CHAPTER - V

DEFINITIONS OF POETRY

It is well said-

"Poetry is one of the most intriguing subjects for defining. In various ages, countries and climes, Poetry is being defined by the critics of the age; and still to this day it has remained a sphinx refusing to be cast in any final mould of definition. It is a subject which as St. Augustine remarked: 'If not asked, I know; if asked, I know not.'

In India too in the long history of Sāhityaśāstra, the definition of Poetry has been repeatedly attempted by great rhetoricians. For defining Poetry one must know the 'differentia' i.e. the distinguishing mark of Poetry. And various differentia having been thought of, these gave rise to different schools of Poetry like the Rasa school, the Rīti school, the Dhvani school, the Vakrokti school and the Alamkāra school." (S.V.Dixit: Kāvyapraṅkāśa of Mammaṭa, I, II and X Ullāsas, 1959; Notes, p.165).
To define Poetry is extremely difficult. Sanskrit rhetoricians have tried to find accurate definition of Poetry. So, some argued 'Togetherness of word and meaning is Poetry'. Some add to these two excellences and figures of speech. Some considered all these to be outer garb or 'body of Poetry'. Then the question arose "What is the inner essence or 'soul' of Poetry?" As an answer to this question several types of discussion took place and also gave birth to several schools of Sanskrit Poetics. Some modern scholars think that still there is room to discover the 'soul' of Poetry.

Dr. T.G. Mainkar observes— "What is Kāvya and why we like it are questions which are often asked and rarely answered satisfactorily. Hence fresh attempts and a discerning criticism of the earlier attempts become a sheer necessity. It would be no exaggeration if it were said that the science of rhetorics is nothing but an attempt to arrive at a new and satisfactory answer to these questions of the definition of Poetry. Kāvya, and the Poetic experience and its precise way of affecting the reader. A definition by itself is a difficult problem and it has been rendered all the more difficult by the severe expectation of the Naiyāyikas, the absence of the three faults of ati vyāpti, over-extension, avyāpti, non-
extension, and asambhava, impossibility. In a sense, these three appear to be very natural expectations of a good definition, but it is these that have created innumerable difficulties for the rhetoricians. A look at the works of Mammaṭa, Viśvanātha, Jagannātha paṇḍita and others will show how much ingenuity is spent on these problems. Arguments and counter-arguments and refutations and improvements characterise these works. It must not be supposed that it is the severe logical expectations and tests that have made these problems so difficult, for in their very nature the problems are difficult to be solved, and admit of different explanations.¹

So it is clear that an entity which is dependent upon psychological basis, is very difficult to define. We know some Vedantins give only a negative description of Brahman and not positive. Even the Upaniṣads adopt the method of 'Neti Neti' while defining or describing Brahman which according to them is beyond being described through words. Indian logicians opine-'A definition should be far from blemishes like Ayyāpti, Ativyāpti, and Asambhava; and also it should be short and clear.'²

Therefore Sanskrit rhetoricians tried to define Poetry. A survey of definitions of Poetry which are given by Sanskrit
rhetoricians reveals the stress laid by them on one or the other aspect of Poetry.

Bhāmaha is the first rhetorician who defines Poetry. He says- "Word and meaning together constitute poetry."³

This definition of Bhāmaha indicates only a simple combination of word and sense, because it does not clearly states 'How should these two be.' Further the togetherness of word and meaning we may also find in conversation of common men, or in the discussion carried out in treatises. So, this definition involves the fault called Ativyāpti.

Dr. P. Sri Ramachandrudu opines- "this cannot technically be called as Laksana at all, for, we hardly come across a literary work where Šabda and Artha are not united. Realising the inadequency of this Laksana, later rhetoricians who followed the foot-steps of Bhāmaha, try to explain this Sāhitya of Šabda and Artha in so many ways. But the real explanation of this Laksana can be found in the words of Bhāmaha himself. To find out the implication of Bhāmaha's definition we must first examine the context in which it is found. Earlier, Bhāmaha discusses the views of old rhetoricians of those who give importance only to the Sabḍalahkāras and of those who give importance only to the Arthalahkāras (KL 1.13.15)."
"At the end he gives his own opinion (KL 1.15) that both the Śabdālāṅkāras and Arthālāṅkāras are acceptable to him. The Laksāna of the Kāvyā, 'Alāṅkārasahitau śabdārthau kāvyam' closely follows the above lines and therefore the word 'Sahitau' in the so-called definition should be taken to mean 'Śabdālāṅkārasahitau śabdārthau kāvyam'. Thus the Laksāna will be 'Alāṅkārasahitau śabdārthau kāvyam'. This definition of a kāvyā would appear to be quite appropriate from the pen of an author who gives much importance to Alāṅkāras. An indirect hint at the definition of Kāvyā acceptable to Bhāmaha may be found in a subsequent line 'Alāṅkāravadagramyamarthyam nyāyyamanākulaṁ' (KL 1.35). Therefore, 'Śabdārthau sahitau kāvyam' may be accepted as Bhāmaha's general definition of Kāvyā, and in this regard we have the support of many of the later writers. The same line with the amplification as explained above, or 'Alāṅkāra-vadagramyam' etc. may be taken as the complete definition acceptable to him, because it fits in well in his system."*4

But Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy says- "Closer examination reveals to us that the definition of Bhāmaha is not so childish as it looks. Bhāmaha never means that any and every word expressive of some meaning is suitable in the context; and the beauty of such compositions is achieved with the help of (a set of) figures of speech and qualities of style. Avoidance of patent defects which are also catalogued, goes a long way in raising a piece of writing to the level of literature."*5
Dāṇḍin defines Kāvya as- "with respect to the body it consists of a series of words, qualified by the sense which the poet wishes to express."\(^6\)

"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 possessed of the intended sense (śrārtha). constitute the body of the Kāvya. The string of words (padāvali) 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 Dāṇḍin's definition of poetry is vast enough to cover in its wider application, the fields of dictions (mārgas), their constituent excellences (guṇas), the defects (doṣas) and, above all, the poetic figures (alamkāras).\(^7\)

"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 S.K.De rightly observes- "the question as to what constitutes poetry or poetic charm, the aesthetic fact, does not arise until
Vāmana and Dhvanikāra come into the field; for earlier authors like Bhāmaha (i.23) and Daṇḍin (i.10) propose to confine themselves chiefly to what they call the 'Kāvyā śarīra' 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.8

"Both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin give much importance to the Alankāras in a Kāvyā and they take them, though not explicitly, as the soul of poetry. They differ only about the Śarīra of Kāvyā. While Bhāmaha accepts both Šabda and Artha as the body of Poetry, Daṇḍin is inclined to take Šabda alone as the body but he does not give any reason in support of his view. But the commentary, Kāvyalakṣaṇa ratnaśrí, remarks that the body of Kāvyā also i.e. Šabda is to be decorated with the Alankāras (perhaps the Arthālāṅkāras) (Kāvyalakṣaṇa-ratnaśrí, p.6).9

We may assume that by the word 'iṣṭārtha', Daṇḍin indicates purpose viz. 'delight' which comes from poetic
figures, because he says- "All attributes adding beauty to poetry go by the name of Alankāra"\textsuperscript{10} and also he says- "No doubt all literary embellishment imparts pleasantness to the idea."\textsuperscript{11} Here Daṇḍin uses the word 'Rasa' not in the broad sense; but in simple sense of 'poetic delight'. So it shows that according to Daṇḍin, "The string of words which consists of figures generating delight, is the body of Poetry."

We may find a flaw in the definition of Poetry of Daṇḍin. He considers the string of words as the body of Poetry, but only the string of words cannot be the frame or the body; both word and meaning can become so. But later rhetoricians like Agnipurāṇakāra,\textsuperscript{12} Jayadeva,\textsuperscript{13} Viśvanātha\textsuperscript{14} and Jagannātha\textsuperscript{15} accept Daṇḍin's opinion. We know that 'History repeats itself', After several centuries from Daṇḍin, Jagannātha followed Daṇḍin literally. So, he says- "Kāvya is word which conveys charming sense."

Undoubtedly Daṇḍin's definition gave a direction to several principles of Sanskrit poetics, like, guna, Mārga, rīti and so on, and also he gave new mode to definition of poetry.

Daṇḍin has often been accredited as the propagater
of the 'Riti' school though the word 'Riti' itself never occurs in his Kāvyādarśa. He accepts the Vaidarbhi and Goudīya styles\(^{16}\) whose essences consist of Gunas which were later on well defined by Vāmana.

As we have already seen, the word Sarīra has been used by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin in their definitions of Poetry. Even Vāmana also accepts this. In the Vṛtti of his first sūtra, he elaborates his idea of poetry. There he says—"word and meaning embellished by Alamkāra and Guna constitute Poetry."\(^{17}\) Here lies the distinction between ordinary composition and poetic composition. He uses the term Alamkāra not in the specific sense of poetic figures only; he takes it in a broader sense to mean poetic beauty.\(^{18}\) This poetic beauty can be acquired by the introduction of poetic excellences, Gunas and poetic figures only enhance this beauty.\(^{19}\) So while Bhāmaha is indifferent to Guna, Daṇḍin restricts its scope to a particular type of diction, and Vāmana makes a clear distinction between the concepts of Guna and Alamkāra. Vāmana is of the opinion that Gunas are the essential qualities of poetic art while Alamkāras, in their restricted sense, are not so essential. The Gunas reside in poetry by samavāya-relation, and Alamkāras by Samyoga relation. The former is a quality of the essence while the latter is an external embellishment.
Vāmana is the pioneer in the field of probing into the inner essence of poetry, and thus has left behind a stamp of individuality. He declared in unequivocal terms that 'Riti is the soul of poetry,' and this term Riti is explained as a particular arrangement of words and this particularity comes due to Guna. In his opinion, certain definite combination of different poetic excellences, Guṇas, makes a particular diction (Riti) palpable and this poetic diction constitutes the essence of poetry. In addition to Vaidarbhi and Gaude types of diction, as recognised by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, Vāmana has mentioned a third type, called Pāṇcālī. These are definitely geographical associations, which in course of time, lost in stereotyped manner of criticism.

To Vāmana, the Vaidarbhi is the best type of diction as it unifies all the ten Guṇas. Ojāb, and Kānti predominate in Gaude, while Madhurya and Saumukārya in the Pāṇcālī. Of these, according to Vāmana, the former be practised by poets.

Vāmana makes a clear advance on the crude teachings of Daṇḍin and insists upon imparting a speciality to word-arrangement which is effected by harmonious unification of some standard, fixed poetic excellences. He treats each
of the excellences, under two heads as शब्दगुण and अर्थगुण. His insight reads a new meaning in the गुनाः of his predecessors and thereby he forms a new theory emphasising the importance of diction in poetry. He for the first time, probes into the soul of poetry. His findings may not be above criticism, but it marks a process of evolution which culminates in the speculation of the ध्वनि theorists.”

So, now we may assume that according to Vāmana 'Poetry is word and sense which are flawless and are possessed of excellences and figures'.

This conception of Poetry of Vāmana is a significant contribution to Sanskrit poetics. Because, he did not consider that only word and sense are poetry. Avoiding flaws and bringing in excellences and figures received significant place in the conception of Poetry. This conception guided to the अग्निपुराणकार, भोजराज and Mammaṭa among others.

Another contribution of Vāmana is his indication of difference between गुण and अलंकार. This idea gave a palpitation to Mammaṭa, so, he considers 'excellences are perpetual and figures are occasional'.

Apart from these more significant contributions of Vāmāna is—declaring the soul of Poetry. Bhāmāha and Daṇḍin had already used the word 'śāriṇa'. This implies that they must have had something else in mind as the soul residing in that body, but they have not expressly mentioned it anywhere in their works and the credit of having first tackled the problem of Ātman or soul of Kāvyā undoubtedly goes to Vāmāna. It is also notable that only after Vāmāna the discussion of the soul of Poetry came into existence.

But, the theory of Riti did not receive much approval. No successor of Vāmāna followed him. Possibly Vāmāna's riti was considered as only the outer-part and not the inner one of Poetry. So, Viśvanātha rightly says—"Riti is nothing but a characteristic mode of composition (rācanāvinyāsa pranālī or style); and this characteristic composition (saṁghaṭana) is like the limbs of an embodied being; but the soul of a being, like the soul of a Kāvyā is quite different from this characteristic composition or style or Riti of a Kāvyā."  

Rudraṭa follows Bhāmāha. He does not give any new definition. He accepts—"Śabda and Artha constitutes Poetry."  

A perusal of the conception of poetry from Bhāmāha
to Rudraṭa clarifies—

1. In this period the discussion of definitions of Poetry stops in outer side only.

2. Even Vāmana's Riti stops on the outer-portion.

3. Vāmana's distinction between Guna and Alakhāra is noteworthy.

4. Vāmana's conception of Guna inspired Ānandavardhana, Mammaṭa and others to consider Guna as a characteristic related to Rasa.

5. Vāmana's Riti-theory encouraged to discuss the soul of Poetry, and so the Dhvani and Rasa theories came into existence.

6. So, we may consider this period i.e. Bhāmaha to Rudraṭa as the pre-dhvani period.

7. These four rhetoricians are the advocates of Alakhāra. So, this period may be considered as roughly the Alakhāra-period.

8. In this period we do not find any systematic discussion of Poetry or of the definition of Poetry, though, elements of Poetics proclaimed during this period, developed later on.
Next comes Ānandavardhana whose Dhvanyāloka is an epoch-making work in the history of Sanskrit Poetics. His unique contribution to the Alāṅkāraśāstra is the doctrine of Dhvani or suggestion though he himself claims for it previous currency among Indian critics. Dhvani Kāvyā is defined as follows- "That kind of poetry in which the directly expressed word and sense become subordinate to suggested sense, is called Dhvani by scholars." Suggestive poetry is poetry par excellence.

Nowhere in his work Ānandavardhana clearly states a definition of Poetry. "Poetry is but that whose body is constituted by sound (or word) and meaning." This statement of Ānandavardhana clarifies his acceptance of the views of his predecessors of the pre-dhvani period. It did not come to conclusions about the 'soul of Poetry'. But Ānandavardhana's statement- "the soul of Poetry is suggestion" gave an impetus discussion regarding the 'soul of Poetry'. Through the two statements of Anandavardhana's 'śabdārtha śarīram tāvatkāvyam' and 'Kāvyasyātmā dhvanih' we may assert - Poetry has word and sense as its body and suggestion as its soul.

Even pre-dhvani period rhetoricians have found two divisions of Artha viz. vācyā and pratiyamāna. Even
Ānandavardhana considers these two as the divisions of Artha. So he says—"That meaning which wins the admiration of refined critics is decided to be the soul of poetry. The 'explicit' and the 'implicit' are regarded as its two aspects." But, here it seems that the first line of this verse indicates dhvani not Artha. So Viśvanātha rightly criticises this. —"It is not sound and is to be rejected; for this saying of his (e.g. Vācyārtha is also the soul of Kāvya) is contradictory to his early saying of 'dhvani' or internal significance as the soul of Kāvya." But Kumudranjan Ray opines—"this saying of Dhvanikāra is not in contradiction to his early saying of 'Dhvani kāvyasya Ātmā', for by Artha we are here to take both Šabda and Artha that constitute Kāvya (Śabdārthaśarīrāmeva Kāvyam) and Sahrdāyaśālāgyah arthah is dhvani or Pratiyamānārtha that can be known by a sahrdaya or vivekin only is Kāvyātmā. And Śabdārtha will give first Vacyārtha then Vyaṅgyārtha i.e. will give both meanings."

Even Abhinavagupta notices this contradiction.

Dr. Krishnamoorthy clarifies—

"Despite all these contradictions, the fact remains that the doctrine of Dhvani marked a great advance in the history
of Sanskrit poetics. The centre of gravity shifted gradually from śabdārtha, Alabhkāra, Guṇa and Rīti to Dhvani and indeed the doctrine is sound in its essentials. It is not merely the presence of some excellence or of figures that accounts for a piece being called great literature. Words may be said to lie dead in a dictionary, skeletons without flesh and blood. 

The Dhvanikāra accepts Citrakāvya. "If Dhvani were the soul of Poetry, then nothing bereft of it could be Poetry. Then again suggestion may be of (1) Vastu or (2) Alabhkāra (embellishment) or (3) Rasa. The highest place is given only to Rasadhvani and not to other two. But Poetry where the plot or figures of speech are suggested is not excluded from the domain of Poetry but are given a subordinate position."

"With the establishment of Dhvani-theory by Ānandavardhana and the subsequent importance that is given to Rasa the concept of poetry has been completely changed and the significance and bearing of Alabhkāras and Guṇas etc. have undergone a thorough revision. From this period onwards the rhetoricians, including those who are opposed to the Dhvani-theory, stopped hovering round the Śabda, Artha, Alabhkāras and Guṇas etc. and began to probe into the depths of
poetry. This significant change in the outlook can be seen in the definitions of Kāvyā of the post-dhvani period. Strangely enough, we do not find either Ānandavardhana or Abhinavagupta attempting at a clear definition of Kāvyā excepting one or two passing general remarks 'Śabdārtha-śāriṃ tāvat kāvyam'\(^{48}\) and 'Kāvyaviśeṣo hi viśisṭārtha pratipattihetuh śabdāsandarbha viśeṣāh'\(^{49}\) etc. can be cited by the followers of Bhāmaha as well as Dandin as an authority for their views."\(^{50}\)

Kuntaka is the first person who gives a definition of poetry systematically. He says- "Poetry is that word and sense together enshrined in a style revealing the artistic (lit, 'out-of-the-way') creativity of the poet on the one hand and giving aesthetic delight to the man of taste on the other."\(^{51}\)

Here Kuntaka's 'togetherness of word and sense' is not like Bhāmaha's idea. Bhāmaha wants simple combination of word and sense. But Kuntaka adds new idea of 'Vakrokti' and also he needs 'Sahrdayāhlādakatā' in the unification of word and sense.

So, he clearly states in the Vṛtti - "Poetry is nothing but word and sense in their unity. The 'denoter' and the
'denoted' taken together constitute Poetry, that they are two and yet one is welcome paradox. As a result of this, the view of some that poetry is word alone beautified highly by the skill of the poet, as also the view of some others that Poetry is sense alone causing aesthetic delight as a result of beauty in style, both these stand refuted. Thus, the quality of giving aesthetic delight co-exists in both severally, even as oil exists in every grain of sesamum, and is not exclusive to either of them."

And also Kuntaka has a peculiar idea about the term 'Sāhitya' - "What we mean by Sāhitya is not merely the mutual coherence invariably found between word and meaning but their extra-ordinary efficiency in the artistic usage of the poet to bring delight to the readers. The qualification that 'the poetic usage involving neither more nor less than the exact form of word and meaning required to make the whole beautiful is inserted in order to indicate that the two are competing with each other, as it were, to produce delight. Between the two, there should be no excess nor deficiency in respect of the contribution of either.

"It might be averred that such an equality is quite possible even between two imperfect units. That is why
it has been explicitly stated 'in respect of beauty'. This consideration of beauty is what culminates in the delight of the readers. An artistic usage directed to this end, and presenting word and meaning in the most apt and striking aspect is denoted by the term Sāhitya. It is the mutual relation between one word and another as well as between one meaning and another which is intended by the expression. We have already seen that the definition of poetry entails the sentence as a whole since the meaning is completed only at the end of the sentence.\(^5\)

It shows Kuntaka used the term 'Sāhitya' in a broad sense. And also Kuntaka gives more stress on Vakrokti or 'artistic turn of speech' in his definition of Poetry. He considers Vakrokti only as the essence of Poetry'. So, he explains Vakrokti — "What exactly is this common ornament? 'Artistic turn of speech' is the reply. It stands for a charming and novel utterance peculiar to Poetry and distinct from familiar usage. It is the very index of the artistic turn that a master-poet's speech takes. In other words artistic utterance itself is the ornament in question.

"Let us sum it up once again: apparently, words and meanings both have their distinct existence in poetry and
come to be adorned by something different from themselves.
The fact of the matter is that the very process of poetic
utterance is constituted by the artistic turns assumed by
words and meanings. The poetic process itself, in this
sense, is the real ornamentation. For, it is extremely
delighting in itself.\(^{54}\)

But Viśvanātha denies Kuntaka's opinion –

"Vakroktijīvātakāra's definition of a Kāvya as
'Vakroktih kāvyajīvītam' (i.e. sly hints are the very breath
of Kāvya) cannot stand; for Vakrokti is an Alāṅkāra like
Upamā, and thus this definition is not 'Kāvyasvarūpāpadhāyaka'.\(^{55}\)

But Viśvanātha's opinion is objectionable. Because
Kuntaka's conception of Vakrokti is completely different
from ordinary figures like Upamā, Utpreksā and others. He
does not like to put Vakrokti in the 'Alāṅkāra-koṭi'. Kuntaka
distinguishes the 'inner' and the 'outer' beauty of Poetry
in the six divisions of Vakratā viz. (1) Varṇavinyāsa,
(2) Pada-pūrvārdhā, (3) Padaparārdhā, (4) Vākya, (5) Pra-
karāṇa and (6) Prabandha. Šabdālaṅkāras and Arthālaṅkāras
merge into Varṇavinyāsavakrata and Vākyavakrata. So,
Alāṅkāras have no separate existence. They are all unseparable
parts of Vakrokti. According to Kuntaka Vakrokti is 'Apūrva
alāṅkāra'. He says- "In order to set forth the nature of
beauty conducive to extra-ordinary delight, a fresh study of Poetry is offered here, like an added ornament to it.\textsuperscript{56}

So, Viśvanātha's objection to Kuntaka's \textit{Vakrokti} seems to be not justifiable.

On Kuntaka's \textit{Vakrokti} Dr. P. Sri Ramacandrudu observes-

"This \textit{Kāvyalakṣaṇa} of Kuntaka is only a logical elaboration of what was said by Bhāmaha while defining \textit{Kāvyya} broadly, (KL I.16), just as his very system of \textit{Vakrokti} is an indirect revival of \textit{Alahkāra} school of which Bhāmaha and others are the exponents. While Ānandavardhana and others are more interested in explaining what is expressed by the poet and how it is enjoyed by sahrdaya, Kuntaka is mainly concerned with how something is expressed. That is why Kuntaka 'devotes nearly the whole of his work, with the exception of the introductory portion of the first chapter, to the definition, classification and illustration of these varieties of \textit{Kāviyāpāravakraṭā}, which thus form the different categories into which Poetic speech may be analysed. Viewed in this light, Kuntaka's definition cannot be called complete because it does not take us beyond the sphere of Śabda and Artha.\textsuperscript{57}

Bhoja\textsuperscript{58} and Agnipurāṇakāra\textsuperscript{59} have not mentioned any new idea in their definitions of Poetry. They also move round the sphere of Śabda and Artha.
Now coming to Mammaṭa, "The Kernel of the First Ullāsa is Mammaṭa's Lākṣaṇa of Kāvya. The definition is important, not so much because of its intrinsic worth, for it hardly possesses any, but because it has provoked the strong criticism of writers like Viśvanātha, the author of the Sāhityadarpana and Jagannātha that brilliant critic, the author of the Rasagahādhara.

Mammaṭa defines Kāvya as 'Adoṣau śabdārthau sagoṇau analaṅkṛtī punah kvāpi' (KP- I.4) on an analysis, the definition states:

i) word and sense constitute poetry;

ii) They must be free from flaws;

iii) They must be marked by excellences;

iv) In rare cases, they can be void of figures.

Looking to the different elements that go to constitute the definition, one cannot resist the conclusion that Mammaṭa attempts therein to focus all the prominent views regarding Poetry that were current in his time and thus lands himself into contradictions. In seeking to blend within the space of a definition all that was claimed by eminent writers on Poetics from the times of Bhāmahā, Mammaṭa has given us a clumsy definition of Poetry."60
Here it is clear that the word 'Śabdārthau' has three adjectives - 'Adoṣau', 'Sagunau', and 'Analahkrti punah kvāpi'. Viśvanātha and Jagannātha reject all three adjectives. Jayadeva laughs at Mammaṭa's adjective 'analāṅkrti'. Jagannātha does not accept the word 'Śabdārthau' also.

Viśvanātha finds four objections in the adjective 'adoṣau'.

"But this is open to objection. For, if Kāvyā is ever 'doṣarāhita' '(devoid of faults), then the śloka "Nyakkāro hyayameva..." (which is Rāvaṇa's uttering about self when Rāma began destroying the Rāksasas in the Mahānātaka) having the fault of 'Vidheyarimārśā' cannot be included within Kāvyā. On the other hand, this having excellent internal significances (dhvani) is included among the best species of Kāvyā and is so accepted by Anandavardhana etc. Thus this definition of Mammaṭa is faulty being a too-narrow one.

"In the above śloka "Nyakkāro hyayameva...", some portion only has the 'Vidheyarimāransadoṣa' and is hence faulty, and the whole is not so. So it is 'akāvyā' where there is 'doṣa' and it is a good Kāvyā where there is 'dhvani' (internal implication augmenting the sentiment or 'Rasa')-
this argument also is not sound; for both Kāvya and 'akāvya' being dragged by the two portions of the self-same one, it is neither indeed; and the faults of 'śruti-duṣṭa', 'vidheyyāvimarśa' etc. are no faults, if they defile a portion only of a Kāvya. They are 'doṣa' if they pollute the entire Kāvya. Indeed their fault is not at all accepted, if they do not mar the main sentiment (Rasa) which is the very essence of Kāvya. And it is for this reason that the arrangement of 'nitya-doṣa' and 'anitya-doṣa' of these are spoken of. Thus the Dhvanikāra declares— "the faults of śrutiduṣṭa etc. are Anitya and to be neglected in Śrīngārārasa if there is dhvani, sadoṣakāvya is also kāvya. Further if 'Nirdoṣakāvya' only is to be Kāvya then it is 'pravirā' (rare) or 'Nirviṣaya' (having no existence at all), for absolutely 'Nirdoṣakāvya' is almost impossible.

"If you say that 'nañ' in 'adoṣa' is used in the sense of Īṣat (meagre), then that also cannot be supported; for in that case the result is— "Īṣaddoṣau śabdārthau kāvyam"; and in this agreement 'Nirdoṣa' matter (faultless writing) can not be termed as Kāvya. If again the rejoinder is— that however faultless (nirdoṣa) there is some or other doṣa in human Kāvya and hence "Īṣaddoṣau" is said in the definition of Kāvyapraṅkāśa. Then also we say that it is unfit as a definition or lakṣaṇa of Kāvya (Kāvyalakṣaṇe ayogyam)."
Because in fixations of 'Ratna' (Jewel), discolorations (malīnatva) etc. that are almost invariably seen in these are not taken into account and are neglected. In other words, scratchings by insects etc. cannot take away Ratnatva of a Jewel, only creates its efficiency in acceptance (Upādeya tāratamya) i.e. increases or decreases its essential quality. So also the faults of 'āruti-duṣta' etc. creates higher and lower grade or quality of Kāvya, and never takes away Kāvyatva of a Kāvya. Thus it is said-Kāvyatā is accepted even with respect to presence of faults of 'ārutiduṣṭa' etc. if flow of sentiment is manifest just as a Ratna is commonly a Ratna even with respect to those that are not bright or have scratches or pores of insects."

Viśvanātha's objections are based on severe logic. So, his objections are note-worthy. Viśvanātha completely knows the concept of blemishes of Mammaṭa; though he refuted 'adoṣau'. Even some commentaries of Kāvyaprakāśa like 'Bālabodhini' accept Viśvanātha's view. Viśvanātha himself is indebted to Mammaṭa for his 'Doṣaprakarana'. Therefore Viśvanātha's objections seem to be only for objection's sake. Then again the question remains- "What is the place of 'adoṣau' in the definition of poetry?" -
"There is no scope for considering it as a Lākṣaṇika-prayoga, for, we cannot find any strong objection making the expression beyond justification. There may be certain things like 'Khaga-sāmyoga' (contact with the bird) which are Aṇyāpyavṛttis, on account of the difference of parts; but the same cannot be said in the case of Doṣābhāva. For, there can be such expressions like 'the tree is in contact with the bird on its trunk but not on the branch', but we do not come across such expressions like 'this verse is kāvyā in its first half (where there is no Doṣa) but not in the second half (because there is Doṣa in it)."  

Viśvanātha raises two objections on 'sagunau' - "Again the qualifying epithet "sagunau" with respect to 'Śabda' and 'Artha' in the above definition of Kāvyā (as given by Mammaṭa in his Kāvyapraṅkaśa) is inconsistent or unfit; for Gunaś are of the same category and are the characteristics as Rasa. For Mammaṭa himself has established this in his definition of Guna as - "ye rasa-syāṅgino dharmāḥ sauryādaya ivātmanāḥ" (KP VIII.1) (Gunas are the qualities of the main sentiment like 'saurya' etc. of the internal soul). If it be said, that this is so, because by transference Guna reveals and illumines the internal Rasa, that also cannot be maintained. First because- (i) Just tell me whether there is any sentiment
(Rasa) in those 'Sabda' and 'Artha' that are chosen as characteristics of Kāvya. If you say there is no Rasa in those Sabda and Artha, then these have no Gunavatta also; for Gunavatta is positively seen where there is Rasa, and is negatively absent where is no Rasa. (ii) If you say such 'Sabda' and 'Artha' have 'Rasa' in them, then why don't you say "Rasavantau" Sabdarthau in place of "Sagunau"-Sabdarthau.

"If again it is said that Guna by transference points to Rasa, and Gunavatta has no significance without reference to Rasa, then better directly say Sarasau and not Sagunau in your definition of Kāvya. For none says "Sauryyādimantaḥ deśāḥ" in place of "Prāṇimanto deśāḥ", though Prāṇin unfailingly points to 'Saurya' (courage). Neither by "Sabdarthau sagunau" you can say that the purpose of the writer is that such Sabda and Artha as implying Guna, are to be used in a Kāvya. For in a Kāvya, Sabda and Artha that imply and point to Guna conduces to the excellence thereof i.e. of Kāvya and do not show or give its true characteristics (na svarūpādhyāyaka) or positive definition."67

Here also Visvanatha shows his analytical view.
Prof. S. V. Dixit justifies Mammaṭa's 'Sagunau' and denies 'Sarasau'.
"The Kāvyalakṣāṇa or Definition of Poetry, as seen above, is very severely criticised by ancient as well as modern critics. The gravamen of the charge specially is for not mentioning Rasa as a differentia of Poetry. But we have been searching for a plausible explanation of this grave omission on the part of Mammaṭa. Once a brother professor suggested, during a discussion, that the present Kārikā is not at all a Lakṣāṇa or Definition of Kāvyā but a mere description of Kāvyasvarūpa. And a description need not be exact like a definition. We were not convinced by this explanation. Even in a description there was no justification for omitting Rasa. And looking to the general scheme of Mammaṭa's discussion of various topics in the Kāvyapraṅkāsa we have to presume that the Kārikā under question is to all intents and purposes meant to be a definition of Kāvyā. For whenever a new topic is taken up Mammaṭa first defines the topic; e.g. Kāvyabheda, Abhidhā, Lakṣāṇā, Vyājanā, Rasa, Alakhāra and the like. So it is but reasonable to suppose that he is defining Kāvyā in this Kārikā. Then why does he omit the mention of Rasa as the differentia of Kāvyā in the definition, when he has given ample evidence in his work to show that he belongs to the Rasa and Dhvani schools which practically are identical? To us the answer seems to be as follows: The definition of Kāvyā given here is
a broad definition of Kāvyā which should apply collectively to all the three sub-varieties thereof which he would be giving. Out of these three subdivisions only the Uttama or Dhvanikāvyā is Rasapradhāna. The Madhyama or Guṇībhūta- vyangya has Rasa in a subordinate position, while the Adhama or Citrakāvyā has no Rasa at all or practically at least has its absence. So if Rasa were to be made the sine quo non of Kāvyā as a whole, how could Guṇībhūta- vyangya and specially the Citra variety come under it? The Definition then would be only of the 'Uttama-kāvyā' and it would be too narrow for Kāvyā as a whole. So Mammaṭa defines Kāvyā in a broad way as 'Śabda' and 'Artha' lacking in Doṣas possessed of Guṇas all the three Kāvyā-bhedas in common. So there is a convincing reason for not mentioning Rasa and Mammaṭa does not seem to be such a fool as he is generally made out to be!  

So Viśvanātha's plea about 'Sarasau' seems not right.

Jayadeva gave a blow to Mammaṭa's 'Analaṅkṛti-punah- kvāpi.'

"Who accepts that absence of figures of word and sense is Kāvyā? Why does he not accept fire as void of heat?"
Second blow came from again Visvanātha—

"For it is said by rhetoricians that word (Śabda) and their meaning (Artha) constitute the body or outward shape of a Kāvya; Rasa etc. is its soul or essence, its Gunas are like Sāurya etc. of a person, its faults are like blindness in a person; and Riti or style of Kāvya is like particular limbs of a person; its Alāṅkāra (like Anuprāsa, Upamā etc.) are like bracelets, bangles, or ear-drops of woman and so on. Hence also the epithet "Analankṛti punah kvāpi" should not be said of a Kāvya; for this does not give its positive characteristic. Its meaning is - Kāvya should always be full of rhetorical excellences or Alāṅkāra and rarely the Alāṅkāra therein may be 'Asphuṭa' (not manifest). And it goes without saying that 'Alāṅkārayukta śabda' and 'Artha' promote to the excellence of a Kāvya and do not show its true definition."\(^{70}\)

This opinion of Viśvanātha shows us that it is very nearer to Mammaṭa's opinion. Because, Mammaṭa says- "The words 'Kvāpi' are used to convey the idea that everywhere they (i.e. word and sense) are possessed of Figures; but even if in some cases, there are no obvious figures, it does not detract from the poetic nature of the composition."\(^{71}\)
Here Mammaṭa's 'Sphuṭalāṅkāraviraha' and Viśvanātha's 'Asphuṭalāṅkāra' have the same meaning. But Viśvanātha does not want to entertain a negative characteristic in a definition.

Jagannātha the brilliant author of the 'Rasagaṅgādhara' is another critic who finds fault with Mammaṭa's definition of Kāvya. His attack is directed, in the main, against Mammaṭa's giving equal prominence to 'Śabda' and 'Artha', while, according to him, it is śabda that must be given greater prominence in view of the fact that we often hear remarks like "Kāvyam śrutam, Artho na jñātah" showing that Kāvya continues to be called a Kāvya even when the 'Artha' element remains ungrasped.

It will be found on a critical examination that Jagannātha's criticism cannot hold water. The instance he cites to prove his case viz. the worldly usage 'Kāvyam śrutam, Artho na jñātah' is fallacious in the extreme. Nobody is ever inclined to call a composition a Kāvya unless he knows the sense thereof. So, when one says 'Kāvyam śrutam, Artho na jñātah', one uses the word Kāvya, not instinctively, not on his own judgement and initiative, but on those of others, some others have styled a particular literary piece as Kāvya on the basis of Śabda and Artha both,
and our speaker describes it with the same term 'काव्या' and says that he has not learnt the sense thereof. This shows that mere शब्द is not called a काव्या, it is 'शब्दार्थात्' that are entitled to be called so.\(^{73}\)

Several ancient and modern scholars objected to Mammaṭa's definition of Poetry; in the same way several scholars find solutions for the objections. Hence Mammaṭa's definition of poetry became well known. Mammaṭa has his own great personality. He is not only a scholar and also is a man acquainted with the mysteries and secret of poetics. He is the man who made Ānandavardhana's Dhvani-theory systematic and acceptable. For this reason, Mammaṭa is respected by students of Sanskrit Poetics. So, his definition of Poetry is considered as a standard one.

But Mammaṭa's definition seems to enjoy ancient sources in Bharata,\(^{74}\) Bhāmaha,\(^{75}\) Vāmana,\(^{76}\) Bhoja,\(^{77}\) Agnipurāṇa\(^ {78}\) among others. Similarly successors of Mammaṭa like Hemacandra,\(^{79}\) Vāgbhaṭa-I,\(^{80}\) Vāgbhaṭa-II,\(^{81}\) Vidyānātha\(^ {82}\) and others followed Mammaṭa's definition of Poetry.

Even Jayadeva's definition resembles Mammaṭa's definition. "But he resents the secondary position that is given to Alāṅkāras by Mammaṭa and Vāgbhaṭa-II. According to him
to talk of a Kāvya without Alāṅkāras is to think of fire without heat (Cl. 1-8). Thus trying to raise the Alāṅkāras to their former glory, he gives his own definition which is rather a more comprehensive list of things connected with Kāvya than its concise definition: "That speech which has flawlessness, distinctive characteristics, styles, ornaments of excellences, figures, sentiments and various Vṛttis like Kaiśiki, Sātvatī, etc. or Abhidhā, Lakṣaṇā etc., is called as Poetry." 83

Here by saying 'Lakṣaṇāvatī', Jayadeva appears to try almost to revive the features first enumerated by Bharata as associated with drama, some of which, in the hands of the later rhetoricians, turned into Alāṅkāras. (Ref. Some Concepts of Alāṅkāra Śāstra, p.43)." 84

"Viśvanātha, though generally a follower of Mammaṭa, has mercilessly criticised each and every word of the latter's definition. These criticisms it must be noted, are well-pointed and, for the most part, justified. The logical conclusion of the theory of Dhvani implied giving the highest place to Rasa in all poetry. Mammaṭa and to some extent even Ānandavardhana, felt shy of saying it in so many words and evaded the issue. The credit of having boldly come forward with his definition— "Vākyam rasātmakam
"Kāvyam" goes to Viśvanātha. What is predecessors had been tacitly taking for granted without acknowledging it was given expression to in his definition which is theoretically precise.  

Viśvanātha gave a surprise to his predecessors by using the term 'Rasa' in his definition, which has came down from the beginning i.e. from Bharata himself. No doubt, Rasa has excellences and figures. Mammata used 'Rasa' indirectly in his definition but Viśvanātha uses it directly. Even Viśvanātha's definition is objected to by some like Jagannātha. "But the only objection that is raised against this by Pāṇḍitarāja is that it is subject to the defect, Avyāpti because this cannot include, among Kāvyas, such works which do not give predominance to Rasa. He says that such works should not be ignored as not being Kāvyas because many of the Kāvyas of even great poets will have to be discarded as not being Kāvyas against the established convention. For, there are many beautiful descriptions of things like the flowing water and the actions of children and apes etc. If in order to bring them under the scope of this Lakṣana, one tries to establish some remote indirect connection with Rasa he will have to face the defect viz. Ativyāpti, because such remote connection with Rasa can be traced in the case of even such wooden phrases like 'the cow moves about' and 'the deer runs', which should not come under the purview of the Lakṣana."
Jagannatha's definition of Kavya i.e. "Ramanīyārtha-
pratipādakah śabdah kāvyam"(or Poetry is the word which
conveys a beautiful idea), is an amplification of Daṇḍin's
definition "Iśṭārthavayvacchinnā padāvalī." (KD I.10).

P. Sri Ramachandrudu observes -

"As was promised by him at the beginning (RG p.4),
Paṇḍitarāja wants to give a Lakṣaṇa of Kavya in its tech­
nical sense, carefully avoiding the three common defects
of Lakṣaṇa. If the meaning of the word Ramanīya in the
'Ramanīyārtha pratipādakah' is to be understood in the
general way, the defect, Ativyāpti arises, for statements
like 'You are blessed with a son' and 'A big fortune is
awaiting you' etc., are sources of pleasure, yet they
can not come under the purview of a Kavya. To avoid
this he explains the 'Ramanīyatā' as synonymous with
'Lokottarāhlādajanaka gocaratā'. The pleasure that is
derived from the above statements is only Laukika, in as
much as it is directly caused by a particular worldly
prosperity and so it is quite personal. Again he makes
the 'Lokottarattva' a synonym to 'Camatkāratva', and
accepts it to be a Jātiviśeṣa to avoid the lack of Anugama
(comprehension). This Camatkāratva should be realised
only through one's experience and cannot be described
in words (RG p.5). This kind of Lokottarāhlāda is the
result of Bhāvanā which is no other than the constant contemplation, (over the Kāvyārtha), (RG p.5). Here by substituting the word Bhāvanā for Jñāna, Panditarāja slightly modifies his previous statement "Ramāṇiyatā ca Lokottarāhālaṇa-janaka-jñānagocarata" as "Ramāṇiyatā ca Lokottarāhālaṇa-janaka-bhāvanā-gocarata" and this has been necessitated by the following reason. There may be some 'Samūhālambana-jñāna' (cognitive jumble) comprising of two thoughts of which one may be of Ramāṇīyārtha (a pleasing idea) and the other of Aramāṇīyārtha, (non-pleasing idea). This kind of Samūhālambana-jñāna also will have to be taken as 'Camatkārajanakajñāna'. Such cases are excluded by replacing 'Jñāna' by 'Bhāvanā'. Bhāvanā being a chain of cognitions, it can be connected only with Ramāṇīyārthas, under special circumstances. In other words, one may be thinking of a particular object again and again for a long time only if it is beautiful and so only beautiful objects can be the Viśaya of Bhāvanā. Thus by substituting the word 'Jñāna' by 'Bhāvanā' the author arrives at the following definition: "Camatkāra-janaka-bhāvanā-visayārtha-pratipādaka śabdatvam" (RG p.5). "Kāvya is that Śabda which conveys a sense which is the object of pleasant constant thinking."

"Panditarāja gives two more amplified forms of the
definition. The first one is: "Yatpratipāditārthaviśayaka bhāvanātvaṃ camatkāra-janakatāvacchedakam tattvam" (RG p.5)

"This modification is introduced to avoid Ativyāpti in Dhārāvāhika-vākyārtha-jñāna. 'Bhāvanā' is only another name for 'Dhārāvāhika jñāna'. When a succession of cognitions, (Dhārāvāhika jñāna) is produced by a Vākya, the Vākya also along with the Vākyārtha, will continue to be the object of cognition (jñānaviśaya). Such subsequent Vākyas also would come under the purview of Kāvyā because "Camatkāra-janaka-bhāvanā-viśayārtha pratipādakatva" can be applied to them also. Such Vākyas are excluded by this modified form of definition.

"A Saṃsāra or sentence expresses a meaning in a particular order and then arises the Bhāvanā taking that Vākyārtha as its Viśaya (object). This Bhāvanā produces Camatkāra. Thus the Bhāvanā being the Camatkārajanaka, Bhāvanātva becomes Camatkārajanakatāvacchedaka. And such sentence in that particular order should be taken as Kāvyā. Thus the meaning of this Lakṣaṇa is 'the Saṃsāra (sentence) of particular order, the meaning of which is the object of Bhāvanā is Kāvyā, when such Bhāvanā is Camatkārajanaka (causing pleasure) and thereby the Bhāvanātva being the Camatkāra-janakatāvacchedaka'. Now the group of sentences reflecting
in the Dhārāvāhikajñāna cannot be said to have had that particular order producing Camatkāra and so the Ativyāpti is avoided (because only the sentence first heard in a particular order, produces Camatkāra but not all the sentences reflecting in the Dhārāvāhika jñāna).

"Not content with this, Panditaraja gives another amplification in Anugama style. He feels that the second one is much cumbersome because it contains Yacchabda and Tacchabda, which being the words of uncertain meanings, hinder the Anugama. Therefore he gives a third modified Lakṣana which is comparatively simple according to the tradition of Tārkikas as there will be no need of bringing many things into Śābda-bodha as in the case of the second form of Lakṣana. This final Lakṣana is: "Svaviśiṣṭa janakatāvacchedakarṭhāpratipādakasāṁsargena camatkāra tvam kāvyatvam" (RG p.5).

"In this Lakṣana, the Sāṁsarga 'Svaviśiṣṭa-janakatāvacchedakārthāpratipādakārthā may be long one but, it need not be brought into Śābdabodha. And by this Kāvyatva is simply defined as 'Camatkāratvavattva' and thus the Lakṣatāvacchedaka is very much simplified. Here 'sva' stands for Camatkāratva. Svaviśiṣṭa is Camatkāra because Camatkāra is associated with Camatkāratva by Samavāya-
sambandha. Bhāvanā being the cause of Camatkāra, Svavīśīṭa janakatā rests with Bhāvanā. This janakatā of Bhāvanā is qualified (Avacchinna) by the Artha because Artha is Avacchedaka of Janakatā by Viṣayatā saṃbandha (by virtue of its being the object of Bhāvanā). Such Artha is conveyed by Śabda and so it is Pratipādaka. Thus the relation between Śabda and Camatkāra is "Svavīśīṭajanakatāvacchedakārtha-pratipādakatā". Therefore the Śabda which is associated with Camatkāra by the above relation is Kāvyā."87

"Against this definition, however, it may be said that it does not help a student to recognise or distinguish what composition deserves to be called Kāvyā. To say simply that what is charming or striking is a Kāvyā does not take us any further."88

A.B.Gajendragadkar opines:

"All these definitions must have made it clear that according to Sanskrit Alamkārikas metre or verification is not essential to poetry. Poetry may occur in any form, metrical or prose. Thus, writers of prose works like Subandhu and Bāṇa are styled poets equally with the authors of metrical Kāvyas and dramas. As a matter of fact composition in prose was regarded as more difficult than that in verse. Compare 'Gadyam kavīnāṃ nikaśam vadanti' (Vāmana
on KLS Vṛ i.3.21). It will thus be seen that novelists and writers of short stories of modern times are, according to Sanskrit rhetoricians, poets. Kavi and Kāvyā in fact possess the same connotation as Sāhityika and Sāhitya or Vāṃmaya.

"In this matter we hold a different view. We believe that form is of the essence of Poetry. Kāvyam comes from the root √ku-kauti to sing or hum and primarily means a composition that can be sung or hummed. In order that a composition should be poetry it must be capable of being sung (Geya). This means that poetry must be metrical...

"Then again, the current meaning of the word Kāvyā in the language favours our view. For, the conventional sense of Kāvyā is a metrical composition. When we come across a prose work, possessed of poetic merit, we call it Gadyakāvyā. The qualification Gadya shows that it lacks one essential of Kāvyā viz. metrical form. But the expression Padyakāvyā is not of such general use. For, padya seems to be superfluous in this case.

"So, if we are allowed to give one more definition of Kāvyā, we would state it as "Vākyam rasātmakam geyam kāvyā śabdābhisanjñitam."
This definition also is not far from the defects. This is also committed with defects which are raised against Viśvanātha's definition. And Gajendragadkar's term 'Geya' is not used in broad sense.

So as it was said in the beginning of this chapter 'defining Poetry is extremely difficult'.

"To conclude: In Sanskrit Poetics the definition of Poetry forms a veritable battle-ground. With the utmost subtlety and hair-splitting distinctions, every rhetorician has come forward to justify his own definition of poetry and to reject the definitions of others. Even this rapid survey of the different schools of Sanskrit poetics has revealed to us that there has been a steady growth in the conception of the nature of Poetry. From the beginnings in Bhāmaha, where the exterior of Poetry receives consideration at length, we come to attempt at solving the inner core of it in Vāmana and see their successful solution in Ānandavardhana. Later writers like Viśvanātha and Mammaṭa made explicit the suggestions embodied in the Dhvanyāloka. Sanskrit theories of Poetry do not in any way suffer by comparison with the recognised theories of western criticism."
After this detail discussion of 'definition of Poetry' a question remains and that is what is the soul of Poetry?

We know that Sanskrit rhetoricians started various schools while discussing about the Soul of Poetry. Main schools are five:
1. Rasa school of Bharata
2. Alankāra school of Bhāmaha
3. Riti school of Vāmana
4. Dhvani school of Ānandavardhana
5. Vakrokti school of Kuntaka.

There is one more school viz. Aucitya school of Kṣemendra. All the details of several schools have been given by Prof. P.V.Kane in his book "History of Sanskrit Poetics" (Pp 355-91) and hence their details are not elaborated.

Here it will suffice to quote S.S.Sukthankar:

"Broadly speaking there are five schools of thought, in Sanskrit Poetics, that come to be distinguished on the basis of the particular views they advance regarding what constitutes the essence of Poetry. They are (1) the Rasa-school; (2) the Alankāra-school; (3) the Riti school; (4) the Vakrokti school; and lastly, (5) the Dhvani school. The difference in their view points has entailed a difference also in their attitude towards Rasa, Guṇa and Alankāra, the three constituents in Poetry."
(I) The Rasa-school: According to this school, what gives life to Poetry is Rasa or Flavour and Guṇas and Alaṅkāras are only ancillary to the Rasa. The theory of Rasa was first fore shadowed in Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra in so far as it bore on Drama. The credit for importing this vital principle in the field of Poetics, as the essence of Poetry, goes to the Dhvanikāra and his followers. The Śṛṅgāratilaka of Rudra, the Agnipurāṇa, the Kāvyamīmāṃsā of Rājaśekhara and the Sāhityadarpāga of Viśvanātha belong to this school.

(II) The Alankāra-school: According to this school, what constitutes the soul of Poetry is the presence of figures of sound and sense, (Alaṅkāra). This school in its enthusiasm for the figurative way of expression, could not recognise the fact that there could be something more essential than mere figures. They were superficial in their outlook. The oldest exponent of this school was Bhāmaha, (7th Cent. A.C.) the author of the Kāvyālaṅkāra. He was followed by Udbhāṭa (circa 800), Rudraṭa (circa 850 A.C.) and Rasa was recognised by this school, but they were not inclined to assign to it a position other than that of subservience. They failed to distinguish Guṇas from Alakāras and subsumed the former under the latter.
(III) The Rīti School: According to this school, Rīti or mode of expression is what constitute the life of poetry. Figures are looked upon by this school as something more extraneous in comparison to Gūnas or poetic excellences. Gūnas are the essence of Rīti and determine its nature. Vāmana (800 A.C.) was the earliest exponent of this system, though he was, in a good measure, anticipated by Daṇḍin. Though the principle of Rītis was recognised by the later writers on Poetics, they were not prepared to regard it as the very soul of Poetry. The Rīti-school, it may be pointed out, went one step farther than the Alāṅkāra-school when it insisted upon Gūnas as something vital to Poetry. This insistence was a great contribution to the progress of Poetics towards the Dhvani theory, the crowning achievement. For the Rīti-school taught critics to go deeper and not to be content with the superficial Alāṅkāras.

(IV) The Vakrokti school: Vakrokti, in plain words, is strikingness of speech. According to this school, an elevated style of expression is what constitutes the essence of Poetry. Thus elevation of style is secured by the employment of figures in the body of Poetry so as to make it striking. This figures are regarded by this school as so many aspects of Vakrokti and Rasa, Guna, Dhvani etc. are
in a Kāvyā merely subservient to Vakrokti. Kuntaka (circa 1000 A.C.) was the great exponent of this doctrine, who carried it too far in his enthusiasm to oppose the Dhvani-system. On account of its pitting itself against the well established Dhvani-theory, the Vakrokti-school could not grow popular nor secure adherents; nevertheless, it raised Alaṅkāra from a position of insignificance to which it was reduced by the Dhvanikāra and secured for it a position of importance among the essentials of a Kāvyā; so much so, that later writers like Mammatā could not ignore the claims of Alaṅkāra when they formulated their definitions of Kāvyā.

(V) The Dhvani school: This was the most powerful school which found its expression in the Kārikas of Dhvanikāra (9th cent.), the Vṛtti of Ānandavardhana (850 A.C. and the commentary of Abhinavagupta, Dhvani is suggestive poetry. All poetry worth the name must be suggestive, said the Dhvanivādin. Dhvani could be Vastudhvani or Alaṅkāradhvani or Rasadhvani. Void of suggestion, no poetry was worthy of the name, they argued. Gupas or Alankāras could be charming only in so far as they were subservient to Dhvani and had no value of their own.

The admission of Dhvani was a great innovation in the field Sanskrit Literature. Vyañjanā as a Vṛtti was not
recognised by any school of thought upto now. The Ālankārikas made this bold step and sought sanction for it in the Sphoṭa theory of the Vaiyākaraṇas.

As an innovation the Dhvani-theory had to face the fierce onslaughts of learned scholars like Pratihārendurāja, Kuntaka, Bhaṭṭanāyaka and Mahimabhatta. But these fierce attacks tended to win for the Dhvani school such a popularity as no other school in Poetics had succeeded in winning. And the school got powerful adherents like Mammaṭa and Jagannātha who accepted the doctrine though with certain modifications.

This was merely a development of the Rasa school while the Rasa-school admitted Rasa to be the soul of Poetry it being presumed that Rasa is suggested, this school went a step further and admitted the suggestion of Rasa as well as Vastu and Alāṅkāra as the soul of Poetry. But it should not be forgotten that even Anandavardhana the foremost Dhvanivādin did not fail to give Rasa the palm of superiority over everything else.

Besides these theories there were the Anumāna theory of Mahimabhaṭṭa and the Aucitya (Propriety) theory of Kṣemendra - not to mention some others - which commanded but meagre influence and therefore deserve little attention."
FOOT NOTES

CHAPTER- V


2. लक्षणशय त्रीणि दृष्णात्नि सन्नित | अध्यात्मतत्त्वावप्त्वत्वमयेकात्तु | लक्षयेक्षेण लक्षणार्थमात्रमृत्युायाप्ति | ....... लक्षादन्दनवतृ 
पृवतमात्रमात्रमृत्युायाप्ति | लक्षये व्यायामित्यथमानमम्भ।।
- श्रीनिवासदास, 
यतीन्द्रमात्रदिपिका, पृ. 7.

3. शब्दाद्धौ सहितानात्काव्यम्।

KL. I. 16


6. शैवीता-यदिशतायत्यम्यिलिन्ना पदावली \\

- KD. I.10


8. Ibid. p.122


10. काव्योभाष्करानुम ध्यानिन्दकारानु प्रवक्षते \\

- KD. II.1.

11. कामेस्वरूप्यालाको रसमेण निग्रिःयति \\

- KD. I.62

12. सीक्षेपादक्यमिश्याक्यविधिन्ना पदावली ||

काव्य स्वरूपकारं गृणवदोषविषिर्तम् \\

- A. i.-337. 6,7;

13. निद्राणा लक्ष्णति सतीतिर्रीणमुक्ता \\

सालंकारसारेकान्तितत्वकाव्यनाममभां ||

- CL. I.7.
14. वाक्यं रसायनं काव्यम् ।

-SD. I. p. 22

15. रमणीयांशु परिवर्धनं: शब्दं काव्यम् ।

-RG. I. p. 4

16. अर्थयेनको गिराते मर्यं: सूक्ष्मेन्द्र: परस्मर्तेः

तत्र वैदभौदीयाः वर्णं त्रयं प्रत्युक्तान्तः ॥

-KD. I. 40

17. काव्यशब्दोद्यो गुणालंकारसंस्कृताः: गुणाः शब्दाः

-KL.S. Vr. on I.1.1;

18. सौन्दर्यमल्लकारः ।

-Ibid. I.1.2.

19. काव्योपाव्यं: कर्तारो धर्मं: गुणं: । तदन्तिषयं कोषस्वर्णानु दक्षिणारः ॥

-Ibid. III.1.1.2;

20. रीतिराज्यम् काव्यस्य ।

-Ibid. I.2.6;

21. विशिष्टं पदर्चना रीतिः ।

-Ibid. I.2.7
22. विशेषो गुणात्मकः

Ibid. 1.2.8;

23. सा एतद्वैद्यं गौडीयः पध्याय वाली येति

Ibid. 1.2.9;

24. विद्मा०गौड़ा-वालेशु तत्त्वं: कवित्वम्या सर्वव्यः गौड़यान्तः

Ibid. Vṛtti on I.2.10

25. समगृहणा वैद्यमाः

Ibid. I.2.11

26. जोजः कालिकतेव गौडीयः

Ibid. I.2.12

27. माधुर्यश्रृंगमार्गायोपन्नना पध्याय वाली

Ibid. I.2.13

28. तासा यूर्वाः श्राह्यः गुणात्मकाव्यः

Ibid. I.2.14,15;

38. काव्यस्यात्म ध्वनिरिति बुद्धिः समाभासपूर्वः ....
DL. I.1

39. यत्रार्थः शब्दं वा तर्काश्रयसार्थविश्वासः
ङ्गकाला: काव्यविशेषः स ध्वनिरितिः सुरिभी: कथितः: II
Ibid. I.13

40. Dr.K.Krishnamoorthy, 'Essays in Sanskrit Criticism'
p.216.

41. शब्दार्थसप्तर्थ तावत्काव्यम्
Ibid. Vṛtti on I.1

42. योद्धः सदृश्यकलाध्यः काव्यात्मक्रि व्यवस्थितः
वाच्यस्यात्मानाहतो तत्य श्रवणमोहमृतो
Ibid. I.2.

43. अर्थ वाच्यस्यात्म तथा काव्यस्यात्म ध्वनि: -
इति स्ववधो विरोधादेव अपातसम्
SD. I. p.21.
(Eng.Trans.by K.R.Ray)

44. K.R.Ray SD, Pub.by Author Vol.I.p.22
45. "शब्दार्थशास्त्रार्थ कार्यमिति" यथावत: तत्र शारीरगुणादीवर
केनचिदात्मानं तदनुपाल्यन्तं भावमेव। तत्र शब्दार्थशास्त्रारीभाग
यथा तस्मिन्विषयं सर्वसमविध्यत्वात्प्रवृत्त्वादिष्ट्व।
अर्थं पुन: सकलसर्वविशेषं न भवति। न ह्ययमार्थेण
कार्यविध्यपदेशः, लोकिकस्विद्विद्वारकमेव तद्वभावात्। तदाह
सूत्रद्वयतात्त्व इति। स एव शास्त्राब्रह्मान्त्य विवेकनिष्ठिस्मावृत्या
विभाज्यते।

तथाहि ततुल्यरूपार्थ किमिति कश्मीर्चिदं: 
शाल्यते। तद्मधुरित्वः तत्र केनचिदश्रीयेषः। ये विषेषः।
स प्रतीयमानभागो विवेकनिष्ठिस्मात्त्वादात्त्वेति व्यवस्थापते।
वाच्यद्विनाशिकसोहितायहेतु तत्प्रस्तुतं विप्रतिवधेऽ।
वाच्यंकृतिवाच्यमोऽर्थेते। अत एव अर्थं इत्यक्तवृत्त सूत्र
द्वयतात्त्व इति विषेषः का देतमिथायापोऽदार्थादृश्ना तस्य
पूर्व मेदायासविश्ववादमेव, न हु द्वाराचात्मानो कार्यवेदेति।

- Locana on DL's I.2.


47. Ibid. p.217

48. See Supra. FN - No.41

49. DL. Vṛtti on III.1.
50. P. Sri Ramachandrudu, PRJ., Pp. 3/-8;

51. शब्दायों सहित वकृतविव्यायाराज्यालिनि।
बन्धे व्यवस्थायां काव्यं तद्विद्वाहलादकारिणि।

-VJ. I.7

(Eng. Tran. by K. Krishnamoorthy)

52. शब्दायों काव्यं वाचको वाच्यं वेदति दृष्टं सैमिलितो वाच्यम्।
तारेकिमिति विविधवैस्यकिति। इति यत्रेश्चाध्यमाति
कार्यसूचकविषयः। शब्द एव केवल काव्यमिति
केषांविदु वाच्येषु रचनाविषयवस्तुकारकारि काव्यमिति,
पक्षमयं निर्सतं भूषित। यस्माद् द्वयोपरि प्रत्येक
प्रतिविलिम्बित तैन तदविद्वाहलादकारितत्वं वाते, न पुनरकारित।

Ibid. Vṛtti on I.7.

(Eng. Trans. by K. Krishnamoorthy)

53. सहित्योभावः। शाहित्यम् अनयोः। शब्दार्थोऽयां काव्यलीकिको
पवित्रव्यायारकारितत्वम्। काव्यम् अवसायित्वस्थितिकार्यं विनयाभिभूणि।
कौटुकाः - अनुयुक्तविनित्तिस्तवमोहरिषिणि, परस्परस्त्रितिवर्णणीय।
बद्धाः द्वयोऽर्थस्थितव्यायं न्यूनत्वं निकृष्टं न विधते नायकतिरिपक्तवालकम्
वास्तीयधः। न यद्य च तथापिः साम्यं द्वयोऽपि वाच्यं
सम्बन्धोऽम्ब शोभालिता प्रति शोभालिता। तथा
शाले शलायोः तस्मानविहारी, तस्मवार्त: शोभालिता, ताः
प्रति सौन्दर्यलाभिन्ता प्रतित्यधः। तैव च शहद्वाहलादकारिता।
तरयां स्पर्शितवें यासारायांसिध्यतं: परस्तरसाम्यतमभास्यानि सा साहित्यमुच्यते। अथ व वाक्यस्य वाचकान्तरेण वाच्यस्य वाच्यान्तरेण साहित्यभास्यमुच्यतम्, वाक्ये काव्यलक्षणं परिलक्षते-त्वादिति प्रतिविदितामेव।

Ibid. Vr. on I.17

(Eng. Trans. by K.K.)

54. काति - क्रोकितेन्। क्रोकित: प्रतिस्व-दायिन्याय्यतिरर्किणि विविषेवात्मिकम्। क्रोकित: - वैदायक-मृदूमितिः। वैदायक-विविधाय: कविकृतकृत्तं यथाभूणी विपरितति:। तथा भूणिः: विविषेवात्मिका वृकःकितिरर्किणि तव। तद्विद्येऽनलक्षणं। यति शब्दोन् पृष्ठावस्थिति न केनापि व्याकरणालक्षणं योजयेति। किन्तु क्रोकिते कैविष्कः गेयात्रियात्मिकान्यमात्रमेवाध्योरस्य:। तस्येव शोभारितमेकारितवातु।

Ibid. Vr. on I.10

(Eng. Trans. by K.K.)

55. शेषे "क्रोकित: काव्यजीविततमिति" क्रोकितारुकारकमपि परस्तम्। क्रोकितस्तेलकारप्रस्पः।

SD. I. 14

(Eng. Trans. by K.R. Ray)

56. लोको तत्तत्वमकारकारिन्द्रियविष्क्रमतिः।
काव्यस्यमलक्षः कोष्पुं विधीयते।

VJ. I. 2

(Eng. Trans. by K.K)
57. P. Sri Ramachandrudu, FRJ. Pp. 38-9

58. See Supra FN - No. 31

59. See Supra FN - No. 12

60. Prof. S. S. Sukthankar 'KF' Notes Pp. 17-8.

61. अब्धीकरणाति य: कार्यं शब्दार्थविवरणलक्ष्यती।
अतः न मन्यते कर्माधुनुष्णमलक्ष्यते।

-सू - 1.8

62. कड़ीवदाहः "तत्त्व अदोषो शब्दार्थो सम्प्रावविवरणलक्ष्यति पुनः क्वांपि।"
हति। शलोचनस्तर्य। तथाःपि यदि दोषार्थितस्य एव कार्यतर्य तदाः।.

"नवकारणे हत्यमेव मे यदर्शस्त्रायासः तपसः
सोकयोजयेण निहिताः शाक्तस्तु जीववयं हो रावणः।
समस्मिक्षुष्णकृणां पूर्वोष्णवत्ता किं कुम्भकर्णस्य वा
स्वर्गायेश्वराभिजितविवेशेष्योऽहुः किमेश्वरिः॥"
परम् श्लोकस्य विशेषाविरोधार्थोऽहुः कार्यतर्य न स्यात्।
प्रत्यत् वानित्येनोत्तमकायवतस्यासाइकृष्टाः। तस्मातु अध्यापितलक्ष्यदोषः।
ननु करिष्यदेववंशं जुष्टो न पुनः तव स्य इति चेपूः।
तर्थिय यत्रस्थिर दोषः कः। अकाव्यलघ्नेऽजः। यत्र ध्यानः।
उल्लभकाव्यलघ्नेऽजः। इति अंगाशयामु उपयवत आकृष्टमारणमिदं
काव्यम् अकाव्यम् वा किमपि न स्यात्। न व करिष्यदेववंशोऽकाव्यम्
बुध्यन्ति शृद्धिम्बुद्धदयो दोषा।। किं तर्थिय न सर्वभिः काव्यम्।
तथाति। काव्यालमधुधिर रसस्य अनुकर्षेः केताख पोषणमपि
नान्धरिफळः। अन्यथा नन्दोषायस्यत्तापि न स्यात्। यदातर
लवनिकृतः। "शृद्धिम्बुद्धदयो दोषा कित्वा अनित्यम् ते च वर्धितः।।
ध्वन्यात्मनेव बृहस्पते देवाय परुषादीर्घः।।" इतिः।

किं व इति काव्य प्रवर्तविषयं निर्विन्ययं वा स्यात्।
सर्वाहं नर्तलश्च एकानमथः।

ननु ईशवरं नमः। प्रयोग हिति चेपुः। तर्थिय "ईशुदोषोषो
शब्दार्थोऽकाव्यम्।" इति इति हितलोकतिः। काव्यतर्व न स्यात्।
तत्ति समयें हितोषा ईश्यः।। "ईशुदोषोषो।" इति चेपुः।
भददपि काव्यलक्षणेत्र अवच्चम्यं रतनार्थे स्यो। कीटानुष्ठाद्यानिरंतरः।
न हि कीटानुष्ठादयो रतनस्य रतनार्थो व्याख्यातामभा। किन्नु
उपादेयतार्थमेव कर्तृम्।। ईशा।।। किं तददृशु। शृद्धिम्बुद्धदयोषो
काव्याः। उक्ता च।। "कीटानुष्ठाद्रतनानिदिसाद्वा रूपमम् काव्यतः।
झुक्तेकः च मतः। यत्र रतनाधुनामः। सुदृढः।।।" इति।।
-SD. Vol. I; I. Pp 7-11
(Eng. Trans. by K.R. Ray)

63. मुख्यार्थिदोषोऽस्मि। रसस्य मुख्यस्तद्वारायायायः।।

KP. VII.1.
64. यत्त दोषरहित काल्य दुर्लभभिमति "न्यककरे हयम् " इत्यदां "तथामूलां हृदयाणि" इत्यदां व काल्यत्व तर्कभूतां नोचयहेे इति। त्रितोष्यसे। दोषरहित उद्देश्यरूपान्तीति प्रतितिविनिमयम्।

तद्भवन्यवाक्यार्थम् विविष्यापूर्वकता तिरितिविमतिहिंदी क्रियेन समावेश्य काल्यविशेषति। यथा व विविष्यापूर्वकतान्तरस्तु प्रति उपदेशाभिमभावन तद्भवन्यवाक्यः। अत यथा "ववन्यवैयक्तिकाणात्मसेठोपिपुणः कर्मिन्" इति 8। कुर्म तत्कथे। तथा अप्रतीतत्व पत्रान्तः अन्तरितं प्रत्यादोषः। अन्तरितप्रतितू प्रदायनसे "कौशानुदिवसं" इत्यस्यापि रसादिवैर्यसे उद्धुस्तसाूपि काल्यविविष्य । विविष्यादोषोऽविशेषतातात्यंभिमतिप्रदीपुष्मादिः स्फटयम्।

-Balabodhini MKP’s I.4.

65. अन्याभिवृतिततव व संवादान्याय्यात्यन्ताभाव प्रतितोऽभिमतम्।

-Tarkasāngraham & asarvasva p.13

66. F.Sri Ramachandrudu, PRJ. Fp.48-9
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