CULTURAL LEADERS OF INDIA

Aestheticians

BHARATA ● BHAMAHA ● DANDIN ● ANANDAVARDHANA ●
VAMANA ● RAJASHEKHARA ● ABHINAVAGUPTA ●
MAMMATA ● KUNTAKA ● BHOJA ● MAHIMA BHATTA ●
VISHWANATHA ● PANDITARAJA JAGANNATHA

PUBLICATIONS DIVISION

Aestheticians

Cultural Leaders of India

Aestheticians

Bharata • Bhamaha • Dandin • Anandavardhana • Vamana • Rajashekhara • Abhinavagupta • Mammata • Kuntaka • Bhoja • Mahima Bhatta • Vishwanatha • Panditaraja Jagannatha

PUBLICATIONS DIVISION
MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

October 1983 (*Asvina* 1905)

Printed in India

Price: Rs. 12.00

PUBLISHED BY THE DIRECTOR PUBLICATIONS DIVISION
MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING,
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
PATIALA HOUSE NEW DELHI-110001

Sales Emporia ● Publications Division

SUPER BAZAR, CONNAUGHT CIRCUS, NEW DELHI-110001
COMMERCE HOUSE, CURRIMBHOY ROAD, BALLARD PIER, BOMBAY-400038
8, ESPLANADE EAST, CALCUTTA-700001
LL AUDITORIUM, 736, ANNA SAALAI, MADRAS-600006
BIHAR STATE COOPERATIVE BANK BUILDING, ASHOKA RAJPATH, PATNA-800004
PRESS ROAD, TRIVANDRUM-695001
10-B, STATION ROAD, LUCKNOW-226001
STATE ARCHAEOLOGICAL MUSEUM BLDG., PUBLIC GARDEN, HYDERABAD-500004

PRINTED AT GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, RING ROAD, NEW DELHI-110064

ABOUT THE SERIES

The object of the series is to offer the general reader authentic accounts of the life and work of the great figures since the earliest times who have contributed in large measure to the culture and thought of India and influenced the mind and life of its people. The series will include about 125 such names—seers and philosophers, poets and dramatists, mystics and religious leaders, writers on science, aestheticians and composers.

The books are intended for the average reader, who is keen to learn more about the past but who has no knowledge of details and is not interested in finer academic issues.

ALSO IN THE SERIES

Volumes already published

Founders of Philosophy (Rs. 3.00)

Scientists (Rs. 5.50)

Devotional Poets and Mystics—Part I (Re-print in Press)

Devotional Poets and Mystics—Part II (Rs. 7.00)

Ramayana, Mahabharata and Bhagavata Writers (Rs. 7.00)

Composers (Rs. 5.25)

Philosophers and Religious Leaders—Part I (Rs. 7.00)

Seers and Thinkers (Rs. 7.00)

Valmiki & Vyasa (Rs. 5.00)

Social Philosophers (Rs. 6.00)

Poets, Dramatists and Story-Tellers (Rs. 10.00)

Under Print

Grammarians

Philosophers and Religious Leaders—Part II

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

1. K. Krishnamoorthy
   Prof. and Head of the Deptt. of Sanskrit
   Karnataka University
   Dharwar (Karnataka)

2. Kamala Ratnam
   F-1/7 Hauz Khas
   New Delhi

3. S.S. Janaki
   Graduate Hall
   Somerville College
   Oxford (U.K.)

4. V.V. Mirashi
   Kamalasadan
   Dharampeth, Nagpur

5. Kanti Chandra Pandey
   Prof. of Sanskrit
   Lucknow University
   Lucknow (U.P.)

6. V. Venkatachalam
   Head of the Deptt. of Sanskrit
   Vikram University
   Ujjain (M.P.)

7. Mukunda Madhava Sharma
   Sanskrit Deptt.
   Gauhati University
   Gauhati (Assam)

8. R.C. Dwivedi
   Prof. and Head of the Deptt. of Sanskrit
   University of Udaipur
   Udaipur (Rajasthan)

9. P. Pradhan
   Prof. of Sanskrit
   Utkal University
   Bhubaneswar (Orissa)

10. P. Ramachandrudu
    Reader in Sanskrit
    Osmania University
    Hyderabad (A.P.)

PREFACE

The desire for unfair advantage in traffic in goods has led to the drive for colonies and empires in history. But in traffic in light, both donor and recipient benefit, and equally. A country which has not radiated impulses and assimilated impulses from other lands will remain stunted in growth.

But assimilation of cultural impulses really means what assimilation of nutrients by the body means. The impulses are not received into a vacuum, but into a deeply rooted and growing structure that assimilates them into its own organic tissue, uses them for its own growth and finer flowering. However, it can happen that after an epoch of strong acculturation backed by political hegemony, a hangover can persist even after the curtain has fallen on that shadowed phase of history. In the uncertain twilight that still lingers, the fullest benefit is not received even from the impulses from abroad. For they are not assimilated through the roots, since the roots look as if they have decayed away.

Is this happening in our literary endeavour today? All critical perspectives and canons seem derived from afar and to the extent that there is widespread ignorance about the correspondences and anticipations in our own tradition, it can be questioned whether, valid as they are, these perspectives have been really understood.

But it has to be admitted that coming into our own here, really assimilating our legacy, is going to be a difficult task. All aspects of poetic activity, from creation to expression, have been studied with perceptive insight and in meticulous detail by the great Indian thinkers in the field from Bharata onwards. But the texts seem to be condemned to the dusty immortality of shelves in libraries for specialised research. Years may pass before their contents become curricular material for education in general humanities and still greater will be the delay before the educated layman will be as familiar with them as he seems to be today with the views of T. S. Eliot on the nature of poetry or of Coleridge on poetic diction.

As the agency responsible for general communication, the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting has ventured into this field as well, in spite of the difficulty of the subject. Six talks, under the title "Major Problems in Indian Poetics", were broadcast by the All India Radio in 1967 and the texts were brought out, under the title *Aspects of Indian Poetics*, by the Publications Division in 1969. The talks were on the major themes. In the present publication, the major Indian thinkers in this field are introduced by writers who have specialised on them.

Unassuming though the publication is, it tries to give in outline the great contributions of the past which together cover all aspects of poetics. Bharata's is perhaps the most complete theoretical statement in the world heritage on the entire poetic circuit : the latent affective reactivity of man, its activation by the organisation of various kinds of stimuli in the dramatic presentation, the reaction to it by the spectator, and its final distillation into a pure aesthetic relish. Bhamaha explored the mysterious mutual interfusing of sound and sense, their transformation into an indissoluble unity, in the poetic language. Anandavardhana perceived and Abhinavagupta further clarified the quantal leap of power, the power of resonance or *Dhvani*, which poetry acquires and which transcends all the logical, grammatical and syntactical resources of prose discourse. Vamana studied the features of the integrated reality that is poetic diction. Other thinkers related poetics to ontology and transcendence. Bhoja's unconventional concept of *Srngara* is really a wholly positive narcissism seeking endless expansion of ego boundaries through poetic experience and Vishwanath equates it to the experience of ultimate, transcendental beatitude.

But, for a seed to germinate, it must fall on hospitable ground. It is to be hoped that this volume will find a readership that is stimulated by it to do the further study. If this happens, this unpretentious publication may well become a turning point.

KRISHNA CHAITANYA

CONTENTS

BHARATA

K. Krishnamoorthy

IF VALMIKI IS the *adi-kavi* or first harbinger of poetic tradition in India, Bharata is traditionally regarded as the father of Indian dramaturgy. Already by the time of Kalidasa (c. 400 A.D.), Bharata had come to be regarded as a *muni* or holy sage. Earlier, Asvaghosa (c. 100 A.D.) and Bhasa (c. 250 A.D.) wrote dramas more or less in conformity with the precepts propounded in Bharata's *Natyasastra*. Panini (c. 500 A.D.) alludes to *natas* or actors as well as their canons (*sutras*) composed by authorities like Silalin and Krisasva.[1] He also uses the technical key-word *rasa* (V. ii. 95) interpreted by Patanjali as an aesthetic term. Rudradaman's inscription of 150 A.D. mentions, along with others, *gandharva* or music as an independent *vidya* or branch of study and shows its acquaintance with the aesthetic categories of *gunas* or qualities and *alamkaras* or figures of speech.[2] After an in-depth study of the peculiar vocabulary, the state of dialects referred to, the metres mentioned, the date of poetics, mythology, etc. in the *Natyasastra* in comparison with Kautilya's and Vatsyayana's usage, the latest authority in the field, viz., Dr. Manmohan Ghosh, has come to the conclusion that we may place the *Natyasastra* in about 500 B.C.[3] Though many of the early dramas have not survived, it is clear that drama developed fairly rapidly in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era and at least in its initial stages, it was a composite theatrical art containing elements of dance as well as music. The view of earlier scholars that it arose due to Greek influence is now exploded; and whether its origin was

1. *Astadhyayi*, IV, iii, 110-111.
2. Cf. D.B. Diskalkar, *Selections from Sanskrit Inscriptions*, New Delhi, 1977, P.1.
3. See Introduction to his English translation of the *Natyasastra*, Vol I, Manisha, Calcutta, 1967.

religious or secular remains yet to be decided since there are indications of both in the *Natyasastra* itself.

It is also interesting to note that Bharata himself is credited with the writing and staging of the first dramas such as *Tripuradahan Lakshmi-swayamvara, Amrita-manthana and Mahendravijaya* in the mythological accounts occuring in the *Natyasastra* and later works.

In Indian historical tradition we have indeed several Bharatas. One is Rama's brother; another is Sakuntala's son, the first emperor of India; a third is a brother of Bahubali in Jaina tradition. But the author of the treatise on dramaturgy is distinct from all these, and he possibly descended from the clan of Bharatas mentioned in the *Rigveda*. What is much more confusing is the fact that, in the *Natyasastra* itself, the word 'Bharata' is also used as a common noun signifying an actor or a stage-director; and quite a few later writers on the subject talk of Bharata the elder, and Bharata the younger. This is occasioned by the mythical account found in the beginning of the *Natyasastra* that sage Bharata brought the art of drama from heaven to the earth and taught it among his hundred sons. Among the latter, Kohala, Dattila, Asmakutta, Nakhakutta, etc. are referred to as authorities by later writers on this subject.

Among the several deities mentioned in the text, we have gods like Indra as well as Puranic gods like Visnu and Brahma. But Siva overtops them all as the presiding deity. This has led some scholars to think that Sanskrit drama had its origin in the composite culture of both Aryans and Dravidians.

We often get in Bharata's text citations from earlier authorities on the subject in prose and verse. Perhaps it is a pointer to several layers of thought redacted by one or more individuals at different points of time.

The present *Natyasastra* saw the light of day only in the beginning of the present century; and it is our singular good fortune that the masterly commentary of Abhinavagupta from

Kashmir (c. 1000 A.D.) on the text for the most part is also recovered from oblivion. It is known as *Abhinavabharati;* and the credit of its first publication goes to the Oriental Institute, Baroda. It is a rich repository of Indian studies in the varied arts of dance, music and drama for well over a millenium ; and almost all later writers on the subject freely draw upon the material therein. There is no accurate copy of Bharata's text and we have several versions. The latest attempt at a critical edition is by Dr. Manmohan Ghosh (Calcutta, 1967). Earlier versions published are from Bombay, Banaras and Baroda.

Bharata's *Natyasastra* is a veritable encyclopaedia in 36 or 37 chapters mostly written in the *sloka* metre, though interspersed with a few prose passages. Its scope is so vast that it includes legendary accounts about the descent of drama from heaven to earth, the construction of diverse theatres, the worship of stage divinities by performers, varieties of dance like *tandava,* forms of histrionics with minute details regarding gestures of hand, eye, etc., the languages to be employed by different characters, the prosodial measures admissible, the elements of music, vocal as well as instrumental, the costumes required, the use of curtains, diverse forms of plays, the elements of plot with junctures and sub-divisions, types of characters, varieties of heroes and heroines, *rasas* or sentiments, *bhavas* or emotions, *alankaras* or figures of speech, *gunas* or literary qualities and *dosas* or defects, besides numerous items of incidental interest. While the earlier items are of technical interest to actors and performers or students of the arts of dance, music and even painting, the other concepts beginning with *rasa* become relevant to literary criticism as well as aesthetics. A number of commentators such as Lollata, Shankuka, Bhatta Nayaka and Abhinavagupta have enriched the aesthetic thought of India and won for it a prestigious place in the world's history of ideas. Bharata rightly holds that there is no art or science, craft or skill, falling outside the purview of *natya* or *stage* performance.[1]

1. *Natyasastra*, I.116.

Only a bare summary of the aesthetic theory of Bharata can be recapitulated here ; and that too as restricted to the field of drama, of which the best exemplars are *nataka* (the heroic or romantic play *par excellence*) and the *prakarana* (realistic comedy). According to Bharata, the general aim of all drama is to provide entertainment to people at large weighed down by their trials and tribulations in life (I. 14). This is achieved by *anukarana* or *anukirtana* by the actors or characters in action—characters either mythological and legendary or invented by the playright. *Anukarana* in Bharata is not crude imitation or mimicry but an imaginative re-construction or re-presentation. If the theme or story is lofty and grand, wherein noble heroes and heroines participate, we have the serious play, *nataka* ; but if the story is concerned with ordinary life-size characters seen in all their foibles and petty concerns, we get the low comedy or *prakarana* A *nataka* by definition is grand in conception as well as execution ; and it allows a free scope for the wondrous and the supernatural too in its *leitmotif*. Whatever the dramatic type, the plot should involve a conflict which is resolved at the end. It will be clearly divisible into units like the opening, where the forces for and against are almost equally ranged, the complication where the end intended becomes almost unrealisable, and the denouement which shows the ultimate victory of the hero's endeavours. Bharata's analysis of the divisions (*sandhis*) and subdivisions (*sandhyangas*) of a dramatic plot is indeed too minute to be enumerated in full here.

A play is divided into Acts from the standpoint of the actors. Unity of time and place necessary for maintaining the 'willing suspension of disbelief' in the audience necessitates that Acts should not involve drastic lapses of time or an incredible shift to distant places. But this is not true of the play taken as a whole. Such distant events and shifts might be reported in intervening scenes between Acts.

Similarly, characters in heroic action as well as in love are subjected to a minute classification by Bharata which might

appear dry and jejune today. Yet it cannot be gainsaid that underlying these minute lies the pivotal fact that variety is the spice of drama as of life. Characters may be heroic and virtuous or bumptious and villainous and it is natural that they clash ; but in the end Bharata rules that virtue must triumph over vice. This shuts out almost the prospect of any real tragedy in Indian drama. The Indian religious atmosphere was such that, indirectly, drama too had to serve as a handmaid to ethical norms accepted by society at large. Bharata states openly that morality, wordly prosperity and fulfilment of the heart's desires should motivate the best characters and their lives should serve as models for the onlookers to fashion their own lives.

Among the innumerable dramatic conventions set out by Bharata, the prologue demanding a long paraphernalia of worship (*nandi*) on the part of the actors whose *finale* is the real opening of the play proper, acquires significance when seen in this perspective. Within the play too, there are conventions as to how several characters are to be addressed depending upon their status, how several provincial dialects of Prakrit are to be used, and how exactly each portion of the text is to be represented with suitable gestures, forms of dance and music. One is indeed amazed by the vast range of minor dramatic forms noted by Bharata, in detail.

By all counts, the most outstanding contribution of Bharata to aesthetics and art activity is his theory of *rasa*, usually translated as sentiment for want of a better word. In Sanskrit its connotation has a wide spectrum including 'taste', 'delight' and 'sap'. Rasa is said to be the quintessence and life-breath of every element in a play—whether representation, plot, style, costume, music or dance. Writers on painting extended its scope to that art also. But the concept of *rasa* is so inextricably bound up with that of *bhava* or emotion that one cannot be understood without the other. In usage *rasa-bhava* is almost an interchangeable single concept.

In Bharata's perceptive and illuminating analysis the raw-material of art or life which it tries to improve upon is none other than the mental world of man bristling with feelings, emotions and sentiments driving him to activity all the time. But the actual passions in the world are not artistic in themselves. Mental states in life are accompanied with their pleasures and pains. However, when an artist turns to them, he puts them into a pattern of his own making in his imagination, a pattern which never existed on earth. Only these patterned mental states, obeying a law of creative genius or imagination, deserve to be technically called *bhavas*. The process of creative imagination itself is *bhavana* which is tantamount to aesthetic sensibility. This is the first pre-requisite as much of the playwright as of the spectator (*bhavaka* or *rasika*).

When the *bhava* is in relation, to say beautiful objects in nature (*vastu-svabhava*), the aesthetic level is at its lowest. It has its place in painting. But in drama creative artistes are not content with such simple representations of nature or human nature. They try to make them more and more complex. The most successful *bhava*-complex deserves to be regarded as *rasa* because its delectability or capacity to yield delight is absolute. This aesthetic psychology is indeed worthy of our admiration even today, though it might appear crude, when considered apart from the later metaphysical speculations foisted upon if, particularly by Abhinavagupta.

Bharata observes :

> There is no *rasa* without *bhava;* nor any *bhava* without *rasa*. In staging, success depends on their mutual involvement. (VI. 36). When a subject or *bhava* finds a ready echo in the spectator it is transformed into *rasa* then and there. His whole body will be on fire with it as dry fuel caught by fire (VII. 7).

Though the word *rasa* in the singular means 'aesthetic delight', the word *rasas* in the plural refers in Bharata's text only to

heightened *sthayibhavas* abiding emotions classified as eight; *rati* or love, *utsaha* or heroic energy, etc. and renamed as *sringara* (the erotic), *vira* (the heroic) and so forth. It is interesting to note that even the painful sentiments of pathos and the ugly can become *rasas* in Bharata's scheme.

These *rasas* are related to the aesthetic object or situation which is a compound of not only abiding emotions (*sthayibhavas*), but also passing moods (*vyabhichari-bhavas* classified as thirty-three; *nirveda* or detachment etc.) and which in their turn spring from external stimuli (*vibhavas*) and become productive of visible effects (*anubhavas*). It should be noted that Bharata has coined all these technical terms pertaining to the core-term *'bhava'*, to emphasize the role of imagination on the part of the spectator. To a spectator without aesthetic sensibility, the presence of a woman in love or the sight of a pleasure-garden may not stimulate any meaningful emotional response. There should be harmony and propriety in the presentation of these on the stage so that the spectator of taste delights in its *rasa*, but if there is no harmony or propriety, there is *rasa-bhanga* or pathos. Viewed from this stand-point we have friendly *rasas* like love and humour and antagonistic *rasas* like pathos. The playwright should see to it that no two opposed *rasas* are juxtaposed between the opposed ones, either by the device of an underplot or an episode.

The principle of a ruling dominant sentiment amidst a variety of *rasas* as the key principle for the success of any drama is Bharata's greatest contribution to dramatic criticism. He states:

> When, in the midst of diversity of psychic states, all transfigured by the imagination, there is one master-passion unifying all of them like a thread; that is to be regarded as the ruling sentiment of a work of art, the rest are but momentary.

There is nothing like a single *rasa* in drama (VII. concluding verses).

In modern times, scholars are observing that T. S. Eliot's idea of 'objective correlative' bears close affinities with Bharata's theory of rasa in terms of adequate *vibhavas*, etc. Much has been written in India and abroad on the variant interpretations of Bharata's aphoristic saying about *rasa*. Lollata (c. 820 A.D.) has given a naturalistic explanation where no distinction is made between life emotion and art emotion. According to him, *rasas* are produced in the characters on the stage and this is delightful to the spectators. Shankuka (c. 850 A.D.) as a logician, explained rasa as an act of cognition or inference made relishable by the unique charm of art. Bhatta Nayaka (c. 900 A.D.) stressed how *rasa* was more of a mystic-like ecstasy involving universalisation of all factors figuring in the aesthetic process. It was left to Abhinavagupta, the Kashmir Saiva philosopher (c. 1000 A.D.) to have the last word by regarding *rasa* as *sui generis* to art and as the highest subjective-cum-spiritual bliss for man by applying successfully Anandavardhana's theory of *dhwani* or suggestive over-tone as the most adequate explanation of the aesthetic function of language. These aesthetic ideas anticipate modern ideas of multiple levels of meaning in literature and the uniqueness of poetic language.

BHAMAHA

Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy

BHAMAHA HEADS ALL the earlier theorists who addressed themselves to the task of formulating the rules of poetry proper. Till 1909, when the text of Bhamaha was published for the first time in the Bombay Sanskrit Series by K. P. Trivedi as an appendix to Vidyanatha's *Prataparudra* and *Yasobhushana*. Bhamaha was no more than a mere name like his predecessors in the field, Medhavirudra, Ramasaran, etc. Except for a few stray quotations in later works on poetics, scholars had no idea of the nature or extent of his work. A lot of scholarly material has accumulated since then pertaining to questions like Bhamaha's date, religion and his contribution. Though on most of these matters wide divergence of opinion among scholars persists, the following general remarks go unrefuted.

Bhamaha was a master of logic, particularly the Buddhist logic as set out by Dinnaga (about c. 500 A.D.). He was an admirer of Panini and his grammatical analysis. In all likelihood Bhamaha was anterior to Dandin and Bhamaha's views appear often to be refuted by Dandin.

Bhamaha was conversant with the Hindu epics, the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*, as well as the romantic tale of the *Brihatkatha*. Even if he were a Buddhist, he did not subscribe to the Buddhist theory of *Apoha*, which denies positive connotation to words. His theory of poetry envisages not only epic and romantic tale, but also *belles-lettres*. It is not unlikely that he knew Kautilya, Bharata, and Kalidasa.

As early as K. 800 A.D., Bhamaha's work found a great annotator in Udbhata whose work, *Bhamaha-vivarana*, is all

but lost. The fragments of that text published by Gnole from Rome recently are so damaged as to baffle understanding.

All later writers on Sanskrit poetics are uniformly agreed about the authority of Bhamaha on definitions of the key concepts of poetry. Even such an original writer as Anandavardhana refers to Bhamaha with deference, though he differs from him on certain aspects. Similarly, Abhinavagupta and Mammata regard him as the father of the *alamkara-prasthana* or *alamkara* school in Sanskrit poetics. Dandin does not differ from him in essentials. Thus, in the view of Indian theorists, Bhamaha is the very fountain-head of Old School of Thought.

Bhamaha declares his intention of formulating the rules relating to *alamkara* or beauty in *kavya* or poetry. He mentions that the good poetry results in proficiency in the values of life as well as in the arts, besides bringing fame and joy. In his opinion erudition in the different branches of learning without a poetic gift is of no avail. He goes on to say that eloquent speech without the poetic gift is as graceless as wealth without good manners, and as night without moonlight. For the first time in the history of Sanskrit poetics, Bhamaha extols the singular glory of *Pratibha* or poetic intuition, in words which mark the province of poetry as distinct from that of scientific writing. Even a dullard may become learned in a branch of science, thanks to the teacher's instruction but not so in poetry. The latter is a spontaneous overflow found in a gifted few. While wealth and other worldly things are ephemeral poetry has an immortality about it. A poet lives as long as his fame lasts.

About the poet's equipment, Bhamaha sets forth the source material for poetry. They are grammar, metre, lexicon, traditional myths and legends, worldly wisdom, logic and fine arts. The aspiring poet is called upon to master these rudiments of his art under the guidance of experts before venturing on poetry. Bhamaha would not brook the presence of a single defect. He compares a poem violating the rules to an unworthy son bringing shame on his father. He goes to the extent of declaring

that while there is no loss of physical, religious or political prestige in not writing poetry, writing bad poetry is tantamount to death for the poet. The classical bent of Bhamaha is unmistakable, here.

Now, it follows as a corollary that Bhamaha considers epic poetry, *mahakavya* as the best of all *genres*. In form as well as matter *mahakavya* is great. Its characters are lofty and its style beautiful. It includes all matters relating to the story or chronicle of the hero, like precepts on statecrafts, war-like expeditions and conquests. Its style is none too obscure and it will have a happy ending. Though it has something to say on all the four-fold values of a human being (*purusharthas*) its emphasis is on material gain (*artha*). It reflects the truth of human nature and has scope for each of the several *rasas* or the recognised aesthetic emotions in poetry.

The other genres of poetry are—drama which is ten-fold, romantic tale in poetic prose, which is two-fold, viz. *akhyayika* and *katha* and stray verses (*anibaddha*).

All the forms of light verse and love poems as well as nature poems of short length come to be classed under the head *anibaddha*. Bhamaha knew how the Sanskrit poet valued the epic as the highest achievement to be desired though he might make a debut as a writer of short poems. The themes for poetry as envisaged by Bhamaha are either those hallowed in epics and legends or those invented by the poet's own fancy.

It is evident that in Bhamaha's view poetry is a tribute paid to heroes. A scholarly poet uses heightened expression, partaking of beauty in achieving his end. The best of poems viz. the art epic (*mahakavya*) contains a well-constructed heroic theme with organic unity of action, which is the essence of the theory of the five *sandhis* explained already by Bharata. Since poetry should delight the reader and instruct him at the same time, imperceptibly though, the poet has to include instructions in wordly wisdom and social behaviour under the cover of stories with emotional appeal.

It follows, therefore, that tragedy is impossible, in the circumstances. To depict one as a great hero worthy of emulation and yet to make him fail, is a violation of poetic justice. So, a poet has to be careful from the beginning not to indulge in an unwarranted praise of a hero.

These dicta of Bhamaha sum up in all the characteristic features of classical Sanskrit literature. In his time *rasas* were understood only as emotional elements in the theme and that is the reason why he is not vexed by problems raised later by Anandavardhana and others as to how *rasa* or the aesthetic delight of the reader could ever be a figure of speech.

What is of interest to a student of aesthetics, however, is Bhamaha's theory of *alamkara*. First of all, he recognises two types of beauty—natural beauty and the beauty endowed by the poet's art. Bhamaha cites the analogy of a beautiful face of a woman which is rendered more attractive by ornaments. Use of figures of speech results in external embellishment, while intrinsic beauty of expression lies in the correct usage of the different parts of speech. But Bhamaha valued both. Bhamaha states that all poems—from a small poem to a *mahakavya*—must be endowed with the vital principle of beauty, i.e. *vakrokti*, or "artful expression". Nothing else by itself can make good poetry in the absence of *vakrokti*.

The whole field of Sanskrit poetics or *alamkarasastra* may be regarded as one continued attempt to unravel the mystery of beauty in poetic language. Bhamaha's ideas are at once penetrating and thought provoking. It is a compliment to his insight that he found such followers as Udbhata and Kuntaka in later times. Verbal, thematic and emotional elements—all contribute to the total experience of beauty. And hence they are all partakers of *alamkara*. According to this view, strict realism in poetry is almost a contradiction in terms and one cannot be sure whether Bhamaha recognised realistic expression (*svabhavokti*) as an *alamkara* at all.

Bhamaha's idea of the primacy of *alamkara* is evidenced in his summary dismissal of the rival aesthetic concept of *guna*-cumriti. Alluding to the distinction between *Vaidarbha* and *Gaudiya* dictions, Bhamaha states categorically that it is a distinction without difference. He has no special regard for the *gunas* or qualities like lucidity (*prasada*), naturalism (*rujutva*) and tenderness (*komalatva*), associated with *Vaidarbha-marga*, because in the absence of full meaning (*pushtartha*) and artistic expression (*vakrokti*), it cannot validly claim to be poetry. By the same token, even the *Gaudiya* could be regarded as good poetry provided it possessed artistic beauty of expression (*alamkara*), and elevated thought, consistent with reason and free from obscurity. Bhamaha sees no beauty in mere word-jingles. He repeats that the two-fold beauty in poetry is the artistic word (*vakra sabda*) and meaning (*artha*). All that we can gather from the summary treatment of *gunas* by Bhamaha in the second chapter is that the diction may have moderate or excessive use of compounds; while profusion of compounds produces 'brilliance' (*ojas*), their absence or moderate use will make for lucidity (*prasada*) and if they are also pleasing to the ear, we have 'sweetness' (*madhurya*) of the sound.

In Bhamaha's treatment of the figures of speech, the distinction of *sabdalamkara* and *arthalamkara* is implicit. His illustrations of alliteration foreshadow the later concept of *kavyavrittis* said to have been developed by Udbhata. Though he illustrates in detail the several varieties of rhyme (*yamaka*), he sounds the caution that they must have the three *gunas*, to win general acceptance. His definitions and illustration of the figures of speech like metaphor (*rupaka*), have been highly appreciated by subsequent writers. His treatment of metaphor and simile also indicates the pitfalls to be avoided.

Bhamaha gives a status to *vakrokti*, a tradition which found a champion in Kuntaka later. Bhamaha states that if a subject become a *vibhava* or promoter of aesthetic emotion, it is entirely due to the power of *vakrokti*. This provides a guiding principle in determining what deserves to be classed as *alamkara*. Mere

mechanical devices as in *hetu* (reasoning), *sukshma* (hinting) and *lesha* (imputation) etc., do not deserve inclusion among *alamkaras* as they are deficient in *vakrokti*. The matter of fact statements like 'the sun sets; the moon shines; the birds return to their nests' are denied the name of poetry for the same reason. More or less the same consideration applies to *svabhavokti*.

Bhamaha finds no difficulty in accommodating the gamut of *rasas*, mentioned by Bharata, under the category of the *alamkaras*. Bhamaha's examples show that he is only trying to account for the appeal of passions in the ancient epic themes by bringing them under the *alamkaras*, *preyas* and *rasavad*. This also applies to his other figures like *Udatta*.

Bhamaha's awareness of a suggested sense in poetry over and above the literal meanings can be discerned in his accounts of figures like *paryayokta* (circumlocution), *viseshokti* (description of the non-contextual) and *vyajastuti* (feigned praise). What later theorists regard as suggestions was thus familiar to Bhamaha also.

In his treatment of *bhavikatva-alamkara* as a *guna* pervading a whole poem and involving the elements of picturesqueness, loftiness and wonder in the main story, besides a dramatic quality and ostentatious style, we see the glimmerings of Bhamaha's appreciation of a poetic work as a whole. We also see his predilection for regarding even *guna* as *alamkara*, which only points to his loose usage of these aesthetic terms. The good taste revealed in his illustrative verses shows him as a poet of imagination.

In the fourth chapter, Bhamaha again turns to the subject of *doshas* and lists more than a dozen defects that mar the poetic value of the compositions. Apart from the account of defects that result from the defects of metre, grammar and denotation, he gives a detailed violation of truth in Nature or Science. Bhamaha suggests to a poet that the blatantly incredible must be avoided. He devotes a whole chapter to the nature of perception, syllogistic reason, the eternality of sound, logical fallacies, etc. But he relates them in a very striking way to the subject of poetry by stating how poetry has its own logic and its own fallacies. A hero's vow

in poetry, according to Bhamaha, may be fourfold, viz., religious, worldly, romantic or wrathful. While successful execution of such vows in the epics is very much desirable, a failure would be deemed as a veritable fallacy. Puru's exchange of his youth for his father's old age, Hanuman's success in seeking out Sita, Vatsaraja's successful kidnapping of Vasavadatta and Bhima's drinking the blood of Dussasana are in accordance with poetic logic. But a Duryodhana resolving to fast unto death and forgetting it in his ambition for power, a Yudhisthira readily undertaking to gamble his fortune away with Sakuni, a Bhishma swearing to remain a bachelor throughout his life and a hero like Parasurama suffering the insult of defeat at the hands of Rama are instances of fallacies, which violate poetic logic.

Bhamaha's critical theory in the evaluation of epics and romances is very well instanced in these observations. Had only the later commentators heeded the principles underlying this approach, they might have added a new dimension to Sanskrit literary criticism. Unfortunately neither the commentators nor the later theorists pursued this line of enquiry. Bhamaha's interest in characterisation as revealed here is nothing but his desire for a well-constructed plot.

Bhamaha's last chapter (VI) is concerned with giving an insight to the poet in the matter of selecting the most appropriate form out of the numerous possibilities in the Sanskrit language indicated by Panini. This shows how Bhamaha was trying his best to press the findings of wide scholarship to the services of poetry.

DANDIN

Kamala Ratnam

DANDIN WAS ONE of the few brilliant prose writers of Sanskrit whose works have come down to us. Unfortunately, the verse creations of great masters like Valmiki, Vyasa and Kalidasa and others equally gifted have tended to overshadow the importance of Sanskrit writing in prose. In the absence of the printing press and other multiplying media, literary creations were preserved by committing them to memory. The verse form with its sonorous rhyme and measured syllables easily lends itself to this process. However, poetry or *kavya* in Sanskrit literature is not restricted to versification only. Both prose and verse forms were recognized as equally representing true poetry. Early in the fifth century B.C. Yaska in his grammatical treatise on the Vedas differentiated between verse *Mitakshara* (having measured syllables) and prose *Amitakshara* in which the syllables were not measured[1]. This he was obliged to do as the Vedas themselves contained examples of poetry written in both verse and prose form. In the *Rigveda* the dialogues of Yama and Yami, Pururavas and Urvasi, Sarama and the Panis and Visvamitra and the rivers are some examples of our early prose writing. The Vedic prose dialogues were an attempt at picturization and dramatization of real-life situation and the prose form proved to be more suited to the purpose. The creative period of Vedic verses was followed by the *Brahmana* literature.

The *Brahmanas* are written entirely in prose as they contain details of ritual to be followed for Vedic practices. Thus the *Brahamanas* have become the earliest repositories of the conscious prose form written in any Indo-European language.[2] Prose is also

1. Yaska, *Nirukta* 1.9
2. Macdonell A.A, *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, page 32.

found inter-mixed with verse in the *Krishna Yajurveda,* which acquired its epithet *Krishna* (black) as it was supposed to have become black being mixed with prose. The sixth section of the *Atharvaveda* (a later work) is entirely written in prose. The older Upanishads along with the *Brahamanas* and *Aranyakas* also use the prose form for their *akhyanas* (stories) meant to illustrate certain points. A very terse and concise form of prose, known as *Sutra* style or aphorism was evolved for writing highly scientific and philosophical subjects, as in this way they could easily be committed to memory. The *Ashtadhyayi* of Panini and other *sutra* literature are examples of this. The vast amount of Sanskrit literature known as *bhashya* or *tika* also uses the prose form.

Literary prose in its highly developed and ornate form is first seen in the inscriptions of Rudradaman (150 A.D.) at Girnar and Harishena (350 A.D.) at Allahabad. Earlier examples of this mellifluous and sonorous style surely must have existed, but they have unfortunately been lost. The difficulty in memorizing long prose passages of creative fiction and the climatic havoc wrought on manuscripts is one reason why it could not be preserved for posterity. A simpler and more direct prose style was in use for the didactic tale typified by the *Panchatantra* and *Hitopadesa.* This class of writing attained great popularity both at home and abroad. Hertel has recorded more than 200 different versions of the *Panchatantra* in over 50 languages of the world. The first translation of the *Panchatantra* in a foreign medium was made in the 'Pahlavi' language of Iran in 570 A.D., to be followed soon by Arabic, Syrian and Greek versions. Prose was also used interspersed with verses in dramas, the early examples of which can be seen in the plays of Bhasa, Kalidasa and Asvaghosha.

Dandin is one of the three famous writers of prose-*kavya* in Sanskrit, the other two being, Subandhu and Bana both of whom preceded Dandin in point of time. However, the time difference between these three brilliant writers is not very great as all of

them flourished within the span of a hundred years (600-700 A.D.). As Bana, the author of the famous *Kadambari,* is known to have been a contemporary of Emperor Harsha (606—647 A.D.), it is not difficult to assign a date to Dandin who was a close successor to Bana, perhaps even a partial contemporary. M. R. Kale, the learned commentator of Dandin's *Dasakumaracharita,* places him anywhere between 550 and 650 A.D.[1] Latest researchers have pushed forward this date more accurately from circa 665 to 710-720 A.D.

In his *Kavyadarsa,* literally 'Mirror of Poetry', (a treatise on the theory of poetry) Dandin mentions two kinds of prose writing. The *katha* and *akhyayika.* Generally speaking these are two broad divisions of prose fiction. In the *akhyayika* the narrator is the hero himself, whereas the *katha* may be told by some one else also. Now it is more than obvious that Dandin had a quantity of literary material before him, before he could arrive at such a classification.

The *kavya* tradition (ornate poetry) in Sanskrit goes back at least to the time of Panini (1500 B.C.) who is credited with the authorship of a *kavya* named *Jambavativijaya* or *Patalavijaya.*[2] Later on Katyayana (400 B.C.) refers to an *akhyayika* and Patanjali (150 B.C.) mentions three prose works classifying them as *akhyayika* viz., *Vasavadatta, Sumanottara* and *Bhaimarathi* besides *kavya* in verse form and prosework *Charumati* written by Vararuchi.[3] He also refers to two works dealing with the death of Kamsa and the humiliation of Bali and dramatic representations of these themes. Similar literary pieces existed in the Pali Buddhist and Jain literature also. This indicates that the Indian mind had begun thinking about the task of poetry and criticism in an orderly manner at a very early date. The Indian love of ornamentation is seen in every walk of life; naturally it

1. Cf. D.K. Gupta, *A Critical study of Dandin,* 1970, page 93.
2. This work is lost to us.
3. Vartika on Panini's Sutra IV—3.87, and Mahabhashya IV—3.101.

found expression in the art of speech also and was duly reflected in literature. Thus poetics or the study of artistic (ornamented) speech developed into a definite system. The works of early poets like Bhasa, Kalidasa and Asvaghosha reveal that a definite poetic style had been established even before the beginning of the Christian era. In this stream we must also count those poets and writers whose names are mentioned along with fragments of their compositions in anthologies, and others like Kaviputra and Saumillaka[1] whose works are totally lost to us.

The earliest extant work on the science of poetics (*alamkara sastra*), where a theory of poetry is clearly delineated is the *Natyasastra* of Bharata (200 B.C.). There is a long gap after Bharata until we come to Bhamaha and Dandin.[2] Bhamaha, who in all probability was a contemporary of Dandin, in his *Kavyalamkara* discusses the various aspects of poetry laying greater stress on *alamkaras* (figures of speech) which embellish poetry. Having given a general definition of the *Mahakavya*, Bhamaha goes into the analysis of prose *kavya* dividing it under the two familiar heads of *katha* and *akhyayika*. Distinguishing between the two established styles of poetry *Vaidarbhi* (simple and sonorous) and *Gaudi* (pompous and vigorous), he speaks about the three *gunas* (*madhurya*, *prasada* and *ojas*) and then begins his long description of *alamkaras* (figures of speech) in which he includes both *sabdalamkaras* and *arthalamkaras*. About the same time Bhatti (circa 590—610 A.D.) in an attempt to make the study of *alamkarasastra* (rhetorics) easier and more interesting to students discussed the subject through the story of the *Ramayana*. The *Bhattikavya* attained wide popularity both at home and abroad[3].

1. Kaviputra and Saumillaka are mentioned along with Bhasa in his drama.
2. There is a difference of opinion about the date of Bhamaha and Dandin, Professor P.V. Kane, author of *History of Sanskrit Poetics* places Dandin before Bhamaha. According to Kane the date of Dandin is before 720 A.D. and the difference between Dandin and Bhamaha is a matter of a few decades only.
3. Outside India in countries of South East Asia like Indonesia and Thailand, The *Bhattikavya* was taken exclusively as a model for the Ramayana story. There it was not treated as a work on poetics.

Dandin is credited with the authorship of three famous works (1) *Dasakumaracharita* (2) *Kavyadarsa* and (3) *Avantisundarikatha*. A fourth work *Dvisandhanakavya*, which tells simultaneously the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata* stories, has been ascribed to him, but apart from stray references, this work has not come down to us. In the *Kavyadarsa* Dandin covers the long gap between Bharata and himself and gives a new orientation and originality to the science of poetics. Dandin is the first known writer who is able to give us a cogent definition of *kavya*. Apparently recognizing the two aspects of *kavya* (literature) as *sabda* (words) and *artha* (meaning), he proceeded to define *kavyasarira* (the body of poetry) as "a series of words characterized by agreeable or desired meaning".[1] This 'string of words' (*padavali*) or speech manifests itself in various poetic styles or dictions and is embellished with certain ornaments (*alamkaras* or figures of speech) which are meticulously listed and illustrated with his own original examples. Stating that the purpose of poetry is to achieve fame and give delight both to the poet and the reader, Dandin proceeds to define prose as a variation of *kavya* (poetry) He also mentions the *gunas* (poetic excellence) and the *doshas* (blemishes) of *kavya*. In his treatment of *alamkaras* Dandin shows greater originality than Bhamaha, but like Bhamaha he values *vakrokti*, pointed speech. He noticed that all figures of speech arise from the desire to describe something extraordinary and the limit is reached in *atisayokti* (hyperbole) when this desire would transcend physical limitations.[2] According to him figures of speech are those attributes of *kavya* which impart beauty to it,[3] and sentiment (*rasa*) imparts sweetness to poetry.[4] Finally Dandin emerges as a foremost supporter of the *marga* or pathway theory of poetry laying great stress on diction which was later described as style (*riti*) by his successors.

---

1. शरीरं तावदिष्टार्थव्यच्छिन्ना पदावली *Kavyadarsa 1,10*
2. विवक्षा या विशेषस्य लोकसीमलंघिनी *Kavyadarsa* II-214.
3. काव्यशोभाकरान् धर्मान् अलंकारान् प्रचक्षते Ibid II—7.
4. मधुरं रसवद्वाचि वस्त्वप्यग्रे रस : स्थित : Ibid I-51.

According to Dandin, there are many ways (*marga*) in which speech may express itself. 'Manyfold is the style of composition with minute mutual differences of these styles, the *Vaidarbha* and the *Gaudiya* are clearly different from each other and I shall describe them now."[1] Describing both the *margas* (*style*) in detail, Dandin established the superiority of the *Vaidarbhi* style, saying that on account of its ten *gunas* (qualities) it was far more lucid and appealing than the *Gaudi* which followed the opposite path from these qualities. Dandin was later followed by Vamana (Circa 800 A.D.) who categorically declared that "style indeed was the soul of poetry" (*ritiratma kavyasya*).

The *Avantisundarikatha* falls under the classification of *akhyayika* in which the hero himself narrates the story and the events are based on facts of real life. Dandin defines prose as "A succession of words not amenable to division into metrical feet."[2] However this definition is applicable only to the external aspect of prose literary form. It does not take into account the inner content of prose literature which is more concerned with ideas as distinct from poetry which involves itself with feeling and emotion. Sanskrit prose developed through the highly intellectual exercise of our great philosophers like the *Mimamsa-Sastra* of Sabara and the terse philosophical treatises of Sankara.

According to Dandin a prose composition is to be divided into chapters (*ucchvasas*) with introduction of verses in *vaktra* and *aparavaktra* metres. It may have a romantic plot like the abduction of a maiden, war among kings, separation of lovers, royal victory or other such momentous events based on real life. However, Dandin does not strictly adhere to this distinction between *katha and akhyayika.* Criticising Bhamaha on this score, he considers both to be of one class with different designations.[3]

---

1. अस्त्यनेको गिरां मार्ग : सूक्ष्मभेद : परस्परम्
तत्र वैदर्भ गौडीयौ वर्ष्यते प्रस्फुटान्तरौ Ibid-I-40.

2. अपादःपादसन्तानो गद्यम्

3. Ibid I—28.

A close examination of the *Avantisundarikatha* strongly suggests that Dandin knew Bana and his works, as the story of this romance closely follows the first half of Bana's *Kadambari,* while the autobiographical part follows the pattern set by the illustrious Bana in his *Harshacharita* which is also classed as *akhyayika.*

The *Avantisundarikatha* gives us some insight into the personal history of Dandin. As with other poets, literary memory has woven many fanciful stories around the life of Dandin. Of these one relates that once Kalidasa (100 B.C.) and Dandin (although centuries apart in real life !) had an argument about each other's excellence. Both of them went to Devi Saraswati (Goddess of learning) to get her opinion. First asked about Dandin, it seems the Goddess exclaimed.

'कविर्दण्डी कविर्दण्डी कविर्दण्डी न संशयः ।

"thrice I declare that Dandin is the POET, there is no doubt about it". Incensed at this Kalidasa asked "who am I, then O' Fool ?" (कोऽहं मूढे ।)

त्वमेवाहं त्वमेवाहं त्वमेवाहं न संशय : ।"

"You are myself personified and there is no doubt about that too".

Another anonymous poet rendering praise to Dandin says, "With Valmiki on earth, the word 'Poet' came into being, with the advent of Vyasa the number (of poets) became Two. But with you Dandin the number is now increased to Three".[1]

The word 'Dandin' signifying 'Staff Bearer' is also applied to a certain sect of Sanyasins who carry a light twig with them as a mark of identification. However 'Dandin' was the personal name of our poet and not a title as is ascertained from the biographical evidence provided by the *Avantisundarikatha.* The internal evidence of Dandin's works suggests that he was a southerner, most probably a native of Vidarbha or North Karnataka. He praises the Maharashtri language and the Vaidarbhi style. His vivid description of a cock-fight and the

1. जाते जगति वाल्मीकौ कविरित्याभिधा भवत् ।
कवी इति ततो व्यासे कवयस्त्वयि दण्डिनि ।।
Subhashitaharavali

meticulously economical house keeping habits related through the episode of Gomini in the *Dasakumaracharita*[1], lend support to the theory that he must have spent a considerable number of his formative years in the south of India. This is further supported by the fact that within a hundred years of its writing his *Kavyadarsa* was translated in the Kannada language (circa 815 A.D.) and a translation of the work in Telugu was available before 1250 A.D. His reference to *Kaveri-tira-pattana,* Kalinga and Andhra also point to the same conclusion. In fact Dandin is one of the few authentic creative writers of Sanskrit who flourished in the South and achieved all India fame and popularity. The evidence of the *Dasakumaracharita* suggests that its author must have lived in affluent circumstances and was familiar with the enjoyment of worldly pleasures, the charms of wine and women, good living and intrigues of rogues and kings. In this work he has given real life descriptions of royal courts, palaces and the luxurious salons of dancers and courtesans. He describes gambling dens, cock-fights, journeys through city and forest and the adventures of thieves and marauders. In short he seems to have been familiar with the dark as well as the bright side of life. Social conditions of his time appear to be very similar to those described in the popular and down-to-earth drama the *Mricchakatika* of Sudraka (circa 500 A.D.).

The discovery in 1924 of a manuscript of the *Avantisundarikatha* though in a mutilated condition, sheds some more light on the personal life of Dandin. According to this source, a family of Kaushika Brahmanas migrated from Anandpur in Gujarat to Achalapur in Central India. To them was born Narayanasvami, who had a son named Damodara also known as Bharavi, the famous author of the *Kiratarjuniyam kavya.*[2] Bharavi was a friend of King Durvinita, an exiled prince of the Western Ganga region. The date of Durvinita is

1. *Dasakumaracharita*, M.R. Kale's edition 1925, PP 143, 144 and Ucchvasa VI.
2. This *Kavya* of Bharavi also acquired great popularity in countries outside India and was diversely imitated.

given as 570 A.D. Later Bharavi became the court poet of Pallava King Simha Vishnu of Kanchi. Bharavi's grandson Viradatta married Gauri, to whom was born Dandin. In this way Dandin became the great grandson of the illustrious Bharavi. While still young Dandin lost both his parents. Later when the Chalukyas invaded Kanchi (circa 655 A.D.) he had to flee his home and become an exile. During this period he travelled extensively all over India and after the Pallava King Narsimhavarman vanquished his foes and regained his capital at Kanchi, did Dandin come back to his native town, where as before, he engaged himself in writing. As he says in an obvious reference to his illustrious great grandfather, "to maintain the literacy prestige of my ancestors".

In Kanchi Dandin wrote the *Avantisundarikatha* which he claims was revealed to him by divine grace when he was in meditation. Dandin was given the sacred thread of the *upanayana* ceremony at the age of seven, and soon thereafter began his studies. He seems to have been greatly addicted to his books, because he says. "Soon after I lost my parents, their place was taken by Sarasvati and Sruta (the Vedas)". During his long wanderings all over the country, he lived in famous centres of learning and besides high proficiency in the Vedas and the arts, acquired much wordly knowledge. He participated in learned assemblies and discussions of scholarly Brahmanas and Kshatriyas amongst whom he acquired great fame and reputation.

Amongst the subjects of his study were included the various Sastras, medicine especially veterinary science, astrology, astronomy and a variety of arts and architecture. He had mastered Kautilya's *Arthasastra* and the *Kamasutra* of Vatsyayana. And as such he was the recipient of many compliments from his friends. A compliment to his knowledge of architecture was paid to him by his friend Lalitaditya, the sculptor, who invited him to express his opinion about the

plastering done by him to repair the broken arm of a stone statue of Trivikrama Vishnu in the temple of Mahabalipuram which in those days touched the sea. Dandin had realized that "the study of books leads to other books; there is no end while man is growing older all the time."

Following the pattern set by Bana, in his romance *Avantisundarikatha* Dandin mentions by name many of his friends and acquaintances. Amongst these figure Ranamalla a poet and magician, Matridatta, the Commander-in-Chief's son, Devasarman, a poet and Vedic scholar, Jayanta, Narayana, Bhajananda, Ramasarman, Vimata and others.

Amongst the literary luminaries mentioned by Dandin are Vyasa, Subandhu, Gunadhya (of the *Brihatkatha* fame to whom Dandin owed a lot), Muladeva, Sudraka, Bhasa, Sarvasena, Pravarasena, Kalidasa, Narayana, Bharavi, Bana and Mayura in that order. This order in all possibility indicates the chronological sequence of these writers as well. At the end of this list Dandin mentions a woman poet (possibly from Karnataka) by name Vijjaka.[1] Vijja or Vijjaka wrote with great feeling and talent. Supporsedly of a dark complexion she wrote this couplet as a rejoinder to Dandin :

नीलोत्पलदलश्यामां विज्जकां मामजानता ।
वृथैव दण्डिना प्रोक्तं सर्वशुक्ला सरस्वती ॥[2]

Dandin in the beginning of his *Kavyadarsa* while invoking the Goddess Sarasvati had described her as 'all white' (Sarvasukla).[3] Taking objection to this Vijjaka, who considered herself to

1. The relevant portion of the manuscript is very badly damaged so that only the following portion can be read :—

"..... चित्रीयते मम ।
वर्णहीनापि या जाता जात्युत्कर्षगुणास्पदम् ।

The phrase वर्णहीना is most probably a reference to Vijjaka. Vijjaka is also included by Rajasekhara in his list of poetesses.

2. *Sarangadharapaddhati* No 108

3. चतुर्मुखाम्भोजवनहंसवधूर्मम ।
मानसे रमतां दीर्घां सर्वशुक्ला सरस्वती । *Kavyadarsa*—I-1.

be Sarasvati incarnate, said, "Not knowing me Vijjaka whose skin is as dark as the petals of a dark-blue lotus flower, in vain did Dandin declare that Sarasvati is all white". Had he known that the dark hued Vijjaka was Sarasvati herself, Dandin would not have made this statement. Another poetess by name Gangadevi[1] has paid this tribute to Dandin :

आचार्यदण्डिनो वाचामाचान्नामृतसंपदाम् ।
विकासो वेधस : पत्न्या विलासमणिदर्पणम् ॥

"The shining splendour of the superbly nectarlike speech of Acharya Dandin, is indeed a true mirror for the jewelled graces of Brahma's consort (Sarasvati)."

Much is not known about Dandin's religious beliefs. But a reference in the *Avantisundarikatha* suggests that he could have been a devotee of Vishnu. He was well acquainted with the strength and weaknesses of the Jain and Buddhist faiths. Brahmana priests, Jain monks and fake astrologers are equally the objects of his bantering tone. In fact we find a persistent strain of satire aimed at the evils of society prevalent in his time and which are amply reflected in his most famous work, the *Dasakumaracharita*.

The *Dasakumaracharita* or the story of the Ten Princes is a prose romance. It is found in three fragments, (1) the *purvapithika* or prologue consisting of five chapters, (2) the middle section containing the account of the adventures of eight princes in eight *uchvasas* (chapters), (3) the *uttarapithika* or epilogue which gives the conclusion of the romance. Of these the middle eight chapters are from the pen of Dandin himself; the prologue and the epilogue are the work of Dandin's friends or disciples. As the story of the middle section begins abruptly and is incomplete without the *purva* and *uttarapithika*, it seems justifiable to conclude that these were appended later on by

1. Gangadevi was the queen of one of the kings of Vijayanagar during the fourteenth century A.D. Her tribute to Dandin in her poetry lends support to the theory of his being a southerner.

Dandin's admirers, the originals having been somehow lost. There is a marked difference of style and scholarship between the original writing of Dandin and the appended portions. According to M. R. Kale, who discovered the highly moth-eaten manuscript of the *Avantisundarikatha* in 1924, and took great pains to edit and publish it, the *Dasakumaracharita* was translated into Telugu in circa 1250 A.D. and the *purvapithika* has been rendered back into Sanskrit from the Telugu text. A close comparison of the two texts seems to point to this possibility.

The framework of the story may be briefly related as follows. Rajahanisa, king of Magadha (capital Pushpapura, modern Patna), is defeated by Manasara, ruler of Malva (capital Ujjayini). He takes refuge in the Vindhya hills. While in exile, Rajahanisa's wife Vasumati bears him a son named Rajavahana. During the period of exile, nine other princes are brought to the king, who are the sons of loyal ministers and noble men who have suffered the same fate with him in war and have followed him in exile. The ten princes (Dasakumaras) grow up together and in course of time go out into the wide world to seek their fortune. For a period of time all of them remain together, until they reach a thick spot in the Vindhya forest where an unknown Brahmana meets Rajavahana. He persuades him to leave his companions and come away with him secretly in order to gain the kingdom of Patala. After a series of adventures in the *Patalaloka* Rajavahana comes back to the same spot and finds his companions missing. Obviously they have gone in different directions in search of him. While searching for his friends, Rajavahana reaches Ujjayini, where he marries Avantisundari, the lovely daughter of King Manasara. After a time the other nine princes join him and together they relate their adventures to each other. As these narratives are coming to an end, a messenger arrives from the old King Rajahanisa with a letter, asking the ten princes to come back. In obedience to this mandate, the princes set out for Pushpapura. On the way they defeat and kill King Manasara at Ujjayini and conquer Malva. Reaching

Pushpapura they regain Magadha and Rajavahana becomes the ruler of the united kingdoms of Pushpapura and Ujjayini.

Thus Dandin is able to present to the reader a well knit and interesting plot which is entirely of his own imagination and invention. Some scholars see a reference to contemporary history in the overthrow of the Magadha kingdom by the king of Ujjayini. However, it is not easy to establish this. The geographical data provided by the romance is surprisingly accurate and seems to be based on Dandin's personal observation and experience. Throughout the work the style is lively and agreeable and sustains the interest of the reader. For this quality of his, Dandin earned the epithet of being endowed with "a beautiful turn of phrase" (*Padalalitya*).[1] Modern critics have praised the vitality of Dandin's narrative as one "which can rank with the best of picturesque romances that Europe has given us." In this work, as was the mode in earlier tales and fables, Dandin does not teach a moral. He is content with the painting of a realistic portrait of the life around him without attempting to derive or even hint at any moral. In the words of Kale, "He observes but does not diagnose, he describes but does not instruct." He knows that the evils around him are evils, but he does not tell us how to steer clear of them or even cure them. His one and only aim is *ranjana*, the pure entertainment and amusement of his reader. He has faithfully described such evils in Hindu society as the prevalence of polygamy, idol worship, belief in dreams, omens, ghosts and sorcery, gambling-dens, the treachery as well as the delectations and charms of lascivous courtesans, thieving, adultery and murder. He writes about the theory of Karma and the doctrine of former births. Unfortunately such evils persist in our society even today. He also refers to the adventurous rich merchant class engaging in foreign trade and undertaking long land and sea journeys and their exciting encounters with other sea-faring people like the Yavanas (Arabs) and others.

1. उपमा कालिदासस्य भारवेरर्थगौरवम् ।
दण्डिनः पदलालित्यम् ।

The world of Dandin may be summarised thus in the words of a modern critic[1], "In the *Dasakumaracharita* we rub shoulders with bawds, courtesans, unfaithful wives, crooked priests, hypocritical ascetics, unscrupulous rogues, incorrigible rakes, light-hearted idlers. A king is ruined by an adviser who is thoroughly irresponsible but irresistably charming. Chanakya had prescribed a heavy daily time-table for the ruler. But what is the use ? While he is checking the receipts and the disbursements, a double amount is stolen by the knavish bureaucrats who have the brains to multiply a thousand fold the forty tricks of speculation mentioned by Chanakya. The king may think he is administering justice, while his officers are making a pile." Keeping in tune with the spirit of the time Dandin derides "Drop this tiring routine. Follow your instincts to the titillation of the senses. Hunting is good because it gives good exercise to the legs, for long-winded speed comes in handy after a defeat." Gambling is even better, "it develops magnanimity, since you drop money like straw." Like Sarvilaka of the *Mricchakatika*, he describes a thief who has made a regular science of his profession. Says the thief, "provided with a varied kit—scissors, tweezers, dark lantern, measuring tape, hook, rod—I raided the house of a miser." The prince turns robber with the pious motive of "bringing into a better frame of mind the misers of the city, by revealing to them the transient nature of all earthly fortune."

In matters of technical skills and brilliance of style Dandin would hardly have a parallel. The seventh narrative of Prince Mantragupta, consisting of more than 200 lines, is written entirely without the use of any labial letter. The excuse given for this literary feat is that Mantragupta's lips have been bitten by the kisses of his beloved, hence "covering his mouth a little with his delicate hand, his lips having been wounded with the passionate teeth-marks of his beloved, he commenced his

1. Krishna Chaitanya, *A New History of Sanskrit Literature*, 1977, page 377.

narrative avoiding the use of labial letters.[1] Indeed so well has this feat been accomplished that the narrative reads like normal prose, until we are reminded of the author's own statement at the beginning. This alone is enough to vouchsafe Dandin's astonishing mastery over language which find no parallel even in the works of the master prose-writer Banabhatta.

Although Dandin had set himself the task to paint and describe and not to discuss or dissect, he could not escape from the responsibility of characterization. This was so because he was dealing with human beings in his narrative. Thus he presents before us an endless gallery of people amongst whom we find, "Venturesome and intriguing kings, gallant princes, wise counsellors, corrupt officials, negligent policemen, crafty and obsequious favourites, sweet-tongued parasites, fraudulent ascetics, licentious men, shrewd gamblers, expert thieves and roguish Brahmanas". Among his women characters he delineates, "unfaithful and cruel queens (who deceive their impotent and lecherous husbands with good reason), impetuous princesses, audacious maidens meeting their lovers at night, stone-hearted wives like Dhumini and virtuous women like Gomini, greedy and heartless whores and bawds as well as simple and affectionate courtesans and weak-minded nuns acting as go-betweens." Dandin's women are bolder than his men characters and at times they surpass men in treachery and cruelty. Indeed some of them show a striking aggressive boldness befitting an Amazon. In matters of sex they are highly voluptuous and lustful often surpassing the male in frankness and physical ardour.

Dandin's descriptions have been compared with the perfection of a Rajput miniature painting or a Matisse for their rich style merging with sound and decorative imagery. They are too long to bear quotation, yet a short example of a girl playing with ball may be cited.

---

1. स किल कर कमलेन किंचित् संवृताननो
ललितावल्लभारसदन्तक्षतव्यसनविह्वलाधर मणिः
निरोष्ट्यवर्णम् आत्मवारितम् आचचक्षे।

"She let it fall to the ground in gentle grace, and as it slowly rose up beat it down with her tender hand having the thumb drawn in a little and the delicate fingers spread out. After having tossed it up with the back of her hand, she caught it again as it fell, following it all the time with her quick glances which were like a bouquet of flowers filled with bees. Then she let it fall down once again." Dandin has remarkable felicity of style which changes according to the subject matter. Here is a portraiture of famine, the style assuming the same sparse, stark, staccato tone. "There was no rain for twelve years. The grain drooped. Plants failed to seed. Trees bore no fruit. The clouds were barren. Rivers languished. Swamps became mud-holes. Springs were dry. All ceased to consummate or celebrate auspicious days. Robbers multiplied. Men's skulls, bleached white like the feathers of a crane, rolled about. Flocks of hungry crows flew around. Cities, villages and towns perished."

Dandin's figures of speech (*alamkaras*) are full of a vivid visual quality, they possess an earthy, physical sensuousness. "The sky turned dark as if choked by smoke from the sun's great furnace which had been dampened by the waves of the Western Ocean." "The army moved towards the groves of the sunset-mountains, as if dressed in the ruddy robes of the crimson sky as though to observe a vow of renunciation." "The evening twilight looked like a stream of blood flowing out of the firmament, cut up as it were, by the sharp points of hundreds of royal crowns." "The tremulous stars bore the appearance of drops of perspiration. . . . . "

Having lived a full and purposeful life, having earned the title of *Acharya* (respected teacher), in the company of nature and his students, Dandin has left this legacy for us. That literature can be either in prose or verse, that it can be written in Sanskrit or any of the local languages (Prakrit or Apabhrainsa

or their mixture), but the language which takes universal pride of place is the Sanskrit language.

"संस्कृतं नाम दैवी वागन्वरव्याता महर्षिभिः"।

Sanskrit indeed is the divine speech, it has been expounded by great sages. Many are the common dialects derived from it or are based upon it, drawing sustenance from the local soil. We find that in this analysis of the phenomenon of speech, Dandin proves true even today.

ANANDAVARDHANA

K. Krishnamoorthy

ANANDAVARDHANA IS THE doyen of Indian aestheticians in the estimation of generations of ancient Indian scholars as well as in the opinion of modern experts in literature. It was because of him that Kashmir, his homeland, came to be hailed as Saradadesa or the land of Sarada, the Goddess of Poetry. He was both a first rate poet and a profound philosopher. A devout votary of religion, he was a great literary critic with impeccable literary sensibility. Several evidences indicate that he lived in the first half of the ninth century A. D. His *magnum opus* is the *Dhvanyaloka* or the "Light of poetic essence" which provides for the first time an insight into the secret of poetic beauty, at once scholarly and illuminating. Before Anandavardhana's time there were only tracts designed to guide aspiring poet and no systematic philosophical works analysing or explaining poetic beauty in general; nor was there any practical or applied criticism analysing even the great Sanskrit epics or plays, lyric poems. Anandavardhana was the first writer to attempt all these; and his all-round brilliance was recognised at once far and wide.

The traditionalists led a counterblast against his new tenets which undervalued, as they thought, the theories of earlier specialists. But the opposition died a natural death, thanks to the labours of celebrities like Abhinavagupta (C. 1000 A. D.) in vindicating Anandavardhana.[1] Anandavardhana's *locus classicus* of aesthetics becomes the great dividing range between Old Criticism and New Criticism in India. All writers of note after

1. Abhinavagupta's dissertation on the *Dhvanyaloka* is known as *Lochana* or 'The Eye' for the light of *dhvani*.

Anandavardhana—Mammata, Viswanatha, etc.,—content themselves with restating his views in their own way and writing eclectic textbooks.

The *Dhvanyaloka*, like all other works in the field, consists of cryptic aphorisms in verse called *karika* and detailed commentary in prose called *vritti*. Though a few scholars thought earlier the two may be by different hands, it is now well-nigh accepted that they are of single authorship for the simple reason that no cryptic statement by itself could be held complete in the absence of illustrative examples, especially in the field of literary analysis.

According to Anandavardhana, intelligent criticism or even right understanding of poetry is given only to a few. Neither a mastery over grammar nor a knowledge of lexicons can ensure it. Critical taste is as rare as creative genius itself. In fact, the two gifts are virtually the twin facets of one ability; a true poet and an ideal critic share in common the gift of imagination (*pratibha*) or aesthetic sensibility. Hence the ideal critic is called *sahridaya* or *rasika;* if the poet creates poetry, the critic recreates it in his imagination and enjoys it. Hence the meaning of poetry can be understood and analysed only by men of taste and mere philosophers have no place or voice in discussing artistic beauty. That is why *sahridayaloka* is another title of the *Dhvanyaloka.*

It might sound strange, but it is true that no predecessor of Anandavardhana had attempted to explain the constituents of beauty even in such admittedly great epics as the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata,* and great plays like the *Sakuntala.* More often than not, theorists were so formal that they trotted off their own self-composed titbits to serve as the best instances of literary beauty. Anandavardhana rightly protests against this summary procedures and devotes his whole work to give illuminating side-lights on what constitutes the essence or 'soul' (*atman*) of poetic beauty, by analysing scores of Sanskrit masterpieces. It

in his credo that a seminal principle of aesthetics can be derived only by men of taste.

Dhvani is the principle so derived by Anandavardhana. It is not only wide enough to apply with equal force to the greatest epic as well as the shortest lyric, it admits also of such infinite details but it will enable one to evaluate the worth of any given instance of poetry, and to distinguish it from others by comparison and contrast. It is also so scientifically precise that it can convince the masters in the allied disciplines of Logic, Semantics and Linguistics. Thus the principle succeeds in vindicating for poetry and art a place no less important than that of science and Philosophy among the valued achievements of humanity. At the same time, this new principle also sheds new light, without supplanting them, on all the earlier aesthetic categories like 'figurative beauty' (*alamkara*) and stylistic beauty (*guna*). What is more, it is a principle which realises the indivisible unity (*sahitya*) of form (*sabda*) and content (*artha*) though the critic is forced to distinguish them unavoidably in his critical analysis.

In the mansion of beauty, there are several layers; and what is most outwardly apparent, is the least important. The palpably beautiful exterior becomes worthy of notice only to the extent it serves as an appropriate medium (or 'objective correlative' in the words of T. S. Elitot) for the inner beauty-core which is *rasa* or aesthetic feeling-tone. To say that form is beautified or designed by this rhythmic device, or content coloured by that image, is only naive according to Anandavardhana. Any aesthetic category be it *alamkara*, *guna*, *riti* or *vritti* loosely hung on mere form or palpable content is deficient *per se* as it misses the inmost core or soul of *rasa*. Any learned man can pick up these normative aspects of beauty; but only the *rasika* is called for to understand or explain the inmost *rasa* which is *sui generis* to poetry.

Hence Anandavardhana structures his whole theory to explain how rasa in its very nature cannot be an *alamkara* or *guna* or

any other alterior characteristic of poetic beauty, but only its inmost soul; *rasa* is really a blissful state of mind which spurs on the creative genius of a poet at the one end and delights the imaginative critic at the other end. It underlines all the organic patterning almost spontaneously achieved by the poetic mind in regard to plot, character and style. It is as much the cause as the effect of poetic beauty, though by loose usage we speak even of the objective poem itself as containing *rasa*. Really speaking, there is no *rasa* until a critic lives through it. It can include in its vast gamut not only deep and long-lasting sentiments like love, but also fleeting moods like anguish.

The problem of aesthetics is to explain how a consummate artist by his dry media such as hackneyed language, colour-paints, sounds etc., evokes *rasa* in men of taste. Language has a conventional usage in diverse walks of life; but poetry transcends this usage. Even in common parlance, we often use metaphors, knowingly or unknowingly. We talk of a boy as an ass, to mean he is dull. Poetic use of language surpasses the metaphorical also. We have said its nature is *rasa*, but how is it evoked ? Only a profound aesthetician can give an adequate answer as the question hinges upon the core essense of all beauty.

The answer given illuminatingly by Anandavardhana is *dhvani*. It does not mean 'sound', not even 'echoing sound' though these are there at the fringe of its connotation. It is really "illumination in a flash" even as *Sphota* or "revelation of meaning" by meaningful sentence-units in Bhartrihari's philosophy of Sanskrit Grammar. For Bhartrihari all sentence units are 'revealers' (*vyanjaka*) of 'total meaning' intended by speakers, both partless and indivisible. So too, in poetry and art, the meaning of *rasa* is 'revealed in an instant' by the sentence—units or its surface meanings after they have exhausted their referential nature. This secret of mystery or magic of poetic language is usually translated by the very inadequate term 'suggestion'. In life we can prosaically suggest so many things.

They are not examples of *dhvani*. We have *dhvani* of Anandavardhana only when the poetic beauty of *rasa* is illuminatingly revealed in a flash whether in a syllable or a word or a pronoun or a phrase or a sentence or a whole poem itself. Ordinary language as well as ordinary meaning is only the jumping-off ground for the leap of *dhvani* to reveal *rasa*. This power is pronounced and prominently present in the languages of master-poets like Kalidasa. Effortlessly, the language transcends its prosaic limits and at the same time gathers into itself all the graces of sound and sense listed by prominent writers. Such is the power of genius to achieve art without becoming artificial. *Dhvani* of *rasa* does not rule out *alamkaras* and *gunas*. It spontaneously partakes of them. But without the vital throb of *rasa*, the outer fripperies of stylistic beauty become almost deadweights like ornaments on a corpse. Every analysable linguistic element in poetry is *vyanjaka* or revealer in regard to *rasa* which must be regarded *ipso facto* as *vyangya* or 'revealed' *par excellence*. Hence, to cover all poetic factors of beauty, we have to extend the connotation of the term *'dhvani'* to include the 'revealer' (form or content) "the revealed", the revealing meta-linguistic function' and the totality of all these factors, viz. the poem as a whole. Anandavardhana used the word in all these senses. It is impossible to do full justice to this wide spectrum of meaning intended by the apparently simple term *dhvani* as used by Anandavardhana. Aesthetic suggestivity is its essence, and it partakes of many-sided symbolism to induce in the reader the intended *rasa* or state of aesthetic feeling.

To be a poem *per se*, *rasa-dhvani*, then, is a must according to Anandavardhana. But can such a theory explain all specimens of admittedly good poetry ? Anandavardhana realises that it cannot. It leaves out a sizeable portion of accepted poetry. Hence, in order to accommodate all variant forms of poetic beauty, he has to dilute to some extent his *dhvani* accordingly, though it is always kept in mind that the hard core of *dhvani* is *rasa* in all its myriad varieties and nothing else.

Let us see now the diluted manifestations of *dhvani* which may have an indirect, if not a direct, relation to *rasa*. When the graces of form and content in poetry are so exuberant and striking as to delay our reaching up to *rasa*, we may conclude that the beauty of *dhvani* here is rendered secondary to the preponderating glitter of stylistic imagery. Yet, since the soul (viz. *rasa*) is there all right, though its realisation is a little delayed and not instantaneous as in the best examples, it can be conceded as beautiful poetry. There are two admissible types of poetic beauty : (1) where *dhvani* is absolutely prominent (*pradhana-vyangya*) and (2) where *dhvani* is auxiliary to beauty of imagery (*gunibhuta-vyangya*). If Valmiki and Kalidasa illustrate the first type, Bana and Magha exemplify the second. In Sanskrit we have also practitioners of verbal acrostics. Really speaking, it is not poetry but only a counterfeit of it and may be dismissed as such (*chitra*). It is called *Chitra* or 'portrait-like' because just as the picture of a horse is not a real horse so an imitation of poetry cannot be genuine poetry.

Talking of the logical possibilities of revealed meaning, Anandavardhana has to admit besides *rasa*, both *vastu* or bare thought and *alamkara* or figurative thought which a poet can embody in his work. The bulk of folk-poetry in Prakrit abounds in pert and witty invitations to lovers by rustic maids. Take for instance this address to a guest wayfarer by the lusty maiden in the house :

My old mother-in-law lies here,
drowned in sleep, O dear !
And I am here, you should mark
these all right before it's dark !
O traveller, blinded by night
Tumble not into wrong beds straight !

The veiled immoral invitation in the verse does not detract from its aesthetic charm. Anandavardhana admits it as *vastu-dhvani*, though its poetic quality can be assessed only in terms of *rasa-dhvani* by a deeper analysis.

Similarly, one plainly stated figure of speech can suggest a second figure allusively. Every metaphor may hide a simile. But we need not class it as suggested simile, because it is part of the very nature of metaphor. But sometimes a plain poem may hide a whole unstated metaphor as in the following :

Filling all space with the light of beauty
When your smiling face shines alert,
O darling, since waves don't rise in duty,
The sea-water is, surely, all inert !

Here the poet has covertly suggested the metaphor that the sweet-heart's face is verily the moon, without openly stating so. Such examples come under the third type of *dhvani* called *alamkara-dhvani*. But one cannot forget that here too the poetic quality is ultimately decided only in terms of *rasa* which may not be quite as instantaneous as in the case of *rasa-dhvani*, whose grasp is likened to the piercing of a hundred lotus-leaves with a single needle because the time-lag between piercing the first leaf and the last is hardly noticeable.

Anandavardhana has also to explain how in concrete examples of poetry, even *rasa* may become subordinate to another more striking element of beauty such as *vastu* or *alamkara*. Such rare instances he classes under a unique category called *Rasavad-alamkara*. Thus, for example, when a poet dwells at length on the agonies to which the wives of his patron-king are exposed while wandering in thorny woods amidst wild beasts, and also how they are enjoying union with their lovers only in dreams which, alas, cannot be permanent, the poet's main purport is concerned with the analogy of the patron's valour on the battle-field. The *rasas* of pathos (*karuna*) and fancied love (*sringara*) are nothing if not subsidiary to the main purport. Even so, Anandavardhana concedes beauty to such examples, because the very touch of *dhvani*, like that of Midas, turns everything into the gold of poetry.

Anandavardhana turns his searchlight on the nature of the aesthetic process and comes to the conclusion that it is nothing

but the creative afflatus of *rasa*. He cites the telling example of Adikavi Valmiki whose spontaneous verse is an outpouring of his own *rasa* of pathos at the sight of the mating birds suddenly parted by the arrow shot of a hunter, killing one of them. Valmiki did not have personal sorrow in the sense one has it when one loses someone near and dear to one in life. Such raw emotion is far from *rasa*. It is transcended, rarefied and sublimated and universalised before it becomes aesthetic *rasa*; and such is the vision of a poet-sage like Valmiki. Anandavardhana thus throws new light on the poetic imagination (*kavi-pratibha*) by making it a partaker of supra-mundane (*alaukika*) *rasa*. He writes a whole chapter to show how the world of poetry is infinite in range and holds out infinitely new scope to poets at all times because of this infinity of situations, real or imagined, open to a gifted poet.

Similarly, Anandavardhana alone could spell out for the first time norms of critical judgement. In judging poetry, the only criterion relevant to *rasa* is *auchitya* or propriety, whether in the arrangement of plot, delineation of characters or adoption of style. He freed aesthetics from extra-aesthetic norms derived from grammar, logic etc. And he even went to the extent of over-riding ethical judgement by openly admitting that even *rasabhasa* which went against ethical norms could be quite aesthetic if it conformed to the norm of aesthetic propriety.

One can thus conclude that Anandavardhana was an original thinker who highlighted for the first time almost all significant aspects in aesthetic thought in a way which is of interest even today.

VAMANA

S. S. Janaki

VAMANA IS NOTEWORTHY amongst the writers who made substantial contribution to the *alamkara sastra* in Sanskrit.

Vamana, in his only available composition, the *Kavyalamkara Sutras* with a commentary (*vritti*), cites illustrations from the works of great masters before him, like Magha (latter half of the 7th Cent. A. D.) and Bhavabhuti (first quarter of the 8th Cent. A.D.). In turn, he is presupposed by Anandavardhana (latter half of the 9th Cent. A. D.) and cited by Pratiharenduraja, Rajasekhara (both of mid. 10th Cent. A.D.) and Abhinavagupta (beginning of 11th Cent. A.D.). According to a Kashmiri tradition, as mentioned in Kalhana's *Rajatarangini* (IV 497), there was a certain Vamana, a minister of King Jayapida of Kashmir (779-813 A. D.). There is however no evidence to clinch the identity of our Vamana with Jayapida's minister. But one thing is certain, namely, that Vamana the writer on *alamkara sastra* is different from and later than his namesake, who was one of the authors of the commentary *Kashika* on Panini's aphorisms in Sanskrit grammar; for the *Kashika* was written before Hiuen-Tsang came to India in the beginning of the 7th Century A.D.

Vamana wrote in the *sutra* style. He added his own commentary, the *Kavipriya* on the *sutras*, illustrating the points with verses from other poets and some composed by himself. Following the ancient *sutra* writers, he divided his work into *adhikaranas*, five in number, each of which was further subdivided into *adhyayas*. The first and fourth *adhikaranas* have

three *adhyayas* each, and the others. two each, the total number of *adhyayas* being thus twelve. He has covered the field of Sanskrit poetics in 317 *sutras*.

Vamana upheld the prime importance of the poetic diction or style (*riti*) in poetry. In the first *adhikarana*, 'the body of poetry' (*sarira*), he deals, in a general manner, with the need for the study of poetics, the worthy person who is to read and understand it, the auxiliaries of poetics and the characteristics of *riti*.

After the invocatory stanza to the Supreme Light, Vamana starts by defining poetry in the first *sutra;* he says that poetry, (which comprehends all literary genres like prose, verse and drama) is appreciated because it is endowed with *alamkara*, 'embellishment'. This 'embellishment' is obtained by the avoidance of poetic flaws, adoption of the poetic excellences and the addition of poetic figures. The discerning poets should therefore know the poetic defects, excellences and the figures from a study of the science of poetics and compose excellent poetry 'which brings about perceptible and imperceptible results to the poet in the form of pleasure and fame'.

Now what is *riti*? Vamana calls it the very 'soul' (*atma*) or essence of poetry. There are three kinds of *riti*—*Vaidarbhi*, the excellent, *Gaudi*, the bombastic and *Panchali*, the middling, the names having been given to each style, after the country in which it was mostly prevalent in those times. In the *Vaidarbhi riti*, "there is not the least touch of any poetical flaw and it is replete with the ten excellences—sweetness, clarity, etc." The style of Kalidasa is the outstanding example of the *Vaidarbhi*. In the *Gaudi riti*, there are long compounds and high-sounding words, i.e. technically, it abounds in the qualities *ojas* and *kanti*. This is illustrated by Bhavabhuti's style; in one of the verses Bhavabhuti describes Rama breaking the bow of Siva and the consequent deafening noise. The words used in the verse not only echo the breaking noise of the bow but are also so compounded, that there are only three compounded words

in the three and a half lines of the verse, composed in the long *Sardulavikridita* metre of nineteen syllables for each line. In the *Panchali riti*, the diction is midway between the above two, although possessed of the qualities of sweetness and softness. Poetry rests on one or the other of these three styles, just as a painting, on the lines drawn on the canvas.

Regarding the equipment of a poet, Vamana feels that he must know the ways of the world, must be proficient in grammar, lexicography, metrics, arts, erotics and polity. He should have acquaintance with the compositions of other great poets, apply himself seriously at composing verses, wait upon seniors of superior knowledge, exercise caution and deliberation in the insertion and removal of words, be able to concentrate, and last and the most important, be endowed with imagination, the latent, potent and intuitive gift.

Having described the nature and constituents of poetry, Vamana deals with the factors that form the requisites of 'Excellent Poetry' which appeals to the discerning critics. The three important requisites are the absence of *doshas* or poetic flaws, presence of *gunas* or poetic qualities and *alamkaras* or the figures of speech. Of these, the first two, *dosha* and *guna*, according to Vamana, are closely related to each other as opposites or reverses. For example, there is a quality, *samata* or uniformity in style, which a poet should adopt throughout a particular verse or in the treatment of a particular idea. The absence of this, i.e. non-uniformity, will then be a flaw. It follows therefore that if one of the category is dealt with, the other could naturally be understood by implication. But Vamana would not admit the idea in toto, for, he wants the poets to understand clearly as much as possible, each flaw and quality so that they may reject the one and take in the other. Moreover, by their very nature, and qualities or defects in general could be innumerable. So although in the third *adhikarana* on the *gunas*, he deals with these flaws that are the opposites of qualities, the

sukshma or the subtle doshas, as he would call them, he has a systematic treatment of the other defects in the second *adhikarana*. He classifies the defects under four heads of words (*pada*), of word meaning (*padartha*), of sentence (*vakya*) and of sentence meaning (*vakyartha*). Under the first he mentions the following : Ungrammatical (*asadhu*), Unmelodious (*kashta*), Commonplace (*gramya*), Unfamiliar (*apratita*), and Meaningless or Superfluous (*anarthaka*); under the second come five flaws—conveying of different meanings (*anyartha*), having a fanciful meaning (*neyartha*), of concealed or obscene meaning (*gudartha*), Indecorous (*aslila*) and Involved (*klishta*). Under the third category of sentence-defects, there are three, metre-deficiency (*bhinnavritta*), *wrong hiatus* (*yatibhrashta*), and defects of *sandhi* (*coalescence*) of words, absence of *sandhi*, harshness of sound or indecorous combinations resulting from the *sandhi*. Under the fourth, those of sentence-idea, there are six defects—Incompatibility or Contradictoriness (*vyartha*), Repetition (*ekartha*), Doubtfulness (*sandigdha*), Improbability (*ayukta*), Lack of sequence (*apakrama*) and contrariety to wordly and scientific knowledge (*loka-vidyaviruddha*).

Over and above these sets of flaws, there are those of the incompleteness of the simile (*upama*), disparity of number and gender, non-similitude and incongruity arising when the poet effects a comparison between two objects in a deficient and wrong manner. Vamana deals with them later in the fourth *adhikarana* under Simile (IV-2-9ff).

Gunas are the positive factors in poetry. So also are the *alamkaras* or the figures of speech. But Vamana would say, 'No'. The two are distinct in as much as the *gunas* are qualities that give the inherent, peculiar charm to poetry, and are hence inevitable, whereas the *alamkaras* impart an added charm and for this reason, not absolutely necessary. It is just like a young lady, endowed with inherent beauty, looking more charming when she wears ornaments.

Of figures of speech, Vamana deals with both kinds, namely, those in which the charm is due to the Word (*sabda*) and those in which it is due to the Sense (*artha*). Of the *sabdalamkaras* he treats of only Rhyme (*yamaka*) and Alliteration (*anuprasa*) in great detail with their main varieties. He does not forget to emphasise that these two should never be overdone or done in a glaring manner (IV. 1 verse 6 and IV 1.9).

The entire second *adhyaya* in the fourth *adhikarana* is on simile (*upama*), its varieties and defects. The second section entitled 'extension or modification of simile' (*upama-prapancha*) treats of the figures which are based on similarity. Twenty-six such figures are dealt with, and some amongst these could be seen now.

In metaphor (*rupaka*) there is a superimposition of the identity of the 'object described' with 'that of comparison' owing to the similarity between them, as instanced in the well-known verse of Bhavabhuti's *Uttararamacharita* (I. 39), where Rama describes Sita as—"She is the fortune in my home, a streak of nectar to my eyes, this touch of hers, a thick flow of sandal paste, her arm around my neck, a cool, soft pearl-string, what of hers is not dear ! Only separation from her would be most unbearable !"

In *vakrokti*, one idea indicates another owing to use of words in secondary meanings, based on similarity. In 'the lotus in the lakes opened and the lily closed in moment' the actions of the eyes, 'opening' and 'closing', indicate respectively the soft and graceful blossoming and drooping of the flowers.

Virodha is 'apparent contradiction' as in the verse from Amaru : 'She is young, I am weak-minded; she is a woman, I am timid; she has heavy breasts, I am exhausted : she is possessed of weighty hips, I am not able to walk. How strange it is that I am incapacitated due to the flaws in another person.'

Nidarsana is 'illustration' as in the verse 'the faded leaf from its grip on the tree : proclaiming to the wealthy that the attainment to a high position results in a fall ; the clause 'proclaiming to the wealthy' indicates the relation between the action of 'falling' and its cause 'the attaining to a high position'.

In 'exceptional utterances' (*viseshokti*), there is metaphor with the absence of one quality. For example, in the *Kumarasambhava* (1—10), 'the efflulgent Himalayan herbs were the night-lamps without oil', it is shown that the herbs fulfilled all the purposes of a lamp at night, without there being any need to fill it with oil.

The other simile-based figures dealt with by Vamana are *samasokti* in which the image of comparison alone is given without the subject on hand, *aprastutaprasamsa* in which the subject is not wholly kept in the background but is just touched, *apahnuti* where the subject is hidden by the object compared to it, *slesa* or double entendre, *utpreksha* or conceit, *atisayokti* or exaggeration, *sandeha* or doubt, *vibhavana* or emergence of a result despite the absence of its cause, *ananvaya* or a thing being its own comparison, *upameyopama* or the two compared things alternating their role, *parivritti* or exchange, *krama* or enumeration in the respective order of the series of the things compared and the objects of comparison, *dipaka* or illumination of several comparable statements by a single action, *arthantaranyasa* or the supporting general statement, *vyatireka* or exalting the subject by pointing out a feature which makes it superior to the thing compared to, *vyajastuti* or feigned praise or blame, *vyajokti* or pretext, *tulyayogita* in which a single predicate carries both the things compared, *aksepa* or obviation of comparison, *sahoki* or the two going together, *samahita* or the emergence of the actual subject in the similar object in which it is imagined.

The above figures may occur individually or conjointly. When there is a mixture of two figures and one gives rise to another,

e.g. simile of metaphor, it is called *Samsristhi*. In the line 'the moon is the red *tilaka* on the forehead of the woman of night, the simile between the night and the woman leads to the metaphor of the moon and the *tilaka*.

The fifth and last *adhikarana*, 'poetic usages' (*prayogika*) speaks of certain conventions to be observed by poets, like not employing the same word twice, observance of the rules of *sandhi* in the *padas* of a verse except at the end of the first half, non-usage of words like 'Khalu' at the beginning of a *pada*. It also deals with grammatical purity, and examines several usages of poets and tries to explain away some apparent irregularities in earlier compositions. The section shows the erudition of Vamana in grammar.

Vamana is one of the three important writers of the pre-*Dhvanyaloka* period of Sanskrit poetics. He was the first to conceive of an *atman* or 'soul' of poetry. As an early attempt in evolving a scientific system, his principles were naturally incomplete or defective. But even the *Dhvanyaloka* (III. 52) appreciates the *riti* school a[illegible]mbrated by Vamana as having perceived, although dimly, that the true nature of poetry lay beyond figures etc. Even so Vamana was the first to speak of *saundarya* or beauty as the chief factor in poetry.

Amongst authors who dealt exclusively with poetics, Vamana was the first to adopt the *sutra* style. His brief *sutras* are explained in a crisp manner, in his own commentary *Kavipriya*, in both his *sutras* and the commentary, he is always to the point, and does not enter into unnecessary discussions or controversies. His illustrations are well-chosen, and amongst them could be found quotations from rare works like the *Hariprabodha* and a work on the love of Kuvalayasva and Madalasa. At the end of each section, he sums up the gist of his discussion in simple and effective verses.

Although Vamana deals with a technical subject, yet his simple style interspersed with apt similes and general statements

makes its study interesting. To drive home the idea that not all poets could be instructed, he divides poets into two classes, metaphorically, those who are not very keen (*arochakinah*), meaning persons of fastidious taste, and others who swallow everything (*satranabhyavaharinah*) i.e. those men going in for any kind of writing. The former, the *vivekins*, could be taught because of their sense of discrimination and not the latter, the *avivekins* who are devoid of any discrimination, and adds that the *kataka* seed, though capable of cleansing the water, cannot cleanse the mud. To a question if the poets should practise first the two styles *Gaudi* and *Panchali* before their attempt to compose in the excellent *Vaidarbhi*, Vamana answers in the negative, pointing out that a weaver practising in weaving jute cannot attain proficiency in weaving wool. Emphasising the need for concentration on the part of a poet, he makes the general statement that the mind can grasp the real essence only when it is drawn in, keeping itself away from all external things. Vamana was a lover of painting, for more than once he draws comparisons for aspects of poetry from the art of painting.

His theory was superseded but it formed a definite stage which paved the way for neo-criticism of Anandavardhana. On several points of literary expression and analysis of its elements and their appreciation, Vamana shows himself as one possessed of a keen artistic sense.

RAJASHEKHARA

V. V. Mirashi

RAJASHEKHARA WAS A poet, dramatist and aesthetician. His family hailed from Maharashtra. Vatsagulma (modern Basim in the Akola District of Maharashtra) was probably the family's original place of habitation; for Rajashekhara shows special love for that place. It was previously the capital of a branch of the great royal family of the Vakatakas, whose kingdom flourished in Vidarbha from the third to the sixth century A.D. In the time of Rajashekhara, Vatsagulma must have lost its previous importance. Still Rajashekhara states in his *Kavya-mimamsa* that the mythical *Kavya-purusha* married *Sahitya-vidya* at Vatsagulma in Vidarbha, "which is the pleasure resort of the god of love." He also mentions Vacchomi (Prakrit for Vatsagulmi) as a synonym for *Vaidarbhi riti*. All this indicate Rajashekhara's predilection for that place.

Several ancestors of Rajashekhara were noted for their poetic talent. Of them he has mentioned and described four. They were : Akalajalada, Surananda, Tarala and Kaviraja. Some stray verses composed by them are included in Sanskrit anthologies. They probably flourished at the court of the Kalachuris of Tripuri (modern Tewar near Jabalpur). Rajashekhara gives considerable information about himself in his works. His father was Durduka (or Duhika), who was a *Mahamantrin*, probably at the Kalachuri court. His mother was Shilavati. Rajashekhara describes himself as a Yayavara. The Yayavaras were Brahmins who led a very simple life and did not accumulate wealth. Rajashekhara, a Brahmin, married a Kshatriya lady named Avantisundari, who belonged to the Chahuana (Chavhan) family. Such *anuloma* marriages are recognised in Hindu Dharmasastras. Avantisundari was

an accomplished and learned lady. Rajashekhara has cited her opinions in some places in his *Kavyamimamsa.*

Rajashekhara was attracted at first by the prosperous court of the Pratiharas. He began his career as the court-poet of the great Pratihara king Mahendrapala of Kanauj, whom he mentions with pride as his pupil in the *Balaramayana.* He rose to the exalted position of Kaviraja in the reign of Mahendrapala's son and successor Mahipala. He mentions Mahipala as his patron in his second extant play, the *Balabharata.* Both these plays are in Sanskrit. His third play, the *Karpuramanjari,* which is in Prakrit, was also staged at Kanauj at the instance of his wife Avantisundari.

During the reign of Mahipala the Pratihara kingdom was invaded by the Rashtrakuta king Indra III, who pressed on as far as its capital Kanauj, which he devastated. Rajashekhara, thereafter, returned to the court of the Kalachuri king Yuvarajadeva I at Tripuri. At this court his fourth play, *Viddhasalabhanjika,* was staged in jubilation at the victory of the Kalachuris over the Rashtrakutas of the Deccan in the battle of the Payosni (modern Purna in Amaravati District of Vidarbha). Mahendrapala I flourished from circa A.D. 885 to A.D. 910. Mahipala was defeated by Indra III in A.D. 915. Yuvarajadeva I flourished from circa A.D. 915 to A.D. 945. Rajashekhara's literary activity may therefore be dated in the last quarter of the ninth and the first half of the tenth century A.D.

The *Balaramayana,* which is the earliest extant work of Rajashekhara, states that he had already composed six *prabandhas.* These, however, have not come down to us. The *Balaramayana* is an enormous play in ten acts, with more than 780 verses, many of them being in such long metres as the *Sardulavikridita* and the *Sragdhara.* It has, for its theme, the story of Rama from the time of his marriage with Sita to his return to Ayodhya, after

the destruction of Ravana. Rajashekhara regarded himself as an incarnation of the great Sanskrit poet Bhavabhuti. He has introduced several changes in the original story of the *Ramayana*, some of them being obviously suggested by the plays of Bhavabhuti. Rajashekhara, however, has no fully developed sense of propriety, anachronism or realism. He describes the *swayamvara* of Sita as being attended by the Kalachuri kings of Mahishmati and Tripuri and the Chalukya king of Lata. A king of the Sakas (Scythians) is also among the suitors. In the fifth act he has introduced two marionettes, representing Sita and her girl friend, who, with, *sarikas* in their mouths, carry on a conversation with Ravana.

The *Balabharata* is another Sanskrit play in two acts. It was either left incomplete or has not come down to us in its full form. The extant portion describes the *swayamvara* of Draupadi, the gambling scene and the departure of the Pandavas into exile. The play is also named *Prachandapandava*, probably after the poet's patron Mahipala, who had the *biruda* (title) of Chandapala.

The *Karpuramanjari* is a Sattaka or Prakrit play. It has for its theme the love story of Chandapala (the Pratihara king Mahipala) and Karpuramanjari, a princess of Kuntala, staying at Vatsagulma in Daksinapatha. The heroine is brought from Vatsagulma to the royal place in Kanauj by the tantrik powers of Bhairavananda, the spiritual preceptor of the queen. Karpuramanjari is represented in the play as the cousin sister of the queen, with whom she stays for a few months. The king falls in love with her as soon as he sees her. The Vidusaka and the heroine's girl friend bring about a meeting of the lovers, the queen grows jealous and imprisons the heroine in a cellar. The heroine escapes by a substerraneous passage. Ultimately, the queen consents to the union of the two, being duped by a trick of her preceptor Bhairavananda. The marriage is said to have resulted in the attainment, by the king, of the position of *Chakravartin* (Emperor).

The *Viddhasalabhanjika* or the Carved Statue is also a similar play. Its plot is, however, more complicated and it has a historical background. The plot is summarised below :

King Karpuravarsha of Tripuri receives at his court his son-in-law Virapala, who is a claimant to the throne of Kuntala. His minister Bhagurayana learns from some astrologer that he who would marry Mrigankavali, a princess of Lata (Southern Gujarat) would become a *Chakravartin* (Emperor). So Bhagurayana persuades her father to send her to Tripuri. Her father having no son had brought her up as a son, naming her Mrigankavarman. None but Bhagurayana knows of this secret. Karpuravarsha's queen, though related to the king of Lata, is shown to be ignorant of the impersonation. She occasionally dressed the pretending boy in the female garb. When the king sees Mrigankavali in a dream, and later in a carved statue, he falls in love with her. The queen, intending to play a practical joke on the king, invites him to marry a sister of the pretending "boy". He agrees and the marriage is performed. In the meantime a message comes from the king of Lata that a son has been born to him. He, therefore, requests the queen to bestow his daughter Mrigankavali on some suitable consort. The queen realised her mistake when it is too late. To make the best of the situation, however, she bestows both the Lata and Kuntala princesses on the king. Just then comes the news that the Kalachuri forces obtained a resounding victory in the battle of the Payosni and they had placed Virapala on the throne of Kuntala. Bhagurayana then declares that king Karpuravarsha has now attained the position of a *Chakravartin*.

The play has a historical background. Karpuravarsha, its hero, is none other than the Kalachuri king Yuvarajadeva I, who had the *biruda* of Keyuravarsha. He espoused the cause of his son-in-law Baddiga alias Amoghavarsha III, represented by Virapala of the play, and placed him on the Rashtrakuta throne of Manyakheta.

Rajashekhara belongs to the decadent age of the Sanskrit drama. His enormous play *Balaramayana* is more of an epic than of the dramatic type. He is himself conscious of it and asks

his critics to read it and to see for themselves, if it contains any beauty of expression. Elsewhere, he defines *kavya* as 'beautiful expression' (*ukti-visesha*). He had, no doubt, considerable poetic talent and could turn out elegant and attractive verses with great ease. But he had little skill in arranging incidents and less in characterisation. He goes on piling verse on verse, regardless of the hindrance to action caused thereby. The anachronism in the scene of *Sita-swayamvara* has already been noticed. In narrating Rama's journey from Lanka to Ayodhya in the *Balaramayana* he first devotes several verses to the description of the Himalaya, Kailasa, Indra's Amaravati, the Chandraloka and the Brahmaloka before he takes up the terrestrial places lying on the way to Ayodhya. In the *Karpuramanjari* and the *Viddhasalabhanjika* he has produced only imitations of the earlier plays such as the *Malavikagnimitra* of Kalidasa and the *Ratnavali* and the *Priya-darsika* of Harsha.

Though most of Rajashekhara's ideas are conventional, he sometimes hits on a really novel imagery. We may consider for instance, the following stanza about love :

प्रेम रम्यमुभयोः समं दिशोः
कामिनां यदिह चाषपिच्छवत् ।
एकतस्तु न च कास्ति साऽन्यपि
श्यामपृष्टमिव बर्हिणच्छदम् ॥

Balaramayana V, (3)

Here Rajashekhara says that "love" to be charming must be from both the parties like the feather of the *Chasa* bird (the blue jay), which looks beautiful from both the sides. "Love" should not be from one party only like the feather of the peacock which looks beautiful from one side but is dark from the other.

Besides these plays, Rajashekhara wrote the *Haravijaya*, a *kavya* in glorification of Siva, probably at the Kalachuri capital. He also composed several verses of the *muktaka* type, descriptive of Sanskrit poets and their works, which have been collected in some Sanskrit anthologies. But for these verses, several Sanskrit authors would have remained unknown.

Rajashekhara wrote also on aesthetics or rhetoric. His *Kavya-mimamsa* is a veritable mine of information on matters poetic. It was planned on an encyclopaedic scale. Only the first section of it, called *Kavi-rahasya,* has been recovered and published. It has 18 sections. That he wrote some more chapters of this work is known from stray quotations noticed in rhetorical works.

The *Kavyamimamsa* is written on the model of the *Arthasastra* of Kautilya and the *Kamasutra* of Vatsyayana. Here and there, Rajasekhara quotes the views of different writers and then states his own under the name of Yayavara. In some places, he has cited the views of his learned wife, Avantisundari. This work was probably intended to serve as a handbook of information to aspiring poets. The author first gives mythological information about divine and semi-divine authors of the 18 sections of the *Kavya-vidya.* He says that as their works have been lost, he has undertaken to deal with the subject briefly in 18 *adhikaranas.* Of these only the first has come down to us.

Rajashekhara deals with a variety of interesting topics. After describing the *Kavya-purusha,* (the spirit of poetry) and his union with the bride *Sahitya-vidya* (the Science of Poetics), at Vatsagulma in Vidarbha, he proceeds to deal with such questions as the essential qualifications of a poet, the relative importance of poetic genius and learning, the nature of the *vrittis* and *ritis,* the sources of poetry, borrowing of ideas from earlier works and when it degenerates into plagiarism, the different poetic conventions, the special features of the regions, mountains, rivers etc. in different parts of India, the proper mode of description of the seasons and of the trees, creepers and birds characteristic of them.

The *Kavyamimamsa* is not a rhetorical work of the usual type. It gives varied information on several topics which are rarely touched upon in rhetorical works. Rajashekhara has a high regard for the science of aesthetics. He calls it the seventh *"anga"* (help-book) of the Vedas, as without its help the full meaning of the Vedic texts cannot be grasped. He considers *Sahitya-vidya* to

be the fifth *vidya*. The fifth *vidya* is of the same importance as the four traditionally recognised *vidyas* viz. (1) the Vedas, (2) trade and agriculture, (3) the science of polity, and (4) metaphysics.

Rajashekhara gives interesting information about, among other things, the literary courts of kings, the daily life of the poet, his studyroom and paraphernalia of writing. He recognises women poets and says that poetic genius does not depend on sex. He advises that kings should hold literary examinations in important centres of learning, where those judged best should be honoured with a fillet and taken in a procession in a special chariot called *Brahma-ratha*. He states that in Ujjayini, great poets like Kalidasa, Mentha, Amara, Bharavi and others were thus tested. The *Sastrakaras*, on the other hand, such as Upavarsa, Varsha, Panini, Pingala, Vyadi and Patanjai went through a similar test at Patalipura.

Rajashekhara has cited several verses in illustration of his own and others' views. Some of them have given very valuable information. For instance, from one verse, we have come to know the home of Paisachi Prakrit to be the areas of Avanti, Pariyatra (Mt. Abu) and Dasapura (Mandsor). Another verse has furnished us with some otherwise unobtainable details about the Ramagupta episode in Gupta history.

Rajashekhara thus occupies a distinctive place in the history of Sanskrit literature. We would have been the poorer in respect of our knowledge of ancient Indian culture in general, and aesthetics in particular, if his *Kavyamimamsa* had not come down to us, even in its present fragmentary form.

ABHINAVAGUPTA

Kanti Chandra Pandey

ABHINAVAGUPTA WAS AN encyclopaedic thinker of Kashmir. He knew the importance of knowing the like of a writer in understanding his works, for he has given a sketch of his life in his two works, the *Tantraloka* and the *Paratrimsika Vivarana*. Abhinavagupta had a historical sense. He has stated the dates of completion of three of his works in Saptarshi era, which began 3076 years before the Christian era :—(i) *Kramastotra* : 9th day of the darker half of Margasirsha, 4066 *i.e.* 990 A.D. (ii) *Bhairavastava* : 10th day of the darker half of Pausha, 4068 i.e. 992 A.D. (iii) *Isvarapratyabhijna Vivritti Vimarsini* : last day of Margasirsha, 4090 i.e. 1014 A.D. Assuming on the basis of maturity of style and judgement, found in the earliest dated work, that he began his literary career when he was about 30 years of age, it is justifiable to admit that he was born in about 960 A.D.

The earliest ancestor of Abhinava, so far known to us, was Atrigupta. He lived in Antarvedi, the region between the Ganges and the Yamuna, in the reign of king Yasovarman of Kanauj (circa 730—740 A.D.). He attained great fame for erudition in all branches of learning in general and in the Saiva Sastras in particular. King Lalitaditya of Kashmir (circa 725—761 A.D.) was so much impressed with Atrigupta's scholarship and so eager did he become to take him (Atrigupta) to his capital that soon after the conquest of king Yasovarman he approached and requested Atrigupta to accompany him to Kashmir. And so earnest was the request that Atrigupta could not but accede to it. Thus the family, which after about two centuries was to produce the Saivacharya Abhinavagupta, migrated from Kanyakubja to Kashmir.

Abhinavagupta's father, Narsimhagupta, alias Chukhula, had equal proficiency in all the Sastras and was a great devotee of Siva. The name of his mother was Vimalakala. She was a very pious and religious lady. The family atmosphere was thus thoroughly religious and scholarly.

As a child Abhinavagupta was sent to a neighbouring *pathasala*. Even there, he showed the signs of future greatness and deeply impressed his teachers with his exceptional intellectual power and fluency in speech. Accordingly, they gave him the name "Abhinavaguptapada".

His mother died when he was a schoolboy and soon after, his father became an ascetic. These events had such an effect on him that he made up his mind never to marry. Thereafter he wandered from place to place to drink at the fountainheads of learning, both in and outside Kashmir. He was interested not only in the theoretical aspects of the three systems—*Krama, Trika* and *Kula*—but also in their practical yogic aspects. He practiced Yoga, realized the Ultimate, and acquired miraculous powers.

Narasimhagupta, his father, was his teacher in grammar: Vamanatha in *Dvaita Tantras;* Bhutiraja in *Brahmavidya;* Bhutirajatanaya in dualistic-cum-monistic Saivaism; Lakshamanagupta in *Krama and Trika* systems; Induraja in *Dhvani* (poetics); Bhatta Tota in dramaturgy and Sambhunatha in *Kula* system.

He was a *jivanmukta* (liberated in life), possessed miraculous powers, which his contemporaries had occasions to see in deeds, and had thoroughly mastered all the *Saiva Tantras*. He was, therefore, recognized as the spiritual head of all the Saiva sects and as an incarnation of Srikantha. Madhuraja Yogin, a pupil of Abhinavagupta, has given a pen-picture of the teacher in the *Dhvanaslokah*, consisting of four verses presenting one of the scenes connected with the said recognition.

He did not die in sick-bed like an ordinary mortal. He was a great Yogi. Therefore, one day, when he thought that he had finished his life's work, he climbed up the hill to enter the Bhairava cave to take his last Samadhi and was never seen again. This information is based on a tradition, which is current, not only in some Brahmin families but in some Muslim homes also in Kashmir. The cave is there even now, about five miles from Magam, a place midway between Srinagar and Gulmarg. A village in its neighbourhood and a brook running down below the hill, wherein the cave is, are both known by the name of Bhairava. And so is the cave itself.

Abhinavagupta wrote more than 50 works. These include those published, available in manuscripts or are known from references only : 1. *Bodha Panchadasika.* 2. *Malini Vijaya Vartika.* 3. *Paratrimsika Vivritti.* 4. *Tantraloka.* 5. *Tantrasara.* 6. *Tantravatadhanika.* 7. *Dhvanyaloka Lochana.* 8. *Abhinava Bharati.* 9. *Bhagavadgitartha Sangraha.* 10. *Paramartha Sara.* 11. *Isvara Pratyabhijna Vivritti Vimarshini.* 12. *Isvara Pratyabhijna Vimarsini.* 13.*Paryanta Panchasika.* 14. *Ghatakarparakulaka Vivritti.* 15. *Karma Stotra.* 16. *Dehastha Devata Chakra Stotra.* 17. *Bhairava Stotra.* 18. *Paramartha Dvadasika.* 19. *Paramartha Charcha.* 20. *Mahopadsea Vimsatika.* 21. *Anuttarastika.* 22. *Anubhavanivedana.* 23. *Rahasya Panchadasika.* 24. *Tantracchaya.* 25. *Pururavo Vichata.* 26. *Kramakeli.* 27. *Sivadristyalochana.* 28. *Purva Panchika.* 29. *Padarthapravesa Nirnaya Tick.* 30. *Prakirnaka Vivarana.* 31. *Prakarana Vivarna.* 32. *Kavyakautuka Vivarana.* 33. *Kathamukha Tilaka.* 34. *Laghvi Prakriya.* 35. *Bhedavadavidarana.* 30. *Devistotra Vivarana.* 37. *Tattvadhva Prakasika.* 38. *Sivasaktyavinabha stotra.* 39. *Anuttarasataka.* 40. *Prakarana Stotra.* 41. *Natyalochana.* 42. *Amuttartatva Vimarsini Vritti.* Besides, there are *Panchikas* on Saivagamas other than the *Sripurva Sastra;* commentaries on other *Stotras* than those mentioned above; and other *Stotras* from which he often quotes, saying "Mayaiva Stotra".

His literary activity admits of division into three periods, *tantrika, alamkarika* and philosophical. His contribution to

aesthetics, is primarily based on the available works of the second period, the *Dhvanyaloka Lochana* and the *Abhinava Bharati*. References to the authorities on various subjects such as dance, music, metre, acting, etc. and quotations from them, found in his works, give a clear idea of the vast intellectual background of his aesthetic thought.

Abhinavagupta was a true aesthetician. He approaches the problems of aesthetics from the historical, analytical, psychological, logical, and philosophical points of view, and discusses the ends of art and the theory of meaning. His treatment of aesthetical problems is confined to those which arise in the context of drama and poetry.

Approaching the problem of aesthetics from a historical standpoint in the context of *rasa* as presented in and experienced from a dramatic presentation, Abhinavagupta refers to the well-known views on *rasa*, presented by his predecessors, Bhatta Lollata (830 A.D.), Srisankuka (850 A.D.) and Bhatta Nayaka (883 A.D.).

From Abhinavagupta's presentation we get the idea that Bhatta Lollata's point of view was essentially practical and that he did not attempt to explain how aesthetic experience arises in the spectator. But, later writers have attributed the theory of illusion to him which, with its criticism may be put as follows :—

Just as at the time of illusory knowledge of silver at the sight of brilliance of a mother of pearl, there is the same experience for a moment as at the sight of the real silver, so on the objective perception of the stage-representation of the historic, there is, for a moment, an extremely pleasant experience very much the same as at the sight of the real. For, the spectator is aware of the presence of an emotive state in the focus of the situation, the hero, though it is really not there. The criticism of this theory is that if art creates illusion it would arouse ordinary attitudes and responses. And such an admission would mean the denial of an independent value to art. It would also mean condemnation of all tragic presentations.

Srisankuka approached the problem of aesthetics mainly from the theoretical point of view. He was concerned with elucidation of the manner in which aesthetic experience arises from an aesthetic presentation on stage—which consists of a situation with a focal point, the hero, mimetic changes, transient emotions and basic emotion. He is an exponent on imitation-inference theory and asserts that while other constituents of the aesthetic presentation admit of clear presentation the siutation, for instance, through vivid poetic description, mimetic changes, because of their display through training and transient emotions by somehow reviving one's past experiences; the basic emotion cannot be presented by any of these means. The relation of the first three to the last is that of means and end. The former are the means of indirectly imitating the latter. He maintains that the word *rasa* stands, not for the configuration of situation etc. but for basic emotion only. The imitated basic emotion is given a different name, *rasa*, to signify the fact that it is indirect imitation. (*Anukaranarupatvadeva cha namantarena vyapadishto rasah.* A. Bh. Vol I, 274)

The inconsistencies of Srisankuka's theory are pointed out in detail in Abhinavagupta's commentary on Bharata's *Natya Sastra* called the *Abhinava Bharati*. The question is "Does the spectator take the reasons, presented on the stage, from which he infers the basic emotion, to be real or simply as the products of art? In the former case the inferred basic emotion will be real and not imitated. In the latter case inference of basic emotion will be out of the question. For, inference presupposes the consciousness of reality of the reason (*hetu*). Further, how can the recognitive judgment related to the hero, presented on the stage, be spoken of as unclassifiable? For, if it is not subsequently contradicted, it is right. But if it is contradicted, it is wrong.

Abhinavagupta approaches the problem of aesthetics from the scientific point of view and analyses the object of aesthetic experience from a dramatic presentation into its constituents. He shows how the constituents of the aesthetic object are related to

one another and distinguishes the personality of the aesthete from the ordinary to which the empirical knowledge is due, as also the aesthetic object from the empirical. He rejects the view of Bhatta Nayaka that the universalization of the subjective and objective aspects of aesthetic experience is brought about by the two powers of poetic language, assumed by him, and shows how, by the technique of presentation of Sanskrit drama, the constituents of the personality of the aesthete and his psycho-physical conditions bring it about.

Looking upon a product of dramatic art as a living human body, Abhinavagupta like an anatomist, analyses it, following Bharata, into its constituents, the stages of action (*karyavasthas*) and means of dramatisation (*arthaprakritis*), and further subdivides both into sixty-four parts technically called (*sandhyangas*). He asserts that a dramatist is free to employ as many (*sandhyangas*) in his product as may be necessary and leave out the rest, and declares *rasa* to be its soul.

Analysing *rasa* as an object, presented on stage, he points out the situation with a focal point (*vibhava*), the mimetic changes (*anubhava*), the transient emotions (*vyabhicharibhava*) and the basic or persistent emotion (*sthayibhava*) are its constituents. He differs from Srisankuka in so far as he holds that (i) *vibhava* etc. do not constitute a set of logical reasons for inference of *sthayin* but constitute a medium for the realisation of the basic emotion by the actor through contemplation and by the spectator on account of identification with the hero; and that (ii) *rasa* is not basic emotion alone in isolation from situation etc., but a harmonious union of the said constituents, similar to that of the various ingredients of a juice, known in Kashmir as *panaka rasa*, and therefore, is entirely different from the basic emotion (*Sthayivilakshano rasah* A. Bh., Vol. I, 285).

Abhinavagupta analyses aesthetic experience into different levels of sense, imagination, emotion, catharsis and transcendency—each of which leads to what follows and allocates each of the various conceptions of aesthetic experience at a separate

level. His analysis begins at the sense-level. He admits that aesthetic experience begins with direct perception of objects of sight and hearing, which pleases. The Hedonistic view of art refers to this level. However this is a layman's view. A real aesthete will never recognize a product of art to be beautiful if it simply pleases the senses and does nothing more.

A true aesthetic object does not simply stimulate the aesthetic senses. It primarily stimulates imagination, of course, through the senses. It simply presents only broad outline of a picture, which has to be completed in all necessary details by the imaginative power of the spectator. The second level of aesthetic experience, therefore, is imaginative.

The situation, however, in which the hero is called upon to act, is emotive. It arouses an emotion in him and develops it to a high pitch. And because the spectator is identified with the hero, therefore, there is identity of emotion of the former with that of the latter. This constitutes the emotion at a high pitch. The view that art presents and arouses emotion refers to this level.

It is, however, an undeniable fact that an emotion at a high pitch makes the emotively affected person completely forget himself. It de-individualises the individual. It frees him from those elements which constitute his individuality. It raises him to the level of the universal. This may be spoken of as the cathartic level, not in an Aristotelian but in an Hegelian sense. At this level, emotive experience is completely freed from all objective reference as also from temporal and spatial relations, which are due to limitations of the individual subject.

The final and highest level of aesthetic experience, according to Abhinavagupta, is that in which the duality of subject and object completely disappears through intense introversion and utter disregard of the basic emotion. At this level basic emotion sinks into the subconscious and the universalized subject

shines in its Ananda aspect. At this stage there is the experience of *Paramananda*, similar to that which a Yogin experiences in *Vyatireka Turiyatita Samadhi*, in which all objectivity merges in the subconscious and the self alone shines.

Abhinavagupta has drawn a distinction between *rasa*, as experienced at the cathartic level (*Rasyate iti Rasah*) and *rasa* as synonymous with *Paramananda* and experienced at the transcendental level (*Rasanam Rasah*) and has declared that only those can have aesthetic experience of the latter type who are capable of rising above even the residual traces of objectivity (I.P.V.V., Vol. II, P. 278-9).

Thus it is clear that aesthetic experience, at its highest level, the transcendental level, is not an emotive experience. There is no tinge of emotion in any form in it. Therefore. Panditaraja Jagannatha is not correct in the presentation of Abhinavagupta's view, when he says that, according to Abhinavagupta, aesthetic experience at the highest level is the experience of a basic mental state or emotion such as love (*rati*) with the universalized Self as its attribute. Jagannatha points out his own difference from Abhinavagupta, asserting that the Self is experienced as the substantive with the basic emotion as its attribute. For, Abhinavagupta holds that substance-attribute relation cannot be attributed to the Self (*Viseshanaviseshyabhavamukhena yo vyavaharah sa Atmani nopapadyate*. (I.P.V.V., Vol. I, P. 147).

Aesthetic experience is not static. It is dynamic. It is the experience of itself by the Self in its absolute universality. It is the experience of Ananda because Ananda is nothing but self-experience of the Self (*Svatmaparamarsa*). Such an experience cannot be explained in the light of the monistic Vedanta. For, it holds the Ultimate, the Atman, the Brahman to be self-luminous (*Svaprakasa*) but not self-conscious (*Svatmaparamarsin*).

Approaching the personality of the aesthete from a psychological point of view, Abhinavagupta shows that taste (*rasi-*

katva), aesthetic susceptibility (*sahridayatva*), power of visualization (*pratibha*), intellectual background that is due to the study of different branches of learning and close observation of facts of nature (*vyutpatti*), contemplative habit (*bhavana* or *charvana*), capacity to identify (*tanmayibhavana-yogyata*), freedom from purposive attitude (*kinchinme bhavishyatityem bhutanusandhisamskarabhava*) and from influence of personal joys and sorrows or pleasures and pains (*nija sukhaduhkhadivivasibhavabhava*) are its essential constitutents. It is, therefore, different from the empirical.

Abhinavagupta psychologically studies the problems of meaning and distinguishes the four types of meaning—conventional (*abhidheya*), secondary (*lakshanika*), intentional or tertiary (*tatparya*) and suggested (*vyangya*)—from one another on the basis of difference in the process, involved in the rise of each. He recognises the suggested meaning to be different from the rest, because it is not due to convention as is the conventional; it does not presuppose the consciousness of the idea of contradiction between the meanings of two expressions as does the secondary; and it is not definitely intended like the intentional.

Abhinavagupta's aesthetic theory is based upon the Saiva metaphysics and epistemology. The system propounded by him may be characterised as (I) rational mysticism, because he holds the Reality to be an absolute unity, which is realised in mystic intuition, attainable through a disciplined life. He rationally justifies what mystic vision reveals, it is a system of realistic idealism (*abhasavada*) because he maintains that all that appears; all that forms the object of perception or conception; all that is within the reach of the external senses or the internal mind; all that we are conscious of when the senses and the mind cease to work; all that human consciousness, limited as it is, cannot ordinarily be conscious of and, therefore, is simply an object of self-realisation; in short all that can be said to exist in any way and with regard to which the use of any kind of language is possible, be it the subject, the object, the means of knowledge or the

knowledge itself, is *abhasa*. The entire world of *abhasas* is a manifestation of All-inclusive Universal Consciousness or Self. It is also called *svatantryavada* or voluntaryism because it holds the Free Will to be the ultimate metaphysical principle.

Abhinavagupta differs from Utpalacharya who in his *Isvara Pratyabhijna Karika* recognised 36 categories, including five transcendental categories (*Siva, Sakti, Sadasiva, Isvara, Vidya*); five subjective conditions (*Kala, Vidya, Raga, Niyati, Kala*); *Maya*, recognised by the Vedanta and 25 categories from *Purusha* to *Prithvi* admitted by the Sankhya. The last 26 categories, though called by same names as those used in the Vedanta and the Sankhya, have different implications in Saivaism. Abhinavgupta admits *anuttara* as the 37th category and recognises it to be the highest.

He maintains that the individual self and the Universal are essentially identical. He recognises that the difference of the former from the latter is due to three impurities, technically called *anava, karma and mayiya*; that there are ways and means of effecting purification of the individual from them. These are discussed in the *tantraloka* in different chapters, entitled *desadhva, tattvadhva* etc. Abhinavagupta feels that at the empirical level the individuality of the percipient is not the same in all perceptions, it changes, according to the individual (i) predilection (*ruchi*) (ii) purposive attitude (*arthitva*) and (iii) capacity to know (*vyutpatti*).

In the light of his philosphy summarily stated above, Abhinavagupta accounts for the universalisation of both the subject and the object at the cathartic (*sadharanibhava*) level of aesthetic experience, and shows what an important part is played by the dramatic technique in bringing it about. Accordingly, he rejects the two powers of the poetic language, (*Bhavakatva* and *Bhojakatva*), assumed by Bhatta Nayaka to account for the universalisation (*sadharanikarana*) of the subjective and the objective aspects of aesthetic experience. He explains aesthetic experience at the transcendental level also, at which it is nothing but the experience of *Ananda*, in the same light.

MAMMATA

V. Venkatachalam

MAMMATA HAS THE unique distinction of being the most popular writer in the field of Indian literary criticism. Literary thinkers, more original than Mammata, there certainly were; connoisseurs of the literary art with finer aesthetic sense and sensibilities, there certainly had been; critics with bolder vision and greater dynamism, who opened up new directions or added new dimensions to literary criticism, there certainly had appeared, but, for sheet popularity, as judged by the area of extent of appeal in the entire country through successive ages, Mammata carries the palm. No other treatise on Poetics has held such extensive and enduring sway over the Indian mind as his *Kavyaprakasa*. No other work in the field of Sanskrit Poetics can claim the distinction of having been studied all over the country so uninterruptedly over the many centuries of its emergence, as the *Kavyaprakasa*. In this respect Mammata's work occupies a position, somewhat analogous to that of *Siddhantakaumudi*, the illustrious work of Bhattoji Dikshita, in the field of Sanskrit Grammar. Of the latter work, it has been said "You grasp it well, and vain is your toil with the *Mahabhashya*; you grasp it not, and equally vain is your toil with *Mahabhashya;*" The idea is, that the *Siddhantakaumudi* has absorbed everything that is worthwhile in the *bhashya*, so much so, that one who has mastered it has virtually nothing new to gain from a separate study of the *bhashya* and, likewise, the *Siddhantakaumudi* has done such excellent work for grammatical studies in Sanskrit that without the basic equipment provided by it, it would be impossible to comprehend the *Mahabhashya* aright. What Bhattoji Dikshita did for Sanskrit grammar many centuries later, Mammata did for poetics in an earlier age, though it must be conceded that his task was considerably lighter than the grammarian's.

Mammata could feel the times and knew how to meet the need of the hour. He came on the Kashmir scene closely on the heels of the golden age of creative criticism, when stalwart thinkers ruled the roost. Udbhata, Vamana, Anandavardhana, Bhatta Nayaka, Kuntaka, Abhinavagupta and Mahima Bhatta had left a heritage in the history of criticism. Coming after them, Mammata set for himself the task of producing a work which would comprehend within its single compass, all that was worthwhile in the medley of the earlier heritage without upsetting its overall balance or disturbing its underlying harmony. In this none-too-easy task of weaving a unity out of the many mutually conflicting strands of thought, he succeeded as well as any one could have done. And it is precisely this syncretic spirit of Mammata more than anything else, which is his achievement and has earned for him and his work, the pre-eminent place which they have ever since occupied.

That the *Kavyaprakasa* has occupied a commanding position in the field needs little demonstration. The best proof of its immense popularity—if proof be needed at all—is furnished by the number of commentaries written on it. Barring the *Bhagavadgita,* which had an unquestioned universality of appeal, the *Kavyaprakasa* has, perhaps, the prerogative of having the greatest number of direct commentaries written on a single Sanskrit text.

On the question of biographical details, Mammata is in the illustrious company of the unknown great Indians. He fares no better than most of our tallest men of the pre-mediaeval or mediaeval periods, who have earned for themselves a *niche* in the temple of India's cultural history by their work, but of whose personal history we know precious little.

Mammata's reticence about himself is total. He has made no personal statements anywhere in the *Kavyaprakasa* or in his other short tract *Sabdavyaparavichara* about his pedigree or parentage or particulars about the teachers. who instructed or initiated him. We have, therefore, to look to other external sources of use our ingenuity to squeeze the truth out of stray internal

references for what little information that can be gathered about his nativity, parentage, education, profession, social position etc. And this modern critical scholarship has already done for us.

To start with facts, which may be put down as definite or fairly definite :

1. Mammata hailed from Kashmir, (the land which gave India many of her brightest luminaries in the field of *alamkara-sastra*. This can be safely taken more or less as proven truth. His name with its typical Kashmiri ring (cf. other well known Kashmiri names are Kaiyata, Jaiyata, Uvata, Udbhata, Rudrata etc.) is the best evidence for it. There are also two other circumstances which support this. First, in his section on blemishes (*doshas*) Mammata has cited a verse to illustrate how the juxtaposition of even innocently used Sanskrit words could sometimes leave a bad colour of obscenity and jar on your finer sensibilities, when the sounds of the words, combined differently, happened to echo certain vulgar slang words of the local spoken language. Commentaries have identified the obscene words hinted at in this verse as Kashmiri slang.

Secondly, a comparative analysis of the numerous authors quoted by Mammata also reveals his association with Kashmir. Along with a host of well-established poets like Kalidasa, Bharavi, Magha, Sri Harsha, Bhatta Narayana, Bhavabhuti and others, whose works had become part of the literary stock of the whole country during his days, there are some citations from certain Kashmiri authors and their works (Utpaladeva, Narayanabhatta, Anandavardhana's *Devisataka* and *Visamabanalila, Bhallatasataka* etc.) which ostensibly, did not circulate outside Kashmir and were probably known only within the confines of the home-state of their authors during Mammata's days. Some of these did not survive even in Kashmir for long. These local citations particularly serve as clear pointers to conclude that Mammata lived and wrote in Kashmir.

2. The title *raianaka* frequently prefixed to the names of Kashmiri writers is found prefixed to Mammata too in the

colophons of many commentaries of *Kavyaprakasa*, as also in the colophons of some manuscripts of the *Kavyaprakasa* itself. The title *rajanaka* perhaps means that these writers or scholars had gained royal favours and occupied some important positions in the royal court of Kashmir. It is significant that he is described as *rajanaka* in the colophon of his other minor work *Sabdavyaparavichara* also.

3. Mammata was a profound scholar. His proficiency was not confined to *alamkarasastra* on which he wrote. He was equally at home in other *sastras* too, most prominent among them being *vyakarana*. His predilection for and profundity in grammar are very well borne out by his description of grammarians as the learned men par excellence, his references to the theories of *vyakarana*, his citations from the *Mahabhashya* and *Vakyapadiya* and by his fondness for grammatical subtleties, evident in his classification of similes on the basis of different grammatical suffixes. These apart, concepts of *Purva Mimamsa, Sankhya, Vedanta* and *Bauddha* metaphysics make their appearance in his dialectics. And, as for his flair for and wide range of reading in Sanskrit and Prakrit literature—his real field—the best proof is furnished by the number and variety of his citations, a large number of which are his own selections, not met with in the works of his predecessors.

This is all that can be said of Mammata's personal life. However, some more biographical details are given by traditions, oral and written.

4. A late commentator of the *Kavyaprakasa* has given some details of Mammata's family and his education. According to this writer Bhimasena, who came more than half a millenium after him, Mammata was the son of Jaiyata and elder brother of Kaiyata and Uvata, two illustrious Kashmiris who have left their lasting "footprints on the sands" of Sanskrit Grammar and Vedic exegesis respectively by their monumental commentaries on the *Mahabhashya* on the one hand and the *Sukla-Yajurveda-Saita* and *Rikoratisakhya*, on the other. This recor-

ded tradition further has it that Mammata himself was the teacher of both the younger brothers Kaiyata and Uvata and that Mammata received his own higher education in Kasi, the pre-eminent seat of Sanskrit learning in those days.

This tradition appears somewhat suspect as it directly conflicts with the colophons and a concluding verse, found in some manuscripts of Uvata's works which give his father's name as Vajrata. The other part of Uvata's concluding verse that he lived in Ujjain and wrote his commentary during Bhoja's reign does not clash with the tradition recorded by Bhimasena for, in that case, Mammata, the elder brother of Uvata could easily be put down as a fairly senior contemporary of King Bhoja and it tallies well with the accepted chronological sequence of Mammata and Bhoja.

Besides, this presumption would give us a very handy clue to explain how the interesting verse panegyrizing Bhoja's munificence could travel from Malwa to Kashmir in such a short time and be cited by Mammata in his *Kavyaprakasa*. Obviously, the younger brother could then have served as the liaison for the quick transmission of this delightful verse to distant Kashmir. Otherwise, the citation of the Bhoja-verse by Mammata would certainly present a chronological problem, since Mammata and Bhoja were certainly near contemporaries, who wrote more or less simultaneously on the same subject in different parts of the country without being aware of each other's work.

5. There is yet another tradition, almost universally current among the traditional pandits of the whole country from north to south, which has been recorded by Buhler as a Kashmiri tradition in his *Kashmir Reports*. According to this interesting story, Mammata was the maternal uncle of Sriharsha, the celebrated author of *Naisadha*. When the nephew submitted his great *mahakavya* to his uncle for opinion, the latter is said to have quipped "My young chap, your book has come to me a trifle too late. How I wish, you had brought it to me earlier.

That would have saved me all the labour I had in hunting out my illustrations from numerous sources for the many varieties of "blemishes" (*doshas*) for the chapter on 'Poetic Blemishes' in my *Kavyaprakasa*. I have them all here at one place in your work !"

Though it is not possible to vouch for the historical authenticity of this traditional anecdote, this involves no anachronism. Mammata, for aught we know of his chronological relations with Sriharsha, could well have been a senior contemporary of Sriharsha. And strange as it might look, Sriharsha has spoken in the concluding refrain of one of his cantos that his poem was applauded by Kashmiris. One is tempted to ask, with the background of this anecdote, was this intended by the poet as a quiet counterblast to the uncharitable castigation of his masterly *mahakavya* by Mammata, the arch fault-finder ? All that can be said with certainty is that such a possibility is not altogether ruled out. Secondly, this anecdote brings into bold relief, one of the most fundamental traits of Mammata as a critic, his uncanny insight for discovering faults, which got so rooted in the imagination of *litterateurs* in later days that the well-merited saying : *Doshadarshane Mammata* has since come to stay in literary circles.

6. A word may also be said about the name Mammata. A consideration of similar Kashmiri names ending in 'ta', reveals three common tendencies : (i) words, where the suffix 'ta', is directly appended to the Sanskrit name in its pristine form (Rudrata, Vairata etc.), (ii) names where the original Sanskrit word is displaced by its corrupt Prakritised form before the suffix 'ta' (cf. Uvata, Kaiyata etc.) and (iii) names where the final 'ta' is no suffix at all, but is an integral part of a single Sanskrit or Prakrit word (cf. Udbhata). In the case of the name Mammata, it is not possible to decide whether it falls under the second or third category. However, it is interesting to observe that at least one commentator (from the South ?) placed it under the third category and took Mammata as a Prakritised form of Manmatha ! In my opinion, this is a case of

false Sanskritisation, of which we have instances galore in all our provincial vocabulary.

7. Regarding the age of Mammata, we have adequate evidence to place him within the margin of a half century. The upper limit is fixed by his reference to Abhinavagupta, as a respected authority with the honorific suffix *pada* and with the reverential epithet *Acharya*. *Abhinavagupta's* literary activity was from 980 A.D. to 1020 A.D., as he wrote one of his works in 990 A.D. and another in 1015 A.D. A fair interval should be allowed between Abhinavagupta and Mammata to justify the manner of the latter's reference, indicating that Abhinavagupta had become a highly respected authority on the subject by then. The upper limit suggested is further corroborated by Mammata's citation of a verse eulogising king Bhoja's munificent gifts to learned men, to which reference has already been made. The lower limit for Bhoja's reign is given as 1054 A.D. Hence, allowing time for a panegyric-verse of Bhoja to travel from Malwa to Kashmir, 1050 A.D. will be the approximate *terminus ad quo* for Mammata's literary activity. A reference to Mammata by the Jain polymath Acharya Hemchandra in his *Kavyanusasana,* written in circa. 1143 A.D and the evidence provided by Manikyachandra, the earliest commentator on *Kavyaprakasa,* who has given the date of his commentary as Vikram Samvat 1216 (i.e. 1159 A.D.) fix the *terminus ad quem* as circa 1100 A.D. Mammata may, therefore be taken as having lived in the latter half of the eleventh century.

The *Kavyaprakasa* is a fairly voluminous work, divided into ten chapters, designated as *ullasas*. The metaphorical title *Kavyaprakasa* (meaning 'Light of Poetry') brings out the author's idea that his work would illuminate all facets of poetry.

The first chapter is a kind of general introduction. Though its main theme is the definition of poetry and its threefold classification into *uttama* (superior), *madhyama* (middling) and *adhama* (inferior); two other topics of a general nature are also

touched upon : namely, the benefits of poetry and the factors that go to make a poet. Mammata's enumeration of the benefits of poetry has since become a common place and is frequently quoted. Besides making it really comprehensive by absorbing and adding to the ideas of predecessors like Bhamaha, Vamana and others, Mammata has attempted to draw the line—though one would wish, he was more specific—between benefit to the poet and to the reader. His treatment of the question of what makes a poet is satisfactory, though rather succinct. Hence he adopts the safe middle course, followed earlier by Dandin and rightly holds that genius, both natural and cultivated, make the poet. But he is cautious enough to emphasise the basic truth that without natural genius, poetry was bound to become a mockery. Mammata conceived of poetry as consisting of word and thought (*sabdartha*), devoid of fault (*dosha*), possessed of merits (*guna*) and decorated with figures of speech (*alamkara*). Here again, he took particular care to qualify his statement by adding that the clause regarding *alamkaras* was not an obligatory condition. Mammata's definition of poetry has two distinct virtues. By defining poetry as the happy fusion of word and thought, he put at rest the controversy about whether poetry inhered in *sabda* or *artha*. And by making *alamkaras* optional, he showed *alamkaras* their place and released pure poetry from the hold of figures of speech. But his definition had its shortcomings; which invited criticism at the hands of the next great writer in the field, Visvanatha, the author of *Sahityadarpana*. This unsparing critic from Orissa took exception to every part of Mammata's definition and also censured him for the omission of the most vital element of poetry, namely *rasa*.

The succeeding chapters of the book flow in a regular natural sequence, dealing with the various ingredients of poetry, mentioned explicitly in the definition as well as those suggested by implication. The second and third chapters are thus devoted to a theoretical discussion about the nature of *sabda* and *artha* respectively, which together constitute the basic substratum of poetry. Both these chapters partake essentially of the

nature of a full-fledged philosophical enquiry and, naturally, Mammata has drawn freely upon the rich heritage left by earlier writers on the *sastras*. The real relevancy of such a discussion in a treatise on Poetics lies in its postulation of *vyanjana*, the new *vyapara* (intermediary link) between word and sense around which *dhvani*, the soul of poetry, hinges. In his *Sabdavyaparavichara*, he deals with the three significatory capacities of word—the primary, secondary and suggested meanings.

This naturally leads on to the exhaustive treatment of *dhvani* (of which *rasa* is the all-important facet) in all its ramifications, which form the subject matter of the fourth chapter, Mammata's treatment of *dhvani* is a resume of what Anandavardhana its founder and first exponent and Abhinavagupta, its stalwart defender, have said on the subject. He has only substituted new examples for the older ones given by the earlier path-finders of *dhvani*. His new contribution to the exposition of the doctrine is that he has mathematically computed all the possible permutations of *dhvani* and given out the types of *dhvani* as 10404 and 10455 !

The fifth chapter deals with poetry of middling quality, in which the suggested sense is made secondary to the primary sense (*gunibhutavyangya*). The ground is now set for a full-scale investigation of the legic of the *vyanjana vyapara*, the plank on which *dhvani* rests. Here, Mammata joins issue with the Mimamsakas and displays his dialectical skill and knowledge of the *sastras*. Accordingly, this vigorous debate which occupies quite a large part of the fifth chapter and contains many original arguments and much that can be called Mammata's own shows his real mettle as a *Sastrakara* and is a tribute to his calibre as a dialectician.

The following chapter is the shortest in the whole work and it deals with the third category or third-rate poetry, *adhamakavya* or *chitrakavya*. There is nothing new in the treatment of this subject.

The seventh chapter is, by far, one of the most important in the whole book. It is devoted to *kavyadosha* (blemishes in poetic expression), which, as already remarked, was Mammata's special contribution. He had a critical acumen and great poets like Kalidasa or critics like Anandavardhana, whom he otherwise adored, could not escape his searching eye. From very early times the Indian mind had welcomed self-criticism and criticism by opponents in all walks of life. And this healthy spirit of openness to adverse criticism was developed to such length in the academic field that the ability to discern faults came to be regarded as the hallmark of true scholarship and the word *doshajna* (knower of faults) became a regular synonym for a learned man in the Sanskrit language.

Mammata has earned a conspicuous niche in the temple of India's cultural history in the aisle assigned for *alamkarikas* (literary critics). His greatness rests on two prime considerations : (1) his uncompromising courage and independence of spirit as a critic who would not spare even the greatest of poets or the ablest of critics and (2) his syncretistic vision, tempered by discrimination, which made it possible for him to absorb and assimilate everything that was worth absorbing in the critical efforts of his great predecessors. There could be other considerations too, which account for his survival as a critic of note, as for instance, (1) the width of his knowledge of Sanskrit and Prakrit literature evidenced by the numberless citations from a wide variety of literary compositions, some of which preserve for us valuable specimens from some lost classics and (2) his profundity in the *sastras*, particularly, *vyakarana* and *mimamsa*, which always serve as the whetstone of intellect.

Mammata censures Kalidasa for describing the amorous sport of Siva and Parvati in *Kumarasambhava*. Anandavardhana's defence of it fails to carry conviction to him. Anandavardhana may, for the nonce, have been overawed by the great name of Kalidasa but Mammata prefers to call a spade a spade. To him the poet had over-stepped the limits of decency in dwelling on the love-sports of the divine parents. It is as improper as describing the amorous dalliance of one's own parents !

Mammata has pointed out many other cases too, where Kalidasa nods in the use of words, epithets, expressions or images, which offend the finer sensibilities of the *sahridaya.*

Mammata does not spare Anandavardhana either. He joins issue with the master on the question of *rasavirodha* (conflict of *rasas*) in a verse, proves his point and maintains the soundness of his stand. Instances can thus be multiplied where Mammata differed on literary issues of much consequence or otherwise from Mahimabhatta, Vamana, Udbhata or Ruyyaka—all illustrious names in *alamkarasastra*—and in most of these cases, his position stands vindicated. This is a tribute as much to his critical judgment as to his dialectical skill. There are also some cases where he has crossed swords with *sastrakaras* like Mukulabhatta or even Mandana Misra—a towering figure in the fields of *Mimamsa* and *Vedanta*—on issues related to epistemology.

In the context of these observations, a passing reference at least must be made to Mammata's own shortcomings as critic. Some modern writers have frowned upon him for his style of writing as slip-shod and loose and have pointed out many instances. Mammata has also been arraigned by commentators of old, as well as by modern annotators, for inconsistences, self-contradictions and inaccuracies in his statements though it is true he was himself conscious of such possibilities and has in one case actually raised such an objection of apparent inconsistency in his own stand and given an effective rebuttal. Others have sought to explain away this lack of consistency and coherence in the work by taking refuge in the two hypotheses current about the *Kavyaprakasa* first, that the *karikas* (the verses) and *vritti* (the prose gloss) are from two different hands and Mammata wrote only the *vritti*, and second that Mammata wrote only upto the figure *parikara* and the concluding part was contributed by another writer, Allata or Alaka. The major defect of Mammata as a critic is the instrusion of his erudition in the

sastras, particularly *vyakarana,* into his equipment as an art-critic, which has imported an element of affectation into some of his discussions of literary problems or expositions of literary beauties. The best illustration of this is furnished by his pedantic classification of *upama* on the basis of grammatical suffixes and trivialities concerning the externals of the simile, where, on the contrary, if he was guided by the aesthetician in him, he would have spontaneously turned to the diverse shades and aspects of the aesthetic content of the simile for its classification. This is a case of scholarship overburdening the sensibilities of the *sahridaya.*

If his eye for faults was sharp, his eye for merits was sharper still. He was certainly a connoisseur of literary beauties, who could discover with alacrity, analyse with discernment and expound with real fervour the merits of great poetry with equal fervour and felicity. He shows a balance of judgment in unrevelling the subtle shades of beauty enshrined in the art of numerous posts, while demonstrating how there could be wealth of suggestive power in a single word or even part of a word, a base, a root or even a particle; preposition or suffix, the tense of a verb, the *vibhakti* or number of a noun and many other subtleties of this kind. The many illustrations for the endless ramifications of *dhvani,* which he has culled from myriad sources and analysed with rare insight in the fourth chapter should suffice as proof of this aspect of Mammata, the unbiased and level headed critic.

Likewise, he is equally balanced in recognising whatever was of real worth in the works of his many predecessors in criticism. His intellect served as a true touchstone to distinguish the gold in criticism from the baser metal. He has frequently quoted with approval from the works of earlier critics, like Bhamaha, Anandavardhana, Bhattanayaka, Abhinavagupta and many others with and without referring to their names. Reference has already been made to his syncretic spirit which enabled him to absorb everything that deserved to be absorbed in the total output of criticism.

There is another interesting feature of Mammata's criticisms. He does not content himself with merely pointing out the faults. In quite a few cases, he has indicated the lines to be followed for avoiding the defects and has, in a few instances, actually reconstructed the defective verses after removing the faults. His *Kavyaprakasa* reflects fully and truly the personality of Mammata as a critic, a multi-faceted personality, which combined robust judgment with spirited independence, width of vision with a passion to synthesise and, above all, a genius for spotting the strong and weak spots of literary creations without allowing his artistic sensibilities to be smothered. A combination of such qualities is indeed extremely rare, so much so, that an overzealous commentator of *Kavyaprakasa* lauds him as the very incarnation of the Goddess of Speech and speaks of him repeatedly as *Vagdevatayatara*. Efforts such as these to make out Mammata as infallible and that everything that is said in the *Kavyaprakasa* is sacrosanct are certainly on the side of hero-worship. Be it as it may, an unbiassed evaluation will readily concede that the credit for giving a practical formulation and concrete form to the ramifications of the doctrine of *dhvani*, which existed as theories and abstractions in the *Dhvanyaloka* and *Lochana*, will always go to Mammata. The work of producing the final finished picture of the *dhvani* scheme should be put down as Mammata's real contribution to criticism.

KUNTAKA

Mukunda Madhava Sharma

KUNTAKA WAS ONE of the foremost aestheticians of ancient India and was better known as the author of the work named *Vakroktijivita*. The work *Vakroktijivita* propounds a theory on the import and importance of *vakrokti* and occupies an unique position in the field of the *alamkara sahitya*. But such an important work was known only through quotations and references until it was partially edited from two imperfect manuscripts by Dr. S. K. De. The work was first published in 1923 in the Calcutta Oriental Series and then in 1928.

In case of Kuntaka as in that of many other illustrious writers of ancient India, we know very little of the biographical details and we can do little more than form an idea of the profound erudition of the author from his works. Kuntaka's date may be fixed approximately on the basis of his quotations from the dramatist Rajashekhara and from Mahimabhatta's citations of him and his work *Vakroktijivita*. Thus, Kuntaka may be placed between the middle of the tenth and the middle of the eleventh century. Kuntaka, in all probability, hailed from Kashmir, for he had the title *Rajanaka*. Kuntaka also has resemblance to the names of other known Kashmiri aestheticians like Srisankuka. Kashmir, in those days, was one of the important centres of learning in entire India. In the field of aesthetics itself, Kashmir was adorned by many a renowned theorist like Anandavardhana, Bhattanayaka, Abhinavagupta and Mahimabhatta. Kuntaka may be taken as a contemporary of Abhinavagupta, the celebrated philosopher, commentator and aesthetician, whose date is around 1015 A.D. Kuntaka could not have been a predecessor of Abhinavagupta, because, had he been so, there must have been some reference to Kuntaka

or his work in the vast extent of Abhinavagupta's writings. In Kuntaka's work there are quotations from Kalidasa, Bhavabhuti, Anangaharsha, Hala, Bana, Magha, Bharavi, Bhallata, Amaru, Mayura, Sriharsha, Bhattanarayana, Rajashekhara, Bhamaha, Rudrata and Anandavardhana, referred to as *Dhvanikara*. Kuntaka also mentions by name the authors Sarvasena, Manjira, Mayuraja and the work *Udattaraghava*.

Kuntaka's *Vakroktijivita*, seems to have been a work completed in four chapters, called *unmeshas*. The work contains some basic verses embodying the principal theory propounded by the work. These verses or *karikas* have a running prose commentary called *vritti*, composed by the same author. The prose *vritti*, which also contains illustrative verses, presents a fuller exposition of the principal theme.

Kuntaka's work stands unique for its exposition of the theory of *vakrokti*. The term *vakrokti* literally means a crooked speech—*vakra* (crooked) *ukti* (speech). *Vakrokti* is a statement, more elevated, more appealing and more ornamented than the speeches of the ordinary day to day conversation. *Vakrokti* is an unusual statement, the type of which is found only in the realm of poetry. In the field of Indian poetics or *alamkara sastra*, the concept of *vakrokti* has been presented by different theorists, in different ways. Some of the theorists recognised *vakrokti* as one of the varieties of figures of speech (*alamkara*); some others recognised *vakrokti* as the very basis of all the figures of speech; and Kuntaka had the distinction of recognising *vakrokti* as the very life of poetry or. *Kavya*, Kuntaka calls *vakrokti* as the *jivita* or the life of poetry, and hence the name of his work, *Vakroktijivita*.

A later theorist Samudrabandha, the author of *Alamkarasarvasva*, analyses and shows that there are five distinct schools of Sanskrit poetics—the first was figures of speech (*alamkara*); the second, poetic qualities (*gunas*); the third, the poetic activity (*kavivyapara*) in regard to beauty of expression (*bhanitivaichitrya*); the fourth, the poetic activity in regard to giving relish to the readers (*bhojakatva*) and the fifth was suggestion. In this

connection Samudrabandha mentions that the third one, viz., poetic activity in regard to the beauty of expression was recognised as the speciality of *kavya* by the *Vakroktijivitakara*, i.e., Kuntaka.

Kuntaka not only presented original ideas in respect of the concept of *vakrokti* but also contributed to various branches of Sanskrit poetics like *sahitya* (the organic juxtaposition of word and meaning in poetry). *Kavivyapara* (creative activity or creative imagination of the poets), *gunas* (potetic qualities) and *auchitya* (poetic propriety).

Kuntaka was inspired by Bhamaha who stated that the whole realm of poetic expression was permeated with *vakrokti* and developed the theory that *vakrokti* is the essence (*jivita*) of poetry. *Vakrokti* is a mode of expression which becomes superior to the ordinary matter of fact expression by virtue of possessing a strikingness (*vaichitrya*). In other words *vakrokti* is an imaginative term of words and ideas (*vaidagdhya-bhangi-bhaniti*).

According to Kuntaka poetic embellishment or *alamkara* is just another name of this *vakrokti* or *vakrata*. Since *vakrokti* is the very life of poetry, no poetry can occur without *vakrokti*, or so to say, without *alamkara*. Hence, it is not proper to say that a certain *alamkara* belongs to poetry, for, that would imply that there might be some poetry even without poetic embellishment. On the contrary an embellished composition alone is poetry—(*alamkarasya kavyata*). While making this observation, Kuntaka does not adhere to the orthodox conception of poetic embellishments. No claims that all the poetic expressions, even without conforming to the traditional definition of any of the figures, present themselves as *vakrokti*. A striking expression or *vakrokti*, explained as *vaidagdhya-bhangi-bhaniti*, owes its origin entirely to an extraordinary skill (*kausala*) or creative imagination (*pratibha*) of the poet. The creative imagination is also called *kaviwyapara*. By recognising creative imagination as the ultimate source of the striking

poetic expression, Kuntaka accommodates, in his *vakrokti* theory one of the fundamental concepts of Indian aesthetics.

Kuntaka shows that the creative imagination operates in five different spheres into which the entire realm of poetry may be analysed. They are arrangements of letters (*varna*), the substantive and terminal parts of a word (*padapurvardha*) and (*padaparardha*), a sentence (*vakya*), a particular topic (*prakarana*) and a composition as a whole (*prabandha*). These are the principal spheres of *vakrata* and there are many sub-divisions of these. All appealing aspects of poetry recognised by other theorists and all the figures of speech fall within the purview of any of these varieties mentioned above.

Kuntaka recognises *rasa* (or aesthetic relish) and its importance in poetry and observes that *rasa* falls within the sphere of *prakaranavakrata* and *prabandha-vakrata*, Kuntaka emerges out as one of the superior aestheticians with his realisation and observation that *prabandha-vakrata* or the *vakrata* occuring in the composition as a whole must be accomplished chiefly by the aid of pleasing *rasas*. The words of the poet come to life only when they become charming on account of giving a continuous relish to *rasa*.

This was also the opinion of Anandavardhana, a renowned Indian aesthetician, the various aspects of his *dhvani* theory were duly accommodated by Kuntaka in the different varieties and sub-varieties of his *vakrokti*, with slight modifications, where necessary.

Kuntaka's conception of the *rasavad alamkara* is also very interesting. Earlier theorists like Bhamaha and Dandin, without discriminating between a principal *rasa* and a subordinate *rasa*, recognised a *rasavad alamkara*, wherever there is a *rasa* in any form. Anandavardhana maintained that when a certain *rasa* occurs as the principal meaning of a certain composition, it should be recognised as a case of *dhvani*. But according to

Kuntaka, *rasavad alamkaras* should enjoy a status similar to that of *rasa*. It should be recognised as *rasana tulyam vartamanam*. While Anandavardhana includes *rasavad* only in the second variety of *kavya*, Kuntaka gives it a status as good as that of any type of *vakrata* by recognising it as "a kind of *vakrokti* in which the *rasa* supplies the principal charm".

Vakrokti or the elevated poetic expression, according to Kuntaka, must possess an extraordinary charm, the final proof of which is 'the pleasure of those who know. i.e. the men of taste.' Thus, Kuntaka agrees with the *dhvani*-theorists or the *rasa*-theorists in respect of this vital concept that the aesthetic sensibility of the men of taste is the final basis for a proper appreciation of the beauty of poetry.

The definition of poetry (*kavya*), given in Kuntaka, gives importance to the men of taste. For Kuntaka, word and meaning together, having *sahitya*, being set in *vakrokti* (elevated speech) should please the men of taste, to become poetry.

For Kuntaka, *sabdarthau sahitau kavyam*—word (*sabda*) and meaning (*artha*) put together (*sahitau*) become *kavya*. The concept of togetherness (or the organic juxtaposition of words and meanings in poetry) involves a very important concept of Indian aesthetics and that is the concept of *sahitya*. The concept of *sahitya* became such an important one that in course of time *sahitya* became a synonym for *kavya* (poetry) or the designation of literature in general. Kuntaka has made very valuable observations in respect of the concept of *sahitya*. Kuntaka defines *sahitya* "as the quality of *sabda* and *artha* vying with each other in the suggestion of *rasa*, or, to put generally in enhancing the beauty of poetry." This *sahitya* is recognised in respect of three different elements of poetry. At first, there is the *sahitya* of *sabda* and *artha*, which is the complete harmony and commensurateness between expression and expressed, form and content. Secondly, there should be mutual *sahitya* between the several words of poetry and also between

the several meanings of the several words. Thirdly, there should be *sahitya* or a harmonious togetherness between the various elements of poetry like *riti, vritti, guna* and *alamkara.* An analysis of Kuntaka's *sahitya* shows that he intends *sahitya* to be an appropriateness of words and meanings in respect of suggesting *rasa.* Kuntaka accepts *rasa* as supreme and also recognises the concept of appropriateness.

Kuntaka's treatment of the concept of *gunas* (poetic qualities) is also original. Two main sets of *gunas* are recognised by him. The first set is *sadharana* (common) and may be found in all varieties of *kavya* (poetry). The second set is *asadharana* (uncommon) and as such *gunas* belonging to this set may pertain to particular *margas* or styles. The first set consists of *saubhagya, lavanya* and *auchitya.* The second set consists of *madhurya, prasada, lavanya* and *abhijatya.* These four *gunas* belong to the two *margas*—the *sukumara marga* and the *vichitra marga.* While the names are common, the four *gunas* are differently defined under the context of the two different *margas.*

The *guna* named *saubhagya* belongs to both word and meaning, which, being endowed with this *guna,* becomes the source of a delectation of the men of taste by developing the contextual *rasa* most effectively. *Lavanya* is the beauty of *sabda* (word) and *artha* (meaning). *Auchitya* means poetic propriety or appropriateness. According to Kuntaka, there should be appropriateness in ideas as well as in the use of words. In presenting description of things and men the ideas introduced must be appropriate to the character, theme and *rasa.* According to Kuntaka the poetical statements gain life from propriety. Kshemendra, who came a little later than Kuntaka wrote a full length text on the theme or *auchitya* and repeated the spirit of Kuntaka and laid down that *auchitya* is the steady life of *kavya,* which becomes established with *rasa*'.

Thus Kuntaka acknowledges the supremacy of *auchitya* and *rasa* showing that his new theory of *vakrokti* also duly

upholds the vital issues of the *alamkara sastra* and thus establishes himself as a protagonist of the chief doctrines of Indian aesthetics.

BHOJA

V. Venkatachalam

WE KNOW PRECIOUS little about the personal history of Sanskrit writers. History was admittedly the Achilles' heel in the steel armour of India's ancient culture. Bhoja, however, is one of the rare exceptions. There is no dearth of authentic historical information about him. Quite apart from the fact that he belonged to a relatively later period, many other factors have accounted for this.

He was a king and *ipso facto* secured a very spacious berth in history. History, in those days, was primarily a record of the lives of kings and their blue-blooded circle. It had no place in it for the "hewers of wood and drawers of water"; nor even for the country's great cultural leaders; except in so far as the lives of the latter had any bearings on the saga of kings or served to heighten their glory. It is only in very recent times that scientific historiography has placed history in its true perspectives as "the essence of innumerable biographies" covering the whole spectrum of the social milieu. The erroneous equation of history with kings' lives by ancient and mediaeval chroniclers, which made their so called histories severely truncated and highly distorted projections of the past, now stands self-exploded as an out-dated feudal relic. Be it as it may, thanks to Bhoja's high status as a king—a truly great king at that—which earned for him a commanding niche in the history of the Paramaras of Malava, we are in a position today to conjure up a vivid, authentic and fairly complete picture of Bhoja's total personality, though the inevitable controversies are very much there.

But royalty was not a major component of his greatness. He was great in his own right. If Bhoja, the king, shot into prominence in history through the accident of his kingship, Bhoja, the man, literally made history through his native talents and showed to the world that he was a veritable superman. In whatever field he stepped in, he wanted to accomplish that which was never before dreamed of by any. And the evidence available bears out that he did succeed tolerably in his aspirations, allowing, of course, the necessary margin for the vanity of human hopes.

He was a great builder, a great scholar, a great poet, a great critic, a great virtuoso, a great scientist, a great experimenter, a great thinker, and above all, a great humanist and a great giver. Two different recorded traditions credit him with having built 84 and 104 buildings (temples ?). The former number is confirmed by Madana, the court-poet and preceptor of Arjunavarman, an illustrious successor, who came two centuries after Bhoja. In his play *Parijatamanjari*, engraved on the stone-slabs of the famous Bhojasala, the author specifically speaks of 84 temples in the city of Dhara and refers to the temple of Sarasvati as the chief among them. This temple aptly named Sarasvati-kanthabharana, and the superb Saraswati idol installed in it must have been the apple of Bhoja's eye. Its distinction lay not in its size nor even in its architectural excellence but in the spirit it enshrined and nurtured. It witnessed for nearly a half-century the rare scene of the cream of the country's intellect collected and canalized for a phenomenal creative effort, never before attempted and, perhaps, never again to be attempted. Even after Bhoja (or Bhoja, the great, as modern historians refer to him to distinguish him from his many other namesakes in his own as well as other royal dynasties) the glorious traditions of this epoch-making institution were preserved and continued by a long line of his Paramara successors for over two centuries, though in a much diluted and debiliated form. The best proof of this is provided by the stone-slabs engraving contemporary literary creations, which continued to be added to the walls of this Bhojasala right up

to the days of Arjunavarman, mentioned earlier. After three centuries of existence, this temple-cum-palace, which symbolised one of the passionate sky-scrapper dreams of Bhoja was demolished by later Muslim conquerors, who overran Dhara and restructured it to house the mosque, which survives today as Kamal Moula mosque. And the exquisite sculpture of Vagdevi too became a victim of iconoclastic vandalism and lay buried there for over five centuries until modern archaeology recovered it in its badly mutilated condition during the reign of Lord Curzon and sent it to London. It is now a prized piece of the British Museum. Deep-rooted popular-traditions die hard. The memory of the previous history of the mosque survives to this day in Dhara, where the local people still speak of it as Bhojasala.

Desire of fame is the common weakness of the great. Bhoja was no exception. He appears to have left no stone unturned to perpetuate his name and achievements through such stone edifices and the many inscriptions in them. The most important of such inscriptions are those which were fortuitously recovered from the concealed Bhojasala walls. The two *Kurmasatakas* in Prakrit engraved on stone mention him as the author. Of these, the first one styled *Avanikurma* was certainly a composition of Bhoja. But more than these stone-structures, stone sculptures and inscriptions on stone, it is his numerous copper-plate grants and his equally numerous books with their truly encyclopaedic range which keep his name alive today as a great 'giver' on the one hand and as a great writer on the other. I shall deal with his writings in some detail later on. As for pious philanthropic gifts, his none-too-few copper-plates tell their legendary tale. In its typical hyperbolic tone, the *Bhojaprabandha* declares: "Only two things were scarce in Bhoja's land; first was iron used up in making fetters for his enemies and the second was copper, which got exhausted through his grant-plates". The wild exaggeration is obvious, but the underlying spirit too is equally obvious. It is significant that Bhoja's copper-plates continue to be discovered from the villages of Malava to this day. Only recently, the Indore Museum has added one to their collection and Dr. Wakankar, the renowned archaeologist of Ujjain,

has rescued another from being melted off! One wonders how many grant-plates might have passed to ignorant hands, to whom the metal-content was more important than the historical value of the engraved lines.

Bhoja came to the throne of Malava in circa 1000 A.D. The reign of his father, Sindhuraja, was very brief ; probably five or just three years. But Munja, his uncle and elder brother of Sindhuraja, was the first great king of the Paramara lineage. He had ruled for more than twenty years and "was not only a great general and a great poet, but also a great patron of art and literature". Bhoja excelled him in every way and established his claim to go down in history as the greatest of the Paramaras and as "one of the greatest kings of mediaeval India". Thanks to Munja's extensive military conquests and his own father's conquest of Aparanta and victories over Lata and Hunamandala, Bhoja inherited a fairly large territory, over which the authority of the Paramaras was recognised, even if not fully consolidated.

Bhoja applied himself to this task of consolidation and further expansion. He waged many wars defensive as well as of expansion. His campaigns took him as far as Orissa, Sakambhari, Lata and Konkan, in all of which he earned victories and also annexed Konkan to his kingdom. He sent his army to the Shahi king Anandapala and his son Trilochanapala in 1008 and 1019 A.D. to assist them in their efforts to resist the attacks of the famous Mahmud of Ghazni. That this formidable invader from Arabia, who had proved his superiority in military strength and strategy and taken the kingdoms of north India by storm wherever he went, to avoid a clash with Bhoja, under whose leadership the Hindu rulers of the region had combined to intercept the marauder, had to take a devious route via Kutch and Sind for his return after the historic desecration and plunder of Somanath in 1025, provides a proof of the measure of political importance Bhoja had acquired in western India at that time. Bhoja's high place in the comity of contemporary kingdoms is also borne out by the alliance he had secured with the powerful Chola king, Rajendra Chola in the Orissa campaign.

But he suffered many reverses too in his military adventures. His attacks against the Chandella king of Bundelkhand, the Kacchapagati king of Gwalior, the Rashtrakuta king of Kanyakubja, the Chahmana king of Nadol (Marwar) etc. proved infructuous or disastrous. The worst came from Someshwara, the hereditary Chalukya rival, who over-ran Dhara in 1042 and Bhoja had to flee for life. His fortunes in his frequent battles and skirmishes with the neighbouring kings of Gujarat were, however, mixed ; with victory and failure oscillating between the two parties. The Paramara power had to pay for all this dearly with the fall of Malava into the hands of Kalachuris and Chalukyas soon after the death of Bhoja in 1055 A.D. and his successor Jayasimha (probably his son) had to seek the help of Vikramaditya VI of Deccan to get back the Paramara throne.

Bhoja was a true visionary. His heart was as large as his vision. His benevolence was not confined by the political boundaries of his sovereignty. When it came to the common weal, he had the integral picture of India before him. The Udaipur (Gwalior) *Praśasti* credits him with building "temples dedicated to Kedaresvara, Rameśvara, Somanatha, Sundira, Kala, Anala and Rudra". Likewise, Kalhana affirms that the embankments of Papasudana-tirtha of Kapatesvara (modern Kother) in Kashmir were built with the subsidies from Bhoja's state coffers. "It is a curious proof", writes Dr. D. C. Ganguly, "of the relations possible in those days between remotely distant places." Dr. Stein too refers to a living tradition current among the Muslim population of the place, confirming the association of Bhoja's name with the tank.

A special mention must be made here of the great lake of Bhojapura (now a village about 18 miles from Bhopal), which is acclaimed as "a feat of hydraulic engineering" of these days, considering its dimensions and the unique plan of the mile-long dam across the narrow gorge, through which the river Betwa and its feeder Kaliasoth pass.

Bhoja's name continues to be remembered to this day as a byword for the most lavish patronage to poets, artists and men of learning. The verse in the *Kavyaprakasa,* which paints

a romantic picture of precious pearls rolling about in the courtyards of the houses of scholars and attributes it to the munificence of Bhoja, is no doubt couched in the panegyric style; but it projects like historical truth of Bhoja's liberal gifts to scholars. The *aksharalaksha* mentioned in the legendary stories need not be taken on their face-value; but they are certain pointers of the staggering limits of Bhoja's gifts. Unfortunately, time has not preserved the details of all the great luminaries of his court, drawn from the different parts of India. But the names of Dhanapala, the reputed Jain 'author of *Tilakamanjari*; Uvata, the Kashmiri scholar of Veda, who wrote his brilliant *Bhasya* on *Sukla-Yajurveda,* the poet Chittapa, whose charming verses are preserved in the anthologies and also find a place in the pages of Bhoja's *Sarasvatikanthabharana* and *Sringaraprakasa* and a host of other poets basked in the sunshine of Bhoja's royal favour.

Though a follower of the Vedic religion and a worshipper of Siva, Bhoja fostered and supported other religions and religionists too. Apart from the Jain chronicles, an inscription in Sravana-belgola[1], which describes him as paying homage to the Jain teacher Prabhachandra testifies to this. The strange stories that claim that he was converted to Jainism and even to Islam ought to be dismissed as motivated fabrications; out at the same time they are evidence of the image of Bhoja's religious toleration in the popular mind. This same spirit of catholicity is reflected in his patronage of learning, which knew no discrimination between the Jain poet Dhanapala and the Vedic scholar Uvata. Vincent Smith has beautifully rounded off the integral personality of Bhoja in these terms : He "reigned gloriously for more than forty years. Like his uncle, he cultivated with equal assiduity the arts of peace and war. Although his fights with neighbouring powers, including one of the Muhammadan armies of Mahamud of Ghazni, are forgotten ; his fame as an enlightened patron of learning and a skilled author remains undimmed; and his name has become proverbial as that of the model king according to the Hindu standard."

1. In Karnataka

As a writer, Bhoja was as prolific as he was encyclopaedic. Two separate traditions credit him with 84 and 104 works. Both these traditions are recorded ones, the first by Merutunga in his famous chronicle, *Prabandhachintamani* and the second by Ajada, also a Jain author, in his commentary on Bhoja's *Sarasvatikanthabharana* on Poetics. It is not possible to vouch for the historicity of these traditions, though there is some indirect confirmation for the number 84 from the reference to 84 temples in *Parijatamanjari*, already referred to. The same two traditions declare that Bhoja named his books after his royal titles (a fact, borne out by his extant works) and that the number of royal titles, books and temples was indentical; 84 according to one and 104 according to the other.

Prima-facie is certainly looks incredible that one single hand could have authored so many works, particularly when some of these like the *Sringaraprakasa* on Poetics and *Samaranganasutradhara* on architecture and engineering are themselves mammoth works with such encyclopaedic range that each of these could be the separate life-work of a person. Furthermore, the apparent impossibility of single authorship of all these works gains added support from the fact that the extant works and the works known through citations and reference cover such diverse fields of knowledge like poetry and poetics, grammar and lexicography, philosophy and *dharmasastra*, astronomy and astrology as well as applied sciences like architecture, engineering, medicine and so on. The fact that some of these works themselves quote Bhoja by name lends considerable strength to the suspicions of scholars, who are sceptic about unauthenticated traditions and regard the attribution to Bhoja in the colophons of the works as of dubious historical value. Besides this positive evidence, which militates against Bhoja's real authorship of such of these works, there is also the negative evidence of the inscriptions and Kalhana. Whereas the inscriptions speak of him as a great poet (*kaviraja*) and Kalhana too speaks of him as a benefactor of poets (*kavibandhava*), no clear mention in made either by Kalhana or in the inscriptions of his scholarship in the arts and

sciences. Even the historical-cum-legendary biographies, the so-called *Bhojacharitra* (History of Bhoja) and *Bhojaprabandha* (Life-story of Bhoja), which have come down in different versions glorify him only as a poet and as a connoisseur of poetry but are silent about his erudition in the *sastras*. Hence, in the absence of authentic historical evidence, the modern historian is apt to look askance at the evidence of the Jain chronicles, which are known to mix up history with legend.

The most important argument in favour of Bhoja's authorship is the fact that many great writers, who came in the wake of Bhoja, quote these books as Bhoja's in their writings. It is significant that some of these writers who speak of these as Bhoja's works are not far removed from Bhoja in point of time. The truth possibly lies—as it happens with most such controversies—somewhere in between the two extremes. And it may be expressed by the paradox that Bhoja *was* and still *was not* the author of these books. Bhoja was possibly *not* the author of all these works in the sense that he did not sit down and write them all by himself and also because the compilation of the raw material for his books was done for him, wholly or partly as the case may be, by one or more experts from his versatile coterie. And, in the sense that he was the guiding spirit of and provided the entire motive force for the planning as well as the execution of the books, he *was* the *de facto* creator of the books, though one or more knowledgeable men from his coterie might have executed the plan and done the physical writing part of it. We have clinching evidence to conclude that Bhoja did write books in other departments of learning besides poetry and poetics. This comes from a book, admittedly his. In one of the prefatory verses to his commentary on the *Yogasutra* of Patanjali, he says it *totidem verbis* that he wrote an independent treatise on medicine called *Rajamriganka*, a grammatical work laying down the rules of grammar and the commentary *Rajamartanda* on the *Yogasutra* and that in this he emulated the example of the great Patanjali. This affirmation by Bhoja in one of his authentic works should be taken as proof positive that his was a virile multi-channelled

mind, which was equally at home in all manner of disciplines and could project itself with ease in every department of human activity. It proves that Bhoja did write books on many branches of learning. It must, however, be confessed in the same breath that this statement cannot conclusively establish his authorship of all the books traditionally attributed to him. For that, we will have to dilute this proof with the weak collateral evidence of *Prabhavakacharita,* which hails him as 'a crest-jewel of the circle of scholars' (*Vidvacchakrasiromani*) and enumerates as many as fifteen branches of learning as the range of his authorship-craft, besides mentioning four books specifically by name. It is neither necessary nor possible to catalogue all the extant works of Bhoja here, which number upwards of thirty and of which only about half have so far been published.

Besides these thirty odd works, which are now actually available, titles numbering more than fifteen are known through reference in later works on the subjects concerned. And in the case of more than half of these, the later writers have given us not only the names of the books of Bhoja but have actually quoted extracts from them. True, we can not rule out the possibility of some of these turning out to be spurious, fictitious or even ghost-titles ! Even allowing a fair margin for such possibilities, it will be a reasonable claim on behalf of modern research that it has succeeded in spotting titles in the neighbourhood of fifty and unearthed reliable evidence for the existence of more than forty works of Bhoja, the scholar king of Dhar. This does lend some semblance of support to the tradition that his collected works included 84 titles.

The brief conspectus, given above, of the contemporary situation regarding Bhoja-studies should itself suffice to let one see its inadequacies. The contribution of this great polyhistor to the various branches of Indian learning has still to be studied, processed, analysed and assessed. However, the field of poetics—with which we are concerned here—was fortunate to have been espoused by a towering orientalist of the modern stream.

Dr. Raghavan. The *magnum opus* of Dr. Raghavan is a monumental study of Bhoja's own *magnum opus*, the *Sringaraprakasa*.

Bhoja wrote two works on literacy criticism : *Sringaraprakasa* and *Sarasvatikanthabharana*. Though there is much overlapping of themes in the two works, the treatment has been so designed that neither makes the other superfluous. Of these, *Sarasvatikanthabharana* is the earlier one and relatively much smaller in size and scope. It does not project to full advantage Bhoja's originality as a literary critic or his substantial contribution to the field. That was reserved for the *Sringaraprakasa*, which, according to Dr. Raghavan, comes under the category of works designated by Bhoja as *Sahityaprakasa*. The type known as *Sahityaprakasa* is the highest among the 24 types of *sravya* compositions recognised by Bhoja and represents the acme of the writer's craft. It is a class of work, which outclasses all the rest and enshrines within its compass the highest wisdom and the most glorious thoughts of all branches of learning. To quote Bhoja :

यस्मिन्नशेषविद्यास्थानार्थ विभूतयः प्रकाशन्ते ।
संहत्य, स साहित्यप्रकाश एतादृशो भवति ॥

Illustrating this type, Bhoja adds that his *Sringaraprakasa* clearly projects the crystallised excellence of the esoteric revelations of all the *sastras* as well as the secrets of all the fine arts and poetic exercises. If Bhoja really meant to claim all this for his *Sringaraprakasa*, the claim is so extravagant that it overshoots itself.

Why did Bhoja write two separate treatises on the same subject with considerable overlapping of topics ? What is the inter-relation between the two, chronologically and thematically ? What is their relative importance in the field of literary criticism ? For answering questions such as these satisfactorily, it is necessary to have a comparative picture of the contents of the two books. Here is a brief survey of the different topics dealt within them.

The *Sarasvatikanthabharana* is divided into five chapters called *Parichedas* covering the whole range of poetics, leaving out drama. It opens with an affirmation of the twofold benefits of

poetry; namely, aesthetic pleasure (*priti*) and fame (*kirti*), following the lines of earlier critics like Bhamaha and Vamana. This statement of the gains of poetry also gives an implied definition of poetry, setting out its four essential elements, spelt out more distinctly in *Sringaraprakasa*, as (1) absence of poetic flaws (*doshahana*), (2) presence of poetic merits or poetic beauty (*gunopadana*), (3) inclusion of figures of speech (*alamkarayoga*), and (4) obligatory infusion of the emotive experience (*rasa-aviyoga*). The first two elements, *doshas* and *gunas*, are compressed into a single chapter, namely the first. The next three chapters are assigned to *alamkaras*, which Bhoja classifies into three; *sabdalamkaras* (figures of sound), *arthalamkaras* (figures of sense) and *ubhayalamkaras* (figures of both sound and sense). With his fascination for reducing everything to a rigid system, Bhoja keeps the identical number 16 for the different types of *doshas* and *gunas* on the one hand and the number 24 for each of the three classes of *alamkaras*. The last chapter which is the most important section of the book, deals with *rasa* which Bhoja too recognises as the dominant and most vital principle of poetry. In terms of physical extent too, this chapter is larger than the rest, both by the number of *karikas* (expository couplets) as well as the number of illustrative verses discussed.

Bhoja's novel theory of *sringara-rasa* as the only *rasa* is not elaborated here and the treatment of the different *rasas* follows the earlier conventional pattern, though there is sufficient evidence to conclude, as Dr. Raghavan has shown, that the new revolutionary ideas were already germinating in Bhoja's mind even while he wrote this earlier work. His new concept of *abhimana-sringara* as the integral rasa, his new approach to *sahitya* as the expression of the twelvefold relation between word and meaning and all his original ideas on literary problems were to explode on the contemporary literary scene with a bang only through his *Sringaraprakasa*, later in time, larger in extent, wider in scope, fuller in treatment, bigger in size, greater in depth, sharper in accumen, deeper in sight and considerably superior in impact.

The *Sringaraprakasa* is a unique work. Its 36 chapters, styled *prakasas*, contain a thorough treatment of all the topics

comprehended in Bhoja's wider concept of *sahitya*, which he defines as the expression of the relationship between *sabda* and *artha*. This relationship between *sabada* and *artha* is rightly hailed as the foundation-principle of literature. Bhoja's analytical eye recognises twelve kinds of this relationship. Of these, the first eight are purely grammatical relations, which are, strictly speaking, not the province of literature. But Bhoja expatiates on these too with all his sastric erudition and devotes the first 8 chapters of his *Sringaraprakasa* to the exposition of this grammatical theme. Of these, the first 3 are assigned to *sabda*, the next three to *artha* and following two to their eightfold forms of grammatical relationship.

Literary criticism proper begins with the ninth chapter. The fourfold poetic relationship between *sabda* and *artha*, comprising *dosahana, gunopadana, alamkarayoga* and *ras-aviyoga*, which were treated at length in the earlier work are given summary treatment here in the next three chapters (9—11). As in the earlier work, *dosha* and *guna* are both huddled up in a single chapter (9). But there is a difference in the treatment of *alamkaras*. The three separate chapters assigned to the three major divisions of figures in *Sarasvatikanthabharana* are compressed into one brief chapter (10) here, obviously because the emphasis here was to be on *rasa*, which is first expounded in brief in chapter 11 and then fully elaborated in 24 chapters, beginning with chapter 13, the intervening chapter (12) being devoted to drama.

The plan of the elaboration is as follows. Two chapters (13-14) assigned to the 49 *bhavas* (emotions): of these, one full chapter (13) is taken up by *rati* (love), obviously on account of the special place accorded to *sringara-rasa* in Bhoja's scheme. The next three chapters (15—17) deal successively with *alambana-vibhavas*, *uddipana-vibhavas* and *anubhavas*, the first two representing the contributory causes (*vibhavas*) and the last, the effects of the emotive experience. The four chapters that follow (18—21) are the result of a new emphasis by Bhoja in the context of *sringara-rasa*. Drawing upon an inconspicuous

reference in Bharata and at the same time making his departures from convention, Bhoja builds a new elaborate structure of the four forms of *sringara* related to *dharma, artha, kama* and *moksha,* which are discussed in this order in these chapters. The ramifications of the conventional *sringara-rasa* occupy all the remaining 15 chapters from chapter 22 onwards.

Chapter 22 is devoted to love (*anuraga*) and serves as a fine example of the limits to which Bhoja could go, when he is in an elaborating spree. It should be interesting to watch this as a random sample of his mental process. Here are the broad lines. Love is first divided into 64 forms, each given a separate nomenclature. Eight patterns are then recognised for each. These eight patterns are then divided into a further eight each, on the basis of differing circumstantial factors, which are again multiplied by three on the basis of varying conditions, which are different in each case. In some cases, the last two stages are clubbed together by doing the multiplication by 24 as one direct step. To device a suitable vocabulary for all these should have been a stupendous mental exercise, by itself. Mathematically, they make 12, 228 forms (64x8x24). More breath-taking is the fact that the major 64 types as well as the 192 sub-divisions of the first stage (64x8) are all provided with separate illustrations, drawn from our early literature ! This should suffice to form an idea of the limits of Bhoja's analytical insight and, what is wonderful, his profound acquaintance with the whole gamut of literary exercises of earlier poets.

Chapter 23 is a brief exposition of the two well-known forms of love, deep-rooted in tradition : *vipralambha-sringara* and *sambhoga-sringara,* representing the two phases of separation and union in love. These two basic topics are then fully elaborated in the next 13 chapters, assigning 9 chapters (24—32) to the former and 4 chapters (33—36) to the latter.

The most outstanding contribution of Bhoja to Indian poetics is his epoch-making theory that *sringara* is the one and only *rasa.* This theory, for which a less known later critics coined

the beautiful name *sringara-advaita,* will always be reckoned as his significant share in the totality of India's philosophy of aesthetics. When all else of Bhoja, the critic, is forgotten, this theory will keep his memory green. It is in this that Bhoja struck new ground. Since the *Sringaraprakasa* itself went out of circulation, the theory did not get its due even at the hands of modern writers on Indian poetics.

It would be difficult—one might as well say, impossible—to give a thoroughly satisfying exposition of this theory and its dialectical basis in all its fulness within the compass of a few paragraphs or pages. Its rationale is a little too abstruse and its ramifications too wide to be so compressed. Bhoja has devoted more than two thirds of his big tome, *Sringaraprakasa* to highlight his findings and to reorient the traditional ideas centering round *rasa* to his scheme of thought. The text bristles with problems of all kinds and is at times corrupt too. Bhoja's manner of writing adds its quota of hurdles. Naturally, it calls for more sustained and determined effort to unfold everything of Bhoja, the critic and recapture his thought in full.

My attempt here will, therefore, be just to give the quintessence of the theory, avoiding intricacies and details to the extent possible. I shall content myself with presenting the bare conclusions and shall only indicate dimly the thought-stream leading upto it.

Fortunately for us, we have Bhoja's own brilliant summary of his theory in the ten opening verses, which immediately follow the two benedictory verses offering obeisance to Siva in his *Ardhanarisvara* from and Vinayaka. In a subsequent chapter, Bhoja has expatiated at length on the subtleties of this opening *Ardhanarisvara*—verse, to show how that verse itself was germane to his *sringara* synthesis. Dwelling with great gusto on the masculine-feminine fusion of the sublime Siva-Parvati amalgam and its amusing corollaries, he has expended all his interpretative profundity to lay bare its symbolic wealth and to establish that every word and phrase of the verse, pay its every fibre and particle, was rich with implications about the different aspects

of *sringara* in its twin aspects of *sambhoga* and *vipralambha*. This is sufficient clue to conclude that Bhoja had designed his ten introductory verses too as an artistic (and artful ?) epitome of his *sringara* theory, a sort of microcosm of that macrocosm, his *Sringaraprakasa*. It will, therefore, be expedient to make these ten verses the basis for our summary of Bhoja's theory, of course drawing upon the relevant chapters of the text for correct comprehension of their content and induction of minimal details.

Here is a free paraphrase of two verses, which present the final upshot of the theory. "Wise men of old have spoken of ten *rasas;* but we affirm that *sringara* alone is the *rasa*, since it alone is of the eseential nature of bliss or aesthetic delight. *vira, adbhuta* and others are *rasas* only by courtesy. Their recognition as *rasas* is nothing more than a popular obsession. Its universal circulation has invested it with an air of respectability ; that is all. Its credentials are highly suspect. It is of a piece with the popular fib of the *vata-yaksa*—the fancied ghost or bugaboo in the village banyan tree ! If it has still spread its tentacles so wide and succeeded in holding generations in its grip, it is because of the common people's hardened habit of following blindly and accepting things without question. As a result, this notion of ten *rasas* or plurality of *rasas* has trickled down as the truth through an unending line of critics without interruption. Our effort in this work will be to disabuse the popular mind of this erroneous idea about *rasa*".

The rationale of the theory is summarised as follows : Bhoja is of the opinion that there is no psychological warrant for drawing distinctions among emotions (*bhavas*) and recognising three separate categories of these as was done by Bharata and adopted without question by all later writers on aesthetics. He rejected Bharata's classification of *bhavas* (emotional states of the human heart) as *sthayins, vyabhicharins* and *sattvikas* and refused to concede any functional disparities or gradations in substratum among them. According to him, *Vyabhicharins* could also serve as *sthayins* and vice versa. He contends—and let it

be said to his credit that it is not possible to deny the logic of his contention or brush aside the justice of his plea—that if *rati* (love) and other *sthyi-bhavas* could attain the state of *rasa* in their state of climatic intensity, what prevented other emotions like *harsha* (jubilation)—a *vyabhichari-bhava,* so called—from climbing to a similar climax and getting transmuted as *rasa* ?

Bhoja contends that it would be more logical to concede the basic equality of all the 49 *bhavas* of Bharata and accept without demur the possibility of any of these emotions being pitched up to a state of paroxysmal excellence and becoming fit at such ecstatic heights for instant aesthetic transmutation into pure bliss. Bhoja's new name for this highest aesthetic bliss is *sringara,* not simply *rasa.* Etymologically, the word *sringara* denotes the process of climbing to a peak. (*yena sringam riyate sa sringarah*) and is hence specially appropriate to signify this zenithal phase of bliss. But it should not be forgotten that Bhoja has no qualms about accepting the traditional *sringara* also side by side with this higher *sringara.* According to him. the traditional concept of *sringara* and other *rasas* represent a relatively lower level of aesthetic experience, which he describes as the middle stage (*madhyamavastha*). The higher *sringara* is the real *rasa* and all the other 49 *rasas* are just its offshoots, serving as its ancillaries. Bhoja has yet another name for this supreme *sringara.* It is *prema-rasa. Preman* here is not a synonym of love. It denotes bliss, the highest aesthetic principle. That is why Bhoja sometimes speaks of it as *ananda-rasa* also.

A vital questions arises here. When the 49 *bhavas* are all made of such different stuff, so different from each other and often so diametrically opposed to each other in nature, how on earth, is it possible for them to have a common culmination ? It will be throwing logic to the winds to postulate a common culmination for all the varied *bhavas* unless there is some basic factor common to all of them. Bhoja's answer to this moot question is his *abhimana.* Speaking functionally, *abhimana* is at the bottom of the aesthetic experience. It is the lowest rung

in Bhoja's three-runged ladder of the aesthetic experience. *Ahamkara* is Bhoja's second name for it. The reflex of *sankhya* thought is clear in the nomenclature. But Bhoja's *abhimana* has totally different bearings, though it is rooted in and has grown out of its *sankhya* namesake. The truth of the matter is Bhoja has evolved a new aesthetic principle out of it. Such an exposition alone of the concept of *abhimana* can explain why Bhoja also speaks of it as *sringara* or as *rasa*. He specifically says in so many words that *ahamkara*, *sringara*, *rasa* are all synonyms of the self-same *abhimana*.

Now, what is this *abhimana*? In the context of Bhoja's theory of aesthetics I would describe it as projection of the 'Ego' on the emotional plane of the responsive *sahridaya*. Bhoja says that in every emotional experience, and, for that matter, in every phase of its aesthetic transmutation, there is this reflex of the Ego, running as an unperceived and unobstrusive under-current. It may surface more often in the initial phase, but even when it does not come to the surface, it is there. Bhoja illustrates this with a beautiful little couplet describing the innermost heart-throbs of a gallant young man, who leaps into ecstasy that a lovely maiden—his image of the "nonpareil of beauty"—looked at him with amorous eyes. He considers himself thrice blest, literally pats himself on his back and addresses himself thus in a paroxysm of jubilation :

अहो ! अहो! नमो मह्यं यदहं वीक्षितोऽनया ।
मुग्धया विस्तसारङ्गतरलायतनेत्रया ॥

For its sheer psychological insight and its relevance to the exposition of Bhoja's concept of *abhimana* as the bottom-principle of the aesthetic experience, I have chosen to capture the beauty of this stanza in English through a free rendering in blank verse :

> Bravo ! Bravo ! Glory unto ME reverend ME ! Ah dear !
> How thrilling that this paragon of immaculate beauty artless
> Should set on me, her lovely eyes, long and tremulous—
> Aye ! on this very ME, those glances of the panicky deer !

Bhoja employs this verse as a tool to analyse the psychology of love and to point out that the *ultimate* cause of the lover's jubilation here is not the beauty of the girl, nor even the girl's love for him, but his own finer feelings for himself, which Bhoja calls *abhimana* and which I have chosen to describe in modern parlance as the reflex of the Ego on the emotional plane, lying at the bottom of the aesthetic experience.

The case of love above is just illustrative. Bhoja holds that the operation of *abhimana* as an under-current or aesthetic experience extends to all emotions. He is at pains to demonstrate its application to other emotions through other similar illustrations.

What we have discussed so far, is only one aspect of Bhoja's concept of *abhimana*. There is yet another phase of it, which is of greater consequence in the aesthetic context. To my mind, it is analogous to what has been called *bhavayitri pratibha* by Rajashekhara, which may be described as the reaction of the poet's imagination and inspiration on the *sahridaya*. It is the quality that makes it possible for the latter to recreate the poet's world for his own aesthetic appreciation. Bhoja mentions two attributes of *abhimana* which lend support to its equation with *bhavayitri pratibha* proposed by me. (1) It is a mental state saturated with *sattva-guna* (the purest and the subtlest of three elements of *sankhya*) and it is a product of exceptional sublimity or purity of the mind (*amala-dharma-visesha*). This probably points to the pure contemplation, which is the basis of aesthetic enjoyment of art. (2) It emerges from the dormant mental impressions (*samskaras*) left by the stream of past experience of this and earlier births. In terms of western criticism, the first is related to imagination and the second, to inspiration.

It should be evident from the foregoing analysis that Bhoja's *abhimana* is not mere ego, nor it is a tame reproduction of the *sankhya* epistemological principle of *abhimana-ahamkara*. If that had been so, it would have had no special relevancy in the aesthetic context. To my mind, Bhoja has recreated the *sankhya*

concept to serve his aesthetic ends and refashioned it as a happy fusion of the *ahamkara* of the philosopher and the *bhavayitri pratibha* of the poeticians.

We may conclude with a restatement of what I have chosen to describe as Bhoja's three-rung ladder theory of aesthetic experience of literature, which can be extended to other forms of Art as well with equal force. The lowest rung of this ladder (*purva-koti*) is the aesthetic *abhimana*, just described. The middle rung of the ladder (*madhyama-avastha*) which Bhoja links with *bhavana*, is a relatively higher stage of emotional contemplation, where all else is effaced out of the mind. Bhoja's name for this second stage of the aesthetic experience is *bhava*. This stage is marked by the plurality of diverse emotions. These are the traditional eight *rasas* of Bharata, to which others have added a few more and Bhoja speaks of this earlier number as ten. According to him, their real number is forty-nine and he too loosely calls them *rasas*. The truth is that this middle stage with its diversity of emotional patterns is not the ultimate in aesthetic experience. That ultimate is the third and final rung of the ladder. It is devoid of any shades of mutual differences and any tinge of plurality. It is the stage of *rasas, par excellence*. This "rolls" beyond the range of *bhavana* within the heart, where *ahamkara* alone lingers and is of the form of Pure Bliss. As already remarked, Bhoja's name for this final consummation is *sringara* or *preman*. Thus Bhoja's scheme of the aesthetic experience comprises a three-scale evolution from *abhimana* (*purva koti*) *to bhava* (*madhyma-avastha*) and from *bhava to rasa* (*uttakar koti*).

I have lingered so long on this *sringara* synthesis theory of Bhoja, because it is the crowning achievement of Bhoja in the field of poetics and has far-reaching implications in the context of Indian thought on aesthetics. But it will be wrong to think that this was his only contribution or even his only important contribution. The spark of originality in Bhoja is visible in his treatment of practically every concept of *alamkara-sastra*. To take a few instances. (i) He accepted Anandavardhana's *dhvani*

in principle but introduced two significant changes. He harmonised it with the *tatparya* of the *mimamsakas*, dispensed with a separate *vyanjana-vyapara* for poetry only and struck a new line by affirming that *dhvani* is just another name of *tatparya* in the poetic context. Secondly, he gave a new twist to the patterns of *dhvani* in Anandavardhana's classification. On the one hand, he simplified (or more correctly, over simplified) it and severely cut down its ramifications; but, on the other hand, introduced a new pattern of *pratisabda-dhvani* as an antithesis of Anandavardhana's *anunada-dhvani*. (2) He struck new ground in the treatment of *alamkara* too. As in the case of *rasa*, so with *alamkara* too, he has a macro-concept and a micro-concept. Taking the clue from Vamana's opening sutra that *alamkara* was a synonym of Beauty in its widest sense and twisting Dandin's definition to his advantage, Bhoja conceived a macro-*alamkara*, which included every facet of literary beauty : *guna, bhava, rasa et hoc genus emni*. But he has no quarrels at all with *alamkara* in the conventional sense. In his treatment of the conventional *alamkaras* too, he has made far-reaching changes by enlarging the scope of some and contracting the scope of others. (3) His treatment of *gunas* is also a break from tradition. The number 24 recurs here too and, for the first time in the history of Indian poetics, we have a scheme of 24-*sabda-gunas* and 24 *artha-gunas*. The two-fold division of *gunas* into *sabda-gunas* and *artha-gunas* is, no doubt, found in Vamana, who recognises 10 under each of these two categories. But Bhoja adds a third category of *vaiseshika-gunas*.

With his fine sensibilities and insight into the niceties of the poet's craft, Bhoja could visualise subtler intricacies in the combination of *alamkaras* and add four more patterns in the artistic fusion of *alamkaras*. For these, he conceived four standards : *chaya-adarsa* (mirror and reflection), *pamsu-paniya* (dust and water), *nara-simha* (man and lion) and *chitra-varna* (painting and colour) and supported his stand of six standards for distinguishing the subtle shades of difference in the patterns of *alamkara*-combinaion with illustrations drawn from the poetic

exercises of Valmiki, Kalidasa, Abhinanda, Dandin and others. It is a proof of his aesthetic alertness that he recognised—and let it be said that he stood alone in this—that the acme of the *chamatkara* (attraction and power) in *alamkaras* lay in their deft combintion as opposed to their existence in isolation. He declared that this *samsrishti* (combination) was the most sublime phase of poetic beauty and preferred to go it alone in extending the scope of *samsrishti* to similar combinations of *gunas, bhavas, rasas* and so on. He has shown that his six standards of combination could be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to *gunas, bhavas, rasas* etc. also.

Though Bhoja's faults and deficiencies can be a rewarding study in itself, considerations of space prevent a full-scale discussion of the subject here. I shall have to dismiss it with a summary treatment.

The cardinal defect of Bhoja, the writer, is that he lacked sense of proportion, which is the basic virtue of quality-writing. His *magnum opus* in poetics, the *Sringaraprakasa* suffers from this as much as any of his giant works in other fields. In this respect, the *Sarasvatikanthabharana* fares better inasmuch as it is better planned and proportioned. But it too is nowhere near perfection in this regard, since it does not give the prominence that was due to what was really original in Bhoja, the critic.

The desire to say everything about everything under the sun was the bane of Bhoja, the writer. This same misplaced passion to give an encyclopaedic character to his *Sringaraprakasa* was, in a sense, the bane of this otherwise important work and hastened its fall from favour. This had an unsalutary effect on the treatment of the various themes in the work itself. What really merited greater space and emphasis got relegated to a position of unimportance and received casual treatment. As a result, many knotty points were left unexplained. And we are left to speculate about what could have been Bhoja's ideas, arguments or answers in respect of such issues. To single out one instance :

Bhoja has not said a word to explain why he deleted two *vyabhicharithavas* from Bharata's list and substituted two new ones in their places.

His most significant contribution, the *Sringara-Advaita* theory itself has suffered on account of such scant attention and lopsided emphasis.

By going to the extreme in systematising types and sub-types of concepts, he made a fetish of certain favourite numbers and tried to force his concepts within the rigid bounds of these numbers and, in this process, sacrificed truth for uniformity. Likewise, by stretching his syncretism to the extreme and by his overfondness to incorporate everything good in every earlier thinker into his synthesis, he landed on ostensibly impossible compromises as in the case of *dhvani* and *tatparya*. This same habit of straining a thing to its extremes is to be seen in his obsession for rigid classification and at times even in his penchant for simplification. It is however, interesting to note that some of his qualities as a critic cut both ways; they have their brighter as well as darker sides and can be looked upon as merits turned defects or vice versa. Another defect, which may not appear as a defect, is his none-too-commendable practice of resorting to the aid of telling similes to prove a point. This too is a product of his desire to oversimplify abstract ideas and has a charm of its own. But, whatever may be the value of this method from the point of forceful communication or easy comprehension its employment as a dialectical tool is certainly questionable and deserves to be deprecated as an irrational substitute for scientific logic.

The picture of Bhoja the scholar and literary connoisseur as it emerges from the near-legendary accounts recorded in the romantic biographies like *Bhojaprabandha* and *Bhojacharitra* and in the Jain chronicles like *Prabandhachintamani* and *Prabhavakacharita* is a promiscuous mixture of truth and fiction. As against this, we have the more reliable picture of Bhoja the scholar-critic as it crystallises from his two works on poetics. The latter should serve as a safe corrective for the former. We

should, in fact, use the works as the divining rod to locate the kernel of truth in the traditional stories and also as a lever to lift the buried truths from the accumulated "legendary trash" to use the phrase of Dr. Kane. In our dispassionate appraisal of Bhoja's integral personality we have to be chary of the panegyric excess and listen to the hidden echoes of his professed works, rather than the tale-tellers !

Such, in short, are the credit and debit sides of the balance sheet of Bhoja, the poetician, taken in isolation. The natural question is : what does it all add up to, when we strike the final balance ? In other words, what is the integral picture of Bhoja, the critic as it emerges from a fusion of the brighter and darker sides. The sum total of Bhoja, the critic, may be expressed in his own characteristic manner—through these similes, which I have conceived for his art. When Bhoja absorbed earlier ideas, he added a new tone to the old, as in a second coat of colour : Witness his theory *Sringara-Advaita*. When he reproduced, he gave a new direction to the earlier approach, as in an echo ! Witness his view of *dhvani* and *tatparya*. Even when he copied, he gave a new garb of beauty to his original, as in intelligent mimicry ! Witness his treatment of *alamkara samsristi*. The truth of the matter is : Bhoja followed, but never blindly ; he borrowed, but never indiscriminately; he imitated too, but never servilely.

All this is easily granted. But I have reserved for the last, the most crucial question. And this question of questions is : did he create ?

The forthright answer is a plain 'No'. This great adaptive genius is a big cipher, when it came to creation. In our dispassionate estimate of Bhoja, we can't afford to wink at what his genius was not. He could refashion old structures but not design or erect a new edifice.

In fine, we can say without any reservations that Bhoja has no place among the frontline of creative critics like Anandavardhana or Kuntaka. But it is equally certain that he has a secure

place at the forefront of the second group of the middle-marchers.

A study of the *Sarasvatikanthabharana* and *Sringaraprakasa* and a correct appreciation of Bhoja's stand on the many literary issues discussed in them—which scholars have been fighting shy of attempting even decades after the appearance of these books in print—is bound to be mighty laborious, what with the bristling textual corruptions that are bound to annoy the circumspect reader, and calls for total dedication. However, it can be assured in the same breath that it will prove to be a rewarding experience, if undertaken with even a modicum of the industry and spirit, which produced these two giant-classics of Criticism.

MAHIMA BHATTA

R.C. Dwivedi

MAHIMA BHATTA (C 1050 A.D.) son of Sri Dhairya and pupil of *mahakavi* Shyamala, belonged to a family of Kashmiri Brahmins as his title *Rajanaka* indicates. He is better known in the history of Sanskrit criticism as the author of the *Vyakti-viveka* (literally, a critique of suggestion, the theory propounded by his predecessor, Anandavardhana). Another work of his *Tattvoktikosa*, in which he gave an exposition of the nature of imagination, is lost to us. His famous work, the *Vyakti-viveka*, propounds the theory of inference in aesthetics. Mahima combines erudition with rare aesthetic sensibility, as is amply evident from his critical appreciation of the poems and from his selection of the poems.

The *Vyakti-viveka*, is divided into three chapters (*vimarshas*). An old commentary on it by an equally important writer, probably Ruyyaka (1100 A.D.), is incomplete as it ends with the second chapter and is, in fact, critical of this author's stand. Another commentary, *Tilakaratna*, is also mentioned by Bhandarkar in his report.

In the first chapter Mahima considers critically the definition of *dhvani* to show that it is not different from *anumana* (inference). Likewise, the *Vakrokti* of Kuntaka and *bhakti* (secondary function and meaning of words) are included in Mahima Bhatta's inference.

Mahima Bhatta is at the best of his critical faculty in the second chapter where he expounds and illustrates five formal literary blemishes. He has cast his net very wide, not leaving even the great poets, like Kalidasa from his criticism.

In the last chapter, the author propounds his new aesthetic theory of Inference on the basis of illustrations of *dhvani* given by Anandavardhana.

Bhatta Gopala, a commentator on the *Kavyaprakasa* of Mammata, paid rich compliments to the author of aesthetic theory of Inference, when he observed : "While the great master, the author of *dhvani,* is plunged into ambrosial river of *rasa,* the glory of inference does not forsake the assembly of literary critics.[1]

That this theory became a point of debate and discussion among learned critics is amply proved by the critical consideration it received at the hands of all leading aestheticians who followed him, like Mammata, Ruyyaka, Vidyadhara, Viswanatha and Jagannatha.

Mahima Bhatta belongs to the school of theorists who believe that art is an imitation of reality. He holds that the relation between the situation (*vibhava*) and the basic mental state (*sthayin*) is that of the cause and effect (*karana* and *karya*)[2]. According to Mallinatha's *Tarala* (p. 85, 191-7), a commentary on *Ekavali,* Mahima Bhatta undertook the task of demolishing the *dhvani*-theory expounded by Anandavardhana (850-84 A.D.). Mallinatha is, in principle, the follower of Samkuka, though he nowhere indicates this fact. According to him, the *vibhavas, anubhavas* and *vyabhicharibhavas* are quite different from the causes etc. in as much as they are artificial and *pratiyamana* or *gamya* (inferable) i.e. existing only in *pratiti* or apprehension. This consciousness or *pratiti* is the enjoyment of *rasa* : *pratiti-paramaras eva cha rasasvadha.*[3]

To show that *rasa*-realisation cannot go beyond the inferential cognition, Mahima Bhatta built up his theory from the base. Language is a rational tool for communication of ideas which should be meaningful to be convincing. According to Jaimini, no

1. रसामृतनदीमग्ने ध्वनिकारे महागुरौ अनुमाया हि काव्यंगोष्ठिम् न मुञ्चति ।
2. Comparative Aesthetics (Revised ed.) P. 335
3. *Vyakti—Vivéka* (V.V.) Chowkhamba ed, p. 73

Vedic passage can be said to have any meaning unless it refers to some action or to some means or fruit of action. Action is the sole end of *sruti*, and so those *sruti* passages which do not aim at action are useless.[1] The purpose of the Veda is to give the knowledge of some activity.[2] "Activity being the aim of *sruti*, passages which have no such aim are useless".[3] In the fashion of the *Mimamsakas*, Mahima Bhatta also believes that the principle of activity, *pravritti*, and passivity or *nivritti*, by and large, governs the function of language.[4] The verbal expression is of two kinds : the word and the sentence. The latter consists of two elements, the *sadhya* (the thing to be inferentially established) and the *sadhana*, or reasoning. As every sentence has these two parts, it is inferential in character. Its meaning also is primary or inferable.[5] Since a word is a simple thing, devoid of parts, it cannot have the *sadhya* and the *sadhana*, therefore, its meaning is always primary.[6] Each of the primary and inferable meanings of a sentence consists of *sadhya* and *sadhana*. The relationship of these two is, again, of two kinds, verbal and ideal. And each of such a *sadhya* and *sadhana* can be either the meaning of a word or a sentence. As the latter two have different varieties, the relationship of the former two is manifold.[7] Thus the ideas conveyed through a sentence involve the relationship of the *sadhya* and the *sadhana*, and are, therefore, inferential in character.

It should be stated here that like Anandavardhana Mahima also subdivides the poetic meaning into three types, namely, *vastu*, *alamkara* and *rasa*, etc. and admits that the first two can be directly presented, the last is always inferable only.[8]

1. *Jaimini Sutra 1.2.1*
2. *Sabara Bhashya 1.1.1.*
3. *Jaimini Sutra 1.2.1*
4. तस्य परप्रवृत्ति-निवृत्ति-निबन्ध तत्वात् न हि युक्तिमान-वगच्चन कश्चित् सम्यक् प्रत्यभाक् भवति VV. pp. 21-22
5. अथोऽपि द्विविधो वाच्योऽनुमेयश्च Ibid, p 39.
6. पदस्यार्थो वाच्य एव नानुमेयावस्य निरंशत्वात् साध्य साधना भावाभावत Ibid, pp 39-40.
7. स हि द्विविधा शब्दार्थोथार्थश्चेरी सोऽपि च साध्यपात्रयो प्रत्येकं पदार्थ वाक्यार्थ रूपत्वात् बहुविधः Ibid pp—45.6
8. Ibid, p. 39.

While a word or a sentence are both directly and indirectly significants of the *sthayin*, a letter or combination of them is only indirectly significant of it. It is only through the meaning of words, which are coloured by the latter, that the basic mental states of love etc. are inferable. The significance (*gamakatva*) of the letters is tenable only indirectly, but not directly.[1] Mahima recognises only one power in words, namely, *abhidha* or denotation which gives rise to the conventional meaning. He includes *lakshana*,[2] *tatparya*,[3] as well as epistemological meanings like *arthapatti*[4] or presumption and *upamana*[5] or comparison and the poetic activity called *vakrokti* mentioned by Kuntaka[6] under inference.

According to the *dhvani*-theorists, *abhivyakti* (a technical term for *dhvani*) is the rise of the manifested meaning, real or unreal, simultaneously with the manifester without the intervening memory of the relation between them[7]. In order to refute the *dhvani*-theory Mahima Bhatta analyses its nature as follows :

First of all the manifestation of the 'real' is of the three types[8] : (i) The effect exists potentially in the cause and is imperceptible. Its having become perceptible is one type. Thus, curd, for instance, existing potentially and imperceptibly in milk becomes manifest and perceptible. This is *samkhya*-view which holds the pre-existence of effect in the cause (*satkarya-vada*). The *Naiyayikas*, however, believe that effect does not potentially exist in the cause (*asatkaryavada*) and that effect is a newly caused thing. According to them curd is produced from the milk.

1. वर्णसंघटनयोरपि गमकत्वमुपचरितमेव परमपर्येण तु साक्षात् ibid—p. 443
2. Ibid, pp. 110-121
3. Ibid, pp. 122-124
4. Ibid, pp. 121-122
5. Ibid, p. 78
6. Ibid, pp. 124-127
7. Ibid, pp. 76-77
8. Ibid, p. 77

(ii) The manifestation of an object which was not perceptible on account of some impediment, is relegated to a secondary position through a manifester, though its presence is felt simultaneously. Here the manifester is spoken of as the *vyanjaka*, cause as opposed to a *karaka*, or material cause. The manifestation of a jar by a lamp, for instance, belongs to this second type.

(iii) The manifestation of an object that has already been experienced and lies in the mind in the form of latent impressions is the third type. This is brought about by either the perception of another invariably concomitant object or by a denotative word. This is just the awakening of the latent impressions of the subconscious mind. The manifestation of fire by smoke or that of an object by a portrait, painting, image or imitation or a denotative word, may be cited as examples of this third type.

Mahima Bhatta asserts that none of these types of manifestation of an object is applicable to the case of suggestion in poetry. It cannot be admitted that like curd, suggestion is also directly perceptible. He is not prepared to allow the suggestionist to choose even the second type, illustrated by the manifestation of the jar by the light of lamp. For, in that case, the consciousness of the two is simultaneous, while in the case of *vyanjaka* and *vyangya*, the segnance is clear and distinct. Secondly, the apprehension of the *vyangya* from the conventional meaning of the *vyanjaka* is not possible without the apprehension of invariable concomitance between them. "Otherwise the consciousness of the suggested meaning from the apprehension of the conventional should arise in all persons irrespective of the fact whether they know the invariable concomitance of the two or not.[1]

The suggestionist may say that though there is admittedly a distinct order or succession when a fact or a poetic figure is suggested, there is not order or succession when *rasa* is suggested, or at any rate, it is not discernible, hence, the definition of *abhivyakti* is offered for *rasa-dhvani*. This point is unacceptable of Mahima Bhatta firstly because it would then exclude the

1. V.V. p. 79. and *Comparative Aesthetics*, Vol. 1, p. 358.

vastudhvani and *alamkara-dhvani*, Secondly because, even in the case of *rasa-dhvani* the synchronous consciousness of the *vibhava*, etc. and the basic mental state is logically untenable as the cause and effect cannot manifest simultaneously.[1]

In order to show that *dhvani* in its meaning of manifester cannot be admitted, Mahima Bhatta discusses the fundamental character of the manifester. The manifester is of two types one that appears as *upadhi* or adjunct to something which it illumines and the other, which is free or independent, not *upadhi* to anything. While the first envelop the illumined, and is illustrated by cases of knowledge, word, light of lamp, etc., the second precedes the illuminated which is apprehended in succession and is illustrated by the case of smoke, etc. The theorists of *dhvani* cannot admit the first type, for by doing so they will have to acknowledge an object of perception and a conventional meaning as a piece of poety. This will defeat the very purpose of the *dhvani* theory, for, that would include only the compositions based on primary sense under the sphere of poetry and exclude the suggested or the *dhvani-kavya*. If the *dhvani*-theorist is to identify *dhvani* as manifester of the second type, then his manifester will not be different from an inferential sign, and he will be compelled to give up his *dhvani* theory and will have to accept the theory of inference.[3]

In his refutation of *abhivyakti*, as discussed above, Mahima Bhatta does not deny the capacity of words or ideas for manifestation but he wants to stress that the example of the lamp, etc. are primarily possessed of *vyanjakatva* and the applicability of such analogies in the sphere of poetry can be accepted only in the secondary (*bhakta*) sense, and not in the conventional sense. A poetic word or idea can be metaphorically said to be *vyanjaka* and the purpose of such a metaphorical use is the clear apprehension of the conventional meaning. By offering

1. V.V. p. 79.
2. Ibid, p. 80.
3. Ibid, p. 131.

the analogy of the lamp and the jar, the *dhvani-vadin* also wants to make the point that the apprehension of the suggested meaning cannot take place without a manifester or *vyanjaka*. The analogy is not stretched beyond this point.[1] But it would be clear that Mahima Bhatta wants to controvert the belief of the *dhvani-vadin* that a manifester is suggestive of a thing different from the conventional meaning. Just as a lamp illumines only the well-known nature of a jar and not its hidden or unrevealed aspects so also a suggestive word can manifest only a well-known and conventionally fixed meaning or a word. It is here that his objections against the *dhvani-vadin's* conclusions on the strength of analogy are pertinent and fundamental.

In order to show that *vibhava*, etc. and the *rasas* stand in temporal sequence like cause and effect and that they can be treated as the inferential signs (like smoke in the inference of fire), Mahima Bhatta reproduces the words of Anandavardhana 'Nobody feels that *vibhava, anubhava* and *vyabhicharins* are nothing but *rasas*'. As the consciousness of *rasa*, etc. is invariably dependent on the apprehension of *vibhava*, etc. the apprehension of the two sets stands in relation of cause and effect; therefore, the temporal sequence is inevitable. It is, however, too quick to be perceived; hence the dictum that the suggested *rasas* are not in a perceptible temporal sequence.[2]

In brief, Mahima Bhatta's theory is that *rasa* is essentially a reflection of *sthayin*, inferred from the artistically presented cause; aesthetic experience (*rasasvada*) is the inferential consciousness, non-empirical in nature, of a basic mental state that shines in an aesthete in consequence of awareness of the *vibhava*, etc. and when it is so, the situation, (*vibhava*), etc. and *rasa* must be considered to be conjoint like smoke and fire. His thesis has advanced two important points. (i) the aesthete experiences *rasa* only cognitively and not effectively, (ii) and that there is a temporal sequence not only in the apprehension

1. Vide V.V. Vyakhyana, pp. 58-59 and 81.
2. Croce, Logic as the Science of Pure concept, trans. by Douglas Ainslie p. 584.

of what suggestion and what is suggested, but also in the experience of a *sthayin* from the situation etc., because both are invariably related as cause and effect.

Mahima Bhatta devotes the whole of second chapter to the consideration of impropriety (*anauchitya*) in poetry. It is of two kinds, intrinsic (*antaranga*) and extrinsic (*bahiranga*). The first one consists in the improper employment of *vibhavas, anubhavas* and *vyabhicharibhavas* in the manifestation of *rasa*. The extrinsic or formal impropriety pertains to either word or meaning. These may be further divided into five classes—*vidheya-avimarsa* (non-discrimination of predicate), *prakarana-bheda* (irregularity of expression), *kramabheda* (violation of order), *paunaruktya* (redundance) and *vachyavachana* (omission of what is to be stated). All defects constitute impediments to *rasa*-realisation. While the intrinsic defects cause this impediment directly, the extrinsic do so indirectly. Mahima has illustrated most of these defects in the very first *karika* of the *Dhvanyaloka* : *kavyasyatma dhvaniriti* etc. which he recasts for making it flawless. He has taken up many other verses of the *Dhvanyaloka* to illustrate the flaws. Examples of these five blemishes are given from well known classics, the *Raghuvamsa, Kumarasambhava, Sakuntala, Balaramayana, Kiratarjuniya, Gita, Harshacharita* etc.

A searching scrutiny of the verses of these works of master poets of Sanskrit followed invariably by suggestions for alternative readings is unparalled in the history of Indian literary criticism. But Mahima Bhatta undertook this task of finding fault in masterpieces of literature in order to meet the requirement of his pupils and to counteract the possible charge of muddle-headedness or lack of good manners. He says that a physician prevents others from unwholesome diet even though, he may himself be addicted to that.[1]

1. Vyaktiviveka-II-1.

A closer view of Mahima's theory of Inference would reveal that it is more comprehensive than the theory of *dhvani*, as it not only emphasises the pre-eminence of *rasa* but also includes the cases of *gunibhutavyangya*. It is *rasa* which endows charm to all poetic creations and can never be subordinated to any other meaning. This also raises the status of the *gunibhutavyangya* in the comprehensive theory of Inference which, as stated earlier, includes *tatparya*, *vakrokti*, etc.

Mahima is a bold and original thinker who is the pioneer among the critics of the theory of *dhvani*. In depth of preception, clarity of exposition, vastness of erudition and scholarly polemics, Mahima has hardly any match in the history of *alamkarasastra*.

VISWANATHA

P. Pradhan

VISWANATHA KAVIRAJA, THE author of *Sahityadarpana,* comes of a very illustrious family of Orissa belonging to Kapinjala Gotra. His father, Chandrasekhar, equally ranks high as a poet and rhetorician. He adorned the court of the Gajapati kings of Orissa like his father and forefathers. His son, Ananta Dasa in the beginning of the Lochana commentary on *Sahityadarpana* aptly remarks "Sri Viswanatha was the moon of the milk ocean of Kapinjala family, the minister of the king of Trikalinga, illustrious, beloved master of many languages, pilot of the ocean of the literary learning, head of those who were well versed in the path of *dhvani* and at the same time, a great poet." This Kapinjala family of Viswanatha was famous in Orissa for its literary activities for about two centuries. His grandfather Narayana Dasa wrote a commentary on the *Gitagovinda* of Jayadeva called *Sarvangasundari;* Chandidasa the younger brother of Viswanatha's grandfather (i.e. Narayana Dasa) wrote a commentary on *Kavyaprakasa* called *Kavyaprakasa Dipika* and another work called *Dhvani Siddhanta Samgraha.* The eldest brother of the father of Chandidasa was also an author as stated by him in his *Dipika.* Chandrasekhar, father of Viswanatha, was master of fourteen languages and was the author of *Pushpamala* and *Bhasarnava,* as stated in *Sahityadarpana.*

Born and brought up in such a family, Viswanatha was a scholar of the first order, a prolific writer and master of eighteen languages. He proved his versatility and merit in producing the following works : (1) *Chandrakala Natika* (a playlet), (2) *Prabhavati Parinaya* (a drama), (3) *Raghava Vilasa* (a poem), (4) *Raghava Vilapa* (a poem), (5) *Kuvalayasva Charita* (a

Prakrit poem), (6) *Prasasti Ratnavali* (in sixteen languages), (7) *Narasimha Vijaya* (a small poem), (8) *Sahityadarpana*, (9) *Kavyaprakasa darpana* (a commentary), (10) *Kamsavadha* (a poem), (11) *Lakshmistava*, and some unknown *gadyakavyas* in Sanskrit and Prakrit and a number of panegyric and devotional verses so far known.

It is evident from Viswanatha's personal notes in *Chandrakala Natika* that he learned all the principles of poetry and rhetorics from his illustrious father, Chandrasekhara who was a writer par excellence. Like his father Viswanatha was the minister of peace and war (*Sandhivigrahika Mahapatra*) under the Gajapati kings of Orissa. Besides, he was the preceptor in *Natyaveda* and a master of stagecraft as well as dramaturgy. Viwanatha's son, Ananta Dasa, who rose to eminence studied under his father.

The date and place of origin of Viswanatha are shrouded in the dark and are given differently by different scholars. But the following materials help us : (1) Parvati temple inscriptions, (2) Simhachalam temple inscriptions, (3) Puri copper plate grant of Narasimha Deva IV, (4) *Chandrakala Natika.*

There are internal evidences in his work where he has referred to the strength and valour of Narasimha Deva IV (1378-1407) in his *Sahityadarpana* :

आहवे जगदुद्दण्ड राजमण्डलराहवे
श्री नृसिंहपाल स्वस्यस्तु तव बाहवे

Ananta Dasa says that his father wrote a treatise on Vijaya Narasimha. The eulogy quoted above on Narasimha might have been taken from that text.

Further, the word 'Umavallabha' occurs in a verse of his father, Chandrasekhar, quoted in the *Sahityadarpana*. From its explanation it appears that "Umavallabha" has two meanings,— spouse of Uma i.e. Lord Siva and husband of queen Uma Devi i.e., Bhanudeva. This Bhanudeva is identified with Bhanudeva

III(1352—1378). In *Chandrakala Natika*, Bhanudeva or Nihshanka Bhanudeva is referred to. This Bhanudeva is the Bhanudeva IV (1407—1434) or Nihshanka Bhanudeva on the occasion of whose supposed victory over the Muslim king of Bengal, the playlet was written and staged—*Yavanpura-purandhari-Varganirgalad-Viralanyanajala — Gajapamaharajadhirajah Trikalinga bhumandalakhandalah Srimannihshankabhanudevah.*

From the above discussions it may be concluded that Viswanatha seems to have been active in the literary field during the reign of Narsimha Deva IV and his successor Bhanudeva IV ruling between 1378—1434 A.D.

The work on poetics by which Viswanatha is known all over India is the *Sahityadarpana.* He adopts in it the method of *Kavyaprakasa.* There are three parts in it—*karikas, vrittis* and examples, *karikas* and *vrittis* are his own, the examples cited are taken from his own works and from works of others as well. The work is divided into ten chapters. In the first chapter, Viswanatha analyses the definition of poetry. He has criticised the established theories of different rhetoricians, and his arguments are mainly directed against the theory of Mammata and Anandavardhana. After defining *kavya* as *vakyam rasatmakam kavyam* in the second chapter he defines the sentences, the words and the different senses derived from the words. Here he analyses three kinds of power of words (*sabda-shakti*)—*adhidha, lakshana,* and *vyanjana* and by the way discusses the *tatparya vritti.* In the third chapter Visvanatha discusses the definition of *rasa,* the method of its realisation, different divisions with their cognate subjects. Here he mentions forty-eight types of *Nayakas* and three hundred and eightyfour types of Nayikas. The fourth chapter exclusively deals with the division of *kavyas* viz. *dhvani* and *gunibhutabyangya.* After refuting the views of opponents, in the fifth chapter, Viswanatha establishes the existence of *vyanjana* as a separate *vritti.* The trend of his

discussion shows him to have been influenced by the corresponding section of the *Kavyaprakaśa*. The whole of the sixth chapter is devoted to dramaturgy. The author here defines *rupakas* and *uparupakas* in detail. The definition of epics *katha*, *champu*, *viruda* and *karambhaka* etc. are given here. Viswanatha has followed Dhananjaya, no doubt but has also criticised him. Further, he has classified the *uparupakas* which are not found in the *Dasarupaka* of Dhananjaya. In the seventh chapter the five types of *kavya-doshas*, i.e. *pada*, *padamsa*, *vakyaartha* and *rasadosa* are dealt with instead of six categories of *doshas* propounded by some of his predecessors. Viswanatha does not accept *alamkaradosha* among other types of *doshas* or takes it to be *gunabhava*. He gives illustrations as to where *doshas* are to be taken as *guna*. Chapter eight deals with the three divisions of *guna*. The author does not accept the twenty divisions of *sabdaguna* or *arthaguna* as propounded by Vamana and Bhoja. He either includes them under the three types of *guna* or does not accept them as *guna*. The different styles of *ritis*—Vaidarbhi, Gaudi, Panchali and Lati are discussed in the ninth chapter. The tenth chapter, the last, defines and illustrates all the *alamkaras* and their subdivisions.

Sanskrit literary compositions are divided into two classes—*sravya* (poems) and *drisya* (plays). The work of rhetoricians prior to Viswanatha dealt with only one aspect of it, either *sravya* or *drisya*. Rhetoricians like Anandavardhana, Mammata and Jagannatha deal with *sravya* aspect; dramaturgists like Bharata, author of *Natyasastra*, or Dhananjaya, author of *Dasarupaka*, dealt exclusively with *drisya*. But Viswanatha for the first time treats of both, devoting a full chapter to drama. His son Ananta Dasa rightly observes :

Sravyabhineyalamkaratattvam satkavisammatam,
yadihasti tadanyatra yannehasti na tat kvachit

All the essential tenets of *sravya*, *abhineya* and *alamkaras* as approved by the good poets are included in this work. Whatever is here, is elsewhere; and whatever is not here, is to be

found nowhere else. Viswanatha giving an estimate of his own work says, "Oh Scholars, looking at *Sahityadarpana* you may know all the essential tenets of Rhetorics with ease".

Sahityadarpana avoids topics which are not essential and necessary. The subjects discussed here are to the point. New theories and thoughts are propounded. Different techniques and forms of drama are dealt with. The exposition is clear, intelligible and to the point. Ananta Dasa, in the following verse refers to these attributes of *Sahityadarpana.*

svalpaksarah subodharthah pradhvastashesha-dooshanah
Sahityadarpano nama granthastena Vinirmitah

'Viswanatha composed *Sahitydarpana* which is brief but clear in meaning and devoid of all defects'.

Sahityadarpana has intrinsic merits of its own and it naturally attained popularity even in far off Kashmir soon after Viswanatha wrote it.

Rhetoricians prior to Viswanatha had propounded a number of theories on the definition of *kavya.* Bhamaha, Udbhata, Dandin and others were the propounders of the *alamkara* school. The *dhvani* theory started by Anandavardhana was accepted and propogated by Mammata. The two schools—*riti* of Vamana and *vakrokti* of Kuntaka could not make much headway. For a long time struggle continued between the *alamkara* school and *dhvani* school; and *dhvani* school survived. Rhetoricians like Viswanatha are responsible for establishing the *dhvani* school on a firm footing. And Viswanatha speaks of himself as *dhvani prasthapanaparamacharya,* a great propounder of the *dhvani* school.

Anandavardhana accepts and establishes the existence of *dhvani* saying *kavyasyatma sa evarthah, kavyasyatma dhvani-riti.* At the same time he emphasises the importance of *rasa* when he says, *Eko raso angikartavyah.* Further, he speaks of three types of *dhvani—vastu dhvani, alamkara dhvani* and *rasa dhvani.* Now the question arises as to which of these *dhvanis* is the soul of

kavya. The first two types of *dhvani* cannot be regarded as the soul of *kavya* as pointed out by Viswanatha.

Viswanatha's *Sahityadarpana* occupies a unique place in the development of poetics in India. He was a leading exponent of the *dhvani* School and he established the *rasa* theory on a firm footing. His son Ananta Dasa paying tribute to his father rightly says—*Dhvanyadhvani proudhadhiyam purogah Sriviswanathah Kavichakravarti* : Viswanatha occupies the foremost place among those of matured thought who had expounded the *dhvani* school.

PANDITARAJA JAGANNATHA

P. S. Ramachandrudu

IT IS THE rare privilege of a few to be endowed with both aspects of *pratibha*, the critical and the creative, and it is this happy combination of these two faculties that has given Jagannatha a high place among the poets as well as the literary critics in Sanskrit literature.

Jagannatha was born some time about 1600 A.D. in the Venginadu-sect of Trailinga (Telugu) Brahmins of Konasima in a village called Munganda, in the East Godavari district of the present Andhra Pradesh. There is another tradition, according to which Jagannatha was born in the village Davuluru of Tenali Taluk in the Guntur district of the same state. But excepting such traditional accounts which are mainly based on regional loyalities, there is nothing to prove the exact place of birth of Jagannatha in the Andhra Pradesh. It is indeed, doubtful if Jagannatha ever lived in his native land at all, for, his father or grand-father appear to have migrated to and settled down in Banaras where Jagannath was probably born. *Upadrashta* (Supervisor of sacrificial rites) was the surname (*Upanama*) of his family. He was the son of Perubhatta and Lakshmi. Perubhatta was a great scholar proficient in all branches of learning, having studied them with the most reputed scholars of that time like Khandurdeva. Excepting *vyakarana* which he studied with Sesha-Viresvara, Jagannatha studied all the other *sastras* with his own father whom he rightly calls *Mahaguru*, because he was both his father and teacher.

There are many stories which are woven around the life of Jagannatha but they are all of little authenticity. According to one such story that has become popular, Jagannatha, when he was in the court of Mughal Emperor, fell in love with a Muslim

girl, Lavangi, and married her with the consent of the Emperor. He was excommunicated by the scholars of Banaras, led by Appayadikshita which resulted in his great animosity of Appayadikshita which was openly exhibited in his works. It is now proved that the person who had liaison with a Muslim girl was different from Jagannatha and that Jagannatha was not at all a contemporary of Appayadikshita. Contrary to the assertion of Achyutaraya, a commentator of the *Bhaminivilasa*, Jagannatha lived a happy married life and there are references in *Karunavilasa* to indicate that his wife's name was Kamesvari.

Jagannatha had many disciples. One of them, Srikulapatimiara of the Mathura Chaturvedi family of Agra, was a great poet in Vrajabhasa and flourished in the court of Sriramasinhaji I of Jaipur. In one of his works, *Sangramasara*, he mentions his teacher's (Jagannatha's) name with great respect. Narayanabhatta was another student of Jagannatha and he studied all the *sastras* with him.

In one of his well-known verses, Jagannatha states :

दिल्लीवल्लभपाणि पल्लवतले नीतं नवीनं वयं

that is, he spent his youth under the patronage of the Delhi Emperor. This Delhi Emperor is usually identified with Shahjahan who ruled from 1628 to 1658 A.D. On the strength of another verse श्यामं यज्ञोपवीतं etc., eulogising Jahangir, some scholars think that Jagannatha entered the Mughal court during the reign of Jahangir himself, perhaps through the good offices of Asaf Khan, the brother-in-law of the Emperor.

Jagannatha seems to have been patronised first, according to some scholars, by Jagatsimha of Udaipur who came to power in the beginning of 1628 and who helped Shahjahan in securing the much contested throne of Delhi. Through Jagatsimha, Jagannatha must have got admission into Mughal court or if he had already some connections with the court, he became the favourite of Shahjahan. He was very loyal to Jagatsimha for the help he gave him, and placed him, in his esteem, on the same footing

with the Mughal Emperor as is evident from the following well-known verse :

दिल्लीश्वरो वा जगदीश्वरो वा मनोरथान् पूरयि समर्थः
अन्येन्द्रुपालं : परिदीयमानं शाकाय वा स्याल्लवणीय वा स्यात्

"Either the Emperor of Delhi or Jagadisvara,[1] i.e. Jagatsimha is the king who can give us to the heart's contentment. Whatever is given by other kings may be just enough to buy either vegetables or salt".

It is said that Jagannatha was not only a great poet-critic, well-versed in all branches of learning but also a musician of repute, as believed by some scholars. Surendranatha Tagore writes in his 'Universal history of Music'—"During Shahjahan's reign (1628—58) the following musicians lived, Jagannatha, Bairanga Khan and Lalkhan, the son-in-law of Bailas, son of Tansen. Jagannatha and Bairanga Khan were weighed in silver and received Rupees 4500 each".

Jagannatha calls himself 'Panditaraja' and states in one or two places that the title was conferred on him by Shahjahan. But it is believed by some that 'Panditaraja' might be the name of an office held by Jagannatha rather than a mere title, for in the colophone of *Asafavilasa* Jagannatha writes about himself :

शाहजहानप्रसादादधिगत पदवी विराजितेन

The use of the word 'Padavi' instead of 'Biruda' is significant. It is quite possible, as in the court of Sivaji, in the Mughal court also there was an office of 'Panditarao' to look after the religious or other matters of the Hindus, which was ably held by Jagannatha.

In the Mughal court, Jagannatha led a highly comfortable life enjoying the patronage of some of the highly influential persons of the royal family like Darashikoh, Asafkhan and others and the best of his literary career was spent there. Perhaps he had to leave the Mughal court in the year 1658 when Shahjahan was imprisoned and Dara was murdered. He reached the court of

1. There is a pun on this word, as it means the 'Lord of the World' also.

Prananarayana, the king of Assam and lived there for a short period as Prananarayana himself had to flee to Bhutan in 1659 A.D. From Assam he went to Varanasi to spend a retired life of quietitude and happiness on the banks of the holy Ganga, as is clear from his well-known verse in the *Santavilasa* of *Bhaminivilasa.*

शास्त्राण्याकलितानि नित्य विधय: सर्वेऽपि सम्भाविता:
दिल्लीवल्लभ पाणि पल्लवतले नीतं नवीनं वय: ।
सम्प्रत्यन्धक शासनस्य नगरे तत्वं परं चिन्त्यते
सर्वं पण्डितराज राजि तिलकेनाकारि लोकाधिकम् ॥

On the basis of a different reading of the third line as "सम्प्रत्युत्किट् वासनं मधुपुरीमध्ये हरि: सेव्यते" it is believed by some, that he settled down in Mathura.

The following is a brief account of the works of Jagannatha.

Gangalahari—This is a very popular poem of 53 verses composed in praise of Ganga.

Amritalahari.—This is a short poem of 11 verses composed in praise of the Yamuna.

***Karunalahari.*—This is a poem of 65 verses in praise of god** Vishnu.

Lakshmilahari.—This is a poem of 41 verses composed in praise of Goddess Lakshmi.

Sudhalahari.—This is a poem of 30 verses in praise of the Sun-god.

Yamunavarnanam.—This is a prose work or a *champu-kavya* in praise of Yamuna; and it is yet to be traced. Only two passages, each of two lines, from this work, are quoted in the *Rasagangadhara.*

Asafavilasa.—This is a panegyric on Asafa Khan, the brother of Nurjahan and the father-in-law of Shahjahan, who wielded great influence in the administration of the empire. This work was written at the instance of one Rayamukuta of Mathura. It is a miniature-*Akhyayiki* of about 75 lines. It begins with a small prose passage, followed by four verses and ends with a long prose passage of about one page and a half.

Jagadabharana and *Pranabharana*.—These two poems are almost identical with difference only in the names of the heroes praised there in the epithets, introduced to suit the particular king described. For example the fourth line of the second verse of *Jagadabharna* :

जागर्तु क्षितिमडलोपरि जगत्सिहो धराधीश्वरः
is changed as जागर्तु क्षितिमण्डले चिरमिह श्री कामरूपेश्वरः

Such changes are to be found only in eight places in this poem of 53 verses, commented upon by the poet himself. As the names indicate, these two poems are eulogies of two princes. As seen above, the *Jagadabharana* was written in praise of the king Jagatsimha, the son of Karna of Udaipur. About 1658 A.D. when he was forced to leave the Mughal Court in its non-congenial atmosphere, Jagannatha sought the patronage of Prananarayana of Assam. Probably he could not find sufficient time or proper mood to compose a new panegyric to Prananarayan and so he changed the *Jagadabharana* itself into *Pranabharana* by giving some touches here and there.

The *Jagadabharana* seems to have been used as a panegyric to the prince Dara Shikoh also by introducing some changes in the epithets but retaining the same title because *Jagadabharana* can be understood in the sense of 'The Ornament of the world'.

Bhaminivilasa.—This is a collection of stray verses (*Muktakas*) in four *vilasas* namely *Prastavikavilasa* (122 verses), *Sringaravilasa* (180 verses), *Karunavilasa* (19 verses) and *Shantavilasa* (44 verses). In the 33rd verse of the *Shantavilasa* the poet says that he has made this casket (*Bhaminivilasa*) for the jewels of his verses lest the poetasters should misappropriate them.

There are hundred of *anyoktis*, ascribed to Jagannatha. The editors of *Panditarajakavyasangraha* have collected 588 verses, many of which bear the distinct stamp of Jagannatha.

Chitramimasakhandana.—This is a small work, really a collection, in which Jagannatha presents in an abridged form, his views against the *Chitramimamsa* as expressed in his *Rasagangadhara*. This work ends with the figure *apanhuti* whereas the *Chitramimansa* of Appayadikshita includes two more *alamkaras*, *utpreksha* and part of *atisayokti*. The reason is obvious. No views of Appayadikshita on *utpreksha* and *atisayokti* were criticised in the *Rasagangadhara* which was the source of this work (*Chitramimamsakhandana*).

Manoramakuchamardana.—Bhattojidihshita, the great grammarian criticised the views of his own teacher Sesha Shrikrishna who happens to be the *paramguru* of Jagannatha. This enraged Jagannatha who calls Bhattoji a *Gurudrohi*. He wrote the above work criticising the *Praudhamanorama* of Bhattoji. Only a fragment of it of about 26 pages is available now.

There are a few more works of little authenticity which are ascribed to Jagannatha. Jagannatha refers to an *akhyayika* of his own from which he quotes a line describing a damsel, in Kanva's hermitage, in the *Rasagangadhara*. It is not known whether it is the same work where *Yamunavarnam*, etc. occur or a different one.

Rasagangadhara.—Jagannatha's most important work on which rests his fame as great scholar and critic is the *Rasagangadhara* which came to hold a high position like the *Dhvanyaloka* and the *Kavyaprakasa* in the field of poetics. It is the masterpiece of Jagannatha in which he shows his mastery of logic, subtle thinking, perspicuity of style, wonderful grasp and insight in the *alamkarasastra*.

The *Rasagangadhara* is divided into two chapters (*ananas*) but the last portions of the second chapter are missing. It is believed by some that Jagannatha wrote this work in five chapters in consonance with the title which means Siva who has five faces (*ananas*). But in the absence of any other strong evidence it may be believed that Jagannatha wrote only two chapters because almost all the important topics have been discussed in the extant work

and Jagannatha was not in the habit of simply repeating the views of old writers on such topics like the Rupaks etc. where he did not have anything special to add.

In one of his verses Jagannatha throws a challenge asking if there is any person who can compete with him in composing sweet poetry. It was not an empty bragging. His verses bear testimony to his unrivalled skill in composing fine poetry. He has a style of his own which is distinct and charming with a beautiful harmony of sound and sense. He is an adept in using sonorous alliteration which he introduces with effortless case. His five *Laharis* are a fine example for poems where *bhavadhvani* is predominant. In this connection the following *sloka* may be cited :

पयः पीत्वा मातस्तव रूपादि यातः सहचरैः विमूढैः सरन्तु कस्विद्पी न विश्रान्ति-मनमम् इदानीमुत्सङ्गे मृदुपवनसञ्चारशिशिरे चिरादुन्निद्रं मां सदयहृदये ! शामय चिरम्

(*Ganga Lahari*-46)

In depicting *sringara* or love Jagannatha maintains propriety (*auchitya*), never crossing the bounds of good taste. Like many other poets, he never indulges in describing the various parts of the body; yet he is successful in delineating *sringara* very effectively. It may be easy to maintain a *rasa* in a long poem (*prabandha*), but it requires high skill on the part of a poet to delineate *rasa* even in a single *sloka* (*muktaka*), and that is what Jagannatha could achieve successfully.

The *anyoktis* of Jagannatha are so full of suggestions that they can have direct effect on the reader of every age and clime. His keen observation of the society, his insight into the human psychology, his capacity to laugh away the human weaknesses—all these are fully displayed in his *anyoktis*. The following verse may be cited as example :

"हारं वक्षसि केनापि क्षिप्तमज्ञेन मर्कटः/
लेढ़ि जिघ्रति संक्षिप्य कुरुते चोच्चमासनम् ॥

A special quality of Jagannatha's poetry is simplicity and perspecuity (*prasada*), whether he is engaged in depicting love,

pathos or any other emotion. Thus his claim in the *Rasagangadhara* 'Almost all my compositions can be taken as examples for *prasada*' is fully justified by his writings.

Jagannatha's contribution to Sanskrit literary criticism is also of considerable value. We may list many of his original views on different topics. The definition of poetry, the assertion of the supremacy of *pratibha* (poetic genius or imagination), the fourfold classification of poems, the new *rasa* theory, the new turn that is given to the concept of *gunas* by accepting two sets of them, the sound arguments that have been advanced while explaining the class of *dhvani* or suggestion based on the capacity of the world *Sabdasaktimuladhvani,* the discussion on the primary and secondary significatory capacities of words, *abhidha* and *lakshana,* the definite shape and scope that is given to many figures of speech (*alamkaras*), these are some of the important points on which Jagannatha has expressed his originality.

With the firm establishment of the theory of *dhvani* (suggestion) by Anandavardhana, Abhinavagupta and Mammata, it became an unquestionable fact that a *kavya* had no claim to be called by that name, unless it had this *dhvani.* While Anandavardhana gives importance to *dhvani* as such whether of *vastu* (theme), *alamkara* (figure of speech) or *rasa* (emotion), Abhinavgupta, emphasises that *rasa* alone is the important element in a poem. While accepting the importance of *rasa* in a *kavya,* Jagannatha feels that a *kavya* need not be denied that name merely because *rasa* is not prominent or is not the chief suggested element in it. A *kavya* can be a source of pleasure even if it has a charming figure of speech (*alamkara*) or even a charming idea *vachyartha,* directly communicated. Accordingly he gives an all comprehensive definition of *kavya,* " रमणीयार्थ प्रतिपादकः शब्दः काव्यम्, that is an expression' conveying a charming sense constitutes *kavya.* In this definition Jagannatha lays stress on *chamatkara* (artistic relish) as an important element in a poem and this element may result from *rasa, alamkara* or *vastu* and conveyed either through suggestion or directly

(*dhvani* or *vachya*). Thus Jagannatha gave a new and comprehensive conception of *kavya*.

Jagannatha is a man of wide learning with great ability for scholastic argument and at the same time an eminent and self-conscious poet. The first two qualities are self-evident in his *Rasagangadhara*. When a point of difference arises he does not spare even such writers like Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta whose views he generally holds in great respect. His confidence in his poetical skill is clearly expressed by him on many occasions.

A staunch believer in *advaita*, Jagannatha shows equal devotion to both Siva and Vishnu but with more inclination towards the latter. His devotion to the holy rivers Ganga and Yamuna also is noteworthy.

Jagannatha is a keen observer of men and manners around him. The atmoshpere of pleasure and gaity, of love and sport which was a thing of common experience in the capital of the Mughal Empire is naturally reflected in his poems of love.

The mention of the name Jagannatha or Panditaraja brings before our mental eye a man of beautiful personality devoted alike to the earthly pleasures and heavently pursuits, a scholar of great erudition and a poet of honeyed expression.

MGIPRRND—II—21 DPD/84—14-9-84—3000.

CULTURAL LEADERS OF INDIA

Publications Division
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting
Government of India