IV. AUCITYA AND OTHER POETIC CONCEPTS

Prefatory note

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

With all probability, the concept of aucitya, as a synthesizing force, has its roots in the Indian philosophical outlook. The Indian person, who appears to be evolved primarily in the unification of distinct cultures, has developed an attitude of unifying any amount of diverse elements in a single whole. This is not the haphazard conglomeration of diverse kind of things, but the intrinsic unification which results in one synthetic organism. This ideal of the achievement of a life of harmony has moulded the Indian Art and the theories on art as well. If viewed from this point, we find that, every later literary theory in India being emerged from the former ones, synthesizing their main aspects in its frame-work, has laid a sound basis for the later ones. Thus aucitya is the most comprehensive and unique concept which can expand itself to any extent to subsume any literary concept under its province.

It should be borne in mind that, aucitya solidifies itself at the time of actual poetic creation and recreation. The various constituents of a literary work strive to register each of its individuality in the process of a literary creation. That poet, who is clear and firm in achieving the foremost aim of poetry, viz., rasa, would adapt all other parts in such a way that, each part
shall contribute to the central theme by making itself secondary. This is
the ‘upasarjanikarana’ of Ānandavardhana, which constitutes the central idea
of the definition of dhvani.\textsuperscript{110} In achieving this, the sense of propriety works
behind the scene. It watches and controls the whole process of literary ac-
tivity. And if the sense of propriety is divested, that is, if the prime aim of
the poet is lost sight of, then an individual part acquires a cancerous de­
velopment resulting in sheer oddity.\textsuperscript{111}

In order to concretize his vision, the poet resorts to one or the other
kind of expression. In poetry, language is the instrument of such an expres­sion. Thus, a poetic creation, in a way, is the vision properly expressed. If
observed from the opposite point, poetry constitutes in the materials or
instruments which the vision employs for its self-expression.\textsuperscript{112} However
great may be the theme visioned by the poet, it is to be expressed through
linguistic materials only. Therefore, the analysis of these materials from
the point of the role they play in the expression of rasa would constitute the
subject of our present study.

(i) Ascitva and Šabda

Poetry distinguishes itself from other arts by the medium it resorts to.
Thus, Šabda has got a vital importance in poetry in so much so that, it is this
Šabda that makes poetry a unique form of art.\textsuperscript{113} Many ālahārikas pay due
regard to Šabda by including it in their definition of poetry, since Šabda is
the primary requisite in a composition. Thus, priority has been given to
Šabda, right from Bhāmaha, who defines poetry as शब्दार्थः सहिती, down to
Jagannātha, who regards poetry as Šabda itself which conveys beautiful mean­ing-रसायायार्थपतिपदकः शब्दः काव्यम्।

In poetry, unlike in scientific treatises, Šabda enjoys very unique sta­
tus. Its significance does not merely lie in conveying the meaning. Šabda,
having co-equal importance with *artha*, form one organic whole called *sāhīya*.

Thus observes Ruyyaka:

न च काल्ये शस्त्रादितं अर्थात्तीत्तर्थं शब्दान्तरं प्रयुक्तं सहित्यं: शब्दार्थोऽस्तरं

प्रयोगात् । साहित्यं तुल्यकक्ष्यवेत्तान्वन्युक्तितिरविष्कर्तवम्।

*Vyākavrivaśabhinirnayaḥ, p. 36*

In the context of Indian literary tradition *sadā* or *vāk* is regarded as having divine nature. In the benedictory verse of *Vākyapadīya*, the celebrated grammarian Bhartṛhari pays homage to this *sadā* as below;

अनातिनियन्त्रं ग्रहो शब्दतत्त्वं यद्यकरम्।

विवर्तते वर्धभावेन प्रक्षिप्त: जगती यतः॥

Kalidāsa identifies *sadā* or *vāk* with Pārvati, the divine mother, and *artha* with Parameśvara, the divine father, both being the parents of the universe;

वागधविव समप्रकार्ति वागर्थ्यूपयोगचे ।

जगत: पितरी वन्दे पार्यतेपनेश्वरी॥

*Raghuvaṃśa, I, 1*

In the province of poetry one cannot think of *sadā* without its *artha*. And accordingly, the *ālaṅkārikas* use the term *śabdārṇau* in their definitions on poetry. If these two stand independent, they turn incomplete. *Artha* without *sadā* is intangible and *sadā* without *artha* turns absurd. In this context Kuntaka's observation is remarkable;

अर्थं समर्थवाचकास्त्रव्येच्यानमत्स्युपरि भृतृभापि मृतक्लयो एवावतिष्ठते । श्वरोढऽ वाक्योपयोगिवाचासऽम्पवे वाच्यान्तरवाचकः समावक्यस्त्र व्याख्येभृत्तः प्रतिभाति।

*Vākroṇkiṣṭaraṇī, p. 13*

[A thought, though striking in itself, will be no better than a corpse when it is not embodied in an adequately striking word. In the same way, a word which does not have an adequate thought-content but which expresses something irrelevant, is to be deemed as a disease of the poem.]*114* It is therefore
their union is expected and this union brings about a great deal of happiness. It is in this sense Kālidāsa proposes;

तत्तद्धिव भारत्या सुतया योक्तुमहसिः
अशोच्या हि पितृः कन्या सत्तृत्प्रतिपादिता

Kumārasambhava, VI, 79

[As sense with word, combine him with your daughter;
since, daughter, handed-over to a good husband
will be no cause of sorrow for her father.]

Kuntaka compares the sympathetic co-operation between these two aspects
to the mutual understanding between two friends:

सुहृदवयम सदुति

Vakroktiśīvita, p. 10

However, a contrary view to this generally accepted notion has been
put forward, which pleads that, 'if this śabda is non-different from its artha,
like Śiva and Śakti, why speak of them as two? And how can any relation
co-exist with non-difference?'115 The interpretation of a literary work varies
according to the varying temperaments of the readers or in the same
reader under varying conditions of taste.

Now the question arises as to when the words and meanings are in-
separably associated, why a literary piece should be subjected to different
interpretations? This leads one to conjecture that, śabda '.... is by nature
polysemic as no word is eternally bound up with a particular meaning'.116
The relation between śabda and artha, it seems, is only arbitrary. It is there-
fore, that, Bhartṛhari has laid down some regulative conditions which de-
cide the meaning of a word.117 Is it in this sense that, he regarded artha as
the 'vivarta'(illusory form) of the eternal śabda?

Indian literary theorists speculate three faces in śabda according to its
functional aspect. They are vācya or expressive, lakṣanika or indicative, and vṛṣṇya or suggestive. These have three powers viz., abhidhā or expression, lakṣana or indication, and vṛṣaṇā or suggestion respectively. Basically word is one, and due to its different powers the divisions are formed in it.118

The word is generally regarded as the signifier in the practical world, but this does not serve the purpose of poetry. Therefore, its peculiarity is to be marked in the province of poetry. Thus observes Kuntaka;

शब्दो विवक्षितार्थकवाचको 5न्येषु सत्स्वापि।

Vakraotrijivita, I, 9ab.

[That unique expression which alone can fully convey the poet’s intended meaning out of a hundred alternatives before him is to be regarded as ‘word’.]

The poet may find alternate general expressions outwardly meaning the same thing, but, the unique feature of the word in poetry lies in the fact that, it does not permit any substitution.

Before Kuntaka, Ānandavardhana had already noticed the unalterable position of words in a poetic expression. After establishing the existence of the suggested sense, he observed;

सौर्ध्यसतद्यवितसामार्थ्ययोगी शब्दश्च कश्चन।
युनात्ता प्रत्याभिव्ययों ती शब्दार्थी महाकवयः।।

Dhvanyaloka, I, 8

[That meaning, and that rare word which possesses the power of conveying it, only these two deserve the careful scrutiny of a first-rate poet.] In the exposition also he clarifies that, any and every word -na sarvaḥ- is not capable of communicating that meaning. Ānandavardhana repeatedly mentions the unsubstitutional character of a word in the province of a dhvanikācya. A bit further he remarks;
[Only that word, which conveys a charm, incapable of communication by any other expression and which is pregnant with suggestive force, becomes a fit for the title ‘suggestive’.

In these observations, both Kuntaka and Ānandavardhana hint at the idea that, the expression which is most proper in conveying the intended idea, is the only proper expression in poetry. This is the auciṣaya regarding ‘word’ in poetry.

This idea leads us to a relative theory of pāka or śayyā, which is feebly voiced here and there in some ālaṅkārikas. As the concept of auciṣaya regarding poetic expression is very closely connected with the theory of pāka, it may not be out of place, to view, what our theorists have thought of this idea of pāka.

Before Ānandavardhana, Vāmana had already noticed the unalterable character of poetic expression. He considers this as śabdāpāka;

That is, the scholars consider it as śabdāpāka where the words do not agree with any substitutes. Ānandavardhana stepping ahead, extends this felicity of expression to the expressed sense also, which is equally held responsible in conveying the suggested meaning. Both the expressive words and expressed sense turn futile if they do not aim at the suggested meaning, i.e., the rasadhvani;
Abhinavagupta, while expounding the word *paripākavatām* i.e., matured poets, comments that, maturity means making both word and sense properly subordinate to *rasa*. He further opines that, even Vāmana’s idea of *pāka* would serve unpurposeful if *śabdapāka* does not properly contribute to *rasa*.

Therefore, Rājaśekhara explains *pāka* as *rasa*.

By propounding the theory of *pāka*, what the *ālāṅkārikas* focus on the point is that, ‘for every aesthetic fact exist only its appropriate words; every other kinds of words is improper.....The mutual favourableness- ‘maitri’ between word and sense is held to be so close that the words cannot be replaced by synonyms. It is thus a theory of inevitability of words, claiming that each poetic intuition has its appropriate and unalterable word counterpart, and which, forming the very foundation of artistic expression, distinguishes at once the conceptual language of science from the intuitive language of poetry’.  

This felicity of expression may be illustrated from a famous verse from the *Kumārasambhava*:

> [Two things have now become fit to be pitied by (their) earnest desire for union with the God possessed of skulls - that famous resplendent digit of the moon and you, the moon-light to the eyes of the world.](Tr.by R.D.Karmarkar)
The significance of the words used in this verse is well brought-out in Kuntaka's equally famous critical analysis of this verse; 

[Though a thousand and one synonyms are possible to refer to the almighty Lord Siva, the poet has chosen here the word 'One whom only skulls adorn' in order that, it may suggest disgust through a word which seems here as a pointer to the primary sentiment of 'horrid'. And he succeeds in endowing the verse with artistic beauty of expression. Again the words 'now' and 'two' are extremely beautiful because they implicitly convey a sense of ridicule that 'while so long only one was to be pitied for indecent craving, now you seem to be adding your support to the first in the misadventure.

The word 'desire for' is also very happily used, since if it were a mere coincidence, there would be no point in censuring the union. But the craze for such a union is bound to start a public scandal. The conjunction 'and' (ca) used twice to balance the moon's digit as well as the heroine is very effective, in so far as the excessive charm of both in competition with each other as it were, is hinted. The poet's preference for words with possessive terminations in respect of proper names of both is also a means of excellence which cannot be conveyed by using their synonyms.]

And Kuntaka again insists on the point in a nut-shell, that, the proper definition of a word or expression is that capacity to convey the particular
meaning intended by the poet;  

Though the ‘word’ is to signify the ‘form’ of a work in general, it would equally convey its grammatical features which also contribute to the total effect. While treating of suggestion with undiscerned sequentiality, Anandavardhana observes:

\[\text{Ibid., p.16}\]

Dhvanyāloka, III.16

[Case-termination, conjugational terminations, number, relation, accidence, primary affixes, and also compounds- all these become conveyers of suggestion with undiscerned sequentiality.]

Not only the above mentioned grammatical aspects of a word, but, the letters also, being the units of such a word, call for an objective analysis of a poetical work. The letters ‘enhance the excellence of poetry because of their harmony with the suggested emotion..... the use of words containing letters of a particular sound-quality helps in the arousal of a particular aesthetic emotion’. The whole of the Gitagovinda of Jayadeva may be illustrated as the best example for such a sound-effect. This lyric describes the delicate sentiment of śṛṅgāra between Kṛṣṇa and Gopīkās in the bowers on the bank of river Yamunā. The following are some of such verses:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{चन्दनचर्यिता} & \text{सीलकलेवरपीतकसमवनमाली}  \\
\text{केलिचलमणिकुण्डलमणियकुण्डलुगस्तितशाली} & \text{।।}  \\
\text{हरिरिह} & \text{मुथवधूनिकरे बिलासिनि बिलसति केलिपरे}  \\
\text{वीणापनधराभरिण हरिः परिरथ्य सरागम्} & \text{।।}  \\
\text{गोपवदि} & \text{सुगमायति कारिधिरुद्धिचितपचमरागम्}  \\
\text{कापि} & \text{बिलासविलोलविलोलविषोलनाजनितमानोजम्}  \\
\text{ध्यायति} & \text{मुथवधूरधिकं मधुसूदनवदनसरोजम्}  \\
\end{align*}
\]
In these verses one may notice that, the poet has employed some particular letters which bring about melodious sound effect. As against this, in the following verse from the *Venisamhāra*, the dramatist, viz., Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa employs harsh sounds appropriate to the sentiment of *vīra*;

\[
\text{घञ्जरकुञ्जरसिद्धमाधिगत-}
\text{सच्चुरोगोपुरुसस्य सुयोधनस्य व}
\text{स्यागान्धवनशोणितशोणिपाणि-}
\text{हर्षसंधिप्लयति कथास्तव देवि भीमः । । 1,21}
\]

As observed by Ānandavardhana in the above cited *kārikā*, the grammatical aspects like case-terminations are to be so properly employed that they become pregnant with high suggestivity. For example;

\[
\text{हे हस्त दक्षिण मूलस्य शिश्नोविग्राहस्य}
\text{जीवाते विसुज शुद्धमुनी कृपाणमुः ।}
\text{रामस्य पाणिरस्य निर्भ्रारभिख़्वः -}
\text{सीताविवासनपर्तोः कहुणा दुःस्तते । ।}
\]

*Uttarārāmacarīya*, II, 10

[ O my right hand, to bring to life
The dead child of a pious brahmin,
Let fall thy sword on the ‘sudra’ sage
Indeed thou art Rama’s hand, one who banished even his innocent queen.
In a sad state of advanced pregnancy,
How can there be any pity in thee?]

Here, in the clause *Rāmasya pāṇīrasī*, *Rāmasya* is verbally the adjective of *pāṇi*. Thus, the import of the clause would be ‘thou art Rāma’s hand’. The adjective *Rāmasya* seems to be subordinate. But, if viewed from the inten-
tion of the speaker, the formal adjective bears pre-eminence over the noun. Rāma accuses himself with deep self-censure for his ruthless deed of abandonment of Sītā. The whole gamut of this mercilessness is transferred to the hand because, it belongs to Rāma. This is implied by the genitive case-termination in the word Rāmasya. If the words Rāmasya and pāṇī were used in a compound Rāmapāṇīḥ, the power of suggestion would have been faded. Thus, even a single word with immense suggestivity, will be advantageous in so much so that, the whole unit of description will be illuminated by that word.122

Sometimes, poets are seen employing such words, which, inspite of their indefinite expressed meaning, will be highly suggestive.

For example;

दर्शने च परिचोदकशिनी पुष्पं भ्रणाधिनो निकिबुधः
प्रेक्ष्य विम्सातुपशिमानालनः कानि कानि न चकार लझायः।

Kumārasambhava, VIII, 11

[Out of utmost bashfulness

What she(Pārvati) did is beyond description;

When she saw her lover’s image seated behind her’s.

While she was looking into the mirror the amorous marks.]

Kālidāsa only suggests the activities of Pārvati, who is under confused state of mind. The scene is so charming because the poet, not specifying any of the activities, leaves the reader independent to imagine what Pārvati did.

And in some instances the poet may use such words which lose their expressed meaning completely, and suggest altogether an un-conventional meaning. The following verse from Pañḍitarāja Jagannātha would justify this;
At the time of his departure, that little girl, placing her lotus-face—the lower
lip of which is faded away by the sighs—on the window of the private plea-
sure apartment, breasts dampened by the falling tears, alas! looks at her
life-lord with tremulous gazes, while all others were uttering auspicious bless-
ings.

In this verse, note the words शिव शिव, which are so appropriately used that,
they suggest the intense pathetic condition of that innocent young girl, which
even pages of description may not reveal.

We may draw a curtain over the discussion on the appropriate use of
words by citing a verse from the drama Sākuntala, where an indeclinable
finds its most proper use.

Hamsapadikā, a forlorn beauty, who was loved once by king Duṣyanta
and now ignored, taunts in this subtle song, his nature of seeking always a
new love;

अभिनवमधुलोलुपस्वं तथा परिचुम्ब्य चूतमंजरीम्।
कमलवसित्मांभिर्निर्दृढः मधुकर विस्मृतोऽस्येनां कथम्।।

[How is it that you forgot that mango-bunch
You once kissed in that way;
O honey-bee, hankering for fresh juice,
Now contented only to seat in the lotus abode?]

Here, the indeclinable 'तथाः' is so aptly used in the context that, it suggests
the previous boundless attachment of the bee (i.e., Duṣyanta) with the
mango-bunch (i.e., Haṁsapadikā). It is so because the poet has not fulfilled the desire (i.e., ākānakṣā) of that word with its accompanying indeclinable ‘yatā’ and it is left to the imagination of the reader to fill in the gap.

(ii) Aucitya and Artha

And now as regards artha: Vācyartha or the expressed meaning lakṣyārtha or the indicated meaning, and, vyāgyārtha or the suggested meaning, these are the three types of meaning accepted in the province of poetry, though some would add one more type of meaning i.e., tātparyārtha or the purport meaning. Out of these, the first type, i.e., the expressed meaning is of conventional nature and is directly expressed by the power of expression. When this expressed meaning becomes incompatible, to make it sensible, the word indicates lakṣyārtha. This power of the word is called lakṣanā or indication, and this is imposed on the word by the listener. It works in a limited range as a subordinate to abhidhā, and hence it is called abhidhāpucchabhūta. This power is imposed with a particular purpose in view. And this purpose is nothing but the vyāgyārtha or the suggested meaning.

As we are to mark the relation between aucitya and dhvani separately, we will deal here only the propriety of the expressed meaning. The expressed meaning finds its significance only in making itself secondary and contribute in suggesting the implied meaning in a first-rate poem. But, there may be some such instances where the expressed meaning itself may appeal. This is because of the assistance of the suggested meaning. The suggested meaning is invariably found in almost all cases and therefore it stands difficult to illustrate an instance where the expressed meaning is found appealing independently.

The following is an example where the expressed meaning is found
more charming than the suggested one. But if there were no suggested meaning, the expressed meaning would also turn pale;

जटा नेयं वेषीङ्कृतकचङ्कलापो न गरलं
गले कमलूर्यं शिरसि शशिलेखा न कुसुमम्।
इन्हं भूतिनांडे द्रियविरहजनमा धवलिमा
पुराणतिथ्रान्या कुसुमशार किं मां प्रहरसि।।

Kuvalāyananda, p. 29

[Not is this the matted hair, but the stringed braid
This is Kastūri, not the poison on the neck
Not moon’s digit on head but flower
And not ashes on the body but paleness from lover’s separation;
Why you hit on me, O the flowery arrowed one, taking to be the enemy of cities!]

Here a separated beloved points at the god of love accusingly, for his mischief of discharging the flowery arrows on her, mistaking her to be Siva, due to the close semblance between the two. This constitutes the expressed meaning which appeals to a great extent. At the same time, the suggested sentiment of vipralambha śringāra directly influences. Without the suggested sentiment, the expressed sense fails to create any effect of enjoyment.

As against this, an expression may create a series of suggested meanings, discarding the expressed meaning completely. This may be illustrated from a line from Bhavabhūti’s Uttaरामोर्पारी. In the seventh act of this drama, a garbhanāṭaka (drama within the drama) is staged in front of the audience who include the major characters of the drama and all the citizens of Ayodhyā. At the end of the garbhanāṭaka, Sītā is shown as merging back into the womb of her mother viz., Prthvī. Shocked on seeing this, Rāma falls unconscious and Laksmana bursts out saying:

भगवन् वामीके! एषे काव्याः?
[O divine sage Vālmīki, is this the meaning of your work?]

Note the wonderful capacity of this line in suggesting an array of meanings. All that Vālmīki achieved by writing the great epic Rāmāyaṇa is, the tragic end of Sītā and thereby also of Rāma. Being a sage, possessed of superhuman qualities, who was kind enough to a separated bird, turned merciless and made unbounded injustice to noble human beings like Sītā and Rāma. By this line, Bhavabhūti, the dramatist, also expresses his protest to Vālmīki, for making the Rāmāyaṇa a tragedy. And this protest is in accordance with the happy end of the Uttararāmacarita.

There may be some such instances where the poem suggests another meaning which neither appeals nor contributes to the expressed meaning. Thus, the absence of mutual accordance makes the poem non-appealing. For instance;

\[
\text{अःः शृःः हरति पयनः किस्मितिदित्युमुखीमिः}
\text{दूरौसाहस्थकितापचितं पुर्वसिद्धाङ्गार्थिः भः}
\text{स्थानादस्मातसरसनिघुलायबद्धमये दशः कः}
\text{दिक्नागानं पथं परिछर्णन्यपुर्वकस्तावलेपान्} \|
\]

_Meghadūsa, 14_

[Fly up into the sky with (your) face to the north, your career(or brisk movements) being looked at with great surprise by the simple Siddha women, with (their) faces upliftted, thinking(iti) 'Is the wind carrying off the peak of the mountain, 'from this place of (that is, abounding in) wet canes, avoiding on the way association with (or, attacks by) the huge trunks of the quarter-elephants.]

According to the commentators, this verse suggests some personal episode of rivalry between Kālidāsa and a Buddhist monk Diṅnāga. But of what use
is in conveying such meaning which in no way contributes to the central theme of the poem?

Thus, words and expressed meaning have by themselves no absolute value in good poetry. Wherever the poet depends on mere words- vācaka and expressed meaning- vācyārtha, such poem is regarded as third grade.\(^{127}\) Their value is relative to their efficiency in contributing to the realisation of rasa, which is a unique experience of aesthetic pleasure entirely distinct and different from pleasure accruing from the satisfaction of mere material needs of a poem. This idea is clearly emphasized by Ānandavardhana when he observes;

\begin{quote}
\begin{verse}
बाध्यानां बाधकानां च बदोभित्येन योजनम्।
रसादिविषयोऽति कर्म पुख्यं महाकवे।।
\end{verse}
\textit{Dhvanyāloka,}III,32
\end{quote}

[The main task of a first-rate poet lies in a proper marshalling of all contents and expressions in the direction of sentiments etc.]

The expression and the expressed are considered as the beautifiers and their existence is justifiable only when, they have the single purpose of conveying the sentiment:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verse}
वाच्यवाचकचारुवस्तुनां विविधात्मनाम्।
रसादिपस्त पद्र स ध्वनेनिषयोऽन्तः।।
\end{verse}
\textit{Ibid.,}II,4
\end{quote}

Further Ānandavardhana says that, the modes of employment called vṛtis like kaiśiki, ārabhaṭi, upanāgarikā etc., treated by Bharata, are nothing but the appropriate employment of words and senses in conformity with the sentiment:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verse}
रसामुग्ययांत्रेन व्यवहारोऽर्थशब्दयोः।
आङ्किरत्यवान्त्यती पद्मा वृत्तियोऽक्वित्योऽस्मृतः।।
\end{verse}
\textit{Ibid.,}III,33
\end{quote}
It is observed by Mahimabhaṭṭa also that, the nourishment of rasa is due to propriety of both sabda and artha;

Vṛtvidhāḥ हि शास्त्रम् | शब्दप्रवचनं अर्थप्रवचनं उपयोगत्व चैति ......उपयोगत्व सागरन्धानं
काव्यं तस्य रसायमकन्वात् | रसस्य च उभयायिन्योऽन परिपोषदश्याः नात् | |

Vṛttiviveka, p.122

Bhoja calls this propriety of word and meaning a prabandha guṇa which is described as rasānurūpasandarbha. He says that, the sound and sense are to be strung together in a perfect harmony with rasa.¹²¹

To conclude the discussion on the propriety of sabda and artha, it may be noted that, poetry is a blend of both form and content; and it is through certain excellences characterizing either of the two that the poet succeeds in inducing in the refined critic the artistic experience. The legitimate function of both form and content is to subserve the emotional aspect. As observed by M.Hiriyanna;

‘The expression is also likely to be more or less imperfect but the question is not whether it is perfect, but, whether it is adequate to convey the thought or emotion to others.
If it is adequate, it is good poetry, otherwise, it is not.’¹²⁹

(iii) Aucitya and Chandas

Chandas is more related with the musical aspect of language than with the literary aspect. But, rhythm, a fundamental feature of music, is not of less importance in Chandas also, with the difference that, in Chandas rhythm is connected with letters, whereas in music it is connected with notes (i.e., svaras). The emotion intensely experienced by the poet picks up its own rhythm suitable for it.¹³⁰ Perhaps, the truth is, the emotion emerges accompanied with a suitable rhythm. The letters, combined in a rhythmic manner according to the necessities of an emotion, are bound to create a
happy sensation in a connoisseur. Two examples may be cited as to how the rhythm and sounds, irrespective of the meaning, appeal to the ears. Kālidāsa would call this śrutiprasādana. 131

One is from the Gītagovinda of Jayadeva, where the sportive dance of Kṛṣṇa with cowherdesses is suggested by the regular beats (lāya);

And in the following verse from Śivatāṇḍavastotra, the rhythmic tāṇḍava dance of Śiva is suggested by the regular recurring emphasis:

While discussing poetic diction, Bharata gives the details of the organisation of words into different kinds of metrical compositions. The metres are to be employed in accord with the aesthetic emotion. Bharata observes that, the emotive quality of a drama determines the kind of language to be used in it. 134

In a Sanskrit drama, we find the mixed language of both prose and verse. Some ideas create the requisite effect if expressed in verse-form only; and some others may demand the prose-form. Whether it is a verse or prose, it is necessary that, it should appropriately reveal the sentiment. Bhoja names

---
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this as an alankāra of śabda called gati and clearly says that, the controlling factor of the use of the medium - verse or prose or the mixed i.e., campū, is aucitraya only:

पद्य गद्य च मिश्रं च काव्यं यत् सा गति: स्मृता ।
अर्थोनित्यादिहितः सापि वागलाद्वार हृष्टते ।।
यथामति यथाशक्ति यथोचित्यं यथार्थचि ।
कवि: पानस्य चैतस्य: ज्ञायेम उपपत्ति ।। 135

In continuation, Bhoja observes that, if a poet resorts to the verse-form as medium of expression, there should be the employment of such syllabic metres which are in accordance with the sentiment. He calls this propriety in metre as an ubhayaguna. Particular sentiments when expressed in some specific metres create the requisite effect. For example, in the drama Venisamhara, Aśvatthāman enraged by the stupidity of Karna, proclaims what he is going to do in his excited valour. This is expressed in a metre called sragdhāra, suited for the sentiment of raundra;

यो य: शस्त्रं बिभरति स्थभुजगुहनदः पाणिवीरां चमुनां
यो य: पांजवालगोंशा शिष्ठवहिकवतः गर्भदशाः गतिः या ।।
यो वस्तकर्मशास्त्री चारति मयं रणेष यद्य यद्य प्रतीपः
कोषाध्यायस्तस्य तस्य भवमपि जगतानन्तस्वत्वकोऽहम् ।।

III, 32

Further, Bhoja says that, through the metrical variety all over is necessary in a mahākāvya due to its big theme, the poet should resort to only those metres which create a pleasing experience due to their musical quality. The employment of such appropriate metres is called śravayavṛttyāram. 137

Though, most of the alāṅkārikas deal with this topic in their treatment of doṣas (i.e., in bhinnayavṛttas,) it was Kṣemendra, who spared a separate work called Svarṭṭatilaka. In this work, he observes that, even the great poets are seen violating the general rules on prosody. Thus, invariably, appeal to the ears is of greater importance and not strict adherence to rules;
For example, in the anustub metre, it has been laid down that, the fifth syllable should be short and sixth long in all the lines. But, in the following verse from Kālidāsa, above rule is violated:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{तदनन्त्ये शुद्धिरंति प्रसूतः} & \text{ शुद्धिमन्तरः} \\
\text{दिलीप इति राजेन्द्ररिंद्रः} & \text{ कृष्णिमाधविः}
\end{align*}
\]

\textit{Raghuvaṃśa, I, 12}

Here, the fifth syllable in the first line \textit{su} is long due to the following conjunct letter and the sixth letter \textit{ddhi} is short.

Further, Kśemendra clearly says that, the poet should make use of metres according to the sentiments or the theme of description:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{काशेरे ससामुखारेण वर्णिनामार्गे} & \text{ च} \\
\text{युधेत सर्वानं विनियोगम्} & \text{ विभागितः}
\end{align*}
\]

\textit{Suvṛttarīkha III, 7}

and,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{तथायवस्थासदृशः} & \text{ साधुशब्दपदस्थितः} \\
\text{सुवृत्तिरेव} & \text{ शोभनों प्रबंधः सज्जना इव}
\end{align*}
\]

\textit{Ibid., III, 12}

That is, the composition of a poet rendered in good metres, that are appropriate to the context, shines like good people who look bright with good conduct, appearing proper on account of their besetting the occasion. Kśemendra repeatedly insists on the point that, a metre placed at a wrong place through infatuation, shows one’s ignorance and a metre increases the beauty of a composition when placed appropriately:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{वृथत्तरावली कामादयने} & \text{ विनियोगिता} \\
\text{कथयत्तिस्ततामेश मेखलेव गाय कृता}
\end{align*}
\]
By pointing to the fact that some poets have a regard for some special metre only, Kṣemendra, though in a vague manner, might have sensed the idea that such a leaning towards a particular metre is not only due to the need of the theme of description but also due to the mental disposition of the poet. Probably, it is the mental make-up of a poet responsible for such special regard. Though one cannot make a blanket generalisation of this idea, it is true that some poets display extreme beauty in the use of that metre:

एकवृत्तादः प्रायः सर्वंमुमानि दृश्याते ।
तत्रवृत्तिविषयमकारादयार्थार्थपूर्णात् ।

Ibid., III, 28

and,

इसवेंव पूर्वकवयः सर्ववृत्तकार अपि ।
अस्मिनुपहार इवेकसिमन् प्रायेणाभ्याधिकारः।

Ibid., III, 36

Thus he opines that Abhinava and Vidyādhara in anuṣṭubh, Pāṇini in upajāti, Bhāravi in vamsastha, Ratnākara in vasantarilaka, Bhavabhūti in śikharinī, Kālidāsa in mandākrānta and Rājaśekhara in śārḍūlavikrīdita excel in the use of those particular metres. (verses 29-35)

The breach in observing the rules of prosody is considered as a serious literary defect, since it reveals the ignorance of a poet. It is named by Mahimabhaṭṭa as duskravava;

दुःश्रवमानिः वृतस्य शब्दानीदिन्त्यमेव, तस्यापि अनुप्रासादेति रसायुग्मायेन प्रायोगिकावतः।

Vyakrticīvaka, p.37
There is a popular saying in Sanskrit, that, one can put maṣa for māṣa but under no condition should there be a breach of metre!

अष्ट माषि माषि कुयति | छन्दोभख्नि न कारयेत! ।

Therefore, even the master-poets are seen using some words which have no license from grammar.

Even in the midst of such rigid regulations of prosody, the creativity of gifted poets, is seen, playing its free dance. Though the feet of a verse in a syllabic metre are regulated as to be composed in a particular order of *ganas*, the poet may make changes with a view to bring some special effects without violating the rules of prosody. Master-poets are gifted with such a unique power as in the following verse picked at random from Kalidāsa.

The impressions of the genuine love of Duṣyanta towards Śakuntalā were wiped out from the his consciousness by the irresistible curse of Durvasas. In this condition, Duṣyanta was caused to hear a song full of pain and sorrow. Responding to this song very lightly on that moment, Duṣyanta slowly turns perturbed, but could not make up the cause for his disturbed condition and says;

रम्याणि वीक्ष्य मधुरांश्च निशाम्य शब्दान्
पर्यःस्वर्णः भवति चालुक्षितोपि जन्तुः।
तद्रे तसा स्मरित नूननम्बोध्यार्या
भावाधिरारु जननात्तत्सौहद्यार्य। ॥ V,2

[On looking beautiful objects and hearing melodious notes]

Man, though happy, turns perturbed:

Sure, he recollects in heart

The deeply impressed relations of former births

Not come until then to consciousness.]

This verse, in the metre called *vasantarilaka* which has the *ganas ta*. 
and two long syllables in each foot, reveals the subtleties as we find in the following analysis:

The foremost effect on the ears is from the long vowels used throughout the verse which successfully reveal the sadness. That too, the long vowel in vākṣya, and the hyābanta that follows immediately, suggest the intensity of one’s interest in seeing the beautiful objects. (Note the plural in ramyāṇi and śabdān. Even the faintest memory of Śakuntalā that arises in the subconscious level of Duṣyanta demands many objects of comparison but not one!) Likewise, the conjunct letters, that occur successively in the word paryusūktī suggest the succession of the moods that oscillate. All these moods end in one dominant mood, i.e., sorrow, and this is implied by the long vowel in the last letter kī. Similarly, the long vowels in the word cetasā suggest the impressions of memory arising from deep layer of an unknown core.

Even Sanskrit prose, in the hands of gifted poets like Bāna, often shows rhythmic movement. For instance, in the following lines from the Kādambarī of Bāna, rhythm, most appropriately employed, suggest the gradual blooming of the youth in Mahāśwetā:

क्रमेण च कुर्तं मे वपुषिः वसन्त इत्य मधुमासोऽन, मधुमास इत्य नवपल्लवेन, नवपल्लाव इत्य कुसुमेन, कुसुम इत्य मधुकरेण, मधुकर इत्य मदेन नवधीवनेन पदम्। p.426

Experiment was made by Sanskrit poets in employing a new form called Dandaka, which, inspite of its rhythm and rhyme, was included neither under prose nor under verse, due to unlimited length of lines. Thus, absorbing the qualities of both prose and verse, these Dandakas, with their unique structure, display poet’s extra-ordinary capacity in writing. The following is a sample from a composition called Śyāmalādandakam found in the name of Kālidāsa;
Thus, the two major concepts of śabda and artha form the basic elements in poetry. Formally they are not distinct from the śabda and artha of the matter-of-fact world. But, what makes them distinct in poetry is their proper arrangement in various modes. These modes of expression are called alaṅkāras or figures of speech. In the forthcoming discussion we propose to give an analytical survey of the basic changes that took place in the concept of alaṅkāra in its historical development and also to point out its relation with the concept of aucitya.

(iv) Aucitya and Alaṅkāra

In Sanskrit poetics, the conceptual development of alaṅkāra took place in two major stages; one is in the alaṅkāraprasthāna headed by Bhāmaha and the other is in the period of dhvaniprasthāna led by Ānandavardhana.

Alaṅkāravādins equate alaṅkāra with the concept of beauty in poetry. It was Bhāmaha who first propounded this view though Vāmana put it in a nutshell in his oft-quoted aphorisms; सां-वर्ध्मनप्रस्थानः and कार्यं गायन-लभ्यं. Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra, I, 2 & 3

This school of alaṅkārikas viewed poetry from the standpoint of beauty and include whole of the poetic creation under vakrokti or subtle indirect statement;

Bhāmaha, Kāvyālaṅkāra, II,85

Alaṅkāras are expressions adopted by the poet as dictated by his creative imagination to record his experiences. An expression which satisfies the
mechanical aspects of an *alankāra* but fails to appeal to the man of taste is no *alankāra* at all. Hence, "the use of language, then, with a view exclusively to beauty is the only true explanation of all *alankāras*...." \(^{138}\)

In its second stage, i.e., in the *dhvani* school of theorists, the scope of *alankāra* is limited to the extent that, an *alankāra* is only an instrument in enhancing the beauty of a poem. In the proposition of *dhvani*-theorists *śabda* and *artha* being the body, *dhvani* constitutes the soul of poetry. *Alankāras*, in this changed phenomena, work at the outer level of *vācyārtha* or expressed sense, and *vācakaśabda* or the expressives. Therefore, Ānandavardhana says:

> अन्नानऽधिभुस्तास्तलोत्तरमन्तव्यः कठकादिविवः

*Dhvanyāloka*, II, 6 cd.

Thus, an *alankāra* is based on the expressed sense and it would enhance the inner beauty of a poem. But it is not mandatory that, a poem should possess an *alankāra*. Without an *alankāra* a literary piece can appeal by its self-beauty. For instance, the following verse which is amusingly simple due to the absence of unmanifested figures of any kind, strikes by its naive beauty;

> यथोध्वासः विवात्सनु पथिको विललाभः
> तथा प्रपानायः थारां विल्पुं तत्रमृत्

[As and when the traveller drinks water with his stretched fingers raising his eyes upwards, the road-side-shed-girl makes the water stream more and more thin.]

It is therefore that Abhinavagupta observes;

> अल्लाक्षसङ्ग रत्नाभरणादिविवेद थे विनापि स्वालिन्द्रेण पुरुषः प्रतिभासते

*Abhinavabhārati* on *Nāyāśāstra*, XVI, 1

The reason for such a contracted scope of *alankāra* in the *dhvani* theory, it seems, is that the *dhvani* theorists had marked the essence of poetry as *dhvani* which the traditionalists might have named as *alankāra*. The tradi-
tionalists named both the beautifier and beautified as *alankāra* whereas the dhvanīvādins maintained the view that, an *alankāra*, as the name itself suggests, ably suits to a beautifier and not to the beautified. The beautified, also called an *alāṅkārya*, is dhvani itself. Another reason for the minimised scope of *alankāra*, probably is that, the later theorists of *alankāra* school centred their treatment more and more on the divisions and technicalities of various *alankāras* than in emphasising the essential nature of beauty in them. Whatever may be the reason, one can not ignore the importance of the concept of *alankāra* in the making of the dhvani theory. For Ānandavardhana, it served as a take-off point.

Besides, the role of an *alankāra* in the total effect of a poem, is not of less importance though dhvani has been established as the soul of poetry. If we accept the idea that, the *alankāras* adorn dhvani or the *alāṅkārya*, invariably we have to accept that this *alāṅkārya* should possess the beauty of its own. Claiming that, this beauty shines supreme, apart from the individual beauty of the different constituents in the speech of master-poets, Ānandavardhana, in justification puts forward the analogy of a damsel, who appeals due to the charm which exceeds the beauty of her individual limbs; 

> प्रतीयमानं पुनर्स्यदेव वस्तवस्ति वाणीषु महाकलीनाम्।
> वस्तवप्रियायार्थारितिरितं विभाति लावण्यमिवादूः।।

*Dhvanyāloka*, I, 4

If analysed at a deeper level, this analogy reveals the fact that, the total beauty is nothing but the beauty made up of the beauty of many individual parts. As a matter of fact, one cannot think of the whole without its constituents, each of which is consubstantially the same with the whole. Therefore, how could there exist the aggregate beauty without the beauty of unformed parts? As against this argument the followers of the dhvani theory
propose that a poem not only exists but can appeal even without any manifested *alaṅkāras*. Thus opines Mammaṭa;¹³⁹

Kāvyaprakāśa, I.

There may not be any specific *alaṅkāra*, listed hitherto, in the illustrations cited in justification of the above view of Mammaṭa. This does not necessarily mean that, there is no *alaṅkāra*, if the illustration is devoid of any known *alaṅkāra*. Daṇḍin had already noticed the infinite nature of *alaṅkāras*;

Kāvyādarsa, II, 1

Ānandavardhana also holds a similar view when he states that the possibilities of speech are infinite, and they are called *alaṅkāras*;

Ananta hi vāchīkālayaḥ, tathaḥkāraḥ eva chaḷāṇyaḥ |¹⁴⁰

Dhvanyāloka, pp. 231-232

It is desirable that our approach towards *alaṅkāras* is to be guided by the awareness of the places were they are employed. Generally, two major places may be noted where employment of *alaṅkāras* is found. They are i) prabandha and, ii) muktaka.

In a prabandha or whole work - whether it is a drama or an epic - the employment of an *alaṅkāra* is aimed at making the *alaṅkārya* more effectively. Instead of resting in contemplating upon beauty of an *alaṅkāra*, the reader’s mind should rest in conceiving the *alaṅkārya* or the theme. In other words, in a prabandha an *alaṅkāra* contributes to the total effect in such a way that it escapes our notice that it is an *alaṅkāra*.

This is not the case with a muktaka or a single stanza. There need not be any purpose on the part of the poet to narrate a story or complete characterization or delineation of *rasa*. A momentary flash that calls for a sponta-
neous expression, shoots out in such verses. Here the prime aim of \textit{alaṅkāras} is the expression of self-beauty.

Thus, while noticing the difference in purpose, based on the difference of the places where \textit{alaṅkāras} are employed—\textit{aśāstra}, \textit{karaṇa}, one should not forget the fact that, in either of the cases \textit{alaṅkāras} should invariably possess self-beauty also. And it should also be borne in mind that, of less importance are the technical requirements of an \textit{alaṅkāra}. Poet’s imagination need not necessarily concentrate on these technicalities while producing an \textit{alaṅkāra}. Because, when an \textit{alaṅkāra} originates with beauty, its technical requirements are also simultaneously satisfied.\footnote{This is because the principal characteristic of an \textit{alaṅkāra} is beauty, and within the province of poetics one cannot think of an \textit{alaṅkāra} devoid of beauty.}

A tradition has been laid down in Sanskrit Poetics to give an analogy of the human body and soul to point out the proper positions of different constituents of poetry. Though the application of this analogy was first found in Daṇḍin\footnote{\textit{Daṇḍin}}\footnote{\textit{Daṇḍin}}, it was Vāmana\footnote{\textit{Vāmana}}, who, for the first time, proposed the idea of a soul of poetry. All the later theorists analysed and explained their views on poetry based on this analogy.

Till the analogy of the body and soul was introduced there was no hierarchy in the constituents of poetry. As already noted, whatever that is beautiful was included under \textit{alaṅkāra}. Even \textit{rasa} was no exception to this. But Vāmana sensed, though feebly, that there is some other essence throbbing in the core of poetry. But he was not able to point it out precisely.\footnote{This work of valuing various constituents was left to Ānandaśvaradhana. He carried out the work successfully and established \textit{rasadhvani} as the soul of poetry.}

The fundamental question that we have to face at this juncture is
that, did Ānandavardhana viewed and treated *alaṅkāra* from the same standpoint from which the ancients viewed and treated it. Or only the word *alaṅkāra* is common in their treatment. Perhaps, for ancient *ālaṅkārikas*, *alaṅkāra* was an end in itself since, they equated it with the concept of beauty in poetry. Whereas for Ānandavardhana and his followers,*alaṅkāra* was only a means to attain the end. Thus, though the word *alaṅkāra* is common, there lies some fundamental difference in its connotation in these two theorists.

It is interesting to note that, except Jagannātha no other *ālaṅkārika* questioned the significance of the analogy of soul and body to poetry. Though the evaluation of an *alaṅkāra* as equal to the ornaments in a body seems to be true, we arrive at some more interesting points if the analogy is stretched still further.

In the worldly plane what is the role of an *alaṅkāra*? Some answer may be derived from the following verse from Kālidāsa:

\[\text{इथमाधिकमनां} वल्कलंगापि तत्त्वी
\text{किनिव हि नसुराणां मण्डलं नाकृतीनाम्।}
\]

*Abhijñāna Śākuntala*, I, 18

From the worldly point of view Śākuntalā is undecorated. But, here the bark-garment also serves as a decoration. This leads to the idea that, when the body is charming no matter whether the garment is made from bark or silk.

Prior to this, some reference of introducing decorations is found in the drama *Svapnavāsavadatta*. In his dream, Udayana asks whether his beloved Vāsavadatta is angry. Probably not receiving any reply he utters;

\[\text{यथकृपिता} \text{किमर्ध} \text{नालकुल्लसि [Act V] [If you are not angry, why have you not put on ornaments?]}
\]

This shows that, decoration is mainly based on the moods of a man. Of some significance are the decorations in the expression of moods.
Wearing or not wearing ornaments itself is suggestive of moods. But, if one is totally devoid of any moods decoration turns futile. Abhinavagupta clarifies this point when he observes;

Locana, P.90

Similarly, in poetry if the *alāṅkāras*, suggestive of moods, are excessively employed they would over-shadow or destroy the moods. Thus, principle of *aucīrya* works as a connecting link between *alāṅkāras* and *rasa*. Besides, *aucīrya* is the principle that governs the nature and quantity of *alāṅkāras* to be employed.

According to Abhinavagupta, this *alāṅkāra-aucīrya*, that *alāṅkāras* are to be employed with sense of propriety keeping the central theme in view, was already noted by Bharata himself. Bharata enumerates thirty-six characteristics of *kāvyā*, of which *bhūṣana* is one. It is defined as below;

\[\text{Nāryāśāstra, XVI,5} \]

On this Abhinavagupta’s comment is noteworthy;

\[\text{Abhinavabhartṛī, p.299} \]

The ornaments are to be put on with great discernment after thinking the place, time situations and, persons etc. As in human beings, in poetry also, improper placing of *alāṅkāras* produces only ridicule. Bharata had already marked this suitability of *alāṅkāras*, of course, pertaining to actors;
Unlike human ornamentation, poetry can agree with any type of alaṅkāras, i.e., an arthaḥalaṅkāra, in any context. It does not matter whether it is upamā or arsāntaraṃyaśa or virodhābhāsa. The propriety of an alaṅkāra lies in its contents and not in its nomenclature. Nowhere in Sanskrit poetics, guiding principles are laid down regarding which arthaḥalaṅkāra suits which context, as guidelines are found on the proper use of sabḍaḥalaṅkāras and metres in connection with rasādi.

a) Aucitya and Sabḍaḥalaṅkāra

In suggesting rasādi, the role of sabḍaḥalaṅkāras is almost negligible, and many a time they obstruct rasānubhūti. Anandavardhana does not encourage the employment of even the simplest of all sabḍaḥalaṅkāras i.e., anuprāsa or alliteration while the erotic sentiment is principally developed; he is of the opinion that alliteration does not contribute in suggesting the delicate sentiments like śṛṅgāra, since it involves great effort in bringing together like-sounding syllables. This implies that, alliteration is welcome when the sentiments other than śṛṅgāra are depicted. Accordingly instances are found in the works of master-poets, especially in dramas and devotional lyrics, where alliteration serves as the source of suggestion of sentiments like vīra, roudra, and abdhuta etc. The description of war between Lava and Candraketu in the drama Uttararāmacarita may be cited as an instance.
following is one of such verses where the valour of Lava is described by Candraketu;

अग्निप्रियकुलकुमारधानिशतीणकर्णजःपरः
च्यानिस्वाममन्दनुमुद्धिरदेवाभ्यामः ।
वेलांद्रवहन्द्वुण्डनिकर्णरूपे वियरो भुवः
तुष्काकालालवकविधवस्ववकीर्तिमाणाविव ।

Act V, 6

Here, the sabdâlankâra called vrityanuprâsa or the harmonious alliteration of many consonants effectively reveal the valour in Lava. Similarly, the Śīvatândâvastotra is the finest example where alliteration assists in bringing about very effectively the roudra and adbhuta sentiments expressed by the tândava dance performed by Śiva. These examples lead to the fact that, alliteration of harsh sounds and the poetic quality ojas co-exist with least exceptions.

The above observation of Ānandavardhana that, alliteration serves least in suggesting the erotic sentiment hardly holds good in some instances where poets are seen employing alliteration as a vehicle for suggesting erotic sentiment successfully. Jayadeva’s Gitagovinda is the example in this matter. Probably assuming such possibilities, Abhinavagupta while commenting upon the above mentioned kârikā (Dhvanyâloka, II, 14) opines that, alliteration would not become improper where it does not demand any extra effort in its employment;

यालत् क्रियान्विति हेतुलोभितेषु एकऽपत्त्वानुसरं लयः कला विचित्रारुपासोदुवध्यमानान

Locana, p.103

Kuntaka also asserts that alliteration shines by its harmony with the theme of description, and excludes those alliterations which reveal poet’s labour in bringing similar syllables;
But as far as the use of śabdālaṅkāras like yamaka (assonance) and other citrabandhas (pictorial constructions) are concerned, Ānandavardhana has spoken in decisive words in what way the poet should deal with these figures. Introducing difficult figures like yamaka can impede to a great extent the apprehension of delicate sentiments like śṛṅgāra;

Anāpyatmasūte śṛṅgarā yamakaśāstikānikābhishagmānā.

 Shacktāvāpi prāmanidāvā vāraśāmā viśeṣādāvā.

Dhvanyāloka, II, 15

Rudrata is also of the opinion that the śabdālaṅkāra viz., yamaka should be employed with a view to aucitya;

śṛṅgāraṃ sātyasthāṃ samāyālochayādāvā। śṛṅgārāṃbhābhūtāyaśteṣāṃ yamakāyaḥ
dhūlysābhāphābhūtā yamakāyānāṃ
dhūlysābhāphābhūtā yamakāyānāṃ
dhūlysābhāphābhūtā yamakāyānāṃ.

Kāvyālaṅkāra, III, 59

Namisadhu, the commentator on Rudrata, explains the word aucitya in the above verse as below;

Aucityaṃ yamakādānavāyāmaṣṭpāna adāvādāvā viddhi te ātyātyā tu ātyātyā tu ātyātyā.

Ibid., p.35

Even though the poet is efficient enough in the use of these figures, as a rule, he should never employ these figures when tender sentiments are delineated. Because, the poet has to employ them deliberately and, invariably he has to make extra effort in the choice of select words. Abhinavagupta cites a verse after remarking;

Abhinavabhāratī, P.299
Kuntaka also, criticising the introduction of *śabdālaṅkāras* which demand extra effort, is of the opinion that, this would result in the loss of *aucitya*;

> व्यस्नित्वम् प्रयत्नविरचने हि प्रस्तुतीचित्रपरिहारमेवच्यवाचकमः
> परस्परपरिविवालक्षणसाहित्यविचित्रः पर्यवस्यति |

*Vakrokiśiteita*, p.78

With regard to śloṣa or double entendre, Abhinavagupta is of the opinion that this figure pertaining to the meaning i.e., *arthāśleṣa*, is not obstructive. For instance in the following verse, *arthāśleṣa* positively contributes to the meaning;

> विलोचन संहने राम पश्चिमाया विवक्ष्यते |
> कुत्ते कुंडल मुख प्रामाणा नाहि नार्यों विनेष्यता |

[On looking at the redness (or love on the face) of West caused by the union with the Sun, the face of the East turned dark. Alas, no woman is without jealousy !]

Here, in this verse the words *rāga* and *kṛṣṇa* bear two meanings by which the verse is highly poetic. Similar is the case with the verses अनुज्ञानवली सन्ध्या.... etc., and रक्तस्व नदापल्लाही.... etc. Even the verbal pun is rejectable only when it is difficult to understand. Otherwise it is also acceptable as in *asoka* and *sasoka* in the verse रक्तस्व नदापल्लाही.... etc. Thus says Abhinavagupta;

> अर्थश्लेषों न दोषाय रक्तस्व ‘इत्यादि । शब्दभूतोऽधिप विलित एवं दुःशः न तु ’ अशोककशोकादी ।

*Locana*, pp.103-104

Thus, the employment of a *śabdālaṅkāra* appears to be controlled mainly by two principles. One is, it should not demand any extra effort on the part of the poet. A poet’s ultimate goal is the delineation of *rasa* and *rasa* alone. When he is in the emotional suffusion the figurative expression should emerge spontaneously. The following observation made by Ānandavardhana bears quotation as it constitutes the last word on this topic;
[Only that is admitted as a figure of suggestive poetry whose employment is rendered possible just by the emotional suffusion of the poet and which does not require any other extra effort on his part.]

In other words, the figurative expression should suit the kāvyārtha. By this it is implied that the sense of propriety works in this emotional suffusion. Otherwise, it may happen so that, a figure, spontaneously expressed, may not suit in the context.

Secondly, a figure should not attract the attention of a sahṛdaya to rest in itself. In the process of literary appreciation the figure should contribute to the total appeal in such a way that the kāvyārtha, more technically the ālāṅkārya, only should shine prominently. This observation equally applies to arthālāṅkāras also.

b) Aucīrya and Arthālāṅkāra

By the observations made in the foregoing pages on śabdālāṅkāra, one need not arrive at the opinion that, similar is the case with arthālāṅkāra also. According to Ānandavardhāna, these figures spontaneously swarm at the beck and call of the poet, gifted with rich imagination, when he is absorbed completely in the delineation of sentiment;

Dhvanyāloka, p.58

And it should be so. Because ālāṅkāras are just the kinds of primary sense and, the sentiments have to be conveyed by way of primary sense only;

Dhvanyāloka, p.60
An instance may be picked from the *Kūḍambarī* of Bāṇa, which is known for its prolific use of *alāṅkāras*. In the lines cited below, Mahāśvetā describes to Candrāpīḍa, the blooming of youth in her body;

\[
\text{क्रमेण च कृतं ने वापुष्टि वसन्त इव मधुमासेन, मधुमास इव नवपल्लवेन, नवपल्लव इव}
\text{कुसुमेन, कुसुम इव मधुकरेण, मधुकर इव मदेन नवधीवनेन पदम्।}
\]

p.426

Here, the series of the figure simile strung like in a chain, pictures the gradual, yet unnoticeable blooming of the youth.

Not of less importance is the sense of propriety even in such emotional suffusion. For, Ānandavardhana clearly says that, the figures become significant only when they are employed with great discrimination;

\[
\text{ध्वन्यालभूते शूद्रारे समीक्ष्य विनियोजित।}
\text{सुपकादिरल्पुखर्वं एति यथार्थताम्।।}
\]

*Dhvanyāloka*, II, 17

Thus, Ānandavardhana who propounds the natural manifestation of figures, also is of the opinion that, employment of figures should be made with deep sense of propriety.

These ideas of Ānandavardhana assert a very important principle that, *aucitya* is the intrinsic factor in poet’s creative imagination and works as an under-current through out artistic creation. The following *kārikās* are of great importance in revealing the nature of such a discrimination;

\[
\text{विवक्षा तत्परवेच नाहिवेचन कदाचन।}
\text{काले च ग्रहणात्यानि नाति निर्विशेषित।।}
\text{निर्युङ्कादयं चाहुः यत्लेन प्रत्येक्षाणम्।}
\text{सुपकादि राल्पुखर्वयय्यांश्यसाधनम्।।}
\]

*Ibid.*, II, 18-19

A figure of speech is only a means to the delineation of sentiment and never an end in itself. It should be employed or abandoned at the right time. The
poet should not be over-enthusiastic in stretching it too far, and he should watch carefully that the figure is placed in a secondary position. The highest secret of employment of figures is that, they should glorify by way of standing in propriety to a particular sentiment. Such only are fit for the designation *alaṅkāra*. Thus observes Abhinavagupta;

> स ऐव‍ौपनिनिध्यमानो रसा‍भिव्यक्तिहेतु‍पर‍स‍वजनीत‍ते महाव‍य‍ण्ड \ | ।

*Locana*, p.107

If these rules are violated, that is, if the figures are employed indiscriminately or if they are made predominant or if stretched too far, they result in sheer impropriety.

The following verse illustrates the appropriate use of an *alaṅkāra* in the delineation of sentiment;

> चलापानं दृष्टि स्नृशसि बहुशो वेष्टुमलि
> रहस्प्रभावांभिर स्वनसि मूर्तु करण्तिकवृहः \ | ।
> करी व्याधुम्यर्यां पिभसि तत्ततस्वस्वमाधरं
> वषयं तत्तत्वेतांतामाधुकर हतास्वं खलु कृतः \ | ।

*Sākuntala*, I,21

[ Oftenly you touch her eye that is trembling and moving in corner, roaming near her ear, you hum tenderly as if whispering in secret, you drink her lip who wave her hands. We, after searching for truth, are disappointed, O Bee! you are really lucky.]

Swayed away by the loveliness of Sākuntalā, Duṣyanta describes the bee which is flitting near the face of Sākuntalā. Evidently, the theme of description is the sentiment of love and figure *svabhāvokti* or realistic description is fully keeping with sentiment.

The employment and abandonment at right time is instanced in the following verse where the double entendre though already taken up for treat-
ment is given up half way, in order to make room for other figures which serve better in revealing the sentiment;

[ Red thou art by fresh tendrils
And so (i.e. fascinated) am I by beloved’s sweet virtues.
Bees so do swarm towards you
So do they (i.e. arrows) come towards me,
Shot by the bow of the God of Love.
A blow from the darling’s sole will delight you
And so does it delight me too;
Thus O sorrowless tree, one in all respects are we;
But I am consigned to sorrow by fate!]

Here the words *rakta*, *śilimukha*, and *aśoka* each have two meanings, but the poet has abandoned the further treatment of double entendre in order to favour the figure *vyatireka* or poetic contrast. As such both the figures contribute to the central theme i.e., love-in-separation in a very impressive manner;

अति हि प्रवन्धप्रवृत्तोऽधिष्ठाय श्लेषः व्यतिरेकविवक्ष्य रसाविशेषं पुष्पाति।

*Dhvanyāloka*, p.66

And, in the following verse, the poet, who is fully bent upon the sole object of delineating the sentiment, desists from stretching the figure too far;

कोपाकोमललोलाभुलोतिकापशोऽन सत्या दूरे।
नीत्या वासनिकश्च दयतत्त्वा सायं संघीनाः पुरः।
He is indeed a lucky lover who is bound fast
By the noose of his beloved’s creeper like arms
So soft and tense in her mounting anger,
Then to the bed-chamber is led in the evening
Even as the confidants are looking on,
Is warned not to do it again with an allusion
To his love-offence in a flattering and sweet tone.
And is beaten by the weeping beloved
As he tries to hide his fault smilingly.

In this verse, the figure metaphor which was initiated in the first line is not carried into its every detail;

_Aaj hi samakamaditya astitvam ut parsha purvyo._

_Ibid., p. 68_

As Abhinavagupta observes, there would have been breach of propriety if the metaphor in _bāhulatikāpāsa_ were further stretched by describing the lady as a hunter woman and the bed-chamber as prison;

_bāhulatikāpāsa_ pashānē suṣṇa yadvā niraśāyate dhāvita bhāvavabā: vāsāgṛha karāgāra padantādīti parsamābhāṣya śtātu._

_Locana, p. 113_

But often we come across some such instances where the poet is seen engrossed fully in the employment of a figure in its every detail disregarding the sentiment, and the result is evidently breach in propriety. For example;

स्वस्तितप्रकारां नमनाद्वारं स्वसुपतंगेन।
उद्भाष्य सा प्रविदत हदयाः मे नृपतमूलः।।

_Ibid., p. 187_
[That princess entered my heart-house opening the eye-doors which have the frame of eye-lacks, by the key of her beauty.]

In this verse, the poet has spoiled the appeal of the figure metaphor by carrying it too far in its every detail. The attention of the reader in perceiving the sentiment śṛṅgāra is obstructed by the elaborate employment of the figure. This does not mean that wherever a figure is employed in all its details, it will result in impropriety only. In the following verse from the Buddhacarita of Aśvaghosa, the same metaphor of lock and key serves effectively in bringing out the sublime character of Tathāgata:

विपालिष्यन्तयामूलनं सद्यर्मतादेन दुरासंदेन || 1,74

[He opens the door of ignorance which have the lock of desire by the key of righteousness, so that the people cross it over.]

There is yet another aspect to be considered in alaṅkāra-aucitya; that is, propriety shines forth if a character describes some idea employing its co-relatives from the world known to it. An aspect picked from the world-limit of the character by which it describes something, not only enhances the beauty of the figure but effectively contributes to the characterization also. For example; in the Raghuvamśa, Kautsa, the pupil of Varatantu, approaches emperor Raghu asking for something to offer to his Guru. But, Raghu was empty-handed, since he had liberally gifted away everything that he had, in the sacrifice called Viśvajit. In this context Kautsa describes him as follows:

शरीरमात्रे गरेन्द्र तिष्ठामापसि तीर्थं पतिपदितं ||
आरण्यकोपाशकलतासूर्तिः स्माचेन नीयार हि ज्ञातीश || V, 15

[O king, by giving away wealth to the worthy, you, by the body remaining, look like a (plant of) wild grain which has only the stem remaining due to its
giving all grains to the forest-dwellers.]

Kautsa, who was living in the forest-regions can compare the king only to a thing from his own familiar world. This illustrates how an *alankāra* being employed with supreme propriety, contributes to the characterization on one hand, and makes the speech more effective on the other.¹⁵⁰

That, which is adorned by an *alankāra* is called an *alankārya*. When one speaks of propriety in the former, equivalent to that, the propriety of the latter should also be ascertained. As in the case with *alankāras*, an *alankārya* also may become improper or dubious. In that case all the beauty of *alankāras* go in vain. Thus observes Abhinavagupta;

Instances for impropriety in a figure pertaining to the nature of the speaker and also to *alankārya* may be cited from the works of great poets. But, at the same time, deciding the impropriety or otherwise is not easy, as several interpretations are possible in the varying contextual implications of these verses. For example;

[Do the sprouts, which place themselves as a comparison with your lower lip that has abandoned the application of lac long before, shoot regularly in these creepers that are nurtured by you with sprinkling of water ?]

Here the *Brahmacārin* speaks to Pārvati who is practicing penance. It seems that, the content of this verse is beyond the limitations of a student who is
practicing celibacy. And accordingly, the simile introduced by him does not fit in his nature.

At the same time, it may also be argued that, the intention of Siva who came in the guise of Brahmacārin, was to enjoy the scene by enraged Parvati. If this interpretation is accepted, the verse suits most in the context.

Similarly, a verse from the epic Rāmāyaṇa may be illustrated for the uncertainty of alaṅkārya;

रेवते ताङ्ग्निं भाग्यस्तु बाराजूर्णमदिः
निब्ध्वासयः ह्वादश्त्रोक्ष्यन्तं न प्रकाशते।

Aranyakaṇḍa, XVI, 13

[The moon, who has transferred all his beauty to the Sun, and whose orbit is covered by fog, looks like a mirror dimmed by exhale.]

This verse is uttered by Lakṣmana, while he accompanied Rāma and Sīta, to take bath in the river Godāvari. As a matter of fact, this verse is cited as a good example for suggestion with completely lost literal import. But the verse suffers from a dubious alaṅkārya. If ‘moon’ is considered as alaṅkārya this verse should fall in mukraka type of poetry. But the verse is found in the description of autumn. It is desirable that, the description of nature should reveal the mood of the describer, as it is the part of the epic. But, in the said context Lakṣmana is not sad or sorrowful to compare the moon to a faded mirror.

A contrary argument may also be put forward. In the epics like Rāmāyaṇa one cannot expect artistic expression in each and every verse since, the sole concentration of the poet is fully bent upon the gross effect of the work. Such descriptions of the seasons are found here and there throughout the work, and they need not necessarily suggest the mood of the describer.
Thus, finally, we reach to the confession expressed by Ānandavardhana that, the exposure of defects of great poets, who have illuminated this world by their thousand good-sayings, would amount to the self-censure of the critic:

Suśrutasahasyothitātmāḥ mahaṁśāṁ ādhiḥśvāsātmāṁ eva duṣṭān bhavyāt

_Dhvanyālōka_, p. 70

By the very combination of contrast or conglomeration of completely distinct entities, an _alaṅkāra_ may show extra-ordinary beauty in _muktakās_, where developing a _rasa_ or delineating a character fully may not be the intention of the poet. In such verses, the _rasa_ or the _alaṅkārya_ in question may not acquire dominant position. On the contrary, _rasādī_, by their very presence beautify the expressed sense i.e., the _alaṅkāra_. Thus, according to Ānandavardhana, verses, which strike only by their beauty in _alaṅkāra_, and do not suggest any _rasa_ clearly, fall under _gurībhūtāryāṅgā_ type of poetry:

Ibid., p. 230

From this angle, many stray verses, that are deemed technically as third rate poetry or _citrakārya_, are fit to enjoy a higher position.

In this way, _alaṅkāras_ are the means of beautifying the essence of a literary work, though some theorists, especially the followers of _dhvani_ theory, hold the view that, _alaṅkāras_ are not inevitable. But, if we drive out completely the _alaṅkāras_ from a work, insipidity would be the only result. Jayadeva is right when he observes that a poem without _alaṅkāras_ is similar to fire without heat.

But, at the same time one should not go to the extreme that, achiev-
ing perfection in alaṅkāras is the only aim of a poet. All beauty of an alaṅkāra lies in its contribution to poetic expression. And that is its greatest propriety. As Ānandavardhana observes;

\begin{quote}
अलक्षीतां शक्तावप्यामुर्म्यं योजनम्

\text{Ibid, III.14}
\end{quote}

Employment with complete harmony so as to suggest rasādī in a whole work is the only principle with regard to alaṅkāras.

(v) *Aucitya* and *Guna* & *Riti*

Apart from its extra-poetical meanings\textsuperscript{153}, *guna*, in the province of poetry, implies at least two layers of meaning: one is ‘quality’ or ‘property’ i.e., a distinguishing factor or a special attribute and the other is ‘excellence’ or ‘merit’. The history of the concept of *guna* is not only labyrinthine in nature but even after a close study of this concept one is still under the confused state regarding what exactly the term *guna* means and in which factor of poetry one is to find it. “The most confusing chapter in the history of alaṅkāraśāstra, if I might say so,” opines Dr. K.Krishnamoorthy, “is the one on *rīti* and *guna* . There is wide divergence of opinion from writer to writer not only on the nature but also on the number of literary *gunas*. I am not even quite sure whether they mean ‘excellence’ or ‘quality’ by that term. When it comes in juxtaposition to *doṣas*, it is possible that they mean ‘excellences’. But when they are described as *rasadharmas*, they appear to mean ‘qualities’.\textsuperscript{154}

That the concept of *guna* has been treated in altogether different directions may be seen by a brief survey of its development through the ages.

*Guna* as a poetic quality has been mentioned in the *Nātyaśāstra*. Bharata
held the view that, *dośas* are the positive entities and *gunaś* signify nothing more than their negation;

एते दोषा हि काव्यस्य मथा सम्यक्क्रियानित्ताः।

गुणा विपर्ययादेशां माधुर्यादार्यलक्षणाः।

*Nāṭyaśāstra*, XVI, 95

Abhinavagupta, while explaining this verse, seems to modify Bharata’s view. Thus, according to him, the essence of poetry is not only due to mere absence of *dośas* but by the *rasa* that shines forth;

एतदुख्तं भवति - एतद्विजिहीनं शृंगितुनं दीनसं च यदि भवति तावता गुणान्तरितस्त्रिंशे नीनमभिक्क लक्षणां गुणाय्यीविध्यार्थितयुक्तम्।

*Abhinavabhāratī*, p.334

Further Bharata insists that, the *kāvyabandha* of a drama should have the qualities of tenderness and sweetness. Words must be simple and give their meaning clearly. Thus, Bharata mentions some general qualities of diction not mentioning their name;

उदारश्वेतम्युः कार्यस्मैतथवशाश्नाः।

*Nāṭyaśāstra*, XVII,120

मृदुशब्दं सुखार्थं च कवि: कुञ्जितेऽनाटकम्।

*Ibid.*, XXI, 131

It is generally accepted that, Bharata enumerated and treated ten *gunaś* that pertain to *kāvya*;

श्लेष्म: दशादं समता सुभाषितम्युःशास्त्रं वदसुदामोऽगम्यम्।

अर्दश्च उपदिक्तादाता च कामिनः काव्यस्य गुणा: दर्शते।

*Ibid.*, XVII, 96

It is interesting to note that, this verse does not include the *guna udārāya* which is mentioned in the above cited verse (*Nāṭyaśāstra*, XVI, 95). Possibly for this reason the scholars who have edited *Nāṭyaśāstra* consider this and
the following verses, where the *guna*as are named and defined, as interpolations. It is likely that some writers after Daṇḍin might have inserted these verses in the *Nātyaśāstra*. If ten *guna*as were treated by Bharata then there was a possibility of their treatment in Bhāmaha also. But the latter mentions only three *guna*as. Therefore, it may not be incorrect if we conjecture that, Bharata has made only some general remarks on the qualities of poetic diction.

As far as the appropriate use of these merits or excellences is concerned, Bharata insists as he does on other constituents of drama, that they should be employed with a view to *rasa*;

\[ \text{सम्मक्यकरोयक्तानि यथार्थसं तु} \]

*Ibid.*, XVI, 4

and,

\[ \text{प्रत्योगमेषां च पुनर्वक्त्यानि रसांश्च भध्यम्} \]

*Ibid.*, XVI, 113

Bhāmaha nowhere uses the term *guna*, except in connection with the poetic figure *bhāvika*;

\[ \text{भाविककरणिः प्राणः प्रत्ययोद्भिं गुणम्} \]

\[ \text{प्रत्यक्षा हि दृश्यान्तो यत्रायं भूतभाविनः} \]

*Kāvyālaṅkāra*, III, 53

Apart from this all-pervasive *guna*, Bhāmaha mentions three entities of poetry namely, *mādhurya*, *ojas* and *prasāda*, which are termed later as *guna*as. Thus, a *kāvyā* is embodied with *mādhurya* if it is sweet to hear and is not overloaded with compounds:

\[ \text{अध्यं नातिसमस्तार्थं काव्यं मधुरमिच्छते} \]

*Ibid.*, II, 3

And the poem which has *prasāda* is easily understood even by boys and
Both madhurya and prasada seem to go together avoiding profuse compounds;

Ibid., II, 1

Poets who want to employ ojas use many compounded words;

Ibid., II, 2

The terms madhurya etc., as observed by P.C. Lahiri are not restricted to the technical poetic excellence, but refer in a wider sense to poetic beauty in general.

Again, in connection with riti, Bhāmaha gives the guṇas like tīrīṭa, komalarava and śrutiṇesalarva with reference to vaidarbhi and anākularva and agrāmyarva with reference to gaudī;

Ibid., 1, 34-35

It is rather difficult to decide whether Bhāmaha considered these aspects as absolute entities of poetry or the subservients of riti, "but the first person who could point out that the three guṇas Madhurya, Ojas and Prasāda were all-in-all was Bhāmaha. There has been no doubt, some difference of opinion regarding the meanings of these words but as far as the comprehensiveness of the division is concerned Bhāmaha's view stood well".187

We have to gather Bhāmaha's ideas on guṇacārya in the general re-
marks made by him in the verses quoted above. Therein Bhamaha says that, the vaidarbhi does not mean good poetry. Over emphasis on gunas may lead to a faulty or unappealing vaidarbhi also. Similarly, if the qualities pertaining to gauḍi are not overdone, there is a possibility of an appealing gauḍī. Thus, judging poetry must be made by the appreciation of the fundamental features that lie at the basis of both vaidarbhi and gauḍī.

Dandin is the earliest known writer who treats of the gunas in connection with riti, although the term riti itself is never employed by him. His mārga, as observed by scholars, is equivalent to riti.158

The ways of speech are infinite and they have minute differences in them. Even then two major ways may be pointed out with noticeable distinctions;

अस्सयनेको गिरां मार्गः सूहमंदः परस्परः ।
तत्र वैदर्भगौदीयी वर्ण्येत्र प्रस्फुटात्तरी ।।

Kāvyādarśa, 1,40

Further Dandin defines and illustrates ten gunas that constitute the very life of vaidarbhamārga, and says that the reverse of these gunas is found in goudavartman;

श्रेष्ठः प्रसादः सन्ताना माधुर्यं सुकुमारता ।
अर्थव्यविधातरं मोक्षकामिकाशमाधथः ।।
एते वैदर्भमार्गस्य प्राणः दशगुणः समृतः ।
एषां विषयं प्रायो दृश्यते गौडवर्त्मनि ।।

Ibid.,1,41-42

But Dandin is silent on the issue of the role of gunas in poetic creation and also in the total appreciation of poetry. He winds up by saying that, the varieties of mārgas are innumerable, since they reside in each poet distinctly. One could be able to notice the difference in these various mārgas,
as one notices the difference in the sweetness of sugarcane, milk and, molasses, but, it is beyond the capacity of even the goddess of speech to explain the nature of this difference;

\[
\text{तत्तद्दासु न शक्यम्यो वक्तुं प्रतिकविस्थित।} \quad !
\]

\text{Ibid., I,101}

\[
\text{इश्वरीगुजानीमानाध्यंजगारं महतुं।} \quad !
\]

\[
\text{तथापि न तदाप्यासु सरस्वतापि शक्यते।} \quad !
\]

\text{Ibid., I,102}

The glimpses of \textit{gunaucirya} in Daṇḍin may be marked in his treatment of \textit{doṣas} where he observes that, some of the \textit{doṣas} like \textit{apārtha} (IV,5), \textit{vyartha} (IV,10), \textit{ekārtha} (IV,14), \textit{samāsaya} (IV,18), \textit{apakrama} (IV,23), and \textit{śabdahīna} (IV,28) become \textit{guna}s in some exceptional cases. Again, the \textit{doṣas} pertaining to \textit{deśa}, \textit{kāla}, \textit{kālā}, \textit{loka}, \textit{nyāya} and \textit{āgama} cross over the path of \textit{doṣatva} due to the skill of the poet. This observation of Daṇḍin has a direct bearing on the concept of \textit{aucirya}. It is this \textit{aucirya} that converts the \textit{doṣas}, of course \textit{anirya doṣas} into \textit{guna}s;

\[
\text{विरोधस्तकलीनयो विद्यतीकियोश्वलात।} \quad !
\]

\[
\text{उलकम्य दोषगणनाः गुणवीर्येन विगाहते।} \quad !
\]

\text{Ibid., IV,57}

And also in the closing verse of his work, Daṇḍin gives guideline to the poet that, an intelligent poet following the suitable path of \textit{guna} and \textit{doṣa}, as shown in his work, attains fame;

\[
\text{व्युक्तविद्विद्विदुर्मुना विधिदर्थात्तेत्तमुणाः प्राणी दोषगुणयो दशवर्तात्तेत्तयो।} \quad !
\]

\[
\text{वास्मिः कृतानुसरणाः मदिरक्षणाधिकार्यो दुःखेव रमते लभते च कीर्तिम्।} \quad !
\]

\text{Ibid., IV. 65}

Vāmana’s definition of \textit{guna}s as makers of beauty in poetry reveals the fact that, he steps ahead towards approaching the real essence of poetry. He regards that the \textit{guna}s are the permanent features of poetry whereas \textit{alāṅkāras}
help in enhancing the beauty in it;

Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra, III, i, 1-3

Extending further Daṇḍin’s analogy of kāvyaśārīra, Vāmana, for the first time in Sanskrit poetics establishes that, poetry has a soul and that soul is rīti; 

Ibid., I, ii, 6

Prior to this, Vāmana proposes a comprehensive concept of alaṅkāra equating it with beauty, in his oft-quoted dictum śīndrangalakāra: I, i, 2. This beauty is attained by avoiding doṣas and introducing guṇas and alaṅkāras;

Ibid., I, i, 3

The derivation of rīti as given by Gopendra Tripurahara Bhūpāla, author of a commentary called Kāmadhenu on Vāmana’s work, reveals the importance of guṇas;

Ibid., p.15

This rīti or ‘ways of collocation’ or ‘diction’ is a distinct structure विशेषज्ञता रचना of words. And this distinction constitutes in the guṇas;

Ibid., I, ii, 8

It is interesting to note that, Vāmana holds the view that doṣas are the opposite of guṇas; (Ibid., II, i, 1) which is directly against the view of Bharata, who regarded guṇas as opposite to doṣas. Some modern writers think that in Vāmana doṣas are the negations of guṇas. Thus observes P.Ramachandrudu, ‘Vāmana accepts dosas as guṇabhāvarūpa whereas some later writers like Mammaṭa tried to prove that some guṇas are doṣabhāvarūpa’. 161 This observation is hardly acceptable on the ground that the word viparyaya used both by Bharata and Vāmana holds the meaning
‘reverse’ or ‘contrary’ and not ‘negation’ as explained by their respective commentators. Thus writes Abhinavagupta;

एवं विपरीत्यादित्या भवनित्, एवंदौषिणियात एवं गुणो भवातः तथा।

Nārāyaṇaśāstra, p.333

And Gopendra Triparahara Bhūpāla elucidates Vāmana’s view as follows;

िपरीत्याति विपरीत्याति, विपरीताः तां एकालामानो वेषाः त्वां विपरीतस्त्रांसुध्रः।
न वाचाक्रुण इत्यत्थः।

Kāvyālākārasūtra, p.40

It may be observed in this context that, a doṣa is not always a doṣa and a guṇa is not always a guṇa. The doṣarva and guṇarva are only contextual. They rely for their significant existence on the concept of aucitya. Madhurya, for instance, is a guṇa but its employment in the delineation of the sentiment like roudra or bibhatsa becomes a doṣa. Similarly punaruktarva is a doṣa but it turns a guṇa when an idea is to be established emphatically or when one wants to suggest something special. For instance, in the following verse the word kamalāni is repeated a second time but, is endowed with the force of suggestion;

तदा जापन्ते गुणं यथा ते राहस्यगृह्यन्ते।
रथिकिरिणानुगृहीतानि भवनित् कमलानि कमलानि।

Dhvanyālākāra, p.38

Thus, we arrive at the point that, aucitya is the only guṇa or it is the guṇa of all other guṇas. Thus observes Municandra;

औदिष्ठयमेकेनक गुणानां राशिरैकह।
विषायते गृहाग्रामां औदिष्ठयपरिवर्तितिः।

162

It may also be observed here that, there are some niриयadosas like bhinnacāya, grāmyā, duṣṭapadarva etc., and avoiding these permanent defects itself becomes a positive quality. It is in this sense we may say that दोषविपरीत्यालामानस गुणः or vice versa. But, it should be borne in mind that the
reverse of the permanent defects are the basic requirements of a literary work. The employment of such permanent guṇas fall under vyutpatti. Therefore, the logical end of this argument is that, permanent guṇas are the reverse of permanent doṣas; नित्यांदोषविपर्ययात्मानी नित्यगुणाः।

Thus, according to Vāmana the sōbhā or the beauty in a literary work is due to guṇas. Alāṅkāras are added for additional beauty. The relation between Kāvyā and guṇa is eternal. Therefore, guṇas are नियतशोभाकर्मांस and thereby it is implied that they subsist in kāvyā through samaṅgāya sambandha. If riti is the soul of poetry, guṇas constitute the soul of that riti itself. Thus, ultimately guṇas stand as the prime constituents of poetry.

Vāmana’s theory that, particular arrangement of words is the soul of poetry and this particularity consists in guṇas has been criticised by the dhvani-theorists. Even the modern advocates of dhvani-theory criticise it as “a poor solution indeed of the basic problem.” But, if we consider sympathetically, Vāmana has his own contribution to the age-long problem of disclosing the secret of poetry. He was well aware of the concept of beauty and it is found in his wide concept of alāṅkāra. At the same time, he was more aware of the fact that, for the purposes of practical application the above theory is of less use. If not solidified in expression, the vision of a poet, however vivid or fanciful it may be, is as good as non-existing. Pada or word is the only thing by which the vision expresses itself taking a form thereby. Guṇas, it may be said, are the characteristic features of expression subsisting in words. Thus, from the practical point of view, the riti theory is more precise and practicable.

Again, the riti theory tried to analyse the essence of poetry from its outer factors i.e., sabda and artha. It is not impossible that Vāmana realised that, ways of expression are infinite and each poet has his own individual
style. The permutation and combination of his twenty *guṇas* in their various degrees result in infinite varieties of expression and this explains why each poet is characterised by his individual style.

In this process of unveiling the secret of poetry, it seems, one can hardly go still further, because, the aspect that reigns supreme standing in the core, is only an abstract thing.

Ānandavardhana tried to analyse that abstract thing. But, even he could not point it out precisely. He describes it in so many words as अन्यदेव बसु । (*Dhvanyāloka*, I,4), काव्यविशेष (Ibid, I,13) and the like. We should bear in mind that, his definition of *dhvani* also consists of words *śabda* and *artha*. It is only by the help of *śabda* and *artha* one could be able to perceive the essence of poetry. In this way Ānandavardhana’s theory of *dhvani* may be regarded as a continuation of Vāmana’s theory of *rīti*. Is it for this reason that, Ānandavardhana who first criticised, pays tribute to *Rītivādins*, by declaring that they had dimly realised the real essence of poetry? 166

Ānandavardhana mentions and treats of only three *guṇas*, namely *ojas*, *prasāda*, and *mādhurya*. The general definition167 of *guṇa* is given by him as below:

That is, the qualities inhere in the principal element of poetry, viz., the *rasa*. On this, one should not generalise that all these *guṇas* reside in all *rasas*. In this connection Ānandavardhana clearly mentions which *guṇa* suits which *rasa*. Where the *rasas* like *śrīgāra* and *karuṇa* are to be delineated they should always be suggested through the *guṇa*, *mādhurya*. This is because, these *rasas* are the most delicate *rasas* and soften the heart to a great extent;
Similarly, rasas like roudra are characterized by the guṇa called ojas. This involves brilliant expansion of heart - dīpti. The guṇa ojas, resides in śabda and artha which are suggestive of rasas;

१८१७ दुर्मितोऽसान्तन्माँहकोऽवधिंननि ।
तद्यथमितेजो वर्द्धायंशाधिक्यौ जो व्यवस्थितां ।।

Ibid., II,7-8

Ānandavardhana cites two verses from the drama Veṇīśamhāra to illustrate how śabda and artha suggest the rasa roudra by producing the effect of excessive excitement. The śabda which produces this effect is adorned by (harsh sounding) lengthy compounds;

चापचूँजयातिषांतकण्डव्यापीः
सूक्ष्मंतोरघुमणलस्य सूक्ष्मोंनस्य ।
स्यानांवनदग्रामशीर्षोऽप्राणी -
हृदंप्रियम् कर्मांश्च देवि भीमः । १,२१

And, as in the following verse, the artha, which produces this effect of forcefulness need not have lengthy compounded constructions;

यो येः षट्षक्ष्मकुत्तरत्त्वमुच्यते प्राणः प्राणीःः
यो येः प्राणीनाः विश्वरूपात्वः गर्भसिद्धाःः मात्र वा ।
यो यो यो यो यो यो यो यो यो
क्रोधंतथस्तमस्य तस्य साधणमिः तिगतात्मकस्थलं तत्कालं ॥

III,32
And lastly, prasāda or lucidity or transparency of sabda and artha is the quality of all rasas and functions in all compositions;

समर्पकल्याणः कायक्षेत्रं यथूः सर्वसाधारणंति।
स प्रसादो गुणों हेतुः सर्वसाधारणक्रिया।

Ibid., II, 10

Thus, according to Ānandavardhana, guṇas do not play any part in poetry by themselves, but they are consequenced by the demands of rasa.

In tune with Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta holds the view that, the guṇas viz., mādhurya, ojas and prasāda exist respectively in the form of three mental conditions called ardṛṣṭa or druti (melting), dipī (expansion or forcefulness) and samarpakarśa or vyāpakarśa (pervasion) respectively. These are evoked only in the realisation of rasa;

समर्पकल्याणः सम्प्रभुवत्सलं हदय्यांवादं प्रतिपत्तिः प्रति स्वाभाविकाद्यावलं कान्त्यकर्मकोधादिरिति
विसमाहसादिरिति वि लोकिति।
Locana, p.96

and,

चीति प्रतिपधुरैदयः विभासविश्वासमाध्यायं

Ibid., p.97

and,

समर्पकल्याणः सम्प्रभुवत्सलं हदय्यांवादं प्रतिपत्तिः प्रति स्वाभाविकाद्यावलं कान्त्यकर्मकोधादिरिति
शुचकायामित्रदृষ्टासनांकल्योगकृत्यान्तो च तदकायां प्रसंसवं नाम सर्वसाधारणं गुणं।

Ibid., p.99

It may be observed in this context that the aspects which we consider as guṇas seem to be the various modes of expression. The expression is the linguistic form by which the intensity of a poet’s emotion is expressed. In the state of poet’s emotional suffusion, the expression becomes more or less spontaneous. In other words, the poet does not combine effortfully the guṇas which suit to the sentiments but, the guṇas are expressed as associ-
ated inseparably with *rasa* itself. “Therefore, it is poet’s nature, his temperament, and his ability, which determine his style”. 169 Abhinavagupta’s observation in this context is remarkable;

Therefore *guna* are regarded as the constant properties of poetry by Bhaṭṭārakṣīṇha. 170 In other words, the question of *guna* does not arise at all when there is no *rasa*.

As it has been observed, *guna* equally belong to *śabdā* and *artha*, eventhough they are considered as the properties of *rasa*;

This explains why the post-śhāvanī writers like Mammaṭa have formed the division of poetry called *citra*, where the composition is found to have only *guna* and *alaṅkāra*.

Further, Abhinavagupta enumerates the *guna* suitable to various *rasa*;

Ānandavardhana and his followers do not entertain the aspect of *rīti* in poetry. Ānandavardhana remarks that, the *rītis* were introduced by those theorists who have dimly understood the secret of poetry;
Abhinavagupta observes that, the riti resolves finally into guṇas and as the guṇas are the intrinsic features of rasa, the riti merges its identity in guṇas and ultimately in rasa;

But, it is remarkable that, though Ānandavardhana does not admit riti in poetry, he admits another poetic factor called saṅghaṭanā. This is based directly on the formation of compounds and according to the nature of compounds it has three divisions;

i) Saṅghaṭanā without compounds, (asamāsa)

ii) Saṅghaṭanā with medium-sized compounds, (madhyamasamāsa) and,

iii) Saṅghaṭanā with long compounds (dīrghasamāsa).

Saṅghaṭanā or texture is oftenly confused with guṇas. There exists a great deal of controversy whether saṅghaṭanā is identical with qualities or not. Rhetoricians like Udbhata held the view, according to Abhinavagupta that, guṇas are the characteristics of saṅghaṭanā;

Even Ānandavardhana himself is of the opinion on one place that, the guṇa ojas is found in those sentences constructed in lengthy compounds. But a little latter, he says that the sense which produces effect of ojas need not necessarily be a composition of lengthy compounds. Therefore he decides that, guṇa, and saṅghaṭanā are not identical. Contrary to the nature of guṇas, saṅghaṭanā is not the permanent characteristic of a sentiment in the sense that a particular saṅghaṭanā should be used in delineating a particular sentiment, whereas qualities are the characteristics of words which illuminate the suggested meaning and who also are capaciated in promoting
The ultimate function of both guṇa and saṅghaṭanā is to help the manifestation of rasa. Saṅghaṭanā realises this object through the guṇas. If guṇas are conditioned by rosas, the nature of saṅghaṭanā is determined by its appropriateness to the speaker and to the theme of discourse;


Dhvanyāloka, p.120

There are some aspects the poet has to consider while composing a poem. First of all, he has to consider the nature of the speaker and then what the speaker wants to say, and finally the nature of the situation to be depicted. Since, these are to be depicted through guṇas, the poet cannot ignore the question of employing a suitable guṇa. And, if a particular saṅghaṭanā proves to be suitable to that guṇa the poet is at liberty to use that saṅghaṭanā in connection with rasa where the guṇa in question prevails. When the poet, or a character, created by him happens to be a speaker is full of emotion, and if rasa is principally intended, then there will be only two types of saṅghaṭanā, one is without compounds and the other is with medium compounds. In the sentiments of karuṇa and vipralambha ṣṛṅgāra, the saṅghaṭanā will be only the one without compounds.

Ānandavardhana out-rightly prohibits the employment of long compounds on the basis that they impede the comprehension of rasa; for, long compounds lend themselves to various kinds of interpretations. The result is the obscure expressed sense and it leads to uncertainty in pointing out the rasa also. Therefore, the poet should not show excessive fondness in
When the sentiments like roudra are to be delineated, the poet can employ middle-sized sanghaṭanā. Sometimes, when the poet intends to describe the activities of a dhīroddhata, it is not essential that the long-compounded structure should be completely avoided.

There is another consideration which governs the employment of sanghaṭanā. It is the aucirya with regard to the literary medium adopted. Thus, sanghaṭanā becomes different in different forms of literature; 

विष्णुःश्रस्यमण्णम् दीर्घतं तानिर्घटति ||
काव्याभेदाक्षरन् धिरतं स्थिता भेदवति हि सः ||

Ibid., p. 130

Of various forms of literature like muktaka, sargabandha, kathā and akhyāṇikā etc., in muktaka form, the poet, who intends to delineate the sentiment, will be guided by the considerations of aucirya relating to the sentiment. In other forms, he is free to employ any sanghaṭanā he likes;

तत्र मुक्तकोपु रसबन्धामिनिमेषिन्, कवेस्तदाक्षरन्मीचिह्ययम् || अन्यत्र कामयां ||

Ibid., p. 130

The whole issue leads to the only conclusion that, compound words should be employed in such a way that they should not impede the delineation and comprehension of rasa. They are sanctioned even in the guṇa viz., mādhurya, and even ojas can go without them, provided the propriety is not lost. The awakening of rasa is not obstructed in any way and the sanghaṭanā is quite in keeping with the character of the speaker and the situation depicted.

Kuntaka is the last writer who has come up with some original views.
on the concepts of riti and guna. Unlike his predecessors, he formulates three different ways of expression-mārgas-which are based directly on the poet’s temperament;

Vakroṭṭijīvi, p.41

The mārgas, sukumāra, vicitra and madhyama, are regarded as the very stimulators of the creative functioning of the poet. Kuntaka is well aware of the fact that, poetic temperaments are infinite, and accordingly, styles also are to be formulated infinitely. But it is impossible to count and exhaust each and every individuality. Therefore a general division is proposed among which the first one is sukumāra or the elegant, and the second one is vicitra or brilliant, and the third and last division is madhyama or a mixed one. All these three are equally effective since, the poetry which is not beautiful falls outside the purview of a critic’s enquiry:\[176\]

\[...........अरमणीयस्यानुपादेयस्यारुपा...........\]

\[ibid.,p.42\]

The principal characteristics of sukumāra marga are:

a) in it every element of beauty is a result of poet’s imagination
b) it succeeds in conveying flashes of gentle grace
c) it has fresh words and meanings which blossom forth by poet’s undimmed imagination
d) it has few and lovely ornaments which come in without extra effort
e) in it prominence is given to the real nature of things.\[177\]

Kuntaka illustrates each of these characteristics by the verses picked from Kālidāsa. One such verse may be cited here, in which all these charac-
The palāśa flowers glowing so red and curved like the crescent moon as they had not fully opened, shone like the nail-imprints of spring as it were, on the bosoms of the sylvan goddesses during their first intimate union.

The second mārga viz., the vicitra or brilliant has the following features dominant in it:

a) artistic beauty appears to be radiating brilliantly
b) the dazzling figures of speech in excessive amount conceal the theme and produce beauty on their own
c) even an ordinary thing is raised to a unique height of excellence by artistic expression
d) the intended purport is communicated by the suggestive use of language.

The third mārga, i.e., the madhyama or the middling style is characterised by the combination of the main features of both the above mārgas.

The guṇas, that commonly reside in all these three mārgas with slight differences are mādhurya, prasāda, lāvanya and ābhijārya. The last two guṇas are newly introduced by Kuntaka which register his superior literary taste and keen observation.

Apart from these four guṇas, Kuntaka introduces two more guṇas which are commonly shared by all the mārgas. They are aucīr̥ya and soubhāgya, which have already been dealt with in the discussion on ‘the historical development of the concept of aucīr̥ya’.

At the outset of this chapter, aucīr̥ya has been viewed as a synthesiz-
ing force, whereas in the foregoing pages, one may notice, much is not said on aucitya, and only the different aspects of poetry have been reviewed, as they were treated by various theorists.

Most of the theorists of pre-dhvani period, it appears, treated the aspects of poetry as absolute entities rather than as the parts, which associated together create an organic whole. The question of aucitya arises mainly when there is the idea of a whole and its components. Therefore, one is left with the only possible alternative of studying the treatment of various aspects itself, and to gather thereby their ideas on aucitya, if any. It is the rasa-dhvani theory, which, for the first time attempted to unify these scattered aspects and thereby tried to find an organic structure in a literary work. But, the perusal of rasa-dhvani theory pre-requires one’s awareness of the doctrine of doṣa which serves, though in a negative way, as a complementary approach to the positive and integral approach of aucitya.