CHAPTER II

GENERAL RHETORICAL DOCTRINES OF DANDIN.

Now we propose to discuss the rhetorical doctrines of Dandin with a general reference to their origin or early conception and their development in later theory. The main contents or topics of his Kāvyādārśa are as follows:

6. Poetic figures (a) ideal figures: II. 1-368; (b) verbal figures and feet: I. 55-61 (anuprāsa); III. 1-124.

A detailed reference to the doctrines contained therein shall be made in this and the following chapters.

Purposes and sources of Poetry. Poetry is essentially an art and its immediate purpose is to give delight, called technically the aesthetic pleasure, both to the poet and the reader; and this has been recognised by the writers of Sanskrit Poetics from the earliest period of the study, though the older theorists do not pay special attention to the discussion of the topic. Dandin makes a passing reference to the purposes of poetry. He casually mentions delight and fame

as gains of poetry to the poet and describes mahākāvyā as a poetic composition which delights the world, implying thereby that the aesthetic pleasure belongs to the reader also. Other early writers, too, content themselves with a general reference to these objects. With the advancement of the study of Poetics, other purposes, viz., fame, wealth, and escape from ills from the poet's view-point and the supreme delight and worldly wisdom from the reader's standpoint, were introduced and discussed. These are sometimes summarily referred to as the attainment of the fruit of the four objects of life (caturvarga). Dāṇḍin indirectly anticipates it when he describes a mahākāvyā as possessed of the goal of the four objects.

With the development of a highly elaborate scheme of Poetics which viewed everything from the standpoint of the suggestion of sentiment, the object of poetry was conceived with reference to the theory of rasa, and it was theorized to create the highest form of aesthetic pleasure philosophically termed ānanda which was regarded as the supreme object of poetry in later poetical theory. It may be noted, however,

3. I. 19 (Lokaranjakam).
5. Op. Mammata (KPr. I. 2); Hemacandra (KAn. p. 2) etc.
6. KA. I. 15; cp. also Bh. Kal. I. 2; 21; SD. I. 2 etc.
that the conception of this ananda originally emanated from the delight (ramaṇa) or pleasure (prīti) of Dandin and Bhāmaha.

Dandin also deals incidentally, at the close of the first chapter of his work, with the sources of poetry which, according to him are (i) poetic imagination (pratibhā), (ii) pure and vast learning (nirmala bahuṣṛuta) and (iii) assiduous application (amanda abhiyōra).

The poetic imagination also called kavitva or the creative faculty of a poet is said to be natural or inborn and has been described as emanating from an antenatal capacity (pūrvavāsanāypūnānubandhi). The later theorists term it sakti (poetic power) also, which has been defined by Abhinavagupta as intelligence (prajñā) capable of fresh invention. The second source, namely, the bahuṣṛuta or a vast fund of learning has also been referred to as vyutpatti or culture by Dandin and, perhaps at his instance, by later theorists as well. Bhāmaha and the later writers undertake

7. Mammata (I. 2 vṛtti) calls the highest bliss (paramānirvṛtti) the chief of all the purposes.


9. KA. I. 103; 105. Rudrata, it may be noted, divides pratibhā into sahajā (inborn) and utpādyā (capable of being produced by culture or vyutpatti).

to give a list of arts and sciences to be studied by a poet. Such a list is significantly absent in Dandin's work. The assiduous application has also been referred to as labour (śrama) and practice (abhyaśa), the last term having been generally accepted by the later rhetoricians. Hemacandra defines abhyaśa as repeated exercise of lessons of a theorist.

Although Dandin recognises the supremacy of poetic imagination, yet he highly rates the importance of wide learning and constant practice and goes even to say that they may bestow some favour even on one lacking in creative faculty. To this view, many of his followers take exception, and vehemently reject the idea of the possibility of poetry without poetic imagination. It may, however, be remarked here that Dandin

12. KA, I, 9; III, 137; cp. Rudra (I. 14); Hemacandra (KAn, p. 6), Jagannatha (RŚ, pp. 9-10); Vaman (I. 3, 1), however, calls it vidya.
14. KA, I, 104; 105; II, 368; cp. Rudra (I. 20); Rāja-śekhara (Khim p. 121), Hemacandra (KAn, pp. 5-9), Jagannatha (RŚ, p. 9) etc. Vaman (I. 3, 11), however, has abhiyoga.
16. KA, I, 104; The standpoint of Rudra who conceives pratiłīla as capable of attainment by culture also, seems to plead for the theory of turning a non-poet into a poet. It is totally different from the training of a poet in the art, which formed a part of Sanskrit Poetics (cp. De: HSP, II, p. 283-98). Dandin (I. 9) also tells us that the works on Poetics were aimed at training the poets.
does not appear to admit the wealth of poetry in the total absence of pratibhā which he expresses by the synonym, kavitva also which underlines the essentiality of the poetic gift in a poet. What he seems to imply is that even if the poetic gift is of mediocre grade, one may reap the harvest of poetry, of course, in a lesser degree, by virtue of his extensive learning and regular practice. But the fault of Dandin is that he has, knowingly or unknowingly, harmed the cause of poetic imagination by putting undue emphasis on the other two sources.

Most of the later theorists refer to the above three sources of poetry, with, of course, minor differences in name or in conception or with regard to their relative superiority. Some theorists add a few more to the list, though majority of them retain the original number.


17. Bhāmaha (I. 5) unerringly refers to this and regards pratibhā as the supreme equipment of a poet. Later theorists mostly follow him; op. Vāmana (I. 3. 16), Mammata (I. 3 ff.) Janannātha (RJ, p. 9) etc. Anandavardhana (Dh. A. III. 6 ff.) remarks that the want of learning may be compensated for by the poetic imagination, but the absence of pratibhā soon becomes flagrant.

18. Op. Vāmana (I. 3. 1) who adds loka (worldly wisdom) etc. to the list.

19. Op. Rudraṭa (I. 14), Mammata (I. 3) etc. Hemacandra (KAn., pp. 5-9) regards pratibhā as the only equipment which, acc. to him, is to be refined by culture (vyut-patti) and practice (abhyāsa). Jagannātha (RJ, pp. 9-10) follows him.
Definition and classification of kāvya. Dandin is perhaps the first known writer who gives us a definition of kāvya. He defines kāvya or rather, metaphorically its body as a series of words characterised by agreeable sense. In this definition, he apparently puts greater stress on the words which, when possess ed of the intended sense (istārtha), constitute the body of the kāvya. The string of words (padāvallī) or speech (vāc) manifests itself in varied poetic dictions and it is embellished with certain ornaments. Again, the series of words is to be properly employed, if it means to yield the desired sense; in other words, it must avoid flaws and, at the same time, should be possessed of the poetic excellences. Thus, the scope of Dandin's definition of poetry is vast enough to cover, in its wider application, the fields of dictions, their constituent excellences, the faults and, above all, the poetic figures. Vāmana and most of the later theorists embody these elements into their definition or exposition of kāvya, perhaps on the suggestion of Dandin.

Dandin's definition reminds us of Jñanānatha's apparently similar exposition of kāvya which, according to him, is a series of words producing some charming idea. But while

20. KA. I. 10; also op. I. 3; 4; 5; 9. The author of Agni-P. (336, 6–7) follows Dandin in this respect; on the other hand, Śāmaḥa (I. 16), Pradatta (III. 1) Kannaka (I. 7; 16) and Mammata (I. 4) etc. give equal prominence to word and sense.


22. Op. KA. I. 3; 6; 7; 8; op. Bh.KAl. I. 11.
Dāṇḍin's īṣṭārtha is simply agreeable or intended sense, Jagan-
maṭha's charming idea is what causes unworldly or disinterest-
ed pleasure, a fact of spiritual experience which depends upon
taste formed by an unbroken chain of the contemplated objects
of beauty. Thus it takes into account the poetic sentiment
or rasa which is essentially universal and impersonal in
character. The definition given by Dāṇḍin, however, does not
refer to the soul of poetry; it rather expressly restricts
itself to the body thereof. In fact, as Dr. De rightly observes,
"the question as to what constitutes poetry or poetic charm,
the aesthetic fact, does not arise until Vāmana and the Dhvani-
kāra come into the field; for earlier authors like Bhāmaha
(i. 23) and Dāṇḍin (i. 10) propose to confine themselves
chiefly to what they call the Kāvyāsārīra or 'the body of
poetry' as distinguished from its ātman, its 'soul' or
animating principle. The advantages of verbal arrangement
with due regard to the expression of an agreeable sense and
of clever clothing of the sense with poetical or rhetorical
ornaments absorb the attention of these writers; and whatever
may be the theoretic basis of poetic charm, it is enough if
it is realised by the objective beauty of ingenious expression." 25
The later theorists who regard rasa as the soul of poetry
define kāvyā as an arrangement of words endowed with poetic

23. Op. Vāmana (i. 1. 1-3 and vṛtti), Mammata (i. 4),
Vā-bhaṭa (Kān. p. 14), Hemacandra (Kān., p. 19) etc.
24. RG. p. 4; for his conception of poetry in detail, op.
De: HSB. II, pp. 253-5.
sentiment.

Dāṇḍin classifies kāvya, on the basis of various factors, into numerous varieties of poetic composition. On the basis of form, he divides it into prose, verse or a mixture of the two forms. The metrical variety has again been divided into two classes, vṛtta and jāti, according as the metres employed are regulated by syllables or moras (mātrā) respectively, while structurally it is subdivided into muktaka (a single verse), kulaka (a group of five verses), kōda (unconnected verses) and saṃghāta (short poem with a story). These forms are said to be included in the main variety, namely, the mahākāvya, also called sargabandha (a composition divided into cantos). The definition of mahākāvya, which seems to be somewhat conventional, contains the following points:

(a) Its preface should consist of either a blessing or a dedication or an indication of the subject-matter. (b) The subject-matter, be it historical or imaginary, should be good. (c) It should be possessed of the fruit of the four objects of life. (d) It should have a skilful and noble person as its hero; his qualities as also those of his enemies should be depicted and the supremacy of the hero should be established by describing his victory over his opponents. (e) It should be well-


26. Op. Vīśvanātha: (3D. I. 3); Jagannātha (HSP. p. 4) etc.

27. The division is at least as old as Yāska (Mr. I. 9) who calls verse and prose respectively mitākṣara (having measured syllables) and amitākṣara (having unmeasured ones).
decorated with descriptions of cities, oceans, mountains, seasons, the rise of the sun and the moon etc. (f) It should be embellished with poetic ornaments. (g) It should be of sizeable length. (h) It should be full of poetic sentiments and emotions. (i) The cantos dealing with different incidents should be metrically well-formed and well-jointed, and should not be very lengthy. Dāṇḍin cares to add that even if some of these features are absent, a mahākāvyā can be acceptable provided the features present are charming.

With fresh experiments in literature, new points were added to the list of the characteristic elements of a mahākāvyā; we have, for instance, the following new earmarks in Viśvanātha: (a) It may contain a number of kings of one dynasty as its heroes. (b) There should be censure of the wicked and glorification of the good. (c) There should be one metre throughout the canto with a change only towards the end. (d) A canto should generally deal with one incident only, and should hint, towards the end, the incident of the following canto. (e) The poem should be named after the poet or the story or the hero or some one else; likewise, cantos may be named after the happenings they relate.

The prose form has been normally divided into ākhyāyikā and kathā, though Dāṇḍin definitely knows its other numerous species as well. The story in an ākhyāyikā is narrated by

28. Bhāmaha (I. 22-3) objects to this procedure on the plea that the enemies should not appear in the tale when they are not meant to pervade through the narrative.
the hero himself, while that in a kathā may be told by some one else also. Again, an ākhyāyikā contains some verses in vaktra or aparavaktra metre and is divided into chapters called uchhvāsas, while these features are absent in a kathā. On the other hand, a kathā deals with the incidents of abduction of a girl, war, separation and victory etc., and is marked by a peculiar sign indicative of the poet's intention, which points are not present in an ākhyāyikā.

Dāndin, however, does not admit the rigid distinction made between the two varieties which, according to him, form one class under two different designations. He emphatically refutes the theory of distinction on the following grounds:

(a) The mere fact that the narrator is the hero himself or some one else cannot form the basis of any distinction. Moreover, exceptions to this are observed in the ākhyāyikās wherein persons other than the heroes appear as narrators.

(b)


31. Dāndin here adds that the depiction of his own virtues by the hero constitutes no blemish. Bhāmaha ('I. 29'), however, rejects the idea of high-born hero depicting his own merits in a kathā, though in case of an ākhyāyikā, he, strangely enough, permits the hero to speak of his glorious deeds! Dāndin, it appears, had before him the example of Brhatkathā, a kathā of Gopālakṣṇa, wherein Naravāhana-datta himself narrates his own virtues; cp. also Lacôte ('Essais sur Gopālakṣṇa et la Brhatkathā, p. 232') who, however, suggests that Dāndin would have noticed that Gopālakṣṇa did not observe the traditional distinction in his Brhatkathā.
Verses in the said metres, like āryā verses, can occur in a kathā also. (c) It is immaterial whether the chapters are called the lambhas or ucchvāsas. (d) Themes like the abduction of a maiden, battle etc. are, in fact, characteristics common to all species of kāvyā, and they occur in a mahākāvyā also. (e) The peculiar mark, said to be characterising a kathā, cannot be a fault in other forms of prose. Although Dāṇḍin was not followed by later theorists in his contention, yet the fact remains that his viewpoint is logical and sound.

The miśra or mixed variety of kāvyā includes drama (nāṭaka) etc. for the elaborate treatment of which Dāṇḍin refers his readers to other specialised works. Though drama was considered even by Dāṇḍin and other early theorists to be a division of kāvyā, yet the study of its theories formed a separate discipline in older times. In later theories, however, Dramaturgy formed a part of the system of Poetics, though

32. Acc. to Tarunā., it is some particular mark of a composition (bandhacantos) like the word Śri at the end of cantos in Śis. or Lakṣmī in Kiritā.

33. Dāṇḍin probably hints here Hoar., an ākhyāyikā, where the hero is not the narrator of the story; cp. also Tarunā. and Ratna.

34. Ratna. on I. 28 recognises the fact.

35. This variety (with regard to form as well as language) is not admitted by Bhāmaha who, however, mentions abhineyārttā, signifying nāṭaka, as one of the 5 forms of kāvyā (I.13; 24).

36. Cp. the existence of Nāṭasūtras in Pāṇini's time, and Bharata's work, also cp. ref. in early writers (KA. I. 31; Bh. Kāl. I. 24) to specialised works for the treatment of drama.
we have in later period works which exclusively deal with drama. Among the midra forms, Dandin mentions campū also which is composed in prose interspersed with verses here and there.

The medium of expression forms the basis of another classification which divides kāvya into four sets, namely, Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhramśa and midra. Of Prakrit, Dandin notices various forms, viz., Māhārāṣṭri, Sauraseni, Sāuḍī and Lāṭī, the first of which is typified as the best. By Apabhramśa, Dandin means the language of the Ābhīras and others in kāvya as distinguished from the scientific writings where it is the name given to all languages other than Sanskrit.

The effect of combining these two principles gives us numerous forms of composition like sārṣabandha etc. in Sanskrit, skandhaka (a poem written in skandhaka metre) etc. in Prakrit, āsāra (a poem in āsāra metre) in Apabhramśa, and nāṭaka, where different languages are employed, in the midra. While these species are composed in the specified languages noted against each, the prose variety or kathā, which, according to him, includes ākhyaṣikā and other prose forms, may be written in Sanskrit or in any spoken language including Bhūtabhāṣā (the dialect of the Pidācas

37. Acc. to Tarunā, it is a poem written in āryaṅgīti.
38. Acc. to Ḫrūd., chapters of an Apabhramśa composition are called osaras (v. 1. for āsāra)
39. De (HSK, II, p. 77 fn.) thinks that it refers to what is now called Hybrid Sans., or mixed Sans., but it probably refers to the employment of various Prakrits in drama.
or the forest tribes) in which, as he points out, Brhatkatha is said to have been composed. Daṇḍin also refers to the traditional division of kāvyā into prekṣya and śravya, according as it is either visible or audible. The former includes dramatic performances like lāṣya (a female dance representing erotic sentiment), chalita (a male dance with erotic and heroic sentiments) sālya (a dance in which the dancer puts his or her hand on the forehead) and others; the latter variety (śravya) signifies all other forms of composition.

These speculations constitute the common stock-in-trade of Sanskrit Poetics and are found repeated, in almost similar form, in most writers irrespective of the school or tradition to which they belong.

the employment of various Prakrits in drama.

40. Acc. to Bhāmaha (I. 28), an ākhyāyikā is written in Sanskrit, while a kathā either in Sanskrit or in Apabhraṃśa.

41. Acc. to Bhoja (ŚKā. II. 143 f.), it is a kīmāra dance with erotic and heroic sentiments; for lāṣya, cp. below, sect. IV; in fact, these are the varieties of dance. It appears that Daṇḍin means by prekṣya dance performance and not necessarily drama which, however, may contain these items. Significantly, he does not mention here drama which is probably intended to be included in śravya (cp. I. 39), though generally it is conceived as a prekṣyārtha.