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CHAPTER-III

COMMENTARIES ON SANSKRIT POETICS
IN BENGALI: AN EVALUATION

From the dawn of Indian culture and civilization to the period of Panditaraja Jagannatha, the evolution of Sanskrit poetics is a multifaceted diverse history. The intellectual consciousness of the touch wand of different scholars has flourished this upsurge or flow, especially between 19th and 20th century. The Bengali scholars also came forward to discussing poetics, analyzing it, and writing annotation, on it, wherever necessary. At the juncture of Bengali Renaissance, a tendency of studying the ancient history and of gathering the jem-like knowledge and information was observed among the Bengali scholars. Simultaneously, the Bengalies’ qualified in the Western education were up and doing in showing their originality with comparative evaluation of the Western rhetoric. The Bengali geniuses were not only introduced to Sanskrit rhetoric but also to the Western poetics. The books containing discussion on rhetoric, which were written by the untiring effort of the inquisitive Bengali intellects, were not noticeable in any other modern Indian language. They not only remained content with the translation of Sanskrit rhetoric but also dealt with genealogy, the period or time of advent (birth), the catalogue of outstanding books or writings and with their analytical penmanship of the Sanskrit rhetorics. Consequently, in the prologue of the books of those who have done Sanskrit rhetoric into Bengali, a long history of Sanskrit rhetoric has been arrayed; and judged from this standpoint
of view, the discussion of Sanskrit rhetoric in the introduction of these books has played a vital role in enriching Bengali rhetoric.

We can, however, make here the special mention of Atul Chandra Gupta’s *Kāvyajñānasā*,1 Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta’s *Kāvyālok*,2 Surendranath Dasgupta’s *Kāvyabicār*,3 Ramaranjan Mukhopadhay’s *Rasasamākṣā*,4 Bishnupada Bhattacharya’s *Sāhityamāṁsā*,5 and *Kāvyamāṁsā*6 etc. Each of these books speaks volumes for the intellectuality of the Bengali geniuses with regard to rhetoric. Now these books may critically be discussed one by one.

Atul Chandra Gupta was the pioneer of the special trend of discussion, which developed in the Bengali language of the modern era, around the views of ancient Sanskrit poetics, especially in the 1st half of the 20th century, and *Kāvyajñānasā* is one of his books on this subject. Though the book was bought out in 1928, the essays therein appeared *Sabuj Patrikā* in phases. The learned Surendra Nath Dasgupta, in the prologue of his book *Kāvyabicār* published in 1939, commented in praise of the books on poetics, written by Dr. Sushil Kumar Dasgupta and the like. “Barring Atul Chandra Gupta’s small work *Kāvyajñānasā*, I know not any other specific discussion held in Bengali.”7 Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta in the introduction to his *Kāvyālok*, wrote, “There is no note-worthy mention of *rasa*, *bhāva* and *dhvani* in the preamble to Pandit Lalmohan Vidyanidhi’s *Kāvyanirṇay* published in 1862”. What is worth mentioning is that long before half a century of Lalmohan Vidyanidhi’s publication of *Kāvyanirṇay*, the maiden endeavour in the discussion on Sanskrit poetics in Bengali is said to have made its first appearance.8 Pandit Mrityunjay Vidyalankar, the Head of the Deptt. Of Bengali, Fort William College, Kolkata, was the pioneer in the discussion of Sanskrit poetics in the Bengali language.9 When Bengali prose was not in a position to lay its
postulation in totality or to earn absolute renownance, the discussion on Sanskrit poetics, for the first time, found its place in his Prabodhacandrikā edited roughly in 1813. The book was, in fact, printed at Sreerampore Mission Press in 1833.

The book was, to all intents and purposes, edited with a view to imparting knowledge, and a few chapters dealing with some other topics related to grammar, ethics, rhetoric etc. were also inserted in it. In connection with grammatical discussion he dealt with vācak, lākśāṇik and vyāñjak. With reference to lākśāṇik and lākṣaṇā, mrityunjay Vidyalankar followed the Indian rhetoric. He dwelt at length on the classification of lākṣaṇā, rūḍhi lākṣaṇā, oupaҫārik lākṣaṇā etc. and on the other divisions of lākṣaṇā, such as upatattiksha upalākṣaṇ and svarūpalākṣaṇ, tatasthalakṣaṇā, bhāgalakṣaṇā, śāvda-lakṣaṇā, tatsthalakṣaṇā, biparīṭlakṣaṇā, jahadjahatlakṣaṇā etc.10 Here, he picked up the examples of lākṣaṇā from rhetoric, even though he forgot not to make the best use of the thoughts and ideas of vedantists.

But it is to be admitted that when Mrityunjay Vidyalankar started this discussion, suitable and facile Bengali prose language has not taken root in literature. When Bengali prose was at an experimental stage, serious and solemn discussion was not at all possible in prose. In this context, it has been said and rightly said, “In that aeon, it was perhaps possible only on the part of Mrityunjay Vidyalankar to touch upon such complicated topic like lākṣaṇā in Bengali prose. Not only that, he had an untiring and sincere endeavour to present the subject matter and the language in an easy but enchanting and inward style.”11 It, of course, goes without saying that in spite of his attempt at using easy language Mrityunjay’s one may be called an obsolete or ‘dead language’ in modern age. The illustrative quotation extracted hereunder will manifest the aforesaid point under discussion.
It is, however, undeniable that, in course of citing the instance of lakṣaṇa at the time of the origination of Bengali prose order (language), Mrityunjoy Vidyalankar left no stone unturned to bring the language closer and closer to the lips of the Bengalis, e.g. āji eder ghar gamgam śavda kariteche Or, as regards the example of padalakṣaṇa satyabhāmāke satyā, padmalocanke padā, Jagannātha-ke Jagā kahe.

At length, in the teeth of his shaky and lazy style of language he tried all means to get rid of such sceptical untidiness; bearing this particular point at issue, one can’t help saying that it was Mrityunjoy Vidyalankar who was the pioneer and torch-bearer of the discourse on Sanskrit rhetoric in the Bengali language.13

Such an awareness had spread through the life, literature and culture of the Bengalis at the start of the nineteenth century as a result of Western influence that there was, as it were, a complete renewal, of life in Bengal. In consequence, in the middle of this century, among the poets, artists and critics of Bengal there had risen a curiosity about the objective elements of literature, its mode of composition and its ideal or objective. As an outcome of this the true beginning of literary criticism took place in Bengal14. In this field, the impact of Sanskrit Rhetoric and that of Western aesthetics were equally string in the minds of the critics. Discussion in Bengali language, on the meaningfulness and justification of form, creative process and theory etc. of literature from the point of the view of Sanskrit aesthetics, probably took place for the first time in 1853 A.D. in Iswar Chandra Vidyasagars Sanskrita Bhāṣā O Sanskrita Śāstra Biṣayak Prastāb. In other words, Vidyasagar was
the first writer to initiate the discussion on Sanskrit aesthetics in the Bengali language. Not only this, 'It was the first history of Sanskrit literature written by an Indian.' In this booklet, instead of showing unreasonable difference to ancient apothegms, or words of great poets (Mahākābi), Vidyasagar discovered inconsistencies even in the compositions of Rṣi poets of Sanskrit applying the method of European criticism.

In this area, the second person who initiated direct discussion on this subject of Sanskrit Rhetoric was Pandit Lalmohan Vidyanidhi. His book, *Kāvyanirnay* divided in six chapters (1862 A.D.) contains discussion on rasa, guṇa riti, doṣa, chanda, alamkāra etc. of Sanskrit poetics. Along with his discussion about the nature of poetry in the *Rasa* chapter of this book he has elaborately discussed different examples of rasa and various forms of Mahākāvyya, Khaṇḍakāvyya and Drśyakāvyya etc. It may be noted that while discussing various structural elements of drama, the author has made use of English synonyms of Sanskrit terms, for instance, Pūrvarāṅga=Prelude, Udghātyaka=1st order Prologue, Kathoghāta=2nd order prologue, Prayogātisāya=3rd order prologue, Prabartaka=4th order prologue, Abagalita=5th order prologue etc. In this book itself he first discussed Dhvanivāda in details and has also done elaborate discussion on 'Sthāyibhāva' Bibhāva, Anubhāva etc. With examples and Sanskrit synonyms, he has discussed nine kinds of rasa in details.

In the chapter on *Guna* he has discussed the various guṇas, in the chapter Ṛti and Chanda ṛti various types eg. Bhujāṅgaprayāṭa, Anuṣṭupa, Rucirā, Kroṅcapadā, Čāmara etc have been discussed respectively. Besides, the new types of chanda which started being composed in Bengali language following those of Sanskrit, namely, tāmarasa, totaka, tvaritagati, dodhaka, kusumavicītṛā, candravartma, baṃsāsthavil, upendraṇabāṛā, harigīlā,
— *kundakusuma*, *śefālikā*, *campaka* etc. have been discussed by him with illustrations also from Bengali literature.\(^{16}\)

In the chapter *Doṣa* he has discussed the various ‘blemishes’ of literature in the light of Sanskrit literature with quotations from Bengali literature. Here, various types of blemishes eg. *Śrutikatutā*, *cyuta saniskṛti*, *aprayuktatā* etc. pertaining to sound and blemishes related to *rasa*, such as *prakaśita birudhatva*, *anucitya*, *kālānucitya*, *sahacaravinnatā*, *luptāhatavisargatā*, *rasa doṣa* etc. have found place in this chapter. It is to be noted here that everywhere he has given examples of these from Bengali literature and for every term he has used English synonyms. As a matter of fact, Lalmohan Vidyanidhi pioneered criticism in the Bengali language in accordance with the principles of Sanskrit rhetoric. Through this wide range of literary criticism he has laid the foundation of the discussion of various aspects of aesthetics. His achievement in this field is of historical importance.

Atul Chandra Gupta was the pioneer of the special trend of discussion which developed in the Bengali language of the modern era, in keeping with the views of the ancient Sanskrit poetics, especially in the first half of the Twentieth Century, and *Kāvyajñānasā* is one of his books on this subject. This book is the first comprehensive discussion in Bengali with regard to the different views of Sanskrit poetics, though he has not discussed all the views of Sanskrit rhetoric. He has depended mainly on the works of Anandabardhana and Abhinavagupta. However, the inquisitive reader will be able to have a clear conception for the first times from this book about the subjects like *Alaṅkāraḥvāda*, *Dhvanivāda*, *rasaṃvāda* and the propriety of poetry (*aucitya*). In fact, in this book, the author has tried to establish the fact that the discussions and conclusions of Indian writers of poetics are universal in character. Though he has drawn most of his examples from Sanskrit
literature, he hasn’t, however, put aside Bengali literature far away. Even, in course of discussion, he has had recourse to English literature also. While showing the resemblance of the Indian rhetoricians with those of the west, in respect of their theories of poetics, he has carried on a comparative study of both; of course, this has been done with a view to vindicating the Indian view. For instance, in order to reveal the outcome of rasa in a general way he has compared it with the view of the Italian philosopher, Benedetto Croce, or the poetics of Wordsworth. In fact, Atul Ch. Gupta was the first to initiate the discussion to demonstrate the universality of Indian poetics. He has earmarked the reference to Croce’s “poetic Idealization’ to show the effect of bhāva, bibhāva, anubhāva etc. which have been mentioned by Indian rhetoricians. Not only this, while explaining from the point of view of the Indian rhetoricians the process of transformation of the general emotions into enjoyable rasa, he has also referred to the subject of Croce’s – “Passage from troublous emotion to the serenity of contemplation”.17 In this context, he has also referred to Wordsworth’s discussion on poetry. At later times, the Bengali critics of Indian poetics had discussed here and there the similarities and dissimilarities between Indian and Western views regarding poetics; of such discussion Atul Ch. Gupta was but the leading pioneer. Explaining how a state of sorrow or grief described in poetry can turn that of delight, he has cited a famous example from the West: ‘Our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought’. In fact, by way of giving a clear form to the sequential history of our poetics he has made us acquaint with the basic tone of the literary criticism of the West.

Of course, certain flaws are also discernible in his discussion. For instance, he has begun his discussion with a reference to the context of Balmiki’s first śloka – mā niśāda pratiṣṭham etc. Then in search of the soul of poetry and with a view to demonstrating the curiosity of the Indian genius
he proceeded to the context, one after the other, of *alamkāravāda*, *rītivāda*, *dhvanīvāda*, *rasavāda* etc. It may be mentioned here that in Indian poetics these ideas did not appear following the same sequence as he has shown. In the very beginning *rasa* was established as the soul of poetry in the discussion of Bharatacarya. On the other hand, Anandavardhana, the protagonist of *Dhvanīvāda*, appeared in the 9th century A.D. In the intervening period there was no such continuity whatsoever in the process of the development of these ideas as Atul Chandra Gupta has attempted to show. Leaving aside this slightest flaw, there is no other shortcoming in his book under our consideration. Rather, the manner in which he had shown – following *abhibyaktivāda* of Abhinavagupta the transformation into *rasa* of the general emotions – had made it certainly obvious and clear to the Bengali readers. Here, so far as the totality of outlook in the studies of Indian poetics is concerned, the first success can be claimed only by Atul Chandra Gupta. Though Pandit Lalmohan Vidyanidhi had brought out his book, *kavyanirñay* in 1862 A.D., there was no notable discussion on it, so to say, of the essential elements of poetry such as *bastu rasa*, *bhāva*, *dhvani* etc. Of course, Bishnupada Bhattacharya has accorded recognition to Lalmohan Vidyanidhi’s book as a pioneering work in the field of studies of this kind. Particularly, the two chapters in the book titled *kathā* and *jal* carry the mark of his versatile erudition in the discussion of literary principles. In short, in the book under consideration the author has dealt only with those dominant questions regarding poetry which are there in the minds of the people of today. Of course, the author has admitted his indebtedness to the First Volume of *studies of the History of Sanskrit poetics* by Sri Sushil Kumar De; this he has done in course of collecting information relating to Anandabardhana and Abhinava Gupta. The remark of Sri Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta regarding his *Kāvyajīnāsā* is note worthy. About this book he has
said – ‘Inspite of being very brief it is well-written and having dispelled Bengalee readers’ fear of poetics and drawing their respect towards it the book has done a great service to the inquisitive readers of poetry. Truly speaking, this book is a valuable introduction to the study of poetics.20

The names of the two Books which have to be mentioned next are Kāvyabicār21 and Sāhityaparicay by Dr. Surendranath Dasgupta. It has been said that these books are fit to be considered as being an important addition to the historical and comparative studies of the gradual development of Indian poetics.22 In his book Kāvyabicār he has given a running description of the famous theories of Indian rhetoric and also about their respective founder-rhetoricians Meanwhile, though western scholars had research oriented publications of treatises and articles etc to their credit in the English language, in Bengali, however, no such work of dissertation has been observed prior to this. But, as a result of the various historical facts starting with hose about the lives and works of rhetoricians having been written too briefly and the author having not been mindful enough regarding the embellishment of the language of his composition, the book, Kāvyabicār has not been well accepted particularly by the average readers. A notable characteristic of this book its analytical-enrichment with information of the views of the rhetoricians beginning from Bharata, Yamaha etc. upto Anandabardhana and Kuntak. Also, the analysis of Acaryas like Bhattalollata, Bhattasankuka, Bhattanayaka and Abhinavaguta regarding their own respective views on rasa has specially been done for the first time in this book. In his discussion of doṣa, guṇa, rīti, Bakroktivāda, rasa & kāvyā, dhvani and sphotavāda etc. have had place in the book, one after another. The first two chapters of the book require special mention. In the first chapter, having demonstrated the relation between the grammarian and the rhetorician, the critic gives us an idea about how our poetics began its journey onwards in the course of evolution. The history of
the gradual evolution of rhetoric has found a place specially in the second chapter of the book. For a comprehensive knowledge of Indian rhetoric, this chapter is particularly important and above all, it has to be mentioned that inspite of the attempt of Nalinikanta Gupta to create new theories of poetics following the terms like paisyantibāka baikharībāka etc. in his contemporaneous discussion of literary principles, no one so far has done any thorough discussion of sphotabāda except Surendranath Dasgupta who, in this field has really played a vital as directive role.

Another notable work in the studies of Sanskrit Rhetoric in Bengali is Dr. Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta’s Kāvyālōk. This is very much a research oriented book and for this the author has secured D. Lit degree from Calcutta University. This book had been appreciated in the society of the learned scholars as a novel addition to the comparative discussion of different subjects of Sanskrit poetics and also in the field of intellectually rich comparative studies of Sanskrit rhetoric with Western poetics. Through philosophical and psychological discussion he has analysed about 150 books on the subject both of the East and of the West, and with quotation from them he has enriched this book in such a way that it is sure to be held in the highest esteem among the learned for all times to come. He has not done away with his responsibility by quoting only but the views of the ancient rhetoricians, he has also pointed, out the faults, if any, and west and means of their rectification as well. In this context he himself has said- “Not only the minor defects or short comings of our predecessors but also finding out wherever necessary their fundamental defects pertaining to information and inferences particularly on account of abyapti or atibyapti or other kinds of faults, I did not shirk establishing our own new theories and conclusions in the perspective of modern literature”.25
In this book divided into five parts he has discussed several topics which we cannot but mention here in order to show the wonderful variety of approach in indifferent directions. For example, the subject of discussion of the first chapter is definition of poetry – Drutikāvya and Diptikāvya; the second chapter deals with rasa and bhāva, in the third we have vyañjanā and dhvani in the fourth bastu and vibhāva and the fifth chapter the contains of the discussion of sabdaḥ and artha. The one aspect of this book which deserves a special mention is its division, viz. Drutikāvya, Diptikāvya the rasa of lyrical poetry i.e. Gitikāvya and the discussion of poetic rasa, examples of rasa from Vaiṣṇava Padāvali literature and Śākta literature. In his book, Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta has not remained confined in the discussion of the aesthetics of the East and West only, he has rather discussed how this rasa had risen in waves in Bengali literature, considered Western aesthetic approach in the light of Sanskrit rhetoric and along with this he also involved Bengali literature in his discussion.

The essays written by Bishnupada Bhattacharya, later compiled in his book titled as Sāhityamīmāṃśa, were first serially published in the magazines the Des and the Sanībārer Cithi. Subsequently, they found their place in the Visvavidyā Saṅgraha Granthamāla and were brought out in the form of a book. The book dealt chiefly with the signs of excellence in kāvya, rasatattva in literature, with characteristic of rasa, and especially with the comparative discussion on the western theories. Besides, the book contains a theoretical analysis about the position of alaṁkāra in kāvya and about its relation with alaṁkāra. It’s worth mentioning that S. Joshi, a writer from Broda, published the translated version of Sāhityamīmāṃśa into Gujrati in 1957.
Bishnupada Bhattacharya's *Kavyakautuk* and *Kavyamimāinsā* deserve the claim for special mention in the discussion on the art of literary composition. The characteristic of *kāvyas*, the word and its terminological meaning, the role of words in *kāvyas*, the positive peculiarity of the poets and the connoisseur and the reciprocity among them, the serious and delightful doctrine in *Alaṅkāra Śāstra*, the difference between the audio-visual *kāvyas*, poems and recitations, the ethics of *kāvyas* in Indian outlook and the distinction between the *sukavi* and *kukkavi* etc. have assured their insertion in the writings of these two books based on original books on Indian rhetoric. Simultaneously, as the books contains the comparative analysis of the doctrines of the Western philosophers and litterateurs, their importance has augmented in the sphere of critical discussion on Cooperative Literature. In this context Bishnupada Bhattacharya's *Prācin Bhāratīya Alaṅkār Śāstrer Bhūmiṅkā* also commands high appreciation. The book provides us with the theories of the rhetoricians like Bharata, Bhamaha, Dandi, Vamana, Udvata, Rudrata, Anandavardhana, Kuntaka and the like. Over and above the tenets of the *Gaudīya Vaiṣṇava* scholars like Srirupa Goswami, Raghunath Goswami, Kavirarnapura have also been briefed in this book. In a word the name of Bisnupada Bhattacharya will remain ever immortal as one of hallowed memory in the realm of the discourse of Sanskrit rhetoric in Bengali.

The book which demands a special reference in the field of studies of Sanskrit poetics in Bengali is *Rasasamikṣā* written by Ramaranjan Mukhopadhay. This book consisting of nine chapters is a valuable contribution to the discussion of Indian rhetoric, particularly to the discussion of the principle of *rasa*. In the first chapter of this book the history of Sanskrit poetics has been described. This discussion has taken its form not through description alone, but also intellectual analysis has gone into it in addition. So, the comment...
which the author has made regarding Sanskrit rhetoric, with an analytical approach, is noteworthy — “so far as the creation of literature is concerned, the Sanskrit rhetoricians have failed to give due recognition to poetic talent. This is why, Sanskrit rhetoric has not developed into aesthetics in the proper sense of the term. In their assessment of poetry, the Sanskrit rhetoricians have only determined the value of the reader’s power of appreciation rather than the creative power of the poet or creator. In their scholarly essays what has been discussed is not the poetry as it come into being in the consciousness of the poet, but that, which is re-born in the reader’s heart. In spite of being not so pleasing, this remark concerning Sanskrit rhetoric is true.

In the second chapter of the book there is the discussion of the theory of rasa which is present in Nāṭyaśāstra. The discussion of such minute details of Bharatacharya’s Nāṭyaśāstra is rarely found in Bengali. The number of rasas and their differences of elements with examples of different kinds of rasas from Bengali poetry have been discussed in the third chapter of this book. In this context, examples of bhāvadhvani and rasadhvani etc. in Bengali poetry have also been given in this chapter. Then the critic has presented an extensive discourse on the views of Bhattacharyya, Bhattacharyya, Bhattacharyya and Abhinavagupta regarding the creation of rasas along with their mutual differences. This long chapter is valuable to the Bengali language specially in the field of analysis of the perception of rasa. In the same chapter, the views of the rhetoricians, Dhananjaya and Dhanika, have been included. In the next chapter the views of rhetoricians like Mahima Bhatta, Bhojaraja, Mamata, Visvanatha Kaviraja etc., who as successors of Abhinavagupta uphold Rasavāda, have been analysed. In short, in these two chapters the discussion on the evolution of the concept of rasa has been presented beautifully from an analytical point of view. The doctrine of rasa, as it appears both in the eyes of the Vaiṣṇava rhetoricians as well as of the
general public, has been discussed in the sixth and the seventh chapters respectively. In the course of his discussion of the Vaiṣṇava theory of rasa, the author dealt with the history of the evolution of bhaktirasa and its characteristic, which undoubtedly deserves to be mentioned. The discussion of rasa and dhvani as well as rasa and alamkāra has come up in the eighth and nineth chapter respectively.

This book of Dr. Mukhopadhyay has become enriched by the discussion of all the Sanskrit schools of thought concerning the principle of rasa. Undoubtedly, in the field of the studies of Sanskrit rhetoric, this treatise of Dr. Mukhopadhyay is an important one.

In Indian poetics not only matters like poetic virtue (guna), rhetoric method (rūti), rhythm (dhvani), rasa etc. which reveal the real nature of poetry and which also cause the embellishment of the beauty of poetry have been thoroughly discussed but also all rhetoricians starting from Bharatacarya to Kesab Misra have also dwelt at length on a, side by side, all the poetic blemishes which are detrimental to the creation of beauty in poetry. While defining poetic beauty it has been said

\[ \text{dūṣyate anena iti doṣaḥ} \]

which means ‘blemish is the presence of that in poetry which is harmful for it.’ Vamana has said in this context

\[ \text{gunābiparyayatmāno doṣaḥ} \]

meaning ‘blemish is the opposite of poetic virtue /merit’. In this context, speaking on the subject of poetic blemish, Acarya Bhamaha has commented:

\[ \text{sarbathā padamapyekeśaṁ na nigādyamabadyabat} \]
which means, ‘as an unworthy son is the cause of a slur on the reputation of a father, so also bad poetry causes the loss of the fame of a poet.’ Thus, almost every rhetorician has discussed the concept of ‘blemish’ in poetry. Yet, inspite of a sufficient number of books on poetic virtues, rhetorics, method, rhythm, rasa etc. having been written by modern Indian writers, no one among them has really discussed the concept of ‘blemish’ in poetry from a historical perspective in a rich and systematic manner. The discussion of this nature occurred only in a scattered, disjointed and contextual manner. In this particular field Dr. Anima Saha has enriched not only Bengali but also critical literature as a whole by bringing out her book *Saṁskṛta Alāṅkāraśāstre Doṣatattva.*

The abundance of discussion on ‘blemish’ found in the works like Bharata’s *Nātyaśāstra* Bhamaha’s *Kāvyālaṅkāra,* Dandi’s *Kāvyādarśa,* Vamana’s *Kāvyālaṅkāraśūtrārbṛtti,* Rudrata’s *Kāvyālaṅkāra,* Anandavardhana’s *Dhvanyāloka,* Bhojadeva’s *Sarasvatikanṭhābharaṇa* and *Sīrīgārapraṇāśa,* Mahimabhatta’s *Vyaktiviveka,* Agnipurāṇa, Mammata’s *Kāvyapraṇāśa,* Bagabhatta’s *Bāgabhaṭalāṅkāra,* Hemachandra’s *Kāvyanusāsana,* Jaydeva’s *Candrāloka,* Vidyadhara’s *Ekāvalī,* Vidyanatha’s *Pratāparudrayaśobhūṣaṇa,* Visvanatha’s *Sāhityadarpaṇa* and Kesavamisra’s *Alāṅkāraśeṣkhara* etc. has been exhaustively surveyed by her and she has interpreted the nature of ‘blemish’ in the light of their views collected by her from the discussion in these works. This will become clear from a few examples given below. For instance:

1. *akrama:* If in a sentence the positional sequence of words is not observed properly then it is a case of ‘poetic blemish’ known as *akrama.* Moreover, according to Mammata, the position of words in a
sentence without proper order or sequence would not be considered in itself a ‘poetic blemish’ of akrama. The violation of the proper sequence in the use of suffixes/declensions (cādi) etc., according to him, is the only mark of ‘poetic blemish’ of akrama.33 Mahima Bhatta, on the other hand, maintained that the absence of proper sequence of words of both kinds, that is, with abyay (suffixes/declensions) or without was a ‘poetic blemish’ of akrama.

2. atimātra: According to Rudrata, when a word is imagined to mean something extraordinarily different and far removed from its usual and familiar meaning, it involves the ‘poetic blemish’ of atimātra.34 As an example Rudrata has mentioned thus:

\[ tāba \bar{b}irahe \, hariṇākṣyaḥ \, plābayati \, jagnāti \, nayanāmbu \]

it means, what people are familiar with is the fact that profusion of tears was just a piece of cloth, but in the above quotation the description of tears flooding the universe crosses all popularly accepted limits. So, it is an instance of poetic blemish known as atimātra. Of course, in the context of the discussion of poetic blemish Smt. Saha has focused adequately on the subject of the nature of poetry, poetic elements, nature and characteristics of poetic blemish etc.

Besides, the great scholars of the 20th Century who published their research works on the concept ‘blemish’ have also been criticised by the author here and there in course of her survey. For example: while discussing Bhamaha’s concept of the particular ‘blemish’ known as guḍhaśabdābidhāna or cryptic diction, as it may be described in English, she has made reference to Dr. Bechan Jha’s work Concept of poetic Blemishes and attempted to counter his views quoting those of the rhetoricians like Bhamaha Vamana, Dandi and others.35 In fact, Dr. Jha had mixed up the concept of blemish of
hidden/cryptic meaning of word mentioned by Bharatacarya with Bhamaha’s *gūḍhaśabdābhidhāna* or cryptic diction. While repudiating the views of Dr. Jha, Dr. Saha has said that apparently it may seem that there is a similarity between the blemishes *gūḍhārthadōsa* said by Bharata or cryptic or hidden meaning of words and *gūḍaśabdabidhāna* or cryptic diction, but that she has found no such similarity, as a matter of fact, in this regard, because, in respect of the blemish of *gūḍhārthadōsa* (concealed) meaning the word or words do not point to their respective appropriate meanings and so fail to evoke usual word-reponse. *Gūḍhaśabdabidhānadoṣa* cryptic diction as mentioned by Vama, on the other hand, causes no such hindrance on the way to perceiving the meaning of the word, but the meaning being unfamiliar or unusual its response gets impaired, or suffers distortion. In the context of thus criticising Dr. Jha’s contention from the historical perspective Dr. Saha refers to the subject of Bhamana’s *Kāvyalāṅkārasūtravṛtti* and mentions therein also that *gūḍhārthadōsa* or the blemish of cryptic meaning in vamana’s is, in fact, the evolved form of Bhamaha’s concept of poetic blemish’ known as *gūḍhaśabdabidhāna* or cryptic diction.

It has to be mentioned here that in course of discussing Bhamaha’s *aparthadoṣa* she has found its similarity with Bharata’s *aviplutarthadōsa* as mentioned by *Abhinavabhārati*. According to her, Bharata’s *aviplutarthadōsa* itself has evolved as *apārtha* in Bhamaha’s poetics. In course of his discussion of this particular poetic blemish, Dr. P.V. Kane has commented that Bharata’s *arthaṁiṇadoṣa* has evolved into Bhamaha’s *apārthadoṣa*, but without sufficient reason in support of his contention which, however, has not been accepted by Dr. Saha on the ground that apparently the *arthaṁiṇa* (meaningless) and *apārtha* have differences in respect of their distinctive characteristics in spite of having the same meaning. Bharata has not recognized all kinds of meaninglessness as the blemish
characterized by arthahina neither all sorts of absence of meaning have been indicated by him as the blemish know as apārtha While defining arthahina Bharata has referred to two kinds of inconsistencies viz. one of them is the lack of consistency in meaning between the parts of a sentence, and the other occurs when in the same sentence no meaning is indicated without the help of other contexts.42

It may be mentioned here that the assertions and comments of the learned authorities of ancient times were not always simple and easily comprehensible. With a great deal of toilsome perseverance the eminent research scholar, Dr. Saha has not only brought to light the essence of these difficult concepts but presented them also in a very lucid language. Furthermore, as and when necessary, she has made the subject amply clear to us through a comparative discussion of the commentaries of her predecessors on the nature of ‘poetic blemishes’ as mentioned by each of the ancient authorities. For example, in the context of explaining the relevant portion of Mammata Bhatta’s mukhyārthahatirdosah43 concerning the definition of ‘poetic blemish’; the author has brought in the matter of ‘poetic blemish’ as discussed by rhetoricians like Vamana, Rudrata, Anandavardhana, Bhojadeva etc. and quoting their views on the subject of ‘blemish’ determined the position of Mammata in the historical evolution of the concept of ‘poetic blemish’. This method has been followed by the author likewise in the case of everyone viz. Bharata, Bhamaha, Dandi, Vamana, Rudrata, Anandavardhana, Bhoja, Mahimabhatta, Mammata etc. In short, the import of this book has not ended up with mentioning, defining and interpreting the concept of ‘poetic blemish’ alone, but also side by side it has left an extraordinary imprint of success in the Bengali language in the field of proper evaluation of the works of rhetoricians from a historical point of view as well as in the perspective of
a relevant comparative study of the views of other authorities of the same order.

The book beginning with the chapter titled *Kāvyā O Tār Upādān* containing rich and valuable discussion on the place of ‘poetic blemish’ in the history of poetics, the nature and distinctive characteristics of ‘poetic blemish’ etc. has helped considerably in building an all pervasive sense of self-confidence in the discussion of poetics in Bengali language. In the last chapter of the book, that is, the 4th chapter, the relation between ‘poetic blemish’ and the perception *rasa* as the soul of poetry has been discussed by the author and also a discussion has been included at that on the question whether the ‘poetic blemishes’ do actually stand on the way of the excellence of literary expressions. In the concluding chapter of the book the author has revealed the objective of her work which, according to her, is not an abstruse analysis of the poetic blemishes in the works of great poets but an attempt to caution those poets of rather limited capabilities, who habitually engage themselves in the creation of poetry in order that their poetry does not go against the basic principles of *rasa*.44

It has to be mentioned here that Dr. Saha added a new dimension to the discussion of poetics in Bengali by putting into use a historical point of view in tracing the evolution of the concept of ‘poetic blemish’ and its classification. In almost every instance she has endeavoured to present before the Bengali intellectuals the otherwise complex and apparently intractable Sanskrit terminology in an easy and simple form, through her interpretation and analysis. For example, in order to bring simplicity to her analysis of *apārtha* she has said that a sentence where the meaning has become *apeta* i.e. *apagata* involves the ‘poetic blemish’ known as *apetārtha* or *apārtha*. Having accepted the lucidity of her presentation one can hardly
overlook the fact that the language of her book by being overburdened with an excessive number of Sanskrit *tatsama* words as also unfamiliar *tatsama* words has often turned faultering and inflexible and thus prevented it from being totally faultless. As an example, a sentence may be quoted here to show the inflexibility of the language:

\[ \textit{Aparpakse, gùddhaśabdabidhāna-doṣasthale śabdabodher āpatti thāke nā, yehetu sesthale bibakṣita arthaṭi padgulir śakyārthai bate; tabe arther aprasiddhi-nibandhan śābdabodh kliśṭha haiyā thāke.}^{45} \]

Here it needs mention that to discuss *doṣatattva* (poetic blemish) of *alamkāraśāstra* the research scholar has created a wonderful *doṣatattva*. Many times, here and there her language does not become seem to be Bengali. Yet, our intuition about her works will remain as a new compass in the Bengali language.

Among the books containing the discussion on the relation between *rasa* and *kavya,* or the importance of the former in the latter, Sri Harihar Misras *Ras O Kāvyā*^{46} occupies a paramount place in the poetical works. It is not only this book in which the author has first elucidated *rasa* or poetical sense of with and humour, but before that also we are acquainted with his book *Vyāñjanā O Kāvyā*^{47} dealing with *rasa* or poetical beauty. In the third canto of this book, the author has dealt with reverberation (or nofe) of poetic excellence. He has discussed the nature and significance of *rasa* and only that is therein he has explained what *rasa* is, what its elements are, how it exudes, and has touch up its kinds and methods; but in that little extent Hariharbabu could not remain satisfied with the extent of the special elements of connotation of *rasa* confining to the brief discussion. In that book, as we observe in his book: *Ras O Kāvyā,* he goes further beyond that extent. This
book is divided into three chapters respectively as nature of poetics, its example, and treatise on analytical appreciation of poetry.

In the first chapter he firstly discusses the inner significance or nature of *rasa* using some terminology of technical words like stability (*sthāyībhāva*), adultery (*byabhcāribhāva*), acquaintance (*vibhāva*), feeling of happiness (*anubhāva*) etc. and refers to elucidation connecting with them the reflecting introduction of *rasa* in different ways and manners; Besides that, in the first chapter of *Raser svarūp* he alludes to the creation of poetic beauty arising out of external and internal mental feelings or elements central round to these thoughts like *vibhāva* (acquaintance), *anubhāva* (feelings of happiness or influence), *śaṅcārī* (transfusing) while talking of these three thoughts of feelings, he has also mentioned different divisions of permanance concerning mental elements.

After thorough discussion made on *rasa* and its nature, the author has given different illustrations of *rasa* and its nature and thus he has tried to make the readers comprehend by way of presenting a transparent picture on this subject. It should be pointed out that the author has in most of the cases omitted the source of reference to examples of *rasa* he has collected from different literatures with Bengali rendering. Probably, the reason may be that he has written the text book for the students only and the cause may be that he has not thought of inquisitive readers or inquirers; as a result the pleasing illustrations of *rasa* like *śṛṅgāra rasa* (erotic sentiment), *pūrvarōga* (courtship), *vipralambha* (separation from lover), *pravāsa-vipralambha* (living abroad being separated from a lover due to a quarrel) etc. etc. the inquisitive mind has little scope to be satisfied; in this chapter he has quoted a Sanskrit verse (or *śloka*) on courtship (*pūrvarōga*) as an example with its
Bengali rendering but where from and from what source, it is collected, has not been mentioned hereto. The Sanskrit sloka is quoted below:

\[
\text{tribhāga-śeśāsu niśāsu ca kṣanam}
\]

\[
nimīlya netre sahasā vyavudhyata |
\]

\[
\text{kva nīlakanṭha! vṛajasītyalakṣyavāk}
\]

\[
\text{astyakaṇṭhārpita-vāhuvandhanā||} 48
\]

Although, he has discussed rasa in third the chapter of his Pravandhagata Rasavicār wherein he has referred to Kalidasa’s play Abhijñānaśākuntala as an example for clarifying the inner concept or theme in an analytical manner to make the whole thing comprehensive.

With reference to the title of the book in which our discussion is concentrated, the author, has consciously tried to defend his stand for titling Ras... O Kāvyā in which he has not isolated rasa from poetry, because he thinks, intrinsically both are same and Indian rhetoricians have appreciated only the beauty of poetry and its aesthetic sentiment and remained confined to it; but it extends to the painting and sculptural art of the nineteenth century in the subject-matter of poetical work, which he has specially established.

Prof. Harihar Misra keeping in view the modern ideas of deliberation has discussed in his present book only the rasa in poetry. In other words, depending on the word and its meaning synthetically, and thus culmination where sthayibhiva has got matured in rasa he has, dwelt precisely on his book Ras... O Kāvyā.

Dr. Bimal Kumar Mukhopadhyay is one of those critics who, after giving plunged headlong into the literary theories of the West, have evaluated Indian rhetoric and made valuable contributions in the field of comparative
the study of literary principles. In the third chapter titled *Deha O Ātmār Sandhāne* of his book *Sāhitya Vivek* a book of comparative studies of literary principles, he has discussed the various theories of Indian rhetoric. He has discussed a number of terms of Indian rhetoric from an analytical angle rejecting the commentarial method of studies of Indian rhetoric. For instance, the first part of this chapter he has presented a theoretically profounded discussion on the mutual relation between the world and the language of literature. In this context in course of his discussion of Bhamaha’s theory *śabdarthou sahitou kāvyam*, he has quoted comments of rhetoricians like Vamana, Rajasekhara, Kuntaka, Bhojaraja Hemacandra etc. and along with this he has analysed some terms such as *śayyā śabdapāka* which are mentioned Bana and Rajasekhara respectively.

The subject-matter of the second discussion of this chapter is about the blemishes (*doṣa*) of poetry, particularly the ten blemishes viz *gūḍhārtham*, *arthāntaram*, *arthahinam* etc. as mentioned by Bharatācarya. In this context six blemishes of Bhamaha such as *neyārtha* etc. along with other as referred to by him; Dandi’s ten blemishes such as *apārtha* etc. four types of blemishes as mentioned by Vamana three kinds of blemishes as classified by Bhojaraja the sixteen types of blemishes put forward by Mammatacarya etc. have been presented in brief. The subject-matter of the third discussion is about *guṇa*. Here also, following the same method, he has carried on the analytical discussion of this term from the point of view of almost all Indian rhetoricians. In the succeeding part he has taken up a long discussion about the application of rhetoric in literature with illustrations from the comments of rhetoricians of both East and West. Thus, in this chapter of his book, discussion of *bakrokta ousitya, ṛitī, dhvani, rasa* followed one after another. In this discussion, along with those of Indian rhetoricians the names of many other poets and critics of the West such as W.B. Yeats, Wordsworth, T.S.
Eliot, Shelley, Walter Pater, Aristotle, Longinus, Strabo, Dryden, Shakespeare, Rene Welleck, I.A. Richards, Middleton Murray, Raneiro Gnoli, Kant, V. Basch, Arnold, Ruskin and host of others crowded in. In fact, we have been able to have a clear glimpse from the mode of criticism adopted by Bimal Kumar Mukhopadhyay, on how the studies of Indian poetics are likely to move forward in the last part of the twentieth century or in the twenty first. As a matter of fact, from the discussion of Bimal Kumar Mukhopadhyay it has been observed how the wave of globalization which has risen across the whole world has had its impact on the discussion of Indian poetics and forced it take its stand in the midst of the world. From this point of view, we can say that the wide range of discussion of Indian rhetoric which moved forward hand in hand with Lal Mohan Vidyanidhi and Atul Chandra Gupta, being in touch with Western criticism all along, had at last attained consummation at the hands of Bimal Kumar Mukhopadhay. But, it has to be admitted, that inspite of being inspired by a modern outlook, the language which the author has used in his translation of the Sanskrit ślokas is very conventional and tortuous. He has blindly followed the manner and attitude of his predecessors. An example may be cited here. In the translation śloka 2/18 of Dhvanyāloka vivakṣā tatparatvena ...etc. he has written : rasapar karei alāṁkārer vivakṣā habe, ādirūpe kadāpi nayā : samaymata tār grahan o tyāg habe ebaṁ prakāṭbhābe tār nirbāha hok – eman icchā thākbe nā \[50\] Compared to this language of translation, it seems, the language of Subadh Chandra Sengupta and Kalipada Bhattacharya in their translation of Dhvanyāloka, published in 1950 A.D., is for more easy flowing. For example, in their translation of the same śloka (i.e. 2/18) of Dhvanyāloka they have written alāṁkār raser upare nirbharśīl bhābei bibākṣita haibe tāhā kakhanao āngī hisābe bibākṣita haibe nā | tāhā abasar mata grhīta o byakta haibe ebaṁ atyantarūpe tāhār nirbbāha hauk eirūp icchā thākibe nā \[51\] In comparison with this language
Bimal Kumar Mukhopadhyay’s one of translation should have been more spontaneous.

The brief discussion of Indian rhetoric in the book *Nandantatva* written by Sudhir Kumar Nandi came relevantly following the course of discussion of aesthetics in Bengali language. In the essay named *Bakrokti* compiled in this book, the critic has commented, accepting Vamaha’s concept of *bakrokti* as the life of poetry, that, inspite of the old era of *bakroktivāda* having been passed over or the modern denying the utility of *bakrokti* (emuends) in the body of poetry “an exact repetition or reproduction of an event as it occurs in real life is beyond the power of human imagination”. An excess or exaggeration rhetorical elements may have disappeared in the age, their colours may have waned or they may have lighter in effect, yet wherever we come across a *rasātmaka bākya* or a sentence filled with a sense of delight we cannot help feeling that somewhere in it an element of obliquity or indirectness has worked for its beauty. The concept of indirectness has changed, but it has not totally gone out of existence, for Bhamaha, *bakrokti* is the life of poetry. Then, quoting from Bengali and Sanskrit literature, he made it clear to us how the idea of *bakrokti* has not been the same for all rhetoricians and how different rhetoricians have accepted it differently. In fact, the arguments which he has offered with a view to establishing the importance of *bakrokti* in the poetry of all poets of all times have been authenticated by him from a broader point of view.

In his article, *Bharataḥ Nāṭyaśāstra*, he has presented the principle of *rasa* established by Bharatacarya from an analytical angle. However, this discussion of the author can hardly claim any special success.
It has to be conceded that drawbacks and distractions were present in the interpretations of Sanskrit rhetoric available with of the Bengali scholars while embarking on the task of translating Mahima Bhatta’s *Vyaktiviveka* and writing explanatory notes and commentaries on it. Prof. Bishnupada Bhattacharya wrote in the introduction of this book—‘I did not devote myself to this task being impelled to it by any philanthropic thought. I had taken up this hard work on account of my own satisfaction, having been drawn to it by the brilliance of Mahima Bhatta’s talent’\(^54\) whereas many others had taken up their pens for discussing Indian rhetoric on philanthropic consideration, particularly keeping in mind the needs of general readers and students; As a result how the general readers and students would receive the book was of greater importance to them rather than their own interest in the subject. Consequently in the books of this kind defects remained. One such book is *Kāvyatattva*\(^55\) by Prof. Jibendra Singhroy. As regards the reason behind his composition of this book he has mentioned in his introduction that he has written this book with an eye to requirements of general readers and students; of course though he has expressed his indebtedness to scholars like Atul Chandra Gupta, Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta, Ramanranjan Mukhopadhay, Bishnupada Bhattacharya, yet flaws have been there at many places in his discussion. We may cite one or two such examples from the book under consideration; for instance the quotation from Kalidasa’s *Kumārasam bhavam* may be mentioned as an illustration of *dhvani* : *ebam bādini devarṣou .......... etc.*; which reads that Devarṣi was not Nārada but Aṅgīrā and it already been pointed out by Shyamapada Chakraborty\(^56\) in his book *Alamkārācandrikā*, yet Prof. Singhroy has repeated the same mistake committed by other scholars. Secondly the example of *byañgārtha* which he has cited from Rabindranath’s poem *Sukh*, is but an example merely of the figure called *svabhāvokti*. He has failed to show how *byañgārtha* has taken
shape transcending bācyārtha. Moreover that dhvani in the true sense of the term means dhvani involving rasa and that it is related with the sthāyi sentiment of the heart has not been shown through explanation from this quotation. Thirdly, as an example of dhavani he has quoted Rabindranath’s Gitimālya basante āj dharār citta halo utalā; the byaṅgārtha underlying this quotation as has been explained is also but the mere bācyārtha of this quotation.

As a result of such piecemeal and haphazard discussion there has occurred, at places of some general works in Bengali, distorted interpretations of various aspects of Sanskrit rhetorics.

The name of a few books and those of authors must be mentioned in course of any discussion on Indian poetics and the evaluation of the various ideas or principles pertaining to it about which deliberations have taken place towards the end of twentieth century. Two of the books Dr. Durgasankar Mukhopadhayay is on Indian poetics must be referred to in this context: these are Kāvyatattvābīcār vol-I Indian Poetics57 and Sāhityatattver Kathā.58 The first part of his Kāvyatattvābīcār is covered entirely in the extensive discussion of Indian poetics. Though many books have been written on the history of poetics starting from Bharatacarya down to the period of Panditaraja Jagannatha covering a period of almost 200 years, yet the author had embarked on the task of writing this book, specially to assess how far useful the theories of Indian poetics were in judging our ancient and modern poetry and also basically to point out a proper method of judgement of poetry through the application of particular theories of poetics to particular poems. Along with the special introduction to 33 authorities of Sanskrit poetics, this book also focuses in the history of Indian poetics, the definitions of poetry and poets, the role of sound in poetry, the analysis of the beauty and rasa in
poetry and on various forms of poetry. The theory of *ramaniyātavāda* and profounded and established by Panditaraja Jagannatha, who failed to occupy any distinctive positive position in Bengali has been specially discussed in this book. According to definition of poetry given by Jagannatha, *ramanīyārthapratipādakah sabdāḥ kāvyam* meaning ‘words’ conveying beautiful sense or meaning, in his opinion, is poetry; this view being totally unfamiliar to Bengali literature, has been specially examined by the author with quotations from Bengali literature. His discussion is often brief, yet this evaluation of Jagannatha has undoubtedly added a new dimension to discussion of poetics in Bengali. Before him, no one else has discussed Jagannatha’s view in this manner. Another aspects of this book which deserves special mention is that in the discussion of the principles of analysis of Indian poetry almost everywhere he has tried to demonstrate its resemblance of thought with that of the Western theoreticians; these has opened up a new horizon of the discussion of poetics to the inquisitive Bengali readers. He has made us more curious about Indian poetics through his quotations of the original *slokas* of Indian rhetoricians given in the Appendix of his book.

His second book, *Sāhityatattver Kkatha* is basically composed keeping the needs of the graduate and post graduate students in view, yet it is certainly a notable supplement to the studies of Indian poetics. The presentation and evaluation of Indian through in this book side by side with that of the West has carried the mark of special success. In the light of the terminologies such as the literacy attributes, the truth of literature, Beauty, the creative process, inspiration, imagination etc. he has made the mention of the Western authors along with the Indian writer of poetics. Side by side with the ancient Indian rhetoricians, the discussion of Bankim chandra and Rabindranath of the modern age has also found a place in this book. However, it is undeniable that
the brevity of this discussion shall be really painful for those who aspire to know and has love for learning.

In this context, the name of *Kāvyajijñāsūr Rūparekhā* by Karunasindhu Das much be mentioned.\textsuperscript{60}

In this book the author has tried to present in an easy flowing manner a short history of the original Sanskrit poetics extricating it from the labyrinth of the commentaries annotations etc. Here, the author has held a very charming and inward discussion starting from the course of the development of the ancient Indian poetics to such particular concepts as *alamkāra, rīti, bakrokti, rasa, dhvani, aucitya* etc. His discussion in course of the interpretation of the terminologies of the same order as those of the *Vedas* and the *Upaniṣadas* has in many places plunged into deeper and deeper layers of ancient tradition. The manner in which he has framed the background of his discussion on the literary principles, quoting lines from poetry before going in to the discussion of the various theories of Indian poetics is undoubtedly worthy of praise.\textsuperscript{61} Though very short the depth of discussion of this book has helped a great deal to get over the fault of its terseness.

Regarding the discussion of Sanskrit rhetoric or poetics in Bengali language, it has to be mentioned that apart from the particular works on this subject the long introductions of the translated versions of Sanskrit rhetoric have also had considerable contribution in this regard. In these introductions, at times, the biographical accounts of rhetoricians or various other information concerning their respective compositions or the threadbare analysis of the particular views of the respective rhetoricians have been done with such utmost dedication that it certainly demands a special reference in the discussion of Indian rhetoric. The contribution of the well-thought-out and
research oriented studies of Sanskrit rhetoric in Bengali language can hardly be denied.

In this context, the well-written introduction covering 37 pages of the book, *Dhvanyāloka O locana* may be mentioned. Here the editor has presented an introduction of Dhvanivāda to us from a very subtle angle; while doing so, just as he has shown the difference between bācyārtha and byāṅgārtha, in the same way he has also unfolded the true nature of rasa. That rasa can be attained through suggestion (vyāñjanā) alone has been demonstrated from the point of view of dhvanivāda with the help of the proofs provided by various examples. In fact, these subjects would not have been clear to the average people except through this translation of *Dhvanyāloka* or the *Locana* commentary. In this connection, he has presented a predominately intellectual discussion regarding the relations between Loukika and Aloukika, poetry and philosophy etc. In the course of this discussion the editor has quoted different portions from Atul Chandra Gupta’s *Kavyajijnasd*. In this context, he has quoted the following remark of Dr. Srikumar Bandopadhay in the introductory part of his book; *Samālocanā Sāhitya*, ‘Their (ref. Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta) view on the effect of ‘suggestion’ (vyāñjanā) has been illustrated from the abstracted parts of poetry and it does not pervade the body of poetry as a whole, and this is known as atmosphere or totality of ambience. Their vision of poetry never reached there so far as their criticism of poetry is concerned.’ Quoting this, the editor has shown the hollowness of this comment with the help of proper reasons and arguments. Indeed, it has been established by Sri Sengupta that Anandabardhana and Abhinavagupta have not looked for the principle of dhvani in separate slokas in isolation only, rather they have judged the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* in their totality from the point of view of
dhvani. In short, this introductory portion of the book is specially important in the discussion of the principle of dhvani in Bengali language.

136-page long introduction of the book, Rājaśekhara O Kāvyamīmāṁsā, by Nagendranath Chakraborty is a notable supplement to the study of Indian rhetoric in Bengali language. Though other books or viewpoints of Indian rhetoric have not had any room in this lengthy discussion, yet it is worth mentioning that this ‘introduction’ enriched with Rajasekhara’s biographical sketch, the period of his appearance as a critic, the detailed discussion of the various compositions by him and, along with these, a thorough analysis of the book Kāvyamīmāṁsā has been accepted by each and every Bengali intellectual with great admiration. In fact, no one has done such extensive studies on Rajasekhara so far in the Bengali language.

The Upakramanikā (Introduction) of Sāhityadarpāṇaḥ translated and edited by Bimalakanta Mukhopadhyay, covering the full length of 34 pages, is a notable addition, in its brief space, to the authenticated discussion of the various aspects of Indian rhetoric. Though brief, it is very important so far as the course of Indian rhetoric is concerned. The importance of this matter shall be established by one or two quotations Regarding the history of Indian rhetoric from the Vedic period down to the days of Jagannatha he has commented thus – ‘Just as the course of evolution of Indian rhetoric has attained a state of restfulness reaching the confluence of the sea of Dhvanivāda, similarities, also its later courses, originating even from this Dhvanivāda itself and meandering along different pathways, have again come back and submerged themselves there itself.’

Secondly, with a view to showing the originality and superiority of the Dhvanivādaś he has said – ‘He (Anandavardhana) has made śabda (word), artha (meaning), guṇa (attribute/virtue), rīti (method), dosa (blemish),
ahamkāra (rhetoric) etc. – all moving in one direction. Accepting the famous words of Bharatacarya nahi rasaḥ ādṛte kascidārthaḥ prabartate (nāṭya 1/273) as the only essential theme of poetics as a whole, just as he extended the principle of rasa from the domain of drama to all kinds of poetic work, in the same way, what was so long a part of decorative art – alaṁkāra, rīti etc. – assimilating which into creative art and making them dependent on the nature and principle of rasa expressed their real nature and essence.64

An examination of these two excerpts makes it easy to conjecture that judged from the point of view of Indian rhetoric this discussion represents a total outlook. In this context, he has moved forward also to the subtle evaluation of the ideas of rasa of the Bengal school of vaisnavism and, commenting on the bhaktirasa established by the rhetoricians vaisnavites of Bengal school said – ‘That the teachers of this school delight in the nature of Pūrṇarasa becomes clear and evident from their discussion of bhāva, rasa, bibhāva etc.65

In the perspective of this discussion, he has looked for the originality of Sāhityadarpāṇa by Visvanatha Kaviraja and averred that the originality of Visvanatha Kaviraja lies not in finding out any original principle, but in the method of co-ordination of ideas.66 This brief discussion in the Bengali language deserves to be specially mentioned in respect of the comprehensive evaluation of Indian rhetoric.

A long 44 page ‘Introduction’ Bharata Nātyaśāstra edited by Suresh Chandra Bandopadhay is a notable addition to the study of the history of the origin and development of the art of drama. Referring to the source of the origin of dramatic thoughts, which was described in the subjects described in the ancient Vedic literature, the critic has carried on a valuable discussion regarding the foundation-ground of dramatic thoughts in the perceptive of the
various contemporary social institutions. Relevantly, enough references to the dramatic art of other foreign countries has also found a place in this discussion. Then follows the discussion of such subjects as-the course of the evaluation of the art of drama in India, the purpose of drama, the period of time associated with Nātyaśāstra as well as a minute interpretation of the form and content of Nātyaśāstra; thus, this introduction consisting of all these details features as an important aspect of the studies of literary principles in Bengali language.

At the end of the first three volumes of the Bengali translated version of Bharata’s Nātyaśāstra in four volumes, various articles on subjects related to Nātyaśāstra, written by different scholars, have been reproduced. In this context, the writer has mentioned: ‘The discussion of Nātyaśāstra necessarily demands a clear interpretation of its subject-matter. That is why, apart from translation, explanatory notes etc. in the appendix relevant discussion about scholars, different artists and art specialists has considerable importance.67 Realizing this importance the editor has got reprinted many articles collected from different journals at the end of the first three volumes of the book under our consideration. As a result, this book contains a discussion full of information regarding Indian drama, stage as well as Nātyaśāstra. Besides, we have come across a wide-ranging discussion on various subjects and forms of drama. In fact, the editor has left an unprecedented mark of achievement by having collected together all these valuable range of discussions, which so far have remained scattered in various journals. The list of the scholars whose articles on drama have been included here has been shown below:

*Bharata Nātyaśāstra*  
Vol. I  
Amulyacharan Bidyabhusan – Ādi Nātyaśāstra Vol. I
The long introduction spread over 59 pages of the translated version of Dandi’s *Kāvyādarsa* presented by smt. Chinmayee is immensely noteworthy in the discussion of Indian rhetoric. While tracing out the beginning and the evolution in this book the translator, has presented the different views of Indian poetics of *rasa* with great scholarship to her credit. The discussion, replete with arguments and reasons, which she has carried on by way of acquainting us with Dandi and his time is specially notable. In this context she has discussed the similarities and dissimilarities between Dandi and Yamaha on various subjects. Besides, the similarities or otherwise between Dandi’s *Kāvyādarsa* and the views of other rhetoricians have also found a place in this introduction. The subject that has to be specially noted is the mention made in this introduction regarding how far Dandi’s ideas on rhetoric were followed by the rhetoricians succeeding him. In course of discussion on this, referring to the rhetorical figures mentioned in the treatises like *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and *Agnipurāṇa* etc., besides those of our rhetoricians, she has commented, ‘The indebtedness of the rhetoricians later to Dandi is undeniable. The person who had been influenced to the greatest extent by Dandi was Bhojadeva, the eminent rhetorician and writer of the rhetoric part of *Agnipurāṇa*.68

In this long introduction deliberating from various angles, she has commented thus—“From this it is clearly seen that the poetics which had its inception in Acaraya Dandi’s *Kāvyādarsa* transformed at later times into a gigantic banyan tree owing to the contributions of many (writers of poetics) rhetoricians”.69

This introduction written by Smt. Chattopadhay is undoubtedly of great significance in the field of studies of Indian poetics. She has also added to this introduction a list of various editions of Dandi’s *Kāvyādarsa* and of the volumes of commentaries on it which is also immensely valuable.
In spite of being very brief the ‘Introduction’ of Abanti Kumar Sanyal’s book, *Abhinavagupter Rasabhāsyā* is of great value in the study of the subject of *rasa*. In this short introduction, just as he has acquainted us, on the one hand, with the personal and academic life of Abhinavgupta, similarly, on the other, tried to show Abhinavagupta’s, originality in the discussion of the principle of *rasa* throwing light on the subject from various angles. In this context, a comparative study of Bhattalollata’s *Utpattivāda*, Bhattasankuka’s *Anumitivāda* and Bhattanayaka’s *Bhuktivāda* with Abhinavagupta’s *Abhibyaktivāda* has followed. Through this discussion he has established the fact that ‘so far as the principle of *rasa* is concerned Abhinavagupta is the best arbiter’ then, he has concluded the introduction of this book with a wide ranging discussion purporting that *rasa* in itself is supernatural.

In this long discussion it was observed that the colourful and multifaceted *Rasa Śāstra* had taken shape in the period beginning from Bharatacarya to Panditaraja, Jagannatha. In the evaluation of it and also in the writing of historically authentic biographies of those rhetoricians associated with it, the contribution of the Bengali intellectuals is significant in comparison with discussion in other languages. This commentary-like writing on Sanskrit rhetoric has grown into a vast range of critical literature by the touch of the thought of Bengali intellectuals. We can divide this huge collection of compositions into two categories. In the first category these are direct analysis and assessment of Indian rhetorical literature and its interpretation. The writings of Atul Ch. Gupta, Bishnupada Bhattacharya, Ramaranjan Mukhapadhya, Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta, Surendranath Dasgupta had enriched this trend of criticism. Apart from this, in the second category or trend, we find—the translated work of a particular Sanskrit rhetoric in the ‘Introduction’ section of such books in question which contain biographical materials on the lives of *Sūtrakāra* or rhetoricians along with the evaluation of their respective aesthetic approaches, comparative assessment and elaborate
commentary-like discussions. Those whose names are particularly important in this category are Nagendranath Chakraborty, Dr. Bimalakanta Mukhapadhyya & others.

In the discussion of the first category, the main focus on the principles of *Rasa* and *Dhvani, Rūti, Alamkāra* etc. looked at from various angles, no discussion, had found enough room there relating to controversies, and differences of opinion which existed regarding the time of birth and other personal details about the rhetoricians. For this type of discussion we have had to depend on the second category. So, combining these two trends, the vast extent of commentary that has been written in Bengali language on Sanskrit rhetoric is undoubtedly amazing. Secondly, the way in which these eminent men of learning experienced in the aesthetics of *rasa* both of the East and the West have evaluated Sanskrit rhetoric bringing it at the global perspective is rare in any other Indian language. In this sphere the contribution of the Bengali in the discussion of Sanskrit aesthetics undoubtedly ranks the highest. This kind of discussion had started in Bengal in the nineteenth century itself and in the 20th Century this trend of writing commentaries expanding all the more extra-ordinarily further enlarged scope of Bengali literature.

In the originality of approach, in directing the focus of analytical light and intermingling the knowledge of the East with that of the West – these eminent intellectuals of Bengal seem to aptly carry out the responsibility of their heritage of ancient Sanskrit mentors.

***
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