Chapter – 1 : Introduction

1.1 Is Language Mere Words?

Any work of art, at first sight, is generally appreciated by the language used. Language consists of sentences. A sentence is a string of words. A word is made of alphabets. These alphabets when organized in an orderly and planned manner (i.e. according to paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships) denote and connote meanings. Isolated letters would denote and connote some meaning only if arranged in a planned and orderly way, otherwise separate letters are meaningless. It is, therefore, not letters but words and that too meaningful words which have the power to communicate and express a certain meaning. Isolated letters, say the word ‘Ganges’, would denote and connote some meaning only if arranged and organized in a planned and orderly way otherwise separate letters like the $G + a + n + g + e + s$ are meaningless.

Just as the function of fetching water is performed by a pot and not by the component particles of clay of which the pot is made, similarly the function of conveying a sense is performed by a word and not by letters. The Padavādins or the Naiyāyikās in Sanskrit Poetics also agree with this notion that it is the word (pada) which is the unit of meaning. While in Sanskrit ghatah means pot, tagah means nothing. Hence, the word (pada) is a word which ends in some case-ending or conjugational suffix (vibhakti). Such a term (pada) which is made of some root (prakṛti) and an affix (pratyaya), for example, guah (cow) in the nominative case or gacchati (goes) in the present tense, is taken as the bearer of a definite meaning (arthapratyāyaka). The potency of generating a sense, therefore, lies in the term as a whole and not in individual letters.

To speak linguistically, the word, though the lowest relatively independent semantic unit of language, is not, nevertheless, the most basic and simplest semantic element of language; this is the morpheme which, of course absolutely lack independence, for morphemes can occur only as parts of a word. There are roots, derivational, and desinential morphemes. A root morpheme is the carrier of the
nucleus of lexical meaning. A derivational morpheme places a word in a certain lexical group, thereby introducing into its meaning a nuance common to all words derived by means of this morpheme. Finally, a desinential morpheme places a word in the morphological system and at the same time makes it capable of incorporation into the semantic structure of the sentence. And these words, building the language structure into higher hierarchies, form language.

Language is, therefore, not a monolithic object. It serves to communicate and express being a human and non-instinctive way of communicating ideas, feelings and desires by means of a system of sound symbols and word symbols. It refers to a system of communication may be spoken or written which is constructed for specific purpose. It carries with it a cord of signals, symbols, ideas, thoughts, passions, feelings, emotions, and expressions etc. It is a human phenomenon, which is as complex as human relationships in a society. It is a system of arbitrary symbols by means of which a social group co-operates. It is a symbol system based on pure or arbitrary conventions infinitely extendable and modifiable according to the changing needs and conditions of the speakers. It is a set of sentences, each finite in length and constructed out of a finite set of elements. That is to say that language has a set structure. But, has it a set structure? Or is it a system of arbitrary symbols used for human communication or is it a mere communication only with each other?

Everybody knows the answer what language is but nobody has so far been able to come out with any standard and set but complete definition that fully explains the term language. It is as complex as a human-mind, as a human-behaviour and also as a human-relationship. According to one view, “language was born in the courting days of mankind”. But it is merely a speculation though an endearing one. According to another view, “God created Adam and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof”. According to Hindu tradition, language came from the goddess “Saraswati”. Hence, a divine source.

Besides, a quite different view of the beginning of human speech is based on the concept of “natural sounds”. Language refers to a system of communication, notation or calculation and is constructed for natural purposes and notational
systems to exhibit and express invariably the innermost inherent ideas, emotions, feelings -- which are quite definitely natural rather than artificial by means of voluntarily produced symbols. Language carries with it a code of signals that are actually transmitted from reader to receiver with process of communication and interaction. Language is, therefore, a combination of those sounds which communicate the inherent motif of a person patterned in words. Saussure (1959), the noted linguist, called language ‘a system of signs that express ideas’. Thus, language is possibly the most vital and powerful of mankind’s unique endowments: by means of it we regulate our social and interpersonal behaviour and build up and stabilize our intellectual engagement with the world. Words are its assets (sampatī), sound is its recognition and expression is its verbalization (sārthaktā).

Any work of literary art is, thus, seen as an organic unity in which matter and manner, thought and expression are indissolubly one. A work of literary art, therefore, can only be understood by a minute study of the language in which it is realized. The fact that language can be “manipulated” to serve an aesthetic purpose depends on the communicative function of language. A literary work of art is thus accessible only through its language. Motifs, themes, images, symbols, plots and compositional schemes, genre, patterns, if any, take its shape in language. Halliday points out that a literary text is meaningful not only in virtue of what it is but also in virtue of what it might have been1 (Chatman 334) when compared with the other. This emphasizes that our knowledge of language is immensely complex; we carry with us not only a vast, intricately patterned code, but also an experience of its varying surrounding circumstances.

Therefore, language --- both code and message --- is a system of systems of signs, a sign being intrinsic and indissoluble combination of perceptible signans and an interpretable signatum. Some linguistic signs occur both in the code and in the message; others occur only in the messages. The linguistic meaning itself is a system of systems of signs and at the same time a sign (of some complexity) with both a signans and a signatum. The act of verbal communication is an effect and exchange of signs between the speaker/poet and the addressee/reader.
Croce remarks: “Language is a perpetual creation. What has been linguistically expressed is not repeated, save the reproduction of what has already been produced. The ever-new impressions give rise to continuous changes of sound and meaning, that is, to ever-new expressions” (Aesthetics 150). Othmar Gachter observes that language does not interfere as an intermediary with the status of reality but is rather the direct assertion of reality itself. “The reality as a whole,” he adds, “will always remain in eclipse until sabda i.e. language, prepares man for the proper state of jijnāsā (inquisitiveness). In fact, language is the... real support of one’s understanding” (Hermeneutics 93-94). Richards views language as an organic mode of communication. At the hands of a creative writer language acquires a life and identity of its own. He says: “It is no mere signalling system. It is the instrument of all our distinctly human development, in everything we go beyond the other animals” (Philosophy 131).

It is evident that all knowledge is imbibed through language. Had our knowledge lost its linguistic form, it would not have been manifested at all, for, it is language that permits every form of knowledge to be manifested. There is no object which has no name. Or in other words, there is nothing which is undefinable by any word. Hence, it is by means of language that a man acquires knowledge in all sciences and arts and distinguishes one object from another. Thus, language holds the position of becoming the medium of communication of knowledge. Moreover, language is conscious in the form of external or internal experience, since, consciousness in all creatures is never devoid of comprehension of words. This is evident also from the fact that all the persons are impelled to react through language and that they become devoid of consciousness like a piece of wood or wall when language ceases. Bhartrihari, the remarkable grammarian-philosopher, contends that just as one cannot conceive of an object entirely independent of knowledge, in a similar manner, one cannot have any knowledge apart from language which is the only medium of its expression. We are, therefore, bound to assume that the fundamental principle must be consciousness or knowledge par excellence, imbibed
with linguistic principle. Thus, knowledge is revelation, revelation is expression and expression is communication. But there is no communication without language.

Again, Bhartrhari says that language is such an expression in which the Principle of Word is of paramount importance. Diverse type of lights are represented by the physical light, the inner light of the mind, and the inherent light of the word, the best light, is represented by the light of expression, which is to say, is the light of all lights. He establishes the paramount importance of expression in the universe yet another way. Continuing with the argument introduced before, he says that the magic wand of expression has got the power of granting a concrete shape to a non-existent entity as also the power of giving a real entity, the show of non-existent.

The ‘language structure’ or langue is used in a ‘speech act’ or parole by individuals of a speech community. Thus, language as the individual property of the speaker, i.e. the individual linguistic norm, necessarily contains both centripetal and centrifugal drives, in other words, both communal and particular components. But as a social endowment as well, language always and inevitably fosters both of these drives, of which Saussure (1959) has termed as: la force unifiante, on the one hand, and l’esprit particulariste, on the other. Moreover, the potential complexities of signifying processes work freely in literature since various studies have genuinely established that literature is the most complex of sign systems. Hence, language of literature is “artistic”, “creative”, “communicative”, “pragmatic”, and “emotive”. Literature is itself a continual exploration of and reflection upon signification in all its forms: an interpretation of experience; a commentary on the validity of various ways of interpreting experience; an exploration of the creative, revelatory, and deceptive powers of language; a critique of codes and interpretative processes manifested in our language and in previous literature.

Now, a piece of literature, say a poem, is basically a language act. Roger Fowler puts it as: “a poem is neither a free creation by the poet, nor his own exclusive property; it belongs to language” (The Language 17). Of all the modes of expression, poetry uses language most precisely and exploits all possible resources of language most fully and to borrow words from I. A. Richards -- “the printed
words of a poem are only its footprints on paper” (qtd. in Seboak, 14). Therefore, language plays a crucial role in poetry. This is the reason why poetry has been called “a language within language” (Valery 64). The phrase “a language within language” adverts to deviated language, which is the natural language of poetry, where functions of language can be enlisted thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressive</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How</td>
<td>What</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genius</td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here language talks and words resonate. Thus, we find that both literature and linguistics are concerned with language. Literature exploits the imaginative faculties of the mind and the creative potential of language. Language becomes its means as well as end. When written on paper, it is a means; and when we read it in between the lines it becomes its end. Therefore, language is not merely words written on a plain paper. It is an expression, an exhibition, and a pavement of the pent-up feelings but only then when we know that language is not merely words. Words do not picture the universe directly, but relate to it indirectly by way of semantic conventions. It is because of the limitations of physical media associated with language that the possibilities for direct representation is severely constrained. Hence, language is not mere words. It is more than what it stands for.

1.2 Words Resonate

The importance of expression element for the purpose of transferring a bit of mind from the creative artist to the receptive reader is conveyed through language. This limited medium of language having unlimited possibilities consists in the art of employment of the same. This conviction enables us to declare that the word is
endowed with the capacity of conveying all things under the sun. By ‘word’ it does not refer to the momentary sound comprehended by the auditory organ but to the eternal Word-essence which is brought into revelation by the transient sounds.

The Greek word of ‘Word’ is ‘Logos’ and it means ‘word’ and ‘thought’ or ‘idea’ at the same time. Talking of the perfection of style, Aristotle observes:

“That diction, ... is lofty and raised above the commonplace which employs unusual words. By unusual, I mean strange (or rare) words, metaphorical, lengthened, --- anything, in short, that differs from the normal idiom .... But nothing contributes more to produce a clearness of diction that is remote from commonness than the lengthening, contraction, and alteration of words. For by deviating in exceptional cases from the normal diction, the language will gain distinction ....” (Poetics, 1458b).

Words-selection can be seen in a wider perspective of language which deepens former insights as well as offering new ones. It should not be difficult to agree with F. S. Scott’s view that “A writer’s style is often expressed as much by his choice of words” (Grammer 56). Bowden in his book, An Introduction To Prose Style, also lays stress on the uses of words -- “Mere size of personal vocabulary, however, is not the test for the writer, but rather, the skill and exactness with which he can use the words which are at his command” (3).

The linguist J. R. Firth (1957) held that words operate in social situations where we pay little attention to single items such as would receive separate entries in a glossary. Our response is holophrastic, made to a total meaning and not to the sequence of separate meanings. Single words are noted only when they are brought into prominence by being particularly striking, disquieting or shocking. In other words, when they are foregrounded and possibly appear deviant. A single use may dignify a word and give it life after many of its contemporaries have faded into archaism for a word culled from the lexicon does not come untested by the speech-community and especially by the creative writer.
What is most true and exact is that the originality is one of the perennial delights of poetry. Pleasure is made deeper by our understanding. Poetry is made of words and obviously the choice of words is important in poetry; indeed in a sense, it is the whole art of writing poetry. In order to form good poetry, words play a significant role. Their accentuation (producing rhythm), their sound (producing onomatopoeia, rhyme effects) and their associative value along with the choice of words for their actual ‘intellectual meaning’ serve the poet in searching the most just, the most exact and the most effective word. The physical from of poetry which includes rhythm, rhyme, intonation, echo, repetition etc. and the mental form of poetry that includes grammatical structure, logical sequence, the pattern of association, the use of dominant image, the pattern of image and emotion, combine to give a good poem its power over imagination. The very picture of a poem that immediately confronts us is in the form of words.

The Indian intellectual tradition is also language centered. The “śabda” is crucial and care is taken in all texts to define the term as precisely as possible. The word is regarded as the creative principal of the world and is accorded divine status (śabda Brahmān). This definition of Word can remind us of the Biblical saying – ‘In the beginning there was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God.’ The word-God is described in the Bhagavata Purāṇa as infinite and boundless like the ocean and extremely difficult to comprehend. Patanjali in his Mahā-Bhāṣya observes that even one word which is known and used properly can be most fruitful. It would not be out of place to mention here that the philosophy of Word and Meaning is one of the most developed branches of Indian scholarship.

A word is like Ardhanārīśwara, an androgynous God. It is a simultaneous embodiment, as Kālidāsa says, of ‘Śiva and Śakti’ i.e. of word and meaning. Without feelings, emotions and sentiments it is like corpse even if ornamented. In “Vākyapadiya” of Bhartṛhari, an Indian Sanskrit poet and grammarian – philosopher, we come across “Sphota”, his theory of linguistics that “all kinds of meanings depend upon the power of words … it is through words that all this difference is perceived … there is no cognition in this world in which language does
not figure ... all this (world/universe) is a parinati, transformation (product) of language." It is not the body but the soul that matters. Without soul, which is the spirit of life, all ornamentation, embellishments fail to serve any purpose.

In a comprehensive sense Kāvyā means all types of creative writing. It is a charming work of art producing pieces of beauty that gives pleasure to the appreciator of beauty. This charming work of art comes into existence by the creative power of the poet in the form of words. Therefore, kāvyā formation is like stringing of a garland which is possible only with the help of words. Bhāmaha says that Words are like flowers. As flowers with different fragrances and of various forms, kinds and colours are available to a garland maker, similarly, words of different sounds, meanings, forms, types and associations are available to the poet. The garland-maker is required to take into account the length of the garland, the objective for which it is intended to be used and the above mentioned four characteristics of the flowers before making the final selection. Consequently, the act of intertwining and setting aside the flowers continues till the final selection completely satisfies him. Similar is the case of words. What to pick and choose amongst the available ones, which are the most useful, depends on the capacity and vision of the poet.

Poetry is, thus, that beauty whose substratum is the word itself. In making of a good Kāvyā, three forces work:

a. Science of beauty
b. Cultural values
c. Human psychology.

As fragrance is the most prominent quality of the flowers, so also meaning is the soul of the word. It is on the element of meaning (arthatatva) that the whole importance of the word rests. Just as a flower becomes worthy of being strung by virtue of its fragrance, so also word proves to be usable in a poem by virtue of its most appropriate meaning. The poem that lacks meaningfulness, well-turned expression, decency, logicality and intelligibleness is bad poetry howsoever musical it may be. Marjorie Boulton also says: "...some words are not easy to pronounce in
public because the associations are painful, sordid or embarrassing.” (Anatomy 117). Refined words having graceful meanings lend kāvyā its grace. Here, sense is primary to sound. The meaning alone lends ‘kāvyā’ literary quality and also makes it pleasurable.

Turner also seems to be in agreement with Indian Alamkārśūtrīs especially Bhāmaha and says: “a scheme of language is never complete and static, because language is always being put to new uses and adjusted to them or resharpemed to old uses. Vocabulary, the least rigorously systematic part of language is especially subject to innovation.” (Stylistics 16). Words are the semantic ‘keys’. A poet chooses them in relation to other words, in relation to some general subject and our general intention concerning that subject and in realtion to our attitude towards reader. Therefore, the semantic character of the poet’s vocabulary is influenced not only by the lexical spheres from which he draws his words but also by the entire semantic intention by which the selection and application is governed in his work.

Warner, too, seems to concur with the resonation of words and the efforts done by a painstaking poet to select them. He maintains, “Words are many and various, they are subtle and delicate in their different shades of meaning, and it is not easy to find the ones that express precisely what we want to say. It is not only a matter of having a good command of language and a fairly wide vocabulary; it is also necessary to think hard and to observe accurately.” (Short Guide 34). Ullmann explains how a writer confronted with more than one equivocal words or structures makes the selection to express himself effectively: “If more than one word is available for the expression of the same idea, the writer will select the one which is best suited to the context, the one which will carry the right amount of emotion and emphasis” (Semantics 151). Therefore, the poet is supposed to exert dexterity, imagination, and subtle aesthetic sense in the ‘choice of words’. Enkvist et al. (1964) calls them “Stylistic choices” (17). Western Stylisticians like Brooks and Warren (1968) also maintain that the words used in ‘poetry’ (kāvyā) must have:

- acceptability to the educated
- conformity to the good taste
c. flawlessness

d. absence of local or regional tinge.

Vallins in his book, *The Best English*, also substantiates the idea of Indian Classical Thinkers as when he puts forth: “We are reminded that the words properly used are never mere counters. They communicate not only with our minds, but also with our hearts and emotions” (29). Majorie Boulton applies the test of associative field to determine the usefulness of certain words and observes: “The idea that some words were more suitable to poetry than others was probably an early consciousness of the power of a word’s associations, and there is enough truth in it to make its acceptance understandable” (Anatomy 121). Richards maintains that words possess qualities which go to make them a set of permanent set of possibilities of understanding. It is on account of words, says he, that a poem acquires an ever-changing face and become “living, feeling, knowing beings in their own rights.”

Words in poetry are characterized by what has been called multivalency of meaning. They keep on “growing as a cell grows with other cells” (Speculating Instruments 197). Not unlike Ānandavardhana (*Dhvanyāloka* 1/7) Richards says that words are not mere signs, but:

“Words are the meeting points at which regions of experience which can never combine in sensation or intuition, come together. They are the occasion and the means of that growth which is the mind’s endless endeavour to order itself” (Philosophy 131).

Vāmana, who introduced “Śabdāpāka” in his *Kāvyālāṃkārasūtra* while signifying it with special reference to “vaidharbhī” style, defines it. He speaks of the delightful effect of the maturity of words (Śabdapāka) resulting from what he considers to be the best mode of diction (vaidharbhī rīti). He describes that in it the excellence of a word quickens and in which the unreal appears as real. He explains that the “Śabdapāka” occurs when the words are chosen in such a way that they cannot bear exchange of synonyms. Vāmana further remarks in his theory of pāka i.e. consummation:
The process of selection and rejection of words should continue so long as the mind is in doubt. Once the words are firmly fixed upon, poetic language attains consummation. When in a work words are so judiciously used that not even a single one of them can be replaced, we have what stylisticians call a 'consummate' composition.\(^\text{11}\)

Thus, manifold is the path of words. A word properly used is like a 'milch cow' (Kāmadhenu) which yields what is desired.\(^\text{12}\) The dignity of composition depends primarily on the power of words. Which words? Only meaningful words. Commenting on the grace of words, Dāṇḍin, a renowned Sanskrit poet-philosopher, has observed that "these three 'worlds' would be entirely dark and blind, had not the light called the 'word' lit them up from the beginning."\(^\text{13}\) The Indian philosophers conceive of God as hermaphrodite being i.e. "ardhānāris'warā". He is not only the generator and the cause of the universe but also its effect. In the same way, the word and its meaning are united and have the same creative power like "ardhānāris'warā".

When we say that a word stands for certain ideas, we are concerned with its meaning only. A word is not a 'word' if it does not have a meaning. How is meaning cognized and conceptualized out of the 'word' is evident from the theory of "Sphota" or Dhvani or sound. It may also be noted here that dhvani (sound) is also taken as the external manifestation of sphota (sense) by some scholars. In 'Sphota' when a word is pronounced, its individual sounds become reflected in some degree in the order of the 'sphota' in which the particular sounds are comprised and as soon as the last sound dies away, the sphota in which the idea corresponding to all these sounds is comprised, becomes manifested and raises to our consciousness the idea that is associated. It is here that words resonate and language starts talking. Genealogies and affinities of words have exercised the ingenuity of numberless generations of acute and inquiring minds. The sphota is not exactly this word-prototype but it may be explained as the sound of word as a whole and as conveying a meaning apart from its component letters (varṇa). The sphota does not contain
exactly the sounds of the word in the order peculiar to the letters, but the sounds or something corresponding to them blended indistinguishably into a uniform whole.

Later on, the exponents of riti and guna schools in Sanskrit Poetics evolved a concept of poetry which hinges on word. Their definition of poetry places word (and its meaning) at the pivotal position. They have spelt out qualities of words required for poetic composition. Bhāmaha enjoins that only words in vogue should be used in poetry, especially those which are pleasant to the ear and expressive of meaning.14 Vāmana too is of the opinion that only those vernacular words should be used which are in current use.15 Notwithstanding Mallarmé's contention, words play a crucial role in poetry. They are the building blocks of poetry and cannot be ignored in any sensible discussion of the language of poetry. I. A. Richards has fully recognized their importance in poetry. His pronouncements on the nature and possibilities of words, their powers and expression of various meanings are highly provocative but significant. His is probably the most cogently worked out theory of metaphoric transference. Moreover, he has been hailed — and rightly so — as a pioneer in semantics. Like Ānandavardhana [Dhvanyāloka, I/7], Richards maintains that words in a language are not mere signs and their meanings are not exhausted by dictionary entries. “A word becomes something that million people use on the same day, and successive generations go on using through hundreds of years” (Coleridge 104). Unlike in poetry, the everyday use does not exploit all facets of a word’s meaning. Echoing Coleridge, Richards says that “the projection of its meaning into a world is an instance of imagination” (Coleridge 110). Meanings thus projected interact and interanimate and eventually lead to one effect. The ways in which meanings are apprehended and the modes of their combination mutually modify one another. He likens language to a plant and words to its parts, and emphasizes their complex interrelationships and does not endorse the definition of the word given by the behaviourist linguists like Bloomfield and Hockett.

It is quite established that figurative language is opaque and indirect. The context not only identifies the figure but also reveals its meaning. An expression will
be said to be used figuratively when its literal meaning is unacceptable because it contradicts our knowledge of the world. From the semiotic point of view, to use Saussurean terms, we observe that in a tropological sign the usual signifier-signified relationship is disrupted.

Most Indian scholars have also strongly emphasized the inseparability of word from its meaning. A collection of words will be considered a sentence only if it conveys one ‘unified’ meaning. According to Mimaṃsakās, a collection of words that goes to constitute a sentence should meet three requirements, viz. *akāṅkṣā* (Expectancy), *yogyatā* (Compatibility), and *sannidhi* (Contiguity). Bhartrhari also puts it as:

“*The meanings of sentences are determined according to the situation, word-meaning, propriety ... form ... Meaning depends on connection, separation, opposition, context, indication, the presence of another word ... suitability.*”

Mammatā has also recognized the following as the determinants of meaning of a word: the speaker, the person spoken to, intonation, the sentence, the expressed meaning, any other meaning, context, place, and time. Significantly enough, the dimensions mentioned by the Indian aestheticians are far more inclusive than the variables mentioned by the modern linguists such as David Crystal and Derek Davy, which comprise individuality, dialect, time, discourse, province, status, modality and singularity. Therefore, this asserts that a word is always in interaction with other words. Western stylistician Winifred Nowottny also asserts: “...Ultimately criticism of diction revolves itself into consideration of the interplay of certain words in a certain context; single words bring to the poem a potential power which derives from their usage outside the poem but the power is not set to work until it combines or collides with other potentials brought to the poem by the other words it also uses” (The Language 46).

In the act of decoding, context plays a decisive role. Since the poetic/figurative designation lacks a physical speech context, its precise reference becomes a function of its linguistic context, the syntagm in which it participates.
Without a context, a designation refers to nothing more than dictionary meaning of the *signifiant* as far as the decoder is concerned. The specific reference of the word arises only in conjugation with other words, and in order for the decoder even to be aware that a figurative transposition is present, he must be provided with a linguistic context. Yāśka, the etymologist, also warns us against giving the meaning of words out of context. The neo-Firthain linguists have talked about the ‘context of situation’. Halliday has considered the value of ‘context’ (the verbal/textual context). These help us disambiguate the real meaning or purport of an utterance.

The word, therefore, has potentiality to illuminate the objects of which it is a symbol through its sense which is ontologically inseparable. Audible correspondence between *śabda* and *artha*, sound and meaning refers actually to a quality wholly self-contained within the work of art itself. It is said that beauty exists in the art in its symbol. The ideal-words and ideal-meanings suggest the beauty of a literature. But word is not simply a symbol of any object as it denotes more than that through suggestion. Therefore, it is referred as ideal word which through its potentiality reveals the mystic meanings of the mind of the poet who uses it through the process of meditation and thus makes it in his application as divine. The ‘word’ does not denote only particular object but suggests the ‘idea’ what ought to and what not to and this ideal word works for communicating the divine thought of the poet. Besides thought, it suggests the hidden imagination through its connotation with the other words.

Word is, thus, a symbol of particular experience and their assemblage in a logical manner composes a sentence and thus gives the meaning of it in some newer experience. Its meaning indicated in the whole sentence gives the idea of the classification of poetry in terms of ‘śitrakāvya’, ‘gunibhūtvyāṅgya’ and ‘dhvanikāvya’. One word may stand for various meanings. It can have the potential of creating poly-meanings. Words are surrounded by a screen or a shade which is scented by the special pollen (*madhu*) of the flower. The screen or shade around the words filters the tenderness of experiences of the poet around their meanings. So, through verbal-medium the tenderness is suggested by the sacred meanings of the
word. Enshrouded in the words, their poly-meanings, again and again, enlighten the experience of the connoisseurs. Thus, poetry is composed of three things— the word, the sense and the imaginative experiences of the poet. So words should be interconnected and impinged upon one another so as to prove their potentiality in their meaning i.e. empirical, ideal and transcendental.

This can be further classified into three word-powers namely denotative (abhidhā), indicative (lakṣaṇā) and suggestive (vyahjanā) powers i.e. primary, secondary and beyond these two respectively. Language, thus, being the unit of words and that too meaningful words is a means of communication and a system of associations of sensations (visual, acoustic, olfactory, tactile, etc.). When a poet uses such words in his poetry (kavya), he makes use of figurative language without which poetry (kavya) cannot gain its momentum, strength and clarity.

1.2.1 Word Powers:

As far as the Western thought is concerned, “denotation is the set of things to which a symbol can be applied”; whereas connotation is “the properties in virtue of which anything is a member of the set which is the denotation” (Ogdan and Richards 187-188). To speak in simple terms, when two or more than two meanings are resolved into one, they are studied under the rubric of ‘connotation’. Barthes (1967) distinguishes between a first order signifying system, the level of denotation, and the second order signifying system, the level of connotation which is built on the first. According to him, language is the first order signifying system and literature is the second order signifying system. A linguistic sign such as ‘flower’ with the signifier ‘f-l-au-a’ is signified as a botanical object contrasted to such objects as the tree, leaves, fruit, etc. On the second level of signification, that is, on the plane of connotation, the sign of the first level becomes a signifier; it is no longer a botanical object but now connotes ‘softness, fragility and passion’ (signified).

Denotation is the dictionary meaning whereas connotation can be had according to stylistic and contextual variables. William Empson (1953) states that the ‘connotative dimension of meaning refers to those uses of language which foreground its multifunctional meaning-making potential. Literature is such a
language. Connotation foregrounds the interplay between multiple paradigmatic contrast sets by evoking a plurality of alternative contextualizing relations. Denotation does not refer to some intrinsic core of (usually) ‘cognitive’ meaning, independent of some contextualizing relations, but those contextualizing relations in which a single and most automatized contextual meaning is foregrounded.

Denotation has a direct correspondence between grammatical mood and illocutionary force. It roots itself on a set of conditions that are both necessary and sufficient to establish the truth of an utterance. On the contrary, connotation encodes itself in lexicogrammatical forms and interrupts direct correspondence between the grammatical mood and illocutionary force. Semiotically speaking, denotation uses its own expression plane whereas connotation does not use its own expression plane and roots itself on the explicit signification of the denotative level of the ‘schemata’ and ‘usages’ (Hjelmslev, 1961). Therefore, connotation articulates higher levels of contextualization that stand implicit in the linguistic structure.

Suggestive meaning in the West is not taken as it is in the Indian intellectual tradition. Roger Fowler opines “we must acknowledge that the meaning of a poem is more than the sum total of its cognitive and formal meanings, and that perhaps some of the causes of this meaning and value are inaccessible to verbal analysis” (The Language 38). Todorov (1983) has talked about verbal symbolism corresponding to the suggestive meaning. It is an indirect meaning for which another name is what we call signification. This verbal symbolism, he suggests, has two forms: lexical and propositional. In lexical symbolism, the primary meaning is abolished, as in metaphor; in propositional symbolism, the suggested meaning is in addition to the direct (primary) meaning. It implies that the utterance meaning is different from the word-meaning and hence, suggestive.

For Derrida, it is a matter of endless signification. In Derrida’s scheme “every signified functions in turn as a signifier, in an endless play of signification” (qtd. in Silvenuen 34). The viewpoints of Todorov and Derrida come close to the Indian concept of vyanjanā. Geoffrey Leech (1969) has also talked about three-level model, instead of two, which applies to the productive and receptive process of
language viz. Realization, Form and Semantics. Similarly, Sanskrit Poetics also talks of three-level model as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production (Poet)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Total Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Lakṣanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Abhidhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Vyañjanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like any classical language of the world, in Sanskrit also, many words are used in two or three meanings or more than that even (empirical, ideal and transcendental). Sāhityadarpana explains word as vācaka bringing vācyārtha with the word-power abhidhā i.e. denotation, expressing literal meaning; lakṣaka bringing in the meaning lakṣyārtha with the word-power lakṣanā i.e. indicative, expressing secondary meaning and vyañjaka bringing in the meaning vyañgārtha with the word-power vyañjanā i.e. suggestion, expressing suggestive meaning.

Therefore, Indian Poetics accepts these three types of relations obtained between words and their meanings. Whereas the denotative is the conventional meaning, indicative is derived under certain conditions when the literal fails to provide the accurate sense of the word, and suggestive is that which is obtained from a word over and beyond its denotative and indicative sense and in addition to them. The literal meaning in this case is not completely effaced but is submerged in the more important suggestive meaning. The very edifice of Indian Poetics is built on this three-fold distinction.
It is noteworthy that the speech theory and the theory of meaning has been a point of difference in Indian Poetics whether a real meaning of a word is its expression, or what is comprehended by way of suggestion and inference. The different schools of philosophy differed in ‘Śūbhabodha’ and this led rhetoricians to distinguish between the merits of abhidā and laksāṇā, expression and implication on the lines propounded by grammarian-philosophers. This directly resulted in a clustering of the study of poetics and grammar which progressed to a third function of word or ‘vyañjanā’ conceived on the analogy of the theory of the Sphoṭa which stated that ‘dhvani’ or ‘Sphoṭa’ is the primary capacity of words. Its signification was also propounded by Sphoṭāyana who was Panini’s predecessor. This theory was perfected in Vākyapadīya written by Bhartrhari. With astounding thoughtfulness, Bhartrhari draws a demarcation between Dhvani and Sphoṭa, the first of which is countless varying according to each pronunciation, while the second is characterized by oneness. It is noteworthy that his doctrine is a natural corollary to the doctrine of Verbal Monism that ascribes oneness to the Eternal Expression. Ānadvardhana adopted this theory and applied it to Poetics, by rejecting the earlier theories of rasa, rīti, and alamkāra and proposed that dhvani or vyañjanā is the soul of poetry.

The rhetoricians also recognize the existence of the function of suggestion in addition to the admitted function of denotation and indication. In explaining the superiority of this supernormal function to other recognized functions, they say, that the function of denotation conveys only one idea and the indication introduces different ideas under different circumstances, whereas the poetic function of suggestion leads to comprehension of myriad meanings from one and the same expression according to difference in the nature of the speaker and the person spoken to.

In Sanskrit poetics, the suggestion, which is the life of poetry of any variety, has been described by Mammaṭa as the sonic waves coming out of the echoes of the ringing bell. In the creative activity, this idea is just parallel to that of the layer-after-layer of consciousness, having been accumulated in the serene, meditative mind of the poet. Here, we get a sort of chemical process taking place between emotions and
their different forms and aspects. This poetic analysis is characteristic of Indian theory of suggestion, original and profound.

The poet expresses in verse while the reader grasps the implied suggestion inherent in the idea of the poet. Suggestion (dhvani) is the result of the function of vyanjanā as opposed to abhidā and lakṣaṇā on the basis of which poetry is classified under three types:

i) Dhvani: where suggestion is prominent.

ii) Gunibhūtavyānjanā: where suggestion is not important.

iii) Čitra: where suggestion is not manifest.

Ānandavardhana maintains that “Suggestive meaning which is admired and coveted by the connoisseur is reckoned as the soul of poetry. The expressed and the implied are its two varieties.” He points out that it is the suggestive meaning which flashes, all at once, on the mind of a discerning connoisseur apathetic towards the expressed meaning. “Suggestiveness”, says T.S. Eliot, “is an aura around a bright clear center” (On Poets 89). In order to have the “aura” (i.e. the suggestive meaning) we must have a bright clear center (i.e. the stated meaning).

Ānandavardhana while discussing the linguistic functions of communication (sabdavyāpāra) through abhidā and lakṣaṇā tried to show the incapabilities of these two śaktis in explaining serious poetry. So he also had to admit a third unnamed power of word/language that is suggestion (vyanjanā). Suggestive meaning is always beautiful which appeals not only to the heart but to the mind also. The creation of beauty is necessary for poetry or any art as its essential feature. Soul of the poetry is beauty whether is called Čaruvāpratī or dhvani. Beautiful means that which gives rise to aesthetic repose. Without beauty the activity of suggestion cannot unfold itself; it comes to rest in the literal sense itself. Grammarians also used the word for both the suggestive word and the suggestive meaning. To the great Indian grammarian, Panini, word (Pada) is that which ends either in a verbal or a nominal inflexion. Words are meaning-bearing patterns, the choice and arrangement of which gives the desired force to a sentence. The Kasika commentary on Panini’s
rule 8.1.8 states that a collection of words is a sentence provided it conveys one unified meaning.

Between the denotation of sense and its indication, there is not always much distance and so the latter is said to be only the tail of the former. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, however, thinks that indication is only the extension of denotation. Actually, in the suggestiveness of the poem, the layers of meanings unfold themselves later, but their sensibilities start working from the beginning. This is the communicability of literature in the true sense of the term. It acts as a clue to the mode of expression, peculiar to literature, and goes on giving new meanings. It is through the process of perfect sensuous concretisation, where the direct power of words is brought into full play, that the meanings are given vent to. The poet is, as it were, a seer who perceives and observes with his intellect, and in course of his composition, there is the spontaneous welling up of images without which there can be no poetry. These images are the units of impressions that the poet has gathered and he arranges them with the help of the words.

It is, therefore, an intrinsic meaning of the word which reverberates differently to different particulars. So greatest poetry is like a condensed form which gives precise hints of the delight by the response of melting-mind of a reader, wherefrom other meanings flow in their flux. It is the glory of the God, which he reveals into various meanings by suggestive word. So word has potentiality to illuminate the objects of which it is a symbol through its sense which is ontologically inseparable. The beautiful eye in the form of the word visualizes the beautiful things of the worlds with their aesthetic sense of experience and also suggests the hidden imagination through its connotation with other words.

Abhinavagupta, the great champion of the Dhvani-theory, offering a new solution to the problem of aesthetic experience, explains it away by the process of vyāśjanā. Contesting Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, a post-dhvani theorist, he says that beyond pratiṣṭa or perception there is no such process as ‘Bhoga’ or enjoyment of Rasa. Thus, the ‘Bhoga’ of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka is nothing but ‘asvāda’ which is effected by the power of Suggestion in poetry. The curtain of nescience covers the bliss portion of
our consciousness in ordinary circumstances, but the magic wand of Suggestion unfolds the curtain at the time of perception of a work of art and the same bliss portion is revealed thereby. And it is in such moments that an appreciator derives aesthetic experience. This *pratiti*, corresponds to the concept given by Bhartrhari, who speaks of the two entities in a significant speech, --- the sound that is comprehended by the auditory organ and the sound that delivers the actual meaning. Of these two entities, the first is referred to as *Dhwani* and the second as the *Sphota*. The *dhwani* conceived of in the science of language thus brings into revelation the eternal *Sphota* which alone is in a position to deliver the idea.\(^1\)

Abhinava further says that suggestion, if given its proper scope, with the beautiful, would bring us to the deepest stratum of the poem, but absence of beauty with the contact of *dhwani* would provide only intellectual feast of meanings. If we compare a poem with a flower, full bloomed, then the fragrance, its reflection in the water or seven colours of sun light on its petals on one side and the inner reference of particular situation of our soul on the other side, improve the beauty of a flower in its truest sense.

Hence, it would not be out of place to say that Sanskrit Poetician’s achievements, are mostly due to their efforts to determine the exact nature of suggested meaning of the expression used, of the relation of one meaning to another and of the relation of one expression to another. Therefore, words resonate and radiate. The hue they emit makes the language colourful and meaningfully bright and radiant. Their resonance not only gives distinction to the language but also sparkles the style and vision of any poet.

### 1.3 Poetic Language, Poetry and the Poet

Resonant words provide the framework of poetic language, which make literature. Any literature is composed of language. Two features perhaps will be noticeable in those works which form a society’s literature. One is the interest attaching to the writer’s choice of the framework for the discourses which together make up his extant work. He will have used a method of organizing and connecting what he wants to say on a particular topic, generally a unit which other writers have
used and which critics have labelled as the species and sub-species known as genres. The other distinguishing feature of literature brings in a word which has been given many interpretations: ‘imagination’. For the moment, it is sufficient to say that the meaning is not confined to that fantasy or even to the creation of characters and episodes which have never had a ‘real’ existence. It means that the linguistic utterance which involves imagination has a quality beyond the use of words to convey referential meaning.

Literature, then, seems to offer language which is different from what may be loosely termed the ‘normal’ or ‘everyday’ usage of a speech community, yet which is intelligible to the members of that community if they are willing to apply special standards of acceptability. Literary language has been chosen and manipulated by its user with great care and complexity than the average language user either can or wishes to exercise. If this distinctive use is recognized, it may be possible to discuss intelligently a writer’s individual ‘style’. The more important consideration is that literature is the work of men who were specially sensitive to the language of their time and who used the skill of language to make permanent their vision of life. They manipulated language to make it contain a unique series of experiences and interpretations.

Now, any language act constitutes the following factors, inalienably involved, as enumerated by Roman Jacobson, the remarkable Russian linguist and scholar:

CONTEXT
ADDRESSER MESSAGE ADDRESSEE
CONTACT
CODE

Each of these six factors determines a different function of language. Addresser sends a Message to the Addressee. To be operative, the message requires a Context graspable by the addressee, and either verbal or capable of being verbalized; a Code fully, or at least partially, common to the addresser and addressee (or in other words...
to the encoder and decoder of the message); and finally, a Contact, a physical channel and psychological connection between the addressee and the addressee, enabling both of them to enter and stay in communication.

Literature is, therefore, distinguished, as Czech scholar Mukarovsky says, by the “consistency and systematic character of foregrounding” (qtd. in Leech 57). And this is especially true of poetic language. The poet makes words and their combinations serve more than their ordinary function. Poetic meanings expressed through language are like a set of concentric circles of wider and wider scope. Hence, the art of poetry consists in the art of employment of limited medium of language having unlimited possibilities. As an instrument of verbal communication, poetry exploits more consistently the full potential of the language. A poem, thus, is an aesthetic object composed of language and poetic language differs from ordinary language in two essential respects:

(i) it permits greater liberties — these take the form of deviations from the grammar of the ordinary language
(ii) it imposes greater restraints.

As such, the language of poetry is characteristically oblique or indirect and thus has been properly recognized both in Indian and Western Poetics.

Scholars like Cassirer, Mukarovsky and Fyre have viewed literature as language. Not only poets and critics but also linguists, philosophers and stylisticians have become keenly aware of the creative use of language in poetry. Paul Valéry, both a poet and an inquisitive theoretician of poetry, calls it “an art of language” (The Art 64). Poetic language, in other words, is “the language at full stretch” (Nowottny 123). Mukarovsky rightly said, “Poetic or literary language is an aesthetically purposeful distortion of standard language” (qtd. in Nowottny 72). It is a language act distinguished from other language acts by characteristic of its own. It appears as a part of linguistic system, as an enduring structure having its own regular development of human expression through language in general.

Scholars, sometimes, have also discussed poetic language as one of the variants of literary language, a variant governed by the general regularity of higher
structures. It is a material like metal and stone in sculpture, like pigment and the material of the pictorial plane in painting, and so forth. Language, too, enters the work of art from outside as a sensorily perceptible phenomenon in order to become a vehicle of the non-material structure of the work; in the work of art it also undergoes elaboration, reorganization for that purpose. Nevertheless, there is a considerable difference between the artistic material and language. Stone, metal, pigment, and so on enter art as mere natural phenomena which gains a semiotic nature only in art whereas language in its very essence is already a sign.

It is on account of its expressive potential that poetic language has received attention of most creative artists. When Coleridge describes poetry as the best words in best order, he was taking due cognizance that language is not mere words. Poet Ransom said, “poetry is a kind of language” (The World’s 235). It is the external and internal form of language that makes a poem a poem. Therefore, a literary work cannot be properly understood without a thorough knowledge of the language which is the medium of expression.

Though attempts have been made to define poetry yet no exact and concrete definition is available. However, according to Encyclopaedia Britannica, we find that the poem is not so much a thought as it is a mind: talk with it and it will talk back, telling you many things that you might have thought for yourself but somehow didn’t until now brought them together. To Matthew Arnold, poetry is the most delightful and perfect form of utterance that human words can reach “thought and art in one” and as “nothing less than the most perfect speech of man” (Essays 3, 76). Ted Hughes has described a poem as “An assembly of living parts moved by a single spirit. The living parts are the words, the images, the rhythm. The spirit is the life which inhibits them when they all work together. It is impossible to say which part comes first, parts or spirit” (Poetry 17).

To Richards (1936), a poem is a union of the signifiant and signifie (in Saussure’s terms). Echoing Bhāmaha’s notion of sauhitya, he defines the commensurateness between form and meaning as a union in which the body, which is alive, is not to be conceived apart from that which informs it, that which it
embodies, and conversely. The critic Tillyard maintains: “All poetry is more or less oblique: there is no direct poetry” (Direct 5). Poetic language has, properly speaking, a transcendental quality – a sudden transformation which words assume under a particular influence.

According to Anandavardhana (Dvanyāloka) “sahṛdaya - hṛdayātalādādi śabdārthmayatvameva kāvyam” i.e. Kāvyā is nothing but the composition of meaningful words in such a way as to cause the arousal as emotion of joy in the mind of aesthetically receptive reader (the ideal speaker-hearer in Chomsky’s terminology). In the Prologue to Kapūrmanjari, Rajaśekhara also defines poetry as uktivīšeṣaḥ kāvyam i.e. a peculiar kind of speech. He further remarks: “Neither is the idea the point, nor the mere word, but the manner of expressing that idea in word is the thing that makes poetry” (Kāvyamimāṃsa, 46).

Noted Russian Formalist Roman Jacobson also agrees with the view that poetry is the mode of composition which is creative par excellence. Therefore, poetic language is a special, careful, elaborated, pruned and tidied form of language very different from everyday, spontaneous, precarious adventures of speech which make up, and have made up, most of the world’s linguistic activity and are in that sense ‘normal language’. Stankiewicz puts it, poetry is the “realm of individual creativity”, which necessitates “violence of language”. Paul Valéry says that the primary characteristic of ordinary language is that “as soon as it is understood it vanishes ... the language is replaced in our minds by what it has signified – the language itself does not last. The particular quality of poetic language, on the other hand, is that it lasts” (The Art 64). In poetry both form and impression remain. In other words, poetic messages enjoy a permanence which is not enjoyed by ordinary language messages. Again Valéry, in describing this quality of permanence in poetry, says that the poem “does not die for having been lived: it is expressly designed to be born again from its ashes and to become endlessly what it has just been. Poetry can be recognized by the property that it ends to get itself reproduced in its own form: it stimulates us to reconstruct it identically” (72).
Mukarovsky in his essay *Standard Language and Poetic Language* says that in ordinary language, the language elements are “automised” and in poetic language, they are “de-automised” (Freeman 42) or foregrounded. Poetry consists of language yet it produces effects that ordinary language does not produce. It is the intentional, systematic violation of the norm of the standard language that makes possible poetic utilization of language; without this possibility there would be no poetry. From this, one can very well infer that poetry is language differently ordered or arranged. The poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination and through foregrounding, the aesthetic function of language is activated. Hence, a work of art is seen as an organic unity, in which matter and manner, thought and expression are indissolubly one.

Ransom calls poetry “aesthetically organized language” (qtd. in Pathak, Vakrokti 5) and Indian Aestheticians made the same point nearly a thousand years ago with greater confidence. As Krishnamoorthy points out, “the whole field of Sanskrit *Alaṃkāraśāstra* or Poetics may be regarded as one continued attempt to unravel the mystery of beauty in poetic language” (Krishnamoorthy, Studies 22). Although Indian Aestheticians did not use the terminology of modern criticism, linguistics and stylistics, they seem to have a very clear idea of poetry, its creativity and expressive resources. Poetry, for them, is a kind of expression. This expression, however, is a linguistic one characterized invariably by beauty and charmingness, and thus Poetry, although as a linguistic expression owes its formal correctness to grammar, remains at least to a considerable extent, outside the province of grammar, a science dealing with only the linguistic expression in general and not poetic expression in particular. This beauty and charm is made possible by figural mode of expression and therefore, poetic language for them, falls under the domain of Poetics, a science that discusses how merely a linguistic expression is elevated to the status of poetic expression.

Beginning right from ‘Bharata’, the father of Indian dramaturgy, Sanskrit rhetoricians have framed definitions of poetry. Infact, in Sanskrit literature, the term *Kāvyā* means “the work or idea of the poet” and denotes verse as well as prose and
even a mixture of both (*Kāvyata iti kavistārya karma bhāvo vā kāvyam*). Poetic language is different from the current mode of speech (*atikrānta-prasiddha-prasthāna-sārānīḥ*) as well as the established manner of expression which we find in sciences (*śāstras*) and the like. The deviating mode of poetry may be compared to Weinreich’s contrast between the ‘desemanticized’ or low-voltage language of conventional usage and the ‘hypersemanticized’ or the high-voltage language of poetry (*Universals 117-118*). The deviation in poetic language is like the beautiful curve of the crescent moon and not like that of a dog’s tail. Bhāmaha defines it as “*Śabdārthau sahitau kāvyam*” (Kāvyālaṃkāra 1.16). Poetry ensues from a perfect commensurateness and organismic union (*sauhitya*) between form and content and Rajaśekhara explains *sauhitya* as the proper equipoise or compatibility (*yathāvat sahabhāva*) between word and meaning (Kāvyamimāṃsā 5). Bhāmaha says that poetry has to be in the form of cow’s tail, bushy at the end, with a crowd of surprises. It is strange and therefore beautiful. It is strange because there is deviation from what is commonplace. He strictly excludes from the purview of poetry ordinariness in expression or bald statement of fact or feeling. Dandin follows Bhāmaha chronologically and to some extent theoretically.

Vāmana, the author of the ‘*Kāvyālaṃkārasūtravṛtti*’, takes this stand on strikingness of expression and asserts that poetry is nothing but the most striking form of utterance that human words can reach: *Kāvyā-sabdoyam guṇālaṃkāra - sanskritayoh śabdārthayor-vartate* (KLS 1.1) and *Ritir -atmā kāvyasya. Viśiṣṭa - padaracanā rīti* (KLS 1.2 ). Kuntaka, one of the greatest Indian aestheticians, also affirms the significance of the parity of idea and its expression in poetry. To him, an idea insufficiently expressed is ‘dead’ (*mrtakalpa*) and an expression devoid of idea or conveying something other than the intended idea is ‘deceased’ (*vyāḍhibhūta*) (Vakroktijīvitam 14). The relationship between form and meaning has been conceived of by Kuntaka as mutual tension or rivalry (*paraspara – spardhītva*) – a constant challenge or provocation to each to hold its own without yielding to the other (Vakroktijīvitam 12). Like Kuntaka, who affirmed the significance of the parity of idea and its expression in poetry, Coleridge, writing on Shakespeare, also
says that in poetry meaning and expression are “reconciled” and fight for articulation “each with its shield before the breast of the other” (Biographia 19).

Ānandavardhana, the author of Dhvanyāloka, lays sole emphasis on suggested sense and calls it the soul of poetry. Mammaṭa in his “Kāvyā Prakāśā” defines poetry as: “Word and meaning devoid of blemishes, endowed with poetic excellence and sometimes devoid also of poetic figures, constitute poetry.” The phrase “sometimes devoid of poetic figures” gives the notion that in most cases, embellished word and sense constitute poetry. It is quite interesting to note that Alamkāra has been defined by Mammaṭa as that element by which the principal element, Rasa, is embellished. As ornaments like necklace etc. adorn a part of the body and thereby add to the excellence of the soul, similarly poetic figures directly residing in word and meaning and beautifying them, ultimately cause the excellence of the underlying soul, which according to him is Rasa in poetry. Mammaṭa also divides poetry into three distinct categories in relation to their power of suggestion. That piece of poetic composition, in which the suggested sense is more charming than the expressed meaning, has been called Uttama Kāvyā, quite in conformity with the Dhvanikāvyā of Ānandavardhana. Again, a piece of poetry in which the suggested content is less striking than the expressed idea, has been termed as Madhyama Kāvyā, which is Gunabhūtayānuga in Ānandavardhana’s vocabulary. Lastly, a composition endowed with Guna and Alamkāra but devoid of any distinct suggested sense has been named Adhamaṅkāvyā, which tentatively corresponds to Ānandavardhana’s lowest type of poetry, Čitrakāvyā.

But the definition of poetry and the concept of poetic language as advanced by Mammaṭa have been an object of bitter criticism in later ages at the hands of some worthy successors like Viśvanātha and Jagannātha. They vehemently attack each and every word occurring in the definition and prove it as unscientific, inaccurate and inconsistent. Viśvanātha, the author of “Sāhityadarpaṇa” puts stress that poetry is the spontaneous embodiment of sentiments in words. Pandīt Jagannātha, the celebrated author of the monumental work, the Rasagaṅgādhara, propounds the definition of poetry in the following manner: ‘Poetry is comprised of
words, i.e., the linguistic expression that delivers a charming idea.\textsuperscript{28} It is quite noticeable that in the definitions of Bhāmaha, Rudraṭa, Vāmana, Kuntaka, Mammata, Vidyānātha etc. both the word and the content, \textit{Śabda} and \textit{Artha}, have been exhibited as a component members of the \textit{Dvanda-compound} and also a subject of the proposition implying the definition of poetry. Such an employment of the word and the meaning as the component member of \textit{Dvanda-compound} and also the subject of the proposition signifies the equal importance of the two elements undoubtedly. By assigning equal importance to the expression and content, what these rhetoricians mean to say is that language and idea are inseparably connected, since a word is necessarily possessed of a meaning and a meaning must have to be communicated through the vehicle of a word.

Therefore, in poetry the thought content is to be properly adjusted with emotive content: there should be food for both intellect and intuition. The poetic expression, Sanskrit Poetics says, is of a peculiar nature, since it is endowed with the capacity of collecting a number of meanings around it. Hence, Indian thinking on poetry is largely centered around language. Poetry has been considered here primarily in terms of linguistic organization.

Again to quote Richards, poetic language “is the supreme form of emotive language” (Ogden and Richards 273) which provides the fuller modes of expression. And this stands true in case of Romantic poetry too. The Romantic view of poetry is also the result of a genuine urge i.e. the need to release or discharge emotions that have accumulated within us to such a degree that to contain them would be distressing. It bears some resemblance to Aristotle’s theory of catharsis in music and tragedy. A very great deal of poetry is, in this sense, a sublimation of emotions which is not allowable or not convenient to express in action thereby making it figurative expressions.

The Romantic view also holds that the impulse of good poetry is emotional and the stuff of living is emotion. The intellect comes in to identify the emotion and make us conscious of it, to classify it and to bring it into relation with other emotions, to refine upon them – in short to shape them. The moment we have found
a word, emotion is stamped with intellect. It is hard to determine how far emotion is the servant of our thought and how far thought is the servant of emotion. It was ‘Nature’ which taught Wordsworth three degrees of emotion: ‘unmixed delight, troubled pleasure and pure fright’. During Wordsworth’s creative process, imagination functions as a faculty which is both emotional and cognitive.

Wordsworth in Appendix on poetic diction added to the Preface to the Lyrical Ballads in 1802 writes:

“The earliest poets of all nations generally wrote from passion excited by real events; they wrote naturally and as men: feeling powerfully as they did, their language was daring, and figurative. In succeeding times, Poets, and Men ambitious of the fame of Poets, perceiving the influence of such language and desirous of producing the same effect without being animated by the same passion, set themselves to a mechanical adoption of these figures of speech, and made use of them, sometimes with propriety, but much more frequently applied them to feelings and thoughts with which they had no natural connection whatsoever. A language was thus insensibly produced, differing materially from the real language of men in any situation” (Enright and Chickera 185)

What is being condemned, of course, is that collection of tricks of diction which enables any reader of poetry to identify almost any passage in the eighteenth century at sight: ‘finny tribes’; personifications, classical allusions, words found rarely in prose. His own view of poetic diction was, in fact, simply that the poets ought once again to write ‘naturally, and as men’ and with real passion, making only those modifications of ordinary language which properly and naturally accompany real passion. It was only when Wordsworth tried to define more closely the kind of modifications needed to adapt the ordinary language of men to poetic purposes that disagreement arose. It is quite amusing to note that both Wordsworth and Coleridge, who also commented on these notorious half-way descriptions of Wordsworth, were
necessarily unaware that they were trying to make observations in a tricky field of linguistics without even glimpsing its existence.

So, it must be realized that poetry or art in general is a spiritual fact. Art is founded in feeling and imagination, the magnificent power of which produces the most vivid impression in the human soul. Poetry, Wordsworth asserted, originates from "emotions recollected in tranquility" (Enright and Chickera 171). Rejecting the contemporary emphasis on form and intellectual approach, that drained poetic writing of strong emotion, he maintained that the scenes and events of everyday life and the speech of the ordinary people were the raw material of which poetry could and should be made.

Now, who is the poet? To speak generally, the poet is a part of the stream of time and life which flows on and on ad infinitum. He shares its joys and sorrows; tears and laughter; hopes and despair; frustrations, depressions, oppressions, suppressions and fixations. But unlike others, he is "endowed with more lively sensibility, more enthusiasm and tenderness, who has a greater knowledge of human nature and a more comprehensive soul ..." (Enright and Chickera 171). He is also endowed with a synthetic and magical power called 'esemplastic power' a phrase from Coleridge. This super sensibility and the alchemy of imagination helps him transmute the base metals of everyday language into the gold of art and present the brazen experience turned into 'a golden' a phrase from Philip Sydney. In a nutshell, it can be said that a poet communicates his live experiences forged in the crucible of his imagination through a specific organization of linguistic choices aimed at particular aesthetic response, perhaps a very simple view of a piece of creative art which is made possible with the stylistic use of language.

Wordsworth wrote that while describing things in language really used by men, the poet throws over them "a certain colouring of imagination, whereby ordinary things should be presented to the mind in an unusual aspect" (Enright and Chickera 164). It quite corresponds with Kuntaka’s phraseology of Vakrokti whose whole work is a continuous discourse having as its sole aim the exemplification of the several ways in which a poet’s genius finds expression in literature. In the search
of the most satisfying mode of expression, the poet keeps on annexing new verbal
domains by making what T.S. Eliot (1957) calls ‘a raid on the inarticulate’. Aristotle
also said: ‘...the poet should prefer probable impossibilities to improbable
possibilities’ (Butcher 95).

The skill of expressing the deepest meaning in the fewest words is
considered the sign of a great writer. The poet makes words and their combinations
serve more than ordinary function. His choice of words and assigning their function
are characteristically different, chiefly because of their dexterous combinations and
striking relations. With the help of enchanting phrases, proper adjustment between
sound and sense and depth of import, the poet transplants his experience into the
mind of the refined appreciator. Thus poetry, emanating from the mind of the poet,
is transplanted further into the mind of the connoisseurs, and consequently, it owes
its existence both to the poet and to the connoisseur.

The poet's thoughts are largely “untranslatable” (Pathak, Vakrokti 72) and
the really important thing in poetry is not the literal assertion made in words, but the
way the assertion is made. In poetry, which is a special kind of human discourse, the
poet tries to communicate his vision or ideas in a highly individualized medium by
resorting to a ‘particular, and in part unique, use of language’. While imposing
certain formal restrictions on the poet, the language of poetry allows him licenses for
making unprecedented innovations by exploiting grammatical possibilities of the
language. Therefore, poetry is an organized act of violence perpetrated on ordinary
language. Deviation from the established mode of expression is one of the chief
devices the poet finds helpful in facing his exceptional challenge.

Leech (1969) also feels that a creative writer may have to transcend the
bounds of standard language to explore and communicate new areas of experience.
But he rightly points out that freedom granted to the creative artist has reached
'pathological degrees of abnormality' in some modern poets. He is of the view that
deviations inevitable as they are in poetry, should not be 'too violent and too
frequent.' The Indian approach, on the contrary, would never allow audacious
licences to the poet, and the freedom given to him has to be exercised within the
limits prescribed by the tradition. It has indeed a greater regard for tradition than for individual talent.

According to the Indian Alamkāra tradition which has a famous saying that: only that person who is dext at description can authoritatively be the title-holder of the word ‘Kavi’. One who has the three requisites (tatva) viz. genius (pratibhā), constant study of the popular classics (lokaśāstra kā anusilan), and practice (vyūtpatti) in appropriate proportion is a poet sublime. In the field of Poetics, pratibhā or śakti is acknowledged as the most important cause of poetry. It is often identified with poetic genius. It is explained as the natural and innate power enabling the poet to have visions. To Abhinavagupta, it is the capability of creating something unique (apurva-vastu-nirmāna-ksamaprajñā) and the soul factor responsible for the inception of the rasa – ensouled beauty in poetry. Pratibhā has been described by Rudrata as insight in the concentrated mind, giving flashes of elegant ideas and expressions. Ānandavardhana has dealt at length with the significance of pratibhā: “it is this gift that makes a poet great; even defects of craftsmanship gets submerged on account of imagination; and endowed with this power, a poet is able to transform trite ideas into real poetry.”

Kuntaka goes to the extent of declaring that whatever charm there is in poetry is due to the power of imagination. The ‘striking activity of the poet’ (vakra-kaviyāpāra) is nothing but kavi-pratibhā – vyāpāra (the shaping power of the poet) transcending the mundane with imagination (Vakroktijāvitam 48, 140). Mahimbhatta also calls it the third eye of Lord Śiva, for it reveals to the poet the very life of things. The poet’s sensibility is thus far more comprehensive and his perception acute than those than the ordinary man. The poet however looks at the objects, happenings, and men and women of the day-to-day world with a disinterested eye and his imagination enables him to shed what Wordsworth would call ‘the film of familiarity’ and perceive them uniquely. The poet’s imagination invests even the meanest object with great significance and make even the ugliest appear charming, objectifying his vision of reality in expressive words (Vyaktiviveka 2. 116-119).
Most Indian Aestheticians regard imagination (pratibhā i.e. poetic genius) as inborn. Rudrata, however, would classify it into two types: inborn (sahaja) and acquired (utpādyā). Moreover, imagination, that is pratibhā, has been considered more important by Indian Poeticians than learning (vyutpatti) and practice (abhyāsa). Dandin and Mamata are of the view that all the three are the causal factors of poetry. But others like Rājaśekhara, Hemaśandra and Jaideva hold that it is imagination that is most important cause of poetry, the other two factors serving as additional causes only.

In the realm of poetry altogether new expressions are not used; those that are common in ordinary usage find their entry into this land. But the intuition of the poet arranges them in such a way that the ordinary becomes extra-ordinary, --- the common becomes the vehicle of the poet’s rich experience. Ānandavardhana states that when a poet is engaged in his creative activity, various structural patterns and various synonyms pervades his mind, of which he picks the best.

The RgVeda introduces the parallelism of the Winnowing Machine and says that just as barley is sifted by the Winnowing Machine, so expression also is sifted by the critical intellect of the poet. Bhāmaha, the originator of Indian Stylistics, says that a good poet is by nature endowed with an entrancing language; the language poets use is essentially different from that a commoner uses in his daily life or a scientist uses in his theoretical dissertation; even a faulty word, if used skillfully by the poet, augments beauty. Here, it should be noted that Bhāmaha is the first Indian poetician to glorify the poets with the epithet, vakravāk, i.e. gifted with charming language. Rājaśekhara has divided Kavi in eight different types:

i) Kāvyakaviḥ punaraśtaḥ račanākaviḥ – i.e. those who write for the sake of writing poetry.

ii) Śabdakaviḥ – i.e. the poet manifesting his skill through the jugglery of words.

iii) Arthakaviḥ – i.e. the poet of hidden meanings

iv) Alamkārakaviḥ – i.e. the poet skilled in using figures of speech

v) Uktikaviḥ – i.e. the poet of dictums
vi) Rasakavih – i.e. the poet exciting different passions
vii) Mārgakavih – i.e. the poet of tradition
viii) Śāstrārthakavih i.e. the poet of argument

Bhaṭṭa Tāuta, Abhinavagupta’s Guru, makes a pertinent observation in his Kāvyakautuka when he maintains that the poets must have the two-fold endowment of vision and expression and that without the latter the seer cannot become a poet:

“It has been said that no non-seer can be deservingly called a poet, and one is a seer only by virtue of his vision. Vision is the power of disclosing intuitively the reality underlying the manifold materials in the world and their aspects. To be called a ‘poet’ it is not enough to be possessed of this vision of reality. But in common parlance, the title is accorded to him alone who possesses vision as well as expression. Thus, although the first poet, Vālmiki, was highly gifted with a clear vision, he was not hailed to as a poet until he embodied it in a poetical work.”

To Wordsworth, as to Coleridge, the poetic mind was creative, but unlike Coleridge, he held that it was stimulated and worked upon by the creative power of Nature, since Nature was possessed by the same divine being, which ran through all things, of whose presence he was conscious in his own ‘interior life’. Hence, the poet is a sensitive being, a creative soul. He creates a new language differently patterned, in order to convey the desired meaning.

A contemplation of the poetic process has given rise to several key-words in the history of aesthetics – the Platonic or Blakean word ‘Inspiration’ (Imagination), the Aristotelian word ‘Imitation’, the Crocean word ‘Expression’, Tolstoy’s word ‘Communication and Persuasion’, a word which Bernard Shaw might have liked to accept. All these words reveal a shift of emphasis, on the part of aesthetician, on the part of the poetic process or the other. The aesthetician tends to regard Inspiration, Imitation, Expression, Communication or Persuasion as the central part of the poetic process and he subordinates other parts to it, almost to a vanishing point. Viewed comprehensively, the poetic process is the sum total of all these parts which is
coloured by the poet’s imagination based on his poetic vision which can range from
the most trivial to the most sublime. The poetic “vision” is the characteristic gift of
the Poet.”Vision,” as Sir Aurobindo has said,” is to the poet what discrimination is to
the philosopher and observation is to the scientist” (Gokak 11).

Since kāvya formation is like a garland which is possible with the help of
flowers that are words, then who is the creator of that garland --- naturally the poet —
who is the poet --- that intuitive faculty which brings for the novel fancies inspired
with the emotive experience constitutes a poet who is endowed with poetic genius,
poetic gift and poetic imagination and is able to conceive and create the un-com-at-
able work of art.

1.3.1 Poetic Function and Meaning

Poetic language is a language within language. Corresponding to the six
factors enumerated by Jacobson in a language act, there are six major functions,
each assuming an orientation within the verbal message on one of the factors:

1) emotive (expressive)
2) conative (appellative)
3) metalingual (metalinguistic, ‘glossing’)
4) poetic (aesthetic)
5) referential (cognitive, denotative, ideational)
6) phatic

The poetic function comprises the focus within the verbal message on the verbal
message itself. In the poetic function, in relation to and as against the five other
functions of language, there is a dominance of a focus upon message. Therefore,
poetic language is that in which the poetic function is the dominant function, but by
no means the only function. Dominance presumes a hierarchization of functions, not
an absolutization of functional differences. Now, the predominance of poetic
function and the subordination of the other function does not mean that the other
functions are subordinate to the extent to being excluded. On the contrary, any one
or more of the functions may be present in a variety of ways and with more or less
importance viz-à-viz the poetic function.

Since the poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis
of selection into the axis of combination, the construction of poetic message is based
on a complex interaction between two different interrelated and mutually
implicating operations of selection (or substitution) and combination (or contexture),
wherein selection (from a repertory of codified signs and sign-matrices) generally
precedes (and is usually complemented by) a succeeding combination. Now, the
signs and sign-matrices selected are usually (but not always) related to each other by
a variety of similarity relation, including equivalence, similarity, dissimilarity,
contrast, antonymy, synonymy, opposition etc. On the other hand, the signs and
sign-matrices combined are usually (but not always) related to one another by
contiguity.

This projection is the defining characteristic of poetic language. Thus, syllable is equated with syllable (in syllable-based meter for example), stress, with stress, word boundary with word boundary, pause with pause etc. whereas in 'ordinary' speech (the referential function), speakers do not measure the number of syllables or stress etc. In like fashion, finite verb is equated with finite verb, comparative degree with comparative, noun with noun, affix with affix, temporal adverb with temporal adverb, etc. Thus, poetic language displays overall a
hierarchical structure of symmetries based on repetitions, regularities, and
systematizations of various kinds.

Mukarovsky states that poetic language is permanently characterized only
by its function; however function is not a property but a mode of utilization a given
phenomenon. Poetic language belongs among the numerous other functional
languages, each of which is an adaptation of a linguistic system to a certain goal of
expression. Aesthetic effect is the goal of expression. However, the aesthetic
function, which thus dominates in poetic language (being only a concomitant
phenomenon in other functional languages), concentrates attention on the linguistic
sign itself (On Poetic 9).
Thus, poetic language is metaphoric. Any linguistic sequence is arranged not only consecutively but also hierarchically. To quote Jakobson, “In poetry where similarity is superimposed upon contiguity, any metonymy is slightly metaphorical and any metaphor has metonymical tint” (Linguistics 28) but it remains the case that metaphoric is the dominant mode. “This emphasis on metaphoric or paradigmatic relationships in the discourse leads correspondingly to a weakening of metonymic or syntagmatic relationships – i.e. the relationship of contiguity in time and space, and of cause and effect” (Lodge 104).

The poetic or metaphoric meaning is then the actualization of the linguistic sign which presents a dichotomy between a relational invariant – sometimes called general meaning – and a variety of hierarchized contextual variants (special meanings) including the basic variant. The variants are themselves linguistic phenomena. They include diverse literal interpretation as well as figurative transfers, both metaphorical and metonymic. They are to a certain extent codified, although not completely, since the creativity associated with clauses, sentences, utterances, discourses means the possibility of providing new contexts and thus new variants. There are both habitual associations and novel associations. In fact, ‘poetic creativity’ largely resides in the exploitation of such possibilities.

Referential or ordinary speech lends less to multiplicity of meaning and more to denotative precision. In the poetic function, however, the breaking of the tie between contextual variant i.e. special meaning and the object/idea is interconnected with the multiplicity of meaning, the inherent ambiguity, the split reference and multiplicity of denotata of the poetic text. “The oscillation between several semantic planes, typical of the poetic context, loosens up the bond between sign and the object. The denotative precision arrived by ‘practical language’ gives way to connotative density and wealth of associations” (Erlich 185) i.e. the suggestion in Indian terminology. Therefore, the potentiality of various figurative transfers leads to the ‘levels of meaning’ inherent in the text. Furthermore, the multifunctionality of the text may lead to a variety of different interpretations depending on the hierarchization of various functions.
1.3.2 Role of Deviance

The literary language constitutes the background against which the linguistic aspect of the poetic work is perceived. It is precisely the deviations from literary usage which are evaluated in poetry as artistic and aesthetic. The artistic and aesthetic uses of language are essentially novel (deviant). They extend productive linguistic process, disrupt expected sequence and proliferate statistical rarities, counteracting linguistic naturalness (ease of perception, articulation and cognition). The result is to increase the ‘palpability’ of linguistic form, to renew perceptions of linguistic substance and semiotic relation.

It is quite noteworthy that a scientist often takes his words (signs) from the ordinary language and amputates them. In his hands, language attains a high degree of precision but at the same time suffers a tremendous degree of restriction. Like a logician, a scientist reduces and diminishes the meaning in ordinary speech. Ordinary speech is woolly and emotional, but scientific discourse takes out the wool and emotion leaving us with a set of finely defined concepts and relationships. A poet, on the other hand, (as the Greek equivalent of the term suggests) is a maker, maker of new worlds. Each work of verbal art creates a world of its own. A poet is nothing if he is not creative --- the literary artist also works with the same ordinary language that the scientists and the logicians employ. But his way of handling language, as is recognized by all who have given some serious thought to poetic language, is essentially different from that of a scientist. In order to create, the poet must destroy the barriers imposed upon him by the ‘code’; otherwise he will ever remain within the domain of inane tautologies. This breach of code gives rise to deviance. Deviation from the established mode of expression is one of many resources that the poet finds helpful in facing his exceptional challenge.

The fact that deviation is a distinguishing mark of poetry had been established in Western Criticism as early as Aristotle (Poetics, XXII). The use of this device, however, has been discussed in detail in modern stylistics. Using Chomsky’s concept of “degrees of grammaticalness”, Professor Sol Saporta in “The Application of Linguistics to the Study of Poetic Language” in Seabeok’s symposium suggests
that the language of poetry is characterized by the density of its “sequence of lower-order grammaticalness” (84), rising at times to an “optimum ungrammaticalness” (92). Hence, deviation. Therefore, deviation, it is said, performs a central role in linguistic organization in poetry, and to analyze the significance and scope of poet’s creativity, we have to assess the communicative import of deviance in poetry. Deviation has been described as “a disruption of the normal process of communication” (Leech 25) by leaving “a gap” in one’s understanding of a text. It may involve omission or suspension of rules of grammar, changes in their acceptability, alterations in the structural changes indicated by them, their reordering or addition of new rules.

The phenomenon of poetic distortion, which gives rise to figurative language, consists in moulding the immediately given intuition or phenomenon – so distorting it, so to speak – as to express an intuition, a meaning not otherwise expressible. Chomsky, the leader of the transformational-generative grammar, who initiated a detailed discussion on linguistic deviance, remarks:

“...There are circumstances in which the use of the grammatically deviant sentences is very much in place ... . In such cases ... a striking effect is achieved precisely by means of a departure from the grammatical regularity” (qtd. in Pathak, Vakrokti 74).

A “well chosen deviant utterance,” says Chomsky, “may be richer and more effective” (Methodological 234). Its richness lies in the demand the deviation makes on one’s interpretative ingenuity, necessitating recognition of various degrees of grammaticalness. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning here that Chomsky himself is not unaware of the limits of this approach for in general, “the rules of stylistic reordering are very different from grammatical transformations” (Aspects 127). Thus, a grammar-based analysis of a poem is not indispensable for a proper appreciation of poetic style for the simple reason that “no grammatical analysis of a poem can give us more than the grammar of the poem” (Riffaterre, Stylistic 213). Besides, Edward Sapir is right when he says: “All grammars leak” (qtd. in Sebeok 65).
Bhāmaha in Indian *Ālauṃkāraśāstra* also feels alike and would not normally brook the presence of a single defect in a poetic composition and would compare a poem violating the rules to an unworthy son bringing shame on his father. But grammar, he admits, can be occasionally sacrificed for beautiful expressions in poetry. “Grammar is no grammar”, he maintains, “meaning no meaning, logic no logic, art no art, if these do not subserve poetry…” (Kāvyālauṃkāra I.9). The value of deviation in poetry has been established by various modern critics and scholars also. Paul Valéry has affirmed the significance of linguistic deviation in poetry. He points out that the *language* is first transformed into non-language and then into a form of language differing from the ordinary form. He further holds:

“The writer is … a maker of deviation. This does not mean that all deviations are permitted to him: but it is precisely his business and his ambition to find the deviation that enrich, that give the illusion of the power or purity or depth of language. In order to work through language he works on language” (qtd. in Pathak, Vakrokti 73).

1.4 Concept of Style and Stylistics

Poetry demands a certain and particular kind of sensibility both in its creation and appreciation. Neither is the idea the point, nor the mere word but the manner of expressing that idea in words is the thing that makes for poetry. What matters is the poet’s way of presentation of verisimilitude. One will be seized by a curiosity as to how this presentation of verisimilitude takes place and a novel work of art is created. Here, the function of style and the concept of stylistics start since language includes both obligatory and variable features at all levels of analysis viz. phonemic, morphemic, syntactical etc. and the study of style concerns the variable features of the code. Many take it to be optional like vocabulary as contrasted with grammar and that mere variation of style is made not to alter the substance or the content of what is expressed but only the way of expressing it. But the concept of style is an old one. It goes back to the very beginnings of literary thought in Europe. It appears in connection with rhetoric rather than poetics. Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian treated style as a proper adornment of thought. Style until recent times
has been a division of rhetoric. “Language is the dress of thought and style is the particular cut and fashion of the dress” (Hough 3). To learn style, one had to learn the types of figures of speech and the appropriateness of each to different levels of discourse – high, middle and low.

Crystal and Devy (1969) talk of four commonly occurring senses of style:

i) as the language habit of one person. For e.g. Shakespeare’s style, Conrad’s style etc. Charles E. Osgood also seems to convey this sense when he says: “Style is defined as the individual’s deviations from the norms for the situations in which he is encoding, these deviations being in the statistical properties of those structural features for which there exists some degree of choice in his code” (Some Effects 293).

ii) all the language habits shared by a group of people at one time or over a period of time. For e.g. the style of the Augustan poets, the style of the Romantic poets etc. Hendricks calls it ‘group style’. (Hendricks 1976, p.101-72)

iii) effectiveness of a mode of expression. For e.g. ‘clear’ or ‘refined’ style. This is something like making a value judgement, consciously or otherwise, on the over-all effect of the language on ourselves.

iv) ‘style’ referring solely to literary language.

These four senses of the term comply either to (i) style taken as on an evaluative index (ii) style taken as on an intimate, individuating index.

The first and third sense of Crystal and Devy’s correspond to Baffon’s famous phrase: ‘style, c’est l’ home meme’ i.e. ‘style is the man himself’. Quiller-Couch (1976) remarked – ‘Style in writing is much the same as good manners in other human discourse.’ Encyclopaedia Britannica has incorporated Charles Bailey’s definition: ‘style in language arises from the possibility of choice among alternative forms of expression, each of which has a different evocative value. Ohmann (1964) puts it as – style in language becomes alternative ways of expressing the same content and also “part of a characteristic way of deploying the transformational
apparatus of a language” (Generative 40). Therefore, style can be constructed as linguistic choice (cf. Enkvist 1964, 1986; Halliday 1971). As linguistic choice can occur at any linguistic level, it will be clear that particular styles may result from choices made at any linguistic level or combinations of levels. Hence, it is quite clear that an understanding of style must involve comparisons between what actually occurs and what might have occurred. It is also worth noting that writers can make deviant choices, i.e. choices that fall outside the normal bound of language code. Such choices may affect style and/or meaning (Enkvist 1964; 1973, 98-108).

According to Bernard Bloch, “The style of a discourse is the message carried by the frequency- distributors and transitional probabilities of its linguistic features, especially as they differ from those of the same features in the language as a whole” (Linguistic 42). Graham Hough takes style as “a part of meaning, but a part which can properly and reasonably be discussed on its own” (Style 8). The analysis of style essentially involves identification and calibration of the various dimensions along which messages may differ because style is the characteristic of message and not utterance tokens. Style can also be seen as a strand in a culture or civilization: a coherent, self consistent way of expressing certain behaviour or performing certain kinds of acts. It is also a selective way: there must be alternative choices, though actually they may never be selected. Style may, therefore, be investigated both as a deviation from norm and as ‘a system of coherent ways or patterns of doing things.’

A literary work is considered good, if the style element fuses into the style compound as the discovered realization of the author’s artistic intension; it is bad, if the style elements are contradictory in themselves, do not fuse into an entity, and do not translate the artistic intension of the author. Style, therefore, being a process which transforms the poet’s basic concept into an effective and meaningful message, is not merely a superstructure but an integral part of communication. In the words of Paul Valery (1958), what makes the style is not merely the mind applied to a particular action; it is the whole of a living system extended, imprinted and recognizable in expression. Hence, style is a deviation, which means purposeful
distortion of language resulting in foregrounding. A style is created not by majorities but by certain conspicuous uses of elements.

A linguistic approach to style will be based on the assumption that all poetry is language but not all language is poetry. When we talk of literary style, we come to the term stylistics. Charles Bally, one of the founding fathers of modern stylistics and virtually the inventor of the term ‘stylistics’ wrote that a littérature (i.e. a poet, a novelist, an orator) “makes a voluntary and conscious use of language…secondly, and above all, he uses language with an aesthetic intension; he strives to create beauty with words, as a painter does with colours or a musician with sounds” (Bally 19). He conceived of stylistics as the study of expressive resources of a given language.

The term “Stylistics” is employed in a variety of senses by different linguists. The study of language and literature obviously has common frontiers and simply speaking, the term stylistics refers to the study of literary style, or, to make matters even more explicit, the study of the use of language in literature. At its narrowest interpretation it refers to the linguistic analysis of literary texts. One of the aims of stylistics in this sense is to identify those features of a text that give it its individual stamp and mark it as a work of a particular author. Another is to identify the linguistic features of the text that produce a certain aesthetic response in the reader.

Stylistics is actually language study at a special level. “The claim of stylistic rests essentially on the proposition that the farthest ranges of a writer’s art, the depths of his emotional experience, the heights of his spiritual insight, are expressed only through his words and can be apprehended only through an examination of his verbal art” (Hough 39) and “that style-study that fails to go on to the consideration of meaning is doomed to sterility” (Hough 50). Stylistics is that part of linguistics which concentrates on variation in the use of language often, but not exclusively, with special attention to the most conscious and complex uses of language in literature. Stylistic choices like any other linguistic phenomena are manifested in parole but described with reference to langue.
The Penguin Dictionary of Language defines stylistics as “the study of any situationally distinctive use of language and the choices made by individuals and social groups in their uses of language”; alternatively the study of the aesthetic use of language in all domains. According to Webster’s New World Dictionary and Thesaurus: stylistics is “the study of style as a means of analyzing works of literature and their effect.” The purpose of stylistic analysis is to investigate how the resources of a language code are put to use in the production of actual message. It provides a basis for aesthetic appreciation by bringing to the level of conscious awareness features of the text. Stylistics, therefore, is the study of literary discourse from a linguistic orientation and its continuous preoccupation with style has brought to the fore ‘a number of fundamental questions’ pertaining to literary analysis.

Roman Jacobson has accepted the importance of linguistics in the study of poetry. But stylistics is not purely linguistics. Linguistics does the scientific analysis of language and describes it as it is. But stylistics moves a step forward and explores the real meaning of an utterance. It not only provides a language analysis but also talks of aesthetic beauty and aesthetic joy and interprets it from different angles. It is a critical faculty which develops and organizes the understanding of a work of art with objective language analysis without any prejudice and brings out the real meaning, the essence/core of the work of art. Roman Jacobson is essentially correct when he maintains that “a linguist deaf to the poetic function of language and a literary scholar indifferent to linguistic problems and unconversant with linguistic methods are equally flagrant anachronisms” today (qtd. in Sebeok 377). What has been said about linguistics can be said with greater force about stylistics. Therefore, the function of stylistics is not just to study the surface structure of a work of art but to analyze its deep structure taking care not to dissect the aesthetic delight but to explore it.

The Czech and Russian School of Formalists asserted that literature performs an aesthetic function of defamiliarisation through its special use of language. Literary language foregrounds itself. Modern stylistics, which works on the twin premises of deviance and linguistic choices, has imbibed the spirit of both
schools and makes a masterly example of how literature and linguistic can work in tandem to the benefit of both. It would also not be out of place to mention that any stylistic analysis must begin with an act of submission to the work as it is in itself and unlike most linguistic analysis, stylistics is essentially evaluative and therefore comparative – an assessment of the effectiveness of linguistic choice, relative to certain aesthetic intentions and within the constraints of certain expressive means. As a result, stylistics can never be purely objective or descriptive.

On the other hand, Indian Aestheticians did not use the terminology of modern criticism, linguistics and stylistics. They seem to have had a very clear idea of poetry, its creativity and expressive resources. A close examination of various aspects of Indian Poetics reveals that Indian Aestheticians never separated linguistics from poetics. From the very beginning, they took due cognizance of linguistic aspects of a literary composition for its proper evaluation. Even Croce’s whole theory in Western Aesthetics amounts to an eloquent plea for unity of the two disciplines i.e. aesthetics and linguistics, labelled as “Identity of Linguistic and Aesthetic” in the eighteenth chapter of his “Aesthetics” which speaks as:

“Aesthetics and Linguistics, conceived as true sciences, are not two distinct things, but one thing only” and that “the truth and errors of the one are the truth and errors of the other” (Aesthetics 142, 151).

Therefore, stylistics in the Sanskrit tradition does exist in some important and undefined sense as Sanskrit Poetics is based on linguistic theorizing. Not only this but the significance of the responsive reader too, which has only recently been realized in Western Stylistics, has been paid adequate attention in Sanskrit Poetics. Not only what happens at the poet’s end but also what goes on in the reader’s consciousness is observed minutely.

Right from Bharta to Viśvanātha, it may be noted that almost all have invariably laid stress on the importance of style in a literary composition. Bharata has termed it as Vṛitti, a particular style of composition. According to Indian Alamkārasāstra, poetry, like a human being, has two constituents – body and soul. Words constitute the body, whereas according to Vāmana, Rīti (which comes close
to the concept of Style in the Western world) is the soul of poetry. Whereas śabdālamkāras are a property of the form i.e. body, arthālamkāras and guṇas are the property of the content i.e. soul. Style (ṛiti) has been likened to ‘the proper adjustment of limbs in a body.’ Vāmana has laid down in clear terms that it is nothing but a particular arrangement of words in a poetic composition. Ānandavardhana calls it pada–saṅghaṭana and defines it as a system of placing words in a composition.

Kuntaka, the author of ‘Vakroktijīvitam’, puts great stress on style which he named as ‘Mārga’. He is aware of the word ‘ṛiti’ and its classification made by Daṇḍin and Vāmana but he does not accept their theory of ṛiti. He rejected this theory based on the classification of good, bad or indifferent. According to him, the nature of the poet is itself the style of his poetry or any other art. Poet is certainly different than the common man in furnishing his creativity. So in the context of the poet, we should enumerate only power (sakti) culture (vyūtpatti) and practice (abhyāsa). The “Aucitya” emphasizes appropriate words and ideas while “Saubhāgya” arises out of the realization of the resources of a composition. The outcome of all this determines the style of any work of art. According to Rudrāṭa’s commentator Nāmisādhu, ṛiti and vakrokti are synonymous.

Thus, a good writer provides a prism-like effect in his style and forces whatever kind of contemplation he wishes on his reader. The method of expression determines the reader’s attitude. A true creative writer drops his words into our mind like stones in a pool and ever-widening circles of meanings essentially ring round and encompass the store of one’s own experience. Style, therefore, is treated today as a useful key to the total meaning of a work. It is a process that transforms the basic concept into an effective and meaningful message.

1.5 Aim of Study

Ornamentation (Arthālamkāras i.e. Tropes) is said to be a style of language but it is not only a style as it styles the language of the poet. And when its application in different languages is studied, it enters the domain of stylistics. It provides the required alertness to the use of language variety, register, ambiguity,
symbolic assonance etc. and helps to understand, interpret, enjoy and appreciate a work of art.

The main purpose of literature which is a unique kind of discourse, is not informational but amusement and aesthetic indulgence of self as well as others. It is deviant in form and character. It can break all rules (grammatical, communicative, logical) with impunity, not to hamper communication, but to enhance its effect. For example, the famous lines of Wordsworth’s “Daffodils”:

“Ten thousand saw I at a glance
Tossing their heads in sprightly dance”

clearly shows that the expression “Ten thousand saw I” violates the rules of syntax, yet, it neither seems ungrammatical nor causes any incoherence. Inversion and deviance, here, are deliberate and create a very special effect.

Therefore, poets do what we all do whenever we speak earnestly; they extend the sense of words for their own purpose. The present study investigates how far Wordsworth and Kālidāsa could extend their vision to improvise the sense of words used to achieve their ends. How can that be accomplished? This study, therefore, brings forth the comparative stylistic analysis of figurative language employed by Wordsworth and Kālidāsa, the two giants of English and Sanskrit respectively on their description of Nature as both are claimed to be the pioneers in this respective field. The stylistic pattern (variation) in languages and of the way in which this is exploited by their users has been studied focusing on the usage of TROPES on the description of Nature, mainly on Simile (Upamā) and Metaphor (Rūpaka).

The purpose is the exposition of literary texts in the framework of the medium used for creative purposes. I aim to explore the way the writers style the language in the process of creation to make for the intended and meant. How does literary language convey meanings and what kind of meanings they are which are conveyed? My primary attention is to pinpoint the way the two have used figurative language in their writings as alamkāras reveal two implications:

a) Alamkroṭi iti Alamkāra i.e. which embellishes and adorns poetry is alamkāra.
Likewise, in English, the field of metaphor has also been divided into two views. In the Classical (Aristotle, Cicero etc.), metaphor is mostly seen as decoration, detachable from language – a way to achieve certain stylistic effects. The Romantic view (Plato, Shelley, Coleridge, Richards) sees metaphor as language itself. Hence, as creating new reality i.e. the former taking it as a means and the latter taking it as an end.

In simple words, I aim to prove that:

(a) *Alamkāras* are language itself, hence creating new reality.
(b) *Alamkāras* are a way to achieve certain stylistic effects.

This study, therefore, aims at stylistically comparing selected verses of English and Sanskrit texts with regard to the description of Nature. Hence, the purpose of this study is two-fold:

(a) **Primary** is to explain as to what these literary works have in common and in what way they differ from each other.
(b) **Secondary** is to justify theories of simile and metaphor employed by Kālidāsa in accordance with his ancient Indian poet-philosophers when it provides a new being in language, an increment to consciousness and a growth in the self.

Sanskrit Poetics says that the poetic expression is of a peculiar nature, since it is endowed with the capacity of collecting a number of meanings around it. The enchanting expression in poetry goes to present the pleasing implicit, which differs from case to case inasmuch as different impressions are awakened in the minds of different persons on comprehension of the same content. It is for this reason that the
function of Vyañjanā is described in terms of Sanskāra or impression by the Viayākarana. How does this vyañga work as the basis of metaphoric language is also given recourse. As Matthew Arnold said, “Critics give themselves great labour, to draw out what in the abstract constitute the character of high quality of poetry. It is much better simply to have recourse to concrete examples” (qtd. in Doubleday 1) and the present study aims at analyzing selected examples from both the poets with regard to metaphoric language based on word-powers.

It is also an established fact that the romantic poems are self-conscious partly because of the mixture in them of self-assertion and self-doubt. In Wordsworth’s case, poem after poem seeks to create the taste by which it may be enjoyed. But as Matthew Arnold suggested his readers that Wordsworth is a poet of passages, and in order to appreciate his poetry, we shall have to refer to the few chosen poems rather than to the mass of huge production ranging from the depiction of poor peasant life to the highest expressions of noble ideals. Hence, to limit the scope of my study as regards Wordsworth, I have taken The Prelude and some other poems for study. The Prelude is the essential living document for the interpretation of Wordsworth’s life and poetry as its sub-title “The Growth of a Poet’s Mind” lends a new meaning to it. Here is a great poem upon a grand scale – one of the great poems of our language – in which we are able to “watch the poetry growing” [Prof. De Selincourt]. Since The Prelude of 1850 version is a better composition than the A-text in which weak phrases are strengthened and its whole texture is more closely knit, I rely on this B-text for the present study. And in The Prelude, I have picked up the precedence pertaining to Nature since ‘Nature’ is the single most significant and powerful codifying term in the whole lexicon of The Prelude. The examples from other poems will also be alike.

On the other hand, every linguistic group in India must prize and study its lingual masterpieces because the contribution of India to her own greatness and the welfare of the world must necessarily be through the chief vernaculars of India. But he who thinks that he can achieve the future enrichment of the vernacular literature without an extensive and intensive study of Sanskrit is the most deluded of the
mortals. If Sanskrit literature is the corrective and the remedy and the supplementary illumination of universal culture, the filial vernacular literatures cannot afford to rebel and to sever their affiliation. The rest of Asia knows and feels its debt of inspiration to Sanskrit. Europe and America have also realized and testified its value. It has been reserved for the short-sighted iconoclasts in India to cast the stones of verbal abuse at the greatest literature in the world.

And Kālidāsa is one of the shining lights of Sanskrit literature. He has been the summation of Indian culture in one of the most exalted periods of triumphant self-realization and his works form a treasury. Therefore, I take Kālidāsa, in respect to his poetic genius for my study. Kālidāsa's *Rtusamhāra*, *Kumārsambhavam*, *Meghsandēśa*, *Raghuvarṇam*, *Mālvikāgnimitram*, *Vikramorvaśiyam*, and *Abhijñānasākuntalam* are taken as his authentic works besides attributing him with works like *Śyamala Dandaka*, *Śrīṅgāra Tilka*, *Śrīṅgāra Rasāṭaka*, *Puṣpabāna Vilāsa*, *Srūtabhodha*, *Gangāśatka*, *Nolodaya*, *Rākṣasakāvyā*, the *Prākrit* poem *Setu-bandhakāvyā*, Kālistotra, *Jyotirvidabharaṇa* which are evidently spurious and do not possess his characteristic excellence of thought and style. I have not chosen *Rtusamhāra* (The Seasons) though it is exclusively devoted to nature and its loveliness because it is considered a work of inferior merit. Hence, many scholars have doubted Kālidāsa’s authorship of it. It is certain that it is probably one of his earlier productions and does not contain that power of maximum effect through minimum means which is so characteristic of his later works (as also the later works of Shakespeare and generally speaking, the earlier and the later works of Wordsworth). The present study picks examples of verse on Nature from *Meghadūta*, *Kumārsambhavam*, and *Abhijñānasākuntalam*.

Besides, another aim of this thesis is to bring out the insights of Indian Aestheticians/Poeticians which have remained unexplored owing to grave obstacles of communication. Their texts bristle with linguistic technicalities and are not always free from obscurity. Their wealth of details, mystical dross, quaint terminology, and abstruse discussions create insuperable barriers to a reader who is not well-versed in Sanskrit and has not been properly initiated to this type of study.
Taken as a whole, their insights are more profound than just being a system of rhetoric, and in its highest reach, soars into aesthetics and linguistic philosophy unfolding new spheres of study and research. Their findings are, “still valid today and (are) even relatively novel to the Western thought” (Gnoli lii). Speaking at the Annual Conference of the British Society of Aesthetics, held in September 1966, Philip Rawson remarked:

“... in the field of aesthetics ... a great series of thinkers who lived in India and wrote in ancient India between the fourth century A.D. [sic. B.C.] and the thirteenth have put up many ideas which must be brought into out present-day debates on art.”

It stands true in the case of stylistics too.

Indian and Western literatures, thus, intersect most fascinatingly. From the earliest historic times, Oriental philosophers and seers were meditating on problems much like those challenged the Western mind. Indian sages were meditating on arts and their potential values for a man about the time that Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle were doing so in the West. Therefore, the present study also propounds the relativity and significance of concepts and terms from interrelated fields of knowledge which can prove to be of great value to each other. An inter-disciplinary approach can be particularly helpful in a comprehensive study of various phenomenon and problems since it has yielded excellent results in literary studies. As Culler points out:

“... linguistics (have) provided a number of concepts which could be used eclectically or metaphorically in discussing literary works ... the use of such terms may help one to identify relations of various kinds, both actual and virtual, within a single level or between levels, which are responsible for the production of meaning” (Structural 255-56).

It is also noteworthy that as linguists and critics become more and more aware of the complexity of human languages, and as psychologists and aestheticians face the staggering difficulties of accounting for artistic creativity, so stylistics in its concern for creative uses of language must explore the theories and practices of a wide
variety of disciplines if the traditional problems are to yield meaningful solution. Hence, stylistic study of this kind offers useful suggestions when one turns to the literary uses of language qua language.

**Why Nature:**

It has been a great urge of any poet to express himself through Nature. There is an inseparable relationship between the mind of the poet and Nature. Nature is understood as the manifestation of divinity of God. Only Nature in itself is complete like God, from within as well as from outside. The external beauty of Nature laid open before us is not momentary but possesses permanent value in it like a work of art. As Nature is extensive, deep, and wide and encompasses even human beings as its part, so Nature teaches the self-sufficiency to man who is distorted by his states and position in the cosmos. The tenderness of the external world elevates human mind. Seeing the bloomed flower, love gets a suggestion for itself. Seeing the vastness of the sky, one eradicates one’s narrow-mindedness. The melody of the music produced by the murmuring of rivers removes the malice of the hearts. Oceans and rivers are full of ebb-tides, ripples, currents and waves yet they remain same since ages but human mind is different and full of varieties and ever changes. This variegated nature of Nature provides full opportunity to poets to express themselves in full. There is no bar, no restriction, and no hazard of any sort. The poet feels free to unfold himself amidst Nature through language. Nature has been described by both Western and Eastern (ancient Indians) writers and Wordsworth and Kālidāśa represent the West and the East respectively.

**Notes**

1. “A text is an operational unit of language, as a sentence is a syntactic unit; it may be spoken or written, long or short; and it includes a special instance a literary text, whether haiku or Homeric epic. It is the text and not some super-sentence that is relevant unit for stylistic studies; this is a functional-semantic concept and is not definable by size.” M. A. K. Halliday, “Linguistic Function and Literary Style: An Inquiry into the Language of

2. Vāgrūpataḥ cenniṣṭāmedavabodhhasya Śāśvatī l
Na prakāśah prakāśeta śi hi pratyavamarṣiṇī l -- Vākyapadiya, I/124.

3. Saśaṁ saṁsārināṁ samjñā baḥirantaśca vartate l
Tanmātrāmanatikrāṇam ċaitanyam sarvajantaśu l -- Vākyapadiya, I/126.

4. Arthakriyāsu vāk sarvān samāhāyati dehinaḥ l
Tadatkrāntau visamjñō'yaṁ dṛṣyate kāṣṭhakudavyaḥ l
-- Vākyapadiya, I/127.

5. Na so'ṣti pratyayo loke yah saṁdāṅgamādṛte l
Anuvīddhamiva jñānam sarvam saṁdena bhāsatē l -- Vākyapadiya, I/123.

6. Pratyastamābhedhāyā yadvācō rupamuttamam l
Tadasminneva tanaṁ jyotih śuddham vivartate l -- Vākyapadiya, I/18.

7. Saṁdabrahma sudurbodham prāṇendriyamanamayam l
anantapāram gambhiram durvīgāhyam samudravat l
-- Bhagavata Purāṇa, I/2.

8. Saṁabrahmaṇati niśñātaḥ Parabrahmādhiṣṭacchati
-- Mahā-Bhāṣya, Śānti Parva.


11. Ādhanoddharaṇe tāvad yāvad dolāyate manāḥ l
padasya sthāpīte sthārye hant saṁdhā sarasvatī l
yat padāni jyajanteva parivṛttisahṣṇutām l
tam saṁdānyāsaniṣṭātāḥ sabdāpaṁkam prācakṣate l
-- Kāvyālāṅkarasūtra 1.3.15 Comm.

12. See Patañjali, Mahābhāṣya I/1.1.

13. Idamandham tamāḥ kṛṣṇam jāyeta bhuvanatrayam l
Yadi sabdāhvayam jyotirāṣaṁśāram na dīpyate // -- Kāvyādāra, 1/4.

14. nāprayuktam praṣayiḥīta ācārsamahakāriniḥam;
 kramāgatam śrutsukham sabdarthamadhyamudīrayet /
 -- Kāvyālāṅkāra, VI. 24, 28.

15. atiprayuktam deśābhāsāpadam -- Kāvyālāṅkarasātravṛtti, V.1.13.

16. vākyāt prakaranād arthād avicitvād deśākālatah /
 śabdarthā pravibhayante na rupadeva kevalāt /
 sanisargo viprayogāśca sāhcvyam virodhitā
darthā prakaranām lingam sabdashanyasya sannidhiḥ  //
 -- Vākyapādiya, II/ 314-16.

17. Mammata, Kāvyaprakāśa, III/ 21-22. For a detail description of all the
factors refer the complete third chapter.

They have discussed how these factors affect the meaning.

19. This is also emphasized by I. A. Richards in his essay “The Interaction of
Words” in Allen Tete, ed. The Language of Poetry (Princeton: Princeton
University Press, 1942) 74.

20. yo’rthāḥ sahrdayasyaśāghyāḥ kāvyāmei vyavasthitāḥ /
vācyaprātiyamānākhyaṃ tasyabhavedavbhau smārau // --Dvānyāloka I/ 2.

21. Yaḥ samyoga -vīgyābhīyāṃ karana-ūpāj āyate /
sa sphoṭaḥ  śabdāinha śabdo dhvanayo’nyair-udāhṛtaḥ  //
 --Vākyapādiya, I/103.

22. For details see Roman Jakobson, “Closing Statement: Linguistics and
Poetics” in Jean Jacques Weber, ed. The Stylistic Reader: From Roman

23. He talks of language as a “material” which makes integrated and hierarchical
organized systems and poetic language as showing various degrees of
development. E. Stankiewicz, “Linguistic and the Study of Poetic Language” in


25. *Tadadoṣau śabdārthau sasyunāvanalāṃkṛti punah kavyāḥ* //


29. *anemānuntyamāyāti kāvīnām pratibhāgūnaḥ / na kāvyārthavirāmo ‘stiyyadisyāt pratibhāgūnaḥ / avyuppattikṛto doṣaḥ śaktyā samvriyate kaveḥ /* //


32. In *Ṛgveda*, the composition of poetry has also been described in terms of making a chariot (1.61..4). For detail discussion of the *Ṛgveda* aesthetics,

34. nāngrīḥ kavirītyuktā rṣiśčā kilā dāraṇāḥ । 
vičitrabhaḥvadharmāṇsataattvaparkhā Śa dāraṇām । 
sa tattvadāraṇādeva śāstresu pathiataḥ kaviḥ । 
dāraṇād vāraṇāc ātāh rudhā loke kaviśrutāḥ । 
tathā hi dāraṇe svacche natyepyādikaver muneh । 
noditā kaviṭā loke yāvaj jātā na vāraṇāḥ । 
Quoted in Hemcandra’s *Kavyanūsāsana* VIII p. 379.

35. Tasmāt saṃskara-viśeṣo dhvaniḥ – Mahābhāṣya, Paśpaśā.