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INTRODUCTION

The Buddha philosophy, the *Veda*, the *Upaniṣada* and the *Gītā* along with Indian rhetoric are the four invaluable and inviolable treasures that are said to have made basic contributions to the history of world culture. The thought of *Kāvya* originated in the minds of the Indian sages, solely urged by the necessity of comprehending the mystery of the origin of literature, its relevance and its nature and characteristics hidden in the *mantras* in the *Veda*. This very tradition of the thought, through Bharatacarya, gave birth to poetics based on the *Rāmāyana* and the *Mahābhārata*. *Veda’s* *pasyam devasya kāvyam na mamār na jiryati* i.e. ‘Look at that poetry of the Deity that neither died nor did wear out’ — *dekho devatār kāvyā — e marlao nā jīrnāo hālo nā or, Vālmiki’s *kimidam byahṛtam mayā* i.e. ‘is it I who have said this’? or ‘what have I said’? — *(eki āmi ballām or, e āmi ki ballām)*. The Indian poetics has its beginning through such a thought of poetics. At a later stage, it is this thought nurtured by *Rasavāda Dhvanivāda, Rītivāda, Alamkāravāda, Bakroktivāda* etc. that had made the advent of Sanskrit poetics possible. As poetics is the philosophy of poetry, it’s deemed to be worth mentioning that with the dawn of poetry, philosophical thoughts came to light in Indian intuition, especially the flourishing of Indian intuitive sense and fundamental analysis that had made their glorious revelation during the periods—from Bharatacarya to Panditaraja Jagannatha, might beyond question be the cause of India’s pride. In later years, this rhetoric itself in its full maturity influenced by and large the poetic genius or creative faculty and inspired as well the Indian intellect and intelligentsia to think of it with
detailed elucidation; Consequently, an affluent commentary came into being following these basic principles or aphorisms of rhetorics. Multifarious thoughts and studies in conformity with Sanskrit poetics making room for comparative deliberation dawned on Neo-Indo Aryan language too.

In this way, a new scriptural discussion issued from Sanskrit poetics. Keeping the aforesaid points in perspective, we are now in a position to throw light on the gradual evolution of Indian rhetoric.

In the course of discussion of the history of Indian rhetoric as well as of its evolution, starting from the inception to Panditaraja Jagannatha, has been divided generally into three phases, viz. (a) the age of creation (b) the age of consolidation and (c) the age of arguments or reasoning. The age of creation refers to the period from the beginning to the middle of the 9th century. ‘In this age, on the one hand, discussion has taken place concerning maṇḍana kalā, rīti, mārga etc. of the principle of rhetoric, that is, the artistic techniques involved in the creation of the form or the external body of poetry. On the other hand, the soul of poetry which pervades the body of poetry has also been interpreted at length’. Then comes the age of consolidation; during the span of about 200 years from the 9th to the 11th century Dhvanivāda had got specially established. In this age, Dhvanivāda which was introduced by Anandavardhana had had a complete support from Abhinavagupta (appeared in the beginning of the 10th century A.D.) and Mammata etc. Though Abhinavagupta started with dhvani, he however, came to the end of his journey with rasadhvani. But in spite of the elaborate explanation of Dhvanivāda having been propagated by Mammata and others, the voice of opposition against independent identity of dhvani is found to have become vocal towards the end of the 10th century and it was represented by Dhananjaya and Dhanika, and also by Acarya Kuntaka who appeared in
the eleventh century. But in the end we find that despite strong opposition the predominance of Dhvanivāda as established by Anandavardhana and recognized by Abhinavagupta, Mammata etc. could not be deterred by any obstacle whatsoever.

Then comes a long period of interval. The discussion of the history of the literary criticism and literary principles of this age reveals that though a considerable number of books and commentaries were written during this period on Sanskrit rhetoric, there was, however, hardly any evidence of originality of the ideas in them. The long period of seven hundred years, from the end of the eleventh century up to the beginning of the 18th century, has been marked in a book as the age of Argument or reasoning written by a modern critic.

Though a plenty of references on the subject concerning the perception of beauty is available in the philosophical treatises or in the āgama śāstra propagating Ānandavāda, a comprehensive discussion on the real nature and enjoyment of beauty is, however, found only in poetics. As a matter of fact, rasa alone is like the foundation of Indian poetics. Rasa is one of the most ancient words of Indian language. In common parlance it is used in four different meanings viz. 1) rasa of the physical body, 2) Ayurvedic rasa 3) rasa in relation with literature and 4) rasa of mokṣa or bhakti. Since when the meaning of rasas in accordance with the śāstras emerged? In the research relating to this question Batsayana’s Kāmasūtra can help us a great deal in this age.

The edition of Kāmasūtra that passes in the name of Batsayana and is available at present with the commentary Jayamangala, has the use of the word rasa in the sense of rati, kāmaśakti etc. But it is very difficult to ascertain whether the sutras (principles) enunciated in the commentary
Jayamangala are ancient or not, or whether they are some of the fundamental sutras of Batsayana or otherwise. Most of the scholars maintain that the composition of Batsayana’s Kāmasūtra was probably done near about Fourth Century B.S. This age is familiar as sutrakala and it extends from 5th or 6th century B.S. to 5th or 6th century A.D. Kāmasūtra was composed perhaps in the early half of this period and Bharatasūtra in the later half. Conclusions concerning rásas as mentioned in Bharatasūtra are so complete, and to the extent Bharata himself refers to his predecessors and makes use of their comments applied in ānubāmsā sloka so extensively that the trend of rasa set by the sástras appears to have been irrefutably in existence even almost two centuries before, computing from the time of Bharata. In the context of discussing this earlier trend, it is worth mentioning that Abhinavagupta considers Kasyapa as one of the predecessors of Bharata. The reference to Kasyapa and Bararuci is also found in the commentary Hṛdayaṅgama of Acarya Dandi’s book Kāvyādarśa. Apart from this, in his book Bhāvaprakāśana, Śrādātānaya has also mentioned the names of Acarya Sadāsiva Gauri, Bāsuki, Nārada, Agastya, Vṛṣṇa, Āṇjaneya etc. But all the works of these ancient rhetoricians having been lost forever in the womb of lime, only Nātyāsāstra composed by Bharatamuni, which is currently in vogue in recent times, is considered to be the oldest. Though Panini’s grammar too has recognized the authors of literary principles such as Kṛṣṇa and Silalina, their books also have gone out of existence. Bharatamuni’s own quotation, atra ānubāmsā slokaḥ bhavataḥ, bhavanti cātraḥ slokaḥ etc. undoubtedly proves the existence of existence of Nātyāsāstra in India even before his own era. According to rhetorician Rajasekhara Bharata was the creator of rūpaka or dṛṣṭya kāvya — Rūpakanirūpanīyāṃ Bharataḥ. Of course, in the famous quotation of Rajasekhara also there is a reference to Nandikesvara besides Bharata, and according to the former, Nandikesvara’s
relation with the principle of *rasa* was far closer than that of Bharata.¹⁰ In his book, *Bhāvaprakāśana* Saradatanaya has mentioned the name of Nandikesvara and has also spoken about receiving from him instructions about Bharata’s principles of *Nātya*. The names of Bharatamuni and his famous *Nāṭyasāstra* have been mentioned several times in Nandikesvara’s book *Abhinayadarpana* edited by Professor Manomohan Ghosh. Viewed from that angle, we have to say that Bharata’s era comes before that of Nandikesvara.¹¹ In this context Rajasekhara has put forward a lost chapter consisting of a list of Indian rhetoricians in his book *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* and the list is as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of the theoreticians</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sahasraksa</td>
<td><em>Kavirahasya</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Uktigarbha</td>
<td><em>Auktika</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Slesa</td>
<td><em>Śavdaśleṣa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pulastya</td>
<td><em>Bāstava</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Subarnabha</td>
<td><em>Rīti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pracetayana</td>
<td><em>Anuprāsa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Citrangada</td>
<td><em>Yamaka o citra</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kuvera</td>
<td><em>Ubhayalamkāra</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bharata</td>
<td><em>Rūpaka</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dhisana</td>
<td><em>Doṣa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Kucamara</td>
<td><em>Aupaniṣadīka</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Aupakayana</td>
<td><em>Upamā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Parasara</td>
<td><em>Atiśaya</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Autathya</td>
<td><em>Arthaśleṣa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Kamadeva</td>
<td><em>Vainodīka</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Nandikesvara</td>
<td><em>Rasa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Upamana</td>
<td><em>Guna</em>¹²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In spite of the mention of the word *rasa* in the above list along with the name of Nandikesvara it has been proved that he succeeded Bharatacarya.

Now, we may look into the matter relating to the period in which Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* was composed. Divergent views exist relating to this period of composition, so much so that it is not possible to arrive at a definite conclusion because without internal evidence there is no other factor which serves as an indicator in this matter. According to the celebrated authority Haraprasad Shastri, *Nāṭyaśāstra* was composed in the second century A.D. In the opinion of Prof. Levy, Bharata composed his *Nāṭyaśāstra* in the reign of Ksatrapada. According to Prof. Keith, the writer of *The History of Sanskrit Literature*, Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* was composed probably after the third century A.D. Sri Manomohan Ghos, thinks that the period of the composition of *Nāṭyaśāstra* falls between the First Century B.S. and the Second Century A.D. Again, in the opinion of some others, the names of Maharastra and Nepal having been mentioned in this book, the date of composition of *Nāṭyaśāstra* is not likely to be stipulated before second century. However, from the reference as found in *Nāṭyaśāstra* to the names of Bharatamuni, Visvakarma, *Purāṇa*, *Kāmaśūtra*, *Kāmatantra*, *Bṛhaspati*, *Nārada*, *Taṇḍu*, *Pāṣupata*, *Drāviḍa*, *Śabara*, *Ābhira* etc., this much can at least, be said that *Nāṭyaśāstra* is contemporaneous with the beginning of the First Century.\(^{13}\)

At later times, various views have been presented by different critics regarding the repertory of *rasa*. But after Bharata the popular interest regarding theories of *rasa* did not continue any further. Later acaryas accepting *rasa* as something basically applicable to dram have laid greater emphasis on *alāṅkāra rīti, guṇas* etc. in relation to poetry. From that point of view the history of Sanskrit poetics can be divided into three separate parts viz. 1) The age preceding *dhavani*: from the beginning to Rudrata (i.e. from
the First / Second Century to the end of the Eighth Century A.D.); 2) dhvani period from Anandavardhana to Bhojaraja (i.e. from the beginning of the Ninth Century to the middle of Eleventh Century; and 3) the period following dhvani, i.e. from Mammata etc. to Panditaraja Jagannatha.14

Pointing out to the order of succession of the rhetoricians the author of Balabodhini has said—

Dandibhdmahabhattadbhatarudratabhattanaya kavāmanamukulapratihārendurājānandavardhanamahimabhattāvavakroktikāra hrdayadarpanaṇakārābhīnavaguptaśauddhodanivābhatavāgbhatruyyakabhojar ājamammatā hemacandreśavamisrīpiyusavarsāvidyānāthagovindathākk uravaidyanāthāpuyayadikṣitajagannāthavisvesāra—pañcitacyutarāya—prab hṛtaya iti. 15

In this period prior to the period of dhvani there are also two more divisions. These can be shown in the form of a chart as given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD BEFORE DHVANI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Trend opposed to rasa
  - Bhamaha, Dandi, Vamana
  - Udbhata and Rudrata
- Trend supporting rasa
  - Lollata, Sankuka etc. and Rudrabhatta

In his Nātyaśāstra Bharata has accepted rasa itself as the soul of poetry, Kalidasa has recognized Bharata as the founder of aṣṭarasā.16

Following the extensive propagation of the principles of rasa by Bharata’s Nātyaśāstra an antagonistic trend also came into force; this trend of antagonism is one that is opposed to rasa. It includes rhetoricians such as Bhamaha, Dandi, Vamana, Udbhata, Rudrata. The periods in which the aforesaid teachers of rhetoric appeared are in the following, chronological
order: Bhamaha in the Fifth or Sixth Century A.D. Vamanacarya in the 750 or
the First part of 8th Century A.D. and Rudrata is considered to be of 9th or 10th
Century A.D. Scholars have failed to agree with one another regarding the era
of Dandi. There is also difference of opinion on the question whether Dandi,
the writer of *Daśakumāra-carita* and *Kavyādāsa* was the one and the same
person or not. In the words of the renowned critic, Prof. Sushil Kumar Dey,
the period in which Dandi appeared on the scene was — 'as the end of the
Eighth Century and the commencement of the Ninth Century A.D.' The
famous scholar P.V. Kane has proclaimed Seventh Century to be the era of
Dandi’s emergence. On the whole, the opinion of each of the rhetoricians as
mentioned here has opposed *rasa*, though there is difference of degree in such
opposition relating to their respective views in this regard. These rhetoricians
have looked for the nature of the literary characteristics of the meaning or
context of poetry in its externalities or form. As for instance for Bhamaha’s
rhetoric is the external feature of the word (*śabdārtha*). Though Vamana was
sufficiently conscious of *rasa*, yet he kept it confined within the limit of the
rhetoric as Rasavāda only. Regarding *rasa* no genuine enthusiasm has been
observed in him.

Now in the context of the discussion of the trend of Rasavāda we can
mention chronologically the name of Lollata, the first person belonging to this
trend. According to the findings of the Sanskrit schools of thought the period
in which he appeared preceded that of Abhinavagupta and followed
Udbhata’s. Probably he was a contemporary of the Kashmiri philosopher
Kallata of the mid-Ninth Century. According to some investigators, he
emerged in Eighth Century A.D. Yet others consider him to be a
contemporary rhetorician of Anandavardhana of the Ninth Century. Regarding
Lollata’s composition, only two subjects of reference are found, viz.- 1) a portion
on the interpretation of *Bharata Sūtra* and 2) his comments
on the subject of abhidhā. After Bharata, Lollata was the first individual who in his own interpretation attempted to clarify the nature of rasa and established its direct and close relation with bhava. His viewpoint is familiar as Utpattivāda.

After Lollata, the name of the second exponent of Bharata’s rhetoric principle (Bharata Sūtra) was Sri Sankuka who was also considered to be (a) Kashmiri Pandita. The period in which Sankuka appeared was shortly before Lollata’s. Probably over a certain span of time towards the end of the Nineth Century A.D. He happened to be contemporary of Lollata. According to others, the period of his advent was the mid-Ninth Century A.D. Sankuka established a new doctrine in his commentary criticising the theory supported by Lollata; his doctrine is known as Anumitivāda. Though he also accepted rasa as the meaning of nāṭyarasa like Lollata; yet, whereas the latter had kept rasa confined within the limits of anukārya and anukartā the former (i.e. Sankuka) had elevated rasa to the level of empathy. Sankuka interprets the theory of rasa in accordance with the views of Nyaya philosophy. The name of his poetical work is Bhūbanābhyaūdaya. In the opinion of Sankuka, rasa is mainly devoted to nāyaka nāyikā relation. While witnessing the stage-acting, the viewers of the play consider actors as imitators not different from the role of the hero or the heroine (nāyak-nāyikā) they play. In his view the meaning of Bharata’s theory (sutra) is — from bhāva bibhāva and byabhicāribhāva, through conjecture, the knowledge of sthāyībhāva such as rati etc. arises in the actor.

The last Acarya in the line of Rasavāda preceding the age of dhvani was Rudrabhatta. Though some scholars are in agreement with one another as regards the period of his appearance taking place in the beginning of the Tenth Century A.D, However, because of various reasons, particularly in
view of his close resemblance with Rudrata and ignorance of the subject of dhvani, it would be only proper to accept him as an acarya belonging to the pre-dhvani period. Rudrabhatta has discussed syṅgāra rasa very elaborately in Śrīgārātilaka. His basic subject was rasa itself. In the first chapter there is the description of bhāva, one of the nine rasas and the differentiation between nāyaka and nāyikā, and in the second and third chapters respectively there are descriptions of bipralambha syṅgāra and other rasas. Expressing his inclinations towards rasa he has said that just as the night without the moon, the woman without her husband and goddess Luxmi without wealth cannot shine in their respective native beauty so also is the state of poetry without rasa.

Besides the classification of acaryas mentioned above, there are two more categories of poets and rasa of the pre-dhvani period. One is—directly Rasavādin which includes the poets of pure Rasavāda like Kalidasa and Bhababhuti who have shown a strong interest in rasa. In the second category, there is Bharbi, Bana, Sri Harsa, Magha and other poets who, in spite of having admitted the supremacy of rasa, has not taken much interest in it. The poets of the first group standing in strong opposition to the critics of rhetorician their respective eras or periods have expressed their interest in rasa. Among them, Kalidasa, in his narrative and lyrical poetry, had possessed equal strong command over vīra and karuna rasa. Here, Bhababhuti’s interest in rasa was much stronger.

Then begins the period of dhvani which falls roughly from 850 A.D. to 1050 A.D., that is, from Anandavardhana to Mammata. The acaryas of this period can be classified into three groups viz. 1) Rasavādin 2) Samanvayavādin and 3) Independents or Satantra in accordance with distinctive viewpoints. These rasavadins too have two divisions — a) Direct
Rasavādin and b) Indirect Rasavādins. This can be made clear with the help of a chart as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Dhvani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rasavādin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samanvayavādin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents or Satantra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bhoja)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kuntaka)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct Rasavādin
Bhattanayaka, Bhattatota, Abhinavagupta, Rajasekhara, Dhananjaya, Dhanika and Mahima Bhatta.

Indirect Rasavādin
Anandavardhana and Ksemendra

Foremost among the supporters of Direct Rasavāda was Bhattanayaka who appeared, we may agree, in the later part of the Tenth Century, that is, between the period after Anandavardhana and before Abhinavagupta. Though in the opinion of some scholars he appeared during the period between Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta, supposedly between 900 and 1000 A.D., yet it is known from Rājatarangini that he was present in the reign of Samkaravarma. Elsewhere again, his time of advent is said to be in the first part of the 10th Century. He founded his view demolishing that Sankuka. Bhattanayaka’s view was known as Bhūktivāda. His concept of rasa is the most refined one. He has explained the concept of rasa with the help of three ideas, viz.- abhidhā, bhāvanā and bhogikṛti etc. Bhattanayaka has resolved a fundamental problem of poetic enjoyment by discovering ‘generalized conclusions’ and unraveled the intrinsic nature of rasa in its correct vocabulary admitting its aspects of empathy and feeling as being authentic. He has described the delight (ananda) derived from the enjoyment...
of poetry as *brahmāsvādasavidhavarti*. But, today it is a matter of misfortune for Indian poetics that Bhattanayaka’s book *Hṛdayadarpana* has remained only as a name, because, having negated his doctrine, Abhinavagupta has established his (the former’s) inferences of comparatively psychological nature.

The period in which Abhinavagupta appeared on the scene was certainly in the middle of the 10th Century A.D. and his practical life spanned over the first part of the Eleventh Century. His approach is known as Abhivyaktivāda. We can mention the name of another rhetorician preceding Abhinavagupta. He was Bhattatota. His book belonging to the same period was based to a great extent on conjecture. Bhattatota has established his doctrine refuting that of Sankuka. In his opinion, *rasa* is *sādhya* whereas other poetics are merely *sādhana*. Regarding the development of the theory of *rasa* the foremost contribution of Bhattatota is that he has clearly included the feelings of the poet in the cycle of *rasa* and thus, in the process of generalization, he has established the poet as the medium between the *nāyaka* and the *sahrdaya*. Abhinavagupta in his work *Dhvanyāloka O Locana* and *Abhinavabhāratī* has respectfully remembered his mentor. As founder of Abhivyaktivāda Abhinavagupta has not discarded the view of Bhattanayaka as a whole. He has explained the highest expression of the feeling of *rasa* only with the help of suggestion (*vyāñjanā*). In fact Abhinavagupta’s philosophical view is *śaivādvaita* which is based on the presence of the Blissful and Non-dual pertaining to the principle of Absolute Reality. Abhinavagupta is predominantly a Rasavādin in spite of his acceptance of *dhvani* as being helpful to the thesis of *rasa*. Abhinavagupta has recognized nine *rasas* having annulled the *antabhāva* as propounded by Lollata and has also accepted *sāntarasa* as *mahārasa*. 
In this context, the name of Rajasekhara, the author of Kavyamimamsa is particularly noteworthy. In fact, chronologically, he was a predecessor of Abhinavagupta. The main subject of consideration for him was kaviśikṣā and his approach was comparatively modern. Rajasekhara has established important ideas of Indian poetics of rasa in the nineth chapter of his book. He has stated unhesitatingly that the description of the beautiful sights of Nature is attractive, but in contact with human sentiments rasa is generated in it.36

Among the direct supporters of rasa siddhānta another important book is Daśarūpaka. The names of the authors of this book are Dhananjaya and his contemporary commentator Dhanika. According to Dhananjaya and Dhanika, the meaning of poetry is sabdārtha determining bhāva-bibhāva etc. Compared with the trend set by Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta, the influence of Lollata, Sankuka and Bhattacharyya is more pronounced and clear. Refuting the doctrine of Dhvanivāda he has recognized rasa to be the fundamental and sole significance of word as form and meaning.37 According to Dhananjaya and Dhanika, rasa does not mean factors of general poetic excellence — rasa implies that ‘delight’ which is produce by sthāyībhāva having been involved with bibhāva etc. Poetry has no other necessity than the spreading of a perception of delight in the responsive hearts. That is why, the work of poetry has to evoke the feelings of delight.38

Another direct Rasavādin of the dhvani age is the eminent scholar Mahimabhatta. While staunchly opposing Dhvanivāda and arguing in favour rasa-attribute of poetry, he has said that where there is poetry there is rasa and reversely, there is no poetry where there is no rasa. So, it appears that his argument regarding rasa is very clear.

According to the chart which has been mentioned earlier, among those who had indirect support towards rasa were the names of two famous
rhetoricians, Anandavardhana and Ksemendra; Though they had propagated dhvani and aucityabicāra separately from rasa, because of their reliance on rasa having been strong, the real meaning of their idea about dhvani and aucitya has, in fact, turned in to rasadhvani and rasa-aucitya. There is a considerable difference of opinion concerning Anandavardhana’s time. Anandavardhana, one of the founders of Indian rhetoric, was present in the reign of the king named Abantibarma of Kashmir in the Ninth Century A.D. (855-84).39 Jacobi, the critic, thinks that dhvanikāra Anandavardhana was a contemporary of the minister of Jayapida, the king of Kashmir and he appeared in the Eighth Century. But in the opinion of Rajasekhara Anandavardhana emerged during the reign of Abantivarma (855-83 A.D).40

In the history of the literature of rhetoric Anandavardhana has authored a brilliant chapter. He is the author of Dhvanyāloka and a believer in the oneness of dhvani. In spite of being an indirect advocate of rasa Anandavardhana accepts poetry to be basically and predominantly suggestive or vyāñjanā pradhāna and despite such acceptance he lays emphasis on rasas among various kinds of ‘suggestions’ or vyāñjana. In the śloka 4.5 of the book Dhvanyāloka he has said that inspite of various forms of bhāva or idea with a certain suggestive quality being possible, the poet should concentrate only on the differentiation of rasa etc.

Besides Anandavardhana another name of the members of aucitya sect is Ksemendra. His view is similar to that of Anandavardhana. During the region of Kashmir-king Ananta in the Eleventh Century,41 the talented rhetorician Ksemendra wrote Aucityavicāra-Carcā, Kavikanṭhāvaraṇa and Kavikarnikā. In Aucityavicāra-Carcā he recognizes aucitya itself as the very life-blood poetry. In his opinion, rasa being all the more enjoyable pervades everyone’s heart by virtue of aucitya.42
Advocates of cohesive approach

In this particular trend śṛṅgāra has been accepted as the supreme and sole rasa Bhojaraja is the acarya of approach. According to him, the poet by his creation of poetical composition which is free from blemish and imbued with guṇa, bedecked with rhetorical elements and nourished with rasa becomes partaker of poetic achievement and admiration. The description of rasas by Bhojaraja proves his attraction towards rasa; the kind of detailed description of every form or part of rasa that we find in Śṛṅgārāprakāśa is to be found nowhere else in Sanskrit poetics. Besides, in all the last twenty five prakāśa there is the description of rasa. And yet Bhojaraja did not hesitate to recognize rasa also in the same way as he did guṇa as alamkāra. In fact, in spite of having followed Bharata and Dandi the influence of Vamana and Anandavardhana on him was also remarkable. From that point of view there is no objection to call him Saṁgrahātmaṇavādin alongside Saṁanvayavādin. His poetical compositions are simultaneously free from blemish, bedecked alamkāra inbued with guṇa and nourished with rasa whose characteristics signs prove and establish him as a poet or acarya of Saṁanvayavāda. According to him, poetic literature or samvandha is of twelve kinds of which first eight inspite of being inevitably present in the totality form of bāṅgamaya in the last four samvandha the sings of the absence of blemish, the elements of guṇa presence of alamkāra and rasabiyogayoga etc. are seen; and all the last four are the characteristics of rasabiyoga.\footnote{Acarya Kuntaka had founded Bakroktī Siddhānta by virtue of his independent thought which was different from the traditional trend in the age of dhvani. In spite of Kuntaka’s clear pronouncement viz: sālaṁkārasya kāvyata, a thorough study of his book Bakroktīvitam clearly shows that Kuntaka’s outlook was different from rasa and his view, though different,
never opposed rasa. Unfortunately the whole book *Bakroktijīvitam* written by Kuntaka is no longer available. It is surmised that he was a contemporary of Abhinavagupta, which means that his period fell in the Tenth or Eleventh Century (950-1025 A.D.)\textsuperscript{44}

Like Bhamaha and Dandi, Kuntaka has not recognized *rasavadalaṁkāra*. *Alaṁkāras* such as *rasabatpreyah* etc. are neither *alāṁkāra* nor *guṇībhūta byāṅga*. These are *alāṁkārya*. Like Anandavardhana he also used to think that *rasa* is never expressed by words.\textsuperscript{45} Following the line of *Rasadhvanivādin* in matters of *rasa* Kuntaka has said, — *rasabat* is not *alāṁkāra* firstly because in it apart from its own reality credence to none other occurs than as *alāṁkārya*; and secondary because of the application of the word *alāṁkāra* with *alāṁkārya rasa* the consistency between word as form and word as meaning is not established.\textsuperscript{46}

However, examining the relation between *rasa* and *bakratā* Kuntaka has said that the vitality of poetry consists in *bakratā* and the wealth of *rasa* is the basic foundation of the abundance of *bakratā*. This is the basic concept what Kuntaka wants to impart.\textsuperscript{47}

Even in the period following that of *dhvani* it was but the important phase of *rasadhvani*. The period from the later half of the eleventh upto the end of Seventeenth Century is marked as the period after the *Dhvani*-era. Among the poets of this period there were poets from Mammata and others to Jagannatha. In this period the predominance of *dhvani* is noticable and the approach of *Dhvanivādins* of this period was almost the same as that of Anandavardhana. The acaryas of this school have considered *rasa* to be dependant on *dhvani* even though they have admitted its dominance. That is, even though they have accepted *rasa* as inevitably desirable from the point of
view of necessity, they have, however, accepted dhvani as the principle of
their own.

The foremost of the acaryas of this school was Mammata, a rhetorician
of the Twelfth Century. Mammata was the son of Jaiyata, an inhabitant of
Kashmir. From the quotation: Bhojanrpatestat tyāgalīlāyitam etc. in
Kāvyaprakāśa it is conjectured that he was a successor of Bhojadeva.48
Mammata has deftly refuted the doctrine of the opponents of Dhvani and has
become famous as Dhvaniprasthāpanaparamācārya. He has established
dhvani siddhānta on a very strong foundation opposing the views of
Mahimabhatta, the learned scholar and others. He has expressed his strong
attachment to rasa in the Maṅgala, śloka and poetic necessity (kāvye
prayojan) in Kāvyaprakāśa composed by him. Mammata has clearly
recognized rasas as alanākāra. According to him49 poetry of rasa, bhāva,
rasābhāsa, bhavāsānti etc. are considered to be different from rasabādādi
alanākāra for being present in poetry as alanākārya. In spite of expressing his
own liking for rasa in Kāvyaprakāśa composed by him in various contexts
viz. – guṇa, alanākāra, doṣa etc. Mammata accords a position to rasa which
is second to dhvani in accordance with his conclusions on rhetoric.
Whatever it may be, despite being a connoisseur of rasa Mammata has
accepted dhvani with absolute sincerity.50

The influence of Mammata is also manifest in another acaryas viz.
Hemacandra. Hemacandra, the Jain acarya of Gurjara was born in 1088
A.D.51 His Kāvyānusāsana is written serially as sūtra and bhūti in eight
chapters. Mammata's influence is also observed on Bidyadhara, a rhetorician
of the Fourteenth Century A.D. In eight chapters of his book Ekāvalī he has
discussed the nature of poetry, etc.
In *Kāvyānusāsana* Hemacandra has discussed or examined almost all those subjects which have been discussed by Mammata. Like Mammata, he has also characterized ānanda (delight) in the enjoyment of *rasa* panisadbhūta. He has shown guṇa, doṣa etc. as the perfection and as sarvaprayojano imperfection of *rasa* and admitted that alaṁkāra is conducive to *rasa*\(^5\). He has described this matter very mindfully in a chapter of his book. On the other hand, he has admitted that *rasa*, *bhāva*, *rasabhāva* etc. are different kinds of byāṅga of effective meaning. Bidyadhara’s *Ekāvalī* is a kind of abridged edition of *Kāvyānusāsana*. There too *rasa* has been recognized through *dhvani*.

The most talented and capable rhetorician of this class was Panditaraja Jagannatha. Panditaraja Jagannatha of the Seventh Century A.D. was the last acarya of this category. Not only this, chronologically he was also the last acarya of Sanskrit poetics. The research that had been going on beginning from Bharata down to Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta concerning the principle which was like the very life of poetry itself and which had been determined in the form of accepted conclusions after a great deal of confrontation of ideas between mutually opposing camps, had attained its peak of development and had been secure on its foundation even before Jagannatha appeared on the scene. Jagannatha’s achievement did not consist in establishing these ideas, but in their interpretation.

Having accepted five differences in *dhvani*, he recognized *rasa* as the soul of *rasadhvani* itself. On most occasions Jagannatha followed Dandi, the ancient rhetorician. Ignoring the view of his predecessors like Mammata, Visvanatha and others, Jagannatha arrived at six kinds of classifications recognizing the differences such as *citrakāvyā*, *śabdacitra*, *arthacitra* etc.\(^5\) He had given his explanation in accordance with the procedure of
Rasavādavedānta of Abhinavagupta and Bhattanayaka. In spite of being a lover of rasa by nature he surpassed even Mammata in matters of dhvani. Mammata had not wholly done away with the predominance of rasa in unequivocal terms, though he made no mention of rasa as one of the characteristic features of poetry and accepted bastudhvani etc. as good poetry; but Jagannatha in this respect had unhesitatingly pronounced that ramanīya artha (i.e. beautiful meaning) was far more widely effective than rasa and within its circumference almost all kinds of poetic excellences appeared to had their place. According to him, ‘It is neither alamkāra, nor dhvani nor rasa – the life of poetry resides in only beauty’: Jagannatha so to say has adopted the modern outlook to poetics for the first time ever. Just as a candle burns more brightly before it goes out so also in the history of Indian poetics – before the curtain falls over it we observe in Jagannatha’s Rasagaṅgādhara the same phenomenon of the candle.

The development of the intellectual and intuitive consciousness and the kind of original analysis captured in the period from Bharatacarya down to Panditaraja Jagannatha of the time of the Mughal emperor Sahjahanah would undoubtedly be accepted as India’s original contribution to the history of world culture. However so far as the history of India rhetoric is concerned, it must be mentioned that not only in Sanskrit language but also in Indo-Aryan Language it had become gradually clear even in the middle ages that the sūtras of Sanskrit rhetoric had a practical aspect. Thus, in India a new trend of rhetoric is found to have emerged in the native language. The main concept of this trend in the middle ages was Bhakti literature. In this context it has been said:
'The basic sustenance of this śāstra of bhaktirasa was not Sanskrit, rather it was the rich and widely pervading poetry of Bhakti composed in modern Indian languages'.

Of these books on the subject of bhaktirasa specially notable ones in Hindi are Sāhityalahari by Suradasa, Rasamāṇjari by Nandadasa Byāsabāṇi of Radhaballava etc., Dhruvadasa's Bayālis Līlā, Siddhānta Dohāvali composed by Nehi Nagaridas etc. The books particularly, note worthy in Bengali are — Bhaktamāla by Krisnadasa Babaji, Caitanyabhāgavata of Brindabanadasa, Śrīśrīcaitanyacaritāmṛta by Krisnadasa Kaviraja, Rasamāṇjari by Pitambara Das etc. Apart from these, reflection of the elaborate practical aspect of bhaktirasa had been observed in languages like Gujrati, Marathi, Tamil, Malayalam etc. It may be mentioned that the onrush of the course of rasa in bhakti poetry of the middle ages which flooded through the Indian languages resulted in securing the undisputed domination of Rasavāda in Indian poetics in the place of the doctrine of Dhvanīvāda or Rasadhvani. However, in spite of such predominance of rasa in Sanskrit literature only Rasadhvani had been particularly recognized. The real credit goes to these bhakta poets of the middle ages for securing Indian literature on the foundation of pure Rasavāda removing the veil of Rasadhvani from over its surface. From 14th–15th Century to 17th–18th Century the curse of madhura bhakti had flowed on with such great force everywhere from North to South, from East to West that the fine layer of the quality of suggestiveness or vyāñjana residing in between poetry and ḫṛdaya rasa fell apart in shreds and disappeared. This is why, it would be agreed to by all, complete entrenchment of rasa siddhānta took place more through the regional literature rather than through Sanskrit.
From this discussion it becomes amply clear that the tradition of Sanskrit rhetoric at a later period, that is, in the middle ages spread out its branches into regional literature and unfolded itself in newer and newer forms. It has to be mentioned here that the Bhakti Movement which had at that time emerged in Bengal centering round Sricaitanya in order to establish bhakti as rasa in it a new sāstra (poetics) or a new approach took shape in Sanskrit owing to the efforts of Srirupa Goswami had also its practical success in manifesting itself in the Padavali literature of Bengal.

The Vast range of Vaisnavite pada literature which was composed in Bengali literature in the middle ages besides Caitanyacarita literature was also born out of this rasa consciousness of the poets. Sricaitanyadeva, or Srirupa Goswami trained and instructed by him and later Krishnadasa Kaviraja—had all developed bhaktirasa, the only rasa of Vaisnavities, in various ways. Following the foot prints of Srirupa Goswami, Krishnadasa Kaviraja had shown that the fundamental rasa was bhaktirasa which was of two kinds viz.- principal bhaktirasa and subordinate bhaktirasa. Principal bhakti is of five kinds viz. śānta, dāsyā, sakhyā, āsūtyā and madhura. Subordinate bhaktirasa, on the other hand are seven which relate to Kṛṣṇa; these are—hāsyā, adbhutā, višā, karunā, raudra, bibhatsa and bhaya. The vast range of padasāhitya of Bengal is basically the poetic expression of the five types of principal bhaktirasa. Leaving aside the Vaiṣṇava literature of Bengal, it can hardly be denied that the Munāla literature of Bengal had also the touches of rasa consciousness. Later on, rasa awareness in Bharatacandra and Śākta Padavali literature, be it under Vaiṣṇava influence or because of proficiency in Sanskrit śāstras, had found a kind of remarkable exposure. It may be said Bharatacandra had been compelled to have recourse to a language mingled with exotic elements with a view to making poetry imbued with rasa,58 or it may be said, securing the place of rasa at the topmost level.
Śākta poets had also displayed their skill at the successful application of rasa in the newer adjustment in the Vaisnavite manner. Like Vaiṣṇava Padavali, the basic subject of Śākta Padavali also was bhaktirasa. But their five principal rasa, were bātsalya, vīra, adbhūt, divya and śānta. Through these five rasas alone all the varieties pada composition by śākta poets can be enjoyed. Padas were fewer on vīra divya and adbhūt, but bātsalya came out as the principal rasa in their poetic compositions. An excerpt may be quoted here in this context, 'The Vaiṣṇava poet sets out from bātsalya to madhura rasa, whereas the Śākta poet begins and ends with bātsalya. Of course, at the end of his journey the Śākta poet, from the point of view of sādhanā or spiritual dedication, takes refuge in śānta rasa'.

In the modern age Michael Madhusudan Dutta engaged himself in the composition of poetry with this pledges before him gāibo mā vīrāse bhāsi mahāgū etc. In his writing the true expression of all the nine rasas of Indian rhetoric starting from srṅgāra etc. was observed. In his efforts to compose literary epic Madhusudana could not deny the influence of the principles of Indian rhetoric inspite of his learning towards Western form. In the composition of the poets who followed Madhusudan a kind of successful application of Indian principles and rasa and dhvani had been noticed. However here we have to mention the name of Bankimchandra, the eminent prose-artist of Bengal. The serious kind of discussion which Bankimchandra had initiated in various contacts in his Bibidha Prabandha and in other writings on literary principles had a place in it for a comparative study of the ancient Indian rhetoric side by side with the methodical literary judgment of modern European literature. In this field he was one of the pioncers; of course, the Bengal Renaissance of the Nineteenth Century had made a special impact.
This marked the history of the gradual evolution of the history of Indian rhetoric and the continuity of its course or heritage in the regional language and its basic contribution.

Now our focus may be shifted on the matter concerning the awareness of our scholars about Indian rhetoric in the perspective of Indian Renaissance. Another special trait of Indian Renaissance which was there with a predilection for looking to the West was to 'turn back to ourselves', that is towards the task of reclaiming our ancient civilization and culture and concentrate on their re-evaluation. It is from this propensity, we have observed a number of great men of learning and intellect in Bengal engaged in the writing of the history of śāstras of Indian rhetoric, doing their translation and making their evaluation. And, along with this, they made fresh attempts at formulating new hypothesis on the basis of Indian rhetorical views concerning literary ideas and principles with a new approach in a new age. The history of this original endeavour of the Nineteenth and the Twentieth Century may be discussed.

As a matter of fact, right from the middle of the 19th Century, development of Indian poetics began to take shape in Indian languages. In this regard, first of all, the achievement of Hindi and Marathi languages must be mentioned. The place of Bengali and Gujarati comes next; and then, credit also goes to Telugu and Kannada languages. The history of modern poetics may be divided mainly into two parts. The first part spread over from the middle of the nineteenth century till the end. During this period the thoughts and deliberations of the scholars foundation of Sanskrit treatises and at times these attempted to establish the inferences (siddhāntas) of Indian poetics in a conventional manner having recourse to the modern Western method of literary judgment. In the second part, the effort to unravel the store house of
the past knowledge as well as to determine its value in new light is observed along with a strong desire towards acquiring and preserving the stock of the knowledge of the past. The main tendencies in the poetics of this age may be classified in the following ways 1) Translation of Sanskrit poetics, 2) determination of the history and the tradition of the ancient *kāvyasiddhānta*, 3) new critical literature on Indian poetics (*kāvyasiddhānta*), its interpretation and re-interpretation and evaluation in the light of Psychology and Sociology etc and 4) new critical literature. In almost all provincial languages, particularly in Bengali this inclination towards rhetorical literature was found to be predominantly present.

Among those who had initiated the discussion of rhetoric in Bengali language at the primary stage the names of Jaygopal Goswami, Lalmohan Bidyanidhi, Sachindranath Mukhopadhyay, Atul Ch. Gupta, Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta are noteworthy.

*Kāvyanirṇaya* a book written by Prof. Lalmohan Bidyanidhi of Sanskrit College of Calcutta is a pioneering work in this field of studies. It was published in 1862 A.D. Another professor of the same college, Prof. Mahamahopadhyay Sitikantha Bachaspati’s. *Alamkārdarpan* has to be mentioned in this context. Though they did not translate any book on Sanskrit poetics, they had took a simple and easy discussion of the basic propositions of Indian poetics taking help from various books. Their outlook everywhere was traditional. Their main objective was more to transform Sanskrit rhetoric into Bengali language rather than to set any trend of original thinking. Thus following the method of interpretation on the basis of the *sūtras* of Sanskrit poetics, they discussed characteristic marks (*lakṣāṇa*) of poetry with example, differentiation of poetry, poetic necessity, the soul of poetry, the power of word, *ṛiti*, *guna*, *alamkāra*, *doṣa* etc. More often they supplied illustrations
from Bengali language itself and on many occasions they tried to show originality in respect of the number of rasas or alaṁkāra with a view to evolving something new. In this context the names of Harioudha, Biharilal Bhatta of Hindi, Sivajipradhan, Balvant Kamalakar Makode, R. Bhagat of Marathi along with Sachindranath Mukhopadhyay and Lalmohan Bidyanidhi of Bengali are noteworthy.

In the field of translation also, the role of Bengal was remarkable. Many in those days made a beginning of rasa consciousness among Bengali readers by translating various treatises of rhetorical Śāstras into the Bengali language though their number was very insignificant.

Among those included in the third category who had made an evaluation of Indian poetics in the light of modern Psychological and Sociological approach were the scholars of Hindi and Marathi language whose success had been foremost; however, the place of Bengali writers was also no less important. In this connection the names which appear ahead of others are those of the great litterateurs Atul Chandra Gupta, the writer of Kāvyajijnāsā, Dr. Surendranath Dasgupta, the former Principal of Sanskrit College and philosopher and author of Kāvyabicār and Sāhityaparicay, the writer of Kāvyalok, Dr. Sudhir Kumar Dasgupta, Dr. Bishnupada Bhattacharya the author of Kāvyakoutuk and Kāvyamīmāṁsā and Sāhityamīmāṁsā and Ramaranjan Mukhopadhyay the author of Rasasamīkṣa.

Besides, the number of those who in their discussion of literary principles attempted to formulate new sūtras keeping Sanskrit rhetoric by their side as well as basing on the same is also not quite small. Though in the writings of Sri Aurobindo, and Brajendranath Seal on the theories and principles of literary art left marks of originality, they wrote in English, But
the invaluable contribution that Rabindranath Thakur and Abanindranath Thakur (Bāgēsvārī Śīlpa Prabandhāvalī) had left in their discussion of the principles of art and literature in Bengali language was mostly influenced indirectly by Indian rhetoric.

In this field the new approach to the studies of literary principles which Nalini Kanta Gupta, the erudite scholar of Oriental and Western literary principles had created deserves mention. In this context it has to be noted that almost all of those who have devoted themselves in the modern age to the studies of aesthetics and have mostly given new direction to such discussion have shown a kind of strange indifference towards the profound inquiry and vision of truth of our ancient Indian acaryas and among them were eminent writers and scholars like Sri Mohitlal Mazumadar, Buddhadeb Basu, Subodh Chandra Sengupta, Sashibhusan Dasgupta, Dvijendralal Nath etc. In fact, from the beginning of Indian culture and civilization deliberations concerning principles of poetry, which had a place in it brought about consummation to this subject being supported later by the Indian rhetoricians. The germination of such reflections on poetry had taken place in the Rgveda itself. That poetry is not the creation or outcome of any individual or personal effort and that it takes shape rather on the support of the creator was first expressed in the Rgveda. In the same way, we observe the expression of this idea in the writing of Vālmīki when he says to byadha, mā niśāda pratiṣṭāṁ etc. — the words of curse which he utters himself and then being wonder-struck asks himself: kimidāṁ byahṛtaṁ mayā that is — “What is it that I have said ?” — With this utterance a fundamental aspect of thoughts concerning the principles governing the creation of poetry seems to take shape. In this manner in the creation of artists and poets, those aspects of thoughts on poetry which had later been captured sporadically and isolatedly at the hands of the Sanskrit theorists turned into a special kind of śāstra which happened to be
India’s basic contribution to the history of world’s art and culture. The work of extra ordinary intellectual power which the Bengali scholastic community had left in the modern age in the cultivation of this śāstra deserves to be noted in particular.

* * *
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