Beginning of the Theory of Poetry and Jagannātha's General Rhetorical Doctrines

Beginning of the theory of poetry

(Poetry is one of the earliest aesthetic activities of the human race.) In the primitive society, it was identical with literature as a whole and was the common vehicle of human knowledge. But these works were not poetry in the true sense of the term. It was a kind of heightened form of speech as distinguished from the ordinary speech. 'This heightening is shown by formal structure - metre, rhyme, alliteration, lines of equal syllabic length, regular stress or quantity assonance - devices that distinguish it from ordinary speech and give it a mysterious, perhaps magical emphasis. There are repetitions, metaphors and antitheses which because of their formality, we regard as essentially poetic.' In Sanskrit literary criticism also, Kāvya is that form of literature which is the artistic creation of a poet and not a book contributing to knowledge or Science. (Thus Kāvya is the artistic creation of a poet and generally those writings which give primarily pleasure to the readers irrespective of their formal structures will be called Kāvyā in the proper sense of the term.) 'It is the characteristic quality which poetry shares with its sister arts, the quality of giving pleasure - the aesthetic pleasure; that is, pleasure which arises neither from a consciousness or right conduct nor from an expectation of material profit; but which consists in

India has a long and varied poetic tradition which begins with the Rgveda itself. Though primarily, it is a book of fervent prayers, it also contains much which is poetic. Many of the hymns show fine specimen of poetry and among them, those addressed to the goddess Usas are the best examples. In the later stage, the two epics of Vyāsa and Vālmiki lead us to the dawn of secular poetry. Vālmiki is regarded as the Ādikavi (first poet); it is he who first indicated to the world the ideal on which Indian poetry should be based. But purely secular poetry also existed written in the form of Sanskrit and Prākrit lyrics most of which are now lost. Hāla's Gāthasaptasāti is the gold mine of secular lyric poetry and unsophisticated love is the main theme of it. The same type of literature was produced in Sanskrit also and this can be inferred by the stray quotations included in Patanjali's Mahābhāṣya and Bharata's Nātyasāstra out the floating material of the time. Side by side with the popular poetry of these types, the court poets of India cultivated a highly artificial type of poetry. It was written in polished style with the clear purpose of giving aesthetic relish to the readers. Thus by the sixth and seventh century A.D., sufficient poetical literature secular in character grew and the growth of this type of literature led to the investigation into the rhetorical rules which culminated in
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criticism or exercise of judgment in literature.

Tracing the earlier phase of literature in the Vedas themselves, MM Kuppuswami Sastri has held the view that the Vedic seers were unconsciously critics too and in support of his view he quotes the following RK verse:

\[\text{uta twat pasyanna dadarsa vācamuta twah ārṇvanna sṛṇotyenam} \\
\text{uta tasmai tanwam visastre jāyeva patyu usati suvāsāh.} \]

VIII, II.23.4

which means that \textit{Muse} reveals herself to him who understands her. Here the Vedic seer praises the critic with appreciative faculty and the critics only can understand the merit of a literary composition.

Coming to the epics, we find that Valmiki was not only the first poet, but he was also the first critic. The creative faculty of a poet and the appreciative faculty of a critic were harmoniously blended in him. He describes the origin of the Rāmāyana in the following verse:

\[\text{pādaśradhokṣarasamah tantrilayasamanvitāḥ/} \\
\text{sokartasya prabṛtto me śloko bhavatu mānyathā/} \]

Rāmāyana, 1.2.18.

When the heart of the poet was filled with pathos, a beautiful poem came from the heart of the poet. He pondered over this spontaneous flow of feelings and appreciated it. He came to the conclusion that

his *soka* (pathos) had been transformed into *śloka* (poetry). This very idea of soka transformed into śloka has played a great role in the history of Alamkāra-śāstra. Ānandavardhana, the propounder of the Dhvani school has been inspired by this grand idea and on the basis of it, he has expounded the doctrine of Dhvani as the soul of Kāvyā. So he says:

\[
\text{kāvyasyātmā sa ebārthastathā cādikaveḥ pura/}
\text{krauncadvandvabiyogatthāḥ sōkah ślokatvamāgataḥ.}
\]

\[(Dhvanyālōk, 1/5).\]

But the unconscious criticism of the Vedic seers or Vālmīkis unconscious appreciation of his own outpouring of heart at the sight of the pathetic scene cannot lead us to the conclusion that Sanskrit criticism as a definite discipline began with the RgVeda or with Vālmīki. There is a virtual gap between the unconscious appreciation of poetry and the conscious formulation of the system of criticism. Ānandavardhana was inspired by the sōka-śloka equation of Vālmīki. But it does not lead us to the safe conclusion that Vālmīki followed a definite set of aesthetic rules knowingly.

In Sanskrit, the theory of poetry has a long history covering a long period with distinct stages of development. But we know very little about the beginning of the system until we come to Bharata's Nātyasāstra. It is a monumental treatise on standard exposition of dramaturgy and deals with poetics in so far as it applies to the theme in hand. This has led many scholars to the conclusion that poetics evolved out of dramaturgy. As Dr Raghavan
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puts it, 'There is a consensus of opinion among the literary critics in considering drama as the greatest form of literature. It is also interesting to note in connection with this enquiry the historical fact that poetics rose out of dramaturgy. Bharata's Natyasastra is also the first work to deal with Alamkara. Aristotle's Poetics considers Tragedy, a type of drama, as the greatest form of poetry. Among the writers of the Sanskrit Alamkara Sastra, it is Vamana who first said that among compositions, the dramatic is the best, for it is variegated and hence complete or full and wonderful like a picture.'

The Natya Sastra, as a cognate branch of study, supplied Sanskrit Poetics a standard on which it made a marked advance. The most important contribution of Natya Sastra is the idea of aesthetic experience as a soul of poetry.) But it is also to be acknowledged that Alamkara Sastra and grammar school are closely associated. While Alamkara Sastra deals with poetic expression, grammar deals with linguistic expression in general. As allied Sciences, both schools have the problem of meaning as the common topic. This led many scholars to the conclusion that Alamkara School arose as an offshoot of grammar school. Dr De believes that the doctrine of Alamkara is based on the grammar school. His remark, in this respect is worth quoting — 'From the internal evidence as well as from the testimony which admits of little doubt, some of the ancient authorities on poetics, it is clear that the theoretical background of the discipline was, to some extent, founded on the philosophical speculations on linguistics, so that Grammar, one of
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the oldest and soundest sciences of India, was its god-father and helped it towards ready acceptance. The supremacy of the grammar school has been recognised from the ancient time and many ancient writers on poetics have acknowledged indebtedness to the grammar school. Ānandavardhana refers to the grammarians in respectful term, as the first and foremost scholars (cf. prathame hi vidvamsāso hi baiyākaraṇāh vyākaraṇamūlalvāt sarbavidyānām, Dhvanyalok, pp.132-33). From the earliest time, grammatical speculations moulded the conception of Upamā under different varieties and grammar has been included in Bhāmaha's Kavyālamkāra and Vāmana's Kavyālamkāra Sūtra. Again the theory of meaning is a matter of difference and philosophers have expressed different views on it. Poeticians too have given different speculations on the theory of meaning on the analogy of the grammatical doctrines. Thus both the grammar school and the alamkāra school were co-related and the natural affinity between these two schools was established from the very beginning.

Though grammar school and the different systems of philosophy influenced Sanskrit poetics and helped in many poetic speculations, we have no knowledge of any first treatise on poetics beyond Bharata's Nāyaśāstra. It is the earliest available work on poetics. Thus it is only with Bharata that we enter into poetics proper though as a discipline it was older than Bharata.9

The history of Sanskrit poetics from Bharata to Jagannātha Panditarāja covers a long period of time, almost two thousand years
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and is marked by an intense ideological speculations about the theory of poetry. During this period of investigation into the soul of poetry, many schools of thought prevailed giving prominence to one principle at the exclusion of the other. Thus five to seven schools are found in the history of Sanskrit poetics. While MM P. V. Kane\textsuperscript{10} recognises five schools, some modern scholars\textsuperscript{11} make it seven with the addition of the Anumitā Theory and the Ancitya Theory in the list. Dr (Kumari) Suman Pande\textsuperscript{12} enumerates six schools given below:

1. Rasa School, which stresses emotion
2. Alamkāra School, which stresses figure of speech
3. Rīti School, which stresses style
4. Dhvani School, which stresses suggestiveness
5. Vakrokti School, which stresses crookedness of speech
6. Ancitya School, which stresses propriety.

These schools of thought are not totally exclusive of each other; rather they indicate gradual stages of development from the unknown beginning of the discipline to the search of the essence of poetry. This continuous search after the doctrine of poetry can be divided into four stages representing different types of scholastic study. The first stage of the discipline can be called the formative stage. It covers generally from the dim beginning of the discipline down to Bhamaha. This is followed by a most important stage, namely the creative stage which is marked by the growth of the three important schools of thought. They are the Rīti, Rasa and the Dhvani schools.
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This stage covers from Bhāmaha to Ānandavardhana. Then follows the definitive stage from Ānandavardhana to Mammata. The writers on poetics of this stage were reactionary in spirit; they refused to accept the new theory of Dhvanikara and attempted to give currency to the older traditions of thought. They tried to define poetry in terms of old ideas, as they refused to accept the new theory of the Dhvanikara. The last stage covering from Mammata to Jagannātha is a scholastic one marked by its distinctive feature of critical elaboration rather than creative acumen. The writers of this stage mostly confined themselves to distinction and subtle elaboration caring little for originality. In the following few pages, we shall try to trace the development of the conception of poetry from Bharata downwards to understand Jagannātha's conception of poetry.

Bharata

Bharata is the earliest writer on Sanskrit poetics. His Nātyaśāstra, as we have it, is the earliest work dealing with poetics. But we should bear in mind that Nātyaśāstra is primarily concerned with dramaturgy and other allied topics; but it has also dwelt with for the first time, other topics coming under the purview of poetics proper. Bharata conceived of the drama as the synthesis of all literary forms and in his Nātyaśāstra he gave a detailed suggestion for integrating stage effects, music, dance and histrionics into an organism, the soul of which was aesthetic pleasure. He has laid down that Rasa is the essence of poetry.

though, of course, his conception of poetry was dramatic. Although
he has not dealt with the general rhetorical doctrines of poetry,
in the sixth chapter of his Natya Sāstra he enumerated thirty six
lakṣāṇas, four poetic figures, ten excellences (gunas) and ten
defects (doṣas). His famous Rasa-sūtra-vibhānumbhāvavybhicāri-
saṁyogādrasānispattāḥ has been commented by many scholars ac­
cording to the different systems of philosophy. It was, however, the
great Kasmirian philosopher Abhinavagupta who evolved the Rasa
Theory of Bharata applicable to poetry as well. Though his con­
ception of Kāvyā was dramatic, Bharata considered the plot as the
body of poetry. Naturally, this leads us to the conclusion that
rasa was taken by him as the soul of Kāvyā (cf. na hi rasādṛte
kaścidārthāḥ pravartate, N.S.). As Dr Krisnamoorty observes, 'It
is interesting to observe that at the beginning of the twenty
first chapter of the Natya Sāstra, Bharata says, Itibṛttam tu
kavyasya śarīram parikṛttitam, 'The plot may be described as the
body of poetry' and there can be no doubt that Bharata meant Rasa
to be its atmam or 'soul' though he has not mentioned it in so
many words. Thus the controversies raging on the body and soul
of poetry in Sanskrit Alamkāra works seem to have taken their
start with Bharata. 15

The Agnipurana

The Agnipurāṇa contains few chapters which deal with poe­
tics proper. Though its date is uncertain, it is also encyclopaedic
in character. Among the scanty enumeration of topics of
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Alamkāra Śāstra, the Purāṇa mentions gesticulations, figures of speech, dosas and gunas. The figures of speech which have been dealt in it, are Yamaka, Citra, Upamā, Rūpaka, Sahokti, Arthantaranyasa, Utpreksā, Atiśaya, Vibhāvana, Virodha and Hetu. The most outstanding feature of this Purāṇa is that here we get for the first time a clear definition of poetry. It runs as followed -

samksepat vākyamistārthavyacchinna padāvalī/
kāvyam ... ...

Poetry is a group of words bringing an elegant meaning. It must have figure of speech, excellences and must be free from defects. This definition reminds as of Dandin’s definition who speaks in the same term - 'śārīram tāवdiśārthavyacchinna padāvalī' (Kāvya-darsa, 1.10). According to Dr De the Purānakāra borrowed Dandin’s definition and supplemented it by adding the latter portion (Kāvyam phuṭatvat etc.). However, without entering into the controversy about the date of Purāṇa, we can say that we find here for the first time a clear definition of poetry which considers words as body and rasa as the soul of poetry. (cf. vāg-vaidagdhyā-prādhrā-nepi rasa evātra jīvitaṃ). Thus in a narrow sense, Bharata is the founder of rasa theory; but the Agnipurāṇa is the propounder of the rasa school applicable to literature as a whole, though the Purānakāra presupposes some rhetoricians like Dandin etc. as his predecessors.

Bhamaha

Bhamaha is the oldest exponent of the Alamkāra school in Sanskrit poetics. It is only him that we enter into poetics proper. In his Kavyālāmākāra he gives in clear term what constitutes the essence of Kāvyā. According to him, sound and sense put together constitute poetry:

'sābdārthau sahitau kāvyam', Kavyālāmākāra, 1.16.

This definition of Bhamaha appears to be common place at the first sight. But a deeper study will reveal that it is not so. What Bhamaha means to say is that poetry consists of words in which a definite sense must prevail and which must be made charming by means of poetic figures. 'Here we must remember the deeper meaning of Kālidāsa's comparison of the relation to the husband and wife as laid down in the Smṛtis (religio-ethical texts). Marriage is a sacrament and man and woman enter into holy union for the service performed together to Moral Law (Dharma) to which they both as well as the institution of marriage are subordinate. Since Rasa in this is like Dharma, it means that sound and meaning are not self-determined entities but determined by the poetic emotion.'

To understand the general rhetorical doctrine of Bhamaha from his sūtra, we should know what he states about the two kinds of figures based respectively on word and sense. In his Kavyālāmākāra Bhamaha summarises the views of some ancient writers. One
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school considers alamkāras related to meaning as real alamkāras. The other school thinks that those alamkāras related to words are real alamkāras. But Bhāmaha accepts both sabdālamkāras and arthālamkāras. He, however, maintains that the peculiarity of alamkāra consists in strikingness in expression (cf. vakrāvidheyaśabdektiritastavacālamkṛtiḥ, Kavyālāmkāra I.36). It is at the root of all alamkāras. P. V. Naganatha Sastry, the learned editor of Bhamaha’s Kavyālāmkāra observes - 'Whether Bhamaha was the earliest to recognise this or not, there is unmistakable evidence that he attached a great deal of importance to it (see Part I. V. 30 and V.36 and Part II V.85). In comparing the style 'Vaidarvi' with 'Gaudi', he calls the former 'Avakrokti'. According to him strikingness of meaning is the same as Atisayokti which according to Ānandavardhana is discoverable in every poetic figures (see Dhvanyāloka Locana 207-208, M.S. ed). Bhamaha's predilection for a 'twist in meaning' was so great that he discards Svabhavokti as a figure, for, in it as its name implies there is no scope for any twist. This theory of Vakrokti has been developed into an elaborate system by Kuntaka in his Vakrokti-jīvita.' (Introduction, p.xv).

As Bhamaha was the upholder of the Alamkāra school, he did not give prominence to Rasa. But this does not mean that he was ignorant of the theory of Rasa. He knew it and stated that a Mahākavya should contain various rasas separately (cf. yuktam lekasvabhāvena rasaisca sakalaih prthak - Kavyālāmkāra I, 21). But
as an exponent of alamkāra theory, he gave importance to figures of speech and rasa was included in Rasavat alamkara. 19

**Dandin**

After Bhāmaha, the most important writer in Sanskrit Alamkāra Sāstra is Dandin. In him, we find an authority who used the works of his predecessors whose works are now lost beyond recovery. He presents us with a fully developed and elaborate doctrine of poetry and defines it thus: 'sarīram tāvadistārthavavyavachin-nā padāvalī,' which means that the body of Kāvya consists of a group of words characterised by an idea which the poet desires to express. Dandin's definition of poetry reminds one of Jagannātha's definition and one is led to consider these two definitions to be virtually identical. But in essence both are different. While Dandin's isticārtha is the intended meaning, Jagannātha's ramanīyata means that charming idea which brings unworldly and disinterested pleasure. As Dr Krisnamoorty rightly observes, 'One might be tempted to at first sight to correlate it with Jagannātha's definition of poetry in his Rasagangādhara, viz., ramanīyarthapratipādakah sadbāh kāvyam' and say that he gives more emphasis on the word or the form than to its substance which is given the subordinate place of a visesana (adjective) in the latter definition. This is what Savani and Kane have actually done. But isticārtha does not mean ramanīyārtha. It means vivaksitartha as Taruna Vācaspati has pointed and should be translated as 'sought to be expressed.' 20

While referring to the body of poetry, Dandin refers to the alamkāras as the principal element in poetry (cf. tāṁ sari-ram ca kāvyānāṁ alamkārasca darsītaḥ). But his conception of alamkāra is different from that of Bhāmaha. He uses the term alamkāra in a wider sense to cover everything which lends charms to poetry like ornaments enhancing the beauty of the human body, excellences or guṇas also would be included in alamkāra. So Dandin uses the term as essential poetic attribute of sabda and artha and hence individual alamkāras are not the sole means of beautifying principle. D. K. Gupta goes a step further to say that in addition to the guṇas, the various forms of dramatic joints (sandhis) and manners (vrttis) and lakṣānas were also conceived by him to be covered by the generic name alamkāra. So it is very difficult to associate Dandin exclusively either with Riti school or Alamkāra school. Dr D. K. Gupta rightly remarks, 'He should be regarded, therefore, as an alamkāra theorist with the same force with which he is associated with rīti school. In fact he affiliates himself to both the schools and it should be clearly understood that he cannot be linked exclusively with either of the two.'

Though Dandin gave prominence to alamkāra in poetry, he was also aware of rasa. He recognised the eight rasas of Bharata and also defined the poetic figures like Ṛṣeyas, rasavat and urjāsvi. Thus he understood rasa both in narrower and wider senses.
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The next writer after Dandin is Vāmana whose works Kāvyālamlkāra-Sūtravṛtti shows further advancement and elaboration of poetic ideas. Though he does not define poetry, his treatment of riti throws sufficient light on his conception of poetry. He is the first poetician who before Āmandavardhana and Dhvanikāra, gave a systematic and careful poetic scheme and is unique inspite of its defects. He had a more developed idea of the nature of poetry than his predecessors and he tried to conceive of the soul of poetry. In fact, his idea of the soul of poetry is the first attempt to grasp the essential or intrinsic element in it. He does not consider mere word and sense as poetry; it must, he holds, possess qualities and alamkāras as well. To him, soul of poetry is the style which is a specific arrangement of words. In his Kāvyālamlkārasūtra, Vāmana, propounding the riti theory, says:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{ritirātmā kāvyasya} \ (1.2.6) \\
&\text{visistapadaracana ritiḥ} \ (1.2.7) \\
&\text{visēṣo gunātmā} \ (1.2.8)
\end{align*}
\]

Thus according to him, riti is the soul of poetry. This riti is a special arrangement of words. This special arrangement, again, is a definite combination of different guṇas or fixed excellences of composition. Vāmana divides riti into three varieties - Vaidarvī, Gaudi and Pāncālī and says that poetry rests on these three ritis as painting rests on the lines drawn on canvas (cf. eśāsu tisṛṣu ritisu rekāhāsviva citram kāvyam pratisthitamiti)

Hindi Kāvyalamkārasūtravṛtti, p.26). They are so named not because of local cause but they are found among the local poets. Of the three ritis, Vaidarvī is the perfect one because it possesses all the qualities.

Vāmana is the first rhetorician who visualised the soul of Kāvyā crossing the body of it. Dhvanikāra appreciates him in clear term for his originality in propounding the theory of riti which perceived vaguely the essential nature of Kāvyā, and being unable to explain what actually brings charms to poetry, he propounded the theory of riti. In this theory, gunas have been given a prominent place. He considers that the qualities are vital and figures are not; they are related to the body, word and meaning of poetry and to the style, which according to Vāmana is the soul of poetry.

The riti school has shown a further development over the alamkāra school. Though this school considers the riti as the soul of poetry it seems to grasp the essential charm of poetry. Dr Sandhya Bhaduri maintains that Vāmana's definition of riti gives a clear indication of the concept of Dhvani as developed by the Dhvanikāra. Krisna Chaitanya also seems to hold the same view when remarks, 'Just as in posture, the body poised for action clearly reflects the inner temper and mood, diction reflects the inner temper, whether it is extrovert and energetic as in Gaudi or balance and serene as in Vaidarvī.' But according to us,
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Vamana pays his attention to the unifying principle of words and meanings which is, in a sense, a form inherent in them. The Agnipurāṇa referred earlier to the unifying principle of aesthetic experience known as rasa. This form is internal and transcends our sense organs. Moreover, this form is not one but many. Noticing this defect in the Agnipurāṇa and non-recognition of unifying principle by the earlier rhetoricians, Vamana lays emphasis on the importance of an external unifying principle inherent in words and meaning. This unifying principle is discernible by our sense organs. This he terms as riti. We think that the mind of Dr. Sandhya Bhaduri and that of Krisna Chaitanya are obsessed by some favourite doctrines.

Dhvanikara and Anandavardhana

The Dhvanyāloka is an epoch-making work in the history of Alamkarāśāstra in India. With the promulgation of the Dhvani theory, a new age ushered in the history of Indian criticism. This marks the change of the whole outlook in the judgment of poetry by a departure from the old approach. Though this theory does not start with a technical definition like other schools of thought, it deals with the very genesis of poetry and gives a new grandeur to the art of poetry.

Before Dhvanikara and Anandavardhana, Bharata's rasa-sūtra was interpreted by Bhāṭṭa Lollāta and other commentators and in their interpretation, they showed the aesthetic importance of rasa. Their rasa-theory took account only of dramatic art and so it did
It was Anandavardhana who showed that rasa-theory was equally applicable to poetry also. While viewed from this angle of vision, the Dhvani-theory can be called an extension of the Rasa theory. But Anandavardhana does not claim himself to be the original innovator of the theory; rather he clearly says that the principle of dhvani was invented by the ancient scholars (cf. kavyasatma dhvaniriti budhairyah samamnakapuraah etc. - Dhvanyaloka, 1.1).

Anandavardhana defines dhvani kavya thus:

\[
\text{yatatrarthah sabdo va tamarthamupasarjanikrtasvarthau/}
\text{vyanktah kavyavisesah dhvaniriti surivih kathitah/}
\]

Dhvanyaloka 1.13.

'That kind of poetry in which the directly expressed word and sense become subordinate to the suggested sense is called Dhvani by scholars. The suggested sense is the essence of Kavya. It differs from the expressed and indicated sense. It is like the glamour on the body of a woman which delights the heart of the sensitive person. Dhvanikara has brought out the idea in an interesting way - 'yathā hyanganāsau lāvanye prthaknirvarṇyamānām
nikhilāvayavavyatireki kimpyanyadeva sahṛdayalocanāṃrtam tatvāntaram tādvadeva saorthaḥ', Dhvanyaloka, p.49).

Though Anandavardhana advocated dhvani as the soul of poetry, he did not lose sight of rasa, the aesthetic experience in
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it. He divided dhvani into three kinds - matter (vastu), figure of speech (alamkāra) and sentiment (rasa) - sa hyartho vācyasam-
arthakṣiptam vastumātramalamkāraśrasādayoscatyaneka pravedaprinno
darsayisyate, (Dhv. p.50). But according to the Dhvanikāra only that type of Kāvyā where sentiment (rasa) is suggested, is the excellent Kāvyā. In other words, neither alamkāra nor vastu but the suggestion of poetic sentiments should be the central point round which other elements of Kāvyā should move (kāvyasyālmā sa eva arthaḥ, Dhv. 1.5). If however in a Kāvyā the suggested sense is subordinate to the expressed sense, that would be a second rate Kāvyā. Again those Kāvyas having no suggestion at all, are the lowest and the third type of poetry and are called Citra-kāvyā. Dhvanikāra attaches highest importance to the suggestion of rasa. The glory of poetic endeavour depends upon the realisation of rasa and the primary intention of a poet should be directed towards the evocation of rasa which is the guiding principle of a poet in his composition of word and sense.\(^{31}\)

The Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana, in fact, marks a departure from the old approach to poetic endeavour and in it, we find for the first time an attempt to study poetics from the aesthetic point of view assimilating all the essentials of various schools of Sanskrit criticism. Giving prominence to rasa, he gives a new explanation of all problems of poetics. And as a matter of fact, alamkāra, rīti, and gunas have their importance only in context of suggestion which is the soul of Kāvyā. Abercrombie rightly remarks,

\(^{31}\) Krisna Chaitanya, Sanskrit Poetics, p.145.
'Literary art, therefore, will always be in some degree suggestion; and the height of literary art is to make the power of suggestion in language as commanding as farreaching, as vivid, as subtle as possible. This power of suggestion supplements whatever language gives by being understood; and what it gives in this way is by no means confined to its syntax.\(^{32}\) One great merit of Ānanda-vardhana is that he establishes dhvani theory to restore Rasa a supreme status in poetry and in his scheme, the relative position of rasa, guna, alāṃkāra and dōsa are fixed for all time to come. Here indeed we meet for the first time an attempt to approach from poetry to poetics. It gives due importance to poet’s imagination and the sense of propriety. Though a discordant note was made against the principle of dhvani by some poeticians, it has touched the fundamentals of poetic art which will be true of all times. It is, to speak in brief, the meeting point of all principles of Indian literary criticism.

In the history of Indian Aesthetics, Abhinavagupta holds a unique position as a critic. A prolific writer on Pratyabhijñā school of Kasmir Śaivism, he has large number of books to his credit. But as a critic, he is widely known for his two commentaries on the Nāṭyaśāstra and the Dhvanīyāloka which go by the name Abhinavabhāratī and Locana respectively. His glory as a critic rests on these two works. He has interpreted Bharata’s famous Rasa-sūtra on the basis of the Pratyabhijñā philosophy and this is known as Abhivyaktivādī which revolutionises the standard Indian

\(^{32}\) Principles of Literary Criticism, p.39.
Aesthetics. Abhinava's theory has drawn the attention of many later alamkārīkaḥs and they have tried to give their own interpretation. Barring one or two rhetoricians, almost all the writers on poetics follow Abhinava's theory on Rasa and Dhvani.33

**Kuntaka**

Chronologically and logically Kuntaka comes next after Ānandavardhana and Dhvanikāra. In the Vakrokti-jīvita, he propounds the novel theory of vakrokti thereby giving vakrokti a high position as the all-pervading principle of poetry. According to this theory, Vakrokti is the soul of poetry. It is not the mere alamkāra of sabda or artha, it is vaicitra or strikingness which causes extra-ordinary or disinterested charm in poetry. While telling the purpose of his Vakroktijīvita, Kuntaka says,

lokottarachamatkāraṁkārivaicitrasIDDhaye/
kāvyanyayamālamkāraḥ kopyapūrvovidhiyate//

(Vakroktijīvita, 1.2)

Though there are hundreds of alamkāras of Kāvya, Kuntaka maintains that they have not such beauty as Vakrokti possesses. His conception of alamkāra is a broad one and in it he includes both the poetic figures and gunas.

In Sanskrit Poetics, Vakrokti is not a new thing. Different poeticians have used in different senses. Bhāmaha regards

Vakrokti not as an alamkāra but as a characteristic mode of expression underlying all alamkaras and this, thus forms the essential element in poetry —

\[
\text{saisā sarbaiva vakroktiranayurtho vibhāvyate/}
\text{yatnōṣyam kavinā kāryah kōlamkāronaya vina/}
\]

(Kāvyālāmākāra 11.85)

Dandin, however, uses the term in entirely different meaning. He uses it to mean all alamkāras other than svavābokti. He divides alamkāra into two broad divisions — svabhābokti and vakrokti and accordingly his Vakrokti is the collective designation of poetic figures. Thus Kuntaka's concept of Vakrokti is a broad one which includes all other poetic ideas under it. To establish Vakrokti as the essential element in poetry, he defines poetry thus:

\[
\text{sabdārthau sahitau vakrakavyāpārasālinī/}
\text{vandhe vyabasthitau kāvyam tadvidādhādakārīnī/}
\]

(Vakroktijīvita 1.7)

Kuntaka maintains that neither mere charming word nor mere charming sense constitute Kāvyā. Sāhitya, according to him, is the combination of beautiful sabda and artha with Vakrokti as its essential embellishment. Vakrokti is defined thus:

\['vakroktireva vaidagāhyabhangibhanitirucyate'\]

(Vakroktijīvita 1.10).

It is a mode of expression depending on the peculiar turn given to it by the skill of the poet. It owes its origin to the Kavi-Kauśala or Kavi-pratīvā. It is a kind of alamkrīti of sabda and artha which are alamkārya. The figures of speech are only aspects of
vakrokti and as such, they are included in the broad connotation of Vakrokti. Judging from this point of view, Kuntaka finds fault with those who hold that alamkāras belong to poetry, for, in that case, Kāvyā can exist without it (cf. tenālāmākrtasya kāvyatvamiti sthitih, na punah kāvyasyalamkāryaya iti, Vakroktijīvita, p.7). Kuntaka does not recognise Svabhāvokti, Rasavat, Preyas, Urjasvin, Udātta and Samāhita as alamkāras. If svabhāvokti is taken as an alamkāra, there is nothing which is alamkārya. So in the Vakrokti scheme of Kuntaka, Vastusvabhāva, rasas and bhāvas etc. are alamkārya and so they cannot be considered as alamkaras. One and the same object cannot be both alamkāra and alamkārya. He has clarified this idea with a beautiful example—

\[
\text{śarīrāṁ chedalāmākāraṁ kīmalaṁkurute param/}
\text{ātmaiva nātmanāṁ skandham kvacidapyadhīrohati/}
\]

(Vakroktijīvita 1.13)

'If alamkāra becomes the body, what would be decorated by it? Nobody can mount on the shoulder of himself.'

Similarly, Kuntaka does not accept Rasavat as an alamkāra. He criticises the views of his predecessors like Bhamaha and Ānandavardhana for acknowledging Rasavat as alamkāra. For, it is alamkārya and not alamkāra. Rasa is always pradhāna and cannot be subordinate to anything. Nor can it be both alamkāra and alamkārya. Ānandavardhana who gives a prominent place to Rasa in his Dīvani theory as the soul of poetry, commits a mistake by treating Rasa as subordinate in the gunībhūtavyangya Kāvyā. Criticising all these views, Kuntaka maintains that in Rasavat, the poet can create vakrokti based on Rasa which provides the charming element in it.
Though Kuntaka attaches highest importance to Vakrata, he is aware of the concepts of riti, guna, rasa, bhāva and dhvani. He interprets all these concepts in the light of his own theory and assigns their position in any form of vakrata. Thus in his Vakroktijivita, admitting the necessity of rasa, he says:

\[
\text{nirantararasodgāragarva\_sandarvonirvarāh/}
\text{girāh kavīnām jibanti na kathāmatramāśrītāh/}
\]

(Vakroktijivita, De's edition, Resume ummesa IV, p.225)

Not merely story or plot can constitute a poet; it is only beauty in the words of the poet by the proper delineation of rasa which actually raises them to the status of poetry. But rasa in Kuntaka's analysis is comprehended in the Vakrokti only.

Kuntaka criticises the riti-theorists for the classification and the names of the ritis adopted by them. He finds faults with the criterion by which riti is divided on geographical basis; for, in that case, there would be infinite number of ritis as there are innumerable countries (cf. na ca visistāritijuktatvena kāvyakāraṇam mātu\_leyavaginip\_vivāhabad desadharmataya\_ vyabasthā- payitum sākyam - Vakroktijivita, p.45). Kuntaka's contention is that riti cannot be based on desadharma; it is based on the poetical power (sakti), culture (vyutpatti) and practice (abhyāsa) of the poet. Similarly he does not admit the classification of riti into uttama, madhyama and adhama, because the inferior type of poetry is not poetry at all.
Kuntaka’s attitude towards dhvani is on the same line as his attitude towards other principles of literary criticism, like Rasa, Riti, Guna etc. On account of his apparent prominence to Vakrakta in poetry, he naturally comprehends dhvani in some kind of Vakrata. So Ruyyaka says in his Alamkarasarvasva - 'upacara-vakratadibhiḥ samasto dhvaniprapanchah svikrtaḥ'. Commenting upon this statement of Ruyyaka, Vidyāchakravartin says - 'upacāro laksanaśrayānām tadvakretiti avivaksitavācyādisamastadhvaniḥ katāksitaḥ' (Alamkarasarvasva of Ruyyaka, ed. S.S. Janaki, p.11). The term upacāra means laksana or indication and so all kinds of dhvani based on Indication and others would fall under upacāra-vakrata. Kuntaka, therefore, may be said to belong to school of opinion which holds that bhakti or laksanā is sufficient to cover suggestion. Dr S. K. De34 calls this view as 'antarābhava-वāda'.

Thus Kuntaka was highly influenced by Anandavardhana. His classification of Vakratā is based on the classification of dhvani.35 It begins from 'letter' the lowest type of unit in poetry and covers the Mahākavya as well. His main classifications are six in number -

1. Varnavinyāsavakrata
2. Patdāpuvārdha Vakrata
3. Patdāparārdha Vakrata
4. Vākyavakrata or Vastu-vakrata
5. Prakarana Vakrata
6. Prabandha Vakrata

35. Dr (Mrs) Hemalata R. Tripathy, 'Principles of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit', p.89.
Kantaka propounded the Vakrokti theory as a rival of Dhvani theory. He did not criticise Ānandavardhana nor did he refute the principle of dhvani. On the other hand, he was under the influence of Dhvanikāra and indirectly he admitted the principle of Dhvani. There is no fundamental difference in the conception of poetic beauty of these two poeticians. Both the principles are related to Kavi-pratīvā and according to them poetic genius is the source of good poetry. But the principles of approach of both the alamkārikas are different. Unfortunately Kantaka’s theory of Vakrokti did not receive liberal recognition at the hands of the rhetoricians as the Dhvani theory of Ānandavardhana got and the proper assessment of Kantaka’s contribution to Sanskrit literary criticism was not duly recognised as Ānandavardhana’s was.

Mahimabhatta

The next writer on Alamkārasāstra deserving our attention is Mahimabhatta. Though he has not dealt with the general rhetorical doctrines on poetry, he wrote his Vyaktiviveka to show that all kinds of so-called suggestive meaning is an inference. So in the beginning of his work, he laid down:

\[
\text{anumantārābhaśvam sarvasyaśa dhaneḥ prakāsitum/} \\
\text{vyaktivivekām kurute pranamyā mahimā parām vacam/} \\
\]  

(VV 1.1)

He wrote Vyaktiviveka for demolishing the theory of dhvani propounded by the Dhvanyaloka. Though Mahimabhatta was a bitter critic of Ānandavardhana, he had great amount of admiration and high respect for Ānandavardhana.³⁶ Mahimabhatta did not differ from

³⁶ Dr M. M. Sharma, Dhvani Theory in Sanskrit Poetics, p.51.
Anandavardhana on all points. He was one with Dhvanikāra in recognising rasa as the soul of poetry (vide, kāvyasyatmani sajnini rasādipūpe na kasyacidvimatih, Hindi Vyaktiviveka, p.111). But he did not admit the position of Anandavardhana that there was a third function called vyañjanā and that the suggested sense is conveyed by this function. According to Mahimabhatta, words have only one power - the power of rousing the conventional meaning. Other powers belong to the meaning and not to the word. Words cannot have many powers. Had they many powers they would have been independent and their functions would have been simultaneous. But as a matter of fact, many powers which are held to belong to the words by the Dhvani theorists are seen not functioning simultaneously. Rather other powers operate only after the conventional meaning is roused. So words have only one power; other powers belong not to the words, but to meanings. Abhidhā becomes weak after bringing conventional meaning; it cannot bring any other meanings. The suggested sense is conveyed not through conventional meaning but through the process of inference.

After recognising abhidhā as a sole function of words, he accepts two senses of a word namely, expressed sense and the inferable sense. The expressed sense belongs to the function of the word and is called a primary sense. Another meaning is conveyed through the inference as from a linga (hetu) in a syllogism. This kind of meaning again is of three varieties in the shape of vastu, alāmkāra and rasa. Of these three, the first two, viz. vastu and alāmkāra are possible through the expressed sense, but the last is always inferable.37

37. Hindi Vyaktiviveka, p.47.
Criticising the definition of Dhvanikāvya given by Anandavardhana, Mahimabhatta points out ten defects in it and enumerates them in the following Karikas:

अर्थस्य विसिस्ततवम्, साधन सविसेसनास्तादां पुमस्वं/ द्विवचानार्थ साधनं सौ, व्यक्तिर्धवनिर्माणम् काव्यावैसिस्तवं/ वाचनावः कथानाकर्तव ध्वनिलक्षणति दास दोषाः/ ये भवन्ते तद्वेदप्रवेदलाक्षणानां नाते गणिताः/ (Hindi Vyaktiviveka, 1.23,24).

He removes the defective padas from the definition and shows that this definition of dhvani is nothing but the definition of anumāna:

वाच्यस्मादनुमितो व यत्रार्थौर्थान्तराम प्रकाशयति/ सांबन्धहात हृतस्थित स काव्यानुमितित्वम् क्योः/ (Hindi VyaktiYiveka, 1.25)

As the exponent of the anumiti theory, he maintains that rasa is not suggested as Dhvanikāra holds; it is inferred from vibhāva, amuhāva etc. So he says, 'यापि विभावादिभि रसादिनां प्रारतिह ताम सामा नेव आन्तर्भावाभावमस्यनि'. According to Dr N. N. Chaudhury, this statement of Mahimabhatta is an echo of Shri Sankuka. Dr K. G. Pandey also considers him to be a follower of Sankuka upholding the inferential theory in aesthetics. Accordingly, Mahimabhatta holds that the relation between the vibhāva and sthā-vibhāva is that of cause and effect. In literature, vibhāva etc. are not real; they are imitation only for the artistic representation. From this unreal vibhāva, amuhāva etc. rasa is inferred.

38. Dhvanyāloka, 1.13.
40. Indian Aesthetics, p.335.
So these are only cause or hetu in the realisation of rasa (rasa-pratiti). These become the helper of cause and effect of rati and other vibhavas and in this way, there is the realisation of rasa (cf. vibhāvamabhāvavyabhicāri pratītirhi rasādipratiteh sādhanamisyate/ te hi ratyādinām bhāvānām kāraṇakāryasahakāribhūtās-tanumāpayanta eva rasādin nispadayanti te eva hi pratiyamānā āsvādāpadavīm gataḥ sante rasa ityucyante/ (Hindi V.V. pp.477).

Mahimabhatta’s Vyaktiviveka is a master piece in the history of Sanskrit poetics. As a writer, he has been able to betray his fine scholarship, brilliant argument and deep critical acumen. As a polemical scholar he will always get a high position among the scholars of India. But advocating the anumiti theory, he could not make an original contribution to the Sanskrit criticism. Like Kuntaka, he was also fighting for a cause which was already lost. His criticism of dhvani is an exhibition of pedantry, and he cannot explain the intensity of feeling as has been shown by Ānandavardhana.

Ksemendra

Ksemendra is a great Kashmirian aesthetician who is known as the exponent of the Auritya theory. Propounding his theory in the Aurityavicāracarca, he maintains that auritya or appropriateness is the essence of verbal principle which surely leads to aesthetic experience (aurityām rasāsiddhasya sthirām kāvyasya jībitam - Aurityavicāracarca, Kārikā 5). He, therefore, considers auritya as the soul of poetry, full of flavour. Thus admitting
rasa as the most vital element of Kāvya, he connects propriety
with poetry as the most important principle in it. In his treat-
ment, propriety is given a higher place in poetry than rasa it-
self. Dr Suryakanta has beautifully brought out the relative po-
sition of aucitya and rasa in Ksemendra's principle of aucitya —
'There are two things which are necessary for the existence of
man — body and soul. The body is made up of the five elements
and is sustained by the vital essence. This essence includes the
seven fluids and is an elementary ingredient. Soul, on the other
hand, is absolutely necessary for sustenance of life in human
body. Both the vital essence and soul are of more or less the
same importance for life. Now, Ksemendra says that 'Aucitya' or
propriety is like the soul in the body of poetry, while Rasa or
flavour is like the vital essence. Thus, in a way Ksemendra pla-
ces Aucitya higher than even Rasa.' 41

Aucitya is not something new in Sanskrit poetics. It has
a long history of its evolution and development as a distinct
school in poetics. Dr Suryakanta deals with the development of the
concept of propriety from the days of Dandin to that of Ksemendra.42
Dr D. K. Gupta, following Dr Raghavan, traces back the doctrine of
aucitya to Bharata who included the concept in the dramatic elements
like prakṛti, pravṛtti, acting, ornamentation etc. Ksemendra,
however, develops the idea of propriety into systematic discipline.
He maintains that aucitya is the perpetual and imperishable life
of poetry and without it, poetry, though possessed of guna and

41. Ksemendra studies, p.78.
42. Ksemendra studies, p.67.
alamkāra, becomes lifeless (aucityam tvagre vaksamanalaksanam
sthiram abinasvaram jibitam kāvyasya tena vināsya gunālāmkarajuk-
Ksemendra defines aucitya thus:

ucitām prāhuracāryāh sadrsam kila yasya yat/
ucitasya yo bhāvastāaucityam pracaksate//

(Aucityavicāracarcā, 7)

'The great masters have called that to be proper which is verily
suited to certain thing. The abstract idea of being proper goes
by the name of propriety.' He enumerates twenty eight places
like word, sentence, composition, etc. where aucitya is available
and remarks that aucitya, though pervades all these places, re-
mains in the life of Kāvyā like the life in human body pervading
all its limbs. Though Ksemendra is given the credit of propound-
ing the theory of propriety, he simply appears to develop the idea
embodied in the following Karika of the Dhvanyaloka –

anaucityādrte nānyad rasabhangasya kāranam/
prasiddhaaucityabandhastu rasasyopanisatparā//

(Dhvanyaloka, p.330)

'Except impropriety, there is no other cause for abatement in the
relish of poetry. A composition containing the well-known propri-
ety is the very secret of flavour.' Thus according to Dhvanikāra,
all poetical elements like rasa, guṇa, rīti have their value in
poetry provided there is propriety in it. The whole fabric of

43. Translated by Dr. Suryakanta.
expression should follow the law of propriety. Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta stabilised the idea that poetry is triple unity of rasa, dhvani and aucitya. Aucitya, therefore, contributes in a long way to the realisation of rasa. Following Abhinavagupta, Ksemendra introduces the novel idea of distinction between the soul and life of poetry and so in the aucitya scheme feeling is the soul and propriety is the life. Other categories of literary excellence like alamkāra, rīti etc., have their value if there is soul in it.

All the exponents of Ksemendra's Aucitya, have been carried away by his rhetorical statements namely, he has expressed Kāvyā as a living body. Most probably he does not dare mention the names of other forms of composition such as, historical records, biography, systems of philosophy, Upanisads etc. as dead Kāvyas. Therefore he has kept silent on that point. All the supporters of Ksemendra have tried their level best to justify Ksemendra's seemingly new statement of aucitya as the life force of literature. Nobody has ever heard of dead literature. Therefore Ksemendra has cleverly managed to omit the examples of dead literatures as his negative examples. He has borrowed the idea of aucitya from Ānandavardhana and attached too much importance to it in order to cast into a shade all other theories of ancient rhetoricians. Aucitya is not at all a new concept. Other critics have pointed out in clear term that Bharata is the propounder of the idea of aucitya.

44. Krisna Chaitanya, Sanskrit Poetics, p.201.
45. ibid., p.201.
Mammatā

Mammatā is the first and foremost of the writers on alamkāra in Post-dhvani period. His far-famed work Kāvyaprakāśa occupies a unique place in the history of alamkāra literature. It occupies the same position in alamkāra literature as the Sarirakabhasya in Vedanta or the Mahābhāṣya in grammar. The great merit of Mammatā's work lies in the fact that here in this classical work different trends and currents of thoughts in Sanskrit poetics flowing from different directions from the dim beginning of the critical discipline, took a unified form running into one clear and main stream. Different theorists supporting different schools of thought laid emphasis on the different elements of poetry in their respective expositions. Thus while the Alamkāra school gave prominence to embellishment in poetic expression, Rasa school confined itself in recognising rasa as the soul of Kāvyā. The Riti school considered riti as the most important in poetry. The Dhvani school admitted the relative importance of all these elements and advocated the novel theory of Dhvani in which all these ideas were harmonised and rationalised into a synthetic system. Mammatā who was a follower of Dhvani school gave final shape to the concept of Dhvani and brought it into perfection.

The great merit of Mammatā's Kāvyā Prakāśa is that though he belonged to the new school of Sanskrit poetics he did not brush aside the theories of the ancients. He not only followed the theory of Dhvani but also helped to a great deal in establishing the

46. MM P. V. Kane, History of Sanskrit Poetics, p.266.
authority of the Kasmirian school headed by Ānandavardhana. But in spite of his support of dhvani, he seems to recognise a composition devoid of dhvani as Kāvyā. No doubt like Dhvanikāra and Ānandavardhana he accepted the importance of rasa in poetry, but in his definition of it, he betrays his adherence to the theories of the ancients. His definition of Kāvyā is a pointer to this direction. This definition does not differ, in essence, from that of Bhāmaha and Dandin where he assigns a subordinate place to the figures of speech. But on account of his support to the ancient rhetoricians, he begins the definition of poetry with sābda and artha and mentions guna, dosa and alamkāra, though he accepts the truth of rasa and dhvani theories. Viśvanātha, though a follower of Mammata, mercilessly criticises each and every word of his definition. In most cases these arguments are fastidious and pedantic and they have been met with by Mammata's commentators. MM. Dr Kane also remarks: 'As to these objections one cannot help saying that Viśvanātha is here over-fastidious and is perhaps actuated by the desire of making a show of his erudition by pouring ridicule upon a famous predecessor. This must be said in favour of Mammata that his definition has the great merit of being simple and easily understood. ... ... Every one is familiar with words dosa, guna and alamkāra. By using them, Mammata conveys a tolerably clear and accurate idea of the character of poetry.'

47. 'tadadosau sābdārthau sagunavanalamkrti punaḥ kvāpi' - Kāvyaprakāśa
48. Dr S. K. De, Problems of Sanskrit Poetics, p.120.
49. Sahitya Darpana, Notes on Pariccheda I, p.16.
Consistent with this definition of poetry, Mammata discusses the function of sābda and artha and accepting the superiority of dhvani, he classifies poetry into three classes - Dhvani, Gaṇībhūta-vyāngle and Citra. While dilating upon the Rasa theory, he examines different interpretations advocated by Lollata, Sānkuka and Bhatta Nāyaka and rejecting them on the ground of inadequacy, he accepts the theory of Abhinavagupta known as Vyaktivāda.

In his treatment of gunas, Mammata differs from Vāmana. He holds the opposite views of Vāmana that gunas are related to sābda and artha; but he interpretes them, after Ānandavardhana, as the property of rasa. He defines gunas thus:

\[
\text{je rasasyāngino dharmā sauryādaya evātmanāḥ/}
\text{utkarsahetavaste syuraēalasthitayo gunāḥ/}
\]

Kāvyaprakāsa 8.66

He concludes his view on guna with the following statement - 'ata eva mādhuryādayo rasadharmāḥ samucitairvarṇairvyajyante na tu varṇamātrātrasrayaḥ'. He views the alamkāras with the same consideration; their position in poetry is justified by their relation to rasa. Thus alamkāras embellish indirectly, through word and sense, the underlying soul of sentiment. If there is no rasa in it, the poetic figures become a mere turn of charming expression. Following Ānandavardhana, Mammaṭa recognises three gunas and not ten as admitted by the ancients. According to him some of these ten can be included under these three and others can be reduced to mere negation of certain defects and as such, they are three in number.
Mammata is a great figure in the history of Alamkārasastra. His Kāvyaprakāśa is an epoch-making work where he dilates upon the different problems of Sanskrit poetics. He has almost fixed for all time to come the course along which the Dhvani-theory had to flow by his most systematic and perfect treatment of various topics of Alamkārasastra. His Kāvyaprakāśa puts an end to all the controversies that were raging earlier against the validity of the Dhvani-theory. In a sense the value of his work does not lie in originality. It paraphrased in a concise and orderly way all the main issues of Sanskrit poetics. It was so timely that it acquired great popularity. 'In a word, Mammata produced a master-piece of a textbook, which people were badly needing and it came to receive so much appreciation that it became the fashion to write similar textbooks in the period that followed.'  

Visvanātha

Mammata presents in a consolidated form the different theories of his predecessors. After him, a galaxy of rhetoricians flourished and they mainly revived the old alamkāra theory again. Among them mention may be made of Ruuyaka (c.1150 A.D.), Vagbhata I (first half of the twelveth century), Jayadeva (c.1200-5) the author of the Chandrāloka and Vagbhata II.  

Hemchandra, a Jain writer and a contemporary of Mammata wrote his Kavyamūsāsana with a commentary upon it, 'Viveka' by name. His work is devoid of originality and shows a placid borrowing from Mammata, Abhinavagupta

50. Dr Krisnamoorthy, Essays in Sanskrit Literary Criticism, p.112.
and Rajasekhara. 52 Other writers who deserve to be mentioned are Vidyadhara (between 1285-1325 A.D.), the author of Ekāvalī and Vidyānātha (fourteenth century A.D.), the author of the Prataparudravyasobhūsana. Both these writers cover the entire field of poetics in their works.

Of all later writers on alāmkāra, Visvanātha is very popular among the scholars of India. Compared with the galaxy of scholars like Ānandavardhana, Mammāta and Jagannātha, he may be of second magnitude; but his Sāhityadarpana has its own merit. 53 The work is a compilation and is largely based on Mammata's work. It also deals with dramaturgy which was left by most of the writers on poetics. Written in the usual form of sūtra and vrtti, he deals with all the topics of alāmkāra-sastra in a very simple and easy flowing language.

The logical conclusion of the Dhwani theory was to give the highest importance to rasa in all poetry. Mammāta and Ānandavardhana felt shy of it and they distinctly did not state that rasa was the soul of poetry. The credit of boldly stating rasa as the soul of poetry goes to Visvanātha who defines poetry as sentence the soul whereof is rasa (vākyam rasātmakam kāvyam). His definition goes a long way in assigning the proper place to rasa which was faintly envisaged by Bharata and more vividly elucidated by Ānandavardhana. But according to Prof. Rajbamsa Sahaya 54 the crédito

52. Keith, History of Sanskrit Literature, p.359.
53. History of Sanskrit Poetics, p.303.
of recognising rasa as the soul of poetry does not go to Visvanātha. Even before him, two rhetoricians Samaddhānī and Chandīdāsa recognised rasa as the soul of poetry. But the logical conclusion of the Dhvani theory was to give the highest importance to Rasa in poetry and Mammāta and Ānandavardhana did not state distinctly rasa as the soul of poetry in their definition. But they tacitly acknowledged it as the most essential element. Visvanātha not only accepted rasa as the soul of poetry but also went a step further to say that under rasa, rasābhāsa also should be included and any composition having rasa or rasābhāsa would be counted as poetry. But by admitting a distant touch of rasa in all poetry, Visvanātha involves himself in a very awkward position and has become the target of severe criticism at the hand of Jagannātha Panditarāja. His definition of poetry, however, reminds us of the celebrated words of English poet Wordsworth who speaks of it as 'spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings' and 'emotion recollected in tranquility'. But while Wordsworth appears to view poetry from the standpoint of the poet, Visvanātha thinks from the point of view of the sahrdaya. Thus, his definition of poetry is a subjective one and goes a long way in assigning the proper place to rasa which was faintly envisaged by Bharata and vividly elucidated by Ānandavardhana. But despite of his giving a supreme position to rasa in poetry, Visvanātha's definition is not free from defects. The most serious objection to it that it will exclude those poetical literature which have no rasa though of
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course they have charms in them and this, however, is not desirable.

**Appayadikṣita**

Appayadikṣita, a south Indian polymath was a great writer on Sanskrit literature and a champion of Southern Saiva philosophy. He is known to have written hundred books. His contribution to Indian poetics are - *Vṛttavārtika, Kuvalayānanda* and *Citramīmāṃsā*. In his *Vṛttavārtika*, he has dwelt on word and meaning. His second work is an elementary work on Alamkarāsāstra dealing with alamkāra. It is based on the Chandrāloka of Jaydeva, and here he profusely borrowed from the latter. In the whole range of Sanskrit poetics, *Kuvalayānanda* is the only work where largest number of poetic figures have been treated. His *Citramīmāṃsā* is an incomplete work; it deals with the division of Kāvyā together with the treatment of few figures of speech. One noteworthy feature of Appayadikṣita is that he has given the elaborate treatment of the largest number of poetic figures and has tried to throw some new flash of thought on some vexed problem of poetics. But from the standpoint of originality, they have little merit. All his rhetorical works are elementary text-books and in them he collects in a systematic manner the speculation of ancient rhetoricians.

**Jagannātha Panditarāja**

Jagannātha is the last giant critic of the rhetoric school. With him the race of Indian literary critics practically extinguished.

---
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ished. As the last luminary in the galaxy of literary critics he deserves a prominent place in the history of Sanskrit poetics. The doctrines of Sanskrit poetics held by different theorists and refuted by opponents were already established on firm footing before the advent of Panditarāja himself. In his Rasagangādhara, he tries to fix the course of intense ideological speculations about the essence of poetry from the time of Bharata. Credit is due to him not for their standardization, but for their exposition and assessment by his subtle reasoning with the application of the Navyanyāya terminology. We propose to make in the following chapters a critical assessment of the chief aesthetic doctrines of Jagannātha and to determine his place in the field of Sanskrit Criticism.

Panditarāja starts his work Rasagangādhara by the definition of poetry. He defines poetry as follows: 'ramaniyārtha-pratipādakaḥ sābdāḥ kāvyam', which means that word expressing charming sense is Kāvyā. This charmingness does not consist in the generation of an ordinary feeling of pleasure. It conveys a very deeper sense. This deeper sense cannot be expressed by any simple equivalent English term. It requires a careful interpretation. It consists of a few elements which constitute the central significance of this sense.

It is not an ordinary feeling which is the private property of an individual soul. This property is called personal feeling. The aesthetic experience consists of also transcendental bliss of an absorbing character. This is called impersonal and universal. It is shared by all connoisseurs alike. Nobody is ashamed in the
presence of all to feel the affectionate love of the hero towards the heroine as identical with that of his own. He has identified himself with the object namely hero etc.; but this identification remains in the background and experiencing the feeling he allows himself to be overwhelmed by the feeling and allows him to become one with the object, though as the subject he experiences the feeling. In this experience, this impersonal experience has been emphasised and this impersonal universal experience tinged with the bliss is called lokattarāhlaḍa.

Let me clearly state the elements mentioned before -

(a) impersonality, (b) universality, (c) identity of the subject and object, (d) subject in the background, (e) prominence of the aesthetic experience, (f) cognition and bliss blended together in a harmonious whole, (g) directness and vividness of such experience, (h) its absorbing character.

Jagannātha's definition of poetry reminds us of Dandin's definition which according to him is a series of words conveying beautiful sense (Kāvyadarsā, 7.10). According to some scholars, Jagannātha's definition is an imitation of Dandin's definition of poetry and in doing so Pāṇḍitarāja, followed the old theory of poetry. As Prof. Siva Prasad Bhattacharjee remarks, 'The definition of Kāvya in the R.G. has been held in some quarters as a crowning achievement of his. A little thought will reveal the slippery foundations of this high praise. The student of alamkāra
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is struck by its affinity to the description of the śarīra (body) of the Kāvyā by Dāṇḍin. But this similarity is apparent, not real. Dāṇḍin's īśṭārtha is simply elegant sense or intended sense. His definition refers only to the body of poetry; it cannot go beyond that. Jagannātha's definition on the other hand, has a deeper meaning. It takes into consideration the poetic sentiment which is purely transcendental and impersonal in character. According to Dr Keith, the definition of Pāṇḍitarāja is a development to a logical conclusion of the doctrine of the enjoyment of sentiment which is essentially universal and impersonal and so purely pleasurable. Thus it is not an amplification of the definition of Dāṇḍin; it is a synthesis of the old theories with new current of thought. Dr (Mumari) Suman Pande rightly observes, 'Jagannātha's ramanīyātā is thus not only the īśṭārtha of Dāṇḍin, not only the saundaryām of Vāmana, it is the sahṛdayasāgyātā of Dhvanikāra, the svaspandaśundarātā of Kuntaka, the aucitya of Ksemendra and rasātmakātā of Visvanātha as well.'

After defining Kāvyā, Jagannātha's criticises Māmāta's definition of poetry. Poetry, according to Māmāta, consists of word and sense without faults and with merit and excellence of style - which may at times be without Figures of speech. Criticising this definition, Jagannātha states word and sense cannot be the import of Kāvyā. From the universal usages of the statements
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like 'poetry is read loudly', 'the meaning of poetry is not understood', 'poetry is heard but meaning is not grasped', go to establish the fact that the import of the term 'poetry' is word only. Again, as there is no valid ground to prove that both word and meaning constitute Kavya, it rests that poetry is word only and the same arguments will applicable to the Vedas and Puranas as well.

Controverting those who hold that which is conducive to the realisation of pleasure is poetry and that belongs to both word and meaning, Panditaraja states that this is not tenable; for then many non-Kavyas, like musical tunes and other accompaniments of dramatic performance will be included in Kavya. So Panditaraja says -

\[ \text{etena rasadhodhasamārthasyaivatra lakṣyatyavityapi parāstam} \]

Again posing the question whether word and sense together constitute Kavya jointly or individually, he states that the first alternative is untenable, because one cannot be two. The second alternative also is rejected on the ground that one poetry will have to be taken to be two which is absurd. So like Vedas and Puranas, poetry is constituted of words alone.

Nāgasa in his Gurumarma Prakāśika (Rasagangadāhara, p.7) refutes the argument of Panditaraja and establishes the faultlessness of Mammata's definition. Refuting the view of Panditaraja, Nāgasa says that though Jagannātha cites instances like 'kāvyam śrutam' 'kāvyam pathitam' in support of his contention that poetry consists of word alone, there are popular expressions like poetry is listened to, poetry is understood etc. and these go to establish that the connotation of poetry covers both word and sense. It is because of this fact Patanjali has rightly enunciated 'tadadhīhe',
'tadveda' which goes to support that the connotation of the Vedas is a group characteristic (vyāsajyaārtti) and it covers both word and sense.

Again, raising his objection against the propriety of the use of the terms 'saguna' and 'sālamkāra' in Mammata's definition, Panditarāja states that guna and alamkāra should not be mentioned in the definition. When the sentence 'the moon has risen' is uttered by a duti to an abhisārīka or a love-lorn lady, then different senses like abhisārabidhi, abhisāranisedha and loss of life etc. would be conveyed by the statements. Again, the sentence, 'the sun has set' which is devoid of guna and alamkāra will fall outside the scope of Kāvyā when judged by the definition of Mammata; but this is untenable. For, in that case many pieces of compositions accepted as Kāvyas by the rhetoricians will not be accepted as such. In fact, Gamatkaritva or flash of aesthetic pleasure is the very essence of poetry and it is in both the examples cited above. Moreover the critics are not unanimous about the exact nature of gunas and alamkāras and on account of the non-existence of the common attributes of the gunas and of alamkāras, they cannot be the essence of Kāvyā.

Similarly, Panditarāja criticises Mammata for his use of the word 'adosau' in his definition of poetry. For a Kāvyā totally free from blemishes is rarely met in the world. Again, there cannot be any lakṣana in the expression 'dustam kāvyam', as there is no incompatibility of the primary meaning.

Next, rejecting the definition of poetry given by Visvanātha, Panditarāja maintains it his definition (Nasātmakam vākyam
kāvyam) is untenable. It excludes vastupradhāna and alamkārapradhāna Kāvyas from the bulk of poetry. But this is against the established tradition of the poets. There are many beautiful poetic descriptions where there is no touch of any rasa, but they have been recognised as poetry. If on the other hand, those descriptions are said to have any touch of rasa, then sentences like 'the cow goes', 'the deer runs' etc. will have to be taken as having flavour which is impossible.

Source of Kāvyā

The discussion on the source of Kāvyā forms an important part of Sanskrit poetics and all rhetoricians have treated this topic in their respective works. While all the writers accept imagination or creative genius (pratibhā) as the basic requisite of a poet, there is divergence of opinion regarding culture (vyutpatti) and practice (abhyāsa). Dandin considers poetic genius, pure and vast learning and deep application as the equipments of a poet. Bhāmaha gives highest importance to imagination as the requisite of a poet (cf. kāvyam tu jāyate jātu kasyacit pratibhā-vatah, Kavyālāmākāra 1.5). But he also seems to lay stress on culture and practice in making a poet. Rudrata the author of the Kavyālāmākāra considers poetic imagination, culture and practice jointly as the cause of poetry. Hemchandra the Jaina writer of the twelfth century thinks imagination as the prime requisite of a poet.
poet and that culture and practice can polish and sharpen the imagination. Ānandavardhana also attaches highest importance to Sakti and brings out the relative importance of Sakti and vyutpatti in poetry by stating that 'the poet's imagination can work such a magic that shortcomings in taste and want of learning might remain unnoticed in particular contexts while the poverty of his imagination would at once invariably catch the attention of the readers.'

According to Kuntaka, poetic genius stands supreme in poetic creation. Whatever charm there be in poetry, all that originates from genius (kavipratibhāpraudhāreva prādhānyenavatistate - Vakroktijīvita, p.13). Vāmana considers pratibhā as the sole germ of poetry; it is a kind of mental impression of former existence without which poetry does not originate and even if composed, it becomes an object of laughter only. Rajasekhara recognises the supremacy of innate capacity of poet, which according to him, is capable of giving rise to genius and proficiency. Mammata, however, regards poetic genius, knowledge born of the study of the worldly affairs and poetic literature and practice of the teachings of those well-versed in writing poetry as the necessary requisites in a person to become a poet. He says that the assemblage of all these together and not singly, are the sine qua non of a poet.

Though some of these rhetoricians hold the view that the threefold equipment of Sakti, nipunata and abhyasa is necessary
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for making a poet, the consensus of opinions among them is that
the creative imagination (pratibhā) is the primary requisite of
a poet. Different alamkārikas have defined it in different manner.
'A precise and comprehensive definition of pratibhā or poetic ima­
gination was laid down by Bhaṭṭa Tauta the author of a work on
poetics called Kāvyā Kautuka (which is not extant now). This de­
finition was reverentially accepted by Abhinavagupta in his Dhva­
nyalokacāna and his authority influenced all the succeeding wri­
ters such as Mammata and others. The definition itself reads
thus - 'Poetic imagination is that gift of mind by whose aid one
can visualise myriads of things anew.'67 Abhinava's definition of
pratibhā in his Locana runs thus : 'pratibhā aśūravastunirmānāk­
samā prajñā'. Poetic genius is a consciousness capable of original
invention. It is due to pratibhā that even old themes come to
take new beauty like trees which put on new glory with the advent
of the spring.68 Thus pratibhā is the inventive capacity by virtue
of which the poet gives vent to spontaneous expression to his feel­
ing.

Jagannātha Pāṇḍitarāja holds poetic genius (pratibhā) alone
as the cause of poetry (tasya ca kāraṇam kāvīgaṇa kevala pratibhā,
Rasagangādhara, p.9). He defines it as the flashing of appropriate
words and meanings for composing a poem. This again originates
from the three-fold cause - firstly it may be due to adrśta which
is possible by the grace of a deity or of a saint. Secondly it
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may be caused by knowledge (vyutpatti) and thirdly by constant practice (abhāṣa). These three - adṛṣṭa, vyutpatti and abhāṣa are separately and individually considered to be the cause of poetic genius according to the trīrāmaniniyāyā but not jointly according to dandacakraṇiniyāyā. For sometimes without abhāṣa and vyutpatti, poetic genius is seen in a child due to the grace of saints and others. In such case it is improper to conceive of knowledge and practice of previous existence. There is no convincing proof to establish that he had inborn impression or secret practice.

Rejecting the contention that mere fate is the source of poetic genius, Jagannātha says that sometimes a person wanting in poetic genius, is found unable to compose poetry, but after sometime the same person is seen to acquire by virtue of his knowledge and practice. Here, Panditarāja maintains, instead of supposing two-fold poetic genius, it is better to regard scholarship and practice as the source of genius.

Thus continuing Jagannātha maintains that vyutpatti (scholarship) and abhāṣa (practice) are also the source of poetic genius. But there is a qualitative difference between the inborn genius and acquired genius and as such, quality of literature varies according to imagination or genius of the poets. Thus the composition of gifted poet will naturally be not equal to that of a poet who acquires genius through the grace of a deity or by the blessing of a saint.
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Division of Kāvya

Against the traditional three-fold division of Kāvya of Mammata, Jagannātha Panditarāja classifies it into four varieties - uttamottama, uttama, madhyama and adhama. Of these, the first variety occurs when the sabda (sound) and artha (expressed sense) making themselves subordinate, suggests a beautiful idea. Here, Panditarāja asserts that the word beautiful (camatkrti) is used to mean that class of poetry where the suggested sense is neither very implicit nor very explicit. Again, as the word and sense make themselves subordinate, those classes of poetry where the suggested idea is a part of sentiment or of the expressed sense, or if it helps only the expressed sense, will not be uttamottama Kāvya. As an illustration, the following verse is cited:

sayitā sabidhepyanesvara safalkartumaho manorathān/
dayitā dayitānananambujam daramilannayanā nirīksate/

'Though lying by the side of her husband, the lovely woman, unable to satisfy her desires, looks at his lotus-like face with her eyes slightly closed.'

Here the nāyaka (hero) is the ālambanabibha, the lonely place as indicated by her sleeping close by her beloved is uddipa-nabibha, her glances with her eyes slightly closed is the amu-bhava, her modesty and eagerness are Vyabhicāribhāvas and through the conjunction of all them nāyikā's love for her beloved is suggested.
Jagannatha rules out the possibility of suggestion of any sense other than rati in the example cited above. Against the contention that here nayika's desire to kiss her husband when he sleeps is suggested, Panditaraja maintains that the desire of the heroine to kiss her beloved is expressed by the general term 'monoratha'. It also cannot be said, Jagannatha asserts, that the word 'monoratha' expresses the desire in general, but the particular desire of the heroine to kiss her beloved is suggested. For, the suggested idea, when it is affected in a way by direct expression ceases to be the genuine suggested sense and so a source of literary appeal.

Next, controverting the proposition that in the example cited above, modesty (trapā) of the heroine has been suggested and as such it is an instance of bhāvadhvani, Panditaraja maintains that 'trapā' is an adjunct of the subject and it cannot be the primary sense of the sentence. So it occupies a subordinate position only. If however, the glance of the heroine with her half closed is supposed to be the predicate and modesty (trapā) also is not an adjunct of subject, then it can be a suggested sense. Against this possible proposition, Jagannatha states that this is not possible. For, slight closing of the eyes may be an act of modesty, but the glance of the heroine with slightly closed eyes is an act of rati only. If the suggestion of modesty is given the primary importance, the statement of the glances will lose all its significance. Just as the glances of the heroine have been expressed mainly by the 'abhidhā' and slightly closing of the eyes which is also the anubhāva of trapā, as a part of it, so also, the sentiment of love (i.e., rati) has been suggested mainly and trapā should be
implied as a part of it. So it is not suggested mainly and cannot be an instance of bhāvadhvani. The second variety of poetry, namely the Uttama Kāvyā has been defined by Panditarāja thus:

\[ \text{yatra vyangyamapradhanameva saccamatkārakāraṇam tad dvitīyam} \] (Rasagangādhara)

That type of poetry in which the suggested idea, though subordinate to something (i.e., the expressed sense) becomes a source of pleasure, is the uttama Kāvyā. Here in the definition the word 'eva' has been used to restrict the scope of this kind of poetry and so it will exclude those Kāvyas (suggestive of vastu and alamkāra) where the suggested element is subordinate to some other suggested sense but more prominent than the expressed sense. Such types of Kāvyā should be recognised as Dhvani Kāvyā. In the Citrakāvyā also, the suggested sense remains submerged in the expressed sense and at no cost it becomes a source of delight. So this type of poetry will not overlap with Jagannātha's madhyama Kāvyā. Showing the impropriety of the use of the term 'citranyatvam' in Mammaṭa's definition of second variety of poetry, Panditarāja maintains that it cannot cover those species of poetry where the figures like paryāyokti, samasokti etc. are predominant. But as a matter of fact in those species of poetry gunībhūtavyānātva and citratva do exist. For illustrating the madhyama Kāvyā, the following verse is cited by Jagannātha -

\[ \text{rāghavavirahajvālāsantāpitasaḥyasailasikharesu/ sisire sukham sayānāh kapayah kuḥyanti pavanatanayāya/} \]

'The monkeys, sleeping happily in the cold winter season on the peak of the Sahya mountain heated by the flames of the fire-like
grief of separation of Rama, are angry with the son of wind-god.'

Here it has been suggested that Rama's fire-like grief of separation is quenched by the happy message of Sita's safely brought by Hanumat and this is subordinate to the expressed idea of monkey's wrath on Hanuma due to extreme cold on the peak of the Sahya mountain. But the suggested sense has its own beauty in its pathetic appeal to the connoisseur like a queen undergoing slavery due to evil luck. As MM. Kuppuswami admirably puts it - 'The whole pathos is to be found in the imprisonment of the suggested ideas. What is the cause of the pathetic appeal in queen who is in prison, of a glorious powerful empress who does not deserve to be thrown into prison and who is imprisoned for the moment, who is placed in the wrong place - the whole pathos of the situation, the whole appealing force of the situation is to be found in that it is a queen that is imprisoned here. It is the suggested idea, it is the suggested element that is imprisoned in the external.' Here, though the suggested idea is subordinate to the expressed one, it is source of literary pleasure. This is Jagannatha's uttama Kāvyā.

The third category of poetry of Jagannatha is the Madhyama Kāvyā which is defined by him thus: 'yat ra vyangyacamatkarasam-anādhikarano vācyacamatkārastattṛtiyām.' If in a poetry, the beauty of the expressed sense is not at par with that of the suggested sense, that means, if the beauty of the expressed sense becomes a source of pleasure independent of the beauty of the
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suggested sense, that is the third variety of poetry. This, Jagan-
nātha illustrates by the passage from his akhyāyīka, Jamuna-
varnana - 'tanayamānakagavesanālambikrtajaladhijatharapraviṣṭāhimagiri-
bhujayāmanayā bhagātya bhāgirathyāh sakhi.'

The river Jamuna, here, has been poetically fancied as a
friend of the river Bhāgirathī (Ganges) which appears like the arm
of the Himalaya extended into the heart of the ocean in search of
his son Maināka. This is an example of utpreksa and here the ex-
pressed sense is a source of pleasure. Though it has suggested
such ideas like whiteness (śāitya) and the state of touching the
Pātāla (pātalacumbitatvatvam), they are shrouded by the beauty of the
poetic fancy like the white colour on the person of a village mai-
den covered by the annointment of Kumkuma produced in Kashmir. The
expressed sense itself is a charming one and is a source of plea-
sure without touching the suggested sense. In the uttama Kāvya,
suggested sense is almost wide-awake and here in the madhyama
Kāvya, the suggested sense is 'deep sleep as it were. All guni-
bhūtavyaṅgas and alamkārapradhāna-Kāvya will be included in these
two varieties.

The fourth variety, i.e., the lowest variety of poetry is
defined thus:

yatrarthacamatkṛtyupaskṛtā sabdacamatkṛtih
pradhānam, taḍḍam caturtham (Rasagangādhara, p.23)

If in a poetry, the beauty of sound cherished through the beauty
of sense is dominant, then it is called the adhama Kāvya, the
lowest variety. It is illustrated by the following verse -
The beauty in the verse lies in sound of words forming alliteration. Though there is charmingness in the sense conveyed by the words, it is subordinate to that of sound only. Jagannātha Panditārāja rules out possibility of recognising a fifth variety of poetry having charm of sound but devoid of any charm of sense. That, according to him, would go against the general definition of his poetry. He also criticises Mammata's three-fold division of poetry where the difference of the charms of sense and sound are not taken into consideration. He maintains that if this difference in the charm is not recognised, the distinction between dhvani and gunibhutavyanga is impossible. So poetry having the charms of both sound and sense should be classified on the basis of the predominance of one over the other. If however, the charms of sense and sound are at equal footing, that class of poetry should be brought under the third variety namely Madhyama Kāvya.

Commentators on the Rasagangadhara

A brief reference to the commentators of the Rasagangādhara may not be out of place here. Though there is a large number of commentaries on other works on Sanskrit poetics, a very few commentaries are available on the Rasagangadhara. The cause of this is not far to seek. Most probably, very few scholars attempted to comment upon this last original treatise on account of its peculiar and difficult styles. But during the last sixty
years many scholars have published many editions of the Rasagangadhara with their commentaries. The oldest available commentary on it is the Gurumarmapramakāśikā written by Nāgēśā who flourished in the beginning of eighteenth century. He was a versatile scholar and wrote on a variety of subjects, though his contribution to in the field of grammar and alamkāra is highest. His Gurumarmapramakāśikā is very short and in many places it has not touched the original. He was also not an impartial commentator; he supported Appaya and refuted the standpoint of Panditarājā.

Another commentary Viṣamapadi by name is mentioned by Amfrecht in his Catalogus Catalogorum. This is a gloss on the difficult words or phrases of the Rasagangadhara where the commentator tries to clear out the intricate and controversial topics of the text.

Among the modern scholars, the name of late Gangādhara Sastrī deserves special mention who edited the Rasagangadhara from Benaras with his illuminating notes in the first few pages of his book. Pandit Mathuranath Sastrī published the Rasagangadhara from Bombay with his own new commentary Saralā by name. This commentary is not very elaborate but it helps the student to understand many intricate problems of the texts. Recently many editions of the text have come out from Benaras with Sanskrit commentaries. Among them mention may be made of Madhusudanī by Sahityāchārya Shri Madhusudan Sastrī and the 'Chandrikā' by Pandit Badarināth Jha. Dr Sandhya Bhaduri's edition of the Rasagangadhara (first ānana only)
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is an original contribution and throws a flood of light on many controversial points. Though it is a doctoral thesis, written in Bengali, it is a lucid exposition of the text and the author has explained many points with the help of both eastern and western criticism.