
CHAPTER-I

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF INDIAN AESTHETICS

At the very outset it is relevant to give a brief history of Indian aesthetics, which is almost parallel to the history of Indian poetics, in order to locate the place of Abhinavagupta in the historical development of Indian aesthetics.

In India, the study of aesthetics which was in the beginning restricted to the study of *Nāṭya*(drama) - draws into origin from motives of a purely empirical order but not from any obstruct or disinterested desire for knowledge. The earliest text in this subject which has come down to us is the Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Indian aestheticians are not certain about the time of this work. "Macdouells assigns it to the 6th century A.D. and M.M.Haraprasād Sāstri to the 2nd century B.C. and Le'vi to the Ksatrapa period. The fact that Kalidasa in his *Vikramorvasi* refers to the Bharata as a Muni, only shows that he was much earlier than Kālidāsa. This would place the lower limit of Bharata to the 3rd or 4th century B.C. From the reference in Kālidāsa we are compelled to say that Dr. De's view that the lower limit of Bharata in the 8th century A.D., seems quite untenable. In any case, there is but little evidence that the present

Nāṭya-Śāstra was written earlier than the commencement of Christian era.”

Nāṭya-Śāstra is an elaborate work conveying the whole ground concerned with drama. It deals with the theatre, the religious rites to be performed in every representation, the dress and equipments of actors, dance, the music, movements and gestures of actors, the different classes of drama. *Nāṭya-Śāstra* is the first work where we find discussions about the nature of ‘*rasa*’ in an elaborate way and it also enumerates eight sentiments.

Bharata’s *Nāṭya-Śāstra* is a work of deep psychological insight. Drama is a powerful medium of aesthetic pleasure as it appeals to the sight and hearing at the same time and is then considers the highest form of art. Both sight and hearing collaborate in arousing in the viewer, more forcibly and more easily than any other medium of aesthetic pleasure or any other forms of art, a state of consciousness unique, conceived intuitively and concretely as a juice or flavour, called ‘*rasa*’.

The primary aim of *Nāṭya-Śāstra* is to give the necessary direction to actors so as to enable them creditably admit themselves in acting out their arts and also it aims at giving necessary direction to the dramatists, who are possessed of the power of poetic vision, to enable them to write dramas which are more attractive to the viewers. It also aims at helping

the aesthete who is eager to enjoy the beautiful and is afraid of the study of *Vedas* and the *Purānas*. It shows the ways to the realisation of the main objective of human life, by supplying the technique of the production of drama, from which he can learn the said ways automatically while enjoying the dramatic performance.

The Primary aim of dramatic presentation is to generate aesthetic pleasure in the audience. But the aesthetic pleasure is the realisation of the basic emotion, affecting a soul that is completely universalised. The de-individualisation or universalisation is a slow process, it presupposes self-forgetfulness which is brought about by the music in the preliminary scene of the drama; identification with the hero; assumption of another personality, viewing everything through the eyes of the hero; being in touch with the entire situation and getting emotionally affected as in the hero, forgetting the assumed personality. Thus, aesthetic experience in the experience of the completely deindividualised or universalised self, having no other affection than that of the universalised basic emotion, which is described by Abhinavagupta as *Sādhāraṇīkaraṇa*.

Regarding creating of art we can say that it is not the work of a amateur but of an expert, of one who has mastered all knowledge and understood the mystery and meaning of life. He is called *Kavi* because he can see behind and beyond the sensible world.

Nāṭya which is produced by a *Nāṭyakār* will prove a source of singular delight to one and all. Various questions were put forward by the pupils of Bharata to him. Following are the questions raised by them. (1) what were the circumstances, which lead to the creation of fifth *Veda*; and for whom it was created ? (2) Into how many parts is the *Nāṭya-Veda* divided ? Are there so many parts that it can not be fully grasped ? (3) What are the various arts necessary for the presentation of drama ? Of how many parts is drama made ? Is it an organic whole or merely a jumble ? (4) What are the various way of knowing the different parts of drama ? And if drama is an organic whole and not a mere jumble, is there any special means of knowing (*Barṇanā*) the interconnection of parts ? And if so what is it ? Because if the existence of any knowable entity (*Prameya*) presupposes some means of knowing (*Pramāna*). (5) How are the different parts of drama to be presented ?

Above are allied questions Bharata attempts in his *Nāṭya-śāstra*. The answer to the 1st question may be put forward in the following ways:

The circumstances, which led to the creation of dramaturgy, were the products of time. During *Tretā-Yuga* ; when *Vaivaśvata Manvantara* was running, the I headed by Indra, approached Brahmā with a request to create a play-thing, which may be pleasing to both eye and ear and lead people automatically to follow the path of duty, without the need of any

external compulsion, such as the order of king. The reason why there arose the necessity of such a plaything in the *Tretā-Yuga* was domineered by *rajas*, the quality of action prompted by desires and emotions, and therefore the common experience in the mixture of pleasure and pain, during the *Yuga*. The need for the plaything arises only among those, whose experience is a mixture of pleasure and pain, the latter being proportionally more than the former. For, plaything is for diversion and it is the means to divert the mind only from what is painful.

Such a division was necessary for humanity. For humanity, being under the influence of *Rajas* was deviating from the right path, pointed out by the vedas and was ignoring the rites due to *gods*. They, therefore, felt the necessity of bringing humanity to the right path. This could not be achieved through vedic instruction because the *śūdras* were not permitted to study the *Vedas*. The I, therefore, wanted an instrument of instruction such as could be utilised for instructing all, irrespective of caste and such would be different in form from that of categorical imperative, would not be a mere command, which is unpleasand ~~and~~ to hear and equally unpleasand to carry out, but same thing may be delightfully instructed through the medium of *Nāṭya* where the teachings may be presented by pleasant sight and sounds. It can appeal to all sections of society in a simple way. This may be compared with the situation that a bitter medicine may be taken with sweet milk.

So, these thinkings lead to the creation of fifth Veda by Brahmā at the request of gods. It was created for those, who do not readily follow the path, pointed out by the *Vedas*, or the *Śūdras*, who were debarred from reading and hearing vedas.

The reply to the second question is that, primarily there are four parts of *Nāṭya-Veda*. These parts dealing with the following topics : (1) Art of effective speech or recitation (*Vāchikābhinaya*), (2) Art of music, (3) Art of acting and (4) *Rasas*. And reply to the third question is that drama, with the science or theory of which the *Nāṭya-veda* is concerned, primarily presents *Rasa*, and the three arts are the means of its effective presentation. Thus, it is an organic whole.

The reply to the fourth question is that it is apprehended directly through eyes and ears. And reply to the 5th question cover the entire *nāṭya-śāstra*.² Through the reply of the above five questions various problems raised in aesthetics are partly solved. We find the solution of the problem of aesthetic senses. What are the aesthetic senses ? Bharata's answer is that they are two viz. eyes and ears. For him end of dramatic art is instruction, not directly, but indirectly through presentation of what is pleasing to eyes and ears.

Another important problem is that, what is the end of dramatic art? And the reply is that end of dramatic art is instruction, not directly, but rather indirectly through the presentation of what is pleasing to eyes and ears. It does not directly command, but it makes the viewer experience the goodness of various path, through the identification with the focus of the dramatic situation.

Bharata holds the view that drama is simply a play or play-thing, which can be able to divert the mind of the viewer from situations or factors which worries or troubles him.

Bharata also mentions that the most essential subjective condition for aesthetic experience is that the mind of the viewer should not be occupied with excessive personal pleasure or pain.

In Bharata's Nāṭya-Śāstra there are four main topics viz. acting, dance, music and *rasa*. The first three topics are the primary or secondary means of presentation of *rasa*. All topics of his book have a direct or indirect bearing on *rasa*. "Most of the things that Bharata talks of, are only the means of presenting *rasa*. *Rasa*, therefore, being the final end of all that he talks about, is the most important thing from his point of view."³

Rasa is essentially a product of dramatic art and is not to be found in the creations of nature. It is not pure unity, but unity in multiplicity.

Bharata has laid much importance on ten *guṇas* and *rūpaka*, *upamā*, *dīpaka*, *gamaka* these four *alaṃkāras*. *Nāṭya-śāstra* also mentions those *dosas* which are to be avoided in the poetic creation or *Kāvya-racanā*. Many *alaṃkāra śāstra* writers, like Harsa, Utvata, Sankuka, Matrigupta, Bhattanayaka etc., has written commentaries on *Nāṭya-śāstra*.

How *Kāvya* be made excellent ? and which special element makes a *Kāvya* which is adorned with aesthetic beauty? Aestheticians of different periods had reacted differently regarding these questions. As a result of this difference various schools of aesthetics have been emerged. Among these schools the following four are major :

- i. *Alaṃkāra* (figure)
- ii. *Rīti* (style)
- iii. *Rasa* (aesthetic pleasure)
- iv. *Dhvani* (suggestion)

Four more schools should also be mentioned in this regard viz.

- (i) *Vaṅkrokti* (ii) *Guṇa* (iii) *Anumāna* and (iv) *Aucitya*.

Alaṃkāra School : According to this school, *alaṃkāra* is the originator of *Kāvya-mādhurya*. Though *rasa* takes an important place yet it is secondary *Alaṃkāra* is of two types , viz. *Sabdālaṃkāra* and *arthālaṃkāra*.

Viśvanātha the author of *Sāhityadarpaṇa* is the chief founder of *alaṃkāra* school. For him poetry consists of a sentence full of *rasa* or aesthetic sentiment. *Rasa* which is the soul of poetry is manifested primarily through *alaṃkāra*. He flourished in the first half of the fourteenth century A.D.

Bhāmaha is famous among ancient *alaṃkārikas*, he belongs to the seventh century A.D. His *Kāvyaḷalaṃkāra*, which is divided into six sections is the earliest work on *alaṃkāra* that has come down to us. The book contains 398 verses.

First chapter of the book which contains sixty verses deals with the qualities of *Kāvya* as prose and poetry, and as work in Sanskrit prose of *apabhraṃsa*, as epic poetry, drama, *ākhyāyikā* and *anubandha*, and also treats of the some literary defects. In the second chapter he deals with three *guṇas*, viz. *Mādhurya*, *Prasāda* and *Ojas*, and takes up the subject of *alaṃkāra* which he continues through the third chapter, the *alaṃkāras* of which he speaks are to kinds of *anuprāsa*, five kinds of *gamaka*, *rūpaka*, *dīpaka*, *upamā* with its seven defects. He denies the status of *Hetu*, *Suksma*, *Leśa* and *Vartta* as they contain no *vakrokti*. These were counted as *alaṃkāra* by some of the predecessors of *Bhāmaha*. In the fourth chapter, he deals with eleven kinds of defects of *Kāvya* and defines and illustrates them.

In the fifth chapter he deals with logic and treats of the defects of *Kāvya* as arising from logical hiatus. In the 6th chapter he gives some practical hints to poets for observing grammatical purity, as Bhāmaha also did.⁴

Being separated from Bhāmaha and Udbhata, Rudrata has discussed on *alaṃkāra*. He is the writer of a famous work *Kāvyaalaṃkāra*, which contains 16 sections and 734 *kārikās*, and comprehends almost all the topics of poetics.⁵

Bhāmaha's conception of poetry is subsequently the same as that of Daṇḍin though it is formulated in a little different way. According to Bhāmaha words and meanings together form the body of poetry. But this definition seems to be too wide as the definition can equally be applied to all linguistic productions. He, therefore, after enumerating the various kinds of poetic production, maintains that the mode of presentation of ideas in words, which gives aesthetic pleasure to those who are possessed of aesthetic susceptibility. It is technically called *vakrokti*, which is considered as the essential element of poetry. For him a poetic composition which is without *vakrokti* is not poetry, though there is the presence of good style and it also possesses qualities like sweetness, clearness etc. "Thus, according to Bhāmaha embellishment (*alaṃkāra*) is

the most essential element of poetry and it consists in the striking manner of putting a striking idea in equally striking words.⁶

According to him, *vakrokti* is the chief characteristics of poetry. Poetic qualities, which are only three viz. *Mādhurya*, *Ojas* and *Prasāda*, are not essential in the poetic production.

Daṇḍin who is the founder of *Rītivādi* school is regarded as the author of the books *Kāvyaḍarsa* and *Dasakumāra – Carita*. His *Kavyāḍarsa* is a famous book on *alaṃkāra śāstra* having three different sections. First section deals with the definition and division of *Kāvya* and two margas viz. *Vaidharbha* and *Gauḍa*; and ten *guṇas* viz. (I) *Śleṣa* (ii) *Prasāda* (iii) *Samatā* (iv) *Mādhurya* or elegance, (v) *Sukumārata* (6) *Artha-Vyakti* (vii) *Udāratā* (viii) *Ojas* (ix) *Kānti*, and (x) *Samādhī*.⁷

This section also deals with other sections that are essential requirements of a good poet. His second section deals with the definition of *alaṃkāra*, enumeration and description of 35 *arthālaṃkāras* including *sabdālaṃkāras*. His work defines the body of *Kāvya* as number of works conveying the internal sense. “*Sarāīam tāvadiṣṭārthavyavaechinnā padāvalī*”. The soul of *Kāvya* composed in the *vaidharbha* style, is stated to be the ten *guṇas*. Daṇḍin himself has followed *vaidharbha rīti*.

Daṇḍin has mentioned in his *Kāvyaḍarsa* that *guṇa* forms the essence of poetry but nowhere he mentions that every specific

alaṃkāra is a *guṇa*. "His general definition of poetry, or rather its body or framework, as *iṣṭārtha-vyavacchinnā padāvali* - a series of words characterized by an agreeable sense or idea naturally leads him to consider, first of all, the question of appropriate expression of appropriate ideas or in other words, to discuss the suitable arrangement of sound and sense for the purpose of producing poetic effect which is technically denoted by the term *mārga* or *rīti*."⁸

Not only Daṇḍin but also a large number of writers on poetics holding that beauty in *Kāvya* lies in charmingness of expression, so far as it is compatible with compactness of form and intelligibility. This tenor of literary appraisal could well take its rise in and suit an analytic language like Sanskrit, where an inherent favouritism for compounds has had to fight a tough fight with a desire for disintegration in expression through the use of word-units – a desire that became growingly manifest in particular periods and localities along with the rise of *Prākṛita* literature, which swept the bounds of stiffness and elocution and loosened, softened, and sweetened the language.

The '*Gouḍa*' consists in compactness of structure as evidence by long compounds in the use of rather unfamiliar, often harsh words, brilliance through richness of words novel and charming expression as well as the prominence of *Rasas*.

Daṇḍin also from the rhetorical point of view, seems to hold an identical position with reference to the topic of *Rasas*. He also tries to incorporate *rasa*, *bhāva*, etc. under such figure as *rasavat*, *preyas* etc.

If we compare Daṇḍin with Bhāmaha then we find that Daṇḍin seems to have give more importance to *rasa*. This is seen in his treatment of the figures such as *rasavat*, *preyas*, etc.

While describing the characteristics of a *mahākāvya* Daṇḍin, like Bhāmaha, mentions that a *mahākāvya* should be full of *rasa* and *bhāvas* and should also have well defined *sandhis*.

“Although Daṇḍin would employ the term *alaṃkāra* as the essential poetic attribute of *śabda* and *artha* and the beautifying principle of poetic expression, he would not take the individual *alaṃkāras* as the soul or essential means of the beautifying principle. He elaborates a theory of two modes (*mārg*) or kinds of poetic diction, which he calls *vaidarbha* and *Gauḍa*, and find the so-called excellence (*guṇa* like sweetness or lucidity) from their essence. Daṇḍin, therefore, employs the generic term *alaṃkāra*, meaning poetic embellishment, to designate both the *guṇas*, on the one hand, and the specific *alaṃkāras* (poetic figures), on the other.”⁹

Chronologically Vāmana comes after Daṇḍin. Vāmana's work is more systematic than Daṇḍin. So Vāmana may be regarded as the best

representative of the *rīti* system. He is the first writer who gave us a well thought out and carefully outlined scheme of poetics. His conception of poetry is a great advance on Bhāmaha. He is the first aesthetician in the history of sanskrit poetics who talks about the soul of poetry as distinct from the body. Regarding the conception of the body of poetry his view is like that of Bhāmaha. But in presenting *rīti* a soul of poetry he maintains not only *vakrokti* but reason also to be an essential element of poetry.

Rīti according to him is a particular style or mode of linguistic possession of the following qualities or distinctive features which are technically called *guṇas* like *ojas*, *prāsāda* etc.

These qualities are common to both the word and the meaning (*sabda* and *artha*). According to him, the poetry which possess all these qualities is called first rate poetry. As he laid much importance to all the ten *guṇas*, he may be regarded as the follower of *vaidharbhi* style. He rejects other two styles i.e. *Gouḍa* and *Pāncāli*.

'*Rīti*' which, according to him, is the soul of poetry. He clearly states, '*Rītiātmā Kāvyaasya*', the '*Rīti*' is the soul of poetry.¹⁰ He defines *rīti* as '*viśiṣṭapada-racanā*' or particular arrangement of words. The particularity (*vaiśiṣṭya*) of arrangement, again rests upon certain definite combinations of the different *guṇas* or some beautiful composition.¹¹

After considering *guṇas* Vāmana deals with poetic figures or *alaṃkāra* as elements of subsidiary importance. So a clear differentiation of *alaṃkāra* from *guṇa* we find for the first time in Vāmana's writings. At the outset Vāmana states, no doubt, that poetry is admissible as such if it associated with embellishment (*alaṃkāra*) ; but he is careful to explain embellishment, not in the narrow sense of poetic figure, but is the broad and primary sense of beauty or charm. (*Kāvyaṃ grāhyam alaṃkāraṭ saundaryam alaṃkāraḥ*). Anything which creates beauty may be taken as *alaṃkāra*. He also points out the term *alaṃkāra* or embellishment is applied to simple and other poetic figures in the secondary sense.

"The *guṇas* being essential to the *Rīti*, are defined as those characteristics which create the charm of poetry (*kāvya-śobhāyāḥ kartāro dharmāḥ*) – a function which is assigned to both *Guṇas* and *Alaṃkāras* by Daṇḍin – but *Alaṃkāras* are such ornaments as served to enhance the charm already so produced (*tad-atisaya-hetavaḥ*). The *Guṇas* are said to be *nitya* (permanent), implying that the *Alaṃkāras* are *anitya* (*punar alaṃkāra anitya iti gamyate eva*) for there can be charm of poetry without the *Alaṃkāras* but no charm without the *Guṇas* (*tairvinā kāvya-śobhānupapatteḥ*). In other words, the *guṇa* stands to poetry in the *samavāya-relation*, while the *Alaṃkāra* in *saṃyoga-relation*, *saṃyoga* being explained as mere conjunction and *samavāya* implying inseparable connexion or inherence."¹²

Dhvani School is headed by Ānandavardhana (9th century) and Abhinavagupta. *Dhvani* is represented for us by the metrical *kārikās* preserved in the *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana of Kāshmir with its super-commentary by Abhinavagupta, *Locan*.¹³

The theory of *Dhvani* finds its origin in the analysis of language and meaning word expresses meaning. The power of expressing meaning is of three types-(1) *Abhidhā* (primary meaning, (ii) *Lakṣaṇā* (secondary meaning), (iii) *Vyañjanā* (suggested meaning). The primary meaning is expressed through *abhidhāśakti*, the secondary meaning is expressed through *Lakṣaṇā* e.g. the phrase, a milkman's colony on the Ganges, is obviously not meaningful as it looks absurd; when the denotation (*abhidhā*) gives no sense, we oblige to find a transferred sense (*Lakṣaṇā*) which gives us the sense of a colony on the bank of the Ganges. This shows the incompatibility of the literal sense as one factor, and possibility of giving an implicative meaning as another.

When anyone utters any word then it evokes a meaning through its *abhidhāśakti* and at the same time it also evokes a different meaning. At that time, we accept the power of suggested meaning. The name of this power is '*Dhvani*'. According to the *Dhvani* school, *dhvani* is the soul of poetry. The school has divided *kāvya* into three kinds considering how much importance is given to *dhvani*. These three types of *kāvya* are (I)

Dhvani-kāvya (ii) *Guṇibhuta kāvya* and (iii) *Citra kāvya*. In *dhvanikāvya* *dhvani* is primary, in *guṇibhuta kāvya* *dhvani* is secondary and in *citra kāvya* *dhvani* is totally absent.

Abhinavagupta, a believer of Kāshmiri Saivism, unified the scattered voices of earlier aesthetic philosophers into a meaningful synthesis, embracing philosophical speculation and mysticism as well as aesthetics. Before entering about the discussion about Abhinavagupta's philosophy of aesthetic experience in details it is necessary to go back to the famous Ānandavardhana. Ānandavardhana had arrived at certain conclusions which were accepted by later rhetoricians though some rare exceptions are also there. In his *Dhvanyāloka* he has given more importance to those words which are not merely symbols denoting some fact but bearing some power to evoke aesthetic emotion. In these words there is not the outward formal construction that leads to beauty, but there is an inexpressible quality in it which can suggest something else. The inexplicable suggestive quality is called *Dhvani* which can not be analysed scientifically nor can it be explained in psychological term. Regarding poetic meaning he says that given meaning is not understood by those who have an insight into the true essence of poetry. The rare word and the meaning expressed through it must be studied carefully by those who wish to become true poets. Just as a man interested in perceiving objects (in the dark) directs his efforts towards securing the

flame of lamp since this is a means to realise his end, so also does one who is ultimately interested in the poetic meaning first evince interest in the conventional meaning . Just as the purport of the sentence is grasped only through the sense of individual words, the knowledge of poetic sense is attained only through the medium of the literal sense. Though by its own power the word-import conveys the sentence import, just as it escapes notice once its purpose is served, so also does that poetic meaning revealed suddenly in the truth-perceiving minds of cultured *critics*, when they are indifferent towards the conventional meaning. To conclude, the connoisseurs give the name of “resonance” (*Dhvani*) to the particular sort of poetry in which both conventional meaning and conventional words are subordinate.¹⁴

A truly poetic word or expression is that which cannot be replaced by other words, without losing its value. Poetry knows no synonyms.

Ānandabardhana further says that just as the loveliness of women is something over and above their limbs so in the words of the great poets we find an exquisite charm which is over and above the words and their meanings. *Lāvanyamiva anganāsu*, and this is *dhvani*. The *rasa* is also communicated by *dhvani*.

Let us take an example ;

Holy father, go thou fearless thine way,
 The dog that barked at thee lies dead
 quite near the bay Manled by the lion
 that on the banks of the Godā does
 rove
 And loves to loiter in that shady
 grove.¹⁵

A lady had a place of meeting with his beloved in a particular garden which is full of flowers, but a religious man used to disturb the solitude of the place and takes the beautiful flowers from the place. The lady in order to frightened the holy man started a cock-and-bull story that a lion was seen in that particular place and it had killed a dog. But the lady addressed the holy man in quite different manner. Her idea comes to this : A lion is loitering about in the garden and you may now walk about the place just as you please. Her words are, "go though fearless thine way". The meaning of this expression is that a man may walk as he pleases. The primary meaning has not been barred by the context and therefore there cannot be any indicatory meaning (*Lakṣaṇā*) by the extension of the primary. Yet we understand from the sentence very clearly that the holy man had been very politely warned. This significant

suggestion comes only by the implication of *dhvani*, for this meaning is completely different from the primary meaning.

Abhinavagupta has accepted the *dhvani* theory of Ānandavardhana and his fundamental work *Locana*, a commentary on *Dhvanyāloka*. For his *rasa* is manifested through *dhvani* which also serves the medium of communication between the creator, appreciator and performer. Among these three, there must be *sahṛdayatva* which is the key concept in Abhinavagupta's philosophy, which will be elaborated later on. His contribution to the theory of *dhvani* consists in offering psycho-physical explanation.

One may ask the question what *dhvani* is? It reply it can be said that it is an exclusively poetic feature concerned with exploiting the beauty of every element in the medium of language like *alaṅkāra*, *guṇa*, *rīti*, serve the ultimate artistic end of *rasa*. *Dhvani* is that meaning of poetry which is appreciated by the *critic* as most beautiful, knowingly or unknowingly.

Apart from the above discussed schools there is a school which propogates *vakrokti* as an essential characteristics of poetry. Kuntaka, the founder of this school, opines that charming mode of expression or *vakrokti* is the essence of poetry in his *Vakroktijīvitā*. For the *vakrokti*, is taken as *vicitra-abhidhā* so that the *vakratva* or *vakra-bhāva* underlying it

becomes synonymous with *Vaicitrya* or *vicitra-bhāva*. Indeed Kuntaka does not appear to make any distinction between them but uses them as interchangeable terms. The *vakratva* or *vaicitra* consists of a strikingness of expression which is different from the established or current mode of speech, such as we find in the *sūtras* and the like. It is thus a division from the matter of fact, manner of treatment established in the sciences and the scripture; or more widely, for established uses in general.¹⁶

Kuntaka holds the view that *vakrokti* constitutes the only possible embellishment or *alaṃkāra* of poetry. His position appears to be that embellished word and sense constitute poetry, and it is not proper to say that *alaṃkāra* belong to *kāvya*, for this statement would suggest that *kāvya* may exist without them. Indeed, *vakrokti* as a mode of expression being essential in poetry, it underlies and forms the substance of all poetic figures so called. In a sense, therefore, Kuntaka (like Daṇḍin) uses the term *vakrokti* as almost coextensive with the generic term *alaṃkāra*. As such, therefore, the *vakrokti* is as Kuntaka holds, the only *alaṃkāra* possible to *śabda* and *artha* and all so called poetic figures are but different aspects of *vakrokti*. As a matter of fact Kuntaka includes the *alaṃkāra* in the province of *vākya* – *vakratā*.¹⁷

Kuntaka's opinion is that *vakrokti* is the only *alaṃkāra* admissible, all other poetic figures or *alaṃkāras* can be properly included in its

comprehensive scope. *Vakrokti* in its nature is indefinable; yet one can distinguish and classify its function into six different spheres.

Kuntaka starts with the creative imagination of the poet. He considers creative imagination of the poet to be the source of the characteristic charm of poetic expression. Poetry is for him embellished sound and sense, the embellishment being chiefly the figurative device known as *alaṃkāra* in the narrow sense, and as this is the only ornament possible and essential, he repudiates the view of those who considers figurative expression as accidental and non-essential. Kuntaka also uses the term *alaṃkāra* also in the larger sense of poetic beauty, not only as the fundamental principle of figurative expression generally. To this he gives the name of *vakrokti*, and comprehending under it all forms of poetic expression, he attempts a fresh interpretation of the problem by rethinking and rearranging under this conception the accepted ideas of *Rīti*, *Guṇa*, *Rasa* and *Alaṃkāra*.¹⁸

Kuntaka maintains that a form or mode of expression becomes a poetic figure or *alaṃkāra* if the fertile imagination of the poet lends a peculiar charm to it.

Notes and References

1. S.N.Dasgupta and S.K.De : *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, vol.I, 2nd edition, University of Calcutta, Calcutta, 1977, p. 522.
 2. Dr. K.C.Pandey : *Comparative Aesthetics*, Vol.I (Indian Aesthetics). The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Studies, Vol.II, Varanasi 1959, p. 15,16.
 3. Ibid, p.21
 4. S.N.Dasgupta and S.K.De : *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, Vol.I 2nd edition, University of Calcutta, Calcutta, 1977, p.526.
 5. S.C.Banerji : *A Companion to Sanskrit Literature*, Motilal Banarasidas, 2nd edition, Delhi, 1989, p.81.
 6. K.C.Pandey : *Comparative Aesthetics*, vol.I, (Indian Aesthetics); The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Studies, Vol.II, Varanasi-1959, p.392.
 7. S.K.De : *History of Sanskrit Poetics* , vol.II, Second edition, Firma K.L.M. Pvt. Ltd. Calcutta, 1988, pp. 80, 81
 8. Ibid, pp. 78-79.
 9. S.K.De : *Sanskrit Poetics as a Study of Aesthetics*, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1963, p. 25.
 10. *KāvyaĀlaṃkāraśūtra* , I. 2.6.
-

-
11. "Viśesogunātmā", *Kāvyaḷamkāra-Śūtra-Vṛtti*, 1.2.8.
"Guṇātmā Ojaḥ Prasādādi guṇa svabhāva ityārthaḥ" *Kāmadhenu* on Śūtra; 1.2.8.
 12. S.K.De : *History of Sanskrit Poetics*; vol.II, Second edition, Firma K.L.M. Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta , 1988, pp.99-100.
 13. A.Berriedale Keith : *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, Oxford University Press, London, 1961.
 14. R.N.Gnoli : *The Aesthetic experience according to Abhinavagupta*, The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office; Varanasi, 1968.
 15. *Bhrama dhārmika / viśrubdhahsa sunakadya māritastena/ Godāvarinadikūla-latāgu'ma-vasana drptasimhenall. Dhvanyāloka*, ¼.
 16. V. Raghavan and Nagendra (ed.) : *An Introduction to Indian Poetics*; Macmillan and Co. Ltd., Calcutta; 1970.
 17. Ibid, p.52.
 18. S.K.De : *Some problems of Sanskrit Poetics* , Firma KLM Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1981, p.36.
-