CHAPTER-IV

KUNTAKA’S VIEWS ON RASAVAT AND ALLIED ALAÑKĀRAS

Kuntaka the exponent of Vakrokti theory does not accept Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras in the form in which they are formulated by Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhāṭa. Nor does he accept the stand of the Dhīvanivādins on Rasādyalaṅkāras. He rejects the view that Rasa, etc., are Alaṅkāras and says that they constitute the Alaṅkārya aspect of poetry. Then he gives his stand on Rasavat and other Alaṅkārs of its group. His view on Rasavat is first discussed here.

1. Rasavadalaṅkāra :

Kuntaka is of the opinion that Rasavat can not be regarded as an Alaṅkāra in the same way as Svabhāvokti.

"Alaṅkāro na rasavat parasyāpratibhāsanāt !
Svarūpadatiriktasya ṣabdārthāsaṅgaterapi \( ^{167} \)"

"Rasavat" is not an adornment because there is nothing palpable apart from it which is adorned by it, and because the literal meaning of that word itself is contradicted.”
It is argued here that Rasavat is not an Alāṅkāra because there is nothing apart from it which is adorned by it and because the meaning of the word itself is incompatible. It can not be argued that it adorns itself because that would call forth the argument adduced in the context of Svabhāvokti as:

"Sarīram cedalaṅkāraḥ kimālaṅkurute param!

Ātmaiva nātmanaḥ skandhaṁ kvacidapyadhrohati //"¹⁶⁸

"If the body itself should be reckoned as ornament, what would be the other thing which it can adorn at all? Never does one climb upon one's own shoulder."

Thus Kuntaka advances two arguments against accepting Rasavat as an Alāṅkāra. Firstly, Rasavat can not be an Alāṅkāra because it is not possible to show an Alāṅkārya apart from it which it can adorn. Secondly, the very term Rasavat is incompatible with its meaning as an Alāṅkāra. The first argument is already presented above. Here, the second argument is taken up for discussion. It pertains to the name Rasavat itself:

(i) The word Rasavadalaṅkāra is not compatible with its meaning. The term can be explained in two ways:
(a) Rasavat is one which is the repository of Rasa. The Alāṅkāra of that Rasavat is Rasavadalaṅkāra. In this sense the Rasavat is the Kāvya itself and the Alāṅkāra of that Rasavat Kāvya is Rasavadalaṅkara. This is possessive compound (Śaṣṭhītātpuruṣa Samāsa).169

(b) That which is the repository of Rasa and at the same time an Alāṅkāra is Rasavadalaṅkāra. This is adjectival compound (Viśesāṇa Samāsa or Karmadhāraya Samāsa).170

If the first compound is accepted, it should be asked as to what other substance remains to be considered as something to be adorned by that Alāṅkāra. If it is said that the substance to be adorned is the Kāvya itself, another question shoots up as to what is that apart from Kāvya which has the scope of being named as Rasavadalaṅkāra. Really speaking there is no such thing as different from Rasavat of which it can be affirmed as the Alāṅkāra.

"Tatra purvasmin pakṣe rasavyatiriktaṁ kimanyat padarthāntarāṁ vidyate yasyāsau alaṅkāraḥ? Kāvyameveti cet, tatrāpi tadvyatiriktaḥ kośau padarthaḥ yat ra rasavadalaṅkārasyapadeśaḥ sāvakāsatāṁ pratipadyate? Viśesātiriktaḥ padārtho na kaścit paridrṣyaṁ yastadvāṅalaṅkāra iti vyavasthitimāsadayaṁ!"171
"In the first alternative the question remains to be answered, 'what matter is involved therein over and above the Rasa in question? If the reply is that it is the poem only, even then the question of finding something other than that to locate the existence of Rasa remains unanswered. Since no such second entity is noticeable anywhere, one cannot affirm any AlankaRa like Rasavat in relation to a non-existing entity."

Thus there is an inherent discrepancy between the term and its meaning if one follows the definition of Rasavadalankara given by the early rhetoricians like Bhamaha, Danjin, etc. This is explained below.

(ii) The term Rasavadalankara could be understood on the analogy of the expression 'Agniṣṭomayājī putro bhavitā', (he will have a son who will become a performer of the Agniṣṭoma sacrifice). On this analogy, the Kāvyā, having first become endowed with Rasa, comes to have the name Rasavat; then the AlankaRa of that is called Rasavadalaṅkāra. The analogy does not hold good because in other persons who had performed Agniṣṭoma, the expression 'Agniṣṭomayājin' had already become well established; while in the present case, the Kāvyā becoming Rasavat is itself dependent on the AlankaRa. Here the flaw of mutual dependence vitiates this explanation. The figure becomes
Rasavat only because it decorates a composition endowed with Rasa and later gets the name Rasavat because of the presence of Rasa.

"Yasmād 'agniṣṭomayājīś abdaḥ pr athamaṃ bhūtalakṣaṇe viṣayāntare nispratipakṣataya samāsāditaprasiddhiḥ paścād bhaviṣyati vākyārthasambandhalakṣaṇayogyataya tamanubhavitum śaknoti / Na punaratraiva prayuṇjate / Yasmād rasavataḥ kāvyasyālaṅkāra iti tatsambandhitayaivasya svarūpalabdhiṃ vā / Tatsambandhinibandhānām ca kāvyasya rasavattvamityevam itotētarāśryalakṣaṇadosaḥ kenāpasāryate /"¹⁷²

"Because in the case of the expression 'the performer of Agniṣṭoma sacrifice', it first communicates indisputably and universally the sense of a person who has successfully performed the sacrifice in the past; then at a later stage it comes to be associated with the sense of a person yet to perform it in future only because of its compatible syntactic relation. But such is not the case in the present usage. The moment we say Alaṅkāra of a poem having Rasa, since the two are mutually involved, we need not go beyond the adorned to anything like an adornment. And if the Rasavattva of a poem is dependent on Alaṅkāra and if its Alahkaratva is dependent on Rasa, who can avoid the glaring fallacy of mutual interdependence?"
(iii) There is of course the simple explanation 'the Alaṅkāra that has Rasa': 'Raso vidyate yasya, asau rasavān alaṅkāraḥ I' But the primary objection that there are two wellknown entities as Kāvyā (from which Rasa is not to be separated) and Alaṅkāra and that there is no third extra element at all, i.e., no third extra element at all, stands against this also.

"Kīm ca rasavataḥ kāvyasya alaṅkāra iti tathāvidhasya satastasya asau iti na kiṁcidanena tasyābhidheyāṁ syāt /"\(^{173}\)

The word Rasavat, according to Kuntaka reveals its own nature. It is not possible to distinguish between Alaṅkāra and Alaṅkārya in the expression or poem with Rasavat Alaṅkāra. Rasa is always Alaṅkārya which should be ornamented by other Alaṅkāras and thus, itself cannot be both Alaṅkārya and Alaṅkāra.

T.S. Nandi remarks:-"Kuntaka ultimately accepts the case of Rasavat, Preyas etc., as Alaṅkāras but only as Pratīyamāna or implied."\(^{174}\)

Here the learned writer is wrong, for, Kuntaka accepts them only as Alaṅkāya and never as Alaṅkāra.
CRITICISM OF EARLIER DEFINITIONS OF RASAVAT

Kuntaka criticises the definitions of Rasavat given by early Ālāṅkārikas and is particularly hard on Udbhāta for having said that the sentiments should be there specified by their own names. He does not also agree with the definition of Rasavadalaṅkāra given by Ānandavardhana.

Firstly, he refers to the definition of Rasavat given by Bhāmaha. He quotes this definition with the preamble that earlier Ālāṅkārikas have not clearly distinguished between what is Alāṅkārya and what is Alāṅkāra. Bhāmaha says -

'Rasavaddarśitaspaśtaśṛṅgārādīrasam'\textsuperscript{175}

"Rasavat consists in the clear manifestation of Rasa such as Śṛṅgāra." Here Kuntaka, poses a significant question. If the compound is taken to mean 'that in which Śṛṅgāra, etc., are clearly manifested', then what does it refer to other than Kāvyā itself? If it is contended that this Alāṅkāra is Kāvyā itself then it does not stand to reason, because to say that there are separate Alāṅkaras of Śabda and Artha and to consider at the same time that Kāvyā itself is the Alāṅkāra would amount to incompatibility between what is stated in the beginning and what is stated later.
"Atra darśitāḥ spr̥ṭāḥ spaṣṭāḥ vā śṛṅgārādayo yatreti vyākhyaṇe kāvyavyatirikto na kaścidanyāḥ samāsārthabhūtaḥ saṃlakṣate / Yo’sāvalaḥkāraḥ kāvyameveti cet tadapi na suspaṣṭa saṁsthavam / Yasmāt kāvyāikadeśayoh ṣabdārthayoh prthak prthagalaḥkāraḥ santīti upakramyedānīm kāvyameva alaṅkaraṇamiti upakramopasaṁhāra-vaiśamyaduṣṭatvamāyāti"\(^{176}\)

"There is also a variant-reading Spr̥ṭa (touched upon) in place of Spaṣṭa (manifested clearly). Whatever the reading we take, if one were to interpret it as a possessive compound, there will be no entity other than the poem signified by the compound. Even if one were to take it as an adjectival compound, identifying the adornment with the poem itself, it will not solve the difficulty. For once having started with the postulate that the constituent elements of poetry are word and content and both of them have their own adornments, it is not justifiable that one should conclude that poetry itself is adornment; it involves the fallacy of contradiction in terms."

In order to escape from this difficulty if it is suggested that the compound can be taken as ‘that by which Rasas such as Śṛṅgāra are clearly manifested’, then it would be asked as to what that amounts to. If it is contended that it refers to the special mode of communication, then it is difficult to maintain such a stand because the special mode
of communication which gives rise to charm should be
different from what is communicated, but not the same as
what is communicated. If it is still argued that the special
mode of communication is itself the clear manifestation of
Rasas, even that does not stand to reason, because when the
Rasas such as Śṛṅgāra are clearly manifested it culminates
in the manifestation of the Rasas in their own form.

"Yadi vā darśitāḥ spaṭṭām śṛṅgāradayo yeneti samāsah,
tathāpi vaktavyameva-kośaviti / Pratipādanavaicitryameveti cet,
tadapi na samyak samarthanārham / Yasmāt pratipādyamānādanyadeva
tadupāśobhāc nibandhanam pratipādanavaicitryam, na punaḥ
pratipādyamānāmeva / Spaṭṭatayā darśitām rasānām
pratipādanavaicitryam yadyabhidhiyate, tadapi na supratipādanam
/ Spaṭṭatyā darśane śṛṅgārādīnām svarūpapariniśpatīreva
paryavasyati /" 177

"The compound word may perhaps be dissolved as 'that
by whose agency the sentiments like erotic are clearly
presented.' Even then the question remains to be answered-
'What is that?' If the answer should be that it is the beauty
of presentation itself, once again the position cannot be
justified. For, the beauty of presentation governing the
type of resultant beauty, has perforce to be different from
the matter described. It can by no means be identical with the
matter presented itself."
Kuntaka then cites the definition:

'\text{Rasavadrasasam\textasciicircumrayat} /'

which is a different reading of better known

'\text{Rasavadrasasap\textasciicircumalam} /'

in Daṇḍin's \text{Kāvyādarśa}.\textsuperscript{178} This is clear from what Kuntaka says immediately after this:

"\text{Rasapesalam iti paṭhe na kiñcid atra atiricyate} /

In either reading, Daṇḍin's definition of Rasavat is said to be refuted by the same arguments applied in the case of Bhāmaha's definition.

"\text{Atha vastusvabhāvariśadipratipādakavākyopārūdha-}
\text{padārthasārthasvarūpamalāṅkāryaṁ rasasvarūpānupraveśena}
\text{vigalitasvaparīsanānāṁ dravyāṅgāṁ iva kathamalaṅkaraṇaṁ}
\text{bhavatītīpyetadapi cintyameva} /

"We know that the adorned consists of group of words arranged in a sentence and describing either facts of nature or Rasa etc. The entry of Rasa in its pure form can never be regarded as an adornment without depriving it of its true nature, just as material (like gold) can never become an ornament unless its form is changed."

An explanation can be offered at this stage on behalf of the old view that when the things in the subject-matter of
Kāvyā are described with Rasas, the Rasa envelops the things and other matter-of-fact characteristics of things slip away or recede into the background. But whether the delineation of Rasa could be taken as an adornment (Alaṅkāra) is open to question.

Then Kuntaka cites the following line from Udbhata’s definition of Rasavat-

"SvaśabdasthāyisaṅcārīvibhāvābhīnayāsPadam /"^{180}

Here the criticism of Svaśabdavācyatva of Rasa, etc., on the lines of Anandavardhana is the only additional matter. The criticism takes the form of a taunt. Kuntaka puts two alternatives before Udbhata:

(1) Do Rasas admit of being designated by their names?

(2) Or, does the poem having Rasas admit of being so designated?

If the first alternative is accepted, then the difficulty is that Rasas are those that are relished and they are contained in their designations such as Ārghāra, etc. In that case it should be admitted that when words denoting Rasas are mentioned, they should start yeiding aesthetic
delight in the hearts of the Sahṛdayas. This is as ridiculous as saying that on hearing the name of a sweet dish one should get the taste of that dish. Thus Kuntaka finds fault with the Svāsabdvācyatva of Rasa, etc. The second alternative also is attacked on the ground that the Kāvyā can not be called as Śṛṅgāra, etc., when it is shown that the aesthetic experience of love, etc., can not be regarded as denoted by the word Śṛṅgāra, etc.

“Yat svāsabdairabhīyamāṇah śrutipathamavatantarantaścetanānāṁ
carvaṇacamatkārāṁ kurvantītyanena nyāyena ghṛtapūraprabhītayaḥ
padārthāḥ svāsabdairabhidhiyamāṇaḥ tadāsvādasāmpadaṁ
samādayanti!"¹⁸¹

“When words denoting Rasas are mentioned, as soon as they fall on the ears of sentients, they should start yeilding aesthetic delight. By the same token, words like a ‘ghee-dish’, as soon as they are uttered, should be enough to produce the taste of that dish.”

Having argued thus against the old conception of Rasavadalaṅkāra, Kuntaka proceeds to show that Ānandavardhana’s conception of it is also not justifiable. His definition of Rasavat is respectfully shelved aside and interpreted differently. He introduces Ānandavardhana’s
definition of Rasavadalanka(on or Rasadyalaṅkāra), explains it, reproduces his illustration "Kṣipto hastāvalagnah" etc., and then offers his criticism.

The points made by Ānandavardhana in his gloss on the above verse, illustrating the second (Sāṅkīrṇa) variety of his Rasavadalanka are:

1. The supreme prowess of Śiva, the destroyer of Tripuras, is the main import.

2. Iṛṣyā-vipralambharasa is used as an accessory to embellish the main theme.

3. This Rasa is mixed with the Alanka called Śleṣa.

A forth point made by Ānandavardhana is that there is also a second Rasa here, viz., Karuṇa, and although the two Rasas Iṛṣyā-vipralambha and Karuṇa are opposed to each other, they are perfectly in order here, as they are both subordinate to the third factor in the form of the main theme, just as two mutually-opposed persons remain quiet and even in a helpful role under a common master.

Kuntaka addresses himself only to Ānandavardhana's interpretation of this verse. First he says that the imagery of love and that of the destructive fire are mutually-opposed in nature and merely by force of being brought into
the same expression, they can not be identified. Word (śabda) is not that powerful to make us enjoy two contradictory things and that flaw can not be obviated by saying that they are both subordinated to Śiva's prowess. On the other illustration of Ānandavardhana, viz., 'Kīm hāsyena' Kuntaka has a longer discussion but only about the interpretation of Rasas in the verse, as in the case of illustration 'Kṣipto hastāvalagnah', etc. This discussion of course involves the question as to how the Rasas are made Āṅgas and how they thus become Alaṅkāras. He criticises Ānandavardhana for giving Rasa a subordinate position in the Rasavadaṅkāra. Rasa is always predominant and it can never be subordinate to any other matter. It can not have a double-position as the Āṅkārya and Alaṅkāra. Ānandavardhana's treatment of Rasa in Rasavadaṅkāra as a Guṇibhūtavyaṅga Kāvyya is a self-contradiction in view of the highest position given to Rasadhvani as the soul of poetry in his theory of Dh vānī. Thus Kuntaka has pointed out the mistake and has tried to correct the same in his own way.

Lastly Kuntaka makes a point against Ānandavardhana that by using the expression Rasālaṅkāra (Rasādyalaṅkāra) as interchangeable with Rasavadaṅkāra he by-passes the crux of the matter, namely the possessive suffix in the expression Rasavat:
"Kimca 'kāvye tasminnalāṅkāro rasādiḥ' iti rasa evālaṅkāraḥ kevalaḥ, na tu rasavaditi matup pratayasya jīvitam na kiṁcidabhīhitam syāt !"¹⁸²

"Furthermore, the declaration that 'Rasa, etc., itself constitutes an adornment in such poems' virtually designates Rasa itself by the term Alaṅkāra and not Rasavat or that which possesses Rasa."

Thus Kuntaka very staunchly argues that the subordinate position can not be given to Rasa at all. In the case of the instances of Rasavat where one Rasa is subordinate to the other Rasa, it is possible to consider them as instances of Rasadhvani from the point of view of the predominant Rasa according to the Dhvani theorists. There is a maxim that –

"Prādhānyena vyapadeśāḥ bhavanti !"

In the light of this maxim those instances should be instances of Rasa only. It is not correct to call those instances as Alaṅkāra from the stand point of what is subordinate. This view is firmly maintained by Kuntaka. Yet Ānandavardhana’s attempt at distinguishing Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras from Rasādidhvani is appreciated by most of the later writers in a spirit of accommodation of the older concepts of Rasavat, etc., as certain instances of Guṇībhūtavyāṅga.
KUNTAKA’S CONCEPTION OF RASAVADAŁĀṆKĀRA

After rejecting the view of the Alaṅkāraravadins as well as the Dhvanivādins in regard to the nature of Rasavadalaṅkāra, Kuntaka has presented an absolutely original view. He is of the opinion that Rasavadalaṅkāra is the case of an Alaṅkāra which is similar to Rasa and not exatly Rasa itself. He considers Rasavat as an Alaṅkāra of great beauty. As may be gathered from his criticism of the views of Bhāmahā and others on this concept, he draws our attention to the word Rasavat with the suffix ‘Vat’ in a comparative sense according to the sūtra ‘Tena tulyāṁ kriyā ced vatīḥ’. He has explained the word Rasavat in his definition as an Alaṅkāra which acts as a Rasa. An Alaṅkāra attains to this status only when it, rising almost to the position of Rasa, affords plesure to the Sahādaya:

“Rasena vartate tulyāṁ rasavattvavidhānataḥ /
Yo’laṅkārah sa rasavat tadvadhāhlādanirmiteḥ ||”¹⁸³

“That adornment or figure of speech, which functions like ‘Rasa’ because it suffuses poetry with ‘Rasa’, is designated as ‘Rasavat’ inasmuch as it causes poetic appeal to connoisseurs.”
For his definition, 'Rasena vartate tulyam', Kuntaka gives the analogy of Brāhmaṇavat Kṣatriyaḥ.

Dr. Raghavan probably due to the bad text that was available, has mistaken the idea of Kuntaka's Rasavadalaṅkāra. In his Śṛṅgāraprakāśa (P.896) he observes-

"On this cf. Kuntaka, V.J. De's-edn.pp. 175-6, where Kuntaka takes the 'vat' in tulyārtha and applies the name Rasavadalaṅkāra to cases like the Samāsokti in the verse 'Upōḍharaṇena', where Śṛṅgāra-rasa is used as an embellishment. That is, Rasavadalaṅkāra is a case similar to one of Rasa but not exactly of Rasa."

Kuntaka has not regarded the said verse 'Upōḍharaṇena' as an example of Samāsokti, (He has not accepted Samāsokti, as an Alaṅkāra (V.J.III.51) but as an illustration of Rūpaka. Śṛṅgāra-rasa is not an embellishment here, but it is used as an Alaṅkārya. (The detailed explanation of the verse is given below).

It is not right to think that Rasavadalaṅkāra in Kuntaka is a case 'similar to one of Rasa but not exactly of Rasa'. 'Rasena vartate tulyam' means 'Co-exists with Rasa' and not 'Similar to Rasa'. It is very clearly stated in the Vṛtti that Tulyaṃ vartate-samānaṃ ātiṣṭhānī under the analogy Brāhmaṇena tulyaṃ vartate brāhmaṇavat kṣatriyaḥ. The
Tulyatva is only in co-presence. Here (in the verse 'Upodharāgeṇa etc'.) we have Śrīngāra as Alāṅkārya along with the beautiful Rūpakālaṅkāra and thus causing Rūpakarasavatadalakāra.

Commenting on the issue, Dr. K. Krishnamoorth (Introduction to V. J. Dharwar edn. P. XXXIII) observes:

"Never does Kuntaka allow one to confound Alāṅkārya with Alāṅkāra. The central theory of Kuntaka is that all Alāṅkāras such as Rūpaka, Utpreksa, and so forth themselves get the designation Rasavadalaṅkāra also when they co-exist with Rasa. Dr. Raghavan has completely distorted this fundamental position of Kuntaka in the passage which requires drastic revision in the light of the text."

Thus, Arthālaṅkāras adding beauty to the Rasa are called Rasavat alāṅkāras and such a good poetry endowed with Rasa, the beauty of which is enhanced by subserving Alāṅkāras pleases the Sahrdayas.

By virtue of this eminence he has commended Rasavadalaṅkāra as the very life (Jīvita) of all Alāṅkāras:

"Yathā sa rasavannāma sarvālaṅkārajīvitam |"184
What Kuntaka implies is that when the Alañkāras, Upamā, etc., contribute to the appeal of the Kāvya and the aesthetic enjoyment of the Sahṛdayas, like Rasas, get the designation of Rasavat since they well-nigh reach the position of Rasas:

"Yathā rasāḥ kāvyasya rasavattām tadvidāhlādām ca vidadhāti evam upamādirapyubhayām nispādayan bhinno rasavadalañkāraḥ sampādayate!"185

"Even as Rasa produces delectability in poetry as well as the aesthetic delight of the connoisseurs, so also figures of speech like the simile produce both these effects and hence merit the designation ‘Rasavat-alañkāra’ legitimately."

The conclusions are:

(i) The Upamā, Rūpaka, etc., in their common use are called Alañkāras.

(ii) But when they are as delectable as Rasa they are designated as Rasavadalañkāra.

(iii) Rasavadalañkāra being capable of affording as much pleasure as the Rasa itself is the life of all the Alañkāras, though it is not Rasa itself.
For instance, Rūpaka, according to Kuntaka, comes to be designated as Rasavat in the following stanza:

"Upodharāgeṇa vilolatārakam
tathā gṛhitam śaśinā niśāmukham I
Yathā samastām timirāṅśukam tayā
puropi rāgād galitam na laksitam II"\(^{186}\)

"The Twilight (heroine's face) with twinkling stars (shining pupils) was illumined (kissed) by the moon (the lover) glowing red (flushed with) passion so suddenly (so ardently) that the entire mass of darkness (black garment) disappearing in the east (slipping even in front), due to illumination (love), was not at all noticed."

The main substance of the stanza is the description of the night and the moon in their delicate relations as lovers. The poet has employed Rūpakālaṅkāra consisting in the superimposition of the behaviour of lovers for the purpose of contributing exquisite charm to the account of the night and the moon. That Rūpaka with the strikingness imparted to it by Śleṣa and with the significant use of gender, makes the stanza bloom with poetic appeal and creates delight in the hearts of the Sahrdayas. Thus it deserves the designation of Rasavat.
Here, the nāyaka-nāyikā-bhāva is attributed to the Moon and the Night. So it is a beautiful Rūpaka with a touch of Śleṣa enhancing the beauty of Śṛṅgāra-rasa depicted in the stanza. Though it is a nature description it is Sarasa and pleasing due to this striking Rūpaka Alaṅkāra which can be called Rasavat.

Kuntaka then cites the following illustration:

"Calāpāṅgām drṣṭiṁ sprśasi bahuśo vepathumatiṁ
Rahasyākhyāyīva svanasi mṛdu karṇāntikacaraḥ!
Karaṁ vyādhunvatyāḥ pibasi ratisarvasvamadharam
Vayāṁ tattvānveśṇmadhukara hatāstvaṁ khalu kṛtiḥ!

"You touch repeatedly her quivering eye the corners of which are tremulous; hovering near her ear you sweetly hum, as though whispering a secret (of love); inspite of her waving her hand you drink her lower lip, the very essence of enjoyment; (whilst) we, (O) bee! are undone through search for truth (regarding her); you, indeed, are blessed."

The above stanza is cited for removing the defect of Bhāva or Rasa being itself regarded as the Alaṅkāra as well as Alaṅkārya.
"Svarūpādatiriktasya parasyāpratibhāsanāt"-
‘Ityalaṅkāryālaṅkaraṇayoh aprthagbhāvasya alaṅkāryatve
cvātmanī kriyāvirodhāt tasyaiva alaṅkaraṇatvānupapattīḥ
udāharaṇāntaraiḥ pariḥśtā II"\textsuperscript{188}

"The next fallacy, namely, ‘there is nothing palpable apart from it which is adorned by it’, i.e. the identity of the adorned and the adorner and consequently, the contingency of opposite functions is one and the same agent, has also been warded off in the new treatment by the citation of independent examples."

In the stanza, the main import is the Śrīṅgāra and the Rūpaka in the form of the superimposition of the lover’s behaviour on the bee contributes exquisite charm to that Rasa:

"Atra paramārthaḥ pradhānāvṛtteḥ śrīṅgārasya
bhramarasamācropitakāntāvṛttānto (rūpakāṁ) rasavadalaṅkāraḥ
śobhātiśayamāchitavān I"\textsuperscript{189}

"Here the final purport is :- The attribution or superimposition of the lover’s behaviour on to the bee is a figure of speech, viz., metaphor which, in its turn, endows exquisite charm to the Rasa or sentiment, viz., the erotic, here."
Hence the *Alaṅkārya*, i.e., *Śrṅgāra* is adorned by the *Alaṅkāra* in the form of *Rūpaka*, which is called *Rasavat*, because it has a *Rasa* to adorn and has an appeal like that of *Rasa*.

In the above stanza, the love of Duṣyanta for Śakuntalā is developed through the mischievous, though innocent, play of the bee about her body. The poet instead of expressing directly Duṣyanta’s feelings at the sight of Śakuntalā, leaves it to be understood from his jealousy towards the lucky bee that enjoyed the person of his love.

Dr. Hemalata Deshpande observes:

"Kuntaka cites it for *rasavat alaṅkāra* to show that Ānandavardhana’s *rasadhvani* and his own *rasavadalaṅkāra* are equally beautiful to be called the best poetry. Practically, Kuntaka is correct. In both the examples, the *Śrṅgāra rasa* is attributed and there is no direct ‘*nāyaka-nāyikā-vyavahāra*.’ There is a sort of inconsistency involved in Ānandavardhana’s practical discussion. Kuntaka has discovered it and tries to correct it, including both the examples of *rasavadalaṅkāra*, the best poetry according to Kuntaka." (Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka—Ph.D Thesis, Karnataka University, Dharwar, 1967.p.135)
As a further illustration of this point, Kunataka cites the verse 'Kapole patrāli' etc., (Amarudataka, 85), which is just like 'Calāpāṅgāṁ drṣṭim', the 'Manyu (anger) being taken here as the lover instead of the bee.

This would mean that Kuntaka can not deny Rasavadalaṅkāra in the verse 'Kṣipto hastāvalagnah' cited by Anandavardhana and criticised earlier by him. He admits this point and adds that his criticism was directed only towards Vipralambhaśṛṅgāra being regarded as subordinate, while it could be an instance of Rasavadalaṅkāra from the point of view of the Rūpakalaṅkāra which is as appealing as the Rasa:

"Satyametat, kintu vipralambha-śṛṅgārasyaṅgatā tatra nivaryate, ṣeṣasya punastattulyavṛttāntatatayā rasavadalaṅkāratvamanivāryameva I"\(^{190}\)

"The contention is applicable only to a little extent. All that we have repudiated in that example is the alleged connection with the sentiment of love-in-separation; once that is conceded, the rest will become a clear example of rasvat-alaṅkāra only since the present examples and that one are on a par in all other respects."

The presence in a stanza of Upama or Rūpaka and Rasavat raises the question whether such cases would be
examples of Saṅkara and Saṁsṛṣṭi. Kuntaka replies that these are not cases of Saṅkara and Saṁsṛṣṭi. Quoting three more verses:

'Aṅgulibhiriva',\(^{191}\)

'Aindram dhanuh',\(^{192}\) and

'Lagnadvirephāñjana',\(^{193}\)

Kuntaka points out that in these examples the Rasavat is the chief Alaṅkāra, the other figures being subsidiary (Aṅga).\(^{194}\) For instance, in 'Aṅgulibhiriva', etc., the Rasavadalaṅkāra in the form of Utpreksā expressed by 'Cumbatīva rajanīmukham ṣaṣī' is predominant, while Upamā (aṅgulibhiriva), Rūpaka (sarojalocanam) and Śleṣa are subordinate.\(^{195}\) Here the description of the moon-rise that includes the poetic conventions is beautiful. All the other figures like Upamā are there only to heighten the beauty of that Utpreksā which is Rasavat and they have no other independent function. It can not be Saṅkara because the distinctness of Rasavat and other Alaṅkāra is clear. Nor is it an instance of Saṁsṛṣṭi because the Rasavat and other Alaṅkāras, though distinct, are not equal in status.

It may be noted here that other writers who follow Anandavṛdhana chose as illustrations as Rasavadalaṅkāra a particular type of verses describing nature as the Uddīpanavibhava. Kuntaka considers them as instances of Rasavat from
a different point of view; which in keeping with his definition of Rasavat. It may be further noted here that one of the examples taken by him, i.e., ‘Upoḍharāgeṇa’, etc., is well-known verse cited as an example of Samāsoktylaṅkāra by Ānandavardhana and others. This raises the question of the confrontation of Rasavat and Samāsokti. Kuntaka solves the problem summarily by rejecting Samāsokti as an Alāṅkāra.196

KUNTAKA ABOUT PREYAS AND OTHER ALĀṅKĀRAS

(1) After discussing the figure Rasavat, Kuntaka goes on to deal with the figure Preyas. He says:

"Nor is ‘Preyas’ (praise) an adornment; for its opposite, viz., dispraise, also might be an adornment at that rate. And the use of accepted figures of speech (like the simile) along with ‘praise’ would have to be regarded as a case of Sāmsṛṣṭi or Saṅkara; and it should come to have an independent status too like other figures, even in instances not involving praise or eulogy":

"Na preyastadviruddhah syādapreyo’sāvalaṅkṛtiḥ / 
Alaṅkārāntare syātāmanyatādaśarśanādapi II"197
Criticising in this connection Bhāmaha’s view on Preyas, Kuntaka remarks that Bhāmaha (III.5) does not define the figure, but thinks that the illustration itself is the definition. (Udāharaṇaṁ atrameva laksanaj manyamanaṁ). He quotes Daṇḍin’s definition of Preyas as:

“Preyaḥ priyatārākhyānam I”

and his illustration which is the same as that given by Bhāmaha:

“Preyo gṛhagataṁ kṛṣṇamavādīt viduro yathā I
Adya yā mama govinda jātā tvayī gṛhagate I
Kālenaiśā bhavet prītistavaṁganat punaḥ II”

As regards this Kuntaka raises his objections:

“As eva na kṣodakṣamataṁ tehatī I
Tathā ca kālene-tyādinocyate yat tadeva varṇyamāṇaviṣayatayā vastunah svarūpaṁ,
tadevālaṅkaraṇamityalaṅkāryaṁ na kīncidavaśisyate I”

“This does not bear any close scrutiny. For, the main content or subject-matter of this passage is none other than what is set forth in the second line of the original, viz., ‘the like of it can be fancied only when you pay your next visit to my residence in course of time.’ If that itself is to be designated as an adornment, there will be nothing else to serve as the content adorned therein.”
Kuntaka's view is that the view of Bhāmaha, etc., on Prayas is not reasonable. What is stated as 'Kālena, etc.,' is itself the form of the theme, which is being described. If that itself is the Alāṅkāra, there remains nothing as the Alāṅkārya.

After discussing another objection to the view that Prayas is an Alāṅkāra, Kuntaka points out that such cases cannot be regarded as instances of Saṁsṛṣṭi and Saṅkara. He cites the illustration—

'Indorlakṣma smaravijayinaḥ etc.'

and remarks:

"Atra pryo'bhihitiralaṅkārya, vyājastutiralaṅkaraṇam; na punarubhayoralalaṅkārapratibhāsao yena saṁsṛṣṭi vyapadeśaḥ saṅkara vyapadeśo vā pravartate tṛtiyasyalaṅkāryatayā vastvantarasasya-pratibhāsanāt l"201

"Here sweet praise or eulogy of the king is really the 'adorned'; its adornment is Vyājastuti or 'ironic praise.' Two distinct figures are not felt as co-existing here. Had they been so felt, one would be justified in regarding the verse as an example of either 'merged figures' or 'mixed figures.' Nor is there any third entity here which could be talked of as 'the adorned' subject apart from Prayas and Vyājastuti."
Here the statement of Preyas (pleasing idea) is the Alaṅkārya and Vyājastuti is the Alaṅkāra. Thus between Alaṅkārya and the Alaṅkāra there can neither be Saṁsṛṣṭi nor Saṅkara. There is no third thing here as the Alaṅkārya.

2) Then Kuntaka goes on to express his opinion about the figures Ürjasvin, Udātta and Samāhita in the same manner:

"Ürjasvyudāttayostadvat bhūṣaṇatvām na vidyate /
Tathā samāhitasyāpi prakāradvayaśobhinaḥ II 202"

Like Rasavat and Preyas, Ürjasvin, Udātta and Samāhita are also not Alaṅkāras. He criticises the definition and examples of Ürjasvin given by Udbhata and Bhāmaha. Quoting Udbhata's definition -

"Anaucityapraṇātābāhām kāmakrodhādikāraṇāt /
Bhāvānām ca rasaṁām ca bandha ürjasvī kathyate II"

he points out that if the Bhāva is anaucityapraṇāt, there would be a breach of Rasa (Rasabhaṅga) in accordance with the dictum -

'Anaucityādṛte nānyadrasabhaṅgasya kāraṇam I 204
He asks as to how can that Rasa which is out of brilliance owing to ‘anaucitya’ and which is impeded by passion, anger, etc., appear as an Alaṅkāra.\textsuperscript{205} Even admitting for argument’s sake that Rasābhāsa, etc., exists, he maintains that the unique mental state involved, be it Rasābhāsa or Rasa is only the Alaṅkārya and never an Alaṅkāra.”\textsuperscript{206}

Using the same argument as used against considering Urjasvin as an Alaṅkāra, Kuntaka rejects Udāṭta as an Alaṅkāra. Udāṭta of both kinds, viz., ‘vṛddhimadvastu, and ‘caritām ca mahātmanām’ is Alaṅkārya only but not Alaṅkāra.\textsuperscript{207}

Then Kuntaka goes on to the figure Samāhitā, which he deals with in the same way, declaring :

'Evam samāhitasyāpi alaṅkāryatvameva nyāyyam na punaralaṅkaraṇabhāvaḥ'\textsuperscript{208}

Then he critises Udbhata’s definition of the figure, which according to Kuntaka, constitutes the first variety referred to in the Karikā. The verse of Udbhata however, is quoted with a reading slightly different from that of the printed texts:
Then he criticises its second variety, as defined by Daṇḍin (II.298-99), whose definition and illustration are both quoted, in connection with the explanation of the above Kārika:

"Yadapi kaiścit prakāraṇaṃ saṃāhitaḥ khyamalaṅkaraṇamākhyātaṃ tasyāpi tathaiva bhūṣaṇatvām na vidyate!" 210

That Alāṅkāra which is defined by others in a different manner cannot be regarded as Alāṅkāra at all.

One should note that Kuntaka emphasises the need of Vakrokti in poetry and not of Rasa, but comprehends Rasa in some aspects of his Vakrokti. Poetry becomes beautiful by the deliniation of appropriate Rasas. Kuntaka examines, at length, figures like Rasavant, etc., and S.K. De remarks -

"These special poetic figures like Rasavat etc. constituted the back door as it were, for the admission of the idea of Rasa into the Alāṅkāra system." 211

Thus the above account of Kuntaka’s view on Rasavat and other Alāṅkāras of its group shows that Kuntaka reveals
altogether different outlook in the conception of these Alaṅkāras. According to him they can not be regarded as Alaṅkāras at all. In their content they are the certain aspects of Alaṅkārya. He has given a new conception of Rasavadalaṅkāra in particular. He thinks that the Alaṅkāras such as Upamā, Rūpaka, Utpreksā, etc. are themselves designated as Rasavadalaṅkāra when they create aesthetic appeal like Rasas. This conception of Rasavadalaṅkāra creates some confusion as to when Upamā, Rūpaka, etc, should be regarded as Rasavat and when they should be considered as Upamā, etc. Kuntaka’s conception of Rasavadalaṅkāra seems to be an opposition for opposition sake. There is nothing new in it. Hence Kuntaka’s view on Rasavadalaṅkāra has not been accepted by later writers on Poetics.

COMPARISON BETWEEN ĀNANDAVARDHANA AND KUNTAKA

According to Kuntaka, Svabhāva-pradhāna vastu or Rasa-pradhāna vastu is always Alaṅkārya and can never be called Alaṅkāra. There can be no poetry without Vastu and Vastu itself cannot be the means of decoration. We have seen how Kuntaka critises Ānanavardhana’s definition of Rasavat Alaṅkāra, for making Rasa subordinate. For Kuntaka, Rasa can never be subordinate to anything; it is always Alaṅkārya. Rasa is always present in a good poetic composition and
Kavipratibhā adds beauty to it to make Rasa relishable. When Rasa is beautiful only due to Arthālaṅkāras, and such that if the Alaṅkāra is removed, the Rasa looses its charm, it is called Rasavat Alaṅkāra by Kuntaka. Alaṅkāra adds an extraordinary beauty to Rasa in the Rasavat Alaṅkāra Thus Kuntaka treats Rasa objectively as a Kāvyā-vastu.

According to Ānandavardhana, Rasa alone brings beauty to a poetic composition, and without Rasa a composition is not fit to be called poetry. According to Kuntaka, Rasa is not subjective and beauty is added to it. So the Alaṅkāras which make Rasa more attractive, are important. Alaṅkāra is a starting point to get Rasa and without Alaṅkāra one cannot realise Rasa according to Kuntaka. Ānandavardhana discusses Rasa mainly as Āsvada, from the critic's point of view. The delight got by the critics, through Kāvyarasa is subjective and supreme. Hence, Ānandavardhana's discussion becomes a bit idealistic. Kuntaka treats Rasa from the point of view of a poet as his book is meant to train the poets; so the Rasa is discussed objectively as a Vastu. Both the ways of explaining Rasa are convincing. Ānandavardhana's theoretical discussion is helped by the practical application of Kuntaka. Thus the two theories are complimentary to each other.
Kuntaka was convinced that Anandavardhana had self-contradiction in his theory making Rasa play both the roles, of Rasadhvani and Rasavadalaṅkāra being predominant and subordinate respectively. This attempt of reconciliation in accommodating the older concept of Rasavat under his second rate poetry is thus rejected by Kuntaka. Kuntaka considers Rasavadalaṅkāra as a case wherein ample opportunity is enjoyed by the poet to bring out Vakrokti dominated by charm due to Rasa.