PART III
COMPARATIVE AND CRITICAL STUDY OF THE SELECTED COMMENTARIES
OF KĀVYAPRAKĀŠA
Salutary Verse

Manikyacandra the earliest of the commentators has described the verse as pertaining to the deity of context and the favourite god, 'Kaver Bhārati'\(^1\) or Muse of Learning has been described by him as 'Adhidaivatarūpa'. He has also described the 'Vyātreka' or figure 'dissimilitude' of the verse in establishing the superiority of Poet's creation over the creation of God; as denoting ultimately 'Alaksya-kramasthāyibhāvoḥtra Kāvya Vyaṅgabh'.\(^2\) He also declares that the suggested, sense here is based on Alamkāra, Mahēśvara on the other hand thinks that the salutary verse is 'Maṅgalaparaka'.\(^3\)

Govinda Thakkura also feels that the salutary verse contains the figure Dissimilitude based on suggestion "Atra Nirmāṇa Vyātreka mukhena caturmukhāt Kavibharatyā Vyātreka-alamkāro vyāngyah".\(^4\) The use of word 'Jayate' by Mammata in the verse according to him is a proof of the fact that the verse is salutary. Otherwise the writer must have used the

\(^1\)Saṃketa, p. 1.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 2.
\(^3\)Sudhāsāgara, p. 2.
\(^4\)Pradīpa, p. 3.
word 'Vartatām',\(^1\) if he had not the above view in mind. He has defended the verse of Mammāta against the attacks that it does not consists of the words meaning 'Daivataparaka' (to the deity) which was essential for the start of such a great work. His argument is that the use of the word 'Vartatām' suggests both the subject matter of the book as well as the pertaining deity.

Srīdhara\(^2\) feels that the verse is highest kind of salutary verse because there are two kinds of such verses (1) Those which are pertaining to favoured deity (2) Not pertaining to favoured deity. Of these two the latter is better, and this verse is an example of latter kind, hence good. He also calls it 'Namaskarātmaka',\(^3\) as well as suggesting subject matter and also 'Dhvanyātmaka'; there is also figure of 'Dissimilitude' in it.

Candrāśa shows that the salutary verse is pertaining to the deity of context. He has shown with a forceful language, how the poetry can deliver happiness, even to the people suffering from great shocks like that of the death of a son 'Putra sakdijanita-jadavino-āpi purasasya dṛk karna praveśāntaramāsvādayogavyavacchedadarśanat'.\(^4\) Hence the

\(^1\)Pradīpa, p. 4.  
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 2.  
\(^4\)Dīpikā, p. 3.
superiority of Poets' creation is established. The poet according to him is 'Apūrva vijñānasilpi'. The essentiarity of salutary verse addressed to 'Adhidaivata' is stressed, because it gives one the 'Bhāvasuddhi'.

Srividyācakravartin has also said that this salutary verse has all the three qualities of a salutary verse, namely, Vyaṅga, Vastu and Alamkāra. By 'Jayati' he says it is pertaining to Vastu. The use of word 'Brahma' according to him is elliptical for depicting figure of 'Dissimilitude' and love for the deity is also suggested in it. So it is a best salutary verse.

Bhattagopāla involves himself in lengthy explanation of the words used in the verse. He has paid negligible attention towards critical evaluation of the verse. Only as a side remark he finds that there is 'Vytireka' in the verse and it is for 'Maṅgala'.

Bhūmasena the writer of Sudhāsākara commentary has criticized Govinda Thakura's explanation at two places, but astonishingly enough he also copies his ideas. He shows that all the three qualities or Gunas of a salutary verse are to

---

1Dīpikā, p. 4.
2Ibid., p. 5.
3Sampradāyaprakāśini, p. 6.
4Sāhityacūḍāmaṇi, p.
5Sudhāsākara, p. 3.
be found in the verse. The interpretations, in this regard
is almost similar to those of the earlier commentators. Only
noteworthy point is that he has regarded all the creations
of poet as Sukhātmaka.

Mahesvara Nyāyālāmākāra involves himself in the
explanation of insignificant words of the verse and used
in its context such as 'Grantha' etc. He declares that this
verse is 'Stutirūpa Māṅglam'. He has replied successfully
to the criticism that 'Namaskāra' is inferred from this
verse, and not suggested. He argues that 'Āksipyata' means
'Vyajyata'. He however does not take pains to show that
there is also Dhvani and Alamkāra, in the verse. His expla-
nation is unusually long.

Nāgojī Bhatta seems to have used the material of
earlier commentators, profusely while explaining this verse.
He has also supported the view of earlier commentators that
the verse has three-fold qualities viz. Vastu, Alamkāra and
Vyaṅgya. He however does not explain these things as
explicitly as the earlier commentators have done. His
explanations are rather brief.

Siddhāchandra Gaṅgi has criticized the verse very

1Adarsā, p. 2.
2Ibid., pp. 2-3.
3Uddyota, pp. 3-4.
His first argument is that it is not correct to say that the creation of the poet is without any regulations. But on the other hand there are also certain set and fixed rules and regulations for poetry such as, the use of particular language in a particular type of creation, in a particular type of Rasa and Meter. In the meanings also there are set similies. The meaning also being regular and irregular is not something unique but general.

Siddhācandra also feels that the creation of the poet cannot be only pleasure giving but on the other hand it has both the pleasures and sorrows in it. The adjective 'Anyaparatantra' is also meaningless because, the poetry of one poet can be cause of some other poet's poetry in the form of 'Pratibhā'.

The number of Rasas according to him cannot be nine because 'Bibhatša' etc. cannot be regarded as Rasas, hence the number cannot be nine in any case.

Vāmanacārya has also explained the word 'Samucita' as pertaining to the context 'Pratipādyaviṣayānurūpam'. He also thinks that because the figure 'Dissimilitude' is suggestive here so "The suggestive sense based on figures or Alamkāra Dhvani" is there in the verse "Vyatirekalakāra nav. Pr, Khandana, p, 2.

---

1Kav. Pr. Khaṇḍana, p. 2.
2Ibid., p. 2.
3Balabodhini, p. 2.
4Ibid.
Mammata has described that poetry brings fame and riches, knowledge of the ways of world and relief from evils; instant and perfect happiness, and counsel sweet as from the lips of a consort. In the Vṛtti on Kārikā he has explained how these were attained by the people in the past. But commentators on Mammata are not unanimous in their views about the attainments of these objects through poetry.

It was a bigoted notion about Indians that they were more dogmatic than rational. This landmark enunciation along with the aims of poetry including the attainment of 'Svarga' and 'Apavarga' i.e. the materialistic and the spiritual attainment, both can be attained through poetry. This is a very rational theory presented by Mammata.

Manikyacandra has not putforth his views on the topic, but is engaged only in defining the words used in the original text. He however has supported the assertion of Mammata that it is the suggestive element of the poetry that gives us counsel sweet as from the lips of a sweetheart. To show the importance of suggestiveness of the poetry he has quoted Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka. He feels that at the stage of creation

1Saṃketa, p. 2.
2Ibid.
of poetry, the poet has to bear troubles and hence cannot enjoy, at that stage, but at the second stage of Bhāvakatva, he also relishes the poetry like a reader of 'Sahṛdyā'.

Sṛḍhara¹ has divided the objects of poetry into two categories (1) The objects of poetry for Shrdaya and (2) The objects of poetry for the poet. This in fact is on the basis of Mammaṭa’s Kārikā on the subject. But Sṛḍhara seems to be the first man to draw a line of demarcation between the two. According to him fame and money are to be attained by both the poet and Shrdaya. But on the other hand he feels that the knowledge of worldly dealing 'Vyavahāra- jñāna'² pertains only to Shrdaya, it has no connection with the poet. He advances no reasons for it. The welfare and loss is of both because of their interdependence. The instant and perfect happiness 'Paranivṛtti' and counsel 'Upadeśa' are only for Shrdaya. Though Nivṛtti also pertains to the poet at the stage of Bhāvakatva but he is also termed Shrdaya at that time.

Śrīvidyācakravartin³ feels that poetry is capable of giving counsel like that of a consort because it possesses suggestion. It shows that commentator gives prominence to

---

¹Kav. Pr. Vivēka, p. 6.
²Ibid.,
³Sampradāyaprakāsini, p.
suggestion in the poetry. By quoting the instance from King Dilipā's life; given in Raghuvamśa, he shows that how poetry teaches to worship those, who should be worshipped. The king was unable to get progeny because he had not worshipped the Kāmadhenu. Hence doing of any such act is warned by the poetry through suggestion. According to him poet and Shrdaya both are entitled to have access to poetry. Just like Śrīdhara\(^1\) he feels that fame and money can be attained through poetry both by the Shrdaya and the poet. On the other hand the knowledge of world affairs and advice not only pertains to Shrdaya but also to the poet, before he writes his poetry. It is essential at that stage for the poet because otherwise he won't be able to write poetry. The instant and perfect happiness is attained by both the poet and the Shrdaya. The commentator feels that one should try to attain all these objectives through poetry.

There is striking similarity of the view of Śrīvidyacakravartin and Śrīdhara, which only shows that Śrīvidyacakravartin has followed Śrīdhara.

According to Candīdāsa the mention of 'Pryojanas' is essential otherwise none will go in for a work which has no purpose. The poetry gives one the 'Paramāvyṛtti'\(^2\) instantly and does not delay it, as one gets the fruit of 'Dharma'.

\(^1\)Sampradāya-prakāśinī, p.

\(^2\)Dipika, p. 5.
lateron. Unbroken stream of pleasure flows from it 'Avacchinnaprvahanavahi'.¹ Quoting Hṛdaya Darpana, the commentator shows how the counsel given by poetry is superior to that given by Sruti, Smṛti etc.² Through the medium of poetry one even accepts the better piece of advice. The experience of pleasure is through Bhāvanā, which the poetry provides amply.

Bhatṭa Gopāla³ the writer of Sahityacudāmāni declares that the sum total of the poetry lies in placing the definition of righteousness in the category of proof; and that depends upon Rasa. He declares that there are two main objectives of the poetry (1) The attainment of transcendent bliss (2) Sweet counsel like that of consort. While describing the Vedas with predominance of sense of word, and Purāṇas with predominance of sense of meaning, he feels that in the poetry none of these predominates. Here it is suggestive sense which is predominating. For him Shṛdaya and poet are both 'Kāvyāsṛṣṭinirvāhakau'.⁴ He has assigned three objectives⁵ to the poet and three to the Shṛdaya. The attainment of fame economic gains and

¹Dīpikā, p. 6.
²Ibid., p. 7.
³Sāhitya-Cudāmāni, p. 8.
⁴Ibid., p. 9.
⁵Ibid., p. 12.
destruction of evils, these are the objectives for poet and knowledge of worldly affairs, the attainment of instant and perfect happiness and sweet counsel like that of consort pertain to Shrdaya.

Govinda Thakkura feels that poetry is the work of poet who possesses extraordinary power of description and only such a work can bring the poet the fame and the economic gains. Like Bhattagopāla he has assigned the first three objectives to poet and the last three to the Shrdaya. But he declares that best of all the objectives, the relishing of Rasa is only done by the Shrdaya or the reader; but he adds that at the time of enjoyment of Rasa poet also relishes it. He declares that it is the capability of poetry only that it provides counsel like that of consort, while the Nītisāstras cannot do this sort of thing. Here he gives prominence to Rasa in the poetry and feels that it is by dint of Rasa that poetry gives sweet counsel, like that of sweet heart and that Rasa has domination over words and meanings in the poetry. He also adds that the poetry enables the ease living princes to learn 'Nīti' without any difficulty which they cannot do by the study of Nītisāstra.

---

1 Pradīpa, p. 5.
2 Ibid., p. 6.
3 Ibid., p. 7.
Bhimasena the writer of commentary Sudhāsāgara has profusely copied from Govinda Thakkura. He in fact has added few more words and explanations to the original of Govinda. For instance he reveals that not only Dhāvaka got money from Śrī Harṣa for writing Ratnāvalī, but the poet who wrote for Bhoja and Maḍha, also got the money likewise. This is a pointer to the ingenuineness of the works of Bhoja and Maḍha. He feels that name of Kālidāsa used in connection with attainment of fame is because he was known only through his poetic works, while the sages like Bālamikā were known otherwise also. Except these original things, he has heavily copied Govinda Thakkura, even his words.

Mahesāvara Bhattācārya has given all traditional explanations of the text in this connection, until he reaches the point of Rasa. Here he states that it is not Rasa which is predominant factor in the poetry, but it is suggestion which has the upperhand and Rasa only becomes a part of it. He has quoted Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa here to vindicate his position. He asserts that poetry gives counsel like that of consort through Śṛṅgāra Rasa, which is presented first and the advice follows it through suggestion. His division of objectives for Shrdaya and poet is different from earlier ones.

---

1 Sudhāsāgara, pp. 11-13.
2 Ibid., p. 12.
3 Adarsa, p. 11.
According to him money and fame pertain exclusively to poet, the knowledge of worldly affairs and advice to the Shrdaya exclusively and the rest two objectives pertain to both.

Nāgojī Bhatta is of the opinion that by counsel we should understand only good counsel. He further adds that the poet has the capacity of producing charm in his poetry. On the point of the division of objectives of the poetry he justifies the position of Govinda Thakkura, but has also added a note of clarification, that fame, economic gain and destruction of evils are the only three objectives pertaining to poet, while these three as well as the other three pertain to Shrdaya. In poetry he feels that the primary meaning is debarred to get the required sense of the meaning.

Siddhacandra Ganī does not agree with Mamamā about the objectives of the poetry. His assertion is that poetry is the means of attaining 'Caturvaraga', because primarily it is in the form of worship of God.

Vāmanācārya clarifies that the mention of name of Kalidāsa and Dravaka etc. in connection with attainment of fame and money is because of predominance, otherwise other people have also attained such things. Poetry according

---

1Uddyota, p. 5.
2Ibid., p. 5.
3Ibid., p. 6.
4Bālabodhinī, p. 12.
to him not only advises a man to do the rightful but also warns him not to indulge in the acts contrary to it. He has also given the two-fold explanation of the words 'Śabdaprādhānya' and 'Arthaprādhānya' as given by the earlier commentators. He also feels that of the objectives defined above, fame, money and destruction of evils pertain only to poet. The knowledge of worldly affairs and sweet counsel pertain only to Shrdaya because the poet has mastery over it already. Attainment of instant bliss also pertains to Shrdaya because the assimilation of the heart of poet is already there.

Sources of Poetry

Mānīkyacandra the earliest of the commentators has said almost nothing on this point but has only explained the words used by Mammaṭa. However, it can be gathered from this explanation that he supports Mammaṭa on his view that poetic genius, knowledge born of a study of the world of sciences and of poetry, and the practice of the teachings of those well versed in writing poetry, these three together constitute the source of poetry.¹

Candāda² who usually has criticized Mammaṭa bitterly, has supported Mammaṭa on this point. He however has given some altogether new explanations of the words used by Mammaṭa in this connection. For instance he interprets

¹Samketa, p. 5.
²Dīpikā, p. 10.
'Sanskāra' as 'Prācinavāsanā', meaning thereby that 'Saṃskāra' is the old impression unconsciously left on the mind by past actions. It is interesting to note here that Pāṇḍitārāja Jagannātha in his Rasagangādhara has put forward Vaśanā or Purātanajanma Saṃskāra as independent source of poetry. There is no doubt that he has taken the clue from this commentary.

Candrāsā has also said that by the blessings of deities also one may have this Saṃskāra or Sakti to create poetry therefore there is no essentiality that the trio of Sakti etc. should be the causes of poetry. This also has been copied by Pāṇḍitārāja - Jagannātha as such in the Rasagangādhara.

Govinda Thakkura, the writer of the commentary Pradīpa seems to be emphasising more on 'Pratibhā' the intelligence to create poetry - which according to him comes with the benediction of gods. He has defined 'Sakti' as 'Pratibhā Vyapadesya'. He has supported Mammata that all the three Sakti, Nipunatā and Kavyajña Śikṣā are jointly one source for the generating of poetry. Govinda Thakkura however explains 'Nipunatā as Vyutpatti meaning thereby the perfect proficiency.'

---

1Rasagangādhara, p.
2Dipikā, p. 11.
3Pradīpa, p. 7.
4Ibid., p. 8.
Nāgojī Bhatta has emphasised the importance of Sakti more clearly than Govinda Thakkura. He says that a poetry generated without Sakti will be full of defects and it may not in certain cases be called poetry under the purview of the definition given by Mammaṭa. Nāgojī has given one more meaning of Sakti hither to not given by anyone. This is "Karana Sakti, Bodhṛtvā Saktiscā" meaning that the power to create and also to know. This signifies that Nāgojī Bhatta put equal emphasis on power of perception and creation. In fact a man lacking the power of perception would not be able to create. In fact Nāgojī Bhatta in clear terms has said that the power of perception is also origin or seed of poetry 'Kavitvasyaiva Bījam'. Following Govinda Thakkura he has said that for proper instilling of Rasa in the poetry it is most essential to learn from those who know the art. He has further supported Mammaṭa that the three sources of poetry mentioned above have their real importance and it is not a superfluous counting. One more thing which shows the belief of the commentator in rebirth, is that 'Nipūṇaś' or proficiency can be of the earlier birth also; 'Janmānteśyā' and the practice can also be of the earlier births. Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha has also put the same view in his Rasagaṅgādhara.

1Uddyota, pp. 7-8.
2Ibid., p. 9.
3Ibid.
Srividya Cakravartin has defined Sakti as Pratibha, giving two slokas for vindication of his statement. He says that wisdom is 'Tatkalaki' or of a temporary and immediate nature and 'Prajna' an equivalent of Sakti is there as eternal of all the three 'Kulas'. He has given an argument for the existence of Sakti or poetic genius. That without which either poetry is not produced and if produced, is laughed at by the readers. Hence it can be concluded that Sakti is something without which proper type of poetry is not produced. While other commentators have just given passing remarks about the importance of metres and Grammar in poetry Vidyacakravartin lays particular stress on it. He adds that for prose books also one must take care of the poetic metre. 'Gadyakavyepichandogranthoanusartvyeva. He has also advocated the need for all the three Pratibha, Nipuntha etc. as 'Hetus' for the poetry.

Bhattagopala the writer of the commentary Sahityacudaman supports Mammata on this point. But he presents the explanation here which is almost striking. He says that Sakti is a sort of seed which is 'Samskara Visesa' which can be termed Vasana in other words. He has quoted a verse saying that without this power any poet is incapable of possessing divine or 'Lokottara Naipunya' in the description

---

1Sampradayaprakasini, p. 13.
2Sahityacudaman, pp. 13, 14.
of things. He has on the other hand condemned the power of creating bad poetry. He has given the process of creating good poetry. The process is like this that first of all the poet should examine the plot (Kathāpriksa), then should sow the seed of the plot with mastery and then should take it up to climax (Falapryantānayana) Vibhāvas and Alamakāras etc. with righteousness.

Sridhara one of the early commentators on Kav. Pr. while commenting on the sources of poetry has given altogether new explanation of the Vṛtti of this portion. Power or Sakti of a poet according to him is the knowledge of all the matters of the world with ease, 'Ākliṣṭānekapadārthajñāna Sakti'.

The seed of the poetry 'Kavitva' according to him is intellect or brightness of conception residing in one's self, which is a particular Samskāra or impression. Creation of the poetry for him is the Smullāsa or excessive brilliance of the pair of word and meaning. This shows that Sridhara followed Bhamaha as far the conception of the definition of the poetry was concerned, and took the meaning and the words as basic constituents, of poetry. Nipunata according to him is the power of discrimination between right and wrong. Sridhara

---

1Sāhityacūḍāmani, p. 13.
3Ibid., p. 7.
4Ibid.
points out that this very power has been called Vyutpatti by others. This shows the insight of the commentator into the works on the subject. Quoting Vāmana about 'Loka' he says that the description of Loka is 'Lokavṛttamloka'. The commentator has also given altogether different definitions of Metre, Grammar, Abhidhānakoṣa etc. He has also given the five-fold division of the Kāvyas as given in Rasārṇava. He has named as Shṛdayas both type of persons, who know how to create poetry and those who know to discuss it. He also supports Mammāta by saying that all the three pre-requisites when combined produce poetry and not singularly.

Bhīmasena the writer of the commentary Sudhāsaṅgara has criticized Govinda Thakkura's explanation of Śakti as Pratībha. His argument is that if poetry is called 'Pratībha' then it will be under someone's domain and hence against theory of Mammāta that 'Kaverbhārati' is 'Ananyaparatantṛā'. He further asserts that the creation of poetry not only needs refinement but also the trio of Śakti etc. So 'Pratībha' consistent with the trio of Śakti etc. is needed for creation of poetry. He feels that the Sanskāra Viśeṣa or Śakti is

---

1 Kav. Pr. Viveka, p. 7.
2 Ibid., p. 8.
3 Ibid., p. 9.
4 Sudhāsaṅgara, p. 18.
attained either by the benediction of the gods or it is a practice done in earlier births. He has also supported the view of Mammaṭa that the creation of a poet without Śakti will be open to mockery. But Bhimasena has wrongly interpreted 'Abhidhanakoṣa'. In a long discussion he has supported that the trio of Śakti etc. are unitedly the cause of poetry and not separately. He has however pointed out that where Nipuṇatā and practice are missing and still the power to create poetry is there, there we should suppose it from the earlier births. This sort of idea was later on followed by Panditarāja Jagannātha in his Rasagaṅgādhara. 2

Siddhicandra Gaṇī does not agree 3 with Mammaṭa that the trio of Śakti etc. is the cause of poetry. His argument is that some times even children have been seen creating excellent poetry. They are without practice and also have not studied the works of the earlier poets. So he says that it is only Śakti which is the source of poetry. 4

Vām菅acārya the latest amongst the commentators also supports Mammaṭa in his assertion that trio of Śakti etc. is the source or cause of poetry. His definition 5 of Śakti

1 Sudhāsāgara, p. 19.
2 Rasagaṅgādhara, p. 30.
4 Ibid.
5 Bālabodhini, p. 11.
differs from others. सक्ति according to him is the thing which empowers the man to create and enjoy the poetry. कवित्वम according to him is learnedness, power of reasoning and scholarship. सामस्कारा according to him is a sort of intellect which one attains it either from the worship of the gods or it is from earlier\(^1\) births. Here वामनकार्य in has followed other commentators. The true definition of इतिहास has been for the first time presented\(^2\) by वामनकार्य, which he says is possessive with of advice regarding 'धर्मार्थाः, कामे इत्यादि' and is with the story of earlier people. This definition covers both orthodox and modern views about 'इतिहास'. He also gives new explanations of 'व्युत्पत्तिः' and 'विमर्शणा'.

**Mahesvara** the Bengali commentator of 18th century, feels that manifestation of कव्या means the creation of कव्या and the attainment of knowledge of कव्या.\(^3\) He says that though there is difference between सक्ति and कवित्वविज्ञा even then they are called one and the same thing because of सामस्कारा. The manifestation of both of these things is because of some particular virtuous deed, 'पुण्या विशेषा'.\(^4\) He has attacked the explanation of the words 'काव्यम न प्रसारे' etc. given by earlier writers. He has given his own explanation which

---

\(^1\)Balabodhini, p. 12.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 12.

\(^3\)Adarsa, p. 13.

\(^4\)Ibid.
is not very different from the earlier ones. He has given his unqualified support to Mammaṭa on the point that the trio of Sakti etc. unitedly is the cause of poetry.

**Definition of Poetry**

Māṇikyacandra the earliest of the commentators is of the view that the poetry subsists in the word and meaning when put together and the word and meaning depend upon each other like community and person. He also advocates that the inherence of poetry also does not exist both in word and meaning separately, but it exists only when both of these are put together. His one more argument which is quite feeble and unimpressive in its force is that the meaning and word both give the pleasure hence both of these combined together are poetry. He further supports the conviction of Mammaṭa that even when figures of speech are not apparent, it is also poetry.

Candidāsa, one of the severest critics of Mammaṭa amongst commentators has interpreted the definition of Mammaṭa in an interesting way. This interpretation later on became the ground for those i.e. Visvanātha and Jagannātha etc. who have severely criticized Mammaṭa's definition. Candidāsa says that Mammaṭa does not want to convey that the defects should altogether not exist in the

---

2. Dīpikā, p. 12.
poetry but the poet should try to avoid these with all his might 'Yathāśaktihānāṣṭutram'. He views that as Mammaṭa has placed the Sabda in first place in the definition, so the 'Sabda' is primarily the poetry, and other adjectives are less important. He concludes that as such word only is the poetry, 'Sabdadharma vakāvyatvam'. In further support of his view that word only is poetry he placed the argument 'Kāvyatvamangikrīlyamāṇam' etc. and declares that as the poetry cannot exist both ways in two, hence the word only is poetry. This argument was borrowed by Panḍītraṇa Jagnnātha in Rasagaṅgādhara. He further refutes the idea that the special action of poet is poetry. Candīdāsa has also bitterly criticized the inclusion of adjective 'Adosau' in the definition of poetry. His argument is that by this, either poetry will be rare or not at all. Viśvanātha the Sāhityadarpanakāra who made an all out attack on the definition of poetry given by Mammaṭa has utilized not only this argument of Candīdāsa but also his words. And if this may be argued that even where there is not Rasa the passage is called poetry, it is of lowest quality which Candīdāsa says he has explained in his 'Dhvanisiddhāntasangraha'. Hence we see

1Dīpika, p. 12.
2Ibid., p. 13.
3Ibid., p. 11.
4Rasagaṅgādhara, p.
that Mammata has been criticized minutely by Candidas and his criticism has been utilized by the later Rhetoricians of Jagannatha and Visvanatha's fame.

Sridhara in his commentary has not criticized any of the opponents of Mammata but he simply elucidates and that also very briefly what the writer wants to convey. However he has given some slight hint about the use of adjectives in Mammata's definition of poetry.

According to him Mammata has used words Gunā and Alamkāra signifying thereby that Gunas and Alamkaras are not one and the same thing as propounded by some earlier writers like Bhāmaha, Dandi and Vāmana etc. Sridhara only points out that Mammata has used the adjectives in the definition, anticipating the order of the subject matter of his book.

The writer of the commentary 'Samprdayaprakāśini Vidvacakravartin' seems to be using the same method of elucidation which Sridhara uses at some places. This is quite evident from his explanation of the definition of poetry and particularly when he describes the order of the subject matter of Kavyaprakāśa in this connection. However, he is supporter of the view that word and meaning both are poetry collectively and not singly 'Sabdarthaudharmiṇau'.

---

1Kav. Pr. Viveka, p. 10.
2Sampradayaprakāśini, p. 16.
3Ibid., p. 16.
On the disputable point of Guṇas and Alamkāras his is the view that these are two different things whereas Guṇas are 'Rasasamavāyino Dharmāḥ'\(^1\) and 'Alamkārah Samyoga Vṛttaya'\(^2\) and hence here we find the refutation of the view that Guṇas and Alamkāras are one and the same thing.\(^3\)

Gopaḷa Ḫaṭṭa, the writer of the commentary also supports the view of Mammaṭa that both words and meanings are collectively poetry and not singly.\(^4\) In this connection he has also quoted 'Vakroktijīvitakāra' for his support. He vehemently opposes the essential existence of Alamkāras 'Alamkāra Naivyayam tu na sahāmahe' i.e. that we do not tolerate the view that the Alamkāras are a must for the poetry. He has further supported this view by quoting certain verses. It has not been possible to ascertain that whether these verses are his own creation or of some one else. A new point taken up by him which none of the commentators has taken up is to clarify the objection that as there is no mention in Mammaṭa's definition of poetry; of Rasa, so even the verses without Rasa\(^6\) may also be called poetry. Gopaḷa Ḫaṭṭa has tried to refute it by saying 'Dosagunaprāmāṇādeva

\(^1\)Sampradāyapraksāsinī, p. 16. 
\(^2\)Ibid. 
\(^3\)Ibid. 
\(^4\)Sāhityacudāmanī, p. 16. 
\(^5\)Ibid., p. 17. 
\(^6\)Ibid., p. 18.
tatsiddhi*. Here he has also quoted the definition of Guṇas and Alamkāras given by Mammaṭa in Chapter VIII and finally concluded that no charm of Rasa can exist in the poetry if defects exist. Hence it is evident that Mammaṭa has conveyed indirectly that Rasa is the main element in poetry.

Govinda Thakkura, the writer of the commentary Pradīpa, has supported Mammaṭa as far as the question of inclusion of word and meaning in the definition of poetry is concerned. But he has interpreted in a novel way Mammaṭa's maxim for the place of figures or Alamkāras in the poetry. If we analyse his statement we find that he has included four types of poetry under his definition.

1. The poetry with Rasa and also with figures of speech where these are quite clear.
2. The poetry with Rasa and without any poetic figure.
3. Poetry with Rasa and without figures of speech where these are not quite clear.
4. Without Rasa and with poetic figures.

This has also been pointed out by Vamanācārya in his commentary on Kāvya-Prakāśa. Govinda Thakkura feels that where there is no Rasa and the figure of speech is also not directly expressed; is not to be called poetry. One more point which Govinda Thakkura has suggested in connection

---

1 Pradīpa, p. 9.
2 Bālabodhīni, p. 17.
with the interpretation of the definition is that by 'Sarvatra Sālamkārava' we should not understand that the existence of poetic figures is most essential in the poetry. But on the other hand the adjective means that poetry consisting of figures of speech directly expressed and may be without Rasa (Erotic); is also poetry. He however has favoured the inclusion of Rasa in first place in the poetry. ¹

Nakoji Bhatta the great grammarian, who has commented upon the commentary of Govinda Thakkura supports the view that both word and meaning collectively are poetry,² because both of these produce the poetic charm. And he also explains that use of word Kāvyam (singular number) by Mammaṭa shows that the poetry resides in words and meanings by Vyāsajyavṛtti. But he feels that the poetry exists in the word and meaning by Pratyeka paryāpta vṛtti³ because nowhere it is used that the word is not poetry like that one is not two. Hence it can be concluded that the poetry exists in word and meaning by Pratyekapryāpta vṛtti. He has supported the view point of Dhvanikāra Ānandārđhana and Mammaṭa that the poet should make efforts⁴ for Rasa and should not bother much for poetic figures. Even the poetry without sufficient

¹Pradīpa, p. 10.
²Uddoyta, p. 9.
³Ibid., p. 10.
⁴Ibid., p. 11.
or any poetic figures gives the needed poetic fancy.

Mahesvara\(^1\) thinks that Kāvya as propounded by Mammaṭa can exist only in few meaningful words and not in all words. Hence it is a thing which exists in some special base and not in every thing (Vishiṣṭa vṛtti na pratyeka vṛtti). Moreover, he refutes powerfully the view of those who advocate that it is only the word which is poetry, and the Kāvyatva is 'Vishiṣṭavṛttirupādhi'. It is also added that inherence of poetry 'Kāvyatva' is not by Vyāsajya vṛtti. On all other points he vehemently supports Mammaṭa except at the point of Doṣas where he seems to differ from Mammaṭa. He feels that the defects can harm the poetry, in its quality\(^2\) and not in its existence. 'Doṣantaram tu kāvyapakārṣakameva na tu, kāvyavighatākavatvam'. Hence the thing which is to be essentially avoided is regular defects.

As far Guṇas are concerned he has nothing to differ; on the other hand he feels that Guṇas are the base for Rasa\(^3\) because the Excellences have an unceasing existence with the Rasa.

Siddhicandra Ganū adopts Visvanātha's criticism\(^4\) of

---

\(^1\) Adarsa, pp. 17-18.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 18.

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) Kav. Pr. Khandana, p. 2.
Mammata's definition. He himself however seems to be one of the Navinas, whose leader must have been Panḍitrāja Jagannātha 'Kāvyatvamakhandopādhi' may be compared with 'Upādhīrūpaṇ Vākhasam' and his criticism of 'Sabdārthau' with 'Sabdārthayuglam etc.' Similarly, 'Sabdārthyo sagunatvatvābhāvāt' may be compared with 'Sabdārthyo sagunatvavisēṣapā' etc. of Visvanātha 'Kāvyamāsvadajīvatupadasan-darbhe' is according Mm. Kane, the view of Canddaśa expressed in his commentary 'Kāvyaprakāśadīpikā'.

Bhīmasena the writer of the commentary Sudhāśāgara has vehemently refuted the arguments of those who say that the words only are poetry. His arguments are - that suggestive sense also exists in meaning as well as in the word. With the rise and fall in the utility of words and meanings in particular usage, the poetry is said to be so. Vibhāvas and other things also do exist in meaning and moreover the ancient poets like Kālidāsa have accounted for the importance of both. He also criticizes Danḍin who is of the opinion that 'Sabdāvalī' is poetry. He argues that the charm of poetry is mainly existing in suggestive sense and that is

---

1Sāhitya-Darpana, p. 15.
2H.O.S.P., p. 354.
3Sudhāśāgara, p. 20.
4Ibid.
5Ibid.
there both in words and meanings. He has given three-fold interpretation of Adoṣatvam but has finally decided that it should mean avoidance of defects as far as possible. He has criticized Viśvanātha for his statement that if defects are to be avoided, then either poetry will be rare or not at all. He says that, that is what, that is wanted, because the Dhvanikāra² has said 'Dvitrīṇyeva' etc. i.e. only two or three are good poets in this world. Hence it is better to have two or three good poets rather than having a lot of useless poets. He has also quoted Subuddhi Mātra in this connection who opines that only the 'Śrutadosas' should be avoided, because it is a hindrance in the proper development of Rasa. And also some of the Dosas are useful for some particular kinds of Rasas, hence it cannot be said that all the defects should be avoided. This argument is very powerful one and clinches the issue and leaves no scope for any further discussion on the matter, because the arguments of the critics have been rightly answered.

Vāmanācārya says that both word and meaning are equally important for poetry but the word has greater importance because it is the refuge of meaning.⁴ That is why

¹Sudhāsāgara, p. 21.
²Ibid., p. 22.
³Ibid., p. 23.
⁴Balabodhini, p. 13.
Māmata has used it first; not only he but even in Vedic uses like 'Nāmarūp avyākarvāṇi' and in old classical uses like 'Vāgarthau' etc. the word has been given first place. He however does not agree with Paniṭrāja Jagannātha that word alone is poetry. He has quoted Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa in this connection, whose arguments we have already given on page 177. He has also criticized those who say that it is the 'Kavidharma' (the action of the poet) which is poetry. He says that the aim of the poetry or Prayojna is the power which makes one feel the taste of the poetry (Āsvādabodhakatva) and that rests in words and meanings hence it is the words and meanings which are poetry.

Kavikarma or the action of the poet only makes this power manifest and hence it is inferior or 'Bhakta'. As far as defects or Doṣas are concerned his is the point of view that only the mighty defects which hinder the proper growth of Rasa should essentially be avoided. He has also criticized Viśvanātha's definition of poetry saying that it does not cover such poetry which is having Rasābhāsa, Vastu and Alamkāra as the chief factors in it. He has supported Māmata on Gunaś and has quoted Pradīpa and Uddyota for the vindication of his statement. On the point

1Bālabodhinī, p. 14.
2Ibid.
3Ibid., p. 15.
4Ibid.
of Alamkāras also he lends a supporting hand to Mammata and in this connection while arguing he has mainly used the material of earlier commentators. But a new thing he has added is that he has categorised the various types of poetry on the basis of inclusion of Rasa and Alamkāra in the poetry. These are six types 1 –

1. With Rasa and direct poetic figures.
2. With Rasa and with Indirect poetic figures.
3. With Rasa and without any figures.
4. Without Rasa and with direct figures.
5. Without Rasa and with indirect figures.
6. Without Rasa and Alamkāras.

Here he points out that according to Mammata2 first, second, fourth and fifth are poetry. Here Vāmanācārya seems to just deciding himself for Mammata. Because Mammata has nowhere mentioned that a verse with Rasa and without any figure of speech cannot be said poetry. However we can conclude from this that Vāmanācārya’s bent of mind is towards Alamkāravādins.

The Divisions of Poetry

Mammata has enumerated three kinds of poetry namely best, middle and inferior. Commentators have their different views about these varieties of poetry. Some commentators do

---

1Balabodhīnī, p. 17.
2Ibid.
not agree to have Māmāta's third variety of poetry. There are others also who have criticized the very division of the poetry.

Mānīkyacandra has defined the best poetry\(^1\) — where the suggestiveness of sense overpowers the expressive power and it also consists of fact, figure and Rasa. He has proved the antiquity of Dhvani theory by explaining and quoting the 'Sphota' theory ofGrammarians. He declares emphatically that Dhvani is the soul of poetry.\(^2\) The pair of words and meanings he declares is called Dhvani, because it is these through which the suggested sense is conveyed.\(^3\) All the three kinds of Dhvani namely Vastu, Alamkāra and Rasa are far away from the expressed sense. In the verse cited as an example of the best poetry, he declares that there is 'Arthaśaktimūlo vākyaprakāśyo Dhvani'\(^4\) (The suggested meaning arising out of the force of meaning found in sentence). The figure of speech 'Upanā' is also suggested here. He has shown how the fact of suggested sense is different from expression. The middle variety of poetry according to him is found where the suggested is dominated by the expressive.

\(^1\) Saṃketa, p. 7. 'Vācyadatisāyani vyangye vastvā-laṃkāra Rasorūpa uttāmam kāvyam'.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 8. 'Nanu dhvanyate dyotyate iti dhvani-rvyadgyam saca kāvyapāya'.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 8.

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 9.
The inferior poetry according to him is that where there is only expressive words and sense and Rasa is in very minute position. This type of poetry is not totally without Rasa and suggestion. This is a note of caution sounded by him, because otherwise it will not be poetry.

Śrīdhara has also supported the division of poetry given by Māmmaṭa. Best poetry he feels is that where there is dominance of suggestive sense instead of expressed one. This is called Dhvani, which is based on the 'Sphoṭa' theory of Grammarians. The words and meanings are called Dhvani because they are capable of suggesting the suggestive sense of fact, figure of speech and Rasa. He feels that by quoting the 'Sphoṭa' theory of Grammarians he has refuted the claim of supporters of theory of Inference and proved that the name Dhvani is used elsewhere also. He refutes the criticism of Vācaspati Miśra, another commentator, that the verse cited as example of best poetry is an example of indication or Lakaṇṇa. He proves that though this example contains Rasa Dhvani, because Vipralambha is found in it, but it is

\[1\] Śaṅkṛeti, p.9. 'Na tu sarvathā nirvyangyam, yataḥ, sa nāsti kascidviṣayo yatraṁtato vibhāvhi rupatavya rasa-paryavasāyitā nāsti'.


\[3\] Ibid.,p.14. 'Evaṁātadā dhvananmūlo varṇesu dhvani-vyavhāra prasiddhah.

\[4\] Ibid.,p.15.

\[5\] Ibid.,p. 16.
primarily a case of Vastu Dhvani. Quoting from the Samketa of Rucaka he further vindicates his assertion that this is an example of Vastu Dhvani. In the middle poetry he feels that suggestive sense is dominated by expressive power, just like a servant of the king is respected more in his marriage even though the king is present there. In the inferior kind of poetry there is only slight tinge of suggested sense.¹

Śrīvīḍyācakravartin has also supported Mammaṭa's division of poetry. Quoting 'Sphoṭa' ² theory very precisely he has shown how Dhvani has been accepted since antiquity. The best poetry he says is there, where the suggested sense outstrips the expressed sense and the word and meanings which possess such a power are called Dhvani or best poetry. On the example of best poetry he feels that there is 'Niṣedha-
rūpa vyaṅga'³ (suggested sense springing forth from negative). He has nothing more to say about the other two varieties of poetry, except what Mammaṭa has said.

Bhattagopāla the writer of the commentary 'Sampradāya-prakāśini' though agrees with Mammaṭa about the definition of poetry, yet he has stressed the importance of the

¹Kav. Pr. Viveka, p. 17. 'Avyanyamityagadārthe nañja dyotyamānasyarthasya kāvye-atyanta-bhāvasambhavāt'.

²Sāhityacūḍamanī, p. 17.

³Ibid.
expressed sense as well. He asserts that even for manifestation of suggested sense there is great utility of the expressed meaning, as a lamp which brings into light a pitcher does not lose its light but may decrease its importance, similar is the case with the expressed and the suggested sense. He goes on to extent of saying that it cannot be denied that there is sufficient charm present in the expressed words and meanings. He has enumerated three types of relationship between suggested and the expressed; (1) Means and to be effected by means (Upāyopeya) (2) Charm and charming (3) Assistance and to be assisted. All these three types of relationship show the great utility of the expressed meaning. He also opines that in the middle poetry though the expressed sense is dominating, the suggested sense is in its natural form, predominance and non-predominance being only distinguishing factors. In the lower type of poetry he says that presence of the suggested is very low.

Govinda Thakkura has also supported Mammaṭa's viewpoint on the division of the poetry. Best poetry according to him is where the suggested sense is dominating than the

1 Sampradāya-prakāśini, p. 17.
2 Ibid., p. 21
3 Ibid., p. 23
4 Ibid. 25
5 Pradīpa, p. 15.
expressed one. Words and meanings possessing capability of manifestation of suggested sense have been termed Dhvani by him, but he adds, that these words and meanings manifest the suggested meaning not only in best poetry but also in middle poetry. He proves that there is suggestion in the verse cited as an example of best poetry and not 'Viparītalakṣāṇa'. In the middle poetry he declares, the suggested is not quite evident but in the lower poetry the suggestion is even less evident, hence these two cannot be confused. In the lower poetry he adds there may be even negation of suggested sense. He does not agree to the view that there is figure of speech 'Utprekaṇa' here.

Bhīmasena Dīksita has copied down Govinda Ṭhakkura's viewpoint on the subject. Even the same language and words have been used. The only contribution he makes is that he cites some more authorities to vindicate his stand. He has indulged in a lengthy discussion on the verse cited as an example of best poetry. But he has finally decided the issue in favour of Mammata. He has emphatically refuted the views

---

1 Pradīpa, p. 16, 'Prādhāni vyanyavānjkatva sadhāraṇadharmanyādagunibhāta vācyam yadvyangyam, tadvyāṅjanaṁ kṣamasya, sābdārthayāyāla rūpasyottamakāvyasya budhair dhvani pāṇḍitair dhvaniṁ saṁjñā kṛtaṁ'.

2 Pradīpa, p. 17.

3 Ibid., p. 19, 'Tenāvyangyam kāvyamadhamam'.

4 Sudhāsāgara, pp. 30, 36; and Pradīpa, pp. 17-18.
of those who assert that there is no suggestion in the verse. He has paid glorious tributes to Mammata for establishing Dhvani.

Mahesvara Bhattacarya also supports Mammata’s division of poetry. In the best type of poetry he feels that the suggested meaning dominates expressed meaning by lowering it. By ‘Budhair’ though Alamkārikas are also meant but here Grammarians only. In the middle type of poetry, either the suggested sense and the expressed sense are at par with each other or the latter dominates. Hence he has suggested two sub-varieties of the middle kind of poetry. With great efforts he shows the suggestive sense in the verse cited as an example of best poetry. He calls the lower poetry as bad poetry.

Nagod Bhatta also supports the division of poetry given by Mammata, which he feels is on the basis of suggested sense and expressed sense. He declares that suggested sense is dominating in the verse ‘Niśeśacyuta’ etc. He also refutes the objections that there are two defects in the

1Adarsa, p. 23. ‘Budhapadasya Alamkārika budhaparate-api.........Vaiyākaraparūpa’.
2Ibid., p. 27.
3Ibid., p. 29.
4Uddyota, p. 17. ‘Adhamapaden-ityukti dhvanitam pradhānynam’.
5Ibid., p. 17. ‘Ata eva Vidheyāvimarsō-ōpi na dōsa iti dik’.
verse namely 'Nyūnapadtādosā' and 'Vidheya vimarsa'. In the lower poetry he feels that the soul of the Rasa; Guṇas are present and the constituents of the body of the poetry namely words and meanings are also present; hence it cannot be excluded from the category of the poetry.

Siddhicandra Gaṇī astonishingly agrees with Mammāta on the divisions of poetry. Though in chapter I as well as chapter II he does not accept suggestiveness of meanings and suggestion itself, he has accepted the division of the poetry made on the basis of suggestion. In the definition of middle type of the poetry he has added one more word to make it more compatible i.e. 'Citrānyatva' meaning thereby that where expressed sense dominates the suggested but which differs from Citrakāvya is called middle poetry. He does not agree with the Grammarians that the suggestive words can be called Dhvani, because only the capability to manifest the knowledge of matters and their sequence cannot be included in Dhvani. His criticism of the lower kind of poetry is that the poems cannot be classified on the basis of subordination and predominance of the very accepted principle of poetry, and

---

1Uddyota, p. 19.
2Kav. Pr. Khandāna, p. 3.
3Ibid., p. 5.
4Ibid., p. 6. 'Nanu Rasadhvanitvādīnā ayam tṛṭīya vibhāgah kr̥ṭah sa ca nopapadyate'.
hence this third variety is not acceptable; in this connexion his reference to Mahimabhaṭṭa is not very clear.

**Vāmapacārya**'s definition of best poetry somewhat differs in wording from that of other commentators. He says that "when the meaning manifested through **Vyāṇajana Vṛtti**, by **Vyaṅga**; is predominating than the expressed meaning expressed through **Abhidhā Vṛtti** then there is best poetry". ¹ Here we see that the commentator lays more stress on the process of meaning and the meaning itself. This is his distinguishing feature. Like others he has also explained the 'Sphoṭa' theory to vindicate the authenticity of Dhvani. In middle poetry he feels that either the suggested sense is dominated by the expressed one or it is equal to that. Hence it is² of two kinds. The third or lower kind of poetry he feels is without suggestion. But he goes on to clarify that it is not entirely without suggestion,³ but on the other hand the suggestion is there but the presence being almost non-apparent.

**Conclusion**

There is negligible difference of opinion amongst the commentators over the salutary verse and 'Kāvyā-pryojanas'

¹Balabodhinī, p. 19. 'Vyāṇjanavṛtti pratipādye-arthe-atisayini adhika camatkarajanake sati uttamam'.
²Ibid., p. 21. 'Vyaṅgyasya vācyādaṇatīśayaśca nyūnatvena tulyatvena ceti dvividhah'.
³Ibid., p. 22.
(Aims of poetry). But the commentators differ quite a bit about the causes of the poetry. It is only Siddhicandra Gaṇi who points out defects even in the salutary verse of Mammaṭa. The difference of opinion, on the 'Kāvyā-kāraṇas' is focused mainly on the issue that whether all the 'Hetus' are collectively the cause of poetry or singularly. The role of 'Vāsanā' which may be, even from the earlier births is stressed. The two major view-points amongst the commentators about the 'Pratibhā' have come to sight. Holders of the first view-point stress that Pratibhā only is the cause of poetry, while there are others who propound the theory of three 'Hetus', they certainly follow the line of Mammaṭa. Caṇḍīdāsa, Bhīmasena and Siddhicandra Gaṇi belong to first category, while others belong to the second.

The definition of poetry is the most most notable point in Ullāsa I of Kāvyaprakāśa. Every word of Mammaṭa's Kārikā has been analyzed, criticized and also appreciated. While some commentators like Caṇḍīdāsa and Siddhicandra do not agree to have words and meanings, both as the basic constituents of the poetry; others like Śrīdhara, Govinda and Vāmanācārya etc. vehemently support Mammaṭa.

A section of the commentators criticize Mammaṭa for not mentioning 'Rasa' or 'Dhvani' in poetry. There are others who justify Mammaṭa's position after forcefully answering the criticism on this point. Caṇḍīdāsa is the only commentator
who propounds the theory that only 'Words' can be poetry. Though Mahesvara also shows his inclination towards this view, but he is not unambiguous like Caṇḍīdāsa. Siddhicandra Gaṇḍī also toes this line.

The support for Guṇas or Alamkāras in the poetry is also not unanimous. While the question of inclusion of the adjective 'Adoṣau' has come under severe criticism.

The division of poetry given by Mammata has also come under heavy criticism. Inclusion of Citra-Kāvyā in poetic category is not relished by some commentators, foremost among such people are Caṇḍīdāsa, Śrīdhara, Siddhicandra Gaṇḍī and some extent Govinda Thakkura.