alāmkāras as gunibhūta-vyānga but includes them in uttama-kāvyas. His
significant achievement with regard to the poetic figures of speech is that he gives only due importance to the ornate expression and assigns them only due place from the standpoint of beauty or charmingness conveyed by them. Through his doctrine of ramanîyata underlying poetic figures he emphasises in definite terms that in aesthetic expression, the beauty of form and content forms a unity and this unity is the test of the appropriate use of figure of speech. Alamkāras, thus in Paṇḍītaraṇjana's āstum justified through the inward conception of expressional unity which controls the details and resides in a poetry as a whole.

Jagannātha's outstanding contribution to Indian Aesthetics is his fine exposition and interpretation of the individual figures too. He has succeeded in discussing and defining lucidly most of the poetic figures applying his critical acumen and scholarship both through employing the methods of navyanyāya dialectics. Another noteworthy feature in his treatment of alamkāra is that he has given a discussion on verbal cognition (śabdabodha) on some of the figures which further shows his dialectical acumen per excellence. To illustrate the individual figures of speech he has given his own examples and these illustrations are very expressive and evidence his clarity of conception. Without a minutely clear conception of the theory, it is not possible to give such uniquely precise and highly expressive illustrations.

Thus we see that Paṇḍītaraṇjana's contribution to Indian Aesthetics is indeed varied and important. He makes a rich contribution to the study of poetics by giving a logical and metaphysical basis to the traditional concepts of poetics.) He reviews the old
problems from the new angle of vision and presents his own view in a precise argumentative and systematic way. He also examines the illustration of the early writers and shows inconsistencies in the view expressed. In his own statement, P&ntilde;itar&aacute;ja is free from any kind of vagueness due to his inherent logical discipline in his modes thinking, which is the result of his training in Ny&acute;ya Philosophy. He did not plant any new sapling but he turned the sapling of the past tradition into full grown tree. In India concept of originality does not demand a departure from the past traditions by devising a totally new standpoint, but the furtherance and the evolution of the past tradition to higher point of growth is accepted as a true mark of originality. In this sense, P&ntilde;itar&aacute;ja Jagann&aacute;tha is an original writer. He did exactly in poetics what was done by Sankara in the tradition of Vedanta Philosophy.