

The Concept of Vakrokti in Sanskrit Poetics



B21355739B

The concept of Vakrokti in Sanskrit poetics : a
ColorMarq PT00010765SGP

Suryanarayana Hegde

*The Concept of Vakrokti in
Sanskrit Poetics - A Reappraisal*

About the Author

Dr. Suryanarayan Hegde is a devoted young scholar in the field of Sanskrit Poetics and Literature. He was awarded Ph. D. degree by Karnatak University, Dharwad. He has proved his ability and industriousness by getting the First Rank with Gold Medals in M.A. Sanskrit and the 8th Rank to the University at the UG level.

With sustained interest in inter-disciplinary studies, he has completed P.G. Diploma in Epigraphy. Besides, he completed Alankara Vidwat and UGC/NET Examinations.

Dr. Hegde is, at present, Teaching Assistant in Sanskrit at Karnatak College, Dharwad. He wields his pen in Sanskrit, English and Kannada with equal facility. He has presented his research papers in various National Seminars.

The Concept of Vakrokti
in
Sanskrit Poetics - A Reappraisal

By
Dr. Suryanarayana Hegde

Readworthy
New Delhi

Copyright © Author

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this publication may be reproduced, utilized, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise), without the prior written permission of both the copyright owner and the publisher.

Permissions appear on pages 255-256. A conscientious attempt has been made to contact proprietors of the rights in every image used in the book. If thru inadvertence the publisher has failed to identify any holder of rights, forgiveness is requested and corrected information will be entered in future printings.

The views expressed in this volume are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the publishers.

First published 2009

Readworthy Publications (P) Ltd.

Regd. Off.: A-18, Mohan Garden
Near Nawada Metro Station
New Delhi – 110 059 (India)
Phone: 011-2537 1324
Fax: +91-11-2537 1323

Branch: 4662/21, Ansari Road
Daryaganj
New Delhi – 110 002
Phone: 011-43549197
Fax: +91-11-23243060

Email: info@readworthypub.com Web: www.readworthypub.com

Cataloging in Publication Data–DK

Courtesy: D.K. Agencies (P) Ltd. <docinfo@dkagencies.com>

Hegde, Suryanarayana.

The concept of Vakrokti in Sanskrit poetics : a reappraisal / by
Suryanarayana Hegde.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references (p.)

Includes index.

ISBN 13: 978-81-89973-93-3 ISBN 10: 81-89973-93-2

1. Kuntaka, fl. 950-1000. Vakroktijivita. 2. Sanskrit poetry--History and criticism. 3. Poetics. I. Title.

DDC 891.21 22

Blessings

Dr. K. B. Archak

Reader, PG Dept. of Sanskrit

Karnatak University,

DHARWAD- 580003

It is indeed a matter of gratification to go through this research work on the science of poetics. A number of prominent writers have laid foundations for a deeper appreciation of the patterns of Indian Sanskrit Poetics. One of such writers is undoubtedly my student-friend, Dr. Suryanarayana I. Hegde who presents this massive and unique work "**Concept of Vakrokti in Sanskrit Poetics – A Reappraisal**" to the field of interested readers.

Perhaps, the most important point which the science of rhetorics discusses, is about the essence or soul of Poetry. This discussion has given rise to five schools such as the *Rasa* School, the *Alaṅkāra* school, the *Rīti* school, the *Vakrokti* school and the *Dhvani* school. Of all these, *Vakrokti* school of Kuntaka advocates that a striking expression is the essence of the poetry. The term "*Vakrokti*" has been used in the literature from ancient times by Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin etc. The *Vakrokti* making the soul of the poetry, emphasizes two characteristics – i) its choice of words is different from that of ordinary poetry, ii) its expression to striking combinations of things that are beyond the reach of ordinary matter. The *Vakrokti* exists in *Varṇa*, *Padārtha*, *Vākya*, *Prakaraṇa* and *Prabandha*. Kuntaka of course denies an independent existence of *Dhvani* as the soul of poetry, but includes under all-pervading *Vakrokti*. Kuntaka is inimitable in his style of judicious use of examples, significant composition of *Kārikās* and rhythmic as well as melodious expression of *vṛttis*.

The objective thinking and critical approach in an intergrated spirit in the present work of Dr. S.I. Hegde are expressive of his

research acumen. Author's exposition of history of *Vakrokti*, and concept of *Vakrokti* are systematically comprehensive. He has critically examined the different views of *Vakrokti*, and introduced the niceties of the theory vakrokti in its practical criticism. In a nutshell, this work shines in its fullest significance of its title.

I am confident that this study of *Vakrokti* by Dr. Hegde will prove an enlightening tool to the discerning *sahridayas* of both India and abroad. I pray God for His blessings to enable Dr. S.I. Hegde to continue his research studies with redoubled vigour.

Foreword

When Dr. Suryanarayana Hegde approached me to write a foreword to his new venture, "**Concept of Vakrokti in Sanskrit Poetics – A Reappraisal**" I was a bit confused because of opposite feelings. The foremost feeling was of affection and pride. For, Dr. Surya happens to be my past student and more than that he is a young scholar having commendable literary taste, sharp analytical skill, training in Epigraphy and Textual Criticism – qualities rarely found in present day students of Sanskrit. This feeling forced me to write this foreword. And the feeling that dragged me back was a kind of hesitation owing to my own limitations of not coming out with any new ideas. May be because much has been said on the *Alaṅkāraśāstra* in particular and much more has been said on poetics and literary criticism in general, and my effort, therefore, will be nothing more than a *Siddhasādhana*! Still there may be some neglected corners yet unexplored. My attempt is to search such corners, if there are any!

For thousands of years our ancients were fascinated by the magic played by '*Vāgartha*.' Attempts were made to explore almost all the nuances of language. Our approach towards language was mystics on the one side and analytical on the other. But aesthetic element was bound to be there in both the approaches. Therefore, one can find abundant instances of poetry even in our works on scientific literature like *Charakasamhitā*, *Līlāvati* etc. Similarly the creative works in literature, as in ornate poetry, also were brimmed with scientific details. The only convincing answer to this fact that readily strikes to one's mind can be found in the great concept called '*Synthesis*'.

In India synthesis was not in knowledge but in person. It was, therefore, a fact that a grammarian was found as a *Rasika* and a *Naiyāyika* had an element of poetic creativity. Inclusiveness

was (and is) a pan-Indian phenomenon. It was therefore accepted that an *Adhikārin* (a qualified student) was the one who was well informed in other branches of knowledge and a beginner in a particular system.

Vakrokti is an off-shoot of such an Indian mind that it can refer to any 'deviated expression'. What makes a man a man? *Vakrokti* can become an answer. The cross-road from which man deviated from animal instincts was definitely *Vakrokti*. Finding of such a deviated expression necessarily pre-requires a vision that is basically aesthetic. Thus, we arrive at a stage where aesthetic aptitude was aroused in man, which was later named as '*Rasa*'. The happy co-operation of *Rasa* and *Vakrokti* culminates in a creative work of art.

In this background Dr. Surya's work is a welcome effort for many reasons. First of all it is a store-house of hundreds of rare references. One can well understand the meticulous search for sources the author has sought for and looked into. And again, this work exemplifies his wide and indepth acquaintance with even unpopular works on the *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. As far as I know, such a study on the concept of *Vakrokti* was not done so comprehensively as by this promising scholar. There are numerous instances to cite in support of Dr. Surya's innovative study. To mention one or two: He finds the origin of *Vakrokti* in Bharata's ideas on *Lakṣaṇa*. Similarly relating *Vakrokti* to Vāmana's definition of *Rīti* seems to be a new finding.

The original contribution of Dr. Surya lies in his discussion on Kashmir *Śaivism* at great length. Many of Kuntaka's findings were rooted in this philosophical system. This idea was discussed in general in many critical works on the *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, but probably it is this scholar who specifically relates Kuntaka's ideas to corresponding details in Kashmir *Śaivism*. It may be a matter of controversy that Kuntaka appears to be nearer to this philosophy than abhinavagupta. The boldness in arriving at such

a conclusion is commendable but needs to be reflected upon on much more substantial grounds.

Again the difference between Kuntaka's *Alaṅkārya* and Ānandavardhana's *Dhvani* (in the sense of *Kāvyaārtha*), Kuntaka's *Sāhitya* and Ānandavardhana's *Auchitya* needs to be shed more light upon. Mahimabhaṭṭa's terse remarks on Kuntaka and on his *Vakroktijīvitā* would also have been dealt with. Equating *Vakrokti* with poet's '*Pratibhā*' itself seems to be a concept worship.

Despite these limitations, so to say, this work exemplifies Dr. Surya's praiseworthy qualities, which I have already referred to at the out-set, and they have worked as an under current throughout this study.

22.08.2008

Dr. Mahesh Adkoli
Dr. A.V. Baliga College of Arts & Science
Kumta (N.K.) Karnataka State

Preface

A close study of Kuntaka's *Vakroktijīvitā* led me to take up a detailed study of the concept of *vakrokti* in Sanskrit poetics. The concept of *vakrokti* took altogether new significance and supreme position as all-pervading poetic concept in Kuntaka. His concept of *vakrokti* emerges as a viable theory of poetic language preexcellence. In order to comprehend Kuntaka's theory, it is necessary to trace the ideas on the concept in earlier and later Sanskrit poetics. A remarkable divergence of conception is noticeable in the same theory of *Vakrokti* as treated by Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Vāmana, Rudraṭa and so on. In fact, it is interesting to note that the very concept was taken up for a detailed discussion by Kuntaka, Bhoja and Abhinavagupta who belonged to the same age. Thus, in Sanskrit literary context, *vakrokti* theory shows remarkable divergence of conception and treatment from writer to writer.

A critical study of the *Vakroktijīvitā* and the isolated concepts of Kuntaka like *sāhitya*, *mārga-guṇa*, *svabhāvokti*, *rasavadalaṅkāra*, etc. has been made by modern scholars in detail. However, the comprehensive study of *vakrokti*, through the ages, has not been done in a systematic way. On the other hand, there is a need of unified study of the concept. "None of the concepts can be studied in isolation, tearing them apart either from each other or from *rasa* which is the overall end and aim of all literature. This need for an integrated approach was fully realized by masterly writers like Mammaṭa, Viśvanātha and Jagannātha in their works. What is most needed today in our *Alaṅkāra* studies is a similar integrated perspective."¹ These words of Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy inspired me to take up this concept and to study in the said perspective.

1 K. Krishnamoorthy, *Indian Literary Theories - A Reappraisal*, Delhi, 1985, p.130.

Thus, the main object of this research work is to present the comprehensive study of the concept of *vakrokti* with an integrated approach. The important original works concerning the concept of *vakrokti* have been taken for the study. And, all the available sources related to the field, both primary and secondary, have been utilized as far as possible.

The views of respective theorists on various aspects have been treated after a careful and critical observation. We have entered into the details of all difficult problems and have left no point worth notice.

The method adopted in the study is critical-cum-comparative, historical and objective. In studying the history of *vakrokti*, much emphasis is put on the ideas behind the concept, not only to the term. Hence, the inter-related concepts are also discussed occasionally. While dealing with Kuntaka's views on various literary concepts, the views of different theorists too are discussed. Also, Kuntaka's influence on his successors is highlighted throughout the work. The value of *vakrokti* theory to modern critical thought is indicated as well. Thus, an attempt is made to present the critical exposition of the concept of *vakrokti* with an integrated perspective.

It is a pleasant duty for me to acknowledge the help extended by various persons in preparing this research work. The task of completing such a research work was made by the generous guidance of my revered teacher Dr. K. B. Archak, Reader, Department of Sanskrit, Karnatak University, Dharwad. I feel myself proud to extend my deep sense of gratitude to him.

In fact, words fail to express my deep sense of gratitude to my beloved *Guru*, Dr. Mahesh Adkoli, who initiated me in studying Sanskrit poetics. He is kind enough to go through the manuscript, rectify the errors and make valuable suggestions. He had always been a source of inspiration to me through out my academic career.

He in the midst of his busy schedules is also kind enough to contribute scholarly and insightful foreword to this work.

I am profoundly indebted to Dr. Shrinivas Ritti, formerly Professor of Ancient Indian History and Epigraphy, Karnatak University, Dharwad. The discussions with him regarding research in general were highly informative and constructive.

I place on record my reverence to Dr. D.N. Shanbhag, Professor (Retd.) of Sanskrit, Karnatak University, Dharwad for his constant encouragement.

I am extremely thankful to Dr. C.S. Naikar, Professor, Department of Sanskrit, and various authorities of Karnatak University for their co-operation and timely help.

I offer my heart-felt regards and sincere obligation to my parents and brothers for their help and encouragement throughout my career.

It is my pleasant duty to record my thankfulness to Readworthy Publications, New Delhi for having published this work in a splendid manner.

Last but not the least, I express my indebtedness to Mr. R.K. Hegde and his associates for type-setting with all patience and care.

All opinions, observations, and comments of readers will be received with full of sportive spirit.

08.08.2008

Dharwad

Dr. Suryanarayana Hegde

Contents

<i>Blessings</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Foreword</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>xi</i>
1. Introduction	1
2. History of <i>Vakrokti</i>	19
3. Kuntaka's Concept of <i>Vakrokti</i> :An Exposition	59
4. <i>Vakrokti</i> in Relation to Other Literary Concepts	107
5. <i>Vakrokti</i> and <i>Dhvani</i>	157
6. <i>Vakrokti</i> and Practical Criticism	165
7. Conclusion	175
<i>Bibliography</i>	179
<i>Index</i>	185

Introduction

Originally *kāvya* or poetry is an art created by the imaginative faculty of a poet. And, it has been well established that *rasānubhūti* or art experience, that can be well achieved by the detached emotive experience of beauty, is the principal purpose of the poetry. Hence, the real office of a poet is to capture beauty through the medium of word and sense and to activate blissful experience in *sahyodaya* or man of taste. Now questions may arise as to how beauty is expressed in poetry? What is the nature of such an experience? How do different elements enhance the poetic beauty? For the purpose of an inquiry into these fundamental questions, the *Alaṅkāraśāstra* was developed. In the Indian literary context, the *Alaṅkāraśāstra* signifies a harmonious blend of aesthetics, poetics and rhetorics.²

It is, indeed, extremely difficult to trace the origin of Sanskrit poetics with the help of available evidences. Dr. S. K. De rightly observes, "The *Alaṅkāraśāstra* is never mentioned among the

2 Traditionally, the *Alaṅkāraśāstra* has been explained as: यस्मिन् खल्ववगते काव्यस्य निर्माणे स्वरूपदोषगुणालङ्कारादीनामवधारणे च शक्तिरुन्मिषति तदलङ्कारशास्त्रम् । Vāmanāchārya Jhalkikar, *Prastāvanā*, Mammata's *Kāvyaprakāśa*, Govt. Central Book Depot, Bombay, 1901, p.1 The other names for Sanskrit poetics are *Sāhitya* or *Sāhityaśāstra*, *Kriyākālpa* and *Kriyāvidhi*. But, the latest and most commonly used name is *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. Vide, Dr. P. V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 2002, pp. 341-344. And also, Dr. V. Raghavan, *Some Concepts of Alaṅkāraśāstra*, Adyar library, Madras, 1942, pp. 264-267.

orthodox disciplines which constitute the so-called *Vedāṅgas*, nor do we meet with any passage in Vedic *Samhitas*, *Brāhmaṇas* or the earlier *Upaniṣads* in which we may find a real basis for a system of poetics."³ Therefore, modern scholars have endeavoured to find traces of a system of poetics in Vedic literature.

Vedic literature has a venerable antiquity. Many of the hymns in the *Ṛgveda* exhibit fine specimens of poetry.⁴ The word *upamā* is found in the *Ṛgveda* and Sāyaṇa comments it in the sense of *upamāna*.⁵ The *Nighaṇṭu* (III.13) collects twelve phrases from the *Ṛgveda* and calls them *upamā*. While commenting on this part of the *Nighaṇṭu*, Yāska cites a scientific definition of *upamā* from his predecessor *Gārgya*⁶ and he discusses the varieties of *upamā* in detail.

Then coming down to Pāṇini, (C.5th cen. B.C.E), we find some interesting references regarding the figure of speech *upamā*.⁷ Patañjali has defined and illustrated Pāṇini's use of the term *upamāna* and cites an example i.e. गौरिव गवयः.⁸ This general idea of comparison held by grammarians, must be considered as an early approach to the technical conception of the *Alaṅkāraśāstra*.

3 Dr. S. K. De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Firma KLM Pvt. Ltd. Calcutta, 1998, Vol. I, p.2.

4 Vide, *Uṣas sūkta* (Ṛg. I. 14), *Yama and Yami* (Ṛg. X. 10), *Viśvāmitra and the rivers* (Ṛg. III. 33) etc.

5 सहस्रसामग्रिवेशिं गृणीषे शत्रिमग्र उपमां केतुमर्यः । *Ṛgveda*, V. 34. 9 & Sāyaṇa comments as उपमाम् उपमानभूतं केतुं प्रज्ञापकं प्रख्यातमित्यर्थः।

6 यदतत्तत्सदृशमिति गार्ग्यः। *Nirukta*, III 3.13

7 उपमितं व्याघ्रादिभिः सामान्याप्रयोगे । *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini, II. 1. 56

उपमानानि सामान्यवचनैः । *Ibid.*, II. 1. 55

चिदिति चोपमार्थे प्रयुज्यमाने । *Ibid.*, VIII.2. 101

8 Strictly speaking, this example adduced by Patañjali has not been considered as उपमालङ्कार since the essential charmingness is missing here. See, गोसदृशो गवय इति नोपमा । *Citraṁīmāmsā*, p.29

Kauṭilya (c.4th cen. B.C.E) illustrates the procedure of epigraphical writing. It is interesting to note that he defines several excellences of writing and calls them *lekhaṇa-sampat*.⁹

The earliest systematic treatise available to us is *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata (c. 1st cen. C.E.), which is an encyclopaedic manual on dramaturgy. It deals with poetic theory within the scope of *vācikābhinaya* and gives almost all the pivotal concepts of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* viz., *lakṣaṇa*, *alaṅkāra*, *guṇa*, *doṣa* and *rasa*.

The period of about seven centuries succeeding Bharata is almost vacuum in the history of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. Epigraphic records of this period show some interesting sidelight on the growth of Sanskrit poetics. The Junagadh inscription of Rudradāman (150 C.E) is a piece of excellent poetry. It refers to some poetical excellences and incidently alludes to the division of poetry into *gadya* and *padya*. Further it explains that both *gadya* and *padya* should be *alaṅkṛta* or adorned.¹⁰ Another remarkable epigraph is Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta. The prose of this epigraph competes with the style of Bāṇa and it mentions very interesting epithet to Samudragupta i.e., विद्वज्जनोपजीव्यानेककाव्यक्रियाभिः प्रतिष्ठितकविराजशब्दस्य.¹¹ The above epigraphical records force one to arrive at an idea that Sanskrit poetics had made large strides before they were composed. Bhāmaha also refers to his predecessors who were already worked out in the field.¹² These observations lead to conclude that even much earlier to Bhāmaha (c. 7th cen. C.E.), Sanskrit poetics had made a good deal of progress.

9 अर्थक्रमः सम्बन्धः परिपूर्णता माधुर्यमौदार्यस्पष्टत्वमिति लेखनसम्पत्। *Arthaśāstra*, II.10

10 स्फुटलघुमधुरचित्रकान्तशब्दसमयोदारालङ्कृतगद्यपद्य । *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. VIII, p.36

11 Ed. J. F. Fleet, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. III, Indological Book House, Varanasi, 1970, p.8.

12 *Vide*, *Kāvyaśāstra of Bhāmaha*, II.19, I.33, V.17, VI.36, III.8 & II.47.

Prasthānas or Schools of Poetics

The classics of Sanskrit literature, obviously, made an inquiry into the true nature of poetic beauty. Hence, rhetoricians started to investigate into the secret of poetic beauty and put forward their own theory. As a result of their incessant efforts, different *prasthānas* or schools came into existence in the history of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. These schools are distinguished on the basis of particular views advanced by their respective promoters and propagators regarding the essence of poetry.¹³ Among the traditional theorists Samudrabandha, a commentator on *Alaṅkārasarvasva* of Ruṣyaka, puts different schools of poetics as follows:

इह विशिष्टौ शब्दार्थौ काव्यम् । तयोश्च वैशिष्ट्यं धर्ममुखेन व्यापारमुखेन व्यङ्ग्यमुखेन वेति त्रयः पक्षाः। आद्येऽप्यलङ्कारतो गुणतो वेति द्वैविध्यम् । द्वितीयेऽपि भणितिर्वैचित्र्येण भोगकृत्वेन वेति द्वैविध्यम् । इति पञ्चसु पक्षेषु आद्यः उद्धटादिभिरङ्गीकृतः द्वितीयो वामनेन तृतीयो वक्रोक्तिजीवितकारेण चतुर्थो भट्टनायकेन पञ्चम आनन्दवर्धनेन¹⁴.....।

13 The word *prasthāna* has been defined by Abhinavagupta as: प्रतिष्ठन्ते परम्परया विहरन्ति येन मार्गेण तत्प्रस्थानम् । And, the *Locanakaumudī* of Uttuṅgodaya illustrates Abhinavagupta's statement in the following way- गमनव्यापारार्थवृत्तिरपि प्रपूर्वोऽयं तिष्ठति इह सादृश्यादौचित्याद्वा यथायोगमनादिप्रवर्तमानकाव्यगोचरकविसहृदयपरम्पराव्यापारविशेषविषयोऽवगन्तव्यः। *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana with *Locana* by Abhinavagupta, *Locanakaumudī* by Uttuṅgodaya, *Upalocana* by Kuppaswami Shastri, Kuppaswami Shastri Research Institute, Madras, 1944, p.51.

Cf. "A *prasthāna*, as Abhinavagupta has put it (प्रतिष्ठन्ते परम्परया विहरन्ति येन मार्गेण तत्प्रस्थानम्) appears to be an idea or a theory that passes through a series of thinkers gradually transforming itself into a tradition and finally established as a school." Dr. Mahesh Adkoli, *Concept of Aucitya in Sanskrit Poetics*, Anand Publications, Muroor, 1997, p.3, fn.8.

14 *Alaṅkārasarvasva*, T.S.S. Edition, Trivandrum. 1962, p.4

Bhaṭṭa Gopāla in his *Sāhityacūḍāmaṇi*, puts different poetic theories while commenting the last verse of *Kāvyaaprakāśa* i.e., इत्येष मार्गो विदुषां

Thus, Samudrabandha records five major schools viz., *Alaṅkāra*, *Rīti*, *Vakrokti*, *Bhogīkaraṇa* and *Dhvani*.¹⁵

Samudrabandha's classification of poetic theories is very significant, though there is a technical difficulty to consider all of them as schools. Bhaṭṭanāyaka is an exponent of Bharata's *Rasa* theory and he explained that *rasa* is to be delineated only by the peculiar function called *bhoga* or *bhogīkaraṇa*. Similarly, *Rasa* theory does not deserve the name 'school,' though many scholars consider it as school.¹⁶ "Strictly speaking, *Rasa* cannot become a school as it is the ultimate aim of all other schools."¹⁷ Thus, Bhaṭṭanāyaka's theory of *Bhogīkaraṇa* cannot become a school.

On the other hand, *Vakrokti* theory of Kuntaka has not been considered as an independent school by many modern scholars as it appears to be an attempt to restore the findings of the *Alaṅkāra* School. To quote Dr. P.V. Kane, "The *Vakrokti* theory is really an off-shoot of the *Alaṅkāra* School and need not be separately recognised."¹⁸ Dr. Kane's statement seems to be inaccurate. In fact, Kuntaka got a clue and inspiration from Bhāmaha to develop the theory of *vakrokti*, though differs from *Alaṅkāra* theorists in many respects. Bhāmaha has taken the term *vakrokti* as the fundamental principle of all the figurative expression (*alaṅkāra-sāmānya-vacana*) and he holds that *alaṅkāra* is

विभिन्नः.....। His classification is similar to that of Ruyyaka's review of previous poetic theories.

15 This classification is, obviously, historically incorrect as pointed out by Dr. S.K. De (*History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Vo. I, p. 329 fn. 1). But it is to be noted here that Ruyyaka and Samudrabandha have taken into consideration 'Dhvani' as the ultimate poetic theory. Thus, all the other views have been arranged earlier as *pūrvapakṣa* or *prima facie* to *dhvani* theory.

16 Vide, Dr. P.V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 355 ff. and , Dr. S.K. De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. II, p. 100 ff.

17 Dr. Mahesh Adkoli, *Concept of Aucitya in Sanskrit Poetics*, p.3, fn.8.

18 Dr. P.V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 386.

the paramount element in poetry.¹⁹ But, Kuntaka's *vakrokti* is all pervading concept which owes its root to *kāvīvyāpāra* or poet's creative imagination and underlies the whole poetic creation. The ways of poetic expression are innumerable, whereas *alaṅkāras* are one among them.

Kuntaka, like Bhāmaha, does not admit *svabhāvokti* as *alaṅkāra*, while the approach in both is totally different from each other. According to Bhāmaha, there is no scope for *svabhāvokti* in poetry as it lacks strikingness. Hence, he considers it *vārta* or non-poetic utterance.²⁰ But it was Kuntaka who holds that *vastu-svabhāva* has its own natural beauty and the *svabhāvokti* is always *alaṅkārya* or embellished.²¹ Similarly, Kuntaka's treatment of the poetic concepts viz., *alaṅkāra*, *guṇa*, *mārga*, *rasavadalaṅkāra*, etc. is distinct from the views of early theorists. Thus, it would be an injustice if we include him in the *Alaṅkāra* School.

On the other hand, Kuntaka was influenced by the teachings of all his predecessors. Of course, he was not a reactionary of *Dhvani* theory as he never denied the general concepts of *Dhvani*. At the same time, he was not entirely satisfied with Ānandavardhana, especially regarding the restricted applications of the *alaṅkāras*. Thus, Kuntaka has tried to harmonize his own views with the main teachings of different schools without being a follower of any school. Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy rightly observes,

19 युक्तं वक्रस्वभावोक्तया सर्वमेवैतदिष्यते । and,

सैषा सर्वैव वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते ।

यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना ॥ *Kāvyaṅkāra* (Bhāmaha), I.3 & II.85.

20 स्वभावोक्तिरलङ्कार इति केचित् प्रचक्षते ।

अर्थस्य तदवस्थत्वं स्वभावोऽभिहितो यथा ॥ and

गतोऽस्तमर्को भातीन्दुर्यान्ति वासाय पक्षिणः ।

इत्येमादि किं काव्यं वार्तामेनां प्रचक्षते ॥ *Ibid.*, II.93 & II.87.

21 *Vide, Vakroktijīvita*, Ed. Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, Karnatak University, Dharwad, 1977, pp 21-23 & 125-26.

"He is not a slavish follower of either the ancient *Alaṅkāra* school or the new *Dhvani* school; at the same time, he is also not an unsparing critic of either school. Kuntaka, therefore, may be regarded as an eclectic writer who incorporates into his work the merits of both the schools."²² Thus, Kuntaka's theory of *vakrokti* can be considered separately, though his theory was not raised to a *prasthāna* due to lack of followers.

In this way, among the classification of Samudrabandha, these two theories viz., Bṛhṭtanāyaka's theory of *Bhogīkaraṇa* and *Vakrokti* theory of Kuntaka do not deserve the name *prasthāna*.²³ Thus, we have three major schools called *Alaṅkāra*, *Rīti* and *Dhvani*.

Meaning of the term *Vakrokti*

The term *vakrokti* took different connotations at the hands of different theorists. In order to understand the ideas behind the concept of *vakrokti*, it will be necessary to trace the derivation of the term and its practical usage in earlier literature. The term *vakrokti* can be explained as वक्रा उक्तिः. The word *vakra* can be derived from two different roots:

- i. वकि कौटिल्ये (वक्+रन्) means 'to be crooked'.
- ii. वञ्चु गतौ (वञ्च्+रक्) which means 'move crookedly'.²⁴

22 Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, *The Dhvanyāloka and its Critics*, Kavyalaya, Mysore, 1968, pp.256-57.

23 Besides these theories, there were the *Anumāna* theory of Mahimabhaṭṭa and *Aucitya* theory of Kṣemendra which also do not deserve the name *prasthāna*.

24 The following are the synonyms of the word *Vakra*:

अरालं वृजिनं जिह्ममूर्मिमत् कुञ्चितं नतम् ।

आविद्धं कुटिलं भुग्नं वेल्लितं वक्रमित्यपि ॥ *Amarakośa*, III.1.71

Apart from the above derivative meanings, the word *vakra* has several meanings.²⁵ The different meanings of the word *vakra* as given in Apte's dictionary are:

1. Crooked, bent, curved, winding, tortuous;
2. Round about, indirect, evasive, circuitous, equivocating, ambiguous;
3. Curled, curling, crisped;
4. Retrograde;
5. Dishonest, fraudulent, crooked in disposition;
6. Cruel, malignant;
7. Prosodially long.

And the word *ukti* is derived from the root वच्-परिभाषणे, which means expression or speech. Thus, *vakrokti* literally means crooked speech or arch speech or evasive speech.

It is interesting to note that Kālidāsa uses the word *vakra* in the verse बालेन्दुवक्राणि..... (III.29) of the *Kumārasambhava*. Here the poet describes that the *palāśa* buds are curved like a crescent moon. The word *vakra*, here, primarily denotes 'curvation' and finally it suggests the excessive beauty of a crescent moon as well as the *palāśa* buds. The crescent moon is always regarded as a standard of comparison due to its excessive beauty.²⁶

Then, let us observe the word '*ūrmimat*' (lit. like a wave of a river), which is one of the synonyms of the term *vakra*. *Ūrmimat* means curled hairs which are hanging down on the forehead. But, simply curved hairs cannot become curls. When they are curved beautifully or created beauty, they become curls. Another related

25 वक्रः शनैश्चरे पुंसि पुटभेदे नपुंसकम् ।

त्रिषु कूरे च कुटिले ॥ *Medinikōśa*, XXVII.65

26 It is interesting to note that Kuntaka while commenting the last *kārikā* of the second chapter (II.35) explains the word *vakratā* as वक्रतैकत्र बालेन्दुसुन्दरसंस्थानयुक्तत्वं इतरत्र रूढ्यादि वैचित्र्यम् ।

word of the same term is *vakroṣṭhikā* (lit. curved lips) means a gentle smile or *smita*. It is to be noted here that merely curved lips cannot produce a gentle smile. A gentle smile appears only when the lips were curved in a proper way. Thus, the above observation shows that the word *vakra*, in practice, does not mean simply curved but it is always related with its effect i.e., beauty.

Similarly, the poetic speech is also considered as *vakra* or curved or deviated from common parlance. However, mere deviation of speech cannot be considered as *vakrokti*. When this deviation is effective, it is termed as *vakrokti*. In this way, *vakrokti* may be regarded as beautiful expression.²⁷

It is curious to note that the word *vakra* had been used in Sanskrit literature from very ancient times,²⁸ although the word '*vakrokti*' is not found in the early literature or the early *kośas*. Obviously, this form seems to be of a later origin. We come across to its reference in Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*. Bāṇa generally uses the term in the sense of bantering humorous speech (परिहासजल्पित).²⁹ At another

27 Cf. "Vakrokti is not just an out of the way expression or poetic turn; it is the masterly art underlying every element of poetry and involving effortless and spontaneous transformation of the prosaic raw materials into things of consummate beauty." Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, *New Bearings of Indian Literary Theory and Criticism*, Ahmedabad, 1982 p. 59, fn. 4

28 The word *vakra* is found in the *R̥gveda* and it is used in the sense of departure:

.....त्वद्वावक्रे रथ्यो न धेना । *R̥gveda*, VII. 21.3 and Sāyaṇa comments thus-
धेनाः नद्यश्च त्वत् त्वत्तो हेतोः रथ्यो न रथिन इव वावक्रे निर्गच्छन्ति । वकिकौटिल्ये इति धातुः ।

29 एषापि बुध्यत एवैतावतीर्वक्रोक्तीः । इयमपि जानात्येव परिहासजल्पितानि ।-----
अभूमिरेषा भुजङ्गभङ्गिभाषितानाम्, इयमेव हि वेति मञ्जुभाषिणी कालं च कारणं च प्रमाणं च विषयं च प्रस्तावं च कोपप्रसादयोः Ed. K.P. Parab, *Kādambarī*, Nag Publishers, Delhi, 1985, p.405

In the *Amaruśataka* (verse 23) also the word *vakrokti* is used in the same sense: नो जानाति सविध्रमाङ्गवलना वक्रोक्तिसंसूचनम् । And also, in the

place Bāṇa says that the people of Ujjayani are skilled in *vakrokti*.³⁰ Here, the term seems to be used in its wide sense. In this connection, a verse of *Rāghavapāṇḍvīyam* draws our attention in a different way:

सुबन्धुर्बाणभट्टश्च कविराज इति त्रयः ।

वक्रोक्तिमार्गनिपुणाः चतुर्थो विद्यते न वा ॥³¹

Subandhu, Bāṇabhaṭṭa and Kavirāja are proficient in the use of *vakrokti*. Here the peculiar use of *vakrokti-mārga*, obviously, does not only mean परिहासजल्पित. Bāṇa is well known for his extraordinary poetic fancy and artistic expressions. Hence, in this context it may be recalled his own ideas about good poetry. Bāṇa says:

नवोऽर्थो जातिरग्राम्या श्लेषोऽक्लिष्टः स्फुटो रसः ।

विकटाक्षरबन्धश्च कृत्स्नमेकत्र दुर्लभम् ॥³²

"Originality in subject, uncommon use of *jāti* (natural description), un-laboured puns, an explicit sentiment and a striking arrangement of words— it is difficult to combine all these in one composition." And, he emphasizes again and again the importance of novelty and originality in the composition. Blending of all these qualities in a poetic style may be the intended idea of the peculiar use of *vakrokti-mārga* of Kavirāja.³³

Kāvyaṇṇakāṣa X.94 the verse सौन्दर्यस्य तरङ्गिणी contains the word विद्यावक्रगिरां and *Nāgeśvarī* commentary explains it as साकूतवचसां (emotive speech). *Kāvyaṇṇakāṣa* with the com. of *Nāgeśvarī*, Ed. Dundiraj Shastri, Benares, 1926, p. 354

Cf. आकूतशब्दः, तात्पर्ये विच्छिन्नौ च वर्तते । *Vakroktijīvoita*, Dharwad edn. P. 49.

30 वक्रोक्तिनिपुणेन आख्यायिकाख्यानपरिचयचतुरेण । *Kādambarī*, Op. Cit. P.113.

31 Quoted by P.V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 386.

32 Ed., A.A. Fuhrer, *Harṣacarita*, Govt. Central Press Bombay, 1909, p.5.

33 Subandhu has not mentioned the term *vakrokti*. In fact, the aim of Subandhu was to use wonderful pun on every word which suggests his way of poetic composition. He says:

In Sanskrit poetics, Bhāmaha was the first to introduce the term *vakrokti* as an essential aspect of poetry. He thought regarding what makes poetic expression distinct from scientific treatises (*śāstras*) as well as the common speech (*vārta*). According to him, it is the figurative way of expression which is technically called *vakrokti* or *atiśayokti*. And, it is at the root of all poetic figures or *alaṅkāras* which are the paramount element in poetry.³⁴

Even though, Bhāmaha did not define *vakrokti*, he speaks about it in connection with the figure *atiśayokti* which is explained as लोकातिक्रान्तगोचरं वचः। Hence, this is an explanation of *vakrokti* also. Bhāmaha's *vakrokti* comprises this extraordinariness or strikingness both in word and meaning. He also lays down that *vakrokti* must be present in various kinds of poetry like epic, drama, etc.³⁵ Therefore, *vakrokti* is taken by Bhāmaha as the fundamental principle of all figurative expression.

In the history of Sanskrit poetics, the term *vakrokti* has got a very important and supreme position as all-pervading poetic concept in Kuntaka's *Vakroktijīvita*. Kuntaka's name is so closely associated with the concept of *vakrokti* that when one utters either of the words, the other one also instantly strikes in one's mind. Let us observe his views on the concept.

Kuntaka started his investigation as to how poetic expression is distinct from the other well-known discourses. He argues that it is *vakrokti* or deviated speech that alone distinguishes poetic

प्रत्यक्षरक्षेपमयप्रबन्धविन्यासवैदग्ध्यनिधिर्निबन्धम् । *Vāsavadattā*, p.3.

Probably, Rudraṭa was influenced by the above statement of Subandhu, and he took it partially (i.e. क्षेपमय) and defined *vakrokti* as a figure of speech based on क्षेप.

34 सैषा सर्वैव वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते ।

यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना ॥ *Kāvyaṅkāra*, II. 85

35 युक्तं वक्रस्वभावोक्त्या सर्वमेवैतदिष्यते । *Ibid.*, I.30.

speech from other discourses.³⁶ It is to be noted that at the outset of his treatise, Kuntaka declares the object of this fresh treatise is to establish the idea of *vaicitrya* or beauty which causes extraordinary charm in poetry.³⁷ Hence, the aim of this deviated speech or *vakrokti* is to attain extraordinary charm.

Thus *vakrokti* is explained as वैदग्ध्यभङ्गी भणितिः or artistic turn of speech. It is a striking mode of speech which strikes by the peculiar turn imparted to it by the creative imagination of a poet. It stands for a charming and novel utterance peculiar to poetry. This is the very index of the artistic turn that a masterpoet's speech takes.³⁸ Therefore, the ultimate emphasis is laid on *kavi-kausalā* or poet's creative genius. This creative

36 वक्रो योऽसौ शास्त्रादिप्रसिद्धशब्दार्थोपनिबन्धव्यतिरेकी वक्रता विशिष्टः कविव्यापारः। & अतिक्रान्तप्रसिद्धव्यवहारसरणिः । *Vakroktijīvita*, p.13 & p. 192

37 लोकोत्तरचमत्कारकारिवैचित्र्यसिद्धये ।

काव्यस्यायमलङ्कारः कोऽप्यपूर्वो विधीयते ॥ *Ibid.*, I.2

38 उभावेतावलङ्कार्यौ तयोः पुनरलङ्कृतिः।

वक्रोक्तिरेव वैदग्ध्यभङ्गीभणितिरुच्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 10

In the *vṛtti* of this *kārikā* he explains: वैदग्ध्यभङ्गीभणितिः वैदग्ध्यं विदग्धभावः कविकर्मकौशलं तस्य भङ्गी विच्छिन्तिः, तथा भणितिः विचित्रैवाभिधा वक्रोक्तिरुच्यते । Here two things must be noted. Firstly विचित्रैवाभिधा does not mean 'only peculiar denotative power of word'. It is used in its wide connotation which includes indicative as well as suggestive power also. Kuntaka himself says in other place as ननु च द्योतकव्यञ्जकावपि शब्दौ सम्भवतः तदसंग्रहान्नाव्याप्तिः, यस्मात् अर्थप्रतीतिकारित्वसामान्यादुपचारात्तावपि वाचकावेव । एवं द्योत्यव्यङ्ग्ययोरप्यर्थयोः प्रत्येयत्वसामान्यादुपचाराद्वाच्यत्वमेव । *Ibid.*, p. 14

Secondly *vakrokti* is designated as the only ornament. Infact, Kuntaka uses the term *alaṅkāra* in its broad connotation.

Cf. "All beauty in poetry is reducible in any ultimate analysis to that of *alaṅkāra* and *alaṅkārya*..... This is a very important credo in the aesthetic theory of Kuntaka which bears a very close affinity to the Crocean aesthetics that all art is expression and that it is creative intuition which culminates in poetry."

K. Krishnamoorthy, *Indian Literary Theories*, Delhi, 1985, p. 216.

imagination of a poet is elsewhere designated as *vakra-kavi-vyāpāra* or *kavi-vyāpāra-vakratva*³⁹ (art in the poetic process) which is the ultimate source of poetry.

The ultimate aim of *vakrokti* is aesthetic appeal. Therefore, *vakrokti* or *vakratā* is used in the sense of beauty also. Kuntaka frequently uses the terms like *vicchitti*, *vaicitrya*, *cārutva*, *camatkāra*, etc. as synonymous or interchangeable terms.⁴⁰ Hence, *vakrokti* in its wide sense, connotes beautiful expression.

This deviation or *vakratā* characterizes both in sound structures of words and their meanings in poetry. Indeed, the ways of *vakrokti* are infinite and all that they have in common is the poet's artistic power.⁴¹

Thus *vakrokti* mainly carries the following implications:

- i. It is deviated or distinct from the established mode of scientific speech as well as common expression.
- ii. *Vakrokti* is the artistic turn of speech having beauty parexcellence due to *pratibhā* of the poet.
- iii. It must have capability of producing aesthetic delight in the mind of *sahṛdayas* or men of taste.

Therefore, in this broad connotation of *vakrokti*, it includes not only the expressive part of the poetry but also the theme or content part. The whole poetic process is governed by *kavi-vyāpāra* or poet's creative genius. Hence, in order to understand the proper nature of *vakrokti*, it is necessary to observe the operation of *pratibhā* or creativity.

The doctrine of *pratibhā*, in Sanskrit poetics, is very comprehensive. It includes:

39 *Vakroktijīvoita*, I. 7, I.18 etc.

40 See, *Ibid.*, pp. 24, 26, 53, 57, 66, 86, 119 etc. It is very clear from the statement रमणीयत्वाद्वक्रतामावहति । *Ibid.*, p. 106.

41 यस्मात् कविप्रतिभानामानन्त्यान्नियतत्वं न सम्भवति । *Ibid.*, p. 36.

- i. Creative inspiration,
- ii. Competent poetic expression,
- iii. Aesthetic sensibility, and
- iv. Poetic beauty.⁴²

The operation of *pratibhā* has two stages:

- i. A bare flash of some original and new idea.
- ii. Competent expression of the idea.

At the primary stage of poetic creation, a new idea flashes which is almost like an unpolished gem. In the secondary stage, *kavi-pratibhā* has to select the competent form to express the intended idea. This stage is compared to a perfectly polished gem.⁴³ Here *pratibhā* endows at once a most appropriate literary form to express the theme effectively.⁴⁴

In order to point-out the role of *kavi-vyāpāra* or *vakrokti*, let us take a practical example from the *Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa.

42 मनसि सदा सुसमाधिनि विस्फुरणमनेकधाभिधेयस्य ।

अक्लिष्टानि पदानि च विभान्ति यस्यामसौ शक्तिः । *Kāvya-lāṅkāra* (Rudrata), I. 15.

प्रतिभा अपूर्ववस्तुनिर्माणक्षमा प्रज्ञा, तस्या विशेषो रसावेशवैशद्य-
सैन्दर्यकाव्यनिर्माणक्षमत्वम् । *Dhvanyāloka-locana*, p.93.

कवेरपि स्वहृदयायतनसततोदितप्रतिभाभिधानपरवाग्देवतानुग्रहोत्थितविचित्रापूर्व-
निर्माणशक्तिशालिनः । *Abhinavabhāratī*, Vol. I, p.4.

रसानुगुणशब्दार्थचिन्तास्तिमितचेतसः । क्षणं स्वरूपस्पर्शोत्था प्रज्ञैव प्रतिभा कवेः॥
Vyaktiviveka (Mahimabhaṭṭa) II. 117.

प्रज्ञानवनवोल्लेखशालिनी प्रतिभा मता । (भट्टतौत), quoted by Hemacandra,
Kāvyaṅusāsana. P.3.

43 कविचेतसि प्रथमं च प्रतिभासमानमघटितपाषाणशकलकल्पमणिप्रख्यमेव वस्तु
विदग्धकविविरचितवक्रवाक्योपारूढं शाणोल्लीढमणिमनोहरतया तद्विदाह्लाद
कारिकाव्यत्वमधिरोहति । *Vakroktijīvita*, p. 9.

44 यस्मात् प्रतिभायां तत्कालोल्लिखितेन केनचित्परिस्पन्देन परिस्फुरन्तः पदार्थाः
प्रकृतप्रस्तावसमुचितेन केनचिदुत्कर्षेण वा समाच्छादितस्वभावाः सन्तो
विवक्षाविधेयत्वेनाभिधेयतापदवीमवतरन्तस्तथाविधाविशेषप्रतिपादनसमर्थेनाभिधानेना
- भिधीयमानाश्चेतश्चमत्कारितामापद्यन्ते । *Ibid.*, p.16.

The background is this: "The cupid is appointed to shake the self-restraint of Śiva who had been practising penance (*tapas*) on the Himalaya. The cupid started his journey with the sole purpose of awakening a desire of carnal enjoyment in the mind of Śiva, accompanied by his faithful consort Rati and his comrade Vasanta (spring). When he entered the peaks of Himalaya, the whole scene of that region suddenly changes from aridity to liveliness." Here Kālidāsa describes the changes in a vivid manner. In one verse the poet describes the impact of Vasanta on *palāśa* buds. This is the verse:

बालेन्दुवक्राण्यविकाशभावाद्बभुः पलाशान्यतिलोहितानि ।

सद्यो वसन्तेन समागतानां नखक्षतानीव वनस्थलीनाम् ॥

(*Kumārasambhava* III.29)

[The *palāśa* buds, extremely red and curved like the crescent moon, because of being un-blown, appeared like the nail-imprints of spring on (the bosoms of) the sylvan goddesses during their intimate union.]

Here the words, the meanings, the figure of speech (called *utprekṣā*), the poetic qualities (*prasāda* etc.) and the poetic style called *sukumāra*—all these blended with harmony produce transcendent delight in the minds of men of taste.

In this verse, every element of beauty is a result of poet's imagination. In fact, the delightful figure of speech involved in the words 'नखक्षतानीव' introduced effortlessly as it were, and naturally related to other epithets of *palāśa*, acquires great charm.⁴⁵ Thus, the whole poem is suffused with *rasa*, called

45 अत्र 'बालेन्दुवक्राणि' 'अतिलोहितानि' 'सद्यो वसन्तेन समागतानाम्' इति पदानि सौकुमार्यात् स्वभाववर्णनामात्रपरत्वेनोपात्तान्यपि 'नखक्षतानीव' इत्यलङ्करणस्य मनोहारिणः क्लेशं विना स्वभावोद्भिन्नत्वेन योजनां भजमानानि चमत्कारकारितामापद्यन्ते । *Ibid.*, p. 45.

Here the poet has used the figure *samāsokti* also. See, Mallinātha's comment:

Śṛṅgāra by virtue of the unique capacity of *rasavadalanākāra*. Thus, the poet has succeeded in infusing a new vitality to even insipid objects.⁴⁶

In the context mentioned above, first of all, the poet has selected only one nature of *palāśa* buds, although the object may be qualified by diverse attributes, as to serve the purposes of the context which is capable of delighting sensitive readers. Its capacity to delight is inferred on the basis of the rare grandeur added to the subject in the poet's treatment or the force added to the literary sentiment.⁴⁷

Then, he selects the component poetic form to express the intended idea which inherits many elements like *śabda*, *artha*, *alanākāra*, *guṇa*, etc. Here a question may arise as to what lies behind this harmonious blending of these elements in poetry? The answer is '*sāhitya*.'

Sāhitya is the complete harmony between the expression and the expressed as well as one word should vie with another and one idea with another in enhancing the beauty of poetry. In brief,

अत्र वसन्तस्य वनस्थलीनां च विशेषणसाधारण्यान्नायकव्यवहारप्रतीतिः
समासोक्तिस्तावदस्ति । 'नखक्षतानीव' इति जातिस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा
वक्रत्वलौहित्यगुणनिमित्ता जागर्ति । सा च
नायकव्यवहाराश्रितसमासोक्तिगर्भिण्येवोत्तिष्ठत इत्युभयोरेककालतैव।

However, Kuntaka does not admit *samāsokti* as an independent *alanākāra*. See, *Vakroktijvita*, III. 51.

46 यदपि नीरसप्रायं पदार्थजातं तदपि सर्वमनेनैव सरसतामुपपद्यते। यथा
'बालेन्दुवक्राणि' इति । तदेवमयं सकलकाव्योपनिषद्भूतः काष्ठकुड्योपमानां
पदार्थानामलङ्काराणां किमपि स्फुरितं समर्थयश्चेतनचमत्कारकारितायाः कारणतां
प्रतिपद्यते । *Vakroktijvita*, p. 169.

47 यद्यपि पादर्थस्य नानाविधधर्मखचितत्वं सम्भवति तथापि तथाविधेन धर्मेण सम्बन्धः
समाख्यायते यः सहृदयहृदयाह्लादमाधातुं क्षमते । तस्य च तदाह्लादसामर्थ्यं सम्भाव्यते
येन काचिदेव स्वभावमहता रसपरिपोषाङ्गत्वं वा व्यक्तिमासादयति । *Ibid.*, p.17.

and also cf.

जडानामचेतनानां सलिलतरुकुसुमसमयप्रभृतीनामेवंविधं स्वरूपं रसोद्दीपन-
सामर्थ्यविनिबन्धनबन्धुरं वर्णनीयतामवगाहते । *Ibid.*, p.142.

every element of poetry has to vie with the other towards enhancing the beauty of poetry.⁴⁸

In the attainment of *sāhitya* also, the pride of place goes to poet's creative genius.⁴⁹ Thus, this selective and decisive imagination of a poet is designated as *kāvīvyāpāra* or *vakrokti*, which includes all the poetic elements in its wide scope.

Even then the matter does not end in poetic circuit. It must be noted that the end of every poetic activity is *sahydayāhlāda* or pleasing the connoisseur which is termed as *rasa* or *rasānubhūti* or *kāvyārtha* or aesthetic experience. Hence '*rasa*' is the be all and end all of poetry. Bharata himself declares, 'there is no *artha* other than *rasa*'.⁵⁰ For this reason, Ānandavardhana declares:

"A poet writing a whole work should be entirely bound by the demands made by sentiment. If he finds, therefore, in a historical source an element which is inappropriate to the sentiment, he should not hesitate to break away from it freely and to invent a new episode in its place which will be appropriate to the sentiment. The poet achieves no purpose indeed by blind fidelity to the story in sources, for this will have already been accomplished by the chronicles themselves."⁵¹

48 वक्रताविचित्रगुणालङ्कारसम्पदां परस्परस्पर्धाधिरोहः । *Ibid.*, p. 10

and, मार्गानुगुण्यसुभगो माधुर्यादिगुणोदयः ।

अलङ्करणविन्यासो वक्रतातिशयान्वितः ॥

वृत्यौचित्यमनोहारि रसानां परिपोषणम् ।

स्पर्धया विद्यते यत्र यथास्वमुभयोरपि ॥

सा काव्यवस्थितिस्तद्विदाह्लादैकनिबन्धनम् ।

पदादिनाक्यपरिस्पन्दसारः साहित्यमुच्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 34.36 (*Antarāśloka*s).

49 सकलवाक्यपरिस्पन्दजीवितायमानस्यास्य साहित्यलक्षणस्यैव कविव्यापारस्य वस्तुतः सर्वातिशायित्वम् । *Ibid.*, p.25.

50 *Nāṭyaśāstra*, under VI. 32.

51 कविना काव्यमुपनिबध्नाता सर्वात्मना रसपरतन्त्रेण भवितव्यम् । तत्रेतिवृत्ते यदि रसाननुगुणां स्थितिं पश्येत्तां भङ्क्त्वापि स्वतन्त्रया रसानुगुणं कथान्तरमुत्पादयेत् । न हि कवेरिति वृत्तमात्रनिर्वहणेन किञ्चित्प्रयोजनम्, इतिहासादेरेव तत्सिद्धेः ।

Kuntaka was well aware of this poetic secret. To quote him, "The quality delighting men of taste is something over and above the three elements so far considered, namely 'meaning', 'word' and 'artful expression.' It has a unique beauty of unfailing appeal."⁵²

Therefore, the process of poetic communication is only a complementary aspect to the poetic intention or *kāvyaārtha*. Thus, ultimately *kavi-vyāpāra* or *vakrokti* is controlled by the *kāvyaārtha* itself. It is indeed, poet's genius itself that determines the poetic intention, although once it has been determined then poet's genius should work in accordance with *kāvyaārtha*.⁵³ It is the greatest secret of poetry.

In brief, *kavi-vyāpāra* or *vakrokti* is the means and the aesthetic experience is the end of poetry. With this necessary background, let us proceed to observe the history of the concept of *vakrokti*.

Dhvanyāloka, Ed. K. Krishnamoorthy, Karnatak University, Dharwad, 1947, p. 144. All the translations from the *Dhvanyāloka* are by Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy and asterisk mark [*] is put for identification.

52 वाच्यवाचकवक्रोक्तित्रितयातिशयोत्तरम् ।

तद्विदाह्लादकारित्वं किमप्यामोदसुन्दरम् ॥ *Vakroktijīva*, I. 23.

(Dr. Krishnamoorthy's translation).

53 Cf. "No wonder then that *Rasa* controls the working of the poet's imagination too. Now we understand the significance of expressions, '*Rasāveśavaiśadya*' and '*Rasānugūṇaśabdārthacintā*' in the definitions of *pratibhā* given by Abhinavagupta and Mahimabhaṭṭa respectively. For the very awakening of the poet's imagination there must be an initial emotional thrill in his heart."

T.N. Sreekanthayya, '*Imagination in Indian Poetics*' in *Indian Aesthetics*, Ed. V.S. Seturaman, Macmillan India Ltd. Press, Madras, 1972, p. 231.

History of *Vakrokti*

Bharata Muni

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata Muni is the most extensive and monumental work on Indian aesthetics and dramaturgy.⁵⁴ It is mainly concerned with *nāṭya*. It considers *kāvya* as only an aspect of *nāṭya*.⁵⁵ So, the *Nāṭyaśāstra* deals with poetry within the scope of *vācikābhinaya* or verbal representation in which the basic tenets of the *Alaṅkāraśāstra* are found. The sixteenth chapter of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* deals with almost all the pivotal concepts of Sanskrit poetics, though the term *vakrokti* is not found anywhere in it.⁵⁶ But, as we see little later, Abhinavagupta, a learned commentator

54 Cf. "For several reasons the *Nāṭyaśāstra* must be regarded as the oldest extant work on the theory of Sanskrit poetics. The work contains the first exposition of the *rasa* theory and also contains considerable information upon many topics pertaining to the *Alaṅkāraśāstra*." P.V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, p.10.

55 काव्यं स्यात् नाटकाश्रयम् । *Nāṭyaśāstra*, XVI.112, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1943.

56 This chapter deals with the concepts *lakṣaṇa*, *alaṅkāra*, *guṇa* and *doṣa*. Among them, *lakṣaṇa* is quite unfamiliar and not elaborated in Sanskrit poetics except in Jayadeva's *Candrāloka*. Some of the functions of *lakṣaṇa* are attributed to *guṇas* and *alaṅkāras*, by early theorists. Viśvanātha and Bhoja took it as *nāṭyālaṅkāra*, though Bharata certainly means them as features of *kāvya* in general. The writers on dramaturgy like Dhanañjaya, Śāradātanaya, etc. developed it.

For detail, See V. Raghavan, 'The History of *Lakṣaṇa*' in *Some Concepts of the Alaṅkāraśāstra*, Adyar Library, Adyar, 1942, pp. 1-47.

of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, equates Bharata's *lakṣaṇa* with the concept of *vakrokti*. It shows that these two concepts are identical with each other.

For the first time in Sanskrit poetics, the term *vakrokti* is used by Bhāmaha. It is, of course, a new term of the old concept of Bharata's *lakṣaṇa*. He is indebted to Bharata in the conception of his *vakrokti*. Dr. K.C. Pandey rightly observes: "*Vakrokti* is not a production of the originality of Bhāmaha. According to the information available from the existing literature, he is indebted to Bharata. In fact, the manner in which he talks of *vakrokti* clearly shows that he regarded it to be a very well known concept. He does not care even to define it. Had he thought it to be his won contribution or something that was not known to and accepted by all, he would have certainly tried to define it clearly and would have tried to justify it as Ānandavardhana has done in the case of *Dhvani*."⁵⁷

While commenting upon Bharata's definition of *upamā* i.e. यत्किञ्चित् काव्यबन्धेषु....., Abhinavagupta explains the word *bandha* as a synonym of *vakrokti*. The other synonyms of the term are *gumpha*, *bhaṇiti* and *kavi-vyāpāra*. And, he states that *bandhas* are identical with *lakṣaṇa*.⁵⁸ Thus, these evidences lead to infer that the latter *Vakrokti* theory is built on the foundation of Bharata's concept of *lakṣaṇa*. Therefore, it is necessary to observe the concept of *lakṣaṇa* in detail.

57 K.C. Pandey, *Indian Aesthetics*, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi, 1995, p.495.

58 काव्यबन्धेषु काव्यलक्षणेषु सत्स्वित्यनेन गौरिव गवय इति नायमलङ्कार इति दर्शितम् । बन्धो गुम्फो भणितिर्वक्रोक्तिः कविव्यापार इति हि पर्यायाः।

Nāṭyaśāstra with the commentary of *Abhinavabhāratī*, Ed. R.S. Nagar Vol. II, Parimal Publications, Delhi, p. 233.

Bharata's Dictum on *Lakṣaṇa*

In the sixteenth chapter of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Bharata gives a list of thirty-six *lakṣaṇas* and defines each of them.⁵⁹ He starts this chapter abruptly without any sufficient introduction. No attempt has been made to give the general definition of *lakṣaṇas* or to differentiate them from *guṇa* and *alanṅkāra*. Also, he does not specify their place in poetry.

At the end of the fifteenth chapter, while dealing with metres, Bharata states that poetic compositions should have thirty-six *lakṣaṇas*:

वृत्तैरेवं तु विविधैर्नानाच्छन्दस्समुद्भवैः ।

काव्यबन्धास्तु कर्तव्याः षट्-त्रिंशल्लक्षणान्विताः ॥⁶⁰

Here, the peculiar usage of the word *kartavyaḥ* (ought to be done) that which is in the potential passive form, denotes *lakṣaṇas* are essential or most important elements in poetry. Further, at the end of the treatment of *alanṅkāras*, he remarks:

एभिरर्थक्रियापेक्षैः कार्यं काव्यं तु लक्षणैः ।

अतः परं प्रवक्ष्यामि काव्ये दोषान् गुणान्स्तथा ॥⁶¹

59 विभूषणं चाक्षरसंहतिश्च शोभाभिमानौ गुणकीर्तनं च ।

प्रोत्साहनोदाहरणे निरुक्तं गुणानुवादोऽतिशयः सहेतुः ।

सारूप्यमिथ्याध्यवसायसिद्धिपदोद्भवाक्रन्दमनोरथाश्च ।

आख्यानयाश्चाप्रतिषेधपृच्छादृष्टान्तनिर्भासनसंशयाश्च ॥

आशीः प्रियोक्तिः कपटः क्षमा च प्राप्तिश्च पश्चात्तपनं तथैव ।

अर्थानुवृत्तिर्ह्युपपत्तियुक्ती कार्योऽनुनीतिः परिवेदनं च ॥

षट्-त्रिंशदेतानि तु लक्षणानि प्रोक्तानि वै भूषणसम्मितानि ।

काव्येषु भावार्थगतानि तत्रैः सम्यक्प्रयोज्यानि यथा रसं तु ॥ *Nāṭyaśāstra*, XVI. 1-4.

60 *Ibid.*, XV. 227.

61 *Ibid.*, XVI. 87.

This observation forces one to arrive at an idea that Bharata included the *alaṅkāras* under the scope of *lakṣaṇa*. He also states that these *lakṣaṇas* are another species of beautifying elements though they are different from *alaṅkāras*. In this sense, they are called decoration (*vibhūṣaṇa*) or decoration-like (*bhūṣaṇa-sammita*).⁶²

Moreover, the particular *lakṣaṇa* called *bhūṣaṇa* is defined in terms of *guṇas* and *alaṅkāras*.⁶³ It seems that Bharata's concept of *lakṣaṇa* includes other poetic elements like *alaṅkāras* and *guṇas* in its comprehensive scope. Thus, one may conclude, from the above observation, that *lakṣaṇas* are essential elements in poetry and the *alaṅkāras* and *guṇas* are subordinate to them.

Abhinavagupta's interpretation of *lakṣaṇa*

As it is already observed, the information given in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* is hardly sufficient to have an exact idea on the concept *lakṣaṇa*. Abhinavagupta, a learned commentator of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, realizes this difficulty and tries to interpret the concept at his best on the basis of the views of his predecessors without losing his originality.⁶⁴ He deals with this concept at a great length and discusses as many as ten views held by his predecessors.⁶⁵ Of these ten views, the first, the third and the seventh merit a special consideration.

According to the first view, *lakṣaṇa* is distinguished from *guṇa* as well as *alaṅkāra*. *Guṇa* is inherent in *rasa*, the soul of

62 *Ibid.*, XVI. 4.

63 अलङ्कारैर्गुणैश्चैव बहुभिर्यदलङ्कृतम् ।

भूषणैरिव विन्यस्तैस्तद्भूषणमिति स्मृतम् ॥ *Ibid.*, XVI. 5.

64 . This portion of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* (XVI Chapter) has two recensions. Abhinavagupta is acquainted with both the recensions, but follows mainly the recension which is handed down to him through his teacher. (उद्देशक्रमस्तु अस्मदुपाध्यायपरम्परागतः). However, while treating the *lakṣaṇas*, he notices the other recension also.

65 इदं तु दशपक्ष्यां वस्तु । *Abhinavabhāratī*, Vol. II., p. 215.

poetry, while *alaṅkāra* is an adornment which is separate from the formal structure of poetry. But *lakṣaṇa* is the body of poetry itself and as such is adorned by *alaṅkāras*. Moreover, *lakṣaṇa* is that which creates the beauty of the body of poetry. This is of two-fold i.e., *siddharūpa* or self-existent and the *sādhyarūpa* or to be achieved later.⁶⁶

The advocates of the third view prove their novelty in their speculation of three different activities (*vyāpāra*) corresponding to the three vibrations (*parispanda*) of the poet's genius. The first vibration of the poet's genius conceives the *rasa* and its *guṇas*. The second vibration, which is also designated as *varṇana*, culminates in the introduction of *alaṅkāras*. The third vibration selects the competent words and ideas. And, it also suggests *guṇas* like *śleṣa* etc. This third activity is the actual body of poetry which is called *lakṣaṇa*. Thus, *lakṣaṇa* is the result of the third activity of the poet's imagination.⁶⁷

The upholders of the seventh view argue that *lakṣaṇa* is an attribute causing the natural beauty of poetry; it is competent enough to make poetry appreciative even in the absence of

66 इह गुणास्तावदात्मनि चिन्मये शृङ्गारादौ वर्तन्ते, शृङ्गारे चावश्यं च लक्ष्यत इति पृथक्सिद्धत्वादलङ्कारः, शरीरनिष्ठमेव यदपृथक्सिद्धं तल्लक्षणं येन शरीरस्य सौन्दर्यं जायते । तच्च सिद्धरूपं साध्यरूपं वा, यथा श्यामेति, मदमन्थरगामिनी इति च । एतदेव लक्षणं, तच्चालङ्कियते । अलङ्कारैर्युक्तं काव्यं लक्षणैर्विना न शोभते । *Abhinavabhāratī*, Vol. II, p. 212.

67 कवेर्यः प्रतिभात्मा प्रथमपरिस्पन्दः तद्व्यापारबलोपनता गुणाः, प्रतिभावत एव हि रसाभिव्यञ्जनसामर्थ्यं माधुर्यादिरुपनिबन्धनसामर्थ्यं, न सामान्यकवेः । अनेन शब्देनेदं वस्तु वर्णयामीत्येवंभूतवर्णनापरपर्यायद्वितीयव्यापारसम्पाद्यस्त्वलङ्काराः । शब्दानमीभिः शब्दैरर्थानमीभिरर्थैः सङ्घटयामीत्येवमात्मकस्तु यस्तृतीयः कवेः परिस्पन्दः तदधीनात्मलाभादिशब्दामार्थात्मककाव्यशरीरसंश्रितानि वक्ष्यमाणश्लेषादिगुणदशकसमभिव्यञ्जनव्यापाराणि शब्दार्थोपसंस्कारकल्पानि क्रियारूपाणि लक्षणानीति । अत्र पक्षे कविव्यापारभेदादगुणालङ्कारलक्षणविभागः । *Ibid.*, p. 214.

alaṅkāras. This *lakṣaṇa* alone can create beauty and it is nothing but special form of poetic body itself.⁶⁸

Unfortunately, there is no definite evidence to know about the upholders of these views. Abhinavagupta himself does not mention the name of the theorists in this connection. On the other hand, there is no sufficient evidence to say that these views are purely imaginary. "In the course of the exposition of the second and the third view, Abhinava twice quotes *Anuṣṭubh* verses with the words तदुक्तं तत्रैव. The third view takes its stand on *vyāpārābheda*. From what the *Anuṣṭubhs* look and the association of *vyāpāra* with Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, we may conjecture that some of these views are expounded in Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's *Hṛdayadarpaṇa*. We also know of the *Mīmāṃsā* predilections of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka."⁶⁹ Thus, it may be concluded that Bharata's concept of *lakṣaṇa* took different interpretations, in course of time, because of its comprehensive and elastic nature. The third view undoubtedly reminds Kuntaka's theory of poetry in both of which *kāvīvyāpāra* plays the most important role. Hence, Kuntaka may be said as being indebted to these theorists to build his theory of *vakrokti*.

Now to come to Abhinavagupta's own view on the concept, he adopts the three views generally mentioned above. He remarks in connection with the verse काव्यबन्धास्तु कर्तव्याः..... that the *lakṣaṇas* are most important elements in *kāvya-bandha* and the treatment of other elements comes only in their connection.⁷⁰ Further, he states that *lakṣaṇas* constitute the body of *kāvya* i.e. poetic expression which is embellished by poetic

68 अलङ्कारादिनिरपेक्षेणैव निसर्गसुन्दरो योऽभिनेयविशेषः काव्येषु दृश्यते, अमरुकशलोकेष्वपि, तत्सौन्दर्यहेतुर्यो धर्मः सुलक्षणः स एव चार्थः काव्यशरीरविशेषरूपो लक्षणम् । *Ibid.*, p. 214.

69 V. Raghavan, *Some Concepts of the Alaṅkāraśāstra*, p.12.

70 अत एव पूर्वं 'काव्यबन्धास्तु कर्तव्याः षट्-त्रिंशल्लक्षणान्विताः' इति लक्षणान्येव हि प्रधानं तत्प्रसङ्गेन गुणालङ्कारा इति तात्पर्यम् । *Abhinavabhāratī*, Vol. II, p. 215.

figures on the analogy of human body.⁷¹ Later on, while commenting upon Bharata's *upamālaṅkāra*, he equates *lakṣaṇa* with *kāvya-bandha* and immediately it is followed by the other synonyms viz., *gumpha*, *bhaṇiti*, *vakrokti* and *kāvīyāpāra*.⁷² The *Kalpalatāviveka* also gives some important citations which throw some more light on this topic. This is the passage: "काव्यलक्षणेष्ु इति । लक्षणापरपर्यायस्य व्यापारस्य प्राधान्ये काव्यगीर्भवेदित्युक्तत्वात् तत्सङ्गाव एव हि काव्यमित्येष शब्दः प्रवर्तते । लक्षणं तु इति । इदमनेन शब्देनानयेतिकर्तव्यतयाऽ मुनाशयेनैवंभूतबुद्धिजननाय ब्रुवे इति कविः प्रवर्तते इति कविव्यापारो लक्षणशब्दवाच्य इति ह्युक्तचरं पल्लवे । मुनिना हि इति । यतो लक्षणानि मुनिना प्रणीतान्यतो बन्धशब्दस्तत्पर्यायतया व्याख्यातः ।"⁷³ In this connection, Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy's observation is to be noted. He remarks: "By the way we are told in the *Kalpalatāviveka*, it appears as if it was the one standard opinion regarding *Lakṣaṇa* repeatedly stressed in the original work called '*Pallava*.' The context, in which it appears, also deserves attention. It occurs immediately before giving extracts from Kuntaka's treatment of *upamā* and tracing back its origins to Bharata's treatment of the same figure, as governed by the prerequisites of *Vakrokti* or *Lakṣaṇa*."⁷⁴

This concept is again explained as a principle of *Rasa-aucitya*. While explaining the particular *lakṣaṇa* called *bhuṣaṇa*, he says that it is the proper use of *alaṅkāras* and *guṇas* in

71 एवं कविव्यापारबलाद्यदर्थजातं लौकिकास्त्वभावाद्विद्यमानं तदेव लक्षणमित्युक्तम् । तत्र शरीरकल्पस्यालङ्कारा अधुना वक्तव्याः । काव्ये तावल्लक्षणं शरीरं, तस्योपमादयस्त्रयोऽर्थभागे..... *Ibid.*, p.233.

Here, he also refers to the view of his teacher: उपाध्यायमतं तु लक्षणबलादलङ्काराणां वैचित्र्यमागच्छति ।

72 काव्यबन्धेषु काव्यलक्षणेष्ुबन्धो गुम्फो भणितिर्वक्रोक्तिः कविव्यापार इति हि पर्यायाः। *Ibid.*, p.233.

73 *Kalpalatāviveka*, L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, 1968, p. 241

74 K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvita, Intro.*, p. XIX.

accordance with the *rasa*. Here he quotes Ānandavardhana's *kārikas* to support his view.⁷⁵

Moreover, Abhinavagupta holds that the poetic expression itself as a whole is composed in accordance with *rasa* and is designated as *lakṣaṇa*. The three-fold *abhidhāvyāpāra* of a poet's genius that brings into light such as *vibhāva* etc. are competent to evoke *rasa*. Thus the three-fold *abhidhāvyāpāra* is capable of being called *lakṣaṇa*, the indicator of *rasa* par excellence.⁷⁶ Here he quotes Bhaṭṭanāyaka, who has given an emphasis on *kāvīvyāpāra* or artistic activity of the poet. Immediately after this, Abhinavagupta quotes Bhāmaha, who has held that poetry is distinguished from the other utterances by the peculiarity of *vakrokti*.⁷⁷ It shows that what Bhāmaha calls *vakrokti* is nothing but Bharata's *lakṣaṇa*. Thus, both the terms are conceptually one and the same.

75 इह गुणालङ्काराश्च विषया इत्यनेन निबद्धाः काव्यार्थीकृतानामभिधेयानां रसविशेषविषयं विभावादिभावं विवरीतुं समर्थाः.....एतमेवार्थं सम्यगानन्दवर्धनाचार्योऽपि विविच्य न्यरूपयत् -

ध्वन्यात्मभूते शृङ्गारे समीक्ष्य विनिवेशितः।

रूपकादिरलङ्कारवर्गं डाति यथार्थताम् ॥

इत्युक्त्वा क्रमेण - विविक्षा तत्परत्वेन नाङ्गित्वेन कदाचन ।

काले च ग्रहणत्यागौ नाति निर्वहणैषिता ॥

इत्यादिना ग्रन्थसन्दर्भेण सोदाहरणेन । *Abhinavabhārati*, Vol. II, pp. 216-17.

76 इदमनेन शब्देनानयेतिर्कृतव्यतयाऽमुनाशयेनेत्यंभूतबुद्धिजननाय ब्रुवे इति कविः प्रवर्तते, स तथाभूतः रसवत्काव्यं विधत्ते । तत्र चित्तवृत्त्यात्मकं रसं लक्ष्यंस्तत्तद्रसोचितविभावादिदैवचित्त्यसम्पादकस्त्रिविधोऽभिधाव्यापारो लक्षणशब्देनोच्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 215.

77 भट्टनायकेनापि तानेव शिक्षित्वा अभिधाव्यापारप्रधानं काव्यमित्युक्तम्- शब्दप्राधान्यमाश्रित्य तत्र शास्त्रं पृथग्विदुः ।

अर्थे तत्त्वेन युक्ते तु वदन्त्याख्यानमेतयोः ॥

द्वयोर्गुणत्वे व्यपारप्राधान्ये काव्यगीर्भवेत् । इति ॥

भामहेनापि 'सैषा सर्वैव वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते'

इत्यादि । तेन च परमार्थं व्यापार एव लक्षणं। *Ibid.*, pp. 215-16.

Considering all the remarks discussed above, one can conclude that this concept of *lakṣaṇa* is an elastic poetic principle rather than a poetic element. Abhinavagupta's interpretation of *lakṣaṇa* is a counterpart of Kuntaka's theory of *vakrokti*. Hence, Abhinavagupta was thoroughly acquainted with the theory of either Kuntaka or with some earlier theorist who formulated similar theory.⁷⁸ As we see, in the history of Sanskrit poetics, *vyāpāraprādhānyavāda* is strongly advocated by Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka. Bhaṭṭa Tauta himself has emphasized the artistic activity of a poet or *kavivṛtyāpāra*. And, of the ten views on *lakṣaṇa*, the third view is based on *kavivṛtyāpāra*. Thus, it is enough to show that Kuntaka got inspiration by the teachings of these theorists including Bharata's concept of *lakṣaṇa*. For this reason, Abhinavagupta naturally equates Bharata's *lakṣaṇa* with the concept of *vakrokti*.

After Bharata, *lakṣaṇa* has changed its name in the history of Sanskrit poetics. Its implications have been reduced by later theorists. The functions and characteristics of some of the *lakṣaṇas* were attributed to *guṇas* and *alaṅkāras* by pre-Dhvani theorists. The development of *alaṅkāras* from three in Bharata to thirty-two in Bhāmaha is interesting but the gap between

78 This is the subject of controversy among modern scholars. Dr. A. Shankaran and Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy strongly argued Abhinavagupta's acquaintance with the theory of Kuntaka with pertinent evidences.

Vide, A Shankaran, *Some Aspects of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit*, University of Madras, 1925, p. 199,

Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvita*, Intro. pp. XVI-XX.

And also,

Cf. " Another probable conclusion is that both Abhinava and Kuntaka are drawing upon one and the same source and this is the *Kāvyaakautuka* of Bhaṭṭa Tauta whose work is unfortunately lost to us" P.C. Lahiri, *Concepts of Rīti and Guṇa in Sanskrit Poetics*. University of Dacca, 1937, p.20.

these two theorists is full of darkness. In this stage, *lakṣaṇas* may be merged in *alaṅkāras*. Daṇḍin's statement is evident to support this view. He declares: "What is elaborated in other treatises (i.e. *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata) including *sandhyāṅga*, *vṛtyāṅga* and the *lakṣaṇas*, etc. that also is considered as *alaṅkāras* by us."⁷⁹

Thus, as observed earlier, Bharata's concept of *lakṣaṇa* is an elastic poetic concept rather than poetic element. The seeds of many later *alaṅkāras* and poetic concepts of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* owe their origin in Bharata's concept of *lakṣaṇa* itself. "It is interesting to see how this basic idea reappears in different garbs as 'bandha-guṇa' of Vāmana, 'bhaṇiti-vaicitrya' cited by Rājaśekhara, 'bandha-cchyāyā' as well as 'ukti-vaicitrya' in the *Dhvanyāloka*. It will be seen that these ideas were all there in an inchoate form before Kuntaka wrote his systematical treatise, viz., the *Vakrokti-jīvita*."⁸⁰

From Bhāmaha to Rudraṭa

BHĀMAHA

A noteworthy theorist in the history of the concept of *vakrokti* is Bhāmaha (7th cen. C.E). He is the first rhetorician, as known to

79 यच्च सन्ध्यङ्गवृत्यङ्गलक्षणाद्यागमान्तरे ।

व्यावर्णितमिदञ्चेष्टमलङ्कारतयैव नः ॥ *Kāvyaadarśa*, II., 367, Ed. V. Narayana Ayer, Madras, 1964.

80 Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvita*, Intro., p. XX.

Cf. "These considerations are enough to show how amidst the seeming diversities of aesthetic concepts such as *alaṅkāra*, *guṇa*, *rīti*, *bandha*, *dhvani*, *vakrokti* and *anumāna* when considered in isolation, there is indeed an underlying thread of unity embodied in the idea of *lakṣaṇa* propounded by Bharata in keeping with *rasa*. All the later developments of ideas by masterly theorists owe their origin to the inchoate but insightful hints of the sage Bharata himself !"

Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, *Indian Literary Theories – A Reappraisal*, pp. 129-30.

us, to introduce the term *vakrokti* in Sanskrit poetics. And, for the first time, he uses the term in its wide connotation as an essential aspect of poetry. Even though he did not define the term, his idea of *vakrokti* can be understood by his statements.

As an exponent of the *Alaṅkāra* school, Bhāmaha argues that *alaṅkāras* are the most essential elements in poetry as they distinguish poetic expression from the ordinary way of speech; and it is *vakrokti* or the extraordinary way of expression, which is the fundamental principle underlying at the roots of all figures of speech.⁸¹ In his *Kāvyaṭīkā*, Bhāmaha discusses this concept in connection with the figure *atiśayokti* or the speech of excellence. Immediately after illustrating the figure *atiśayokti*, Bhāmaha declares:

"This *vakrokti* is found everywhere. Sense or content is made more charming only by *vakrokti*. Effort should be made by a poet towards this. What is an *alaṅkāra* without this?"⁸² From this verse, it is clear that *atiśayokti* and *vakrokti* are identical; and it is taken in the sense of extraordinariness or striking mode of expression and not in the sense of a particular figure.⁸³ It is more clear from

81 गतोऽस्तमर्को भातीन्दुर्यान्ति वासाय पक्षिणः ।

इत्येवमादि किं काव्यं वातमिनां प्रचक्षते ॥ and

अपुष्टार्थमवक्रोक्तिं प्रसन्नमृजु कोमलम् ।

भिन्नं गेयमिवेदं तु केवलं श्रुतिपेशलम् ॥ and

वक्रवाचां कवीनां ये प्रयोगं प्रतिसाधवः ।

प्रयोक्तुं ये न युक्ताश्च तद्विवेकोऽयमुच्यते ॥ *Kāvyaṭīkā*, II. 87, I. 34 & VI. 23.

82 सैषा सर्वैव वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते ।

यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 85.

83 सैषेति । याऽतिशयोक्तिर्लक्षिता सैव सर्वा वक्रोक्तिरलङ्कार इत्यर्थः । एवं चात्रातिशयोक्तिरिति वक्रोक्तिः पर्याय इति बोध्यम् । सर्वत्र सर्वेष्वलङ्कारस्थलेषु । वक्रोक्तिरिति । वक्रा वैचित्र्यधायिका लोकातिशायिनी उक्तिः कथनमित्यर्थः ।

Bālābodhinī commentary on *Kāvyaaprakāśa*, p. 906.

the same context that Bhāmaha discards *hetu*, *sūkṣma* and *leśa* as poetic figures as they do not possess *vakrokti*.⁸⁴ Therefore, in his opinion, *vakrokti* is the essence of all the figures. लोकातिक्रान्तगोचरं वचः which he gives as the definition of *atiśayokti* as the general characteristic of his *vakrokti* too.⁸⁵

In this connection, Ānandavardhana's remarks are illuminating. He opines that it is possible to find *atiśayokti* in all figures, and it has been incorporated by great poets with a view to enhance the beauty of poetic composition. Here he cites Bhāmaha's famous verse (II.85) as a definition of *atiśayokti*.⁸⁶ On the other hand, Abhinavagupta explains *vakrokti* as an extraordinary form of expression involved in all figurative expressions. By this, objects are rendered as the component factors of *rasa*.⁸⁷ "From this, it is reasonable to conclude that by *vakratā*, Bhāmaha implies a kind of heightened or extraordinary turn given to expression (what Kuntaka would call *bhaṅgī* or

Cf. also, 'निमित्ततो युतु वच' इत्यतिशयोक्तिरक्षणम् । सैषा इति सेत्यनुवादकम् । एषा इति च विधायकम् । सा वक्रोक्तिरेषैव अतिशयोक्तिरेव नान्येत्यर्थः । *Kalpalatāvivēka*, p. 265.

84 हेतुश्च सूक्ष्मो लेशोऽथ नालङ्कारतया मतः ।

समुदायाभिधेयस्य वक्रोक्त्यनभिधानतः ॥ *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra*, II. 86.

85 निमित्ततो वचो यत्तु लोकातिक्रान्तगोचरम् ।

मन्यन्तेऽतिशयोक्तिं तामलङ्कारतया यथा ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 81.

86 यतः प्रथमं तावदतिशयोक्तिगर्भता सर्वालङ्कारेषु शक्यक्रिया । कृतैव च सा महाकविभिः कामपि काव्यच्छविं पुष्यति, कथं ह्यतिशययोगिता स्वविषयौचित्येन क्रियमाणा सती काव्ये नोत्कर्षमावहेत् । भामहेनाप्यतिशयोक्तिरक्षणे यदुक्तम्- सैषा सर्वैव वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते ।

यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना । इति ॥ *Dhvanyāloka*, III. 36.

87 यातिशयोक्तिर्लिखिता सैव सर्वा वक्रोक्तिरलङ्कारप्रकारः सर्वः । 'वक्राभिधेय-शब्दोक्तिरिष्टा वाचामलङ्कृतिः इति वचनात् । शब्दस्य हि वक्रता लोकोत्तीर्णेन रूपेणावस्थानमित्ययमेवासावलङ्कारभावः, लोकोत्तरतैव चातिशयः, तेनातिशयोक्तिः सर्वालङ्कारसामान्यम् । तथा हि अनया अतिशयोक्त्या अर्थः सकलजनोपभोगपुराणीकृतोऽपि भाव्यते । तथा प्रमदोद्यानादिः विभावतां नीयते । *Dhvanyāloka -locana*, Ed. Jagannath Patak, Varanasi, 1997, pp. 499-50.

vicchitti), which constitutes the charm or strikingness of poetic expression, as distinguished from common speech where facts are simply stated."⁸⁸

For this reason, Bhāmaha states that the *vakrokti* enshrined at the root of poetic word and sense ensures to the beauty of poetry.⁸⁹ According to him, ornaments of speech are strikingness in word and in meaning.⁹⁰ Thus, *vakrokti* is the harmonious blend of beautiful words and meanings. Hence, Bhāmaha declares that *vakrokti* must be present in various kinds of poetic composition like *mahākāvya*, *nāṭaka*, *kathā* and so on.⁹¹ Therefore, *vakrokti* is taken by Bhāmaha as the fundamental aesthetic principle of all figurative expression, indirectly poetry itself.

DANḌIN

Danḍin's conception of *vakrokti* has wide connotation. He uses the term as a collective designation for all poetic figures except *svabhāvokti*. However, there is no systematic treatment on the concept of *vakrokti* in his *Kāvyaḍarśa* (7th cen C.E.). The term *vakrokti* is used only once by Danḍin, yet one can understand his views through some of his related statements.

According to Danḍin, the whole realm of poetic composition can be divided into two distinct classes viz., *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti*.⁹² Of these two, *svabhāvokti*, also called *jāti*, is considered

88 S.K. De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. II, p. 52.

89 वाचां वक्रार्थशब्दोक्तिरलङ्काराय कल्पते । *Kāvyaḍarśa*, V. 66.

90 वक्राभिधेयशब्दोक्तिरिष्टा वाचामलङ्कृतिः । *Ibid.*, I. 36.

91 युक्तं वक्रस्वभावोक्त्या सर्वमेवैतदिष्यते । *Ibid.*, I. 30.

92 श्लेषः सर्वासु पुष्पाति प्रायो वक्रोक्तिषु श्रियम् ।

भिन्नं द्विधा स्वभावोक्तिर्वक्रोक्तिश्चेति वाङ्मयम् ॥ *Kāvyaḍarśa*, II. 363.

Ratnaśrījñāna comments :

वाङ्मयं सर्वमेतदलङ्कारजातं द्विधा नान्यप्रकारावस्थामवतिष्ठते । कथम्, स्वभावोक्तिर्जातिः पूर्वोक्तलक्षणा यथावस्थितविचित्रपदार्थपरिदीपनरूपा, वक्रोक्तिश्च

as primary figure of speech. It describes the actual forms of different conditions of the objects and it alone is supreme in the fields of science and it is desired even in poetry.⁹³ On the other hand, *vakrokti* is distinct from *svabhāvokti*, in which all the figures like *upamā* etc. are included in its wide scope.⁹⁴ Thus, *vakrokti* is the striking mode of speech often obtaining charm from paronomasia.

At another place, Daṇḍin declares that *atiśayokti* is the very basis of all *alankāras*.⁹⁵ This leads to conclude that *vakrokti* and *atiśayokti* are identical. Both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin agree with this standpoint. Thus, लोकसीमातिवर्तिनी विवक्षा, which is the definition of *atiśayokti* given by Daṇḍin, is the nature of his *vakrokti* also.⁹⁶

वस्तुस्वभावस्य तथातथान्यथाभिधानस्वभावा पूर्वोक्तविचित्रप्रभेदा
उपमादिरुक्तिश्चेत्यनेन रूपेण द्विधेति प्रकृतम् ।

Kāvyaḍarśa with the commentary of *Ratnaśrījñāna*, Ed. Anantalal Thakur & Upendra Jha, Darbhanga, 1957, p. 196.

In other place (under I. 22), *Ratnaśrījñāna*, defines *vakrokti* in a different way:

काव्यं हि वक्रोक्तिप्रधानम् । अयं च क्रमः वक्रोक्तिस्वभावः यद्विपक्षवर्णनद्वारा
प्रतिपक्षोत्कर्षकथनम् । *Ibid.*, p. 15.

93 नानवस्थं पदार्थानां रूपं साक्षाद्विवृण्वती ।

स्वभावोक्तिश्च जातिश्चेत्याद्या सालङ्कृतिर्यथा ॥

शास्त्रेष्वस्यैव साम्राज्यं काव्येष्वप्येतदीप्सितम् ॥ *Kāvyaḍarśa*, II. 8 & II.13.

Ratnaśrījñāna defines *svabhāvokti* as :

स्वभावं पदार्थानां विचित्रं वक्तीति स्वभावोक्तिः । जातेः पदार्थस्वरूपस्य तथा
प्रतिपादकत्वेन तदर्थ्याज्जातिः । *Op. cit.* p. 69.

94 वक्रोक्तिशब्देन उपमादयः सङ्कीर्णपर्यन्ता अलङ्कारा उच्यन्ते ।

Hṛdayaṅgamā Commentary, quoted by S.K. De, *Vakroktijīvita*, Intro., p. XXIV.

95 अलङ्कारान्तराणामप्येकमाहुः परायणम् ।

वागीशमहितामुक्तिमिमामतिशयाह्वयाम् ॥ *Kāvyaḍarśa*, II. 220.

96 विवक्षा या विशेषस्य लोकसीमातिवर्तिनी ।

असावतिडायोक्तिः स्यादलङ्कारोत्तमा यथा ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 214.

VĀMANA

Vāmana (8th cen C.E) uses the term *vakrokti* in an entirely different sense. He was the first to apply it to designate a specific poetic figure. He defines the figure based on indication or *lakṣaṇa*. There are, of course, many bases for indication; *aupamya* or similitude is one among them. When *lakṣaṇā* is based on similitude, it gives rise to *vakrokti*.⁹⁷ This is the example:

प्रत्यूषेषु स्फुटितकमलामोदमैत्रीकषायः। (Meghadūta, I. 31.)

Here, the word *maitrī* indicates coming in contact with or co-existence. Vāmana adds that the secret of true indication lies in the quickness with which its real sense is comprehended.⁹⁸

In fact, Vāmana's definition of *vakrokti* seems to be striking. He differs from Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. The basis of his idea is hardly tracable.⁹⁹ Anyway, Vāmana's concept of *vakrokti* reminds the *samādhigūṇa* of Daṇḍin¹⁰⁰ and *avivakṣita-vācya-Dhvani* of Ānandavardhana. The verse of the *Meghadūta*, cited above, is quoted in the *Dhvanyāloka* as an instance of पदापेक्षया वाच्यालङ्कार

97 सादृश्याल्लक्षणा वक्रोक्तिः । बहूनि हि निबन्धनानि लक्षणायाम्, तत्र सादृश्याल्लक्षणा वक्रोक्तिरसाविति । *Kāvyaṭīkāraśāstra*, IV. 3.8.

Ed. Hargovinda Shastri. Chaukhamba Surabharati Prakashan, Varanasi, 1995.

Kāmadhenu commentary points out, a *lakṣaṇā* is possible in five ways:

अभिधेयेन सम्बन्धात् सादृश्यात् समवायतः ।

वैपरीत्यात् क्रियायोगाल्लक्षणा पञ्चधा मता ॥

इति लक्षणायाः निमित्तानि द्रष्टव्यानि । *Ibid.*, p. 174.

98 इत्येवमादिषु लक्षणार्थो निरूप्यत इति लक्षणायां झटित्यर्थप्रतिपत्तिरक्षमत्वं रहस्यमाचक्षत इति । *Kāvyaṭīkāraśāstra*, IV. 3.8.

99 There is significant verse quoted by Bhoja in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* which states that all kinds of *lakṣaṇā* are *vakrokti*.

अभिधेयाविनाभूत प्रतीतिर्लक्षणोच्यते ।

सैषा विदग्धवक्रोक्तिजीवितं वृत्तिरिष्यते ॥

100 अन्यधर्मस्ततोऽन्यत्र लोकसीमानुरोधिना ।

सम्यगधीयते यत्र स समाधिः स्मृतो यथा ॥ *Kāvyaadarśa*, I. 93.

संसृष्टत्व ।¹⁰¹ For this, Ānandavardhana pays tribute to *Rīti* theorists as they had dimly realized the secret of poetry but they could not fully analyse it.¹⁰²

At the same time, it has been maintained that Vāmana did not ignore *vakrokti* in its wide sense. The 'particularity' (*viśiṣṭā padaracanā*) in his definition of *Rīti* is not very different from the concept of *vakrokti*. And, the various qualities of word and meaning (*bandha-guṇāḥ*) considered by him involve the idea of *vakrokti*. For instance, the qualities of words like *ojas*, *śleṣa*, *udātta*, *kānti* and the like come under the scope of *varṇa-vinyāsa vakratā* of Kuntaka. Similarly, *arthagūṇa-ojas*, which falls under the perview of *paryāyavakratā* and the concept of *śabdapāka*¹⁰³ of Vāmana, is closely related to the concept of *sāhitya* of Kuntaka. Thus, it may be concluded that though Vāmana uses the term *vakrokti* in restricted sense, the idea behind the concept of *vakrokti* is treated in various forms and names.

RUDRAṬA

Rudraṭa restricts the scope of *vakrokti* to a particular verbal poetic figure. In the history of *vakrokti*, it was Rudraṭa who for the first time treated it as a verbal figure based on paronomasia or intonation. According to him, *vakrokti* is of two kinds. The first variety which is called *śleṣa-vakrokti* is defined thus:

"A sentence spoken in one sense by a speaker is taken in a different sense by another speaker resorting to double meaning of the words."¹⁰⁴

101 अत्र हि मैत्रीपदमविवक्षितवाच्यो ध्वनिः । *Dhvanyāloka*, under III. 43.

102 *Ibid.*, III. 46.

103 आधानोद्धरणे तावद् यावद्दोलायते मनः ।

पदस्य स्थापिते स्थैर्ये हन्त सिद्धा सरस्वती ॥

यत्पदानि त्यजन्त्येव परिवृत्तिसहिष्णुताम् ।

तं शब्दन्यासनिष्णाताः शब्दपाकं प्रचक्षते ॥ *Kāvya-lāṅkārasūtra*, under I. 3.15.

104 वक्रा तदन्यथोक्तं व्याचष्टे चान्यथा तदुत्तरदः ।

The next variety of *vakrokti* is *kāku-vakrokti*. By a change of speaker's intonation, there is a change in the meaning of a sentence as a whole; it is known as *kāku-vakrokti*.¹⁰⁵

Curiously, Rājaśekhara¹⁰⁶ and Hemacandra¹⁰⁷ do not treat *vakrokti* based on *kāku* as it depends on *pāṭhadharma* or peculiarities of reading; but, in later period Mammaṭa and others accept Rudraṭa's definition of *vakrokti* in toto.

वचनं यत्पदभङ्गैर्ज्ञेया सा श्लेषवक्रोक्तिः ॥

किं गौरि मां प्रति रुषा ननु गौरहं किं कुप्यामि कां प्रति मयीत्यनुमानतोऽहम् ।

जानाम्यतस्त्वमनुमानत एव सत्यमित्थं गिरो गिरिभुवः कुटिला जयन्ति ॥ *Kāvyaṭīkā* (Rudraṭa), II. 14 & 15, Ed. Pt. Dugraprasad, Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1983.

105 विस्पष्टं क्रियमाणादक्लिष्टा स्वरविशेषतो भवति ।

अर्थान्तरप्रतीतिर्यत्रासौ काकुवक्रोक्तिः ॥ *Ibid.*, II.16.

vide, The benedictory verse of the *Mudrārākṣasa* of Viśākadatta is an example of *kāku-vakrokti* :

धन्या केयं स्थिता ते शिरसि शशिकला किं नु नामैतदस्याः

नामैवास्यास्तदेतत्परिचितमपि ते विस्मृतं कस्य हेतोः ।

नारीं पृच्छामि नेन्दुं कथयतु विजया न प्रमाणं यदीन्दु-

र्देव्या निन्होतुमिच्छोरिति सुरसरितं शाठ्यमव्याद्विभोर्वः ॥

106 काकुवक्रोक्तिर्नाम शब्दालङ्कारोऽयं इति रुद्रटः।

अभिप्रायवान्पाठधर्मः काकुः, स कथमलङ्कारी स्यात् इति यायावरीयः ।

Kāvyaṃimāmsā, Ed. Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai, Chowkhamba Vidyabhavan, Varanasi, 1977, p. 83.

107 Hemacandra quotes Rājaśekhara to reject *kāku-vakrokti* as *śabdālaṅkāra*. It is interesting that he considered it under *guṇībhūta-vyaṅgya* of Ānandavardhana. *Vide*,

गुणीभूतव्यङ्ग्यप्रभेदः एव चायम् शब्दस्पृष्टत्वे नार्थान्तरप्रतीतिहेतुत्वात् । यदाह ध्वनिकारः -

अर्थान्तरगतिः काक्वा या चैषा परिदृश्यते । सा व्यङ्ग्यस्य गुणीभावे प्रकारमिमाश्रिता ॥

Kāvyaṇuśāsana, Ed. W.L. Shstri Pansikar, M.L. Publications, Delhi 1986, pp. 281-82.

Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta

Ānandavardhana (9th cent. C.E.) is the doyen of Indian aestheticians and his *Dhvanyāloka* is an epoch-making treatise in the history of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*.¹⁰⁸ His *Dhvani* theory provides for the first time an insight into the secret of poetic beauty. And, his main concern is to synthesize the former literary theories and to fix the exact place of every poetic element in relation to *Rasa-Dhvani*, the soul of poetry.

Although Ānandavardhana refers to and discusses *vakrokti*, he does not treat it separately. In the third chapter of his *Dhvanyāloka*, while treating the *guṇībhūta-vyaṅgya-kāvya*, citing Bhāmaha (II.85), he holds that strikingness in meaning can be seen in all poetic figures and this *atīśayokti* or *vakrokti* is pervasive of every figure of speech. He remarks:

"For, in the first place, one can posit at least a touch of exaggeration in figures, one and all. In fact, the greatest poets have amply incorporated exaggeration into their works with a view to endowing them with a unique shade of charm. When such exaggeration is utilized in a work in keeping with principles of decorum, how can it even fail to cause delight? Bhāmaha, indeed, has given the following definition of exaggeration:

This (exaggeration) itself is the artistic turn of speech and it is by this that poetic content is made manifest. A poet should strive after this in particular and what figure can be there without it?

This should be understood to convey the following sense only: Only that figure, in which exaggeration reigns supreme, acquires abundant beauty due to the poet's genius. Others are ornamental figures only in name. Hence all figures deserve to be regarded as

108 Cf. "No other work on Sanskrit Poetics has indeed exerted so much influence as the *Dhvanyāloka*, which brought to a focus the tentative efforts of earlier thinkers, and by its thoroughness and masterly exposition eclipsed all its predecessors, dominating, as it did, thoughts of generations of theorists even down to the present time." S.K. De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. II, p. 175.

so many bodies (whose soul is exaggeration) only and by a metaphorical application of identity between them (one might say that) exaggeration is itself the same as the host of all figures."¹⁰⁹

Thus, it is enough to say that, according to Ānandavardhana, *vakrokti* and *atiśayokti* are identical; the beauty of *vakrokti* is originated from poet's genius and the propriety of the content (विषयौचित्य) governs it. Therefore, it may be concluded that Ānandavardhana was fully conversant with the *vakrokti* concept of Bhāmaha and he accepted the basic tenets of the theory too.

Further, he comments that this *atiśayokti* or *vakrokti* sometimes merges with other figures expressly or suggestively. Its suggestibility may be found in two ways viz., principally and subordinately. In the first case, it belongs to expressed figures. In the second case, it comes under *Dhvani* while in the third case, it falls under the perview of *guṇībhūta-vyaṅgya-kāvya*. Thus, *atiśayokti* or *vakrokti* is all pervasive of every poetic figure and this is the uniqueness of it.¹¹⁰ This observation of Ānandavardhana shows the

109 यतः प्रथमं तावदतिशयोक्तिगर्भता सर्वालङ्कारेषु शक्यक्रिया । कृतैव च सा महाकविभिः कामपि काव्यच्छविं पुष्यति, कथं ह्यतिशययोगिता स्वविषयौचित्येन क्रियमाणा सती काव्ये नोत्कर्षमावहेत् । भामहेनाप्यतिशयोक्तिलक्षणे यदुक्तम्-
सैषा सर्वैव वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते ।

यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना ॥ इति ॥

तत्रातिशयोक्तिर्यमलङ्कारमधितिष्ठति कविप्रतिभावशात्तस्य चारुत्वातिशययोगोऽन्यस्य त्वलङ्कारमात्रतैवेति सर्वालङ्काररूपेत्ययमेवार्थोऽवगन्तव्यः । *Dhvanyāloka*, under III. 36.

110 तस्याश्चालङ्कारान्तरसङ्कीर्णत्वं कदाचिद्वाच्यत्वेन कदाचिदव्यङ्ग्यत्वेन । व्यङ्ग्यत्वमपि कदाचित्प्राधान्येन कदाचिद्गुणीभावेन । तत्राद्ये पक्षे वाच्यलङ्कारमार्गः । द्वितीये तु ध्वनावन्तर्भावः । तृतीये तु गुणीभूतव्यङ्ग्यरूपता । अयं च प्रकारोऽन्येषामप्यलङ्काराणामस्ति तेषां तु न सर्वविषयः । अतिशयोक्तेस्तु सर्वालङ्कारविषयोऽपि सम्भवतीत्ययं विशेषः । *Ibid.*, under III. 36.

Inspite of this, Ānandavardhana uses the term *vakrokti* in its general sense in two more places: *Vide*,

तत्र वक्रोक्त्यादि वाच्यलङ्कारव्यवहार एव । *Ibid.*, p.76.

यदा वक्रोक्तिं विना व्यङ्ग्योऽर्थस्तात्पर्येण प्रतीयते तदा तस्य प्राधान्यम् । *Ibid.*, p.236.

comprehensive nature of *atīśayokti* or *vakrokti*. Probably Kuntaka was influenced by this treatment of Ānandavardhana and he includes *Dhvani* too, under the all-encompassing concept of *vakrokti*.

Apart from this, it is to be noted that Ānandavardhana uses the term *ukti-vaicitrya*, which is well known in Kuntaka's treatment. He maintains that *ukti-vaicitrya* or variation in the manner of presentation is nothing but expression which is capable of conveying the intended sense. The matter and the manner are, indeed, inseparable. Hence, the variation in the manner of presentation leads to variation in the matter presented.¹¹¹ And this effects novelty in poetry. But the thing is Ānandavardhana warns, it will shine out only in the association of *rasa* or sentiment.¹¹² Thus, Ānandavardhana's observation presents the basic tenets of the concept of *vakrokti* and its position in the scheme of *Dhvani* theory. It gives, in fact, valuable information to understand the concept.

Now let us observe Abhinavagupta's remarks. Abhinavagupta is the celebrated commentator of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and the *Dhvanyāloka*. His views regarding the concept of *vakrokti* in the *Abhinavabhāratī* are discussed earlier. Abhinavagupta, in his *Locana*, discusses the idea of *vakrokti* at three different places. Firstly, while commenting the verse of Manoratha quoted by Ānandavardhana, he equates *vakrokti* with a 'consummate composition' or *saṅghaṭanā* and holds its absence equivalent to absence of qualities, both of sound and sense.¹¹³

111 किमिदमुक्तिवैचित्र्यम्, उक्तिर्हि वाच्यविशेषप्रतिपादनवचनम् । तद्वैचित्र्ये कथं न वाच्यवैचित्र्यम् । वाच्यवाचकयोरविनाभावेन प्रवृत्तेः । किञ्च उक्तिवैचित्र्यं यत्काव्यनवत्वे निबन्धनमुच्यते, तदस्मत्पक्षानुगुणमेव । *Ibid.*, under IV. 7, p. 290.

112 भूम्नैव दृश्यते लक्ष्ये तत्तु भाति रसाश्रयात् । *Ibid.*, IV. 8.

113 वक्रोक्तिः उत्कृष्टा सङ्घटना, तच्छून्यमिति शब्दार्थगुणानाम् । वक्रोक्तिशून्यशब्देन सामान्यलक्षणाभावेन सर्वालङ्काराभाव उक्त इति केचित् । तैः पुनरुक्तत्वं न परिहृतमेवेत्यलम् । *Locana*, p. 29-30.

Secondly, while commenting on Bhāmaha's definition of *atiśayokti* as *vakrokti* quoted in *Dhvanyāloka*, citing Bhāmaha (I.36) he explains: There is, in fact, the strikingness in word and meaning. It consists in their transgressing the ordinary way of expression. This very quality constitutes poetic figures, and it is the extraordinary way of expression peculiar to poetic expression.¹¹⁴ On this point, P.V. Kane remarks, "This insistence on *vakrokti* emphasizes two characteristics of poetry, viz., that, though poetry necessarily takes the words used in common speech, its choice of words is different from that of ordinary speech i.e. its diction is different and that the poet gives expression to striking combinations or relations of things which are beyond the reach of ordinary matter of fact of men."¹¹⁵ Thus it is evident, Abhinavagupta here treats *vakrokti* in accordance with that of Bhāmaha.¹¹⁶

Thirdly, while discussing different views on *rasa* theory,¹¹⁷ he holds that *lokadharmī* and *nāṭyadharmī* in drama are *svabhāvokti*

On this point Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy says:

"In my opinion, the history of the concept of *Sanḥaṭana* can be traced as far back as Bharata's concept of *Lakṣaṇa* itself." *Introduction to Vakroktijīva*, p. XVII.

114 शब्दस्य हि वक्रता अभिधेयस्य च वक्रता लोकोत्तीर्णेन रूपेणावस्थानमित्येवासावलङ्कारभावः । लोकोत्तरतैव चातिशयः, तेनातिशयोक्तिः सर्वालङ्कारसामान्यम् । तथा हि - अनया अतिशयोक्त्या, अर्थः सकल-जनोपभोगपुराणीकृतोऽपि विचित्रतया भाव्यते । तथा प्रमदोद्यानादिः विभावतां नीयते । विशेषेण च भाव्यते । रसमयी क्रियते, इति तावत्तेनोक्तम् । *Locana*, p. 499.

115 P.V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 385.

116 Cf. "By putting a technical interpretation on the word *vibhāvayate* in Bhāmaha II.85, Abhinavagupta attempts to make out that *Rasa* as well as *Alaṅkāra* originates in *vakrokti*; but this is probably an instance of the not unusual but rather far-fetched ingenuity of the commentator." S.K. De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. II, p. 52.

117 काव्येऽपि च लोकनाट्यधर्मिस्थानीयेन स्वभावोक्तिवक्रोक्ति प्रकारद्वयेनालौकिकप्रसन्नमधुरौ जस्विशब्दसमर्च्यमाणविभावादियोगादियमेव रसवार्ता । अस्तु

and *vakrokti* in poetry, respectively. This view of Abhinavagupta deserves more elaboration.

Bharata in his *Nāṭyaśāstra* enumerates eleven aspects of *naṭya*.¹¹⁸ Among these aspects, *rasa* is the first and foremost and others are complementary to it. *Dharmin* is one of them and its two aspects are *lokadharmī* and *nāṭyadharmī*.¹¹⁹ *Lokadharmī* is the very nature of things presented in drama, whereas the qualities pertaining to the stage is said to be *nāṭyadharmī*.¹²⁰ The two may be rendered as world ways and stage ways which refer to elements of *Realism* and elements of *Idealism*.¹²¹ The former constitutes the raw material, while the latter brings out beauty and inner nature of things being represented.¹²² Taking into consideration *dharmī* in a wide perspective, Abhinavagupta covers the wide spectrum of the creative process applicable to any art. *Lokānusāritva* and *Vicitrayogitva* are the two aspects of this process, which stand for *lokadharmī* and *nāṭyadharmī*,

वात्र नाट्याद्विचित्ररूपा रसप्रतीतिः उपाययवैलक्षण्यादियमेव तावदत्र सरणिः ।
Locana, p. 197.

118 रसा भावा ह्यभिनया धर्मीवृत्तिप्रवृत्तयः ।

सिद्धिः स्वरास्तथातोद्यं गानं रङ्गश्च सङ्ग्रहः ॥ *Nāṭyaśāstra*, VI. 10.

119 धर्मी या द्विविधा प्रोक्ता मया पूर्वं द्विजोत्तमाः ।

लौकिकी नाट्यधर्मी च तयोर्वक्ष्यामि लक्षणम् ॥ *Ibid.*, XIII. 69.

120 स्वभावाभिनयोपेतं नानास्त्रीपुरूषाश्रयम् ।

यदीदृशं भवेन्नाट्यं लोकधर्मी तु सा स्मृता ॥ *Ibid.*, XIII. 71.

योऽयं स्वभावो लोकस्य सुखदुःखक्रियात्मकः ।

सोऽङ्गाभिनरसंयुक्तो नाट्यधर्मी तु सा स्मृता ॥ *Ibid.*, XIII. 80.

121 Dr. V. Raghavan, *Lokadharmī and Nāṭyadharmī in Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, Vol. VII, p. 360.

122 यद्यपि लैकिकधर्मव्यतिरेकेण नाट्ये न कश्चिद् धर्मोऽस्ति । तथापि स यत्र लोकगतप्रक्रियाक्रमो रञ्जनाधिक्यवैचित्र्यप्राधान्यमतिरोहयितुं कविनटव्यापारे वैचित्र्यं स्वीकुर्वन् नाट्यधर्मीत्युच्यते ।

Abhinavabhārati, Vol. II, p. 162.

respectively.¹²³ Of course, *nātyadharmī* is said to be the very life of *nāṭya*.¹²⁴ With this background, Abhinavagupta states that the two concepts of *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti* have sprung from these two *dharmīs*, respectively. This view of Abhinavagupta reminds Dandin's statement which divides the whole realm of literature into *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti*.

Thus, the concept of *vakrokti* was taken up for a detailed discussion by Abhinavagupta and he treats *vakrokti* in its wide conception.

Rājaśekhara

Rājaśekhara's *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* is considered as a work of *Kaviśikṣā* or a practical hand-book for poets. It is, in fact, a unique work, but it does not present one systematic theory. "The work is also remarkable for its varied collection of different opinions as well as for the light it throws on the literary practices of a certain period. Its views cannot be directly connected with any particular school, but it is quite possible that its author follows in the main a tradition of opinion inherited from his literary ancestors, whom he frequently quotes as the *Yāyāvartīyas*."¹²⁵

Rājaśekhara too upholds *vakrokti* in poetry. He does not mention the term *vakrokti*, but he uses the terms *ukti* and *bhaṇiti* which correspond to the concept of *vakrokti*. He quotes the statements of Palyakīrti and Avantisundarī in support of his basic postulates. 'Whatever be the appearance of a thing, the aesthetic sense of a poet lies in his natural disposition' says Palyakīrti.¹²⁶ Similarly, Avantisundarī holds that the *vastu-*

123 काव्यनाट्ययोर्हि लोकानुसारित्वं वैचित्र्ययोगित्वं वा धर्मः । *Ibid.*, p. 163.

124 यस्मात् कविगता नाट्यगता वागलङ्कारचेष्टा नाट्यधर्मरूपा सर्वप्राणवती । *Ibid.*, p. 165.

125 S.K. De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. II, p. 292.

126 यथा तथा वास्तु वस्तुनो रूपं वक्तृप्रकृतिविशेषायत्ता तु रसवत्ता इति पल्यकीर्तिः ।

svarūpa is comparatively less important than the *bhaṇiti-bhaṅgi* or beautiful manner of poetic expression. She maintains: 'There is no constant nature of things, so far as poetry is concerned, for, the poet's artistic mind and his ingenious terms of expressions conceive of things in all sorts of ways.'¹²⁷ Rājaśekhara accepts both these views.¹²⁸ And, P.V. Kane opines that "Kuntaka's definition of *vakrokti* as '*vaidagdhya-bhaṅgī-bhaṇitī*' seems to be borrowed from someone like Avantisundarī."¹²⁹

It should be noted that in the prologue to his *Karpūramañjarī*, Rājaśekhara defines poetry as *ukti-viśeṣa* or peculiar poetic manner of expression.¹³⁰ Neither the idea nor the word is the point, but the manner of expressing that idea in words is the thing that makes poetry. Thus, it is evident that he called *vakrokti* by the name of *ukti*. In this context, Dr. V. Raghavan's observation is worth mentioning:

Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, Ed., Ganga Sagar Rai, Chowkhamba Vidyabhavan, Varanasi, 1977, p. 122.

127 विदग्धभणितिभङ्गिनिवेद्यं वस्तुनो रूपं न नियतस्वभावम् इति अवन्तिसुन्दरी । तदाह - वस्तुस्वभावोऽत्र कवेरतन्त्राः गुणागुणावुक्तिवशेन काव्ये ।

स्तुवन्निबध्नात्यमृतांशुमिन्दुं निन्दंस्तु दोषाकरमाह धूर्तः ॥ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

Cf. The same idea is emphasized by Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita in his *Śivalīlārṇava*:

यानेव शब्दान् वयमालपामः यानेव चार्थान् वयमुल्लिखामः ।

तैरेव विन्यासविशेषभ्रव्यैः सम्मोहयन्ते कवयो जगन्ति ॥ I. 13

And also,

त एव पदसङ्घातास्ता एवार्थविभूतयः ।

तथापि नव्यं भवति काव्यं ग्रन्थनकौशलात् ॥

Rasārṇavasudhākara, I. 242.

128 उभयमुपपन्नमिति यायावरीयः । *Ibid.*, p. 123.

129 P.V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 385.

130 अर्थविशेषास्त एव शब्दास्त एव परिणमन्तोऽपि ।

उक्तिविशेषः काव्यं भाषा या भवतु सा भवतु ॥ *Karpūramañjarī*, I. 8.

"To Rājaśekhara, I think, must go the credit of making important the word *Ukti*. We find in the list of *Alaṅkāras* given by Bhāmaha, *Samāsa-ukti*, *Atiśaya-ukti*, *Svabhāva-ukti*, *Viśeṣa-ukti* and *Saha-ukti*; and above all *Vakra-ukti*. In all these, we find the *viśeṣya* as *ukti* qualified by different attributes. Here it is that the conception of *ukti* was born. *Ukti* as such came to mean poetic utterance and soon there felt to be no need to qualify *Ukti* by the attribute *vakra* to mean poetic expression as a whole. Rājaśekhara, while describing the *Kāvya-puruṣa*, says that his speech is rich in *Ukti*—*Ukti caṇam te vacaḥ*. All *Alaṅkāras* are *Vakrokti* to Bhāmaha but poetic expression itself is denoted by *Ukti*."¹³¹

Thus, Rājaśekhara treated the idea of *vakrokti* in terms of *ukti* and *bhaṇiti*. His concept of *ukti* is wide enough to denote the poetic expression as a whole. Therefore, the concept of *ukti* can be equated with *bandha*, *gumpha*, *bhaṇiti* and *kavi-vyāpāra*, the synonyms of *vakrokti*.

Bhoja

Bhoja is the author of two voluminous works on *Alaṅkāraśāstra* viz., *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* and *Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharana*. The concept of *vakrokti* is analysed in detail by Bhoja in both of these works. His concept of *vakrokti* has the following implications:

- a. Poetic expression in general.
- b. Collective designation for a set of *alaṅkāras*.
- c. Poetic expressions based on *lakṣaṇā*.
- d. One of the varieties of verbal poetic figure called *vākovākya*.

These implications represent the views of Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Vāmana and Rudraṭa, respectively. But Bhoja does not follow these views blindly. Considering the merits of his predecessors' views, he treats *vakrokti* with his own modifications.

131 V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, Madras, 1978, p. 106.

It has been accepted that poetic expression is distinguished from scientific treatises as well as ordinary way of expression. But the question is what is that element which distinguishes the poetic and the non-poetic expression? Bhoja says, it is nothing but *vakratā* or poetic beauty. Hence, in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, he gives a comprehensive definition of poetry in terms of *vakratā* or *vakrokti*.¹³²

Bhoja further opines that an instance of 'धूमोज्यमग्रे:' is not an *alaṅkāra* as it is devoid of requisite beauty or *vakratā*. He cites Daṇḍin's definition of *alaṅkāra* and maintains *vakrokti* as *alaṅkāra-sāmānya-lakṣaṇa* or *kāvyaśobha* or poetic beauty in general. Hence, his concept of *vakrokti* or *alaṅkāra* is wide enough to comprise all the three varieties of *ukti* viz., *svabhāvukti*, *vakrokti* and the *rasukti*. Thus, beautiful poetic expression as a whole is considered as *vakratā* or *vakrokti*.¹³³ "Thus *Rasa*, *Dhvani*, and everything goes to make the beauty called *Vakratā* that is poetry. So Bhoja will accept *Dhvani* and consider it as holding a supreme position in poetry, ध्वनिरेव काव्ये, but at the same time he will emphasize *Vakratā*."¹³⁴

132 कः पुनरयोः काव्यवचसोः ध्वनितात्पर्ययोः विशेषः ? उच्यते –

यदवक्रं वचः शास्त्रे लोके च वच एव तत् ।

वक्रं यदर्थवादादौ तस्य काव्यमिति स्मृतिः ॥

Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, Ed, G.R. Josyer, Mysore, 1955, Vol. I, p. 221.

133 न चैतद्वाच्यं, धूमोज्यमग्रेः इत्यत्राप्यर्थान्तरन्यासः प्रसज्यते । यद्यपि धूमस्य उत्पाद्यस्य साधनसमर्थोऽग्निः, तथापि काव्यशोभाकरान् धर्मान् अलङ्कारान् प्रचक्षते इत्येतदपि सर्वालङ्कारसाधारणं लक्षणम् अनुसर्तव्यम् । अस्मिन् सति सर्वालङ्कारजातयो वक्रोक्त्यभिधानवाच्या भवन्ति । तदुक्तम् –

वक्रत्वमेव काव्यानां पराभूषेति भामहः ।

श्लेषः पुष्पाति सर्वासु प्रायो वक्रोक्तिषु श्रियम् ॥

नन्वेवं सति विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद् रसनिष्पत्तिरित्यादिना न भवितव्यमेव अलङ्कारेण, नैवम् । त्रिविधः खलु अलङ्कारवर्गः, वक्रोक्तिः, स्वभावोक्तिः, रसोक्तिरिति । Ibid, p. 438.

134 Dr. V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, Madras, 1978, p. 118.

On the other hand, Bhoja classifies the whole realm of poetic expression into three categories viz., *svabhāvokti*, *vakrokti* and the *rasokti*. *Vakrokti* happens where the figures like *upamā* etc., are dominant, while *svabhāvokti* will occur where *guṇas* get prominence; and the *rasokti* takes place where *rasa* is delineated by *vibhāva* etc. According to Bhoja, the last one i.e., *Rasokti* is the best of all the three.¹³⁵ Bhoja here uses *vakrokti* in a restricted sense of collective designation for a set of *alaṅkāras* beginning with *upamā*. Thus he uses the term *vakrokti* in a wide as well as in a restricted sense. "To avoid confusion, Bhoja restricts the word *vakrokti* to the restricted sense of figures *upamā* etc., and generally applies the name *Alaṅkāra* to the larger concept. The use of the word *vakrokti* in the larger sense is rare in Bhoja. Elsewhere, however, Bhoja uses the concept and name *vakratā* in the larger sense of poetic expression as such, forming the very distinguishing mark of poetry."¹³⁶

It has been noted that Vāmana treats *vakrokti* based on *sādhṛśya-lakṣaṇā*. In this connection a question may arise as to why only *sādhṛśya-lakṣaṇā* forms *vakrokti*. But Vāmana is silent on this point. For Bhoja, all kinds of *lakṣaṇā* come under the preview of *vakrokti*. In his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, he quotes a significant verse and holds that *lakṣaṇa* is the very life of *vakrokti*.¹³⁷

A lucid and detailed discussion on *Bhoja* and *Vakrokti* is made by Dr. V. Raghavan in this book. pp. 113-29. A lot of material from this book is used by me to write this portion.

135 वक्रोक्तिश्च रसोक्तिश्च स्वभावोक्तिश्च वाङ्मयम् ।

सर्वासु ग्राहिणीं तासु रसोक्तिं प्रतिजानते ॥ *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana*, V. 8.

त्रिविधः खलु अलङ्कारवर्गः, वक्रोक्तिः, स्वभावोक्तिः, रसोक्तिरिति ।
तत्रोपामाद्यलङ्कारप्राधान्ये वक्रोक्तिः, सोऽपि गुणप्राधान्ये स्वभावोक्तिः
विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगासु रसनिष्पत्तौ रसोक्तिरिति ।

Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, Vol. II, p. 438.

136 Dr. V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 116.

137 तदुक्तम् - अभिधेयाविनाभूत प्रतीतिर्लक्षणोच्यते ।

Besides the wide conception of *vakrokti*, Bhoja considers it as a sub-variety of a verbal poetic figure called *vākovākya*. Bhoja accepts only the *śleṣa-vakrokti* of Rudraṭa. And, it is divided by Bhoja into two kinds viz., *nirvyūḍha* (sustained) and *anirvyūḍha* (unsustained).¹³⁸

In this connection, Bhoja's treatment of *ukti* also deserves consideration. The word *ukti* is treated by Bhoja as a *guṇa*. The *ukti* of *śabdaguṇa* is defined as a peculiar and graceful turn of expression while *ukti* of *arthaguṇa* is explained as an idea found in artistic turns. It is expressed by peculiarly beautiful elaborations.¹³⁹ These two

सैषा विदग्धवक्रोक्तिजीवितं वृत्तिरिष्यते ॥ *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, Vol. I, p. 223.

Cf. "It is likely that Bhoja took the first line defining *Lakṣaṇa* from Kumārila and added to it the second line giving *Lakṣaṇa* as the life of *Vakrokti*. We need not doubt Bhoja's authorship of the second line and the idea of *Lakṣaṇā* as the life of *Vakrokti*, just because of the words तदुक्तम् introducing the verse. As already pointed out Bhoja introduces his own verses with the words तदुक्तम् It must be noted that accidentally we meet with in this verse the combination of the words *Vakrokti-jīvitam*, which gives the name of Kuntaka's work !"

Dr. V. Raghavan, *Op. cit.* p.129, fn.1.

138 उक्ति प्रत्युक्तिमद्वाक्यं वाकोवाक्यं विदुर्बुधाः।

द्वयोर्वक्रोस्तदिच्छन्ति बहूनामपि सङ्गमे ॥

ऋजुक्तिरथ वक्रोक्तिर्वैयात्योक्तिस्तथैव च।

गूढं प्रश्नोत्तरोक्ती च चित्रोक्तिश्चेति तद्विदा ॥ *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana*, II. 131-132.

139 विशिष्टा भणितिर्या स्याद् उक्तिं तां कवयो विदुः । *Ibid.*, I. 76.

Here, Ratneśvara comments:

लोकोत्तराः सन्ति हि भणितिप्रकाराः, लोकप्रसिद्धाश्च । यथा सुमोऽसीति प्रश्ने गृहे देवकुले वेत्यादि । एतत्प्रसिद्धिव्यतिक्रमेण तु या काचित् कविप्रतिभया भणितिराकृष्यते, सा भवति लोकोत्तरा । तथा च प्रतिभाकृष्टतया चमत्कारित्वाद् गुणत्वम् । अत एव कवय इत्याह । कविसहृदयानामेव तादृशोक्तिपरिचयसम्भवात् । *Ibid.*, p. 71.

and,

उक्तिर्नाम यदि स्वार्थो भङ्ग्या भाव्योऽभिधीयते ॥

अत्र अभीष्टस्य नायकनायिकासङ्गमस्य भङ्ग्या भणनमुक्तिः । *Ibid.*, I. 88.

Cf. "This is not any particularized *Guṇa* of restricted scope; it stands for charming poetic expression itself. Bhoja's definition of *Ukti* as a

classes of *ukti*, of course, are not mere *guṇas* but constitute the distinguishing mark of poetic expression.

Thus, it would be clear from the above observation that Bhoja's conception of *vakrokti* is wide enough to designate poetic expression in general. In the history of Sanskrit poetics, the concept of *vakrokti* took this status at the hands of Kuntaka and Bhoja in the post-Ānandavardhana period. Of course, there are many parallel ideas between Kuntaka and Bhoja, particularly in the treatment of *vakrokti* and *sāhitya*. But there is no evidence to prove Bhoja's familiarity with Kuntaka's work. To quote Dr. V. Raghavan:

"Bhoja takes up the *Vakrokti* from Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, independent of any other writer and without any knowledge of Kuntaka. Bhoja and Kuntaka were writing at the same time and it happens in the history and destinies of ideas and subjects that at different places, different scholars happen to work at the same idea. The current of *vakrokti* coming down from the hill of Bhāmaha had two courses. There is one culmination in Bhoja and another in Kuntaka."¹⁴⁰ But, "Some indirect knowledge of Kuntaka's theory of *vakrokti* by Bhoja is not ruled out, however, by chronology."¹⁴¹

Mahimabhaṭṭa

Mahimabhaṭṭa,¹⁴² who flourished immediately after Kuntaka, finds fault with the theory of *Vakrokti*. The main purpose of his treatise i.e.

Guṇa, in the present context, tries to narrow it but fails to do so and Ratneśvara is plain that it means the peculiar expression of infinite variety which is the creation of the poetic genius." Dr. V. Raghavan, *Op.cit.* p. 299.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

¹⁴¹ Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvitā*, Intro., p. XXVII.

¹⁴² "Mahimabhaṭṭa's work is undoubtedly a masterpiece of scholastic argumentation, exhibiting much fastidious criticism and great

Vyaktiviveka, was to demolish the theory of *Dhvani*; incidentally he takes up Kuntaka's definition of poetry and his idea of *vakrokti* for criticism. According to his criticism, the concept of *vakrokti*, which is maintained as the idea of a unique aesthetic use of poetic expression as distinct from the established mode of speech, can be identified either with *Aucitya* or with *Dhvani*.¹⁴³

"The first alternative, viz, *aucitya*, he says, is a requirement which must be taken for granted while speaking of poetry; its express statement is futile. The poet's creativity lies only in devising *vibhāvas* etc., and unless they are devised in conformity with classical rules, they cannot yield *rasa*. *Rasa* is the soul of poetry which rules out even the possibility of the slightest impropriety on the poet's part. Where there is the need for a theorist to give propriety as the differentia of poetry. Again, if the second alternative is accepted it is nothing but *Dhvani* served out again in another garb. That seems to be the reason why the divisions of *Vakratā* are identical with the divisions of *Dhvani* and the illustrations too are common to both. That *Dhvani* is proved throughout the *Vyaktiviveka* and hence no separate refutation of *vakrokti* is called for. *Vakrokti* can be classed under Inference (*anumāna*) as well as *Dhvani*."¹⁴⁴

learning of a miscellaneous kind; but its avowed object is polemical and it does not pretend to set up a new system."

S.K. De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. II, pp. 199-200.

143. शब्दार्थो सहितौ इत्यादिना शास्त्रादिप्रसिद्धशब्दार्थोपनिबन्धनव्यतिरेकि यद् वैचित्र्यं तन्मात्रलक्षणं वक्रत्वं नाम काव्यस्य जीवितमितिसहृदयमानिनः केचिदाचक्षते तदप्यसमीचीनम् । यतः प्रसिद्धोपनिबन्धनव्यतिरेकित्वमिदं शब्दार्थयो- रौचित्यमात्रपर्यवसायि स्यात्, प्रसिद्धाभिधेयार्थव्यतिरेकि प्रतीयमाना- भिव्यक्तिपरं वा स्यात् । प्रसिद्धप्रस्थानतिरेकिणः शब्दार्थोपनिबन्धनवैचित्र्यस्य प्रकारान्तरासम्भवात् ।

Vyaktiviveka, Ed. Rewaprasad Dwivedi, Varanasi, 1964, p. 142.

144 Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvitā*, Intro., p. XXI.

तत्राद्यस्तावत् पक्षो न शङ्कनीय एव, तस्य काव्यस्वरूपनिरूपणसामर्थ्यसिद्धस्य पृथगुपादानवैयर्थ्यात् । विभावाद्युपनिबन्ध एव हि कविव्यापारो नापरः । ते च

It would be clear that Mahimabhaṭṭa's criticism in the above analysis is rather based on logical grounds than on aesthetic grounds. Hence, his approach seems to be irrelevant as poetry is basically an aesthetic interaction. Only imaginative genius of sensitive readers leads them to experience the poetic meaning, and that experience is not the result of inference.¹⁴⁵ Nevertheless, Mahimabhaṭṭa has rightly comprehended the idea of Kuntaka's *vakrokti* than Vidyādhara, Jayaratha and others. On the other hand, the concept of *vakrokti* is wrongly identified with *aucitya* or *Dhvani*. *Aucitya* is a linking principle that can synthesize the poetic elements in a harmonious manner in accordance with *rasa*. *Aucitya* is an all-encompassing poetic concept but not the poetic expression or *kavi-vyāpāra* itself. In other words, *aucitya* is the governing principle of poetic expression. And the criticism that Kuntaka has modelled his work on *Dhvanyāloka* has statistical support since about forty verses are common to both.¹⁴⁶ It must be accepted that Kuntaka was much influenced by *Dhvani* theory. Probably, the close resemblance of Kuntaka's divisions of *Vakrokti* and Ānandavardhana's divisions of *Dhvani* forced Mahimabhaṭṭa to criticize so.

Mammaṭa

Mammaṭa in his *Kāvyaaprakāśa*¹⁴⁷ treats *vakrokti* as *śabdālaṅkāra*. He defines: "When a statement said in one sense is interpreted

यथाशास्त्रमुपनिबध्यमाना रसाभिव्यक्तेर्निबन्धननंभावं भजन्ते, नान्यथा । रसात्मकं च काव्यमिति कुतस्तत्रानौचित्यसंस्पर्शः सम्भाव्यते, यन्निरासार्थमित्थं काव्यलक्षणमाचक्षीरन् विचक्षणंमन्याः । द्वितीयपक्षपरिग्रहे पुनर्ध्वनेरेवेदं लक्षणमनया भङ्ग्याभिहितं भवति, अभिन्नत्वाद् वस्तुनः। अत एव चास्य त एव प्रभेदास्तान्येवोदाहरणानि तैरुपदर्शितानि ।"

145 Cf. प्रतिपत्तुन् प्रति सा प्रतिभा नानुमीयमाना अपितु तत्तदावेशेन भासमाना ।

Bhaṭṭa Gopala's *Sāhityacūḍāmaṇi* on *Kāvyaaprakāśa*, Trivandrum Edn. Vol. I, p. 279.

146 Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, *Op. cit.* p. XXII.

147 "In the *Alaṅkāra* literature the *Kāvyaaprakāśa* occupies a unique position. It sums up in itself all the activities that had been going on

differently by another person, either through pun or intonation is known as *vakrokti*.¹⁴⁸ In fact, he accepted Rudraṭa's treatment of *vakrokti* completely and gives the examples of both the *bhaṅga-śleṣa* and *kāku* varieties of it.

It is interesting to note that Śrīdhara in his commentary on *Kāvyaṣaṅkṣa* observes that Mammaṭa starts his treatment of *alaṅkāras* with *vakrokti* to show respect to the *Vakrokti* theory of Kuntaka.¹⁴⁹ But this observation of Śrīdhara seems to be his own interpretation. Nevertheless, Mammaṭa accepts one of Kuntaka's stands that the extra-ordinariness or *vaicitrya* constitutes the life of every figure of speech.¹⁵⁰

In spite of the above restricted conception of *vakrokti*, Mammaṭa treats it as the basic principle of some *alaṅkāras*. While illustrating the figure *viśeṣa*, citing Bhāmaha (II.85), he holds that everywhere with a pervue of this kind, *atiśayokti* or *vakrokti* exists as the life of the figure concerned. Because without it, generally no figure is possible.¹⁵¹

for centuries in the field of poetics; while it becomes itself a fountain-head from which fresh, streams of doctrines issue forth. Like the *Śārīrakabhāṣya* in *Vedānta* or *Mahābhāṣya* in grammar, the *Kāvyaṣaṅkṣa* becomes a starting point for future exegesis and expansion. P.V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 266.

148 यदुक्तमन्यथा वाक्यं अन्यथाऽन्येन योज्यते ।

श्लेषेण काङ्क्षा वा ज्ञेया सा वक्रोक्तिस्तथा द्विधा ॥ *Kāvyaṣaṅkṣa*, XI. 1.

149 सर्वेषामलङ्काराणां कविसंरम्भगोचरवैदग्ध्यभङ्गीभणितः स्वभावख्यापनाय वक्रोक्तिजीवितकाराभिप्रायेण प्रथमं वक्रोक्तिं लक्षयति ।

Kāvyaṣaṅkṣa with the commentary of Śrīdhara, Ed. Sivaprasad Bhattacharya, Calcutta, 1961, Vol II, p. 268.

150 वैचित्र्यं चालङ्कारः। *Kāvyaṣaṅkṣa*, Ed. A.B. Gajendragadkar, Bombay, 1939, p.40.

151 सर्वत्र एवंविधविषये अतिशयोक्तिरेव प्राणत्वेनावतिष्ठते। तां विना प्रायेण अलङ्कारत्वायोगात् । अत एवोक्तम् - सैषा सर्वैव वक्रोक्तिःइति। *Ibid*, under X.50. p. 125.

From this, one may conclude that Mammaṭa, like Bhāmaha, maintains *atiśayokti* or *vakrokti* as the underlying principle of *alaṅkāras*. All the orthodox commentators of Mammaṭa support this view and they interpret *vakrokti* in the sense of extraordinary way of figurative expression.¹⁵² But A.B. Gajendragadkar strongly opposes the above view.¹⁵³ He maintains that *atiśayokti*, here, just signifies the figure of that name and not Bhāmaha's conception of the same; and this is its natural interpretation. To quote him, "It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that *Mammaṭa* also is here speaking of *atiśayokti*, the figure, as the basis of most *alaṅkāras*, rather than of *atisayokti* in the sense of a striking expression. It is worthy to note that while Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin owing to the very wide nature of their *atiśayokti* speak of it respectively as the basis of all figures of speech and of other figures generally, Mammaṭa and Hemacandra owing to the limited scope of their *atiśayokti* state that it constitutes the life of most figures."¹⁵⁴

Ruyyaka

Ruyyaka is one of the noteworthy writers in the history of the concept of *vakrokti*. In his *Alaṅkārasarvasva*,¹⁵⁵ a standard work on

152 अतिशयेन लोकसीमातिक्रमेण उक्तिः कथनमित्यर्थः, न तु पूर्वोक्तातिशयोक्ति अलङ्कारोऽत्र विवक्षितः तस्यात्र असम्भावत् । एवं च मूलकृतं मम्मटोपाध्यायकल्पितातिशयोक्तिसामान्यलक्षणे अतिशयोक्तिपदं योगरूढम्, अत्र तु यौगिकमेवेति नास्या अलङ्कारत्वम्, किन्तु सर्वालङ्कारबीजभूतत्वमेव ।

Bālābodhinī of Vāmanācārya. pp. 906-07.

153 For detailed discussion, see, *Kāvyaaprakāśa*, Ed. A.B. Gajendragadkar, pp.701-705.

154 For detailed discussion, see, *Kāvyaaprakāśa*, Ed. A.B. Gajendragadkar, p. 704.

155 The *Alaṅkāra-sarvasva* of Ruyyaka, produced about the middle of the 12th century in Kashmir, forms a landmark in the history of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. It is the first treatise exclusively dealing with the *alaṅkāras* as such, and as accepted in the foremost school of the *Dhvani-vādins*. It has maintained its place as a standard treatise in the branch ever since, having been used not only by writers of

figures of speech, Ruyyaka treats *vakrokti* as *arthālankāra*.¹⁵⁶ He accepts Mammata's definition of *vakrokti*, though he considers it as an *arthālankāra*. Further, he illustrates both *śleṣa* and *kāku* varieties of *vakrokti*. In this connection, an important remark has been made by Ruyyaka. He says, "though the word *vakrokti* connotes collective designation for poetic figures, here it signifies the particular figure."¹⁵⁷ Hence, Ruyyaka agrees restricted sense as well as the wide sense of the term *vakrokti*.

At the very out set of his work, Ruyyaka briefly summarizes the views of previous theorists regarding the essence of poetry. In this connection, his review of Kuntaka's theory of *vakrokti* is noteworthy. He observes: "It has been said by Kuntaka that the *vakrokti* or artistic turn of speech, which is multi-dimensional in its nature, is the essence of poetry. He emphasized the artistic function of a poet and comprehended all the ideas of *Dhvani* under *upacāra-vakratā* and so on."¹⁵⁸

Anandavardhana proposes that *vyañjanā* or suggestion is the aesthetic function of all poetic languages, while "Kuntaka holds that poetic language embraces more aesthetic uses than that of

comprehensive treatises like *Viśvanātha*, author of the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, but also by writers on the exclusive topic of *Alaṅkāra* like Appayya Dīkṣita." S.S. Janaki, *Preface to Alaṅkārasarvasva of Ruyyaka* with commentary of *Sañjivini*, Meharchand Lalchhmandas, Delhi, 1965, p. I.

156 अन्यथोक्तस्य वाक्यस्य काकुक्षेषाभ्यामन्यथायोजनं वक्रोक्तिः । *Ibid.*, p. 200.

157 वक्रोक्तिशब्दश्चालङ्कारसामान्यवचनोऽपीहालङ्कारविशेषे संज्ञितः । *Ibid.*, p. 202

158 वक्रोक्तिजीवितकारः पुनः वैदग्ध्यभङ्गीभणितिस्वभावां बहुविधां वक्रोक्तिमेव प्राधान्यात्काव्यजीवितमुक्तवान्। व्यापार प्राधान्यं च काव्यस्य प्रतिपेदे । अभिधा प्रकारविशेषाः एवालङ्काराः। सत्यपि च त्रिविधे प्रतीयमाने व्यापाररूपा भणितिरेव कविसंरम्भगोचरः। उपचारवक्रतादिभिः समस्तो ध्वनिप्रपञ्चः स्वीकृतः। केवलमुक्तिवैचित्र्यजीवितं काव्यं, न व्यङ्ग्यार्थजीवितमिति तदीयं दर्शनं व्यवस्थापितम् । *Ibid.*, p.10-11.

Cf. Vidyācakravartī's comment:

यश्च वस्त्वलङ्काररसरूपः त्रिविधः प्रतीयमानोऽर्थः तत्र विद्यमानेऽपि तत्प्रत्यायनलक्षणस्य व्यापारस्यैव प्राधान्यमस्य मतमित्याह । *Ibid.*, p. 11.

vyāñjanā and gives his wider concept of *vakrokti*.¹⁵⁹ Ānandavardhana holds that *vyāṅgyārtha* or suggested sense itself is the soul of poetry while according to Kuntaka, *vakra-kavi-vyāpāra* is the soul of poetry. This is the difference between the theory of Ānandavardhana and that of Kuntaka. It is interesting to note that Abhinavagupta himself declares that *vyāñjanā-vyāpāra* itself is the soul of poetry.¹⁶⁰

Thus, Ruyyaka rightly estimates the theoretical stand of Kuntaka. But his commentator Jayaratha has misunderstood Kuntaka's stand as well as Ruyyaka's observation, and branded Kuntaka as a *Bhāktavādin*.¹⁶¹ It must be noted that according to Ruyyaka, Kuntaka comprehended all the ideas of *Dhvani* under *upacāra-vakratā* and so on. Accordingly, the early commentator Samudrabandha rightly explains Ruyyaka's stand in the light of pertinent references to the *Vakroktijīva*.¹⁶² He goes on to cite examples of *upacāra-vakratā*, *viśeṣaṇa-vakratā* and *saṃvṛti-vakratā* which cover different varieties of *Dhvani*.

159 K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīva*, Intro., p. XXVIII.

160 For detail, see, *Ibid.*, p. XIX.

161 इदानीं यदप्यन्तरस्य भक्त्यन्तर्भूतत्वमुक्तं तदपि दर्शयितुमाह - वक्रोक्तीत्यादि ।

Alaṅkārasarvasva, K.M. Edition, p. 8

Vidyādhara too follows Jayaratha: कुन्तकेन भक्तावन्तर्भावितो ध्वनिः ।

Ekavali, Ed. Dr. P. Ramachandradu, Hyderabad, 1981, p. 47.

162 उभौ शब्दार्थौ। वैदग्ध्यं विदग्धभावः, कविकर्मकौशलम् । तस्य भङ्गी विच्छित्तिः। तया भणितिः विचित्रैवाभिधा वक्रोक्तिः। अयमर्थः। शब्दार्थौ पृथगवस्थितौ न केनाप्यतिरिक्तेनालङ्कारेण योज्यते किं तु वक्रतया वैचित्र्ययोगिताया अभिधानमात्रमेवानयोरलङ्कारः, तस्यैव शोभातिशयकारित्वादिति। व्यापारप्राधान्यमिति। तदुक्तं- 'शब्दार्थौ सहितौ कारिणि' इति ! वक्रकविव्यापारो नाम शास्त्रादिप्रसिद्धशब्दार्थोपनिबन्धनव्यतिरेकि वर्णविन्यासपद पूर्वार्धप्रत्ययवाक्यप्रकरणे प्रबन्धात्मकषड्विधवक्रताविशिष्टः क्रमः । अभिधेति । तथोक्तं - 'वाक्यस्य वक्रभावो भविष्यति' इति । उपचारवक्रतादिभिरिति । आदिशब्देन विशेषणवक्रतादयः परिगृह्यन्ते ।

Alaṅkārasarvasva, TSS Edition, 1926, p. 7.

Thus, though Ruyyaka treats *vakrokti* as *arthālaṅkāra*, he is aware of its wide connotation.

Maṅkhaka

The *Sāhityamīmāṃsā* of Maṅkhaka¹⁶³ deserves importance in the history of Sanskrit poetics due to several reasons. Firstly, Maṅkhaka is the only writer who accepts Kuntaka's divisions of *vakrokti* and reproduces the original *kārikas*, long passages, *antaraśloka*s and illustrative verses from *Vakroktijīva*ta. Secondly, in connection with the concept of *sāhitya*, he agrees with that of Kuntaka. Then he was the first, as the title of his work shows, to discuss the subject of poetics under the name of *sāhitya*.

Maṅkhaka was well acquainted with *Vakroktijīva*ta of Kuntaka. Dr. V. Raghavan holds that the *Sāhityamīmāṃsā* follows the works of Bhoja.¹⁶⁴ But it differs from Bhoja's works in many respects. Maṅkhaka, of course, not only cites Bhoja but also Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Vāmana, Udbhaṭa, Kuntaka and so on. Hence, the author seems to be more a compiler than an original writer. Nevertheless, he has a peculiar way of arriving at a theory with his own modifications. It is striking that Maṅkhaka does not speak of the *vyāñjanā* function of words, but of *tātparya-vṛtti*

163 This work was published for the first time in Trivendram Sanskrit Series in 1934. This edition is based on a single manuscript and it is edited in a highly defective manner. The editor himself points out that in several places there are gaps and lacunae. The same work was edited recently by Gaurinath Shastri of Varanasi with the help of three manuscripts. It was published in 1984. There is a controversy regarding the authorship of this work. There is no sufficient evidence to know the author as the manuscripts are silent in this matter. The TSS edition and the Varanasi edition ascribed this work to Maṅkhaka. But Dr. P.V. Kane thinks that this is the work of Ruyyaka.

Vide, P.V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 283.

164 V. Rāghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*. pp. 683-86.

which gives rise to *Rasa-realization*.¹⁶⁵ Anyway, he was much influenced by the works of Bhoja and Kuntaka.

While treating the concept of *sāhitya*, Maṅkhaka reproduces long passages, *kārikas* (I. 16,17,7,8,9), *antara-ślokas* (I. 34-40), and the illustrative verses (I. 19-20, 9-11, 21,24,25,27,28,30,31,33) from the *Vakroktijīvita*.¹⁶⁶ And, he concludes his review with the remark that this view of Kuntaka does not differ from that of his own. Still one can notice a slight difference between them. According to Kuntaka, *sāhitya* or the embellished word and meaning is poetry, while Maṅkhaka holds that *pariṣkāra-viśiṣṭa-sāhitya* is poetry.¹⁶⁷

Again, he quotes the *kārikas* of *Vakroktijīvita* (I.11-15), which deal with *svabhāvokti* as *alaṅkārya* or embellished.¹⁶⁸ Immediately after this, as many as twenty *alaṅkāras* are included under *vakrokti*.¹⁶⁹ Then, he cites the major varieties of *vakrokti* of Kuntaka and adds his own variety i.e. *Dhvani-vakratā* to them.¹⁷⁰ It must be noted that he

165 अपदार्थोऽपि वाक्यार्थो रसस्तात्पर्यवृत्तिः । *Sāhityamīmāṃsā*,
Ed. Gaurinath Shastri, Varanasi, 1984, p.100.

166 *Ibid.*, pp. 16-20.

167 एतन्मतमपि प्रायो मतमस्माकमश्रुते ।

अभेदः ख्याप्यते तत्र किन्तु साहित्यकाव्ययोः ॥

एतन्मतमप्यस्मन्मतमेवाप्रोति । इदमन्तरम् परिष्कारः साहित्यमिति तेषां मतम्, वयं तु शब्दार्थयोः सम्मेलनमात्रमुक्तिरूपं साहित्यं तच्छास्त्राख्यानादिसाधारणम्, अन्यत् परिष्कारविशिष्टं तत् काव्यमिति मन्यामहे । *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

168 *Ibid.*, p. 116.

169 प्रथन्ते कविवाक्येषु वक्राविंशतिरुक्तयः ।

विवक्षा या विशेषस्य लोकसीमातिवर्तिनी ॥

असावतिशयोक्तिः स्यादेषा वक्रोक्तिर्जीवितम् ।

सा च प्रायो गुणानां वा क्रियाणां बोधकल्प्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, VI. 329-30

170 *Ibid.*, pp. 133-135

At the very out set of this section he says-

ध्वनिवर्णपदार्थेषु वाक्ये प्रकरणे तथा ।

प्रब्रध्नेऽप्याहुराचार्याः केचिद् वक्रत्वमाहितम् ॥ *Ibid.*, p. 133

concludes this section with the remark that the thirty-six *lakṣaṇas* of Bharata can be included in the realm of *Vakrokti*.¹⁷¹

It is interesting to note that *Sāhityamīmāṃsā* cites Bhaṭṭanayaka's stand i.e., *vyāpāra-prādhānya-vāda* in the beginning of this section;¹⁷² then Kuntaka's divisions of *vakrokti* is cited, and at the end he speaks about Bharata's *lakṣaṇas* and includes them under *vakrokti*. From this, it may be concluded that there is an underlying thread of unity among these concepts viz., Bharata's *lakṣaṇa*, Bhaṭṭanāyaka's *vyāpāra* and the *vakrokti* of Kuntaka.

Apart from these references to *vakrokti*, *Sāhityamīmāṃsā* states that *guṇas* and *alankāras* acquire charmingness by introducing *vakrokti*.¹⁷³ He also declares that the specific way of a poet's expression leads to *rasa* realization.¹⁷⁴

Thus, Maṅkhaka's *Sāhityamīmāṃsā* is an important work in the history of the concept of *vakrokti*. Indeed, there is no advancement in the treatment of the concept. But he uses the

Anyway Kuntaka does not treat the ध्वनिवक्रता.

171 व्यतिरेकेण षट्-त्रिंशल्लक्षणान्यपि ।

ऊर्ध्वरेखादिवत् काव्ये केचिदाचक्षते बुधाः ॥

अन्तर्भवन्ति तेष्वेव तानि किं शब्दविस्तरैः । *Ibid.*, p. 135

172 शब्दप्राधान्यमाश्रित्य

अतः शब्दार्थयोर्यस्मिन्नापाद्य गुणतां कविः ।

उक्तेः प्राधान्यमादध्यात् काव्यस्योच्छ्वसितं हि तत् । *Ibid.*, p. 133

173 गुणालङ्कारवर्गस्य तद्वत् काव्यावलम्बिनः ।

वक्रोक्तिविनिवेशेन काचिज्जायेत रम्यता॥

उक्तं हि -

उपर्युपरि काव्योक्तिः कवेः स्फुरति यद्वशात् ।

भूषाः प्रयान्ति नवतां लता इव मधुश्रिया॥ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

Here he says.....वक्रोक्तिश्चित्तहारिणी ।

174 तत्तद्रसाविनाभूतविभावादिसमर्पकः ।

विशिष्टो हि कवेर्गुम्फो रसस्य प्रतिपादकः ॥ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

term in its wide sense and accepts Kuntaka's conception of *vakrokti*. And he always refers to Kuntaka with much reverence.

Hemacandra and later theorists

Hemacandra too, like Rudraṭa, considers *vakrokti* as *śabdālankāra*.¹⁷⁵ He illustrates both the *sabhaṅga* and *abhaṅga* varieties of *vakrokti*. But, Hemacandra, following *Rājaśekhara*, does not accept *kāku-vakrokti*. Being a follower of Ānandavardhana, he includes *kāku* under *guṇībhūta-vyaṅgya*.¹⁷⁶

After Hemacandra, the word *vakrokti* signified the particular figure of either *śabda* or *artha*. The *Alaṅkāra* theorists of this period follow either Mammaṭa (who follows Rudraṭa) or Ruṣyaka in the treatment of *vakrokti*. There is, of course, no advancement or difference in conceptual scheme. Anyway, these theorists' views are mentioned briefly as they have their own historical importance.

Viśvanātha, however, follows Mammaṭa completely and treats *vakrokti* as *śabdālankāra*.¹⁷⁷ Viśveśvara,¹⁷⁸ Narendraprabhasūri¹⁷⁹ too, follow Mammaṭa. On the other hand, Vidyānātha,¹⁸⁰ Jayadeva,¹⁸¹ Appayya Dīkṣita,¹⁸² the author of

175 उक्तस्यान्येनान्यथाश्लेषादुक्तिर्वक्रोक्तिः । *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*, p. 280.

176 काकुवक्रोक्तिस्त्वलङ्कारत्वेन न वाच्यः । पाठधृत्वात् । तथा च अभिप्रायवान् पाठधर्मः काकुः स कथमलङ्कारी स्यादिति यायावरीयः, गुणीभूतव्यङ्ग्यप्रभेदः एव चायम् शब्दस्पृष्टत्वेनार्थान्तरप्रतीतिहेतुत्वात् । *Ibid.*, p. 281-82.

177 अन्यस्यान्यार्थकं वाक्यमन्यथा योजयेद्यदि ।

अन्यः श्लेषेण काक्वा वा सा वक्रोक्तिस्ततो द्विधा ॥ *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, X.11.

178 उक्तिप्रत्युक्तिमद्वाक्यं वाकोवाक्यमितीरितम् । *Camatkāracandrikā*, p. 145.

It is interesting to note that *Viśveśvara* following Bhoja, remarks on *Vakrokti*, *Swabhāvokti* and *Rasokti* as follows:

चिरं जीवतु वक्रोक्तिः स्वभावोक्तिश्च तिष्ठताम् ।

रसोक्तेरेव काव्यानि ग्राहिणीति मतिर्मम ॥ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

179 वाक्यं यत्रान्यथैवोक्तमन्यो व्याकुरुतेऽन्या ।

काक्वा श्लेषेण वा तस्मात् सा वक्रोक्तिर्द्विधा मता ॥ *Alaṅkāramohodadhī*, VII.23.

180 अन्यथोक्तस्य वाक्यस्य काक्वा श्लेषेण वा भवेत् ।

Alaṅkāraṁaṇihāra,¹⁸³ Devaśaṅkara,¹⁸⁴ Amṛtānandayogin¹⁸⁵ and others follow Ruyyaka and treat *vakrokti* as *arthālaṅkāra*.

Thus, in Sanskrit poetics, the theory of *Vakrokti* shows a remarkable divergence of conception and treatment. It is, of course, the most confusing chapter in the history of *Alaṅkāraśāstra* as there is a wide difference of opinion on the concept from writer to writer upto medieval Sanskrit poetics. And, it is interesting to note that the concept of *vakrokti* took altogether a new significance in the *Vakroktijīvoita* of Kuntaka. In post-Ānandavardhana period, this concept was taken up for a detailed discussion by Kuntaka, Bhoja and Abhinavagupta who belonged to the same age. How did this older concept reappear in this age as an important aspect of poetry is an interesting study. Of these three writers, it was Kuntaka who dedicated his whole work for the treatment of *vakrokti*, in which the term *vakrokti* got the supreme position. This matter, of course, deserves a discussion at some length which forms the subject of the following chapter.

अन्यथा योजनं यत्र सा वक्रोक्तिर्निगद्यते ॥ *Pratāparudrīya*, VIII.115.

181 वक्रोक्तिः श्लेषेकाकुभ्यां वाच्यार्थान्तरकल्पनम् ।

मुञ्च मानं दिनं प्राप्तं मन्द नन्दी हरान्तिके ॥ *Candrāloka*, V. 111.

182 वक्रोक्तिः श्लेषकाकुभ्यामपरार्थप्रकल्पनम् । *Kuvalayānanda*, p. 259.

183 The author, illustrating in detail with twenty one beautiful examples, concludes with this remark: यद्यप्येवं विधा वक्रोक्तिः प्राक्तनैरवाक्तनैर्वा न विवेचिता, तथापि तादृशचमत्कृति सद्भावाद्वक्रोक्ति - रेवेयमित्यस्माभिर्व्यवेचि । *Alaṅkāraṁaṇihāra*, Ed. R. Shama Shastri.

Mysore, 1923. Vol. III, pp. 305-16.

184 श्लेषेण काङ्क्षा वा यत्रत्वर्थान्तरं प्रकल्प्यते ।

वक्रोक्तिस्तत्र विज्ञेया गूढोक्तेर्हि विलक्षणा ॥ *Alaṅkāraṁaṇijūṣā*, Verse, 123.

185 कोपात्प्रियवदुक्तिर्या वक्रोक्तिः कथ्यते यथा । *Alaṅkārasaṅgraha*, VI. 49.

This definition is different from that of others. This is the example of his *vakrokti*:

साधु दूति पुनः साधु कर्तव्यं किमतः परम् ।

यन्मदर्थे विभिन्नासि दन्तैरपि नखैरपि ॥

Kuntaka's Concept of *Vakrokti*: An Exposition

Kuntaka [c.950 C.E.]¹⁸⁶ is known for his literary sensibility, refined taste, deep insight and original thoughts. His *Vakroktijīva* is an epoch-making work in the history of the concept of *Vakrokti*. He appeared on the scene when the *alaṅkāraśāstra* had almost reached its final stage of development. Ānandavardhana had ably synthesized the former literary theories and put them in a new order and established the importance of *Rasa* and *Dhvani* in poetry. Kuntaka, on the other hand, made an attempt to harmonise his own views with the main teachings of different schools and put forward his *Vakrokti* theory. The several literary concepts like *guṇa*, *alaṅkāra*, *sāhitya*, *mārga*, etc. found a meaningful explanation under the *Vakrokti* theory. And, this new *Vakrokti*-synthesis makes Kuntaka one of the first rate literary thinkers, next only to Ānandavardhana.

In the whole range of Sanskrit poetics, the term *vakrokti* took altogether a new significance and the highest position as the all-pervading poetic concept in Kuntaka's *Vakroktijīva*. He revived

186 'Kuntaka has quoted profusely from Rājasekhara's works and Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka*, indicating that he is later than 900 C.E. He has not quoted from any works of Abhinavagupta, whose literary activity extended between 980 C.E. to 1020 C.E. but he is severely criticised by Mahima Bhaṭṭa of the 11th century. This narrows down the date of Kuntaka's *Vakroktijīva* to about 950 C.E.' K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīva*, Intro., p.XIV.

the concept from mere verbal poetic figure to the essence of poetry. Kuntaka is the only writer who dedicated his whole work for the treatment of *vakrokti*. He not only explains but also explores the multi-dimensional aspects of *vakrokti*. Hence, his name is so closely associated with the concept. "His *vakrokti* is an inevitable and deliberate departure from the empirical linguistic mode to achieve aesthetic effect. It is a deviation from common parlance dictated by the very necessities of poetic facts and it is not an intellectual but an imaginative activity."¹⁸⁷

Now a question may arise as to why did Kuntaka start a new poetic theory though Ānandavardhana had ably established the *Rasa-Dhvani* theory which may be accepted by one and all? After Ānandavardhana, we can see mainly two groups of theorists viz., *pro-Dhvani* theorists and *anti-Dhvani* theorists. Abhinavagupta, Mammaṭa, Viśvanātha, etc. are the noteworthy writers of *Dhvani* school, while Bhaṭṭanāyaka, Mahimabhaṭṭa and others are regarded as *anti-Dhvani* theorists. But Kuntaka stands outside the groups mentioned above as he neither denies *Dhvani* in general nor fully satisfied with it.

At the very outset of his work, Kuntaka himself declares that the main purpose of the fresh treatise, though many other works exist already in the field,¹⁸⁸ is to establish the idea of *vaicitrya* or strikingness which causes extraordinary charm.¹⁸⁹ This very assertion is enough to say that Kuntaka was not entirely satisfied with the theories of his predecessors including that of Ānandavardhana. In fact, being an admirer of Ānandavardhana, he found that *Dhvani*-synthesis and elaboration of *Rasaucitya* were perfectly justified. But Kuntaka does not accept everything taken

187 K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvita*, Intro., p. XXXIX.

188 यद्यपि सन्ति शतशः काव्यालङ्कारास्तथापि न कुतश्चिदप्येवंविधवैचित्र्यसिद्धिः।
Vakroktijīvita, p.3.

189 लोकोत्तरचमत्कारकारिवैचित्र्यसिद्धये । *Ibid.*, p. 2.

for granted. He thought that some of the views of his predecessors could never do justice to all the manifold instances of poetry.

First of all, he found fault with Ānandavardhana regarding the restricted applications of *alaṅkāras*. "The *Dhvani* theorists had either dismissed the poetic figures as mere *vāg-vikalpas*, or considered them only as heightening the charm of the unexpressed element in poetry."¹⁹⁰ On the other hand, at the time of Rudraṭa, *alaṅkāra*-analysis was lost its aesthetic value and ended in worthless erudition. The later *Alaṅkāra* theorists were interested in hairsplitting divisions of *alaṅkāras*. Even Ānandavardhana did not make any attempt to reinterpret the particular *alaṅkāras*.¹⁹¹ Hence, there was a need of defining each and every *alaṅkāra* with a view to aesthetic purview and poetic imagination. Therefore, Kuntaka argued against their views and redefined them. Thus, his main purpose was to lay an emphasis on the inner value of *alaṅkāras* which are the part and parcel of poetry.

Further, Kuntaka criticises earlier rhetoricians who consider *svabhāvokti* as an *alaṅkāra* and forms his new theory of *svabhāvokti* as *alaṅkārya*. Again, Kuntaka shows his originality in the analysis of *mārga* or *rīti*. He thought the regional differences cannot explain different *rītis* or styles and the gradation of them is also incorrect. In the same way, *rīti* cannot be the inherent attribute of word and sense. But the different styles can be satisfactorily explained on the basis of the nature of poets.

Kuntaka does not accept the definitions of *Rasavadalaṅkāra* of earlier writers including that of Ānandavardhana. He does not admit the dual position of *rasa* as synthesized by *Dhvani* theorists. For him, *rasa* is always of primary importance and cannot subordinate to anything else; it is always *alaṅkārya* or

190 S.K. De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. II, p. 188.

191 Cf. तत्र वाच्यः प्रसिद्धो यः प्रकारैरुपमादिभिः ।

बहुधा व्याकृतः सोऽन्यैः ततो नेह प्रतन्यते॥ *Dhvanyāloka*, I. 3.

adorned. Again, Kuntaka disagrees on the fundamental gradations of poetry as held by Ānandavardhana viz., the best, the next best and the third rate. He thinks that there are no such gradations in poetry.

Poetry is nothing but the creation of a poet. Hence, Kuntaka started to analyse poetry from the standpoint of poetic creativity. The activity of *pratibhā* is more comprehensive than *Dhvani*. *Kavi-pratibhā* can manifest in a thousand and one ways; the major ways are of *Dhvani*. Thus, it is not chained to *Dhvani* only. Therefore, the name chosen to designate this boundless poetic process was *vakrokti*. Thus, Kuntaka attempts to make a new synthesis of all phases of poetic expression under the comprehensive term *vakrokti*. "Of all the writers of Sanskrit poetics, Kuntaka appears to have been fully alive to this fact and this is why he has tried to explain his theory of poetry as broadly as possible, keeping himself free from the hard-and-fast technicalities of the orthodox schools, accepting them only so far as it was necessary for the sake of maintaining a continuity of the *Śāstra* harmonizing his theory with the main teachings of the different schools of speculations and of securing for his work a definite place in the history of the discipline."¹⁹²

Denotation and Connotation of 'Vakrokti'

It has already been observed in the previous chapter that the concept of *vakrokti* shows remarkable divergence both in conception and in treatment. The very concept of *vakrokti* is so multi-dimensional and all-inclusive that the modern scholars too differ so to say in its interpretation. Thus, V. Raghavan defines *vakrokti* as a 'striking, deviating expression'.¹⁹³ 'In a simple way, it may be understood as deviation in expression from the common place. This deviation may be due to various causes, but when the

192 P.C. Lahiri, *Concepts of Rīti and Guṇa in Sanskrit Poetics*, Dacca, 1937, p. 118.

193 V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 114.

deviation is effective, it is termed as *vakrokti*', comments Kuppaswami Shastri.¹⁹⁴ Gnoli calls it 'the curved or oblique diction peculiar to poetic language.'¹⁹⁵ K. Krishnamoorthy writes, "*Vakrokti* is not just an out-of-the way expression or poetic turn; it is the masterly art underlying every element of poetry and involving effortless and spontaneous transformation of the prosaic raw-materials into things of consummate beauty."¹⁹⁶ Damodar Thakur says, "*Vakrokti* is a tone arising from an experience and a precise position within that experience, and the tone controls the words and their meanings, and their ordering into forms. Such a tone cannot be expressed by the language of the *Śāstras*."¹⁹⁷ Thus, Kuntaka's theory of *vakrokti* encompasses poetic language itself.

Now referring to Kuntaka's own words. *Vakrokti* is an inevitable departure from the empirical mode of expression to achieve aesthetic effect. It is a deviation from the established way of expression and, hence, considered as artistic turn of speech having beauty par-excellence due to poetic creativity.¹⁹⁸ Thus, the

194 Kuppaswami Shastri, *Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit*, Madras, 1945, p. 28.

195 Gnoli, *Udbhaṭa's Commentary on the Kāvya-lāṅkāra of Bhāmaha*, Rome, 1962, p. XXIII.

196 K. Krishnamoorthy, *New Bearings of Indian Literary Theory and Criticism*, Ahmedabad, 1982, p. 59, fn.4.

197 Damodar Thakur, 'Vakroktijīvitam and Modern English Criticism' in *Literary Criticism: European and Indian Traditions*, Ed. C.D. Narasimhaiah, Mysore, 1965, p. 83.

198 वक्रो योऽसौ शास्त्रादिप्रसिद्धशब्दार्थोपनिबन्धव्यतिरेकी षट्प्रकारवक्रताविशिष्टः कविव्यापारः । *Vakroktijīvita*, p. 13.

अतिक्रान्तप्रसिद्धव्यवहारसरणिः । *Ibid.*, p. 192.

वक्रोक्तिः प्रसिद्धाभिधानव्यतिरेकिणी विचित्रैवाभिधा।

वक्रोक्तिरेव वैदग्ध्यभङ्गीभणितिरुच्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 20.

And also, cf.

प्रसिद्धं मार्गमुत्सृज्य यत्र वैचित्र्यसिद्धये ।

ultimate emphasis is laid on *kavi-kauśala* and this creative imagination of a poet is elsewhere designated as *vakra-kavi-vyāpāra* or *kavi-vyāpāra-vakratva*, which is the ultimate source of poetry. The ultimate aim of *vakrokti* is aesthetic appeal which is attained by the extra-ordinary charm. The pithy phrase of Kuntaka i.e., *lokottara-camatkāra-kāri-vaicitrya-siddhaye* is the essential characteristic of *vakrokti*. Hence, the term refers to a kind of heightened expression. Thus, Kuntaka's *vakrokti*, in its wide sense, is a synonym for the principle of beauty of poetic language itself. The term is often equated with *vaicitrya*, *vicchitti*, *cārutva*, *camatkāra* and so on.¹⁹⁹ Therefore, the scope of *vakrokti* is as wide as that of *kāvya* itself. *Vakrokti* alone makes poetry what it is, and it is regarded as the very life of poetry.

Taking this broad connotation of *vakrokti*, Kuntaka declares that *vakrokti* is the only possible *alaṅkāra* in poetry.²⁰⁰ It is to be noted here, the term *alaṅkāra* as used by him in connection with poetry in its general sense. It does not connote the poetic figures but it is of a wide connotation; it is another name for the all-encompassing *vakrokti*. The poetic figures constitute only one of the many varieties of *vakrokti* i.e., *vākya-vakratā*. Apart from this broad connotation, Kuntaka rarely uses the term in its restricted senses viz., the general

अन्यथैवोच्यते सोऽर्थः सा वक्रोक्तिरुदाहृता ॥ *Vyaktiviveka*, I. 69.

199 *Vide*, तद्विदाह्लादकारित्वलक्षणं वक्रत्वमभिव्यज्यते ।

Vakrokijīva, p. 29.

वक्रता भणितिविच्छित्तिः । *Ibid.*, p. 53.

वैचित्र्यं नाम यदलौकिकच्छायातिशययोगित्वेन भूषणोपनिबन्धः । *Ibid.*, p. 57.

अतीवरमणीयत्वाद्वक्रत्वमावहति । *Ibid.*, p. 106.

विच्छित्या वैदग्ध्यभङ्ग्या..... । *Ibid.*, p. 196.

वैचित्र्यं नूतनचमत्कार इति यावत् । *Ibid.*, p. 268.

तद्विदाह्लादकारित्वमेव वक्रत्वम् । *Ibid.*, p. 37.

200 उभावेतावलङ्कार्यौ तयोः पुनरलङ्कृतिः ।

वक्रोक्तिरेव वैदग्ध्यभङ्गीभणितिरुच्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 10.

principal underlying all figures of speech²⁰¹ and figures of speech.²⁰²

Thus, Kuntaka's *vakrokti* theory emerges as a viable theory of the language of poetry par-excellence. The expression has to exhibit the primary requisite of an all-pervading beauty which alone makes poetic expression distinct. Without this primary beauty or *vakratā*, poetry will be mere mundane speech. "Therefore, even *Dhvani* will cease to be poetic when it is not the case of an expression which is essentially beautiful. This insistence on an essential and primary beauty lying at the very basis of poetic expression is accepted by Abhinavagupta also. This *guṇālaṅkāra-aucitya-saundarya* of the *śabdārtha* or the *śarīra* of poetry is held by others as comprehended in the composite concept of *vakratā*, *vakrokti* or *alaṅkāra*. This is a strong point for the *vakrokti* and the *tātparyā* schools of thought and a somewhat weak point for the *dhvanivādins*."²⁰³

Concept of Poetry

Originally, poetry is a linguistic art. The poetic language represents the most conscious use of language. According to Matthew Arnold, 'Poetry is the most delightful and perfect form of utterance that human words can reach.' Thus, *kavi-vyāpāra* or *vakrokti* or creativity of a poet plays an important role in the creation of poetry. Hence, Kuntaka analysed poetry from the standpoint of the creativity of a poet.

In connection with the nature of poetry, three important statements have been made by Kuntaka. They are:

- i. कवेः कर्म काव्यम् । (Poetry is poet's activity)²⁰⁴
- ii. सालङ्कारस्य काव्यता । (Poetry consists in ornamentation)²⁰⁵

201 वक्रोक्तिः सकलालङ्कारसामान्यं विषयो यस्य तत्तथोक्तम् । *Ibid.*, p. 49.

202 वक्रोक्तिवैचित्र्यम् अलङ्कारविचित्रभावः । *Ibid.*, p. 60.

203 V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, pp. 117-118.

204 *Vakroktijivita*, p. 2.

- iii. शब्दार्थौ सहितौ वक्रकविव्यापारशालिनि।
बन्धे व्यवस्थितौ काव्यं तद्विदाह्लादकारिणि ॥²⁰⁶

(Poetry is that word and sense together enshrined in a style revealing the artistic creativity of the poet on the one hand and giving aesthetic delight to the man of taste on the other.)*²⁰⁷

Of these, the first two appear to be general statements; and the last one is technically the definition of poetry. But they jointly lead us to some important conclusions:

- i. Primarily, poetry is an art created by the poet.
- ii. Alankāra is an essential element of poetry and it depends upon the individual power of a poet.
- iii. The undivided whole of adorned and the adornment is poetry.
- iv. The poet's genius determines its own form to express the intended idea. Thus, the question of ornamentation does not arise. Whereas the poet's experience itself is sālankṛta or ornamented.
- v. The ultimate aim of this poetic process is to produce an extra-ordinary pleasure. Thus, poetry is viewed from the two extreme points of poetic circuit. It is *vakra-kavi-vyāpāra-śālīni* from the standpoint of the creative artist and *tadvidāhlada-kāriṇi* from the refined reader's point.

As we know, Kuntaka for the first time defined poetry in a systematic manner. He defines and illustrates each and every word of the definition in a lucid way. What is more, the whole *Vakroktijīvita* is an illustration of his definition of poetry. The first chapter deals with the distinguished features of poetic word, meaning, *sāhitya* and *bandha*; it also explains the varieties of *vakrokti*

205 *Ibid.*, p. 6.

206 *Ibid.*, I. 7.

207 All the translations from the *Vakroktijīvita* are by Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy and asterisk mark [*] is put for identification.

in brief. The remaining chapters are reserved for the detailed discussion of the divisions and subdivisions of *vakrokti*. In doing so, Kuntaka adopted the scientific method as he gives the general definition first, which is followed by the particular definition.²⁰⁸

Let us observe the definition of poetry of Kuntaka. The word and sense are considered as the fundamental elements of poetry. Thus, most of the theorists thought that the theory of poetry revolves on these two pivotal aspects. Consequently, Kuntaka too holds that word and sense blended together constitute poetry. He boldly states that neither beautiful word alone nor beautiful content alone can constitute poetry.²⁰⁹ Mere jingling of words without pleasant sense indicates poverty of imagination of the poet.²¹⁰ Similarly, a striking idea devoid of artistic beauty of words cannot deserve the name poetry.²¹¹ The charmingness must be present, both in word and sense as is oil in each seed. Therefore, the stand upheld by Kuntaka is that both word and sense constitute poetry in their unity.²¹²

Nature of poetic *Śabda* and *Artha*

In poetry, like other discourses, *śabda* or word enjoys a unique status. But word does not exist without *artha* or sense. Word having co-equal importance with sense forms an organic whole. To indicate this indissoluble union of these two, Hindu myth has a concept, i.e., *ardhanārīśvara*. Kālidāsa compares the relation of *śabda* and *artha* with the union of divine couple viz., Pārvaṭī and Parameśvara.²¹³ Thus, *artha* without *śabda* is intangible and *śabda* without *artha* turns absurd. Kuntaka rightly observes: "A

208 तयोः सामान्यविशेषलक्षणद्वारेण स्वरूपनिरूपणं क्रियते। *Ibid.*, p. 6.

209 न शब्दस्यैव रमणीयताविशिष्टस्य केवलस्य काव्यत्वम्, नाप्यर्थस्येति। *Ibid.*, p. 9.

210 प्रतिभादारिद्र्यदैन्यात्। *Ibid.*, p. 7.

211 वस्तुमात्रं च शब्दशोभातिशयशून्यं न काव्यव्यपदेशमर्हति। *Ibid.*, p. 7.

212 तेन शब्दार्थौ द्वौ संमिलितौ काव्यमिति स्थितम्। *Ibid.*, p. 9.

213 वागर्थविव सम्पृक्तौ वागर्थप्रतिपत्तये।

जगतः पितरौ वन्दे पार्वतीपरमेश्वरौ ॥ *Raghuvamśa*, I.1.

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 poet.^{*11214}

In poetry, a word has three powers viz., *abhidhā* or denotation, *lakṣaṇā* or indication and *vyañjanā* or suggestion. Similarly, the meanings which a word conveys by means of these powers, are known as *vācya* or expressed, *lakṣya* or indicated and *vyañgya* or suggested, respectively. Basically, the word is one and due to its different powers the divisions are formed in it. The function of indicative and suggestive words is also to communicate and consequently they also can be treated, though metaphorically, as *vācakas*. Similarly, the indicated and the suggested meanings are *vācya*s on the similarity of being communicated.²¹⁵

The word and meaning are generally regarded as the signifier and the signified in the practical world. But this does not enough to serve the purpose of poetry. Therefore, Kuntaka proceeds to discuss the nature of word and meaning in poetry. It is regarded as poetic word that which alone can fully convey the poet's intended idea out of many alternatives.²¹⁶ Any and every word is not capable to convey the intended idea. The real office of a poet is to find out the most appropriate word which can fully convey the intended meaning. Thus, the unique feature of poetic word lies in the fact that it does not

214 अर्थः समर्थवाचकासद्भावे स्वात्मना स्फुरन्नपि मृतकल्प एवावतिष्ठते । शब्दोऽपि वाक्योपयोगिवाच्यासम्भवे वाच्यान्तरवाचकः सन् वाक्यस्य व्याधिभूतः प्रतिभाति। *Vakroktijivita*, p. 13.

215 द्योतकव्यञ्जकावपि शब्दौ सम्भवतः, तदसङ्ग्रहान्नाव्यसि, यस्मात्प्रतीतिकारित्वसामान्यादुपचारात्तावपि वाचकावेव । एवं द्योत्यव्यङ्ग्ययोरप्यर्थयोः प्रत्येयत्वसामान्यादुपचाराद्वाच्यत्वमेव । *Ibid.*, p. 14.

216 शब्दो विवक्षितार्थैकवाचकोऽन्येषु सत्त्वपि । *Ibid.*, I. 9.

permit any substitution.²¹⁷ This unalterable nature of words in a poetic expression had already been noticed by Ānandavardhana. He observes, "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."²¹⁸ He repeatedly mentions the unsubstitutional nature of a word in the province of *Dhvanikāvya*.

In fact, what Kuntaka's novelty remains is his interesting and lucid illustration of this idea. The uniqueness of expression may be illustrated with a famous verse from the *Kumārasambhava* (V.71) of Kālidāsa:

द्वयं गतं संप्रति शोचनीयतां समागमप्रार्थनया कपालिनः ।

कला च सा कान्तिमती कलावतस्त्वमस्य लोकस्य च नेत्रकौमुदी ॥

[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 moon and you (Pārvaṭī), the moon, light to the eyes of the world.]²¹⁹

Kuntaka critically analysed the artistic beauty and the significance of the words used in this verse in the following way:

"Though a thousand and one synonyms are possible to refer to the Almighty Lord Śiva, the poet has chosen here the word 'one whom only skulls adorn' in order that it may suggest disgust through a word which serves here as a pointer to the primary sentiment of the 'horrid'. And, he succeeds in endowing the verse with artistic beauty of expression. Again, the words 'now' and 'two' are extremely beautiful because

217 Vāmana appears to be the first rhetorician to notice this idea and he considered this as *Śabdapāka*. Vide,

यत्पदानि त्यजन्त्येव परिवृत्तिसहिष्णुताम् ।

तं शब्दन्यासनिष्णाताः शब्दपाकं प्रचक्षते ॥ *Kāvya-lāṅkāra-sūtra*, under I. iii. 15.

218 सोऽर्थस्तद्वक्तिसामर्थ्ययोगी शब्दश्च कश्चन ।

यन्नतः प्रत्यभिज्ञेयौ तौ शब्दार्थौ महाकवेः ॥ *Dhvanyāloka*, I. 8.

219 Translation is by R.D. Karmarkar.

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 'craze 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.*²²⁰

Thus, all the words in the verse are very beautiful and most appropriate. They are capable of revealing the poetic meaning intended, and to please the man of taste by their extraordinary charm. Kuntaka again insists on the point in a nut-shell that the proper definition of a word or expression is the capacity to convey the particular meaning intended by the poet.²²¹

Then *artha* in poetry is that which alone possesses such refreshing natural charm as to create delight in the hearts of the refined readers.²²² An object may be qualified by many attributes,

220 अत्र परमेश्वरवाचकशब्दसहस्रसम्भवेऽपि कपालिन इति बीभत्सरसालम्बनविभाववाचकः शब्दो जुगुप्सास्पदत्वेन प्रयुज्यमानः कामपि वाचकवक्रांतं विदधाति । 'सम्प्रति' 'द्वयं' चेत्यतीव रमणीयम् - यत् किल पूर्वमेका सैव दुर्व्यसनदूषितत्वेन शोचनीया जाता, सम्प्रति पुनस्त्वया तस्यास्तथाविध-दुरध्यवसायसाहाय्यं कमिवारब्धमित्युपहस्यते । 'प्रार्थना' शब्दोऽप्यतितरां रमणीयः यस्मात् काकतालीययोगेन तत् समागमः कदाचिन्न वाच्यतावहः प्रार्थना पुनरवात्यन्तं कौलीनकलङ्ककारिणी । 'सा च' 'त्वं च' इति द्वयोरप्यनुभूयमान-परस्परस्पर्धिलावण्यातिशयप्रतिपादनपरत्वेनोपात्तम् । 'कलावतः' 'कान्तिमती' इति च मतुप्प्रत्ययेन द्वयोरपि प्रशंसा प्रतीयत इत्येषां प्रत्येकं कश्चिदप्यर्थः शब्दान्तराभिधेयतां नोत्सहते । *Vakroktijīvita*, p. 15-16.

221 कविविवक्षितविशेषाभिधानक्षमत्वमेव वाचकत्वलक्षणम् । *Ibid.*, p. 16.

222 अर्थः सहृदयाह्लादकारिस्वस्पन्दसुन्दरः । *Ibid.*, p. 14.

but a poet has to select only one of them, which is capable of delighting the sensitive readers.²²³ "Its capacity to delight is inferred on the basis of the rare grandeur added to the subject in the poet's treatment or the force added to the literary sentiment developed."²²⁴ For instance:

भर्तुर्मित्रं प्रियमविधवे विद्धि मामम्बुवाहं
तत्सन्देशाद्धृनिहितादागतं त्वत्समीपम् ।
यो वृन्दानि त्वरयति पथि श्राम्यतां प्रोषितानां
मन्द्रस्निग्धैर्ध्वनिभिरबलावेणिमोक्षोत्सुकानि ॥ *Meghadūta*, 96

(O lady, take me to be a bosom friend of your husband, who is living yet. I am the cloud come to you with his message treasured up in my heart. It is I, as you know, who urge the tarrying travellers on the road into the arms of their pining beloved by my majestic and deep rumblings, in order that they might add toilet to their unkempt hair).²²⁵

This verse from the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa is the part of the message entrusted by *Yakṣa* to be carried out by his friend cloud. According to Kuntaka, this verse is the very life of the work viz., the *Meghadūta*. To quote his beautiful analysis: "Here we have, in the first place, a very significant vocative (*avidhave*) which infuses confidence in the mind of the person addressed. The qualification that he is her husband's friend points to his respectability. The intimacy of friendship is reinforced by the epithet 'bosom', and justifies the possibility of being entrusted with a confidential message. Having thus put her at ease, he approaches the main subject of the message meant for her. The epithet 'treasured up in my heart' reveals his great keenness in preserving it.

223 यद्यपि पदार्थस्य नानाविधधर्मखचितत्वं सम्भवति तथापि तथाविधेन धर्मेण सम्बन्धः समाख्यायते यः सहृदयहृदयाह्लादमाधातुं क्षमते । *Ibid.*, p. 17.

224 तस्य च तदाह्लादसामर्थ्यं सम्भाव्यते येन काचिदेव स्वभावमहता रसपरिपोषाङ्गत्वं वा व्यक्तिमासादयति । *Ibid.*, p. 17.

225 Translation is by Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy.

One might wonder why another person endowed with better senses and talents was not commissioned for the task. So he adds that he alone possesses special qualifications in that regard. He is a 'carrier' of water by nature and carrying something is his speciality. He hastens the hosts of travellers sinking with fatigue on the road by his own rumbling sounds. The plural throughout brings out how his helping nature is evidenced repeatedly. The sweet and delightful sounds of the cloud suggest the words of the ideal messenger. The specification 'on the road' goes to show how assistance is rendered by him even to unrelated persons as his second nature. So much more would be his sense of urgency in regard to a message entrusted to his care by his dearest friend. Finally, the adjective describing the women emphasises how their spirits are dropping owing to separation from their lovers and how, at the same time, the lovers are deeply attached to them in love.

The drift of the whole stanza is this: 'It is a self-chosen solemn mission with me to display my hearty friendship by effecting the joyous union of lovers that might have been torn apart by fate in spite of their burning love for each other'. The beauty of thought embodied here by the poet supplies, as it were, the very vital essence of his poem name 'Cloud-Messenger,' and is supremely delightful to tasteful readers.*¹²²⁶

226 अत्र प्रथममामन्त्रणपदार्थस्तदाश्वासकारिपरिस्पन्दनिबन्धनः भर्तुर्मित्रं मां विद्धीत्युपादेयतामात्मनः प्रथयति । तच्च न सामान्यम्, प्रियमिति विश्रम्भपात्रताम् । इति तामाश्वास्योन्मुखीकृत्य च तत्सन्देशात् त्वत्समीपमागमनमिति प्रकृतं प्रस्तौति । हृदयनिहितादिति सुहृत्वविहितं सावधानत्वं द्योत्यते । ननु चान्यः कश्चिदेवंविधव्यवहारविदग्धबुद्धिः कथं न नियुक्त इत्याह । ममैवात्र कौशलं किमपि विजृम्भते । अम्बुवाहमित्यात्मनस्तत्कारिताभिधानं द्योतयति । यः प्रोषितानां वृन्दानि त्वरयति सञ्जातत्वरणि करोति । कीदृशानाम्- श्राम्यतां त्वरायामसमर्थानामपि । वृन्दानीति बाहुल्यात् तत्कारिताभ्यासं कथयति । केन - मन्द्रास्त्रिगधैर्ध्वनिभिः, माधुर्यरमणीयैः शब्दैर्विदग्धदूतप्ररोचनावचनप्रायैरित्यर्थः । क्व - पथि मार्गे । यदृच्छया यथाकथञ्चिदहमेतदाचरामीति किं पुनः प्रयत्नेन सुहृत्प्रेमनिमित्तं संरम्भबुद्धिं न करोमीति । कीदृशानि वृन्दानि - अबलावेणिमोक्षोत्सुकानीति तेषां तदनुरक्तचित्तवृत्तित्वम् । तदयमत्र वाक्यार्थः - विधिविहितविरहवैधुर्यस्य परस्परानुरक्तचित्तवृत्तेर्यस्य कस्यचित्कामिजनस्य

To conclude this section, it may be noted that, this is the unique feature of word and sense in poetry and poetry is a blend of both form and content. Kuntaka considered both of them as *alaṅkārya* or adorned. And, the *alaṅkārya* should also have the positive artistic beauty i.e. *vakrokti*, which is the only ornament.²²⁷

Concept of *Sāhitya*

The concept of *sāhitya* of word and sense was deemed in Sanskrit literary theory as the primary requisite of poetry. The term *sāhitya* has been used frequently for a long time in Sanskrit literary context. However, as Kuntaka points out, no writer ever expounded the significance of the concept.²²⁸ It was left for Kuntaka to explain the intrinsic significance of the concept. For him, it is complete harmony and commensurateness between the expression and the expressed.

As noted earlier, the word and sense are inseparable elements and always move together. The term *sāhitya* literally means the relation between the word and sense²²⁹ and without this no linguistic expression is possible. In poetry, the nature of this *sāhitya* is of a special kind—*viśiṣṭa-sāhitya*. It is an extraordinary relation between poetic word and sense. Thus, "poetry is speech par-excellence, and *sāhitya*, relation par-excellence."²³⁰

समागमसौख्यसम्पादनसौहार्दे सदैव गृहीतव्रतोऽस्मीति । अत्र यः पदार्थपरिस्पन्दः
कविनोपनिबद्धः प्रबन्धस्य मेघदूतत्वे परमार्थतः स एव जीवितमिति सुतरां
सहृदयाह्लादकारी । *Op. cit.* p. 18-19.

227 उभावेतावलङ्कार्यौ तयोः पुनरलङ्कृतिः ।

वक्रोक्तिरेव वैदग्ध्यभङ्गीभणितिरुच्यते । *Ibid.*, I. 10.

228 यदिदं साहित्यं नाम तदेतावति निःसीमनि समयाध्वनि साहित्यशब्दमात्रेणैव
प्रसिद्धम् । न पुनरेतस्य कविकर्मकौशलकाष्ठाधिरूढरमणीयस्याद्यापि कश्चिदपि
विपश्चिदयमस्य परमार्थ इति मनाङ्गात्रमपि विचारपदवीमवतीर्णः । *Ibid.*, 23-24.

229 सहितयोर्भावः साहित्यम् । *Ibid.*, p. 24.

सहितौ सहितभावेन साहित्येनावस्थितौ । *Ibid.*, p. 10.

230 V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 85.

In poetry, there must be equally beautiful word and sense or the expression and the expressed. The expression and the expressed should vie with each other in enhancing the beauty of poetry. Kuntaka compares the sympathetic co-operation between these two with two meritorious friends.²³¹ Then, he examines some verses and concludes that striking thought without embodied in an adequately striking word will be no better than a corpse; and beautiful word devoid of a striking idea is to be viewed as a disease of a poem. Thus, *sāhitya* is the perfect harmony and mutual competence between the expression and the expressed.

Secondly, one word should vie with another in the expression and one idea vie with another in the expressed. It is of the nature of mutual competition in respect of beauty.²³² Further, this idea is defined at length in *kārika* I.17 and the *ṛtti* thereon.²³³ Thirdly, *sāhitya* is explained with reference to other elements of poetry viz., *mārga*, *ṛtti guṇa*, *alaṅkāra* and *vakrokti* in general.²³⁴ Each and every part of expression has to vie with the other towards enhancing the beauty of poetry.

Thus, in the province of *vakrokti* theory, the conception of *sāhitya* in general is that the expression and the expressed, as also the several units of poetry must be arranged in a glorious race, competing with each other in making poetry beautiful. "In this

231 समसर्वगुणौ सन्तौ सुहृदाविव सङ्गतौ।

परस्परस्य शोभायै शब्दार्थौ भवतो यथा ॥ *Op.cit.* p. 10.

This idea of Kuntaka can be equated with that of Kālidāsa.

cf. अन्योन्यशोभाजननाद् बभूव साधारणो भूषणभूष्यभावः। *Kumārasambhava*, I. 42.

232 सहितावित्यत्रापि यथायुक्ति सजातीयापेक्षया शब्दस्य शब्दान्तरेण वाच्यस्य वाच्यान्तरेण च साहित्यं परस्परस्पर्धित्वलक्षणमेव विवक्षितम्। *Vakroktijīva*, p. 11.

233 साहित्यमनयोः शोभाशालितां प्रति काप्यसौ।

अन्यूनानतिरिक्तत्वमनोहारिव्यवस्थितिः। *Ibid.*, I. 17.

234 वक्रताविचित्रगुणालङ्कारसम्पदां परस्परस्पर्धाधिरोहः। *Ibid.*, p. 10.

And, See, Ch. I. fn. 48 below.

respect, the concept means the appropriateness and power of the *vācya-vācaka* in suggesting the *rasa*. For, Kuntaka accepts *rasa* as supreme. Therefore, this conception of *sāhitya* generally likens it to the other concept of *aucitya* which also figures very much in Kuntaka."²³⁵

Thus, the concept of *sāhitya* has been expounded by Kuntaka as a great principle in poetry. It is the greatest perfection in poetic expression a master poet can achieve; it is the harmonious blend of all poetical elements in promoting extraordinary delight. And, in the attainment of *sāhitya* too, the prime place goes to *pratibhā* of a poet.²³⁶

To conclude this discussion, it may be observed that only *śabda* and *artha* blended together do not constitute poetry. The word and sense must be enshrined in *bandha* or composition. Then what is the nature of this *bandha* intended. *Bandha* has been explained as a peculiar arrangement of sentences shining in an attempt to create poetry and nourishing the two excellences of the expression and the expressed viz., *saubhāgya* and *lāvanya*.²³⁷ *Saubhāgya* or inner-charm is the fruit of dynamic imagination and causes delight of the heart whereas *lāvanya* or outer-charm is the beauty of arrangement.²³⁸ Again, Kuntaka insists that *bandha* should have two qualifications viz., revealing the artistic activity of the poet and giving aesthetic delight to the man of taste.²³⁹ Finally, it must be noted that the end of all this poetic endeavour is aesthetic experience. Hence, Kuntaka declares: "The quality

235 V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 100.

236 साहित्यलक्षणस्यैव कविव्यापारस्य वस्तुतः सर्वातिशायित्वम् । *Vakroktijīvita*, p. 25.

237 वाच्यवाचकसौभाग्यलावण्यपरिपोषकः ।

व्यापारशाली वाक्यस्य विन्यासो बन्ध उच्यते । *Ibid.*, I. 22.

238 सौभाग्यं प्रतिभासंरम्भफलभूतं चेतनचमत्कारित्वलक्षणम्, लावण्यं सन्निवेशसौन्दर्यम् । *Ibid.*, p. 39.

239 कीदृशे बन्धे—वक्रकविव्यापारशालिनि । तद्विदाह्लादकारिणि । *Ibid.*, p. 13.

delighting men of taste is something over and above the three elements so far considered, namely, 'meaning', 'word' and 'artful expression.' It has a unique beauty of unfailing appeal.*²⁴⁰

Types of Vakrokti

Though the ways of *vakrokti* are infinite due to poetic creativity, it may be classified into six major types. They are:

- I. *Varṇa-vinyāsa-vakratā*
- II. *Pada-pūrvārdha-vakratā*
- III. *Pada-parārdha-vakratā*
- IV. *Vākya-vakratā*
- V. *Prakaraṇa-vakratā*
- VI. *Prabandha-vakratā*

Of these, each one may have numerous subdivisions. Thus, the classification of *vakrokti* is much comprehensive as it includes the different devices of the language such as phonemic, morphological, syntactic and also semantic functions.

I. *Varṇa-vinyāsa-vakratā*

In poetic expression, strikingness may appear in the peculiar arrangement of syllables and it is termed as *varṇa-vinyāsa-vakratā*. This strikingness consists in skillful employment of syllables or consonants²⁴¹ with a view to their sound effect. This *varṇa-vinyāsa-vakratā* itself is recognised as *anuprāsa* or alliteration by ancient theorists.²⁴² Kuntaka here insists the harmony of the sound effect with the theme intended. Thus, quite naturally, he excludes the sphere of alliteration, which reveals only the author's labour at sound effect and which are detrimental to the

240 वाच्यवाचकवक्रोक्तित्रितयातिशयोत्तरम् ।

तद्विदाहलादकारित्वं किमप्यामोदसुन्दरम् ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 23.

241 वर्णशब्दोऽत्र व्यञ्जनपर्यायः तथा प्रसिद्धत्वात् । *Ibid.*, p. 74.

242 एतदेव वर्णविन्यासवक्रत्वं चिरन्तनेष्वनुप्रास इति प्रसिद्धम् । *Ibid.*, p. 27.

harmony of the subject.²⁴³ Thus, syllables should be arranged with a view to propriety of the theme or, *rasa*. The *Gītagovinda* of Jayadeva is the best example of *varṇa-vinyāsa-vakratā* where the alliteration successfully suggests the delicate sentiment i.e., *Śṛṅgāra*.²⁴⁴ Similarly, in the context of sentiments like *Vīra*, *Adbhuta* and *Raudra*, the harsh sounds must be employed.²⁴⁵

Further, Kuntaka insists some conditions for the successful shining of this alliterative art: "When alliteration is effected without extra effort, when it is adorned with syllables which are not harsh, when it becomes appealing by discontinuance of earlier sound repetitions and by new choices for reiteration."²⁴⁶ Again, he says that this alliterative art must be appropriate to specific literary styles formed by distinctive qualities. Udbhata spoke of it in his own way as literary modes such as *upanāgarikā* etc.²⁴⁷ And, the figure *yamaka* is also included in this *varṇa-*

243 प्रस्तुतं वर्ण्यमानं वस्तु तस्य यदौचित्यमुचितभावस्तेन शोभन्ते ये ते यथोक्ताः। न पुनर्वर्णसावर्ण्यव्यसनितामात्रेणोपनिबद्धाः प्रस्तुतौचित्यम्लानत्वकारिणः। *Ibid.*, p. 75.

cf. रसाक्षिप्ततया यस्य बन्धः शक्यक्रियो भवेत् ।

अपृथग्यत्ननिर्वर्त्यः सोऽलङ्कारो ध्वनौ मतः ॥ *Dhvanyāloka*, II. 16.

244 ललितलवङ्गलतापरिशीलनकोमलमलयसमीरे

मधुकरनिकरकरम्बितकोकिलकूजितकुञ्जकुटीरे ।

विहरति हरिरिह सरसवसन्ते नृत्यति

युवतिजेनेन समं सखि विरहिजनस्य दुरन्ते ॥

उन्मदमदनमनोरथपथिकवधूजनजनितविलापे

अलिकुलसङ्कुलकुसुमसमूहनिराकुलबकुलकलापे ॥ *Gītagovinda*, I. 3. 2-3.

245 चञ्चद्भुजभ्रमितचण्डगदाभिघात -

सञ्चूर्णितोरुयुगलस्य सुयोधनस्य ।

स्त्यानावबद्धघनशोणितशोणपाणि -

रुत्तंसयिष्यति कचांस्तव देवि भीमः ॥ *Veṇṇsamhāra*, I. 21.

246 नातिनिर्बन्धविहिता नाप्यपेशलभूषिता ।

पूर्वावृत्तपरित्यागनूतनावर्तनोज्वला ॥ *Vakroktijīvita*, II.4.

247 वर्णच्छायांनुसारेण गुणमार्गानुवर्तिनी ।

वृत्तिवैचित्र्ययुक्तेति सैव प्रोक्ता चिरन्तनैः ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 5.

vinyāsa-vakratā.²⁴⁸ Thus, Kuntaka's *varṇa-vinyāsa-vakratā* is wide enough to include the various varieties of beauty in the arrangement of syllables.

II. Pada-pūrvārdha-vakratā

The lexical aspects of the language may contribute to the total effect of the poetry. Poets have full scope to bring out beauty in the artistic usage of *prātipadika* and *dhātu*, which form the base part of the nouns and the verbs, respectively. This includes the peculiar use of synonyms, conventional words, attributive words, covert expressions and so on. Thus, there are various types in the *pada-pūrvārdha-vakratā* or art in the base form of substantives.

1. RŪDHI-VAICITRYA-VAKRATĀ

Although the words have, by nature, no special capacity to connote speciality, by the art of the poet, they are made to signify specific meaning intended by the poet. "When common denotation of words is seen to expand to include connotation of even impossible attributes imagined by the poet, or to include a hyperbolic excess of even an existing attribute as a result of the poet's intent to shower extraordinary belittlement or extraordinary glorification of the theme, we get what is called art in beautifying conventional sense."²⁴⁹ This variety of *vakratā* will constitute a number of varieties due to its diverse attributes.²⁵⁰ Kuntaka himself admits that Ānandavardhana had already explained the suggester and the suggested relation in these instances. For example:

248 यमकं नाम कोऽप्यस्याः प्रकारः परिदृश्यते ।

स तु शोभान्तराभावादिह नातिप्रतन्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 7.

249 यत्र रूढेरसम्भाव्यधर्माध्यारोपगर्भता ।

सद्धर्मातिशयारोपगर्भत्वं वा प्रतीयते ॥

लोकोत्तरतिरस्कारक्ष्णाध्योत्कर्षाभिधित्सया ।

वाच्यस्य सोच्यते कापि रूढिवैचित्र्यवक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 8-9.

250 एषा च रूढिवैचित्र्यवक्रता प्रतीयमानधर्मबाहुल्याद् बहुप्रकारा भिद्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 85.

निग्धश्यामलकान्तिलिसवियतो वेल्लद्वलाका घना
वाताः शीकरिणः पयोदसुहृदामानन्दकेकाः कलाः।
कामं सन्तु दृढं कठोरहृदयो रामोऽस्मि सर्वं सहे
वैदेही तु कथं भविष्यति हहा हा देवि धीरा भव ॥²⁵¹

Here, the word '*Rāma*' connotes what even the other words cannot convey. The proper name itself suggests a most unimaginable and extraordinary cruelty in him. Kuntaka again insists on the point in a nut-shell, that the inmost essence of this *vakratā* lies in the overshadowing of the general denotation of the word and in the suggestion of a unique shade of meaning intended by the poet and releasing a rich poetic appeal.²⁵²

2. PARYĀYA-VAKRATĀ

Among the many synonyms when the most appropriate word, bringing effective beauty, is chosen, it is called *paryāya-vakratā*. A word may have many synonyms, but in literature the poet selects only one among them which alone conveys the intended meaning and reveals extraordinary charm. It is defined: "The use of a synonym, which approximates most to the meaning intended, which can add to the beauty of meaning considerably, which can embellish the meaning by itself or its epithets coming to assume other shades of figurative beauty; which by itself, contributes to a new lease of excellence, which hints at a meaning having almost inconceivable elements; which contains embellishing figurative elements conducive to beauty, comes to be termed a superior art in the use of synonyms."²⁵³ For instance:

251 *Ibid.*, p. 83-84.

252 एतस्यां वक्रतायामयमेव परमार्थो यत् समान्यमात्रनिष्ठतामपाकृत्य कविविवक्षितविशेषप्रतिपादनसामर्थ्यलक्षणः शोभातिशयः समुल्लास्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 85.

253 अभिधेयान्तरतमस्तस्यातिशयपोषकः ।

रम्यच्छायान्तरस्पर्शान्तदलङ्कर्तुमीश्वरः ।

स्वयं विशेषणेनापि स्वच्छायोत्कर्षपेशलः ।

असम्भाव्यार्थपात्रत्वगर्भं यश्चाभिधीयते ॥

अलङ्कारोपसंस्कारमनोहारिनिबन्धना

अङ्गराज सेनापते राजवल्लभ रक्षेन भीमाद् दुःशासनम् ।²⁵⁴

Here all the three synonyms convey that Karna cannot be conceived of having any ability to protect Duḥśāsana.

3. UPACĀRA-VAKRATĀ

"Wherein even when the two are far apart from each other, a common attribute, however slight, is metaphorically superimposed in order to indicate that the resemblance is very close and which forms the basis for various pleasing and inventive figures of speech headed by metaphor—such a type of poetic beauty is designated by the name beauty of metaphorical expression."²⁵⁵ In this type, the superimposition of identity plays an important role. The poet attributes a kind of identity between the subject described and the standard of comparison, though the two are actually 'far apart,' to serve some special purpose. Here the term 'far apart' is used in the sense of 'divergence in nature.' Thus, in this type of *vakratā*, sentient activities are attributed to non-sentient objects, concreteness is to abstractness and so on.²⁵⁶ For example:

गगनं च मत्तमेघं धारालुलितार्जुनानि च वनानि ।

निरहङ्कारमृगाङ्का हरन्ति नीलाश्च निशाः ॥²⁵⁷

Here '*mattatva*' (drunkenness) and '*nirahaṅkāratva*' (pridelessness) are attributed to the inanimate objects viz., clouds and the rays of the moon, respectively.

पर्यायस्तेन वैचित्र्यं परा पर्यायवक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 10-12.

254 *Ibid.*, p. 28.

255 यत्र दूरान्तरेन्यस्मात्सामान्यमुपचर्यते ।

लेशेनापि भवत् काञ्चिद्रक्तुमुद्रितवृत्तिताम् ॥

यन्मूला सरसोल्लेखा रूपकादिरलङ्कृतिः ।

उपचारप्रधानासौ वक्रता काचिदुच्यते । *Ibid.*, II. 13-14.

256 सोऽयं स्वभावविप्रकर्षः विरुद्धधर्माध्यासलक्षणः पदार्थानाम् । यथा मूर्तिमत्त्वममूर्तत्वापेक्षया, द्रवत्वं च घनत्वापेक्षया, चेतनत्वमचेतनत्वापेक्षयेति । *Ibid.*, p. 93.

257 *Ibid.*, p. 94.

Another variety of this *upacāra-vakratā* serves as the underlying principle of the figures of speech headed by metaphor. Thus, *upacāra-vakratā* is the life-informing principle of these *alaṅkāras*.

4. VIŚEṢAṆA-VAKRATĀ

In poetry, the use of appropriate epithets may reveal extraordinary charm. "If, as a result of the excellence of the epithet, beauty is added to the verb or the noun (in a sentence), it is to be classed as beauty in epithet."²⁵⁸ When the epithets have great poetic value, they serve to heighten the charm of verbs or nouns. To illustrate:

करान्तरालीनकपोलभित्तिर्बाष्पोच्छलत्कूणितपत्रलेखा ।

श्रोत्रान्तरे पिण्डितचित्तवृत्तिः शृणोति गीतध्वनिमत्र तन्वी ॥²⁵⁹

Here the adjectives of the lady have vivified the verse. And, the *vipralambha-śṛṅgāra-rasa* too, is revealed through these adjectives.

Further, Kuntaka says that the proper use of epithets can endow a new charm to even recognised *alaṅkāras*. For example:

देवि त्वन्मुखपङ्कजेन शशिनः शोभातिरस्कारिणा ।

पश्याब्जानि विनिर्जितानि सहसा गच्छन्ति विच्छायाताम् ॥²⁶⁰

Here, the epithet of queen-face adds extraordinary beauty to the figure *pratīpa*. Thus, this type of *vakratā* is regarded as the vital essence of all good poetry.²⁶¹ Kuntaka again insists on this point that the significant epithet should properly be utilized by the poet to infuse extraordinary charm into the three-fold poetic *vastu* viz., *rasa*, *svabhāva* and *alaṅkāra*.²⁶²

258 विशेषणस्य माहात्म्यात् क्रियायाः कारकस्य वा ।

यत्रोल्लसति लावण्यं सा विशेषणवक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 15.

259 *Ibid.*, p. 97.

260 *Ratnāvalī*, I. 25.

261 एतदेव विशेषणवक्रत्वं नाम प्रस्तुतौचित्यानुसारि सकलसत्काव्यजीवितत्वेन लक्ष्यते। *Vakroktijīvitā*, p. 98.

262 स्वमहिम्ना विधीयन्ते येन लोकोत्तरश्रियः ।

5. SAMVṚTI-VAKRATĀ

"In order to achieve excellence of expression, when the subject of description is screened as it were by the use of pronouns and so forth, we have what is designated as beauty of concealment."²⁶³ This type of poetic beauty admits several varieties. Sometimes, the poet feels that the direct way of description may remove or circumscribe the infinite speciality of the object. To prevent such an eventuality, he will conceal it by a pronoun and suggest the special meaning by other clauses. To illustrate:

तत्पितर्यथ परिग्रहलिप्सौ स व्यधत्त करणीयमणीयः ।
पुष्पचापशिखरस्थकपोलो मन्मथः किमपि येन निदध्यौ ॥²⁶⁴

In this example, it was possible for the poet to state that Bhīṣma displayed incredible self-restraint because of his extraordinary magnanimity. But the poet had avoided the direct statement and concealed it by a pronoun. And the poet has succeeded in the second half of the verse in suggesting it through the relative clause.

There is another variety of this kind in which pronouns are used to conceal the object when the speciality of an object is beyond words. We have still another variety wherein an exceedingly beautiful subject shines most by its concealment itself and, hence, it does not permit any elaborate description. For instance:

दर्पणे च परिभोगदर्शिनी पृष्टतः प्रणयिनो निषेदुषः ।
वीक्ष्य बिम्बमनुबिम्बमात्मनः कानि कानि न चकार लज्जया ॥²⁶⁵

Here the actions of Pārvatī who is in the state of embarrassment are concealed by the pronoun 'kāni' which itself beautifully suggests what she might have done.

रसस्वभावालङ्कारास्तद्विधेयं विशेषणम् ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 57 (*Antarāśloka*).

263 यत्र संनियते वस्तु वैचित्र्यस्य विवक्षया ।

सर्वनामादिभिः कैश्चित् सोक्ता संबृतिवक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 16.

264 *Ibid.*, p. 99.

265 *Kumārasambhava*, VIII. 11.

A further variety is that, when a subject is concealed to suggest something that which can only be experienced.

निद्वनिमीलितदृशो मदमन्थराया
नाप्यर्थवन्ति न च यानि निरर्थकानि ।
अद्यापि मे वरतनोर्मधुराणि तस्या
स्तान्यक्षराणि हृदये किमपि ध्वनन्ति ॥²⁶⁶

In the verse, the word '*kimapi*' suggests the indescribable delight of the heart at listening to her and which can only be experienced. There is one more variety in which the concealment suggests the spaker's inability to describe verbally what has been experienced by another person.

6. VṚTTI-VAICITRYA-VAKRATĀ

"A usage where beauty of word forms such as adverbial compounds shines forth may be deemed as an instance of beauty of *vṛtti*."²⁶⁷ The special usages of these *vṛttis* such as compounds, verbal and nominal derivatives provide an effective base for the suggestion of unique beauty. For example:

अप्येतसां दयितविरहे विद्वषत्सुन्दरीणाम् ।
यैरानीता नखपदमयी मण्डना पाण्डिमानम् ॥²⁶⁸

Here the word *pāṇḍimānam* contributes unique beauty and its synonyms like *pāṇḍutā* or *pāṇḍubhāva* do not provide such a beauty.

7. BHĀVA-VAICITRYA-VAKRATĀ

In this type of *vakratā*, the well known roots of words are used in a novel way. "An example wherein an activity yet to be accomplished is described as already accomplished, illustrates beauty of *bhāva*."²⁶⁹ When the intended idea receives a scant

²⁶⁶ *Vakroktijīvita*, p. 30.

²⁶⁷ अव्ययीभावमुख्यानां वृत्तीनां रमणीयता ।

यत्रोल्लसति सा ज्ञेया वृत्तिवैचित्र्यवक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 19.

²⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

²⁶⁹ साध्यतामप्यनादृत्य सिद्धत्वेनाभिधीयते ।

यत्र भावो भवेदेषा भाववैचित्र्यवक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 20.

treatment if characterised as 'yet to be accomplished', the poet imaginatively describes it as already completed. Thus, that idea receives the best emphasis. For instance:

श्वासायासमलीमसाधररुचेर्दोःकन्दलीतानवात्
केयुरायितमङ्गदैः परिणतं पाण्डिन्नि गण्डत्विषा ।
अस्याः किं च विलोचनोत्पलयुगेनात्यन्तमश्रुता
तारं तादृगपाङ्गयोररुणितं येनोत्प्रेतापः स्मरः ॥²⁷⁰

Here, the actions described are accomplished as all imaginative and produce a sense of delight.

8. LINGA-VAICITRYA-VAKRATĀ

The special use of genders is called *linga-vaicitrya-vakratā*. It is of three types:

i. The use of words in different genders to signify one and the same object. This common basis of two different genders leads to a unique beauty.²⁷¹

ii. Although other genders are possible, a specific gender is preferred by a poet in harmony with the intended idea. The poetic purpose here, as elsewhere, is the attainment of beauty.²⁷²

iii. Sometimes, poets preferred the feminine gender to designate an object, though even other genders of the word could be used. Kuntaka says, it is so because even a name in the feminine gender is pleasing.²⁷³ And, it becomes suitable for association with *rasa* too. For instance:

यथेयं ग्रीष्मोष्मव्यतिकरवती पाण्डुरभिदा
मुखोद्भिन्नम्लानानिलतरलवल्लीकिसलया ।

270 *Ibid.*, p. 104-105.

271 भिन्नयोर्लिङ्गयोर्यस्यां सामानाधिकरण्यतः ।

कापि शोभाभ्युदेत्येषा लिङ्गवैचित्र्यवक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 21.

272 विशिष्टं योज्यते लिङ्गमन्यस्मिन् सम्भवत्यपि ।

यत्र विच्छिन्नतये सान्या वाच्यौचित्यानुसारतः ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 23.

273 सति लिङ्गान्तरे यत्र स्त्रीलिङ्गं च प्रयुज्यते ।

शोभानिष्पत्तये यस्मान्नामैव स्त्रीति पेशलम् ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 22.

तटी तारं ताम्यत्यतिशशियशाः कोऽपि जलद-
स्तथा मन्ये भावी भुवनबलयाक्रान्ति सुभगा ॥²⁷⁴

Here, the word for 'tata' (shore) can take any of the three genders. Yet, the poet has used the feminine gender of the word, as it is most tender. This provides a basis for suggesting the love affair, yet to come, between the heroine 'shore' and the hero 'cloud'.

9. KRIYA-VAICITRYA-VAKRATĀ

The artistic use of root verbs may produce a unique beauty and it is regarded as *kriyā-vaicitrya-vakratā*. It has five varieties. "Extreme capability of the subject, superiority to another subject who could perform the same action, a significant qualification of the action itself, beauty of metaphorical superimposition, concealment of the direct object etc. These five which add charm to the idea described are regarded as the five forms of beauty in action*"²⁷⁵ To illustrate:

क्रीडारसेन रहसि स्मितपूर्वमिन्दोर्लेखां विकृष्य विनिबध्य च मूर्ध्नि गौर्या ।
किं शोभिताहमनयेति शशाङ्कमौलेः पृष्ठस्य पातु परिचुम्बनमुत्तरं वः ॥²⁷⁶

This is an instance of the first variety of *kriyā-vaicitrya-vakratā* i.e., extreme capability of the subject. Here Śiva could not have any better action to indicate the extreme beauty of Pārvatī than the kiss. Hence, this special expression of the action acquires unique beauty.

III. Pada-parārdha-vakratā

Strikingness may appear in the terminal part of the word. It is called *pada-parārdha-vakratā* or *pratyaya-vakratā*. It consists in a peculiar use of tense, case, number, voice, person, particle and indeclinables. Thus, it forms many varieties.

274 *Ibid.*, p. 106.

275 कर्तुरत्यन्तरङ्गत्वं कर्त्रन्तरविचित्रता ।

स्वविशेषणवैचित्र्यमुपचारमनोज्ञता ॥

कर्मादिसंवृतिः पञ्च प्रस्तुतौचित्यचारवः ।

क्रियावैचित्र्यवक्रत्वप्रकारास्त इमे स्मृताः ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 24-25.

276 *Ibid.*, p. 48.

1. KĀLA-VAICITRYA-VAKRATĀ

Poets achieve unique beauty in poetry through the employment of significant tenses appropriate to the subject of description. To take an example:

समविषमनिर्विशेषाः समन्ततो मन्दमन्द सञ्चाराः ।

अचिराद्भविष्यन्ति पन्थानो मनोरथानामपि दुर्लङ्घ्याः ॥²⁷⁷

This is a statement of a vexed lover who is suffering from the pain of separation of his beloved. The description of the immediate approaching rainy season as closing the paths of desires reveals beauty due to its future termination.

2. KĀRAKA-VAKRATĀ

"Treatment of one and all auxilliary 'instruments of action' as if they were pre-eminent by superimposing primacy on them and reducing the status of the really pre-eminent into that of an auxiliary so that some special shade of charm is infused into the artful poetic expression—a treatment which thus involves a reversal of status in 'instruments of action'—comes to be designated by the phrase beauty of instruments of action."²⁷⁸ Thus, here animation is attributed to even inanimate objects and the cases governing the agent etc., are used for the development of *rasa* and the like. For example:

स्तनद्वन्द्वं मन्दं स्रपयति बलाद्वाष्पनिवहो
हठादन्तः कठं लुठति सरसः पञ्चमखः ।
शरज्जोत्स्नापाण्डुः पतति च कपोलः करतले
न जानीमस्तस्या क इव हि विकारव्यतिकरः ॥²⁷⁹

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

²⁷⁸ यत्रकारकसामान्यं प्राधान्येन निबध्यते ।

तत्वाधारोपणान्मुख्यगुणभावाभिधानतः॥

परिपोषयितुं काञ्चिद् भङ्गीभणितिरम्यताम् ।

कारकाणां विपर्यासः सोक्ता कारकवक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, II 27-28.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

Here the sentient agency is attributed to the flow of tears, the sweet voice and the forehead to develop the *rasa* i.e., *vipralambha-śṛṅgāra*.

3. ŚŒKHYĀ-VAKRATĀ

When the poets employ transposition of numbers with a view to achieving special poetic beauty, it is called *sañkhyā-vakratā* or oblique beauty of number. For example:

वयं तत्त्वान्वेषान्मधुकर हतास्त्वं खलु कृती ॥²⁸⁰

Here 'we' is used for 'I' in order to suggest that he (Duṣyanta) is a stranger. Sometimes, two words having different numbers are brought together to bring extraordinary delight as in -

पुल्लेन्दीवरकाननानि नयने पाणी सरोजाकराः ॥²⁸¹

4. PURUṢA-VAKRATĀ

Sometimes, poets may prefer the third person in the place of first or second person to acquire poetic charm. It is regarded as *puruṣa-vakratā* or oblique beauty of person. To illustrate:

अयं जनः प्रष्टुमनास्तपोधने न चेद्रहस्यं प्रतिवक्तुमर्हसि ॥²⁸²

Here the third person is used for the first person to suggest disinterestedness.

5. UPAGRAHA-VAKRATĀ

"When both the *Ātmane-pada* and *Parasmai-pada* affixes are possible for a root, if a poet is seen preferring the one as against the other because of an aesthetic purpose, that may be designated as arresting beauty of *upagraha* or verb-affix."²⁸³ For example:

तस्यापरेष्वपि मृगेषु शरान्मुमुक्षोः
कर्णान्तमेत्य बिभिदे निबडोऽपि मुष्टिः ।

280 *Abhijñānaśākuntalam*, I. 24.

281 *Vakroktijīva*, p. 117.

282 *Kumārasambhava*, V. 40.

283 पदयोरुभयोरैकमौचित्याद् विनियुज्यते ।

शोभायै यत्र जल्पन्ति तामुपग्रहवक्रताम् ॥ *Vakroktijīva*, II. 31.

त्रासातिमात्रचटुलैः स्मरयत्सु नेत्रैः
प्रौढप्रियानयनविभ्रमचेष्टितानि ॥²⁸⁴

The eyes of the female deer remind the king Daśaratha of his own beloveds and the beautiful movements of their eyes. He is unable to kill them because of this remembrance; even he holds back the arrow set the bow. The *Ātmanepada* 'bibhidhe' beautifully suggests how of its own accord the thumb-grip became loose without any conscious effort.

6. PRATYAYA-VAKRATĀ

When the poets use extraordinary affixes apart from the usual affix, with a view to striking beauty, it is called *pratyaya-vakratā*. For example:

लीनं वस्तुनि येन सूक्ष्मसुभगं तत्त्वं गिरा कृष्यते
निर्मातुं प्रभवेन्मनोहरमिदं वाचैव यो वा बहिः ।
वन्दे द्वावपि तावहं कविवरौ वन्देतरां तं पुनः
यो विज्ञातपरिश्रमोऽयमनयोर्भरावतारक्षमः ॥²⁸⁵

The comparative affix in the word '*vandetarām*' exhibits special beauty; it praises the critic's ability to understand both *Kavisrṣṭi* and *Brahmasrṣṭi*.

7. PADA-VAKRATĀ

In Sanskrit, the word is classified into four groups viz., *nāma* (noun), *ākhyāta* (verb), *upasarga* (preposition) and *nipāta* (indeclinables) so long the beauty lies at the parts of nouns and verbs has been analysed under *pada-pūrvārdha-vakratā* and *pada-parārdha-vakratā*. But *nipāta* and *upasarga*, the underivable words, do not take case terminations. Thus, Kuntaka analysed their beauty under *pada-vakratā*. "In a poem where the prepositions and indeclinables are employed only to suggest *rasas* as the sole essence of a poem as a whole, we have what may be called another type of word-beauty*"²⁸⁶ Of course, the

284 *Raghuvamśa*, IX. 58.

285 *Vakroktijīva*, p. 120.

286 रसादिद्योतनं यस्यामुपसर्गनिपातयोः।

upasargas, the *nipātas* have usual meanings assigned to them by grammarians; but, in poetry they will get special meaning due to artistic usage of a poet and they will become the means of suggesting *rasas*. For instance:

वैदेही तु कथं भविष्यति हहा हा देवि धीरा भव ॥²⁸⁷

In this line of the verse, we can see the touching description of perturbed Rāma over the loss of Sītā. Here, the sentiment of love-in-seperation rising to a climax by the cumulative effect of the various *nipātas* viz., *hahā*, *hā* and *tu*.

Thus, Kuntaka analysed, with deep aesthetic insight, the possible beauty or *vakratā* occurring in the words and their different parts under these two heads viz., *Pada-pūrvārdha* and *Pada-parārdha*. To sum up this discussion, it must be noted that, out of infinite types of artistic beauty even a single type is enough to contribute the extraordinary delight to the men of taste. When several varieties of *vakratā* are found together in such a way as to enhance the beauty of one another, they bring extraordinary beauty to poetry as a portrait with the combination of many pleasing colours.²⁸⁸

IV. *Vākya-vakratā*

Strikingness may appear in the peculiar use of a sentence. This is regarded as *vākya-vakratā* or artistic beauty of a sentence. There are numerous varieties in *vākya-vakratā* as it includes the triple entities of poetry viz., *rasa*, *svabhāva* and the whole field of *alankāras*. "The artistic beauty of a sentence is something quite distinct from the wealth of beauty due to qualities and figures of speech in so far as they relate to artistic word and content belonging to one or the other of the (three) styles. In fact, expressiveness of the sentence-form should be regarded as the

वाक्यैकजीवितत्वेन सापरा पदवक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, II. 33.

²⁸⁷ See, fn. 253 above.

²⁸⁸ परस्परस्य शोभायै बहवः पतिताः क्वचित् ।

प्रकारा जनयन्त्येतां चित्रच्छायामनोहराम् ॥ *Vakroktijivita*, II. 34.

essence of this beauty. It is an index of the unique skill of the poet even as the unique total appeal of a painting which is something quite distinct from the beauty of the individual elements that go to fashion it such as lovely canvas, lines, and colour-shades.*²⁸⁹ Here, Kuntaka states that the poetry, the poetic material and the poet bear a close resemblance to the painting, the painting material and the painter, respectively. In a fine specimen of painting what strikes the appreciator most is not the lines of colour but the unique skill of the painter. This over-all beauty is distinct from the beauty of materials viz., painting board, line-sketch and the shades of colour. Of course, these ingredients contribute their own beauty to the total effect. Similarly, in a brilliant specimen of poetry what captivates the minds of the men of taste is not the external expression, but the skill of the poet in bringing successful poetic image into being. Thus, in *vākya-vakratā*, different constituent elements of poetry like words, meanings, etc. contribute their own beauty, but the unique skill of the poet shines out distinctively.

Further, Kuntaka says that this *vākya-vakratā* serves to add beauty to other kinds of *vakrokti*. Even the triple entities of poetry. viz., *rasa*, *svabhāva* and *alaṅkāras* get a new lease of charm by the touch of this *vākya-vakratā*.²⁹⁰ Thus, the scope of *vākya-vakratā* is so vast. For instance:

उपस्थितां पूर्वमपास्य लक्ष्मीं वनं मया सार्धमसि प्रपन्नः ।
त्वामाश्रयं प्राप्य तया नु कोपात्सोढास्मि न त्वद्भुवने वसन्ति ॥²⁹¹

289 मार्गस्थवक्रशब्दार्थगुणालङ्कारसम्पदः।

अन्यद्वाक्यस्य वक्रत्वं तथाभिहितिजीवितम् ।

मनोजफलकोल्लेखवर्णच्छायाश्रियः पृथक् ।

चित्रस्येव मनोहारि कर्तुः किमपि कौशलम् ॥ *Ibid.*, III. 3-4.

290 रसस्वभावालङ्कारा आसंसारनपि स्थिताः।

अनेन नवतां यान्ति तद्विदाह्लाददायिनीम् ॥ *Ibid.*, IV. 24 (*Antaraśloka*).

291 *Raghuvamśa*, XIV. 60.

The figure of speech here is *kāvyaalinga* or poetic reason. *Karuṇarasa* is developed throughout the verse. Kuntaka aesthetically analyses the significance of the verse: This is the message sent by Sītā to her dear husband when her heart was overwhelmed by grief (at her desertion). "That you who was once eager to go to the forest with me rejecting even the goddess of wealth who was dancing attendance on you, could do this is something which cannot be imagined as possible even in a dream. That goddess surely must have been unable to brook my presence in your home because of her jealousy which is quite natural in a co-wife. The idea, in other words, is that I, after becoming once an object of so much favour on your part even at a time when you were weighed down by the direct distress, should now be exposed to the humiliation of desertion without a reason when you are installed in your empire—whether this is proper or improper deserves to be considered by yourself, knowing as you do the course of justice."²⁹²

The primary subject-matter of the poetic activity is the expressed content. Thus Kuntaka, in this context, takes up for consideration the nature of the matter described. This is considered as *vastuvakratā* or beauty of the content. The matter, which is intended by the poet as relevant to his creative effort, is regarded as *vastu* or content in poetry. It is two-fold viz., natural and superadded.²⁹³

The first type of *vastu-vakratā* is defined thus: "When the subject-matter is described in a way conducive to beauty by virtue of its own infinite natural charm and by means of

३

292 एतत्सीतया तथाविधकरुणाक्रान्तान्तःकरणया बल्लभं प्रति संदिश्यते - यदुपस्थितां सेवासमापन्नां लक्ष्मीमपास्य श्रियं परित्यज्य पूर्वं यस्त्वं मया सार्धं प्रपन्नो विपिनं प्राप्तस्तस्य तव स्वप्नेऽप्येतन्न सम्भाव्यते । तथा पुनस्तस्मादेव कोपात् स्त्रीस्वभावसमुचितसपत्नीविद्वेषात्त्वद्गृहे वसन्ती न सोढास्मि । तदिदमुक्तं भवति - यत् तस्मिन् विश्वरुदशिविसंघुलेऽपि समये तथाविधप्रसादास्पदतामध्यारोप्य यदिदानीं साम्राज्ये निष्कारणपरित्यागतिरस्कारपात्रतां नीतास्मीत्येतदुचितमनुचितं वा विदितव्यवहारपरम्परेण भवता स्वयमेव विचार्यतामिति । *Vakroktijīvoita*, p. 36.

293 सैषा सहजाहार्यभेदभिन्ना वर्णनीयस्य वस्तुनो द्विप्रकारा वक्रता । *Ibid.*, p. 130.

exclusively artistic expressions, we may take it as an instance of creative beauty relating to content.*²⁹⁴ Thus, in these instances, poets have to select the content which possessed full of beautiful natural traits. Then only it deserves to be adorned by appropriate figures of speech. But it must be noted that there will not be much scope for the use of *alanīkāras*; because their use might spoil the delicate natural charm of the content itself or the clarity in the development of *rasa* came to be obscured thereby. Thus, in all such instances, the natural beauty of the context itself captures the hearts of the refined readers. Kuntaka also adds that poets must be careful in the use of words too. Out of many charming expressions, only that particular one will be selected which conveys better the intended idea. For instance:

तां प्राङ्मुखीं तत्र निवेश्य तन्वीं क्षणं व्यलम्बन्त पुरो निषण्णाः ।
भूतार्थशोभाहियमाणनेत्राः प्रसाधने सन्निहितेऽपि नार्यः ॥²⁹⁵

Here the poet intends to communicate the exquisite beauty of Pārvatī. Hence, he feels that any addition of an ornament may spoil the natural grace of the content described. Thus, the natural but highly ingenious description reveals extraordinary delight.

There is another type of *vastu-vakratā* which is regarded as *āhārya* or superadded. It consists in the creation of original poetic subjects and its beauty combines both the inborn genius as well as the acquired skills of the poet.²⁹⁶ In other words, poets do not give existence to the non-existent things in the world, but they only endow such superior and original excellence to things which merely existed before. Thus, such a unique poetic creation becomes charming. Kuntaka further

294 उदारस्वपरिस्पन्दसुन्दरत्वेन वर्णनम् ।

वस्तुनो वक्रशब्दैकगोचरत्वेन वक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, III. 1.

295 *Kumārasambhava*, VII. 13.

296 अपरा सहजाहार्यकविकौशलशालिनी ।

निर्मितिर्नूतनोल्लेखलोकातिक्रान्तगोचरा ॥ *Op. cit.* III. 2.

says that this type of *vastu-vakratā* cannot be anything other than figures of speech.²⁹⁷ For example:

अस्याः सर्गाविधौ प्रजापतिरभूच्चन्द्रो नु कान्तिद्युतिः
शृङ्गारैकरसः स्वयं नु मदनो मासो नु पुष्पाकरः ।
वेदाभ्यासजडः कथं नु विषयव्यावृत्तकौतूहलो
निर्मातुं प्रभवेन्मनोहरमिदं रूपं पुराणो मुनिः ॥²⁹⁸

Here, Purūra is amazed at the sight of the extraordinary beauty of Urvaśi. It is not possible for the Creator to create such a beauty as He is always engrossed in the chanting of the *Vedas*, and disinterested in worldly things. The poet imagines that the moon or cupid or spring might have created the beautiful Urvaśi. The adjective '*svayam*' governing all these and adds charm to the verse. The moon, being himself very beautiful, has given his own lustre to Urvaśi. Cupid himself possesses the *śṛṅgārārāsa* and in creating Urvaśi certainly he has shown a good taste (*rasikatā*). Spring, who is the abode of all fresh flowers, made her so soft and sweet.

There is *utprekṣālaṅkāra* in the description of Urvaśi's beauty. With the *utprekṣa*, *sandehālaṅkāra* also is present in the verse indicating the excess of her beauty which surpasses the moon, cupid and spring. Thus, due to the *āhārya-kauśala*, the poet's imagination could describe such an extraordinary beautiful thing.

Further, the poetic content is classified into two groups viz., sentient and non-sentient. The sentient group is again divided under two heads viz., primary sentients like gods, demons, human beings, etc., and secondary sentients like animals, birds, etc. The primary sentients are made beautiful by a spontaneous presentation of emotions.²⁹⁹ On the other hand, the secondary

297 यदेवमाहार्या येयं सा प्रस्तुतविच्छित्तिविधाप्यलङ्कारव्यतिरेकेण नान्या काचिदुपपद्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 130.

298 *Vikramorvaśīya*, I. 8.

299 मुख्यमक्लिष्टरत्यादिपरिपोषमनोहरम् ।

स्वजात्युचितहेवाकसमुल्लेखोज्वलं परम् ॥ *Vakroktijīvitā*, III. 7.

sentients and non-sentients are described in such a way as to promote the rise of *rasas*.³⁰⁰

Kuntaka observes another kind of poetic content which relates to human conduct. All the primary sentient-subjects should be described in such a way that their actions serve as models for others for achieving the four-fold values of life.³⁰¹ And, the secondary sentient-subjects deserve to be treated as they help towards the attainment of the same.

V. *Prakarāṇa-vakratā*

The art of devising episodes or incidents in such a way that they give maximum consistency to the total effect of the poetry is regarded as *prakarāṇa-vakratā* or beauty of episode. Maintaining suspense till the denouement, introduction of originality in plot-contruction through innovations, organic unity among the episodes etc. come under this *prakarāṇa-vakratā*.

"When we find the speakers giving vent to such expression as is replete with the beauty of expressing their ideas powerfully; when the intended object at the end will remain inscrutable from the beginning (i.e., suspense remains constant till the denouement), the unique and boundless poetic skill underlying it all should be regarded as the poetic beauty of an episode."³⁰² The gist of this variety of *prakarāṇa-vakratā* is that, when the great heroes with high degree of nobility are described, the suspense maintained must be such that their inner feelings remain inscrutable in the middle of the story. An abundance of such

300 रसोद्दीपनसामर्थ्यविनिबन्धनबन्धुरम् ।

चेतनानाममुख्यानां जडानां चापि भूयसा ॥ *Ibid.*, III. 8.

301 धर्मादिसाधनोपायपरिस्पन्दनिबन्धनम् ।

व्यवहारोचितं चान्यल्लभते वर्णनीयताम् ॥ *Ibid.*, III. 10.

302 यत्र निर्यन्त्रणोत्साहपरिस्पन्दोपशोभिनी ।

प्रवृत्तिर्वहर्तृणां स्वाशयोल्लेखशालिनी ॥

अप्यामूलादनाशङ्क्यसमुत्थाने मनोरथे ।

काप्युन्मीलति निःसीमा सा प्रबन्धांशवक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, IV. 1-2.

instances will intensify the literary interest as well as aesthetic appeal. And this contributes beauty not only to the episodes but also to the work as a whole. Kuntaka illustrates the episode of Raghu and Kautsa from the *Raghuvamśa* of Kālidāsa as an instance of this idea.

Introduction of originality is another type of *prakaraṇa-vakratā*. "When a poet is constructing a plot of his own, though it might be based on a well-known source, if he succeeds in infusing even a small streak of originality, the beauty gained thereby will be singular; even as an episode too can shine forth as the vital essence of the work as a whole, brimful of sentiments reaching their utmost limit."³⁰³ Here, Kuntaka suggests that a poet should select only such themes, from the well-known source, as are capable of evoking *rasas* and *bhāvas*, and generating a sense of wonder. The poet must also note that theme selected will give full scope for original and matchless inventive power of his genius. As an illustration, Kuntaka refers to the curse of *Durvāsa* introduced by Kālidāsa in his *Abhijñānaśākuntala* to effect a state of Duṣyanta's

303 इतिवृत्तप्रयुक्तेऽपि कथावैचित्र्यवर्त्मनि ।

उत्पाद्यलबलावण्यादन्या लसति वक्रता ॥

तथा यथा प्रबन्धस्य सकलस्यापि जीवितम् ।

भाति प्रकरणं काष्ठाधिरूढरसनिर्भरम् ॥ *Ibid.*, IV. 3-4.

This variety of *prakaraṇavakratā* corresponds to what Bhoja describes as *prabandha-doṣahāna*, avoiding the *anaucityas* in the source by new imaginative creations and deviations from the original:

वाक्यवच्च प्रबन्धेषु रसालङ्कारसङ्करान् ।

निवेशयन्त्यनौचित्यपरिहारेण सूरयः ॥ *Sarasvatikanṭhabharana*, V. 126.

And also cf. "One of the surest tests is the way in which a poet borrows. Immate poets imitate, nature poets steal, bad poets deface what they take, and good poets make it into something better, or at least something different. The good poet welds his theft into a whole of feeling which is unique, utterly different from that which it was torn; the bad poet throws it into something which has no cohesion." T.S. Eliot. Quoted by Krishna Caitanya, *Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 190.

inability to recognise Śakuntalā. The reason why Duṣyanta is unable to recognise her is left unexplained in the original *Mahābhārata*. Kālidāsa's inventive genius has compensated the fault in the character of Duṣyanta.

Organic unity among the episodes is some other variety of *prakaraṇa-vakratā*. "An organic unity which strikingly underlies the various incidents described in different parts of the work leading to the ultimate end intended, each bound to the other by a relation of mutual assistance, reveals the essence of creative originality which is most aesthetic only in the case of a very rare poetic genius who is endowed by nature with the gift of an extraordinary inventive imagination."³⁰⁴ Kuntaka illustrates this idea with the instance of *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti. At the outset of the drama, Rāma gives information to Sītā about the missile *Jṛmbaka* in her advanced pregnancy and also told that they are bound to attend on her progeny. This statement becomes significantly helpful in recognising Lava, the son of Sītā, in the fifth Act of the play.

The next variety is defined: "When even one and the same theme is again and again described in different places with a new touch of creative originality, and is made to radiate the glow of sentiments and figures of speech; it manifests a strikingly new mode of artistic beauty."³⁰⁵ Subjects of description like moon-

304 प्रबन्धस्यैकदेशानां फलबन्धानुबन्धवान् ।

उपकार्योपकर्तृत्वपरिस्पन्दः परिस्फुरन् ॥

असामान्यसमुल्लेखप्रतिभाप्रतिभासिनः ।

सूते नूतन वक्रत्वरहस्यं कस्यचित्कवेः ॥ *Vakroktijīva*, IV. 5-6.

This corresponds to Bhoja's *Prabandha Guṇa* called *śuṣṭiṣṭasandhitva* which is explained with reference to *mahākāvya*s as the unity and the mutual co-operation between the different cantos: सुश्लिष्टसन्धित्वमित्यनेन तु सर्गादीनां परस्परमेकवाक्यतया महावाक्यात्मकस्य प्रबन्धस्योपकारित्वं दर्शयति । *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, Vol. II, p. 431.

305 प्रतिप्रकरणं प्रौढप्रतिभाभोगयोजितः।

एक एवाभिधेयात्मा बध्यमानः पुनः पुनः॥

rise, sun-rise, etc. may occur more than once in a literary work; but their recurrence should be appropriate with the plot and they harmoniously endowed with different *rasas* and *alaṅkāras*. Then only even the recurrence of conventional themes reveal extraordinary charm. In the *Harṣacarita* of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, descriptions of mountain, the close of the night and the like occur more than once, but are invested with enormous beauty and presented in strikingly new and varied style of a poet.

When the conventional themes like water-sports described as an integrated part of a whole pattern supplied by the art by plot-construction, a novel artistic beauty is achieved.³⁰⁶ This is another type of *prakaraṇa-vakratā*.

"Another type of beauty in respect of Acts etc. is instanced when the beauty is so exclusive to an Act that it cannot be attained by any other Act, either preceding or following, in the play and the Act thus serves as a touchstone in its own way of the ruling sentiment in the play."³⁰⁷ All the Acts of a drama or cantos in an epic may not be equally beautiful. That particular Act or canto which is exceedingly beautiful will be flourishing with the ruling sentiment and that alone strikes most. Its artistic excellence cannot be imitated or repeated in any other Act of the same drama. Kuntaka cites the example of *Vikramorvaṣṭya* (IV

अनूतनूतनोल्लेखरसालङ्करणोज्ज्वलः।

बध्नाति वक्रतोद्वेदभङ्गीमुत्पादिताद्भुताम् ॥ *Vakroktijīvitā*, IV. 7-8.

306 कथावैचित्र्यपात्रं तद्वक्रिमाणं प्रपद्यते ।

यदङ्गं सर्गबन्धादेः सौन्दर्याय निबध्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, IV.9.

This aspect of *prakaraṇavakratā* has been considered by Bhoja as *arthalaṅkāras* of *prabandha*: नगराश्रमशैलसैन्यावासाणवादि वर्णनम्, ऋतुरात्रि-
दिवाकस्तिमयचन्द्रोदयादिवर्णनम्, नायकनायिकाकुमारसहायवाहनादि वर्णनम्,
मन्त्रदूतप्रयाणसङ्ग्रामाभ्युदयादिवर्णनम्, वविंहारजलक्रीडामधुपान- मानापगमरतोत्सवा-
दिवर्णनामित्यर्थलङ्काराः ॥

Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, Vol. II, p. 431.

307 यत्राङ्गिरसनिष्यन्दनिकषः कोऽपि लक्ष्यते ।

पूर्वोत्तरैरसम्पाद्यः साङ्कादेः कापि वक्रता ॥ *Op. cit.* IV. 10.

Act) wherein the manifestation of *vipralambha-śṛṅgāra* of the hero is a piece of immortal literary art.

Even a small incident, apparently independent, ultimately makes a significant contribution to the plot as a whole. "When the inventiveness of the poet in devising some other incident also ultimately contributes to add significance to the total plot, it should be regarded as another type of beauty of episode."³⁰⁸ Kuntaka illustrates this idea through a few incidents from the sixth Act of the *Mudrārāksasa*.

Garbhāṅka or play-episode is also considered as one of the forms of *prakaraṇa-vakratā*. "When actors, expert in the art of pleasing the audience, are seen to play the role of an audience themselves on the stage with other actors performing, such a play-episode within a play-episode may be regarded as illustrating a literary art which beautifies the entire drama exquisitely."³⁰⁹ The seventh Act of the *Uttararāmacarita* is one of the best examples for this variety of *prakaraṇa-vakratā*.

There is one more variety of episodal beauty. "The art of the dramatic plot should be pleasing by the construction of delightful 'junctures' (*sandhi*); each of the parts should be organically related to each other, the succeeding one following logically from the preceding one. It should not be vitiated by any excessive craze for observing rules even when they are in opportune. Only in such cases, the episodes will reveal a

308 प्रधानवस्तुनिष्पत्यै वस्त्वन्तरविचित्रता ।

यत्रोल्लसति सोल्लेखा साऽपराप्यस्य वक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, IV. 11.

309 सामाजिकजनाह्लादनिर्माणनिपुणैर्नटैः ।

तद्भूमिकां समास्थाय निर्वर्तितनटान्तरम् ॥

क्वचित्प्रकरणस्यान्तः स्मृतं प्रकरणान्तरम् ।

सर्वप्रबन्धसर्वस्वकल्पां पुष्पाति वक्रताम् ॥ *Ibid.*, IV. 12-13.

Bhoja considers this aspect as one of the types of *ubhayālaṅkāra* of *prabandha* i.e., *garbhāṅkavidhāna*. Vide, *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, Vol. II, p. 431.

unique charm of originality.*³¹⁰ Thus, the preceding and succeeding episodes must have intimate connection in a literary work. Kuntaka mentions the incidents of the *Kumārasambhava* as an instance of this idea. In the epic, all the incidents are mutually connected by an intimate and logical relation and possessing the highest possible beauty.

Considering the negative aspect that excessive craze for observing rules be avoided at the untimely instances, Kuntaka cites the example of the second Act of the *Veṅṭsamhāra*. Duryodhana overhears the incident of Bhānumatī's dream and at that juncture of grave battle, the desire of a hero like Duryodhana for amorous indulgence is highly improper. He suspects the fidelity of his wife without understanding the real mind of her, is extremely inappropriate.

VI. Prabandha-vakratā

The peculiarity of the whole composition is regarded as *prabandha-vakratā*. It consists in the originality and inventiveness of a poet. Thus, it has many varieties. "When there is a departure from the enriched '*rasas*' of the source-book and a new delightful '*rasa*' is delineated by the poet at the conclusion of his work, so that the delight of the readers is ensured, we should regard it as beauty of a whole work.*³¹¹

The original story in the source book might be ending in any particular *rasa*. After adopting the story, the poet will deliberately abandon it and substitute it with another *rasa* securing a new

310 मुखाभिसन्धिसंह्लादि संविधानकबन्धुरम् ।

पूर्वोत्तरादिसाङ्गत्यादङ्गानां विनिवेशनम् ॥

न त्वमार्गग्रहस्तवर्णकाङ्गैः कदर्थितम् ।

वक्रतोलेखलावण्यमुल्लासयति नूतनम् ॥ *Vakroktijīvita*, IV. 14-15.

311 इतिवृत्तान्यथावृत्तरससम्पदुपेक्षया ।

रसान्तरेण रम्येण यत्र निर्वहणं भवेत् ॥

तस्या एव कथामूर्तेरामूलोन्मीलितश्रियः ।

विनेयानन्दनिष्पत्यै सा प्रबन्धस्यवक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, IV. 16-17.

beauty for his work as a whole. Kuntaka illustrates this idea with the instance of *Veṇīsamhāra* of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa. The story of the drama is based on the original *Mahābhārata* whose principle *rasa* is *śānta* or tranquillity. The dramatist has expunged the *śānta-rasa* at the end of his work and substituted in its place the *vīra-rasa* along with *adbhuta* which suit the story of *Pāṇḍavas* much better.

"When a good poet concludes his work with only such a select incident in his original source as promotes the singular prosperity of the hero depicted as an ideal character in all the three worlds, with the idea of avoiding the distasteful culmination of the story in the original, it should be regarded as another appealing form of beauty relating to a whole work."³¹² This idea has been explained with an instance of the *Kirātārjunīya* of Bhāravi which is based on the *Mahābhārata*. At the outset, the epic expresses the ultimate victory of *Pāṇḍavas*. The end devised by the poet is the battle between Arjuna and hunterguised Śiva which provides an opportunity for the display of Arjuna's peerless valour.

This work is an improvement over the source-book avoiding so many defects. Kuntaka mentions a few of such inappropriate incidents. Arjuna defeats Bhīṣma with Śikhaṇḍin in his front. This is impossible for such a hero. On the other hand, the incident of cutting down of the arm of king Bhūriśravas when he was otherwise engaged is certainly uncreditable. Similarly, Arjuna kills Karṇa when he was lifting up his chariot, though told that shooting at such a time was against the rule. Such inappropriate incidents of the original *Mahābhārata* are rightly omitted by Bhāravi.

312 त्रैलोक्याभिनबोल्लेखनायकोत्कर्षपोषिणा ।

इतिहासैकदेशेन प्रबन्धस्य समापनम् ।

तदुत्तरकथावर्तिविरसत्त्वजिहासया ।

कुर्वीत यत्र सुकविः सा विचित्रास्य वक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, IV. 18-19.

There is another variety in the *prabandha-vakratā*. "Supposing the even flow of the main story has been broken and its sentiment impaired by the intrusion of some incident whose connection with the main story is almost indiscernible; the poet might give the incident such a turn that it will become inevitable for the conclusion of the main story and thus maintain the unbroken course of '*rasa*' and invest his whole work with a very unique, novelty thereby."³¹³ For instance, in the *Śiśupālavadha*, Vāsudeva, the hero of the epic, first listens to the message of Indra sent through Nārada. Then, he decides that his foremost duty is to destroy Śiśupāla. But this decision is seen to be apparently ignored when he sets out to Indraprastha. Then, in that very sacrifice, Śiśupāla saw his end. Thus the thread which first took the story in the opposite direction itself has been pressed into service in an effective way to yield the designed goal.

"Again, though the hero is concerned in achieving primarily a single goal, when he is seen to attain incidentally many other equally great fruits, which add up to make his glory shine very brilliantly, such an assemblage of his great achievements will contribute in another way to the beauty of a work as a whole."³¹⁴ For instance, in the *Nāgānanda*, Jīmūtavāhana offers his body and saves not only one *Nāga* i.e., Śaṅkhacūḍa, but also the whole race of *Nāgas* from the clutches of Garuḍa. Such an all-round achievement of the hero makes the work a perfect piece of literary art.

313 प्रधानवस्तुसम्बन्धतिरोधानविधायिना ।

कार्यान्तरान्तरायेण विच्छिन्नविरसा कथा ॥

तत्रैव तस्य निष्पत्तेर्निबन्धरसोज्ज्वलाम् ।

प्रबन्धस्यानुबध्नाति नवां कामपि वक्रताम् ॥ *Ibid.*, IV. 20-21.

314 यत्रैकफसम्पत्तिसमुद्युक्तोऽपि नायकः ।

फलान्तरेष्वनन्तेषु तत्तुल्यप्रतिपत्तिषु ॥

धत्ते निमित्ततां स्फारयशः सम्भारभाजनम् ।

स्वमहात्म्यचमत्कारात् सा पराप्यस्य वक्रता ॥ *Ibid.*, IV. 22-23.

Apart from these, a poet can display his artistic skill even in designating his main plot with a very significant title.³¹⁵ The proper name itself reveals the abounding inventive power of the poet, since it significantly highlights the most important and interesting aspect of the whole plot itself. For example, titles of plays such as *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, *Mudrārākṣasa*, *Pratimānāṭaka* and so on.

Kuntaka's classification of *vakrokti* is substantially based on Ānandavardhana's classification of *Dhvani*. Ānandavardhana classifies *Dhvani* in *varṇa*, *pada*, *padāvayava*, and so on from the standpoint of *vyāñjaka* or the suggester. Similarly, Kuntaka's classification is based on the different devices of language, beginning from syllables, the minutest ingredients to the whole work which constitutes the highest end in the structural scale. But it must be noted that all the varieties of *vakratā* or beauty so analysed derive from the whole and sole source of *pratibhā* of the poet.

Kuntaka and *Pratyabhijñā-darśana*

There is a close relation between *Alaṅkāraśāstra* and other philosophical systems. Our rhetoricians established their literary theories on the sound basis of different philosophical systems. It is so because many rhetoricians themselves were great philosophers too. Thus, quite naturally their literary theories were affected by their philosophical background. Therefore, in order to understand one's poetic theory, it is necessary to understand his philosophical background.

Kuntaka hails from Kashmir. He was a follower of Kashmir-Śaivism which is generally known as *Pratyabhijñā-darśana*. The invocatory verse of the *Vakroktijīva* itself shows the impact of *Pratyabhijñā-darśana* on Kuntaka. The verse gives the gist of Śaiva metaphysical system: "Salutations to Lord Śiva, the supreme artist, who is the Creator, with the sole

315 आस्तां वस्तुषु वैदग्धी काव्ये कामपि वक्रताम् ।

प्रधानसंविधानाङ्कनान्नापि कुरुते कविः ॥ *Ibid.*, IV. 24.

means of his own dynamic nature, of the exquisite painting which is the universe consisting of three worlds."³¹⁶

The basic tenets of *Pratyabhijñā-darśana* are these: The supreme reality is called Śiva who is infinite consciousness, uncaused, free from all defects, omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient, self-luminous and so on. He is also called *Śaktimat*.³¹⁷ By his own dynamic power (*śakti*) inherent in him, Śiva manifests in the form of limited souls on the one hand, and the objective universe, on the other. Thus, Śiva is one and the only reality whose activity i.e., *spanda* is the cause of all distinctions in the manifested world.

Śiva has five-fold powers viz., *cit* (intelligence), *ānanda* (bliss), *icchā* (will), *jñāna* (knowledge) and *kriyā* (creative power).³¹⁸ Thus, Śiva and his *śakti* are not two separate entities but two phases of the same reality. As a result of the *spandas* (vibration) of *śakti* of Śiva, the whole universe comes into existence. Therefore, *śakti* is the very nature of Śiva, *spanda* is the characteristic of *śakti* and the world is the manifestation of *spanda*. Thus, Śiva and *śakti* are non-distinct; *śakti* and *spanda* are non-distinct; *spanda* and the world are non-distinct. This philosophical implications can be seen in Kuntaka's literary theory. While explaining the different literary styles, he says that the poet and his creative power are identical

316 जगत्त्रितयवैचित्र्य चित्रकर्मविधायिनम् ।

शिवं शक्तिपरिस्पन्दमात्रोपकरणं नुमः ॥ *Vakroktijīvitā*, p. 1.

317 न शिवः शक्तिरहितो न शक्तिर्व्यतिरेकिणी ।

शिवः शक्तस्तथा भावानिच्छया कर्तुमीहते ।

शक्तिशक्तिमतोर्भेदः शैवे जातु न वर्ण्यते ॥ *Śivadr̥ṣṭi*, I. 14.

318 स्वयं प्रकाशरूपता चित्शक्तिः। स्वातन्त्र्यम् आनन्दशक्तिः।

तत् चमत्कारः इच्छाशक्तिः। विमर्शात्मकता ज्ञानशक्तिः।

सर्वाकारयोगित्वं क्रियाशक्तिः। (तन्त्रसार)

Quoted by J. Rudrappa, *Kashmir Śaivism*, University of Mysore, 1969, p. 33-34.

or non-distinct.³¹⁹ For Kuntaka, poetry is nothing but the creation of the poet. The original peculiarity of a poem is due to poet's individuality. Thus, the poet and his creative power (*pratibhā*), *pratibhā* and its *parispanda*, *parispanda* and poetry are non-distinct. Therefore, poetry is nothing but the manifestation of poet's individuality.³²⁰

In this *Śaiva* metaphysical system, as observed earlier, the highest principle is *Śiva*. There is nothing beyond this reality; all that moves in the universe is enveloped by His living presence. And, His *śakti* is described as heart-essence of *Śiva* (*hṛdayam paramēṣṭhinah*). Similarly, in the world of poetry, the poet is the lord and his *śakti* which is nothing but *vakrokti* in its creative process, is regarded as the essence of poetry. This *śakti* or *pratibhā* is not only the essence of poetry, but the essence of the poet too. Therefore, Kuntaka holds that this *pratibhā* of a poet or *vakra-kavi-vyāpāra* is responsible for all the poetic lapses.

Ābhāsavāda or the theory of manifestation is one of the chief doctrines of this philosophical system. From the standpoint of the manifested world, the entire world is nothing but the *ābhāsa* or manifestation of *Śiva*. In the Absolute, the entire variety is in perfect unity exactly as the whole variety of colours that we find in full grown peacock while in a state of perfect identity in the yolk of peacock's egg. This analogy is technically called *mayūrāṇḍarasanyāya*. This philosophical implication may be seen

319 सुकुमारस्वभावस्य हि कवेस्तथाविधैव सहजा शक्तिः समुद्भवति, शक्तिशक्तिमतोरभेदात् । *Vakroktijīvita*, p. 41.

320 The philosophical overtones of the following sentence about the *vācaka* word gives us some ideas of the depth of the impression of philosophy on Kuntaka's literary theory:

कविविवक्षितविशेषाभिधानक्षमत्वमेव वाचकत्वलक्षणम् । यस्मात्प्रतिभायां तत्कालोल्लिखितेन केनचित्परिस्पन्देन परिस्फुरन्तः पदार्थाः प्रकृतप्रस्तावसमुचितेन केनचिदुत्कर्षेण वा समाच्छादितस्वभावाः सन्तो विवक्षाविधेयत्वेन अभिधेयता-पदवीमवतरन्तस्तथाविधविशेषप्रतिपादनसमर्थेनाभिधानेन अभिधीयमानाश्चेतश्चमत्कारितामापद्यन्ते । *Ibid.*, p. 16.

in Kuntaka's doctrine of *alaṅkāra*. According to him, *alaṅkāras* are not distinct from *alaṅkārya*. They are the part and parcel of poetry. So he boldly states what is embellished is poetry.

Another important doctrine of this philosophical system is *spandavāda*. "*Spanda* is the supreme universal power embodying all manifestations. In this, the cause is not different from the effects, though the effects appear as different. *Spanda* is the first moment of will (*ichhāśakti*), the initial motion of the spirit. The term *sphoṭa* (sudden bursting out), *sphurana* (spontaneous outburst), *calana* (movement), *kampana* (shaking out), *niṣyanda* (flowing), *udaya* (awakening), *unmeṣa* (opening out), *ābhāsana* (shining out), *unmīlana* (uprising) and *sphurattā* (vibration) express the concept of *Spanda* in various ways according to the movement in which the *Spanda* energy manifests."³²¹

Thus, in this philosophical system, *Spanda* has following implications:

- i. *Spanda* is the very nature of *Śakti*;
- ii. It is an attribute of *Śakti*;
- iii. It is *vyāpāra* or activity of *Śakti*;
- iv. It is *vilasita* of *Śakti* ; and
- v. It is *sphurattā* of *Śakti*.

Kuntaka uses the term *spanda* with all these implications.³²²

321 J. Rudrappa, *Kashmir Śaivism*, p. 58.

322 i. स्वस्पन्देनात्मीयेन स्वभावेन सुन्दरः ... ।

स्वभावव्यतिरेकेण स्वपरिस्पन्दं विना । *Ibid.*, p. 21.

स्वस्पन्दमहिमा स्वभावोत्कर्षः । *Ibid.*, p.191.

ii. यो धर्मः कश्चित्परिस्पन्दस्तस्याध्यारोप । *Ibid.*, p. 82.

परिस्पन्दः कश्चिदेव धर्मविशेषः । *Ibid.*, p. 195.

iii. परिस्पन्दो व्यापारः क्रियाक्रमलक्षणः । *Ibid.*, p. 4.

सर्वसाधारणः यः परिस्पन्दः व्यापारः । *Ibid.*, p. 223.

iv. सूक्तिपरिस्पन्दाः सुभाषितविलसितानि । *Ibid.*, p. 2.

Before concluding this section, it is to be noted that both Kuntaka and Abhinavagupta belong to Śaiva philosophical system of Kashmir. Though their philosophical basis is one and the same, how do their literary theories are different. The answer probably lies in their schemes of identification of the elements of the philosophical system with the components of their respective literary theories.

Abhinavagupta says that the meaning is Śiva and the speech is Śakti. The non-distinction he wants to establish is that of the poetic import and its verbal form. So in his literary theory, poetic import is in the centre. On the other hand, the non-distinction Kuntaka wants to establish is that of the poet and his creative power and hence the poet is in the centre. In other words, Abhinavagupta's entire theory is conditioned by the standpoint of aesthetic experience of *sahṛdaya*, while Kuntaka analysed poetry from the standpoint of poet's creative process.

Thus, the above observation leads to the conclusion that Kuntaka was very much influenced by *Pratyabhijñā-darśana* and established his literary theory on the basis of this philosophical system. The philosophical identifications of his poetic system are very clear. And we can see the technical terms of *Pratyabhijñā-darśana* used frequently in the *Vakroktijīvita*.

परिस्पन्दः स्वविलसितं तेन। *Ibid.*, p. 102.

v. परिस्पन्दः स्फुरितत्वं तेन सम्पाद्यम् । *Ibid.*, p. 69.

Vakrokti in Relation to Other Literary Concepts

Prefatory Note

*"If synthesis is the watchword of Hindu religion and culture, and if synthesis is the watchword of Hindu ways of life and ways of thought, and if it is the watchword of Hindu civilization, I may at once tell you that it is the watchword of Indian art also."*³²³

Aesthetic experience or *rasa* is the foremost end of poetry. In a literary work, various constituents strive to register their individuality, at the same time, each part should contribute to the central theme by making itself secondary. This is the central idea of *Dhvani* theory. In achieving this, sense of propriety or *aucitya* works behind the scene. It watches and controls the whole poetic process. Thus, the concept of *aucitya* is deemed as a synthesizing force in *Dhvani* theory.

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

Also, cf. "The Indian person appears to be evolved primarily from the unification of distinct cultures, and has developed an attitude of absorbing any amount of diverse kinds of elements in a single whole. This is not the haphazard conglomeration of diverse kinds of things, but the intrinsic unification which results in one synthetic organism. This ideal of the achievement of a life of harmony has moulded the Indian art and the theories on art as well." Dr. Mahesh Adkoli, *Concept of Aucitya in Sanskrit Poetics- A Reappraisal*, pp.46-47.

Kuntaka's *vakrokti* synthesis differs from the *Dhvani* synthesis. According to Kuntaka, all poetry is an inseparable whole where both word and meaning are in perfect concord; where the adorned and the adornment once again make an indivisible whole. And, both the content and the form should be equally aesthetic; and hence, the emphasis is not exclusively either on content or on form but their unity. This is the stand held by Kuntaka. The several elements of poetry must be arranged in a glorious race, competing with each other in making poetry beautiful. The concept of *sāhitya* lies behind this harmonious blending of various elements. It is the perfect harmony and mutual competence between the expression and the expressed in respect of beauty; it is the harmonious blend of all the literary concepts in promoting aesthetic experience.³²⁴

Thus, the concept of *sāhitya* is a synthesizing force in *Vakrokti* theory. But it must be noted that, in the attainment of *sāhitya* too, the importance is given to poet's creative genius which is designated as *vakrokti* or *kavi-vyāpāra*.³²⁵ It is thus helpful in harmonizing and integrating into a unity of several literary concepts. Therefore, the different poetic elements are all related to *vakrokti*.

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

324 For concept of *Sāhitya*, Vide, supra, Ch. III, pp. 75-77.

Cf. "In this respect the concept means the appropriateness and power of the *vācya-vācaka* in suggesting the *Rasa*. For, *Rasa*, Kuntaka accepts as supreme. Therefore, this conception of *Sāhitya* likens it to the other concept of *Aucitya* which also figures very much in Kuntaka."

Dr. V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 100.

325 साहित्यलक्षणस्यैव कविव्यापारस्य वस्तुतः सर्वातिशायित्वम् । *Vakroktijīvita*, p. 25.

I. Vakrokti and Alaṅkāra

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

All that is responsible for poetic appeal is designated as *alaṅkāra* by Bhāmaha and others.³²⁶ They used the term in the sense of both poetic beauty as well as various figures of speech. Vāmana equates the concept of *alaṅkāra* with the concept of beauty and also with various figures of speech in decisive terms.³²⁷ Thus, in pre-*Dhvani* period, the term *alaṅkāra* carried two different meanings viz. overall beauty of poetry and various devices of adornment.

In its second stage, the scope of *alaṅkāra* was restricted by the *Dhvani* theorists. According to *Dhvani* synthesis, *rasa* alone is of primary importance and all other elements are subordinate to it. *Alaṅkāra*, in this changed phenomenon, is only an instrument in enhancing the beauty of a poem. Ānandavardhana says, "Figures are to be known as those that are associated with its parts even like ornaments such as the bracelet."³²⁸ Thus *alaṅkāras* are based on expressed sense and hence they are external appendages to poetry. But when the *alaṅkāras* partake in the element of suggestion, they become intrinsic to poetry. They can enter into the realm of suggestivity in two ways, either in the role of suggesters or in the role of being objects of suggestion. Thus, in the analysis of Ānandavardhana, we find the three-fold treatment of *alaṅkāras*. They are:

326 सैषा सर्वैव वक्तोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते ।

यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना ॥ *Kāvyaṭalaṅkāra* (Bhāmaha), II. 85.

काव्यशोभाकरान् धर्मानलङ्कारान्प्रचक्षते । *Kāvyaḍarśa*, II. 2.

327 सौन्दर्यमलङ्कारः । अलङ्कृतिरलङ्कारः, करणव्युत्पत्त्या पुनरलङ्कारशब्दोऽयम् उदमादिषु वर्तते । *Kāvyaṭalaṅkārasūtra*, I. 1.2.

328 अङ्माश्रितास्त्वलङ्कारा मन्तव्याः कटकादिवत् । *Dhvanyāloka*, II. 6, cd.

- i. Expressed *alaṅkāras*.
- ii. *Alaṅkāras* possessing subordinated suggestion.
- iii. Primarily suggested *alaṅkāras* or *alaṅkāra-Dhvani*.

Of these, Ānandavardhana gave much emphasis to primarily suggested *alaṅkāras* and the *alaṅkāras* possessing subordinated suggestion. The expressed *alaṅkāras* have been taken as mere *vāg-vikalpas*.³²⁹

In its third stage, the concept of *alaṅkāra* got new interpretation and justification by Kuntaka. His main object was to give emphasis on the inner value and beauty of *alaṅkāras*. At the out-set of his *Vakroktijīvitā*, Kuntaka states that the word *alaṅkāra* has several clear-cut and distinct meanings:

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

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

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

iv. The name of a treatise which discusses the beauty of poetry.³³⁰

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

The general comparison of figures of speech with ornaments like bracelet leads one often to the mistaken notion that embellishment is an entity separable from poetry. "But the truth is

329 अनन्ता हि वाग्विकल्पास्तत्प्रकारा एव चालङ्काराः । *Ibid.*, p. 230.

अलङ्कारो हि बाह्यालङ्कारसाम्यादङ्गिगनश्चारुत्वहेतुरुच्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 62.

330 अलङ्कारशब्दः शरीरस्य शोभातिशयकारित्वान्मुख्यतया कटकादिषु वर्तते, तत्कारित्वसामान्यादुपचारादुपमादिषु, तद्वदेव च तत्सदृशेषु गुणेषु, तथैव च तदभिधायिनि ग्रन्थे । *Vakroktijīvitā*, p. 3.

that there is no poetry apart from *alaṅkāras* as there can be a damsel's body in life, apart from her ornaments like the ring and the bracelet."³³¹ Thus Kuntaka declares pinpointedly that 'What is embellished' is regarded as poetry. There is nothing like a pre-existing poetry to which ornaments can be superadded.³³² There is, of course, no such distinction between the embellished and the embellishment. Therefore, *alaṅkāras* are not an external appendages to poetry but they are part and parcel of poetry. Further on he states that both *alaṅkārya* and *alaṅkāra* should equally be aesthetic because both stem from the same aesthetic and creative activity of the poet.

Kuntaka's main stand is that the source of each and every part of poetry is poetic imagination. Hence, *alaṅkāras* too are the direct outcome of imagination.³³³ In a poetic figure, Kuntaka discovers a differentia consisting of a peculiar turn of expression (*vakratā*) resulting in a characteristic strikingness and depends on the imaginative activity of the poet. Thus, the so-called figures of speech of early theorists are admissible only when they possess peculiar charm imparted by the imagination. *Alaṅkāras* thus are dependent on *kavi-pratibhā* without this power, there will be no striking *alaṅkāra*. Hence Kuntaka says:

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

This fact has been emphasized by Ruyyaka:

लौकिकालङ्कारवैधर्म्येण काव्यालङ्काराणाम्लङ्कार्यपारतन्त्र्यध्वननार्थः।

Alaṅkārasarvasva, p. 16.

332 सालङ्कारस्यालङ्करणसहितस्य सकलस्य निरस्तावयवस्य सतः समुदायस्य काव्यता कविकर्मत्वम् । तेनालङ्कृतस्य काव्यत्वमिति स्थितम्, न पुनः काव्यस्यालङ्कारयोग इति । *Vakroktijīvitā*, p. 6.

cf: "The poetic intuition automatically chooses its own expression, which is only the externalisation of this spiritual activity and therefore not a mechanically fixed fact but a part and parcel of that activity." S.K. De, *Sanskrit Poetics as a Study of Aesthetics*, p.15.

333 कविप्रतिभासापरपर्यायप्रायाणामन्येषामपि भूषणानां *Vakroktijīvitā*, p. 192.
तत्सर्वमलङ्कारादि प्रतिभोद्भवं कविशक्तिसमुल्लसितमेव, न पुनराहार्यं यथाकथञ्चित्प्रयत्नेन निष्पाद्यम् । *Ibid.*, p. 44.

“Though as a matter of fact all the three elements of poetry, namely, sentiment, subject in nature, and embellishments, have only poetic skill as their life-essence, still its relationship with embellishments is one of utmost intimacy, for without it, if the object of poetic description comes to have just the bare pattern of a figure of speech in a matter of fact way, it ceases to cause delight to the connoisseurs; and therefore we do not attach any poetic appeal to such a so-called ornament.”³³⁴ And, the *alaṅkāras* are regarded as contributing to fresh charm of poetry.³³⁵ It is also stated that *alaṅkāratva* or figurativeness is due to its capacity to produce the special charm.³³⁶ So, the strikingness or *vicchitti* due to *kavi-pratibhā* is taken as the criterion of a poetic figure. Thus, it would be clear that the two characteristics are necessary to constitute a poetic figure viz. *kavi-pratibhā* and the special charm denoted as *vicchitti*.

Regarding the use and abuse of *alaṅkāras*, Kuntaka's stand does not differ from that of *Rasa-Dhvani* theorists. He says that, when the natural charm of the content is described, there will not be much scope for the use of *alaṅkāras* like simile and so on as their use may spoil its exquisitely delicate beauty.³³⁷ And also “If a subject-matter is wanting in unique excellence, even if it should be adorned with figures, it would fail to delight the connoisseurs even like an airy ghost, and should therefore be disregarded as

334 यद्यपि रसस्वभावलङ्काराणां सर्वेषां कविकौशलमेव जीवितम्, तथाप्यलङ्कारस्य विशेषतस्तदनुग्रहं विना वर्णनाविषयवस्तुनो भूषणाभिधायित्वेनाभिमतस्य स्वरूपमात्रेण परिस्फुरतो यथार्थत्वेन निबध्यमानस्य तद्विदाह्लादानिधानानुपपत्तेर्मनाद्वात्रमपि न वैचित्र्यमुत्प्रेक्षामहे, प्रचुरप्रवाहपतितेतरपदार्थसामान्येन प्रतिभासनात् । *Ibid.*, p. 135.

335 तदेवं नूतनातिशयविधायिनः काव्यार्थस्वरूपस्य अलङ्काराः । *Ibid.*, p. 164.

336 विच्छित्तिविहितपरिमितलङ्करणविन्यासा शोभातिशयनिधानतां प्रतिपद्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 244.

शोभातिशयकारित्वस्य युक्तिशून्यत्वे अलङ्करणत्वानुपपत्तिः । *Ibid.*, p. 170.

337 यदेवंविधे भावस्वभावसौकुमार्यवर्णनप्रस्तावे भूयसां न वाच्यलङ्काराणामुपमादीनामुपयोगयोग्यता सम्भवति, स्वभावसौकुमार्यातिशयम्लानताप्रसङ्गात् । *Ibid.*, p. 125.

valueless.*³³⁸ At the same time, it must be noted that in some instances the content described will not be charming without *alaṅkāras*. In such cases, the addition of *alaṅkāras* capable of endowing description becomes quite proper.³³⁹ But it must be noted that *alaṅkāras* are to be employed with the sense of propriety with the theme described.

Kuntaka agrees with the view that the real office of an *alaṅkāra* is to add aesthetic charm to the content or *alaṅkārya*. He clearly states that, "All the figures of speech explained so far share one common feature; and that is their promotion of aesthetic effect in spirit of their secondary function or status."³⁴⁰ At the same time, Kuntaka holds that sometimes the *alaṅkāras* may shine independently and produce extraordinary delight. "Though logically (or contextually) the subject-matter which is the adorned must be deemed primarily important and naturally it follows that all the adornments or figures of speech should play a subsidiary role in respect of it, when these adornments are so devised as to carry an extraordinary significance, by reason of their very significant placement, they come to assume a rare prominence; and though secondary, they begin to appear as if they were very primary; and since their impressiveness is striking in the way they are used by poets, they are interpreted here as possessing primacy of appeal."³⁴¹ It is also stated that,

338 सातिशयत्वशून्यधर्मयुक्तस्य वस्तुनो विभूषितस्यापि पिशाचादेरिव तद्विदाह्लादकारित्वविरहादनुपादेयत्वमेवेत्यलमतिप्रसङ्गेन । *Ibid.*, p. 129.

339 तदेवविधे विषये वर्णनीयवस्तुविशिष्टातिशयविधयी विभूषणविन्यासो विधेयतां प्रतिपद्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 132.

340 एवं गुणभूतादपि स्वरूपोत्कर्षमहात्म्यादलङ्कारसामान्यस्वभावात् काञ्चिदलङ्कारानभिधायेदानीं विभूषणत्वादेव तथाविधान् गुणभूतानुपक्रमते । *Ibid.*, p. 230.

341 एवमलङ्कार्यस्य वस्तुनः प्रधानभूतस्याङ्गभावेन व्यवस्थितोऽप्यलङ्कारवर्गः किञ्चिदतिरिक्तवृत्तितयोपनिबध्यमानः सन्निवेशसौकुमार्यमाहात्म्यादुद्विक्तभावेन परिस्फुरन् गुणभूतोऽपि मुख्यतामिवापद्यमानः निबन्धनप्रभावानु प्राधान्येनावभासमानो व्याख्यातः । *Ibid.*, p. 194.

even as *rasa* produces delectability in poetry as well as the aesthetic delight of refined readers, so also *alaṅkāras* like simile produce both these effects.³⁴² Thus, the above stands regarding the *alaṅkāras* are outstanding contribution of Kuntaka.

Thus, the real office of an *alaṅkāra* is to achieve new vitality to even insipid subjects by its unique capacity. And hence, they become the source of new delight to the refined readers.³⁴³ Kuntaka thus defined *alaṅkāra* as something internal to poetry. He refused to recognize any *alaṅkāra* as an *alaṅkāra* unless it evokes *rasa*. He emphatically declared that all true *alaṅkāras* are *rasavat*.

Kuntaka too, like Ānandavardhana, accepts the three-fold nature of *alaṅkāras*. It is said that the soul of *alaṅkāra* is three-fold viz. explicitly stated, implied by indicators and the suggested.³⁴⁴ As noted earlier, Ānandavardhana emphasized the *alaṅkāras* which possess primarily or secondarily suggested elements. And the expressed *alaṅkāras* have been treated as *vāg-vikalpas* and considered lowest class of poetry. But there might arise cases where the poet's obvious intention is not to awaken *rasa* or anything else unexpressed, but simply to produce a strikingness in the form of expressed figures. It may be seen in figurative depiction of inanimate objects like the flowing river, the blooming flower and so on. It is of course difficult for the later *Dhvani* theorists to consider all such compositions as lowest class of poetry. So they extend their view as there is an indirect touch of *rasa*.

Kuntaka justifies the significance of such figures of speech in poetry and shows that this significance is independent of all considerations. "Kuntaka in this way not only supplies a

342 यथा रसः काव्यस्य रसवत्तां तद्विदाह्लादं च विदधात्येवमुपमादिरप्युभयं निष्पादयन् रसवदलङ्कारः सम्पद्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 165.

343 यदपि नीरसप्रायं पदार्थजातं तदपि सर्वमनेनैव सरसतामुपपद्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 169.

344 वाच्यं सामर्थ्यलभ्यं च प्रतीत्या च समर्पितम् ।

अलङ्कृतीनामात्मानं त्रिविधं तद्विदो विदुः ॥ *Ibid.*, III. 23.

remarkable deficiency in the teaching of the *Dhvanikāra* and Ānandavardhana, but also justifies the existence and fixes the conception of a poetic figure as distinguished from a mere speech-figure. It is no wonder, therefore, that later followers of the *Dhvani* School, who form the bulk of post-*Dhvani* writers on poetics, readily accept Kuntaka's analysis, and regard the two characteristics, viz. *vicchitti* and *kavi-vyāpāra* as forming the ultimate test of a poetic figure.³⁴⁵

The later rhetoricians, even if they neglected Kuntaka's *Vakroktijīvita*, have accepted Kuntaka's idea of poetic figure. Mammaṭa repeats in general the view of Ānandavardhana, but he adds that in cases where there is no suggested *rasa*, the poetic figures simply result in a charmingness of expression.³⁴⁶ At the very outset of the tenth chapter of his *Kāvyaaprakāśa*, Mammaṭa states that *alaṅkāra* is strikingness itself.³⁴⁷ At other place, while criticizing Rudraṭa's definition of the figure *hetu*, Mammaṭa agrees with Bhāmaha and Kuntaka that it is no poetic figure at all because it has no strikingness.³⁴⁸

Ruyyaka and his commentators too accepted Kuntaka's analysis of *alaṅkāra*. The strikingness (*vicchitti*) due to *kavi-pratibhā* is taken throughout as criterion of a poetic figure by Ruyyaka.³⁴⁹ Jayaratha in many places of his commentary makes

345 S.K. De, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. II, p. 189.

346 यत्र तु नास्ति रसः, तत्र उक्तिवैचित्र्यमात्रपर्यवसायिनः। *Kāvyaaprakāśa*, *vṛtti* on VIII. 2.

347 वैचित्र्यं चालङ्कारः। *Ibid.*, *vṛtti* on X.1.

348 हेत्वलङ्कारोऽत्र न लक्षितः। आयुर्धृतमित्यादिरूपो ह्येष न भूषणतां कदाचिदहति वैचित्र्याभावात्। *Ibid.*, under X. 34.

349 सादृश्यहेतुकापि भ्रान्तिर्विच्छित्यर्थं कविप्रतिभोत्थापितैव गृह्यते । *Alaṅkārasarvasva*, Ed. S.S. Janaki, Delhi, 1965, p. 58.

कविप्रतिभोत्थापिते सन्देहे सन्देहालङ्कारः। *Ibid.*, p. 55.

रूपकमूलत्वेनालङ्कारान्तरगर्भीकारेण विच्छित्याश्रयणात्तर्कानुमानवैलक्षण्यम् । *Ibid.*, p. 173.

the standpoint of Ruyyaka quite explicit.³⁵⁰ He states that the essential factor is *kavikarma*; without it no *alaṅkāra* is possible. *Jagannātha*, the author of *Rasagaṅgādhara*, has repeatedly stressed the special mode of utterance or *bhaṇīti-viśeṣa* which constitutes the *alaṅkāra*. He accepts the theory beyond question that the peculiar charm resulting from *kavi-pratibhā* is the general nature of *alaṅkāras*.³⁵¹ Thus, it would be clear that how later theorists were influenced by Kuntaka's thought in forming the doctrine of *alaṅkāra*.

Before concluding this section, it must be noted that Kuntaka accepts only eighteen *alaṅkāras*. They are *dīpaka*, *rūpaka*, *upamā*, *utprekṣā*, *vyatireka*, *śleṣa*, *arthāntaranyāsa*, *ākṣepa*, *vibhāvanā*, *paryāyokta*, *apraśutapraśamsā*, *atiśayokti*, *sasamdeha*, *virodha*, *apanhuti*, *vyājastuti*, *dr̥ṣṭānta* and *sahokti*.³⁵²

350 कविप्रतिभात्मकस्य विच्छित्तिविशेषात्मकस्यालङ्कारत्वेनोक्तत्वात् । *Vimarśinī* on *Alaṅkārasarvasva*, p. 144.

दोषाभावमात्रं च नालङ्कारत्वं तस्य कविप्रतिभात्मकविच्छित्तिविशेषत्वेनोक्तत्वात् । *Ibid.*, p. 149.

अतश्चास्य कविकर्मैववैलक्षण्यनिमित्तम्

एवं च कविकर्माभावाद् यत्र विच्छित्तिविशेषाश्रयणं न स्यात् तत्र नायमलङ्कारःकविकर्मणा एवालङ्कारनिबन्धनत्वेनोक्तत्वात् । *Ibid.*, p. 160.

351 विच्छित्तिविशेषादलङ्कारता । *Rasagaṅgādhara*, p. 477.

काव्यलिङ्गं नालङ्कारः । वैचित्र्यात्मनो विच्छित्तिविशेषस्याभावात् । *Ibid.*, p. 633.

अस्य च कविप्रतिभोल्लिखितत्वेन चमत्कारित्वे काव्यालङ्कारता । *Ibid.*, p. 640.

अलङ्काराणां भणितिविशेषमात्ररूपत्वात् । *Ibid.*, p. 593.

विच्छित्तिविशेषोलङ्कारभेदक इति प्राचामुक्तिरेवात्र शरणम् । *Ibid.*, p. 619.

अलङ्काराणां परस्परविच्छेदस्य वैलक्षण्यस्य हेतुभूता जन्यतासंसर्गेण काव्यनिष्ठा कविप्रतिभा तज्जन्यत्वप्रयुक्ता चमत्कारिता वा विच्छित्तिः । *Ibid.*, p. 628.

352 Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy says that Kuntaka has accepted only sixteen *alaṅkāras*. But he mentions only fifteen *alaṅkāras*. (*Vakroktijīva*, Intro. p. XXXI) In fact, Kuntaka accepts eighteen *alaṅkāras*.

He brings some of the remaining *alaṅkāras* under one or the other *alaṅkāra* accepted by him. For instance, *ananvaya*, *nidarśana* and the like are included in the purview of *upamālaṅkāra*. And, some *alaṅkāras* have been rejected due to lack of charmingness and the *rasavat* and so on are considered as *alaṅkārya*.³⁵³ Therefore, it is a mistake to think that Kuntaka's main preoccupation was with figurative expression. He, for the first time, revolted against the tendency of multiplying the number of *alaṅkāras*. "In the decadent period of Indian poetics from Mammaṭa onwards, the tendency of adding to the number of *alaṅkāras* and their subdivisions in a mechanical way became a rage; and the fine distinctions between them from the intellectual standpoint almost elbowed out the underlying aesthetic theory, which was taken almost as an axiomatic postulate".³⁵⁴

Thus, Kuntaka is the only exception to this general tendency. He boldly states that there is an infinite possibility in poetic modes of expression, but not in the definitions of individual figures.³⁵⁵ In other words, it can be said that a number of figures, that appear different in their details, can be brought under a single head as the principle governing all of them will be the same.

II Vakrokti and Svabhāvokti

In Sanskrit poetics, the two modes of expression viz. natural and figurative have been recognized as two distinct sources of poetic beauty. Daṇḍin has divided the whole realm of

353 भूषणान्तरभावेन शोभाशून्यतया तथा ।

अलङ्कारास्तु ये केचिन्नालङ्कारतया मनाक् ॥

... न केवलं ताभ्यामेव, यावदलङ्कारतया विभूष्यत्वेनापि तेषामलङ्करणत्वमनुपपन्नम् ।
Vakroktijīvita, III. 62.

354 K. Krishnamoorthy, *Indian Literary Theories*, p. 165.

355 तदेवमभिधावैचित्र्यप्रकाराणामेवंविधं वैश्वरूपं, न पुनर्लक्षणभेदानाम् । *Op. Cit.*, p. 204.

literature into two classes viz. *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti*. This two-fold division is implicitly accepted by Abhinavagupta too. He makes the interesting comparison of these modes of expression to *lokadharmī* and *nāṭyadharmī*, respectively, and recognizes as the two facilities of suggestive language responsible for the delineation of *rasa*.³⁵⁶ Thus, in Indian literary context, *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti* represent the two distinct modes of poetic expression which constitute the fundamental approaches in literature.³⁵⁷

Svabhāvokti is the natural description of a thing. It is nothing but the description of things as they are. For instance, the descriptions of a child, or a young, innocent lady, the sports of birds and animals bring more charm to poetry.³⁵⁸ Daṇḍin considered *svabhāvokti* as the first embellishment and divided it into four categories viz., description of a class or *jāti*, actions or *kriyā*, qualities or *guṇa* and substance or *dravya*.³⁵⁹ Thus, *svabhāvokti* is recognized as an important *alāṅkāra*

356 काव्येऽपि च लोकनाट्यधर्मिस्थानीयेन स्वभावोक्तिवक्रोक्तिप्रकारद्वयेनालौकिकप्रसन्नमधुरौजस्विशब्दसमर्पमाण विभावादियोगादियमेव रसवार्ता । *Locana*, p. 197.

For detail, See, Supra, Ch. II, pp. 40-42.

357 It is generally held that *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti* are mere figures of speech. Daṇḍin, Abhinavagupta, Kuntaka and Bhoja are few exceptions to this general notion.

cf: "It is interesting to note that somewhat parallel notion of the *svabhāvokti-vakrokti* pair of Sanskrit poetics can be found in the concept of direct and oblique poetry formulated by E.M.W. Tillyard." C. Rajendran, *Studies in Comparative Poetics*, p. 74.

358 संस्थानावस्थानक्रियादि यद्यस्य यादृशं भवति ।

लोके चिरप्रसिद्धं तत्कथनमनन्यथा जातिः ।

शिशुमुग्धयुवतिकातरतिर्यक्संभ्रान्तहीनप्रात्राणाम् ।

सा कालावस्थोचितचेष्टासु विशेषतो रम्या ॥ Rudrata's *Kāvyaalāṅkāra*, VII. 30-31.

359 नानावस्थं पदार्थानां रूपं साक्षात् विवृण्वती ।

स्वभावोक्तिश्च जातिश्चेत्याद्या सालङ्कृतिर्यथा ।

जातिक्रियागुणद्रव्यस्वभावाख्यानमीदृशम् ।

by the rhetoricians. Except Kuntaka, all the rhetoricians of Sanskrit poetics declare with one voice that *svabhāvokti* is an *alaṅkāra*.

Kuntaka's treatment of *svabhāvokti* as an *alaṅkārya* is unique in the history of Sanskrit poetics. Kuntaka criticizes the view of his predecessors regarding the figure *svabhāvokti*. *Svabhāvokti* is nothing but the natural description of a thing; if *vastu-svabhāva* itself is an *alaṅkāra* what else remains for *alaṅkārya* or being embellished. Thus, Kuntaka says, there will be a self-contradiction if we consider *svabhāvokti* as an *alaṅkāra*.³⁶⁰ Further on, he states that, it is impossible to state anything about a thing except in terms of its *svabhāva* or nature. In a poetic context, nature of a thing or *vastu-svabhāva* is nothing but the poetic theme intended by the poet. Without this, an object is tantamount to a non-existent idea.³⁶¹ Thus *vastu-svabhāva* is to be considered as the body of description. If the body of description itself is counted as an *alaṅkāra*, what would be the other thing which can adorn it? One should not climb upon one's own shoulder.³⁶² Therefore, *svabhāvokti* cannot be *alaṅkāra* as it is the very nature of the idea which

शास्त्रेष्वस्यैव साम्राज्यं काव्येष्वप्येतदीप्सितम् ॥ *Kāvyaadarśa*, II. 8 & 13.

360 अलङ्कारकृतां येषां स्वभावोक्तिरलङ्कृतिः ।

अलङ्कार्यतया तेषां किमन्यदवतिष्ठते ॥ *Vakroktijīva*, I. 11.

361 स्वभावव्यतिरिक्तेण वक्तुमेव न युज्यते ।

वस्तु तद्रहितं यस्मान्निरुपाख्यं प्रसज्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 12.

यस्यकस्यचिद्वर्ण्यमानस्य वस्तुनो वर्णनीयत्वेन स्वभाव एव वर्ण्यशरीरम् । *Ibid.*, p. 21.

362 शरीरं चेदलङ्कारः किमलङ्कुरुतेऽपरम् ।

आत्मैव नात्मनः स्कन्धं क्वचिदप्यधिरोहति ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 13.

cf. "In the whole field of Sanskrit poetics, Kuntaka is the only theorist who calls a spade a spade and asks us -'How can you stand on your own shoulder? As far as I know, no straight answer has been forthcoming up to date in the field of Sanskrit criticism."

K. Krishnamoorthy, *Studies in Indian Aesthetics and Criticism*, pp. 193-94.

provides the material for the further employment of *alaṅkāras*.³⁶³

It is said that, *alaṅkāra* and *alaṅkārya* are not one and the same. Everywhere in the poetry we find *vastu-svabhāva-varṇana*, and if it is called *alaṅkāra*, there is no scope for other *alaṅkāras* like simile, and if at all they occur, it will be the case of either *samsṛṣṭi* (separable union of figures) or *saṅkara* (inseparable union of figures). So, only these two *alaṅkāras* will remain in poetry; and defining all other *alaṅkāras* will be useless as they will not have any scope.³⁶⁴ Or it may be argued that merely the general nature of things is *alaṅkārya*, and the special nature is *alaṅkāra*. Kuntaka states that this argument is not at all sound. Writing poetry is not something which has to be done perforce because the whole poetic activity is taken up for definition in the context of delight to the refined readers.³⁶⁵ Both the *alaṅkārya* and *alaṅkāra* must be equally beautiful. Therefore, the general nature of things stands outside the purview of discussion in poetics.

Thus, *vastu-svabhāva* should be considered as *alaṅkārya*. When a thing is imagined by a poet as fit for poetic description, its

363 यस्यकस्यचित् पदार्थजातस्य कविव्यापारविषयत्वेन वर्णनापदवीमवतरतः स्वभाव एव सहृदयाह्लादकारी काव्यशरीरत्वेन वर्णनीयतां प्रतिपद्यते । स एव च यथायोगं शोभातिशयकारिणा येन केनचिदलङ्कारेण योजयितव्यः । *Op.cit.* pp. 22-23.

364 भूषणत्वे स्वभावस्य विहिते भूषणान्तरे ।

भेदावबोधः प्रकटस्तयोरप्रकटोऽथवा ॥

स्पष्टे सर्वत्र संसृष्टिरस्पष्टे सङ्करस्ततः ।

अलङ्कारान्तराणां च विषयोनावशिष्यते ॥ *Vakroktijivita*, I. 14-15.

365 यतस्तेषां सामान्यवस्तुधर्ममात्रमलङ्कार्यम्, सातिशयस्वभाव-सौन्दर्यपरिपोषणमलङ्कारः प्रतिभासते । तेन स्वभावोक्तेरलङ्कारत्वमेव युक्तियुक्तमिति ये मन्यन्ते तान् प्रति समाधीयते - तदेतन्नातिचतुरस्रम् । यस्मादगतिकगतिन्यायेन काव्यकरणं न यथाकथञ्चिदनुष्ठेयतामर्हति, तद्विदाह्लादकारिकाव्यलक्षणप्रस्तावात् । किञ्च अनुकृष्टधर्मयुक्तस्य वर्णनीयस्यालङ्करणमप्युसमुचितमिति भागोल्लिखित आलेख्यवन्नशोभातिशयकारितामावहति । *Ibid.*, p. 126.

nature itself becomes a beautiful *kāvyaśarīra* which attracts the hearts of refined readers. And such *kāvyaśarīra* is to be decorated by charming figures of speech. At the same time, it must be noted that the excessive use of figures of speech may spoil the delicacy of *svabhāva-varṇana* or *rasapoṣaṇa*. So the employment of figures of speech should be made carefully by the poets. Kuntaka gives a beautiful analogy that a lady does not wear many ornaments at the time of her bath, love-sports and so on. Natural charm, in such occasions, will be more charming due to her natural delicacy.³⁶⁶

Kuntaka also insists that, if the content is not beautiful, any addition of *alaṅkāras* will fail to add beauty to it as a portrait painted on an improper canvas. Therefore, it must be conceded that the content described should be full of exquisitely beautiful natural traits. Kuntaka thus rebels against the established tradition to form his new and unique theory of *Svabhāvokti* as *alaṅkārya*.³⁶⁷ Cases which are *svabhāvokti* for others would be cases of *vastuvakratā* for Kuntaka.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Mahimabhaṭṭa eloquently defends *svabhāvokti* as an *alaṅkāra*. One thing can be described generally or particularly, when it is described particularly its nature is well known and a poet has to use his power (*pratibhā*) to make the natural description charming which

366 यस्मादत्यन्तरमणीयस्वाभाविकधर्मयुक्तं वर्णनीयवस्तु परिग्रहणीयम् । तथाविधस्य तस्य यथायोगमौचित्यानुसारेण रूपकाद्यलङ्कारयोजनया भवितव्यम् । एतावांस्तु विशेषो यत् स्वाभाविकसौकुमार्यप्राधान्येन विवक्षितस्य न भूयसा रूपकाद्यलङ्कार उपकाराय कल्पते, वस्तुस्वभावसौकुमार्यस्य रसादिपरिपोषणस्य वा समाच्छादनप्रसङ्गात् । तथा चैतस्मिन् विषये सर्वाकारमलङ्कार्य विलासवतीव स्नानसमयविरहव्रतपरिग्रहसुरतावासानादौ नात्यन्तमलङ्करणसहतां प्रतिपद्यते, स्वाभाविकसौकुमार्यस्यैव रसिकहृदयाह्लादकारित्वात् । *Ibid.*, p. 126.

367 Cf. "Kuntaka does not reject *svabhāvokti*, lock, stock and barrel. He only declares that it is a self-contradiction to style, it is an ornament because it is truly what is embellished (*alaṅkārya*)."

K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvita*, Intro., p. XXXI.

is not the same as found in the ordinary speech.³⁶⁸ "It is accepted by logicians that one's apprehension of an object there are really two kinds of awareness, one of the object itself as such and another of the object as possessing a name and such belonging to class. Perception is thus indeterminate and determinate, *nirvikalpaka* and *savikalpaka*. Somewhat similar to this, there are two apprehensions of an object by a poet endowed with penetrating imagination and by an ordinary man. The latter sees what is but the common nature—*sāmānya-svarūpa*—of an object; the expression which he uses in communicating about that object communicates only the ordinary nature of the object. But the imaginative eye of the poet which is like a Yogin's vision or a divine third eye, sees a special aspect of a thing, not with reference to its common nature, but details whose presentations reveal a wondrous picture of it. If we understood Mahima's *sāmānya* and *viśeṣa-svabhāva* in such a general manner, his verses do not offer any problem for interpretation."³⁶⁹ But Kuntaka holds that the general nature of the object stands outside the purview of poetry; and the *viśiṣṭa-svabhāva* alone forms the body of poetry. Thus, Kuntaka, however, is still unanswered. Hemalatha Deshpande opines that "If naturally beautiful *artha* alone is *kāvyaārtha*, then Kuntaka is right. On the other hand, if an *artha* in poetry is held to be transformed into beauty by the imagination of the poet, then Mahimabhaṭṭa will be right in calling *svabhāvokti* an *alaṅkāra*. The operation of *pratibhā* occurs

368 कथं तर्हि स्वभावोक्तेरलङ्कारत्वमिष्यते ।

नहि स्वभावमात्रोक्तौ विशेषः कश्चनानयोः॥

उच्यते वस्तुनस्तावद्वैरूप्यमिह विद्यते ।

तत्रैकमत्र सामान्यं यद्विकल्पैकगोचरः।

स एव सर्वशब्दानां विषयः परिकीर्तितः ।

विशिष्टमस्य यद्वपुं तत् प्रत्यक्षस्य गोचरः।

स एव सत्कविगिरां गोचरः प्रतिभाभुवाम् ॥ *Vyaktiviveka*, II. 113-116.

369 V. Raghavan, *Studies in Some Concepts of Alaṅkāraśāstra*, p. 115.

not only before the act of creation but continues even during the creation itself as attested by several artists. Such being the case, it is very difficult to decide between these two views."³⁷⁰

Ruyyaka has something special to contribute to the study of *svabhāvokti*. He holds that the description of the minute nature (*sukṣmasvabhāva*) of a thing as it is, is *svabhāvokti*.³⁷¹ This minuteness is perceived only by the power of imagination and hence such descriptions are called *alaṅkāras*. But it is interesting to note that Ruyyaka refuses to include *svabhāvokti* under any of the broad heads of *alaṅkāras* as it relates primarily to the poetic content.³⁷²

370 Hemalata Deshpande, *Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka- A Comparative Study*, (Ph.D. Thesis) Karnatak University, Dharwad, 1967, p. 10.

Note: *Śatāvadhāni* R. Ganesh strongly opposes Kuntaka's stand on *svabhāvokti* as *alaṅkārya*. In his lucid and exhaustive article, he establishes the *alaṅkāratva* of *svabhāvokti* on aesthetic and philosophical grounds. He states that, infact Kuntaka's concept of *vakrokti* is all-pervading; but his argumentation of *svabhāvokti* as *alaṅkārya* is incorrect and self-contradictory.

Vide, *Śatāvadhāni* R. Ganesh, '*Svabhāvoktiya Samasye*' (Kannada) in *Shambhunidhi* (Prof. C.G. Purushottama Sambhavana Grantha), Pratibha Samsad, Mysore, 1995, pp.10-79.

371 सूक्ष्मवस्तुस्वभावस्य यथावद्वर्णनं स्वभावोक्तिः। *Alaṅkārasarvasva*, I. 78.

Vidyā Cakravartin comments:

कविप्रतिभागोचरस्य स्वभावस्य सम्यग्वर्णनं स्वभावोक्तिः।

372 "Among the *alaṅkāras* dealt with by Ruyyaka at the end of his work, figures like *Svabhāvokti*, *Bhāvika*, *Rasavad*, *Preyas* and *Ūjasvin* related to *rasa*, stand on a different and higher footing. In the treatment of *Svabhāvokti* and *Bhāvika* especially, Ruyyaka has clarified in a detailed manner, the conceptions of these figures and marked off the respective spheres of these two and *Rasavad*."

S.S. Janaki, *Alaṅkārasarvasva*, Intro., p. 126.

Vide, K. Krishnamoorthy, '*Ruyyaka's Views on the Nature of Poetic Beauty*' in *Essays in Sanskrit Criticism*, pp. 230-40.

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

III. Vakrokti and Rasavadalaṅkāra

Rasavadalaṅkāra is a delightful figure of speech.³⁷³ Before Kuntaka, there were two major theories regarding the figure *rasavat*; one is in the pre-*dhvani* period headed by Bhāmaha and the other is in *Dhvani* school led by Ānandavardhana. Kuntaka took a bold step on the nature of *rasavadalaṅkāra* as against the established tradition. His treatment of *rasavadalaṅkāra* has two sections; in the first section Kuntaka scrutinized the views of his predecessors and in the second section he gives his own definition of *rasavadalaṅkāra*.

In poetry, whenever the sentiments are manifested clearly, it is the case of *rasavadalaṅkāra* for Bhāmaha and his followers.³⁷⁴ They comprehended all ideas of *rasa* in *rasavat* and allied *alaṅkāras*. Thus, they considered *rasavat* as subserving the expressed meaning in poetry. Udbhaṭa extends

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

374 रसवद्दृशितस्पष्टशृङ्गारादिरसं यथा ।

देवी समागमद्धर्ममस्करिण्यतिरोहिता ॥ *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra*, III. 6.

रसवद्रसपेशलम् । *Kāvyaḍarśa*, II. 275 (b).

the idea of Bhāmaha. He states that, in *rasavadalaṅkāra* there must be a clear portrayal of any of the nine sentiments. And that *rasa* can be manifested by the five elements viz. specification of *rasa* by its designation, mention of permanent emotion, depiction of the passing mood and narration of the exitant and gesture.³⁷⁵ Thus, it would be clear that the manifestation of *rasa* is considered as *rasavadalaṅkāra* by Bhāmaha and his followers.

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

"But if in a poem the chief purport of the sentence should relate to something else, and if sentiments and so on should come in only as auxiliaries to it, it is my opinion that sentiment and so on are figures of speech in such a poem."³⁷⁶ Two points are highlighted here; one, there must be a main purport in a poem, and second, there must be sentiments and other similar things which are subsidiary to the main purport of the poem. It is thus *rasa* has a dual position in poetry. It may be both *dhvani* and *alaṅkāra* depending on the poetic intention.

Kuntaka, however, does not admit this dual position of *rasa*. For him, *rasa* is always of primary importance. Hence, he criticized all the earlier views on *rasavadalaṅkāra* including that of

375 रसवद्दर्शितस्पष्टशृङ्गारादिरसोदयम् ।

स्वशब्दस्थायिसञ्चारिविभावाभिनयास्पदम् ॥ *Kāvyaṭīkārasaṅgraha*, IV. 3.

376 प्रधानेऽन्यत्र वाक्यार्थे यत्राङ्गं तु रसादयः ।

काव्ये तस्मिन्नलङ्कारो रसादिरिति मे मतिः ॥ *Dhvanyāloka*, II. 5.

Ānandavardhana. Kuntaka boldly states that *rasavat* is not an *alaṅkāra* but *alaṅkārya*. His argument is based on two points:

"*Rasavat* is not an ornament because there is nothing palpable apart from it which is adorned by it, and because the literal meaning of that word itself is contradicted."³⁷⁷ Kuntaka elucidates the point that in *rasavadalaṅkāra*, there is no additional decorative element beyond the *kāvya-svarūpa* itself, he cites and examines the definitions of *rasavadalaṅkāra* of Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhaṭa and shows the self-descrepant conception representing *alaṅkārya* as an *alaṅkāra* of ancient theorists.

He also criticizes Udbhaṭa's theory of 'Rasa by its designation' (*svaśabdavācyarasa*) and asks whether *rasa* is *svaśabdavācyā* or *rasavat* is *svaśabdavācyā*. If it is accepted, by mere utterance of the word *śṛṅgāra*, *rasa* can be experienced and thus by mere uttering of the words we will be able to enjoy all the happiness and luxuries in the world.³⁷⁸ Thus, this theory is not at all sound.

Kuntaka then examines with the help of grammar that the word *rasavadalaṅkāra* itself is a contradictory one.³⁷⁹ His critical examination may be summarized as below:

377 अलङ्कारो न रसवत् परस्याप्रतिभासनात् ।

स्वरूपादतिरिक्तस्य शब्दार्थासङ्गतेरपि ॥ *Vakroktijīvitā*, III. 11.

378 ततस्त एव रससर्वस्वसमाहितचेतसस्तत्परमार्थविदो विद्वांस एव प्रष्टव्याः - किं स्वशब्दास्पदत्वं रसानामुत रसवत् इति । तत्र पूर्वस्मिन् पक्षे रस्यन्त इति रसास्ते स्वशब्दास्पदास्तेषु तिष्ठन्तः शृङ्गारादिषु वर्तमानाः सन्तः तज्ज्ञैरास्वाद्यन्ते । तदिदमुक्तं भवति - यत् स्वशब्दैरभिधीयमानाः श्रुतिपथमवतरन्तश्चेतनानां चर्वणचमत्कारं कुर्वन्तीत्यनेन न्यायेन घृतपूरप्रभृतयः पदार्थाः स्वशब्दैरभिधीयमानास्तदास्वादपदं सम्पादयतीत्येव सर्वस्य कस्यचिदुपभोगसुखार्थिनस्तैरुदारचरितैरयत्नेनैव तदभिधानमात्रादेव त्रैलोक्यराज्यसम्पत्सौख्यसमृद्धिः प्रतिपाद्यते इति नमस्तेभ्यः। *Ibid.*, p. 146.

379 Vide, *Ibid.*, p. 145.

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

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

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

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

Kuntaka then takes up the two verses from *Vikramorvaśīya* of Kālidāsa³⁸⁰ which Ānandavardhana cites to show *rasa* in the

380 तन्वी मेघजलार्द्रपल्लवतया धौताधरेवाश्रुभिः

शून्येवाभरणैः स्वकालविरहाद् विश्रान्तपुष्पोद्गमा ।

चिन्तामौनमिवास्थिता मधुकृतां शब्दैर्विना लक्ष्यते

चण्डी मामवधूय पादपतितं जातानुतापेव सा ॥

तरङ्गभूभङ्गा क्षुभितविहगश्रेणिरशना

विकर्षन्ती फेनं वसनमिव संरम्भशियिलम् ।

यथाविद्धं याति स्खलितमभिसंधाय बहुशो

नदीभावेनेयं ध्रुवमसहना सा परिणता । *Vikramorvaśīya*, IV. 38 & IV. 28.

description of inanimate objects, and examines whether the word *rasavat* could be derived properly. In these two examples, *rasa* and *alaṅkāra* can be known separately. The splitting of the term *rasavat* as रसवतः अलङ्कारः is quite proper here. After all, the purpose of *alaṅkāra* is to nourish and develop *rasa* and hence, *rasavatva* depends on *alaṅkāra*. The other explanation i.e., रसवांश्चासौ अलङ्कारश्च is also applicable. Both the verses describe the sentiment of love in separation. The *rasa* attributed to the river and the creeper is *alaṅkārya*. The figures of speech viz. simile and metaphor are the figures of *śṛṅgāra-rasa*. Kuntaka finally points out that neither of these two ways of explanation are completely correct.³⁸¹ Thus, *rasavat* cannot be justified by a possessive compound or an attributive compound in the sense which earlier theorists conceived.

There is no point in conceiving a special *alaṅkāra* called *rasavat*. *Rasa* itself is the essence of poetry, and hence, if its *alaṅkāra* is called *rasavat* then all the *alaṅkāras* like *upamā* would be entitled to be called *rasavadalaṅkāra*. This would not be proper. Or, it may also be argued that in the case of animate objects, the description of *rasa* is *rasavadalaṅkāra*; and in the case of inanimate objects the description of *rasa* leads to other figures of speech like *upamā*. But Kuntaka says that *rasa* can be developed in inanimate objects also when they are described like animate objects and such examples can prove to be *sarasa-kāvya* if they take shape beneath the pen of great poets.³⁸²

381 किन्तु 'अलङ्कार' शब्दाभिधानं विना विशेषणसमासपक्षे केवलस्य रसवानिति अस्य प्रयोगः प्राप्नोति । रसवानलङ्कार इति चेत् प्रतीतिरभ्युपगम्यते, तदपि युक्तियुक्ततां नार्हति, रूपकादेरभावात् । रसवतोऽलङ्कार इति षष्ठीसमासपक्षोऽपि न सुस्पष्टसमन्वयः । सर्वस्य कस्यचित् काव्यस्य रसवत्त्वमेव । *Vakroktijīvita*, pp. 148-49.

382 अथवा चेतनपदार्थगोचरतया रसवदलङ्कारस्य निश्चेतनवस्तुविषयत्वेन चोपमादीनां विभागो व्यवस्थाप्यते, तदपि न विद्वज्जनावर्जनं विदधाति । यस्मादचेतनानामपि रसोद्दीपनसामर्थ्यसमुचितसत्कविसमुल्लिखि तसौकुमार्यसरसत्वादुपमादीनां प्रविरलविषयता निर्विषयत्वं वा स्यादिति शृङ्गारादिरसनिस्त्यन्दसुन्दरस्य सत्कविप्रवाहस्य च नीरसत्वं प्रसज्यत इति प्रतिपादितमेव पूर्वसूरिभिः । *Ibid.*, p. 149.

Kuntaka here agrees with Ānandavardhana's point that if *rasatva* is not admitted in inanimate things, the vast portion of good poetry will be counted as bad poetry.³⁸³

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

As observed earlier, in the scheme of *Dhvani* theory, *rasa* has dual position. It may be both *dhvani* and *alaṅkāra* depending on the poetic intention. Kuntaka feels that, this is the most intriguing and confusing part of the *dhvani* argument. For him, *rasa* is always of primary importance and cannot be subordinate to anything else. Hence, he criticises Ānandavardhana's view. His review of the example given by Ānandavardhana is indeed refreshing. Here it is:

किं हास्येन न मे प्रयास्यसि पुनः प्राप्तस्चिराद्दर्शनं

केयं निष्करुण प्रवासरुचिता केनासि दूरीकृतः ।

स्वप्नान्तेष्विति ते वदन् प्रियतमव्यासक्तकण्ठग्रहो

बुद्ध्वा रोदिति रिक्तबाहुवलयस्तारं रिपुस्त्रीजनः ॥³⁸⁴

Ānandavardhana holds that this is the pure example of *rasavadalaṅkāra* because *karuṇarasa* or the sentiment of pathos is portrayed here as subservient to the primarily intended praise of the king.³⁸⁵ But Kuntaka does not think so. This is the penetrating critique of Kuntaka:

"Here the primary purport is: "O King, as you have slain all your enemies, the widows of thy enemies are plunged in sorrow and helplessness; they are in such a wretched plight that the pathos of the situation is rising to its highest pitch. Hence,

383 Vide, *Dhavyāloka*, p. 46.

384 *Dhavyāloka*, under II. 5.

385 इत्यत्र करुणरसस्य शुद्धस्याङ्गभावात्स्पष्टमेव रसवदलङ्कारत्वम् । *Ibid.*, p. 42.

this purpose is served best only by regarding the sentiment of pathos as primary. It is wrong to think that the primary import here is the sentiment of love-in-separation caused by the lover's journey to a distant place. As we have already seen, the term 'adornment' is properly applicable only when it manifests itself as a secondary means towards the promotion of others which are primary and whose basis is constituted by all the constituents in congruity with one another (i.e. a sentence).

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

One might still object that the initial question itself, viz. 'how is it that love-in-separation arises at all at the outset?' is left unanswered. But the objection is baseless. For it is just as well possible to argue that the enemies and their queens have heard reports of the irresistible valour of the mighty heroes and run helter skelter to save their lives and they are still alive, though parted for the time being (and not dead at all; and this argument justifies the rise of love-in-separation).

Once we admit the initial rise of pathos as a certainty, it follows as a corollary from its promotion to a high pitch in the minds of the widowed queens that due to their minds long immersed in grief, they day-dream in terms of love and once in a while get the actual dream of union with their beloved after a long time, and even then the sweet dream breaks up all too suddenly on waking up, they start wondering and realize the sharp contrast in their past and present situations, a contrast which is heart-breaking. Hence, they go on lamenting long such an interpretation of facts will lead us inevitably to the conclusion that pathos alone is the primary sentiment fully presented here (without any trace of love-in-separation). The interlude of the sweet love-fulfilment dream is only an appropriate passing mood to foster the primary pathos; and there is no other adequate explanation for its intrusion otherwise. Hence, how can there be even a jot of aesthetic *rasa* if one were to assert that love-in-separation due to journey has an independent existence of its own here?

Or else, it might be alleged that eulogy of the hero alone is primary; and since pathos is calculated to serve that end as a means, it is designated as an ornament. That statement, again, is not without fault. For, in both of the above examples, the import primarily intended is pathos alone in its variegated manifestations. As in the case of the figures of speech *paryāyokta* (euphemism) and *anyāpadeśa* (indirect statement) those meanings which are other than referential, i.e. suggested, will be such that they too could be plainly states if one wished to do so; and pathos, being a *rasa*, can in no wise be reduced to a referential meaning, once we accept that it exists. Never can it be taken as an example of subordinated suggestion because the *rasa* of pathos is felt as primarily suggested. Both the *rasas* cannot be regarded as suggested because then they cannot have the relation of primary and secondary between themselves (since both would have to be equally primary). All these alternative explanations of *rasavat-*

alaṅkāra in the given example have been imagined by us and refuted the analogy of the said figures (viz. *Paryāyokta* and *Aprastuta-praśamsā*) do not hold good here.*³⁸⁶

This long extract itself shows Kuntaka's deep insight in aesthetic analysis. Incidentally, we get here a complete inner-picture of literary analysis from the standpoint of *rasa*. Thus, Kuntaka strongly justifies that *rasa* cannot be *alaṅkāra* under any circumstance and proves that Ānandavardhana's conception of *rasavadalaṅkāra* is also self-discrepant. "It is in this critique of Ānandavardhana that we see Kuntaka at his best and his reasoning is forcible and critical acumen subtle so as to win the admiration of readers, even today. Kuntaka shines here as the doyen of critics who first blazed the trail of practical literary analysis and critical judgement."³⁸⁷

Kuntaka then gives his own conception of *rasavadalaṅkāra*. He defines: "That adornment or figure of speech, which functions like *rasa* because it suffuses poetry with *rasa* is designated as '*rasavat*' in as much as it causes poetic appeal to connoisseurs."³⁸⁸

According to this new interpretation, figures like *upamā*, *rūpaka* and so on are called *rasavat* when they are in a state of equanimity (*tulyatva*) with *rasas*. This is clear from the analogy that *kṣatriya* functioning like a *brāhmaṇa* (ब्राह्मणवत् क्षत्रियः). Similarly, the figure of speech which functions like *rasa* is termed as *rasavat*. Thus, it would be clear that *rasavat* is not an independent one but the nature of simile and so forth. Kuntaka further makes this point clear. Even as *rasa* produces delectability in poetry as well as the aesthetic delight,

386 *Vakroktijīva*, pp. 151-153.

387 K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīva*, Intro. p. XXXV.

388 रसेन वर्तते तुल्यं रसवत्त्वविधानतः।

योऽलङ्कारः स रसवत् तद्विदाह्लादनिमित्तः ॥ *Ibid.*, III. 16.

so also figures of speech like simile produce both these effects and hence deserve the designation *rasavadalāṅkāra*.³⁸⁹

For instance:

उपोढरागेण विलोलतारकं तथा गृहीतं शशिना निशामुखम् ।

यथा समस्तं तिमिरांशुकं तथा पुरोऽपि रागाद्भलितं न लक्षितम् ॥³⁹⁰

The main content of this verse is night and moon are personified as delicate lovers approaching the point of union in time. The sentiment *śṛṅgāra* is presented here as *alāṅkārya*. The figure of speech metaphor has employed with superimposition of the behaviour of lovers which adds beauty to the main content of the poem. Thus, the metaphor here acquires the status of *rasavadalāṅkāra*.

In this connection Dr. Raghavan observes: "Kuntaka takes the 'vat' in *tulyārtha* and applies the name *Rasavadalāṅkāra* to cases like the *samāsokti* in the verse *upodha-rāgeṇa* where *śṛṅgāra rasa* is used as an embellishment. That is, *Rasavadalāṅkāra* is a cEase similar to one of *Rasa* but not exactly of *Rasa*."³⁹¹ Dr. Krishnamoorthy finds fault with the opinion of Dr. Raghavan. He writes: "These lines bristle with several downright errors.

389 यथा रसः काव्यस्य रसवत्तां तद्विदाह्लादं च विदधात्येवमुपमादिरप्युभयं निष्पादयन् रसवदलङ्कारः सम्पद्यते । *Ibid.*, p.165.

390 अत्र 'स्वावसरसमुचितसुकुमारस्वरूपयोर्निशाशशिनोर्वर्णनीयत्वं' प्राधान्येन वाक्यार्थशरीरम् । तत्कालान्तिकारितया रूपकालङ्कारः समारोपितकान्तवृत्तान्तः कविनोपनिबद्धः । स च श्लेषच्छाया मनोज्ञविशेषणवक्रभावात् विशिष्टलिङ्गसामर्थ्याच्च सुतरां समुद्भासमानः काव्यस्य सरसतां समुल्लासयन् तद्विदाह्लादमादधानः स्वयमेव रसवदलङ्कारतां समासादितवान् । *Ibid.*, p. 165-166.

This verse is quoted in *Dhvanyāloka* as an example of the figure of speech called *samāsokti*. Ānandavardhana holds that it is a case of गुणीभूतङ्ग्यकाव्य because the suggested *śṛṅgāra-rasa* is not exclusively prominent: इत्यादौ व्यङ्ग्येनानुगतं वाच्यमेव प्राधान्येन प्रतीयते, समारोपितनायिकानायकव्यवहारयोर्निशाशशिनोरेव वाक्यार्थत्वात् । *Dhvanyāloka*, pp.20-22.

391 V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, p. 896.

Firstly, Kuntaka does not regard the verse *upodha-rāgeṇa* as an example of *samāsokti* because he flatly rejects *samāsokti* as an *alaṅkāra* in a *kārikā* itself (III.50); in Kuntaka's opinion, the verse in question is only an instance of *rūpaka*. Secondly, *śṛṅgāra-rasa* is not used here as an embellishment (*alaṅkāra*), but used as an *alaṅkārya* itself. Thirdly, it is an egregious blunder to think that *rasavadalaṅkāra* in Kuntaka is a case 'similar to one of *Rasa* but not exactly of *Rasa*.' '*Raseṇa vartate tulyam* (III.16) means 'co-exists with *rasa*' and not 'similar to *rasa*'. The *Vṛtti* clearly states *tulyam vartate samānam ātiṣṭhati* and adduces the analogy ब्राह्मणेन तुल्यं वर्तते ब्राह्मणवत् क्षत्रियः। The *tulyatva* in question is only in co-presence and no other verisimilitude is intended.³⁹² The first two points are no doubt the errors in the opinion of Dr. Raghavan. But the third objection of Dr. Krishnamoorthy seems to be the crux of matter. Dr. Krishnamoorthy interprets *raseṇa tulyam vartate* as coexists with *rasa* on the basis of the *vṛtti* thereon. But '*samānam-ātiṣṭhati*' is just given as equivalent to '*tulyam vartate*' and not used in the sense of *sāmānādhikārya*. Thus, it is quite proper to translate the phrase as 'functions like *rasa*.' It is interesting to note that Dr. Krishnamoorthy himself translates the phrase as 'functions like *rasa*' in his critical edition of *Vakroktijīvita*. The analogy given by Kuntaka also supports our view. Kuntaka takes his stand on the basis of the grammatical rule तेन तुल्यं क्रिया चेत् वतिः³⁹³ which means that the termination *vat* is added to words in the instrumental in the sense of *tulya*, provided the common property is an action. Thus, it would be clear that co-presence of *kṣatriya* with *brāhmaṇa* will not be called ब्राह्मणवत् क्षत्रियः ।

Therefore, *alaṅkāra* functioning like *rasa* alone can constitute *rasavadalaṅkāra*, according to Kuntaka. Hence, Dr. Raghavan's

392 K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvita Intro.*, p. XXXIII.

393 *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, V. 1.115.

Bhattoji Dikṣita comments on it: ब्राह्मणेन तुल्यं ब्राह्मणवदधीते । क्रिया चेत् इति किम्? गुणतुल्ये मा भूत्, पुत्रेण तुल्यः स्थूलः।

interpretation i.e., similar to one of *Rasa* but not exactly of *Rasa*, seems to be correct.

Kuntaka further states that the appearance of other figures of speech along with *rasavadalaṅkāra* will be the cases of 'mixed' or 'merged' figures of speech. But the major figure should be deemed as *rasavat* and the other figures being subsidiary to it.³⁹⁴

This point has been illustrated by quoting four more verses. Kuntaka then concludes the treatment of *rasavadalaṅkāra* with praise on it: 'It is the foremost among all *alaṅkāras*; the life-essence of all figures of speech and the quint essence of poetry itself.'³⁹⁵

Kuntaka thus takes a bold step to prove his new theory of *rasavadalaṅkāra*. "Kuntaka brushes aside all older views in this respect, and thinks that the case of *rasavat* should be considered as one in which the poet has an opportunity to create a kind of *vakrokti* in which the *rasa* supplies the principal charm."³⁹⁶ But unfortunately, his theory of *rasavadalaṅkāra* is completely neglected³⁹⁷ by later theorists and Ānandavardhana's theory of it, is generally followed.

394 न चालङ्कारान्तरे सति रसवदपेक्षानिबन्धनः संसृष्टिसङ्करव्यपदेशप्रसङ्गः प्रत्याख्येयतां प्रतिपद्यते । अत्र रसवदलङ्कारस्य रूपकादीनां च संनिपातः सुतरां समुद्भासते । तत्र 'चुम्बतीव रजनीमुखं शशी' इति उत्प्रेक्षालक्षणस्य रसवदलङ्कारस्य प्राधान्येनोपनिबन्धः । तदङ्गत्वेनोपमादीनाम् । केवलस्य प्रस्तुतरसपरिपोषापरनिष्पत्तेः । *Vakroktijīva*, pp. 167-168.

395 अयं स रसवन्नाम सर्वालङ्करणाग्रणीः ।

चूडामणिरिवाभाति कायोत्कर्षैककारणम् ॥

कविकौशलसर्वस्वमद्योद्घाटितमञ्जसा ।

विपश्चितां विचारस्य गोचरत्वं गमिष्यति ॥ *Ibid.*, III. 73-74 (*antara-śloka*).

396 S.K. De, *Vakroktijīva*, Intro., p. XXXIX.

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

IV. *Vakrokti* and *Mārga*

In Sanskrit poetics, we may notice three major stages in the conceptual development of *rīti* or *mārga* or literary style. Dr. Raghavan observes: "The history of the concept of *Rīti* has three stages: first, when it was a living geographical mode of literary criticism; second, when it lost the geographical association and came to be stereotyped and standardized with reference to subject; and third, its re-interpretation by Kuntaka, the only Sanskrit *Ālaṅkārika*, who with his fine literary instinct and originality as evidenced on many other lines also, related the *Rīti* to the character of the poet and replaced the old *Rītis* by new ones."³⁹⁸

Kuntaka's view on the concept of literary style or *mārga* is original. In *vakrokti* synthesis, the concept of *mārga* does not constitute a particular variety of *vakrokti*.³⁹⁹ In fact, the specific characteristic of poetry itself is called *mārga*. It is defined as modes of poetic practice (*kavi-prasthāna-hetu*). For every poet takes recourse to one of the *mārgas* according to his own nature. The *mārgas* have been classified on the basis of the three varieties of poetry. It will also be seen that the distinction between the

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

एवं च संक्षेपेण निरूपिता रसाः। एषां प्राधान्ये ध्वनिव्यपदेशहेतुत्वम्, गुणीभावे तु
रसालङ्कारत्वम् । केचित्तु 'प्राधान्य एवैषां रसत्वमन्यथालङ्कारत्वमेव ।
रसालङ्कारव्यपदेशस्त्वलङ्कारध्वनिव्यपदेशवत्, ब्राह्मणश्चमणन्यायात् ।
Rasagaṅgādhara, p.56.

398 V. Raghavan, *Studies in Some Concepts of the Ālaṅkāraśāstra*, p. 147.

399 It seems to be wrongly stated by Hemalata Deshpande that 'Kuntaka's *mārgas* come under *vākyavakratā*.' (Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka, Ph.D. Thesis, KUD, 1967, p. 18). But Kuntaka's concept of *mārga* is the specific characteristic of poetry itself. He clearly states:

एवं काव्यसामान्यलक्षणमभिधाय तद्विशेषलक्षणविषयप्रदर्शनार्थं मार्गभेदनिबन्धनं
त्रैविध्यमभिधत्ते । *Vakroktijīvita*, p. 40.

means and the end, viz. *mārga* and *kāvya*, is only theoretical and ultimately they will be identical.

Kuntaka criticizes the names and classification of *rītis* propounded by ancient theorists. He remarks that the ancients have proposed three literary styles viz. *Vaidharbhī*, *Gouḍīyā* and *Pāñcālī*, naming them after the geographical regions. They also declared that these styles represent the best, the average and the low, respectively. Some writers have mentioned only two styles.⁴⁰⁰ This remark of Kuntaka applies to Vāmana and Daṇḍin.⁴⁰¹ Kuntaka argues that the geographical differences cannot explain different *rītis* as the geographical regions are infinite. Hence, they would be endless. On the other hand, a *rīti* named after a particular region is not found exclusively in that region; it can be found elsewhere too. And, *rīti* does not depend on particular regional characteristics. Thus, there is no invariable connection between the two.⁴⁰²

400 यस्माच्चिरन्तनैः विदर्भादिदेशविशेषसमाश्रयणेन वैदर्भीप्रभृतयो रीतयस्तिष्ठः समान्नाताः। तासां चोत्तमाधममध्यमत्वेन त्रैविध्यम् । अन्यैश्च वैदर्भगौडीयलक्षणं मार्गद्वितयमाख्यातम् । *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

401 Vāmana held the theory that the particular arrangement of words, which is termed as *rīti* is the soul of poetry. This particularity consists in *guṇas*. The permutation and combination of these *guṇas* give rise to different *rītis*. Among the three *rītis* proposed by him, *Vaidarbhī* is the best as it contains all the qualities. He rejects the other two imperfect dictions viz., *Gouḍīyā* and *Pāñcālī*.

Vide, *Kāvya-lāṅkārasūtra*, Ch.I.

Daṇḍin has introduced only two *mārgas* viz., *Vaidarbha* and *Gauḍa* and gave much emphasis to '*Vaidarbhamaṛga*'. Vide, *Kāvya-ādarśa*, I. 42.

402 यस्माद्देशभेदनिबन्धनत्वे रीतिभेदानां देशानामानन्त्यादसंख्यत्वं प्रसज्यते । न च विशिष्टरीतियुक्तत्वेन काव्यकरणं मातुलेयभगिनीविवाहवद् देशधर्मतया व्यवस्थापयितुं शक्यम् । देशधर्मो हि वृद्धव्यवहारपरम्परामात्रशरणः शक्यानुष्ठानतां नातिवर्तते । किञ्च शक्तौ विद्यमानायामपि व्युत्पत्त्यादिराहार्यकारणसम्पत्प्रतिनियतदेशत्रिष्यतया न व्यवतिष्ठते, नियमनिबन्धनाभावात् तत्रादर्शनाद् अन्यत्र च दर्शनात् । *Vakroktijīvitā*, p. 41.

If, however, the names *Vaidarbhi* etc. are meant only as designation and do not mean any geographical connection with poetry, Kuntaka has no objection.⁴⁰³

Similarly, the gradation of *ritis* into the best, the average and the low is not proper. Poetry is not something to be composed at any cost. The real definition of poetry is that which delights the men of taste. Poetry which is not beautiful falls outside the purview of critic's enquiry.⁴⁰⁴

Kuntaka then proceeds to explain his own views regarding the concept of *mārga* or style. In his opinion, the various poetic styles can be satisfactorily explained on the basis of *kavi-svabhāva* or poetic temperament. If a poet is gentle in his temperament, quite naturally he will be possessed with an elegant creative imagination as the creative power and the creator are identical. And that elegant imagination builds up the soft *vyutpatti* or equipment. These two direct the course of the poet's practice. The equipment and practice proceed in all men only in tune with their unique nature as conditioned by innate tendencies. Similarly, the poets who have ostentatious temperament will develop a brilliant imagination; and they will build up *vyutpatti* in conformity with their imagination. They start practising the *Vicitra-mārga* or the brilliant style.⁴⁰⁵ Thus these two *mārgas*,

403 तदेवं निर्वचनसमाख्यामात्रकरणकारणत्वे देशविशेषाश्रयणस्य वयं व विवदामहे ।
Ibid., p. 41.

404 न च रीतीनामुत्तममध्यमाधमत्वभेदेन त्रैविध्यं व्यवस्थापयितुं न्याय्यम् । यस्मात्
सहृदयहृदयाह्लादकारिका व्यलक्षणप्रस्तावे वैदर्भीसदृशसौन्दर्यासम्भावात्-
मध्यमाधमयोरुपदेशवैयर्थ्यमायाति । परिहार्यत्वेनाप्युपदेशो न युक्तातामालम्बते,
तैरेवानभ्युपगतत्वात् । न चागतिकगतिन्यायेन यथाशक्ति दरिद्रदानवत् काव्यं
करणीयतामर्हति । Ibid., p. 41.

405 कविस्वभावभेदनिबन्धनत्वेन काव्यप्रस्थानभेदः समञ्जसतां ग्राहते ।
सुकुमारस्वभावस्य हि कवेस्तथाविधैव सहजा शक्तिः समुद्भवति, शक्तिशक्तिमतोरभेदात् ।
तथा च तथाविधसौकुमार्यरमणीयां व्युत्पत्तिमावध्नाति । ताभ्यां च
सुकुमारवर्त्तनाभ्यासतत्परः क्रियते । तथैवैतस्माद् विचित्रः स्वभावो यस्य
कवेस्तद्विदाह्लादकारिकाव्यलक्षणप्रस्तावात् सौकुमार्यव्यतिरेकिणा वैचित्र्येण रमणीय

Sukumāra and *Vicitra*, are the two extreme styles of composition. And there is one more style called *Madhyama*, which is an admixture of both the types above.⁴⁰⁶ Thus, we have three major literary styles which serve as high roads for the progress of poets⁴⁰⁷ and hence they are called *mārgas*.⁴⁰⁸ Kuntaka was well aware of the fact that it is impossible to count and exhausts each and every poetic individuality. Therefore, a general division is proposed.⁴⁰⁹ Kuntaka boldly states that the three *mārgas* are equally aesthetic and effective.⁴¹⁰

It is *Sukumāra-mārga* or the elegant style which master-poets follow like bees roaming along the grove of full-blown blossoms.⁴¹¹ The principal characteristics of the *Sukumāra-mārga* may be summarized as below:

- i. In it every element of beauty is a result of poet's imagination.
- ii. It succeeds in conveying flashes of gentle grace.

एव, तस्य काचिद्विचित्रैव तदनुरूपा शक्तिः समुल्लसति। तथा च तथाविधवैदग्ध्यबन्धुरां व्युत्पत्तिमाबध्नाति । ताभ्यां च वैचित्र्यवासनाधिवासितमानसो विचित्रवर्त्मनाभ्यासभाग्भवति । *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

406 एवेमतदुभयकविनिबन्धनसंवलितस्वभावस्य कवेस्तदुचितैव शबलशोभातिशयशालिनी शक्तिः समुदेति । तथा च तदुभयपरिस्पन्दसुन्दरं व्युत्पत्युपार्जनमाचरति । ततस्तच्छायाद्वितयपरिपोषशलाभ्यासपरवशः सम्पद्यते। *Ibid.*, p. 42.

407 सन्ति तत्र त्रयो मार्गाः कविप्रस्थानहेतवः।

सुकुमारो विचित्रश्च मध्यमश्चोभयात्मकः॥ *Ibid.*, I. 24.

408 त एव तत्प्रवर्तननिमित्तभूता मार्गा इत्युच्यन्ते । *Ibid.*, p. 42.

409 यद्यपि कविस्वभावभेदनिबन्धनत्वादनन्तभेदभिन्नत्वमनिवार्यं, तथापि परिसंख्यातुमशक्यत्वात् सामान्येन त्रैविध्यमेवोपपद्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 42.

410 तस्मादेतेषां प्रत्येकमस्खलितस्वपरिस्पन्दमहिम्ना तद्विदाहलादकारित्वपरिसमाप्तेन कस्यचित् न्यूनता । *Ibid.*, p. 42.

411 सुकुमाराभिधः सोऽयं येन सत्कवयो गताः।

मार्गेणोत्फुल्लकुसुमकाननेनेव षट्पदाः॥ *Ibid.*, I. 29.

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

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

v. In it prominence is given to the inner nature of things.

vi. Its wealth of beauty reminds the supreme artistic creation of the universe by the **Creator** Himself.⁴¹²

The *Vicitra-mārga* or brilliant style is very difficult to travel on and very few learned poets could compose in this style. This style has been compared to the path of sword-blades traversed by the cherished desires of brave warriors.⁴¹³ The main features of this *Vicitra-mārga* are as below:

i. Its life-breath is artistic beauty of expression.

ii. In it artistic beauty appears to be radiating brilliantly.

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

iv. Even an ordinary thing is raised to a unique height of excellent artistic expression.

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

412 आम्लानप्रतिभोद्धिन्नवशब्दार्थसुन्दरः।

अयन्नविहितस्वल्पमनोहारिविभूषणः॥

भावस्वभावप्राधान्यकृताहार्यकौशलः।

रसादिपरमार्थज्ञमनःसंवादसुन्दरः॥

अविभावितसंस्थानरामणीयकरञ्जकः।

विधिवैदग्ध्यनिष्पन्ननिर्माणातिशयोपमः।

यत् किञ्चनापि वैचित्र्यं तत्सर्वं प्रतिभोद्धवम्।

सौकुमार्यपरिस्पन्दस्यन्दि यत्र विराजते॥ *Ibid.*, I-25-28.

413 सोऽतिदुःसञ्चरो येन विदग्धकवयो गताः।

खड्गधारापथेनेव सुभटानां मनोरथाः॥ *Ibid.*, I. 43.

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

vii. The real nature of things pregnant with sentiments is augmented with novel beauty.⁴¹⁴

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

414 प्रतिभाप्रथमोद्धेदसमये यत्र वक्रता।
 शब्दाभिधेययोरन्तः स्फुरतीव विभाव्यते॥
 अलङ्कारस्य कवयो यत्रालङ्करणान्तरम्।
 असन्तुष्टा निबध्नन्ति हारादेर्मणिबन्धवत्॥
 यदप्यनूतनोल्लेखं वस्तु यत्र तदप्यलम्।
 उक्तिवैचित्र्यमात्रेण काष्ठां कामपि नीयते॥
 यत्रान्यथाभवत् सर्वमन्यथैव यथारुचि।
 भाव्यते प्रतिभोल्लेखमहत्वेन महाकवेः॥
 प्रतीयमानता यत्र वाक्यार्थस्य निबध्यते।
 वाच्यवाचकवृत्तिभ्यां व्यतिरिक्तस्य कस्यचित्॥
 स्वभावः सरसाकृतो भावानां यत्र बध्यते।
 केनापि कमनीयेन वैचित्र्येणोपबृंहितः॥
 परिस्फुरति यस्यान्तः सा काव्यतिशयाभिधा ॥ *Ibid*; I. 34-35 and 38-42.

as it is called) is an element in both; but in the former the *rasa* becomes an *aṅga* of the delineation of *svabhāva*, while in the latter, the ornamentation is to be done in accordance with the underlying motives or *rasa* (*rasākūta*). In Kuntaka's opinion, the *Vicitra-mārga*, which is favoured by all good poets, is the more difficult of the two, demanding greater skill and maturity of treatment."⁴¹⁵ The learned scholar keenly observed the distinction between the two *mārgas*, but he seems to have mistaken the idea of *rasa* in the *Sukumāra-mārga* as it is subordinate to the *vastu-svabhāva*. Kuntaka clearly states that *vastu-svabhāva* becomes *vibhāva* or stimulant of *rasa* and it is subordinate to *rasa*.⁴¹⁶

Kuntaka's concept of these two styles reminds us of the distinctions made by John Stuart Miller. "Miller distinguished poets into two classes: Poets who are born and poets who are made. Accordingly, poetry is also distinguished into natural and cultivated. The former is 'feeling itself, employing thought only as the medium of its utterance' and very much corresponds to the poetry of the *Sukumāra* type where 'emotion dominates and the cultivated skill derived from the study is kept to the minimum'. In cultivated poetry, the result of culture is written with a distinct aim, where thought remains the conspicuous object, surrounded by a halo of feeling. It is somewhat paralled by Kuntaka's *Vicitra-mārga* which is less spontaneous and more ornamented".⁴¹⁷

The *Madhyama-mārga* is an admixture of the two other *mārgas*; it is a happy blend of the two. And hence, here both the

415 S.K.De, *Vakroktijīvitā*, Intro, pp. XXXIV-XXXV.

416 अत्र राशिद्वयकरणस्यायमभिप्रायो यद् विभावादिरूपेण रसाङ्गभूताः शकुनिरुततरुसलिलकुसुमसमयप्रभृतयः पदार्थाः सातिशयस्वभाववर्णनप्राधान्ये नैव रसाङ्गतां प्रतिपद्यन्ते । तदप्यतिरिक्ताः सुरगन्धर्वप्रभृतयः सोत्कर्षचेतनायोगिनः शृङ्गारादिरसनिर्भरतया वर्ण्यमानाः सरसहृदयाह्लादकारितामायान्तीति कविभिरभ्युपगतम् । *Vakroktijīvitā*, p. 47.

417 C. Rajendran, *Studies in Comparative Poetics*, p. 54.

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

"Where the two styles, viz. the 'elegant' with its natural beauty and the 'brilliant' with its decorative effect both come to be blended, where the whole host of qualities like 'sweetness' become grounded on the 'middling' mode of style so as to nourish a unique stylistic effect, we get the third style, pleasing all tastes, and containing the best of both the other styles in competition as it were, which may be termed *middling*."⁴¹⁸

The *guṇas* or poetic qualities have been treated along with the *mārgas*. Each *mārga* has a group of four *guṇas* of the same name but with different characteristics. They are *mādhurya*, *prasāda*, *lāvanya* and *ābhijātya*. They are salient features of each *mārga*. Besides the group of four *guṇas*, Kuntaka enumerates two other *guṇas* viz. *aucitya* and *saubhāgya*, which are said to be present in all compositions. Thus, the last two *guṇas* are common to all the three styles. Variations in poetic temperament and artistic skill yield different *guṇas* and the variation in *guṇas* is rooted in *pratibhā* itself.

Mādhurya or sweetness is the first and foremost *guṇa* of *Sukumāra-mārga*. It is vivified by the use of lovely and uncompounded expression.⁴¹⁹ The expressions must be free from

418 वैचित्र्यं सौकुमार्यं च यत्र सङ्कीर्णतां गते ।

भ्राजेते सहजाहार्यशोभातिशयशालिनी ॥

माधुर्यादिगुणग्रामो वृत्तिमाश्रित्य मध्यमात् ।

यत्र कामपि पुष्पाति बन्धच्छायातिरिक्ताताम् ॥

मार्गोऽसौ मध्यमो नाम नानारुचिमनोहरः ।

स्पर्धया यत्र वर्तन्ते मार्गद्वितयसम्पदः ॥ *Vakroktijīvita*, I. 49-51.

419 असमस्तमनोहारिपदविन्यास जीवितम् ।

compounds and must be arranged in a way that they may serve to give delight to the readers' ear and mind. *Prasāda* or perspicuity is clarity of meaning. In the *Sukumāra* style, it brings out the poet's intended idea without any effort on the reader's part, and it is concerned with sentiments and artful speech.⁴²⁰ 'When even a little beauty in respect of alliterative syllables and in choice of diction results in the charm of syntax and contributes to the beauty of style, it is called *lāvanya* or grace of *Sukumāra-mārga*.'⁴²¹ *Ābhijātya* or classicality is very delicate and beautiful excellence of this style. It is smooth on the ear, and capable as it were of intimate embrace by thought and it is a naturally sparkling shade of loveliness.⁴²²

In the *Vicitra-mārga*, *Mādhurya-guṇa* stands for avoiding looseness of structure and it becomes a means of producing compact beauty in diction.⁴²³ *Prasāda*, in this style, is meant for the use of uncompounded words with a slight touch of floridity.⁴²⁴ *Lāvanya* is a skill in arranging the syllables in a composition bringing charm to the words. "By words without elision of the final aspirates and in euphonic combination with each other, and by syllables which precede conjunctions, *lāvanya*

माधुर्यं सुकुमारस्य मार्गस्य प्रथमो गुणः॥ *Ibid.*, I. 30.

420 अक्लेशव्यञ्जिताकृतं झगित्यर्थसमर्पणम्।

रसवक्रोक्तिविषयं यत्प्रसादः स कथ्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 31.

421 वर्णविन्यासविच्छित्तिपदसंधानसम्पदा ।

स्वल्पया बन्धसौन्दर्यं लावण्यमभिधीयते ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 32.

422 श्रुतिपेशलताशालि सुस्पर्शमिव चेतसा ।

स्वभावमसृणच्छायमाभिजात्यं प्रचक्षते ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 33.

423 वैदग्ध्यस्यन्दि माधुर्यं पदानामत्र बध्यते ।

याति यत्त्यशैथिल्यं बन्धबन्धुरताङ्गताम् ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 44.

424 असमस्तपदन्यासः प्रसिद्धः कविवर्त्मनि ।

किञ्चदोजः स्पृशन् प्रायः प्रसादोऽप्यत्र दृश्यते ॥

गमकानि निबध्यन्ते वाक्ये वाक्यन्तराण्यपि ।

पदानीवात्र कोऽप्येष प्रसादस्यापरः क्रमः॥ *Ibid.*, I. 45-46.

or grace is enriched.*⁴²⁵ *Ābhijātya* is a product of great artistic skill. Neither too harsh nor too soft syllables are used and thus bring charm in a composition.⁴²⁶

In the *Madhyama-mārga*, the whole host of *guṇas* like *mādhurya* tend to subsist in the 'middling' style in a very spontaneous manner contributing to a colourful style, on the one hand, and strikingness of pattern, on the other.⁴²⁷

Besides the group of four *guṇas*, Kuntaka illustrates two other *guṇas* viz. *aucitya* and *saubhāgya* which are common to all the *mārgas*. *Aucitya* or propriety is the striking expression in which the excellence of an object is rightly depicted. In poetry, the ideas introduced must be appropriate to the character or theme or *rasa*. It is defined: "That quality is known as 'propriety' by virtue of which the poetic subject gains in value in a most lucid manner; in fact it may be regarded as the vital essence of all poetic description.*⁴²⁸ Further, Kuntaka notices another important facet of *aucitya* i.e., decorum. He observes: "An instance wherein the matter on hand is concealed as it were by reason of the exquisitely charming nature of either the speaker or the listener, also deserves being regarded as an example of propriety.*⁴²⁹ Thus, Kuntaka treats *aucitya* as an all encompassing quality in poetry. The *Dhvani* theorists judge the importance of *aucitya* in connection with *rasa*.

425 अत्रालुप्तविसर्गान्तैः पदैः प्रोतैः परस्परम् ।

ह्रस्वैः संयोगपूर्वैश्च लावण्यमतिरिच्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 47.

426 यन्नातिकोमलच्छायं नातिकाठिन्यमुद्वहत् ।

आभिजात्यं मनोहारि तदत्र प्रौढिनिर्मितम् ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 48.

427 यत्र च माधुर्यादिगुणग्रामो माधुर्यप्रभृतिगुणसमूहो मध्यमामुभयच्छायाच्छुरितां वृत्तिं स्वस्पन्दगतिमाश्रित्य कामप्यपूर्वा बन्धच्छायातिरिक्ततां सन्निवेशकान्त्यधिकतां पुष्पाति पुष्यतीत्यर्थः ॥ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

428 आज्ञसेन स्वभावस्य महत्वं येन पोष्यते ।

प्रकारेण तदौचित्यमुचिताख्यानजीवितम् ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 53.

429 यत्र वक्तुः प्रमातुर्वा वाच्यं शोभातिशायिना ।

आच्छाद्यते स्वभावेन तदप्यौचित्यमुच्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 54.

They frame some binding rules for the observance of *aucitya*. Any violation of the rule of *aucitya* gives rise to violation of *rasa*.⁴³⁰

Saubhāgya-guṇa is the fruit of dynamic imagination and causes delight of refined readers.⁴³¹ It is further defined thus: "In the wide-ranging material before the poet, that which is pitched upon by the genius of the poet for its activity endows the whole with the quality of 'splendour.' It is something attained by the full co-operation of all the constituent elements and it is something which surely results in an extraordinary aesthetic effect in the mind of connoisseurs; in short, it is the whole and sole essence of poetry."⁴³² Thus, these two literary qualities viz. *aucitya* and *saubhāgya* are very appealing in all the three styles and they permeate extensively all the three elements of poetry viz. word, sentence and the work as a whole.

Kuntaka thus treated the concepts of *rīti* and *guṇa* in a novel way; not only his *mārgas* are original but the *guṇas* of the three *mārgas* too. The early theorists have treated *guṇas* in connection with word and sense in a general way. And the *Dhvani* theorists do not entertain the idea of *rīti* in poetry. Ānandavardhana does not admit *rīti*, but he admits another poetic factor called *saṅghaṭana* or texture which is based on the formation of compounds. He treats three *guṇas* viz. *Mādhurya*, *Ojas* and *Prasāda* and considered them as *rasadharmas*. Abhinavagupta observes that *rītis* resolve finally into *guṇas* and the *guṇas* are intrinsic features of *rasa*. Thus, *rītis* ultimately merge into *rasa*.⁴³³

430 अनौचित्यादृते नान्यदसम्भङ्गस्य कारणम् ।

प्रसिद्धौचित्यबन्धस्तु रसस्योपनिषत्परा ॥ *Dhvanyāloka*, p.138.

431 सौभाग्यं प्रतिभासंरम्भफलभूतं चेतनचमत्कारित्वलक्षणम् । *Vakroktijīvita*, p. 39.

432 इत्युपादेयवर्गेऽस्मिन् यदर्थं प्रतिभा कवेः।

सम्यक् संरभते तस्य गुणः सौभाग्यमुच्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, I. 55.

433 रीतिर्हि गुणेष्वेव पर्यवसिता । यदाह विशेषो गुणात्मा । गुणाश्च रसपर्यवसायिन एव। *Locana*, p. 290.

Therefore, it would be clear that the concepts of *rīti* and *guṇa*, in Sanskrit poetics, have different connotations. Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy rightly observes: "The most confusing chapter in the history of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, if I might say so, is the one on *rīti* and *guṇa*. There is wide divergence of opinion from the writer to writer not only on the nature but also on the number of literary *guṇas*. 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."⁴³⁴

Kuntaka enumerates *mārgas* and their *guṇas* on the basis of *kavi-svabhāva* or poet's temperament. The *guṇas* belong to *mārgas* in their broad spectrum. And they do not characterize merely words, but they relate to word, sentence and the work as a whole.⁴³⁵ For Kuntaka, *kavi-svabhāva* alone furnishes the criterion for literary styles. In this respect, Abhinavagupta's observation is highly remarkable. He says that the *guṇas* are concretized in the initial stage of activated imagination. It is only that poet who is gifted with creative imagination is capable of composing the *guṇas* or delineating the *rasas*.⁴³⁶

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

434 Quoted by Dr. Mahesh Adkoli, *Concept of Aucitya in Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 89.

435 मार्गेषु गुणानां समुदायधर्मता । यथा न केवलं शब्दादिधर्मत्वं तथा तल्लक्षणव्याख्यावसर एव प्रतिपादितम् । *Vakroktijīvita*, p. 66.

436 कवेर्यः प्रतिभात्मा प्रथमपरिस्पन्दः तद्वापारबलोपनता गुणाः, प्रतिभावत एव हि रसाभिव्यञ्जनसामर्थ्यं, माधुर्यदिरुपनिबन्धनसामर्थ्यम्। *Abhinavabhārati*, p. 296.

could exercise their judgment in each individual case.⁴³⁷ Kālidāsa's poetry represents *Sukumāra-mārga*, while Bāṇa, Bhavabhūti and Rājaśekhara are cited as representatives of *Vicitra-mārga*. Māṭṛgupta and others typify the *Madhyama-mārga*. Though Kuntaka's approach to literary styles is acceptable and nearer to modern criticism,⁴³⁸ his theory is completely neglected in later Sanskrit poetics.

437 तस्मात् सहृदयैः सर्वत्र सर्वमनुसर्तव्यम् । एवं मार्गत्रितयलक्षणं दिङ्मात्रमेव प्रदर्शितम्, न पुनः साकल्येन सत्कविकौशलप्रकाराणां केनचिदपि स्वरूपमभिधातुं पार्यते । *Op.Cit.*, p. 66.

Similar is the view of Daṇḍin also. cf.

अस्त्यनेको गिरां मार्गः सूक्ष्मभेदः परस्परम् ।

तत्र वैदर्भगौडीयौ वर्ण्येते प्रस्फुटान्तरौ ॥ &

इति मार्गद्वयं भिन्नं तत्स्वरूपनिरूपणात् ।

तद्धेदास्तु न शक्यन्ते वक्तुं प्रतिकविस्थिताः॥

इक्षुक्षीरगुडादीनां माधुर्यस्यान्तरंमहत् ।

तथापि न तदाख्यातुं सरस्वत्यापि शक्यते ॥ *Kāvyaadarśa*, I. 43 & 101-102.

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

Quoted by V. Raghavan, *Some Concepts of Alankāraśāstra*, p. 180.

V. Vakrokti and Rasa

In Sanskrit poetics, '*rasa*' is the most significant and pivotal concept. *Rasa* is the first and foremost aesthetic canon. It is the greatest secret, the governing principle and the vital essence of literary art. *Rasa* initially inspires the poet into creativity and ultimately ensures the aesthetic experience of the man of taste. The concept of *rasa* is introduced by Bharata and then developed by the later theorists.

The term '*rasa*' has multi-dimensional implications in Sanskrit literature.⁴³⁹ As far as its poetic implication is concerned, the nature and meaning of *rasa* is very complex. "*Rasa* is one of those words in Sanskrit whose precise significance is as indefinite as its usage is wide-spread. In the history of Sanskrit poetics, perhaps no other concept has give rise to so much controversy. Even Jagannātha, the author of *Rasagaṅgādhara*, who tries to review in detail the diverse shades of expert opinion centering round *Rasa*, is driven to confess at the end that the only common point that emerges is, *Rasas* felt as that which is invariably connected with the highest joy and partaking of beauty in the world."⁴⁴⁰

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

439 In the history of Sanskrit literature one can trace five major dimensions of the concept of *rasa* :

- i. The philosophical dimension as found in the *Upaniṣads* which speak *Rasa* as identical with **Brahman**.
- ii. *Rasa* is one of the qualities as found in the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* systems.
- iii. *Rasa* found in the *Āyurveda*.
- iv. The aesthetic implications as found in the poetics.
- v. The religious implications of *Rasa* as found in the *Bhakti* movement.

440 K. Krishnamoorthy, *Essays in Sanskrit Criticism*, p. 74.

term, *rasa* is the relishable quality inherent in artistic work. Every work is supposed to treat an emotive theme and communicate a distinct emotional mood. In this sense, *rasa* denotes all types of *cittavṛtti* or emotions.⁴⁴¹ In its subjective interpretation, *rasa* stands for 'the emotional experience of beauty'⁴⁴² or 'integral aesthetic experience'⁴⁴³ or 'delectable subjective condition of impersonalized enjoyment.'⁴⁴⁴ Thus, *rasa* is an absolute, ecstatic ephemeral experience.

Let us proceed to observe the status of *rasa* in *vakrokti* synthesis. Kuntaka was the first to include the idea of *rasa* in the definition of poetry. He defines poetry as the activity of the poet aimed at aesthetic delight to the refined reader.⁴⁴⁵ For him, poetry should have two qualities viz. artistic activity of a poet and capacity to produce aesthetic delight. The peculiar usage of the term *tadvit-āhlāda* connotes the idea of *rasa*-experience. In other place, Kuntaka clearly states that *tadvit* or *sahṛdaya* means *rasādiparamārthajña*.⁴⁴⁶ He frequently used the terms like *āhlāda*, *vaicitrya*, *lokottara-camatkāra* and *vakratva* as the interchangeable words which obviously connote the idea of *rasa*-experience.⁴⁴⁷

441 Cf. रसभावौ तदाभासौ भावस्य प्रशमोदयौ ।

सन्धिः शबलता चेति सर्वेऽपि रसनाद्रसाः॥ *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, III. 529.

442 P.V. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 351.

443 M. Hiriyanna, *Art Experience*, p. 46.

444 S.K. De, *Some Problems of Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 114.

445 शब्दार्थौ सहितौ वक्रकविव्यापारशालिनि ।

बन्धे व्यवस्थतौ काव्यं तद्विदाह्लादकारिणि ॥ *Vakroktijīvita*, I. 7.

446 Cf. रसादिपरमार्थज्ञमनःसंवादसुन्दरः। रसाः शृङ्गारादयः। तदादिग्रहणेन रत्यादयोऽपि गृह्यन्ते। तेषां परमार्थः पररहस्यं तज्ज्ञानन्ति इति तज्ज्ञास्तद्विदस्तेषां मनःसंवादो हृदयसंवेदनं स्वानुभवगोचरतया प्रतिभासः। *Ibid.*, p. 46.

447 cf. "After Abhinavagupta, the two meanings have been confounded so often that it is difficult to determine what exactly is meant by any writer in a given context. But Kuntaka is blissfully free from this ambiguity. He restricts his usage of the word *rasa* to the first meaning only unlike post-Abhinavagupta writers. He invariably uses

And, it is stated that the foremost purpose of poetry is the immediate sense of delight which is equated with the experience of nectar.⁴⁴⁸ Thus, it would be clear that Kuntaka is well aware of the fact that the ultimate aim of poetry is aesthetic experience.

While dealing with *prakaraṇa-vakratā*, Kuntaka states that 'the words of great poets come to life only when they contain incidents which are bubbling with *rasas*; not when they merely follow the story as found in the source.'⁴⁴⁹ It is also stated that the beauty of episode exercise unique appeal (*rasaniṣyandinī*) to the readers in the works of master poets.⁴⁵⁰ The fourth chapter of the *Vakroktijīvitā* is completely dedicated to the treatment of plot construction and the proper arrangements of episodes with a view to *rasa*.⁴⁵¹ Again, Kuntaka agrees with Ānandavardhana on the point that the ruling sentiments of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the

other words like *āhlāda* to mean the second. But he is second to none in his insistence on a sensitive literary taste in the readers and always describes them with epithets like *sahṛdaya* or *tadvit*."

K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvitā*, Intro., p. XXXVIII.

448 चतुर्वर्गफलास्वादमप्यतिक्रम्य तद्विदाम् ।

काव्यामृतरसेनान्तश्चमत्कारो वितन्यते ॥ *Vakroktijīvitā*, I. 5.

449 निरन्तररसोद्गारगर्भसन्दर्भनिर्भराः ।

गिरः कवीनां जीवन्ति न कथामात्रमाश्रिताः ॥ *Ibid.*, p. 252.

cf. Ānandavardhana's dictum:

न हि कवेरितिवृत्तमात्रनिर्वहणेन किञ्चित्प्रयोजनम्, इतिहासादेव तत्सिद्धेः ।
Dhvanyāloka, p. 144.

450 एवमेषा महाकविप्रबन्धेषु प्रकरणवक्रताविच्छित्तिः रसनिष्पन्दिनी सहृदयैः स्वयमुत्प्रेक्षणीया । *Op. cit.* p. 248.

451 भाति प्रकरणं काष्ठाधिरूढरसनिर्भरम् । *Ibid.*, p. 248.

यत्राङ्गिरसनिष्पन्दनिकषः कोऽपि लक्ष्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 266.

एवमेषां मानन्तोपायानां कथारसनिष्पन्दतत्पराणां परिपाटिः कामपि कामनीयकसम्पदमुद्भावयति । *Ibid.*, p. 273.

रसायनं रसस्येव स्वानुप्रकरणं विदुः । *Ibid.*, p. 274.

सातिरेकरसोत्सेककर्मनिर्माणकर्मणः । *Ibid.*, p. 278.

Mahābhārata are *Karuṇa* and *Śānta*, respectively.⁴⁵² He rejects Udbhaṭa's theory of '*rasa*-by its designation (*svaśabdavācya*)' and says that *rasa* can only be experienced. He clearly states that *rasavattā* is the distinguished quality of poetry and hence that must be present in one and all.⁴⁵³ And, it is strongly held that *rasa* is always *alaṅkārya* and that never become *alaṅkāra*. Thus, the observation is enough to show that Kuntaka recognized *rasa* as the supreme canon of poetry.

For Kuntaka, the poetic content is two-fold viz. *svabhāva* and *rasa*.⁴⁵⁴ Though the two heads are given independently, the former, when properly accomplished, becomes a direct partaker and promoter of the latter i.e., *rasa*. Thus *svabhāva* etc. are *vibhāvas* or means towards the achievement of *rasa*.⁴⁵⁵ Further on, the poetic content is divided into sentient and non-sentient. The sentient group is again divided into two heads viz., primary sentients like gods, human beings, etc., and secondary sentients like animals, birds and so on. The primary sentients are made beautiful by a spontaneous presentation of emotions. On the other hand, the secondary sentients and non-sentients are described in such a way as to promote the rise of *rasas*.⁴⁵⁶

452 रामायणमहाभारतयोश्च करुणशान्ताङ्गित्वं पूर्वसूरिभिरेव निरूपितम् । *Ibid.*, p. 276.

453 सर्वस्य कस्यचित् काव्यस्य रसवत्त्वमेव । *Ibid.*, p. 149.

454 तदेवंविधं स्वभावप्राधान्येन रसप्राधान्येन च द्विप्रकारं । *Ibid.*, p. 143.

cf. तस्य च तदाह्लादसामर्थ्यं सम्भाव्यते येन काचिदेव स्वभावमहत्ता रसपरिपोषङ्गत्वं वा व्यक्तिमासादयति । *Ibid.*, p. 17.

455 अत्र राशिद्वयकरणस्यायमभिप्रायो यद् विभावादिरूपेण रसाङ्गभूताः शकुनिरुततरुसलिलकुसुमसमयप्रभृतयः पदार्थाः सातिशयस्वभाववर्णनप्राधान्येनैव रसाङ्गतां प्रतिपद्यन्ते । तद्व्यतिरिक्ताः सुरगन्धर्वप्रभृतयः सोत्कर्षचेतनायोगिनः शृङ्गारादिरसनिर्भरतया वर्ण्यमानाः सरसहृदयाह्लादकारितामायान्तीति कविभिरभ्युपगतम् । *Ibid.*, p. 47.

456 मुख्यमक्लिष्टरत्यादिपरिपोषमनोहरम् ।

It is to be noted that, though Kuntaka gives importance to *alaṅkāras*, his recognition of *rasa* is not subordinate to them. It is clearly stated that *alaṅkāras* like *rūpaka* should be employed with propriety and they should not spoil the beauty of *rasa* or the delicacy of natural description.⁴⁵⁷ Thus, Kuntaka's ideas towards *rasa* are not opposed to that of *Dhvani* theorists. Therefore, the following observation of S.K. De seems to be inaccurate. He wrote: "From the prominence thus given to the analysis of *alaṅkāra*, it will be clear that Kuntaka could not put enough emphasis on *rasa* and *bhāva* as elements of poetry. The *rasa* is dealt with topically in connection with the poetic figures of the different *mārgas* in which it is involved, as also in the treatment of *prakaraṇa-prabandha-vakratā*. Kuntaka admits the necessity of *rasa*, but regards its delineation apparently as a special kind of realizing *vakratva* in a composition. He admits that it is not the mere matter or plot but the beauty imparted to it by the continuous development of *rasa* which can make the words of a poet live, and in this he follows the dictum of Ānandavardhana; but as he had already accepted the essentiality of *vakrokti*, the *rasa* could be comprehended only as an element of *vakrokti*."⁴⁵⁸

First of all, it is not proper to think that Kuntaka could not put enough emphasis on *rasa* and *bhāva*. Secondly, it is a mistake to think that *rasa* is only an element of *vakrokti* or Kuntaka includes

स्वजात्युचितहेवाकसमुल्लेखोज्वलं परम् ॥

यो रत्यादिः स्थायिभावस्तस्य परिपोष शृङ्गारप्रभृतिरसत्वापादनम्, 'स्थाय्येव तु रसो भवेदिति' न्यायात् । *Ibid.*, III. 7.

रसोद्दीपन सामर्थ्यविनिबन्धनबन्धुरम् ।

चेतनानाममुख्यानां जडानां चापि भूयसा ॥ *Ibid.*, III. 8.

457 *Vide, Vakroktijīvita*, pp. 126-29.

458 S.K. De, *Vakroktijīvita*, Intro., p. XXXVI.

rasa in different varieties of *vakrokti*.⁴⁵⁹ As observed earlier, *rasa* has got the supreme status in *vakrokti* synthesis too. It is obvious that Kuntaka does not include *rasa* in the varieties of *vakrokti*, but he shows how different varieties of *vakrokti* help to delineate *rasa*.⁴⁶⁰ Out of countless types of *vakrokti*, he says, even one type is enough to contribute to the aesthetic experience of readers.⁴⁶¹

As observed earlier, the term *āhlāda* or *vaicitrya* or *camatkāra* is used to connote the aesthetic experience of a reader, and the word *rasa* is used in the sense of different sentiments which denotes the object of aesthetic relish. Thus, Kuntaka's treatment of *rasa* is subjective as well as objective. Dr. Krishnamoorthy observes: "Kuntaka is also aware that in the spectrum of meanings of the word *rasa* this meaning (reader's experience) as well as the meaning of the tasteful liquid drink are included. But he never confuses them in his usage, he keeps them strictly apart as they deserve to be. Kuntaka is the only writer who does not obfuscate the issue while talking of *rasa* and clarifies the position very pointedly and penetratingly. He realizes fully that the presence or manifestation of *rasa* as *alaṅkārya-kāvyārtha* is possible only by way of its *vibhāvadis* or invariable antecedents, consequents and accessories, which are associated with the characters in the poetic work, and not with the subjective mental

459 Following De, Hemalata Deshpande also observes: "Thus Kuntaka includes *rasa* in the varieties of *vakratā*, considering *rasa* as a *vastu* (or *itivyṛtta*)." *Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka*, p. 242.

460 Cf. रसादिद्योतनं यस्यामुपसर्गनिपातयोः।

वाक्यैकजीवितत्वेन सापरा पदवक्रता॥ *Vakroktijivita*, II. 33.

रसादिप्रयोजनयोग्यत्वात् । *Ibid.*, p. 106.

एतदेव विशेषणवक्रत्वंयस्मादनेनैव रसः परां परिपोषपदवीमवतार्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 98.

क्रियासमावेशलक्षणं रसादिपरिपोषणार्थं कर्तृत्वादिकारकत्वं निबध्यते । *Ibid.*, p. 34.

461 वक्रतायाः प्रकारणामेकोऽपि कविकर्मणः।

तद्विदाह्लादकारित्वहेतुतां प्रतिपद्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

states or emotions of the poet himself, except when he happens to write in the lyrical vein in the first person. Even there the generalizing *pratibhā* is active and the question of private emotion is ruled out. In poetry, we are concerned with *rasa* and its associates as verbally embodied. It is in the nature of *rasa* to condition a sympathetic response in the readers making them feel as if they are themselves undergoing the emotional experience."⁴⁶²

Then it may be asked what is the relation between *vakrokti* and *rasa*. *Vakrokti* is regarded as the life of poetry, on the one hand, and *rasa* is said to be the supreme principle, on the other. Is it not a contradiction? Dr. Nagendra states that, for Kuntaka, poetry is *vakrokti* or an artistic activity. To achieve this poetic art, a poet has to use various grandeurs of word and meaning. Among the magnificences of meaning, *rasa* is the most important one. It means that, *rasa* is the supreme principle of poetic art or *vakrokti*. Therefore, *vakrokti* is the life-essence of poetry and the wealth of *rasa* is the main source of *vakratā*.⁴⁶³ On the other hand, Hema Atmanathan opines that Kuntaka nowhere used the word *jīvita* in the sense of *ātma* or soul. Thus, what relation lies between life and soul is the relation between *vakrokti* and *rasa*. Therefore, *vakrokti* is *jīvita* and *rasa* is *ātma* of poetry.⁴⁶⁴

Both the views of Nagendra and Hema Atmanathan are acceptable. But there is another possible better conclusion. It is

462 K. Krishnamoorthy, *Indian Literary Theories*, p. 219.

463 Dr. Nagendra, *Rasa Siddhānta* (Hindi), Kannada translation by Dr. Pradhan Gurudatta, pp. 74-75.

464 "इस सन्दर्भ में यह भी ध्यातव्य है कि कुन्तक ने वक्रोक्तिजीवित ग्रन्थ में कहीं भी वक्रोक्ति को काव्य की आत्मा नहीं कहा है और 'जीवित' शब्द का प्रयोग भी 'आत्मा' अर्थ में नहीं किया है;जब शरीर में प्राणशक्ति ही नहीं रहेगी, शरीर अस्तित्वहीन अर्थात् निर्जीव रहेगा, तो उसमें निहित आत्मा कैसे प्रकाशित हो सकता है?.....वक्रोक्ति काव्य का प्राण (जीवित) है और, रस अथवा तद्विदाह्लादकारित्व काव्य की आत्मा है।" - हेमा आत्मनाथन्, अलङ्कारशास्त्र में आचार्य कुन्तक की देन, pp. 193-94.

observed in the first chapter itself that *vakrokti* is means and the aesthetic experience is the end of poetry. In no uncertain terms Kuntaka has clarified the arcanum of poetry in his very definition of poetry itself. Inclusion of the two phrases - *vakra-kavi-vyāpāra* (*vakrokti*) and *tadvidāhlāda* (*rasa*) in the definition makes him 'different', more a synthesizer preferably, in the midst of our *Ālarikārikas* who uphold either of the two in their definitions of poetry. Kuntaka visualizes the poetic activity in its totality, for if the former phrase *vakra-kavi-vyāpāra* unveils the creative phase of the poet, the latter one, i.e. *tadvidāhlāda* suggests the re-creative phase making the art complete. Therefore, the proper presentation of *vibhāva* etc., through the medium of *vakrokti* leads to the delineation of *rasa*. In other words, *rasa* will be manifested by the way of *vakrokti* or *kavi-vyāpāra*. At the very outset of the *Vakroktijīvita*, it is clearly stated that 'since poetry is a source of delight, through its charm of *rasa*, not only at the time of reading but also in the long run, it shall be made the subject of our enquiry.'⁴⁶⁵ Thus, *vakrokti* is the result of Kuntaka's enquiry. In other place, Kuntaka states that *kavi-kausāla* or *vakrokti* is the reason in the delineation of *rasa*.⁴⁶⁶ Thus, it would be clear that *vakrokti* is the cause to achieve the ultimate end of poetry i.e., *rasa*.

465 आयत्यां च तदात्वे च रसनिस्त्यन्दसुन्दरम् ।

येन सम्पद्यते काव्यं तदिदानीं विचार्यते ॥ *Vakroktijīvita*, p. 5.

466 भावस्वभावसौकुमार्यवर्णने शृङ्गारादिरसस्वरूपसमुन्मीलने वा विविधविभूषणविन्यासविच्छित्तिविरचने च यः परः परिपोषातिशयः तद्विदाह्लादकारितायाः कारणम् ।कविकौशलमेव निबन्धनतया व्यवतिष्ठते । *Ibid.*, p. 134.

अत्र उत्साहाभिधानः स्थायिभावः समुचितालम्बनविभावलक्षणविषय-सौन्दर्यातिशयक्षणाश्रद्धालुतया विजिगीषोर्वैदग्ध्यभङ्गीभणितिवैचित्र्येण परां परिपोषपदवीमधिरोपितः सन् रसतां नीयमानः किमपि वाक्यवक्रभावस्वभावं कविकौशलमावेदयति । *Ibid.*, p. 136.

Vakrokti and Dhvani

In the whole range of Sanskrit poetics, the *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana and the *Vakroktijīvita* of Kuntaka stand out for their illuminating and enchanting explanation as well as their aesthetic analysis of Sanskrit masterpieces. Both Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka have worked out with marked individuality and originality. Both *Dhvani* and *Vakrokti* are striking concepts in their own respective ways. Both highlight all the poetic facts and illustrate their theories with remarkable and tasteful examples. Both offer workable norms for a meaningful literary analysis.

The two theories, however, present striking contrasts.⁴⁶⁷ *Vakrokti* theory controverts the views of *Dhvani* theory in some respects. There are some notable differences between these two perspectives regarding the concept of *Alaṅkāra*, *Rīti-Guṇa*, *Svabhāvokti*, *Rasavadalaṅkāra* and gradations of poetry. Kuntaka was not satisfied with Ānandavardhana's exclusive consideration of *Dhvani*. The activity of *pratibhā* is more comprehensive than *dhvani*. Ānandavardhana held that *kavi-pratibhā* works through the medium of *dhvani* and hence it is the soul of poetry, while Kuntaka thinks that *kavi-pratibhā* can manifest in numerous ways; the major ways are of *dhvani*. Thus, it is not chained to *dhvani*

467 In the preceding chapters (III & IV), the differences between these two theories have been discussed occasionally. Hence, here only a passing reference has been made.

only. In *dhvani* synthesis, the various poetic elements are related to *dhvani* i.e., *rasa-dhvani*, while in *vakrokti* synthesis, the several poetic elements are all related to *vakrokti*. In other words, *dhvani* synthesis is based on the principle of *upasarjanīkaraṇa* (render subordinate to the main theme), while *vakrokti* synthesis is based on *parasparaspardhā* (mutual competence). All these are notable differences between the two perspectives.

On the other hand, the two theories are complementary in many respects. First of all, Kuntaka accepts the existence of suggestion in poetry. He says that the function of indicative and suggestive words is also to communicate and consequently they also can be treated, though metaphorically, as *vācakas*. Similarly, the indicated and the suggested meanings are *vācya*s on the similarity of being communicated.⁴⁶⁸ At another place, it is stated that 'the learned author of *Dhvanyāloka* has established at length the relation of suggestion and suggester in such instances. Hence, there is nothing special in repeating the same.'⁴⁶⁹ Again, Kuntaka explicitly states that *paryāya-vakratā* is identical with suggestion in word coming under the class *Śabdaśaktimūla-anuraṇanarūpa-vyāṅgya*,⁴⁷⁰ and the same illustrations cited by Ānandavardhana are quoted. Further, while treating the figure *vyatireka*, Kuntaka quotes Ānandavardhana's definition of *Dhvani* with approval.⁴⁷¹ Thus, it would be clear that Kuntaka

468 ननु च द्योतकव्यञ्जकावपि शब्दौ सम्भवतः, तदसंग्रहान्नातिव्याप्तिः, यस्मादर्थप्रतीतिकारित्वं सामान्यादुपचारात्तावपि वाचकावेव । एवं द्योत्यप्यङ्गयोरप्यर्थयोः प्रत्येयत्वसामान्यादुपचाराद्वाच्यत्वमेव । *Vakroktijīvitā*, p.14.

469 यस्माद् ध्वनिकारेण व्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकभावोऽत्र सुतरां समर्थितस्तत् किं पौनरुक्त्यो न । *Ibid.*, p.83.

470 एष एव च शब्दशक्तिमूलानुरणनरूपव्यङ्ग्यस्य पदध्वनेर्विषयः बहुषु चैवंविधेषु सत्सु वाक्यध्वनेर्वा । *Ibid.*, p. 89.

471 *Ibid.*, p.222.

is fully alive to the importance of suggestion in poetry; and his *vakrokti* is not only *abhidhā-vaicitrya* but incorporates all the ideas of denotation, indication and the suggestion.⁴⁷²

Secondly, about thirty-five illustrative verses are common to *Dhvanyāloka* and *Vakroktijīvitā*; both Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka point out the same beauty. But the only difference is that, the former mentions them as a type of *Dhvani*, while the latter illustrates them as a variety of *vakrokti*. Now let us take few examples:

तदा जायन्ते गुणा यदा ते सहृदयैर्गृह्यन्ते ।

रविकिरणानुगृहीतानि भवन्ति कमलानि कमलानि ॥⁴⁷³

Ānandavardhana cites this verse to illustrate the *arthāntara-saṅkramita-vācya-Dhvani* since the second lotus possessing attributes like fragrance through suggestion.⁴⁷⁴ Kuntaka, on the other hand, would suggest that the second lotus signifies some meaning other than its well known connotation, and thus causes strikingness.⁴⁷⁵ In fact, these meanings are always suggested. He considered it as an example of *rūḍi-vaicitrya-vakratā*. To take another example:

472 प्रतीयमानता यत्र वाक्ययार्थस्य निबध्यते ।

वाच्यवाचकवृत्तिभ्यां व्यतिरिक्तस्य कस्यचित् ॥ *Ibid.*, I.40.

कविना नूतनत्वेन यदुल्लिखितं तदतीव प्रतीयमानमह्वव्यक्तिपरत्वेन चमत्कारकारितामापद्यते । *Ibid.*, p.59.

अर्थान्तरप्रतीतिकारित्वं च पदानां प्रतीयमानार्थस्फुटतावभासनार्थमुपनिबध्यमानमतीव चमत्कारितां प्रतिपद्यते । *Ibid.*, p.54.

कामापि सहृदयानुभूयमानां न पुनरभिधागोचरचमत्कारां वक्रतां..... । *Ibid.*, p.278.

473 *Dhvanyāloka*, p.38.

474 इत्यत्र द्वितीयः कमलशब्दः *Ibid.*, p.38.

475 प्रतीयते इति क्रियापदवैचित्र्यस्यायमभिप्रायो यदेवंविधे विषये शब्दानां वाचकत्वेन न व्यापारः अपितु वस्त्वन्तरवत्प्रतीतिकारित्वमात्रेणेति युक्तियुक्तमपि डातदिहनाति-प्रतन्यते ।

Vakroktijīvitā, p.83.

समविषमनिर्विशेषाः समन्ततो मन्दमन्दसञ्चाराः ।

अचिराद्भविष्यन्ति पन्थानो मनोरथानामपि दुर्लङ्घ्याः ॥⁴⁷⁶

Ānandavardhana here exemplifies the suggestiveness of tense. He states that the future tense in the verb 'will exceed' is highly suggestive of the sentiment love-in-separation due to journey.⁴⁷⁷ On the other hand, Kuntaka considers it as an example of *kāla-vaicitrya-vakratā*. He illustrates: "This is a statement by a vexed lover, who is already suffering the pangs of separation from his beloved and who anticipates the time yet to come in his mind with all its associated deductions and thus becomes exposed to the upsurge of all his pent-up longings because of this enkindling stimulus; and unable to bear the impact of bewitching beauty of such a nature clad in splendour, he becomes a victim of overwhelming apprehension. He mourns: 'Before long the roads will become inaccessible even to the flight of thoughts.' The future termination here is indeed expressive unique beauty in the latter part of the world."⁴⁷⁸ Thus, it would be clear that the critical observations of these theorists are identical and both find out beauty in the latter part of the same word. To take one more instance:

अयमेकपदे तथा वियोगः प्रियया चोपनतः सुदुःसहो मे ।

नववारिधरोदयादहोभिर्भवितव्यं च निरातपत्वरम्यैः ॥⁴⁷⁹

476 *Dhvanyāloka*, p.154.

477 अत्र ह्यचिराद्भविष्यन्ति पन्थान इत्यत्र भविष्यन्तीत्यस्मिन् पदे प्रत्ययः कालविशेषाभिधायी रसपरिपोषहेतुः प्रकाशते । अयं हि गतार्थः प्रवासविप्रलम्भशृङ्गारविभावतया विभाव्यमानो रसवान् । *Ibid.*, p.54.

478 अत्र वल्लभाविह्वैधुर्यकातरन्तःकरणेन । भाविनः समयस्य सम्भावनानुमानमाहात्म्यमुत्प्रेक्ष्य उद्दीपनविभावत्व विभवविलसितं तत्परिस्पन्दसौन्दर्यतन्दर्शनासहिष्णुना किमपि भयविसंश्रुलत्वमनु भूयशङ्काकुलत्वेन केनचिदेतदभिदीयते- यदचिराद् भविष्यन्ति पन्थानो मनोरथानामप्यलङ्घनीया इति भविष्यत्कालाभिधायी प्रत्ययः किमपि परार्धवक्रतां विकासयति ॥ *Vakroktijvita*, p.114.

479 *Dhvanyāloka*, p.150.

This verse is cited in *Dhvanyāloka* as an example of suggestiveness of indeclinable which Kuntaka calls *pada-vakratā*. Kuntaka states: "There are two factors here which equally possess an irresistible capacity to excite one's agony, namely, separation from the beloved and the advent of the rainy season. Both of them are described here as converging at the same time by the force of the two particles *ca.....ca...* (and). This force is indeed like the southern breeze which fans the fire of sorrow bursting at once into flame."⁴⁸⁰ Thus, both Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka show as to how beauty is acquired through the appropriate use of indeclinable. Therefore, it would be explicit that the comments of these two theorists on these verses are identical in spirit, but the only difference is one calls it *Dhvani* and the other terms it *vakrokti*.

Thirdly, Kuntaka's classification of *vakrokti* is substantially based on the classification of *dhvani*. Both the varieties are based on the different devices of language beginning from syllables to the whole work. *Dhvani* is classified into *varṇa*, *pada*, *padāvayava* and so on from the standpoint of *vyañjaka* or suggester.⁴⁸¹ Suggestiveness of *varṇa* is Kuntaka's *varṇa-vinyāsa-vakratā* and, suggestiveness of *pada* and *padāvayavas* are Kuntaka's varieties of *pada-pūrvārdha* and *pada-parārdha-vakratā*. *Arthāntara-saṅkramita-vācya-dhvani* and *atyanta-tiraskṛta-vācya-dhvani* are *ruḍhi-vaicitrya-vakratā* and *upacāra-vakratā*, respectively; and the very instances are quoted. *Śabda-śakti-mūla-Dhvani* is explicitly brought under

480 अत्र द्वयोः परस्परं सुदुःसहत्वोद्दीपनसामर्थ्यसमेतयोः प्रियाविरहवर्षाकालयोस्तुल्य-
कालत्वप्रतिपादनपरं 'च' शब्दद्वितयं समसमयसमुल्लसितवह्निनदाहृदक्षदक्षिणवात-
व्यञ्जनसमानतां समुद्गीयमपि कामपि वाक्यवक्रतां समुद्दीपयति । *Vakroktijīvitā*, p.121.

481 यस्त्वलक्ष्यक्रमव्यङ्ग्यो ध्वनिवर्णपदादिषु।

वाक्ये सङ्घटनायां च स प्रबन्धेऽपि दीप्यते ।

सुसिद्धवचनसम्बन्धैस्तथा कारकशक्तिभिः।

कृतद्वितसमासैश्च द्योत्योऽलक्ष्यक्रमः क्वचित् ।

Dhvanyāloka, III 2&16.

paryāya-vakata. The threefold classification of *dhvani* viz., *vastu*, *alaṅkāra* and *rasa*, is implicitly accepted by Kuntaka.⁴⁸² *Alaṅkāra-dhvani* and *Vastu-dhvani* are brought under *vākya-vakratā* and *vastu-vakratā*, respectively. *Rasa* is said to be at the root of all kinds of *vakrokti* and its particular manifestation in relation to *pada*, *vākya*, *prakaraṇa* and *prabandha* is illustrated. Thus, the whole field of *dhvani* is accepted and included under the province of *vakrokti*.

Thus, the analysis would reveal that Kuntaka is influenced by the teachings of Ānandavardhana. And, his *Vakroktijīvitā* is more or less modelled upon *Dhvanyāloka* and supplement is by extending its insights. As far as practical criticism is concerned, Kuntaka started his analysis where Ānandavardhana left off. And working on the cues of Ānandavardhana, Kuntaka gave a full-fledged criticism of the classics of Sanskrit literature. It is thus the two theories, *dhvani* and *vakrokti*, are complementary in many respects. For this reason, Mahimabhaṭṭa, who came immediately after Kuntaka, states that '*vakrokti*' is nothing but *dhvani*, served out again in another garb. It has modelled on *dhvani*, utilizing most of the instances cited in *Dhvanyāloka* changing the name *dhvani* into *vakrokti*.⁴⁸³ But Mahimabhaṭṭa's criticism has statistical support since about forty verses are common to both; and the varieties of *dhvani* and *vakrokti* are based on the same grounds. It must be noted that Kuntaka is neither a slavish follower nor an unsparing critic of *Dhvani* school. He is an eclectic theorist who incorporates the merits of different schools. The close resemblance of Kuntaka's varieties of *vakrokti* and divisions of *dhvani* forced Mahimabhaṭṭa to criticise so. Of course, Kuntaka is an original thinker and an aesthetic critic. Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy rightly observes: "Kuntaka appears

482 रसस्वभावालङ्कारा आसंसारमपि स्थिताः।

अनेन नवतां यान्ति तद्विदाह्लाददायिनीम् ॥ *Op.cit.* p.137.

483 *Vide, Supra.*, Ch.II, fn.143.

thus as a true successor of Ānandavardhana, giving new orientation to literary study itself. He marshals new arguments and proposes new classifications. He removes the contradictions he sees in the *Dhvani* theory and though apparently ranged against it, he virtually extends it in his idea of *Vakrokti*. If Ānandavardhana regards *guṇas* as *rasa-dharmas*, Kuntaka regards them as ingrained in poetic temperament (*Kavi-svabhāva*) which is his great psychological insight. If Ānandavardhana regards gradations in poetry as possible, Kuntaka thinks that there are no such gradations. Either something is poetic or unpoetic, we cannot have any other qualitative gradations within the poetics, though there may be infinite variations in the way poetry manifests itself. *Vastu-dhvani* of Ānandavardhana also comes to be accommodated as *Alaṅkārya-vastu* by Kuntaka. What was implicit in Ānandavardhana's treatment of *pratibhā* or creative imagination is rendered more explicit by a wealth of illustrative examples in Kuntaka. All the varieties of *dhvani* are properly explained as so many varieties of *vakratā*. All this indicates how Kuntaka has shown his originality as an aesthetic thinker and a practical literary critic.⁴⁸⁴

Thus, *Vakrokti* theory, no doubt, was ingenious, beautifully explained and comprehensive; but in its very nature it could not affect the stream of thought. It became a particular figure either of *śabda* or *artha* in later Sanskrit poetics. But Kuntaka's impression in this profound field of Sanskrit poetics is everlasting. The following reasons may be given for the decadence of *Vakrokti* theory:

- i. Kuntaka has used the term *vakrokti* in the sense of *kavi-vyāpāra*. But he did not explain how the term *vakrokti* is identical with *kavi-vyāpāra*. At the time of Kuntaka, the term has restricted meaning as mere figures of speech. Kuntaka, indeed, took the old term with new connotations. But, Viśvanātha, the author of

484 K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvita, Intro.*, pp. XXXVI-VII.

Sāhityadarpaṇa, remarks that *vakrokti* cannot become the soul of poetry as it is only an *alaṅkāra*. Even a hasty reading of *Vakroktijīva* is enough to disprove Viśvanātha. Thus, it would be clear that how the term *vakrokti* misled the later theorists.

ii. Mahimabhaṭṭa, who came immediately after Kuntaka, says that *vakrokti* is nothing but *dhvani* masquerading in disguise. On the other hand, the staunch followers of Ānandavardhana, Vidyādhara and Jayaratha, had branded Kuntaka as *bhaktavādin*. These mis-statements make Kuntaka's theory out of consideration.

iii. Kuntaka's *Vakrokti* theory is much practical rather than philosophical. At his time, *Alaṅkāraśāstra* had almost reached its final stage; Ānandavardhana had established *Rasa-Dhvani* theory with sound philosophical and aesthetic grounds. And his immediate followers viz., Abhinavagupta and Mammaṭa have made *Dhvani* theory more powerful. Unfortunately, Kuntaka had no such followers.

iv. "But the sturdy independence," as P. C. Lahiri thinks, "which prompted him to formulate a novel theory of poetics without adhering to the teachings of the orthodox schools, was responsible for his failure to attract any following in the later history of the discipline."⁴⁸⁵

485 P.C. Lahiri, *Concepts of Rīti and Guṇa in Sanskrit Poetics*, p.148.

Vakrokti and Practical Criticism

Poetics is a branch of study concerned with the fundamental theories of poetry. But poetics is not an end in itself. It is to serve as a guide to educate good taste and promote good criticism.⁴⁸⁶ The greatest function of criticism is to evaluate the works of master poets. Practical criticism is nothing but the application of poetic theory to the existing literary works. It is the conscious evaluation and sensitive appreciation of poetry. Thus, practical criticism proceeds within the light of poetics. In other words, poetics provides the criteria for criticism to estimate a literary work and to determine its place and magnitude in the galaxy of literature. Thus, practical criticism is an important aspect of poetics. Theoretical and practical aspects are the two faces of the same coin. Without applied criticism, poetic theory will be meaningless. Therefore, poetic theory and practical criticism are complementary to each other.

In Indian literary context, the discipline called *Alaṅkāraśāstra* was developed which signifies a harmonious blend of aesthetics, poetics and rhetorics. In its long history over thousand and five hundred years, various poetic theories were established. It is accepted that Sanskrit poetics gave much emphasis to theoretical

486 The word '**criticism**' has been used in the sense of **poetics** in English literature only since seventeenth century. It was used in the sense of evaluation of a literary work in Greek and Roman books of poetics. Here, the word '**criticism**' is used in its old sense i.e. evaluation of a literary work or **practical criticism**.

aspects of poetry rather than its practical analysis. But in Western poetics, practical criticism was predominantly developed. In ancient India, though comprehensive poetic theories were established, applied criticism could not develop in a remarkable way. Early works on Sanskrit poetics lay emphasis on the stereotyped nature of its critical rules and canons. No attempt has been made to give a full integration of the concepts into a working methodology of critical criteria.

Though in ancient India, full-fledged criticisms of whole works were not prominent, significant attempts had been made by Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka. Ānandavardhana, for the first time, supplemented practical criticism to the theoretical portions. He examined the two great epics viz., *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* from the total perspective. But he did not extend his literary analysis to the classics of Sanskrit literature. Working on the cues of Ānandavardhana, Kuntaka gave a full-fledged criticism. Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy rightly observes:

"In the whole range of Sanskrit poetical theory, we do not have any one who can be termed a practical literary critic in the modern sense of the term, except Kuntaka. Most of the early rhetoricians like Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin are so interested in rules and definitions that they offer examples of their own authorship for the points in question and they do not even select examples from master poets. Even those who do select examples from literature, like Vāmana, are satisfied with illustrating petty details noted by them and their works reveal but partial glimpses of literary beauty in individual bits. None of them even attempt the task of reviewing or appreciating a literary work as a whole, analysing the various elements that work up to a unity of impression. Bharata's rules regarding dramatic plot-construction, characters and *rasa* are simply taken for granted but never illustrated in detail with reference to any specific work. Though Ānandavardhana subjected the two major epics to an examination revealing a total perspective, he too did not extend

his literary analysis to the Sanskrit classics of poetry and drama. Kuntaka, indeed, is the only writer who attempted this task of literary analysis, critical appreciation and appraisal from a total perspective, of almost all the major poets and playwrights in classical Sanskrit literature.⁴⁸⁷

Kuntaka thus shows remarkable critical imagination in writing about a given piece of poetry. He selects very apt and beautiful examples to establish his theory. When he is writing about even an individual verse, he has the context of the whole poem in view and what it aims at and evaluates every words and phrases in so far as they promote the central meaning of the poem.⁴⁸⁸ His greatness is further seen in the amendments suggested for avoiding defects. For instance:

सद्यः पुरीपरिसरेऽपि शिरीषमृद्धी
गत्वा जवात्त्रिचतुराणि पदानि सीता ।
गन्तव्यमद्य कियदित्यसकृद् ब्रुवाणा
रामाश्रुणः कृतवती प्रथमावतारम् ॥⁴⁸⁹

Kuntaka feels that the word *asakṛt* in the verse is very much disgraceful as it degrades the personality of both Rāma and Sītā. To quote his critical analysis: "Here the idea 'more than once' is to be regretted as it does not redound to the nobility of Sītā's personality. Nor does it add to the appeal of the sentiment in question. For, Sītā's undertaking the journey is voluntary and worthy of her nobility. Even if we concede that because of extreme physical tenderness, some such thoughts came to her mind, no sensitive reader can imagine that it would find verbal expression. Again, it is difficult to believe that repeated assertions on the part of Sītā were required to draw the first tears

487 Dr.K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvita, Intro.*, PP.XXXV-XXXVI.

488 *Vide, Supra.*, Ch.III, pp. 71-75.

489 *Bālarāmāyaṇa* of Rājaśekhara, VI.34.

from Rāma, because even at her first utterance, Rāma is much more likely to break into tears. Thus, we see here a very lovely idea spoilt altogether by the poet's concentration straying away for the moment from its object. Therefore, we suggest that the phrase 'more than once' is emended into 'unwittingly.'⁴⁹⁰ Here one can see the real literary criticism, sensitive appreciation and critical judgement. Kuntaka's criticism is positive and constructive.

In the fourth chapter of his *Vakroktijīvita*, Kuntaka subjects almost all the major works of Sanskrit literature to an examination from the total perspective. Let us see few specimens of practical criticism of Kuntaka. While dealing with *Prakaraṇa-vakratā*, Kuntaka views Kālidāsa's masterpiece, the *Abhijñāna-śākuntalā*, which is based on the well-known epic i.e. *Mahābhārata*. The reason why Duṣyanta is unable to recognize Śākuntalā is left unexplained in the original *Mahābhārata*. For explaining it adequately, Kālidāsa has invented the episode of the curse of sage *Durvāsa*. This episode shines forth as the vital essence of the work as a whole. Kuntaka says that 'such an art of plot-construction may surely be regarded as the best repository of literary sentiments.'⁴⁹¹

490 अत्रासकृत् प्रतिक्षणं कियदद्य गन्तव्यमित्यभिधानलक्षणः परिस्पन्दो न स्वभावमहातामुन्मीलयति, न च रसपरिपोषाङ्गतां प्रतिपद्यते । यस्मात्सीतायाः सहजेन केनाप्यौचित्येन गन्तुमध्यवसितायाः सौकुमार्यदिवंविधं वस्तु हृदये परिस्फुरदपि वचनमारोहतीति सहृदयैः सम्भावयितुं न पार्यति । न च प्रतिक्षणमभिधीयमानमपि राघवाश्रुप्रथमावतारस्य सम्यक् सङ्गतिं भजते, सकृदाकर्णनादेव तस्योपपत्तेः । एतच्चात्यन्तरमणीयमपि मनाङ्गात्रचलितावधानत्वेन कवेः कदर्थितम् । तस्माद् अवशम् इत्यत्र पाठः कर्तव्यः । *Vakroktijīvita*, p.19.

491 एवंविधस्य संविधानकस्यरसनिधानकलशायमानस्य माहात्म्यादखिलस्यापि नाटकस्य कापि (विच्छित्तिः)..... । *Ibid.*, p.250.

Kuntaka further explains Duṣyanta's inability to recognize Śakuntalā in spite of a hundred chances provided to him to recognize her on psychological grounds. He did not take the curse motif mechanically. The curse is only an external motif and it cannot change the inmost nature of a man. Hence, Kuntaka shows penetratingly the genius of Kālidāsa in delineating the character of Duṣyanta in such a novel way. Duṣyanta is not forgetful of his deep attachments in love. That is why, the fifth Act of the drama begins with the song of *Hamsapadikā* which stirs the hidden springs of memory in Duṣyanta. Kuntaka comments that though Duṣyanta's memory has been very temporarily blacked out by the power of the curse, the traces are still left of the old love. He cites the verse of *Abhijñāna-śākuntala* (V.2) and comments:

"Here the beauty of such a recollection of Śakuntalā (so deep down in the layers of his subconscious), at once guileless and charming, appeals very much to the hearts of connoisseurs. What is more, she is turned down later, her story and ring of recognition are dismissed as false; the account of her marriage with him and pregnancy given by sage Kaṇva's disciple is discredited and the king is seen in a fit of anger. Then, even transgressing the limits of natural shyness, her veil is removed from her face suddenly. Yet the king is under the illusion that she is another's wife. Though her bubbling youthful charm, superior to that of all the women seen by him so far, impress him very much as much as her narration, as sweet as the strains from a lyre, of intimate incidents of her association to bring back his memory, incidents such as excursions in the forest grove, still he shows the rudeness of rejecting Śakuntalā. Such rudeness too becomes understandable only by the intensity of his later repentance at the termination of the curse, a repentance which is indicative of the depth of his unmitigated love for her in his heart. And it is most appealing to the connoisseurs. And in

devising the end of the curse, the poet prefaces it with a description of the intense wretchedness of the king's mental state who is suffering feverishly the pangs of unbearable separation after the dawn of his memory of the forgotten incidents. Synchronizing with it comes the recovery of the lost ring too which again delights the readers very much.*⁴⁹²

Further, Kuntaka quotes three more verses from the Act VI and shows how this Act internally concerned with intense self-censure and repentance of Duṣyanta for his unpardonable mistake. Kuntaka finally observes that if this curse episode was not incorporated in the drama, it would have been a source of blemish as in the original story.⁴⁹³ This psychological study of a character by Kuntaka is profound and far-reaching.

In his assessment of the *Raghuvamśa*, Kuntaka brings out one more fundamental aspect of criticism, viz., significance of parts in relation to the whole. He analyses that the description of Daśaratha's hunting expedition seems to be irrelevant at the outset. But it becomes in fact the seed of a curse which acts almost as a boon to the sonless Daśaratha; and prepares the

492 रम्याणिवीक्ष्य मधुरांश्च निशम्य शब्दान् पर्यत्सुकीभवति यत्सुखितोऽपि जन्तुः।
तच्चेतसा स्मरति नूनमबोधपूर्वं भावस्थिराणि जननान्तरसौहृदानि ॥

अत्र संमुग्धसुभगमेनकानन्दिनीस्मरणलेखालावण्यमन्यदेव चमत्कारकारणं सहृदयानां
समुद्योतते । अपरं च परावर्तितायामपि व्यलीकमभिज्ञकं च,
महर्षिशिष्यसमाख्यातकरग्रहणगर्भादानायां महामन्युसमुन्मेषः। मनागुल्लङ्घित-
सहजलज्जावतारतापसशीघ्रापनीतावगुण्ठनेन (पराङ्गनारचित)
तथाविधसकलललनालावण्यावलेपसंपदि संपादितविपश्चीटङ्कारवल्गुवाग्विलास-
व्याहृतवनविहरणहृस्याभिज्ञायां भरतमातरि तथारूपप्रत्यख्यानपरुष्यमपि राज्ञः शापस्य
सम्पत्त्यमानानुतापं परस्परं प्रकाशीभवदनर्गलानुरागप्राग्भारसङ्गादतीव
सहृदयाह्लादकारि । शापावसानसमुत्पत्तये प्रसिद्धस्मरणसमुल्लासिदुः
सहविरहज्वरपातावेगविकलत्वं च समनन्तरमेवाङ्गुलीय-सङ्गमादतीव
सहृदयानाह्लादयति । *Ibid.*, pp.250-51.

493 अविद्यमाने पुनरेतस्मिन् उत्पाद्यलवलावण्यललान्नि प्रकरणे निष्कारण-
विस्मरणवैरस्यमितिहासांशस्यैव रूपकस्यापि विरूपकतापत्तिनिमित्ततामवगाहते ॥
Ibid., p.251.

ground for the birth of his sons. Kuntaka illustrates the importance and beauty of this portion in detail.⁴⁹⁴ He also explains the importance and charmingness of *Raghu-Kautsa* episode⁴⁹⁵ and Kuśa's water-sport⁴⁹⁶ of *Raghuvamśa* from the total perspective.

In respect of the *Kumārasambhava*, Kuntaka shows another point of criticism. In a literary work, each preceding part should be connected intimately with each of the succeeding ones. In *Kumārasambhava*, the incidents viz., the initial description of the divine beauty of *Pārvatī*, her worshipful service to Śiva, Creator's advice to Gods regarding the destruction of demon *Tāraka*, Cupid's appointment for shaking the self-restraint of Śiva and his death, the lament of the widowed Rati, *Pārvatī*'s observance of austerities and so on are mutually connected together into a most enchanting sequential synthesis and possessing the highest possible beauty.⁴⁹⁷

The *Mudrārākṣasa* is another excellent work undertaken for analysis by Kuntaka. He says that the title of the drama is most significant as it highlights the important and interesting aspect of the plot itself. In the beginning of the Act VI, a man who is in fact a secret agent of Kauṭilya, entering with a rope to commit suicide. Meanwhile, *Amātya-Rākṣasa* enters there and he is informed about the supposed execution of *Candandāsa*. This episode is a minor incident. But it ultimately contributes

494 *Ibid.*, pp. 260-62.

495 *Ibid.*, pp. 246-48.

496 *Ibid.*, pp. 263-65.

497 यथा वा कुमारसम्भवे - पार्वत्याः प्रथमतारुण्यावतारवर्णनम्, शङ्करशुश्रूषा, दुस्तरतारकपराभवपारावारोत्तारकारणमरविन्दसूतेरुपदेशः, कुसुमाकरसुहृदः कन्दर्पस्य पुरन्दरोद्देशात् गौर्याः सौन्दर्यबलाद्विप्रहरतोहरविलोचनविचित्रभानुना..... भस्मीकरणं निरर्गलानुरागप्राग्भारपरिमृष्टचेतसा परमेश्वरेण पाणिपीडनम्, इति प्रकरणानि पौर्वापर्यपर्यवसित सुन्दरसमावेशसम्बन्धुराणि रामणीयकधारामधिरोहन्ति । *Ibid.*, pp. 273.

significance to the plot as a whole. Kuntaka quotes this portion from the play and comments: "The story of the man is so effective that even *Rākṣasa*, who deemed himself an expert in the very complex and confusing art of diplomacy, is easily deluded and made to feel the agony of a friend's death for his sake that he then and there sets out to free the body of Candanadāsa by sacrificing his own body as exchange."⁴⁹⁸

It is indeed the real office of a critic to bring out both the merits and demerits of a literary work and to give a definitive judgment. Kuntaka did not ignore about the demerits of literary works. Even master poets would make mistakes. He does not hesitate to criticize even great poets like Kālidāsa. He daringly shows the defect of impropriety in the works of Kālidāsa.⁴⁹⁹ For instance.

पुरं निषादाधिपतेस्तदेतद्यस्मिन्मया मौलिमणिं विहाय ।

जटासु बद्धास्वरुदत्सुमन्त्रः कैकेयि कामाः फलितास्तवेति ॥⁵⁰⁰

This is the verse taken from the *Raghuvamśa* wherein Rāma remembers the words of Sumantra and tells them to Sītā. Kuntaka observes that the words 'Kaikeyi, be content, now that your desires are fulfilled' from the mouth of Rāma, a hero endowed with all virtues are highly improper. That such a great person as Rāma not only remembers the meanest incident but

498 किं बहुना, विचित्रसंभावनागहने नीतिवर्त्मनि विचक्षणमन्यस्य राक्षसस्यापि तथा संभ्रमः सन्तापमुज्ज्वलां बभूवे, यथा वा सः स्वदेहदानेन चन्दनदासदेहमोचनायोपचक्रमे ॥ *Ibid.*, pp.269.

499 Two other instances are II. 54 of *Raghuvamśa* and III.7 of *Kumārasambhava*. Vide, *Vakroktijīva*, pp. 71-72.

We might ask why Kuntaka chooses Kālidāsa himself even for the examples of literary blemishes. Kuntaka himself says:

एतच्चैतस्यैव कवेः सहजसौकुमार्यमुद्रितसूक्तिपरिस्पन्दसौन्दर्यस्य पर्यालोच्यते, न पुनरन्येषामाहर्षमात्रकाव्यकरणकौशलक्ष्माधिनाम् । *Ibid.*, pp. 72.

500 *Raghuvamśa*, XIII. 59.

also states it. This suggests the narrow outlook of Rāma and hence it is full of impropriety.⁵⁰¹

On the other hand, Kuntaka condemns the attitude of few poets that excessive craze for observing the rules even when they are improper. He cites the example of the second Act of *Veṅṭsamhāra* wherein Duryodhana overhears the incident of Bhānumatī's dream. At the juncture of grave battle, the desire of a hero like Duryodhana for amorous indulgence is highly improper.⁵⁰²

These are the few specimens of Kuntaka's literary analysis. The fourth chapter of *Vakroktijīvitā* is devoted to the literary analysis of well-known works of Kālidāsa, Māgha, Bhavabhūti, Bhāravi, Viśākhadatta, Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa as well as the less known works like *Abhijñāna-Jānakī* and *Puṣpadutikā*. Kuntaka thus endeavours to develop his theory and practice on the basis of the achievement of great poets and tries to systematize classical practice and critical ideas into a theory for the guidance of future poets. He has given us a full-fledged criticism of a large number

501 अत्ररघुपतेरनर्घमहापुरुषसम्पदुपेतत्वेन वर्ण्यमानस्य कैकेयि कामाः फलितास्तव इत्येवंविधतुच्छतरपदार्थसंस्मरणं तदभिधानंचात्यन्तमनौचित्यमावहति ।

Op. cit., p.71.

Dr. Mallikarjuna Paraddi does not agree with the views of Kuntaka. He discusses the three instances in detail which are cited as examples of impropriety, and concludes that 'Kuntaka's remarks are farfetched or rather unwarranted. *Vide, Three Incidents in Kālidāsa's Poetry-Assessment by Kuntaka, Proceedings of the fifth World Sanskrit Conference, Varanasi, 1981, pp.255-60.*

502 यथा वेणीसंहारे प्रतिमुखसन्ध्यङ्गभागिनि द्वितीयेऽङ्के भानुमत्याः स्वप्रवृत्तान्तश्रवणसमुत्पन्नदुर्विनयबुद्धेर्दुर्योधनस्य विविधविपक्षवैलक्ष्येतादृशी समरसंमर्दे समुदवृत्ते, शरशय्याशायिनि मन्दाकिनीनन्दने, निहन्यमानेषु च कुमारसोदरसम्बन्धिसुहृत्सु, तथाविधवीरवृत्तेरभिमानिनोऽस्पन्दमवस्थितिरप्यनुचिता किं पुनर्विलासव्यापृतिः, तत्रापि वेश्यायामिव विलासः महाराजस्य महिष्यां विचारमन्तरेण तदुचितचित्तपरिचितिं विना च दुर्विनयाध्यासः सकलमिदमसमञ्जसताभाजनमुपेक्ष्यमेव ।
Vakroktijīvitā, p.274.

of classical works. His aesthetic insights are everfresh and everlasting. His critical and creative analysis both informs and transforms the readers. His theory of *Vakrokti* gives us a working methodology of critical criteria which is applicable to any literature.⁵⁰³ "Kuntaka may not be as great a philosopher as Ānandavardhana; he may not be as good a logician as Bhāmaha or as fervent a dialectician as Mahimabhaṭṭa; but as a literary critic in the true sense of the term, Kuntaka stands unrivalled. He was a very sensitive critic with genuine literary taste. His literary criticism itself often rises to the level of good literature."⁵⁰⁴ But it is indeed a dismal feature of Sanskrit poetics that later theorists completely neglected this important aspect of literary criticism.

503 Prof. C.N. Ramachandran and Prof C.N. Srinath have made attempt to analyse English poetry within the framework of *Vakrokti* theory of Kuntaka.

Vide, C.N. Ramachandran, *Vakrokti in Application: An Examination*, & C.N. Srinath, *Vakrokti in the poetry of Hopkins*, in *East West Poetics at Work*, (Ed.C.D. Narasimhaiah), Sahitya Academi, New Delhi, 1994, pp.88-94 and 223-229, respectively.

504 Dr. K.Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvita, Intro.*, P.XXXVI.

Conclusion

The comprehensive study of the concept of *vakrokti* in Sanskrit poetics has been made in the foregoing chapters. The study itself reveals the multi-dimensional aspects of *vakrokti*. In Sanskrit poetics, *vakrokti* theory shows remarkable divergence both in conception and treatment from writer to writer. In its history, the concept was taken up for a detailed discussion by Kuntaka, Bhoja and Abhinavagupta. Among them, *vakrokti* took altogether new significance and supreme position as all-pervading poetic concept in Kuntaka's *Vakroktijīva*. His *vakrokti* theory emerges as a viable theory of poetic language par-excellence. *Vakrokti* is an inevitable departure from the empirical mode of expression to achieve aesthetic effect. It is an artistic turn of speech having beauty par-excellence.

The present research work provides the conceptual study of *vakrokti* at various stages. The important works on Sanskrit poetics concerning the concept of *vakrokti* are taken for the study and observed the views of respective theorists carefully and presented systematically. It is to be noted that Kuntaka's name is so closely associated with the concept that one utters either of the words the other one also instantly strikes in one's mind. And, one can see the full-fledged development of *vakrokti* in his *Vakroktijīva*. Hence, much emphasis is laid on his theory of *vakrokti*.

The introduction presents the major schools of Sanskrit poetics, general definition of *vakrokti* and its multi-dimensional implications.

The second chapter is concerned with the history of *vakrokti*. Here, attempts have been made to present the views of different theorists on *vakrokti*. In presenting the views of respective theorists, the interrelated concepts are also considered.

The third chapter exposes Kuntaka's theory of *vakrokti*. Kuntaka is known for his originality, refined taste and literary sensibility. His *Vakroktijīva* is an epoch-making work in the history of *vakrokti*. He revived the concept of mere verbal poetic figure to the essence of poetry. Kuntaka was not entirely satisfied with the theories of his predecessors. He is neither a slavish follower nor an unsparing critic of any school. He is an eclectic theorist who incorporates the merits of different schools. Thus, Kuntaka made an attempt to harmonize his own views with the main teachings of different schools.

In fact, there is a close relation between *Alaṅkāraśāstra* and other philosophical systems. It is so because many *ālaṅkārikas* themselves were great philosophers too. Thus, quite naturally, their literary theories were affected by their philosophical backgrounds. Kuntaka was the follower of Kashmir *Śaivism* which is generally known as *Pratyabhijñā-darśana*. The impact of *Pratyabhijñā-darśana* on Kuntaka's poetic theory is discussed at the end of the third chapter.

In its critical analysis, the fourth chapter presents *vakrokti* in relation to various literary concepts viz., *alaṅkāra*, *svabhāvokti*, *rasavadalaṅkāra*, *mārga* and *rasa*. *Vakrokti* synthesis is based on the principle of *Parasparaspardhā* (mutual competence). The several elements of poetry must be arranged in a glorious race, competing with each other in making poetry beautiful. The concept of *sāhitya* lies behind this harmonious blending of various elements. Thus, *sāhitya* is the synthesizing force in

ṛ krokti theory. But it must be noted that in the attainment of *suhitya* too, the pride of place goes to *vakrokti* or poet's creative genius. It is thus helpful in harmonizing and integrating into a unity of several literary concepts. Therefore, various poetic elements are all related to *vakrokti*.

Further, this chapter discusses the exact status of various literary concepts in the scheme of *vakrokti* theory. It also reveals Kuntaka's contributions to Sanskrit poetics and his influence on his successors.

The fifth chapter focuses the striking similarities between *Dhvani* and *Vakrokti* perspectives. In the whole range of Sanskrit poetics, these two theories stand out for their illuminating and aesthetic analysis of Sanskrit masterpieces. Both the theories worked out with marked individuality and offer workable norms for meaningful literary analysis. These two theories are complementary to each other in many respects. Their comments on the illustrative verses are identical in spirit but the only difference is one calls it *Dhvani* and the other terms it *vakrokti*.

The sixth chapter deals with *vakrokti* and practical criticism. Though in ancient India, full-fledged criticisms of whole works are not prominent, significant efforts have been made by Kuntaka. Working on the clues of Ānandavardhana, Kuntaka gave a full-fledged criticism of almost all the major classics of Sanskrit literature. He is the only practical literary critic in the modern sense of the term. This chapter brings out the fundamental aspects of practical criticism as showed by Kuntaka.

Thus, the present book provides the comprehensive study of *vakrokti* theory in Sanskrit poetics. Poetry is the manifestation of poet's creative genius or *vakrokti*. Hence, Kuntaka has attempted to make a new synthesis of all phases of poetic expression under the comprehensive term *vakrokti*. It is a means to achieve the end i.e., aesthetic experience. *Vakrokti* theory gives us a working methodology of critical criteria which can be applied to any

literature. What is most needed today is applied criticism. Though *vakrokti* theory was ingenious, beautifully explained in its very nature, it could not affect the stream of thought in later poetics. But Kuntaka's impression in this profound field is everlasting.

वक्रानुरञ्जनीमुक्तिं चञ्चूमिव मुखेवहन् ।

कुन्तकः क्रीडति सुखं कीर्तिस्फटिकपञ्जरे ॥ (Bhaṭṭa Gopāla)

Bibliography

SANSKRIT

- Ānandavardhana. *Dhvanyāloka*. Edited & translated by Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy. Dharwad: Karnatak University, 1974.
- . *Dhvayāloka with Locana of Abhinavagupta*. Edited by Jagannatha Pathak. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1997.
- Dīkṣita, Appayya. *Citramīmāṃsā of Appayya Dikshita*. Edited by N.C.V. Narasimhacharya. Tirupati: Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, 1999.
- . *Kuvalayānanda*. Edited by Bholashankar Vyas. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Vidyabhavan, 1997.
- Bāṇabhaṭṭa. *Kādambarī*. Edited by Kāśinātha Pāṇḍuraṅga Parab. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1985.
- Bharata, Muni. *Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharatamuni with the commentary Abhinavabhārati: vol.I-iv*, Edited by R S Nagar. Delhi: Parimal Publications, 1981.
- . *Nāṭyaśāstra, with the commentary of Abhinavagupta, Vol II*. Edited by Mānavalli Rāmakṛṣṇakavi. Baroda: Central Library, 1934.
- Bhāmaha. *Kāvyaṭīkāra of Bhāmaha*. Edited and translated by. P V Naganatha Sastry. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.
- Bhoja Maharaja, *Bhojaraja's Śringara prakasha: the great 10th century work on Sanskrit and Prakrit rhetoric*. Edited by G R Josyer. Mysore: Coronation press, 1955.
- . *Sarasvatī-Kaṇṭhābharana with the commentary of Ratneśvara*. Edited by Kedarnath Sharma. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Orientalia, 1987.
- Daṇḍin. *Kāvyaadarśa*. Edited and translated by V. Narayan Ayer. Madras: Vanivilas Press, 1964.
- . *Kāvyaadarśa, with commentary called Ratnaśrī of Ratnaśrījñāna*. Edited by Anantalāla Thakkura and Upendra Jhā. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1957.

Hemacandra. *The Kāvyaṇuśāsana of Hemacandra with his own gloss.*

Edited by Pt. Śivadatta and Kāśīnātha Pāṇḍuraṅga Paraba. New Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas Pub, 1986.

Jagannātha. *Rasagaṅgadhara*. Edited by Mathuranath Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988.

Jayadeva. *Gītagovinda*. Edited by M. R. Telang & W. L. S. Pansikar. Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1913.

Kālidāsa. *Kālidāsa-granthāvalī*. Edited by Revāprasāda-Dvivedī. Varanasi: Benaras Hindu University, 1976.

—. *Kumārasambhavam*. Edited by Vasudeva Laxman Shastri Panshikar. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1985.

Kālidāsa. *Meghadūta*. Edited and translated by M. R. Kale, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2002.

Kuntaka. *The Vakroktijīvita of Kuntaka*. Edited and translated by K. Krishnamoorthy. Dharwad: Karnatak University, 1977.

—. *Vakroktijīvita*. Edited by S. K. De. K. L. Mukhyopadhyaya, Calcutta, 1961.

—. *Vakroktijīvita* of Rājanaka Kuntaka. Edited by Rādheśyāma Miśra. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Sansthan, 1977.

Mahimabhaṭṭa. *Vyaktivivekaḥ*. Edited by Rewa Prasad Dwivedy. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1964.

Mammaṭa. *Kāvyaaprakāśa*. Edited by Vamanacharya Jhalkikar. Bombay: Govt. Central Book Depot, 1901.

—. *Kāvyaaprakāśa with the commentaries of Saṅketa & Madhumatī*. Edited by N.S. Venkatanathacharya. O.R.I. University of Mysore, 1977.

Mammata. *The Kāvyaaprakāśa of Mammaṭa; first, second, third and tenth ullāsas*. Edited by Aswathama Balacharya Gajendragadkar. Bombay: Popolar Prakashan, 1970.

Maṅkaka. *Sāhityamīmāṃsā of Maṅkhaka*. Edited by Gaurīnātha Śāstrī. Varanasi: Sampurnananda Samskrita Visvavidyalaya, 1984.

Rājaśekhara. *Kāvyaṁīmāṃsā*. Edited by Ganga Sagar Rai. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Vidyabhavan, 1977.

Rudraṭa. *Kāvyaḷāṅkāraḥ*. With the commentary Namisādhū. Edited by Durgaprasad Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.

Ruyyaka. *Alaṅkārasarvasva with the commentary of Sañjīvinī*. Edited by S.S. Janaki. Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas, 1965.

— . *Alaṅkāra Sarvasva with the commentary of Vimarśinī of Jayaratha*. Edited by Kāśīnātha Parabha. Delhi: Bharatiyavidya Prakashan, 1982.

Udbhata. *Kāvyaṭāṅkārasaṅgrahaḥ*. Edited by Mangesh Ramakrishna Telang. Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1915.

Vāmana. *Kāvyaṭāṅkārasūtra*. Edited by Haragovinda Śāstrī. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Surabharati Prakashan, 1989.

Viśvanātha. *Sāhityadarpaṇa*. Edited by Karunakar Sharma. New Delhi: Bharatiya Book Corporation, 1997.

Viśveśvara. *Camatkāra candrikā*. Edited by Pandiri Sarasvati Mohan. Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas, 1972.

Vidyānātha. *Pratāparudrīya*. Edited by V. Raghavan. Madras: Sanskrit Education Society, 1970.

Kalpalatāviveka. Edited by Murari Lal Nagar and Harishankar Shastri, Ahmedabad. L. D. Institute of Indology, 1968.

English

Mahesh Adkoli. *Concept of Aucitya in Sanskrit Poetics - A Reappraisal*. Muroor: Anand Publications, 1997.

S.C., Agarwal S.C. & Mundra. *Principles and History of Literary Criticism*. Bareilly: Prakash Book Depot, 1969.

Bhattacharya, Bishnupada. *New trends in Sanskrit poetics*. Dharwad: Prasaraṅga, Karnatak University, 1987.

Chari, V K. *Sanskrit Criticism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1993.

De, Sushil Kumar. *History of Sanskrit Poetics*. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1960.

— . *Sanskrit poetics as a study of aesthetics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.

— . *Some problems of Sanskrit poetics*. Calcutta: K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1959.

Principles of literary criticism in Sanskrit. Edited by Dwivedi, R.C. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1969.

Hiriyanna M., Mysore. *Art experience*. Mysore: Kavyalaya Publishers, 1954.

- Kāne, Pāṇḍuraṅga Vāmana. *History of Sanskrit poetics*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1971.
- Krishnamoorthy, K. *Essays in Sanskrit Criticism*. Dharwad: Karnatak University, 1964.
- . *Indian Literary Theories : a Reappraisal*. New Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas Publications, 1985.
- . *New bearings of Indian literary theory and criticism : four lectures*, 80. Ahmedabad: B.J. Institute of Learning and Research, 1982.
- . *Studies in Indian aesthetics and criticism*. Mysore: D.V.K. Murthy, 1979.
- . *The Dhvanyāloka and its critics*. Mysore: Kavyalaya Publishers, 1968.
- Chaitanya, Krishna. *Sanskrit Poetics; a critical and comparative study*. Bombay: Asia Pub. House, 1965.
- Some aspects of the Rasa theory: a collection of papers read at the "Rasa" seminar*. Edited by Kulkarni, Vaman Mahadeo, Delhi: B.L. Institute of Indology series, 1986.
- Raja, K Kunjunni. *The language of poetry*. Dharwad: Karnatak University, 1978.
- Krishnamurthy, Shikaripura. *Kuntaka's Vakrokti and literary criticism : a critical estimate of Kuntaka's Vakrokti theory of criticism in Sanskrit poetics*. Mangalore: Mangalore University, 1994.
- Lahiri, P C. *Concepts of Rīti and Guṇa in Sanskrit poetics in their historical development*. Dacca: University of Dacca, 1937.
- East West poetics at work : papers presented at the Seminar on Indian and Western Poetics at Work, Dhvanyāloka, Mysore, January 1991*, Edited by Narasimhaiah, C D. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1994.
- Pandey, Kanti Chandra. *Indian aesthetics*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1959.
- Raghavan V. *Studies in Some Concepts of Alāṅkāraśāstra*. Madras: Adyar Library, 1942.
- Raghavan, V. *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra prakāśa*. Madras: 1978.
- . *The number of rasas*. Madras: Adyar Library, 1940.

- Rajendran, C. *Studies in comparative poetics*. Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corp., 2001.
- Rudrappa, J. *Kashmir Śaivism*. Mysore: University of Mysore, 1969.
- Shahane, Vasant Anant. *What is Indian about Indian sensibility? : an aspect of modern Indian literary tradition*. Dharwad: Karnatak University, 1986.
- Kuppuswami, Shastri. *Highways and Byways of Litarary Criticism in Sanskrit*. K.S.R.I. Madras, 1945.
- Sankaran, A. *Some aspects of literary criticism in Sanskrit, or, the theories of Rasa and Dhvani*. New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corp., 1973.
- Shastri, A C. *Studies in Sanskrit aesthetics*. Calcutta: P. Ghosh, 1952.
- Warder, A K. *Indian Kāvya literature, Vol. I.* Delhi: Motilal Bandrsidass, 1980.

Kannada

- Gundappa, D V. *Jīvana saundarya mattu sāhitya : vāṇmaya vicārada kelavu upanyāsagaḷu*. Mysore: D.V.K. Murthy Publishers, 1967.
- Gurudatta, Pradhan. *Rasa Siddhānta*. Delhi: Sahitya Academi, 1995.
- R., Lakshminarayana. *Kannaḍa vakrōkti jīvita*. Mysore: Samvahana, 2004.
- Sivarudrappa, G S. *Kāvyaṛtha cintana*. Bangalore: Priyadarsini Prakashana, 2006.
- Sreekantaiya, T Nanjundaiya. *Bhāratīya kāvyamīmāṃse*. Mysore: University of Mysore, 1961.
- H., Tipperudraswami. *Taulanika Kāvyaṛmīmāṃse*. Mysore: D.V.K. Murthy Publishers, 1985.

Hindi

- Ātmanathan, Hemā. *Alaṅkāraśāstra meṃ Ācārya Kuntaka kī den*. Varanasi: Sampurnand Sanskrit University, 1991.
- Nagendra. *Bhāratīya kāvyasāstra kī bhūmikā*. New Delhi: National Pub. House, 1976.

Thesis

Hemalata, Deshpande. *Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka - A Comparative Study*. Dharwad: Karnatak University, 1967.

Articles

R., Ganesh. *Svabhāvoktiya Samasye, in Sambhunidhi*. (Prof. C. G. Purushottama Sambavana Grantha) Mysore: Pratibha Samsad, 1995.

R.S., Pathak. "The Indian Theory of Vakrokti in Relation to the Stylistic Concept of Deviance." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* Vol. LXIII (1982): pp.195-211.

V., Raghavan. "Lokadharmī and Nāṭyadarmī." *Journal of Oriental Research Madras* Vol. VII & Vol. VIII: pp. 359-37 & pp. 57-74.

Mallikarjun, Paraddi. "Three Incidents in Kalidasa's Poetry - An Assessment by Kuntaka." *Proceedings of the Fifth World Sanskrit Conference*. Varanasi, 1981. pp. 255-60.

T.N., Shrikanthaiyya. *Imagination in Indian Poetics, Indian Aesthetics*. Edited by V.S. Seturaman. Madras: Macmillan Indian Ltd. Press, Madras 1972 (pp. 219-234).

Damodar, Thakur. "Vakroktijīvitam and Modern English Criticism." Edited by C.D. Narasimhaiah. *Literary Criticism: European and Indian Traditions* (University of Mysore), 1965: pp. 78-90.

Index

- A.B. Gajendragadkar, 51
ābhāsa, 104
Ābhāsavāda, 104
abhidhā-vaicitrya, 159
abhidhāvvyāpāra, 26
ābhijātya, 143
Ābhijātya, 145
Abhijñāna-Jānaki, 173
Abhijñāna-śākuntala, 169
Abhijñānaśākuntala, 102
Abhijñāna-śākuntalā, 168
Abhinavabhārati, 38
Abhinavagupta, 19, 24, 40, 41, 53,
58, 106, 118, 146, 175
adbhuta, 100
aesthetic, 96
aesthetic effect, 60, 113
aesthetic experience, 18
Aesthetic experience, 107
aesthetic theory, 117
aesthetically analyses, 91
aesthetics, 1, 165
Agniṣṭoma, 127
Agniṣṭomayajña, 127
āhārya, 92
āhārya-kausala, 93
ākhyāta, 88
ākṣepa, 116
Alaṅkārasarvasva, 51
alaṅkāra, 6, 16, 21, 22, 25, 44, 50,
55, 61, 74, 81, 105, 109, 120, 127,
176
Alaṅkāra, 5, 29, 43
Alaṅkāra School, 5
alaṅkāra-analysis, 61
alaṅkāras, 11, 81, 92
alaṅkāra-sāmānya-lakṣaṇa, 44
Alaṅkārasarvasva, 4
alaṅkāraśāstra, 59
Alaṅkāraśāstra, 1, 2, 4, 19, 28, 36,
58, 102, 147, 164, 165, 176
alaṅkārya, 61, 73, 120, 126, 128
alaṅkārya-kāvyaṛtha, 154
Alaṅkārya-vastu, 163
alaṅkṛta, 3
alliteration, 76
Amātya-Rākṣasa, 171
ānanda, 103
Ānandavardhana, 6, 17, 20, 30,
36, 52, 59, 102, 109, 114, 115,
177
*antara-śloka*s, 54
anti-Dhvani, 60
anuprāsa, 76
Anuṣṭubh, 24
anyāpadeśa, 131
aprastutaprasāmsā, 116
Aprastuta-prasāmsā, 132
ardhanārīśvara, 67
Arjuna, 100
art experience, 1
artful expression, 18
artha, 16, 67, 70, 75, 122, 163
arthaguṇa, 46
*arthaguṇa-oja*s, 34
arthālaṅkāra, 52, 58
arthāntaranyāsa, 116
asakṛt, 167
aspects of *vakrokti*, 60
atiśayokti, 11, 29, 30, 32, 37, 39, 50
ātīṣṭhati, 134
Ātmane-pada, 87

- aucitya*, 107, 143, 145
Aucitya, 48, 49
aupāmya, 33
Avantisundarī, 41
Bāṇa, 3, 9
Bānabhaṭṭa, 10
Bāṇabhaṭṭa, 97
bandha, 20, 43, 66
Bandha, 75
bandha-cchyāyā, 28
bandha-guṇa, 28
bandha-guṇāḥ, 34
Bhāktavādin, 53
Bhāmaha, 3, 11, 26, 27, 28, 33, 36,
 39, 43, 51, 109, 115, 125, 166
bhaṅga-śleṣa, 50
bhaṅgī, 30
bhaṇiti, 25, 41, 43
bhaṇiti-bhaṅgi, 42
bhaṇiti-vaicitrya, 141
bhaṇiti-viśeṣa, 116
Bhāravi, 100
Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa, 100
Bhaṭṭanāyaka, 5, 26, 60
bhāva, 83, 153
Bhīṣma, 82, 100
Bhogikaraṇa, 5, 7
Bhoja, 47
Bhūriśravas, 100
bhūṣaṇa-sammīta, 22
brāhmaṇa, 132, 134
Brāhmaṇas, 2
Brahmasṛṣṭi, 88
calana, 105
camatkāra, 64, 154
cārutva, 64
Cloud-Messenger, 72
common expression, 13
composition, 110
concept of vakrokti, 47
concreteness, 80
congruent, 130
connoisseurs, 112, 130
consummate beauty, 63
creative genius, 13
creative imagination, 13
criticism, 165, 168, 174
curvation, 8
Damodar Thakur, 63
Daṇḍin, 137, 166
Daśaratha, 88
dharmī, 40
dhātu, 78
Dhvani, 6, 38, 48, 59, 65, 102, 107,
 109, 177
Dhvanikāvya, 69
Dhvani-synthesis, 60
dhvanivādins, 65
Dhvanyāloka, 28, 33, 36, 38, 49,
 157, 158, 159, 162
Dīkṣita, 57
dṛṣṭānta, 116
drunkenness, 80
Durvāsa, 95
Duṣyanta, 96, 169, 170
embellishments, 112
epic, 11
epithet, 81
exaggeration, 36
extraordinary charm, 81
gadya, 3
Garbhāṅka, 98
Gārgya, 2
gumpha, 25, 43
guṇa, 21
guṇas, 23
guṇibhūta-vyaṅgya, 57
guṇibhūta-vyaṅgya-kāvya, 36, 37
Hamsapadikā, 169
harmony, 74

- Harṣacarita*, 97
 Hema Atmanathan, 155
 Hemacandra, 35, 51
 Hindu religion, 107
Hṛdayadarpaṇa, 24
hṛdayam, 104
icchā, 103
ichhāśakti, 105
 ideal messenger, 72
 imagination, 139
 immersed, 131
 Indraprastha, 101
 innovation, 94
 inspiration, 14
 Jagannātha, 149
 Jayaratha, 53, 115
 Jimūtavāhana, 101
jīvita, 155
jñāna, 103
Jyambaka, 96
 K. Krishnamoorthy, 63
kāku, 50, 52
 Kālidāsa, 69
Kalpalatāviveka, 25
kampana, 105
kārika, 125
kārikas, 55
 Kārṇa, 100
Karpūramañjarī, 42
karuṇarasa, 129
Karuṇarasa, 91
kathā, 31
 Kauṭilya, 3, 171
kavi-kauśala, 12, 64, 141, 156
kavi-prasthāna-hetu, 136
kavi-pratibhā, 111, 157
Kavi-pratibhā, 62
 Kavirāja, 10
Kaviśikṣā, 41
Kavisṛṣṭi, 88
kavi-svabhāva, 138, 147
Kavi-svabhāva, 163
kavivṛyāpāra, 6, 24, 25, 27
kavi-vyāpāra, 14
kavi-vyāpāra, 18
kavi-vyāpāra, 18
kavi-vyāpāra, 43
kavi-vyāpāra, 108
kavi-vyāpāra, 163
kāvya, 1, 64, 137
kāvya-bandha, 24
Kāvya-lāṅkāra, 29
kāvya-līṅga, 91
Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, 41
Kāvya-prakāśa, 49, 50, 115
kāvya-rtha, 18, 122
kāvya-śarīra, 121
kāvya-svarūpa, 126
kimapi, 83
Kirātārjunīya, 100
kriyā, 118
ksatriya, 134
Kumārasambhava, 8, 14, 69, 99, 171
 Kuntaka, 6, 53, 58, 59, 60, 62, 77,
 95, 115, 121, 125, 137
lakṣaṇa, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28,
 33, 45
lakṣaṇā, 43, 68
lāvanya, 143, 144
lekhaṇa-sampat, 3
 literary style, 136
lokadharmī, 40, 118
Lokānusāritva, 40
 love-in-separation, 130, 131
mādhurya, 143
Mādhurya, 146
Mādhurya-guṇa, 144
Madhyama, 139
Madhyama-mārga, 142, 148
Mahābhārata, 100, 152, 166, 168

- mahākāvya*, 31
Mahimabhaṭṭa, 49, 60, 122, 174
Mahimahaṭṭa, 162
maitrī, 33
Mamata, 51, 57, 60, 115, 117, 164
Mañkhaka, 55
Manoratha, 38
Mātr̥gupta, 148
Matthew Arnold, 65
mayūrāṇḍarasanyāya, 104
Meghadūta, 33, 71
 metaphor, 80
 metaphorical, 85
 methodology, 177
Mīmāṃsā, 24
 mode of speech, 12
Mudrārākṣasa, 102, 171
 multi-dimensional, 175, 176
 mutual competence, 74
Nāga, 101
Narendraprabhasūri, 57
nāṭaka, 31
 natural beauty, 92
nāṭya, 41
nāṭyadharmī, 40, 41, 118
Nāṭyaśāstra, 19, 21, 22, 28, 40
Nighaṇṭu, 2
nipāta, 89
nirvikalpaka, 122
 novel beauty, 141
ojas, 34
Ojas, 146
 organic unity, 94
 origin of Sanskrit, 1
 ornament, 140
pada-parādhā-vakratā, 88
Pada-parārdha, 89
Pada-parārdha-vakratā, 76
Pada-pūrvārdha, 89
pada-pūrvārdha-vakratā, 78, 88
Pada-pūrvārdha-vakratā, 76
pada-vakratā, 161
padāvayava, 161
padya, 3
palāśa, 8, 15
Pāñcālī, 137
Pāṇḍavas, 100
pāṇḍimānam, 83
pāṇḍutā, 83
paramēsthinaḥ, 104
Parasmai-pada, 87
parasparaspardhā, 108, 158
parispanda, 23, 104
Pārvatī, 82, 171
paryāya-vakata, 162
paryāya-vakratā, 158
paryāyokta, 116
Paryāyokta, 132
pāṭhadharma, 35
 pathos, 130, 131
 penance, 15
 philosophical, 102
 poetic beauty, 4
 Poetic beauty, 14
 poetic expression, 11
 poetic speech, 9
 poetic theory, 60
prabandha, 162
prabandha-vakratā, 101
Prabandha-vakratā, 76
prakaraṇa-vakratā, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 151
Prakarana-vakratā, 76, 168
prasāda, 143
Prasāda, 144, 146
prasthāna, 7
pratibhā, 13, 14, 62, 75, 102, 121, 122, 143, 155, 157, 163
Pratimānāṭaka, 102
pratīpa, 81

prātipadika, 78
pratyamānatā, 141
Pratyabhijñā-darśana, 102, 106, 176
pratyaya-vakratā, 85, 88
 preserving, 71
 pridelessness, 80
 pronouns, 82
Purūrava, 93
Puṣpadūtikā, 173
Rāghavapāṇḍvīyam, 10
Raghu-Kautsa, 171
Raghuvaṃśa, 95, 170, 171, 172
Rājaśekhara, 35, 42, 43
Rākṣasa, 172
Rāmāyaṇa, 166
rasa, 49, 118, 126
Rasa-aucitya, 25
rasa-dharmas, 163
rasa-dhvani, 158
Rasa-Dhvani, 36, 112
rasādīparamārthajñā, 150
Rasagaṅgādharā, 116
rasānubhūti, 1, 17
rasapoṣaṇa, 121
Rasaucitya, 60
rasavadalāṅkāra, 6, 16, 124, 125, 126, 128, 129, 132, 133, 135, 176
Rasavadalāṅkāra, 61
rasavat, 114, 117, 124, 127, 128, 132, 135
rasavatva, 128
rasikatā, 93
rasokti, 44
Rasokti, 45
Raudra, 77
Ṛgveda, 2
 rhetorics, 1
*rīti*s, 137
Rudradāman, 3

rūpaka, 132
Ruyyaka, 54, 58, 115, 123
śabda, 16
śabdaguṇa, 46
śabdālāṅkāra, 49, 57
śabdārtha, 65
sādhya-lakṣaṇā, 45
sādhya-lakṣaṇā, 45
sāhitya, 16, 34, 47, 54, 59, 66, 73, 108, 176
Sāhityadarpaṇa, 164
Sāhityamīmāṃsā, 54, 56
sahṛdaya, 1, 106
sahṛdayāhlāda, 17
sahṛdayas, 13
Śaiva, 106
Śaktimat, 103
samādhiguṇa, 33
sāmānādhikarṇya, 134
samānam-āthiṣṭhāti, 134
samāsokti, 134
Samhitas, 2
samsṛṣṭi, 120
Samudrabandha, 4, 5, 7
Samudragupta, 3
sandhi, 98
saṅghaṭanā, 38
Śaṅkhacūḍa, 101
Sanskrit poetics, 59
śānta-rasa, 100
Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharāṇa, 43
Śāstra, 62
Śāstras, 63
saubhāgya, 143, 145, 146
Saubhāgya, 75
Saubhāgya-guṇa, 146
savikalpaka, 122
 sense in poetry, 73
 sense of urgency, 72
 sentient, 93

- siddharūpa*, 23
Śikhaṇḍin, 100
Śiśupāla, 101
Śiśupālavadhā, 101
śleṣa, 34, 52, 116
śleṣa-vakrokti, 34
soul of poetry, 48
sound structures, 13
spanda, 103
spandavāda, 105
sphurattā, 105
śṛṅgāra, 126
śṛṅgāra, 133
Śṛṅgāra, 16
Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, 43, 44
śṛṅgārārāsa, 93
śṛṅgāra-rasa, 128
strikingness, 60, 115
Strikingness, 85
Subandhu, 10
substitution, 69
sūkṣma, 30
sukṣmasvabhāva, 123
sukumāra, 15
Sukumāra, 139, 142
Sukumāra style, 141
Sukumāra-mārga, 139, 143
superimposition, 85
svabhāva, 81, 89, 90, 119, 152
Svabhāva-ukti, 43
svabhāva-varṇana, 121
svabhāvokti, 6, 31, 41, 44, 45, 55, 61, 118, 119, 123, 124, 176
Svabhāvokti, 157
svaśabdavācya, 126, 152
svaśabdavācyarāsa, 126
svayam, 93
tadvidāhlāda, 156
tadvidāhlāda-kāriṇi, 66
tadvit-āhlāda, 150
tātparya-vṛtti, 54
tulya, 134
tulyatva, 132, 134
udātta, 34
udaya, 105
Udbhaṭa, 124, 126
ukti, 8, 46
ukti-vaicitrya, 28, 38
unmeṣa, 105
upacāra-vakratā, 52, 81
upagraha, 87
upamā, 2, 20, 25, 32, 45, 128, 132
upamālaṅkāra, 25, 117
upanāgarikā, 77
upasarga, 88
upasarjanīkaraṇa, 108, 158
upodha-rāgeṇa, 133, 134
Urvaśi, 93
utprekṣā, 116
utprekṣālaṅkāra, 93
Uttararāmacarita, 96, 98
V. Raghavan, 47, 62
vācya-vācaka, 75
vāg-vikalpas, 114
vaicitrya, 12, 64, 154
Vaidarbhī, 138
Vaidharbhī, 137
vakra, 9
vakra-kavi-vyāpāra, 104, 156
vakratā, 30
Vakra-ukti, 43
vakrokti, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 24, 27, 29
Vakrokti, 5, 49
Vakroktijīvita, 11, 53, 58, 59, 102, 106, 110, 115, 134, 151, 156, 157, 159, 162, 164, 168, 173, 175, 176
Vakrokti-jīvita, 28
vakrokti-mārga, 10
vakrokti-vaicitrya, 141
vakroṣṭhikā, 9

vākya-vakratā, 64, 90
Vākya-vakratā, 76
Vāmana, 33, 109
varṇana, 23
varṇa-vinyāsa-vakratā, 76
Varṇa-vinyāsa-vakratā, 76
Vastu-dhvani, 162, 163
vastu-svabhāva, 6, 119, 124, 142
vastu-svabhāva-varṇana, 120
vastu-svarūpa, 42
vastuvakratā, 91, 121
vastu-vakratā, 91
vastu-vakratā, 92
Vāsudeva, 101
Vedāṅgas, 2
Veṇīsamhāra, 99, 100, 173
vibhāva, 142
vibhāvanā, 116
vibhūṣaṇa, 22
vicchitti, 13, 64, 112
Vicitra style, 141
Vicitra-mārga, 138, 140, 141, 142,
 144, 148
Vicitrayogitva, 40

Vidyānātha, 57
Vikramorvaśīya, 97, 127
vipralambha-śṛṅgāra, 87, 98
vipralambha-śṛṅgāra-rasa, 81
vīra-rasa, 100
Viśākhadatta, 173
viśeṣa, 50
viśeṣaṇa-vakratā, 53
viśeṣa-svabhāva, 122
Viśeṣa-ukti, 43
viśiṣṭa-sāhitya, 73
Viśveśvara, 57
vyājastuti, 116
Vyaktiviveka, 48
vyāṅgya, 68
vyañjaka, 102, 161
vyañjanā, 52, 54
vyāpāra, 23, 56
vyāpāraprādhānyavāda, 27
vyāpāra-prādhānya-vāda, 56
vyatireka, 116
vyutpatti, 138
yamaka, 77
Yāyāvarīyas, 41

Key to Transliteration

Vowels and Diphthongs

अ	a	उ	u	ए	e
आ	ā	ऊ	ū	ऐ	ai
इ	i	ऋ	r̥	ओ	o
ई	ī	ॠ	r̄	औ	ô
		ऌ	l̥		au

Consonants

Gutturals		Palatals		Cerebrals		Dentals	
क	ka	च	ca	ट	ṭa	त	ta
ख	kha	छ	cha	ठ	ṭha	थ	tha
ग	ga	ज	ja	ड	ḍa	द	da
घ	gha	झ	jha	ढ	ṛa	ध	dha
ङ	ṅa	ञ	ña	ढ	ḍha	न	na
				ढ़	r̥ha		
				ण	ṇa		
Labials		Semivowels		Sibilants		Aspirate	
प	pa	य	ya	श	śa	ह	ha
फ	pha	र	ra	ष	ṣa		
ब	ba	ल	la	स	sa		
भ	bha	व	va				
म	ma						

Conjunct Characters

क्ष	kṣa	ज्ञ	jña	and others similarly
-----	-----	-----	-----	----------------------

Anusvāra	Anunāsika	Visarga	Avagraha
ं ṁ	ँ ṅ, ṁ	ः ḥ	' (apostrophe)

The Concept of Vakrokti in Sanskrit Poetics A Reappraisal

In the whole range of Sanskrit poetics, the term vakrokti took altogether a new significance and the highest position as the all pervading poetic concept in Kuntaka's Vakroktijivita. He revived the concept from more verbal poetic figure to the lessons of poetry. He not only explains but also explores the multi-dimensional aspects of Vakrokti. But unfortunately, no comprehensive study of Vakrokti has been done in a systematic way. This book is an effort in this direction.

Presenting the major schools of Sanskrit poetics, the book gives general definition of vakrokti and its multi-dimensional implications. Further taking a close look at the views of different theorists on vakrokti, it exposes in detail kuntaka's theory of vakrokti and makes its critical analysis in relation to various literary concepts- alankara, svabhavokti, rasavadalankara, marga and rasa. Finally, it deals with the striking similarities between dhvani and vakrokti, and brings out the fundamental aspects of practical criticism as shown by kuntaka.

Suryanarayan Hegde is a devoted young scholar in the field of Sanskrit Poetics and Literature. He was awarded Ph. D. degree by Karnatak University, Dharwad. He has proved his ability and industriousness by getting the First Rank with Gold Medals in M.A. Sanskrit and the 8th Rank to the University at the UG level.

Dr. Hegde is, at present, Teaching Assistant in Sanskrit at Karnatak College, Dharwad. He wields his pen in Sanskrit, English and Kannada with equal facility. He has presented his research papers in various National Seminars.

Readworthy Publications (P) Ltd.

City Off.: 4662/21, Ansari Road, Daryaganj,
New Delhi - 110 002
Phone: 011-4354 9197, Fax: +91-11-2324 3060
Regd. Off.: A-18, Mohan Garden,
Near Nawada Metro Station, New Delhi - 110 059
Phone: 011-2537 1324, Fax: +91-11-2537 1323
Email: info@readworthypub.com
Web: www.readworthypub.com

81-89973-9



Rs. 595.00