CHAPTER - VIII

CONCLUSION

The study highlights the main tenets of Poetry and the trends which were prevalent in the course of the development of Sanskrit Poetics. It is quite thought-provoking and a useful guide to scholars as well as students of Sanskrit Poetics. It contains many topics which have been brought to light with fresh colours for the first time and thus the thesis serves as a substantial contribution to the existing literature on Indian Literary Criticism.

Chapter I named 'Origin and Growth of Sanskrit Poetics' maintains that the अलाख्करासास्त्र or the Science of Poetics or Literary Criticism is an important branch of the vast and varied Sanskrit Literature. It takes note of the fact that there are no definite evidences about its origin, and that it is not exactly known as to when it came to be designated as अलाख्करासास्त्र, even though अलाख्करा or figure of speech is not unanimously considered to be the
The chapter further points out: we can find technical terms of Alankaraśāstra in earlier works like Vedas, Yāska's Nirukta, Panini's Astādhyāyī, Patanjali's Mahābhāṣya among others. This idea developed into a Śāstra. V. Raghavan guesses that this treatise had been named in the beginning as 'Kriyākalpa'. At the time of Bhāmaha it came to be designated as 'Alaṅkaraśāstra'. It is termed as 'Kāvyāśāstra' also.

Chapter II named as 'A Brief Historical Survey of Sanskrit Literature on Poetics'. It begins the survey from the Nātyaśāstra of Bharata which is considered to be the oldest available work on Sanskrit Poetics. This work is an encyclopaedic treatise on Dramaturgy as well as on Poetics. It has Abhinavagupta's famous commentary named 'Abhinavabhāratī'. It is noteworthy that according to Bharata the Alankaraśāstra is as sacred as the Vedas.

Bhāmaha's Kāvyālaṅkāra is the next available work on Sanskrit Poetics. This work separates poetics from dramaturgy. Bhāmaha is the earliest exponent of what has come to be known as the Alaṅkāra school. The other major works belonging to this school and subsequent to
Bhamaha are 'Kavyalanka-samgraha' of Udbhata and Kavyalanka of Rudra. Udbhata wrote a commentary named Bhamaavivarana on Kavyalanka of Bhamaha. Bhamaha is the first rhetorician who has given a definition of Kavya and also has dealt with the salient features of Mahakavya.

After Bhamaha there flourished Dandin, the author of Kavyadarsha who has devoted attention to the Gupa-Riti theory. His successor Vamana built up Gupa-Riti concept in his work 'Kavyalanka-sutra-vrtti'. He is treated as the protagonist of the 'Riti-School'. Dandin and Vamana have also given their definitions of Kavya. Dandin also deals with the characteristic features of a Mahakavya, Vamana prominently deals with gupas which should be brought in and dosas which should be avoided by a poet.

Eminent exponent of the 'Dhvani school' is Anandavardhana. He has gained a prominent place in the history of Sanskrit Poetics by his work 'Dhvanyaloka'. This work has a commentary named 'Dhvanyalokalocana' by Abhinavagupta. The 'Dhvanyaloka' is considered to be the 'crowning achievement in Sanskrit Aesthetic Thought', by Dr.K.Krishnamoorthy and this has been highlighted in his own words.

Almost during the same period Bhatta Lollata, Saunkuka
and Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka had interpreted Bharata's Rasa-sūtra. The 'Kāvyamīmāṁsa' of Rājaśekhara does not attempt to propagate any new theory. This treatise is a treasure of valuable information on Poets and Poetics; it has been shown elaborately in the chapter 'Causes of Poetry', the importance of the matter dealt with by Rājaśekhara.

Next comes Kuntaka the author of 'Vakroktijīvita'. It founded the Vakrokti-school in Sanskrit Poetics. Mahimabhaṭṭa the author of 'Vyaktidveka' strove to build a school of Poetics based on the concept of 'Anumāna' or logical inference. King Bhoja of Dvārā is noted for his view that there is only one rasa in poetry and that is Śṛṅgāra. Accordingly, his work is named 'Śṛṅgāraprakāśa'. Apart from this he is credited with another work entitled 'Sarasvatīkapṭhābharana'.

The brightest luminary in this phase of the history of Sanskrit Poetics is Mammata, the author of 'Kāvyaprakāśa'. He was a staunch follower of the Dhvani-school. Hemacandra, Vāgbhaṭa, and Ruuyaka followed Mammata.

Then we have Rāmacandra, Guṇacandra, Śāradātanaya, Sāgaranandin, Śiṅgabhūpāla and others who composed works on Sanskrit Poetics including Dramaturgy.
Viśvanātha's 'Sāhityadarpāna' lays emphasis on rasa as the soul of poetry. In the meanwhile, Bhāndudatta, Rūpagośvāmin, Kavikārnāpura, Keśavamiśra, Prabhākara, Appayya Dīkṣita and others wrote several books on Rasa and Alāṅkāra Theories.

The last great luminary in the firmament of Sanskrit Poetics is Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha who lived in the 17th century A.D. He composed 'Rasagāndhara'. It deals with many aspects of Sanskrit Poetics. With Jagannātha the line of eminent writers on Sanskrit Poetics comes to a close.

Chapter III named as 'Purposes of Poetry' is vast and varied. The topic of 'Purposes of Poetry' is also a very interesting one. It is well-said: "Prayojanamanuddiśya mando'pi na pravartate." Every activity has a purpose. The oldest Sanskrit rhetorician is Bharata who says that the purposes of poetry are four: 'Dharma', 'Artha', 'Yaśas', and 'Upadeśa'. According to Bhāmaha 'four-fold values', 'proficiency in arts', 'delight' and 'fame' are the benefits accrued by studying poetry. But Vāmana approves only two: 'delight' and 'fame'. Mammaṭa's enumeration of six benefits of poetry is well known.
"Kāvyam yaśase-arthakṛte vyavahāravide śīvetarakṣataye
Sadyah paranirvṛtaye kāntāsammitatayopadeśayuje".

They are: (1) Fame, (2) Wealth, (3) Knowledge of the world, (4) Removal of miseries, (5) Intant joy, and (6) Persuasive instruction.

All subsequent rhetoricians almost follow Mammata.

But most of them agree that the prime purpose of poetry is delight or bliss of connoisseurs. Accordingly other purposes are secondary. Some of these purposes go to the poet and some to the connoisseurs; some to both. This proves that Indian rhetoricians did not believe in the theory of 'Art for Art's sake'. According to them 'Art is purposeful'.

Chapter IV named as 'Causes of Poetry' is divided into two sections. Section I gives in brief the causes of Poetry as maintained by several rhetoricians. The fundamental belief is: Art is purposeful. So too is Poetry. It is Kaveh karma or work or composition of a Poet. The moot question is: "What is/are the cause/causes of poetry?" Another question is: "Whether the poet is born or made?" Indian rhetoricians reply variously.
'Pratibhā' or inborn genius, 'Vyutpatti' or vast study and 'Abhyāsa' or repeated practice - these three form the cause of poetry or to be exact, of "good poetry". Most of the rhetoricians agree: 'Tritayamidam vyāpriyate śaktirvyut-pattirabhyāsāh' (Rudrata 1.14). Bhāmaha, Dāṇḍin and Vāmana lay more emphasis on Pratibhā as the cause of poetry. Most of the rhetoricians use the word 'Śakti' as a synonym of 'Pratibhā'. Hemacandra, and Jagannātha contend that the cause of poetry is 'Pratibhā'. The 'Pratibhā' is defined by all rhetoricians as inborn genius or the seed of poetry. Vyutpatti and Abhyāsa are secondary causes or factors which cause the Pratibhā to blossom into good poetry. The great scholar viz. A.B.Gajendragadkar has commented appropriately on all these views and his comment has been quoted in extenso.

Section II has been reserved for Rājašekhara. He is the only rhetorician who has dealt with the poet, his equipment, his daily routine and other useful topics in his work 'Kāvyamāṁśa'. All this matter has been brought to light for the first time in this thesis. After reading this Section II any student of Sanskrit Poetics will become convinced that 'Rājašekhara the Rhetorician is Great but Ignored.'
Chapter V has been named 'Definition of Poetry and Essence of Poetry'. It deals primarily with two questions: 'What is Poetry' and 'What is the soul or essence of Poetry?'

Answers to these two questions pervade the whole range of Sanskrit Poetics. In answer to the first question several rhetoricians have offered numerous Kāvyaśānas. Terms 'Śabda' and 'Artha' are commonly used in their definitions. Some rhetoricians like Bhāmaha, Rudraṭa, Kuntaka, Mammata, Vidyānātha, Vāgbhaṭa and Hemacandra give stress on both 'Śabda' and 'Artha'. But some others like Daṇḍin, Jagannātha and Jayadeva lay stress more on 'Artha'. However the latter definitions would not be satisfactory. Because, Poetry is based essentially on 'Śabda' or word, which forms as though its body. Daṇḍin says:

'Sarīram tāvadīśtartha vyavacchinnā padāvalī'

Then arises the question: 'What is the soul of poetry?' Several schools have come to existence depending on the answer given to this question. Main schools are five:

1. Rasa school of Bharata
2. Alankāra School of Bhāmaha
3. Rīti School of Vāmana
4. Dhvani School of Ānandavardhana
5. Vakrokti School of Kuntaka

There is one more school viz. Aucitya School of Kṣemendra.
A careful consideration of all these schools shows that rasa is the soul of poetry. It is easy to understand. The primary purpose of Poetry is giving delight; and as rasa gives delight it should be treated as the soul of poetry.

Chapter VI is called as 'Divisions of Poetry'. It begins with Daṇḍin who was the first rhetorician to make clear divisions of Poetry, although it was based on the outer form. He classifies Poetry as three-fold: 'Gadya', 'Padya' and 'Miśra'. Most of the rhetoricians accept this division. Daṇḍin proceeds further. Padya is again classified as 'Sargabandha' i.e. 'Mahākāvya', 'Muktaka', 'Kulaka', 'Kośa' and 'Samghāta'. Gadya is classified as 'Kathā' and 'Ākhyāyikā'. Miśra includes Campū and Nāṭaka. According to Daṇḍin, Kāvya again can be divided into 'Samskṛta', 'Prākṛta', and 'Apabhraṃśa'. But Rudraṭa brings in three more: 'Māgadha', 'Piśāca' and 'Śūrasena'. Hemacandra classifies as 'Prekṣya' and 'Sravya'. Dhananḍaya divides Nāṭaka into ten varieties. We find another type of divisions of poetry. It is based on its inner merit or its competency to give delight to the sahṛdayas or connoisseurs for whose delight Poetry is composed. Mammaṭa divides Poetry as 'Uttama', 'Madhyama' and 'Adhama'. Vāmana classifies as 'Vaidarbhi', 'Gouḍīyā' and 'Pāncālī'.
Kuntaka divides as 'Sukumāra', 'Vicitra' and 'Madhyama'.

This classification shows that there is gradation in poetic compositions. Of course, Kuntaka does not agree with the idea of gradation. The discussion throws much light on the concern of the rhetoricians in advising the poets to strive to be always good or superior poets.

This chapter has pointed out, pertinently, even the minor divisions.

Chapter VII is quite unique. It has highlighted for the first time 'Jinasena's Views on Poetry'. No writer on the history of Sanskrit Poetics has taken note of the 'Ādipurāṇa' of Jinasena (circa 800 A.D.). But this work is a must for any student of Sanskrit Poetics. Because it deals with the ingredients of Poetry primarily in its first chapter. Jinasena maintains peculiar views which are quite note-worthy looking to the period in which he flourished. Of course his views are in conformity with the main tenets of Jainology. This chapter is therefore devoted to discuss Jinasena's views and to estimate his contribution to Sanskrit Poetics. Hence, this chapter is a new contribution to the existing literature on Sanskrit Poetics.
In fine, this thesis on *Conception of Poetry: A Critical Estimate* serves as a worthy reference book to all those who desire to undertake a serious study of Sanskrit or Indian Literary Criticism. It has many new and weighty portions which can be considered as fresh contributions to the treasure of existing literature and knowledge on Sanskrit or Indian Literary Criticism.
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