CHAPTER IV

THE TEN GUNAS OF DANDIN

Origin and conception of gunas. The number and the names of the gunas of Bharata as also the substance of some of them were adopted in tradition by his followers. There is no doubt that in Bharata we have, for the first time, a definite statement, if not the exposition, of the guna doctrine, though, his conception of individual gunas was either totally dropped or only partially retained by later theorists. As Dr. De remarks in this connection, the disagreement between the different writers with regard to the definition of individual gunas is a common experience in the history of Sanskrit Poetics. It is not surprising, therefore, that there is a wide gulf between Bharata and the later theorists with regard to the conception of certain gunas.

Bharata describes the gunas as negative forms of the faults and thus regards them in spirit as negative elements. His treatment of them, however, does not indicate or support the negative state of all his gunas. The excellences like mādhurya and audārya, for instance, as defined by himself, are not really negations of any particular faults. Nor can they be held to be the opposites of the ten defects discussed by him. Jacobi's explanation appears to be correct that Bharata's view is in keeping with the commonsense view of the

matter that it is easier to seize upon a fault instinctively. Although Bharata does not define the guna, yet it is evident that, according to him, gunas are the elements which make the oral acting in a drama and the language and diction in poetry impressive and forceful.

After Bharata, Daṇḍin makes an elaborate exposition of the guna doctrine, though he gives them a subordinate place in his mārga scheme, for, according to him, gunas form the constituent elements of the mārgas. Daṇḍin is the first known theorist who related the gunas to the dictions, for we know for certain that Bharata before him was unaware of this peculiar relationship. Like Bharata, he also does not define the gunas as such, though his definition of the alaṃkāras may be stated to cover the gunas also which he regards as the special alaṃkāras that characterise the various mārgas. According to this scheme, the gunas are the characteristic attributes which beautify a kāvyā in general and form the constituent elements of the literary dictions in particular.

The gunas have not been made subordinate to rasa by Daṇḍin, as they have been done by some later theorists, but in his scheme they rather form independent parts of a kāvyā. In other words, they render direct assistance to a kāvyā, without, in any way, being subservient to the rasa. Daṇḍin, as we have seen, describes kāvyā as a series of words expressive

of charming sense; the charm of the series of words, in consequence, forms the charm of the kāvyā and, in this way, the elements which lend essential grace to a poem are directly related to the series of words characterised by charming sense, that is, they refer to the word as well as the sense conveyed thereby.

Vāmana for the first time supplies guṇa with a definition. He presents Daṇḍin's definition of alaṁkāra as that of his guṇa. Daṇḍin's conception of alaṁkāra is, as we have seen, vast enough to cover the sphere of the excellences. But since Vāmana makes a clear-cut distinction between them, he slightly alters his predecessor's conception of alaṁkāra. Thus according to him, guṇas are the elements which impart essential beauty to a poem, while alaṁkāras are the attributes which add to the charm. In another form, the guṇas constitute the permanent and indispensable characteristics of a kāvyā, whereas alaṁkāras the transitory elements which may be dispensed with. Vāmana, like Daṇḍin, relates the guṇas directly to the word and sense, without subordinating them to rasa. Instead, he subordinates rasa itself to guṇa by defining the excellence, kānti as predominance of rasa. Like Daṇḍin again, he establishes their relationship with poetic

5. Op. III. 1. 3; also cp. SKA. I. 59; KPr. VIII. k. 66-7 vṛtti.
6. Op. III. 1. 1 vṛtti; acc. to the comm. though guṇas are, strictly speaking, concerned directly with riti, they are spoken of as elements of word and sense as a popular use
dictions, though while Dandin regards the ten guṇās as the life-breath of the Vaidartha marga, Vāmana considers them to be constituent elements of the rāti in general. Significantly enough Vāmana regards the guṇās as positive elements and the defects as their negations. One novel feature which he introduces in his treatment of the guṇās lies in enhancing their scope and practically increasing thereby their number to twenty. He divides each of the ten guṇās into those relating to the word the sense. In order to accommodate this change, he has to alter some of the definitions and introduce some new points, which, many of them, must be admitted as being farfetched, and in this task, he cannot be held to have succeeded, for one can clearly see that his guṇās have stood afar from the concepts that their names imply. Dr. De rightly observes about his treatment of the guṇās: "the somewhat pedantic classification of guṇas into external and internal, verbal and ideal, is in itself open to objections and has been controverted by later writers (e.g. Manmatha VIII; Hamsacandra, op. 195-200; Jagannathac p. 62 f.). The distinctions are sometimes unconvincing; they are made for the sake of sym-

mastery of having two sets each of ten excellences". We must admit, however, the fact that "Bharata's scheme of the guṇas as a whole is developed to its farthest possibilities by Vāmana".

The dhvani theorists and almost all the writers who followed them generally considered the guṇas as before to be the beautifying elements of poetry, though they subordinated them to the predominant principle of rasa. According to these theorists, guṇas form the characteristics of rasa, the soul of poetry, and not of word and sense, the mere body thereof. The doctrine, however, could not win universal acceptance, for we see that while Jāranṭāṭha specifically regards guṇas as elements of word and sense, Mammatā and Viśvanāṭha clearly establish the relation of their guṇas with words. Thus the guṇas, though fundamentally the attributes of rasa, are generally related to the word and sense which form the body of poetry.

Number of Guṇas. With regard to the number of guṇas, we meet with, from the very early period, two opposite tendencies. While on one hand, Bhāmaha reduces their number to three, on the other, Vāmana virtually increases their number.

10. HSP. II, pp. 95-6.
11. Ibid. p. 93.
13. Op. RG. pp. 66 ff; KPr. VIII. k. 73-7; SD. VIII. 3-4; 5f; 8.
14. Op. KPr. VIII. k. 71; SD. VIII. 8; op. Nagendra: HKAS.
to twenty. The tendency to multiply the number is well exhibited in a writer like Bhoja who enumerates as many as seventy-two gunas in three groups each formed of twenty-four of them. His first group belongs to the word and second to the sense, while defects changing into excellences in particular conditions constitute the third group called the vaiśeṣika or specific gunas. The Avni-Purāṇa enumerates eighteen gunas, six each of word and sense and six referring to both of them. Kuntaka also gives the same number of gunas, but on an entirely different base. On the basis of the natural disposition of a poet (kaviavabhāva), he considers literary diction to be either soft (sukumāra) or brilliant (vicitra) or middle (madhyamā), each having six characteristics technically called the gunas. As a matter of fact, the drift towards the increasing of the number forms no originality or speciality. Bhoja and the author of Avni-Purāṇa have, in fact, made a mess of the subject, while Vāmana, too, cannot be credited with success in this respect.

The dhvani theorists as also the later rhetoricians in general recognise only the three gunas, mādhurya, ojas and prasāda, while they, some of them, accommodate other excellences either as part of the said three gunas or as negative forms of certain defects or even as poetic figures. Vāmana, it may be noted, includes Vāmana's verbal gunas, śleṣa, samādhi,

intro., pp. 61-3.
udārata and prasāda in his ojas, verbal mādhurya in his mādhurya, verbal arthavyakti in his prasāda, ideal arthavyakti and ideal kānti in his svabhāvokti figure, while he takes the verbal guṇas saukumārya and kānti as negations of the faults kaṣṭatva and grāmyatva, the ideal guṇas ojas, prasāda, mādhurya, saukumārya and udārata as the negative forms of the defects apustārtha, adhikapadatva, anavikṛtta, amāṅγalarūpa aṅkīlātva and grāmyatva respectively as also the ideal samatā as the absence of the fault vaiṣamya. Again, it is interesting to note that he regards the verbal samatā as a fault rather than an excellence, while he rejects outright the ideal guṇas ojas, śleṣa and samādhi. Thus he refutes almost all the older guṇas along with their conceptions and sets out the three guṇas, ojas, prasāda and mādhurya with new meanings. Hemacandra, Viśvanātha and others follow him. These theorists explain guṇas as the characteristics of rasa, indicative of different stages of mind. On the basis of the three attitudes of the mind, namely, fluidity (druti), glaringness (dīpti) and expansion (vyaṣṭipakatva) in the process of the realisation of rasa, the guṇas mādhurya, ojas and prasāda are formed in their respective order. Since the guṇas are, as we have seen above, generally regarded as the attributes of word and sense, they are also treated on the basis of the peculiar arrangement of syllables as also that of words.

The Gunas of Dandin in relation to Vaidarbha diction.

As noticed above, Dandin considers the gunas to be the basic elements of poetic diction. Vamana also patronises the same view when he defines riti as the peculiar arrangement of words (vidistā padracanā), the peculiarity being called forth by the poetic excellences. He has, however, expanded the scope of elements of the riti by dividing the gunas, the characteristic elements, into two groups, one referring to word and the other to sense. In his riti-guna scheme, he accepts, in spirit, the sentiments, poetic figures the expressive powers of words and the negation of faults, besides the usual gunas, as the chief elements of riti. The peculiar arrangement or knitting of words, with its footing on the gunas, forms in his view, the external aspect of the riti, the internal elements being the rasa, ideal figures and absence of faults. Evidently, his viewpoint is an improvement on that of Dandin whose conception of marga-guna is not so comprehensive, though it must be admitted that he implicitly accepts the poetic figures, the expressive powers of words, and the negation of faults as constituent elements of diction. After Dandin and Vamana, a few more attributes like yogavṛtti or upācāra (application of derivative meaning) and softness were introduced by later theorists as the principal elements of diction.

First of all, we propose to discuss the gunas of Dandin in their origin and gradual development in later times, with a reference to their relation with the Vaidarbha marga which
is described as possessed of all the ten excellences.

(1) Ślesa or the quality of being well-knit is the saithiyarāhitya (absence of laxity) generating from the abundant use of small-breath letters (short vowels, the first, third and fifth letters of the five classes of consonants, and the semivowels) and from the employment of high-breath letters in a smaller quantity; e.g. 'mālatīdāma laṅghitām bhramaraṁ,' where all letters excepting gh and bh, are small-breath ones.

According to Bharata, slesa consists in (a) subtlety, clear in appearance, but in fact difficult to observe, and (b) coalescence of words connected with one another through the aggregate meaning desired by the poet. Vāmana's slesa, as a verbal guṇa, is the coalescence of words resulting in smoothness, while as an ideal guṇa, it is the commingling of many ideas. Evidently, Daṇḍin's guṇa resembles the second (b) part of Bharata's definition, while it is close to the verbal guṇa of Vāmana who has obviously drawn upon Daṇḍin.

20. By letters Daṇḍin means here only the consonants, because vowels (long ones), even if they are mahāprāṇas, are soft and hence result in looseness.
21. This is what the phrase 'alpāprāṇākṣaṛottaram' (KA. I. 43) exactly implies; cp. Kramaḍīśvara (cited in Jivānanda comm.). Daṇḍin sees non-residence of laxity in the co-existence of both kinds of letters, though, of course, with a difference in their relative quantity in the aforesaid way. If only the small-breath letters appear, there will occur the fault of looseness; cp. below; the fact has been hinted at by Daṇḍin himself; cp. I. 69.
Prasāda or lucidity is the use of words easy of comprehension and free of affectation; e.g. indor indivara-dyuti lakṣma lakṣmī tanoti ( 'the blue-lotus-like spot of the moon adds to its charm' ).

In Bharata, it is the clearness where sense transpires from the words employed, through the relation of the easily understood word and sense. According to Dr. De, Bharata here implies some kind of hint ( anukta artha ), transparent from the words used, and this corresponds partly to the metaphorical way of expression or Danḍin's guṇa, samādhi or to the laksanā of later theorists. But in fact, the word 'anukta' ( in Bharata's definition of the guṇa) which De takes to mean 'unexpressed' should be taken in the sense of avyākyāta 'which needs no explanation', as is suggested by the subsequent phrase 'sukhaabhārdhasambodhat'. In this case, there is nothing suggestive of laksanā or samādhi here. Bhāmaha describes prasāda as comprehension of the sense even by the womenfolk and children. Vāmanā's prasāda as a verbal excellence is the laxity of structure and as an ideal guṇa, it is clearness of meaning brought about by the avoidance of superfluity. It is evident that Danḍin's guṇa bears
a close resemblance to its conception in Bharata as also in
his successors like Bhāmaha and Vāmana. The verbal guna of
Vāmana, however, deviates from the usual track; it is obviously
the opposite of Dāṇḍin’s śleṣa. Its admissibility as a guna
depends on its communion with ojas which he himself describes
as the compactness of structure.

(3) Samatā is evenness in the grouping of wordsounds
which are of three kinds, (i) soft, (ii) harsh and (iii)
middling, arising respectively from the use of soft, harsh
and mixed letters; e.g. (i) kokilālapvācālo mām eti
Malayānilāh, (ii) ucchalacchikarācchacchanirjharāmbhaḥkanokṣi-
taḥ, (iii) candanaśrāṇayodgandhir mando Malayamārutah.

In Bharata, according to one recension, it is the even-
ness which is easy to understand and in which there is no re-
dundance of expression nor excess of short compounds (cūrṇa-
padas) and according to the other and better reading, it is
the balanced co-existence of poetic figures and excellences.
Vāmana describes its verbal aspect as homogeneity of manner

28. Also cp. the later theorist Viśvanātha (Śv. VIII. 7) who defines it as that which causes the sense to flash
upon the mind instantaneously and spread like fire in
dry fuel.

29. Cp. III. 1. 6-9; see below also.

30. Hrd. is not right in suggesting that the soft and harsh
bandhas are accepted by the Caudas and only the mixed one
by the Vaidarbhas for its being not uneven (cp. Karga-
carya ed. p. 31). Rātna rightly refutes the view in
detail and maintains that all the three bandhas are accept-
ed in the Vaidarbha diction. He cites Ragh. (IV. 64),
a southern-styled kāvya, to show that they have been
employed in the Vaidarbha mārga.
and its ideal form as non-relinquishment of proper sequence of ideas. Abhinava compares Bharata's guṇa to Vāmana's verbal excellence which is, on its part, closely comparable to Dandin's conception.

(4) Mādhurya or sweetness is the elegance consisting of (i) alliteration of similar sounds technically called śrutiya-nuṇāsa which is the grouping of similar sounds belonging to the same place of articulation, and (ii) absence of vulgarity. The verbal and ideal forms of sweetness have been called vāg-rasa and vastu-rasa respectively. The examples of the two forms are: (i) alliteration: 

\[ \text{esā rāja yadā lakṣmīṃ prāptavān brāhmaṇapriyāḥ, tadāprabhṛti dharmasya lokśamīn-utsavo'bha-vaḥ; } \]

(ii) absence of vulgarity: kāmaḥ kandarpacāndalo mayi vāmākeśi nirdayaḥ, tvai nirmatsaro diśyā.

In Bharata, it is sweetness where a sentence heard or repeated many times does not bore or disgust. According to Bhāmaha, the mādhurya of kāvya consists in (i) its being pleasing to the ear and in (ii) the use of a smaller number of compounds, while Vāmana calls it, as a verbal guṇa, the

31. Cp. (a) GOS. ed. XVI, 100; (b) ChŚŚ. XVII. 109.
32. Cp. III. 1. 11; 2. 5.
33. As De (Sir Ashutosh Mookerje Silver Jubilee Vols. (Orientalia vol. III) pp. 212 ff.) points out, the term 'rasa' here bears distinct sense which is different from that given to it by the rasa school or even by Dandin at another occasion (KA. II. 292); cp. also Lahiri: ChŚ. pp. 67-8. It may be noted here that Kāmaṇa explains rasāvaha (KA.52) as 'rasaṁ āvahati śruti- subhaṅgatāṁ ātanoñitī.' Bhoja, however, probably due to misunderstanding, cites Dandin's I. 63 (kāmya etc.) in
distinctness of words due to absence of long compounds and, as an ideal guna, the strikingness of utterance (uktivisitya).

Bharata’s guna is a general excellence; the first element of the guna in Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha bears close resemblance thereto. Daṇḍin’s ideal sweetness or vasturasā has been taken by Vāmana in his ideal aspect of udārata, while the second characteristic in Bhāmaha’s conception has been adopted by him in his mādhurya as a verbal excellence. Vāmana’s ideal guna, however, is his own creation. Bhāja ākṣara follows Vāmana’s conception of verbal mādhurya. In Viśvanātha, it is the source of pleasure caused by fluidity of heart, arising from absence or rarity of compounds.

(5) Sukumārata (softness) consists in the absence of harshness due to the use mostly of soft vocables, with implied employment of harsh vocables also at places, lest the diction should become ‘all-soft’ (sarvā-komala) which

the context of rasa-exposition.

34. Bh. NS. XVII. 102.
35. Cp. (a) Bh. KaI. II. 1; (b) Vāmana III. 1.20; 2.10.
36. Bhāmaha and later rhetoricians would term the strikingness of utterance as vakrokti which they consider to be the fundamental principle underlying all figurative expression. Daṇḍin’s vakrokti (Ka. II. 363), too, has this very import; cp. below.
37. SKA. I. 68.
38. SD. VIII. 2; 4; also cp. KPr. VIII. k. 74.
39. Cp. Tarkavāgīśa (on Ka. I. 69) who remarks that it consists in tenderness as a total effect arising from the commingling of soft and harsh letters. Acc. to him,
condition constitutes the defect of looseness of diction. The example is: mandalikrtya barhani kañthair madhuryitibhih, kalapinah pranirtyanti kāle jīmatamālinī.

According to Bharata, it is smoothness where an agreeable sense is realised by means of agreeably employed words and well-formed euphonic combinations. In Vāmana, it is the absence of harshness as a verbal guṇa and freedom from disagreeable sense (apāruṣya) as an ideal excellence. Dāṇḍin, whom Vāmana follows in his verbal excellence, partially takes his conception from Bharata. Vāmana's ideal aspect of the guṇa has been directly adopted from a part of Bharata's definition which we do not notice in Dāṇḍin, though he has indirectly accepted the idea by admitting the existence of agreeable sense (anuṛjita or sukuṁārtha) in his illustration. Vāmana has interpreted Bharata's agreeable sense (sukumārtha) as avoidance of the inauspicious sense. It is on this ground that Mammata and others do not regard it as a guṇa, but take it merely as the negation of the defect of inauspicious sense. But this sense was meant neither by Bharata nor by Dāṇḍin.

Alphaprāṇa letters are not necessarily soft; they may become harsh in their conjunction with particular letters. It appears, however, from Ka. I. 69 that the author considers them to be soft; cp. also Lahiri: CR. p. 72.

42. Cp. III. 1. 21; 2. 11.
(6) Arthavyakti (precision of expression) is the explicitness of sense, or absence of its neyata (implicitness); if the ocean is to be described as red, the cause of its redness needs also be stated, as in the example: haripoddhātā, bhūḥ khurakṣaṇanāgārghohitād udadhāḥ .............. ('Visnu in his Boar incarnation lifted up the earth from the ocean which had got red through the blood of the serpents crushed under his hooves'). If, however, the cause is left to be implied, it would suffer from the defect of inexplicitness.

In Bharata, according to one recension, it is explicitness which describes the nature of things as they appear in the world by means of well-known predicates, and according to other version, it is perspicuity of sense, comparable to his own as well as Dāṇḍin's prasāda. Dāṇḍin's arthavyakti is evidently different from Bharata's first-quoted conception which bears resemblance to the former's svabhāvokti figure.

44. Cp. Vāmana's vṛtti on III. 2. 11.
45. KPr. VIII. k. 72.
46. De (USP. II, p. 14 fn.), however, seems to ascribe this sense to Bharata.
47. Cp. Bh. NS. (a) GSS. ed. XVI. 108; (b) ChSS. ed. XVII. 105; for the gupa prasāda see above; also cp. KPr. VIII. k. 72f. and SD. VIII. 11-2, which include it in prasāda.
48. The fact is admitted by later writers also; cp. Mammata (KPr. VIII. k. 72 vṛtti); also cp. SD. VIII. 15. Bhoja, however, tries to differentiate between the two by stating that the figure describes the present form of a thing, while the gupa depicts the everlasting aspect thereof (cp. SKE. III. 4-5) and Agni-2. divides svabhāvokti into
Vāmana explains the verbal form of the guna as explicitness of words whereby the meaning is easily apprehended, while its ideal aspect has been described by him as explicitness of idea which makes the nature of things clear. Vāmana's verbal excellence takes its inspiration from Bharata's conception (in ChSS. recension), while his ideal guna resembles Bharata's first-quoted view and is very close to the conception of sva-bhāvokti in Dāṇḍin and later writers. Dāṇḍin, does not follow Bharata's conception of the guna which, however, is the source of Vāmana's exposition of the excellence. Dāṇḍin gives it a new explanation perhaps in order to distinguish it from the guna prasāda 'in which the sense must not be unusual and words should be used in their generally understood sense, whereas in arthavyakti, the connection of ideas is apprehended from the words actually used. Dāṇḍin might have noticed the defect of one guna overlapping the other in Bharata, though he admits that both/gunas bring about easy comprehension (pratītisubhāvata) in poetry and thus accepts their closeness to some extent.

---

50. Hemacandra (KAn., KM. ed., p. 239) equates Bharata's arthavyakti with Vāmana's ideal guna of the same name; op. De: HBr. II, p. 15 fn.
The basis of his new explanation is the explicitness of sense, or the absence of the defect of implicitness (meyeśā) of sense. He explains the excellence also as the law of the expressive power of words (sabdangāya). According to Hṛdayamāṇa, it is the condition where an ellipsis need not be supplied to make the sense clear and complete.

(7) Udāratva consists in (i) the elevation in the form of the expression of some high merit or virtue and (ii) the employment of excellent epithets. The example of the depiction of great merit is as follows: arthināṃ kṛpanā dṛṣṭis tvaṃmukhe patitā sakṛt, tadvaasthā punar deva nānyasya mukham ḫṣate ("Once the sad eye of the supplicants has fallen on thy face, O king, it taketh there its abode, and gazeth not at the face of any other"). where high virtue of charity has been expressed.

As is evident from the example, the guṇa refers, not to any elevated way of expression, but to some excellent merit of the subject-matter in hand. The second form of the guṇa may be exemplified by expressions like lilāmbuja (sport-lotus), hemāṅgada (gold-bracelet) etc., which embody high-wrought (sālaṃghya) apppellative (vidēsaṃgha).

53. Bhāmaḥa probably derives inspiration from Dāṇḍin's exposition of the guṇa for his fault nayārtha (Kal. I.38); op. the term sabdanyāya which occurs both in KA.I. 75 and Kal. I. 38.

54. Op. KA. I. 75; Hrd. explains it as a proper balance of word and sense; op. SKA. I. 69 which adopts Dāṇḍin's arthavyakti; also op. I. 12; 34; 130.

55. Taranā interprets sālaṃghya as vaisiṣṭyayapratītikṛt, i.e.
In Bharata, according to one recension, it is exaltedness where there are superhuman sentiments, varied feelings and erotic and marvellous moods, and according to another reading, it is the quality consisting in the particular meanings, in varied forms, conveyed beautifully. Vāmana calls it, as a verbal guṇa, liveliness (vīkātātva) in which the words appear as though they are dancing, while his ideal excellence is decency or absence of vulgarity. Bharata's exaltedness is the outcome of the superhuman and marvellous elements which may be traced partially in Vāmana's ideal aspect of the guṇa kānti, containing as it does the idea or rasa or sentiment. Daṇḍin's elevation, however, is based on quite a different principle. His second form appears to be the result of misinterpretation of Bharata's second reading. Vāmana's ideal guṇa, udāratva is the same as Daṇḍin's ideal mādhurya, noted above. Bhoja, perhaps misunderstanding Vāmana's verbal guṇa, describes udāratā as verbosity (vīkātākṣara-bandhatva), indicative of the particularity of an object, and this is apparently supported by Daṇḍin's examples. But we need not take it in this restricted sense alone; cp. also Lahiri: CR., p. 76.

56. Op. (a) GOS. ed. XVI. 110; (b) ChSS. XVII. 106; Hemacandra patronizes this reading.
59. Op. Vīsesa (in Bharata) vīsesana (in Daṇḍin); Bana (Hoc. intro. v. 8; Kad. intro. v. 9) propably refers to this guṇa of Bharata in his nava artha padartha.
60. Op. Vāmana III. 1. 22; vīkātākṣara-bandha, also termed
and order to accommodate Dandin's second explanation of the guna, introduces a new excellence named udattatā. Agni-Purāṇa, on the other hand, tries unsuccessfully to combine the misconceived idea of Vāmana's verbal guna and Dandin's second form of the excellence into one by describing it as elevation of words (uttāna-paddata) composed of excellent attributes.

61. Perhaps it has been inspired by the figure of that name; Dandin's udāratva, however, must be distinguished from his own figure udatta (II. 300), where greatness, high merit or prosperity of a personage is depicted directly; and in this light, the 'pratīyastāt' is implied in the definition of udāratva is significant, though it need not mean any technical suggestiveness of the dhvani theorist; cp. Lahiri: CK. p. 75 fn. It must, however, be admitted that the figure udāta and the excellent udāratva resemble closely.

62. Cp. Arni-P. 346. 9; in Dandin and even in Vāmana, the idea of uttānapaddata is absent; it, however, corresponds to aksarađambara of Bāna or vikātāksara-bandhatva of Bhoja.

63. By 'bhuyastva' the author probably means 'presence', because in the next verse (I. 81), he refers to the...
lengthy or short in measure. Thus, ojas has six main varieties: (i) abundance of long compounds, (ii) rarity of long compounds, (iii) moderate number of long compounds, (iv) abundance of short compounds, (v) paucity of short compounds and, lastly, (vi) middle quantity of short compounds. The first three forms may be equated with Vāmana's utkalikāpṛṣya and the last three with his sūrṇa variety. The various forms of ojas are observed in prose species like ākhāyikā etc. A typical example of the excellence is as follows: payodharatatotsālsa-lagnasaṁdhītapāṁsukā, kasya kāmāturaṁ ceto vārunīṁ na kari-ṣyati?

According to one reading in Bharata, ojas is the strength which consists in the use of varied and dignified compounded words, having letters agreeable to one another, while according to the other, it is the structure which imparts loftiness (even if it is low and undignified) and where there is communion of word and sense. Bhāmaha describes it as the paucity of compounds as a variety of ojas. We may, however, take it to mean 'abundance' also. But it can by no means indicate 'lengthiness' (of compounds) for which he gives another word, (gurutva). In fact, lengthy compounds do not form a real guna and Vāmana (III, 1.20) admits the presence of mādhurya only in their absence.

64. Op. Bhāmaha (I. 25; 35) who alludes to the term; in I. 35, he remarks that Gaudiya, too, is good if it is anakula.

65. The commas, Taruṇa., Ratna., Vidyaśāgara etc. (Hṛd., however, is not clear) explain guru and laghu as mahāprāṇa and alpa-prāṇa letters respectively. Dr. Lahiri (Urots, p. 76) follows them in this respect. But in fact, there is no context of a reference to letters here; the words, therefore, should be connected, as adjectives, with compounds.
employment of lengthy compounds; his conception seems to be the result of a wrong interpretation of Dandin's saṃśā- bhūyastva which, on its part, derives its source, with of course, some change, from Bharata, quoted as the first read-
ing. Vāmana considers it, as a verbal guṇa, to be the com-
pactness of word-structure (gāḍhābhandhatva) and, as an ideal guṇa, to be the maturity of conception (arthaprauḍhi).

His verbal guṇa partly resembles Dandin's śleṣa which is the non-residence of laxity, while his ideal guṇa is a new thing.

Bhoja and the author of Agni-Parana accept Dandin's conception. Mammata and Viśvanātha conceive ojas as the glaringness (dīptatva) which causes expansion of heart and which consists in abundant use of compounds and verbosity. They also include śleṣa, samādhi, audārya and prasāda in their conception of ojas.

(9) Kānti (grace) is the quality of agreeableness due to conformity to general usage, that is to say, absence of the unnatural, the exaggerated or the grotesque, noticeable in (i) dialogues (vārttā) and (ii) laudatory speeches (varṇanā).

66. Op. (a) Sos. ed. XVI. 105; (b) ChSS. ed. XVII. 103.
68. Op. III. 1. 5; 2. 2; Bhoja (SKA. I. 63 f.) includes gāḍhābhandhatva in one of his new guṇas, aurjitya.
70. Op. KPr. VIII. k. 72; 75; SD. VIII. 4; 7; 9-10.
71. Op. Hṛd. and Tarkavāgīśa; the latter also explains vārttā as legendary account; the former sense, however, suits us
e.g. (i) grhāṇī nāma tāṇy eva taporādir bhavādrāh, saṃbhāvayati
yānyevaṁ pāvanaṁ pādapaṁsuhīḥ (‘only those houses indeed
deserve to be called as such which a receptacle of penance like
your good self honours with the purifying dust of his feet’).
(ii) anayor anavadyāḥri stanayor jñābbhāmāṇayoh, avakāśo na
pāryāptas tava bāhulatāntare (‘O maiden with faultless
limbs, there is not space enough between thy creeperlike arms
for the expansion of these swelling breasts’).

In Bharata, according to one recension, it is loveliness
which delights the ear and the mind or which is realised by
the meaning conveyed by graceful gestures, while according to
another version, it is the word-structure which gives delight
(prasāda) to the ear and the mind. In Vāmana, it is, as
a verbal guṇa, the brilliance or refinedness of words and, as
an ideal guṇa, the prominence of sentiment (dīptarasatva).
Bharata's kānti, according to first reading, appears to be some
dramatic excellence; a part of it may, however, be compared
to Daṇḍin's figure, sūkṣma. The second conception, which

better; Ratna. renders it by pravrīttinivedana (telling
of news). This vārttā should not be confused with the
figure of that name in Bhaṭṭi (X.46) or Bhāmaha (Kal.
II. 37); op. De (Hār. II, p. 56) who wrongly takes
one for the other.

72. Op. Hrd.; it may also mean the depiction of the nature
of things (op. Ratna.), but even then, it would be
different from Daṇḍin's svabhāvokti; op. Lahiri:OEG. pp.
78-9.

73. Op. (a) GOS. ed. XVI. 112; (b) OhSS. ed. XVII. 107.

74. Op. III. 1. 24; 2. 14; on the basis of Vāmana's conception
of ideal form of kānti, Viśvanātha (SB. VIII. 15) includes
Vāmana follows in his verbal gūṇa, is comparable to Daṇḍin's mādhurya. Vāmana's ideal gūṇa corresponds to Bharata's conception according to the first reading. Bhoja follows Vāmana's verbal aspect of the gūṇa. Daṇḍin's kāṇṭi, is, in a way, the atiśayokti figure, with the only difference that while the latter transgresses the worldly usage, the former conforms to it, and, as Ṣeṣmacandra puts it, it only defines the limit to the atiśayokti figure. He, however, refuses to admit it as a gūṇa. It is to be noted that Appaya Dīksita quotes Daṇḍin's example of kāṇṭi (varṇanā) as an instance of atiśayokti, while the verse, which Daṇḍin gives under atyukti, the opposite of kāṇṭi, has been given under the atyukti figure by him with the remark that the two figures differ inasmuch as they refer to the real and unreal statements respectively.

Thus Daṇḍin's vartamān kāṇṭi and its opposite atyukti are comparable respectively to atiśayokti and atyukti figures of later rhetoricians.

(10) Samādhi (metaphorical expression) is the transference, in accordance with the worldly usage, of the quality

75. Cp. Ka. II. 260; see below, the chap. on alāṃkāras.
77. SKA. I. 69; at another place (I. 35), he regards grāmyatva as the opposite of kāṇṭi, implying thereby that the latter is the absence of vulgarity; also cp. KPr. VIII. k. 72 f; this kāṇṭi would resemble Daṇḍin's ideal mādhurya.
or qualities of one thing to another; e.g. kumudāni nimīlanti kamalāny unmaśanti ca ( 'The water-lilies slumber, the lotuses wake up' ). Here the quality of the eyes has been transferred to the lilies and lotuses. Another example registering transference of a number of qualities is as follows: guru-garbhabhārāklāntāḥ stamantyo meghapaṅktayāḥ, acaḷādhīṣṭhitotsaṃram imāḥ samadhīśarete ( 'The ranges of clouds weary with the weight of advanced pregnancy and moaning from pain sleep on the laps of the mountain').

In Bharata, according to one reading, it is superimposition (samādhāna) of something special or distinguishing in the sense and according to the other, it is the laboured communion (atīsaṃyoga) of the sense expressed or implied by simile. Vāmana describes it, as a verbal guṇa, as symmetry due to orderly ascent and descent, that is, when the heightening effect is toned down by the softening touch and vice versa, and, as an ideal guṇa, as the pregnancy of, or significance in,
the sense ( arthadṛṣṭi ). Dandin's samādhi approximates, on one hand, to the lakṣaṇa or gaunavṛtti (secondary application of words), and, on the other, to rūpaka and samāsokti figures. Its difference from rūpaka lies in the fact that while it consists in transference of the quality of one dharmin to another, in rūpaka one dharmin is superimposed on another. In samāsokti, instead of a reference to the intended thing, another object similar thereto in attributes is mentioned, whereas in samādhi, instead of a mention of the real quality of an object, another quality similar thereto is referred to. The inspiration of Dandin's samādhi comes from Bharata (as in the ChSS. ed.), though the latter's definition of the guna is not so clear. Wūmana's verbal guna is a new interpretation which Bhoja adopts in gati, one of his 24 vakyagamas, while the ideal aspect of his guna is an improvement on Bharata's definition and is comparable to Dandin's guna also, though he includes the latter's conception of samādhi in his vakrokti figure. Bhoja and the author of Agni-Purāṇa follow Dandin in this respect.

definition simply as the superimposition of an object on another quality. In Dandin, however, it is the superimposition of a quality on a different object. (b) ChSS. ed. XVII. 101.

83. Op. III. 1. 12; 2. 6; for verbal guna, cp. KPr. VIII. k.72f.

84. He himself refers to gaunavṛtti in this context in KA. I. 95; also op. II. 254; Agni-P, which repeats Dandin's definition of samādhi (355. 13; 13), treats it in the context of lakṣaṇa with a hint apparently of identifying the two; cp. De: HSP. II, p. 205.

85. Op. also De: HSP. II, pp. 81-2; 97; acc. to V. Aghavan (SCAS., p. 81), the guna & samādhi produces the figure
The viparayayas of the ten gunas. As we have already discussed, the anyathātva (contrariety or the changed condition) of the aforesaid gunas is generally observed in the Gauda path. It may be recalled that the viparayayas do not constitute defects in Dandin's view, though they might not be cent per cent gunas. Here we propose to discuss these viparayayas with reference to the Gauda diction of which they constitute the characteristic elements, and thereby determine the concept of the path.

(1) Saithilya or the laxity of structure is the opposite form of ślesa. It consists in the employment entirely of the alpaprāṇa letters and is tolerable (iṣṭa) in the Gauda path if it brings about dignity of diction (bandhagaurava) through the employment of alliteration, as for instance in 'mālatimāla lolālikalilā'. Bandhagaurava is a general quality which resides in the accompaniment of alliteration, or else, the existence of bandhagaurava or dignity of diction in loose structure is inexplicable. In fact, laxity of structure is not a quality, samāsokti.

86. Cp. Vāmana IV. 3. 8;
87. Cp. SKA. I. 72; Agni-1. 355. 13; 13. Bhoja (IV. 44) has a figure also of the same name and definition.
88. 'Anyathātva' should not imply that the conception of the Gaudas regarding gunas generally differed from that of the Vaidarbhās; cp. Lahiri: CRU. pp. 58 ff.
89. It may be noted in passing that Bhoja (SKA. I. 28-41) describes these opposites as aritimat faults, but he also includes them in the gunas of Gauda diction (I.128 ff.).
nor is it appreciated by the Gauḍas, but it is allowed for the sake of alliteration which accompanies it and which lends dignity to the diction. The verbal play or the akṣaraṭānmba, as Bāna would call it, is favoured by the Gauḍas so much so that they are unmindful of the laxity of diction if at all it occurs thereby.

(2) Vyutpampa, the opposite of prasāda, is farfetchedness due to the employment of vocables in their unconventional, though etymologically justifiable, senses; e.g. anatayunjān-jāmasīrka ṣākko valarkṣaguh ( 'the white-beamed one (i.e. moon) has a spot similar to the not-very-white water-born ones (i.e. lotuses)'

(3) Viṣama, the viparyaya of sama, is unevenness or the co-employment of uneven dictions (bandhas), which are of three kinds, namely, soft, harsh and middle. The view of Hṛdayarāma that the soft and harsh dictions were favourite with the Gauḍas (and the middle one with the Vaidarbhās) is untenable and Ratnāśrīnjāna has rightly rejected it. In their predilection for the bombast both of word and sense as also of poetic figures, the Gauḍas do not mind unevenness if it creeps in. In other words, they would allow it, provided it enhances the charm of poetic diction, as for instance, in ' (Malayamārutaḥ) spardhaḥ ruddhamaddhairyo vararāmānā-nilaih' ( 'The Malaya breeze which has impeded my patience vies

90. Op. KA. I. 43-4; also I. 69.
91. Bhoja (SKA. I. 34) calls it aprasama.
with the breath of the beautiful lady). The verse illustrates the pomp of simile and alliteration, due to which fact, the fault of unevenness (that is, the harsh bandha in first line and soft one in the second) has been allowed to occur. It may be noted here that Vāmana's verbal guṇa, saṃādhi closely resembles the idea of viṣama.

(4) Niṣṭhura, the viparyaya of sukuṃāratā, is the use of harsh sounds which are difficult to pronounce. It is preferred by the Gaudas for its being grand or glaring and embellished. The example is: nyakṣena ṭapitaḥ pakeṣaḥ ksatriyānāṃ kṣanāt.

Such bandhas are accepted by the Gaudas on account of the glaring sense (ūrjita artha) and alliteration they contain.

(5) Atyukti, the viparyaya of kānti, is the exaggerated expression which crosses the limit of worldly usage; e.g. (वार्ता): devadhiṣyam ivārūṇhyam adyaprabhṛti no gṛham, yuṣmatpādarajapātadhautaniḥśesakalmaṣam ('From today our house is to be adored as a temple, since the dust of your feet has entirely washed away all its sins'); (वर्णना): alpaṁ

92. Bhoja (SKA. I. 127) interprets Dandin's phrase, arthā-laṃkāraṇaṃbharā as ideal figures and verbal pomp. We may, however, take it to signify word and sense and poetic figures as well.


94. Vāmana ascribes kānti itself (which he explains as auyjvalya and dintarasaṭva; see above) to the Gaudī rīti. Bhoja (SKA. I. 35) gives grāmya as the opposite of kānti. Appaya (Kuval. I. 163) adopts Dandin's atyukti in the form of a figure of that name; op. above, fn. 80.
nirmitam ākāśam anālocyaiva vedhasā, idam evamvidhām bhāvi bhava-
tyāḥ stanajrmbhāḥ (Surely the Creator has made this space too
narrow, foreseeing not so great an expansion of thy breasts).

The remaining five guṇas are, according to Tarunāvācaspāti's
interpretation of 'prāyo dṛṣṭyatā', admitted in the same form in
the Gaūḍa diction. This is also clear from Daṇḍin's own admis-
sion to that effect. As a matter of fact, these five guṇas are
accepted by the Gaūḍás with certain specifications in some cases.
They require, therefore, a separate reference in the context of
the Gaūḍa diction.

(1) The verbal mādhūrya or vājrāsa consists of śrutiyanu-
prāsa and varamānuprāsa (termed simply anuprāsa) which have
been separately alluded to by the author with the remark that the
former is favoured by the Vaiḍarbhas, while the Gaūḍás prefer
the latter to the former. Varamānuprāsa, according to him, is
the recurrence of letters, very close to one another and giving
the impression of previous occurrence. It may be remarked
here that the Gaūḍás would not like the alliteration with
repetition of letters after long gaps. The ideal mādhūrya

95. Cp. comm. on I. 42; also cp. Hatma.
97. Cp. KA. I. 54; 60; Taruna regards both the anuprāsas as
acceptable to both the dictions, but remarks that Vaiḍarbha
mārga does not permit the alliteration which causes harshness
and laxity of diction (cp. KA. I. 60; Ranga. ed. p. 37);
this, however, is admissible in the Gaūḍa mārga due to the
recurrence of letters only. SKA. (I. 36) cites the ex.
KA. I. 59 under asamasta fault, the opposite of ojas;
or vasturasā is the absence of indecency which gets admission into both the dictions.

(2) Arthavyakti is accepted by the Gaudās in the same form in which the Vaidarbhas adopt it.

(3) Udāratva, too, is a guṇa common to both, or even all, the mārgas.

(4) Ojas or samāsa-bhūyastva is acceptable in the Gaudā diction in verse also, while it is appreciated in prose only by the Vaidarbhas. The guṇa in its extreme form is a special characteristic of the Gaudā diction and the fact has been admitted by Vāmana also, though his conception of ojas is quite different. He has, however, recognised Daṅdin's ojas also by describing Gauḍī as a diction characterised by the abundance of compounds and verbosity (samastātyudbhātappādā). An apt example of ojas of the Gaudās is the verse: astamastakaparyasamastārkaṁdusahastaraḥ, pīnastānastātāmāravastrevābhāti vāruṇī. The author makes a hint to the effect that the ojas of the Gaudās is confusing and hence unpleasant. This remark seems to represent his personal viewpoint which preferred the Vaidartha diction to the other one.

(5) The guṇa samādhi has been regarded as the essence of poetry (kāvyasarvasva) with the implication that it is appreciated not only in the two clearly distinguishable dictions,

---

98. Bhoja (SKA. II, ex. 189) cites this verse under his Paundrī vṛttī (Paṇḍra = Gauḍadesa).
but in all the possible literary paths.

The foregoing discussion brings out the following facts:

(i) The ten gunās are essential in any good composition; but the Gauḍa path often represents a different aspect of some of the gunās. (ii) The ideals of composition differ generally in the two diction. While the Vaidartha path emphasises the refined and classical manner and demands compactness of structure, clarity of expression and a sense of proportion, the Gauḍa path prefers the elements of hyperbole and verbosity. (iii) In order to achieve this object, the Gauḍas do not mind the defects of looseness and unevenness, though it is never meant that the above defects form inseparable part of the Gauḍa path. (iv) Farare fetchedness, exaggeration etc., however, regarded as positive excellences by the Gauḍas who often welcome them/poetry in order to attain the standard which has a distinct liking for the fervid and the bombastic. Vāmana's Gauḍīyā rīti is characterised by the excellences, ojas, comprising the elements of compactness of structure and maturity of meaning, and kānti composed of brilliance and prominence of rasa. He also calls it a diction marked by profusion of compounds and verbal display. Viśvanāthah Gauḍī rīti also is particularised by the abundance of compounds.

An assessment of Dandin's treatment of gunas. Judging independently of the treatment of diction, Dandin's elaboration of the gunas is not exhaustive and strictly logical. The

99. KA. I, 100; ārd. takes kāvyasārvasva to imply that the guna is common to the two paths. We, however, like to take it in its wider application of all diction, that is, a poetic composition in general.
definitions of some of them are not very much clear. The guṇas udāratva and kānti, for example, have been defined vaguely. Although in both of them the author evidently admits the subjective evaluation, yet he does not care to make this fact clear in his definitions. Again, the definition of kānti appears to be incomplete; for while the agreeable sense within the limit of the worldly usage has a very wide range which may cover many things, an examination of the illustration clearly shows that the writer means to restrict the scope only to the expression of something special, which is, in fact, a part of the definition of the figure atīśayokti. The position of mādhurya, too, is not better. It has been regarded as an excellence both of word and sense, but there is no connection or relation whatsoever between the verbal and the ideal mādhurya. One can understand the existence of verbal mādhurya in an alliterative composition, but the idea of the necessary existence of sweetness of sense in the absence of vulgarity is not comprehensible, and Dr. De rightly remarks that the guṇa mādhurya though defined primarily as a particular mode of word-arrangement has been regarded more or less as a subtle excellence which defies analysis. Again, some of the guṇas which evidently contain positive characteristics have been given negative definitions. There can be the least doubt that the guṇas, śleṣa, sukumāratā and arthavyakti are positive.

100. Cp. also De: HSP. II, p. 81.
excellences, but they have been negatively defined by the writer. This has been done probably in order to achieve more clearness, but this could very well be secured by positive definitions also.

Although on the whole, the author has improved upon the definitions of Bharata, yet it must be admitted that in some cases, he has obscured the real conception of a guna by providing it with an entirely different interpretation, and thereby has given rise to certain problems. His exposition of samata would illustrate this point. Herein he admits the soft, harsh and middle bandhas arising respectively from the use of soft, harsh and mixed letters, in both the margas. The admission, however, is incompatible with the author's own statement that the soft diction contains the defect of looseness of bandha and that it is, for this reason, not admissible in the Vaidarbha marga. The soft bandha may be supposed to be acceptable to the Vaidarbhas due to its being 'soft', but the idea of the harsh bandha which contains the indefensible defect of 'being difficult to pronounce' (krochodyatva) being acceptable to the Vaidarbhas is beyond comprehension. In fact, the two bandhas, containing as they do the defect of looseness (in all-soft) and that of being difficult to pronounce respectively ought not to be admitted in the Vaidarbha path. The question drew the attention of the old commentators. According to Hrdayamab, the soft and harsh bandhas are liked by the Guadas

102. Cp. Ka. I. 69; the ex. (I. 48) of soft bandha is closely comparable to that of Saithilya (I. 43) which is not acceptable to the Vaidarbhas.

103. Cp. the example, I. 48, with I. 72 which is called krochodya.
and the middle one by the Vaidarbhās. Refuting this expla-
nation, Ratnaśrījñāna remarks that the soft and harsh bandhas
are noticeable in standard Vaidarbhās works like Raghuvamśa and
Jātakamālā composed by southern writers. The explanation is,
of course, not fully convincing and is acceptable only partial-
ly. In fact, Bharata's definition of sumatā (ChSS. ed.) is
the appropriate exposition of the gunās; and by changing it
Dāṇḍin has merely given rise to confusion. His definition of
the gunās, mādhurya and kānti also cannot be considered to be
better than that given by Bharata.

The second flaw in Dāṇḍin's treatment of the excellences
is that some of his gunās have not been clearly distinguished
from one another. The distinction between śleṣa and sukumārata,
for instance, is not very much clear. According to the defini-
tions, śleṣa consists in the abundant use of alppraprāṇa letters,
while sukumārata is composed of soft syllables. As the al-
paprāṇa letters are generally soft, the difference between the
gunās is practically nil. Besides, the absolute absence of the
mahāprāṇa and harsh letters respectively in the two gunās
results in the same defect, namely, bandhasaithilya or laxity
of diction. The commentator Tarkavāgīśa tries to distinguish
the two by stating that the admixture of alppaprāṇa and mahāprāṇa
letters constitutes śleṣa, whereas sukumārata consists in tender-
ness as a total effect arising from the mixing of soft and harsh
letters. He further clarifies the fact by adding that the

104. Op. the comm. on KA. I. 47.
alpaprāṇa letters are not necessarily soft; they tend to become harsh in conjunction with certain letters, and similarly, the mahāprāṇa letters, too, become soft in their particular arrangement. But it should be borne in mind that Dāṇḍin himself has admitted the alpaprāṇa letters to be soft by saying that the use entirely of alpaprāṇa letters constitutes all-softness. The ṛṇas, prasāda and arthavyakti also have got too much mutual affinity and, as De remarks, the latter may well be included in the former. Both the guṇas aim at easy comprehension ( pratītiśubhāyatḥ ), the difference lying only in the means thereof. While in prasāda, the aim is realised by the use of words easy of comprehension, that in the other guṇa is achieved by means of the explicitness of sense. The author was perhaps aware of the defective nature of the classification which he has hinted at towards the end of his treatment of guṇas.

Some of the guṇas tend to enter the jurisdiction of certain poetic figures, and have been specifically treated as such by later theorists. The verbal aspect of mādhurya has been called anuprāṇa, a poetic figure of word, by the author himself. The guṇa, udāratva is very close in conception to the udāta figure. Mr. Lahiri, differentiating between the two, remarks that in the figure, the greatness, high merit or prosperity of a personage...
is described directly, while in the excellence it is just implied. Evidently, the point of difference, especially when it is between a guna and an alamkara, is quite negligible. Moreover, we do not notice the element of implicitness in the example of udaratva. The guna kanti, likewise, bears a close affinity, within a limit, to the atidhayokti figure. In both the cases, there is expression of something special, though not clearly mentioned by the author in the context of the guna. The expression of the special restricts itself in the guna to the worldly usage, while in the figure it transgresses the limit. As noted above, Hemacandra clearly states that the guna borders on the atidhayokti figure and Appaya Dikshita virtually identifies Danjin’s kanti with atidhayokti and atyukti (the opposite of the guna) with the figure of that name.

Similarly it is difficult to distinguish the excellence samadhi from the figure rupaka where there is also poetic superimposition of an object or its qualities upon another; a slight difference may consist in the fact that in the guna, there is transference only of the qualities or actions of one thing to another, while in the figure, one object itself is substituted for another. But in fact, this process of poetic transference is essentially a mode of figurative expression restàng


110. Lahiri(op. cit.) himself remarks that it need not mean any technical suggestiveness of the dhvani theorists.

111. Op. (a) KAn., p. 239; (b) Kuval. I. 163; op. above, fn.
finally on laksanā (secondary application of meaning).

Vāmana, too, regards it as a figure in the form of laksanā based on similarity, though he terms it vakrokti and not rūpaka.

The guṇa is comparable to the figure samāsokti also, the only point of difference between the two being that the guṇa, instead of referring to the real quality of an object, mentions some other quality similar thereto, while in the figure, the poet, instead of referring to the intended object, mentions another object close thereto.

When guṇas are regarded as the essential or constituent elements of the mārga, it is natural to expect that they would present a positive aspect. But in the case of ideal mādhurya, we observe that its existence is due to the absence of the defect of indecency and thus it represents a negative form. In fact, the inevitable residence of mādhurya in the absence of vulgarity is not possible unless there exists already some positive element conducive to sweetness. This positive element can either be the emotion of love (as is indicated by Daṇḍinī's example, I. 64) which according to him should be alluded to in decently-veiled phrases, or the strikingness of expression.

79-80.


113. Op. IV. 3. 8; its example is closely comparable to Daṇḍinī's example of samādhi (KA. I. 94).

114. V. Raghvan (SCAS. p. 81) remarks that the guṇa samādhi produces the figure samāsokti.
Although Dāṇḍin does not classify the guṇas into those of word and sense, nor perhaps was he aware of this distinction, yet an examination of his guṇas shows that some of them refer to word, some to sense, while one of them refers to both. The excellences, śleṣa, sukuṃārata and ojas which refer to sound-effects constitute what may be called verbal guṇas, while prasāda, arthavyakti, udāratva, kānti and samādhi come under the ideal excellences. The guṇa mādhurya refers to both word and sense. In this classification of guṇas, the position of samatā which cannot be directly related either to word or to sense is curious, though, since it denotes uniformity of diction or word-arrangement, it may be regarded as a verbal excellence.

Notwithstanding some inevitable flaws in Dāṇḍin’s treatment of the guṇas, it must be admitted that he has in his own way considerably improved upon the vague definitions of Bharata and, by introducing novel features at places, has exhibited his creative and critical mind. In fact, the topic dealing with the guṇas remains defective in the whole range of Sanskrit Poetics in general and in the works of early

115. The distinction is vaguely hinted at in the solitary case of mādhurya which, the writer says, resides both in word and idea (I, 51).

theorists including Bharata, Dāṇḍin and Bhāmaha and even Vāmana, in particular. Dr. De has rightly remarked on this point that "the whole doctrine despite the care of its exponents is still unsatisfactory and indicates the fruitlessness of the efforts of early theorists in comprehending all the excellences of a composition within the hard and fast limits of a few categories on the interpretation of which they spend so much ingenuity, but on which cannot in the nature of things arrive at any absolute agreement". We may make an estimate of Dāṇḍin's treatment of the subject in the light of this remark, and if we do so, we must appreciate his valuable contribution, of course, within narrow limits, to this important part of Sanskrit Poetics.

117. HSp. II, p. 98.