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TRANSLATION OF SANSKRIT POETICS IN BENGALI: HISTORY AND EVALUATION

From the very inception of the advent or composition of literature in the native language, a process, which had begun in the hour of the origination of Neo-Indo-Aryan Language in the 10th century A.D., our litterateurs started on their journey in various ways along the path shown by Indian poetics. So, the influence of Indian rhetoric till the 18th century is quite manifest in the literature of the early and the middle ages. Many have consciously made use of Sanskrit poetics in their poetry, others have done so without being aware of their heritage of Sanskrit poetics. But, as a result of the impact of Renaissance in India in the 19th century and of that of the early indications of consciousness conspicuously noticed in Bengal, great men of intellect directly initiated fresh thinking and discussion of Indian rhetoric. The beginning of intellectual exercise came through the work of translations of Sanskrit poetics.¹

Here, of course, in comparison with other Indian Language, the achievement of Bengali language is remarkable. Though it has already been mentioned that Bengali along with Gujrati occupies a position that comes next to Hindi and Marathi considering whatever has been done in this field by them.

In this context a critic has rightly remarked ‘It is regrettable that, regarding this vast and rich subject of aesthetics or literary pursuit very little curiosity has been observed among the sections of average educated Bengalis
and the men of letters as well. Even to this day the number of books that have been translated from original Sanskrit *Alaṅkāra śāstra* is not uncountable. Accepting this discontent of the writer we must say that almost all of the books of Sanskrit poetics which have so far been translated into Bengali are of a very high standard in respect of translating skill, spontaneity of expression and the style of presentation and depth of lucidity, so, from this point of view, the achievement of the Bengali intellectuals in the translation of Sanskrit *Alaṅkāra* can hardly be dispensed with altogether. Now we attempt to make a critical study on the works of translation of Sanskrit Rhetoric in Bengali language.

In this field of the works of translation, the name of the very first book of Sanskrit aesthetics translated into the Bengali language which must be mentioned is Nandikesvara’s *Abhinayadarpana*. The translator of this work is Ashoknath Sastri. The name of the translated version of the book is *Abhinayadarpana*. The book was first published in 1937 A.D.

At least three different communities on groups representing Ṛtta\(^3\) Ṛtva Nāṭya Nāyika existed in ancient India viz. 1) Nandikesvara community, 2) Bharata community and 3) Kohata Matanga community. On some only of the aṅgābhīnaya of Nandikesvara community has been described briefly in *Abhinayadarpana*. Through Bharacarya has described physical acting or aṅgikābhīnaya as being fit for the lower sort or lesser sort of individuals, yet the authenticity or value of physical acting cannot be altogether other denied. Before the creation of language, men had been expressing their minds through movements of physical organs. Having transformed those primitive expressions of early men into refined and artistic forms, India had shown the way to a new world of rasa. In fact, whether through music or through physical postures, men’s offerings of inner aspirations—even is also an
essential part of poetics. Sri Asoknath Sastri has added a new dimension to Bengali language by his verbatim translation of Nandikesvara’s original *Abhinayadarpana* into Bengali along with an extensive Bengali annotations, an illustrations of 65 pure *mudrās* (artistic form pertaining to body movements etc.). His translation being closely faithful to original its lacks spontaneity and ease at many places. However, meanings and explanations for each and every *śloka* having been added in the annotation part of the book, the short coming of the translations do not really pose any difficulty in the understanding of the meanings of the *ślokas*. Why giving a definition of *sāciḍrṣṭi* as for example, Nandikesvara has written –

\[
\text{svasthāne tiryyagākāramapāṅgabalanaṁ kramāt} \quad \| 70 \| \\
\text{sāciḍrṣṭiritī jñeyā nātyaśāstrabisāradaiḥ} \qquad \| 6 \| – \text{in its translation the author has written} – \text{svasthāne kramāsah tiryyagbhāve āpāṅgabalana} – \text{nātyaśāstravisāradgaṅ-kartṛk sāciḍrṣṭi baliyā bijñāta haiyāche} \quad 70-71 \| 7
\]

The translation of the sort clearly reveals that it is impossible to translate a clear meaning of this *śloka*. But immediately following this translation, Sri Sastri has written a gist (given below) of the entire *śloka* along with the meanings of the terms like *tiryyaka balana svasthāna* etc. – “instead of looking at an object within the range of vision in a simple and easy manner, the act of insinuation (*bakra-katākṣa*) over and above again is called *sāci* which is just the opposite of *samadrṣṭi* (look in a straight way).

At the end of the book the writer has commented, - “unfortunate from Bengal of ours Bharata or Nandikesvara community’s teaching and study of *Nātyaśāstra* had disappeared long before.” The fresh attempt on the part of the translator with a view to bringing about the rebirth of this art in Bengal is really praiseworthy.
One of the originators of Indian Rhetoric, Anandavardhana, lived in the reign of the king of Kashmir, Abanti Varma (855-884 A.D.) in the 9th century A.D. Dhvanyāloka composed by him, and on it of commentary work titled Locana by Abhinavagupta are recognized to be the two best books of Sanskrit rhetoric. Even, it has been remarked, 'As Panini in Sanskrit grammar or Patanjali’s Mahābhāṣya, so also are Dhvanyāloka O Locana in Sanskrit Alamkāra śāstra'. About one hundred and fifty years after Anandavardhana, in the later part of the Tenth century or in the beginning of the Eleventh Abhinavagupta, a pandit of Kashmir, gave the finishing touch to Dhvanivāda by writing the famous commentary Locana on Dhvanivada. Abhinavagupta had named his book on commentary as Sahādaya Locana. Locana together with Dhvanyāloka has been translated by Subodh Chandra Sengupta and Kalipada Bhattacharya. The book was first published in 1951 A.D. Dhvanyāloka divided into four chapters along with Locana. Translated verbatim has found place in this work of translation.

The special terms of Dhvanyāloka viz. lakṣaṇa, abhidhā, vyāñjanā etc. in Bengali language continued to be used since middle ages. Krishnadas Kaviraj has used these in Caitanyacaritāmṛta, in the conversation between Basudev Sarbabhouma and Mahaprabhu as the words of the latter —

\[
mukhyārtha chādi kara gaunārtha kalpanā
\]

\[
abhidhā- vr̥tti chādi śavder kara lakṣaṇā\]

So, the translation Dhvanyāloka as the source-book of these terms in Bengali language and its commentary Locana was absolutely necessary. By translating these two books into the Bengali language, Subadh Chandra Sengupta and Kalipada Bhattacharya have fulfilled a long standing want of
the Bengali’s and have thus opened up a new horizon in the discussion of Sanskrit aesthetics in the Bengali language.

It may be noted that the kind of fault that had crept up in the translation of Sanskrit Rhetoric, namely the lack of spontaneity mainly resulting from an attempt to keep close to the original, was not found in this book *Dhvanyālōka O Locana* under consideration. Here the language is spontaneous and lucid everywhere. The matter may be made clear with the help of an illustration of a complex sloka quoted and translated below:

śaṣau sarefasamyoga dhakāraschāpi bhūyasā
dirodhinam syuh śṛṅgāre tena varṇā varṇā rasacyutah

In translation of this there is—

śa, sa, ref samyoga e-kāra-śṛṅgāre ihāder bahul prayoga rasaparipanthī hay

kāraṇ tāhār dvārā barṇasamūha ras haite bicuyata hay

Another precious aspect of this book is that the references to various principles or aphorisms which are there regarding byakarana mimamsa, nyaya and Buddhist philosophy in this book *Dhvanyālōka O Locana* in order to make these easily comprehensible to readers an elaborate commentary on these terms and aphorisms or proverbs, which has been appended at the end of this book will be considered very valuable by the Bengali readers.

In short, this book has been of immense help in enriching the modern Bengali literary criticism and in unraveling the inner significance of Bengali literature in general.

The personality of Rajasekhara as a playwright, critic and poet—all in one—deserves the special mention. The monotony of convention and the artificiality which had weakened the vitality of the course of Sanskrit
literature in the period following Bhababhuti—exactly in those bad days, the emergence of Rajasekhara, a man of versatile talent, had taken place. From what the great writers have discussed the time when he appeared and the place where he lived can be easily determined. The poet himself has provided a lot of information and description about these matters from which it can be surmised that his life as a litterateur was spread over a period from 880 A.D. to 920 A.D.\textsuperscript{13}

From various authentic books and accounts it is understood that Rajasekhara’s caste or clan identity was Yayabara (i.e. ‘nomad’). In his book \textit{Kāvyamīmāṃsā}, Rajasekhara has referred to himself as \textit{yāyābarīya} or ‘nomadic’.\textsuperscript{14} This nomadic lineage of Rajasekhara was one of famous scholars; Akalajalada, the poet, was his grandfather.\textsuperscript{15} Besides, the great men like Surananda Taral, Kaviraja etc. and the like came of this genealogical heritage. Rajasekhara’s father’s name was Mahamantri Durduka (or Duhika) and his mother’s name was Silavati, Rajasekhara’s wife was Avantisundari, born of the Cauhan stock, was a talented lady. Having been inspired by his mother, Rajasekhara has created in his plays hosts of female characters who were adept in the art of writing poetry.

Rajasekhara has many composition to his credit other than \textit{Kāvyamīmāṃsā} on poetics. In the foreword of his play \textit{Vāla-Rāmayana}, Rajasekhara says that he has composed six books. Other than \textit{Karpūramaṇjarī}, \textit{Viddhasalabhāṅjikā}, \textit{Vāla Rāmāyana} and \textit{Vāla Bhārata} (his last book) he composed another book called \textit{Haravilāśakāvyya} which at present is extinct. Some say that Rajsekhara had written another book called \textit{Kavivimarṣa}.\textsuperscript{16}

The celebrated rhetorician like Bhamaha, Dandi, Rudrata etc. had created the ground of literary criticism centering round Natyacarya Bharata’s
(dramatic art) *Nāṭyaśāstra* with Bharata’s principle of *rasas* – *bibhāvānubhāvabhyabhicārisāmyogād rasanispattih* at the centre various schools of criticism had also developed during that period. *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* is the outcome of the combined endeavour all these. The categorisation of the scientific basis of all these various groups, the methodical classification of the principles of their criticism of poetry, the analysis of their real nature etc. were Rajasekhara’s sole objective. With this purpose in view Rajasekhara had followed the methods of Kautilya in *Arthasastra* and Batsyayana’s in *Kāmasūtra*, especially in the matters of systematic arrangement of subject matters etc. The method of critical judgement of Rajasekhara’s *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* is structured in the pattern of *Dharmamīmāṁsā* and *Brahmamīmāṁsā*. The very title of the work itself bears testimony enough to how their art and style had been followed. In describing the source *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* the author to the shelter of the deity. In an effort to create a supernatural atmosphere in the book he composed in Puranic style an account of the tradition of gurus and the ancient history of the various branches of literatures.¹⁷

Rajasekhara has divided the subject of *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* into eighteen parts and has introduced a scientific method in them. Though, we can say, Rudrata was his predecessor in this matter, he could not demonstrate a more comprehensive and elaborate classification than that of Rajasekhara. Besides, in Rajasekhara’s book of literary criticism Kautilya’s *Arthasastra* and Batsyayana’s, *Kāmasūtra* have also been mentioned.

In fact, by introducing Upanisadic elements in the imitative form of *Arthasastra* and *Kāmasūtra* even in poetics, perhaps it was Rajasekhara’s desire to show to men of little talent and less intellect the way to the attainment of poetic fame through the power of incantation of *mantras* etc.
There is a striking resemblance between the arrangement of the subject-matter of *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* and that of Kautilya and Batsyayana. At the end of the first chapter of each of these books, the contents of the whole book are given. In the same way in *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* also, a brief idea of the subject-matter is given under the heading *Śāstrasamgraha*. But the matter of regret is that in all these eighteen parts, instead of the details of content, only the content of the first chapter has been given under the subtitle *Kavirahasya*.¹⁸

However, *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* not being extant in all the eighteen parts the author's total outlook and planning of this book are impossible to get at. Yet, from what has been found this much can be said that the three chapters of the first part constitute somewhat like a general introduction or preamble to the whole book as it has been planned in eighteen parts.

The grave responsibility of introducing to the Bengali intellectual section this man of versatile genius and specially his *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* was undertaken by Prof. Nagendranath Chakraborty of Visvabharati. In this context Prof. Chakraborty stated that this book which had already been edited and published in Sanskrit, English, German, French etc. was taken up by him for bringing out its edited version in Bengali, as a mark of inspiration for this work by his mentor, the great scholar Sri Bidhusekhar Bhattacharya.

The success of Prof. Nagendranath Chakraborty in the field of translation and discussion of Sanskrit poetics is remarkable. The original text with its translation in Bengali along with an introduction spreading over 136 pages is one of top-ranking achievements in Bengali language.¹⁹ In the Footnote section at the end of each of the chapters of *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*, his translation with special explanatory comments can be the cause of envy for scholars of any language. The book is divided into three parts. In the
introductory part of the book, the author has touched upon several subjects starting from the personal details of Rajasekhara’s life, writings concerning his literary works, his lineage, caste, religious belief, the period of his emergence as a writer, place of birth, his special liking for Kanauj and Panchal etc.; besides, in his discussion he found room to elaborate the special meaning of the word, *Yayabara* while tracing the family history of Rajasekhara. In this same context he has acquainted us in the introduction of the book with Rajasekhara’s literary genius along with the books composed by him.

The literary evaluation of Rajasekhara’s works such as *Vāla Rāmāyana*, *Vāla Bhārata*, *Biddhaśālabhaṇjikā*, *Ṣaṭṭakabicāra* and the play, *Karpūramaṇjari* has been included in this section. In course of writing about the play *Karpūramaṇjari* written in *prakṛta*, a discussion of the special dramatic form called *ṣaṭṭaka* together with a critical evaluation of the literary excellence of this book has found place in this book. While showing the total success of Rajasekhara, the editor has presented to us the basis of the eighth chapter of *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*, an idea of the intellectual excellence of the author and, at the same time, of his subtle knowledge of the various philosophies of India.

In the long introduction of this book detailed discussion of each chapter of *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* along with the general discussion has been included. In fact, evaluation of Sanskrit poetics in this extensive proportion in any book of translation in Bengali language has not come to our notice till now. Not only the translation of *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* but also the deep rooted analysis of this work will ever remain as a matter of pride for any other language. It is like a vast research compendium of *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*. 
Citing one or two examples will make the moot point clear: the subject matter of the first chapter of *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* is *Śāstrasamgrahāh.* On the basis of this chapter he has discussed four subjects elaborately in the introduction; these are –

A. Assessment of consistency and the subject of consideration.

B. The discussion on the course of development of *sastras.*

C. Following the manner and style of interpretation.

D. The totality of outlook of Rajasekhara compared with those of the rhetoricians preceding or succeeding him.

Similarly, in each chapter the editor has presented research oriented discussions extensively on various subjects.

In the introduction of tenth chapter of the book, he has discussed at length the seven aspects on the basis of *kavicārya rājacārya ca* (i.e., the duties of the poet and of the king). Besides these he has thrown light on some extraordinary subjects viz. – the origin of literature as a subject of study; geographical information; historical information; popular stories concerning literature; Rajasekhara’s fondness for *prākṛt* etc.

Apart from this, he has also discussed various other subjects in this book, such as- ‘Poetical quotations in *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* and some views’, ‘Elements helping the composition of *Kāvyamīmāṃsā,* and the later masters’, *The Ideal of Rajasekhara* etc. In the context of discussing the elements helpful to the composition of *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* the author has referred to some sources of this book and this undoubtedly carries the mark of Sri Chakraborty’s erudition as an editor. In the discussion of Sanskrit poetics in Bengali language the book *Rājaśekhara O Kāvyamīmāṃsā* deserves the highest position in respect of achievement. Even when doing merely word for
word translation of the original text, the author has frequently added long explanatory notes in the foot-note. In these foot-notes he has also presented a comparative study on the subject of *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* side by side with those described by other rhetoricians. At times he has also provided elaborate explanations of special terminological expressions in this book. After having done the work of translation, the editor has put in considerable efforts to satisfy all the curiosities in the minds of his readers. The appendix given at the end of the book is also remarkable. Appendix - 1 contains – (A) The list of the names of writers and other persons mentioned in *Kāvyamīmāṃsā*, (B) The list of the names of the books mentioned in *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* and the terminological expressions used in it. Appendix – 2 gives (A) the list of names of trees, plants, fruits, flowers etc, referred to in *Kāvyamīmāṃsā*, (B) list of biological aspects of birds, animals etc., appendix – 3 includes the description of the books used in *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* and preparation of the foot-notes, and this will surely go a long way in satisfying the curious Bengali readers for all times to come. We have no doubt whatsoever that this book, not merely as a translation of *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* but also as a source of subtle and wide knowledge on the subject of Indian poetics, will continue for ever to be appreciated in the Bengali language.

A great deal of controversy exists regarding the period of Mahimabhatta’s appearance. The summary of Mahimabhatta’s view having been described in *Alamkāra sarvasva*, it may be argued that he belonged to a period before twelfth century. He is also considered to belong to a period later than even tenth century because of his quotations taken from Rajasekhara’s *Vāla-Rāmāyana* and his criticism of Kuntaka’s *Bakroktijīvita*. Mahimabhatta has been criticized in Mammata’s *Kāvyaprakāśa* which indicates that Mahimabhatta emerged in the period between 1020 to 1060 A.D. In the first half of the twelfth century Ruyyaka composed his commentary on
Mahimabhatta's *Vyaktiviveka*; so it can be easily surmised that Mahimabhatta was present during the period between Abhinavagupta and Ruyyaka.\(^20\)

This book *Vyaktiviveka* composed by Mahimabhatta was discovered in the library of Trivankuaraja, and Mahamohopadhyay Pandit Ganapati Sastri published this book.

Mahimabhatta had a vast knowledge of Buddhist *nyaya* and philosophy. Like Bhattanayaka, he also did not recognize *vyāñjanābṛtti*. In this context he has refuted the views of Anandavardhana and Abhinava Gupta. He was a master words, a debater and a philosopher all at the same time. Later, a commentary on this book *Vyaktiviveka* of Mahimabhatta was composed by the great man of genius Ruyyaka.\(^21\)

The name of Bishnuapada Bhattacharya is note-worthy as the translator and interpreter in Bengali language of Mahimabhatta's *Vyaktiviveka* written in Sanskrit Here we shall discuss the book *The Vyaktiviveka of Rajanaka Sri Mahimabhatta* (part-I) by Bishnuapada Bhattacharya. The first part of the original book has been published in translated version along with its elaborate interpretation and comments.\(^22\) The subject-matter of this first part again has been published in two volumes. The eminent scholar Dr. Satkari Mukhopadhyay has enhanced the value of this book by writing intellectually rich introduction presenting Mahimabhatta and the historical role of his point of view. We become acquainted with the achievement of the versatile literary and philosophical talent of Mr. Bhattacharya from this composition of his in the form of a presentation executed in a fully philosophical method. Here he has put forward his own views along with the Bengali translations of each and every aphorism.

Mention may be made that the ancient commentary *Candrikā* of Anandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka* had already gone out of existence.
Abhinavagupta had refuted many of his conclusions of Candrika in his Locanaīkā. Bhattanayaka had refuted the conclusions of Dhvanyāloka before Abhinavagupta. Even before that Jayanta Bhatta of Kashmir attempted to prove the insufficiency of Dhvanyāloka. Mahimabhatta was one of those who represented the trend opposed to Dhvanyāloka. He did not accept laksanā and vyāñjanā as established by Anandavardhana, and also refuted Dhvanivāda with great skill and reason. Bishnupada Bhattacharya had translated the original ṭālokas of Mahimabhatta's book along with the prose versions, and everywhere an elaborate statement was added to it. Bishnupada Bhattacharya who was an extraordinary scholar of Sanskrit language mentioned various views of Sanskrit rhetoric in the context of discussion and presented his views on the basis of comparative studies. This philosophical discussion of Mahimabhatta was presented by Bishnupada Bhattacharya from a philosophical angle too. Consequently, what is rather difficult to comprehend in the discussion of Mahimabhatta has appeared as easily understandable and lucid in Bengali language by virtue of the writer's skill. Here he had taken help from various books of rhetoric along with their more or less famous commentaries. Bengali language would have suffered a great deficiency, had this book not been published.

Of course, it may also be mentioned here that the kind of defect that has been observed almost everywhere in the translation of Sanskrit treatises on rhetoric, that is the lack of spontaneity of language which the book of Bishnupada Bhattacharya too is not free from. His language too, at many places, has not been and spontaneous and often it also becomes difficult to understand the meaning of his sentences. For example-

a) ekmātra anukārner kṣetrā chāḍā śabder kothāu upasarjanikṛtārthatva sambhab nay
As a result of which this book is likely to remain one to be appreciated by a selected group of scholars of a special category.

Among the Indian writers of poetics the name of Vamana is particularly noteworthy. In the history of Sanskrit literature we come to know of three Vamanas. (1) Reference to Vamana, the minister of Kashmir king Jayapida, is found in *Rājatarangini*; (2) then, there is Vamana the co-author of *Kāśīkā* and (3) finally, we know of Vamanacarya who was the author of *Kāvyālaṁkārasūtraḥṛtyti*. It can be conjectured that Vamana was probably the minister of Jayapida, the king of Kashmir, because Kahlana mentioned a name of one Vamana who was the minister of the aforesaid king as referred to in his book *Rājatarangini*.23 But, in spite of the resemblance between the collaborating author Vamana of *Kāśīkā* and Vamana, the author of *Kāvyālaṁkārasūtraḥṛtyti*. Relating to their views on grammatical matters a time gap of almost 200 years seems to separate them so much so that they are thought to be different persons altogether.24

However, the period in which Vamana appeared is about 750 A.D. or the first half of the Eight\textsuperscript{th} century A.D. He wrote the *ḥṛttyis* of *sūtras* or the principles of poetics in order to elucidate their *ḥṛttyis* (meaning). In the history of Sanskrit poetics he has been the first to investigate into the soul of poetry in its body consisting of words both as *savya* and *artha*. He has established the principle of diction by determining *ṛiti* or diction as the soul of poetry. Vamana has said – *kāvyam grāhyamalaṁkārāt* - which indicates that c ‘poetry is pleasing because of *alaṁkāra*'; by this word *alaṁkāra* here he has
also meant all those attributes which denote the beauty of poetry, guṇas, rāti or diction, alaṃkāra etc., all beautifying elements of poetry.

In the books of Sanskrit poetics three kinds of rules or conventions have been in vogue relating to the presentation of the subject matter of a book. These are – (1) padya śailī or verse style, (2) sūtrabṛttī śailī or the style of presenting sūtras and bṛttis (meaning) and (3) kārikā bṛttī śailī or kārikā-bṛttis style. Acarya Vamana has followed the second or the sūtra bṛttī style. Through this sūtrabṛttī style Vamana has presented the subject which he wants to propound in his book, Kāvyālāṃkārasūtrabṛttī. In this book he has followed the style adopted in Kautilyas’s Arthaśāstra and Batsayana’s Kāmasūtra which are composed in the form of sutras, and has also planned the division of his work Kāvyālāṃkārasūtrabṛttī in accordance with the division followed in the above mentioned books. Accordingly, Acarya Vamana has divided his book Kāvyālāṃkārasūtrabṛttī into five parts or adhikaraṇas and then first and third adhikaraṇas into three chapters each and the remaining parts into two chapters each.

The five parts into which this book has been divided are śārīra, doṣadarśana, guṇavivecana, alaṃkārikā and prāyogika respectively. The first part is divided into three chapters in which the beauty of poetry, the body of poetry, the necessity of poetry, the question of eligibility for the study of poetics, the soul of poetry, rāti or diction, differences of rāti or diction etc. have been discussed. In the two chapters of the second part the word, the sentence and the blemishes in the meaning of sentence are discussed.

The two chapters of the third part include the discussion of guṇas and the mark of alaṃkāra, the difference between them, the ten guṇas each clarifying word (śabdah) and sense (artha).
In the three chapters of the fourth part there is the discussion of yamaka, anuprāsa, upamā, six blemishes of upamā, other upamā centric rhetorical figures etc. and in the two chapters of the fifth adhikaraṇā called prāyogika kāvyasamaya and śābdasuddhi have been discussed. The subject matter of the second chapter of this fifth part has resemblances with the subject described by Acarya Bhamaha in the sixth chapter of his book Kāvyālaṁkāra.25

Vamana had also composed the bṛttis of his sutras or principles of his poetics, and this he had also clearly mentioned in the maṅgala śloka at the beginning of the bṛtti which was named Kāvipriya.

This book written in Sanskrit has been translated into different provincial languages. One of the translators of these is Dr. Anil Chandra Basu, the principal of Ranaghat Collage, Kolkata. He has translated this book into Bengali.26 In the book translated by him, starting from an introduction of Acarya Vamana and his time, Dr. Basu has discussed the method of composition of the original work, the bṛtti called Kāvipriyā, the commentary on Sri Gopendratripurahara and Kāmadhenuḥ, the five adhikaraṇas or parts of the original book and their chapters etc. Though in the introduction of the book the five parts of the book have been mentioned, Dr. Basu, however, has translated only three chapters of the first part and the two chapters of the third part in its translated portion. He has not translated the second, fourth and fifth parts of the book.

Dr. Basu has done verbatim translation not only of the sutras but also of each of the bṛttis. But it is noteworthy that unlike other translators of Bengal or Bengali translators he has not translated each bṛtti into Bengali alone but also into English side by side with Bengali version. This can be
made clear by citing one or two examples: the fourth *sutra* of the second chapter of the first part is – *sūtra*: *na sāstramadravyeṣṛtha va* - 11 4 11

*bṛti*: *na khalu sāstramadravyeṣyavivekāṣṭhavat* - 11 4 11

English Translation

‘If this can be so, then the *śāstras* or science will not accord favour everywhere. Who thinks so? It is said the knowledge of the *śāstras* is indeed, futile in the case of unworthy recipients who are lacking in the power of discrimination.’

Here it is to be noted that though Dr. Basu has done verbatim translation of the *sūtra* and the *bṛti* in Bengali, he has not, however, done so with regard to English; rather, here he has elaborated a general one in English stressing mainly on its central meaning.

In the same way we can cite another such example of a *bṛti* along with *sūtra* when Dr. Basu has played the role of both an adept or successful translator as well as that of a commentator: in No. 6 *sūtra* and *bṛti* of the second chapter of first part we find in the translation –

*sūtra* – *rītrātmā kāvyasya*. - 11 6 11

*bṛti* – *rītrnāmeṣātmā kāvyasya*.

*sarīrasyeva vākyaseṣaḥ* - 11 6 11

Here it has been mentioned in continuation of the earlier context –

‘After determining the required qualification to the study of poetic it is being said regarding *rīti* or diction – (Quote in Bengali Translation of *sūtra*: *rīti* prediction is the soul of poetry.
Translation of *bṛttī*: *ṛiti* or diction of soul of poetry. ‘Like śārīra or body’ – this is the remaining part of the sentence. That means, like the body’s soul, *ṛiti* or diction is the soul of poetry.

Quote: English Translation – Having ascertained the persons qualified for the study of the Science of Poetics Vamana here lays down in clear terms that: –

*ṛiti* or diction is the sole of poetry. Like the soul in a body the *ṛiti* or diction according to Vamana, is the essence of *kāvyā* or poetry.  

Here however, Dr. Basu, the translator, did not stop after translating only the *sūtra* No. 6 or the *bṛttī* in Bengali, and with their English translation he has also provided notes in English side by side with his translation. For instance – notes (a) Acarya Vamana is the first writer on poetics who goes in for the search of the soul of poetry. …………….. what is called the soul of poetry is something quite different (*Sāhityadarpana*, first chapter).

Notes (b) Acarya Vamana says that the word *kavya* applies to word (*śabda*) and sense (*artha*) endowed with *guna*s…………..*ṛiti* or diction.  

Mention of many books of commentaries are found on the book, *Kāvyālanikārasūtrabṛttī* written by Vamanacarya. Notable among the commentators of these are Mahesvara (*Sāhityasarvasva*) and Srigopendratripurahara (*Kāmadhenuḥ*). Apart from these, the work of a commentator named Sahadeva has remained untraced even to this day.

In each sutrabṛttī of his translation Dr. Basu has mentioned the name of the commentary *Kāmadhenu* by the commentator Srigopendratripurahara. Not only this but also in the introduction of his book running to the full length of 33 pages the translator has very skillfully and aptly described, on the basis of comparative studies, the singularly special position of Vamana in the history of Indian poetics. In fact, the world of
Vamana, one of the creators of the concept of riti or diction would have remained unknown to us had it not been translated into Bengali. Of course, the chapters fourth and fifth titled Alāmkarīkā and Prāyogika respectively have been left out of Kāvyālāṃkārasūtrabhṛti of the translation, yet, so far as familiarising the writers of Sanskrit poetics and their achievements are concerned, the contribution of Dr. Anil Kumar Basu is surely undeniable.

Visvanatha Kaviraja, the author of Sāhityadarpaṇa was a great scholar, philosopher and poet, all in one. Opinions differ widely regarding his appearance on the literary scene. However, it is a proven fact that he was a native of Orissa. From the adjectival word describing Visvanatha as mahāsandhibigraphika it is conjectured that he was a Brahmin by caste and for status a prime minister. He received the title of honour, Kaviraja, on account of the impact of the manifestation of his extraordinary poetic talent at the Royal court of Orissa. It is known from another source that he was one of the important ministers in the court of Gajapati Nisamka, Bhanudeva, the erstwhile king of Orissa. A great poet and learned person of that time, Candrasekhara, was the father of Kaviraja. So far his religion was concerned, he was a vaisnavite. The differences of opinions prevalent among the learned scholars regarding the era of Visvanatha are as follow:- According to Susil Kumar De, the emergence of Visvanatha dates back to the first half of the 14th century (i.e. approximately during 1300-1350 A.D.) And again, according to the views of some others, Visvanatha Kaviraja appeared in the first half of the 15th century, which means exactly one hundred years later than the period which has been mentioned by Dr. Susil Kumar De. Another important fact to be noted in this context is that Visvanatha Kaviraja was the Sandhibigraphika of Narasimhadeva II. Accordingly, Visvanatha’s time should have been recorded presumably around 1306 A.D.
Apart from *Sāhityadarpaṇa* Visvanatha authored many other treatises. These are – 1. *Rāghava vilasa* 2. *Kuvalayasvacarita* (in *prākrit*) 3. *Prabhāvatī-parinaya* (Nāṭīka) 4. *Candrakalā* (Nāṭīka) 5. *Prasāstrīnāvalī* (a kārambhaka in sixteen languages); other than these Visvanatha had written two other books after *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, one of them was *Narasiniha – Vijaya* and the other was an expository statement on his book *Kāvyaparakāśa*. He was proficient in eighteen languages and this earned him the enolgy of being called *aṣṭādāśa – bhāṣabāravilāsinībhūjaṅga*. *

*Sāhityadarpaṇa* composed by Visvanatha is one of the most authentic works of Indian rhetorics. A comprehensive discussion on all subjects covering the nature of poetry, the power of the word (*śavdasākti*) the use of sound in accordance with the principle of *rasa* (*rasadhvani*), suggestiveness, the nature of the drama, poetic blemish, poetic virtues, poetic method/process (*ṛiti*), rhetorics (*alāṅkāra*) etc. is included in the subject matter of *Sāhityadarpaṇa*. Though not of a very high order, the literary analysis of *Sāhityadarpaṇa* is, however, comprehensive and this is the reason why it is possible for us to have an approximate glimpse into the nature of Sanskrit literature and specially its method of analysis from this book. Possibly because of this *Sāhityadarpaṇa* next to *Kāvyaparakāśa* is so close to the heart of those who truly love Sanskrit literature.

Amongst the authorities preceding him Visvanatha had followed Mammatabhatta’s *Kāvyaparakāśa* and *Daśārūpaka* of Dhananjaya. In fact, *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, excluding the sixth chapter in it, can be considered to be just a simple version of *Kāvyaparakāśa*; Nevertheless, it is also true that in respect of merit *Sāhityadarpaṇa* stands decidedly ahead of *Kāvyaparakāśa*.

*Sāhityadarpaṇa* consist of the discussions on poetic blemishes, poetic merits/(virtues), literary principles and rhetorics are in the chapters seventh,
eighth, Ninth and tenth chapters respectively. Whatever may be the
distinctive quality or characteristic of the analytical approach of this
discussion, it has but accepted the views of Dhvanivādis in principle.42
Discussion on literary principles or poetics on the whole, including the
principles of the drama (dramatic principles) <dramaturgy> is one of the most
important merits of Visvanatha’s works. Here too the success of Visvanatha
lies not in presenting new and original ideas but in the method of putting them
in order.43 So far as the discussion of drama in his Sāhityadarpaṇa, is
concerned, Visvanatha anchored himself on Bharata’s Nātyasūtra which was
the source-book on the subject, and included the latter’s main principles in his
own book.44 Subtle observation and judgment reveals the fact that as a
rhetorician Visvanatha’s approach falls within Bharata’s principles of rasa
which, however, he interprets scientifically and he himself becomes
instrumental in bringing about fullness to the principles of rasa. Apart from
this, everyone of his successors such, as Mammata, Visvanatha, Ruyyaka,
Jagannatha & others has mainly followed Dhvanyūloka and has failed to
contribute anything new to poetics or rhetorics.45 The author of
Sāhityadarpaṇa recognized only rasadhvani instead vāstu and
alamkāradhvani. That vāstu and alamkāra turn into rasa alone – this remark
of Abhinavaguptapada was not accepted by Visvanatha in the proper
manner.46 The same kind of lack of discrimination he had shown in the
criticism of Mammata’s definition of literature. Though Mammata did not
mention rasa in his definition, yet in his discussion of poetic blemishes,
literary virtues, rhetorics etc., he made it amply clear that rasas constitute the
ultimate aim of literary art.47

In his work, Sāhityadarpaṇa, Visvanatha called himself
Dhvaniprasthānaparamācāryya.48 Therefore, it was admitted indirectly by
himself that he was a Dhvanivāda. Now, let us see how the author of
Sāhityadarpana has analysed the chapters in his book. In all there are ten chapters in it. Having dismissed the views of his adversaries in the first chapter of Sāhityadarpana the author went on to point out the distinguishing characteristic of poetry as being vākyamṛśātmakam kāvyam. In the second chapter there is discussion on the real nature of the word, abhidhā, lakṣaṇa, vyañjanā etc. The third chapter is Rasabhāvādinirūpana, Nāma Trīya Paricchedah. Here we find the discussion on the concepts of the nature of rasa, the manner of the turning of vibhāva into rasa, the basis of rasa etc. In the second, fourth and fifth, the topics of discussion are- 1. śāvārther vācya, lakṣya & vyaṅgabheda, 2. Various classifications of lakṣaṇa & vyañja, 3. dhvani & guṇībhūta vyaṅga respectively; then after classifying poetry into two categories mentioned in no. 3. above, the author engaged himself in the task of various other classifications of poetry and of the foundation of vyañjanaṇavṛtti pratiṣṭhā etc. But, what so ever dexterous display of analytical intellect might have been there, the author did not really succeed in adding anything new to the basic concepts pertaining to literary principles. Whatever might have been his method of analysis, he however, accepted the views of the rhetoricians (Dhvanivādi) in the matters relating to literary principles.

In the sixth chapter, the author has presented, with illustrations, the descriptions of dramatic art (nātyālamkāra), metaphor, uparūpaka, epics, narrative and lyric poetry etc. In the seventh, eighth and nineth chapters respectively the author has taken up the task of the determination of ‘poetic blemishes’, poetic virtues and method (ṛiti). He has recognized four poetic methods, viz. Vaidarbhi Gaudi, Pancali & Lati. Visvanatha accepts three poetic virtues, viz mādhurya, ojaḥ and prasāda. According to him it is not necessary to recognise the virtue of content/meaning separately. In the tenth chapter he goes on to the discussion on the question of the importance of
forms (śāvṛdālaṁkāra) and content (arthālāṁkāra). In the determination of rasa Dr. S.N. Dasgupta has observed a remarkable difference between Abhinavagupta and Visvanatha. On this Dr. Dasgupta has said in Kavyavicāra, ‘One of the main differences between Visvanatha and his predecessors is that the latter i.e. Abhinavagupta, Mammata etc. have tried to present only psychological interpretation of rasa, but has not attempted to give any kind of metaphysical explanation.’

The distinctive characteristic of Sāhityadarpana lies in its completeness and in its method of analysis of the dramatic art, which are quite rare traits in other works of rhetorics. It may be mentioned here that starting from Srirupa Goswami, the exponents of the poetics of rasa of the vaisnavite school, to the Bengalee scholars of modern times have all accepted no other works of Sanskrit poetics as wholeheartedly as they have done with regard to this treatise. In this context, it will be interesting to take note of what Prof. P.V. Kane said. Prof. Kane comments in a somewhat lighter vein that this book gets wider appreciation in Bengal rather than in any other province of India. Trying to explain why the thoughtful and appreciative scholars of Bengal like this book so much, a non Bengali scholar writes: The Sahityadarpana is really superior to the Kāvyaprakāśa because of its treatment of the science of rhetoric in all its branches, its systematic exposition of topics its clear and precise definitions and its easy and flowing style.’

Dr. Bimalakanta Mukhopadhyay is one of the important translators of this book. In this translation of Dr. Bimalakanta the commentary of Sāhityadarpana by Sri Ram Chandra Tarkavagisa has been well-appreciated by the scholars. This work of Bimalakanta in the seventies of the 20th century is an important contribution to Bengal’s repertoire of knowledge. The
extension of this large and difficult work in Bengali language has been the outcome of the very hard work spread over a period of two years. Bimalakanta Mukhopadhyay has established the intimate relation of the Bengalees with this book upon a strong foundation by bringing out his translation of this work. It may be mentioned here that Dr. Bimalakanta Mukhopadhyay has left behind enough evidence of his success in this work of translation which has been rendered in such spontaneously lucid Bengali language that even those whose knowledge of Sanskrit is no more than the average would not be deprived of the savour of the original work. The success here is entirely the author’s own.

While discussing Dr Bimalakanta’s work of translation we observe the fact that in the course of doing verbatim translation the author has followed the original work meticulously as well as faithfully. As a result, his translated version of Sāhityadarpana has also ten chapters just as the original book comprises. He has also added sub-titles separately to each of the ten chapters. These are respectively -

1. kāvyasvarūpanirūpana
2. kāvyasvarūpa nirūpana
3. rasādinirūpana
4. kāvyabhedanirūpana
5. vyāñjanāvyapāranirūpana
6. dṛśyāśāvānyakāvyanirūpana
7. doṣanirūpana
8. guṇa-vivecana
9. rītvivecana
10. alamkāranirūpana
But the fact to be noted here is that though Visvanatha has divided the content of his *Sāhityadarpana* into ten separate chapters, he has, however, given no separate titles to them; only the first chapter of his book has been titled as *Avatāranikā* (Foreword). Dr Bimalakanta, on the other hand, has given title to each chapter in accordance with the subject matter it contains and thus he has left his mark of originality as a translator.

This book enriched by the discussion of various concepts arranged in accordance with a logical method abounding in terminological expressions and sentences, was itself a very difficult one and not at all easy to translate; yet having studied all the earlier translations including even the version alongside the books of commentaries with profound devotion, Dr. Mukhopadhyay had been able to achieve remarkable success in presenting a lucid translation of the book in Bengali.

The translation of this book is quite easy to understand and thoroughly faithful to its original. In this context of Bimalakanta’s success as a translator, a particular comment of a critic is noteworthy: ‘Dr. Bimalakanta is an adept and accomplished writer of the Bengali language and it is quite needless on my part to say anything more regarding this matter. However, having looked into his translation I felt great joy and wonder at the same time. In it the subject matter of the difficult book has been expressed in clear and lucid language. People whose knowledge of the Sanskrit language is but moderate will also be able to understand and appreciate the meaning of the compositions of the entire original with the help of this translation with least or no effort at all. To succeed in expressing the content of a classic without impairing the beauty of language is the real mark of literary prowess.’

Dr. Bimalakanta has given enough evidence of his competence in his translation. He has translated the book in such spontaneous Bengali that its
clarity and simplicity will surely help even those who have no more than a moderate knowledge of the Sanskrit language and they will not be deprived of the flavour of the original work. In this context, a critic has commented in the ‘Foreword’ of the book – “We are indeed very grateful to Prof. Bimalakanta Mukherjee for making this great work available in a very fine edition where the Sanskrit text with commentary and Bengali translation is very well done, and it reads well, and both specialists and ordinary persons interested in the subject will find it useful and helpful. It would be a convenient volume to dip into for easy reading and full understanding at the same time.”

Proofs strewn all over his work demonstrate clearly that Dr. Bimalakanta Mukhopadhyay has done a verbatim translation of the original book. Besides, that his work of translation is both simple and easily understandable at the same time will be adequately established by a few examples given below –

1st Chapter

prathama paricchedah

avataranikā

(Ga) ‘asya granthasya kāvyāṅgatayā kāvyaphalair ava phalatvamiti kāvyaphalānyāh.

i.e. ‘This book is a part of poetry, so its outcome is determined by that of poetry; Therefore the outcome of poetry is stated severally.’

Trtiya pariccheda

(n) sa ca pūrvarāgamāṇa-pravāsakarunātmakasya turdhā syāt || (185)

It is of four categories, viz., pūrvarāgatmaka, mānātmaka, pravāsātmaka and karunātmaka.
1. *tattvajñānāpādirgyādornirvedah svāvamānanam* (3/143) i.e., ‘The loss of self-respect as a result of *tattvajñāna*, *āpada*, *īrqā* etc. is but ignorance. (*nirveda*)

2. *uttarottaramukkarṣo vastunāḥ sāra ucyate.* (10/78) i.e. ‘More and more refinement of matter make *sāra* alamkāra.

3. *visarpo yat samāravdhaim karmāniṣṭaphalapradam yathā, venyām — ekasyaiva vipākohayam etc.* (2/204)

i.e. “The harmful effects of work begun is called ‘*visarpa*’. For example, the consequence of a single action as in *Venisamhāra* etc.”

In fact, the book which not only has been serving so long as a link of intellectual awareness between Bengal and Orissa but also demonstrated the consummation of the studies of the principles of *rasa* by co-ordinating the various schools of Sanskrit poetics, has been fortunately translated by Dr. Bimalakanta Mukhopadhyay, and thus the heritage of the course of that tradition has been implanted at the very root of Bengali culture. Looked at from this angle, his work of translation has got a historical significance.

Bharata’s *Nāṭyaśāstra* is one of the memorable books of ancient India. It is the only authentic and dependable book not only on drama but also on the art of acting, dance, music and rhetoric. Besides, this work was also the basic source of all the various books written on rhetoric in the later periods after Bharata. By translating this book into lucid modern Bengali Dr. Suresh Chandra Bandopadhyay and Dr. Chhanda Chakraborty made the entire Bengali community indebted to them. Their translation bearing the title *Bharata Nāṭyaśāstra* was published in four parts successively in 1980, 1982, 1982 and 1995. It may be mentioned here that though Bharata’s *Nāṭyaśāstra* had already been translated into various languages and, moreover, its
translation and evaluation was also done by foreign scholars, yet in Bengali
this was the first ever translation of this book. We have already pointed out
that the language of this book of translation is modern Bengali and
spontaneous in character. For example:

\[
kintvalpasūtragūḍhārthamanumānaprasādhakam
\]
\[
nāṭyasyasya prabakṣyāmi rasa bhābādisamgraham \]

60

to translate this sloka the translator has written, kintu eai natyer (Nāṭyasāstra)
alpaśutra hetu gūḍhārthhayukta o anumāner sahāyak rasa, bhāva prabhṛṭir
samgraha sambandhe balba.61

However, examples may also be cited to show how on many occasions
this language has turned laboured and also failed to be easily comprehensible
to general readers. Often in course of reading this book it may seem to the
general reader that along with the translation some discussion by way of
explaining certain difficult terms was necessary. For instance, explaining the
characteristics of āryāchanda Bharatacarya wrote.:

\[
ayujah sarbagurabo gurumadhyāgaṇaḥ yujah |
\]
\[
Yasyāṣyuh pādayoge tu bijñeyā capalā hi sā. ||
\]

The meaning of this portion is, tār nām capalā yār ayugma gane hay
sakal aksar guru ebam yugmapāde hay gurumadhyagaṇa

Here, if the explanations of the terms ayugmagana, gurumadhyagaṇa
had been adden, the book would have been more pleasurable to go through.
However, at many places the translators appended notes on some particular
words, For example, in the interpretation of the word sakar following 3/53 of
Sāhityadarpāṇa they had written mattata, murkhata, abhimān o alaṅkāra
samppanna, doṣkulajāta, aśvāryavān, aparinītā, lokabhogyā, ramaṇīr bhrātā,
rājār, śyālak | Miles and Glorius of the Greek play. However, as the translators, were fully aware of the lack of clear explanation of the subject. So at the end of each part, speaking about this deficiency they said: ‘If one goes to discuss Nāṭyasāstra the demands for a clear explanation of the subject-matter is sure to arise’. So, in the Appendices of Vols. I, II and III they have added the reprints of some valuable articles on Nāṭyasāstra written by different scholars, which they had collected from various journals. In the Appendix of Vol – IV the translators presented a discussion on the subject of rasatattva which is valuable and rich in information. In the Appendices – II and III of the same volume the subjects mentioned in Nāṭyasāstra which had been referred to in the writings of Nandikesvara (Abhinayadarpaṇa) Dhananjaya (Daśarūpaka), Srirupa Goswami (Nāṭaka Candrikā), Sagarnandi (Nāṭakalakṣaṇa Ratnakoṣa), Ramacandra Gunacandra (Nāṭyadarpaṇa), Saradatanay (Bhāvaprabhāṣa), Singabhupal (Rasarṇavasudhākara), Sarangadeva (Saṅgītaratnākara) were also duly located. As a result, the translators succeeded showing a way to undertake research concerning how these subjects and terms were used, in what books with what senses etc.

Panditaraja Jagannatha is positioned at the last stage of the development of Indian rhetorics, which moved forward on its way to consummation depending on the various more or less familiar courses of its tributaries and streams as well as commentaries. Historians have identified the period from 1628 to 1657 to be the era of Shahjahan. Jagannatha was the contemporary of Shahjahan and Darasiko. His place was recorded in the middle of the 17th century. In his work Jagadābharan Kāvya Jagannatha had enlogized Darasikoh.

In rhetorical literature Panditaraja stands bright in his own distinctive characteristic. He was born in the Benginadu family of Tailanga settlement of
Baranasi (Benares). He acquired his knowledge of the ancient texts from his father Peribhatta and from Jhanendrabhiksu. He had referred to his father as *Mahāguru* (The Great Teacher). His mother’s name was Laxmi. This information imparted in the opening of his book *Rasagangādhara*.

 srīmājñānendrabhikṣoradhigata sakalabrahmavidyāprapañcaḥ

 kāṇādirakṣapādīḍrapi gahanagiro yo mahendrađavedī
dillivallabhapanipallavatale nitam navināṁ vayah

 sampratyujjhitamāmsam madhupurimadhhye hariaḥ sevate

 Shahjahan, the Badshah of Delhi appointed him tutor of Darasiko. The first part of his youth was spent in Delhi; later, he lived in the city of Mathura. In *Bhāminīvilāsa* he himself let us know –

 Jagadāvarana and possibly Āsafavilāsa at the demise of Asaf Khan, the courtier of Darasiko. From his writings it is known that he was in love with a Muslim lady: *yavani ramañī bipadahśamanī* (*the Muslim woman, the sumous of danger*). The story goes that as a result of being involved in love with this Muslim lady both committed suicide by drowning in the Ganga. Rajasekhara had written a chapter in his book on the subject of misappropriation (plagiarism) of words and meanings from others’ books. Lest others should have misappropriated his own poetry, Jagannatha, therefore, for fear of such eventuality expressed the determination to publish his own collection of poetry.
Apart from his *Rasagaṅgādhara* Jagannatha has composed other books also. These are – *Gāṅgālāhari* *Sudhālahari*, *Lakṣmīlahari* *Anūṭa-Lahari* Rūpa Karuṇālahari, *Yamunā Varṇana-campū*, *Vasumati Parināya*, *Rati Manmatha Nāṭaka*, *Āsvadhāti Kāvyā*, *Prāṇābharaṇa Kāvyā* etc. On his *Rasagaṅgādhara* Nageshbhatta has written a commentary called *Marmaprakāśa*. It is conjectured that *Rasagaṅgādhara* remains incomplete at *uttarālaṃkāra* of the ‘second Ānana’ itself, because Nageshbhatta’s commentary runs only upto that point.

Panditraja Jagannatha is the last and best in the line of the authors of rhetorics. The research, which had been going on starting from Bharata down to Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta on the question as to what the soul of poetry was, and what was determined in the form of an inference at the end of a good deal of conflict of ideas between the contending parties, had attained complete development and got established even before Jagannatha appeared on the scene. Jagannatha’s success lies not in their re-establishment but in their interpretations. The foremost characteristic of Jagannatha was that in his book he cited examples from his own poetical compositions. How a rhetorician would be if he happened to be a poet himself was well exemplified by Panditaraja. The distinctive quality of his discussion is that after determining the features of the subject matter of his discussion he presented his interpretation with the help of the examples from his own poetry. But on most occasions he had followed the views of the ancient rhetoricians, particularly like Dandi and others.

Apart from bringing out a verbatim translation of Jagannatha’s *Rasagaṅgādhara*, Dr. Sandhya Bhaduri has made a comparative study of the Western rhetoricians or experts of aesthetics, particularly of English literature, or poetry, side by side with the author of *Rasagaṅgādhara* Panditaraja and
various other sections of different Indian rhetoricians and in doing so she has set a new trend in the discussion of Sanskrit aesthetics or rhetorics in the Bengali language. In fact, in the context of discussing the overall achievement of Panditaraja in rhetorics she has discussed the history of Indian rhetorics and presented an elaborate account of rhetoricians along with an acquaintance of *alamkāra*va, *rītivāda*, *dhvanivāda* and *rasavāda*. At particular places, comparative discussion on Indian rhetorics as well as western aesthetics has been presented in the background of the special ideas of Sanskrit poetics. Not only this, following Indian rhetorics she has also described the poetic significance of *alamkāra*, *rīti*, *guna* etc. As a result of this, just as the discussion of rhetorics has been presented elaborately on the one hand, the discussion of *Dhvanivāda* and *Rasavāda* has also on the other occupied a wider space. In the course of this very discussion, the subject of *Vakroktivāda* has also found a completely independent position. At places she has also demonstrated the influences of several ancient rhetoricians on this 18th century rhetorician (i.e. Panditaraja Jagannatha). Following the words of Jagannatha, she had observed - *ramanīyārthapratipādakāśābdaḥ kāvyam* - the influences of Dandi’s poetic ideal as reflected in śloka 1/10 - *taiahśarīram ca kāvyālāmkāraśca* etc.

In this context she has briefly introduced to us Nageshabhatta the grammarian and interpreter of *Rasagaṅgādhara*, and referring to the interpretation of Nageshabhatta in the course of discussion she has also shown how on many occasions it has not been just or reasonable. Just as Dr. Bhaduri has translated the original text so also she has presented comparatively at different places and has mentioned introducing terminological words in the footnote. Dr. Bhaduri, an erudite scholar both in the Indian as well as in the Western poetics has left the mark of her versatile scholarship in the foreword of her book which will be useful to each and
every enlightened Bengali reader. In this context she quotes from Rabindranath Thakur: "In order to express the formless through form the inexpressible has to be secured in speech. As beauty and shyness in women, so is the inexpressible in literature, - it is beyond imitation, rises over and never gets overshadowed by rhetorics". - Comparing this portion of Thakur with the words of the Sanskrit rhetorician, Anandavardhana, the translator has said: ‘This is but the echo of Anandavardhana, the rhetorician’

pratīyamānaṁ puṇaranyadeva vastvasti vānīṣu mahākavīnāṁ

yattat prasiddhayavātiriktaṁ vibhāti lāvanyamivāṅgarāṇāśu || Dhvanyāloka || 4||

Showing the resemblance of the inner meaning of this śloka with the western literary attitude, Dr. Sandhya Bhaduri has quoted from Ogden. Saying that the same kind of attitude has been expressed in Ogden’s language, she quotes: “What is certain is that there is a common and important use of word which is different from scientific or as we shall call it the strict symbolic use of word. Under the emotive function I have included both the expression of conditions, attitude, mood, intuition etc. in the speaker and their communications and their evocation in the listener.”

(The Meaning of Meaning by C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richard)

In the interpretation of the word, Sahrdaya she has quoted the portion 1/1 from Locana commentary of Dhvanyāloka and has applied the word Saman dharma in this connection from Bhababhuti and in the same way as referred to the expression ‘Kindred soul’ from Grey’s writing. In the same vein she has given relevant quotations from Tolstoy’s What is Art and Croce’s Theory of Aesthetics. Many more examples may be cited in this context. For instance, in the poetry where Bharata has recognised the utility of
rasa Dr. Bhaduri has said quoting from śloka 7/7 of Bharatacarya’s Nātyaśāstra. “But Bharata has not discussed much as to what the relation of poetry with rasa is. On this subject the view of the celebrated scholar P.V Kane is noteworthy. He says – “The relation of rasas to poetry in general was not systematically dealt with till Dhvanyāloka was composed.”

In addition to this achievement, the translator has added many a time in her work of translation, keeping the Bengali readers in mind, special notes and comments on particular difficult terms. She has mentioned the definition of the term, visēṣyatābacedaka in the footnote while translating the prose-portion of tatrakīrti-paramāhātā-gururājadevatāprasāda etc. following the ślokas which are there in the very beginning of Rasagaṅgādhara.

Furthermore, the translator has not only translated the definition of poetry given by Jagannātharaja–viz.- ramanīyārthapratipādakaḥ śabdaḥ kāvyam (i.e., the word which proves or indicates to be beautiful meaning is poetry) but also appended an interpretation of this in the foot-note. Indeed, apprehending that the use of the word ‘beautiful’ in the otherwise dry subjects like grammar etc. may lead to error of accepting these as poetry the translator has written: “By the application of the term śabda (word) music, image etc. are not meant. Panditaraja has not said here that it conveys beautiful meaning. As the word of suggestive meaning is also poetry so instead of using ‘word’ in its literal sense uses the term pratipādaka (that which proves or shows) meaning the word which bring out both kinds of meaning both literal as well as suggestive. What he intends to say is that the word which expresses both literal and suggestive meaning is poetry.”

Similarly, while translating Rasagaṅgādhara Dr. Bhaduri has endeavoured to allow the Bengali readers to have access to the difficult word Sanskrit rhetorics by incorporating critical notes on all unfamiliar words or
terms. Here, we can mention a few such examples: binigamaka (P:9), anugama (page: 11), abyapyabyttī (p: 14), svaprabṛttiprayojaka (p:30), phalabala (p. 68) etc. which have been elaborated by her in the foot-notes.

But, it has to be mentioned here that while translating Rasagaṅgādhara, the translator has used such speech pattern, replete with tatsama words, which has not only turned out to be quite unfavourable for the Bengali language but also obscure at many places. In fact, the extraordinary labour which she has put in for the translation of this book of poetics into Bengali was much more than what she has undertaken to make it easily accessible to her Bengali readers. Of course, such shortcoming has been observed specially in the translation of Sanskrit poetics by many other authors. Here we want to cite two quotations from the book under discussion to show the kind of lack of lucidity of the language mentioned by us –

1. kāraṇsadbhābe kāryer sadbhāb — iḥā anvay byāpti | kāraṇer asatāy
   kāryer asattā iḥā byatirake byāpti | kāraṇābhimater sadbhābe
   kāryābhimater asattā haile anvay vyabhičār doše ukta
   kāryakāraṇabhāb saddha haibe nā l⁰ etc.

2. vedāntī anubyabasāy svīkār karen nā | tāhār mate ajñāta
   jñānasukhādirūp antāḥkaraṇ dharmer sadbhāber kona pramāṇ nāi |
   nānā anubyabasāy svīkār karile gaurābdoṣi haiyā thāke l¹

On several occasions, it appears that the book would have been much more favourable for the Bengali language had the author made the subject of the book of her own through assimilation and then rendered it in terms of its principal ideas. Having gone through the book, very often one may feel the want of a separate Bengali commentary on this book and also otherwise a sentence such as - .............sesthale byutpatti o abhyāse tādṛś bailaksanya
āche, ihāte pramān nāi baliā tāhārā karantābacchedak-bīśīta hay nāi etc.
which, as a sentence, may not at all appear to be a part of Bengali language. It
seems as if the book had been written exclusively for students of Sanskrit
literature and not for the Bengali speaking readers. However, in the
introduction of the book where the tradition of Sanskrit poetics has been
discussed at length this fault of uneasiness of language is totally absent. In
conclusion it has to be said that just as this effort of Dr. Sandhya Bhaduri has
helped in introducing Panditaraja along with his achievements to the
Bengalis in the same way it has also helped to satisfy the curiosity of the
Bengali intellectuals regarding him; it is this success which has to be admitted
by all means.

As to the period of Dandi, the second greatest teacher in the
community of rhetoricians, scholars have not so far been able to reach any
consensus. There are differences of views if at all the writer of
Daśakūmāracarita and Dandi the author of Kāvyādarśa, was the one and the
same person or not. If Daśakūmāra Carita had belonged to a period
preceding Vāsavadatta by Subandhu and if the writer of that treatise had been
none other than the rhetorician Acarya Dandi, then definitely it has to be
accepted that the era in which Dandi emerged was before Bhamaha.83
According to many, it would be just to think that Dandi appeared not in the 9th
century but even before that period, that is, before the emergence of Vamana.
K.P. Trivedi, H. Jacobi, Nobel, Rangacarya, Ganapati Sastri and Surendranath
Dasgupta maintain that Dandi appeared at a later period than that of
Bhamaha.84 We find support of this view also in the words of the famous
critic Prof. Sushil Kumar De. According to him, the period in which Dandi
appeared might be regarded, ‘............... as the end of the 8th and the
commencement of the 9th century.’85 On the other hand, according to the
views of eminent scholars like Maxmuller, Macdonald, K.B. Pathak, A.B. Keath etc. Dandi was predecessor of Bhamaha. Kane, the great scholar, has proclaimed the 7th century A.D. as the period of the emergence of Dandi, through a learned deliberation on the subject and with the support of both internal and external evidences in abundance. In this context by way of establishing his own view as against those of other critics like Maxmuller, Webber, Prof. Mandonell and Col Jacob etc. and after having negated their contention Kane has said:

'That date must now be given up in favour of the view that Dandi’s literary activity lay between 660 and 680 A.D.' Anandavardhana did not make any reference to Dandi. Dandi was mentioned for the first time in the writings of Pratiharenduraja. Dandi had mentioned Brhatkatha and Setubandha written by Prabar Sen in Maharastrian Prakrt in 5th - 6th century. So it can be conjectured that these two works were there before the period he came to prominence as a writer.

From Abanti Sundari Kathasara it can be found that Dandi’s parents who died in his childhood were inhabitants of Kanci. He was brought up by Sarasvati and Sruta. When Vikramaditya, the king of Calukya, conquered Kanci in 655 A.D., Dandi left his place of birth and set out for travels abroad. Later, when the king of the Palhavas captured Kanci, Dandi returned to his native country and was subsequently placed to a high post of the royal court. Thinking that in the sloka No. 114 in the third chapter of Kavyadarsha the Palhava rulers had been delineated in cryptic language, some scholars like Kane accepted Dandi as rhetorician of South India. It may be mentioned that in the third chapter of Kavyadarsha, there is a clear reference to Cola kingdom, and the rivers Kalaguru and Kaveri. The reason for accepting Dandi as a predecessor of Vamana is that the very method mentioned by Dandi as
Mārg in his work has been enshrined as the soul of Vamana’s Kāvyālauṅkārasūtrabṛttī. So, Dandi can be called Vamana’s pathfinder.\(^{90}\)

At this stage the subject of our discussion shall be the work of translation of the book: Śrīdāndācāryyabhiracita Kāvyādārśāh by Mrs. Chinmayee Chattopadhyay. Smt. Chattopadhyay has not here engaged herself solely in the work of translation; apart from translation, depending on the subject, elaborate comments and statements have also found their place in it and the indications of this we find even in the maiden page of the book. It is written there –

\[
Śrīpremendra tarkabāgīsā bhaṭṭācārya-viracita
\]

\[
Mālinyaprōñchāṇī-saṁjñāka tīkā sahitā
\]

\[
O
\]

\[
dīrghabhūmikā, mūl śloker baṅgānuvād,
\]

\[
vibṛti o tippanīte samṛddha.\(^{91}\)
\]

Besides, the proof of such hints as mentioned above can be provided from any part of any chapter of the book. For example, in translating the first śloka (epigram) belonging to ‘maṅgalācaraṇa –caturmukhamukhāṁbhojavanahāṁ-savadhūṁmarma etc. she begins at the outset with the analysis of the sequence viz. caturmukhamukhāṁbhojavanahāṁsavadhūṁ sarvaśūklā sarasvati māma mānase nityam ramaṭām.

The purpose or meaning of this part has come out clearly in the statement section. Thus it goes there – “In the very opening of his work the writer and rhetorician, Dandi, prays to the goddess of learning in the hope of gaining her grace so that his book can attain its conclusion without any hindrance’ etc. etc.\(^{92}\) Again every word of this part has been supplemented by
notes and comments, such as — comments 1. — This being maṅgalācarana śloka the word mānasā means three types of propositions viz., śravana, manana and nididhyāsanārūpa (i.e. hearing, thinking and meditation), because worship or prayer demands what mānasā contains.93

Regarding rhetorics the author has presented a comparative study concerning each and every principle of Dandi from the historical point of view. This analytical approach to the method of discussion has kept the Bengali readers informed not only of Dandi’s book but also, side by side of the works and views of other rhetoricians. An example may be cited to clarify this point: The definition of Dandi’s rhetorics is — kāvyasobhākaraṇ dharmāṇa alamkārāṇ pracākṣate | (2/1). That is, ‘the quality which works for the embellishment of poetry is called rhetorics’.

The writer has added easy meaning of the Sanskrit version at the very beginning of the first aphorism (śloka) of the second chapter of Kāvyādāśā. And then, she has done its Bengali translation. In the statement section of this śloka she has shown the derivation of every word present in the basic aphorism. She has discussed with illustrations from books like Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, Sarasvatīkāṇṭhābharaṇa etc. to show that rhetorics not only means alliteration, metaphor etc. pertaining word sound or word meaning but also the quality of the embellishment of poetry.94 In this context she has discussed the views of the Rasavādīs and the Dhvanivādīs. While writing the commentary on this particular śloka of Dandi, the writer has surveyed, from the historical point of view, all definitions and discussions of rhetorics of Agnipurāṇa along with the works of rhetoricians like Bharatacarya, Yamana, Bhamaha, Mammatabhatta, Visvanatha Kaviraja, Anandavardhana, Abhinavagupta and Bhojaraja etc. Apart from this she has also referred to different ancient treatises on rhetorics and mentioned the number of
rhetorical items contained in each. For example, Natyasastra - 4, Visṇudharmottara Purāṇa - 18, Dandi - 35, Bhatti, Bhamaha-Udvata, Vamana-30-40, Mammata Bhatta-arthaśāstra-61, śabdalaṁkāra-7, Ruuyaka-75, Visvanatha-82, in Jayadeva's Candrāloka -100, and in Apathya-dikṣita Kuvalāyananda-115. She has made the whole nation indebted to her in terms of knowledge by her discussion of the history of Sanskrit poetics in her resourceful work of translation. In the discussion of this very śloka she has added a long Sanskrit note. Thus, the writer has dwelt almost on every sloka of Dandi's Kāvyādarśa. Besides, following the definition Dandi's rūpaka alaṁkāra or metaphor she has given the definition of the same alaṁkāra in accordance with the views of different books and rhetoricians. Having referred to twenty types of differences of rūpaka or metaphor as shown by Dandi, the writer has mentioned the distinctions made by other rhetoricians. For instance, she has mentioned the kinds of differences as given below –

Visvanatha Kaviraja – 4 Kinds of differences

Vamana – 2 Kinds of differences

Udbhata – 4 Kinds of differences

Mammata – 4 Kinds of differences

Bhojaraja – 6 Kinds of differences

In fact, the writer has unlocked the door to a vast land of knowledge in the course of her translation of Dandi’s Kāvyādarśa. From this point of view Chinmayee Chattopadhyaya's Kāvyādarśa, instead of being considered merely as a work of translation, can be recognised specially to be an extensive history of the rhetoricians.
Just as a short description of the evaluation of poetics starting from Bharatacarya to modern rhetoricians has found a place in this book, so also in the course of discussion the similarities and dissimilarities between Dandi’s views and those of other rhetoricians have also occupied a place in her book. Another matter which needs to be mentioned here is that the commentary of Premendra Tarkabagis on Kāvyādarsa, Mālīnyapronchani, has completely been added to the first and second chapters of the book and special portions of this commentary have found their respective places in the third chapter, and in the rest of the book references to this have been avoided for fear of redundancy. Though in the foreword, the authoress has mentioned that the book has been written mainly for the students of B.A. Honours, it can, however, be said without any doubt that this purpose of the writer having been fulfilled, the book has become highly acceptable to all Bengali readers thirst for knowledge. Moreover, the list of various editions of Kāvyādārsā and of different commentaries which the writer has presented in her book depending on the History of Sanskrit Poetics by S.K. De. (Vol. - 1, P - 69-70) and P.V. Kane’s History of Sanskrit Poetics will serve as an invaluable source of information in the Bengali language.

Having quoted the commentary part of the theory vibhābānubhāva vyabhicārisainyogād rasanispatti of Bharatacarya from Abhinavabhāratī of Abhinavagupta, the best critic of Indian rhetoric particularly of rasatattva, Abantikumar Sanyal has translated the same into the Bengali language in his book Abhinavagupter Rasabliasya. The Bengali translation of this commentary written by Abhinavagupta and known as Abhibyaktivāda is undoubtedly an important addition to Bengali. In fact, some of the achievements of Abhinavagupta in the discussion of Indian rhetoric are –
a) By *rasa* Bharatcarya meant *nātyarasa* itself. The theorists of *rasa* like Bhattalollata, Bhattasakuka also basically discussed this *nātyarasa*. It was Anandavardhana who was the first to recognize the role of *rasa* in poetry and establish the relation between the theories of *dhvani* and *rasa*. In his opinion, the *rasa* mentioned by Bharata was not merely the life of *nātya* (drama) but also the essence of *dṛśya* (visual) and *sravya* (auditory) poetical creation.96

b) He repudiated *Utpattivāda*, *Anumītivāda* and *Bhuktivāda* of his predecessors Bhattalollata, Bhattasankuka and Bhattanayaka respectively and established the best doctrine of *rasa* called *Abhibyaktivāda*.

This *Abhibyaktivāda* of his was elaborately explained in particular in his book of commentary on Bharata’s *Nātyasāstra* called *Abhinavabhāratī*. This book is not only the best book on the art of Indian drama but also of Indian aesthetics, and the commentary of *Abhinavabhāratī* is the best interpretation of the theory of *rasa* of Bharata’s celebrated *rasasūtra*. Abantikumar raised the standard of critical literature of Bengali by translating this book into Bengali. His translation basically verbatim and the language is modern Bengali in use now-a-days. For the sake of completion in sentence structure and meaning, the translator has added in most cases words within brackets. One of the notable aspects of this work of translation is that at the end of the translation of each chapter a long commentary has been presented; at many places the commentary part has extended to greater length than the translated portion. In this commentary section, the translator has explained various words as well as done subtle analysis of different doctrines and views. As a matter of fact, as an outcome of the intermingling of the translator’s erudition with the ideas of Abhinavagupta, this book is considered to be a
remarkable addition to the studies of Sanskrit Rhetoric in Bengali language. Had this valuable commentary part not been added, the translation of the original commentary of Abhinavagupta would have remained inscrutable to Bengali readers. In this annotation part, at many places, he has explained some particular philosophical terms also and has clarified many topics by quoting relevant portions from various books composed till now on *Rasasastra* in the modern times. Instead of performing the role of a translator, the author has played the role also of a front ranking interpreter.

*Daśarūpaka* composed by Dhananjaya is a representative work of all the famous and extant books written on the principles of Sanskrit dramatic art (poetics) Dhananjaya’s father’s name was Visnu. Dhananjaya was a poet in the royal court of king Munjaraja of the Paramar family of Malava.97 *Daśarūpaka* was written in the 10th century A.D following the form of Bharata’s *Nāṭyaśāstra*.98 Dhananjaya’s junior Dhanika,99 composed *Daśarūpabaloka*, a book of commentary on *Daśarūpaka*. Apart from this, other rhetoricians like Nrsimhabhatta, Devapani, Kurabirama etc. have also written commentaries on *Daśarūpaka*. The area of the variety of subjects on the art of drama is vast. Dhananjaya has only dealt with the principles and data of information according to his necessity. He has kept his views confined within four expository chapters. Two rich parts of this book are its *kārikā* and *bṛttī*. The writer of the *kārikā* part is Dhananjaya and that of *bṛttī Abaloka* is Dhanika. In spite of having followed *Nāṭyaśāstra* at most places and having been influenced often by Bhattaminamsakas the writer, Dhananjaya has left his mark of originality. Later on, Visvanatha, the creator of *Sūhityadarpaṇa* had taken a lot of elements from Dhananjaya’s *Daśarūpaka* in his discussion concerning the principles of drama in the sixth chapter of his famous book.
The terminological name of द्रष्यकाव्य (visual poetry or drama) is रूपाका. The book under our discussion is दसरूपाका. So, the very name of the book serves as an introduction to the book itself. The subject-matter of this book is drama/or रूपाका (drama of metaphor) and its fundamental subject comprises description of the ten recognized principal differences depending on the varied subjects or elements of drama. Probably for this reason, Dhananjaya had named his book दसरूपामा,100 but later on the book became famous as दसरूपाका.

This book consisting of 300 कारिकास (short verses) is divided into four Editions. The subject of the first edition is the form of drama or the characteristic marks of रूपाका, the difference between नृत्या and नृत्ता; then the writer has discussed the differentiating principle of रूपाका after having discussed the ten types of रूपाका depending on the differences of their subject or other elements/dramatic elements; then other things such as classification of material, the nature and difference of meaning, पञ्चबास्था पञ्चसांहि and सांहिका etc. have been discussed.

The second principle of difference of रुपाका comprising the classification of heroes or principal protagonists, पताकानायका, प्रतिनायका, differences of heroines (नायिका), the description of various सात्त्विक qualities of the hero and the heroine are found in the second edition. In this second edition Dhananjaya has also mentioned four different types of heroes often having described their general attributes; these are – धीरोददाता, धीरललिता धीरप्राशांता, धीरोद्धहता etc. Then the differences of heroines, heroines’ lady companions, and heroines’ सात्त्विक qualities have been discussed.

In the third edition भारती ब्रति and the description of its parts have been presented after the description of the different types of स्थापना or prologue. Then in this same addition drama and the characteristics of the ten
types of elements of rūpaka or drama have been discussed. Thus in the three editions of the book the external or formal nature of drama or rūpaka has been determined.

In the forth edition, having discussed the formal or external nature of rūpaka, the author has written about the inner nature (or ātmatttva) of rūpaka. Here these are mainly the discussions of rasas. In this edition itself the application of the authors own ideas concerning rasas are found to be at work. Then Dhananjaya has discussed vibhāba, anubhāba, sātvika bhāba and has given an elaborate description of byabhicāribhāba. Another characteristic of this edition is the rejection of the concept of vyāñjanā bṛtti or suggestive meaning.

This book written in Sanskrit has been translated into several languages. Noteworthy among these is Daśarūpaka in Bengali edited by Dr. Sitaram Acharya and Dr. Debakumar Das. Here Dr. Acharya and Dr. Das have given translation, description and explanation along with the original kārikās themselves. But the point to be noted here is that only in the first and the second editions edited by them the authors have added the translation and interpretation of the original kārikās. Instead of verbatim translation of the original book, here the role of the editors had been that of both translator and commentators. This can be made clear by a few examples: - the verse No. 21 of the first edition apāyābhābata ...............etc. has been translated thus along with commentary.

Anubad : Niyatāptir lakṣaṇ balā hacche – bādhār abhābe phalaprāpti sunīścita hale niyatāpti hay । Yeman Raināvalīe ‘Bidūṣjak-Sāgarikār bēce thākāi duṣkar’ ekhān theke ārambha kare, ‘Upāy cintā karcha nā kena’ eai kathār par rāja – bayasya, Debīr anugraha chādā ekhāne ār anya upāy dekhchi nā ।’ – Parabarti aṁkāntargata eai bindudvārā
The notable fact in the discussion of this book is that the book really rich in the discussion of the various principles of the art of drama, replete with numerous terminological expressions and also composed in logical pattern is at times genuinely difficult for translation. In performing this difficult task, the translators have taken the help of different translators who, as their predecessors translated the book in Hindi and English. It is as a result of their effort that the long-standing want which was there in the discussion of Daśarūpaka in the Bengali language has been removed. Their contribution in this regard certainly deserves recognition.

In the conclusion it has to be said that the history of Sanskrit rhetoric is a vast and variegated history. The history of its origin and development is also very colourful and spread over a long period of time. This history consists of all those varieties of basic schools of thought and doctrines which can be the pride of any country. In this context a word of regret from a critic about Bengalee's curiosity or rather lack of it concerning this subject may be noted here - 'It is a matter of great regret that the curiosity in the community of the average Bengalee educated people and the society of the literateurs about this vast, grand and rich subject dealing with literary judgement is very very little. Till now the number of translations of the basic Sanskrit works of rhetoric into Bengali language is rather too small to count'. Keeping this remark of the critic in mind it can be said that though compared with Hindi and Marathi languages, Bengal's awareness concerning this ancient subject 'rhetoric' is quite poor, yet the standard of the translations done till now is by no means of a low level. Above all, the kind of intellectually rich and thoughtful discussions that have found their place in the introductions to these works of
translation can be a matter of pride for any language. And it can hardly be denied that these translated versions of Sanskrit rhetoric in Bengali language had inspired the Bengali intellectuals and helped them to raise and entrench the standard of Bengali literary criticism at a very rich and lofty pedestal.

***
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