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I.1. A Survey of Sanskrit Poetics

Poetics, the science of poetry (kāvyā) known by numerous names such as Kāvyasastra, Alāṅkāraśāstra, Sāhityāśāstra in Sanskrit literature is a fully developed discipline which deals with the nature of kāvyā and its important aspects, viz., Rasa, Alāṅkāra, Guna, Doṣa and many others in a comprehensive and critical manner. The continuous literary activities of the Sanskrit poeticians over a period extending from the hoary antiquity upto the eighteenth century A.D. resulting in the form of original works, commentaries and sub-commentaries have made this important śāstra detailed in its nature and varied in its scope. But the exact time of the origin of this science is not known. Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra (NS) is considered as the earliest available work dealing with the poetic theories in the field of Sanskrit literary criticism. But the origin of the Sanskrit Poetics is definitely prior to the NS of Bharata. For, in various works we find references to some authors like Nāndikesvara, Kāśyapa etc., who have probably preceded Bharata and whose works are not available to us. They seem to have significantly...
contributed to this science. Bhamaha tells us that he had predecessors whose works apparently he had utilised. While referring to these predecessors generally as *anye*, *apare*, and *kecit*, Bhamaha cites twice by name one Medhāvin, probably a Buddhist Poetician.

Rājaśekhara, in his *Kāvyamīmāṃsa* gives a mythical account of the genesis of *Kāvyapurūsa*, a personification of poetry. He describes *Kāvyapurūsa* as born of Goddess Sarasvatī and as having instructed seventeen students born by his will. These seventeen students themselves are supposed to have written separate treatises. Apart from this mythical account the seeds of this science are found in the *Ṛgveda* and earlier *Upaniṣads* also. The word *Upama* is found as early as the *Ṛgveda*. The *Ṛgvedic* poets indulge in various figures of speech such as *Upama*, *Atisayokti*, *Rūpakā* etc. Similarly, *Upaniṣads* also contain some good examples of *Rūpakā*. Later on these subtle ideas gradually got crystalized in *Alaṅkārasāstra*. This becomes evident from the grammatical analysis of the general ideas adumbrated in the *Nighantu*, *Nirukta*, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini and *Vārttikas* of Kātyāyana. It is an early but clear approach to some technical elements of poetry. The first available work dealing with Sanskrit literary theories is Bharata's *NS* (200 B.C. to 200 A.D.) which is an encyclopaedic manual on theatre art but 'poetry' comes within the scope of *vācikābhīnaya* of drama and therefore finds a place in Bharata's
treatise. Bharata discusses in detail various aspects of poetics like Rasa, Lakṣaṇa, Guṇa, Doṣa and Alaṅkāra.

The period of about five centuries succeeding Bharata is comparatively a blank one in the history of Sanskrit Poetics as no work of Alaṅkāraśāstra in this period (except perhaps the citraśūtra section of Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa) is available. Hence, Bhāmaha (650 A.D.), the author of Kāvyālāṅkāra (KA) is considered to be the first poetician to formulate the doctrines of Sanskrit Poetics in a systematic manner. The major works subsequent to Bhāmaha are Kāvyādāra (KD) of Daṇḍin, Kāvyālāṅkāra-sūtra-vṛtti (KASV) of Vāmana, Kāvyālāṅkāra-sāra-samgraha (KASS) of Udbhata (800 A.D.) and Kāvyālāṅkāra of Rudrata (900 A.D.). The ninth and tenth centuries A.D. constitute an outstanding period in Sanskrit Poetics as it saw the birth of many important theoretical works. Outstanding figures like Ānandavardhana, Lollaṭa, Śaṅkuka, Nāyaka, Tauta, Abhinavagupta, Kuntaka and others flourished, propounded many different and independent theories, developed various viewpoints and made valuable contributions to this science.

Sanskrit Poetics has a very long history of uninterrupted development which witnessed various changes in contents and outlook. In the field of poetics we find much by way of growth as a result of dialectical examination and refutation of views which resulted in a gradual rise, formation and
development of five schools, Viz., I. Rasa-school of Bharata II. Alankāra-school of Bhāmaha III. Rāti-school of Vāmana IV. Dhvani-school of Ānandavardhana and V. Vakrokti-school of Kuntaka. These schools are not in conflict with one another as they all recognise the indespensability of Rasa in any literature worth the name. But they attach relatively more importance to some one element of these than to the rest.

Bharata is considered to be the earliest exponent of RASA school. The greatest and most far-reaching contribution of Bharata to poetics is his formulation of the Rasasūtra to explain the genesis of Rasa. On this Rasasūtra many of the later rhetoricians built their own theories of Rasanispatti. (Even those others who did not do so, have, from Bhāmaha onwards, at least incorporated the element of Rasa in their scheme of poetics). But the original work of Lollata, Śaṅkuka and Nāyaka are yet not found and we have rely upon the summaries of their views furnished by their critics such as Abhinavagupta and Mammata. There are also several other works dealing with Rasa like Sarasvatikanṭhābharaṇa, Śrīgāraprakāśa, Daśarūpaka, Śrīgāratilaka, Bhāvaprakāśana, Rasatarāṅgini etc.

Some poeticians made outstanding efforts to analyse the nature of ALAMKĀRA and the role it plays in beautifying poetry. Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Udbhata and Rudrata are the main exponents.
of this theory. The significance of alaṅkāra in kāvyā, particularly in the sense indicated by Vāmana 'saundaryam alaṅkāraḥ', has attained so much importance that the whole Śāstra is named after it, i.e. Alāṅkāraśāstra.

The RITI school got developed under the leadership of Vāmana. He is the foremost known representative of this school. The credit for setting forth, for the first time, a fairly systematic theory of poetics goes to Vāmana. He is also the first author to probe into what constituted the soul of poetry. According to him, Riti, the distinctive arrangement of words, is the soul of the poetry, the distinction being the presence of Guṇas (poetic qualities). Vāmana mentions three Ritis, Viz., Vaidarbhi, Gauḍīya and Pañcali, but holds that among them, only the formed is preferable because it alone possesses all the Guṇas. He makes a clear distinction between Guṇas and Alaṅkāras. The former are constant elements which empart beauty to poetry while the latter merely enhance its beauty. Guṇas in Vāmana's scheme are actually twenty in number since the ten Guṇas appear both as śabdaguṇas and arthaguṇas. To Rasa, which was regarded only as an alaṅkāra by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, he gives a superior position by including it as the final arthaguna, kānti.

With the DHVANI-vādins, notably Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta, poetics turned into a subject that can stand...
logical treatment and resulted in a philosophy of poetry which propounded an aesthetic experience which was compared later on to the spiritual experience of Brahman. Later on the dhvani theory is controverted by Mahimabhatta, who in his Vyaktiviveka (VV) saw no reason for recognising dhvani as a special mode of thought, since it can be subsumed under inference (anumāna).

Kuntaka, the author of the Vakrokti-jīvita held that VAKROKTI (aesthetic expression) is the very life-breath of poetry. Vakrokti, in plain words, is strikingness of speech. According to this school, an elevated style of expression constitutes the essence of poetry. This elevation of style is secured by the employment of figures in the body of poetry so as to make it striking. Thus, figures are regarded by this school as different aspects of Vakrokti. Rasa, guna and dhvani etc., are merely subservient to Vakrokti in a kāvya. Kuntaka was the great exponent of this doctrine, who carried it too far in his enthusiasm to oppose the dhvani system. On account of its pitting itself against the well-established dhvani theory, the Vakrokti school could not grow popular nor secure adherents; nevertheless, it raised alaṅkāra from a position of insignificance to which it was reduced by the dhvanikāra and secured for it a position of importance among the essentials of a kāvya so much so, that later writers like Mammata could not ignore the claims of alaṅkāra when they formulated their definitions of kāvya.
On the above lines some are inclined to accept a sixth school i.e. the **AUCITYA** school of Kṣemendra, the Kashmirian polymath of the eleventh century A.D. In his **Aucityavicārācāra** Kṣemendra propounds his theory of *Aucitya* (propriety). He defines *Aucitya*, distinguishes it from other constituents of poetry e.g. figures of speech, excellences, blemishes and others, speaks of places where it should be present and calls it the very soul of poetry - the word, the verb, gender, number, case, place, time, name and wish - every one of these limbs of poetry does *Aucitya*, as its soul, pervades and permeates. But we do not find even a single writer in **Alaṅkāraśāstra**, who does not recognise the importance of *Aucitya* and so being a quality acceptable to all, it need not be given a separatistic name of school. But the principle of propriety is always related to something else; and one would always ask the question: 'appropriate to what?' and this 'what' constitutes the soul of poetry - not the principle of propriety itself. Hence no one gives much importance to this poetic theories and it has not found any following.

The great stalwarts in the field of Sanskrit Poetics who have made some kind of important contributions to the development of Sanskrit Poetics and widened its nature and scope are Mahimabhaṭṭa, Mammaṭa, Ruuyaka, Vāgbhaṭṭa, Vidyaṭhāra, Vidyanātha Viśvanātha, Kesavamiśra, Jagannātha, Viśvanāthadeva, Viśveśvara Paṇḍita, Yajñesvara Dīkṣita and Devaśaṅkara Purohita. Apart from this there are numerous poeticians who have also contributed
to this field but unfortunately they have not been successful in earning names of sublime reputation. In the present thesis we have concentrated only on the important works of prominent poeticians as listed above.

In course of the development of this science of poetry some rhetoricians take help of other disciplines like Vyākarana and philosophical systems and incorporate their ideas in poetic works. It is natural that one discipline has to take help of other disciplines for its development. It is impossible to think of anything which is entirely influenced by something else. Hence, it is a truism that no system can develop in isolation. Sanskrit Poetics, not being an exception to this general phenomenon, is more or less influenced by other Śāstras of Indian tradition.

In fact, the same idea lies in the verses of Bharata and Bhāmaha, in which they observe that śabda, artha, all types of śāstra and all types of kālā have their place in the poetry. Professor De rightly remarks:

This concept of the Sahitya of śabda and artha, from which literature itself came to take the designation of Sahitya, is not new; but it had a grammatical origin. It means the general grammatical and logical relation between word and sense in all linguistic expression and did not at first connote any special poetic relation between the two. We know that, like Sanskrit Grammar, Sanskrit Poetics started as an
empirical and normative disciplines; and since, from the very beginning, Poetics accepted the authority of the science of Grammar, to which it was solely related, the grammatical speculations on speech in general not only prompted its speculations on poetic speech, but also influenced its method and outlook. It is no wonder, therefore, that both Bhāmaha and Vāmanā, two of the earliest formulators of poetic theory, devote whole sections of their works to the question of grammatical correctness; and the grammatical analysis of word and sense came to possess an important place in rhetorical speculation.

We will now see below how other disciplines have influenced Sanskrit Poetics.

I.2. Influence of Grammar

Grammar is considered to be the most important of all the Śāstras. Explaining the importance of Grammar Bhāmaha rightly says:

\[\text{सुवर्णभसं पद्मवर्ते पालयणसंतत्कम् ।} \\
\text{धानुणादिदिवणवः पृथ्वीनागवुटन्त्वसम् } \| 2\| \\
\text{धीर्मशाकाकितप्रमल्यम् भैरवधिरसुखितम् ।} \\
\text{सर्वकालेषु सर्वकालं विषयविधाकैरेण भि: } \| 2\|\]
All the Śāstras in Sanskrit literature have contributed little or more to the development of Sanskrit Poetics. But the Vyākaraṇaśāstra has exercised a profound influence on it.

From the Rgvedic age the Vyākaraṇaśāstra has enjoyed a significant position and therefore has been considered as one of the six Vedāṅgas. Prime importance has been attached to it by calling it the mouth of Vedapurūga. Dictums like - "Kāṇadām Pāṇinīyam ca sarvasāstropakārakam" also reflect the importance and necessity of the study of Grammar for the knowledge of all Śāstras.

It is, therefore, not surprising that eminent literary theorists like Bhāmaha, Vāmana and Ānandavardhana have been considerably influenced by the concepts developed by the grammarians. Ānandavardhana in his Dhvanyāloka(DḥA . ) makes a clear reference to them by saying that grammarians are the first scholars, since all branches of study are built upon the groundwork of Grammar. Further, Ānandavardhana’s fundamental doctrine of dhvani itself is admittedly an extension of the principle of sphaṭa first enunciated by the Grammarians. Sphoṭa is the all-pervading, eternal and indestructible word-principle and dhvani manifests it as said in the Vākyapadīya.
The discussion of the meaning of words which we find in the Alankāra works is mostly based on the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali and the Vākyapadīya of Bhartrihari. The Kāvyaprakāśa (KP) of Mammata quotes twice from the Vākyapadīya as helping in the determination of the meaning of a word that has several significations. The definition of the figure of speech, Vibhāvanā given by Mammata in his KP is based on the view of Grammarians that kriyā means hetu. The sub-divisions of Upama alankāra found in Udbhata's KASS, Mammata’s KP and Viśvanātha’s SD are based on grammatical rules of Pāṇini about kyać, kyañ and namul.

Vāmana, the author of KASV and the chief protagonist of the Riti school is also referred to as an authority on deciding certain grammatical issues.

The KASV, to a great extent, is endowed with the flavour of a grammatical work. It is the earliest and only work on poetics which is written in the sutra style. In doing so very probably he adopts sutra style of Grammar. It is significant to note that like the Grammarians Vāmana employs the device of Anuvṛtti. For example, a rule of the KASV, runs as: ‘ḥityam saṁhitai kapa davat padesvar dhāntavarjam’. This is followed by the rule - ‘na padantalaghor gurutvam ca sarvatra’. This latter rule is to be augmented with a part of the earlier rule dragged in by the device of Anuvṛtti.

Vāmana names the Śāstras to be studied by one who aspires to be a poet. He begins the list of Śāstras with śabdasmrti.
which is nothing but Grammar. While discussing the dogas Vāmana dwells first of all with the padadosas and in the padadosas, firstly Asadhu which occurs because of grammatical incorrectness of words. By giving it the first place he establishes the importance of Grammar.

The influence of Grammar on the KASV is most prominent in the second Adhyāya of the fifth Adhikarana. In this Adhyāya he determined the purity of words on the basis of Grammar. Since the whole Adhyāya is directly concerned with grammatical issues it looks more like a work of Grammar than of poetics. Other rhetoricians like Jagannātha Pāṇḍita also were influenced by the system of Grammar and therefore they have used some grammatical principles or sūtras of Pāṇini while discussing their poetic theories.

Bhoja in his Srīgaraprakāśa (Sr.P) has dealt with grammatical subjects under (chapter 1-8), Sabda, Artha and the grammatical part of sāhitya. Numberless quotations from Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Pāṇājali appear in these chapters. These chapters on Grammar contain the essence of the sūtras, the Vārttikas and the Bhāṣya and form a succient and useful contribution to the Vyākaraṇaśāstra.

I.3 Influence of Philosophical Systems

Indian Philosophical systems viz., Sāmkhya, Yoga, Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā, Uttaramīmāṁsā or Vedānta, Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya have
influenced the poetic theories and poetics of great importance.

(A) Sāmkhya System

The influence of the Sāmkhya system is mainly found on the interpretation of the concept of Rasa. Bhaṭṭanāyaka's theory of Rasa known as Bhuktivāda seems to be originated because of the profound influence of the Sāmkhya system.

The enjoyment, by virtue of the different forms of contact between sattva, rajas and tamaś consists of the states of drutī (fluidity), vistāra (dilatation) and vikāsa (expansion). It is characterised by a resting (viśrānti) on one's own consciousness (samvit), which due to the emergent state of sattva is pervaded by beatitude (ānanda) and light (prakāsa) and is similar to the tasting of the supreme Brahman.

The light of the Self, does not reveal itself, in the sāṃsārika existence, but is conditioned by the three constituent elements of mental substance (buddhi), sattva, rajas and tamaś. These three constituent elements are never present in isolation, but mingled together in unequal proportions. The three constituent elements viz., sattva, rajas and tamaś are associated with three states of conciousness called respectively, expansion (vikāsa) provoked by an absolute predominence of sattva, fluidity (drutī) determined by a contact of sattva with rajas and dilatation (vistāra) determined by a contact of sattva with tamaś.
It is important to note that even prior to the Rasa theory of Bhaṭṭanāyaka, a brief Sāmkhyan interpretation of Rasa is available in Abhinavagupta's commentary on NS. But the work does not provide any information about the propounder of this view. Hemacandra in his Kāvyānusāsana also clearly maintains this view of Rasa.\(^3\)

The source of this Sāmkhyan interpretation of Rasa is three guṇas—sattva, rajas and tamas and their relation with sukha, dukha and moha as described in the Sāmkhya philosophy.\(^3\) Guṇas are of the nature of the prīti, aprīti and visāda.\(^3\) According to this theory, since all the worldly objects including Rasa are endowed with three qualities they are of the nature of sukha, dukha and moha.

According to the Sāmkhya theory of causality(satkāryavāda) an effect (kārya) prior to its production exists in its cause and after the kāraṇavyāpāra it gets manifested in the form of an effect.\(^3\) In the same way sukha, dukha and moha elements which remain present in the antahkarana in an unmanifested form get manifested while they come in contact with the external causal factors. Similar is the process of the realisation of the Rasa, which exists in inconspicuous form in its causes i.e. vibhāva etc., and in due course of time, because of the kāraṇavyāpāra transforms into the state of Rasa.
(B) Yoga System

Like the Sāṃkhya, the Yoga school of Patañjali has also influenced poetic theory of Rasa. While dealing with Śāntarasa one clearly realises that Yoga system has had its impact on it. Bharata's theory of Śāntarasa, its existence etc., (vibhāvādi) and latent emotion (sthāyībhāva) seem to be influenced by the Yoga system. The concepts like Yama, Niyama and Dhāranā used in the description of Śāntarasa are referred to the technical terms of Yogasūtras. The word lingagrahaṇa also indicates eight limbs of Yoga. In this connection Abhinavagupta quotes a number of sūtras from the Yogasūtra of Patañjali to substantiate his position.

Masson and Patwardhan support this position. They opine that Abhinava and Yogavāśiṣṭha reveal very close similarity to each other. The data found in the Yogavāśiṣṭha about Śāntarasa can be compared with that of NS. According to the NS (the portion interpolated at the end of the chapter VI. according to the editors of NS Vol.I, GOS) Śāntarasa can be realised only in the state of salvation when the original nature of the Self is realised. Further, four vṛttis of mind namely, muditā, maitrī, karunā and upeksa, which cause Śāntarasa as described in the Daśarūpaka of Dhanañjaya are taken from the Yoga system.
Secondly, the Yoga system has also influenced the poetic doctrine of figure of speech (alāṅkāras). The alāṅkāra, Bhāvika is an example. In the Yogasūtra of Patañjali there is a description of the three parināmas of sāmyama by which a yogi acquires the knowledge of the past and future objects. The Bhāvika-alāṅkāra seems to be based on this conception for, this alāṅkāra as described by Bhāmaha, Uṣṇikī, Māmapātha, Ruyyaka, Appayya and Viśvanātha gives an idea that the objects of past and future are described as the objects of the present perception.

The poetic doctrine of Doṣa also reveals some awareness of the Yoga system though we may not call it an influence of Yoga. In the VIIth chapter of KP, Māmapātha describes the following Yogasāstrāstra-viruddha-doṣa under the heading of Śāstrāstra-viruddha-doṣa. He gives the following example:

\begin{quote}
अव्याप्त-शेषपरिशीलनकीलांकनमे‌
कु तुः साधस्वदिसविविद्व निरूपितकेतने‌ ।
आसारायनभूमनाश्च्चविवेक- ।
स्वातिकमाधिक्यन्यामिनिग्रिनिग्रिमुक्तः II (KP. VII, P.391)
\end{quote}

Here it is described that a yogi obtains release immediately after discriminative wisdom. But, according to the Yogaśāstra, first of all the yogi obtains discriminative knowledge followed by concrete meditation and abstract meditation and finally release.

While enumerating different tattvas according to the different philosophical systems, Bhoja in his Śr. P. mentions the
Yoga system which gives the subject in four sections called Yoga, Śādāna, Vibhuti and Keivalya. In the same section, Bhoja quotes the Yogasūtra (I.15) and while giving the various conceptions of niḥśreyasa mentions the Yoga conception, quoting the Yogasūtra (I.3) - tada drśtuḥ śvarūpavedānam.

(C) Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā System

The system of Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā is mainly concerned with the interpretation of Vedic texts relating to the sacrificial rituals, and evolves the main principles of interpretation of Vedic sentences. It is the Mīmāṃsā school that started detailed study of the structure of sentences and developed elaborate canons of interpretation. Hence, during the discussion of the doctrine of Sabda and Artha in the rhetoric works the impact of Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā system can be easily marked.

According to the Mīmāṃsakas the primary meaning of a word is the universal (jāti) which is the essential quality common to all the particular instances of that class. It is admitted that while the cognition of the meaning brought about by the word pertains to the universal, all the practical activities that follow the word pertain to the vyakti (individual). It is the primary relation of the word that must be to the universal. Mammata refers to the view of Mīmāṃsakas in his KP. Hemacandra and Viśvanātha also follow in the footsteps of Mammata who gives full discussions of Abhihitāñvayavāda and Anvitābhādhanavāda in the second and fourth chapters of KP.
The poeticians seem to be more attentive to the Anvita-bhidhana theory of the Mīmāṃsakas of the Prābhākara school. They consider dhvani or vyañjana to be included in the primary function Abhidhā itself, for, according to them, the meaning of a word is that what is conveyed by it. There is no restriction for the significative force of a word. In a sentence a word conveys not only its own individual meaning, but also its relation with the other words in the sentence. The sāmsarga, or the mutual relation of the word-meanings suggested by their juxtaposition in a sentence is also included in the primary meaning itself. In certain context the word may suggest new ideas beyond its normal sense but all of them come under Abhidhā itself. Just as the range of an arrow can be extended further and further depending on the force with which it is discharged, the meaning of a word can be extended to any length.

Ānandavardhana and his followers attack this view from the standpoint of the Abhihitānvaya theory. The suggested sense cannot be conveyed by the power of Abhidhā, for it is only the definite conventional sense which is directly related to the word and conveyed by Abhidhā. The power of the primary function of the word is exhausted when this task is performed. Even the sentence-meaning cannot be expressed by the words through the primary function alone. Another function has to be accepted to explain the suggested meanings. The primary sense is directly related to the word, but the suggested sense
is, at times, known only indirectly through the expressed sense. The primary sense is definite and fixed; but the suggested sense changes according to the changes in the contextual factors. The primary sense of a word can be objectively learned by any one from a lexicon but the suggested sense in poetry can be fully appreciated only by a man of taste.

The influence of Mimāmsā is seen on Mammaṭa who in his KP quotes Kumārilabhaṭṭa's definition of Laksanā. He says that for pure lākṣaṇa there need not be any invariable concomitance between the primary and the actual reference. If there is an invariable association between the two, there could be no transfer of meaning in cases like mañcāha kroṣanti (the cots cry) since the relation between the cots and the children is only temporary. Moreover, there will be no necessity to resort to transference, since the related sense could be derived through implication itself. If the relation is one of similarity the transfer is qualitative (gauni), if it is any other relation such as that of cause and effect, owner and owned, measure and measured, part and whole etc., it is pure Lākṣaṇa. All these instances prove that Mimāmsā system of philosophy has influenced some of the prominent concepts of Indian Poetics.

(D) Uttaramīmāṃsā System

The Uttaramīmāṃsā system known by the name Vedānta has also influenced the rhetoricians and their important doctrine of Rasa. According to this school bliss (ananda) is of the
form of Brahmananda, for bliss constitutes the essential nature of the Brahman, the highest transcendental reality. This concept of Brahman has influenced Rasa theory. Some poeticians like Jagannatha and Visvesvara quotes statements like 'raso vai sah', 'rasam hyevayam labdhvanandi bhavati' in order to describe the blissful state of the realisation of Rasa.

In Upanisads, the term 'Rasa' is used with various meanings. In Taittirîya Upanisad the essential entity of the world is titled as Rasa and that is described as the only source of the realisation of bliss. In Sanskrit poetics Rasa is considered as the soul of poetry. Just as in Vedāntic texts all the factors are described with the main goal of attaining Brahman, similarly in the Sanskrit poetics also all factors like alaṅkāra, guṇa, rīti, dhvani etc., serve to achieve the realisation of Rasa.

Further, as Brahman is described as unitive (akhaṇḍa), being devoid of any parts in the Upanisads as well as in Vedāntic texts, similarly, unitive nature of Rasa is described in the poetic works like SD.

(E) Vaiśeṣika System

The Vaiśeṣika system of philosophy propounded by Kaṇāda had separate origin. In its initial period it had developed as an independent system but later on it merged in the Nyāya school of Gautama. The earliest extent work of the Vaiśeṣika
System is the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* of Kaṇāda also called *Vaiśeṣika Darśana*.

Vaiśeṣika system of philosophy exerts a little influence on Sanskrit poetics. Only Bhoja in his *Śr.P.* quotes some *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* of Kaṇāda and makes some references to his doctrine.

(F) **Nyāya System**

An intensive study of some important works of Sanskrit poetics leads one to the conclusion that Nyāya system of logic has made a profound impact on the science of poetry. Among the philosophical system which have exerted tremendous impact on *Alaṅkāraśāstra* as shown above, the Nyāya system— the Indian science of logic and reasoning— may be ranked as one of the two most important ones the other being Grammar. This is because the Nyaya system has propounded some logical and scientific principles which are quite necessary for the scientific elucidation of poetic theories. No Śāstra or science in any field of human knowledge can stand independently without logic and scientific principles. Sanskrit poetics is no exception to it. If we understand the term Śāstra in the sense of a science, a systematic body of knowledge, then, we must admit that it is definitely based on logical principles. As such, *Alaṅkāraśāstra* from its very beginning, has followed the logical principles which have been mainly propounded by Naiyāyikas of ancient India. This fact is also proved by
the term 'Sahityaashastra' which is often used as a synonym of Alaankaaraashastra, as a science of aesthetic and logical relation (sahitsya bhava) of sound and sense constituting the cornerstone of the Sanskrit poetics. V. Raghavan observes:

Poetry, being expression in 'language' is based on Grammar which helps to secure correct expression. Its subject-matter is 'thought' and Nyaya which is the Grammar of thought also comes up naturally into the fold.

In making and maintaining the aesthetic and logical relation of word and meaning the poet's task becomes arduous. He has to compose a kavya of which word, meaning, logic and aesthetic form ingredients. Therefore all - sabda, artha, sciences and all types of arts (kalas) constitutes the body of kavya as very rightly pointed out by Bharata and after him Bhamaha. The special mention of the term 'Nyaya' by Bhamaha makes it clear that the role of Nyaya is unavoidable in poetics. Nyaya has its place in poetry within an aesthetic framework. Mukulabhatta rightly says:

\[ \text{Abhidhāvṛttiṃūtākā, Verse 13} \]

Since Nyaya (logic or reasoning) is the most essential element of every science, the importance of Nyayaashastra which exclusively deals with it, is recognised by the scholars of
ancient India as the light of all the branches of learning. Because the logicality of any proposition or any structure of arguments is fundamental to the presentation of any science worth the name, Vātsyāyana in his Nyāyabhāṣya(NBh) very rightly eulogises Nyāya as:

प्रतिप: सर्वतियानामयाय: सर्वकर्मणाम्!
आश्रय: सर्वधर्माणां विषयदेशः प्रकटिताः॥
(NBh. P-12)

The system has influenced more or less all the Śāstras of ancient and medieval India.

It is significant to note that in Indian philosophical literature the term 'Nyāya' has been used in a number of senses. Nyāya is genitically a term of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā system and denotes the upshot of the ratiocination employed in reconciling the apparently contradictory texts in the Vedic literature particularly the Brhamanas. This is the import of the definition of the Nyāya of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā. Thus there are Nyāyas in the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā like jāteṣṭīnyāyāḥ and others. How Nyāya forms the very backbone of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā system can be judged by the nomenclature of several Mīmāṃsā works, particularly that of Jaimini, which is called Nyāyamālā.

It is easy to understand how the term Nyāya which first denoted reasoning in the sphere of Vedic rituals came to be applied to all reasoning irrespective of its bearing on the Vedic rituals. The term attained a much wider application on
wordly as well as scientific levels. Nyāya like sthūpanikhanana-nyāya came into existence. Again, the Vedānta system speaks of adhyāropa and apavādanyāya. Jaina logicians also speak of Nayāsa.

Nyāya or the Nyāyaśāstra which comprises logic, epistemology, and metaphysics of a particular school has been regarded as an important branch of learning in India since very early times. Nyāya is also known by various names, e.g. Hetuvidyā, Hetuśāstra, Pramāṇāśāstra, Tarkaśāstra, Tarkavidyā etc. Another name of Nyāya is Ānvikṣiki. Bhāmaha perhaps refers to this system by using the term Nyāya in his KA. Rajaśekhara also in his Kāvyamimamsā makes references to Ānvikṣiki. As the term Nyāya popularly signifies reasoning, the Nyāyaśāstra is considered as the science of sound reasoning and correct judgement. One can understand therefore why the Nyāya system of Gautama is which primarily teaches how to reason came to possess that name.

I.4 Brief History and Development of the Nyāya System

The most ancient available work on Nyāya is the Nyāyasūtra (NyS) of Gautama or Gotama alias Aksapāda (200A.D.). The earliest available commentary on the NyS is the NBh of Vātsyāyana. On this NBh Uddyotkara wrote his super-commentary, Nyāyavārttika on which again Vācaspatimisra wrote his super-commentary, Nyāyavārttikatātparyātikā. This Tātparyātikā is again commented upon by Viśvanātha. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, a Kashmirian author of renown (third quarter of the 9th century A.D.) has contributed
to the Nyāyaśāstra an elaborate Vṛtti (only on select sūtras of Gautama) called Nyāyamañjari (NM). In the tenth century a great Naiyāyika by name Udayanācārya wrote na number of works such as Kīranaṃvā, Ātmatattvaviveka, Nyāyakusumānjali etc. Thus the period of Prācīna Nyāya school starting from Aksapāda to Udayanācārya is an important phase of development in the history of Nyāyaśāstra in India.

The second phase of the development of the Nyāya system is known by the term Navya-Nyāya (the Modern school of Indian logic). It is commonly believed to have been founded by Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya (12th century A.D.), the illustrious author of the Tattvacintāmaṇi (TC). But Udayanācārya actually stands on the threshold of ancient and modern ages of he Nyāya system. His Pariśuddhi round up and is practically the last important work of the ancient age of Nyāya, but he also enjoys the privilege of heralding the modern age of Nyāya system with his work Kusumānjali. However, the actual ushering of the modern age of Nyāya is credited to Gaṅgeśa whose work TC is called to be the first landmark of Navya-Nyāya. With Gaṅgeśa and after him, the Nyāya system became a rigorous quest for precision of meaning.

Like the Nyās of Gautama, the TC of Gaṅgeśa also gained such popularity that the whole school went on developing for the next six hundred years in the form of commentaries and sub-commentaries on this great work. Later on the galaxy of
Astute logicians headed by Jayadeva Miśra, Raghunātha Śiromaṇi, Mathurānātha Tarkavāgīṣa, Jagadīśa Tarkālaṅkāra, Gadādhara Bhaṭṭācārya etc., to mention only a few, developed this branch of Nyāya to a great extent.

Prācīna Nyāya mainly deals with metaphysical, logical and some methodological topics. Navya-Nyāya is basically an epistemological and linguistic system. Analysis of statement and concepts and theory of knowledge etc., form the subject of Navya-Nyāya. We find subtle logic at its extreme in the works of this period. It is the turning point which pioneers an altogether new method of philosophical investigation.

The unique feature of Navya-Nyāya is its techniques which are so thorough and subtle that it is almost impossible to conceive a more perfect and unambiguous method of expression in Sanskrit or for that matter, in any other language.

The Navya-Nyāya is a comprehensive system of philosophy having for its subject-matter not only logic but epistemology, grammar and many other topics of interest. To quote prof. Ingalls:

These philosophers (Navya-Naiyāyikas) have written on logic, epistemology, physics and grammar, but logic has been the most distinctive of their disciplines. 27

The highest possible perfection and extreme thoroughness of
analysis are the outstanding features of Navya Nyāya. This system has developed its own way of interpretation with the help of numerous abstracts, cliches and technicalities. In this respect the Navya-Nyāya has been thoroughly systematic and perfect. The subtle analysis of objects and ideas necessitated the forming of a very difficult and complex system of terminology and hence the system of language of Navya-Nyāya appears to be an altogether different language as compared to that of the other Sanskrit Scientific literature.

The third phase of the development of the Nyāya school is known as Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school. The two schools—Nyāya of Gautama and Vaiśeṣika of Kaṇḍāda were separate in their origin as well as in the early course of their development. From the earliest times so many doctrinal similarities between the two schools were their, but from the tenth century onwards we find treatises in which the subject matter of both the systems has been formally amalgamated. A preliminary study of a Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika manual like Tarkasamgraha of Annambhaṭṭa and Kārikāvalī with Nyāyasiddhāntamuktāvalī both of Viśvanātha Nyāyapāñcānana are the two famous works of the syncretic Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school.

1.5 Buddhist Logic

Another phase of the development of the Nyāya system is Buddhist logic. The period from fifth to the eleventh century is most significant in the history of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school.
During this period Nyāya system developed as a result of constant conflict with the Buddhists. It is the period of conflict and development. To this period belongs the galaxy of thinkers such as Diṅnāga, Dharmakīrti, Dharmottara and Śāntarakṣita of the Buddhist camp, and Uddyotakara, Vācaspati, Jayanta and Udayana on the orthodox realistic side. The interaction gave rise to a distinct system of logic in India known by the name Buddhist Logic.

The term Buddhist Logic (Bauddha Nyāya) means a system of logic and epistemology, originated in the field of Buddhist philosophy with the advent of great master Diṅnāga. This System gave more emphasis on the logical and epistemological aspects of Buddhist philosophy than its metaphysical and ontological aspects. It developed and flourished in India till the end of the 11th century A.D.

So far as the seeds of the Buddhist logic are concerned, they are present to some extent even in the teachings and discussions of Lord Buddha. But Nāgārjuna extended this system further. He wrote two tracts - Vighrahavyāvatī and Vaidalyasūtraprakaraṇa in which he refuted Pramāṇa etc. and established his own theories of relativity (sāpekṣatā) through a very unique dialectical method which shows his efficiency in dialecticism. It is, however, true that an independent nature of the Buddhist logic was not yet developed. The tradition laid down by the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system of Akṣapāda
Gautama was being followed. Long after Nagarjuna, there appeared two brothers named Asanga and Vasubandhu (5th century A.D.). Among them Vasubandhu has earned a reputation as a good logician. Vasubandhu had composed three works on the art of debate viz., Vadavidhi, Vadavidhana and Vadahrdaya. Besides these, one 'Tarkasāstra' is also ascribed to Vasubandhu. It appears that a background for the Buddhist logic was already prepared by Vasubandhu and others, but a systematic form was given to it by Diṅnāga, a great master of Buddhist Logic.

Several treatises are mentioned on his name. The Pramāṇasamuccaya is one of the greatest literary monuments of Diṅnāga. The Nyāyapravēsa is another excellent work on logic by him. The others works like Ālambanaparīkṣā, Trikālaparīkṣā, Hetucakrasamarthana and Nyāyamukha are his other works. Some other writers like Paramārtha, Śaṅkarasvāmi, Dharmapāla, Ācārya Śilabhadra etc., also have made significant contribution to the development of Buddhist logic.

The Buddhists in upholding their logical tenets offered a bold challenge to Hindu Naiyāyikas. To dispel the error of Diṅnāga, the Brahmin logician Uddyotkara wrote his Nyāyavārttika. He, in his turn, was assailed by the Buddhist logicians Dharmakīrti who defended Diṅnāga. After Uddyotakara and Vācaspatimiśra a large number of Buddhist logicians appeared in the field to vindicate the Buddhist logic from the attacks of Hindu Naiyāyikas. They fought valiently against the Hindu Naiyāyikas for nearly seven hundred years from 4th century A.D. to 11th
century A.D. This gave rise one independent system of logic known by the term Buddhist logic.

Thus the system of Nyāya philosophy developed in India and bifurcated into three streams such as Hindu logic, Buddhist logic and Jaina logic. Like Buddhist logic Jaina logic also developed through the efforts of the philosophers exclusively belonging to the Jaina philosophical tradition. But as far as the Jaina logic is concerned it hardly differs from the Hindu logic which is at its root. Even though it has been given some independent status yet it is not so substantial in its contents as well as approach as the system of Buddhist logicians. Again, in the context of Sanskrit poetics the Jainas have not achieved any special success as the Buddhist poeticians have. We, therefore, can safely omit the historical development of Jaina logic and its influence on Sanskrit poetics. The influence is almost nil and does not deserve a special treatment in the present thesis.

Both the Nyāya system and Sanskrit poetics have taken great strides together in India. The parallel development opened the scope for Sanskrit poetics to borrow whatever was important and necessary from the Nyāya system. As Nyāyaśāstra had something substantial to offer it naturally attracted the poeticians and influenced them. And the influenced is deep and varied. We will discuss them in detail in the following pages. And the influenced is so deep and varied that however hard we may try we shall be able to show only some representative aspects of it.
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