CHAPTER - IV

VAKROKTI IN RELATION TO OTHER LITERARY CONCEPTS

Prefatory Note

"If synthesis is the watchword of Hindu religion and culture, and if synthesis is the watchword of Hindu ways of life and ways of thought, and if it is the watchword of Hindu civilization, I may at once tell you that it is the watchword of Indian art also."¹

Aesthetic experience or rasa is the foremost end of poetry. In a literary work various constituents strive to register their individuality, at the same time each part should contribute to the central theme by making itself secondary. This is the central idea of Dhvani theory.

¹ Mm. Kuppuswami Shastri, *Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit*, Madras, 1945, p 77

also, cf 'The Indian person appears to be evolved primarily from the unification of distinct cultures, and has developed an attitude of absorbing any amount of diverse kinds of elements in a single whole. This is not the haphazard conglomeration of diverse kinds of things, but the intrinsic unification which results in one synthetic organism. This ideal of the achievement of a life of harmony has moulded the Indian art and the theories on art as well"

Dr Mahesh Adkoli, *Concept of Aucitya in Sanskrit Poetics- A Reappraisal*, pp 46-47
In achieving this, sense of propriety or *aucitya* works behind the scene. It watches and controls the whole poetic process. Thus, the concept of *aucitya* is deemed as a synthesizing force in *Dhvani* theory.

Kuntaka's *vakrokti* synthesis differs from the *dhvani* synthesis. According of Kuntaka, all poetry is an inseparable whole where both word and meaning are in perfect concord; where the adorned and the adornment once again make an indivisible whole. And, both the content and the form should be equally aesthetic; and hence, the emphasis is not exclusively either on content or on form but their unity. This is the stand held by Kuntaka. The several elements of poetry must be arranged in a glorious race, competing with each other in making poetry beautiful. The concept of *sahitya* lies behind this harmonious blending of various elements. It is the perfect harmony and mutual competence between the expression and the expressed in respect of beauty; it is the harmonious blend of all the literary concepts in promoting aesthetic experience.  

Thus, the concept of *sahitya* is a synthesizing force in *Vakrokti* theory. But it must be noted that, in the attainment of *sahitya* too, the importance is given to poet's creative genius which is designated as

2. For concept of *Sahitya*, Vide, supra, Ch. III, pp. 17-19
   Cf. "In this respect the concept means the appropriateness and power of the vācyavācaka in suggesting the *Rasa* For, *Rasa*, Kuntaka accepts as supreme. Therefore, this conception of *Sahitya* likens it to the other concept of *Aucitya* which also figures very much in Kuntaka"
   Dr. V. Raghavan, *Bhoja’s Śrīgāraprakāśa*, p 100
vakrokti or kavi-vyāpāra. It is thus helpful in harmonizing and integrating into a unity of several literary concepts. Therefore, the different poetic elements are all related to vakrokti.

In brief, the dhvani synthesis is based on the principle of upasarjanīkaraṇa while vakrokti synthesis is based on parasparaspardhā. With this prefatory note, let us proceed to discuss the exact status of various literary concepts in the scheme of Vakrokti theory.

I. Vakrokti and Alāṅkāra

In Sanskrit poetics, the conceptual development of alāṅkāra has three major stages, first one is in the Alāṅkāra school headed by Bhāmaha, and second one is in the Dhvani period led by Ānandavardhana and the third is at the hands of Kuntaka.

All that is responsible for poetic appeal is designated as alāṅkāra by Bhāmaha and others. They used the term in the sense of both poetic beauty as well as various figures of speech. Vāmana equates the concept of alāṅkāra with the concept of beauty and also with various figures of speech in decisive terms. Thus, in pre-dhvani period the term alāṅkāra carried two different meanings viz. overall beauty of poetry and various devices of adornment.

3 साहित्यलक्षणांश्च कविविधायपारस्य वस्तुतः सर्वत्रतिरशीचित्वम्। Vakroktiyivita, p. 25
4. सैष्ठ सर्वश वक्रोक्तिरस्यायाय विभाज्यतेः।
   यत्नैःस्यां कविविधायां कोलास्त्रास्यं नव्या विना। Kāvyālankāra (Bhāmaha), II. 85
   कविविधायपासः च वर्णितत्रास्यां च। Kāvyādarsā, II. 2
5. सौन्दर्यविधायां। अतलःतिरस्थाः। Kāvyālankārasūtra, I. 1 2
It its second stage, the scope of *alanka*ra was restricted by the *Dhvani* theorists. According to *Dhvani* synthesis *rasa* alone is of primary importance and all other elements are subordinate to it. *Alanka*ra, in this changed phenomenon, is only an instrument in enhancing the beauty of a poem. Ānandavardhana says that "Figures are to be known as those that are associated with its parts even like ornaments such as the bracelet." Thus *alanka*ras are based on expressed sense and hence they are external appendages to poetry. But when the *alanka*ras partake in the element of suggestion, they become intrinsic to poetry. They can enter into the realm of suggestivity in two ways, either in the role of suggesters or in the role of being objects of suggestion. Thus in the analysis of Ānandavardhana we find the three fold treatment of *alanka*ras. They are:

i. Expressed *alanka*ras.

ii. *Alanka*ras possessing subordinated suggestion.

iii. Primarily suggested *alanka*ras or *alanka*ra-*dhvani*.

Of these, Ānandavardhana gave much emphasis to primarily suggested *alanka*ras and the *alanka*ras possessing subordinated suggestion. The expressed *alanka*ras have been taken as mere *vāg-vikalpa*s.  

---

6. अनुश्रूतात्तत्त्वालक् च न्यायान्त्वित। Dhvanyaloka, II. 6, cd.
7. अनन्त्य हि बाद्धिकत्पात्तकार एव चाल्कारः। Ibid., p 230
   अल्कारहि बहुः आल्कारसाम्याद् बाल्का। Ibid., p 62
In its third stage the concept of *alaṅkāra* was got new interpretation and justification by Kuntaka. His main object was to give emphasis on the inner value and beauty of *alaṅkāras*. At the out-set of his *Vakroktijīvita*, Kuntaka states that the word *alaṅkāra* has several clear-cut and distinct meanings:

i. The general sense of the term is ornaments like rings, necklace worn by women.

ii. In its secondary sense the term *alaṅkāra* refers to the figures of speech like alliteration, simile which enhance the beauty of sound or sense in poetic composition.

iii. It also refers to the overall beauty of sound and sense achieved through the medium of various poetic devices.

iv. The name of a treatise which discusses the beauty of poetry.⁸

Of these, the second meaning of the term *alaṅkāra* viz., the figures of speech is the subject of our present discussion.

The general comparison of figures of speech with ornaments like bracelet leads one often to the mistaken notion that embellishment is an entity separable from poetry. "But the truth is that there is no poetry apart from *alaṅkāras* as there can be a damsel's body in life, apart from her ornaments like the ring and the bracelet."⁹ Thus

---

⁸. अलङ्कऱ्कः सस्त्रीस्य सोमातिशयकरिवाचार्यायुं च वर्णकल्पितं च तत्कृत्यसामान्याप्रचारकेश, तद्वर्णयुं च तस्य नामस्यायुं च वर्णान्यायुं च वर्णाकर्तिकायुं च। *Vakroktijīvita*, p. 3

⁹. K. Krishnamoorthy, *Indian Literary Theories*, p 163

This fact has been emphasized by Ruyyaka:

लोकिकालङ्कऱ्कियायुं च वाचार्यायुं चारणाप्रचारकेशायुं च वर्णायुं च वर्णायुं च। *Alaṅkārasarvasva*, p 16
Kuntaka declares pinpointedly that 'What is embellished' is regarded as poetry. There is nothing like a pre-existing poetry to which ornaments can be superadded.\textsuperscript{10} There is of course no such distinction between the embellished and the embellishment. Therefore, \textit{alaṅkāras} are not an external appendages to poetry but they are part and parcel of poetry. Further on he states that both \textit{alaṅkārya} and \textit{alaṅkāra} should equally be aesthetic because both stem from the same aesthetic and creative activity of the poet.

Kuntaka's main stand is that, the source of each and every part of poetry is poetic imagination. Hence, \textit{alaṅkāras} too, are the direct out-come of imagination.\textsuperscript{11} In a poetic figure Kuntaka discovers a differentia consisting of a peculiar turn of expression (\textit{vakratā}) resulting in a characteristic strikingness and depends on the imaginative activity of the poet. Thus the so-called figures of speech of early theorists are admissible only when they possess peculiar charm imparted by the imagination. \textit{Alaṅkāras} thus are dependent on \textit{kavi-pratibhā} without this power, there will be no striking \textit{alaṅkāra}. Hence Kuntaka says:

\textsuperscript{10} साल्यालथालयांसहितस निरस्तावथथ सच्च: समुद्रास्य काय्यता कविकर्मलम्।
तेनाल्यालथास्य काय्यकरिति स्थितम्, न पुनः काव्यस्यालथाचर्योग इति। \textit{Vakroktijīvita}, p. 6

\textsuperscript{11} कविदुप्रतिभासायत्त्वायप्रायागायामनस्येषांमधिम भूषणाना ..... \textit{Vakroktijīvita}, p. 192

\textsuperscript{15} "The poetic intution automatically chooses its own expression, which is only the externalisation of this spiritual activity and therefore not a mechanically fixed fact but a part and parcel of that activity"

\textit{S.K.De, Sanskrit Poetics as a Study of Aesthetics, p.15}

\textsuperscript{44} तत्त्वमल्यालयारद प्रतिप्रेक्षे कविश्वाखतेसितसमुदेशमेव, न पुनरारा स्थाणाकथितचित्रसितन निष्पादयम्।

\textit{Ibid}, p. 44
"Though as a matter of fact all the three elements of poetry, namely, sentiment, subject in nature, and embellishments, have only poetic skill as their life-essence, still its relationship with embellishments is one of utmost intimacy, for without it, if the object of poetic description comes to have just the bare pattern of a figure of speech in a matter of fact way, it ceases to cause delight to the connoisseurs; and therefore we do not attach any poetic appeal to such a so-called ornament."  

And, the *alaṅkāras* are regarded as contributing to fresh charm of poetry. It is also stated that *alaṅkāratva* or figurativeness is due to its capacity to produce the special charm. So, the strikingness or *vicchitti* due to *kavi-pratibhā* is taken as the criterion of a poetic figure. Thus it would be clear that the two characteristics are necessary to constitute a poetic figure viz. *kavi-pratibhā* and the special charm denoted as *vicchitti*.

Regarding the use and abuse of *alaṅkāras*, Kuntaka's stand does not differ from that of *Rasa-dhvani* theorists. He says that, when the natural charm of the content is described, there will not be much scope for the use of *alaṅkāras* like simile and so on as their use may spoil its exquisitely delicate beauty. And also "If a subject-matter
is wanting in unique excellence, even if it should be adorned with figures, it would fail to delight the connoisseurs even like an airy ghost, and should therefore be disregarded as valueless.*16 At the same time it must be noted that, in some instances the content described will not charmful without alaṅkāras. In such cases the addition of alaṅkāras capable of endowing description becomes quite proper.17 But it must be noted that alaṅkāras are to be employed with the sense of propriety with the theme described.

Kuntaka agrees with the view that the real office of an alaṅkāra is to add aesthetic charm to the content or alaṅkārya. He clearly states that, "All the figures of speech explained so far share one common feature; and that is their promotion of aesthetic effect in spite of their secondary function or status."18 At the same time Kuntaka holds that, sometimes the alaṅkāras may shine independently and produce extraordinary delight. "Though logically (or contextually) the subject-matter which is the adorned must be deemed primarily important and naturally it follows that all the adornments or figures of speech should play a subsidiary role in respect of it, when these adornments are so devised as to carry an extraordinary significance, by reason of their very significant placement, they come to assume a rare prominence; and though secondary, they begin to appear as if

16. सातिशयत्वशृण्य यत्त्वय वर्नुनो विभूषितमथपि पिशाचवेदित तद्विद्वालिकारितविविर्हतदुपा -
   दैयलकेश्वलमितिप्रसक्नन् । Ibid., p. 129
17. तदेवविचविवर्णिनीयविवश्मतिश्वंचविविधायी विभूषणविन्यायो विवेष्यतां प्रतिपदते।
   Ibid., p 132
18. एव गुणभूतादिपि स्वरूपोकर्ममहात्म्याल्लासानायथभावात् काष्ठिविद्वाल्लासोभिकायेतादैवी विभूषणलविदि
   तथाविषयायुष्मण्यादल्लासै। Ibid., p. 230
they were very primary; and since their impressiveness is striking in the way they are used by poets, they are interpreted here as possessing primacy of appeal.\(^\text{19}\) It is also stated that, even as *rasa* produces delectability in poetry as well as the aesthetic delight of refined readers, so also *alaṅkāras* like simile produce both these effects.\(^\text{20}\) Hence, the above stands regarding the *alaṅkāras* are outstanding contribution of Kuntaka.

Thus, the real office of an *alaṅkāra* is to achieve new vitality to even insipid subjects by its unique capacity. And hence, they become the source of new delight to the refined readers.\(^\text{21}\) Kuntaka thus defined *alaṅkāra* as something internal to poetry. He refused to recognize any *alaṅkāra* as an *alaṅkāra* unless it evokes *rasa*. He emphatically declared that all true *alaṅkāras* are *rasavat*.

Kuntaka too, like Ānandavardhana accepts the three fold nature of *alaṅkāras*. It is said that the soul of *alaṅkāra* is three-fold viz. explicitly stated, implied by indicators and the suggested.\(^\text{22}\) As noted earlier, Ānandavardhana emphasized the *alaṅkāras* which possess primarily or secondarily suggested elements. And the expressed *alaṅkāras* have been treated as *vāg-vikalpas* and considered lowest class of poetry. But there might arise cases where the poet's obvious

---

19 एवंलक्ष्येयं कदनु प्रायः पुत्रशास्त्राभवेन व्यवस्थितोपयोद्धार्थवर्त्तिकिचित्रंदितिकाचरणेऽपिनियमानं सत्त्रिभंशीकृतमण्डलं गुणबुद्धिमुखित्कालक्षालं शर्माभावनें परस्येद्यूपः मुख्यतमत्वातिपाद्यमानं नित्यवनप्रभावामहात् प्रायमेनावभासामानी व्याख्यात्. *Ibid.*, p. 194

20 यथा रसां काव्यस्य स्वरूपतां तद्वित्त्वादं च विद्यायतेपुपुष्यादिद्विश्वव्याक्तिवान् निषादवन् समस्वद्विश्वसंपद्यते। *Ibid.*, p 165

21 यदति नीरसप्रायं सर्वज्जाः तदपि सर्वमन्नैव सर्वसाम्यं समस्पद्यते। *Ibid*, p 169

22 वाच्च समारथ्यं च प्रतीत्यं च समपिन्तम्। अलकुलितामातामां त्रिविष्ठ तद्भ्रो विद्यते। *Ibid*, III 23
intention is not to awaken *rasa* or anything else unexpressed, but simply to produce a strikingness in the form of expressed figures. It may be seen in figurative depiction of inanimate objects like the flowing river, the blooming flower and so on. It is of course difficult for the later *Dhvani* theorists to consider all such compositions as lowest class of poetry. So they extend their view as there is an indirect touch of *rasa*.

Kuntaka justifies the significance of such figures of speech in poetry and shows that this significance is independent of all considerations. "Kuntaka in this way not only supplies a remarkable deficiency in the teaching of the *Dhvanikāra* and Ānandavardhana, but also justifies the existence and fixes the conception of a poetic figure as distinguished from a mere speech-figure. It is no wonder, therefore, that later followers of the *Dhvani* School, who form the bulk of post-*dhvani* writers on poetics, readily accept Kuntaka's analysis, and regard the two characteristics, viz. *vicchitti* and *kavi-vyāpāra* as forming the ultimate test of a poetic figure."23

The later rhetoricians, even if they neglected Kuntaka's *Vakroktijīvita*, have accepted Kuntaka's idea of poetic figure. Mammaṭa repeats in general the view of Ānandavardhana, but he adds that in cases where there is no suggested *rasa*, the poetic figures simply result in a charmingness of expression.24 At the very outset of the tenth chapter of his *Kāvyaprakāśa*, Mammaṭa states that *alāṅkāra* is strikingness itself.25 At other place, while criticizing

24 यत्र तु नासित रस, तत्र उक्तिवैकित्यमात्रपर्यवसायिन। *Kāvyaprakāśa, vrtti* on VIII 2
25 वैचित्र्यः चाल्ल्द्वेषः *Ibid., vrtti* on X 1
Rudrata's definition of the figure *hetu*, Mammata agrees with Bhāmaha and Kuntaka that it is no poetic figure at all because it has no strikingness.  

Ruuyakka and his commentators too, accepted Kuntaka's analysis of *alaṅkāra*. The strikingness (*vicchitti*) due to *kavi-pratibhā* is taken throughout as criterion of a poetic figure by Ruuyakka. Jayaratha in many places of his commentary makes the standpoint of Ruuyakka quite explicit. He states that the essential factor is *kavikarma* without it no *alaṅkāra* is possible. Jagannātha, the reputed author of *Rasagaṅgādhara*, has repeatedly stressed the special mode of utterance or *bhaniti-visēsa* which constitutes the *alaṅkāra*. He accepts the theory beyond question that the peculiar charm resulting from *kavi-pratibhā* is the general nature of *alaṅkāras*. Thus, it would be clear that how later theorists were influenced by Kuntaka's thought in forming the doctrine of *alaṅkāra*.

26. *Ibid.*, under X 34
27. Alankārasarasvata, Ed S.S Janaki, Delhi, 1965, p 58
28. *Vimarsim on Alankārasarasvata*, p 144
29. *Rasagaṅgādhara*, p. 477
Before concluding this section, it must be noted that Kuntaka accepts only eighteen *alaṅkāras*. They are *dīpaka*, *rūpaka*, *upamā*, *utprekṣā*, *vyatireka*, *śleṣa*, *arthāntaranyāsa*, *ākṣepa*, *vibhāvanā*, *paryāyokta*, *apрастutaprasamsā*, *atiśayokti*, *sasamdeha*, *virodha*, *apanhuti*, *vyājastuti*, *dṛṣṭānta* and *sahokti*.30

He brings some of the remaining *alaṅkāras* under one or the other *alaṅkāra* accepted by him. For instance, *ananvaya*, *nidarśana* and the like are included in the perview of *upamālaṅkāra*. And, some *alaṅkāras* have been rejected due to lack of charmingness and the *rasavat* and so on are considered as *alaṅkārya*.31 Therefore, it is a mistake to think that Kuntaka's main preoccupation was with figurative expression. He for the fist time revolted against the tendency of multiplying the number of *alaṅkāras*. "In the decadent period of Indian poetics from Mammata onwards, the tendency of adding to the number of *alaṅkāras* and their subdivisions in a mechanical way became a rage; and the fine distinctions between them from the intellectual standpoint almost elbowed out the underlying aesthetic theory, which was taken almost as an axiomatic postulate".32

30 Dr. K Krishnamoorthy says that Kuntaka has accepted only sixteen *alaṅkāras* But he mentions only fifteen *alaṅkāras* (Vakroktīvīta, Intro p. XXXI) Infact, Kuntaka accepts eighteen *alaṅkāras*

31 भूषणान्तरभावेन श्रोपाशून्यतया तथा।
अलबुरसते ये केचिन्त्रालबुरसतया मनादृ।
.न केवलं ताध्यामेव, याबद्धालबुरसतया विभूष्यायवेनापि तेषामलबुरसतलर्गन्नमुपत्रमु।

Vakroktīvīta, III 62

32 K Krishnamoorthy, *Indian Literary Theories*, p 165
Thus, Kuntaka is the only exception to this general tendency. He boldly states that, there is an infinite possibility in poetic modes of expression, but not in the definitions of individual figures. In other words it can be said that a number of figures, that appear different in their details, can be brought under a single head as the principle governing all of them will be the same.

II Vakrokti and Svabhāvokti

In Sanskrit poetics, the two modes of expression viz. natural and figurative have been recognized as two distinct sources of poetic beauty. Dandin has divided the whole realm of literature into two classes viz. svabhāvokti and vakrokti. This two-fold division is implicitly accepted by Abhinavagupta too. He makes the interesting comparison of these modes of expression to lokadharmi and nātyadharmi respectively, and recognizes as the two facilities of suggestive language responsible for the delineation of rasa. Thus, in Indian literary context svabhāvokti and vakrokti represent the two distinct modes of poetic expression which constitute the fundamental approaches in literature.

---

33 तदेवमस्मिदावैधितङ्कपकारायामेवेदविष्णुवविष्णुवव न पुरुषक्रियापेदानाम्। Op. cit, p 204
34 काव्ये वि च लोकनाट्यमिद्यस्तानीयेन स्वभावायितवक्रोक्तिप्रकारायामेवनालीकृतिप्रसमस्मुरौजितविन्दतसमर्थयुपविदायादविनेवययणम्। Locana, p 197
35 It is generally held that svabhāvokti and vakrokti are mere figures of speech. Dandin, Abhinavagupta, Kuntaka and Bhoja are few exceptions to this general notion. cf: "It is interesting to note that a somewhat parallel notion of the svabhāvokti-vakrokti pair of Sanskrit poetics can be found in the concept of direct and oblique poetry formulated by E.M W Tilwyrd." C Rajendran, Studies in Comparative Poetics, p. 74
Svabhāvakti is the natural description of a thing. It is nothing but the description of things as they are. For instance, the descriptions of a child, or a young, innocent lady, the sports of birds and animals bring more charm to poetry.36 Danḍin considered svabhāvakti as the first embellishment and divided it into four categories viz., description of a class or jāti, actions or kriyā, qualities or guṇa and substance or dravya.37 Thus svabhāvakti is recognized as an important alaṅkāra by the rhetoricians. Except Kuntaka, all the rhetoricians of Sanskrit poetics declare with one voice that svabhāvakti is an alaṅkāra.

Kuntaka's treatment of svabhāvakti as an alaṅkārya is unique in the history of Sanskrit poetics. Kuntaka criticizes the view of his predecessors regarding the figure svabhāvakti. Svabhāvakti is nothing but the natural description of a thing; if vastu-svabhāva itself is an alaṅkāra what else remains for alaṅkārya or being embellished. Thus, Kuntaka says, there will be a self-contradiction if we consider svabhāvakti as alaṅkāra.38 Further on, he states that, it is impossible to state anything about a thing except in terms of its svabhāva or

36 सद्यानवस्थान्नित्रवधि यद्यव सदृश भवति।
तोके चिरमसिध्द तत्तक्षनन्तरः जातिः।
शिशुसुभुधवतिकातर्तिक्षुसन्नात्त्विनित्रवधिः।
सा कालात्वेंद्रिचित्येव विपश्चियति रथा॥
Rudrata's Kāvyālaṅkāra, VII 30-31

37 नानावस्थाय पदार्थाः रूपं साक्षात् बिवृत्तिः।
स्वभावोक्तिः जातिः चेत्यात्त्विनित्रवधिः।
शिशुभुधवतिकातर्तिक्षुसन्नात्त्विनित्रवधिः।
जातिकालेनुपरुसस्थलाभावायामीत्रतमु।
शास्त्रवैवेद्यसंसारस्मर्यचित्येव रथः॥
Kāvyādarśa, II. 8 & 13

38 अल्क्कृतां येषा स्वभावोक्तिर्मृगृहिः।
अल्क्कृतायतथा येषा किमपदावत्तिन्ति॥
Vakroktijīvita, I. 11
nature. In a poetic context, nature of a thing or vastu-svabhāva is nothing but the poetic theme intended by the poet. Without this, an object is tantamount to a non-existent idea.\(^{39}\) Thus vastu-svabhāva is to be considered as the body of description. If the body of description itself is counted as an alaṅkāra, what would be the other thing which it can adorn it? One should not climb upon one's own shoulder.\(^{40}\) Therefore, svabhāvokti cannot be alaṅkāra as it is the very nature of the idea which provides the material for the further employment of alaṅkāras.\(^{41}\)

It is said that, alaṅkāra and alaṅkārya are not one and the same. Everywhere in the poetry we find vastu-svabhāva-varṇanā, and if it is called alaṅkāra, there is no scope for other alaṅkāras like simile, and if at all they occur, it will be the case of either samsṛṣṭi (separable union of figures) or saṅkara (inseparable union of figures). So, only these two alaṅkāras will remain in poetry; and defining all

\(^{39}\) \textit{Ibid.}, I. 12

\(^{40}\) cf. "In the whole field of Sanskrit Poetics, Kuntaka is the only theorist who calls a spade and asks us -'How can you stand on your own shoulder? As for as I know, no straight answer has been forthcoming up to date in the field of Sanskrit criticism". K. Krishnamoorthy, \textit{Studies in Indian Aesthetics and Criticism}, pp. 193-94

\(^{41}\) \textit{Op.cit.} pp 22-23
other *alaṅkāras* will be useless as they will not have any scope.\textsuperscript{42} Or it may be argued that merely the general nature of things is *alaṅkārya*, and the special nature is *alaṅkāra*. Kuntaka states that this argument is not at all sound. Writing poetry is not something which has to be done perforce, because the whole poetic activity is taken up for definition in the context of delight to the refined readers.\textsuperscript{43} Both the *alaṅkārya* and *alaṅkāra* must be equally beautiful. Therefore, the general nature of things stands outside the perview of discussion in poetics.

Thus, *vastu-svabhāva* should be considered as *alaṅkārya*. When a thing is imagined by a poet as fit for poetic description, its nature itself becomes a beautiful *kāvyāśarīra* which attracts the hearts of refined readers. And such *kāvyāśarīra* is to be decorated by charming figures of speech. At the same time it must be noted that the excessive use of figures of speech may spoil the delicacy of *svabhāva-varṇana* or *rasapoṣana*. So the employment of figures of speech should be made carefully by the poets. Kuntaka gives a beautiful

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{42} "भूखण्डेस्वभावस्य बिहितं भूखण्डानं।
meshāyaḥ स्म प्रकटस्तोप्रसंकोशतिः।।
स्येक्षे संरक्षितस्येक्षे सुदुरस्तता।।
अतुरुत्तातरां व विषयं नावशिष्यते।।
Vakroktijīvita, I. 14-15"
\item \textsuperscript{43} "यतत्सौः सामायवस्तुसङ्गमार्यमात्रमल्ल्यं, सातिस्यस्यभावासौन्दर्यसङ्गमार्यमात्रमल्ल्यं प्रतिभासते। तेन
स्वभावोक्तसाल्ल्यं लग्ने दुनितुषान्तिति वे ममते तानुः प्रति समाधीयते- तदेवतात्त्विकवस्तुम्।
स्वामाधानात्त्विकाविधियो नानुक्तार्यमात्रमल्ल्यं, नन्देन्त्रिक्रियक्षाणवर्षुः। किभी
अनुलक्षणवर्षुः वर्गनीयस्यश्चः।
Ibid, p. 126"
\end{enumerate}
analogy that a lady does not wear many ornaments at the time of her bath, love-sports and so on. Natural charm, in such occasions, will be more charming due to her natural delicacy.\(^44\)

Kuntaka also insists that, if the content is not beautiful, any addition of *alaṅkāras* will fail to add beauty to it as a portrait painted on an improper canvas. Therefore it must be conceded that the content described should be full of exquisitely beautiful natural traits. Kuntaka thus rebels against the established tradition to form his new and unique theory of *Svabhāvokti* as *alaṅkārya*.\(^45\) Cases which are *svabhāvokti* for others would be cases of *vastuvakrata* for Kuntaka.

In this connection it is interesting to note that Mahimabhaṭṭa eloquently defends *svabhāvokti* as an *alaṅkāra*. A thing can be described generally or particularly, when it is described particularly its nature is well known and a poet has to use his power (*pratibhā*) to make the natural description charming which is not the same as found in the ordinary speech.\(^46\) "It is accepted by logicians that one's..."
apprehension of an object there are really two kinds of awareness, one of the object itself as such and another of the object as possessing a name and such belonging to class. Perception is thus indeterminate and determinate, nirvikalpaka and savikalpaka. Somewhat similar to this, there are the two apprehensions of an object by a poet endowed with penetrating imagination and by an ordinary man. The latter sees what is but the common nature, sāmānya-svarūpa, of an object; the expression which he uses in communicating about that object communicates only the ordinary nature of the object. But the imaginative eye of the poet which is like a Yogin's vision or a divine third eye, sees a special aspect of a thing, not with reference to its common nature, but details whose presentations reveal a wondrous picture of it. If we understood Mahima's sāmānya and višeṣa-svabhāva in such a general manner, his verses do not offer any problem for interpretation. But Kuntaka holds that the general nature of the object stands outside the perview of poetry; and the viśiṣṭa-svabhāva alone forms the body of poetry. Thus, Kuntaka is however still unanswered. Hemalatha Deshpande opines that "If naturally beautiful artha alone is kāvyārtha, then Kuntaka is right. On the other hand, if an artha in poetry is held to be transformed

उष्णते वस्तुनिर्माताद्वृहृद्यभिषेक विद्यामुः।
तत्रैकमन्त्र सामान्य यत्तत्त्वप्रक्षेरऽि।
स एव सर्वशब्दानां विषयं परिक्कृतितः।
अत एवाभिचरं ते सामान्यं बोधयन्त्वलम्॥।
विशिष्टमहस्ते यथौ तत्र प्रत्यक्षस्य गोचरः।
स एव सर्वाभिविगं गोचरं प्रतिभायुवनाम्॥ Vyaktiviveka, II. 113-116

47 V. Raghavan, Studies in Some Concepts of Alankārasāstra, p. 115
Before concluding this section, Ānandavardhana's views on this problem may be viewed. Ānandavardhana has not said much about vastu-svabhāva. He holds that when vastu-svabhāva is primarily suggested, it is alaṅkārya. But, when vastu-svabhāva is expressed it is alaṅkāra. Kuntaka removes this basic postulation of Ānandavardhana of vyaṅga-prādhānyā. For him every vastu-svabhāva is alaṅkārya. Thus in the whole range of Sanskrit poetics, Kuntaka is the only writer who considers svabhāvokti as alaṅkārya.

III. Vakrokti and Rasavadalaṅkāra

Rasavadalaṅkāra is a delightful figure of speech. Before Kuntaka, there were two major theories regarding the figure rasavat, one is in the pre-dhvani period headed by Bhāmaha and the other is in Dhvani school led by Ānandavardhana. Kuntaka took a bold step on the nature of rasavadalaṅkāra as against the established tradition. His treatment of rasavadalaṅkāra has two sections; in the first section Kuntaka scrutinized the views of his predecessors and in the second section he gives his own definition of rasavadalaṅkāra.

In poetry, whenever the sentiments are manifested clearly, it is the case of rasavadalaṅkāra for Bhāmaha and his followers. They

51 The five figures of speech viz., rasavat, preyas, ūrjasvin, udātta and samāhita come under the group of rasavadādi-alaṅkāra which are based on different states of emotions. Here rasavadalaṅkāra is taken for specific consideration, and what is said of it will apply to the other figures of this group. Like rasavat, these figures have also been considered as alaṅkārya by Kuntaka on the same ground. Vide, Vākroktijivita, pp. 153-164

52 सस्तवदुविशिषतपदस्तुश्चार्दिशया।
देशी समागममन्यमस्तिष्टितमदिहिताः।। काव्यालान्काः, III. 6
सस्तवदर्श्यांशलम्। काव्यदर्शिः, II. 275(b)
comprehended all ideas of *rasa* in *rasavat* and allied *alaṅkāras*. Thus they considered *rasavat* as subserving the expressed meaning in poetry. Udbhāta extends the idea of Bhāmaha. He states that, in *rasavadalaṅkāra* there must be a clear portrayal of any of the nine sentiments. And that *rasa* can be manifested by the five elements viz. specification of *rasa* by its designation, mention of permanent emotion, depiction of the passing mood and narration of the exitant and gesture.\(^{53}\) Thus it would be clear that the manifestation of *rasa* is considered as *rasavadalaṅkāra* by Bhāmaha and his followers.

Ānandavardhana takes a bold step is going against the old theory of *rasavadalaṅkāra*. He shows how the early theorists misconceived the status of *rasa* and also failed to explain *rasa-experience*. According to Dhvani system, principal *rasa* is designated *dhvani*; but when *rasa* is subsidiary to the main purport of the poem, it acquires the lower status of *rasavadalaṅkāra*. This is well defined in the following *kārika*:

"But if in a poem the chief purport of the sentence should relate to something else, and if sentiments and so on should come in only as auxiliaries to it, it is my opinion that sentiment and so on are figures of speech in such a poem."\(^{54}\) Two points highlighted here are: one, there must be a main purport in a poem, and second, there must be sentiments and other similar things which are subsidiary to

\(^{53}\) स्ववद्विश्वतपदश्वश्वरादिलोकदयम्।
स्ववद्विश्वताविक्ष्विविश्वविलोकदयम्। Kāvyalankārasaṅgraha, IV 3

\(^{54}\) प्राधणेन्दुष्टः बाल्यचारिः यत्रास्तु हु रसादयः।
काल्वेत्र तस्मिन्नल्लभो रसादिरिति मे मते। Dhvanyāloka, II 5
the main purport of the poem. It is thus *rasa* has a dual position in poetry. It may be both *dhvani* and *alaṅkāra* depending on the poetic intention.

Kuntaka however does not admit this dual position of *rasa*. For him *rasa* is always of primary importance. Hence he criticized all the earlier views on *rasavadalaṅkāra* including that of Ānandavardhana. Kuntaka boldly states that *rasavat* is not an *alaṅkāra* but *alaṅkārya*. His argument is based on two points:

"*Rasavat* is not an ornament because there is nothing palpable apart from it which is adorned by it, and because the literal meaning of that word itself is contradicted."^{55} Kuntaka elucidates the point that in *rasavadalaṅkāra*, there is no additional decorative element beyond the *kāvyā-svarūpa* itself, he cites and examines the definitions of *rasavadalaṅkāra* of Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhata and shows the self-descrpept conception representing *alaṅkārya* as an *alaṅkāra* of ancient theorists.

He also criticizes Udbhata's theory of 'Rasa-by its designation' (*svaśabdavācyarasa*) and asks whether *rasa* is *svaśabdavācyya* or *rasavat* is *svaśabdavācyya*. If it is accepted, by mere utterance of the word *śṛṅgāra, rasa* can be experienced and thus by mere uttering of the words, we will be able to enjoy all the happiness and luxuries in the world.\(^{56}\) Thus, this theory is not at all sound.

---

55 31dglfl
Vakroktijīvita, III. 11

56. -wubferuHifed^duwiwrdfa^ famruesto
Ibid., p. 146
Kuntaka then examines with the help of grammar that the word *rasavadalaṅkāra* itself is contradictory one.\(^{57}\) His critical examination may be summarized as below:

1. *Rasavadalaṅkāra* may mean *alaṅkāra* of that which has *rasa* viz. *kāvya*. But this is just a statement of the very nature of poetry itself and nothing special has been stated.

2. If it is said that the *alaṅkāra* which infuses the quality of *rasavattva* in a poem, then it will not be an *alaṅkāra* of *rasavat*, but *rasavān-alaṅkāra*. As a result the poem too becomes *rasavat*.

3. Or, the term may be understood on the analogy of the usage 'this man's son will become a performer of the *Agniṣṭoma* sacrifice. So also in the usage *rasavadalaṅkāra*, it may be argued that a poem which comes into relation with *rasa* first, later on comes to be termed as an *alaṅkāra*. But this analogy is illogical. In the former case the term *Agniṣṭomayājin* had well established by other persons who had already performed *Agniṣṭoma* sacrifice; but in our case the *rasavattā* of a poem is itself depended on the *alaṅkāra* and its *alaṅkāratva* is dependent on *rasa*. Thus the fallacy of mutual dependence vitiates this explanation.

4. If the term is taken as 'the *alaṅkāra* that has *rasa*, it does not explain the meaning properly as it indicates poetry only, there are only two well-known entities viz, *alaṅkāra* and *alaṅkārya* and there is no third element at all. *Alaṅkārya* and *alaṅkāra* cannot be the

one and the same. Thus there is an inherent discrepancy between the term *rasavadalaṅkāra* and its meaning.

Kuntaka then, takes up the two verses from *Vikramorvaśīya* of Kalidāsa\(^{58}\) which Ānandavardhana cites to show *rasa* in the description of inanimate objects, and examines whether the word *rasavat* could be derived properly. In these two examples *rasa* and *alaṅkāra* can be known separately. The splitting of the term *rasavat* as *सङ्गठित अलंकृत* is quite proper here. After all, the purpose of *alaṅkāra* is to nourish and develop *rasa* and hence, *rasavatva* depends on *alaṅkāra*. The other explanation i.e., *संज्ञानात्मक अलंकृत* is also applicable. Both the verses describe the sentiment of love in separation. The *rasa* attributed to the river and the creeper is *alaṅkārya*. The figures of speech viz. simile and metaphor are the figures of *संगठित-रस*.

Kuntaka finally points out that neither of these two ways of explanation are completely correct.\(^ {59}\) Thus *rasavat* cannot be justified by a possessive compound or an attributive compound in the sense which earlier theorists conceived.

\(^{58}\) तद्वेता मेघजलाद्विण्ठलवतु धीताधरवालङ्कितः

शृङ्खलावपरसः स्वकालविरहाः विश्रान्तपुष्पमा।

विनामोनिवासितः महुकुतां शब्दणिविना लक्ष्याते

चण्डी मामव्यूह पायततं जातानुपायेव सा।।

तरङ्ग्भुग्धा श्लोभितविगुणश्रेणिर्याना

विकर्ष्टैः पैि वसनमिव संस्पर्शितिलम्।

वधाविद्ध याति स्खलितमपिनसंबंधा बहुशः

नधीभावेत ज्ञवमसहन ता परिणता।।

*Vikramorvaśīya*, IV. 38 & IV 28

\(^{59}\) किंतु 'अलंकृतार्थार्थमिति धिमना विश्रोणिसमास्याविषये केवलस्य शब्दविनतिः अस्य प्रयोगः प्रतिपद्तः।

स्ववानलङ्कारः इति चेत् प्रतीतिर्बुधुप्रकाशयेऽऽः

तद्रिवुक्तुक्तातं नास्ति, रूपकदेशधाराः।

सवानलङ्कारः इति पञ्चःमात्रायकृष्टिः न सुस्पष्टःसमन्वयः।

सवश्य काश्चिन्तु काव्यस्य रसवक्त्रमेव।

*Vākroktijīvīta*, pp 148-49
There is no point in conceiving a special *alaṅkāra* called *rasavat*. *Rasa* itself is the essence of poetry, and hence, if its *alaṅkāra* is called *rasavat* then all the *alaṅkāras* like *upamā* would be entitled to be called *rasavadalaṅkāra*. This would not be proper. Or, it may also be argued that in the case of animate objects, the description of *rasa* is *rasavadalaṅkāra*, and in the case of inanimate objects the description of *rasa* leads to other figures of speech like *upamā*. But Kuntaka says that *rasa* can be developed in inanimate objects also when they are described like animate objects and such examples can prove to be *sarasa-kāvya* if they take shape beneath the pen of great poets.\(^6\) Kuntaka here agrees with Ānandavardhana’s point that if *rasatva* is not admitted in inanimate things, the vast portion of good poetry will be counted as bad poetry.\(^6\)

Having argued thus against the old conception of *rasavadalaṅkāra*, Kuntaka proceeds to show that Anandavardhana’s conception of it, is also not justifiable. Kuntaka introduces Ānandavardhana with great reverence and cites his definition for critical examination.

As observed earlier, in the scheme of *Dhvani* theory *rasa* has dual position. It may be both *dhvani* and *alaṅkāra* depending on the poetic intention. Kuntaka feels that, this is the most intriguing and confusing part of the *dhvani* argument. For him *rasa* is always of

---

\(^6\) Vide, *Dhavnyālōka*, p 46
primary importance and cannot be subordinate to anything else. Hence he criticizes Anandavardhana's view. His review of the example given by Anandavardhana is indeed refreshing. Here it is:

कि हास्यन न मे प्रवास्यसि पुनः प्रासशिविरार्द्धानं 
केवल निष्करुण प्रवासरूपिता केनासि दूरीकृतं।
स्वप्रान्तोचित्ते ते वदनु प्रियतमयास्माजःकण्ठाःग्रहो 
बुद्धवा रोदिति रिवेतवाहवलयस्तवंरिपुस्त्रीजनः।

Anandavardhana holds that this is the pure example of rasavadalaṅkāra because karuṇarasa or the sentiment of pathos is portrayed here as subservient to the primarily intended praise of the king. But Kuntaka does not think so. This is the penetrating critique of Kuntaka:

"Here the primary purport is: O King, as you have slain all your enemies, the widows of thy enemies are plunged in sorrow and helplessness; they are in such a wretched plight that the pathos of the situation is rising to its highest pitch. Hence this purpose is served best only by regarding the sentiment of pathos is primary. It is wrong to think that the primary import here is the sentiment of love - in - separation caused by the lover's journey to a distant place. As we have already seen, the term 'adornment' is properly applicable only when it manifests itself as a secondary means towards the promotion of others which are primary and whose basis is constituted by all the constituents in congruity with one another (i.e. a sentence).

62. Dhvanyāloka, under II. 5
63. इत्यतः करुणारस्य शुद्धर्याऽवाचारस्यमेव रसवदलेश्वरस्य। Ibid., p 42
As this secondary sentiment, love-in-separation, is not devoid of its determinants, no one can urge that it falls short of the differentia of *rasa*, that it lacks in the casual ingredients that promote *rasa*, the ingredients being constitutive stimulants and so forth. The other defect also of simultaneous presentation of two conflicting *rasas* cannot taint our view to any extent. For, if both the *rasas* are really existent and if they are clearly felt, they cannot have any opposition between themselves at all since they do not compete with each other for primacy. Thus the simultaneous presentation of both love-in-separation and pathos can rightfully delight the connoisseurs, because we have no decisive ground to affirm either the exclusive existence of the sentiment of love-in-separation due to journey. We can only conjecture that the latter is fostered by its casual factors such as proper constituent stimulants etc. as long as the dream lasts, and when the dream is over, they are pushed back into their original grief or sentiment of pathos. Hence both the sentiments are congruent to the primary import mentioned already.

One might still object that the initial question itself, viz. 'how is it that love-in-separation arises at all at the outset?' is left unanswered. But the objection is baseless. For it is just as well possible to argue that the enemies and their queens have heard reports of the irresistible valour of the mighty hero and run helter skelter to save their lives and they are still alive, though parted for the time being (and not dead at all; and this argument justifies the rise of love-in-separation).
Once we admit the initial rise of pathos as a certainty, it follows as a corollary from its promotion to a high pitch in the minds of the widowed queens that due to their minds long immersed in grief, they day-dream in terms of love and once in a while get the actual dream of union with their beloved after a long time, and even then the sweet dream breaks up all too suddenly on waking up, they start wondering and realize the sharp contrast in their past and present situations, a contrast which is heart-breaking. Hence they go on lamenting long such an interpretation of facts will lead us inevitably to the conclusion that pathos alone is the primary sentiment fully presented here (without any trace of love-in-separation). The interlude of the sweet love-fulfillment dream is only a very appropriate passing mood to foster the primary pathos; and there is no other adequate explanation for its intrusion otherwise. Hence, how can there be even a jot of aesthetic rasa if one were to assert that love-in-separation due to journey has an independent existence of its own here?

Or else, it might be alleged that eulogy of the hero alone is primary; and since pathos is calculated to serve that end as a means, it is designated as an ornament. That statement again, is not without fault. For, in both of the above examples, the import primarily intended is pathos alone in its variegated manifestations. As in the case of the figures of speech paryāyokta (euphemism) and anyāpadesa (indirect statement) those meanings which are other than referential, i.e. suggested, will be such that they too could be plainly states if one wished to do so; and pathos, being a rasa, can in no wise be
reduced to a referential meaning, once we accept that it exists. Not can it be taken as an example of subordinated suggestion because the *rasa* of pathos is felt as primarily suggested. The two *rasas* cannot both be regarded as suggested because then they cannot have the relation of primary and secondary between themselves (since both would have to be equally primary). All these alternative explanations of *rasavat-alaṅkāra* in the given example have been imagined by us and refuted the analogy of the said figures (viz. *Paryāyokta* and *Aprastuta-prāśamsā*) does not hold good here.*64

This long extract itself shows Kuntaka's deep insight in aesthetic analysis. Incidentally, we get here a complete inner-picture of literary analysis from the standpoint of *rasa*. Thus Kuntaka strongly justifies that *rasa* cannot be *alaṅkāra* under any circumstance and proves that Ānandavardhana's conception of *rasavadalaṅkāra* is also self-discrepant. "It is in this critique of Ānandavardhana that we see Kuntaka at his best and his reasoning is forcible and critical acumen subtle so as to win the admiration of readers, even today. Kuntaka shines here as the doyen of critics who first blazed the trail of practical literary analysis and critical judgement".65

Kuntaka then gives his own conception of *rasavadalaṅkāra*. He defines: "That adornment or figure of speech, which functions like *rasa* because it suffuses poetry with *rasa* is designated as 'rasavat' in as much as it causes poetic appeal to connoisseurs.*" 66

---

64 Vakrōktijīvita, pp. 151-153
65 K Krishnamoorthy, Vakrōktijīvita, Intro. p. XXXV
66 सर्वे तर्तित तुल्य रसाचलोचिताः।
योपुल्लकः स रसवत् तत्प्रियाद्राह्नितिर्मिते। 11 Ibid., III. 16
According to this new interpretation, figures like *upamā, rūpaka* and so on are called *rasavat* when they are in a state of equanimity (*tulyatva*) with *rasas*. This is clear from the analogy that *kṣatriya* functioning like a *brāhmaṇa* (*ब्राह्मणवतृः क्षत्रियः*). Similarly, the figure of speech which functions like *rasa* is termed as *rasavat*. Thus, it would be clear that *rasavat* is not an independent one but of the nature of simile and so forth. Kuntaka further makes this point clear. Even as *rasa* produces delectability in poetry as well as the aesthetic delight, so also figures of speech like simile produce both these effects and hence deserve the designation *rasavadalaṅkāra*.\(^{67}\)

For instance:

\[\text{उपोदरगेष्न विभलोलतारकं तथा गृहीतं श्राशिना निशामुखम्।}\\
\text{यथा समस्तं तितिरंशुकं तथा पुरेोपि रागाद्विलंतं न लक्षितम्।}^{68}\]

The main content of this verse is night and moon personified as delicate lovers approaching the point of union in time. The sentiment *śṛṅgāra* is presented here as *alaṅkārya*. The figure of speech metaphor has employed with superimposition of the behaviour of

---

67. यथा सरः काव्यस्य सर्वता तदन्तः च विद्यात्वेयपुणमादिपर्युप्यर्थ निषादसरः सर्वदल्द्वारः सम्पद्यते. \*Ibid., p 165

68. अः स्वाबसरमुचितस्मार्तश्रुवद्ध्वः ऋषिनिशिष्ठ, निशिष्ठीयते सार्वभौमेय तोप्पोसते स्वरूपपितकावलम् ग्रामलोकम्। स च इर्शेष्टत्रयायं विशादिक्षिनमालकर्नायु: श्रीभक्तिविहितसामादित्यायुः सुमुखसामनन्त: काव्यस्य सर्वता समुल्लासायन: तदन्तः सर्वदल्द्वाराः सामादित्यायन:। \*Ibid., pp. 165-66

This verse is quoted in *Dhvanyāloka* as an example of the figure of speech called *samāsakti*. Ānandavardhana holds that it is a case of *गुणीपूर्वत्वकाव्य* because the suggested *śṛṅgāra-rasa* is not exclusively prominent: *इत्यादाविशेषायनागतवाच्यमेव प्राधाययोऽनि एव वाच्यार्थलक्ष्यः*.

*Dhvānyaloka*, pp.20-22
lovers which adds beauty to the main content of the poem. Thus the metaphor here acquired the status of rasavadalaṅkāra.

In this connection Dr. Raghavan observes: "Kuntaka takes the 'vat' in tulyārtha and applies the name Rasavadalaṅkāra to cases like the samāsokti in the verse upodha-rāgena where śṛṅgāra rasa is used as an embellishment. That is, Rasavadalaṅkāra is a case similar to one of Rasa but not exactly of Rasa"\(^69\) Dr. Krishnamoorthy finds fault with the opinion of Dr. Raghavan. He writes: "These lines bristle with several downright errors. Firstly, Kuntaka does not regard the verse upodha-rāgena as an example of samāsokti because he flatly rejects samāsokti as an alaṅkāra in a kārikā itself (III.50); in Kuntaka's opinion, the verse in question is only an instance of rūpaka. Secondly, śṛṅgāra-rasa is not used here as an embellishment (alaṅkāra), but used as an alaṅkārya itself. Thirdly, it is an egregious blunder to think that rasavadalaṅkāra in Kuntaka is a case 'similar to one of Rasa but not exactly of Rasa'. 'Rasena vartate tulyam (III.16) means 'co-exists with rasa' and not 'is similar to rasa'. The Vṛtti clearly states tulyam vartate samānam ātiṣṭhathi and adduces the analogy ब्राह्मणेन तुल्यं वर्तते ब्राह्मणवत् क्षत्रियां. The tulyatva in question is only in co-presence and no other verisimilitude is intended."\(^70\) The first two points are no doubt the errors in the opinion of Dr. Raghavan. But the third objection of Dr. Krishnamoorthy seems to be the crux of matter. Dr. Krishnamoorthy

\(^{69}\) V Raghavan, Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, p. 896
\(^{70}\) K Krishnamoorthy, Vākroktijīvita Intro., p XXXIII
interprets *rasena tulyam vartate* as coexists with *rasa* on the basis of the *vṛtti* thereon. But '*samānam-āthiṣṭhati*' is just given as equivalent to '*tulyam vartate*' and not used in the sense of *sāmānādhikārṇya*. Thus it is quite proper to translate the phrase as 'functions like *rasa*.' It is interesting to note that Dr. Krishnamoorthy himself translates the phrase as 'functions like *rasa*,' in his critical edition of *Vakroktijīvita*. The analogy given by Kuntaka is also supports our view. Kuntaka takes his stand on the basis of the grammatical rule *vāt* which means that the termination *vat* is added to words in the instrumental in the sense of *tulya*, provided the common property is an action. Thus it would be clear that co-presence of *kṣatriya* with *brāhmaṇa* will not be called *brahajñātāt kṣatriyāḥ*.

Therefore, *alaṅkāra* functioning like *rasa* can alone constitute *rasavadaṇaṅkāra* according to Kuntaka. Hence, Dr. Raghavan's interpretation i.e., similar to one of *Rasa* but not exactly of *Rasa*, seems to be correct.

Kuntaka further states that, the appearance of other figures of speech along with *rasavadaṇaṅkāra* will be the cases of 'mixed' or 'merged' figures of speech. But the major figure should be deemed as *rasavat* and the other figures being subsidiary to it.  

---

71. *Aṣṭadhyāyī*, V 1 115

Bhattoji Diksita comments on it *brahāṇeṇa tulyam brahjanavadyātātmikam kriyā ma bhūtā, tulyaṇā tāt kṣatriyāḥ*.

72. *Aṣṭadhyāyī*, V 1 115

Bhattoji Diksita comments on it *brahāṇeṇa tulyam brahjanavadyātātmikam kriyā ma bhūtā, tulyaṇā tāt kṣatriyāḥ*.
This point has been illustrated by quoting four more verses. Kuntaka then concludes the treatment of *rasavadalaṅkāra* with praise on it: 'It is the foremost among all *alaṅkāras*; the life-essence of all figures of speech and the quint-essence of poetry itself.'

Kuntaka thus takes a bold step to prove his new theory of *rasavadalaṅkāra*. "Kuntaka brushes aside all older views in this respect, and thinks that the case of *rasavat* should be considered as one in which the poet has an opportunity of creating a kind of *vakrokti* in which the *rasa* supplies the principal charm." But unfortunately his theory of *rasavadalaṅkāra* is completely neglected by later theorists and Ānandavardhana's theory of it, is generally followed.

**IV. Vakrokti and Mārga**

In Sanskrit poetics we may notice three major stages in the conceptual development of *riti* or *mārga* or literary style. Dr. Raghavan observes: "The history of the concept of Rīti has three

---

73. अर्थ तस रसवदलान्कार सबललूल्पनाग्राणी।
चूड़ामणिरिवाभाति कामोक्तमिककारणम्।
कविकौशलसर्वसचिवश्रव्योद्धारितम्यतं।
विपश्चिता विचारस्य गोचरत गमिष्टित।।

Ibid., III 73-74 (antara-ślokas)

74. S.K De, Vakroktiṣvita, Intro., p XXXIX

75. It is interesting to note that, no straight attempt has been made by any writer to criticise Kuntaka's view on *rasavadalaṅkāra*. It is to be noted, Mammaṭa did not regard *rasavat* as a figure but brought it under the गुणःभूतम् व्यक्तकारणम्. Vide, Kavyaprakāśa, Ch. V

On the other hand, Jagannātha calls it *rasālaṅkāra*. He says that it is called so, on the analogy of *Brāhmaṇapāramanā-nyāya*. He left *rasavat* out of specific consideration but casually mentions here and there:

एवं च स्वस्यन्य निन्दिता रसाः।
एवं प्रायाये व्यविष्ठयदेशेशतत्वम्।
गुणःभूतम् तदस्मत्तस्वललूल्पतम्।
केवलोऽपि प्रायाये व्यविष्ठयदेशेशतत्वमेव।
स्वललूल्पदेशेशतत्वं व्यविष्ठयदेशेशतत्वम्।
ब्राह्मणश्रमण-नयायेत्।

Rasagāṅgādhara, p.56
stages: first, when it was a living geographical mode of literary criticism; second, when it lost the geographical association and came to be stereotyped and standardized with reference to subject; and third, its re-interpretation by Kuntaka, the only Sanskrit Ālaṅkārīka, who with his fine literary instinct and originality as evidenced on many other lines also, related the Rīti to the character of the poet and displaced the old Rītis by new ones".  

Kuntaka's view on the concept of literary style or mārga is original. In vakrokti synthesis, the concept of mārga does not constitute a particular variety of Vakrokti. In fact, the specific characteristic of poetry itself is called mārga. It is defined as modes of poetic practice (kavi-prasthāna-hetu). For every poet takes recourse to one of the mārgas according to his own nature. The mārgas have been classified on the basis of the three varieties of poetry. It will also be seen that the distinction between the means and the end, viz. mārga and kāvyā, is only theoretical and ultimately they will be identical.

Kuntaka criticizes the names and classification of rītis propounded by ancient theorists. He remarks that the ancients have proposed three literary styles viz. Vaidharbhi, Gouḍīyā and Pāṇcālī, naming them after the geographical regions. They also declared that these styles

---

76 V Raghavan, Studies on Some Concepts of the Alankāraśāstra, p. 147
77 It seems to be wrongly stated by Hemalata Deshpande that 'Kuntaka’s mārgas come under va$kavakratā'. (Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka, Ph D. Thesis, KUD, 1967, p. 18) But Kuntaka’s concept of mārga is the specific characteristic of poetry itself. He clearly states: एवं काव्यासामान्यलक्षणामविप्रभाव्यतः दीर्घशोषलक्षणविप्रवर्तार्थ्यां मार्गाभिधिवचन तैविविध्यामविध्याते. Vakroktijīvita, p 40
represent the best, the average and the low respectively. Some writers have mentioned only two styles.\(^\text{78}\) This remark of Kuntaka applies to Vāmana and Daṇḍin.\(^\text{79}\) Kuntaka argues that the geographical differences cannot explain different \textit{ṛitis} as the geographical regions are infinite. Hence they would be endless. On the other hand, a \textit{ṛiti} named after particular region is not found exclusively in that region; it can be found elsewhere too. And, \textit{ṛiti} does not depend on particular regional characteristics. Thus, there is no invariable connection between the two.\(^\text{80}\)

If however the names \textit{Vaidarbhī} etc., are meant only as designation and do not mean any geographical connection with poetry, Kuntaka has no objection. \(^\text{81}\)

Similarly the gradation of \textit{ṛitis} into the best, the average and the low is not proper. Poetry is not something to be composed at any
cost. The real definition of poetry is that which delights the men of taste. Poetry which is not beautiful falls outside the perview of critic's enquiry.  

Kuntaka then proceeds to explain his own views regarding the concept of mārga or style. In his opinion, the various poetic styles can be satisfactorily explained on the basis of kavi-svabhāva or poetic temperament. If a poet is gentle in his temperament, quite naturally he will be possessed with an elegant creative imagination as the creative power and the creator are identical. And, that elegant imagination builds up the soft vyutpatti or equipment. These two direct the course of poet's practice. The equipment and practice in all men only in tune with their unique nature as conditioned by innate tendencies. Similarly, the poets who have ostentatious temperament will develop a brilliant imagination; and they will build up vyutpatti in conformity with their imagination. They start practicing the Vicitra-mārga or the brilliant style. Thus these two mārgas, Sukumāra and Vicitra, are the two extreme styles of composition. And there is one more style called Madhyama which is an admixture of both the

82. न च नीतीनामुक्तमध्यथांभाविभेदेन जैविकम्य व्यवस्थापितम् न्यायायम्। सम्बादु सहदिश्वदाधारानि

83. कविविश्वासवेदनिवन्धनावेदेन काव्यप्रसान्तेऽक्षमस्तात गाहते। कुकुमारक्खासव हि कविविश्वासवेदन

Ibid., p 41

Ibid., pp 41-42
Thus we have three major literary styles serve as high roads for the progress of poets and hence they are called mārgas. Kuntaka is well aware of the fact that it is impossible to count and exhausts each and every poetic individuality. Therefore a general division is proposed. Kuntaka boldly states that the three mārgas are equally aesthetic and effective.

It is Sukumāra-mārga or the elegant style which master poets follow like bees robbing along the grove of full-blown blossoms. The principal characteristics of the Sukumāra-mārga may be summarized as below:

i. in it every element of beauty is a result of poet's imagination,

ii. it succeeds in conveying flashes of gentle grace,

iii. it has fresh words and meanings which blossom forth by poet's undimmed imagination,

iv. it has few but lovely ornaments which come in without extra effort,

v. in it prominence is given to the inner nature of things,
vi. its wealth of beauty reminds the supreme artistic creation of the universe by the Creator himself.  

The Vicitra-mārga or brilliant style is very difficult to travel on and very few learned poets could compose in this style. This style has been compared to the path of sword-blades traversed by the cherished desires of brave warriors. The main features of this Vicitra-mārga are as below:

i. its life-breath is artistic beauty of expression,

ii. in it artistic beauty appears to be radiating brilliantly,

iii. the dazzling figures of speech in excessive amount conceal the theme and produce beauty,

iv. even an ordinary thing is raised to a unique height of excellence artistic expression,

v. the intended purport is communicated by the suggestive use of language,

vi. every thing is made to acquire altogether new features by the power of poet's inventive genius,

90 आम्लान्तसत्प्रेभस्त्रिनवविज्ञानविज्ञानितसदांसुबद्धतः।
अवलम्बितस्वभिलालनधारितविपूणणम्॥
भावस्थावस्थावायुन्यकङ्गाश्चार्थकृतकोऽशलः॥
सर्वदिकार्यक्षीरसंवैदुर्गृहः॥
अवचिर्बिनितस्वात्मनायसकारुङ्कः॥
विधवेंद्रनिष्ठ्यनिमाणात्मितिस्योपमः॥
यद्यक्रियापि वैचिकविषयवर्त्तत्वम्।
सौकृत्यपरिस्परत्वस्यद्वि वङ्ग विदीर्यते॥ ।Ibid., I-25-28

91 सोधितुद्वास्तवः वेन विद्वस्तवः दृष्टते।
खङ्गारराध्येनवे सुचिमण्ड्यनस्मः॥Ibid., I. 43
vii. the real nature of things pregnant with sentiments is augmented with novel beauty. 92

Thus, it is clear that these two mārgas are the two extreme styles; one is the simple and delicate while the other is elevated. S.K. De observes the distinction between these two mārgas: "Broadly speaking, the chief distinction between the Sukumāra and the Vicitra-mārga seems to be that in the former the kavi-kauśala is not āhārya (adventitious or artificial) because of the prominence given to the svabhaṇa of things, and consequently whatever ornamentation it possesses is effected with the least effort, while in the Vicitra-mārga, the vakrokti-vaiṣṇitya, by which is meant alaṅkāra-vicitrabhāva, predominates and the poetic effort is subordinated to this object. In the Sukumāra style the natural powers of the poet find an unhampered scope and result in a kind of heightened (sātiśaya) expression; while in the Vicitra style the art is chiefly decorative, and through it the bhaṇjiti-vaiṣṇitya attains a peculiar factitious charm. The dhvani (or

---

92 प्रतिभाप्रधानोऽऽस्मये यत् वर्णता।
शवालभिभयोषीर्तम् स्वरूपीय विभाव्यते।
अलक्कुशस्य कवयो यत्रालक्कुशगंगातर्म्।
आसन्तुम्भ निवर्जत्वं हारारंदेपिणेनब्यववत्।
यवयज्ञानोऽलेख वस्तु यत् तद्यतलम्।
उदित्वैविव्यवहाराण कार्यं कामिनी नीचते।
यत्रान्यायांवस्तु सर्वंनयैव यथानि च।
भाव्यते प्रतिभोलेखमहाकवेन महाकवेः।
प्रतीवा मन्त्र यत् बायांस्य निबध्यते।
वाव्यावावकवृतिः यथितिरिविद्रव्यकवितृ॥
स्वभावं ससासकृतो भावाभारं यत् वर्णे।
केन्द्राकृति वधिवेण वैधिक्यायोग्यवृहितता॥
परिस्कृतिः यस्यानां सा कायितिशयापिता॥
Ibid: II 34-35 and 38-42
pratiyamānatā as it is called) is an element in both; but in the former the rasa becomes an āṅga of the delineation of svabhāva, while in the latter the ornamentation is to be done in accordance with the underlying motives or rasa (rasākūta). In Kuntaka's opinion, the Vicitramārga, which is favoured by all good poets, is the more difficult of the two, demanding greater skill and maturity of treatment." The learned scholar keenly observed the distinction between the two mārgas, but he seems to have mistaken the idea of rasa in the Sukumāra-mārga as it is subordinate to the vastu-svabhāva. Kuntaka clearly states that vastu-svabhāva becomes vibhāva or stimulant of rasa and it is subordinate to rasa.

Kuntaka's concept of these two styles reminds one of the distinctions made by John Stuart Miller. "Miller distinguished poets into two classes: Poets who are born and poets who are made. Accordingly poetry is also distinguished into natural and cultivated. The former is 'feeling itself, employing thought only as the medium of its utterance' and very much corresponds to the poetry of the Sukumāra type where 'emotion dominates and the cultivated skill derived from the study is kept to the minimum'. Cultivated poetry, the result of culture is written with a distinct aim, where thought remains the conspicuous object, surrounded by a halo of feeling. It

93 S K De, Vakroktijīvīta, Intro, pp. XXXIV-XXXV
94 अत्र राशिद्वयकरणस्यावमविप्रमयो यदृ विभावदिरिलयेण संसाध्येताः ब्रजसतततथसंसिद्धसपनसमयप्रभुश्च पदार्थां सार्ववव्यवस्थवर्जनप्रग्रहये नैव स्थाज्ञाता प्रतिप्रवर्तने। त्रिवृत्रिक्ताः सुराग्नांश्चप्रभुष्क्षो चोक्तवेचतनयोगिनः श्रुत्तासदिसाधनसिद्धसतवश्च वर्षमानाः सरससहवाच्चाकारितामायान्ति
कानिधिरसपुष्पस्तः। Vakroktijīvīta, p 47
somewhat is paralleled by Kuntaka's *Vicitra-mārga* which is less spontaneous and more ornamented*.95

The *Madhyama-mārga* is an admixture of the two other mārgas; it is a happy blend of the two. And hence, here both the natural skill as well as the power of artistic ornamentation of the poet shine equally. The beauty which is derived from the two extreme styles of poetry vie with each other in this *Madhyama-mārga*. Thus it is equally attractive to all the refined readers. This is characterized as below:

"Where the two styles, viz. the 'elegant' with its natural beauty and the 'brilliant' with its decorative effect both come to be blended, where the whole host of qualities like 'sweetness' become grounded on the 'middling' mode of style so as to nourish a unique stylistic effect, we get the third style, pleasing all tastes, and containing the best of the both the other styles in competition as it were, which may be termed middling.*" 96

The *guṇas* or poetic qualities have been treated along with the mārgas. Each mārga has a group of four *guṇas* of the same name but with different characteristics. They are *mādhurya, prasāda, *

---

95 C Rajendran, *Studies in Comparative Poetics*, p 54
96 वैचिन्द्र सौकुमार्यः च यत्र सद्भूर्वतां गते।
प्रातंते सहजार्ह्योभावांतिशशाशालिनी।।
माधुर्यादिगुणाग्रामो वृत्तिमाखील मध्यभाव।
यत्र कामपि पुण्याति बन्यचायतिरिक्तताम।।
मार्गोऽसै मध्यमो नानारूढिचित्तमोहस।
स्पष्टया यत्र वर्तने मार्गात्तिलयस्यसम्मद।। Vakroktijivita, I 49-51
lavanya and abhijatyā. They are salient features of each mārga. Besides the group of four guṇas Kuntaka enumerates two other guṇas viz. aucitya and saubhāgya which are said to be present in all compositions. Thus the last two guṇas are common to all the three styles. Variations in poetic temperament and artistic skill yield different guṇas and the variation in guṇas is rooted in pratibhā itself.

Mādhurya or sweetness is the first and foremost guṇa of Sukumāra-mārga. It is vivified by the use of lovely and uncompounded expression. The expressions must be free from compounds and must be arranged in a way that they may serve to give delight to the readers' ear and mind. Prasāda or perspicuity is clarity of meaning. In this Sukumāra style, it brings out the poet's intended idea without any effort on the reader's part, and it is concerned with sentiments and artful speech. 'When even a little beauty in respect of alliterative syllables and in choice of diction results in the charm of syntax and contributes to the beauty of style, it is called lavanya or grace of Sukumāra-mārga. Ābhijatyā or classicality is very delicate and beautiful excellence of this style. It is smooth on the ear, and capable as it were of intimate embrace by thought and it is a naturally sparkling shade of loveliness.
In the *Vicitra-marga*, *mādhurya-guṇa* stands for avoiding looseness of structure and it becomes a means of producing compact beauty in diction.\(^{101}\) *Prasāda*, in this style, is meant for the use of un-compounded words with a slight touch of floridity.\(^{102}\) *Lāvanya* is a skill in arranging the syllables in a composition bringing charm to the words. "By words without elision of the final aspirates and in euphonic combination with each other, and by syllables which precede conjuncts, *lāvanya* or grace is enriched."\(^{103}\) *Ābhijātya* is a product of great artistic skill. Neither too harsh nor too soft syllables are used and thus bring charm in a composition.\(^{104}\)

In the *Madhyama-marga* the whole host of *guṇas* like *mādhurya* tend to subsist in the 'middling' style in a very spontaneous manner contributing to a colourful style on the one hand and strikingness of pattern on the other.\(^{105}\)

Besides the group of four *guṇas*, Kuntaka illustrates two other *guṇas* viz. *aucitya* and *saubhāgya* which are common to all the

\(^{101}\) Ibid., p. 44  
^{102}\) Ibid., p. 45-46  
^{103}\) Ibid., p. 47  
^{104}\) Ibid., p. 48  
^{105}\) Ibid., p. 65
mārgas. Aucitya or propriety is the striking expression in which the excellence of an object is rightly depicted. In poetry, the ideas introduced must be appropriate to the character or theme or rasa. It is defined: "That quality is known as 'propriety' by virtue of which the poetic subject gains in value in a most lucid manner; in fact it may be regarded as the vital essence of all poetic description."106

Further, Kuntaka notices another important facet of aucitya i.e., decorum. He observes: "An instance wherein the matter on hand is concealed as it were by reason of the exquisitely charming nature of either the speaker or the listener, also deserves being regarded as an example of propriety."107 Thus, Kuntaka treats aucitya as an all encompassing quality in poetry. The Dhvani theorists judge the importance of aucitya in connection with rasa. They frame some binding rules for the observance of aucitya. Any violation of the rule of aucitya give rise to violation of rasa.108

Saubhāgya-guṇa is the fruit of dynamic imagination and causes delight of refined readers.109 It is further defined thus: "In the wide-ranging material before the poet, that which is pitched upon by the genius of the poet for its activity endows the whole with the quality of 'splendour'. It is something attained by the full co-operation of

106. आँग्लीसेंन स्वभाववस्य महत्वं चेतें पोष्यते।
प्रकारण तद्विद्वितिमुसमितास्यन्नीविशत्।। Ibīd., I. 53

107. वत्र बक्कुः प्रमातुयाय वाच्यं श्रोभावतिशाविना।
आच्छादःत्वमेव स्वभावाय तद्विद्वितिमुस्य।। Ibīd., I 54

108 अनौचित्यादेशे नान्यद्वसमकस्त्व कारणम्।
प्रसिद्धिविशेषस्य ससौपसिद्धस्य।। Dhvanyāloka, p.138.

109 सौभाग्यं प्रतिभासर्म्भांवस्तूं चेतनचलकारित्वलक्षणम्। Vakroktijīvita, p. 39
all the constituent elements and it is something which surely results in an extra-ordinary aesthetic effect in the mind of connoisseurs; in short it is the whole and sole essence of poetry.\textsuperscript{110} Thus, these two literary qualities viz. \textit{aucitya} and \textit{saubhāgya} are very appealing in all the three styles and they permeate extensively all the three elements of poetry viz. word, sentence and the work as a whole.

Kuntaka thus treated the concepts of \textit{rīti} and \textit{guna} in a novel way; not only his \textit{mārgas} are original but the \textit{gunas} of the three \textit{mārgas} too. The early theorists have treated \textit{gunas} in connection with word and sense in a general way. And the \textit{Dhvani} theorists do not entertain the idea of \textit{rīti} in poetry. Ānandavardhana does not admit \textit{rīti}, but he admits another poetic factor called \textit{saṅghatana} or texture which is based on the formation of compounds. He treats three \textit{gunas} viz. \textit{mādhurya}, \textit{ojas} and \textit{prasāda} and considered them as \textit{rasadharmas}. Abhinavagupta observes that \textit{rītis} resolve finally into \textit{gunas} and the \textit{gunas} are intrinsic features of \textit{rasa}. Thus \textit{rītis} ultimately merge into \textit{rasa}.\textsuperscript{111}

Therefore it would be clear that the concepts of \textit{rīti} and \textit{guna}, in Sanskrit poetics, have different connotations. Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy rightly observes: "The most confusing chapter in the history of \textit{Alaṅkāraśāstra}, if I might say so, is the one on \textit{rīti} and \textit{guna}. There is wide divergence of opinion from the writer to writer not only on..."

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Ibid.}, I 55
\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Locana}, p 290
the nature but also on the number of literary gunas. I am not even quite sure whether they mean 'excellence' or 'quality' by that term. When it comes in juxtaposition to doṣas, it is possible that they mean 'excellences'. But when they are described as rasadharmas they appear to mean qualities."112

Kuntaka enumerates mārgas and their gunas on the basis of kavi-svabhāva or poet's temperament. The gunas belong to mārgas in their broad spectrum. And they do not characterize merely words, but they relate to word, sentence and the work as a whole.113 For Kuntaka, kavi-svabhāva alone furnishes the criterion for literary styles. In this respect Abhinavagupta's observation is highly remarkable. He says that the gunas are concretized in the initial stage of activated imagination. It is only that poet who is gifted with creative imagination, is capable of composing the gunas or delineating the rasas.114

Kuntaka finally insists that only a broad direction of the triple styles could be indicated here. Infact, no one would venture to recount exhaustively every individual instance of the infinite forms of the art of great poets. Thus the refined readers could exercise

112 Quoted by Dr. Mahesh Adkoli, *Concept of Aucitya in Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 89
113 भारतेपुरुष गुणानां समुद्रविधानम्। वधा न केवल ज्ञानदिग्दिसमन्दिरं तथा तत्तलस्माणवाक्याक्षरं एवं प्रतिपद्दितम्।
   *Vakroktijīvita*, p 66
114 कल्याणे प्रतिबाध्यम प्रधमपरिसमन्द तुद्वापराभोजनं गुणाः, प्रतिभावत एवं हि सामांवज्ञाननमा सम्मधर्म, नामावदघुरिनिनवनसान्तर्यमू।। Abhinavabhāratī, p. 296
their judgement in each individual case. Kālidāsa's poetry represents *Sukumāra-mārga* while Bāna, Bhavabhūti and Rājaśekhara are cited as representatives of *Vicitra-mārga*. Mātrgupta and others typify the *Madhyama-mārga*. Though Kuntaka's approach to literary styles is acceptable and nearer to modern criticism, his theory is completely neglected in later Sanskrit poetics.

V. Vakrokti and Rasa

In Sanskrit poetics, 'rasa' is the most significant and pivotal concept. *Rasa* is the first and foremost aesthetic canon. It is the greatest secret, the governing principle and the vital essence of literary

115. तत्साथः सहमैव सर्वत्र सर्वनन्दसत्तत्वम्। एवं माखकश्चिन्तकान्तं दिख्मात्रिच्छस्तं सर्वम्। न पुनः साक्तौ न सक्ष्रिय श्रवावहस्तं। पतिते। *Op. Cit.*, p 66

Similar is the view of Dandin also

cf

अस्तयंकृषहः गिरां मार्गं सूचितमेधम परस्पराम्।
तत्र वैद्यं गीतों वर्णं प्रस्तुतं प्रशस्तान्तरी।।
&
इति मार्गं धिश तत्त्वं रत्नतिनिर्भयं।
तत्र शक्यते वर्णं प्रतिवेद्य स्थिताः।।
इश्वरणुपवेदीमां मधुरवस्यान्नरमहात।
तत्वापि न तदवत्तं सरस्वतविश्व शक्यते।।
*Kavyādāra*, I. 43 & 101-102

116 Cf "But while individuality is not to be classified, it may be said that there are, in general, two opposite tendencies in personal expression: on the one hand to clearness and precision, on the other to largeness and profusion. The difference between the two may be seen by comparing such poetry as that of Matthew Arnold with that of Tennyson or such prose as that of Newman with that of Jeremy Taylor. Minds of one class insist on sharply divided ideas, on clearness of image, on temperance, and precision of epithet. Their style we characterize as chaste or classic. The other class have a great volume of thought, but less well defined, more fervour and less temperance of feeling, more abundant and vivid imagery, more wealth of colour, but less sharpness of definition. The one makes upon you the impression of greater delicacy, temperance, charm; the other, the impression of greater mass, complexity, power. We are not called upon to pronounce either manner absolutely better than the other." Winchester

Quoted by V. Raghavan, *Some Concepts of Alankārasāstra*, p. 180
art. Rasa initially inspires the poet into creativity and ultimately ensures the aesthetic experience of the man of taste. The concept of rasa is introduced by Bharata and then developed by the later theorists.

The term 'rasa' has multi-dimensional implications in Sanskrit literature. As far as its poetic implication is concerned, the nature and meaning of rasa is very complex. "Rasa is one of those words in Sanskrit whose precise significance is as indefinite as its usage is wide-spread. In the history of Sanskrit poetics, perhaps no other concept has give rise to so much controversy. Even Jagannātha, the redoubtable author of Rasagaṅgādhara, who tries to review in detail the diverse shades of expert opinion centring round Rasa, is driven to confess at the end that the only common point that emerges is, Rasa is felt as that which is invariably connected with the highest joy and partaking of beauty in the world."\(^{118}\)

In the context of poetics, the term rasa comprehends two major ideas viz. the object of aesthetic relish and the aesthetic experience itself. According to objective interpretation of the term, rasa is the

---

117 In the history of Sanskrit literature one can trace five major dimensions of the concept of rasa:
- i. The philosophical dimension as found in the Upanisads which speak Rasa as identical with Brahman
- ii. Rasa is one of the qualities as found in the Nyāya-Vaiśesika systems
- iii. Rasa found in the Āyurveda
- iv. The aesthetic implications as found in the poetics
- v. The religious implications of Rasa as found in the Bhakti movement

118 K. Krishnamoorthy, Essays in Sanskrit Criticism, p. 74
relishable quality inherent in artistic work. Every work is supposed to treat an emotive theme and communicate a distinct emotional mood. In this sense *rasa* denotes all types of *cittavṛtti* or emotions. In its subjective interpretation *rasa* stands for 'the emotional experience of beauty' or 'integral aesthetic experience' or 'delectable subjective condition of impersonalized enjoyment'. Thus *rasa* is an absolute, ecstatic ephemeral experience.

Let us proceed to observe the status of *rasa* in *vakrokti* synthesis. Kuntaka was the first to include the idea of *rasa* in the definition of poetry. He defines poetry as the activity of the poet aimed at aesthetic delight to the refined reader. For him poetry should have two qualities viz. artistic activity of a poet and capacity to produce aesthetic delight. The peculiar usage of the term *tadvit-āhlāda* connotes the idea of *rasa-experience*. In other place, Kuntaka clearly states that *tadvit* or *sahṛdaya* means *rasādiparamārthajñāna*. He frequently used the terms like *āhlāda*, *vaicitrya*, *lokottara-camatkāra* and *vakratva*.

119. cf साहित्य दर्पण, तद्भाषा भाषा प्रशासकारी। सन्निधिः शब्दप्रेम चैति सर्वेखि रसनाइतः। Sāhityadarpana, III 529
120 P V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, p 351
121 M. Hiriyanna, *Art Experience*, p. 46
122 S K. De, *Some Problems of Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 114
123 श्रवणानैः साहित्य वक्रकविव्यपारसालिनि। वनचे व्यवस्थिती काव्यं तत्त्वद्वाहायकारिणः। Vakroktijivita, I. 7
124 cf साहित्यार्थ मनस्संवाहनम्। सत्यम् श्रवणात्वं। तद्विन्ध्राह्पणः तत्वाद्योऽधिपः गृहद्वान्। तेषा परमार्थं परस्त्रयं त्वजानति। इति तत्त्वात्त्विदिष्टेषां मनससंवाहोः हृदयसंबेद्यां स्वानुभवगोचरत्या। प्रतिवासः। Ibid, p 46
as the interchangeable words which obviously connote the idea of *rasa-experience*. And, it is stated that the foremost purpose of poetry is the immediate sense of delight which is equated with the experience of nectar. Thus it would be clear that Kuntaka is well aware of the fact that the ultimate aim of poetry is aesthetic experience.

While dealing with *prakaraṇa-vakrata*, Kuntaka states that 'the words of great poets come to life only when they contain incidents which are bubbling with *rasas*; not when they merely follow the story as found in the source'. It is also stated that the beauty of episode exercise unique appeal (*rasanisyandini*) to the readers in the works of master poets. The fourth chapter of the *Vakroktijīvita* is

---

125 cf "After Abhinavagupta the two meanings have been confounded so often that it is difficult to determine what exactly is meant by any writer in a given context. But Kuntaka is blissfully free from this ambiguity. He restricts his usage of the word *rasa* to the first meaning only unlike post-Abhinavagupta writers. He invariably uses other words like *āhāla* to mean the second. But he is second to none in his insistence on a sensitive literary taste in the readers and always describes them with epithets like *sahrdaya* or *tadvat"* K Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvita, Intro*, p XXXVIII

126 cf Anandavardhana's dictum:

127 *Dhvanyāloka*, p 144

128 cf *Op cit.* p 248
completely dedicated for the treatment of plot construction and the proper arrangements of episodes with a view to *rasa.*

Again, Kuntaka agrees with Ānandavardhana on the point that the ruling sentiments of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* are Karuṇa and Śānta respectively. He rejects Udbhāta's theory of 'rasa-by its designation (svaśabdavācyā)' and says that *rasa* can only be experienced. He clearly states that *rasavattā* is the distinguished quality of poetry and hence that must be present in one and all. And, it is strongly held that *rasa* is always *alaṅkārya* and that never become *alaṅkāra.* Thus, the observation is enough to show that Kuntaka recognized *rasa* as the supreme canon of poetry.

For Kuntaka, the poetic content is two-fold viz. *svabhāva* and *rasa.* Though the two heads are given independently, the former, when properly accomplished, becomes a direct partaker and promoter of the latter i.e., *rasa.* Thus *svabhāva* etc., are *vibhāvas* or means towards the achievement of *rasa.* Further on, the poetic content is

---
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divided into sentient and non-sentient. The sentient group is again divided into two heads viz., primary sentients like gods, human beings etc., and secondary sentients like animals, birds and so on. The primary sentients are made beautiful by a spontaneous presentation of emotions. On the other hand, the secondary sentients and non-sentients are described in such a way as to promote the rise of rasas.\(^\text{134}\)

It is to be noted that, though Kuntaka give importance to alaṅkāras, his recognition of rasa is not subordinate to them. It is clearly stated that alaṅkāras like rūpaka should be employed with propriety and they should not spoil the beauty of rasa or the delicacy of natural description.\(^\text{135}\) Thus, Kuntaka's ideas towards rasa are not opposed to that of Dhvani theorists. Therefore the following observation of S.K. De seems to be inaccurate. He writes: "From the prominence thus given to the analysis of alaṅkāra, it will be clear that Kuntaka could not put enough emphasis on rasa and bhāva as elements of poetry. The rasa is dealt with topically in connection with the poetic figures of the different mārgas in which it is involved, as also in the treatment of prakaraṇa-prabandha-vakratā. Kuntaka admits the necessity of rasa, but regards its delineation apparently as a special

\(^{134}\) Vide, Vakroktijīvita, pp 126-29
kind of realizing vakratva in a composition. He admits that it is not the mere matter or plot but the beauty imparted to it by the continuous development of rasa which can make the words of a poet live, and in this he follows the dictum of Ānandavardhana; but as he had already accepted the essentiality of vakrokti, the rasa could be comprehended only as an element of vakrokti."136

First of all, it is not proper to think that Kuntaka could not put enough emphasis to rasa and bhāva. Secondly, it is a mistake to think that rasa is only an element of vakrokti or Kuntaka includes rasa in different varieties of vakrokti.137 As observed earlier, rasa has got the supreme status in vakrokti synthesis too. It is obvious that Kuntaka does not include rasa in the varieties of vakrokti, but he shows how different varieties of vakrokti help to delineate rasa.138 Out of countless types of vakrokti, he says, even one type is enough to contribute to the aesthetic experience of readers.139

As observed earlier, the term āhlāda or vaicitrya or camatkāra is used to connote the aesthetic experience of a reader, and the word rasa is used in the sense of different sentiments which denotes the

---

136. S K De, Vakroktivīta, Intro, p. XXXVI
137 Following De, Hemalata Deshpande also observes "Thus Kuntaka includes rasa in the varieties of vakratā, considering rasa as a vastu (or itivṛttā)" Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka, p 242
138. cf रसादिविद्वंसंस्मृतिनिपातयोः।
बाबार्तविद्वंसिसंस्मृतिनिपातयोः। | Vakroktivīta, II. 33
रसादिविद्वंसंस्मृतिनिपातयोः। | Vakroktivīta, II. 33
एवलब विद्वंसिसंस्मृतिनिपातयोः। यस्मादमनवत्ततः परिपूर्णविद्वंसिसंस्मृतिनिपातयोः। | Ibid., p 106
क्रियासाधारे क्रियापरिपूर्णविद्वंसिसंस्मृतिनिपातयोः। क्रियासाधारे क्रियापूर्णविद्वंसिसंस्मृतिनिपातयोः। | Ibid., p 98
139 वक्रतायाय प्रकाशयात्मकोऽपि क्रियाविशेषणाः।
तद्विधास्त्रादविद्वंसिसंस्मृतिनिपातयोः। | Ibid., p. 122
object of aesthetic relish. Thus Kuntaka's treatment of *rasa* is subjective as well as objective. Dr. Krishnamoorthy observes: "Kuntaka is also aware that in the spectrum of meanings of the word *rasa* this meaning (reader's experience) as well as the meaning of the tasteful liquid drink are included. But he never confuses them in his usage, he keeps them strictly apart as they deserve to be. Kuntaka is the only writer who does not obfuscate the issue while talking of *rasa* and clarifies the position very pointedly and penetratingly. He realizes fully that the presence or manifestation of *rasa* as \( ala\'k\'aryak\'avy\'arthasa \) is possible only by way of its \( vibh\'avadisa \) or invariable antecedents, consequents and accessories, which are associated with the characters in the poetic work, and not with the subjective mental states or emotions of the poet himself, except when he happens to write in the lyrical vein in the first person. Even there the generalizing \( pratibh\'a \) is active and the question of private emotion is ruled out. In poetry we are concerned with *rasa* and its associates as verbally embodied. It is in the nature of *rasa* to condition a sympathetic response in the readers, making them feel as if they are themselves undergoing the emotional experience." 140

Then it may be asked what is the relation between *vakrokti* and *rasa*. *Vakrokti* is regarded as the life of poetry on the one hand, and *rasa* is said to be the supreme principle on the other. Is it not a contradiction? Dr. Nagendra states that, for Kuntaka, poetry is *vakrokti* or an artistic activity. To achieve this poetic art, a poet has to use various grandeurs of word and meaning. Among the magnificences of

140. K. Krishnamoorthy, *Indian Literary Theories*, p 219
meaning, *rasa* is most important one. It means that, *rasa* is the supreme principle of poetic art or *vakrokti*. Therefore, *vakrokti* is the life-essence of poetry and the wealth of *rasa* is the main source of *vakrata*.\(^{141}\) On the other hand, Hema Atmanathan opines that, Kuntaka nowhere used the word *jīvita* in the sense of *ātma* or soul. Thus what relation lies between life and soul is the relation between *vakrokti* and *rasa*. Therefore *vakrokti* is *jīvita* and *rasa* is *ātma* of poetry.\(^{142}\)

Both the views of Nagendra and Hema Atmanathan are acceptable. But there is another possible better conclusion. It is observed in the first chapter itself, that *vakrokti* is means and the aesthetic experience is the end of poetry. In no uncertain terms Kuntaka has clarified the arcanum of poetry in his very definition of poetry itself. Inclusion of the two phrases - *vakra-kavi-vyāpāra* (*vakrokti*) and *tadvidāhlāda* (*rasa*) in the definition makes him 'different', more a synthesizer preferably, in the midst of our Ālaṅkārikas who uphold either of the two in their definitions of poetry. Kuntaka visualizes the poetic activity in its totality for, if the former phrase *vakra-kavi-vyāpāra* unveils the creative phase of the poet, the latter one, i.e. *tadvidāhlāda* suggests the re-creative phase making the art complete. Therefore, the proper presentation of *vibhāva* etc., through the medium of *vakrokti* leads to the delineation of *rasa*. In other words, *rasa* will be manifested by

---

\(^{141}\) Dr Nagendra, *Rasa Siddhānta* (Hindi), Kannada translation by Dr. Pradhan Gurudatta, pp 74-75

\(^{142}\) "इस संदर्भ में यह भी ध्यात्म है कि कुन्तक ने वक्रोक्तिजीवित प्रश्न में कहीं भी वक्रोक्ति को काव्य को आत्मा नहीं कहा है और 'जीवित' प्रश्न का प्रयोग भी 'आत्मा'अर्थ में नहीं किया है; .... जब शरीर में प्राणजीवित ही नहीं रहेगी, शरीर असतिल्लिह्न अर्थात् निर्जीव रहेगा, तो उसमें निहित आत्मा कैसे प्रकाशित हो सकता है?" ...... वक्रोक्ति काव्य का प्राण (जीवित) है और, रस अथवा तद्वद्वाल्कलकित काव्य की आत्मा है।" - हेमा आत्मनाथन, अल्पकुस्तिकाश्च में आचार्य कुन्तक की वेदन, pp 193-94
the way of *vakrokti* or *kavi-vyāpāra*. At the very outset of the *Vakraktijīvita* it is clearly stated that 'since poetry is a source of delight, through its charm of *rasa*, not only at the time of reading but also in the long run, it shall be made the subject of our enquiry'.

Thus *vakrokti* is the result of Kuntaka's enquiry. In other place, Kuntaka states that *kavi-kauśala* or *vakrokti* is the reason in the delineation of *rasa*. Thus, it would be clear that *vakrokti* is the cause to achieve the ultimate end of poetry i.e., *rasa*.

---

143 *Vakraktijīvita*, p. 5

144 *Vakraktijīvita*, p. 137

*Vakraktijīvita*, p. 5

*Vakraktijīvita*, p. 137