CHAPTER VIII

DANandin AND LATER DOCTRINES OF POETICS

Danandin lived and worked in a period when various theories were making their appearance, whether conscious or sub-conscious, in the horizon of Poetics. The theory of dhvani or rasa-dhvani had not yet been evolved, though it may be observed in its crude form in Danandin's reference to the idea of suggestion in his treatment of the figures, ākṣepa and vyatireka. We have already discussed the concept of vakrokti as an element characterising poetic figures, which developed in later times into a full-fledged system of Poetics. Other doctrines to which our author makes a passing reference or which we may observe in him in their rudimentary form are the theories of rasa and auricitya which occupied prominent place as definite systems of later Poetics. Here we propose to make a brief reference to these doctrines.

The doctrine of rasa. Danandin recognises the importance of rasa in poetry or in a mahākāvyā which, according to him, should be abounding in sentiments and emotions. Being, however, an alamkāra theorist, he assigns it a minor position in his system. He deals with rasas under the figure rasavat where

1. The element of suggestion is frequently noticed in Danandin's examples of ākṣepa which was later approximated to the poetry of subordinate suggestion. One of his examples (KA, II, 139) has been cited as an instance of vastudhvani by Hemacandra (KA., pp. 37-8); also cp. above, chap. VII, under ākṣepa. For the concept of suggestion implied in vyatireka, cp. KA, II, 182 and also II, 180; 189.

2. KA. I. 13.
rasa as such is subservient to the expressed figure itself, of which it serves as a means of embellishment. Thus in him, rasa is an ornamentation of language or of the sense. His peculiarly objective viewpoint with regard to the concept is evidently responsible for the subordinate place which he and other followers of rîti and alamkāra schools accord to it.

Dandin enumerates and illustrates the traditionally recognised eight rasas which are śṛṅgāra (erotic sentiment), vīra (heroic sentiment), kārūnya (pathetic sentiment), hāṣya (comic sentiment) and the sentiments of raudra (fury), bībhatsa (horror), advayata (wonder) and bhayānaka (terror), developed respectively from the dominant emotions of rati (love), utsāha (energy), śoka (grief), hāsa (mirth), krodha (anger), jugupsā (disgust), vismaya (astonishment) and bhaya (fear). He also refers to the various elements which cause the realisation of rasa. Besides sthīyabhāvas or the dominant emotions which he expressly mentions, he implies the ideas of vibhāvas (determinants which may be either fundamental or excitant ones), anubhāvas (consequents) and vyabhicāribhāvas (transitory emotions) in his term rūpabāhulyayoga. As said above, his conception of rasa was objective, as that of Lollaṭa, if we accept Abhinavagupta's interpretation of his view. Dandin, according to him, believes

in causal development of sentiment through vibhaivas and annabhavas, otherwise remaining dormant. From what the writer himself remarks in this connection, it is gathered that development of rasa in his view follows from some dominant emotion.

It may be casually remarked that the term rasa used in the context of madhurya guṇa does not denote rasa in its technical meaning of sentiment, as has been taken by some writers. The word there conveys quite a different sense. The alliterative series of words and the refined meaning have been collectively regarded there as element conducive to rasa or elegance. Danḍin himself means to distinguish the two when he states that the rasa of madhurya guṇa is means of refined speech, while the traditional rasas refer to eight emotions and their realisation as corresponding sentiments.

Principle of Ausītya. According to Kaśmendra, the great exponent of the principle of ausītya in poetry, that

5. Cp. AB. on Bh. NS. VI., KM. ed. p. 62 (where he cites KA. II. 281 and 283 and remarks that acc. to Danḍin, the dominant emotions develop into corresponding sentiments through the assistance of vibhaiva and annabhava etc.).


7. E.g. the comm. Taruṇa. (on II. 292) who calls it a ninth rasa, and Bühler (op. Keith: HSL. p. 378).

8. Also op. Raṃga. on KA. I. 52; 62 and Hemacandra: Kan., p. 198; also op. above, chap. IV, fn. 33.

9. KA. II. 292.
which suits or conforms to a particular thing is called ucita
in its relation to that object. This idea of ucitva or
propriety may refer to various aspects of a poem such as the
series of words, the sense, poetic excellences and figures,
sentiments and language and diction. It may also apply to
considerations of time and place.

Danḍin implies the idea of propriety in various spheres
of his concepts and gives a general form of the doctrine in
the making. The principle of propriety is at work when he puts
special stress on proper employment of words, and condemns a
speech improperly formed. The idea is again implied in his
treatment of śuṇas and doṣas and especially in his observa-
tion, made perhaps for the first time in Sanskrit Poetics,
that defects cease to be defects or even become excellences
under certain circumstances. Again, the idea underlying
kavikāusala or the skill of a poet due to which all kinds of
incongruity changed into good qualities refers exactly to
the sense of propriety said to be essential for a poet. In

11. KA. I. 6; also cp. above.
12. It is important to note that Mahimabhāṭṭa (Vv. II)
discusses the question of external propriety with ref.
to five defects of composition two of which, kramabheda
and paunaruktya correspond to Danḍin’s doṣas, apakrama
and śkārtha respectively.
13. After him, the idea occurs in Śhāmaha (I. 54-5) and
in Rudraṭa (IV. 8; 21-4; 25-39; V. 47) who speaks of
this as an aspect of propriety. Bhoja (SKA. I. 89-
156) develops this idea by forming a peculiar class of
course of his treatment of upamādoṣas, he makes an important observation that the cases of defective simile cease to remain faulty, if they do not hurt the cultivated sensibility; they constitute defects only when they injure the mind of a sahrdaya. The writer further remarks that the faulty cases of simile are skilfully avoided by men of taste whose fine sensibility serves as the criterion for outlining merits and defects. This poetic sense of propriety clearly refers to the principle of aucitya in poetry. Again, the defect deśakālalokavirodhi consisting in non-observance of the rules of place, time and common usage, later developed by Kāsemendra as one of the spheres of application of the principle of aucitya, underlines the doctrine in its inception. Elsewhere also, Daṇḍin emphasises the importance of worldly usage which constitutes a vital aspect of the concept of propriety. His guṇa kānti consists in non-violation of the common usage, while the ideal aspect of his mādhurya guṇa dogmatises the

14. KA. III. 179; also cp. III. 130; 133; 137; 141; 146.
15. Op. II. 51; 54-5 and esp. 56. It may be noted that Kāsemendra includes gender and number also in his list of the cases to which the principle of aucitya is applied. In KA. II. 56, the words: 'kāranām tatra cintyatām' seem to allude to the sense of propriety; also cp. KA. I. 20.
16. KA. I. 55; esp. the ex. I. 87 illustrating, so to say, the aucitya of common usage which as Daṇḍin himself remarks here delights the hearts of men of taste who follow the worldly usage. The ex. I. 91 exemplifies impropriety termed atyukti by Daṇḍin (I. 92).
avoidance of indecency which in later theory appears as ideal or internal acitya.

The idea of propriety is involved also in Danḍin's conception of bhāvika which brings about mutual assistance of different parts of the theme and helps the poet in avoiding redundant attributes and describing things in their proper place and in such a proper sequence of expression as clearly brings out even a serious theme. All these aspects of bhāvika which according to Danḍin are bhāvayatta, controlled by the inward conception of a poet that comprehends, inter alia, his sense of propriety, refer to the various elements of acitya. Besides, the writer is eloquent on the point that the ultimate test of poetry rests with the appreciation of men of taste, and thus by referring to the intrinsic sense of appreciation of the sahṛdayas or connoisseurs, he indirectly advocates the theory of acitya in poetry.

The doctrine of acitya may be traced back to Bharata who, as pointed out by Dr. V. Raghavan, implies the principle in his reference to worldly usage and dramatic manners, to the concepts of prakṛti and pravṛtti and in his treatment of acting and the ornamentation effecting it, of various qualities of recitation, of accents and the employment of sentiments and especially of the anubhāvas. These elements point to

17. KA. I, 62-4; cp. Mahimabhaṭṭa's antaraṇya or arthaviśaya acitya.
18. I. 20; 51; 71; 88; II. 51; 53-4; 56 etc.
the doctrine of appropriateness, propriety and adaptation (comprehended by the term auritya).

The term auritya, however, occurs as late as Rudrata who treats the concept with reference to the employment of poetic figures. He also speaks of impropriety of usage, dress etc. After him, the term occurs frequently in Dhvanyâloka in which Ñandavardhana deals with the concept with reference to poetic excellences and figures and, above all, sentiments. His commentator, Añhinavagupta finely elaborates the idea and it is also implied in Râjaâekhara's definition of vyutpatti. Kuntaka treats auritya as a guṇa, while in Agnipurâṇa, it comes as a poetic figure. Finally, Kâemendra develops the idea of propriety into a systematic doctrine of auritya which he extols as the soul of poetry overflowing with sentiments. He also speaks of auritya as the essence of rasa and develops in this respect the idea of Ñandavardhana that impropriety is the only thing which disturbs the realisation of rasa and that the supreme secret of rasa consists in conforming to rules of propriety. Thus the idea of auritya was established as a definite system by Kâemendra whom Mahimabhâṭṭa joins later.

19. Sm. Bh. XIX; XXIII. 42; 69; XXVI. 113-9; XXIX. 1-4; op. V. Raghavan: SCAS. pp. 194 ff.
20. Sm. II. 32; XI. 9.
21. Sm. II. 17; III. 6; 15 etc.
22. DhA. I. 13; 75; Edim., 603. ed. p. 16.
23. VJ. I. 53-4; for detail, see Raghavan: SCAS. pp. 194-213; 230f.
Dandin and later theorists. As we have seen in the fore­
going pages, Dandin covers a vast field of Sanskrit Poetics to
which he richly contributes, and paves the way for his succe­
ssors. Almost all the theorists who come after him exhibit
his great impact, either direct or indirect, in their works
and while dealing with the main streams of his poetic theory,
we have had sufficient occasion to refer to his influence on
his successors. Of his immediate followers, Bhāmaha and
Udbhaṭa belong to 8th century A.D., the former flourishing in
its first half and the latter in the second. They develop the
theory of alamkāra on the line of Dandin in their works which
both of them name Kāvyālāmkāra. Then follow Vāmana and Rudraṭa,
both belonging to the second half of 9th century A.D. Of them,
Vāmana in his Kāvyālāmkārasūtraṇa develops Dandin's mārga
theory in his own way and establishes the rīti school, while
Rudraṭa elaborates the older alamkāra theory in his Kāvyā­
laṅkāra.

Then appear on the scene the rasa-dhvani theorists
who push back the earlier schools and propound the theory of
suggestion of rasa. They include the anonymous author of
Dhvani and Ánandavardhana (last quarter of 9th century),
the author of Dhvanyālōka as also his commentator, Abhinava­
gupta (c. 950-1020 A.D.) who wrote Dhvanyālakalocana, besides

24. AYC. I. 5.
25. Ibid. I. 3; cp. DhA. III. 14 ff.; for a detailed account
194-257; De: BSP. II. 282; 293-5.
Abhinavabhāratī, a commentary on Bharata’s Nātyadāstra. In later period, Mammatā and others followed the doctrine substantially.

The writers who flourished between Ānandavardhana and Mammatā include Rājasekhara (d. 900 A.D.), the author of Kāvyamīmāṃsā, Mukulabhaṭṭa (last quarter of 9th century), the author of Abhidhāvṛttimātrikā, Bhaṭṭa Tauta (third quarter of 10th century), the author of Kāvyakautuka, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka (between 900 and 1000), the author of Hṛdayadarpana, Kuntaka (between 950 and 1050), the author of Vakrokti-jīvita, Mahimabhaṭṭa (end of 11th century), the author of Vyakti-viveka, Bhoja (between 1010 and 1055), the author of Sarasvatīkāntābhāraṇa and Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, Kṛṣṇendrā (middle of 11th century), the author of Aucityavicārācara, and the unknown author of the alaṃkāra portion of Agni-Purāṇa.

Among these writers, Kuntaka elaborates the theory of Vakrokti the inspiration for which comes originally from Dāṇḍin, while Bhoja and the author of Agni-Purāṇa owe a great deal to him in respect of their general doctrines and material. The seed of Kṛṣṇendrā’s aucitya was also sown by our author.

Mammatā (c. 1100) presents in consolidated form the earlier theories in his Kāvyapraṅga, though he chiefly patronises the doctrine of rasadhvani. His successors revive the alaṃkāra theory once again. Among them, Ruyyaka (c. 1150 A.D.), the author of Alakaśārarvasa, Sāhityamīmāṃsā etc., Vāgbhaṭa I (first half of 12th century), the author of Vāgbhaṭalakāra, Jayadeva (c. 1200-50), the author of
Candrāloka and Vāgbhaṭa II (14th century) deserve special mention. Some writers cover, like Māmaṭa, the entire field of Poetics; their list includes Hemacandra (1080-1173 A.D.), the author of Kāvyānudāsana, Vidyādhara (between 1285-1325), the author of Śakalī, Vidyānātha (14th century), the author of Pratāprudrayadobhūṣaṇa and, above all, Viśvanātha (between 1300 and 1384), the author of Sāhityadarpaṇa. Viśvanātha was followed by less familiar theorists like Jāradātānaya (1175-1250), the author of Bhāvaprakāśana, Śingabhūpāla (c. 1330), the author of Rasārṇavasudhākara, Bhāṇudatta (between 1450 and 1500), the author of Rasamaṇjarī etc., Rūpagośvāmin (c. 1500 A.D.), the author of Ujjvalanilamani and Appaya Dīkṣita (between 1554 and 1626), the author of Kuvalayānanda and Citramāmānasā, till another big name appears in Jagannātha (1620-65), the author of Rasagāṅādhara, who may be regarded as the last great writer of Sanskrit Poetics.

A brief reference to the commentators of Dandaṁ may not be out of place here. There are at least fifteen commentaries on Kāvyādāra, the oldest of them being perhaps the Hṛdayaṅgamā by an anonymous author who wrote before Bhoja, or the Ratnasrī by Ratnasrījñāna, a Ceylonese monk of about 900 A.D. Of others, those of Taruṇavācaspati (13th century), his son, Kesaṅbhāṭṭāraka, Harinātha (who wrote Mārjanā) (between 1575 and 1675), Vādiyaṅgala (who wrote Śrūtanugālinī) and Mallīnātha (the author of Vaimalyavīdhāyini) occupy next place both in point of time and value. Among other commentaries are the Muktāvalī by Narasiṁha Sūri,
Candrikā by Trīṣaraṇalatābhīma, Vivṛti by Kṛṣṇaśīkara, Kāsi-
raṇjari by Viśvanātha and those written by Bhagīratha, Yāmu-
neya, Viśyananda (1626 A.D.) and Tribhuvanacandra Vādīsimha,
the last two being in incomplete form. Besides, there are
commentaries by anonymous authors. Unfortunately most of the
commentaries are still in manuscript form. Among modern
commentators of Daṇḍin, the names of Premacandra Tarkavāgīśa,
Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara and Rāmacandra Miśra deserve special
mention.