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In the discussion of poetics in India two main trends are clearly observed: one group has stressed on the external or physical aspects of poetry, and the other on its soul which goes beyond its physical or formal aspect in search of the reality underlying in the form or the body of poetry. In fact, this search of the second group has resulted in the evolution or growth of the ideologies of dhvani and rasa in Indian poetics. On the other hand, the outcome of the investigation of those who had engaged themselves in the search for the inner reality of poetry on the basis of its external or physical elements of beauty, was the creation of the concepts of Alamkāravāda, Ritivāda etc. in Indian poetics, Bhamaha, Vamana and Dandi were the main among these ‘formalist’ (dehavādi) rhetoricians. In Indian poetics rhetorics occupied the position of importance only next to that of the theory of rasa. Rhetorics had attained so much importance in Indian poetics that even poetics itself came to be known as rhetorics.¹ Besides, Rajaśekhara called rhetorics as the seventh Vedānta in his book Kāvyamimāṁsā.²

One meaning of the word alaṁ is ornament. So, alaṁkāra means something which embellishes or decorates as ornaments do. The first ever use of the word alaṁkāra has been found in the ancient Indian literature Rgveda.³ There too, this word has been used in the sense ‘ornament’. Even in modern Bengali the same kind of use of the word has been observed.⁴ The word upamā or simile is quite old in origin. The great sage Gārgya has given its
first definition. Among the ancient rhetoricians only the views of Dandi and Vamana on the subject of rhetorics have been particularly acceptable. While defining rhetorics Dandi has said: \( \text{kavyaśobhākarāṇaḥ dharmān alaṁkārāṇaḥ pracakṣate} \) etc., That is, the attribute, which creates the beauty of poetry, is called rhetoric. By way of defining rhetorics Vamana also said – ‘Rhetoric is the beauty of poetry’ \( \text{saundaryam alaṁkārāḥ} \). Watts-Dunton has said in his book *What is poetry* – ‘............the poet must never forget that his final quest is beauty.’ In India in the distant past the thinkers of poetry accorded prime position to this idea of beauty in their search for the soul of poetry. They put so much stress on this concept of beauty that the theory of literature or poetry itself began to be called rhetorics (a treatise on beauty).

Of course, in a general way some have referred to any kind of beauty to mean poetic beauty or the use of rhetorics in poetry. From this point of view *rasa*, *dhvani*, attributes or qualities (*guna*) — all these contribute to the enhancement of the beauty of poetry; so, they are parts of rhetorics. On the other hand, they have used the word rhetoric in a special sense indicating the special extraneous beauty of poetry consisting of such elements of embellishment as alliteration, simile etc. When Vamana says \( \text{kāvyam grāhyyam alaṁkārati} \) (poetry is to be considered by its rhetorical elements), he means that poetry is enjoyable to all because of the presence of rhetorical elements in it. Here rhetoric mainly indicates the inherent beauty of poetry. However, those who aspire to go beyond the body of poetry looking for its soul transcending the body understand and use the word rhetoric in a special sense indicating only alliterations, similes etc.

Rajsekhara, the writer of *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*, in the context of describing *kāvyapurūṣa* where he imagines poetry as a male body, has said — “The word and its meaning is the body of poetry, *rasa* is his soul, the hairs on his body
comprise rhythm, and alliteration, similie etc. are his ornaments."\(^{10}\) Comparing poetry to the human body Bhojadeva, the 11\(^{th}\) century rhetorician also says – "The word and its meaning constitute the body of poetry, \textit{rasa} is its soul, its attributes (viz. vigour, prowess, rancour ..... \textit{rīti} etc.) are comparable to the juxtaposition of the limbs, and the rhetorical elements are like \textit{katāka} , ear-rings etc."\(^{11}\) From the two quotations cited above, it can be guessed that they have used rhetoric only in a specialised sense, that is, in the sense of alliteration, similie etc. In this chapter we shall discuss how the Bengali thinkers of poetics have accepted and interpreted the rhetorical elements of poetic beauty such as alliteration, similie etc. of Sanskrit poetics. Applying the word in a special sense Bhamaha said in his book \textit{Kāvyālaṅkāra} : ‘However lovely the face of a lady may be it never looks nice without ornaments.’\(^{12}\) Of course, Abhinavagupta raised questions about the utility of this kind of use of external rhetorical devices. He said : “There is no enhancement of beauty in the use of ornaments on a dead body because the existence of soul is not there in it. A monk’s body bedecked with ornaments becomes ludicrous because it is not justified by soul or spirituality.”\(^{13}\) In this context, in order to show the propriety of the use of rhetorical figures, the Dhvanivādīs say that in the poetics of \textit{dhvani} which requires no separate effort, the composition of which becomes possible by being attracted by \textit{rasa}, the soul of poetry, and which reaches fruition under the same aegis along with \textit{rasa} has been called rhetorics.\(^{14}\) From this point of view, rhetorical elements or rhetorics of best poetry become one and the same with \textit{rasa}; that is, it no longer remains extraneous to the matter of expression of \textit{rasa}.\(^{15}\) In this context the Dhvanivādīs say– \textit{na teṣāṁ bahiraṅgatvaṁ rasābhivyaktau} – that is, in the expression of \textit{rasa} the rhetorical elements are not extraneous to poetry. This view of the Dhvanivādīs seems to be echoed by the modern European scholars. On rhetorics Prof. Zeueng has said: ‘A good test of
figure's usefulness is its naturalness; it ought to rise spontaneously out of the subject if it were the one necessary form of expression. "16 Here lies the usefulness of rhetorical figures. However, it cannot be denied that as those who crave for light take care of the flame of the candle so also the Dhvanivādis, keep their eyes fixed on dhvani beyond the physical aspects of poetry; yet they have not ignored the words and their meanings pertaining to the body of poetry and have accorded a special place to the metaphonical elements, simile, alliteration etc. from the point of view of dhvani.

Just as scholars of Sanskrit poetics have reached the soul of poetry through their analysis of it, so also they have left their mark in the sphere of the ideas regarding the various ways of enhancing the beauty of the body of poetry. In Sanskrit rhetorics we have come across innumerable kinds of rhetorical figures. They made subtle classification of these figures on the basis of the fundamental elements of poetry, that is, the word and the meaning. Poetry is but a proposition which fulfils the criteria of rasa and again, that proposition consists of words which express ideas. Again, these words have two forms – one is colourful and the other meaningful. "The appeal of the first is to our senses (particularly to the sense of hearing) and that of the second to our perception, one is concrete and the other is abstract."17 Following these two categories namely, śabdālāṅkāra (figures pertaining to word as sound) and arthālāṅkāra (figures of word as meaning), two kinds of figures are found in poetry. Though figures of word as sound is limited in number, those relating to word-meaning have found enough place and occurred in large number in Sanskrit books.

In the discussion of the literary principles in Bengali literature the awareness regarding the studies of rhetorics is found only in the modern age. Though application of rhetorical figures of sound and meaning of words have
been there to a considerable extent, yet their definition, classification and the discussion of each rhetorical figure with illustration were observed only in the modern age. However, the skill of the *Vaiśṇava* poets in the use of the rhetorical figures and their awareness in this matter were remarkable. Though the discussion of *Vaiśṇava* literature, specially of the devotional element or *bhakti-rasa* occupies an important place in Bengali, particularly in relation to *Caitanyacaritāmṛta*, the lack of curiosity with regard to the discussion and analytical studies of rhetorics is rather distressing. In fact, they have stressed mainly on the *rasa* called *madhura* in the discussion of *rasas* of literature without going into discussion of rhetorics as such; so, for them the best *rasa* was *madhura*, the other name of which was *ujjvala* (bright) – which is brighter than the brightness of God. Where *rasa* was spontaneously resplendent, the creation of poetic beauty through rhetorical method, they considered, was destined to be entirely external and hackneyed. The Vaisnavites did not crave for beauty in the conventional sense devoid of any divine implication. Among the eight *ślokas* composed by Śrīcaitanya in the penultimate chapter or *Antyālīḍa* of *Caitanyacaritāmṛta* Śrīcaitanya discarded poetry in the sixth chapter along with wealth, beautiful women etc. (obviously he had referred here to secular poetry only). So, in the *Vaiśṇava* poetry in spite of the prevalence of the use of varieties of rhetorical figures the Vaisnavites had no headache concerning the discussion of the rhetorical elements, which augment the beauty of the body of poetry. This does not, however, mean that their poetry (literature) was bereft of the use of rhetoric. In fact, varieties of rhetorical elements had their access in their poetry hand in hand with *rasa*. In the *Padāvatī* literature there are not only rhetorical figures such as – *Anuprāsa*, *Yamaka*, *Śleṣa*, *Rūpaka*, *Vyatireka*, *Utpreksa* *Arthāntaranyasa*, *Nidarsana*, *Vyajastuti*, *Atiśayokti*, *Viśama*, *Bhrāntimāna*, *Samsṛṣṭī* etc. pertaining to *śabdālāṁkāra* and *arthālāṁkāra*, but also there has
been found the use of certain archaic figures, such as Milita, Vinokti etc. This is, why we had to wait till the modern age to know about the definition of rhetorics and their illustrations from Bengali.

As various kinds of śāvadālanikāra and arthālanikāra have been created in Sanskrit literature, similarly there has been scholarly evaluation of them along with definition in Sanskrit. We have come across the mention of about 115 types of rhetorical figures. It does not seem that there had ever been such wide varieties of rhetorical figures in any other ancient literature of the world. Naturally, the creation of rhetorical figures have been there in abundance in Bengali literature, particularly in poetry in order to make their sound and meaning full of variety and beauty. It may be noted here that the major part of the figures in the Bengali language has been composed in keeping with the definitions of rhetorics in Sanskrit. This is why, many books have been written in Bengali on rhetorics and everywhere in their writings Sanskrit rhetorical figures have been followed. In this context the names of the books with their authorship which are noteworthy are:

(1) Alamkāra Darpana by Sitikantha Bāchaspati,
(2) Visvakośa by Nagendranath Basu,
(3) Kāvyanirṇay by Lalmohan Bidyanidhi
(4) Kāvyā-pradīpa of Govinda Thakur,
(5) Alamkāracandrikā of Shyamapada Chakrabarty,
(6) Kāvyasrī by Sudhir Dasgupta,
(7) Alamkāra Jijñāsā by Suddhvasatta Basu
(8) Banglā Kāvye Rūp O Rūi by Ksudiram Das.
In the sphere of discussion and reference to Sanskrit rhetoric in Bengali the name of *Viśvakoṣa* edited by Nagendranath Basu is certainly worth mentioning. Here, in this book various figures have been mentioned as well as their definition given. But nowhere the figures have been authenticated by illustrations from Bengali literature. This can be made clear by an example. Making a mention of the figure *urjjasvi* it has been just said, 'It is a kind of rhetoric by which an exaggerated expression of boastfulness is expressed.' It may be mentioned here that in the Bengali *Viśvakoṣa* also the same method was followed as the definitions of various figures of rhetoric shown in the book *Śabdakalpadrumāḥ* composed by Sir Radhakanta Bahadur. Whether the figures mentioned in this book were at all used in Bengali language or if there was any appropriate instance in Bengali – regarding these matters the writer of *Viśvakoṣa* had no concern whatsoever; on the contrary only an attempt was made there to satisfy the investigator’s curiosity by simply referring to the word in the figure and its definition alone.

When as an outcome of Renaissance in Bengal the awareness of the Bengalis concerning their language and literature was advancing by leaps and bounds towards its rich youthful culmination, spreading newer and newer sappy delights into the mother tongue. The person who in that hour came forward to compose the first ever learned book for the sake of the total prosperity of this language, on the basis of the various aspects of Sanskrit poetics, was none other than the erudite scholar Lalmohan Bidyanidhi, one of the pioneers in the studies of Sanskrit poetic in Bengali. The name of the book written by him is *Kāvyanirnay*, first published in 1862 A.D. The book was dedicated to Dr. E.B Kaul. In fact the historical role played by Lalmohan Bidyanidhi as a pioneer in the discussion of Sanskrit poetics in the Bengali language shall be remembered forever. There will be hardly any exaggeration of fact in mentioning the name of Lalmohan Bidyanidhi as one of the
forerunners who had initiated scholastic research work in Bengali. In this context the remark of Dr. Sunitikumar Chattopadhyay deserves mention—

‘The kind of research, scholasticism and power of judgment we get to see in the sphere of the Bengali language and literature now, like an image of similar phenomena in other fields of learning, had introduced Lalmohan Bidyanidhi as one of the pioneers who had laid its foundation. This is why each and every Bengali scholar serving the interest of the mother tongue shall pay respects in his memory.21

In the Fifth chapter of the first part of this book divided into six chapters, a detailed discussion of the figures of Sanskrit rhetoric has found its place. The special chapter *Alaṃkār Paricched* containing the figures of speech collected from the literary creations of Bidyapati, Candidasa, Mukundarama, Krttibasa, Bharatacandra, Iswargupa and Madhusudan with the Sanskrit definitions of these figures has been compiled in this book. Of course, the author had got this published separately in 1860 itself, in two periodicals, viz. *Paridarsāk Patra* and *Rahasya Sandarva*. Later on, this chapter had its place in the book called *Kāvyanirṇay*.

In the segment *Alaṃkār Paricched* of the book *Kāvyanirṇay* covering about eighty pages, various definitions of rhetoric composed in the light of Sanskrit rhetoric, with their distinctive marks, have been included. Having classified the rhetorical figures into *śabdālaṃkāra* and *arthālaṃkāra* (depending on sound and meaning) respectively, the author has presented the illustration of each and every figure from Bengali literature along with its equivalent term. The English terms which he has used here for the figures of Sanskrit rhetoric are his own. Here are some examples with regard to the terms:
In the śabdālaṃkāra portion of the book the author has mentioned a new figure of speech called Bhāṣāsama or bilingualism along with prevalent figures like śles (satire), anuprās (alliteration), yamak (pun), etc. This new figure (i.e. Bhāṣāsama) has not been mentioned in any other book of Sanskrit rhetoric except Sāhityadarpaṇa. In this part he has mentioned Prahelikā (i.e. riddle); but he has also clearly mentioned how shrewdly reference has been drawn to Prahelikā as a figure which it was not. In this context he has also argued with considerable reason that Prahelikā cannot be accepted as śles. Another point to be noted here is that having referred to a figure called Citrālaṃkāra along with its definition, the author has abruptly concluded without any elaborate discussion on it except a remark that in Bengali language there is no extraordinary creation of this particular figure.

In the section dealing with Arthālaṃkāra he has included only the widely familiar figures such as Upamā, Rūpaka, Bhrāntimāna, Asaṅgati etc. with their respective definitions and their Bengali illustrations. His definitions of rhetorical figures have been framed invariably in accordance with Sanskrit rhetoric. Of course there are few figures which Bengali critics after him have not included in their discussion on the ground that they thought them to be redundant. These are -Abhāvāryti Anigūḍhabācyā etc.

In short, in the discussion of Bengali rhetoric Kāvyanirṇay has really been a pioneering work. Among the poets up to Madhusudan all the various rhetorical figures used in Bengali literature have found place in this chapter of rhetoric as illustrations. Later, Bengali rhetoricians succeeding him have extended their world of illustrations into the realm of literature of
Rabindranath and the Bengali poets after him. The manner in which Lalmohan Bidyanidhi has studied Bengali literature in minute details deserves particular mention. It has been truly said about him: 'The portions which have been quoted from the books of Bengali poetry have for a long time gone on finding their place in many later books as precious pearls. Pandit Lalmohan Bhattacharya gained his versatile outlook as the outcome of his mature youth which is a matter of great delight and amazement. 24

With reference to the books on Bengali rhetoric written in accordance with Sanskrit rhetorics, Jibendra singha Roy’s Bāmlā Alaṅkār needs momentous and special mention. In the Introduction of this book, the learned Sasibhusan Dasgupta discovers a newness in its contents saying, ‘The author has succeeded in bringing to light in his book the Bengali rhetoric in its truest sense.’ As his treatment (discussion) bears a revelation of this very attitude, so also is his consciousness conspicuous in the art of anthology of illustrations. Yet it goes without saying that the book under discussion does not seem to have any role to play in the books on rhetoric; on the contrary the book in its precise and brief form is strictly meant for students. A set of university questions has also been appended with this book. The questions in the list aforesaid dealing with alamkāra and with a comparative query between one (alamkāra) and the other have perhaps been chosen in keeping with the trend of university examination question-papers.

In this context, the book in Bengali which can claim to be the first to have had at most success and is considered best by inquisitive Bengali readers of the subject of rhetorics is Alaṅkāracandrika by Shyamapada Chakraborty, Professor Emeritus and former leading professor of Bengali literature and language in the Department of Bengali, Bangabashi College, Kolkata. 25 Of course, even before Shyamapada Chakraborty the investigative urge of the
Bengali scholars concerning the studies of rhetorics is born out also by another book entitled *Kāvyanirṇay* by Lalmohan Bidyanidhi composed in 1862 A.D. Prior to this Pandit Jay Gopal Goswami had on rhetorics written a book known as *Sāhitya-Muktābali*. In the journal named *Paridarśhak patrika* (1269 B.S. – 1st paus vol.) the difference between the two books, i.e. *Kāvyanirṇay* and *Sāhityamuktābali* has been likened to that between Heaven and Hell. In this connection *Alaṁkāra Darpaṇa* by Sitikantha Bachaspati can be mentioned. But this book is actually the translation of chapter 10 of *Sāhityadarpaṇa*. However, at places only examples from the Bengali book have been provided. In this context the name of another book may also be recorded. It is *Nivātakavacabadha*, written by the poet, Mahesh Chandra Tarkachudamani and published in 1869 A.D. In the 14th and 15th chapter of this, some *Arthālaṁkāras* (figures of word-meaning) had been included.

Here the name of Shyamapada Chakraborty is specially noteworthy because of the fact that has defined every Sanskrit rhetorical figure in Bengali adequately by explaining it according to this definition. Above all, he has established the subject by giving sufficient number of examples from Bengali literature. In fact, Shyamapada Chakraborty came forward to write this book mainly with a view to clearing the complexity which was created in Bengali for having followed books on rhetorics written in Sanskrit by Lalmohan Bidyanidhi and Sitikantha Bachaspati and above all, in order to present sufficient number of examples from Bengali literature. Almost all the definitions, which he has presented, are almost all of them have their source in chapter 10 of *Sāhityadarpaṇa* of Visvanatha Kaviraja. In most cases in his discussion western rhetorics of the parallel nature has been referred to from a comparative viewpoint and compared their similarities or otherwise with those of Bengali. Now and then, in order to elucidate the definition extensively he has had recourse to other Sanskrit treatises also. For instance,
he has explained *Luptopamā* in details on the basis of Panini’s principle *(sutra)* 2/2/4 as presented by *Kātyāyanavartikā’s* commentary. Similarly while discussing *pūrṇopamā* in course explaining an example from the book, *Kāvyasrī* by Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta reference has been made to Katayyan’s commentary on Panini’s principle 3/1/7 and Panini version’s interpreter Kayat. In short in *Alaṅkāracandrikā* he has made full use of his versatile genius and refereed intellect. Besides, he has mentioned some such rhetorical elements which are present abundantly in use in Bengali literature. In the discussion of these a Bengali term has been side by side with each western name of the figure and every where he has also this terminology closely following the meaning of the original names as far as practicable. As a result, some more new rhetorical figures found their entry into Bengali.

One or two examples will make this matter clear as to how in mentioning Sanskrit rhetorics Shyamapada Chakraborty’s out look has left the mark of unswerving devotion and compliance to the original text. For example, while defining the figure *utprekṣā*, Visvanatha Kaviraja had written: *bhavet sambhāvanot-prekṣā prakṛṣṭya paratmāna.* In his Bengali translation prof. Chakraborty has written: When a strong resemblance between *prakṛta* (i.e., ‘Real’ = *upameya* i.e. the object compared) and *paratmā* (*upamān*’ i.e. thing to which comparison is made) created doubt the figure is *utprekṣa.* In Bengali the definition is but the verbatim translation of Sanskrit. The primary division of *utprekṣa* has been shown in *Alaṅkāracandrikā* as *bācya* and *pratiyamāna* in keeping with *Sāhityadarpaṇa.* Of course, as the sixteen types *bācyotprekṣā* in *Sāhityadarpaṇa* have hardly any application in Bengali, therefore, Sri Chakraborty has not mentioned them in *Alaṅkāracandrikā.* Similarly, he has made no reference whatsoever to sixteen or thirty-two types of differences of *pratiyamānotprekṣā* in pursuance of *Sāhityadarpaṇa.* The definition of *pratiyamānotprekṣā* like that of *bācyotprekṣā* he has drawn into
from *Sāhityadārpaṇa*. Of course, to bring clarity to the definition of *pratīyamānotprekṣā* he has taken the help of the book, *Rasagaṅgādhara* also. In short, prof. Chakraborty has churned the entire gamut of the subject of Sanskrit rhetorics in order to give them a form in Bengali and has made them clear by supplying sufficient number of examples from Bengali literature. In many instances, he has criticised also the remarks of many ancient and modern writers in his discussion of rhetorics. Apart from this he has compared figures with each other and brought their respective distinctive characteristics to light. He has taken the help now and then of English poetry also; for instance, while citing an example of *Pūrnopamā* he has quoted Shalley’s words:

‘Thou dost float and run

Like an unbodied joy whose race is just begun.’

He has quoted Smith’s definition of rhyme of English literature as given below while clarifying Visvanātha Kavirāja’s ‘svarasaṁyuktākṣarabiṣiśṭam’ etc. in the context of the definition of Antyānuprāsa, or rhyme. Likeness between the vowel sounds in the last metrically stressed syllables of two or more lines or sections of lines, and between all sounds consonant or vowel, that succeed.” Another matter which is note-worthy is that the rhetorical figures – *Anvaya, Apagūṇa, Anujñā, Aḷpa, Avaṇṭāalankṛti, Asadarthanidarśanā, Asambhava, Āvṛttiṭidāpaka, Abhidhāhetu, Ullāsa, Kārakādāpaka, Citra, Nirukti, Parikarāṁkura, Pihita, Pūrbbarūpa, Pritiśedha, Prastuṭāṁkara, Praharśaṇapadāḥkārī, Bhaṣāsāṁveśā, Mūḍrā, Yukti, Ratnāvalī, Bhāṣāsama, Lālita, Lēśa, Vikalpa, Vidhi, Vyājanindā, Viśādāna, Śama, Sambhāvanā, Stokokti, Śmyṭimāna, Heta, Hetvapahnuti etc.* are not mentioned in *Sāhityadārpaṇa*, nor Prof. Chakraborty has mentioned them in *Alaṁkāracandrikā*. However, there are
some such figures in *Sāhityadārpaṇa* which have hardly any use in Bengali literature, and so he has felt no necessity to mention the definition of these figures some of which are *Uttara, Udāṭta, Citra, Vinokti, Yathāsāmkhyā, Milita, Rasavata, Śreya, Uṛjvasvī, Samāhita, Bhāvodaya, Bhāvasandhi, Bhāvasāvalatā* etc. though this should also be noted here that on many occasions by way of giving examples of rhetorical figures he has given his own translation of these. Possibly he has not found the examples of these figures in the Bengali language; on the other hand, nor could he get rid of a strong desire to mention them. The figure, *Parisāmkhyā* is an example; citing an illustration of it he has quoted one from the poetry of Rangalal, and the other from that of his own composition. 33 Similarly in defining the figure *Byaghāta*, he has given the one form what has been said by Visvanatha Kaviraja द्रष्टिदागद्धम मनसिजम – etc., which he has followed in his Bengali translation thus –

*Drṣṭidāgḍha mansije tomar drṣṭir parasaṇe*

*palake jāgate pāra, he sundari, nabin jibane;*

*maheśvar bijayini, ayi cārulocanā, tomār*

*carāṇe kābir namaskār.* 34

('By the touch of thy look, o thou beautiful one, thou constantly awaken to the new life the look-burnt *Manasij;* o thou beautiful eyed, conqueror of Maheswara poets obeisance at thy feet.')

Another noteworthy aspect of this book is that having added a chapter to the heading—'Figure, *Bakrokti* (enuendo) and *Alamkāra* (rhetoric)' Shyamapada Chakraborty has carried on a comparative discussion of Indian rhetorics with *Bakrokti*, and long with this Aristotle’s ‘metaphor’ or after Aristatle ‘figure’ (of speech) which comes from Latin Figura (this particular
kind of terminology i.e.). And finally he has reached the conclusion, ‘The nature of the ideas of rhetorics of the two countries of Grecece and India is not dissimilar.’ However, he has also admitted the fact, ‘In the early period ancient rhetorics mainly political (or state-centric) awareness was active among the Greek teachers whereas among the Indians it was poetical beauty.’ According to him, life of the Greeks was all state, and so in their drama also they were allegiant to the state. The weapon of victory for the state was extraordinary power of argument. So, ‘For them the aspect of the power of words became more important, whereas to us it was but the beauty of words.’ Another valuable aspect is the inclusion of the chapter with the heading *The History of Rhetoric*. Here he has presented, in brief outline and with adequate scholarship and clarity, the history of Sanskrit rhetorics from *Rgveda* extended upto *Rasaganga* in the 17th century. In this book he has discussed the terms *Abhidha Laksha Vyanyan* etc. in the section titled *Savda O Artha*. In the two chapters *Dhvani* and *Rasadhvani* he has presented illustrations of every definition from Bengali literature along with minute classification of sound (*Dhvani*). The definition of *Rasadhvani* has been analysed and its examples from Bengali have also found place in the book. In the same way the elaborate discussion of *Lakshan*, *Guqibhuta Vyan* etc. and their examples from Bengali have been included. In this context, the chapter, *Lakshan O Alamkura* certainly deserves mention. Another pint of important to be noted is that a strange and gross mistake was made by each of the authors, right from Panditaraja Jagannatha, the interpreter of *Sahityadarpana* down to Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta, the writer of *Kavyalok*, in the matter of presenting or introducing ‘Devarsi’ referred to in Kalidasa’s *Kumarsambhava* as ‘Devarsi Narada’ due to their misconception or misinterpretation of the *sloka—ebam vadini Devarsa* etc. etc., but Shyamapada Chakraborty has conspicuously pointed out this arrow in his
book. It is also to be recorded that Charkaborty’s book, immediately after its publication, was accepted as a text-book by Calcutta University and other educational institutions. In fact, Shyamapada Chakraborty had shouldered the grave responsibility, through his book, of acquainting the Bengali teachers and students as well as inquisitive readers with the wonderful world of Sanskrit rhetorics. Not only this, but through numerous quotations presented in this book we also came to know about that ornamental angle of the beauty of Bengali literature which had gathered bit by bit its kaleidoscopic splendour of form. Had Shyamapada Chakrabarty not shown us this end shooting of the ions of beauty reflected through Bengali literature in the light of Sanskrit rhetorics (aesthetics) then perhaps they would not have revealed thus and neither would the scholarly individuals of later period have got the inspiration to come forward to carry this work.

In the discussion of rhetorics in Bengali language Dr. Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta’s book *Kāvyasrī* also can claim a special mention. Of course, Dr. Dasgupta was all out to write this book with a special aim in view. We shall speak of this aim in his own language – “We have attempted to determine the value of Sanskrit rhetorician keeping in view the nature and the necessity of Bengali literature and accordingly the assessment of interpretation, determination of terminology, analysis and classification of definition of rhetorical figures etc have been done and new ‘figures’ have also been added, wherever necessary. Looking at the impact of English rhetorics on the Bengali literature, efforts have been made to make them understandable in course of explaining the early figures and they have been accepted either by being included in the original figure or separately with a new nomenclature.” Apart from this, he has tried to make the Western rhetorics comprehensible wherever possible keeping in mind the influence of English rhetorics on modern Bengali literature and has accepted them
through their inclusion in original, or separately by new names. In this context, we may present here a few examples: in the discussion of the figure vyuṅgokti, he has chosen the English figures - Irony, Innuendo, Euphemism which have been respectively named Kūṭilabhāsana (Crocked words), Vakrabhāsana (oblique words) and Subhāsana (good words) and has discussed them with appropriate illustrations from Bengali literature. Besides, following English Periphrasis he has added a new figure in Bengali which he named pallavita bhāsana (inflated words) and has given examples of it from Bengali literature. While discussing the figure Rūpaka he has introduced newer terms in Bengali, such as, allegory, parable, fable etc. and these have been named respectively as Ṛkhyānṛūpaka, Uparūpaka, Kathārūpaka etc. It is also observed that for English 'Oxymoron' 'climax' and 'antithesis' he has allowed new terms to enter into the Bengali language, which serially are Birodhotki Āroha or Pratibinīyaśa or Biruddhabinyāsa etc.

Another new figure (alamkāra) which he has used in Bengali for the first time has been named as Kāvyasṛī; of course, no special novelty has been found in Kāvyasṛī in the discussion of the figures taken from Sanskrit. Almost everywhere in the framing of the definitions of rhetorics he has been dependent on Sāhityadarpana. However, the fine literary sensibility, on the one hand and the just and skilled thinking on the other above all, intimate familiarity with the early, middle and modern literature of the author has elevated this book under our consideration to a position of importance. With this his close acquaintance with the English language and literature was of great help, as was rightly commented by Dr. Shashibhusan Dasgupta, to the author having written this book.

In the context of discussing Sanskrit subject of rasas as a whole, Dr. Suddhasatva Basu had written separate books; these are - Rasa-jijñāsā, Chandajijñāsā and Alamkār-jijñāsā. His Alamkār jijñāsā can claim a special
place in the discussion of Sanskrit rhetorics. Though he had followed the
eamples of Shyamapada Chakraborty and Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta; yet his
book under our consideration certainly had left some marks of special
estimation in the studies of rhetorics. The minute classifications of some
figures (of speech) he had presented words with appropriate illustrations from
the store-house of Bengali literature. Some important ones among them are:-
Anukta-nimitta, Vyañjanāgarbha, Upamā, Apakārṣātmaka-vyatireka,
Uktaviśayaka-ākṣepa, Utkarṣātmaka-vyatireka etc. Besides, he has also made
us familiar with many new ‘figures’ of Sanskrit rhetorics for the first time,
such as, Bhāvopamā, Mahopamā, Prekṣā, Yathāsāmkhyā etc. Another
extraordinary success of Suddhasatva Basu, in the discussion of rhetorics, is
that while defining the figures taken from Sanskrit literature, he pointed out,
at many places, whatever terms can be there for these from Sanskrit literature
itself; for example: Atiśayokti, Svabhābokti etc. as endorsed by Dandi as
Alāmkarottama, Ādyālāmkāra etc. respectively. Similarly, the figures Sāra,
Chekanuprāsa, Mahopamā, Arthānantarnyāsa, etc. are respectively mentioned
as Udāra, Ekānuprāsa, Garbhita-upamā, Viśvavyapī etc. the terms given by
other Sanskrit rhetoricians. At the same time he has discussed the significance
of these terms at the appropriate place in his book. It may be mentioned here
that while citing examples of rhetorical figures from the vast kingdom of
Bengali literature he has used the compositions of a total of 78 creative
writers as his source. Apart from the discussion of Sanskrit, he has cited many
examples of English ‘figures’ from Bengali literature. As a result, the
inquisitive readers will get an opportunity to make comparative studies of
Sanskrit rhetorics and English literature. As the recognition of this success of
Suddhasatva Basu, Calcutta University, has appropriately honoured the author
by selecting his book as a special textbook for the Honours students.
In this context, the name of another book has to be mentioned. It is *Bāṅglā Kāvye Rūp O-Rūti* by Dr. Kshudiram Das.\(^2\) This book is divided into four sections viz. *Kāvyer Lakṣaṇa* (Distinctive marks of poetry) *Kāvyer Svarūp* (Nature of poetry), *Kāvyer Chanda* (Rhythm of poetry), and the distinguished creators of Bengali literature etc. In course of elaborate and learned discussion on these matters Dr. Das has also discussed at length in the second chapter of his book where under the title *Alaṅkār Paricay* he has treated in Bengali with the definition of Sanskrit rhetorical figures and their examples. Of course, in the first section of the book a learned discussion under the heading *Kāvyā O Alaṅkārti* has been done on the theme of the relation between poetry and rhetorics. In the section *Alaṅkār Paricay* he has discussed *Śabdālaṅkāra* and *Arthālaṅkāra* rather in the traditional manner with definitions and their examples presented side by side. But in this, the writer's success has been dependent elsewhere. It is the place where he has referred to definitions from Sanskrit poetics and in course of discussing at length with illustrations, he has pointed out the shortcomings of the Bengali scholars preceding him wherever disagreement has occurred with them and this he has done through elaborate discussion with references to original Sanskrit texts and at the same time he has also attempted to remove these differences of opinion. It is here that the special value of this book lies in the continuity of discussion of rhetorics in the Bengali language. Now and then on special occasions just as he has removed our doubts by raising controversies supported by facts, so also he has tried to awaken a flawless sense of confidence regarding Sanskrit rhetorics. He has tried occasionally to establish his view with the keep of quotations from Sanskrit rhetorics or books of commentary. He has been dependent here on Sanskrit literature, and similarly he has made his point of view clear with extensive quotations from *Sāhityadarpaṇa, Kāvyādarśa, Apyayadīkṣita* etc. How his differences of
opinion cropped up with those of the Bengali scholars preceding him and how
he attempted to remove them may be discussed with the help of a few
examples. The portion quoted hereunder as illustration of *Aprastut Prasāṁśā*
in *Alanikār candrikā* is as follows:

\[ \text{Yār yāhā bal} \]

\[ \text{Tāi tār astra pitāḥ, yuddher sambal} \]

\[ \text{Byagrāśane nakhadante naheka samān,} \]

\[ \text{Tāi bale dhanuśāre bāḍhi tār prāṇ} \]

\[ \text{Kon nara lajjā pay?} \]

(O father, one’s weapon is one’s intrinsic strength; to fight with the tiger
tooth and nail alone is not equal; so, no man is really ashamed to kill him with
arrows.’) has been presented as an example of *Pratibastupamā* in the book,
*Kāvyasrī*. But Dr. Das has written about this example that it is neither
*Pratibastupamā* nor *Aprastut Prasāṁśā*, but it is an example of
*Arthāntarṇayay*. He had given appropriate reasons in support of this view.\(^4^3\)

In *Alanikār candrikā* Shyamapada Chakraborty gives an example of
the ‘figure’ *Nīścay* quoting a portion of Rabindranath Thakur’s poetry — *e
nahe mākhara vanamarmara guñjīta ............etc.* and this example cannot
be considered since *Nīścay* has been argued by Dr. Das with sufficient
reason.\(^4^4\) Similarly, the example of the figure *Utpreksā* as given in the two
books on rhetorics in Bengali, *Alanikārcandrikā* and *Kāvyasrī*, - *Sūhārā āni
yena maṇīhārā fanī etc.* is not basically *Utpreksā* but *Upamā* according to Dr.
Das. He has argued his contention with proper reasons. In this context he has
presented arguments in favour of his opinion with a portion from the
discussion of a particular commentator in Sanskrit.\(^4^5\) In the same way— *yadi
kari viśpān/Tathāpi nā yāy prāṇ............. etc.* the author of *Kāvyasrī* is not
willing to accept it as an example of *Bisesokti*; again, this reluctance on the part of that author has been shown to be unreasonable by Dr. Das.46

At some places he has firmly established the definitions of Sanskrit rhetorics on a comparative basis; for example, in the course of the discussion of the figure *Samāsokti* he has brought in the discussion English ‘figures’ ‘Personification’ or ‘Pathetic fallacy’ etc. But one fault in his book, however, cannot escape our notice; it is that the examples he has cited are without any reference to their respective sources. As a result, the curious readers are puzzled with the question as to where the examples have been taken from. This book which, in fact, depends on information, should have paid more attention to quotations. The author has only referred to the source of his own translated portion from the Sanskrit text. It is undoubtedly painful to note that he was so very reluctant about mentioning the source of Bengali examples.

It is found that in determining the definitions of Sanskrit rhetoric in the Bengali language, in explaining them by citing examples from Bengali literature, and in acquainting the Bengali readers having thirst for enjoyment with the aesthetic beauty of Sanskrit rhetoric, even at times through examples of figures made at random for this purpose, the contribution of Bengali intellect is remarkable. Sanskrit *Śabdālāṅkāra* and *Arthālāṅkāra* used specially in literature have been discussed in different Indian languages. Discussion by Bengali intellectuals has not remained circumscribed by that. Even those figures of Sanskrit rhetoric which are of very little use in Sanskrit itself and also almost non-existent in the regional languages have been made familiar to the inquisitive readers. Along with that they have quoted definitions and examples of similar nature from western rhetoric side by side with Sanskrit rhetoric and have thus made Sanskrit rhetoric accessible to all. They had to do so beyond the school and college syllabuses. So it can be
easily said that writing the history of Sanskrit rhetoric in Bengali, citing examples of rhetorical figures from Bengali language and above all, in analyzing the definitions etc., they have imported the long trend to the discussion of rhetoric in literature by carrying on all these works can undoubtedly claim a separate history of rhetoric in the Bengali language. This history by its nature, character and sharp analytical skill is really without any precedence. In spite of this trend of discussion having developed in accordance with definitions of Sanskrit rhetoric figures, the analytical skill underlying this pursuit on the part of the Bengali intellect is totally its own.
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