लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी
L.B.S National Academy of Administration
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE

पुस्तकालय
LIBRARY

अवाप्ति संख्या
Accession No. 19319 / 12450
वर्ग संख्या
Class No. 891.2
पुस्तक संख्या
Book No. Rag

BHOJA'S

ŚṚṄGĀRA PRAKĀŚA

BY

V. RAGHAVAN, M. A., Ph. D.

Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras

AUTHOR OF

'Number of Rasas', 'Concepts of Alaṁkāra Sāstra' etc.

VOLUME I—PART II

KARNATAK PUBLISHING HOUSE

BOMBAY (INDIA)

THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
DEGREE OF PH.D. IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

Printed by M. N. KULKARNI, at the Karnatak Printing Press, Chira Bazar, Bombay and published by him at the Karnatak Publishing House, Chira Bazar, Bombay 2.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGES
15	DOṢAS	216–257
16	HISTORY OF GUṆAS	258–360
17	BHOJA'S CONCEPTION OF ALAṀKĀRA	361–417
18	BHOJA'S CONCEPTION OF RASA IN THE SARASVATĪKAṆṬHĀBHARAṆA	418–434
19	BHOJA'S CONCEPTION OF RASA IN THE ŚṚṄGĀRA PRAKĀŚA ..	435–542

ADDITIONAL LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Amara	Amarakośa.
A. P.	Agnipurāṇa.
A. S.	Alaṁkārasarvasva.
Bh. R. Bha. Ras.	Bhaktirasāyana of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī.
K. A.	Kāvyālaṇkāra of Rudraṭa. Kāvyānuśāsana of Hemacandra. Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi.
K. A. S.	Kāvyālaṁkārasūtras of Vāmana.
K. A. Vyā.	Kāvyānuśāsana Vyākhyā of Hemacandra.
K. S. K. Sū.	Kāmasūtras of Vātsyāyana.
M. Bhārata	Mahābhārata.
R. G.	Rasagaṅgādhara of Jagannātha.
R. T. Ras. Tar.	Rasataraṇginī of Bhānudatta.
Rv.	Ṛgveda
Śāk.	Śākuntala of Kālidāsa.
S. A. S.	Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra of Bhoja.
S. D.	Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha.
S. M. Library.	Sarasvatī Mahāl Library, Tanjore.
Ś. V.	Śiśupālavadha of Māgha.
अमरुक०	अमरुक कवेः शृङ्गारशतकम्
उत्तर० उत्तर० रा० च०	उत्तररामचरितम्
का० आ०	काव्यादर्शः
किरात०	किरातार्जुनीयम्
कुमार०	कुमारसम्भवम्
ता० व० रा०	तापसवत्सराजम्
ना० शा०	नाट्यशास्त्रम्
बा० रा०	बालरामायणम्
महावी० च० महावीर०, महावीर० च० वीरचरितम्.	महावीरचरितम्
मालती० मालतीमा०	मालतीमाधवम्
रत्ना०	रत्नावली
रुद्रट० का० अ०	रुद्रटस्य काव्यालङ्कारः
विक्रमो०	विक्रमोर्वशीयम्
वेणी० वेणीसं०	वेणीसंहारम्
शाकु०	शाकुन्तलम्
स० क० आ०	सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरणम्

ERRATA

PAGE	LINE	READ
222	21	Abhi. Bhā.
	40-41	*Anucita* is Doṣa.
223	35	speak.
224	9	or non-universality
225	37	अपशब्दः
226	21	satisfies.
236	16	Guṇa chapter
248	2-3	Guṇa chapter
	17	माधुर्यमुक्तमाचार्यैः
250	3	Guṇa chapter
254	19	Then Mammaṭa
265	34	K. A.
267	30	क्वचित्
	36	प्रसादरम्यम्
273	17	reverse
290	23	समासवन्ति
297	3	goes away saying
	12	Angacchāyāyoni
301	10	अलङ्क्रियाः
302	15	of the Rītis
305	16	काव्यशोभा–
308	25	अलङ्कारयोगः
313	23	पदार्थे
	31	–मात्रार्थमुपात्तेषु
328	36, 37	Saubhāgya
329	21	in this Purāṇa
338	6	Saṁghaṭanās
341	22	prefers
354	23	in the chapter
364	16	See chapter
368	25	गृहीतव्युत्पत्तीनाम्
	26	अध्यासते
370	25	वीप्यङ्गानि
372	37-38	describe
379	21-22	Śāstra in kāvya.
387	27	Sauśabdya

PAGE	LINE	READ
392	1-2	of Anvayavyatireka for deciding an Alaṁkāra as belonging to Śabda or to Artha.
409	14	where
410	8	वाक्यार्थ–
	28	इत्येतदपि
413	12	– प्रकरी –
	22	– प्रयाणाजि –
	29	– मङ्गलांकित –
414	10-11	Sadalaṁkāra vākyatva
	13	K. A.
417	42	श्चङ्गारितमाश्रयामि काक्षिगतम् ।
418	37	ऊर्जस्वि
419	12	अहङ्काराभिमान–
429	2	स्थास्नुरेव
	28	कल्प्यते
	29	विभावादिष्वपि
		प्रसङ्गात्
433	13-14	– भयानकाद्भुताः
434	12	– रत्यादिभावेन
444	18	श्चङ्गारी
465	19	प्रकृतिविकारः
	29-30	सूक्ष्मावस्थो द्वितीयाम्
470	19	It is the one
493	19	similarity
508	1	श्चङ्गारः
511	6	भेदं
519	22	– जन्मा
520	29	ऊर्जस्वि—
523	13	– शय्यापीत्यादि –
526	20	श्चङ्गारः
527	20	धिक् ते
	36	तेभ्यस्तेभ्यः
528	29	– बुद्बुद –

ADDENDUM

Pp. 428-430. Writers who noticed Bhoja's ideas on Rasa in the S. K. Ā. and criticised them.

I have spoken here (p. 430)' of Śiṅgabhūpāla, the author of the *Rasārṇavasudhākara*, as the only writer to note and criticise Bhoja's Udātta and Uddhata Rasas.

Earlier Śiṅgabhūpāla, Bopadeva and Hemādri (c. 1260-1300), had seen the S. K. Ā. and its additional Rasas, Preyas, Udātta and Uddhata. In Ch. XI of the (*Bhāgavata*) *Muktāphala* (*Calcutta Oriental Series*, 5, pt. I.) Bopadeva describes a Viṣṇubhakta and classifies him into nine kinds in accordance with his experience of the Lord through the nine different Rasas. The nine Rasas are themselves considered as forms of the one Rasa, called Bhakti (p. 183). In the commentary called *Kaivalyadīpikā* ascribed to Hemādri, on this portion, there is a discussion on Rasas. After establishing Bhakti as a Rasa as against Abhinavagupta and Hemacandra, Hemādri says that Rasas are nine only. He then adds that there are other Rasas according to King Bhoja and others, and gives Bhoja's Preyān (snehasthāyin), Udātta (Matisthāyin) and Uddhata (Garvasthāyin). The illustrations are the same as found in the S. K. Ā. and the descriptive passages are also mostly identical with those in the same work (see p. 183 of the *Kaivalyadīpikā*,[1] pp. 422-3 of my thesis, and S. K. Ā. pp. 514-5). After citing Bhoja's view, Hemādri criticises it as impossible, for Garva, Sneha and Dhṛti are counted among Vyabhicārins, and to speak of vyabhicārins as Rasas is to say that 'my mother is a barren woman'; if it is however held that these vyabhicārins are Sthāyins, there will be as many Rasas as Vyabhicārins.

"स नवधेति । सन्त्येव हि रसान्तराण्यपि भोजराजादिभिर्दर्शितानि । तथा हि स्नेहस्थायिभावः प्रेयान् यथा 'यदेव रोचते etc. × × × तथा सति (मति)स्थायिभावादुदात्तो यथा 'साधारणो (-रण्यात्) × × × गर्वस्थायिभाव उद्धतो यथा 'धृतायुधाः × × × इति । मैवम्; मौलिकस्य स्थायिन एवात्र सद्भावात् । स्नेहादयो हि व्यभिचारिषु तैरेव पठिताः 'गर्वः स्नेहो धृतिर्व्रीडा' इत्यादिना । व्यभिचारिणः स्थायिनश्चेति तु 'मम माता वन्ध्या' इतिवत् विप्रतिषिद्धे वचसि (सी) । एवमप्युच्यमाने व्यभिचारिसंख्यया रससंख्यापत्तिः स्यात् । अत एवेदमस्पृष्टं भरतादिभिः ।" Pp. 188–9.

---

1. The Calcutta edn. of the Muktāphala with commentary has many mistakes.

"तत्र अभिधाविवक्षादिभिः निरूपिते शब्दार्थयोः साहित्ये वाक्यस्य प्रयोगयोग्यता प्रयोगानर्हता च निश्चीयते। यदाह—'एकः शब्दः सम्यक् प्रयुक्तः स्वर्गे लोके कामधुक् भवति।' दुष्प्रयुक्तः पुनरधर्माय संपद्यते। सम्यक्प्रयोगश्चास्य तदोपपद्यते यदा दोषहानं, गणोपादानं, अलङ्कारयोगः, रसावियोगश्च भवति। तेषां च प्रथमं दोषहानमेव विधेयं, यतः कमनीयरूपादिसंपदुपेतमपि वपुः कुष्ठबिन्दुनैकेनापि दौर्भाग्यमनुभवति।

उक्तं च— 'तदल्पमपि नोपेक्ष्यं काव्ये दुष्टं कथञ्चन।
स्याद्वपुः सुन्दरमपि श्वित्रेणैकेन दुर्भगम्॥' (Daṇḍin)

किञ्च— 'नाकवित्वमधर्माय मृतये दण्डनाय वा।
कुकवित्वं पुनः साक्षान् मृतिमाहुर्मनीषिणः॥' (Bhāmaha).

Śṛ. Pra. Ch. IX. Vol. II. pp. 144-5.

It will be granted by all critics that any utterance should first of all be devoid of flaws, grammatical, logical and literary. Flaw is that which detracts,—Apakarṣa-hetu. Flaws can appear in any part of a poet's expression, in grammar, in the position of the words, in the choice of the words, in the delineation of emotion, in the metre, in the conception of the idea and so on. Thus there are Śabda-doṣas, Artha-doṣas, and Rasa-doṣas in the main. Among the Śabda-doṣas, there will be many pertaining to the realm of grammar. Among Artha-doṣas, many are literary and logical and many of the Rasa-doṣas are based on the nature of men and things in this world. The less there is of flaw in poetry, the greater is the merit of the composition. Therefore in all old definitions of poetry, we find the proper definition शब्दार्थौ काव्यं'—qualified thus—अदोषौ सगुणौ सालङ्कारौ काव्यम्. This is the definition adopted by Mammaṭa, in his Kāvya-prakāśa. In later times, writers like Vidyānātha chose to adopt it, since it is not, as far as idea goes, incorrect. But writers like Viśvanātha and Jagannātha, two of the later first rank writers on Poetics, criticised the definition. Previous to Mammaṭa, most writers gave only the definition शब्दार्थौ काव्यम्. Bhāmaha defined poetry as Word and Sense united; and not until we come to Vāmana do we see a clear statement of the definition with any new idea added to it. Vāmana added Alaṁkāra, by which he meant Saundarya, the beauty which results from Guṇas (Rītīs and Rasas) and Alaṁkāras. To him, Word and Sense beautified by Guṇas (which comprehend style and emotion) and by Alaṁkāras (figures of speech), is Kāvya.

काव्यं ग्राह्यमलङ्कारात्। I. i.
काव्यशब्दोऽयं गुणालङ्कारसंस्कृतयोः शब्दार्थयोर्वर्तते॥

Vāmana further qualifies his description of poetry in the third Sūtra where he lays down that Saundarya or beauty of poetry is not only securable by Guṇas and Alaṁkāras but primarily also by the avoidance of flaws—Doṣa-hāna.

स दोषगुणालङ्कारहानादानाभ्याम्॥ I. i-3

Thus Vāmana is the first writer to fashion the definition, which Mammaṭa adopted. Slightly earlier than Mammaṭa, Bhoja, who followed Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana, gave his description of Kāvya in his S. K. Ā. 1.2.

निर्दोषं गुणवत् काव्यं अलङ्कारैरलङ्कृतम् ।
रसान्वितं कविः कुर्वन् कीर्तिं प्रीतिं च विन्दति ॥

By this, Ratneśvara says in his commentary that Bhoja has also defined poetry here. एतेन काव्यलक्षणमपि कटाक्षितम् । P. 3. In his Śṛ. Pra. where Bhoja has elaborated a system called Sāhitya, he has made the avoidance of flaws the first among the four Sāhityas.

The necessity for the poet to minimise flaws and to eliminate them completely, if possible, will be recognised by all. The absence of flaws is itself a beauty, an excellence. Says poet Māgha अपदोषतैव विगुणस्य गुणः (IX. 12) which we can restate that, though a thing is devoid of positive beautifying features, it is beautiful negatively, in so far as it is completely devoid of flaws. Keśavamiśra quotes the following verse in his Alaṁkāra-śekhara from some writer—(A. Śekhara II. 1).

दोषस्सर्वात्मना त्याज्यः रसहानिकरो हि सः ।
अन्यो गुणोऽस्तु मा वास्तु **महान्निर्दोषता गुणः** ॥

By such emphasis on Doṣas, the writers mean that, as far as it lies in a poet's powers he should try to avoid them. He may not be able to be absolutely flawless; for even Homer nods! Surely a composition will not cease to be poetry, if it has a few flaws in it. For, has not the poet said: एको हि दोषो गुणसन्निपाते निमज्जतीन्दोः किरणेष्विवाङ्कः (K. S. I. 3). Nay, the poet goes further and says that the spot only adds to the beauty of the moon :

मलिनमपि हिमांशोर्लक्ष्म लक्ष्मीं तनोति । (Śak. I. 20)

This is granted; but none can dispute the view that a learned man must be one who knows the faults and eliminates them; even the Sanskrit vocabulary says that a Vidvān is called 'Doṣajña,' one who knows the flaws. विद्वान्विपश्चिद्दोषज्ञः (Amara). Hence a poet should strain every nerve to write as faultlessly as possible. Kumārasvamin observes :

दोषवर्जनस्यादौ व्याख्यानम् अल्पोऽपि दोषः प्रमादादिनापि अनुपेक्ष्य इति द्योतयितुम् । तदुक्तं दण्डिना 'तदल्पमपि' etc.

Viśvanātha, the author of the Sāhityadarpaṇa, makes the first regular criticism of the inclusion of the condition of 'Flawlessness' as part of the definition of the Kāvya. He says that the definition with the condition of 'Adoṣatva' is vitiated by Avyāpti. The definition is technically illogical in that it excludes very beautiful specimens of suggestive poetry like the verse न्यक्कारो हि etc., which is an instance of the flaw of Avimṛṣṭavidheyāṁśa or Vidheyāvimarśa.[1] This is only a technical objection and it does not deprive

1. "A book may be amusing with numerous errors, or it may be very dull without a single absurdity." Goldsmith, Advertisement to his Vicar of Wakefield.

the old definition of its merits. For, Viśvanātha does not say that there should be flaws. Taking available facts into consideration and seeing that however much one may try to be cautious, one or two flaws may creep in, he says that we cannot dismiss a poem because of its few flaws, by defining poetry as 'Adoṣa.' Says Bharata in XXVII. 47 :

न च किञ्चिद् गुणहीनं दोषैः परिवर्जितं न वा किञ्चित् ।
तस्मान्नाव्यप्रकृतौ दोषा नात्यर्थतो ग्राह्याः ॥

Viśvanātha : एवं काव्यं प्रविरलविषयं निर्विषयं वा स्यात् । सर्वथा निर्दोषस्य एकान्तमसंभवात् ।

Then there is the difference between flaw and flaw. Minor flaws can be overlooked but not serious Rasa-doṣas. Namisādhu on Rudraṭa VI. 1 considers the Doṣas 'Nyūnādhikādi' given by Rudraṭa in II. 8 as more serious flaws than those given in VI.

न्यूनाधिकादिदोषो हि नेत्रोत्पाटतुल्यः । असमर्थादिकस्तु पटलनिभः ॥

And Vidyācakravartin also makes such a distinction among Doṣas.

"—रसदोषो महान् दोषः—अर्थदोषः तदपेक्षया निकृष्टः.....। पदपदैकदेशदोषाः परिपाट्या दविष्ठाः इति निकृष्टतराः । P. 7. Vol. II, Kāvyaprakāśavyākhyā. T.S.S.

Besides this fact, there is the rule that a poet has to be judged by the best he has written. Even then a flaw is a flaw and hence it is that we say that a given specimen of poetry is faulty, काव्यं दुष्टम् . It is poetry, yet a faulty specimen. If Viśvanātha is not as anxious as Daṇḍin, Bhāmaha, Vāmana and Bhoja to avoid all flaws in expression, he would not have devoted a chapter to a consideration of flaws. Further Viśvanātha makes a subtle distinction between Kāvya and Sukāvya and Upādeya kāvya, which is of little practical value.

न हि कोटानुवेधादयो रत्नस्य रत्नत्वं व्याहन्तुमीशाः । किन्तु उपादेयतारतम्यमेव कर्तुम् । तद्वदत्र श्रुतिदुष्टादयोऽपि काव्यस्य । उक्तं च— 'कीटानुविद्धरत्नादिसाधारण्येन काव्यता । दुष्टेष्वपि मता, यत्र रसाद्यनुगमः स्फुटः ॥ ' S. D. I.

It will be surely recognised by Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka who wrote the above-cited verse and by Viśvanātha that between a flawless gem and a spoilt gem, people will choose only the former. Thus from all points of view Doṣahāna is important and Doṣas must be avoided as far as possible.

Nature of Doṣa : Doṣa svarūpa and Doṣa lakṣaṇa.

It is an unsettled question whether there is any positive entity called Good or whether it is only the absence of the Bad. In philosophy, it is discussed whether Mukti is only the cessation of bondage (the word really means that) or the positive attainment of a state of bliss. The question cannot be settled, for, it all depends upon the way one chooses to speak of the thing. Bharata enumerates and describes in chapter 17 ten Doṣas and before going to the Guṇa, observes that Guṇas are the 'reverses' of

Doṣas. He starts with the flaws and defines Guṇas as the 'reverses or opposites' of flaws,—Viparyaya.

एते दोषास्तु विज्ञेयाः सूरिभिर्नाटकाश्रयाः ।
एत एव **विपर्यस्ताः** गुणाः काव्येषु कीर्तिताः ॥

It can be argued that the Doṣas are Guṇaviparyaya or Guṇābhāva. Mammaṭa who recognises only three Guṇas as a follower of Ānanda, says regarding the other Guṇas given by others, that they need not be recognised, since many of them are only the absence of the flaws which have been recognised and have been pointed out. Says Mammaṭa, Kā. Pra. VIII. 72 : दोषत्यागात्परे श्रिताः। Mammaṭa also points out some instances of such equation of Guṇas with the Abhāva of certain Doṣas. Though Bharata gives this general description of Doṣas and Guṇas, he has not explained himself and it cannot be maintained that his ten Guṇas are the 'Viparyayas' of his ten Doṣas. Vāmana holds the other viewpoint that Doṣas are the result of the absence of Guṇas. He says :

दोषस्वरूपकथनार्थमाह—'गुणविपर्ययात्मानो दोषाः । II. i. i. गुणानां वक्ष्यमाणानां विपर्ययाः, तदात्मानो दोषाः । 'अर्थतस्तदवगमः । II. i. 2. गुणस्वरूपनिरूपणात् तेषां दोषाणां अर्थादवगमोऽर्थात्सिद्धिः । किमर्थं ते पृथक्कृत्य प्रपञ्चयन्त इत्याह—'सौकर्याय प्रपञ्चः । ' II. i. 3.

At the beginning of the Guṇa section also he says :

यद्विपर्ययात्मानो दोषाः, तान् गुणान् विचारयितुं गुणविवेचनमधिकरणमारभ्यते ।

a position which corresponds to that of the author of the Kāmasūtra, Vātsyāyana, who says with reference to the Guṇas and Doṣas of Nāyakas गुणविपर्यये दोषाः । K. Sū. VI. i. 15. p. 303. Chowk. Edn.

Vāmana substantiates his position to some extent at the end of the section on Doṣas. For, he holds Guṇas to be more than the ten of Śabda and ten of Artha given in the Guṇa section, where only the more important Guṇas are defined and illustrated. Each Doṣa, when avoided, gives a Guṇa. Or rather, Doṣas are innumerable. Only the more prominent among them can be shown. The absence of each Guṇa is a flaw. This can be seen from the Pratyudāharaṇa given by Vāmana for each Guṇa. Vāmana says :

एते वाक्यवाक्यार्थदोषाः त्यागाय ज्ञातव्याः । ये त्वन्ये शब्दार्थदोषाः सूक्ष्माः, ते गुणविवेचने वक्ष्यन्ते ।

The Doṣas which Vāmana describes as Sūkṣma and which are illustrated in the Guṇa section by the counter-illustrations, are already available in Daṇḍin. Daṇḍin has a set of special Doṣas in a separate section in the end, but in addition to those Doṣas, he gives what Vāmana calls 'Śūkṣma doṣas,' which are clearly Guṇa-viparyayas. Daṇḍin is the inspirer of Vāmana here, as elsewhere also. Daṇḍin, while he describes the beautiful Vaidarbhī and its Guṇas, says that these Guṇas have their 'reverses'—Viparyayas—which can *generally* (Prāyaḥ) be found in the inelegant Gauḍī style.

एषां विपर्ययः प्रायो दृश्यते गौडवर्त्मनि । K. Ā. I.

It is here, in the Viparyayas of the Guṇas of Daṇḍin that Bhoja takes inspiration for creating a group-flaw called 'Arītimat' in the S. K. Ā. and 'Śleṣādi guṇa viparyaya' in the Śr. Pra.

Lakṣaṇa is the essence of Svarūpa. To call Doṣa, Guṇābhāva or Guṇa viparyaya is to stand in need of a further enquiry into what Guṇa is. Writers have defined Doṣa independently. Bhoja says of Doṣas हेयाः काव्ये, that they are to be avoided in Kāvya. And Ratneśvara points out that Bhoja has given here a general definition—Sāmānyalakṣaṇa—of Doṣa :

हेया इत्यनेन सामान्यलक्षणम् । ये हेयाः ते दोषा इत्यभिप्रायात् । p. 3.

The idea and the very word 'Heya' are derived by Bhoja from Vāmana. In the Śr. Pra., Bhoja uses the phrase 'Doṣahāna', and it is derived from Vāmana's Sūtra : "स **दोष** गुणालङ्कार **हान**-आदानाभ्याम्". Much earlier than Vāmana, Daṇḍin made this distinction between Guṇa and Doṣa and along with it gave also a general definition of both :

दोषा विपत्तये तत्र गुणाः संपत्तये तथा । IV. 1.

Flaws spoil ; excellences beautify. Vipatti and Sampatti apply in general to every part of poetic expression. Vāmana only slightly changes and expands this when he says :

"-काव्यसौन्दर्याक्षेपहेतवः त्यागाय दोषा ज्ञातव्याः—"

Doṣas are those that spoil the beauty of poetry, says Vāmana. This is more plainly stated by others that Doṣa is that which is not in agreement with or which is not promotive of what one has to convey. What one may have to do at a particular moment may be to convey Rasa, or to say a mere word and the Doṣa may be a Rasadoṣa or a mere Padadoṣa. Expanding the idea of Heyatva in Bhoja's description of Doṣa, Ratneśvara says :

"अभिमतप्रतीतिव्यवधायकतया विघ्नभूतः (यः) शश्वत् काव्ये हेयतामासादयति स एव दोषः ।"

Mammaṭa takes his stand on the soul of Kāvya, Rasa, the chief object or end of expression—Mukhyārtha—and defines Doṣa as its obstacle, मुख्यार्थहतिः. This characterisation will naturally extend to the Śabda and Artha with which Rasa is clothed. Says Ratneśvara :

अयमेवार्थः 'मुख्यार्थहतिर्दोषः'—इति पदेन अन्येषां अभिमतः ।

Keśava also says in his Alaṁkāraśekhara, II. i. (P. 14 Chowk. Edn.) :

दोषत्वं च रसोत्पत्तिप्रतिबन्धकत्वम् ।

and Vidyānātha also says the same thing :

दोषः काव्यापकर्षहेतुः, शब्दार्थगोचरः ।

If Guṇa is Kāvyotkarṣahetu or Kāvyasampattihetu in Daṇḍin's language, Doṣa is Kāvyāpakarṣahetu or Kāvyavipattihetu. Just as Guṇas are really Rasadharmas, even as Śaurya etc., are our Ātmaguṇas, so also Doṣas are properly the properties of Rasa. It is only as impediments to Rasa-realisation that they are called flaws. When Rasa-realisation is not impeded,

there is no flaw. As a corollary of this position, the doctrine of Doṣas being Anitya is got at. From this we pass to the class of Guṇas called Vaiśeṣika-guṇas or Doṣa--guṇas found in Bhoja and from there we sight the doctrine of 'Adaptation' or 'Appropriateness' called Aucitya. Says Ānandavardhana :

श्रुतिदुष्टादयो दोषाः अनित्या ये च सूचिताः।
ध्वन्यात्मन्येव शृङ्गारे ते हेया इत्युदीरिताः ॥

Says Abhinava on this :

" नापि गुणेभ्यो व्यतिरिक्तं दोषत्वम्। बीभत्सहास्यरौद्रादौ त्वेषां अस्माभिरुपगमात् शृङ्गारादौ च वर्जनाद् अनित्यत्वं समर्थितमेवेति भावः ॥ " p. 83

The point is made plain in the third Uddyota also. All Doṣas are Anitya and this will be more elaborately considered in the Guṇa section in this thesis, in the sub-section on Bhoja's Vaiśeṣikaguṇas. Besides, in my article on Aucitya, published in the *Journal of the Madras University* (Vol. VI. No. 1, Vol. VII. No. 1) I have explained the point at length.

At the end of the Doṣa section in the Abhinavabhāratī, Abhinava makes a distinction among Doṣas as Nitya and Anitya. He considers such grammatical flaws like Apaśabda and material flaws like Bhinnavṛtta as Nityadoṣas; and Śrutiduṣṭa, Grāmya etc., as Anitya, since in certain cases they become Guṇas.

एकं (षां) मध्ये तु केचिन् नित्यदोषाः यथा अपशब्दः। केचिदनित्याः यथा ग्राम्यं, हास्यादौ तस्य चेष्टतमत्वात् ॥ P. 409, Vol. II, Abi. Bhā.

This distinction is not final. The difference is only comparatively stated, for, even in the case of Raudrarasa where the flaw of Śrutiduṣṭa becomes a Guṇa, an Apaśabda continues to be a flaw. But strictly speaking even Apaśabda is only an Anityadoṣa. For the condition of Imitation—Anukaraṇa —as Rudraṭa and Bhoja observe, makes Guṇas of even Apaśabdas. When an illiterate man's character and his speech are portrayed, grammatical flaws in his speech are highly suggestive of the character and the Rasa pertaining to him, and they thus become Guṇas. Namisādhu in his comments on Rudraṭa VI, 47 enunciating this principle of imitation transforming Doṣas into Guṇas illustrates the point by a verse depicting the absurd speech of the illiterate husband of the poetess Vikaṭanitambā.

तदपि पदं न दोषाय। यथा विकटनितम्बायाः पतिमनुकुर्वाणा सखी प्राह—

काले माषं सस्ये मासं वदति शकाशं यश्च सकाशम्।
उष्ट्रे लुम्पति रं वा षं वा तस्मै दत्ता विकटनितम्बा ॥

Thus 'Abhimatārthavighnahetu', 'Mukyārthahati' or 'Rasavighna' lands us on a very comprehensive definition of Doṣa as *Anaucitya.* Aucitya, Ānanda says (Ud. III.), is the very soul of Rasa and that there is no other cause for Rasabhaṅga than Anaucitya. In the language of the Rasika, a Nīrasaprabandha is an Apaśabda ; similarly anything which is *Anucita* is of Doṣa. Mahimabhaṭṭa defines Doṣa in this manner, as Anaucitya.

शब्ददोषाणमनौचित्योपगमात्। P. 31. V. V., T. S. S.

The same is put by him thus in the Samgraha kārikās :

पारंपर्येण साक्षाच्च तदेतत्प्रतिपद्यते ।
कवेरजागरूकस्य रसभङ्गनिमित्तताम् ॥
यत्त्वेतत् शब्दविषयं बहुधा परिदृश्यते ।
तस्य प्रक्रमभेदाद्याः दोषाः पञ्चैव योनयः ॥ Śls. 90-91. I. p. 32.

Bhoja also, while describing the Doṣa in the composition as a whole, describes Doṣa as Anaucitya in general.

तत्र दोषहानमनौचित्यादिपरिहारेण ।—
Śr. Pra. Vol. II. P. 410.

Further, while describing some of the Doṣas one by one, Bhoja points out how they are the results of the neglect of Aucitya, as can be seen from the section on Aucitya in this thesis.

The fundamental relation of Doṣa to Rasa brings us to a more basic definition of Doṣa. Rasa is the aesthetic relish or Camatkāra of the Sahṛdaya. Whatever promotes this relish has been called Guṇa, Rītī, Alaṁkāra, etc., and whatever (pertaining to any of these elements) obstructs Rasa-realisation or this relish and jars on the ears of the Sahṛdaya is a Doṣa. Says Ratneśvara : महदयोद्वेजकत्वेन हि दोषता । S. K. Ā. Vyā. P. 99.

So it is that Daṇḍin points out that verses like स्त्रीव गच्छति षण्डोऽयं etc., are very appealing and none feels the Upamādoṣa like the difference in gender etc., as a bar to realising their beauty. Says Daṇḍin :

न लिङ्गवचने भिन्ने न हीनाधिकतापि वा ।
उपमादूषणायालं **यत्रोद्वेगो न धीमताम्** । II. 51
× × × ×
इत्येवमादौ सौभाग्यं न जहात्येव जातुचित् ॥ II. 54

Taking inspiration from this passage in Daṇḍin, Keśavamiśra, after giving some traditional flaws, closes his section on Doṣas thus : "I followed the practice of writers in giving these flaws ; but really, only this can and must be said : one must write such poetry as will, in no part of it, jar on the ear of the Sahṛdaya."

सम्प्रदायानुरोधेन व्याख्येयं मम, वस्तुतः ।
तादृक् काव्यं प्रकुर्वीत यत्रोद्वेगो न धीमताम् ।
A. Śekhara II. P. 20 Kāśī Edn.

The Number and Classification of Doṣas.

The Nyāyasūtras of Gautama speaks of the Doṣas twice. We meet with the Doṣas we are familiar with in the Doṣa section of the Alaṁkāra works in two contexts in the Nyāyasūtras. The first is the section on Śabdapramāṇa, where the Pūrvapakṣa states that verbal source of knowledge is not valid (is Apramāṇa) since it is liable to such flaws as untruth, contradiction and redundance,—Anṛta, Vyāghāta, and Punarukta. II. i. 57. Of these Vyāghāta and Punarukta are flaws we meet with in the Doṣa sec-

tion in Alaṁkāra works. This Vyāghāta is the Vyartha of Bhāmaha and the Pūrvāparaviruddha of Daṇḍin, one part contradicting another. Punarukta is very well known and is seen as Ekārtha in Bharata, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin.

In the subsequent sūtras and the Bhāṣya thereon, Gautama and Vātsyāyana explain where and how Vyāghāta and Punarukta are not Doṣas. Cases of apparent contradiction may ultimately mean something else and may be designed ; and Punarukti for Anuvāda is also not a flaw. This is the 'non-eternality of non-universality'—Anityatva—of Doṣa and the idea of Vaiśeṣika-guṇa or the Guṇībhāva of Doṣas is also contained in this part of the text of the Nyāyasūtras and their Bhāṣya.

A larger number of Doṣas are met with towards the end of the Nyāya-sūtras while the Nigraha-sthānas are enumerated and dealt with, V. ii. beginning with sūtra 1. Here the flaws in debating, resulting in points of defeat, are given. Some of these are the flaws met with in the Doṣa section of the Alaṁkāra śāstra.

1. *Arthāntara.* This is the sixth Nigraha-sthāna, defined in Sūtra 7 (V. ii.) प्रकृतादर्थाद् अप्रतिसंबद्धार्थमर्थान्तरम् ।

Vātsyāyana's illustration of this flaw is humorous. He says that one gets defeated if he should fall a prey, to this flaw of irrelevant digression. One has to prove that Śabda is Nitya and gives a Hetu or reason for it ; if at this stage he should derive the word 'Hetu' from its root, point out the Pratyaya and how it is a Kṛdanta and then proceed to give the various kinds of Padas, he commits 'Arthāntara'. Bharata gives a flaw called Arthāntara which is the same as this and Bharata defines it as the description of of that which need not be described,—Avarṇyavarṇana.

2. *Nirarthaka.* V. ii. 8. This is a case of the words themselves having no meaning ; we should not even say 'words' ; for a 'word' has some meaning, primary or secondary. In this flaw there are not words but only some concatenation of sounds which make no intelligible word.

3. *Avijñātārtha.* This is what is not understood by or is not understandable to the opponent or to the assembly, even when repeated for the third time. This is not an unitary flaw but is a composite one. Explaining it, Vātsyāyana says that various flaws may go to produce this defect, such as words with many meanings, obscure words etc. The second of these, Apratīta-śabda is met with in Alaṁkāra-śāstra. It is akin to Bhāmaha's Gūḍhaśabda abhidhā (I. 45-46). Apratīta, from the time of Vāmana, got its meaning restricted to the use of scientific terms in poetry, of words known only to scholastic and technical scholars.

4. *Apārthaka.* Sutra 10. This is the ninth Nigrahasthāna.

पौर्वापर्ययोगात् अप्रतिसम्बद्धार्थमपार्थकम् ।

This is different from the above-noticed Nirarthaka. While Nirarthaka means sounds or words which have themselves no meaning, Apārtha refers to a sentence as a whole not making any sense, though its separate words are sensi-

ble. Vātsyāyana says तत्समुदायार्थस्य अपायात् अपार्थकम् and he gives दश दाडिमानि षडपूपाः as an example. This is exactly identical with the Apārtha of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, which Bhāmaha defines in almost Vātsyāyana's own words and illustrates with the same expression as given by Vātsyāyana.

समुदायार्थशून्यं यत् तदपार्थकमिष्यते ।
दाडिमानि दशापूपाः षडित्यादि यथोदितम् ॥ IV. 8.

5. *Punarukta.* II. i. 57. This is too plain to need any explanation and is met with in all Alaṁkāra works. Both Gautama and Vātsyāyana speak of Śabda paunaruktya and Artha paunaruktya. The latter, illustrated by Vātsyāyana, corresponds to what Mammaṭa has given among his Artha doṣas as Anavīkṛta. See below.

Further, Gautama speaks of two more Doṣas i.e., Nigrahasthānas, Nyūna and Adhika, which refer to Nyūnatā and Ādhikya of the Aṅgas, Pratijñā, Hetu, etc. This Nyūnatā and Ādhikyam are met with in the Doṣa section in Alaṁkāra works with reference to the use of words –Nyūnapada and Adhikapada (vide Rudraṭa) and with reference to the Upamā-alaṁkāra and Upamādoṣas.

Kauṭilya

The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya speaks of Śāsana, writing letters, writs, documents and grants of the State in II. 10. called the Śāsanādhikāra. With reference to the writing of these Śāsanas, Kauṭilya mentions here some good qualities of writing and composition which these Śāsanas should possess (Guṇas) and some flaws which they must be free from (Doṣas). The Doṣas are thus mentioned by Kauṭilya :

Akānti, Vyāghāta, Punarukta, Apaśabda, Samplava.

अकान्तिः, व्याघातः, पुनरुक्तम्, अपशब्दः, संप्लवः इति लेखदोषाः ।
P. 177. T. S. S. Vol. I.

The first flaw, Akānti, is foreign to our present purpose, referring as it does to the art of the scribe. Vyāghāta is thus defined by Kauṭilya : पूर्वेण पश्चिमस्य अनुपपत्तिः व्याघातः and it is plain. It is Bhāmaha's and Daṇḍin's Vyartha, Purvāparavyāghāta. Punarukta, the third flaw, is also plain and Kauṭilya defines it properly as repetition *without purpose.* "उक्तस्य **अविशेषेण** द्वितीयमुच्चारणं पुनरुक्तम् " Pointless repetition is a flaw ; but repeating a thing for emphasis and such other purpose is a Guṇa as pointed out by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. It is, in certain cases, a Vaiśeṣikaguṇa as Bhoja says. This point is stressed by the word 'Aviśeṣeṇa' in Kauṭilya's definition of Punarukta. The fourth flaw, Apaśabda is grammatical error in gender, number, etc. "लिङ्गवचनकालकारकाणामन्यथाप्रयोगः शब्दः " । It is the last flaw called Samplava that is not easily understood. Kautilya defines it thus :

अवर्गे वर्गकरणं, वर्गे चावर्गक्रिया, गुणविपर्यासः संप्लव इति ।

The definition clearly consists of two aspects. It is the first that is not clear. In it occurs a word, *Varga,* which occurs earlier also in this same chapter.

एकपदावरः, त्रिपदपरः परपदार्थानुरोधेन वर्गः कार्यः

In his commentary on the Arthaśāstra in the T. S. S. Edn., Mm. Ganapati SASTRI has only reproduced what the two old commentaries, the Jayamaṅgalā and the Pratipadapañcikā, have given as the meaning of the word Varga. The Jayamaṅgalā (R. 5208 ; T. 4. 191 ; Mad. Govt. Oriental Mss. Library), a commentary on the Arthaśāstra by one Bhikṣuprabhamati, according to a colophon (P. 129, end of III. ii) in the Ms. interprets Varga as Samāsa, in both the places where the word occurs.

वर्गः समास इत्यर्थः । p. 172. असमासे समासकरणम् and समासेऽप्यसमासः ।

Bhaṭṭasvāmin interprets Varga in his Pratipadapañcikā on the Arthaśāstra (V. 5. 47 D. 3873 Mad. Ms.) first as Samāsa and then as Virāma or stop. (Pp. 22 & 30). His Virāma is not exactly 'paragraph spacing' as is taken by Mm. Syama Sastri in his translation. How can there be a Samāsa with one word ? or a paragraph with one word ? It is difficult to reconcile the word Vargakaraṇa to Samāsa and Paragraph. There cannot be a paragraph even of three words : Tripadapara. Perhaps, Varga means the spacing (Virāma) between word and word or between one group of words and another. Perhaps, Kauṭilya says that one may leave some space for every word or at least for every three words. If Varga means Samāsa, the flaw related to it is literary ; if it refers to paragraph or any other kind of stop, it pertains to calligraphy like the first flaw of Akānti. It must be accepted that none of the meanings suggested above satisfy.

The second aspect of Samplava is fortunately plain. It is similar to Daṇḍin's Guṇaviparyaya, Vāmana's Sukṣma-doṣa and Bhoja's Arītimat. Kauṭilya describes it as reverses, Viparyāsas, of the Guṇas of Lekha which have previously been mentioned. The Guṇas mentioned by Kauṭilya are Arthakrama, Sambandha, Paripūrṇatā, Mādhurya, Audārya and Spaṣṭatva. See the Guṇa section. The Viparyāsa of Arthakrama is Apakrama found in Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and others. Sambandha is defined by Kauṭilya as non-contradiction of the idea by any idea coming ahead and its Viparyāsa will be the same as the Vyāghāta which has been separately and independently given as Doṣa. From the text of Kauṭilya himself describing Sambandha we can construct its Viparyāsa as "प्रस्तुतस्य अर्थस्य उत्तरेण उपरोध." : The third Guṇa called Paripūrṇatā has more than one aspect : 1. Anyūna-anatiriktatā of Artha, Pada and Akṣara. The Viparyāsa of this is the Nyūnatā and Ādhikya of these three elements. Nyūnapada and Adhikapada are met with in the Doṣaprakaraṇa of Alaṁkāra works. Rudraṭa II. 8. The Nyūnatā and Ādhikya of Akṣara is not clear. It is understandable if it is a metrical flaw. Perhaps it refers to the art of writing and not of composing the Śāsana. 2. Full and clear presentation of the case with arguments and illustrations is the second aspect of Paripūrṇatā. No definite Viparyāsa of this corresponding to any of the Ālaṁkārika's doṣas can be pointed out for this aspect of Paripūrṇatā. Perhaps one may mention here the Doṣa of Apuṣṭārtha of Rudraṭa. 3. Aśrānta-padatā : this seems to be expression or words powerful enough for conveying the idea. The Jayamaṅgalā interprets it as Akliṣṭa-

padatā and gives it as the quality of condensed expression as contrasted with weak and spread out expression. See Guṇa section. We can easily give its Viparyaya as Śrānta-padatā. Mādhurya is both ease and grace in idea and expression. सुखोपनीतचार्वर्थशब्दाभिधानं माधुर्यम् । Its reverse which can conveniently be called Amādhurya may be put as strained and far-fetched ideas in unattractive words. Audārya is the use of Agrāmya śabda, sublime words, words not sullied by vulgar and colloquial use. Its reverse is undignified expression which can be put as Grāmya śabda. Sphuṭatva is the use of well known words, Daṇḍin's Prasāda. प्रतीतशब्दप्रयोगः स्पष्टत्वमिति. Its Viparyāsa is Apratītaśabda, the Apratīta of Vāmana, Vyutpanna and Anatirūḍha words according to Daṇḍin, I. 46.

The above is mostly an independent examination of the meaning of the Guṇas and Doṣas found mentioned by Kauṭilya in the Śāsanādhikāra of his Artha-śāstra. The Jayamaṅgalā and the Pratipadapañcikā on the Artha-śāstra do not give these same meanings for some of these Guṇas and Doṣas.

The Anuyogadvāra.

The *Anuyogadvāra* * of the Jainas speaks, on pp. 261a ff., of 32 flaws, Doṣas, to be avoided in an expression. A few of these are ethical, some logical and others, literary :

Anṛta—stating that which is not a fact as well as suppressing that which is a fact.

Upaghāta-janaka—inciting violence to a living being like the Vedic injunction to do animal sacrifice.

Nirarthaka—meaningless concatenation of sounds.

Apārthaka—words intelligent by themselves but not forming a sensible sentence.

Cchala—quibble.

Druhila—an ethical Doṣa (involving Droha ?) like the second.

Nissāra—devoid of reasonableness and also trifling (yuktirahitam, pariphalgu)

Adhika—comprises two flaws ; hypermetrical and too many words.

Ūna—metrically wanting in syllables, insufficient expression and deficient in Hetu and Dṛṣṭānta ; this comprises thus three flaws, metrical, literary and logical.

Punarukta—redundant ; two varieties,—in word and in idea.

Vyāhata—inconsistent ; 'purvāparavyāghāta.'

Ayukta—improbable ; ' anupapattikṣama.'

Krama-bhinna—devoid of proper order.

Vacana-bhinna—incongruent number.

---

* Edn. with Hemacandra's Sanskrit gloss in the Āgamodaya samiti series. This Hemacandra was an elder contemporary of the Hemacandra who wrote the Kāvyānuśāsana.

Vibhakti-bhinna—incongruent case.

Liṅga-bhinna—incongruent gender.

Anabhihita—stating a tenet not belonging to an Āgama or Śāstra.

Apada—another metrical flaw interpreted as drifting into another metre ; 'anyac chandaḥ.'

Svabhāva hīna—against Nature ; 'loka-viruddha.'

Vyavahita—long digression.

Kāla-doṣa—wrong tense and mood.

Yati-doṣa—another metrical flaw.

Chavi-doṣa—explained as the fault of being devoid of the colour of figure, Alaṁkāra. The gloss explains 'Chavi' as 'Alaṁkāra-viśeṣa' ; is any definite figure meant ?

Samaya-viruddha—similar to Anabhihita. While in the former, something not said in a school of thought is attributed to it, here something said is misrepresented.

Nirhetuka—simply stating a thing without the support of argument.

Arthāpatti-doṣa—another logical flaw.

Samāsa-doṣa—this is clear.

Upamā-doṣa—comprises three Doṣas,—Hīnopamā, Adhikopamā and Anupamā. Anupamā is citing wrong simile.

Rūpaka-doṣa— does not pertain to the figure Rūpaka as could be mistaken ; Rūpaka here means Rūpa, form ; this flaw is inaccurate description of the form of an object.

Nirdeśa-doṣa is explained as the absence of Ekavākytā of the words uttered and is illustrated by a sentence devoid of the verb.

Padārtha-doṣa—false argument based on the second meaning of the synonym of the word in question.

Sandhi-doṣa—this is clear.

The Mahābhārata

The Sulabhā-Janaka-samvāda in the Śāntiparvan of the *Mahābhārata* (ch. 325 in the Kumbhakonam edn. and ch. 320 in the Citraśālā Press edn.), speaks of some Guṇas and Doṣās of expression in verses 87-90. We can make out here the following Doṣas :—

Apetārtha, Bhinnārtha, Nyāyaviruddha, Adhika, Aślakṣṇa, Sandigdha, Gurvakṣara, Parāṅmukhapada, Anrta, Trivarga-viruddha, Asamskṛta, Nyūna, Kaṣṭaśabda, Vikrama, Saśeṣa (i.e. incomplete), Niṣkāraṇa (i.e. Aprayojana), Ahetuka (yuktirahita).

In the place of Parāṅmukhapada, the Citraśālā edn. has Parāṅmukhasukha which is meaningless. In the place of the Saśeṣa found in the Citraśālā edn., the Kumbh. edn. has the meaningless reading 'Sadoṣa.' After Saśeṣa, the Citraśālā edn. reads 'Anukalpena' which Nīlakaṇṭha interprets as Lakṣaṇā (!) and Kumbh. edn. reads in that place 'Adhikalpena.' Nīlakaṇṭha explains in his commentary the Doṣa 'Kliṣṭa' which is not traceable in the original.

We shall now notice the writers on Alaṁkāra, beginning with Bharata.

Bharata.

In chapter 17, Bharata speaks of ten Doṣas :

गूढार्थम्, अर्थान्तरम्, अर्थहीनम्, भिन्नार्थम्, एकार्थम्, अभिप्लुतार्थम्, न्यायापेतम्, विषमम्, विसन्धि, शब्दच्युतम्.

The last is named Śabda-hīna also. Of these the last four are clear. Nyāyāpeta is 'illogical' and 'contrary to the facts of the world'; in it can be brought together the last two flaws given by Bhāhama viz., Deśa-kāla-kalā loka-nyāya-āgama-virodhi and Pratijñāhetu-dṛṣṭānta-hīna. The former is accepted by Daṇḍin and Vāmana. Vāmana splits it into two, Loka-viruddha and Vidyā-viruddha. Bhoja puts all such flaws under the single Artha-doṣa called Viruddha. Bharata defines Nyāyāpeta as Pramāṇa-parivarjita and Pramāṇa is the sciences and arts as well as the world which is the basis of science, art and literature. Viṣama is also clear. It is a metrical flaw : 'वृत्तदोषो भवेद्यत्र विषमं नाम तद् भवेत्" In it, both the later Bhinna-vṛtta and Yatibhraṣṭa are comprehended. Not only these, inappropriate choice of metre will also be a Vṛtta-doṣa coming under Viṣama. For, as later writers like Kṣemendra (in his Suvṛtta-tilaka) and earlier writers like Kātyāyana (quoted in the Abhinava-bhāratī ; *vide* my article on Writers quoted in the Abhinava-bhāratī in the *JOR* Vol. VI. pp. 222-223) say, there is appropriateness and inappropriateness in metres with regard to Rasa and Artha. There is Vṛttaucitya and Vṛttadhvani. There will be Viṣamadoṣa wherever metre is not appropriate. Mahima-bhaṭṭa says that jarring metre is an Anaucitya and a Śabda-doṣa, "दुःश्रवत्वमपि वृत्तस्य शब्दानौचित्यमेव" V. V. II. p. 37.

Visandhi is either absence of grammatical sandhi or wrong grammatical Sandhi and this is found in all later writers. The definition in the text of Bharata however is not clear.

अनुप्रतिष्ठाशब्दं यत् तद्विसन्धीति काश्यितम् ।

Śabdacyuta or *Śabda hīna* is defined by Bharata as Aśabda. It may be the inappropriate word which is a literary flaw and may also refer to grammatically incorrect words and usages. When an idea is not expressed exactly, in the most proper words, precision and power are lost. From the point of view of Rasa and Artha, it is an Apaśabda. Says Kuntaka :

वाच्योऽर्थो वाचकः शब्दः प्रसिद्धमिति यद्यपि ।
तथापि काव्यमार्गेऽस्मिन् परमार्थोऽयमेतयोः ॥
शब्दो विवक्षितार्थैकवाचकोऽन्येषु सत्स्वपि ।
अर्थः सहृदयाह्लादकारिस्वस्पन्दसुन्दरः ॥
स शब्दः काव्ये, यस्तत्समुचितसमस्तसामग्रीकः । *V. J.* I. 8-9.

But in view of what Śabda-hīna means in Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and all later writers, we must take it in Bharata as grammatically incorrect words.

Coming now to the other flaws : Gūḍhārtha is described as paryāya-śabdābhihita. The name is more plain than the description. It seems to

refer generally to all cases where there is no Prasāda or lucidity in expression and consequently the meaning is obscure. In drama especially, rare expressions and obscure synonyms must be left aside and only the well-known and easily understood words should be used. In XVII. 123, Bharata again emphasises that drama must be devoid of expressions whose meanings are obscure : Gūḍhaśabdārtha-hīna. In chapter I, Bhāmaha speaks of a flaw called Gūḍhaśabdābhidhāna

गूढशब्दाभिधानं च न प्रयोज्यं कथंचन ।
सुधियामपि नैवेदमुपकाराय कल्पते ॥ I. 45.

and he gives in illustration a verse the meaning of which has to be made out with great labour. Both Bharata and Bhāmaha are easily understood by the definition and illustration of the Pada-doṣa called Gūḍha-artha in Bhoja.

गूढार्थम् अप्रसिद्धार्थप्रयोगं ब्रुवते बुधाः । *S. K. Ā.* I. 11.

In the illustrative verse, the unused synonyms not in currency in the world are used ; as for instance, the word 'Go' is used in the sense of 'Eye', which is not common.

Arthāntara is defined by Bharata as Avarṇya varṇana, the description of what ought not or need not be described. This is not exactly a small Pada-doṣa. It is of great literary significance and refers in general to all irrelevancies. When we realise that whatever is introduced and is said has to justify itself by helping the suggestion of Rasa, those words, ideas and parts of a composition which have no purpose must be marked out as Arthāntara, irrelevant. Of this flaw, I have spoken at some length in my paper on Aucitya in the *Journal of the Madras University*. It is this flaw that Mahimabhaṭṭa calls Avācya-vacana and Vācya-avacana, description of the needless and non-description of the needful.

Artha-hīna. Bharata's definition of this Doṣa is not clear.

अर्थहीनं त्वसंबद्धं सावशेषार्थमेव च ।

Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and others speak of a flaw called Apārtha, which is meaningless prattle as of a madman.

समुदायार्थशून्यं यत् तदपार्थकमिष्यते ।
दाडिमानि दशापूपाः षडित्यादि यथोदितम् ॥ Bhāmaha IV. 8.

Surely this is Asambaddha and Artha-hīna.

Bhinnārtha. Bharata describes this flaw in two ways. First, he says that it is Asabhya and Grāmya, vulgarity and coarseness. This flaw, divided into many varieties, is found in later writers. The second definition of Bhinnārtha in Bharata is as follows :

विवक्षितेऽन्य एवार्थे यत्रान्यार्थोऽभिधीयते ।
भिन्नार्थं तदपि प्राहुः काव्यं काव्यविचक्षणाः ॥

The text seems to be corrupt and we have given above our reconstuction. It is Bhinnārtha, 'of a different meaning,' when one wants to convey one thing

but actually says something else which is often the exact opposite. This is what Bhoja calls the Pada-doṣa, Viruddha.

विपरीतं विरुद्धार्थप्रकल्पनमिहोच्यते ।

When one uses the word 'Anuttama,' he may mean best as well as worst. 'Akārya-suhṛt' may mean Avyāja-suhṛt as well as companion in crimes. Abhinava takes the line as it is, not as amended by us, but the meaning is however the same.

Ekārtha. This flaw is found with the same name in Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. It is a synonym of Punarukta.

Abhiplutārtha is described by Bharata thus :

अभिप्लुतार्थं विज्ञेयं यत् पादेन समस्यते ।

and this is not clear at all. Abhiplava is overflow. There is nothing here to help even a guess. Nor is there anything in the flaws of later writers which can throw light upon Bharata's Abhiplutārtha. We think it can be taken as the later Sasaṁśaya. Other flaws in Bharata have nothing to correspond to the flaw of Sasaṁśaya.

The text of Bharata was considered above as it stands and by itself and we have given above what we can make out of it. Let us now see what Abhinavagupta made out of these Doṣas in Bharata. As we shall see in the Guṇa section, Abhinava follows Vāmana completely on the two subjects of Doṣas and Guṇas in the *Abhinava bhāratī*. Abhinava takes Bharata's Gūḍārtha as Vāmana's Neyārtha (Kalpitārtha) ; he cites Vāmana's illustration for Ekārtha or Uktārtha under Bharata's Arthāntara and this is not sufficiently intelligible. Abhinava adds that by 'Avaṃya vaṃana' Bharata means a Vākya-doṣa, that the commentator who took it as a Prabandha-doṣa is wrong and that the Prabandha-doṣa of poets digressing and giving irrelevant descriptions is to be considered under Sandhi-sandhyaṅgas. Artha hīna, Abhinava takes as Vāmana's Vyartha. Bharata's definition of Artha hīna has two parts :

अर्थहीनं ह्यसंबद्धं - सा त्वशेषार्थमेव च ।

The first, Asambaddha, is clear and has been explained above. The second bit can thus be reconstructed from Abhinava's commentary : *Sāvaśeṣārtham eva ca.* It is explained by Abhinava as the 'Sandigdha' or the doubtful of Vāmana, where a word like 'Mahāpadam' can mean 'great position' as well as its direct opposite, 'great fall.' But in such cases context can decide the meaning to some extent. This dependence on context for the decision of the import is taken as Sāvaśeṣārthatva.

अत्र हि सावशेषः प्रकरणापेक्षः वस्तुनिश्चयः । अभाग्यवशादिति अपि संभाव्यत्वात् ॥

Abhinava takes Bhinna-artha as comprising three kinds of flaws : i. Dūra sambandha vyavadhāna : The illustration for this Doṣa given by Abhinava is not found in Vāmana, Bhāmaha or Daṇḍin. It approaches Vāmana's

Doṣa called Kliṣṭa which is Vyavahita-artha-pratyaya. But this first variety of Bhinnārtha is not warranted by the text of Bharata which gives only two varieties. Perhaps in Abhinava's reading, the words 'Bhinnārtham abhivijñeyam' are replaced by other words giving the idea of Dūra-sambandha-vyavadhāna. ii. The second variety is Grāmya and Asabhya. iii. The third is mutual contradiction of two bits of ideas in the same sentence. "विवक्षितोऽन्य एवार्थः यत्रान्यार्थेन भिद्यते।" 'स्याच्चेदेष न रावणः' इत्युक्त्वा 'क्व नु पुनः सर्वत्र सर्वे गुणाः' इति। उद्दिष्टं ह्यत्र रावणस्य अनुपादेयत्वम्। क्व पुनरित्यनेन अन्यथाकरणाद् भेदितम्। p. 409. *Abhi. Bhā.*

The text of Bharata defining Abhiplutārtha यत्पादेन समस्यते we pointed above, is obscure. Abhinava's comments presuppose the reading as 'Yatpādeṣu samāpyate.'

अभिप्लुतार्थं यथा—'स राजा नीतिकुशलः सरः कुमुदशोभितम्।
सर्वप्रिया वसन्तश्रीः ग्रीष्मे मालतिकागमः॥

अत्र प्रतिपदं (प्रतिपादं) अर्थस्य परिसमाप्तत्वाद् अभिप्लुतम्। एकवाक्यत्वेन निमज्जनाभावात्। p. 409. *Abhi. Bhā.*

This does not seem to be exactly what Bharata means. Abhinava has nothing here taken from Vāmana. What he has said is found as the Doṣa called Apārtha which is Samudāyārtha-śūnya in Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. Then, it is not different from Bharata's Arthahīna or Asambaddha. Nyāyāpeta is taken as Deśa-kāla-kalā-śāstra-viruddha ; and regarding Viṣama, Visandhi, and Śabdahīna, Abhinava agrees with what we have said above. Though there are occasions, as noted above, where he has no help from Vāmana and has himself to exercise his imagination, Abhinava follows in the main only Vāmana on Doṣas. Commenting on the bit in Bharata 'एत एव (दोषाः) विपर्यस्ताः गुणाः काव्येषु कीर्तिताः', Abhinava remarks that there are ten Viparyayas or reverses of the ten flaws which are ten Guṇas ; but besides these ten Doṣa-viparyaya-guṇas, there are also ten more, Śleṣa etc. which are also Guṇas.

Besides the ten Doṣas given in the Doṣa section in the 17th chapter, Bharata gives some Doṣas in the chapter on Siddhis (27th), where he speaks of the judges who mark the merits and the demerits in a dramatic performance. The text of the drama is one department of the performance and of it, the flaws are :

पुनरुक्तं ह्यसमासो विभक्तिभेदो विसन्धयोऽपार्थाः।
त्रिलिङ्गजाश्च दोषाः प्रत्यक्षपरोक्षसंमोहः॥
छन्दोवृत्तत्यागः गुरुलाघवसंकरो यतेर्भेदः।
एतानि स्थूल(?) घातस्थानानि काव्यस्य॥

Of these, Punarukta is the Ekārtha given in the 17th chapter. The Apārtha given above is the Arthahīna of the 17th chapter. Visandhi given in the 17th chapter is repeated here with the same name. Asamāsa, as a

flaw, is not intelligible ; perhaps it means incorrect Samāsa ; for there are rules governing compounds. Vibhakti-bheda and Triliṅgaja-doṣas are mistakes of grammar referring to declension and gender. The whole of the third line refers to metrical flaws which have been put under the single name of Viṣama in chapter 17 and which later writers put as two flaws, Bhinnavṛtta and Yatibhraṣṭa. We have another flaw called Pratyakṣa-parokṣa-sammoha, whose sense is obscure. Perhaps it refers to flaws of grammar regarding tenses and moods. For, when declension is taken into consideration and Vibhakti-bheda is enumerated, conjugation can be expected to be mentioned. Hence Pratyakṣa-parokṣa-sammoha many mean confusion regarding present and past.

Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin.

Bhāmaha speaks of Doṣas once at the end of the first chapter itself and then towards the end of his work, in a separate section. In I. 37 he mentions six flaws : Neyārtha, Kliṣṭa, Anyārtha, Avācaka, Ayuktimat, and Gūḍha-śabda-abhidhā. These flaws are explained and illustrated in Śls. 38-46. In śl. 47 some more flaws are given : Śruti-duṣṭa, Artha-duṣṭa, Kalpanā-duṣṭa and Śruti-kaṣṭa.

After giving these ten flaws, Bhāmaha points out how these Doṣas sometimes become Guṇas in Śls. 54-58. In chapter IV, Bhāmaha gives the following flaws : Apārtha, Vyartha, Ekārtha, Sasamśaya, Apakrama, Śabdahīna, Yatibhraṣṭa, Visandhi, Deśa-kāla-kalā-loka-nyāya-āgama-virodhi, and Pratijñā-hetu-dṛṣṭānta-hīna. Chapters IV and V, deal with these ten flaws. Among these, the Ayuktimat mentioned in the first list in the first chapter, which is illustrated by cases like employing clouds and such inanimate objects or even such beings as birds as love-messengers, can be brought under the Loka-viruddha of the ninth flaw in the second set.

Bhāmaha's Neyārtha is clearly the Gūḍārtha of Bharata and the Kalpitārtha-neyārtha of Vāmana. Kliṣṭa is also taken by Vāmana from Bhāmaha and defined by the same words as found in Bhāmaha. It is Vyavahitārtha-pratyaya. Bhāmaha's definition of Anyārtha is found in the printed text of the Kāvyālaṁkāra in the Haridas Skr. Series as अन्यार्थविगमे यथा।

विजहुस्तस्य ताः शोकं क्रीडायां विहृतं च तत्॥

There is another reading 'Anyārtam vigame yathā'. The meaning however is clear. The writer says 'Vijahruḥ tasya tāḥ śokam,' purporting to say "They removed his sorrow," but the correct verb must be 'Jahruḥ', and Hṛ with Vi means 'play'—Vihāra, Viharana etc. Vāmana's Anyārtha agrees with this Anyārtha of Bhāmaha. Avācakam is inexpressive word, a word which is not associated or which cannot be easily associated with the idea. As for instance, Himāpahāmitradhara means cloud ; Himāpaha means fire that removes fog ; its Amitra or the enemy of fire is water which extinguishes it and that which carries water is cloud. If this is the flaw of Avācaka, it is not very much different from the Paryāyābhidhāna or Neyārtha or Kalpi-

tārtha ; again it cannot be distinguished from Kliṣṭa which is Vyavahitārtha-pratīti. Vāmana who accepts Bhāmaha's Kliṣṭa leaves off Avācaka as unnecessary. Ayuktimat is illogical conception like making the cloud a messenger. This is not a Pada-doṣa or a Vākya-doṣa but a Prabandha-doṣa. The last is Gūḍha-śabdābhidhāna which is put by Vāmana as Gūḍhārtha and is defined as Aprasidha-artha-prayukta, the use of a word in its less known sense when it has two senses, one more widely known and the other less known. But from Bhāmaha's illustration (I. 46), we see that it is the employment of unheard of words.

The second set of four flaws in Bhāmaha are three kinds of Duṣṭa and one Kaṣṭa. Śruti duṣṭa is the use of words like Visarga, Udgāra etc., which have also bad meanings. Artha-duṣṭa is a whole sentence giving rise to another obscene meaning also. In Śruti-duṣṭa, the vulgarity rests in a single word ; but in Artha-duṣṭa, the words themselves do not have a second vulgar meaning but the sentence as a whole gives rise to an indelicate and vulgar idea. The third called Kalpanā-duṣṭa is the same flaw of obscenity ; here, neither a single word nor the whole sentence is responsible for the obscenity ; but as a result of the careless placing of the various words in a sentence, part of one word combines with part of the next to create a word having an obscene meaning. Śruti-kaṣṭa is sounds that grate on the ear, those that are harsh.

Coming to the third set of ten flaws : Apārtha is incoherent prattling as of mad men, there being no sentence possible in their words. Vyartha is Viruddha-artha, a sentence in which one part contradicts another,—pūrva-apara-vyāghāta. Ekārtha is tautology. Sasamśaya is doubtful utterance. Apakrama is the lack of the natural order in mentioning things. Śabdahīna is grammatical mistake, Apaśabda. Yatibhraṣṭa is caesura at the wrong place in a metre. Bhinnavṛtta is defective metre, in respect of long and short letters. Visandhi is non-coalition or wrong coalition of words. Viruddha is contradiction of facts of the world, science, logic, arts and traditional lores.

Daṇḍin speaks of these ten flaws towards the end of his work. His definitions correspond to those of Bhāmaha not only in idea but often in expression also. Apārtha, Vyartha, Ekārtha, Apakrama,—in these cases there is agreement between the two in the idea as well as the words. Both agree in idea though not in expression regarding Sasamśaya, Śabdahīna, Yatibhraṣṭa, and Deśādi-viruddha. On Bhinnavṛtta, there is agreement in idea and expression also to some extent. Visandhi, Bhāmaha does not define but only illustrates ; Daṇḍin defines and illustrates. Regarding the last, Deśādi-viruddha, Bhāmaha takes Nyāya as Śāstra i.e., the Darśanas and treatises on Dharma, Artha, Kāma, and Daṇḍa nīti. To a flaw of Artha śāstra, he devotes rather elaborate attention viz., the absurdity of the story of the trap laid for capturing king Udayana. Daṇḍin briefly deals with Deśa, Kāla, Kalā and Loka and pays more attention to Hetu vidyā (Nyāya) and Āgama.

An important difference between Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin is that the former

recognises an eleventh flaw called Pratijña-hetu-dṛṣṭānta-hīna which Daṇḍin rejects as a dry enquiry,—

विचारः कर्कशप्रायः तेनालीढेन किं फलम्।

Bhāmaha devotes the whole of chapter V to it.

Still another difference between these two writers is this : at the end of the ten flaws given in chapter I, Bhāmaha says that those flaws sometimes become Guṇas. He does not elaborate the idea in chapter IV. But Daṇḍin, after illustrating every Doṣa, explains with illustration also, how it becomes a Guṇa under other special circumstances. Daṇḍin finally also observes in general, that all flaws as such can become Guṇas and gives six verses in illustration of this principle.

Besides these two sets of twenty flaws, Bhāmaha speaks of seven flaws which vitiate the figure of simile, flaws which he reproduces from the treatise of one of his predecessors named Medhāvin.

हीनतासंभवो लिङ्गवचोभेदो विपर्ययः।
उपमानाधिकत्वं च तेनासदृशतापि च॥
त एते उपमादोषाः सप्त मेधाविनोदिताः। II. 39-40.

Such flaws can be pointed out for each of the Alaṁkāras. If Alaṁkāras have Lakṣaṇas, there are bound to be flaws. But writers seem to have considered in connection with Doṣa only the Upamālaṁkāra. Upamā is surely the greatest of the Alaṁkāras and is at the root of many other figures also. But that is no reason why Upamādoṣas alone must be specially dealt with. Says Ratneśvara in this connection :

"—उपमायाः प्रभूतविषयतया प्राधान्याच्च उदाहृतमतिस्फुटं भवतीति संक्षेपः।"
P. 101. S. K. Ā. Vyā.

Daṇḍin does not regularly treat of Upamādoṣas. He rather points out at first that there are cases of Upamā technically having Bhinnaliṅga and other Doṣas but whose beauty is not thereby spoilt. Certain cases do not jar on the ears of Rasikas though they are technically faulty. But there are cases where these flaws are flaws and the reason is that critics feel ugliness there. (II. 51-56. K. Ā.) This gives us a greater definition of Doṣa than either Rasāpakarṣakatva or Anaucitya viz., Sahṛdaya-udvejakatva. As pointed out already, Ratneśvara says " Sahṛdayodvejakatvena hi doṣatā," p. 99. Daṇḍin, as we have seen already accepts all the ten flaws dealt with by Bhāmaha in chapter IV. He rejects Bhāmaha's Pratijñādi-hāni. He does not also speak, in this context, of Neyārtha and the other nine flaws Bhāmaha describes in chapter I. Vāmana and Bhoja follow Daṇḍin in leaving out the eleventh flaw of Bhāmaha, Pratijñā-hetu-dṛṣṭānta-hāni.

In chapter I, while describing the Guṇas which are generally met with in the Vaidarbhī, Daṇḍin says that the reverses, Viparyaya of these Guṇas, are generally met with in the Gauḍī. These Guṇa-viparyayas are the Sūkṣma doṣas which Vāmana speaks of and of which we made mention above. These

Guṇa-viparyayas contain some Doṣas which can be shown to correspond to the Doṣas given by Bhāmaha in the first chapter.

Daṇḍin's Guṇa-viparyayas met with in Ch. I. K. Ā.—

Guṇa.	*Tadviparyaya.*
Śleṣa	Śaithilya
Prasāda	Anatirūḍha
Mādhurya	Grāmyatā of Śabda and Artha
Sukumāratā	Niṣṭhuratā, Dīptatva or Kṛcchrodyatva.
Arthavyakti	Neyārtha
Kānti	Atyukti

We have here Bhāmaha's three flaws of Śruti, Artha and Kalpanā Duṣṭas in Grāmyatā, the reverse of Mādhurya. Neyārtha of Bhāmaha is found here as the Viparyaya of the Guṇa of Arthavyakti. Kṛcchrodya or Niṣṭhura of Daṇḍin, the Viparyaya of Sukumāratā can be equated with Bhāmaha's Śruti-kaṣṭa. Anatirūḍha, Daṇḍin's reverse of Prasāda, can mean Bhāmaha's Avācaka and Gūḍha-śabda-abhidhāna. See also the Guṇa section and the Doṣa called Śleṣādi-viparyaya under Bhoja in this same chapter.

There are yet other contexts where Bhāmaha speaks of some other Doṣas. 1. In ch. I. 31-36, Bhāmaha is making his critique of the mode of literary criticism based on the distinction of the two styles, Vaidarbha and Gauḍīya. Bhāmaha points out that, as the basis of all styles and as essentials of good poetry, there are certain primary good qualities ; and without them, even Vaidarbha is bad, and with them, even Gauḍīya is good. Those who praise Vaidarbha and condemn Gauḍīya emphasise the case where the Gauḍīya's features have become exaggerated, all the time forgetting that the Gauḍīya has virtues, provided its features keep within certain limits, and that even the virtues of Vaidarbha can become exaggerated. Bhāmaha says in this connection :

अपुष्टार्थमवक्रोक्ति प्रसन्नमृजु कोमलम् ।
भिन्नं गेयमिवेदं तु केवलं श्रुतिपेशलम् ॥
अलङ्कारवदग्राम्यमर्थ्यं न्याय्यमनाकुलम् ।
गौडीयमपि साधीयो वैदर्भमपि नान्यथा ॥ I. 34-35.

The first verse on Vaidarbha says that surely Vaidarbha does not set to decorate and develop its idea with figure, fancy and conceit ; that is, the Vaidarbha is plain and straight, Ṛju. But this simplicity and plainness can easily deteriorate into insipidity and commonplaceness. Apuṣṭārtha and Avakratā are the two Doṣas that result. This Apuṣṭa of Bhāmaha is met with in Rudraṭa and Avakra is Bhoja's Niralaṁkāra as can be seen below. Prasāda

also is a Guṇa within certain limits. There must always be a quest and discovery, and a half concealed idea gleaming through the words is always the chief source of charm. An over-emphasis on Prasāda may make Vaidarbha, matter of fact. Similarly its sweetness can become so much as to cloy. कोमलम्, भिन्नं गेयमिवेदं तु केवलं श्रुतिपेशलम्। See the Guṇa section also.

Similarly, the flaws to which the Gauḍīya is liable are excessive ornateness (Atyalaṁkāra), verbosity and being devoid of much sense (opposite of Arthyatvam), reversals of natural order, i.e., conceits and hyperboles running riot (opposite of Nyāyyatvam) and involvedness (Ākulatvam). The word 'Anākula' can be done into 'uninvolved.' Bhāmaha meant something definitely by it, something which is easy to imagine for ourselves though difficult to describe. Bhāmaha mentions this again in his description of Bhāvika in III. 54 as Śabda-anākulatā. Śabda-ākula seems to be "word-ridden" composition. Again in V. 67, Bhāmaha speaks of the flaw 'Ākula.'

2. In V. 62-63, Bhāmaha criticises certain compositions which do not appeal, whose meaning is obscure and cannot be unravelled easily and which, even if they have some feeling, are not beautiful. He compares such compositions to an unripe Kapittha fruit. Here there is mention of one flaw 'Asunirbheda,' 'not easily understandable,' a reverse of Prasāda and Arthavyakti, a composite flaw comprising a number of more definite flaws.

3. Bhāmaha speaks of Virudha-pada. Asvartha, Pāda-pūraṇa (Bahu pūraṇa) and the already mentioned Ākula in V. 67.

विरुद्धपदमस्वर्थं बहुपूरणमाकुलम्।
कुर्वन्ति काव्यमपरे व्यायताभीप्सया यथा॥ V. 67.

Viruddha-pada is the use of words meaning the opposite of what is intended to be said. Pāda-pūraṇa or Bahu-pūraṇa is simply padding. These two flaws are met with in later writers. Ākula has already been noticed. Asvartha is not having any good idea; i.e., one wastes a huge dictionary of words but there is not even a grain of idea worth seeking in that bushel of chaff. Bhāmaha says that some love this way of flourish, bombast and lengthiness, and illustrates it with a verse.

4. In II. 18 Bhāmaha points out when one can tolerate Yamakas. Here are mentioned certain Guṇas from which some Doṣas can be derived.

Vāmana.

Though Doṣas are being described from the time of Bharata, no writer ever analysed them into different classes. There is no classification in Bharata. Bhāmaha gives the Doṣas in three groups even as he gives his Alaṁkāras group by group and this does not mean any classification at all. When however Bhāmaha gives in chapter I two kinds of Duṣṭa named Śruti-duṣṭa and Artha-duṣṭa, he has a distinction into Śabda doṣa and Artha doṣa. Similarly, while describing his Ekārtha or Punarukta in chapter IV. 12, he gives two varieties of it, of Śabda and of Artha.

पुनरुक्तमिदं प्राहुरन्ये शब्दार्थभेदतः। IV. 12.

Daṇḍin, in whose work also the classification of Doṣas has not yet begun, almost repeats Bhāmaha's idea regarding the Śabda and Artha Punaruktis.

अर्थतः शब्दतो वापि तदेकार्थं मतं यथा। IV. 12.

This case of Doṣas is similar to that of the Guṇas. The division of Guṇas into those of Śabda and those of Artha is not definitely made by Daṇḍin even. It is Vāmana who first classifies Doṣas and Guṇas into those of Śabda and those of Artha.

As already pointed out, there is much agreement on Doṣas between Bhāmaha and Vāmana. Vāmana borrows Neyārtha etc., given by Bhāmaha in the first chapter. For his second set of Doṣas, Vāmana utilises both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. The following are Vāmana's flaws :

Pada doṣas		*Vākya doṣas*	
Pada doṣas	*Padārtha doṣas*	*Vākya doṣas*	*Vākyārtha doṣas*
Asādhu	Anyārtha	Bhinna vṛtta	Vyartha
Kaṣṭa	Neyārtha	Yati bhraṣṭa	Ekārtha
Grāmya	Gūḍhārtha	Visandhi	Sandigdha
Apratīta	Aślīlārtha		Ayukta
Anarthaka	Kliṣṭārtha		Apakrama
			Loka-vidyā-viruddha

The Guṇas are classified only into those of Śabda and Artha. But the Doṣas are classified by Vāmana into four classes, Doṣas of Pada, Padārtha, Vākya and Vākyārtha. Now to an examination of Vāmana's Doṣas : His Asādhu is the Śabda-hīna of Bharata, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. Kaṣṭa is given by Bhāmaha as the fourth in the second set of four flaws in the first chapter. Grāmya of Vāmana is seen in Bharata's first variety of Bhinnārtha. In Bhāmaha, it is not mentioned by name and defined but, as in some other cases in Bhāmaha, it is simply illustrated. In I. 53, Bhāmaha says—गण्डमप्यपरे किल (नेच्छन्ति). This Gaṇḍa is slang, Grāmya. If poets should not use vulgar words, they should not also use the technical words of the class-room. So, side by side with this Grāmya, Vāmana introduces the flaw called Apratīta, which he is the first to speak of. Vāmana's Anarthaka is the flaw resulting from padding with words like 'Tāvat.,' 'Tu' 'Hi,' to fill up the metre. This is also an almost new flaw introduced by Vāmana, though we have in Bhāmaha V, 67 the flaw Bahu-pūraṇa comprehending it. Vāmana's Anyārtha and Neyārtha are identical with those two flaws in Bhāmaha, ch. I. Bhāmaha has in ch. I the Gūḍha-śabda-abhidhāna to correspond to Vāmana's Gūḍhārtha, but their respective meanings are not exactly identical. Vāmana's Aślīla is Bhāmaha's Duṣṭas of Śruti, Artha and Kalpanā. Vāmana's Kliṣṭa is also the same as that given by Bhāmaha in

chapter I. Thus almost all the flaws given by Bhāmaha in Chap. I, except Avācaka and Ayuktimat, are taken by Vāmana and constituted into the class of Pada-Padārtha-doṣas with the addition of a few more.

Regarding the Vākya-Vākyārtha-doṣas in Vāmana, these are almost the same as given by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin in the fourth chapter of their works. Vāmana like Daṇḍin omits Bhāmaha's Pratijñādi-hāni and accepts the rest. It is to be noted that Vāmana omits also the first flaw of Apārtha ; Vāmana has nothing even corresponding to it. He starts with Vyartha and has the other eight. Deśa-kāla-kalā-loka-nyāya-āgama-viruddha is split into two by Vāmana, Loka-viruddha which comprehends Deśa, Kāla and Lōka and Vidyā-viruddha which comprehends Kalā, Nyāya and Āgama Viruddhas. To these Vāmana adds the Ayukta of the first chapter of Bhāmaha, which he left out earlier. Vāmana's Ayukta is however not clear. He says : '*Māyādi-vikalpitārtham ayuktam.*' II. ii. 21. Perhaps Vāmana refers to illusions and fantasies in which incoherent things happen. Gopendra Tippa illustrates it from the Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍana and is equally obscure. It is significant that Bhoja has no need for this Ayukta.

In IV. 2, Vāmana accepts six Upamā-doṣas,—Hīnatva, Adhikatva, Liṅga bheda, Vacana bheda, Asādṛśya, Asambhava. Bhāmaha has one more viz., Viparyaya which Vāmana omits. It is plain that Vāmana follows Bhāmaha pretty closely ; for Bhāmaha says that an exaggerated statement is not a flaw in simile ; it cannot be the Upamā-doṣa called Asambhava. Bhāmaha says :

यस्यातिशयवानर्थः कथं सोऽसंभवो मतः।
इष्टं चातिशयार्थत्वमुपमोत्प्रेक्षयोर्यथा ॥

and, following Bhāmaha, Vāmana says at the end of the Upamā section :

उपमायामतिशयस्य दृष्टत्वात्।

and makes the sūtra also 'Na viruddho'tiśayaḥ' (IV. ii. 21.) The reason for Vāmana's omission of Viparyaya is his inclusion of both the varieties of Viparyaya viz., Hīnopamā and Adhikopamā in the general Hīnatā and Ādhikya accepted by both.

Mention has already been made of the Sūksma doṣas, referred to by Vāmana at the end of II. ii.

Rudraṭa.

In II. 8, Rudraṭa gives a few Guṇas and Doṣas of Vākya in general. From this verse we derive the following flaws : Nyūna pada, Adhika pada, Avācaka, Apakrama, Apuṣṭārtha, Acārupada. Namisādhu explains and illustrates these flaws. Nyūnapada is insufficient words, or absence of an important and necessary word. When there is this flaw, Arthavyakti is absent. It will produce what Daṇḍin calls the Neyārtha-doṣa. Adhikapada is Vāmana's Anarthaka ; Punarukti also comes under this. Avācaka is what Bhāmaha mentions in chapter I ; words which we use for certain ideas but which do not express those ideas, words like Paṅkti-vihaṅgama-nāma-bhṛt for

Daśaratha. Apakrama is not only the absence of the natural order of things or of their logical sequence but also the grammatically wrong position of words which spoil Anvaya. Apuṣṭārtha is related to Adhikapada ; Namisādhu here points out that Rudraṭa uses the word śabda here,—Apuṣṭārtha-śabda which means, another flaw called Apuṣṭa śabda which is Apa-śabda. Acārupada is the śrutikaṣṭa of Bhāmaha ; Namisādhu calls it Duśśrava. Rudraṭa pays special attention to the last flaw Acārupada and speaks of it in two verses, II. 9-10.

In chapter VI, Rudraṭa takes up the subject of śabda doṣas after having done with śabda-alaṁkāras. He has also got the distinction of Doṣas into those of Pada and Vākya. In Rudraṭa, the distinction of Doṣas into those of śabda and Artha is very clear and he treats of śabda-doṣas after śabda-alaṁkāras and Artha-doṣas after Artha-alaṁkāras. śabda-doṣa is first described as pertaining to Pada and Vākya. 'Pada-vākya-stho doṣaḥ'. In the six flaws noted above as given in II. 8, there are both Pada-doṣas and Vākya-doṣas, as Namisādhu also points out.

Asamartha, Apratīta, Visandhi, Viparītakalpana, Grāmya, Avyutpanna and Deśya are the Pada-doṣas given by Rudraṭa in VI. 2. Asamartha is Anyārtha or the Rūḍhicyuta of Vāmana ; it is Bhāmaha's Anyārtha e.g. Vijahruḥ for Jahruḥ ; Prasmaranti for Vismaranti ; and Prasthitaḥ for Prakarṣeṇa sthitaḥ. Rudraṭa gives a second variety of Asamartha as using 'Hanti' to mean 'goes.' Surely the root has that meaning but is not prevalent in that sense in poets' usages. A third variety is using Jalabhṛt for ocean. The second and third varieties are Vāmana's Gūḍhārtha. A fourth variety is also pointed out by Rudraṭa which resembles what Bharata means by Sāvaśeṣārtha according to Abhinava's interpretation. Vide above. Apratīta is also Rūḍhicyuta and Kalpita, unestablished synonym or created name. As for instance one says Himahā, destroyer of fog ; he may intend to convey the sense of fire but the word may mean Sun also. This is Sasaṁśaya-apratīta. The Asaṁśaya-apratīta is a similar created name which does not however refer to more than one idea. E.g. Aśva-yoṣiṅ-mukha-arciṣmān meaning Vaḍavā-mukha-agni. Visandhi is not only incorrect coalition but is also bad coalition resulting in sound-combinations which mean obscene things, what Bhāmaha calls Kalpanā-duṣṭa. Viparītakalpanā is illustrated by the expression Akāryamitra and this is Vāmana's Sandigdha. See above. Grāmya is inappropriate and low words. Rudraṭa gives three kinds of Grāmya : i. The use of inappropriate address. As for example, it is Grāmya for one to address a king as Bhagavan. It is not possible how this can be Grāmya ; it can be any other flaw, say, Loka-viruddha, but never Grāmya. The third variety of Grāmya given by Rudraṭa is also open to this same criticism. It is given as inappropriateness in the use of onomatopœtic words ; Raṇita for example must be used only for the sound of anklets and so on. This may be Loka-viruddha but never Grāmya. Only the second variety which is the use of words like Gaṇḍa is really Grāmya. Rudraṭa takes Grāmya as Anaucitya in general but Anaucitya is even bigger than

what Rudraṭa takes it here to be ; it can take within it the whole world of flaws. The last two flaws are Avyutpanna pada and Deśya pada which are sufficiently clear.

VI. 40 : Vākya doṣas—Saṅkīrṇa, Garbhita, Gatārtha and Analaṁkāra. Saṅkīrṇa is words of one sentence getting mixed up with those of another. Garbhita is a whole sentence creeping into another. Gatārtha is not illustrated by Rudraṭa but is defined and given as a Prabandha-doṣa. Namisādhu explains this as the understanding of the full import of a sentence only by future sentences or by amplifications coming ahead. Niralaṁkāra is Apuṣṭārtha, bald expression.

Artha doṣas.—In VII. 7, Rudraṭa says that there is a comprehensive flaw of Artha in general viz., Anyathākaraṇa, description of things contrary to Deśa, Kāla and such other conditions of Nature. This means the Deśādi-viruddha of Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana.

In chapter XI, Rudraṭa speaks of Artha-doṣas. They are Apahetu, Apratīta, Nirāgama, Bādhayat, Asaṁbaddha, Grāmya, Virasa, Tadvat and Atimātra. Rudraṭa's Apahetu is an instance of a later writer taking up the logical errors described by Bhāmaha in chapter V. Apahetu of Rudraṭa can be taken as the Hetu-hāni in Bhāmaha's Pratijñā-hetu-dṛṣṭānta-hāni. Apratīta is ' Kavibhiḥ aprayuktam,' words which poets have not used. Nirāgama is included in the first given flaw of a general nature viz., Deśa-kālādi-viruddha. Bādhayat is Pūrvāparavyāhata, the Vyartha of Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana. Asaṁbandha is Vāmana's Ekārtha of the second variety. न विशेषश्चेदेकार्थम्. Grāmya is Anaucitya and is the Loka-viruddha of other writers. Virasa is a flaw pertaining to Rasa and this is the first time Rasa is considered in connection with Doṣas. There is more than one variety of this flaw of Virasa. If in one Rasa, another incompatible Rasa crosses, it is a Virasa. Another kind of Vairasya is too much development of even the pertinent Rasa, Ativṛddhi. Tadvat is similar to Asambaddha. It is also use of words which are not for any significant purpose, padding. This is what Vāmana calls Pūraṇārtha, where however he counts only the words Tu, Hi, etc. Rudraṭa counts also other words which do not add any special idea but are used only to fill up the verse. Atimātra is what Daṇḍin gives as Atyukti, the Viparyaya of his Guṇa of Kānti.

A noteworthy feature in Rudraṭa's treatment of Doṣas is that, like Daṇḍin, he points out, then and there, how all these flaws, with change of conditions, become Guṇas.

The Upamā-doṣas of Rudraṭa. Rudraṭa recognises only four : Sāmānya-śabdabheda, Vaiṣamya, Asambhava and Aprasiddhi. (XI. 24). Namisādhu clearly reviews the seven old simile-flaws of Medhāvin as found in Bhāmaha and points out the sufficiency of recognising only four. We noticed previously that it was Vāmana who began to reduce the number of Upamā-doṣas. He accepts only six, because he clubs together Viparyaya and Hīnatā-Adhikatva. Hīnopamā and Hīna-viśeṣaṇa are both Hīnatva of Upamā ; similarly, Adhikopamā and Adhika-viśeṣaṇa are both Adhikatva of Upamā. Rudraṭa makes a

different kind of simplification. Hīna-viśeṣaṇa and Adhika-viśeṣaṇa are put together by him under one single head Vaiṣamya. Instead of the more narrow Liṅga-vacana-bheda, Rudraṭa gives a more reasonable and comprehensive flaw called Sāmānya-śabda-bheda in which are included disagreement regarding Liṅga, Vacana, Kāla, Kāraka and Vibhakti. (Śl. 26). Regarding Vaiṣamya which is numerical superiority or inferiority of the attributes of the two objects compared, Rudraṭa has the interesting remark that it applies only to cases of Kalpita and Utpādya Upamās. Asaṁbhava is the same old Upamā-doṣa. Under Aprasiddha, Rudraṭa brings Hīnopamā, Adhikopamā and Aprasiddhopamā of Bhāmaha as is evident from his illustration.

Ānandavardhana.

In the *Dhvanyāloka* we can expect only casual mention of Doṣas. In II. 12, Ānanda refers to Guṇas as Rasa-dharmas and places Doṣas in the same position. In II. 12, he refers to Śruti-duṣṭa and other flaws and characterises them as 'Anitya,' flaws only relatively and not fundamentally. The same flaw of Śruti-duṣṭa is also referred to in Uddyota III. (p. 129 Samgraha ślokas).

It is however the subject of a new category of Doṣas called Rasa-doṣas in the evolution of which Ānanda's work occupies a prominent place. Fundamentally, as Ānanda points out in II. 12

ध्वन्यात्मन्येव शृङ्गारे ते हेया इत्युदीरिताः।

all Doṣas directly pertain to Rasa and hinder its realisation; and hence are Rasa-doṣas. But analytically speaking and dividing poetic expression into its various departments, we classify Doṣas into those of Pada, Vākya, Prakaraṇa and Prabandha; of Śabda and Artha; and of Rasa. We have also seen how there are Alaṁkāra-doṣas when we considered under Bhāmaha the Upamā-doṣas coming down from Medhāvin's time; and in connection with that we remarked that flaws can thus be shown for other Alaṁkāras as well. Regarding Alaṁkāras as such and in general, Ānanda has an interesting section in Uddyata II where he gives certain rules for introducing Alaṁkāras in the most proper way. When these rules are not observed, the following faults result :

1. यमकादि शब्दालङ्काराणां शृङ्गारादि–अङ्गिरसेषु एकरूपेण निबन्धनम् (II. 15)
2. पृथग्यत्ननिर्वर्त्यत्वम् (II. 17)
3. —अरसपरत्वं रूपकादेः (II. 19-20)
4. अङ्गित्वेन करणम्.
5. अकाले ग्रहणम्, काले अग्रहणम्, अकाले त्यागः, काले अत्यागः
6. अतिनिर्वाहः

Alaṁkāras then do not serve their purpose and become Doṣas. These can be taken as Alaṁkāra doṣas in general. Similar flaws in respect of Guṇa, Saṁghaṭanā etc., can be pointed out and they will all be aspects of Anaucitya of Guṇa, Saṁghaṭanā etc. See my paper on Aucitya, *Journal of the Madras University*, VI. I & VII. I. Since Rasa is the most important and since its

delineation is the most difficult task, Ānanda has taken pains to observe the masters and lay down some generalisations for the guidance of others in Uddyota III, 18-19. The flaws that vitiate Rasa are thus given by him :

1. विरोधिरससंबन्धिविभावादिपरिग्रहः
2. विस्तरेणान्वितस्यापि वस्तुनोऽन्यस्य वर्णनम्
3. अकाण्डे विच्छित्तिः
4. अकाण्डे प्रकाशनम्
5. पुष्टस्यापि पुनः पुनः दीप्तिः
6. वृत्त्यनौचित्यम् (This last can be separated as Vṛtti doṣa)

These are called by Ānanda 'Rasa-virodhas.' The concept of Rasa-doṣa arose even earlier than Ānanda and we find in the Artha-doṣas of Rudraṭa, which we examined above, one Doṣa called Virasa. This Virasa of Rudraṭa is of two kinds : 1. Incompatible Rasa, Kramāpeta-rasa-nipāta, i.e. Viruddha-rasa-saṁbandha ; and 2. 'too much development of even the relevant Rasa' ; (1) क्रमापेत रसनिपात or विरुद्धरससम्बन्ध and (2) सावसरस्यापि रसस्य अतिमहती वृद्धिः निरन्तरम् i. e. पौनःपुन्येन दीपनम् of Ānanda (Rudraṭa, XI. 12-14). Rudrabhaṭṭa's *Śṛṅgāra tilaka* speaks of the avoidance of the touch of antagonistic Rasa,—Viruddharasa-samparka-vivarajana—in III. 20-22 and in the same chapter, Śl. 46, it says :

विरसं प्रत्यनीकं च दुःसन्धानरसं तथा।
नीरसं पात्रदुष्टं च काव्यं सद्भिर्न शस्यते॥

Of the flaws mentioned herein, Virasa is explained as Viruddha-rasa and Nīrasa as the second variety of Rudraṭa's Virasa viz., the over-development of one Rasa, Nirantaram eka-rasa-vṛddhiḥ.

These flaws are very elaborately explained by Ānanda in Uddyota III pp. 161-181. Mammaṭa thus formulates the following Rasa-doṣas on the basis of the Dhvanyāloka : (Kāvya prakāśa. VII. 12-14).

1. रस-स्थायि-व्यभिचारिणां स्वशब्दवाच्यत्वम्

Here Hemacandra points out that sometimes Vyabhicārins mentioned by their names can be passed.

रसादेः स्वशब्दोक्तिः, क्वचित्सञ्चारिवर्जं दोषः। K. A. III. i.

This is derived by Mammaṭa from Uddyota I of the Dhvanyāloka.

2. अनुभावविभावयोः कष्टकल्पनया व्यक्तिः। [विभावानुभावक्लेशव्यक्तिः (Hemacandra, III.)]

3. प्रतिकूलविभावादिग्रहः। [विरोधिरससम्बन्धिविभावादिपरिग्रहः। Ānanda]

Hemacandra analyses this Prātikūlya of Vibhāvas etc., on the basis of Ānanda's remarks.

4. पुनःपुनः दीप्तिः
5. अकाण्डे प्रथनम्
6. अकाण्डे च्छेदः

7. अङ्गस्याप्यतिविस्तृतिः
8. अङ्गिनः अननुसन्धानम्
9. प्रकृतिविपर्ययः
10 अनङ्गस्याभिधानम्

Hemacandra copies Mammaṭa and Mammaṭa draws upon Ānanda and to a small extent upon Rudraṭa also. Mammaṭa points out also in the closing section of the seventh chapter how these Rasa-doṣas are not Doṣas in certain cases.

Rājaśekhara.

The bulk of the *Kāvya-mīmāmsā* of Rājaśekhara is lost. According to his own table of contents given at the beginning of his work, he devotes one chapter to Doṣas. दोषाधिकरणं विषणः p. 1. Since that chapter, along with many others, is lost, we cannot at present find out how much Rājaśekhara borrowed from earlier writers, how much he himself added and how much Bhoja borrowed from him on the subject of Doṣas.

Similarly we are not able to examine here the contributions of Bhaṭṭanāyaka and Tota to the Doṣaprakaraṇa. We have noticed Abhinava's contribution under Bharata.

Bhoja.

It is with Bhoja that we started. Bhoja defines poetry first as expression which must be flawless. He makes Doṣa-hāna the first of the four Sāhityas in his Śṛ. Pra. For his section on Doṣas, Bhoja draws upon Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Vāmana and Rudraṭa.

Bhoja gives only three classes of Doṣas : Doṣas of Pada, of Vākya and of Vākyārtha. Vāmana's second class of Padārtha-doṣas is felt as unnecessary by Bhoja. The Pada-doṣas of Bhoja are sixteen in number. Of these, those borrowed from Vāmana are nine : Asādhu, Kaṣṭa, Anarthaka, Anyārthaka, Apratīta, Kliṣṭa, Gūḍhārtha, Neyārtha and Grāmya. Since Bhāmaha is the source for Vāmana himself, Bhāmaha (Ch. I.) is utilised here by Bhoja also. (Bhāmaha I. 37 & 47). Apuṣṭārtha is taken by Bhoja from Rudraṭa, II. 8 and so also Asamartha and Deśya from Rudraṭa, VI. 2. Besides these flaws, we have in Bhoja Aprayukta which is 'Kavibhir aprayukta,' Sandigdha and Aprayojaka which is 'Aviśeṣa-vidhāyaka.' The second and the last are to be found in some other form in earlier writers as can be seen from the earlier part of this section. Aprayojaka can be compared to Rudraṭa's Artha-doṣa called Tadvat. Bhoja introduces Aprayukta which is prohibition of the non-poetic word, i.e. words which poets have not used. The vulgar words have to be left out (Deśya and Grāmya) ; the learned and technical words (Apratīta) have to be left out also and similarly, among the remaining, those not in poetic usage (Aprayukta) must also be left out.

The Vākyadoṣas are also sixteen in number and of these, those common to Bhoja and Vāmana are only Visandhi, Bhinnavṛtta and Bhinnayati. These

are found in other writers also. Four Upamā-doṣas are also counted here by Bhoja as Vākya-doṣas and for some Vākya-doṣas Bhoja is indebted to Rudraṭa. Bhoja's Vākya-saṅkīrṇa and Vākya-garbhita are from Rudraṭa's Vākya-doṣas in VI. 40.

Bhoja's Śabda-hīna is a new addition but it is unnecessary since a Śabda-hina vākya-doṣa is only the Pada-doṣa of Asādhu. Krama-bhraṣṭa is given by Vāmana as a Vākya-*artha*-doṣa with the name Apakrama. (II.ii.22). Similarly Punaruktimat of Bhoja is the Ekārtha of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin and is a Vākyārtha-doṣa in Vāmana. Four of the seven or six Upamā-doṣas, Bhinna-liṅga, Bhinna-vacana, Nyūnopamā and Adhikopamā which are related to Śabda are here taken as Vākya-doṣas.

The new Vākya-doṣas of Bhoja are five in number, Śabda-hīna, Vyākīrṇa, Apada, Aśarīra and Arītimat. The first is nothing but a sentence having the Pada-doṣa called Asādhu. Vyākīrṇa is haphazard, scattered position of subject and object, creating confusion. Apada needs some explanation.

विभिन्नप्रकृतिस्थादि पदयुक्त्यपदं विदुः। I. 24. S. K. Ā.

तदेतत् प्रकृतिस्थकोमलकठोराणां नागरोपनागराणां ग्राम्याणां वा पदानामयुक्तेः अपदम्।

There are six kinds of words : Prakṛtistha, Komala, Kaṭhora ; Grāmya, Nāgara and Upanāgara. These fall into two classes of three ; the first three go into a class and the second three into another. The first class is related to the structure and the texture of the words, and Komala and Kaṭhora at least are self-explanatory. The second class, as Ratneśvara puts it, refers to usage, Prasiddhi,—used by all, used by only the learned few, and used by the learned as also a few men of the world who are in touch with the learned. These are respectively called Grāmya, Nāgara and Upanāgara.

According to context the poet has to use the appropriate word ; the nature of the content decides that of the words which are to be Prakṛtistha, Komala or Kaṭhora ; and the nature of the speaker or character involved decides whether the words shall be Grāmya, Nāgara or Upanāgara. These conditions can be called Vācya-aucitya and Vaktṛ-aucitya. When these two aspects of Aucitya or appropriateness are not found, there arises the flaw of Apada.

In the Śr. Pra., Bhoja adds something regarding this Doṣa of Apada and this addition in Bhoja's other work has been pointed out by Ratneśvara in his commentary on this portion of the S. K. Ā.

श्रृङ्गारप्रकाशे तु भाषाणामपि भेदः पदमित्युक्तम्। P. 20. S. K. Ā.

In the Śr. Pra. (Chap. IX. p. 204, Vol. II) Apada is thus defined :

भिन्नभाषाप्रकृत्यादिकमपदम्।

Just as there are appropriate words and vocabulary to suit the meaning and the speaker, there is also, from the same points of view of matter and the speaker, the appropriate language viz., Sanskrit or one of the many Prākṛts. This appropriateness of language (Bhāṣā-aucitya) has been made the first Śabdālaṁkāra and has been called Jāti by Bhoja. See the Alaṁkāra section. The reverse or Viparyaya of Jātyalaṁkāra is taken as one of

the aspects of the Doṣa called Apada in the Śr. Pra. Ratneśvara's commentary on this flaw in the S. K. Ā. is very elaborate.

Aśarīra is the flaw of the absence of the verb in a sentence. Vāgbhaṭa II, who is indebted to Bhoja for his Doṣaprakaraṇa, accepts this Aśarīra of Bhoja. Arītimat is a flaw which Bhoja has built out of the first chapter of Daṇḍin's Kāvyādarśa. As noted above, Daṇḍin gives the ten Guṇas and adds that they have reverses (Viparyayas) which can *generally* be found in the Gauḍī style. As he defines each guṇa and illustrates, he points out also its Viparyaya and gives an illustration for it. Vāmana also recognises, as has been pointed out previously, that the Viparyayas of the Guṇas are flaws belonging to the class of Sūkṣma-doṣas. Bhoja it is who constitutes a special flaw or rather a special set of flaws out of these Guṇa-viparyayas of Daṇḍin. He calls this flaw Arītimat. Only nine Guṇas are taken and Samādhi, whose character naturally separates it as belonging to an altogether different category, is left out.

Śleṣa—Śaithilya. Samatā—Viṣamatā. Saukumārya—Kaṭhoratā.	Three Śabda-pradhāna-viparyayas.
Prasāda—Aprasāda. Arthavyakti—Neyārthatva. Kānti—Grāmyatva.	Three Artha-pradhāna-viparyayas.
Ojas—Asamastatva. Mādhurya—Anirvyūḍhatva. Audārya—Analaṁkāra.	Three Ubhaya-pradhāna-viparyāyas.

Of these Viparyayas, we find Daṇḍin's text itself justifying not all ; nor all in this same manner. His text contains : Śleṣa—Śaithilya, Prasāda—Vyutpanna or Anatirūḍha, which is to be taken as Bhoja's Aprasanna, Sama—Viṣama. Regarding Sukumāratā, Daṇḍin gives Niṣṭhura as Viparyaya and Bhoja's Kaṭhora means the same thing. The illustration given by Daṇḍin is : न्यक्षेण क्षपितः पक्षः क्षत्रियाणां क्षणादिति। Daṇḍin characterises this as Kṛcchrodya, 'hard to mouth' and Dīpta. Bhoja gives a verse from Bhāmaha as illustration for Kaṭhoratā—Bhāmaha I. 46, Bhāmaha's illustration for his flaw of Gūḍha śabdābhidhāna. Bhoja has not critically analysed Daṇḍin's Guṇas and Viparyayas of Guṇas. There are two kinds of Saukumārya given by Daṇḍin, one of Śabda and one of Artha. मण्डलीकृत्य बर्हाणि etc., is illustration for Artha-saukumārya, for Anūrjita-artha. Its Viparyaya is neither indicated nor illustrated. We can clearly see its Viparyaya as Alaṁkāra. Plain, direct, simple and delicate pen-pictures are contrasted here with high-flown conceit and figure, Anūrjita-sukumāra-artha with Ūrjita-alaṁkṛta-artha. Śabda-saukumārya has also to be taken as illustrated by the soft words of the same verse मण्डलीकृत्य बर्हाणि etc., as contrasted with न्यक्षेण क्षपितः etc. Here the antithesis is Śabda-saukumarya X Śabda-naiṣṭhurya or Kṛcchrodyatva or Dīptava. Another fact is also pointed out by Daṇḍin here ; there is also the other extreme which one

must avoid. Surely Naiṣṭhurya must be avoided and Saukumārya adopted ; but 'too soft' or Sarva-komala cloys and lands in Śaithilya.

बन्धशैथिल्यदोषोऽपि दर्शितः सर्वकोमले ॥ Daṇḍin.

There must be an equally balanced display of softness and vigour. Something like this golden mean is also stressed by Vāmana by his Śleṣa and Prasāda, i.e., Gāḍhatā and Śaithilya. III. 2. 5-8. Bhoja is justified in giving Neyārthatva as the Viparyaya of Arthavyakti, for Daṇḍin's text says :

अर्थव्यक्तिरनेयत्वमर्थस्य and नेयत्वमुरगासृजः ।

This Viparyaya is a great flaw and is to be avoided even by the adherents of the Gauḍī style. Other cases of insufficient analysis of Daṇḍin by Bhoja are the Viparyayas of Mādhurya, Kānti and Ojas. Mādhurya of Daṇḍin is of two kinds,—Śabda-mādhurya which is born of mild Anuprāsa and Śabda-agrāmyatā, and Artha-mādhurya which is born of Artha-agrāmyatā. Regarding Anuprāsa-mādhurya, the Viparyaya is Ulbaṇa-anuprāsa. Therefore Bhoja's description of Mādhurya-vyatyaya as Anirvyūḍha and its illustration have little meaning or support from Daṇḍin's text. Then Grāmya, Daṇḍin's Viparyaya of Mādhurya, is given by Bhoja as the Vyatyaya of Kānti. It is plain from Daṇḍin's description of that Guṇa, Kānti, that it is 'Laukika-artha-anatikrama' and that its reverse is Atyukti.

इदमत्युक्तिरित्युक्तमेतद् गौडोपलालितम् ।

and this Kāntiviparyaya is really the flaw of Atimātra given by Rudraṭa in XI. 17. Ojas and Audārya of Daṇḍin stand on a different footing from that of Śleṣa and other Guṇas examined above. Like Samādhi, Audārya has no clear Viparyaya. Its application is general. Ojas is similarly not a 'Prāṇa' of the Vaidarbhī ; it is a Prāṇa or Jīvita of Gadya ; *Etad gadyasya jīvitam.* The Vaidarbhas resort to it only in Gadya, whereas the Gauḍas use it even in verse and this is the only difference between the two regarding Ojas. Bhoja picks out the illustration found in Daṇḍin (I. 59) for Bandha pāruṣya and śaithilya resulting from one kind of Anuprāsa etc., and gives this as the illustration for the flaw of Asamasta, failure to compound, which he gives as the Vyatyaya of Ojas. Bhoja's Audārya-vyatyaya is interesting. It is given as Analaṁkāra. Either 'graceful attributes', Ślāghya viśeṣaṇa, or the suggestion of noble ideas, Utkarṣavad-guṇa-pratīti, must be found in any good verse. Then only would Daṇḍin call a verse Udāra. When neither is present, trivial are the attributes mentioned and trifling is the idea. We have on the whole Apuṣṭārtha or Niralaṁkāra.

दीर्घपुच्छश्चतुष्पादः ककुद्मान् लम्बकम्बलः ।
गोरपत्यं बलीवर्दः तृणमत्ति मुखेन सः ॥

तदिदमपुष्टार्थत्वात् अनुत्कृष्टविशेषणमनुदारं निरलंकारमाचक्षते ॥ S. K. Ā. p. 30.

There is surely a need for such a flaw to rule out of poetry all *bald* utterances ; but it will be a problem for Bhoja to justify the need for this Audārya-

viparyaya called Analaṁkāra, side by side with his Vākyārtha-doṣa of Niralaṁkāra derived from Rudraṭa. This subject is also dealt with in the Guṇa section.

Bhoja's Vākyārtha doṣas are sixteen in number. Apārtha, Vyartha, Ekārtha, Sasaṁśaya, Apakrama and Viruddha—six—are from Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. Atimātra and Virasa are from Rudraṭa's Artha doṣas. Aślīla is also derived from earlier writers and so also the Upamā-doṣas of Hinopamā, Adhikopamā, Asadṛśopamā and Aprasiddhopamā. The last is from Rudraṭa, from whom is also the Niralaṁkāra borrowed. Rudraṭa mentions the Vākya-doṣa of Analaṁkāra in VI. 40 & 46. The additions found in Bhoja are only two, viz., Khinna and Paruṣa. Khinna is defined as a poet's incapacity to continue or sustain the development of an idea taken on hand. Paruṣa is a kind of Atimātra. It is defined as Krūra-artha. Its absence is the Mādhurya guṇa of Artha as can be seen from Bhoja's definition of it as 'Atīvratā'.

यत्तु क्रूरार्थमत्यर्थं परुषं तु तदुच्यते।
माधुर्ययुक्तमाचार्यैः क्रोधादावप्यतीव्रता॥

Regarding Virasa, it has to be noted that Bhoja takes only the first variety of Rudraṭa's twofold Virasa. He takes the Aprastuta or Kramāpeta Rasa. Ativṛddhi of even the relevant Rasa, the second Virasa of Rudraṭa is left out. Virodha is classified by Bhoja into Pratyakṣavirodha, Anumānavirodha and Āgamavirodha.

Pratyakṣavirodha	Anumānavirodha	Āgamavirodha.
Deśa-	Yukti-	Dharma, Kāma, Arthādi Śāstra
Kāla-	Aucitya-	
Loka-	Pratijñā-	
Etc.		

Bhoja here takes up Bhāmaha's Pratijñā-hāni under Anumāna-virodha. It has to be noted here that it is quite unintelligible to class Aucitya-virodha under Anumāna-virodha.

Prabandha doṣa.

While examining Abhinava's explanation of Bharata, we saw how Abhinava objected to an earlier commentator taking Bharata's Arthāntara or Avarṇya-varṇana as a Prabandha-doṣa. Abhinava takes it as Vākya doṣa and points out that the insistence on Sandhi-sandhyaṅgas is for avoiding such irrelevancies as Arthāntara in Prabandha. Rudraṭa describes his Vākya (Śabda) doṣa of Gatārtha as a Prabandha doṣa.

तदिति **प्रबन्धविषयं** गतार्थमेतत्ततो विद्यात्। VI. 45.

तदेतत् प्रबन्धविषयं विपुलग्रन्थगोचरम् etc. Namisādhu.

Similar Prabandha-doṣas are spoken of by Bhoja also. Just as presence of Rasa is secured in a Vākya by avoiding flaws and then embellishing it with Guṇas and Alaṁkāras, so also, Rasa-aviyoga in a composition as a whole is secured by avoiding the larger flaws of the composition as a whole and by adding similar Guṇas and Alaṁkāras of the whole work. All the flaws of a Prabandha are put under one comprehensive head by Bhoja, viz., Anaucitya and an instance is given in illustration.

"प्रबन्धविषयः (रस-अवियोगः) उच्यते । सोऽपि दोषहानेन गुणोपादानेन अलङ्कार-सङ्करेण च प्रकाशमानः मनीषिणां मनःप्रहर्षहेतुः भवति ।

तत्र **दोषहानम्** अनौचित्यादिपरिहारेण । यथा मायाकैकेयीदशरथाभ्यां रामः प्रवासितः, न मातापितृभ्यामिति निर्दोषदशरथे । etc." Śr. Pra. Vol. II. Ch. XI. P. 410. Vide S. K. Ā. V. Pp. 642-3.

वाक्यवच्च प्रबन्धेषु रसालङ्कारसङ्करान् ।
निवेशयन्त्यनौचित्यपरिहारेण सूरयः ॥ Kārikā 126. S. K. Ā.

This is the avoidance or change of those parts of the original story, for dramatisation or romantic fiction, which do not help the idea or Rasa intended to be developed by the poet. Similar kinds of Anaucitya in a source have to be eschewed and the poet has to exercise his imagination and invent. This is very elaborately dealt with by Ānanda in Uddyota III. 11.

इतिवृत्तवशायातां त्यक्त्वाननुगुणां स्थितिम् ।
उत्प्रेक्ष्योऽप्यन्तराभीष्टरसोचितकथोन्नयः ॥

See Vṛtti also on P. 147-8. Kuntaka gives this as a kind of Prakaraṇa-vakratā in chapter IV. प्रकरणवक्रता—

इतिवृत्तप्रयुक्तेऽपि कथावैचित्र्यवर्त्मनि ।
उत्पाद्यलवलावण्याद् अन्या भवति वक्रता ॥

× × × × ×

निरन्तररसोद्गारगर्भसन्दर्भनिर्भराः ।
गिरः कवीनां जीवन्ति न कथामात्रमाश्रिताः ॥ Pp. 224-5. De's Edn.

There is little difference between the S. K. Ā. and the Śr. Pra. regarding the Doṣa section. While Bhoja leisurely treats of the subject in the S. K. Ā., defining each in a line of verse or in a verse, he hurries over the subject in the Śr. Pra. He gives in the latter short prose paraphrases of the definitions in the former. There are two other differences, one noteworthy and one trivial. The Arītimat of the S. K. Ā. is descriptively renamed in the Śr. Pra. as Śleṣādi-guṇa-viparyaya. The Apada-doṣa, as pointed out above, is described not only as inappropriate words (Pada jāti) but also as inappropriate language (Bhāṣā jāti).

Regarding the subject of Doṣa-guṇas, which Bhoja calls Vaiśeṣika guṇas, enough has been said above while defining Doṣa itself as Anitya. Bhāmaha points out at first in his opening chapter how certain times flaws become excel-

lences. Daṇḍin works it out in his Doṣa-prakaraṇa and Rudraṭa follows him. Bhoja makes out of them a class of Guṇas, called Vaiśeṣika-guṇas. See the Guṇa section below and the paper on Aucitya above referred to. Bhāmaha's verses on this subject सन्निवेशविशेषात्तु etc. (I. 54) and किञ्चिदाश्रयसौन्दर्यात् etc. (I. 55) are reproduced by Bhoja.

Mahimabhaṭṭa.

The next noteworthy contribution to the Doṣa-prakaraṇa came from that great Doṣajña, may we say Purobhāgī also, Mahimabhaṭṭa. Chapter II of his Vyaktiviveka is wholly given up to a consideration of literary flaws.

It has already been noted that Mahimabhaṭṭa defines Doṣa in general as Anaucitya. It pertains to Śabda and Artha. The latter, viz., Artha-doṣa, Mahiman says, applies to the delineation of Vibhāvas etc., and has been dealt with by earlier writers i.e. by Ānanda in Uddyota III. The former, Śabda-doṣa is external, Bahiraṅga and is of numerous varieties. Five of them are most important.

इह खलु द्विविधमनौचित्यमुक्तम्। अर्थविषयम् शब्दविषयं चेति। तत्र विभावानुभाव-व्यभिचारिणाम् अयथायथं रसेषु यो विनियोगः, तन्मात्रलक्षणमेकमन्तरङ्गम् आद्यैरेवोक्तमिति नेह प्रतन्यते। अपरं पुनर्बहिरङ्गं बहुप्रकारं संभवति तद्यथा—(1) विधेयाविमर्शः (2) प्रक्रमभेदः (3) क्रमभेदः (4) पौनरुक्त्यम् (5) वाच्यावचनं चेति। दुःश्रवत्वमपि वृत्तस्य शब्दानौचित्यमेव, तस्याप्यनुप्रासादेरिव रसानुगुण्येन प्रवृत्तेरिष्टत्वात्। एतस्य च **विवक्षित रसादि प्रतीति-विघ्नविधायित्वं नाम सामान्यलक्षणम्।**

अन्तरङ्गबहिरङ्गभावश्चानयोः साक्षात्पारंपर्येण च रसभङ्ग हेतुत्वादिष्टः। त एते विधेयाविमर्शादयो दोषा इत्युच्यन्ते॥" V. V. II. P. 37. T. S. S. Edn.

शब्ददोषाणामनौचित्योपगमात्। V. V. P. 31.

पारंपर्येण साक्षाच्च तदेतत् प्रतिपद्यते। कवेरजाकरूकस्य रसभङ्गनिमित्तताम्॥

यत्त्वेतत् शब्दविषयं बहुधा परिदृश्यते।
तस्य प्रक्रमभेदाद्या दोषाः पञ्चैव योनयः॥ Śl. 90–91

Of these five major flaws, the first named Vidheya-avimarśa relates to Samāsa. Compounding words without ruining the emphasis on certain words is very difficult. Therefore, says Mahiman, the Vaidarbī which is devoid of compounds is the best and the safest. Vidheya-avimarśa is lack of necessary prominence for what we want to keep prominent. Prakrama-bheda and Krama-bheda are related flaws and are new and amplified forms of the old Apakrama. Paunaruktya is an old flaw, known in earlier writers as Ekārtha. Flaws like Pāda-pūraṇa, Aprayojaka, Tadvat, which result from or coexist with Punarukti are also referred to by Mahimabhaṭṭa in his characteristic word Avakara,—mere dust, verbiage. Vācya-avacana is non-expression of that which must be expressed and to this is related another aspect of the same flaw, Avācya-vacana,—expression of the needless. (P. 100) All Avācya-vacana is Avakara.

यत् स्वरूपानुवादैकफलं फल्गुविशेषणम् ।
अप्रत्यक्षायमाणार्थं स्मृतमप्रतिभोद्भवम् ॥
तदवाच्यमिति ज्ञेयं वचनं तस्य दूषणम् ।
तद् वृत्तपूरणायैव न कवित्वाय कल्पते ॥ p. 107.

Svarūpa-anuvādaika-phala-viśeṣaṇa is Rudraṭa's Tadvat and Bhoja's Aprayojaka ; to these Pādapūraka etc., are also related. When the bare idea is given, due care must be taken not to make the expression bald. Not to give attributes which vivify the picture but to give nothing more than the well-known ordinary details of an object is to make the picture bald. Unnecessary verbiage also is Avakara and Avācyavacana. Hence the poet must be precise but, at the same time, powerful. If he is not powerful his idea suffers from what Rudraṭa calls the Doṣa of Apuṣṭa (Artha). Mahimabhaṭṭa also refers to this flaw of Apuṣṭa artha.

वस्तुमात्रानुवादस्तु पूरणैकफलो मतः ।
अर्थदोषस्सदोषज्ञैः अपुष्ट इति गीयते ॥[1] V. V. II. 122. P. 109

Chapter II of the *Vyakti Viveka* is a masterly treatise, showing high critical acumen. But we are constrained to say that, pushed to their extreme, Mahimabhaṭṭa's flaws make poetry itself impossible. Rāghava bhaṭṭa follows him to some extent and tries to rewrite some of Kālidāsa's verses in his commentary on the Śākuntala for avoiding the Doṣa of Prakrama-bheda. But Pūrṇasarasvatī points out rightly in his comments on the first verse of the second part of the Meghadūta that such trivialities as the Prakrama-bheda in the verse, विद्युत्वन्तं etc. do not detract from the eminence of the poet. Mahimabhaṭṭa himself points out that poetic utterance as such, deviating as it does from the natural mode of utterance, cannot but be vitiated always by the flaw of Prakramabheda.

तदेतदुक्तं भवति—सर्व एव भणितिप्रकारः प्रक्रमभेदस्य विषय इति ।

Therefore these flaws must be applied within a restricted sphere.[2]

Mammaṭa.

One codification of the Doṣas was made by Bhoja and there was another by Mammaṭa in his Kāvyaprakāśa where Mahimabhaṭṭa's contribution also was taken into consideration. Mammaṭa states his idea of Doṣa clearly, as a follower of Ānanda, that Doṣa is what spoils the essence or the chief element

1. This line is missing in the text of the T. S. S. Edn. of the *V.V.* As it is, the text in the T. S. S. Edn. has on p. 109 the Sangraha Ślokas ending with a half line. This missing line, given above, I secured from Hemacandra's *Kāvyānuśāsana* which is a rare collection of all the fine passages in all the earlier works. See Hemacandra, *Kāvyānuśāsana vyākyā*, P. 275.

2. In later times, Vidyādhara, author of Ekāvali, follows Mahimabhaṭṭa on Doṣas. He however omits Kramabhaṅga and gives the other four Doṣas of Mahimabhaṭṭa : Avimṛṣṭa-vidheyāṁśa, Prakramabhaṅga, Vācya-avacana (and Avācya-vacana) and Artha Paunaruktya.

viz., the Rasa and as such primarily pertains, as Dharma, to Rasa. It is however secondarily spoken of as Śabda-doṣa, Artha-doṣa, Varṇa-doṣa and Racanā-doṣa.

शब्दाद्या इत्याद्यग्रहणाद् वर्णरचने ॥ P. 8. T. S. S. Edn. Part II.

Though we pointed out even earlier that the doṣas can be spoken of even as regards Saṅghaṭanā, Vṛtti, etc., we could not see till now the writer who definitely mentioned or elaborated Doṣas of those departments of poetic expression also. Here we have Mammaṭa clearly speaking of Varṇa-doṣas and Racanā-doṣas.

Mammaṭa first gives the following sixteen flaws : Śrutikaṭu, Cyutasamskāra, Aprayukta, Asamartha, Nihatārtha, Anucitārtha, Nirarthaka, Avācaka, Aślīla (3 kinds), Sandigdha, Apratīta, Grāmya, Neyārtha, Kliṣṭa, Avimṛṣṭa-vidheyāmśa, Viruddha-matikṛt, and three Samāsa-gata doṣas.

Bhoja's Aprayukta,—word not favoured by poets—is taken up by Mammaṭa. Vāmana's Gūḍhārtha is given here with the new name Nihatārtha, using a word of two meanings in the less known meaning. Anucitapada is perhaps Mammaṭa's new introduction. It is inappropriate word and though its scope and significance are very wide, Mammaṭa's illustration makes it somewhat definite. Kliṣṭa, Avimṛṣṭa-vidheya and Viruddha-mati-kṛt are classed for the first time here expressly as Doṣas related to compounds, Samāsa. Before Mammaṭa, only the second was connected with Samāsa. Under Avimṛṣṭa-vidheya, everything said by Mammaṭa, illustrations and comments is taken from Mahimabhaṭṭa. Some of the other flaws are also sometimes related to Samāsas by Mammaṭa. Śṛutikaṭu in Samāsa is an instance. (P. 29. Vol. II. T. S. S. Edn.) In VII. 4, Mammaṭa points out that some of these flaws, Cyutasamskāra, Asamartha and Nirarthaka being left out, pertain not only to Padas but also Vākyas, while some others among these pertain also to parts of a word.

वाक्येऽपि दोषाः सन्त्येते पदस्यांशेऽपि केचन ।

He illustrates these in Vākyas. Here also, Vāmana and Mahimabhaṭṭa are fully utilised by Mammaṭa. Similarly, Śrutikaṭu and some other flaws above mentioned are pointed out with regard to part of a word or syllables on p. 53. These flaws are Śrutikaṭu, Nihatārtha, Nirarthaka, Avācaka, Aślīla, Sandigdha etc.

In VII. 5 and 6, Mammaṭa gives a set of Vākya-doṣas :

Pratikūlavarṇa, Upahataluptavisarga, Visandhi, Hatavṛtta, Nyūnapada, Adhikapada, Kathitapada, Patatprakarṣa, Samāptapunarātta, Ardhāntaraikavācaka, Abhavanmatayoga, Anabhihitavācya, Apadasthapada, Apadastha-samāsa, Saṁkīrṇa, Garbhita, Prasiddhi-atikrānta, Bhagnaprakrama, Akrama and Amataparārtha.—20.

Ānanda's treatment of Varṇadhvani in Uddyota III has yielded to Mammaṭa the Varṇadoṣa in Vākya called Pratikūlavarṇa, letters unsuited to Rasa. Another creation of Mammaṭa is Upahataluptavisarga, all Visargas becoming 'O' at a stretch or getting dropped at a stretch. The third new flaw of

Mammaṭa is Kathitapada, the same word with the same idea used twice, in a sentence. Patatprakarṣa and Samāptapunarātta are the fall of the rising climax and taking up again a finishing idea, and all later writers have accepted these two. The sixth new flaw is Ardhāntaraikavācaka, a solitary word of a previous half of a verse appearing in the second half. Mammaṭa's illustration makes this Doṣa further clear and Ratneśvara effectively compares the 'strayed words' to waifs and strays. Abhavanmatayoga is a case of the poet's clumsy expression which intends an Anvaya that is not possible according to grammar. The illustration explains the point further and it is related to the use of 'Yat-Tat' in a verse.

Anabhihita-vācya of Mammaṭa is Mahimabhaṭṭa's Vācya-avacana. Asthāna-pada is the placing of a word, of such an important word as 'Na' for example, in a wrong place. This, together with the next flaw, Asthāna-samāsa, forms Mammaṭa's addition. The Aucitya and Anaucitya pertaining to Samāsa-sanghaṭanā is discussed at great length in the 3rd Uddyota of his work by Ānanda and it is from here that Asthāna-samāsa is derived. The next two, Saṁkīrṇa and Garbhita Vākyas are from Rudraṭa and we noted above that Bhoja also takes them. Prasiddhi-dhuta is the misuse in onomatopœtic words and words of a similar nature which are associated only with certain definite objects and beings. As for instance, Heṣita can be used only for a horse's neighing and not for the elephant's noise which is called Phīṭkāra. Rudraṭa notes this flaw but brings it rather inappropriately, as has been pointed out already, under Grāmya. Prakrama and Kramabhaṅga are both taken from Mahimabhaṭṭa. Amataparārtha, though made to look new by a new, cumbrous and uncouth name, is really only the first variety of Rudraṭa's Virasa, which alone is accepted by Bhoja also. As in this case, in other instances also, Mammaṭa, partly on account of the Āryā metre chosen by him, gives uncouth names which have no Prasāda and which do not deliver their meanings immediately.

Artha doṣas are then dealt with by Mammaṭa (VII. 7-9) :—Apuṣṭa, *Kaṣṭa*, Vyāhata, Punarukta, Duṣkrama, Grāmya, Sandigdha, Nirhetu, Prasiddhi-viruddha, Vidyā-viruddha, *Anavīkṛta, Saniyama-parivṛtta, Aniyama-parivṛtta, Viśeṣa-parivṛtta, Aviśeṣa-parivṛtta, Sākāṅkṣa, Apadamukta, Sahacarabhinna,* Prakāśita-viruddha, *Vidhyanuvāda-ayukta,* Tyakta punassvīkṛta and Aślīla.

Of these, Apuṣṭa and Nirhetu are two noteworthy flaws taken from Rudraṭa. Vyāhata, Punarukta etc., form a set of old flaws. Prakāśita-viruddha and Tyakta-punassvīkṛta correspond to the Śabda doṣas of the same nature called Viruddha-matikṛt and Samāpta-punarātta. The old Loka-virudha has been changed into Prasiddhi-viruddha, for what is Prasiddhi except Loka? Further, Prasiddhi includes within it other things also which are not found in nature but are Prasiddha according to Kavisamaya. The italicised flaws need special notice, for they are newly introduced by Mammaṭa. Anavīkṛta is repetition of the same set of words or phrase without

giving the same variation through turns of expression. Non-specification of an idea that has to be specified is the flaw of Saniyama-parivṛtta. Needless specification is its related flaw on the other side. Incorrect qualification, absence of proper characterisation of an object, lack of proper particularisation of a more general idea is Viśeṣa-parivṛtta. It is aviśeṣa-parivṛtta when the particular is mentioned for the general. Sākāṅkṣa is incompleteness of sense. The closing of an idea at a wrong point is Asthānamukta. When an idea is being elaborated and its various aspects are drawn in the picture, shade by shade, one cannot, while closing, mention something which goes contrary to what has been said previously. Sahacarabhinna is incompatibility of accompanying ideas. When a series of good things are being listed and described, no bad thing can get into the list. As for example, it is not good to say "intellect is adorned by learning, idiocy by misery". Then, that idea which is the primary affirmation in the sentence must not be made unimportant like other accessory ideas. The Vidheya must not be made Anuvāda.

Mammaṭa then points out how all these cease to be flaws in certain circumstances and under such conditions as Imitation, nature of the speaker etc.

The Mammaṭa gives the following Rasa-doṣas :

स्थायिव्यभिचारिणां स्वशब्दोपादानम्, कष्टव्यक्तिः अनुभावादीनाम्, प्रतिकूलविभावादिग्रहः पुनः पुनः दीप्तिः, अकाण्डप्रथनम्, अकाण्डच्छेदः, अङ्गातिविस्तृतिः, अङ्गिनोऽननुसन्धानं, प्रकृति-, विपर्ययः, अनङ्गस्य अभिधानम्। These have already been noticed under Ānandavardhana, to the 3rd Uddoyta of whose work Mammaṭa is indebted for this section. After giving these flaws, Mammaṭa points out exceptions, conditions which make Guṇas of these flaws.

The 7th chapter of the Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammaṭa is the largest treatise on Doṣas and is the most important. Except Apada and Arītimat and one or two more less important flaws found in Bhoja only, all other flaws and many more, including those added by Mahimabhaṭṭa and by Mammaṭa himself, are found in the 7th chapter of the Kāvyaprakāśa. Mammaṭa was the last original writer on Doṣas. As on other topics, on Doṣas also, he was followed completely by the later compilers.

Mammaṭa's place in the history and evolution of Doṣas is important for another department of Doṣa dealt with by him, viz., Alaṁkāra doṣas. From the time of Medhāvin, we have only Doṣas of one Alaṁkāra, Upamā. Of Alaṁkāra in general, Ānanda pointed out certain methods of proper use, on ignoring which Doṣas of Alaṁkāra in general will occur. But it is Mammaṭa in whose work we find flaws pertaining to particular Alaṁkāras worked out. At the end of the Alaṁkāra chapter (X), we find Mammaṭa mentioning the following flaws in respect of certain Alaṁkāras. But instead of accepting them, he says that these flaws need not be had separately, since they are included in one or the other of the numerous flaws of Pada, Vākya and Vākyārtha given in chapter VII.

Alaṁkāra.	*Flaws to which it is liable.*	*Accepted flaws of chapter VII in which they are included.*
Anuprāsa.	Prasiddhyabhāva, Vaiphalya, Vṛttivirodha.	Prasiddhivirodha, Apuṣṭārthatva, Pratikūlavarṇatā.
Yamaka.	Pādatrayamātra yamanam.	This is contrary to the poet's practice and hence is the Doṣa called Aprayukta of Ch. 7.
Upamā.	Jātipramāṇagatam Nyūnatvam, Adhikatvam ca, Dharmāśrayanyūna-adhikate.	Anucitārthatva. Hīnapada and Adhika pada.
	Lingavacanabheda and Kāla-puruṣa-vidhyādibheda.	Prakramabheda.
	Asādṛśya & Asambhava.	Anucitārthatva.
Utprekṣā.	Dhruvevādiśabdasthāne yathādiśabdaprayoga.	Avācakatva.
	Tāttvikarūpeṇa parivarjita ; Nirupākhya ; Gaganālekhyaprakhya.	Anucitārthatva.
Samāsokti.	This is liable to Apuṣṭārthatva and Punaruktatā; and Vyaṅgyāmśasya Svaśabdopādāna.	Svaśabdopādāna.
Aprastutapraśamsā.	do.	do.

This is a very interesting subject. There are many Alaṁkāra manuals in later times dealing exclusively with Śabda and Artha alaṁkāras but none devotes its attention to flaws in Alaṁkāras. A critical study of Alaṁkāras, their proper use according to Ānanda's canons and the lakṣaṇas of each, their abuse and their Doṣas,—these form an interesting subject. Among later writers, Viśvanātha, as will be seen presently, takes up this last part of the last chapter of the Kāvyaprakāśa, gives Alaṁkāra-doṣas in chapter VII of his own work and following Mammaṭa fully, brings these flaws under the accepted flaws of Pada, Vākya and Vākyārtha.

Hemacandra.

Hemacandra's treatment of Doṣas in chapter III of his *Kāvyanuśāśana* is almost a reproduction of Mammaṭa's chapter on Doṣas. Hemacandra accepts all the Rasa doṣas ; most of Mammaṭa's Pada doṣas and Vākya doṣas are accepted and in the place of the last flaw of Mammaṭa, Amataparārtha, Hemacandra gives the name Ananvita. All the Artha doṣas in Mammaṭa are also accepted and chapter III of Hemacandra's *Kāvyānuśāsana* is almost identical with chapter VII of Mammaṭa's *Kāvyaprakāśa*. The number

nature, and the illustrations of all the flaws are the same in the two books. In Hemacandra's own commentary on his work, Hemacandra has given additional matter drawn from Ānanda and Mahimabhaṭṭa under the heads of Rasa doṣas, Avimṛṣṭavidheya and Prakrama and Krama Bhaṅgas.

Viśvanātha.

Viśvanātha reproduced in the seventh chapter of his *Sāhityadarpaṇa* the seventh chapter of Mammaṭa's work. One fact to be noted in Visvanātha's work is that after dealing with Rasa doṣas, he reproduces also the Doṣas of Alaṁkāras, from the end of the 10th chapter of the Kāvyaprakāśa, which we noticed above. But, following Mammaṭa, he also opines that these need not be specially mentioned.

Vidyānātha.

Vidyānātha, author of the *Pratāparudrīya*, deals with Doṣas in Chap. V. Vidyānātha, though he follows Mammaṭa, is one of these who have taken as much as possible from the S. K. Ā. of Bhoja also. This can be seen as much in the case of Doṣas as in that of Guṇas. Among Vākya doṣas, Vidyānātha gives the old flaws accepted and codified by Bhoja and Mammaṭa. Aśarīra and Arītimat are two which deserve to be noted as flaws taken from Bhoja. Vidyānātha simplifies Bhoja's Arītimat ; he takes the name but reinterprets it so as to make it comprehend all cases of inappropriate style, Rasa-ananuguṇa-rīti. This is not exactly what Bhoja meant by Arītimat. Bhoja meant by it the Viparyaya of Śleṣa and the seven other Guṇas. Vidyānātha took Bhoja's name and applied it generally to what Mammaṭa gives as the flaw of Pratikūla varṇa.

Similarly, Vidyānātha makes up his list of Artha doṣas from both Bhoja and Mammaṭa. Among his Artha doṣas must be noted Niralamkṛti, Atimātra, Paruṣa and Virasa taken from Bhoja. Following Mammaṭa, Vidyānātha indicates in the last line of Chap. V the Rasa doṣas also. Vidyānātha is one of the few later writers to draw upon Bhoja to some extent on the subject of Doṣas.

Keśavamiśra.

Another later writer whose section of Doṣas is indebted to Bhoja to some extent is Keśavamiśra, author of the *Alaṁkāra Śekhara* (third quarter of the 16th century). Keśavamiśra devotes the second chapter of his work to a consideration of Doṣas.

Among Vākya doṣas, Keśava has Bhoja's Arītimat but like Vidyānātha, he gives a new meaning to it. Keśava's meaning of Arītimat is not Vidyānātha's. To Vidyānātha, Arītimat is Rīti unsuited to Rasa. Keśava takes it as a Prakrama-bhaṅga or Rīti-bhaṅga Doṣa, beginning in a Rīti and leaving it off, failing to sustain it ; and Rīti itself, it is surprising, is taken by Keśava as Prakrama or the order begun. He cites an instance of Prakrama bhaṅga, गाहन्तां महिषाः etc., from the Śākuntala, an instance coming down from Mahimabhaṭṭa through Mammaṭa. A kind of Krama and Upakrama,

Bhoja himself gives as the meaning of the Rīti which he recognises both as a Śabda guṇa and Artha guṇa.

उपक्रमस्य निर्वाहो रीतिरित्यभिधीयते।

Perhaps Keśava was emboldened by Bhoja's example of this Guṇa called Rīti. While Vidyānātha's Arītimat has some relation with Bhoja's Arītimat in so far as Vidyānātha also means by Rīti the same Rīti or Mārga of Daṇḍin, Keśava's Rīti as Krama makes his Arītimat a synonym of the Prakrama bhaṅga of Mahimabhaṭṭa.

It is only in Keśava's Artha-doṣas, numbering eight, that we find something as given by Bhoja. We find here Virasa which Bhoja took up from Rudraṭa and in addition to this we find Keśava taking up Khinna which Bhoja introduced for the first time in his S. K. Ā. That Bhoja's Virasa it is which is repeated by Keśava is plain in as much as Keśava follows Bhoja who was responsible for restricting Virasa to Viruddha-rasa-samāveśa or Kramāpeta-rasa, casting off Rudraṭa's second variety of Virasa which is Atidīpti of even the relevant Rasa. Khinna is defined by Bhoja as the failure of the poet to sustain the idea taken up for delineation. But Keśava takes it in a related sense which is really the effect of Bhoja's Khinna. Keśava equates Khinna with apuṣṭa. A poet cannot give Poṣa to his idea if he becomes Khinna.

While Viśvanātha follows Mammaṭa and does not include the Upamā-doṣas in the list of the accepted Doṣas of Pada, Vākya and Vākyārtha, Vidyānātha and Keśava, though they follow and borrow from Mammaṭa also, choose to follow Bhoja in retaining the Upamā-doṣas in the list of the flaws of Vākya and Vākyārtha.

To sum up, we have to bear in mind the following landmarks in the history of Doṣas: the definition of Guṇa and Doṣa by Bharata and Vāmana as Viparyayas of Doṣas and Guṇas respectively; the relating of Doṣa to Rasa, the Ātman, by Ānanda; the rise of Rasa doṣas, Saṅghaṭanā doṣas etc., in the post-Ānanda period; the rise of the idea of Doṣas becoming Guṇas sometimes in the first chapter of Bhāmaha, the elaboration of the same idea in the fourth chapter by Daṇḍin, Ānanda's characterisation of Doṣa as Anitya, and Bhoja's section on Vaiśeṣika guṇas or Doṣa-guṇas; the definition of Doṣa as Sahṛdayodvejaka; the first classification by Vāmana of Doṣas into those of Śabda and Artha, Pada and Vākya; Rudraṭa's addition, the first appearance of a Rasa doṣa (viz. Virasa) in Rudraṭa; Mahimabhaṭṭa's definition of flaw as Anaucitya and his addition of Avimṛṣṭa-vidheya, Prakrama bhaṅga, Krama-bhaṅga and Avācya-vacana; Bhoja's additional flaws and Bhoja's creation of Prabandha-doṣa; the Prabandha-doṣa idea in pre-Bhoja writers; Mammaṭa's additional flaws, his first codified treatment of Rasa-doṣas; Upamā-doṣas of Medhāvin and Bhāmaha, the reduction of their number by one in Rudraṭa's work, exceptions to the Upamā-doṣas pointed out by Daṇḍin and Mammaṭa's elaboration of Doṣas of other Alaṁkāras, though as part of Pūrvapakṣa; and finally Vidyānātha and Keśavamiśra following Bhoja to some extent on Doṣas.

CHAPTER XVI

HISTORY OF GUṆAS

गुणयोगस्तयोर्मुख्यः गुणालङ्कारयोगयोः । *S. K. Ā.* I. 59.

The Guṇa-mode of literary appreciation is the most ancient, the extolling of a good thing through a 'Guṇa' being the most spontaneous expression of appreciation. Mādhurya or sweetness is the earliest Guṇa; for, when one enjoys music or poetry, the first expression of his joy takes the form of praising what has enthralled him as 'sweet'. When the two boys sang the 'sweet' epic of Vālmīki before the gathering of sages, the sages exclaimed

पाठ्ये गेये च **मधुरम्**
अहो गीतस्य **माधुर्यं** श्लोकानां च विशेषतः ।

Rāmāyaṇa, I. IV. 8, 17. (Kumbh. edn.)

When the epic was sung, those who heard it realised the events so vividly that it seemed to them that the events, though long past, seemed to happen before their very eyes. The sages said :

चिरनिर्वृत्तमप्येतत् प्रत्यक्षमिव दर्शितम् । I. IV. 17.

This quality that imparts the virtue of Pratyakṣāyamāṇatva to poetry is part of what Bhāmaha gives as the Prabandha guṇa called Bhāvika.

भाविकत्वमिति प्राहुः प्रबन्धविषयं गुणम् ।
प्रत्यक्षा इव दृश्यन्ते यत्रार्था भूतभाविनः ॥ III. 53.[1]

The verses of the Rāmāyaṇa are 'beautiful', 'pleasing to the mind'—Manorama, and the metre, the sense and the word, Vṛtta, Artha and Pada, are all exalted.

उदारवृत्तार्थपदैः मनोरमैः ततस्स रामस्य चकार कीर्तिमान् ।
समाक्षरैः श्लोकशतैर्यशस्विनो यशस्करं काव्यमुदारधीर्मुनिः ॥

ibid. Bālakāṇḍa. II. 42.

Here Audārya guṇa is mentioned, besides a very general Manoramatva. The metrical quality of 'equal syllables'—Samākṣaraśloka—is also mentioned. Proper Samāsa and Sandhi, two grammatical Guṇas, and Samatā, and Mādhurya of Artha and Vākya are then mentioned in the next verse, which also describes the epic.

तदुपगतसमाससन्धियोगं सममधुरोपनतार्थवाक्यबद्धम् ।
रघुवरचरितं मुनिप्रणीतं दशशिरसश्च वधं निशामयध्वम् ॥ I. II. 43.

As spontaneous and natural as the general appreciation through the word 'Mādhurya' is that through the word 'wonderful'. Vālmīki's epic is written

1. See my paper on Bhāvika in the *IHQ*, XIV, 1938.

in 'wonderful' language, the words and ideas of his verses are 'wonderful'—Vicitra.

चकार चरितं कृत्स्नं **विचित्रपदमात्मवान्** । I. IV. 1.

Again

श्रूयतामिदमाख्यानमनयोर्देववर्चसोः ।
विचित्रार्थपदं सम्यग् गायकौ समचोदयत् ॥ I. IV. 26.

As we shall see presently, the Bhārata often extols itself as 'wonderful'.

In the Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Rāma pays a great tribute to the speech of Hanumān and this context mentions some Guṇas. Hanumān talked neither very much nor ambiguously ; his speech was not verbose, it was brief but the brevity was not inconsistent with clarity. Hanumān talked succinctly and clearly.

अविस्तरमसंदिग्धम् Kiṣkindhā. III. 30.

His speech was grammatically pure and was set in proper order in respect of the ideas expressed.

संस्कारक्रमसम्पन्नां (वाचं) *ibid.* Śl. 31.

In short, Hanumān talked wonderfully :

अनया **चित्रया** वाचा *ibid.* Śl. 32.

Prolixity (Vistara) and ambiguity (Sandigdhatva) are met with among the Doṣas in the Doṣaprakaraṇa of the Alaṁkāra works. Samskāra is Śabda śuddhi and Sauśabdya, and its absence is the flaw of Śabdahīna.

The *Mahābhārata*[1] is described as 'wonderful' in its words, ideas and stories. The Vicitrapadatva occurring in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is met with in the *Girnar Inscription* as Citrapadatva. The *Bhārata* says :

तस्याख्यानवरिष्ठस्य विचित्रपदपर्वणः Ādi. I. 24.
विचित्रार्थपदाख्यानम् ,, II. 245.

Vyāsa himself is called 'Adbhuta karmā' in Ādi. I. 27. Describing the talks between Vidura and Kṛṣṇa, the Udyoga parvan says (94 Śls. 2-3).

विचित्रार्थपदाक्षराः । शृण्वन्ती विविधा वाचः ।

Śubha or beautiful words are found in Ādi. I. 37 as adorning the epic.

अलङ्कृतं शुभैः शब्दैः समयैर्दिव्यमानुषैः ।

The Guṇa of Ślakṣṇatva meaning 'beauty' occurs often in the praise of speeches. Dhṛṣṭadyumna made from the platform on the occasion of his sister's Svayamvara a speech that was 'fine' and at the same time 'full of thought'.

वाक्यमुच्चैर्जगादेदं **श्लक्ष्णम् अर्थवदुत्तमम्** । Ādi. 200. 59.

Emphasis on polish of speech may deprive it of value regarding contents. But his speech was 'beautiful' and at the same time 'full of meaning'—

1. Kumbhakonam Edn.

Ślakṣṇa and Arthavat.[1] Hence, it was 'Uttama'. In the Sabhā parvan, Sahadeva is said to make a speech which was similarly 'Arthavat'.

व्याजहारोत्तरं तत्र सहदेवोऽर्थवद् वचः। 62. 1.

Cf. Kālidāsa, *Raghuvaṁśa*, I. 58. अर्थ्याम् अर्थपतिर्वाचम्।

Bhāravi also refers to this 'meaningfulness'. The Lord's speech is full of meaning, yet *not heavy*, Arthya and Laghu.

अर्थ्यं तथ्यं हितं वाक्यं **लघु**[1] युक्तमनुत्तरम्।
उवाच भगवान् वाक्यं सुभद्रां भद्रभाषिणीम्॥ Sabhā. 2. 5.

Śravyatva, Śrutisukhatva and Mādhurya are often met with in the *Bhārata*.

श्रुत्वा त्विदमुपाख्यानं **श्राव्यमन्यन्न** रोचते Ādi. 2. 385.
श्राव्यं श्रुतिसुखं[2] चैव पावनं शीलवर्धनम्। Ādi. 62. 52.
पाण्डवं प्रत्युवाचेदं स्मयन्**मधुरया गिरा** Sabhā. 8. 9.
उवाच चैनं मधुरं सान्त्वपूर्वमिदं वचः। Sabhā. 41. 1.
इदं होवाच वचनं मधुरं मधुसूदनः Udyoga. 93. 1.

Vālmīki's Samatā appears in the same manner with Mādhurya in the *Bhārata* also.

निशम्य वाक्यं तु जनार्दनस्य
धर्मार्थयुक्तं मधुरं समं च। Udyoga I. 25.

The Guṇas of Samāsa and Vyāsa which Vāmana speaks of as aspects of his Arthaśleṣa are mentioned by Vyāsa more than once.

विस्तरैश्च समासैश्च धार्यते यद् द्विजातिभिः।
× × × ×
इष्टं हि विदुषां लोके **समासव्यासभाषणम्**॥ Ādi. I. 36 & 65.

Logical qualities of speeches which we meet with in Bhāravi are mentioned by Vyāsa now and then.

तमुवाच × × × × **हेतुमद्वचः**। Śānti. 18. 6.

Appreciating Arjuna's speech, Yudhiṣṭhira says :

उक्तं × × × **न्याय्यं युक्तम्**। Śānti. 19. 5.

In Vana, we find : अब्रवीदु**पपन्नार्थ**मिदं वाक्यविशारदः। 36. 28.

In Udyoga. 5. 2. also Upapatti occurs as a Guṇa : **उपपन्नमिदं** वाक्यम्।

Vālmīki also mentions the logical Guṇa of Hetumattva. वाक्यं **हेतुमदर्थ्यं** च।
Yuddha, 17. 32.

1. Cf. *Rāmāyaṇa*, Yuddha, 17. 50, Hanumān's speech is described thus :
उवाच वचनं **श्लक्ष्णम् अर्थवन्मधुरं लघु**।
It was beautiful, full of meaning, sweet and *not heavy*.
2. Cf. *Rāmāyaṇa*, Bāla, 4, 28 : श्रोत्राश्रयसुखम्।

General appreciation in terms of Mādhurya, Citratva, Ślakṣṇatva and Valgutva appears elsewhere also :

उवाच वाक्यं **मधुराभिधानं** मनोहरं चन्द्रमुखी प्रसन्ना । Ānuśāsana 32. 5.

Abhidhāna here means Śabda.

द्रौपद्या वचनं श्रुत्वा श्लक्ष्णोदारपदं शुभम् । Vana. 29. 1.

वल्गुचित्रपदं श्लक्ष्णं याज्ञसेनि त्वया वचः Vana. 31. 1.

In Śānti, ch. 325 (Kumbh. edn.) ch. 320 (Citraśālā edn.), Sulabhā-Janaka samvāda, mention is made of 18 Guṇas, but we are not able to make out all the 18 Guṇas.

Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra.

I. In II. 10-28, while describing political despatches, Lekha, Kauṭilya gives in his *Arthaśāstra* some literary qualities which the composition in the letter should possess. He mentions them as the excellences of a letter, Lekha-sampat. He speaks of six Guṇas here. pp. 169-170 T. S. S.

अर्थक्रमः, सम्बन्धः, परिपूर्णता, माधुर्यम्, औदार्यम्, स्पष्टत्वम्, इति लेखसम्पत् ।

Fortunately for us, Kauṭilya himself has defined these Guṇas.

1. Arthakrama. तत्र यथावदनुपूर्वक्रिया प्रधानस्यार्थस्य पूर्वमभिनिवेश इत्यर्थक्रमः ।

This quality can be rendered as order and method of presentation. The subject has to be clearly conceived and the ideas have got to be arranged properly with proper emphasis on the chief idea. A kind of 'Krama' or order in ideas is mentioned by Bhoja in his definition of his Arthaguṇa called Rīti :

रीतिस्सा यस्त्विहार्थानामुत्पत्त्यादिक्रियाक्रमः ।

The Krama here mentioned by Bhoja is very much restricted in scope, whereas Kauṭilya's Arthakrama means something like an ordered conception and presentation of the subject, a large and important literary quality. A kind of Krama which is not explained further, is mentioned by Vāmana as making up his Arthaguṇa called Śleṣa III. ii. 4.

2. Sambandha. प्रस्तुतस्यार्थस्य अनुपरोधाद् विधानम् आसभाषेः इति संबन्धः ।

This Guṇa 'relation' stands for coherence, relevancy etc. of the several ideas making a subject, which qualities alone can remove the flaw of mutual or internal contradiction among the ideas. It also emphasises how to the end there must be a unity of idea and how every detail must go to develop or stress it.

3. Paripūrṇatā. अर्थपदाक्षराणाम् अन्यूनानतिरिक्तता हेतूदाहरणदृष्टान्तैः अर्थोपवर्णना अश्रान्तपदतेति परिपूर्णता ।

This characteristic called 'completeness' is defined by Kauṭilya in three parts, i.e., three kinds of completeness are given by him.

(1) अर्थपदाक्षराणाम् अन्यूनानतिरिक्तता,

(2) हेतूदाहरणदृष्टान्तैः अर्थोपवर्णना and

(3) अभ्रान्तपदता ।

Of these, the first two are sufficiently clear and the third is somewhat obscure. Many writers on poetics have stressed a quality of the nature of this Paripūrṇatā. Daṇḍin emphasises this in his Arthavyakti. An idea is clear and its expression can convey it to us only when every bit of it is sufficiently expressed. In its absence, we have to guess a lot and take for granted many things or face doubt. The meaning becomes obscure, and Neyārtha is the Doṣa that results. Daṇḍin says that Neyārthatva is against rules of expression.

अर्थव्यक्तिरनेयत्वमर्थस्य । *K. Ā.* I. 73.

न हि प्रतीतिस्सुभगा शब्दन्यायविलङ्घिनी ।

See Bhoja also *S. K. Ā.* I. 34, p. 27.

Therefore, while avoiding verbiage, Pādapūraṇa, Vṛthāpallava etc., one must see that there are words sufficient to express the idea in his expression. The words and the ideas must be equal, Sammita, neither more nor less, Anyūnaanatirikta ; Śabda and Artha must be 'Tulādhṛta'. It is this idea that Kuntaka expounds in his Sāhitya. Kauṭilya in short means the Sammitatva or Yāvadarthapadatā of Bhoja.

यावदर्थपदत्वं च संमितत्वमुदाहृतम् ।

अर्थस्य पदानां च तुलाविधृतवत् तुल्यत्वेन संमितत्वम् ।

Kauṭilya's *Akṣara*-anyūnānatiriktatā relates to the scribe's art or to metrical correctness.

ii. The second Paripūrṇatā is the development of the idea and enriching its exposition by arguments, illustrations and analogies. In its absence one's expression will be 'Apuṣṭārtha', a Doṣa mentioned by Bhāmaha while speaking of the two Rītis.

iii. Aśrāntapadatā which is the third 'completeness' is obscure. Perhaps by śrāntapadatā, Kauṭilya refers to weak words, ineffective expressions or expression itself failing the writer sometimes. One must be able to keep up and successfully convey his whole idea with power. Aśrāntapadatā can be likened to Bhoja's Arthaguṇa called Prauḍhi which is 'Vivakṣitārtha nirvāha', the result of mature poetic power.

विवक्षितार्थनिर्वाहः काव्ये प्रौढिरिति स्मृता । *S. K. Ā.* I. 88.

The explanation of this Paripūrṇatā by Mm. Ganapati Sastri in his commentary is not convincing. His explanation of the first Paripūrṇatā is quite trifling and he takes Aśrāntapadatā to mean what Vāmana calls Ojas, an Arthaguṇa of his, वाक्यार्थे च पदाभिधा, expressing a sentence in a word.

अभ्रान्तपदता वाक्यार्थे पदवचनम् । e.g. सन्धत्स्व for सन्धिं कुरु p. 169. Triv. Edn.

4. Mādhurya. सुखोपनीतचार्वर्थशब्दाभिधानं माधुर्यम् ।

Kauṭilya's 'sweetness' refers to beautiful idea (Artha), as well as beautiful word (Śabda). Facility and grace in expression may also be meant by Kauṭilya in his definition of Mādhurya. Compare Bharata :

मृदुशब्दं सुखार्थं च कविः कुर्यात्तु नाटकम् ।

5. Audārya. अग्राम्यशब्दाभिधानम् औदार्यम् ।

'Exaltedness" is the avoidance of the ordinary, the low and vulgar words. The avoidance of Grāmyaśabda is Mādhurya for Daṇḍin.

6. Spaṣṭatva. प्रतीतशब्दप्रयोगः स्पष्टत्वम् इति ।

This is lucidity or clarity, and corresponds to Daṇḍin's Prasāda, the use of well-known and easily understandable words which deliver their import quickly and are not ambiguous or obscure.

प्रसादवत् प्रसिद्धार्थम् । *K. Ā.* I. 45.

II. Towards the end of the same section, Kauṭilya describes some literary flaws that may vitiate a letter, Lekhadoṣas. From these Doṣas, some Guṇas may be derived. For often, flaws are the results of the absence of the Guṇas ; they are Guṇaviparyayas. The following are the Doṣas mentioned by Kauṭilya :

अकान्तिः व्याघातः पुनरुक्तम् अपशब्दः संप्लव इति लेखदोषाः p. 177.

Of these, Kānti is defined as a quality of the scribe's art. Vyāghāta is a flaw resulting from the absence of the Guṇa called Sambandha given above.

पूर्वेण पश्चिमस्यानुपपत्तिः व्याघातः ।

Punarukta is repetition. Apaśabda is grammatical mistake and the Guṇa of its reverse is Sauśabdya. The nature of Samplava is not clear. It may be a flaw pertaining to metre or to the writing of the letter as explained by the commentaries. See Doṣa chapter, pp. 225-7.

Aśvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita* speaks of Guṇas which can be compared to those mentioned by Vālmīki and Vyāsa on the one hand and by Bhāravi on the other.

I. 59. गभीरधीराणि वचांस्युवाच ।

IV. 83. इति श्रुत्वा वचस्तस्य श्लक्ष्णमागमसंहितम् ।

Ślakṣṇa is what Vyāsa often mentions and Āgama-samhitatva is met with in Bhāravi who says अनुमानेन न चागमः क्षतः ।

Rudraṭa mentions its absence as the flaw of Nirāgama. XI. 6.

V. 74. मधुराक्षरया गिरा शशास ।

VII. 50 mentions a number of Guṇas among which we meet with Vyāsa's Arthavattva.

ततो वचः सूनृतमर्थवच्च सुश्लक्ष्णमोजस्वि च गर्वितं च ।

IX. 42. इत्यात्मविज्ञानगुणानुरूपं मुक्तस्पृहं हेतुमद् ऊर्जितं च ।

Hetumat is seen in Vyāsa and Ūrjita in Bhāravi.

IX. 62. अनूनम् अव्यस्तम् असक्तम् अद्रुतं धृतौ स्थितो राजसुतोऽब्रवीद् वचः।

Most of the qualities in this reference pertain to speaking as such and not to the speech itself. Anūna and Avyasta, Asakta and Adruta, all refer to speaking.

The Girnar Inscription.

(2nd Century A.D.)

This inscription of Rudradāman mentions Gadya and Padya adorned with words which are Sphuṭa, Laghu, Madhura, Citra, Kānta and also Udāra. Laghu, Madhura, Citra and Udāra are Guṇas mentioned also in the two epics.

Sphuṭa and Laghu may be Prasāda ; Laghu may mean also 'easy for mouthing', Daṇḍin's Saukumārya (of Śabda), or 'not cumbrous'. Madhura refers to sweetness in general and Kānta is also a general 'attractiveness' ; Citra is 'striking' and Udāra, 'exalted'.

See P. V. KANE, *Introduction to Sāhityadarpaṇa*, p. cxxxviii.

Jain Canonical Works.

The *Anuyogadvāra sūtra* (Āgamodaya samiti series, p. 261) speaks of thirty-two Doṣas and eight Guṇas, of which we have noticed the former in the previous chapter. The eight Guṇas mentioned in this text are Nirdoṣa, Sāravat, Hetuyukta, Alaṁkṛta, Upanīta, Sopacāra, Mita and Madhura. Of these, Nirdoṣa is the quality of being free from the thirty-two flaws previously described ; Alaṁkṛta is, like the first Lakṣaṇa of Bharata, the excellence resulting from figures of speech ; Upanīta is explained by the commentator as the quality of having the Tarkāṅga called Upanaya ; Sopacāra is explained as 'refinement' in expression, Grāmya bhaṇiti rahita ; and Mita may be the Guṇa of keeping the sense of proportion.

The *Rājapraśnīya* (Āgamodaya series) also mentions some qualities of speech (pp. 12-13). These are given as the thirty-five Atiśeṣas of Satya-vacana, and while some of these relate to ethics and some to mouthing and voice, there are others here which are literary Guṇas. Seven of these Atiśeṣas are classified as verbal (Śābda) and among these seven, three deserve notice by us : Samskāravattva, Udāttatva and Upacāropetatva. Samskāra may be taken as 'correctness' of the language and Udātta may refer to the use of 'exalted' words. Upacāropetatva is explained by the commentator, Malaya-giri, as 'refinement' (Agrāmyatā) and is the same as the Sopacāra mentioned in the *Anuyogadvāra.* Of the Arthāśraya Guṇas we may note the following : Mahārtha—having rich and great meaning or having well-developed thought. Avyāhata-paurvāparya—free from contradiction between parts. Asandigdha—clear in import. Deśa-kāla-avyatīta—observing the aucitya of place and time. Aprakīrṇa prasṛta—not being diffuse with digression into miscellaneous matters. Anyonya pragṛhītatva—with parts logically well-knit. Abhijāta,—which the commentator explains as 'just saying straight and well the idea sought to be conveyed'. (यथाविवक्षितार्थाभिधानशीलता)

Atisnigdha madhura—coherent and sweet. Udāra explained as 'Ativiśiṣṭa gumpha guṇa yukta' or 'Atucchārthapratipādaka'; this twofold verbal and ideal explanation of Udāra is comparable to Daṇḍin's twofold Udāra; Viśiṣṭa gumpha may be 'exalted words' and Atucchārtha, 'exalted ideas'. Anupanīta is explained by Malayagiri as grammatical purity, but is this not a Śabdaguṇa and is it not covered by Samskāra noted already? Three Guṇas follow, of which the meaning is not clear,—Sākāra, Sattva parigṛhīta and Aparikhedi. Sākāra may mean the impression of a certain shapliness about the expression; Malayagiri explains the next as 'Ojasvi',—imbued with life and vigour; and the third may refer to the quality which never makes the reader feel bored. The seventh Guṇa is 'Avyavacchedi' and it is clear from the commentary as "having power to sustain effective expression till the whole thought is fully conveyed".

Bhāravi.

Bhāravi gives us valuable information on the subject of Guṇas which makes us understand the nature of the topics comprehended within treatises on poetics in the time of and before Bhāmaha. Bhāmaha devotes one chapter to Nyāyanirṇaya and here he discusses certain logical points. Before him also, rhetoricians must have discussed under poetics both logic and grammar, though Daṇḍin brushes aside inquiries into logic as Karkaśaprāyavicāra in III. 127. But though, in later works, Nyāya is not discussed, they do devote some attention to Nyāya in the Doṣaprakaraṇa where Nyāyavirodha is mentioned as a flaw from Daṇḍin downwards. This Nyāya in Nyāyavirodha is defined thus by Daṇḍin:

हेतुविद्यात्मको न्यायः स स्मृतिः श्रुतिरागमः ।

Daṇḍin and later writers also consider the logical qualities of speech as Guṇa by counting their absence as a flaw. Bhāravi mentions the logical qualities of Upapatti or Yukti etc., more than once. In II. 1 he says उपपत्तिमद् वचनम् । It is to this same quality that he again refers in II. 26 as 'Apavarjita viplavatva' which Mallinātha interprets as Sapramāṇatva. Again Bhāravi makes Yudhiṣṭhira praise Bhīma's speech that it had Upapatti and Anumāna which did not go against Āgama, all of which Daṇḍin speaks of under Nyāya in his Nyāyavirodhadoṣa.

उपपत्तिरुदाहृता बलादनुमानेन न चागमः क्षतः । *K. Ā.* II. 28.

Śls. 38-41, Canto XI, contain a description by Arjuna of the "Guṇas" as Bhāravi calls them, in the speech of Indra. Here the quality of conformity to logical principles, Nyāya, is mentioned with the name Nyāyanirṇaya, the phrase which Bhāmaha uses.

न्यायनिर्णीतसारत्वान्निरपेक्षमिवागमे ।

Therefore, we are able to see that pre-Bhāmaha works on poetics considered the subject of Nyāyanirṇaya as part of their scope.

Similarly, grammatical studies formed part of the Alaṁkāra śāstra in the pre-Bhāmaha times. This we see from the fact of Bhāmaha devoting

one section to Śabdaśuddhi in his work. Daṇḍin does not separately speak of it but Vāmana does. This subject was also called Sauśabdya and Suptiṅ vyutpatti. In later literature, however, Sauśabdya changed into a Guṇa resulting from the use of quaintly graceful or striking grammatical rarities. The old study of grammar as part of poetics survives from the time of Daṇḍin in a list of grammatical flaws in the Doṣaprakaraṇa. Bhāravi mentions grammatical qualities also. In I. 3 he mentions 'Sauṣṭhava' which Mallinātha takes as Śabda sāmarthya. In II. 26, Bhāravi speaks of 'Śucitva' which Mallinātha interprets as Sauṣṭhava. These two between themselves cover two aspects of Sauśabdya. Śabdaśuddhi as such is only grammatical purity or correctness. It is only this aspect that Vāmana considers, but Bhāmaha considers how much Sauśabdya can be an Alaṁkāra, how graceful usages like 'Śabalayanti' can beautify writing. Thus Sauṣṭhava must cover both the aspects, correctness and grace. In later literature, the former aspect survives only in the Doṣaprakaraṇa, where its absence is counted as flaws under different heads and the latter aspect has become the Guṇa of Sauśabdya. Vide *S. K. A.* of Bhoja and Vidyānātha's *Pratāparudrīya.* Again, Sāmarthya is mentioned by Bhāravi in II. 29 न च सामर्थ्यमपोहितं क्वचित्। Sāmarthya is taken by Mallinātha as the purely grammatical quality of Sākāṅkṣatva of the Padas. गिरामन्योन्य साकाङ्क्षत्वम्। Sākāṅkṣa is one of the Guṇas mentioned by Bhāravi in XI. 88.

साकाङ्क्षमनुपस्कारं विष्वग्गति निराकुलम्।

At the beginning of his treatment of Alaṁkāras, Bhāmaha says :

रूपकादिमलङ्कारं बाह्यमाचक्षते परे।
सुपां तिङां च व्युत्पत्तिं वाचां वाञ्छन्त्यलङ्क्रतिम्॥
तदेतदाहुः सौशब्द्यं नार्थव्युत्पत्तिरीदृशी।
शब्द-अभिधेयालङ्कारभेदादिष्टं द्वयं तु नः॥

At the time of and before Bhāmaha, there were some writers who attached greater importance to Śabda and to the correct use of the words. This Śabdavyutpatti or Suptiṅ vyutpatti or Sauśabdya they said was the real Alaṁkāra of writings ; and in their view, Rūpaka etc., which belong to the sphere of ideas, were Bāhya, external. Perhaps they called Rūpaka etc., Arthavyutpatti. Bhāmaha accepts both, the former as Śabdālaṁkāra and the latter as Arthālaṁkāra. To this subject it is, in pre-Bhāmaha literature, that Bhāravi refers in XIV. Śl. 5.

स्तुवन्ति **गुर्वीमभिधेयसंपदं विशुद्धिमुक्तेरपरे** विपश्चितः।
इति स्थितायां प्रतिपूरुषं रुचौ सुदुर्लभाः सर्वमनोरमा गिरः॥

'Gurvī abhidheya sampat' is rich ideas and refers to Arthavyutpatti or the Abhidheyālaṁkāra of Bhāmaha. 'Uktiviśuddhi' is the Sauśabdya or Śabdālaṁkāra of Bhāmaha. Bhāravi says that some like only the former and some only the latter, which shows that in poetics of Bhāravi's time, no conclusion was reached as to the comparative superiority or importance of these

two. Māgha also refers to this difference in view-point and expresses himself that both Śabda and Artha are important. Daṇḍin, who elaborates more the Arthālaṁkāras and speaks little of Sauśabdya or Suptiṅ vyutpatti, which does not form a section in his work as in Bhāmaha's, follows a school which Bhāmaha did not wholly follow, Bhāmaha having accepted the importance of Sauśabdya also. Jinasena (*c.* 838 A.D.) also refers to this controversy in his *Ādipurāṇa* and himself subscribes to the view of Māgha and Bhāmaha.[1]

केचिदर्थस्य सौन्दर्यमपरे पदसौष्ठवम् ।
वाचामलङ्क्रियां प्राहुः तद् द्वयं नो मतं मतम् ॥ Śl. 95.

Bhāravi often speaks of this Arthaguṇa called Guru-abhidheyasampat. This Guṇa is considered by him as Gurutā, Garīyastva, Gaurava, Gāmbhīrya, Aurjitya. The following passages refer to this Guṇa.

स सौष्ठवौदार्यविशेषशालिनीम् (वाचम्) I. 3. ऊर्जिताश्रयं वचनम् II. 1. (Mallinātha: ऊर्जिताश्रयत्वम् = उदारार्थता) गरीयसीर्गिरः II. 4 (गुर्वर्थप्रतिपादिका गिरः— Mallinātha). न च न स्वीकृतमर्थगौरवम् II. 29 गरीयः XI. 35. औदार्यमर्थसंपत्तेः XI. 41. गंभीरपदा सरस्वती XIV. 3. गंभीरमर्थम् XIV. 4. (अर्थगुरुक Mallinātha)

This quality is not definitely surviving in this same manner, in later literature. It may be the Puṣṭārthatva of Bhāmaha mentioned by him in his discussion on the two Rītis, and by Rudraṭa also. This old Gaurava is called also Gāmbhīrya and Audārya. Audārya takes another character in Daṇḍin and Gāmbhīrya appears in Bhoja as Dhvanimattā and Śāstrārthasavyapekṣatva. The second variety of Daṇḍin's Audārya, and Bhoja's Gāmbhīrya have really some relation to Bhāravi's Arthagaurava or Gāmbhīrya.

Wherever he speaks of the above Arthasampat or Audārya or Gaurava or Gāmbhīrya, Bhāravi considers that, in a bad artist, attention to it will sacrifice the other Guṇa of ease, simplicity and clarity, which is also very necessary. This Guṇa is the Prasāda of Śabda and Artha in Daṇḍin and others. To achieve both is a distinction.

स्फुटता न पदैरपाकृता न च न स्वीकृतमर्थगौरवम् ।
रचिता पृथगर्थता गिरां न च सामर्थ्यमपोहितं क्वचित् ॥ II. 29.

and Mallinātha says on this : वैशद्यप्रसक्तार्थगौरवाभावनिवर्तनार्थं नञ्द्वयम् ।

Padasphuṭatā is the Guṇa of Śabda and its corresponding Arthaguṇa is Pṛthagarthatā in the second line. In XI. 38, he again says गरीयो लाघवान्वितम्— full of ideas but not heavy or verbose. So it is that he mentions together Prasāda and Gāmbhīrya in XIV. 3. प्रसन्नगंभीरपदा सरस्वती । Prasādaguṇa is mentioned along with Ojas, as by Māgha, in the speech of Indra : प्रसादरायम् ओजस्वि । In XIV. 3 Viviktavarṇatva is mentioned and it is part of Śabdaprasāda.

Some other Guṇas are also mentioned by Bhāravi. In I. 3. विनिश्चितार्थामिति वाचमाददे—he refers to the Guṇa of precision, the reverse of which is

1. See Vol. I. of this thesis, pp. 88-9.

considered as the flaw of Sandigdha. In III. 10, Uktiviśeṣa occurs and Mallinātha takes it as Uktivaicitrya, which is Vāmana's Arthamādhurya. "Nirākulatva' is given as a Guṇa in Indra's speech in XI. 38.(विष्वग्गति निराकुलम्) and it is the same as the Anākulya of Bhāmaha mentioned by him in his discussion on the Rītis and in the definition of his Bhāvika.[1] In XIV. 3, Sarasvatī is praised as Sukhaśruti. It may be the general quality of Śravaṇasukhatva mentioned by the writers noticed above.

The following in the *Kirātārjunīya* of Bhāravi are some more passages where Guṇas are mentioned :

II. 4 : गरीयसि × × वचसि ।

II. 26. अपवर्जितविप्लवे शुचौ हृदयग्राहिणि मङ्गलास्पदे ।
विमला तव विस्तरे गिरां मतिरादर्श इवाभिदृश्यते ॥

III. 10. इत्युक्तवानुक्तिविशेषरम्यम् । उदारचेता गिरमित्युदाराम् ।

XIV. 3. विविक्तवर्णाभरणा सुखश्रुतिः + + प्रसन्नगम्भीरपदा सरस्वती ।

Bhaṭṭi.

Our guide to understand the Alaṁkāraśāstra upon which Bhaṭṭi bases himself is the *Jayamaṅgalā* on his Kāvya. The Guṇas we come across in Bhaṭṭi are only two, Prasāda and Mādhurya. Of these two, Prasāda is the first and the universal quality of poetry which distinguishes it from Śāstra. Because the ideas expressed in Śāstraic language are not understood by all, poets must not write in the Śāstraic language. Poetry should be so simple that even unlearned men and women and children can understand it. *Jayamaṅgalā* quotes and follows Bhāmaha's definition of Prasāda and gives this Prasāda as the first characteristic of poetry.

प्रथमं चेदं लक्षणं यत्प्रसन्नता नाम, 'अविद्वदङ्गनाबालप्रतीतार्थं प्रसन्नवत्' इति ।

So it is that, as contrasted with the previous cantos, contos X, XI and XII are called 'Prasanna-kāṇḍas.'

Canto XI is devoted to illustrate the Mādhurya guṇa. The eleventh canto, says *Jayamaṅgalā*, describes dawn in Laṅkā to illustrate the Guṇa called Mādhurya. Mallinātha points out only the latter, Mādhurya, in canto XI and does not speak of Prasāda at all. But the colophons in his commentary also speak of these cantos as Prasanna-kāṇḍas.

Māgha.

Some Guṇas are implied in the verses of Bhāmaha criticising the differentiation of style into Vaidarbha and Gauḍa. Further, at the beginning of Chap. II. Bhāmaha mentions, without defining their place in Kāvya, three Guṇas, Prasāda, Mādhurya and Ojas. Daṇḍin gives us a system which has a highly worked out doctrine of Rītis based on Guṇas numbering ten. Surely

1. 'Anākula' is mentioned by Jinasena also :

तत्प्रतीतार्थमग्राम्यं सालङ्कारमनाकुलम् ।

Daṇḍin also mentions predecessors and must have followed a tradition which made much of Mārgas and which was belittled by Bhāmaha who did not follow it. Thus, before Bhāmaha, there must have been some Guṇas elaborately dealt with in works of poetics. We have seen Guṇas mentioned by some poets in the previous sections. Māgha is one more poet, whom we have to mention here in the history of Guṇas. Māgha mentions the Guṇas twice and both times, he mentions only two Guṇas, Prasāda and Ojas. From this, it appears that there was a persistent current of thought which, without speaking of ten Guṇas, mentioned only two or three. Bhāmaha and Māgha followed it. As we shall see in a further section, from another point of view, Ānanda accepted the same three Guṇas only. Māgha omits Mādhurya, evidently because it is very general. He mentions Prasāda and Ojas twice in the following two verses.

तेजः क्षमा वा नैकान्तं कालह्रस्य महीपतेः ।
नैकमोजः प्रसादो वा **रसभावविदः** कवेः ॥ II. 83

ओजस्विवर्णोज्ज्वलवृत्तशालिनः प्रसादिनोऽनुज्झितगोत्रसंविदः ।
श्लोकानुपेन्द्रस्य पुरः स्म भूयसः गुणान् समुद्दिश्य पठन्ति बन्दिनः ॥ XII. 35.

In both the verses, only two Guṇas are mentioned, Ojas and Prasāda, as important enough in a composition to deserve notice. The latter verse is not important as much as the former which really gives us Māgha's view of Guṇa. Bhāmaha, we know, gives the Guṇas as related to Samāsa ; Mādhurya, along with Prasāda, is given as a Guṇa due to use of few compounds, Asamasta vākya. Ojas is the result of ample use of compounds. The relation between Ojas and Samāsa is seen in Daṇḍin also. But, Māgha's conception of Guṇa is different and it is the same as that of Ānanda. Māgha means by Ojas a flaring up and by Prasāda, a quietening effect. The former is like Tejas and the latter like Kṣamā. In Māgha is already seen a clear grasp of the real nature of Guṇa. It is only in the time of Ānanda that Guṇa is going to be definitely related to Rasa and Bhāva as their Dharma. Though Māgha was earlier than that time of theoretical determination of the exact nature of Guṇa, he, as a poet, grasped the real nature of Guṇas. He definitely related them to Rasa and Bhāva, which control them as Niyāmakas. The verse is of importance in the history of Aucitya also. See my paper on the History of Aucitya.

This does not mean that Māgha's Guṇas could not relate to Śarīra, Śabda and Artha, also. In the second verse given above, Māgha speaks of Ojasvi *varṇa.*

Bhavabhūti.

As is evidenced by numerous passages in his three dramas, and in his ***Mālatīmādhava*** especially, Bhavabhūti wrote with the constant thought of the critical literature of Alaṁkāra śāstra. An examination of his works gives us some Guṇas. Bhavabhūti himself sets forth an appreciation of his work

and points out those qualities which appeal to him as marking off great literature. In the Prastāvanā of the *Mālatīmādhava* he says :

यत्प्रौढित्वमुदारता च वचसां यच्चार्थतो गौरवम्
तच्चेदस्ति ततस्तदेव गमकं पाण्डित्यवैदग्ध्ययोः ॥

There is an old verse which says that Bhāravi is noted for Arthagaurava, a quality which he himself mentions often. Bhavabhūti also mentions here that Arthagaurava. It may mean depth of thought or grand ideas. This Arthagaurava is a general Guṇa and cannot be found among the Guṇas specifically given by Daṇḍin and others. Something like it is called Pāka by some other writer who says अर्थगंभीरिमा पाकः (Vidyānātha). Corresponding to this Arthaguṇa of Gaurava, Bhavabhūti mentions the Audārya of Vacas or Śabda, a Śabdaguṇa. Grand ideas have to be set in grand words. This quality may be the Udāratā which appears in Daṇḍin and other writers. Both Arthagaurava and Vāgudāratva can be achieved only by a master of expression. It is that masfery of expression, ripe poetic powers, that Bhavabhūti means by his first Guṇa, Prauḍhi.

The Guṇa of Prauḍhi is referred to in a similar verse by Bhavabhūti's patron, Yaśovarman, in the prologue to his *Rāmābhyudaya.*

शुद्धिः प्रस्तुतसंविधानकविधौ **प्रौढिश्च शब्दार्थयोः**
विद्वद्भिः परिभाव्यतामवहितै रेतावदेवास्तु नः ॥

Quoted in Chap. XI. of the *Śṛ. Pra.*

Yaśovarman refers to Prauḍhi of Śabda and Artha. See p. 120, my article on Aucitya, and the section on Yaśovarman's *Rāmābhyudaya* in this thesis.

Pūrṇasarasvatī, in his commentary on the *Mālatīmādhava,* (Ms. in the Madras Govt. Oriental Mss. Library, pp. 29-30), takes Prauḍhi in the above verse of Bhavabhūti as Pāka, quoting Bhoja's definition of it in the *S. K. Ā.*

उक्तेः प्रौढः परीपाकः प्रोच्यते प्रौढिसंज्ञया ।

He quotes also Vāmana on Pāka यत्पदानि त्यजन्त्येव etc. This Pāka of Drākṣā, Nārikela etc., is taken as Śabdapāka. Pūrṇasarasvatī speaks of Artha pāka or Arthaprauḍhi separately and he quotes here Vāmana's Artha-Ojas, which Vāmana defines as Prauḍhi of Artha. (III. ii. 2). Udāratā is also taken as both a Śabda-guṇa and an Artha-guṇa ; Śabda-udāratā is taken as Vikaṭākṣarabandha (Vāmana and Bhoja) and Artha-udāratā is explained by one of the two Audāryas of Dāṇḍin, उत्कर्षवान् गुणः कश्चित् etc. Arthagaurava is taken by him as Laghupratīti, Vimarda-sahatva and Vyaṅgyaprādhānya.

Here we can study Bhavabhūti's Prauḍhi by comparing it with the Prauḍhi we see elsewhere. Vāmana who came a little after Bhavabhūti has a Guṇa named Prauḍhi. III. ii. 2. अर्थस्य प्रौढिरोजः । It consists in the power of the poet to write according to the needs of the situation and with an eye to the effect ; it is the power which sometimes says a thousand ideas in a few words ; sometimes spreads a small thing and delineates it vastly. (Vyāsa-samāsa ;

Padārthe vākyābhidhā and Vākyārthe padābhidhā.) Vāmana adds also Sābhiprāyatva under this Prauḍhi. While Vāmana applies this Prauḍhi to Artha, Bhavabhūti applies it in general to both Śabda and Artha and as productive of the Guṇas of Udāratā of Vāk and Gaurava of Artha. Another writer who speaks of Prauḍhi as a Guṇa is Bhoja. He has two Prauḍhis, of Śabda and of Artha. Bhoja equates Śabdaprauḍhi with Pāka, an old concept.

उक्तेः प्रौढः परीपाकः प्रोच्यते प्रौढिसंज्ञया ।

Similar is the Arthaprauḍhi of Bhoja. It is the power to accomplish what the poet undertook. It is successful expression of all that the poet intended to express.

विवक्षितार्थनिर्वाहः काव्ये प्रौढिरिति स्मृता ।

In the prelude to his *Mahāvīracarita,* Bhavabhūti describes his own work thus :

प्रसन्नकर्कशा यत्र विपुलार्था च भारती ।

Here he speaks of the well-known Guṇa of Prasāda. By Karkaśatā of his expression, Bhavabhūti points out how he rises to the needs of the occasion of Vīrarasa, which he wants to portray in all its various subtle shades in the *Mahāvīracarita.* It is the quality needed to execute the ideas he wants to portray, ideas which he mentions in the lines :

महापुरुषसंरंभो यत्र गंभीरभीषणः ।
× × ×
अप्राकृतेषु पात्रेषु यत्र वीरः स्थितो रसः ।
भेदैः सूक्ष्मैरभिव्यक्तैः प्रत्याधारं विभज्यते ॥

The *Mahāvīracarita* is a study in Vīrarasa and its varieties. To suit such a purpose, the expression has to be sometimes Prasanna and sometimes Karkaśa, limpid and intriguing or, at the same time, clear and virile. The third general Guṇa of Bhavabhūti is Arthavaipulya, which we can liken to the Arthagaurava mentioned in the *Mālatīmādhava.* It is immensity of import, secured only by a master of expression in whose small utterances a great train of ideas can be found. Ānanda's Dhvani explains this. A great poet's expression will be eternally suggestive. Abhinava says महाकविवाचोऽस्याः कामधेनुत्वात् *Locana,* p. 117.

Bharata.

Bharata insists that the Sāhitya of a drama to be enacted should have the qualities of tenderness and sweetness producing a sense of happiness when heard. Words must be simple and must give their sense quickly and clearly. They must not be learned, rugged or difficult of being rendered into action. In this connection, Bharata mentions some qualities of diction. Expressions must be exalting and sweet, words, soft and tender,

उदारशब्दैर्मधुरैः कार्यास्तेऽर्थवशानुगाः। XVII. 120. Kāśi edn.
शब्दानुदारमधुरान् प्रमदाभिनेयान्
नाट्याश्रयान् कृतिषु–प्रयतेत कर्तुम्।
तैर्भूषिता बहु विभान्ति हि काव्यबन्धाः
पद्माकरा विकसिता इव राजहंसैः॥ XVII. 121.

मृदुललितपदार्थं गूढशब्दार्थहीनं बुधजनसुखयोग्यं बुद्धिमत्तृत्तयोग्यम्। बहुरसकृतमार्गं सन्धिसन्धानयुक्तं भवति जगति योग्यं नाटकं प्रेक्षकाणाम्॥ XVII. 123.

मृदुशब्दाभिधानं च कविः कुर्यात्तु नाटकम्॥
मृदुशब्दं सुखार्थं च कविः कुर्यात्तु नाटकम्॥ XXI. 131.

These passages emphasise that diction in drama should be Udāra, Madhura, Lalita and Mṛdu. Only then is Abhinaya possible. The diction by itself is subordinate in drama and drama is the main theme of Bharata's work. These qualities of the Kāvyabandha, the Vācika in the drama, are given from the point of view of easy Abhinaya. Words with such qualities are said to beautify Kāvyabandhas as blown lotuses and swans, a lotus pond. Bharata thus shows that in drama that is intended to be acted, the chief quality of style is Mārdava[1] as opposed to Naiṣṭhurya or harshness and toughness, Mādhurya or sweetness and Lālitya, beauty and delicateness.

By Mādhurya, Lālitya, Mārdava and Audārya, Bharata means that poetry should be pleasing to the senses and powerful enough to infect the mind with æsthetic mood. That is what he means by Sukhārtha. Easy Abhinaya or quick expression of idea is impossible, if words are abstruse and obscure. That is why Bharata says that the Nāṭaka should be devoid of obscure words, Gūḍha-Śabdārtha-hīna. This Doṣa called Gūḍha-śabda and Gūḍha-artha is to be avoided, i.e., there should be the quality of Prasāda. Words should be Mṛdu, soft ; and unpronouncable grammatical forms like Cekrīḍita go ill with a beautiful drama.

चेक्रीडितप्रभृतिभि र्विकृतैस्तु शब्दै
र्युक्ता न भान्ति ललिता भरतप्रयोगाः। XVII. 122
चेक्रीडिताद्यैः शब्दैस्तु काव्यबन्धा भवन्ति ये।
वेश्या इव न शोभन्ते कमण्डलुधरै र्द्विजैः॥ XXI. 132.

In all these statements, Bharata seems to have in his mind, only the graceful and soft type of drama, the Lalita or Masṛṇa, and not the Āviddha or Uddhaṭa. These are quite general descriptions of Kāvya and of the qualities of style or diction, of Śabda and of Artha, qualities which have not come down into the Guṇa section of the texts. Of all these Guṇas, Bharata

1. Mārdava is Daṇḍin's Saukumārya (of Śabda). The only other writer to speak of Mārdava guṇa is poet Vāgbhaṭa who says in his *Neminirvāṇa*, K. M. Edn. p. 56.

तस्याः शरीरमपदोषम् अशेषकान्ति-माधुर्य-मार्दव- मुखैश्च गुणैर्गरीयः। etc., III. 34.

seems to attach the greatest importance to Prasāda, to the quality of the text of the drama being easily understood. He says in chapter XXVII, the Siddhi chapter :

तस्मादूंभीरार्थाः शब्दाः ये लोकवेदसंसिद्धाः ।
सर्वजनेन ग्राह्याः संयोज्या नाटके विधिवत् ॥ 46.

Chapter XVII of the Nāṭya śāstra deals with topics of Alaṁkāra, Lakṣaṇa, Guṇa and Doṣa. Bharata gives here ten Guṇas :

श्लेषः प्रसादः समता समाधिर्माधुर्यमोजः पदसौकुमार्यम् ।
अर्थस्य च व्यक्तिरुदारता च कान्तिश्च काव्यस्य गुणा दशैते ॥ 96.

Bharata does not define Guṇa or indicate its function and difference from Lakṣaṇas and Alaṁkāras. He simply says that the above ten pertain to Kāvya. Regarding Doṣas, he says that their reverses form Guṇas.

एते दोषास्तु विज्ञेयाः सूरिभिर्नाटकाश्रयाः ।
एत एव विपर्यस्ताः गुणाः काव्येषु कीर्तिताः ॥ XVII. 95.

Though there is no difficulty in accepting generally the character of Guṇa to be the reverse of Doṣa, the ten specific Guṇas in Bharata are not each of them the reverses of the ten Doṣas given by Bharata. There is also no distinction of Guṇa into that of Śabda and that of Artha in Bharata. The words Śabda and Artha are often used in the descriptions of particular Guṇas but generally the Guṇas are spoken of as Guṇas of Kāvya. In the Upajāti verse above given which enumerates the ten Guṇas, we find two Guṇas which are qualified viz., Saukumārya and Vyakti. The first is given as Pada Saukumārya and the second as Arthavyakti. They must be given so. For, Saukumārya is a Guṇa of the words. Of Artha, it is a Guṇa not in a restricted sense but very comprehensively. It is a Guṇa of Artha, of the whole class of dramas called Sukumāra, as contrasted with Uddhata. Artha-saukumārya pertains to the dramas of the type having the Kaiśikī vṛtti as contrasted with the Ārabhaṭī-vṛtti. Therefore, Arthasaukumārya need not be mentioned here while speaking of the qualities of diction. Vyakti is of Artha and it is given so by Bharata. Arthavyakti is a Guṇa of Artha. The corresponding Guṇa of Śabda is Prasāda. Prasanna-padas deliver their meaning quickly and clearly. Prasāda and Arthavyakti go together. Of the other Guṇas, Mādhurya goes with Pada-saukumārya, as the quality characterising sweet and tender themes couched in sweet and tender diction, the Kaiśikī vṛtti dramas of the Sukumāra type.

This portion of Bharata's text has two recensions for some Guṇas. The Kāśī Edn. gives variant definitions for Samatā, Samādhi, Ojas, Arthavyakti, Udātta and Kānti. Besides, it gives two verses on Śleṣa, one of which is not found in some manuscripts according to the footnote. The K. M. Edn. contains both the verses on Śleṣa and has thus eleven ślokas on the ten Guṇas. The K. M. Edn. contains only definitions noted in the footnotes in the Kāśī Edn. for the Guṇas Samatā, Samādhi, Ojas, Arthavyakti, Udātta and Kānti. The Kāśī text is followed by Maṅgala, as can be seen from Maṅgala's Anu-

vāda of Bharata's Ojas quoted by Hemacandra in his *Kāvyānuśāsana Vyākhyā*. Abhinava follows the text of the K. M. Edn. on Guṇas. He further says that in certain books, the Guṇa section is found before the Doṣa section but that he treats the Guṇa section as following the Doṣa section because it is so in most mss.

केषुचित् पुस्तकेषु च एष ग्रन्थः पश्चात् दृश्यते। बाहुल्येन प्रथमं दृश्यत इति तथैव व्याचक्षामहे। *Abhi. Bhā.*, Mad. Ms. Vol. II. p. 408.

The Kāśī and the K. M. Edns. agree in having the Doṣaprakaraṇa before the Guṇaprakaraṇa. Regarding the particular definitions : Abhinava accepts only one verse on Śleṣa, viz. इप्सितेनार्थजातेन and takes the same for Arthaśleṣa as well as Śabdaśleṣa. He also says here that instead of this verse, certain writers read another verse on Śleṣa, viz. the other verse given in both the Kāśī and K. M. Edns.— विचारगहनम् etc., and which is taken by them as defining the Arthaśleṣa in the first half and the Śabdaśleṣa in the second half. On Samatā, Samādhi, Ojas, Arthavyakti, Udāratā or Udātta and Kānti, Abhinava follows the K. M. recension. Regarding Mādhuryalakṣaṇa alone, the second half of the Śloka is read by Abhinava differently from that available in the K. M. Edn., as will be shown below. Abhinava is acquainted with the other recension for Udāratā and Kānti only. For, he says at the end :

अन्ये त्वौदार्यकान्त्योः लक्षणद्वयं विपर्यासेन पठन्ति।

Pp. 410-419. Vol. II. *Abi. Bhā.*, Mad. Ms.

Prasāda.

Bharata defines it thus : (Kāśī Edn.)

अप्यनुक्तो बुधैर्यत्र शब्दोऽर्थो वा प्रतीयते। सुखशब्दार्थसंबोधात् प्रसादः परिकीर्त्यते॥

The definition in the K. M. Edn. is better :

अथानुक्तो बुधैर्यत्र शब्दादर्थः प्रतीयते।
सुखशब्दार्थसंयोगात्प्रसादः परिकीर्त्यते॥

Hemacandra gives Bharata's definition of Prasāda as follows :

'विभक्तवाच्यवाचकयोगाद् अनुक्तयोरपि शब्दार्थयोः प्रतिपत्तिः प्रसादः इति भरतः। पदपूर्विका तदर्थावगतिरिति शब्दार्थयोर्ग्रहणम्।' *K. A. Vyā.*

Generally speaking, the meaning of Prasāda has not changed in history. Bharata says that Prasāda is that Guṇa by which, even without being told, the meaning of the words is clear, because of the fact that the idea has been expressed in easy words, Sukha-śabdārtha-samyoga.

Arthavyakti.

The following two verses are available for Arthavyakti :

यस्यार्थानुप्रवेशेन मनसा परिकल्प्यते।
अनन्तरं प्रयोगस्य सोऽर्थव्यक्तिरुदाहृता।
सुप्रसिद्धा धातुना तु लोककर्मव्यवस्थिता।
या क्रिया क्रियते काव्ये सार्थव्यक्तिः प्रकीर्त्यते॥

Hemacandra gives Bharata's definition of Arthavyakti thus :

'यस्मिन्नतथास्थितोऽपि तथास्थित एवार्थः प्रतिभाति सोऽर्थव्यक्तिर्गुणः इति भरतः।

This Anuvāda of Hemacandra is based on neither of the two verses given above. The second verse is not clear except for the first bit 'Suprasiddhā dhātunā', which seems to mean the use of well-known roots and verbs. The first verse can be reconstructed thus :

यस्यार्थोऽनुप्रवेशेन मनसा परिकल्प्यते।
अनन्तरं प्रयोगेण सार्थव्यक्तिरुदाहृता॥

This would mean that Arthavyakti is clear Abhinaya of ideas and objects. When Abhinaya or action is going on, even earlier than the actors' Prayoga of the coming ideas, the Sāmājika knows the coming ideas by virtue of his heart being in unison with the theme (Anupraveśena manasā, Prayogeṇa anantaram). That is, action is only going to appear but the attuned heart has already known the thing.[1] Prayoga here is a word occurring often in the Nāṭyaśāstra in the sense of the presentation of the drama. If it is taken to mean the use of words in expression in the field of the text of the drama, we can say that this quality is similar to Prasāda and means that the idea should be so clear that the reader gets it even before going through the whole of the expression.

Mādhurya.

बहुशो यच्छ्रुतं वाक्यमुक्तं वापि पुनः पुनः।
नोद्वेजयति यस्माद्धि तन्माधुर्यमिति स्मृतम्॥

Hemacandra : बहुशो यच्छ्रुतम् अभिहितं वाक्यम् अनुद्वेजकं मनसः तन्मधुरमिति भरतः।

Mādhurya is the quality which does not make a sweet thing become stale or cloy however much it may be repeatedly heard.

Saukumārya.

The definition of this Guṇa has two parts which can be easily taken without strain in relation to Śabda and Artha. In the first line Bharata says that words must coalesce closely and must be easy for pronunciation. Sukha prayojyatā of Śabdas may also mean the use of words that are easy for Abhinaya. In the second half Bharata clearly says that Arthasaukumārya is the delineation of fine and delicate ideas. Perhaps Bharata means by Sukumārārtha samyukta his Kaiśikī Vṛtti rūpakas.

सुखप्रयोज्यैर्यच्छब्दैर्युक्तं सुश्लिष्टसन्धिभिः।
सुकुमारार्थसंयुक्तं सौकुमार्यं तदुच्यते॥

1. Cf. Vāmana :

पश्चादिव गतिर्वाचः पुरस्तादिव वस्तुनः।
यत्रार्थव्यक्तिहेतुत्वात् सोऽर्थव्यक्तिः स्मृतो गुणः॥

III. I. P. 82. Vanivilas Edn.

Hemacandra : सुखशब्दार्थं सुकुमारमिति भरतः ।

There are no other readings for Mādhurya and Saukumārya.

Ojas.

There are two verses available for Ojas. One verse is as follows :

अवगीतविहीनोऽपि स्यादुदात्तावभावकः ।
यत्र शब्दार्थसंपत्तिः (त्त्या) तदोजः परिकीर्तितम् ॥

Bharata often clubs together Śabda and Artha in his definition of Guṇas, because the quality of one is bound up with that of the other. Ojas, says Bharata, is achieved by Śabdārthasampatti. Rich expression, of words and ideas, even though the theme or the object described is trifling, the exaltation of ordinary things is the Ojas of Bharata. Generally speaking, Ojas, which transmutes a clod of earth into gold by the genius of the poet, pertains to the whole range of poetry. It refers to the brightening up of faded language and familiar things, both of which have lost their beauty to the ordinary people. Maṅgala and Hemacandra give this definition of Ojas of Bharata, with their criticism that this cannot be a Guṇa because poets have three ways of describing,—making small things exalted, making great things small, and describing things as they are.

अवगीतस्य हीनस्य वा वस्तुनः शब्दार्थसंपदा यदुदात्तत्वं निषिञ्चन्ति कवयः तदोजः इतिः भरतः । Hemacandra, p. 195.

अनवगीतस्य अहीनस्य वा वस्तुनः शब्दार्थयोः [अर्थ] संपदा यदनुदात्तत्वं निषिञ्चन्ति कवयः तर्हि तदनोजः स्यादिति मङ्गलः × × ×

कवीनामभिधेयं प्रति त्रयः पन्थानः । एते न्यूनमुत्कर्षन्ति, अधिकमपकर्षन्ति, यथार्थं वस्तु स्थापयन्ति, तत्कथमिवायं गुणः × × । *Ibid.*, p. 195.

The other recension of Bharata defines Ojas as the collocation abounding in Samāsas, a conception of Ojas which has persisted in history.

समासवद्भिर्विविधैः विचित्रैश्च पदैर्युतम् ।
सा तु (काकु ?) स्वरैरुदारैश्च तदोजः परिकीर्त्यते ॥

Bharata's verse gives extra ideas such as Vicitra Pada and Udāra Svara when a verse in Ojas is given out on the stage. The former perhaps refers to the brilliant and attractive phrasing and the latter to the pitch in the delivery of the text. 'Sā tu' in the third quarter of the verse may be 'kāku'. For Ucca kāku in Vīra, Raudra and Adbhuta, see Bharata, XIX, 58, p. 223, Kāśi edn.

Kānti.

Kānti is defined in the two recensions almost identically. It leans towards Mādhurya. Its definition includes Prasāda. Kānta is such composition as produces a repose of the heart when it is heard.

यो मनःश्रोत्रविषयः प्रसादजनको भवेत् ।
शब्दबन्धः प्रयोगेण स कान्त इति भण्यते ॥

यन्मनःश्रोत्रविषयमाह्लादयति हीन्दुवत् ।
लीलाद्यर्थोपपन्नं वा तां कान्तिं कवयो विदुः ॥

The second verse seems to have two parts which can be taken to refer to Śabda and Artha separately. The first line gives Śabdakānti, and 'Līlādyartha-upapannatva' in the second line can be taken as Arthakānti. Critics realise how this Guṇa is almost identical with Mādhurya. We find in Hemacandra :

श्रोत्रमनःप्रह्लादजननं कान्तम् (इति) भरतः । तदिदं माधुर्यसाधारणमिति वामनीयाः ।

Audārya.

Udāra has two recensions, and in one of them it is given as Udātta.

अनेकार्थविशेषैर्यत् सूक्तैः (सूक्ष्मैः) सौष्ठवसंयुतैः ।
उपेतमतिचित्रार्थं तदात्तं तच्च कीर्त्यते ॥

Hemacandra : बहुभिः सूक्ष्मैः (for सूक्तैः in Kāśī edn. of *N. Ś.*) विशेषैस्समेतमुदारमिति भरतः । p. 199.

This approaches the later Udāttālaṁkāra. The definition seems to be more of Artha than of Śabda. The other recension defines it with the name Udāra.

दिव्यभावपरीतं यच्छृङ्गाराद्भुतयोजितम् ।
अनेकभावसंयुक्तमुदारं तत्प्रकीर्तितम् ॥

The Guṇa pertains to the Śṛṅgāra and Adbhuta rasas and themes depicting divine personalities. This is the quality of the first type of Drama, Nāṭaka.

Hemacandra gives an Anuvāda based on the first verse and points out that the Guṇa of Udātta or Udāra is not different from Ullekha.

उल्लेखवानयमर्थः कथं गुण इति वामनीयाः ।

Śleṣa.

This Guṇa is defined as related to Padas and Artha. There are two verses on it, belonging to the two recensions.

विचार्यं (र) ग्र (ग) हणं (नं) वृत्त्या स्फुटं चैव स्वभावतः ।
स्वतः सुप्रतिबन्धश्च (न्धं च) श्लिष्टं तत्परिकीर्त्यते ॥

ईप्सितेनार्थजातेन संबद्धानुपरस्परम् ।
श्लिष्टता या पदानां हि श्लेष इत्यभिधीयते ॥

The latter verse describes Śleṣa as the harmony of sound and sense, of word and idea. The verse means : Śleṣa is the state of close embrace of the words with the ideas needed to be expressed.

ईप्सितेन अर्थजातेन अनु परस्परं संबद्धा या पदानां श्लिष्टता (स) श्लेष इत्यभिधीयते ।

The first verse is rather obscure. The idea can be made out of it that Śleṣa is the quality of expressions being apparently plain but revealing a world of ideas on examination.

विचारगहनं वृत्त्या स्फुटं चैव स्वभावतः ।

Hemacandra says स्वभावस्पष्टं विचारगहनं वचः श्लिष्टमिति भरतः ।

and illustrates Bharata's idea of Śleṣa by the verse from the Kumāra sambhava स्थिताः क्षणं etc., a description of the first rain drops falling on Pārvatī, a mere Svabhāvokti, which has within it a minute description of the beauty of Pārvatī's form. Hemacandra's Anuvāda is of the first verse and his criticism is that this is Vyavahāra vaidagdhī and not any Sandarbhadharma.

Samatā.

In one recension, it is defined as a very comprehensive Guṇa, as a principle of Aucitya in the use of Alaṁkāras and Guṇas themselves. The two must suit each other and beautify each other. This in short is Samatā.

अन्योन्यसदृशं यत्र तथा ह्यन्योन्यभूषणम् ।
अलङ्कार (रा) गुणाश्चैव समासात्समता यथा ॥

Hemacandra's Anuvāda is based on this verse and he criticises this as meaningless.

परस्परविभूषणो गुणालङ्कारग्रामः सममिति भरतः । × × भिन्नाधिकरणा हि गुणालङ्कारास्तत्कथमन्योन्यं भूषयेयुः × × । p. 197.

The other recension describes Samatā as the absence of superfluous words and of words which do not add to the sense. Only the needed words should be used but their meaning must be clear. Avoidance of superfluous words must not mean the obscuring of the idea.

नातिचूर्णपदैर्युक्ता न च व्यर्थाभिधायिभिः ।
न दुर्बोधा तैश्च कृता समत्वात्समता मता ॥

Samādhi.

The definitions of Samādhi in both recensions are obscure. The first includes within it the Upamālaṁkāra.

उपमास्विव हिष्टानां (?) अर्थानां यत्नतः तथा ।
प्राप्तानां चातिसंयोगः समाधिः परिकीर्त्यते ॥
अभियुक्तैर्विशेषस्तु योऽर्थस्यैवोपलभ्यते ।
तेन चार्थेन संपन्नः समाधिः परिकीर्त्यते ॥

Hemacandra gives Bharata's definition of Samādhi thus

अर्थस्य गुणान्तरसमाधानात्समाधिरिति भरतः ।

A conception similar to that of Daṇḍin and which has nothing to do with either verse given above.

Thus, we see on an examination of the ten Guṇas of Bharata that—

1. Some Guṇas are specifically mentioned as Guṇas pertaining to drama as such. The occurrence of the word Prayoga in them proves this, though Prayoga can also be taken as linguistic expression.

2. Some Guṇas are very comprehensive, as for instance Śliṣṭatā according to the second recension and Samatā according to the first. The first is word matched to idea and the second is the mutual appropriateness and mutual beautification of Guṇas and Alaṁkāras.

3. While certain Guṇas seem to be of Artha only, some of Sabda only, some seem to be of both, and Guṇas of Kāvya in general.

4. Udāra is expressly mentioned as the Guṇa of Śṛṅgāra and Adbhuta rasas and of the theme in which divine personalities figure. We have a few Guṇas of this type pertaining to the whole theme.

Abhinavagupta on Bharata.

Abhinavagupta's position in the *Nāṭyaśāstra Vyākhyā* is not the same as that in his *Locana.* Firstly, it must be noted that he utilises as much as possible the ideas in the system of Ānandavardhana in his own interpretation of Bharata. He even tries to reconcile Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana by quoting all to suit his purpose. In explaining the concept of Lakṣaṇa according to certain theorists, he gives a classification of Guṇas into two sets, the Rasa guṇas (according to the school of Ānanda) Mādhurya, Prasāda and Ojas, and the ten Guṇas, Śleṣa etc., pertaining to the collocation of Śabda and Artha. P. 380 *Abi. Bhā.* Mad. Ms. Vol. II. See Pp. 58-59, Vol. VI. *J. O. R.*, my article on Lakṣaṇa in Bharata. He considers Guṇas and Alaṁkāras as decorations on the body of Kāvya, similar to the painting of the walls of a house to beautify it. Explaining the several concepts in Vācikābhinaya such as metre, Lakṣaṇa, Alaṁkāra, Guṇa etc. by adopting the comparison of a house, Abhinava says at the end of the commentary on the 15th chapter :

चित्रकर्मप्रतिमम् अलंकार**गुण**निवेशनम् । P. 377 Vol. II. Mad. Ms.

Thirdly, while explaining the difference between Lakṣaṇa on the one hand and Guṇa and Alaṁkāra on the other, Abhinava says that Guṇa is more intimately related to Rasa than Alaṁkāra. Śabdaguṇa is the capacity or power or ability of Śabda to manifest Rasa and similar is Arthaguṇa. But Alaṁkāra is an altogether different thing, an extraneous thing brought to beautify an object. (Pp. 381-382 Vol. II)

एवमर्थस्यापि यद् रसाभिव्यक्ति हेतुत्वं सोऽर्थगुणः । P. 382.

यस्तु वस्त्वन्तरम्, वदनस्येव चन्द्रः, सोऽलंकारः । P. 382.

See also p. 66 of my paper on Lakṣaṇa.

Lakṣaṇa, Abhinava considers as the very Kāvya śārīra ; next to it comes Guṇa which is inseparably fused with Rasa and Kāvya ; last comes Alaṁkāra which is separable and extraneous ornament. This he says more plainly on p. 405 (Vol. II) but the text being corrupt, only a few bits can be quoted here.

"गुणशून्यं तु न काव्यं किञ्चिदपि ।"

अहेयत्वप्रदर्शनार्थमेव हि प्रसादादीनां गुणवाचोयुक्त्या व्यवहारः, तद्विना काव्यरूपत्वाभावात् । उपमाद्यन्तरेण तु भवत्येव काव्यमिति प्रकटीकर्तुम् उपमादीनाम् अलंकारत्वेन व्यवहारः ।

P. 405 Vol. II.

Abhinava records here another view which follows Daṇḍin and holds all beautifying factors in Kāvya as Alaṁkāra.

तथा हि–दण्डिना काव्यशोभावहा धर्माः अलंकाराः सर्वे उक्ता इति केचित् । P. 405.

But Abhinava himself, though he recognises that functionally Guṇa and Alaṁkāra are identical, yet holds a distinction between the two as a follower of Vāmana and Ānanda that the former is more important and intimate than the latter which is removable decoration.

When we come to the Guṇa prakaraṇa itself, we see that in the exposition of the ten Guṇas, Abhinava completely follows Vāmana. Here Abhinava notes that in some mss. the Doṣa prakaraṇa is found after the Guṇa prakaraṇa but in most mss. it precedes the later. The verse of Bharata that gives the character of Guṇas as the reverse of the Doṣas, Doṣa Viparyāsa (*N. Ś.* XVII. 95 Kāśī edn.) is differently read by Abhinava and his comments on this verse are valuable since he has to say here much on the nature of Guṇas. But unfortunately the text here is not completely available, there being many gaps. Abhinava also says that Guṇas are the Viparyayas of Doṣas.

एतद्दोषविघात एव गुणो भवतीत्यर्थः। P. 410.

From the meagre text available we can reconstruct his view to some extent. Of the Guṇas that are the reverses of Doṣas, two seem to be specifically mentioned by Bharata in the text followed by Abhinava. These two are Mādhurya and Audārya, and Abhinava explains them as Śruti sukhatva and Dīpta rasatva. The latter is not exactly Audārya but Kānti according to Vāmana. The interpretation of Mādhurya as Śruti sukhatva is very general. But it is certainly enough, broadly speaking, to have these two, Mādhurya and Audārya, as the essential Guṇas of Kāvya. For, of Śabda, the sense of sweetness must be the supreme Guṇa and of Artha, the presence of brilliant Rasa, Dīpta Rasa. Then, Abhinava says that besides these two, there are other Guṇas and Bharata mentions them in the verse श्लेषः प्रसादः etc.

"अन्येऽपि गुणाः सन्तीति दर्शयति—श्लेषः प्रसाद इत्यादि। P. 140.

Coming to Abhinava's explanation of Bharata's definition of each Guṇa, Abhinava notes the second recension available for certain Guṇas. In his main exposition, he follows Vāmana completely. Somehow he manages to interpret Bharata to mean what Vāmana says. He quotes the same illustrative verses as given by Vāmana for his Guṇas. In explaining Śleṣa, he takes it as Vāmana meant it and observes while illustrating it यथोदाहृतं वामनेन and gives the verse cited by Vāmana दृष्ट्वैकासनसंस्थिते etc. This Śleṣa is taken as Ghaṭanā by Vāmana घटना श्लेषः। क्रमकौटिल्यानुल्बणत्वोपपत्तियोगो घटना, स श्लेषः। Abhinava incorporates all these ideas in his interpretation of Bharata's Śleṣa.

अर्थभागानां कविसमुत्प्रेक्षितया परस्परसंबद्धया **योजनया** संपन्नं यदीप्सितमर्थजातं तेन उपलक्षितार्थस्य **उपपद्यमानस्य उपपद्यमानतात्मा** गुणः श्लेषः। यथोदाहृतं वामनेन etc. P. 410.

Commenting on the illustrative verse he says :

तेन **कुटिलोऽप्ययं क्रमः** न हृदये **उल्बणत्वं** भजते। P. 411

The other verse of Bharata on Śleṣa is taken as describing the Śabda guṇa Śleṣa. It is thus explained by Abhinava.

अनेकमेकपदमिवाभाति। तदेव मासृण्यमुच्यते।

Vāmana is here followed.

मासृण्यं श्लेषः । मासृण्यं नाम तत्, यस्मिन् सति बहून्यपि पदानि एकवद् भासन्ते ।

Prasāda of Artha is taken as Artha vaimalya and Śabda prasāda as Śaithilya. Explaining Samatā, Abhinava says

"समता उपक्रान्तमार्ग-अपरित्यागरूपा इत्युक्तं भवति" P. 412.

The Artha guṇa of Samatā is taken as Prakrama-abhaṅga. Samādhi of Artha is taken as Artha dṛṣṭi and of Śabda as Ārohāvaroha. Abhinava illustrates and explains Ārohāvaroha at great length on pp. 414-5. Śabda mādhurya is taken as Alpa samāsa and Artha mādhurya as Ukti vaicitrya.

विचित्रीकृतोऽयमर्थ इति मधुरोऽयमर्थः P. 416.

Ojas is interpreted as Gāḍhatva. Abhinava takes one and the same verse on Ojas as defining both Śabda Ojas and Artha Ojas, on both of which Vāmana is followed. The several kinds of Prauḍhi which is Vāmana's Ojas are explained by Abhinava. Saukumārya is taken as Apāruṣya according to Vāmana. Bharata's Artha vyakti also is taken as Vāmana's and so also Udāratā. तदुक्तं 'विकटत्वं नरोनृत्यमानत्वम्' इति । P. 418.

Bharata's verse on Kānti is made to yield Vāmana's idea of Dīpta rasatva. The words 'मनःश्रोत्रविषयमाह्लादयति,' 'लीलाद्यर्थोपपन्न' are taken to refer to Śṛṅgāra rasa and its Līlās. He says :

तदेव दीप्तरसत्वमित्युक्तमन्यैः । P. 418.

Thus, on the ten Guṇas and their nature, Abhinava follows completely Vāmana. The *Abhinavabhāratī* here is more a commentary on Vāmana's Guṇaprakaraṇa than on Bharata's. Where two verses, belonging to two recensions, are available for the Guṇas, Abhinava easily takes them as defining Śabda guṇa and Artha guṇa. Where there is only one verse, Abhinava has to strain himself and find in the same verse, the definition of both the Śabda guṇa and the Artha guṇa.

Abhinava reproduces Vāmana's distinction between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra, that the former is Nitya and Samaveta and the latter Anitya and Samyukta. Without the former there can be no Kāvya ; but the poet may or may not introduce the latter. Daṇḍin's view also is referred to here, that all beautifying factors are Alaṁkāras.

To illustrate how Abhinava interprets Bharata's text to mean what Vāmana said of the several Guṇas, we can cite one instance. Mādhurya is defined by Vāmana as 'Pṛthak padatva' of Śabda and 'Ukti vaicitrya' of Artha. Bharata's text has this definition :

बहुशो यच्छ्रुतं वाक्यम् उक्तं वापि पुनःपुनः ।
नोद्वेजयति यस्माद्धि तन्माधुर्यमिति स्मृतम् ॥

There is no second recension for the Guṇa and Abhinava has to find in the same verse Śabda mādhurya as well as Artha mādhurya defined. Abhinava's commentary discloses the fact that Abhinava read it differently. The text is

somewhat corrupt and the second line where the difference occurs is thus reconstructed by Prof. S. Kuppuswami SASTRI.

नावगीतं भवति यत् तन्माधुर्यमिति स्मृतम् ।

Abhinava comments upon it thus :

" माधुर्यमाह–बहुशो यच्छ्रुतमित्यादि । यदि यस्माद्धेतोः वाक्यं श्रुतं संशयविपर्ययोः आस्पदं न भवति इति तन्माधुर्यम् । द्राघीयसि समासे तावत्स्थ्यं भवत इति तद्विरह एव माधुर्यं शब्दगुण इत्युक्तं भवति । यथा–गाहन्तां महिषा निपानसलिलं ' इत्यादि ।

" पुनः पुनरपि उक्तमर्थजातं यस्माद्धेतोः अवगीतं अवगानेन वैरस्येन (युक्तं न भवति) तद्वचनवैचित्र्यात्मकं माधुर्यम् अर्थगुणः । वचनान्तराभिधेयतया हि सपार्थो (स एवार्थो) विचित्रो भवति । यथा ' रसवदमृतं कस्सन्देहः मधून्यपि नान्यथा ' etc."

Abhinava separates the bit ' Yad vākyam śrutam ' and interprets the word ' Śruta ' to mean ' free from flaws of doubt or error '. That is, when a sentence is uttered its sense should not be doubted or mistaken by the hearer. This is possible only when the words are not interlocked into compounds. So this bit means the Śabda guṇa of Mādhurya, Pṛthak padatā or Samāsa viraha, Vāmana's view !

The bit ' उक्तं वापि पुनः पुनः नावगीतं भवति ' is taken to refer to the Artha guṇa of Mādhurya which Vāmana gives as Ukti vaicitrya, saying the same thing in a variety of ways without causing monotony or staleness. This idea of Vāmana is extracted by Abhinava completely from the one word in Bharata ' Na avagīta.'

Daṇḍin.

One judging Poetry speaks generally of the form and the content, of Śarīra and Ātman. From the point of view of the latter he speaks of the emotion realised or suggested, the motif of a piece or the moral implication of a play. From the point of view of the former, style is the main subject of study. Style is Rīti and it differentiates poet and poet, and poem and poem. That Rītis vary with each poet is plain from what Daṇḍin says of them :

तद्भेदास्तु न शक्यन्ते वक्तुं प्रतिकविस्थिताः ।

The speciality of a Rīti is its Guṇas. Says Vāmana :

विशिष्टा पदरचना रीतिः । विशेषो गुणात्मा ।

Vāmana's treatment of Rīti is an elaboration of chapter I of Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*. Daṇḍin gives ten Guṇas, the same as Bharata's and describes them as the very life of the style (Rīti or Mārga) called Vaidarbhī. At the beginning, he says that the ten Guṇas constitute the speciality attached to the Vaidarbhī, while the other style called Gauḍī is *generally* devoid of these ten.

एषां विपर्ययः प्रायो दृश्यते गौडवर्त्मनि ।

But on examination we find much difficulty in placing all Guṇas on the same par or in accepting the rule that all of them are found in the Vaidarbhī and absent from the Gaudī. Mādhurya is a curious Guṇa in Daṇḍin. Daṇḍin

has two kinds of Rasa, one Rasa called Mādhurya and the other, the eight Rasas of Śṛṅgāra etc. The Rasa of Mādhurya is a result of refinement in expression, Agrāmyatā. This Mādhurya is a Guṇa, one of the ten given as the life-breath of the Vaidarbhī, and is of two kinds. One is the above-mentioned Agrāmyatā, which alone is Rasāvaha. The other Mādhurya is the result of a mild Anuprāsa called Śrutyanuprāsa. This latter is purely the Mādhurya of Śabda. The Agrāmyatā mādhurya has two aspects, one pertaining to Śabda and another pertaining to Artha. Śabda grāmyatā is collocation resulting in the formation of unhappy words with bad meanings, such as प्रिया या भवतः। The Śabda mādhurya born of Anuprāsa is seen to a moderate extent in the Vaidarbhī, and the Gauḍī and is characterised by an excess of a wild variety of Anuprāsa. It can be said that, as far as this Anuprāsa śabda mādhurya goes, the Gaudī is devoid of what the Vaidarbhī has. But as regards the Mādhurya of Agrāmyatā of both varieties, it cannot be said that it is present in Vaidarbhī only and absent in Gauḍī. Agrāmyatā[1] is a Doṣa to be avoided in both the Mārgas. Daṇḍin himself says :

एमवादि न शंसन्ति **मार्गयोरुभयोरपि।**

Similarly, Arthavyakti is a Guṇa of both Mārgas. It is the avoidance of the Doṣa of Neyārthatva, which both Mārgas must avoid. Daṇḍin himself says so :

नेदृशं बहुमन्यन्ते **मार्गयोरुभयोरपि।**

The Guṇa of Udāra, according to one reading, is a feature of all styles.

तदुदाराह्वयं तेन सनाथा **सर्वपद्धतिः।**

Taking Samatā, there are three varieties of Samabandha or even collocation: Mṛdu or all-soft, Sphuṭa or all-harsh, and Madhyama or the alternation of soft and harsh. All these are Samatā and its reverse is Vaiṣamya. The Vaidarbhas use only the Madhyama bandha samatā whereas the Gauḍas use a collocation which is all-soft, or all-harsh or Viṣama. (See *K. Ā.* I. 47-50 and the Com.). Then, Ojas is described as one of the Prāṇas of the Vaidarbhī. As a matter of fact it is not so. In verse, it is a flaw which the Gauḍī loves

1. Anuprāsa mādhurya is Śabda mādhurya and is referred to by the words 'Madhuram Rasavad *Vāci*' and Artha mādhurya which is of the form of Agrāmyatā is referred to by the words '*Vastunyapi* Rasasthitiḥ'. The latter is of two kinds, of Śabda and Artha. Artha agrāmyatā is purely conceptual and Śabda agrāmyatā is avoiding the use of such words which when they combine with the accompanying word create in the middle an indelicate word. Says Daṇḍin

अग्राम्यार्थौ रसावहः; शब्देऽपि ग्राम्यतात्येव।

Simhabhūpāla who almost follows Daṇḍin on Guṇas, casts off this threefold Mādhurya of Daṇḍin, the Anuprāsa mādhurya and Śabhyapada mādhurya of Śabda and the Agrāmyatā of Artha and simplifies it by taking Daṇḍin's word Rasa here and elsewhere in relation to Mādhurya in a sense not intended by Daṇḍin. That is, Simhabhūpāla takes

मधुरं रसवद् वाचि वस्तुन्यपि रसस्थितिः

as the clear presence of Rasa, Śṛṅgāra etc., in Śabda and Artha.

तन्माधुर्यं भवेद्यत्र शब्देऽर्थे च स्फुटो रसः। *R. A. S.* I. 234. P. 66. TSS.

to indulge in. As a Guṇa, it is defined as Prāṇa not of the Vaidarbhī, but of Prose.

ओजस्समासभूयस्त्वमेतद्वद्यस्य जीवितम्।

The Vaidarbhas are not used to it in verse but perhaps Vaidarbha prose employs it. But this is not clear, for Daṇḍin says definitely that the Vaidarbhas favour only the Anākula and Hṛdya type of Ojas even when they want to employ it.

अन्ये त्वनाकुलं हृद्यम् इच्छन्त्योजो गिरां यथा। I. 83.

Thus, Anojas or Anākula and Hṛdya Ojas is the Prāṇa of Vaidarbhī. Simhabhūpāla gives Ojas as a Prāṇa of Vaidarbhī and defines it as Samāsabāhulya, but while interpreting it, he says that the Vaidarbhī of which Ojas is a Prāṇa employs Ojas only with an eye to Aucitya. He says :

यथोचित समास बाहुल्यमोजः *R. A. S.* pp. 64-67.

This makes the difference between the Vaidarbha and Gauḍa styles that while the Vaidarbhas employ Ojas according to Aucitya only, the Gauḍas employ it everywhere. *R. A. S.* pp. 64 & 67. T. S. S. Further the Guṇa called Samādhi cannot be a speciality of the Vaidarbha only. Its Viparyaya is not specified and Samādhi cannot be found to be absent in the Gauḍī. This is realised by Daṇḍin himself and hence it is that he says that the Viparyayas of these Guṇas are *generally* (Prāyas) to be found in the Gauḍī एषां विपर्ययः **प्रायो** दृश्यते गौडवर्त्मनि। The commentators draw attention to the significance of the word Prāyas.

प्रायःशब्दः अर्थव्यक्त्यौदार्यसमाध्यादयो गुणाः उभयसाधारणा इति दर्शयति।
Taruṇavācaspati. p. 28.

प्रायोग्रहणं साकल्यनिवृत्त्यर्थम्। तेन अर्थव्यक्त्यौदार्यसमाधिगुणाः उभयमार्गतुल्या इति गम्यते।
Hṛdayaṁgamā p. 29.

The Samādhi guṇa takes us to another kind of analysis of Daṇḍin's ten Guṇas. Samādhi does not stand on a par with the other Guṇas. It stands for metaphorical expression and personification and prosopopœia. Mādhurya of the second kind resulting from Śrutyanuprāsa is a Śabdālaṁkāra. Or, rather it is the result of a Śabdālaṁkāra. To this class belongs the first variety of the Udāra guṇa also.

उत्कर्षवान् गुणः कश्चिद्यस्मिन्नुक्ते प्रतीयते।

It is illustrated by a verse from which is suggested the greatness of Tyāga, and this is a case of Dhvani. It will be bald to straightaway say that such and such a person is munificent ; instead the poet suggests the great quality of munificence by a winding expression. This is called Udāraguṇa. The other definition of Udāra is

श्लाघ्यैर्विशेषणैर्युक्तमुदारं कैश्चिदिष्यते।
यथा लीलाम्बुजक्रीडासरोहेमांगदादयः॥

This Udāra is the qualifying of words like Saras with Viśeṣaṇas Krīḍā and so on. This is the second kind of Udāttālaṁkāra given by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. Both writers are not clear about the definition of the Udātta alaṁkāra. Their definitions revolve round the word 'Ratna'. The exact definition can be made out as has been made out by later Ālaṁkārikas. उदात्तम् ऋद्धिमद्वस्तुवर्णनम्। In his illustration of the second kind of Udātta alaṁkāra, Bhāmaha mentions Krīḍāgṛha and Śaśikāntopala and Daṇḍin mentions Ratnabhitti. These are the points in Udāttālaṁkāra. The same are the points in the second Udāra guṇa ; these are the Ślāghyaviśeṣaṇas Daṇḍin speaks of in defining the Udāra for a second time. Simhabhūpāla, in following Daṇḍin, omits the second variety of Udāra guṇa since there is the Udāttālaṁkāra for cases of Ślāghya-viśeṣaṇas. *R. A. S.* p. 67. Towards the end of chapter V Bhāmaha gives a similar thing without a name and says that certain writers adorn their expressions in this manner.

अंशुमद्भिश्च मणिभिः फलनम्रैश्च शाखिभिः।
फुल्लैश्च कुसुमैरन्यैं (न्ये) **वाचोऽलंकुरुते** यथा॥
शुभमरकतपद्मरागचित्रे०—॥

Bhāmaha sometimes does not give the general law or definition but simply illustrates. One such case is this. On analysis this turns out to be the Ślāghya-viśeṣaṇa udātta. If we examine minutely Daṇḍin's Udāttālaṁkāra, we see that Daṇḍin is repeating there what he said of his Udāra guṇa. He describes the Udāttālaṁkāra also in two ways, one as the delineation of a great idea or Bhāva, Āśaya utkarṣa or Mahattva and the other as Vastūtkarṣa or Vibhūti as in the case of Ślāghyaviśeṣaṇas. *K. Ā.* II. 300-3.

आशयस्य विभूतेर्वा यन्महत्त्वमनुत्तमम्।
उदात्तं नाम तं प्राहुः अलंकारं मनीषिणः॥ etc. II. 300-303.

In the first illustration there is Āśayamāhātmya and Rāma's great regard for the command of the father is *suggested.* In the second there is Ratnabhitti which *suggests* opulence, Vibhūti māhātmya.

पूर्वत्राशयमाहात्म्यम् (१) अत्राभ्युदयगौरवम् (२)।
सुव्यञ्जितमिति व्यक्तमुदात्तद्वयमप्यदः॥ II. 303.

This Āśayamāhātmya and Vastu vibhūti māhātmya are exactly identical with the Pratīti of Utkṛṣṭaguṇa and the Ślāghyaviśeṣaṇas in the two Udāraguṇas in the first chapter of Daṇḍin. Thus, Daṇḍin's Udāraguṇa and Udāttālaṁ-kāra are identical in all respects.

The other Guṇas are Bandhaguṇas. Śleṣa is the Guṇa the reverse of which is the Doṣa called Śaithilya. A well-knit style is Śliṣṭa and a loose style is Śithila. The Saithilya doṣa is not cared for by the Gauḍas whose love for Anuprāsas bring in its wake this Doṣa. It is clear that Daṇḍin's Śleṣa is a Śabdaguṇa. Prasāda is such expression as is easily understood or has well-established meaning known to all, 'Pratītisubhagam vacaḥ' and 'Prasiddh-ārtha.' The Viparyaya of this is Anatirūḍha words which the Gauḍī favours.

Samatā is, in the language of the later writers, Ārabdha rīti nirvāha. It is evenness of style. It is of three kinds Mṛdu, Sphuṭa and Miśra and is clearly a Śabdaguṇa. Mādhurya has already been analysed. Sukumāratā is the Guṇa of the sounds being delicate. Its Viparyaya is harsh sounds, Niṣṭhurākṣara. Excess of delicateness is also to be avoided ; for it will produce the Doṣa called Śaithilya.

अनिष्ठुराक्षरप्रायं सुकुमारमिहोच्यते ।
बन्धशैथिल्यदोषस्तु दर्शितः सर्वकोमले ॥ I. 69.

This Saukumārya is of Śabda. Daṇḍin also gives Arthasaukumārya in the same Svabhāvokti illustration which served to illustrate Śabdasaukumārya. Refined expression avoiding vulgar excess of exaggeration is Arthasaukumārya. It is Anūrjita artha. Daṇḍin's conception of best poetry is very high. He says here that no figure can give that beauty which this Saukumārya of Artha gives.

इत्यनूर्जित एवार्थः नालंकारोऽपि तादृशः ।
सुकुमारतयैवैतदारोहति सतां मनः ॥ I. 71.

The Viparyaya of this Arthasaukumārya and Padasaukumārya is the vain quality called 'dīpta' which is really a flaw. Dīpti may be of Śabda or of Artha. Dīptaśabda is what Daṇḍin calls Kṛcchrodya, hard to pronounce, illustrated by the line

न्यक्षेण क्षपितः पक्षः क्षत्रियाणां क्षणादिति

Arthasaukumārya will overlap with the Arthaguṇa Kānti. Arthasaukumārya is the Guṇa of resorting least to Arthālaṁkāras or figurative expressions. Its Viparyaya is highly adorned artificial expression. Neyārthatva is the reverse of the Arthavyakti guṇa. There must be enough words to give the idea fully. The Śabdanyāya or nature of expression is that sufficient words should be used to clearly convey the idea and this is the Guṇa of Arthavyakti. When analysed, this Guṇa seems to come under Prasāda. The two kinds of Udāra have been examined above. Their Viparyayas are not easily derivable from the text. We can say that straight and bald expression may be their Viparyayas. Ojas also has been dealt with above. The Vaidarbhas, if they resort to it, resort only to its Anākula and Hṛdya variety.

अन्ये त्वनाकुलं हृद्यमिच्छन्त्योजो गिरां यथा

The Gauḍas use it even in verse and it is to illustrate a case of uninvolved and beautiful Samāsa in Vaidarbha that Daṇḍin gives the verse पयोधरतटोत्संग etc. Thus, Ojas which is Samāsa is a Śabdaguṇa. Kānti is a Guṇa of Artha. It is not very different from Arthasaukumārya or the Saukumārya of Anūrjitārtha. In Vārtā and Varṇana, in speech generally, refined and restrained utterances are beautiful. Flat exaggeration is a fault. Refined expressions are pleasing because they do not set at nought the ordinary nature of things. The Viparyaya of Kānti is hyperbole or Atyukti. Thus, Kānti is an Artha-

guṇa in Daṇḍin. Of the tenth Guṇa Samādhi, we have spoken above. It is a Guṇa of Artha. So Śleṣa, Prasāda, Samatā and Ojas are purely Śabda-guṇas. Kānti and Samādhi are the only two that are purely Arthaguṇas. Arthavyakti embraces both Śabda and Artha though it primarily rests on the former. Mādhurya has two varieties, one pertaining to Śabda and one to Artha. Saukumārya and Udāratā have each two varieties pertaining to Śabda and Artha.

I.

Guṇas.	*Their Viparyayas.*
Śleṣa.	Śaithilya.
Prasāda.	Nātirūḍha or Vyutpanna words.
Samatā.	Vaiṣamya. All-soft or all-harsh
(Aviṣama miśra bandha)	which mean Śaithilya or Pāruṣya.
Mādhurya.	
1. Rasāvaha śrutyanuprāsa.	Arasāvaha and Ulbaṇa Varṇānu-prāsa, Nātidūrānuprāsa and result-ant Bandha pāruṣya and Śaithilya.
2. Agrāmyatā.	Grāmyatā.
Sukumāratā.	Niṣṭhura or Dīpta Śabda.
	Ūrjita or Dīpta Artha.
Arthavyakti.	Neyārthatva.
Udāratā.	No Viparyaya shown.
Anākula and Hṛdya Ojas.	Ojas as such. Ahṛdya and Ākula Ojas.
Ojas only in prose.	Ojas in verse also.
Kānti.	Atyukti.
Samādhi.	No Viparyaya shown.

II.

(*a*) Single and unclassified Guṇas : Śleṣa, Prasāda (Prasiddhārtha and Pratītisubhaga), Samatā, Arthavyakti, Ojas, Kānti and Samādhi.

(*b*) Guṇas that have varieties : Mādhurya ; this is also called Rasa. It has first two varieties, Anuprāsa and Agrāmyatā. The latter is again of two kinds, of Śabda and of Artha. Sukumāratā has two varieties : Aniṣṭhurākṣara which is Śabdasaukumārya and Anūrjita artha which is Artha-saukumārya. Udāratā : Utkṛṣṭaguṇapratīti (Artha udāratā) and Ślāghya-viśeṣaṇa Śabdodāratā).

Note : The two cases of Vārtā and Varṇana are not two kinds of Kānti.

III.

Śabdaguṇas.	*Arthaguṇas.*	*Śabdārthaguṇas.*
Śleṣa.	Kānti.	Mādhurya.
Prasāda.	Samādhi.	Sukumāratā.
Samatā.	(Agrāmyārtha mādhurya).	Arthavyakti.
Ojas.	(Anūrjitārtha Saukumārya).	Udāratva.
(Anuprāsamādhurya)	(Arthavyakti).	
(Śabda-agrāmyatā mādhurya).		
(Aniṣṭhurākṣara Saukumārya).	(Ukṛṣṭaguṇa pratīti-udāratā).	
(Arthavyakti).		
(Ślāghyaviśeṣaṇa Udāratā).		

Note. Bhoja utilises Daṇḍin's Guṇas twice, once in the Doṣaprakaraṇa and again in the Guṇaprakaraṇa. Bhoja utilises completely chapter I of Daṇḍin on Guṇas under his Doṣa called 'Arītimat', which is a description of the Viparyayas of Daṇḍin's Guṇas, all except Samādhi. There Bhoja gives this classification of the nine Guṇas of Daṇḍin :

Śabda guṇas : Śleṣa, Samatā and Saukumārya.
Artha guṇas : Prasāda, Arthavyakti and Kānti.
Ubhaya guṇas : Ojas, Mādhurya and Audārya.

This is not faithful to Daṇḍin. See below section on Bhoja.

IV.

Characteristics of Vaidarbhī.	*Characteristics of Gauḍī.*	*Characteristics that must be in both Mārgas.*
Śleṣaguṇa.	Śaithilya doṣa.	
Prasādaguṇa.	Vyutpannatā, Anatirūḍha śabdatā, two Doṣas.	
Madhyama miśra bandha.	Śaithilya, Pāruṣya and Vaiṣamya.	
Avaiṣamya.	Anuprāsa and Arthālaṁkāra ḍambara.	

Characteristics of Vaidarbhī.	*Characteristics of Gauḍī.*	*Characteristics that must be in both Mārgas.*
Śrutyanuprāsa Mādhurya.	Utkaṭa varṇānuprāsa and Nātidūrasthityanuprāsa resulting in Bandha pāruṣya and Śaithilya.	
Dūrāntarasthityanuprāsa mādhurya.	Niṣṭhura dīpta śabda and Ūrjita dīpta alaṁkṛta artha.	
Sukumāratā.	Ākula and Ahṛdya Ojas and Ojas in verse also.	
Aniṣṭhura śabda and Anūrjita artha.	Atyukti.	
Ojas only in Gadya.		Mādhurya of both kinds of Agrāmytā.
If in Padya, only Anākula and Hṛdya Ojas.		Arthavyakti.
Kānti.		Udāratā.
		Samādhi.

Note: (1) Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha, in his commentary on chapter I of Bhoja's *S. K. Ā.* (Mad. Ms.), says that two Guṇas in Daṇḍin are Asādhāraṇa, 'special'. They are Saukumārya and Ojas; the former distinguishes Vaidarbhī and pertains to it exclusively; the latter characterises the Gauḍi and is present only in it. The rest are Sādhāraṇa Guṇas, common to both Mārgas.

(2) Of the four Guṇas given as features of all Mārgas of poetry, Agrāmyatā mādhurya and Arthavyakti go together into a class, for, they must be looked to by all poets and their absence will unmake poetry. The Sahṛdaya or the grammarian of poetry will not tolerate Grāmyatā and the grammarian of language will not tolerate Neyārthatā, the Viparyaya of the latter. The former Guṇa is an essential Kāvyanyāya and the latter a Śabdanyāya.

Udāratā and Samādhi go together similarly. Of both of them Daṇḍin says सनाथा सर्वपद्धतिः । कविसार्थः समग्रोऽपि तमेनमनुगच्छति । They are not as necessary as Agrāmyatā or Arthavyakti. Without Agrāmyatā or Arthavyakti, there can be no Kāvya. Without Udāratā and Samādhi, there can be Kāvya. If they are present, they add to the beauty; they are Śobhātiśayahetu, if we can apply here what Vāmana says of Alaṁkāra while distinguishing it from Guṇa.

3. The Doṣa of śaithilya results from śleṣābhāva, Sarvamṛdu or Sarvakomala, Nātidūrasthityanuprāsa, and Atyantasukumāra or Atyanta aniṣṭhura śabdas. In all these forms, it is dear to the Gauḍas.

4. Śleṣa, Samatā, Śabdasaukumārya, and Ojas are features of whole collocation or śabdaracanā while Prasāda, Agrāmyaśabdamādhurya and ślāghyaviśeṣaṇa-udāratā pertain to separate words singly. Udāratā of the first variety and Samādhi touch Dhvani, and Anuprāsa mādhurya and the Viparyaya of Kānti viz., Atyukti are Alaṁkāras.

Bhāmaha.

As he opens chapter II, Bhāmaha just gives a running treatment of a very meagre character to Guṇas. He gives here three Guṇas, Mādhurya, Prasāda and Ojas. This fact of Bhāmaha mentioning only three Guṇas does not mean the later theory of Guṇas being only three as a corollary of the theory of Guṇas as Rasadharmas established by Ānandavardhana.

Madhurakāvya is sweet to hear and is not overloaded with Samāsa.

श्रव्यं नातिसमस्तार्थं काव्यं मधुरमिष्यते ।

A Kāvya has Prasāda, if its meaning is understood by women and boys as easily as by learned men.

आविद्वदङ्गनाबालप्रतीतार्थं प्रसादवत् ।

Both these Guṇas, Mādhurya and Prasāda, would seem to go together, avoiding profuse compounds. For, Bhāmaha says :

माधुर्यमभिवाञ्छन्तः प्रसादं च सुमेधसः ।
समासवन्ति भूयांसि न पदानि प्रयुञ्जते ॥

Ojas is said to be liked by some and it is the use of profuse Samāsa.

केचिदोजोऽभिधित्सन्तः समस्यन्ति बहून्यपि
यथा मन्दारकुसुमरेणुपिञ्जरितालका ॥

The illustration is not suitably given by Bhāmaha. In it, there is no Ojas ; there is only Samāsa. Previously, Bhāmaha said that Mādhurya and Prasāda are secured by avoiding Samāsa. Here is not an instance of a long Samāsa. It is further Madhura as well as Prasanna. Ānandavardhana quotes this line of Bhāmaha as an instance of Dīrgha samāsa sanghaṭanā in Śṛṅgāra. P. 135 *Dhvanyāloka.* Śṛṅgāra is a *Madhura* rasa.

While speaking of the Rītis, Bhāmaha gives some Guṇas. From here, we can know something of the relation between Guṇas and Rīti, a relation which is not expressly stated by Bhāmaha. Bhāmaha says of the Vaidarbhī that the very name of Vaidarbhī does not mean good poetry ; that Guṇas pertaining to it can be carried to excess and that thus a faulty or bad Vaidarbhī is also possible. Similarly, though the available specimens of Gauḍī are bad, a good Gauḍī is theoretically possible. Qualities pertaining to it, when they are not overdone, produce a good style. In such a case, even the former is bad and the latter is good. So, judging poetry as good or bad must be, not

by the conventional catch-words of Vaidarbhī and Gauḍī but by an appreciation of what lies as the fundamental features at the basis of both.

अपुष्टार्थमवक्रोक्ति प्रसन्नमृजु कोमलम् ।
भिन्नं गेयमिवेदं तु केवलं श्रुतिपेशलम् ॥
अलंकारवदग्राम्यम् अर्थ्यं न्याय्यमनाकुलम् ।
गौडीयमपि साधीयः वैदर्भमपि नान्यथा ॥ I. 34-35.

Here are found the following Guṇas mentioned : Prasāda, Ṛjutā, Komalatva, and Śrutipeśalatva with reference to the Vaidarbhī ; and Anākulatva and Agrāmyatā with reference to the Gauḍī. Prasāda and Ṛjutā go together ; the latter is straight statement with least Vakrokti. An over-emphasis on this leads to the faults of Apuṣṭārthatva and Avakratva. Vakrokti is what nourishes beauty of expression. It is Alaṁkāra and by that alone ideas can be made beautiful. It will be stale to be saying always in a straight manner in one's anxiety to be simple and straight that a thing is *very* beautiful, *very* charming etc. The use of '*very etc.*' alone cannot beautify expression. *It is, like Rasavācyatva, the Svaśabdavācyatva of ideas.* Immediately after his two verses on the Rītis above given, Bhāmaha says :

न नितान्तादिमात्रेण जायते चारुता गिराम् ।
वक्राभिधेयशब्दोक्तिरिष्टा वाचामलंकृतिः ॥ I. 36.

The Guṇas, Komalatva and Śrutipeśalatva, mentioned in the verse criticising Vaidarbhī go together. The latter is Mādhurya. It is not very much different from the former. When this quality of sweetness is overdone, we have the flaw of Śaithilya born of Sarvakomalatva as has been pointed out by Daṇḍin.

बन्धशैथिल्यदोषस्तु दर्शितः सर्वकोमले ।

The Guṇa Agrāmyatā mentioned in the verse on the Gauḍī is one of the varieties of Mādhurya described by Daṇḍin. What is the Grāmyatā which the Gauḍī is liable to commit ? Bhāmaha may refer here to Grāmyānuprāsa which the Gauḍī resorts to as against the good Anuprāsa which is the Prāṇa of the Vaidarbhī according to Daṇḍin. Says Bhāmaha in chapter II. 6.

ग्राम्यानुप्रासमन्यत्तु मन्यन्ते सुधियोऽपरे ।
सलोलमालानीलालिकुलाकुलगलो बलः ॥

So, Bhāmaha thinks that a good Gauḍī must avoid Grāmyānuprāsa. Gramyānuprāsa is closely related to Ojas and Samāsa. Good Ojas and Samāsa must be such as resorted to by the Vaidarbhas, Hṛdya and *Anākula* as Daṇḍin says. Bhāmaha refers to the same *Anākulatva* in his second verse on the good Gauḍī.

While pointing out the circumstances under which one can stand Yamaka in II. 18, Bhāmaha gives some more Guṇas : Pratīta śabda (Prasāda), Ojasvitā, Suśliṣṭsandhitva, Prasāda (again) and Svabhidhāna.

In III. 53-54, Bhāmaha speaks of a Guṇa of a Prabandha as a whole called Bhāvika and this Daṇḍin also gives at the end of chapter II. Bhā-

maha gives it as a composite Guṇa, the result of other Guṇas like Citra-udātta-adbhuta-arthatva, the Svabhinītatā of the Kathā (obscure) and Śabda-anākulatā (uninvolved expression or expression which is *not word-ridden*).

In an article on Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha, in the volume of Indian studies in honour of LANMAN, Dr. KEITH prefers to vote with those who consider Daṇḍin as earlier than Bhāmaha and Bhāmaha as criticising Daṇḍin. As regards the Guṇas in Bhāmaha, Dr. KEITH makes remarks in this article which must be here noted. He is already possessed of the idea of Daṇḍin's priority and hence interprets Bhāmaha's treatment of Guṇas as a criticism of Daṇḍin. He says that Bhāmaha " found a solution by reducing the number of Guṇas to three, which though not stated in Bhāmaha, rest on fundamental distinctions of the manner in which the mind of the reader was affected ". Again " we need not claim for Bhāmaha precise appreciation of the emotional states to which his Guṇas were to correspond ; but the reduction to three must clearly have been based on the principle of this kind, and in any event the advance on Daṇḍin is enormous ". Now, unless one is already prepossessed with the priority of Daṇḍin, one cannot interpret Bhāmaha's Guṇas like this. For, the above is not borne out by facts. Even though Dr. KEITH clearly accepts that Bhāmaha cannot be credited with such a critical, scientific and subjective formulation of the Guṇa concept as found only from the time of Ānanda, he goes to the extent of saying that Bhāmaha himself, as a critic of Daṇḍin, reduced Guṇas to three, basing himself on some principle of the kind of Ānanda's definition of Guṇas as Rasadharma. No such principle can be suspected to exist even unconsciously in Bhāmaha. Bhāmaha's definition of Guṇa as such is not available ; his definition of Mādhurya, Prasāda and more especially Ojas are definitely and very clearly related to such objective physical features as Śravyatva, *Asamastārthatva*, sweetness to the sense of ear, absence of compound, simplicity as regards the understandability of the meaning even by boys and women as much as by learned men, and compounding numerous words. In the face of such definition of these three Guṇas, which do not make even the smallest advance over Daṇḍin and which are not on the way to make Guṇas what they are in Ānanda, we are not able to see the reasonableness of Dr. KEITH's interpretation. The few verses on Guṇas at the opening of chap. II in Bhāmaha stand detachedly, without being clearly constituted into a topic or section. Bhāmaha just mentioned the Guṇas, because his predecessors had treated of them. If Dr. KEITH wants to stick to the logicality of his view, we may ask this question : Dr. KEITH says that as regards the Rītis,[1] Bhāmaha's attitude is " a criticism of Daṇḍin in the usual insulting manner of Bhāmaha ". But why does not Bhāmaha

1. Dr. KEITH says here (p. 178 of the above said Volume) that Bhāmaha " is reproaching Daṇḍin with following blindly a wrong tradition " and that Bhāmaha's attitude is severely critical. But KEITH contradicts himself soon on p. 183 where he says that as against the reactionary Daṇḍin, Bhāmaha " is often more wedded to tradition " and " was content to accept the tradition as handed down." If he was a " traditionalist," why did he grow ' severely critical ' towards the Rītis ?

treat the Guṇas of Daṇḍin also to a similar insult? Bhāmaha's attitude towards Rītis is no doubt "severely critical" but the attitude is against those predecessors who, without really understanding the fundamental characteristics of poetry, such as पुष्टार्थत्वम्, वक्रोक्तिः, अग्राम्यत्वम्, अर्थ्यत्वम्, न्याय्यत्वम्, अनाकुलत्वम् were simply led away by mere catchwords like Vaidarbha and Gauḍa, and not against Daṇḍin. Bhāmaha, if he had criticised Daṇḍin either on Rīti or on Guṇa, must have given us some clue to his knowledge of Daṇḍin's clear formulation of Rīti as intimately connected with and essentially based on the Guṇas.

Therefore, as pointed out earlier in the section on Māgha, there were before the time of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin different traditions, one which Bhāmaha chose to follow, another which Bhaṭṭi chose to follow and still another which Daṇḍin chose to follow. The criticism in Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin are of the different currents of thoughts on one or the other of which the two authors based their texts. Otherwise the consistent mention of only two Guṇas, Ojas and Prasāda, by Māgha is unintelligible.

Vāmana.

Vāmana was the first to definitely classify Guṇas into the two classes of Śabda guṇas and Artha guṇas. He gives the same ten Guṇas found in Bharata and Daṇḍin. First he treats of them as Bhandhaguṇas or qualities pertaining to the collocation. (बन्धः पदरचना) Vāmana has changed the nature of the various Guṇas considerably. We shall first examine his Śabda guṇas.

Ojas is defined as Gāḍhabandha; Prasāda as Śaithilya. This Śaithilya by itself is a Doṣa but is called the Guṇa of Prasāda by its association or coexistance with Ojas. It is said to be clearly experienced by knowing critics that these contrary qualities of Gāḍhatva and Śaithilya exist together.

नन्वयमोजोविपर्ययात्मा दोषः, तत्कथं गुण इत्यत आह-**गुणः संश्लवात्**। गुणः प्रसादः, ओजसा सह संश्लवात्। शुद्धस्तु दोष एवेति। ननु विरुद्धयोरोजःप्रसादयोः कथं संश्लव इत्यत्राह— **स त्वनुभवसिद्धः**। स तु संश्लवस्तु अनुभवसिद्धः तद्विदां रत्नादिविशेषवत्। अत्र श्लोकः—

करुणप्रेक्षणीयेषु संश्लवः सुखदुःखयोः।
यथानुभवतः सिद्धः तथैवौजःप्रसादयोः॥

This seems to be a very clumsy view of Prasāda. Others have criticised it. See *Kāvyānuśāsana vyākhyā* p. 196. Śleṣa is defined as Masṛṇatva or that quality which makes even a number of Padas appear together as one. Samatā is stated to be Mārga-abheda, uniformity of style. Samādhi is described as the rise and fall of a verse, Āroha and Avaroha. Certain critics consider this Āroha and Avaroha as not different from Ojas and Prasāda. They say that Ojas is of the form of Āroha or a mounting up of the heart and Prasāda is of the form of Avaroha, a coming down or lowering of the key. These critics mean the subjective reaction to Ojas and Prasāda. Vāmana refutes their view with two arguments. Āroha and Avaroha are separate but Ojas and Prasāda coexist. Then, there is no strict law that in Ojas there is Āroha and in Prasāda there is Avaroha. But in a way, Vāmana succumbs in the

end. Vāmana attempts to reply that it is only Tīvra Ojas and Tīvra Prasāda that are of the form of Āroha and Avaroha and the Guṇa responsible for the Tīvratva is Samādhi. Mādhurya is defined as the absence of Samāsa and words standing separate, Pṛthak padatva. समासदैर्घ्यनिवृत्तिपरं चैतत्. It is Bhāmaha who says that writers who favour Mādhurya compound their words little. Saukumārya is Ajaraṭhatva or Apāruṣya which is the same as Daṇḍin's Aniṣṭhurākṣaraprāyatva. The Śabdaguṇa of Udāratā is described as Vikaṭatva, the dance of words. Arthavyakti is defined as the quality of words giving their meaning quickly. It is because Vāmana has this Arthavyakti as a Śabdaguṇa that he has to give Prasāda the curious character of Śaithilya. Kānti is brilliance without which the verse looks like an old faded picture.

Vāmana is a poet and a connoisseur of painting. He infuses poetry into his conception of Guṇas. He speaks of Ajaraṭhatva which surely an imaginative Sahṛdaya feels. The dance of words, the brilliance of words, the rise and fall of verse, these are very poetic conceptions of Guṇas. Earlier, praising drama as supreme literature, Vāmana compares it to picture.

सन्दर्भेषु दशरूपकं श्रेयः। तद्धि चित्रं, चित्रपटवद् विशेषसाकल्यात्। I. 3. 30, 31.

His Śabdaguṇa Kānti is borrowed from painting. It is described as Aujjvalya. The faded and dull appearance of old pictures, Purāṇacchāyā, is what results when verses have no Kānti.

औज्ज्वल्यं कान्तिरित्याहुः गुणं गुणविशारदाः।
पुराणचित्रस्थानीयं तेन वन्ध्यं कवेर्वचः॥[1]

Again Vāmana borrows a comparison from the field of painting.

यथा विच्छिद्यते रेखा चतुरं चित्रपण्डितैः।
तथैव वागपि प्राज्ञैः समस्तगुणगुंफिता॥

Guṇas in general are poetic conceptions and Vāmana's conception of many of them are more so. That is why Vāmana takes pains to refute sceptical and unimaginative readers to whom such Guṇas are non-existent, are mere

1. The means to achieve this Kānti is the choice of those words only which are poetic. Only certain names of objects have a poetic flavour. The use of these only gives a lasting brilliance to a verse. The dull words of daily use make a verse look like an old effaced picture. Ratneśvara says in commenting upon Bhoja's Śabda kānti which is the same as Vāmana's :

कान्तिविपर्ययः पुराणी च्छाया × × × अत एवाह 'पुराणचित्रस्थानीयं तेन वन्ध्यं कवेर्वचः' इति। तस्मादप्रहृतपदैः आरंभः सन्दर्भस्यैव कान्तिः। तथथा– 'कुसुमस्य धनुः' इति प्रहृतं, कौसुममिति अप्रहृतम्; 'जलनिधौ' इति प्रहृतं, 'अधिजलधि' इति अप्रहृतम्; गुरुत्वमिति प्रहृतं, गौरवमिति अप्रहृतमित्यादि। अत एव प्रहृतशंका। चमत्कारित्वं तु सहृदयाह्लादित्वम्। अस्ति हि तुल्येऽपि वाचकत्वे पदानां कश्चिदवान्तरो विशेषः, यमधिकृत्य किञ्चिदेव प्रयुञ्जते महाकवयः, न तु सर्वम् यथा पल्लव इति वक्तव्ये किसलयमिति। श्रीति वक्तव्ये कान्तेति। कमलमिति वक्तव्ये राजीवमित्यादि।" P. 48. *S. K. A. Vyā.*

illusions, or are only the accidental effects, caused by reading verses in different ways.

नासन्तः, संवेद्यत्वात्। न भ्रान्ताः, निष्कम्पत्वात्। न पाठधर्माः, सर्वत्र अदृष्टेः।

Hemacandra records on p. 200 of his *Kāvyānuśāsana vyākhyā* the view that some hold only five Guṇas and even those as *Pāṭha dharmas.*

Let us examine these Guṇas of Vāmana. Ojas seems to be the old Śleṣa. Śleṣa itself is taken as Masṛṇatva or Ekapadavad bhāna ; Ojas seems to be ' well-knitness ', Śleṣa is cohesiveness. For the old conception of Ojas as Samāsa bhūyastva, Vāmana has no counterpart in his scheme. His conception of Prasāda is very clumsy. Samādhi is taken as Ārohāvaroha which is not a stylistic Guṇa but a consequence of Metre. In the Śikhariṇī metre, where the line begins with a short letter, rises up with five long, runs down again with five short, rises again with two long and makes again a final glide, one sees the Ārohāvaroha of Vāmana clearly. Hence it is that the metre itself is called Śikhariṇī. In other metres, long and short alternate at short intervals and the rise and fall is very marked, there being no long curve. In his Parikara ślokas on these Śabda guṇas on p. 82 (Vanivilas Edn.), Vāmana himself says in the verse on Samādhi that it pertains to the Yatis. It has also to be noted that all the instances given by Vāmana are cases of Śikhariṇī where the Ārohāvaroha is very clear. Bhoja seems to modify Vāmana but really means the same thing in his Śabda samādhi. Ratneśvara actually interprets the Guṇa as related to metre and says that such Guṇas as Rise and Fall must be felt, that they are Ānubhavika. On pp. 200-201, Hemacandra records a view of Guṇas as metrical characteristics. Mādhurya is defined as Pṛthak padatva ; but there is Mādhurya in compounds also as Ānanda points out. Udāratā is defined as the dance of words and Kānti as brilliance of words and these two are entirely new conceptions of Vāmana.

Arthaguṇas. The same ten Guṇas are taken as Arthaguṇas also. Ojas is interpreted as Arthaprauḍhi. This Prauḍhi itself is of five kinds : Padārthe vākya vacanam ; Vākyārthe padābhidhā ; Vyāsa ; Samāsa ; Sābhiprāyatva. There is no logic in putting all these together under some name called Prauḍhi and identifying that as Ojas. Prauḍhi in general is a feature of poets' genius and expression, and is of various kinds. Hemacandra offers the proper criticism of this Ojas of Vāmana when he says

" इति या प्रौढिः ओजः, तद्वैचित्र्यमात्रम् "। P. 195.

The difficulty springs from the writers attaching some sanctity to the number ten regarding Guṇa and their strain to take the same ten as Śabdaguṇas and Arthaguṇas, while as a matter of fact, only some can be made Śabdaguṇas and some only, Arthaguṇas. There is no harm if some of the ten are taken as Śabda guṇas only and some others again, as Artha guṇas. If each should be taken once as a Śabda guṇa and again as an Artha guṇa, ignoring the individuality of each, there is bound to be Kleśa, far-fetchedness.

Prasāda is plain, being defined as Arthavaimalya. As such, it has to be differentiated on the one hand from the Śabdaguṇa called Arthavyakti and

on the other from the Arthaguṇa called Arthavyakti. The Arthavyakti of Śabda is the use of words which deliver their sense easily. Prasāda, as an Arthaguṇa, has a somewhat restricted sense in Vāmana. It has affinity with the second rescension of Bharata's Samatā. The use of just sufficient words is Prasāda. Certain writers simply pile beautiful words which do not add to the meaning and such writing is the Viparyaya of Vāmana's Prasāda.

अर्थस्य वैमल्यं प्रयोजकमात्रपदपरिग्रहे प्रसादः ।

The Aprayojakapadas, useless verbiage, here given as Prasādaviparyaya is referred to by Bhāmaha also at the end of chapter V.

विरुद्धपदमस्वर्थं बहुपूरणम् आकुलम् ।
कुर्वन्ति काव्यमपरे व्यायताभीप्सया यथा ॥
एतत्कोलनागस्फुटबकुललताचन्दनस्यन्दनाढ्यः°—

These Aprayojakapadas are what Mahimabhaṭṭa calls 'Apratibhodbhava' or Avakara. They form the Śabdadoṣa called by Bhoja 'Aprayojaka.' Stevenson calls them *Cheville* in his essay on the *Technical Elements of Style.* "The genius of prose rejects the Cheville no less emphatically than the laws of verse; and the Cheville, I should perhaps explain to some of my readers, is any meaningless or very watered phrase employed to strike a balance in the sound." Those who write in this manner are called Racanā kavis by Rājaśekhara. *K. M.* p. 17.

The Arthaguṇa called Śleṣa is similar to the Arthaguṇa of Ojas, comprising as it does many things under some kind of name. Arthaśleṣa is given as Ghaṭanā and what is this Ghaṭanā? Vāmana describes it as Krama, Kauṭilya, Anulbaṇatva and Upapattiyoga. How are these related together and how does the word Ghaṭanā mean these things? And how does Śleṣa mean Ghaṭanā? Vāmana illustrates from Amaruka and adds that illustrations for this Arthaguṇa are profuse in the works of Śūdraka and others. Krama is, as we gather from the illustrative verse from Amaruka and from the commentary, the order of things or description in a certain order. This is taken by Bhoja as a Śabdālaṁkāra variety, the Kramakṛta Gumphanā. *S. K. Ā.* p. 156. Kauṭilyaghaṭanā occurs in Cāṭus, Vakroktis, Vyājoktis and such other kinds of expression common in love. The path of love itself is crooked, Kuṭila. Anulbaṇatvaghaṭanā has affinity with Daṇḍin's Kānti and Saukumārya of Artha which are Anūrjita artha or Lokasīma-anatikramaṇa. The *Kāmadhenu* and the *S. K. Ā. Vyākhyā* of Ratneśvara take the whole as one क्रमकौटिल्यानुलबणत्वोपपत्तिघटना and point out all these in the single illustration. A clear exposition of Vāmana's Śleṣa is available in Ratneśvara under Bhoja's Arthaśleṣa. In fine, it is thus put by Ratneśvara : अघटमानस्येव वाक्यार्थस्य बुद्धिचातुर्येण घटनमिति वाक्यार्थः । See below under Bhoja's Arthaguṇas.

Samatā of Artha is the avoidance of the Doṣa called Prakramabhaṅga. This can be included in the Kramaghaṭanā, a variety of the above-noticed Arthaśleṣa. Vāmana is not satisfied with this view and says in the end सुभगत्वं वा अवैषम्यमिति and illustrates it with a verse from act V of the *Śākuntala* कास्मिदवगुंठनवती etc. What special quality Vāmana means by Subhagatva

and how such a quality is seen in that verse art not understandable. As regards the Pratyudāharaṇa which, if given, may give us some help, Vāmana simply goes away by saying प्रत्युदाहरणं सुलभम् । Samādhi is a curious idea as an Arthaguṇa. It is said to be Arthadṛṣṭi or Arthadarśana. It is called Samādhi because only a concentrated mind can see the thing which is to be put in the verse. समाधिकारणत्वात् समाधिः । अवहितं हि चित्तम् अर्थान्पश्यतीति उक्तं पुरस्तात् । This is no Guṇa of Arthasandarbha. It is a Guṇa of the poet and his Pratibhā. It is out of place here and ought to have occurred earlier in I. 3 along with the general Sūtras on Poet and Poet's Sāmagrīs described in Sūtras 16-20 चित्तैकाग्र्यमवधानम् etc. The Artha conceived and expressed by the poet is here classified as 'quite original', 'imitative', and 'resembling that of other poets'—Ayoni and Anayachāyāyoni, a subject further developed by Ānandavardhana in the last Uddyota, by Rājaśekhara in his *Kāvyamīmāmsā* and by Kṣemendra in his *Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa.*

Mādhurya is defined as Uktivaicitrya which however is characteristic of poetry in general. Vāmana does not further explain it but simply gives an illustrative verse and passes on to Saukumārya. The Arthaguṇa saukumārya is a mark of refinement in expression; it is defined as Apāruṣya. The words of distress and danger are not shot straight by refined speakers; they do not shock with terrible words; they do not say Mṛta, they say 'Yeśaśśeṣa'. Instead of saying 'go', Gaccha, they say 'Sādhaya'. The Arthaguṇa Udāratā is Daṇḍin's Agrāmyatā Mādhurya. Vāmana says: अग्राम्यत्वमुदारता । Arthavyakti is the pictorial quality in a word-picture. In a composite picture painted by the poet, the various things composing the picture must be distinct and clear. This seems to me to be the correct meaning of the phrase 'Rūpabheda' which has been given as one of the six essentials (Ṣaḍaṅga) of a picture in a verse on painting in the *Jayamaṅgalā* on the *Kāmasūtras* and which has not been properly interpreted by the many writers who have written upon it. The graphic Svabhāvoktis, minutely portraying to us every detail clearly and powerfully, have this Guṇa called Arthavyakti as their very life.

Vāmana's Kānti is important as the only place where Vāmana mentions Rasas. The formal brilliance giving a lasting colour to the words is the Śabdaguṇa of Kānti. The real brilliance of a piece that gives it life and makes it long-lived is its Rasa brilliantly developed. If Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin held Rasa as an Alaṁkāra, the Rasavadalaṁkāra, Vāmana took it as a Guṇa, the Arthaguṇa called Kānti. There is an advance in considering Rasa as *Arthaguṇa,* for Vāmana considers Guṇa as superior to Alaṁkāra and as inseparably related with Kāvya.

Vāmana's contribution is the classification of Guṇa into that of Śabda and that of Artha and a clearer and a more definite description and illustration of each Guṇa. The greater contribution of Vāmana is his attempt to define Guṇa in general and to indicate its difference from Alaṁkāra and its place in Kāvya. That, we reserve for another section and note here some

other general observations of Vāmana on Guṇa. Vāmana says that maturity of style or Kāvyapāka is the *clear* and the *complete* presence of these Guṇas. The style is to have all these Guṇas completely and clearly (Sphuṭa and Sakala) and then only can it be said to have Pāka. Mere parading of grammatical niceties and striking expressions, Suptiṅ samskāra, devoid of Guṇas is bad Pāka. It is Apārthaka, if it is devoid of the ten Guṇas.

गुणस्फुटत्वसाकल्ये काव्यपाकं प्रचक्षते ।
चूतस्य परिणामेन स चायमुपमीयते ॥
सुप्तिङ्संस्कारसारं यत् क्लिष्टवस्तुगुणं भवेत् ।
काव्यं वृन्ताकपाकं स्यात् जुगुप्सन्ते जनास्ततः ॥
गुणानां दशतात्यक्तो यस्यार्थः, तदपार्थकम् ।
दाडिमानि दशेत्यादि न विचारक्षमं वचः ॥

Vāmana therefore considers that best poetic diction must have all these ten Guṇas of Śabda and Artha clearly and completely. That best diction, he would call Vaidarbhī which is the complete and clear presence of all these Guṇas.

समग्रगुणोपेता वैदर्भी ।
अस्पृष्टा दोषमात्राभिः **समग्रगुणगुंफिता** ।
विपञ्चीस्वरसौभाग्या वैदर्भीरीतिरिष्यते ॥

To suit this idea of his, Vāmana has changed the meaning of many Guṇas. Guṇas are not for him features which characterise one kind of style or one poet but they are essentials which best poetry as such must possess. In the Śabda-guṇas, he has omitted the feature of Ojas as Samāsabhūyastva, since it is not a feature of the Vaidharbhī. This position is slightly illogical since it supposes that in a single verse chosen as a specimen of the best diction of Vaidarbhī, as for instance the verse गाहन्तां महिषाः etc., one must show the presence of all the ten Guṇas of Śabda and Artha. According to the theme, only certain Guṇas will be found. For instance, not in all cases can the Padas be dancing with the Guṇa called Udāratā.

Gauḍī is described by Vāmana differently from Daṇḍin. Daṇḍin said that the ten Guṇas are the life of the Vaidarbhī and that the Gauḍī generally has the reverses of the ten Guṇas. Thus, Gauḍī was a defective style almost. Vāmana says of Gauḍī that it is the same style of Vaidarbhī but with Ojas and Kānti displacing Mādhurya and Saukumārya.

ओजः कान्तिश्च विद्येते यस्यां सा ओजःकान्तिमती गौडीया नाम रीतिः । माधुर्यसौकुमार्ययोरभावात् समासबहुला अत्युल्बणपदा च । अत्र श्लोकः—

समस्तात्युद्भटपदामोजःकान्तिसमन्विताम् ।
गौडीयामपि गायन्ति रीतिं रीतिविचक्षणाः ॥ P. 20 Vanivilas edn.

When all the Guṇas are present, we have the Vaidarbhī and we have to take also that the Vaidarbhī is marked by an emphasis on Mādhurya and Saukumārya. For, Vāmana himself says so and gives the Gauḍī as the same Rīti minus Mādhurya and Saukumārya and plus Ojas and Kānti.

What are the Ojas and the Kānti here? Vāmana says in his Vṛtti "Samāsa bahulā, Atyulbaṇa padā ca". These two are the meanings of the Ojas and Kānti which are said to create the Gauḍī. We face here a contradiction; for, in the Guṇa prakaraṇa itself, Ojas is never Samāsa bāhulya and Kānti has nothing to do with the Udbhaṭatva or Ulbaṇatva of Padas!

The third Rīti of Pāñcālī is brought in to explain the two Rītis of Vaidarbhī and Gauḍī. Vāmana says that the Pāñcālī is the style which is marked by the emphasis on Mādhurya and Saukumārya.

माधुर्येण सौकुमार्येण च गुणेनोपपन्ना पाञ्चाली नाम रीतिः। ओजःकान्त्यभावाद् अनुल्बण-पदा विच्छाया च। P. 21. Vanivilas edn.

Ojas and Kānti which are the dominant Guṇas of the Gauḍī are entirely absent in the Pāñcālī and in their place we have Mādhurya and Saukumārya. The Pāñcālī is described in a verse also:

आश्लिष्टश्लथभावां तु पुराणच्छाययान्विताम्।
मधुरां सुकुमारां च पाञ्चालीं कवयो विदुः॥ P. 21, *ibid.*

Therefore it seems that the Vaidarbhī becomes the Gauḍī if Ojas and Kānti are emphasised and the Pāñcālī, if Ojas and Kānti are eliminated and instead, Mādhurya and Saukumārya are emphasised. Vaidarbhī itself has all the Guṇas in an equal measure. When Vāmana says of the Pāñcālī that it is 'Ślatha', the reverse of the Ojas of his Guṇaprakaraṇa is meant here. Śaithilya is the reverse of Ojas which is Gāḍhabandhatva. In the Vaidarbhī, it coexists with Ojas and hence is the Guṇa of Prasāda. It is a flaw by itself:

गुणः प्रसादः, ओजसा सह संश्लवात्। शुद्धस्तु दोष एवेति।

In the verse describing the Pāñcālī however, we find Ojas and Kānti as described in the Guṇa-section proper.

Thus the Guṇas which play a part in the differentiation of Rītis are Mādhurya and Sukumāratā and Ojas and Kānti. The other six Guṇas must be taken as present in all the three Rītis.

The History of the Distinction of Guṇa from Alaṁkāra.

We have two main topics in the history of the concept of Guṇa, compared to which the number and nature of each particular Guṇa is a matter of detail only. They are the classification of Guṇas into those of Śabda and those of Artha and the formulation of the difference between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra; and these two affect the other topic of the number and nature of Guṇas also.

Until the Guṇa was exactly defined by Ānanda, writers were having twenty Guṇas, ten of Śabda and ten of Artha and each writer added or subtracted as he pleased and described each of the Guṇas accepted by him according to his own wish. The pre-Dhvanyāloka period of Sanskrit Poetics was a period of research in figures of speech. That period laid emphasis on formal beauty which it found to be of various kinds. All formal beauty of Kāvya, all beauty of Kāvya as such, was put down as Alaṁkāra, which was an omnibus concept comprehending all points of appeal in Kāvya,—Guṇa, 'figure-

alaṁkāra', Rasa, Vṛttyaṅga, Sandhyaṅga, and Lakṣaṇa. (Daṇḍin II 366). The concept of Alaṁkāra, which applied normally to Śabdacitra like Yamaka and Anuprāsa and Arthacitra like Upamā, Rūpaka etc., came to be widened till it became 'Poetic Beauty' as such—SAUNDARYA—when it burst and again sank to its normal significance of Yamaka etc., and Upamā etc. During this reign of Alaṁkāra, the concept had many votaries who held it as the mark of Kāvya. Alaṁkāra seems to have lost its individuality; either it meant very big things or it meant very poor things. We have a glimpse into the other extreme position of Alaṁkāra in this period of Alaṁkāra-chaos. The anonymous commentary *Hṛdayaṁgamā* on the *Kāvyādarśa* refers to a very odd view of Alaṁkāra which reduces that concept to something very trifling.

अपरे अलङ्कारलक्षणमेवमाहु :—

चतुर्णामपि पादानाम् आदौ मध्येऽन्त एव वा ।
स्थितिरेकपदस्यैव तदलङ्कारलक्षणम् ॥ P. 29. Mad. edn.

This will be the marking of a verse with the same word at the beginning, the middle and the end. Such vagaries are found in the post-Dhvani period also, as for instance in Bhoja's list of Śabdālaṁkāras. We shall now trace the thread of the distinction of Alaṁkārā from Guṇa from the beginnings up to Ānandavardhana and see how, even after Ānandavardhana, some writers like Bhoja chose to follow only the ancients.

In Bhāmaha's work the three Guṇas, Prasāda, Mādhurya and Ojas are described. But they are not called Alaṁkāra definitely anywhere. Nor do we find the word Guṇa mentioned anywhere in Bhāmaha, even in verses describing these three Guṇas. He mentions Doṣas, defines and illustrates them at length at the end of chapter I and in chapters IV and V. At the end of chapter I, he says that sometimes certain Doṣas cease to be Doṣas and actually give beauty,—'Śobhām Dhatte,' 'Śobhate'. Not even here is it mentioned that these Doṣas become Guṇas. There is only one place where the word Guṇa occurs and it is in the definition of Bhāvikatva at the end of all the Alaṁkāras, at the end of chapter III.

भाविकत्वमिति प्राहुः प्रबन्धविषयं गुणम् ।

This Guṇa pertains to the whole of a work and this soon becomes an Alaṁkāra. Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin do not club it with Mādhurya and other Guṇas, though it is called a Guṇa; and though they call it a Guṇa, a Guṇa of the Prabandha, they treat of it at the end of Alaṁkāras.

The beginning of some sort of differentiation between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra is first seen in Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*. Daṇḍin considers all the topics in poetics, and in drama also, Guṇa, Alaṁkāra, Vṛtti, Sandhi, their Aṅgas and Lakṣaṇas, as Alaṁkāra. But as regards Guṇa and Alaṁkāra, Daṇḍin points out some difference which his commentators elucidate.

The Kāvyaśarīra is in many styles or paths, Mārgas, two clearly definable paths among which are the Vaidarbhī and the Gauḍī. There are certain qualities which constitute the life-breath of the various paths. What exactly is

the nature of these Guṇas which constitute the life of a style? Daṇḍin replies that Guṇas are the special features of the Kāvyaśarīra, its Asādhāraṇa dharmas, going to distinguish the various styles. From a functional point of view these Guṇas or special features of styles are Alaṁkāra. What is Alaṁkāra? Any feature, Dharma, which gives beauty to the Kāvya is Alaṁkāra.

काव्यशोभाकरान् धर्मानलङ्कारान् प्रचक्षते ।
ते चाद्यापि विकल्प्यन्ते कस्तान् कात्स्न्र्येन वक्ष्यति ॥
× × ×
काश्चिन्मार्गविभागार्थमुक्ताः प्रागप्यलङ्क्रियाः ।
साधारणमलङ्कारजातमद्य प्रदर्श्यते । *K. Ā.* II. 1-3.

In chapter III, while speaking of the Doṣa called Sasaṁśaya, Daṇḍin says, as in the case of other Doṣas also, that it is sometimes not a Doṣa. For Doṣas depend on circumstances and cease to be so sometimes. Daṇḍin must say here that when they cease to be Doṣas, they become Guṇas, but instead, he says that they become Alaṁkāra. Alaṁkāra is here used as a synonym of Guṇa.

ईदृशं संशयायैव यदि जातु प्रयुज्यते ।
स्यादलंकार एवासौ न दोषस्तत्र, तद्यथा । *K. Ā.* III. 141.
न दोषः पुनरुक्तोऽसौ प्रत्युतेयमलङ्क्रिया । *K. Ā.* III. 137.

As distinguished from the Guṇa-asādhāraṇa-alaṁkāras described in chapter I, the figures of speech described in chapter II are called by Daṇḍin Sādhāraṇa alaṁkāra. Thus, to Daṇḍin :—

1. Guṇas are Alaṁkāra, since they are also features beautifying Kāvyaśarīra.

2. Alaṁkāra means feature imparting beauty to Kāvya ; in a restricted sense, it also means the figures of speech, Upamā etc.

3. Guṇas, which were dealt with in chapter I as the distinguishing features of the two Mārgas are Asādhāraṇa or special Alaṁkāras. Their Asādhāraṇya, speciality, consists in their occupying the status of features that separate and distinguish poetic expression into different styles (Mārga vibhājakatva).

4. The figures of speech are Sādhāraṇa, general or common to all styles. This is clearly pointed out by the *Hṛdayaṅgamā.*

पूर्वस्मिन् परिच्छेदे वैदर्भगौडमार्गविभागार्थं काव्यशरीरप्रदर्शनार्थं च **असाधारणधर्माः** केचिदलङ्कारा उक्ताः । इदानीं शब्दरचनालक्षणतः प्रतिष्ठापितस्य काव्यशरीरस्य **साधारणा** ये अलङ्काराः ते अस्मिन् परिच्छेदे वक्ष्यन्ते । P. 59. Rangacharya's Madras Edn.

In interpreting the verses of Daṇḍin quoted above, Taruṇavācaspati refutes Vāmana's theory of the difference between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra. He says the view that Guṇas are Śobhāhetu while Alaṁkāras are Śobhātiśayahetu is no distinction. For, we are not speaking of Śobhā at all, but of Śobhā-atiśaya only. Taruṇavācaspati therefore holds that both Guṇa and Alaṁkāra are Śobhātiśayahetu and are to be distinguished by some other distinguishing mark. The

figures of speech are Alaṁkāras which are not employed as the differentia of Mārgas of poetry whereas the Guṇas are employed so. This is the difference between the two.

शोभाहेतवो गुणाः, शोभातिशयहेतवोऽलङ्कारा इति कैश्चिदुक्तम् । शोभातिशयस्यैव विवक्षितत्वात् नायं भेदहेतुः इति गुणा अलङ्कारा एव इत्याचार्याः । ततः श्लेषादयो गुणात्मकालङ्काराः पूर्वं मार्ग-प्रभेददर्शनाय उक्ताः । अधुना मार्गद्वयसाधारणा अलङ्कारा उच्यन्ते । P. 60 *Ibid.*

Therefore, the difference according to Taruṇavācaspati is that Guṇas are special features that present themselves as characteristics of a certain style in some place only, whereas Alaṁkāra is common to all styles of poetry and exists everywhere. The latter does not go to characterise style and its presence or absence does not make or unmake a Mārga of poetry.

Rudraṭa. Rudraṭa does not have a subject called Guṇa, clearly formulated in his mind. The word Guṇa occurs in a very general significance in his work. In chapter II, after treating of the division of Śabdas into Nāman, Ākhyāta etc., and the Rītis, Rudraṭa has a verse on what his commentator Namisādhu calls 'Vākya guṇas'.

अथ वाक्यगुणानाह—

अन्यूनाधिकवाचक-सुक्रम-पुष्टार्थशब्दचारुपदम् ।
क्षोदक्षममक्षुण्णं सुमतिर्वाक्यं प्रयुञ्जीत ॥

The first 'Anyūnādhika vācaka' means the absence of many Doṣas. It is also the Śabda guṇas of Arthavyakti and Prasāda according to both Daṇḍin and Vāmana. Namisādhu explains it at length with illustrations and shows what Doṣas should be avoided to secure this Guṇa. Sukrama refers generally, even as Puṣṭārthaśabda, to what Stevenson calls the logical nature of web. The 'web', Stevenson says, must at once be sensuous and logical. Sanskrit Alaṁkāras emphasise a third quality, which of course is absolutely necessary and hence must be taken for granted. It is the grammatical correctness of the web, of the words in it. The quality of being logical is emphasised by many a Guṇa in Sanskrit Alaṁkāra. Aspects of Anyūnādhikavācakatva, which emphasise precision, clarity and cutting away of all surplusage, refer to some part of logicality. The quality of Sukramatva also emphasises the same. The avoidance of the Doṣa called Prakramabhaṅga, which is the sense in which Namisādhu takes Rudraṭa's Sukramatva, is only one small aspect of the logical virtue of the web. The Cārupadatva of Rudraṭa stands generally to denote the sensuousness of the web of Stevenson. Namisādhu takes Kṣodakṣama and Akṣuṇṇa to refer to Prasāda and Paripūṇṇatā, the result of the avoidance of all Doṣas and the securing of all Guṇas.

In the next two verses, Rudraṭa returns to what he said in the above-quoted verse as Cārupadatva. There are any number of synonyms and any number of words for ideas. But only such as make the expression beautiful are used by the poet. This quality of giving beauty to the web is what Rudraṭa calls Sanniveśa cārutva. This, Rudraṭa definitely says is a Śabda-guṇa.

रचयेत्तमेव शब्दं रचनाया यः करोति चारुत्वम् ।
सत्यपि सकलयथोदितपदगुणसाम्येऽभिधानेषु ॥ II. 9.

Then Rudraṭa gives an example of the absence of this Guṇa, an example of a harsh unpronouncable expression तर्वाल्युर्वेवर्षे तरुपङ्क्तिरसंकटैव मुने। II. 10. The 'Sanniveśacārutva' comprises within itself all the Guṇas, it being considered a comprehensive Guṇa and the Cārutva of the word in the collocation being of many kinds from the many points of view. It is the general beauty of expression as a whole.

In the last verse of Chapter XI which closes the section on Alaṁkāras and Arthadoṣas, Rudraṭa uses the word Guṇa, though only generally.

शब्दार्थयोरिति निरूप्य विभक्तरूपान्
दोषान् **गुणांश्च** निपुणो विसृजन्नसारम् ।

Namisādhu. In the history of Guṇas, Namisādhu occupies an important place for he exhibits a strange notion of Guṇa in his commentary on Rudraṭa. It has been pointed out above that it is Namisādhu who introduces Rudraṭa's verse II. 8 as mentioning Vākya guṇas. In I. 4, Rudraṭa uses the phrase ज्वल-दुज्ज्वलवाक्प्रसर where 'Jvalat' is taken by Namisādhu as 'Alaṁkārayukta'. and 'Ujjvala' as 'Doṣābhāvena vimala', pure, being rid of flaws. Namisādhu, unlike Rudraṭa, mentions the name Guṇa often, but shows himself in abject confusion. There were writers who were under an Alaṁkāra-stroke and Namisādhu is one who had a Guṇa-stroke. In chapter II, Rudraṭa says that words have two Vṛttis or two kinds of collocation, the compounded and the uncompounded, Samāsavat and Asamāsa. The Samāsavat class is further divided into three classes which are the three Rītis of Pāñcālī, Gauḍīyā and Lāṭīyā. In the Pāñcālī, the compound word has only two or three word units; the Lāṭīyā compounds five to seven words; the Gauḍīyā uses the longest Samāsas. These three are thus Laghusamāsa, Madhyama-samāsa and Āyatasamāsa collocations respectively. The Asamāsavṛtti has only one variety. It is the Vaidarbhī Rīti. II. 3-6. Namisādhu says here that the Rīti is Bhaṅgi or Vicchitti. रीतिर्भङ्गिर्विच्छित्तिरिति पर्यायः And what is the nature of their place in Kāvya? Namisādhu says that the Rītis are not Alaṁkāras but they are GUṆAS, of *Śabda.* He seems to emphasise Śabda while saying Śabdaguṇas.

एताश्च रीतयो नालङ्काराः, किं तर्हि **शब्दाश्रयाः गुणाः** इति । P. 10.

It is to this view of Namisādhu that Vāsudeva, commentator on the *Karpūra-mañjarī* refers while commenting upon the Rītis mentioned by Rājaśekhara in the Nāndī verse of that drama.

केचित्तु रीत्यादीनामपि गुणत्वं मन्यन्ते । P. 2. K. M. Ed.

Namisādhu has yet some more surprise for us. In the chapter on Rasa, chapter XII, p. 150, Namisādhu observes in his comments on the second verse :

अलङ्कारमध्य एव रसा अपि किं नोक्ताः? उच्यते। काव्यस्य शब्दार्थौ शरीरम्। तस्य वक्रोक्तिवास्तवादयः कटककुण्डलादय इव कृत्रिमा अलङ्काराः। **रसास्तु सौन्दर्यादय इव सहजा गुणाः** इति भिन्नः तत्प्रकरणारम्भः।

The Śabdālaṁkāras and the Arthālaṁkāras are considered as artificial ornaments like bangles and pendants while Rasas are the natural Guṇas like Saundarya and other qualities of a woman. Namisādhu seems to emphasise the latter. Thus, this writer has two kinds of Guṇas, the Kṛtrima guṇas, which are the Alaṁkāras and the Sahaja guṇas which are the Rasas. That Namisādhu considers Alaṁkāras also as Guṇas is plain from what he says in his comments on Rudraṭa, XI. 36 :

"शब्दस्य हि वक्रोक्त्यादयः पञ्च **गुणाः**। दोषास्त्वसमर्थादयः षट्। अर्थस्य पुनर्**गुणाः** वास्तवादयः चत्वारः। दोषास्त्वपहेतुत्वादयो नव॥" P. 149.

The Śabdālaṁkāras and Rītis are Śabda guṇas ; the Arthālaṁkāras are Artha guṇas ; all these are Kṛtrima guṇas ; (but it must be stated that Namisādhu does not definitely say whether the Rītis also are Kṛtrima) ; as contrasted with these, the Rasas are Sahaja guṇas. It is in Namisādhu that Guṇa attained the greatest proportions and became a concept that could stand comparision with the concept of Alaṁkāra in the sense of Saundarya.

The view that Rasas are the 'Guṇas' of poetry finds a scholastic and polemical position as a Pūrvapakṣa in the third Uddyota of Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka.* Ānanda refutes the view which holds the Rasa as the Guṇa of poetry. The Pūrvapakṣa refuses to adopt the phraseology of Śarīra and Ātmam and the view that Kāvyaśarīra is 'Śabdārtha' and Kāvyātman is Rasādi. It says that Rasa is the Guṇa of the Kāvya.

अत्र केचिदाहुः—गुणगुणिव्यवहारः रसादीनां इतिवृत्तादिभिस्सह, न तु जीवशरीरव्यवहारः। रसादिमयं हि वाच्यं प्रतिभासते, न रसादिभिः पृथग्भूतम्। अत्रोच्यते। P. 182. *Dhva. Ā.*

Udbhaṭa. The *Kāvyālaṁkārasārasaṁgraha* of Udbhaṭa which is a short resume of figures of speech has no place for Guṇas. But Udbhaṭa's ideas on Guṇas, expressed by him in his lost commentary on Bhāmaha, *Bhāmahavivaraṇa,* are available to us. His ideas on Guṇas are always kept in view both by Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta in their discussion on Guṇa in Uddyotas II and III. His opinion as such is definitely set forth in the *Kāvyaprakāśa* and is identified as his by Māṇikyacandra and following him, by others also afterwards. Hemacandra identifies the opinion as Udbhaṭa's in his commentary on his own *Kāvyānuśāsana.* Udbhaṭa advanced the argument that since Guṇas and Alaṁkāras are both of them features that beautify Kāvya, Kāvyaśobhākaradharma, there is essentially no difference between these two and the distinction alleged to exist is due to the blind traditionism of the indiscreet and the ignorant. Also, he considered both Guṇas and Alaṁkāras as subsisting in Kāvya through inherence, Samavāya sambandha.

ओजःप्रभृतीनाम् अनुप्रासप्रभृतीनां च उभयेषामपि समवायवृत्त्या स्थितिरिति गड्डलिकाप्रवाहेणैषां भेद इत्यभिधानमसत्। *Kāvyaprakāśa.* VIII.

शब्दार्थालङ्काराणां गुणवत्समवायेन स्थितिरिति **भामहवृत्तौ भट्टोद्भटेन** भणनमसत्।
P. 289. Māṇikyacandra. Mys. Edn.

इह तु उभयेषां समवायेन स्थितिरिति अभिधाय 'तस्माद् गङ्गरिकाप्रवाहेण गुणालङ्कारभेद' इति भामहविवरणे यद् भट्टोद्भटोऽभ्यधात्, तन्निरस्तम्। P. 17 Hemacandra.

उद्भटादिभिस्तु गुणालंकाराणां प्रायशः साम्यमेव
सूचितम्, विषयमात्रेण भेदप्रतिपादनात्। P. 7. *Alaṁkārasarvasva.*

It is also known to us that Udbhaṭa held Guṇas as Samghaṭanādharmas, qualities pertaining to the collocation and he must have differentiated the Alaṁkāras as features of Śabda and Artha.

Vāmana. It is to refute Udbhaṭa who definitely denied any difference between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra that Vāmana, his contemporary, attempted to distinguish the two.

तत्र ओजःप्रसादादयो गुणाः यमकोपमादयस्त्वलङ्काराः इति स्थितिः काव्यविदाम्। तेषां किं भेदनिबन्धनमित्याह—" काव्यशोभायाः कर्तारो धर्मा गुणाः। " ये खलु शब्दार्थयोर्धर्माः काव्यशोभां कुर्वान्ति ते गुणाः। ते च ओजःप्रसादादयः, न यमकोपमादयः। कैवल्ये तेषामकाव्यशोभाकरत्वात्। ओजःप्रसादादीनां तु केवलानामस्ति काव्याशोभाकरत्वमिति। " तदतिशयहेतवस्त्वलङ्काराः।" तस्याः काव्यशोभायाः। तस्य हेतवः। तुशब्दो व्यतिरेके। अलङ्काराश्च यमकोपमादयः। " पूर्वे नित्याः।" पूर्वे गुणा नित्याः, तैर्विना काव्यशोभाया अनुपपत्तेः। *K. A. Sū.* and *Vṛ.* III. 1.

The essential notion of the word Alaṁkāra in Daṇḍin viz., Kāvyaśobhākara dharma has not changed in Vāmana who equates Alaṁkāra with all beauty in Kāvya, Saundarya, and says that the distinctive mark of a Kāvya is Alaṁkāra. Even as Daṇḍin, Vāmana had one comprehensive and wide concept of Alaṁkāra, and another smaller concept of Alaṁkāra. The bigger and smaller concepts are both seen in the second Sūtra where Vāmana says that *Alaṁkāra* is achieved by avoiding flaws and introducing Guṇas and Alaṁkāras. It is between Guṇa and the smaller Alaṁkāra that Vāmana points out the difference in chapter III. They both are means of Saundarya but they have a slight difference. Saundarya or Śobhā of a Kāvya is due to Guṇas. Alaṁkāras are added for additional Śobhā. This is one difference. The second difference is a consequence of the first. The absolutely necessary Śobhā without which there is no Kāvya, is by Guṇa. Thus Guṇas are in all Kāvyas. The connection between Kāvya and Guṇa is eternal. पूर्वे नित्याः। Guṇas are therefore Nitya, niyataśobhākara dharma. Alaṁkāras are Anitya since they are for additional beauty only and they may or may not be introduced. They are Śobhātiśayahetus. By themselves, they do not beautify poetry. कैवल्ये तेषाम् अकाव्यशोभाकरत्वात्. It is implied here that Guṇas subsist in Kāvya through inherence (Samavāyasambandha) and Alaṁkāras exist simply through the separable relation of Samyoga.

Thus the contribution of Vāmana to the Śāstra, besides the word Ātman, is some kind of definite distinction of Guṇas from Alaṁkāras, as also the definite classification of Guṇas as Śabda guṇas and Artha guṇas. Many fol-

lowed Vāmana's differentiation of Guṇa from Alaṁkāra. Pratīhārendurāja, commentator on Udbhaṭa, accepts it and so also Bhoja. In his definition of Kāvya, Mammaṭa may appear to subscribe to this view of Vāmana, a view which he definitely refutes in the eighth chapter. Mammaṭa defines Kāvya as Adoṣa, Saguṇa and Sālaṁkāra and adds that sometimes Kāvya may be Analaṁkāra. This means that Guṇas are of greater importance, they being invariably present, Nityasambaddha, in Kāvya. Commenting on this text, Vidyācakravartin says :

अनेन गुणालङ्कारयोर्भेदोऽप्यासूचितः। यतः शब्दार्थयोः परिस्फुटगुणयोरेव काव्यत्वम्। क्वचित्तु स्फुटालङ्कारविरहेऽपि न काव्यत्वहानिः।

Bhaṭṭa Gopāla subscribes to this same view in a longer discussion on the subject. But this does not mean that these writers, Mammaṭa and his two commentators, follow Vāmana. They are followers of Ānanda who also hold Guṇas as eternally related to Kāvya, and Alaṁkāras to be less intimately related and less important. Their agreement with Vāmana is only apparent. In the Guṇa chapter, Mammaṭa himself criticises Vāmana's Guṇālaṁkāraviveka. If Mammaṭa holds Guṇas as Nitya, it is because he holds them as 'समवायेन काव्ये अचलस्थितयः'. He holds that, in the absence of Guṇas also, Alaṁkāras may make a Kāvya. It is possible in cases of Citrakāvya. Guṇa pertains eternally only to Rasa and hence to Rasakāvya only.

Pratīhārendurāja. Pratīhārendurāja commented upon Udbhaṭa's *Kāvyālaṁkārasārasaṁgraha* and availed himself of certain opportunities to expound things not dealt with by Udbhaṭa in his small work devoted exclusively to Alaṁkāras. Pratīhārendurāja makes himself a follower of Vāmana on the question of the difference between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra, and differs from him in other respects. He is aware of the Rasa doctrine and accepts Rasa as the Ātman of poetry. He does not accept Dhvani. He says Guṇa is the eternally associated beauty of a Kāvya without which there is no Kāvya. Alaṁkāras by themselves and in the absence of Guṇas, are not only not features of beauty but they look also ugly and ludicrous, pp. 75-76.

यद्येवमिदानीं गुणैरेव कृतकृत्यत्वात् काव्यस्य अलङ्काराणां तत्र निरुपयोगता प्राप्नोति। नैवम्। गुणाहितशोभे काव्ये अलङ्काराणां शोभातिशयविधायित्वात्, लौकिकालङ्कारवत्। × × × न खलु निर्गुणे काव्ये निबध्यमानानामलङ्काराणां जरद्योषिदलङ्कारवत् शोभाविधायित्वं दृश्यते। × × × तथा काव्यालङ्काराणामपि निर्गुणे काव्ये निबध्यमानानां काव्यशोभाहेतुत्वाभावः स्वशोभाहानिश्च भवति। यदवोचद्भट्टवामनः "युवतेरिव + सदलङ्कारविकल्पकल्पनाभिः॥ यदि भवति वपुश्च्युतं गुणेभ्यः + दुर्भगत्वं, नियतमलंकरणानि संश्रयन्ते॥ × × × अत एवालंकाराणामनित्यता। गुणरहितं हि काव्यं अकाव्यमेव भवति, न त्वलङ्काररहितम्। अलङ्काराणां गुणोपजनितशोभे काव्ये शोभातिशयविधायित्वात्।

He then quotes Vāmana's Sūtra on the distinction of Guṇa and Alaṁkāra and gives instances of poetry with Guṇa only and no Alaṁkāras, from the *Amaruśataka.*

लक्ष्ये च अलङ्काररहितमपि केवलगुणसंस्क्रियमाणशब्दार्थशरीरं काव्यं दृश्यते, यथा अमरुकस्य कवेः अनि(नु)बद्धशृङ्गाररसस्यन्दी श्लोकः 'कथमपि कृतप्रत्यासत्तौ ०—॥' न खल्वत्र अलङ्कारः कश्चित्परिदृश्यते माधुर्यौजोभ्यां परिबृंहितस्य प्रसादस्य विद्यमानत्वात् काव्यरूपता। P. 76.

Prathīhārendurāja would therefore define Kāvya as Śabdārtha beautified by Guṇas. He actually does so.

"काव्यं खलु गुणसंस्कृतशब्दार्थशरीरत्वात्—" P. 75.

"मुख्यया तावद्वृत्या गुणसंस्कृतशब्दार्थशरीरमेव काव्यम्।" P. 78.

But he followed Vāmana only so far. In the number of Guṇas and the nature, he differed. In their number, he followed Ānanda by accepting only the three Guṇas Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda. He says on p. 75, Varga VI, under Kāvyaliṅga :

तथा हि गुणाः काव्यस्य माधुर्य-ओजः—प्रसाद लक्षणाः।

In his conception of the nature of these three, he differs from Ānanda. He never says that they are Rasadharmas. He says that they are the differentia of Kāvya, Kāvya being Śabdārtha beautified by Guṇa. This means that Guṇa is a Dharma of Śabda and Artha, but he says that they are to help and be in accordance with Rasas. Mādhurya is defined as was done by Ānanda, as Āhlādakatva. Ojas is not defined as Dīpti, but as Gāḍhatā, following Vāmana. Prasāda is not changed. It is said that of the three, Prasāda is the most important. The other two are in all Kāvyas but the proportion of these two will vary according to the Rasa. In a verse, Mādhurya and Ojas help Prasāda in delivering the Rasa.

तत्र माधुर्यमाह्लादकत्वम्, ओजो गाढता, प्रसादस्त्वव्यवधानेन रसाभिव्यक्त्यनुगुणता। तदेतेषां त्रयाणां गुणानां मध्यात् प्रसादस्य प्राधान्यम्। माधुर्यौजसोस्तु तत्तद्रसाभिव्यक्त्यानुगुण्येन तारतम्येन अवस्थितयोः प्रसाद एव सोपयोगता। एवं च तत्र तत्तद्रसानुगुण्येन माधुर्यौजोभ्यां तारतम्येनावस्थिताभ्याम् उपकृतो योऽसौ प्रसादात्मा रसानामव्यवधानेन प्रतीतिहेतुर्गुणः, तदुपेतशब्दार्थशरीरत्वेन काव्यस्यावस्थानात् सरसतैव भवितुमर्हति, न तु नीरसता।

He accepts Rasa as the Ātman of poetry and that Kāvya is said to live or have life, Jīvadrūpa, only by having that Ātman of Rasa. He separates Rasa, the Ātman of Kāvya, from its Śarīra which is Śabda and Artha. To this Śarīra belong the Guṇas. The Śarīra has Prasāda helped by Mādhurya and Ojas in a certain proportion and such Prasāda is the means of the manifestation of Rasa.

न खलु काव्यस्य रसानां वा अलंकार्यालंकारभावः, किन्तु आत्मशरीरभावः। रसा हि काव्यस्य आत्मत्वेन व्यवस्थिताः, शब्दार्थौ च शरीररूपतया। यथा हि आत्माधिष्ठितं शरीरं जीवतीति व्यपदिश्यते, तथा रसाधिष्ठितस्य काव्यस्य जीवद्रूपतया व्यपदेशः क्रियते। तस्माद्रसानां काव्यशरीरभूतशब्दार्थविषयतया आत्मत्वेन व्यवस्थानं, न त्वलङ्कार्यतया। रसाभिव्यक्तिश्च यथायोगं माधुर्यौजोभ्यां तारतम्येनावस्थिताभ्याम् उपबृंहितो योऽसौ प्रसादात्मा गुणः, तेन क्रियते। P. 77.

Kāvyas are thus Sarasa as contrasted with Śāstra. The Rasas are the soul and life in whose absence the Kāvya is a corpse. These Rasas are manifested by Prasāda helped by Mādhurya and Ojas. These Guṇas are invariable and permanent characteristics of Kāvya even as the Rasas, the difference being that the Guṇas pertain to the Śabdārtha, the Śarīra, of which Rasa is the soul. The Guṇas are the primary requisites without which there is no Kāvya and

Alaṁkāras may sometimes appear for giving additional beauty but they can be added only when a Kāvya is already Sarasa and Saguṇa.

Pratīhārendurāja then makes a great blunder. He says that it is because of this that drama is not Kāvya though it is Sarasa ! Kāvya has to be Sarasa and Saguṇa. Vyākaraṇa is not Kāvya because it is nīrasa, and drama because it is Nirguṇa. If however, drama also is called Kāvya, it must be through courtesy ! Perhaps he thinks here of the enacting of the drama itself, the art of Abhinaya or dramatic representation and not the text of the drama, but even that cannot be devoid of the three Guṇas.

यद्येवं गुणशून्यत्वान्नीरसे व्याकरणादौ, भरतादौ च (निर्गुणे) काव्यव्यपदेशो न प्राप्तः × × × उच्यते । मुख्यया तावद्वृत्त्या गुणसंस्कृतशब्दार्थशरीरमेव काव्यम् । गुण-रहितशब्दार्थशरीरे तु काव्यमात्रे काव्यशब्दस्य काव्यसादृश्याद् उपचारात् प्रयोगो भविष्यति ।

We are not able to understand this viewpoint of Pratīhārendurāja.

Bhoja.

As will be shown in the chapter on Alaṁkāra, Bhoja follows Vāmana on the difference between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra and quotes the two verses of Vāmana on the point. In the fifth chapter of the *S. K. Ā.*[1] he points out that like Rasāviyoga, Guṇayoga is Nitya in Kāvya as contrasted with Alaṁ-kārayoga which is Anitya.

नित्यो हि काव्ये गुणयोग इव रसादियोगः । p. 614.

कदाचिदलङ्कारयोगोऽपि त्यज्यते, न तु रसावियोगः गुणयोगश्च व्यभिचरितसंबन्धाविति ।

In chapter V, while beginning the topic of Guṇālaṁkāra saṁkara, Bhoja says that Guṇālaṁkāra saṁkara must always be there, for it is only to a sentence already having Guṇas in it that an Alaṁkāra is added.

गुणवत्येव वाक्येऽलङ्कारयोग P. 620. *S. K. Ā.*

That means that without Guṇa, Alaṁkāra has no meaning.

Again Bhoja says that certain Alaṁkāras themselves are made up of certain Guṇas. There is cause and effect relation between the two. The Rītis which are Śabdālaṁkāras are made up of or are due to various assortments of the Guṇas, Śleṣa etc.

गुणैर्हि गुणभूतैरेव अलङ्काराः प्राय आरभ्यन्ते । तद्यथा–अस्पृष्टा दोषमात्राभिः etc.

Pp. 622-3 *S. K. Ā.* P. 403, Vol. II. Mad. Ms. *Śṛ. Pra.*

Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha clearly states the distinction of Guṇa and Alaṁkāra in his commentary on the *S. K. Ā.* P. 28 Mad. Ms.

नियतो धर्मो गुणः, आगमापायी अलङ्कारः ।

Following Daṇḍin, Bhoja considers all elements of beauty in Kāvya as Alaṁkāra. That is, Bhoja has the bigger conception of Alaṁkāra as Saun-darya found at the beginning of Vāmana's work also. He, however, distin-guishes the Guṇas, as Vāmana did, by holding them to be inseparably related

1. On Doṣas, Guṇas and Alaṁkāras, the *Śṛ. Pra.* simply reproduces the *Ś. K. Ā.*

to Kāvya and to be of greater importance than Alaṁkāra. At the beginning of the Guṇa section, he says in the *S. K. Ā.*

अलंकृतमपि श्रव्यं न काव्यं गुणवर्जितम् ।
गुणयोगस्तयोर्मुख्यो गुणालङ्कारयोगयोः ॥

He says in the *Śṛ. Pra.*

'तत्र गुणोपादान–अलङ्कारयोगयोः गुणोपादानं गरीयः ।' अयमेम गुणालङ्कारयोर्विशेषः यद्गुणोपादाने नियमः, अलङ्कारयोगे तु कामचार इति । Mad. Ms. Vol. II., p. 211.

To the two verses he quotes from Vāmana on this subject युवतेरिव रूपम् and यदि भवति वपुश्च्युतम्, Bhoja adds a third of his own in which he emphasises the same idea that only when the Kāvyaśarīra has already the beauty of Guṇas can it be further beautified by the addition of Alaṁkāra.

दीर्घापाङ्गं नयनयुगलं भूषयत्यञ्जनश्रीः
तुङ्गाभोगौ प्रभवति कुचावर्चितुं हारयष्टिः ।
मध्ये क्षामे वपुषि लभते (लगति) स्थानकूर्पासलक्ष्मीः
श्रोणीबिम्बे गुरुणि रशनादाम शोभां बिभर्ति ॥

See Alaṁkāra chapter.

According to Ratneśvara's exposition, Bhoja accepts neither the Kashmerian view of Guṇas that they are three and are Rasadharmas nor Vāmana's view of Guṇa and Alaṁkāra as differing on the basis of their being Śobhāhetu and Śobhātiśayahetu respectively. The passage in Ratneśvara's *S. K. Ā Vyākhyā* is quoted in the coming section on Ratneśvara. Ratneśvara's position is curious. Bhoja accepts Ānandavardhana partially and gives in chapter V of the *S. K. Ā.*, and in chapter XI of the *Śṛ. Pra.*, a special status to the three Guṇas of Ānanda as vitally connected with the three Rasas. That apart, Bhoja formally gives the name Alaṁkāra to Guṇas and Rasas for the sake of one kind of synthesis. There is little meaning in what Ratneśvara gives as the difference between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra. The difference that the former is Mukhya and the latter Amukhya leads to Vāmana's position. Taruṇavācaspati also casts off Vāmana's distinction of Śobhāhetu and Śobhātiśayahetu but he has the feature of Mārgavibhājakatva to effectively distinguish Guṇa from Alaṁkāra. Ratneśvara has no such thing. Therefore we must conclude that though Bhoja did not use the words Śobhāhetu and Śobhā*atiśayahetu*, the words which he uses, Mukhya and Amukhya, mean the same thing and Ratneśvara is wrong and stands independent when he says that this position differs from that of Vāmana.

Bhoja classifies Guṇas into three classes, Bāhya—the Śabda guṇas, Ābhyantara—the Artha guṇas, and Vaiśeṣika guṇas or Doṣa guṇas which are cases of Doṣa turning out to be Guṇas under certain circumstances.

त्रिविधाश्च गुणाः काव्ये भवन्ति कविसंमताः ।
बाह्याश्चाभ्यन्तराश्चैव ये च वैशेषिका इति ॥
बाह्याः शब्दगुणास्तेषु चान्तरास्त्वर्थसंश्रयाः ।
वैशेषिकास्तु ते नूनं दोषत्वेऽपि हि ये गुणाः ॥ *S. K. Ā.*

In the *Śṛ. Pra.*, Bhoja adds an illustration. In a damsel, her pedigree, age, form and physical beauty are the Bāhya guṇas ; her conduct, character, artfulness, culture etc., are her Ābhyantara guṇas ; Vinaya or modesty is a Guṇa of women and Avinaya, lack of Vinaya, is a Doṣa or fault. But in courtesans, it is Avinaya that is a Guṇa even as smoke which is Doṣa elsewhere is Guṇa when it emanates from scent-wood like sandal. The last is Vaiśeṣika guṇa.

तत्र अन्ववायवयोरूपलावण्यादयो बाह्याः, शीलवैदग्ध्यमाहाभाग्यसौभाग्यादयः आन्तराः । ये तु दोषा अपि आश्रयविशेषावस्थाविशेषाद्युपाधेः गुणत्वमाश्रयन्ते ते वैशेषिकाः । यथोच्यते (छाया)—

'सामान्यसुन्दरीणां विभ्रममावहत्यविनय एव ।
धूमोद्गयः प्रज्वलितानां बहुमतः सुरभिदारूणाम् ॥'

काव्यशरीरेऽपि ते [ति] त्रिधैव । तत्र बाह्याः शब्दगुणाः, ते ह्यन्वयादिवत् बाह्यत्वेन अवभासन्ते । आन्तराः अर्थगुणाः, ते सौशील्यादिवत् विमर्शेन ज्ञायन्ते । वैशेषिका दोषगुणाः, ते हि पात्रविशेषाद्युपाधेः दोषा अपि गुणत्वेन विख्यायन्ते । *Śṛ. Pra.*, Vol. II., pp. 211-212.

The Vaiśeṣika guṇas are thus constituted into a special class and given regular treatment for the first time by Bhoja. The Vaiśeṣika guṇas of poetry are such flaws as Punarukti which becomes a Guṇa in the speech of an emotion-filled lover, in drunken state etc. Some of these Vaiśeṣika guṇas have been indicated in the Doṣa sections by earlier writers like Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Rudraṭa. Bhoja only constituted them into a class of Guṇas and gave them elaborate treatment. In chapter I Bhāmaha speaks of Doṣas ; of the Doṣa Ayuktimat, he says that making messengers of clouds, wind, moon etc., are liable to be called Ayuktimat but adds that, if the man who sent the message is mad in lovelornness, it is no fault.

यदि चोत्कण्ठया यत्तदुन्मत्त इव भाषते ।
तथा भवतु भूम्नेदं सुमेधोभिः प्रयुज्यते ॥

Bhāmaha again says that according to the particular setting, even the bad adds to the beauty.

सन्निवेशविशेषात्तु दुरुक्तमपि शोभते ।
नीलं पलाशमाबद्धमन्तराले स्रजामिव ॥
किञ्चिदाश्रयसौन्दर्याद् धत्ते शोभामसाध्वपि ।
कान्ताविलोचनन्यस्तं मलीमसमिवाञ्जनम् ॥
× × ×
अनयान्यदपि ज्ञेयं दिशा युक्तमसाध्वपि । I. 54-7.

These verses are incorporated by Bhoja in his text in the section on Vaiśeṣika Guṇas. In chapter IV, Bhāmaha speaks of Punarukta doṣa ceasing to be a Doṣa in utterances in fear, sorrow etc.

भयशोकाभ्यसूयासु हर्षविस्मययोरपि ।
यथाह गच्छ गच्छेति पुनरुक्तं न तद्विदुः ॥

Daṇḍin shows also that Doṣas become Guṇas. Of Apārtha he says :

उन्मत्तमत्तबालानामुक्तेरन्यत्र दुष्यति । *K. Ā.* III. 128.
इदमस्वस्थचित्तानामभिधानमनिन्दितम् । *K. Ā.* III. 130.

Of Vyartha :

अस्ति काचिदवस्था सा साभिषङ्गस्य चेतसः ।
यस्यां भवेदभिमता विरुद्धार्थापि भारती ॥ *K. Ā.* III. 133.

Of Punarukti :

अनुकम्पाद्यतिशयो यदि कश्चिद्विवक्ष्यते ।
न दोषः पुनरुक्तोऽपि प्रत्युतेयमलङ्क्रिया ॥ *K. Ā.* III. 137.

Of Sasaṁśaya :

ईदृशं संशयायैव यदि वातु (जातु) प्रयुज्यते ।
स्यादलङ्कार एवासौ न दोषस्तत्र तद्यथा ॥ *K. Ā.* III. 141.

Of Apakrama :

यत्नसंबन्धविज्ञानहेतुकोऽपि कृतो यदि ।
क्रमलङ्घनमप्याहुः सूरयो नैव दूषणम् ॥ *K. Ā.* 146.

And finally Daṇḍin says that, by the powers of the poet, all these flaws will cease to be such and be utilised as Guṇas.

विरोधस्सकलोऽप्येष कदाचित्कविकौशलात् ।
उत्क्रम्य दोषगणनां गुणवीथीं विगाहते ॥ *K. Ā.* III. 179.

Rudraṭa ends his section of Doṣas with the same idea :

अनुकरणभावमविकलमसमर्थादि स्वरूपतो गच्छन् ।
न भवति दुष्टमतादृक् विपरीतक्लिष्टवर्ण च ॥ VII. 47.

Ānandavardhana has pointed out that Śrutiduṣṭa and other Doṣas are by nature Anitya, in Uddyotas II and III and Abhinava has fully explained this doctrine of the Anityatva of Doṣa. Abhinava has fully explained this in his commentary on the Doṣaprakaraṇa in chapter XXVII of Nāṭyaśāstra, where he shows how Doṣas are Anitya and how the Doṣas become Guṇas sometimes. *Abhī. Bhā.* Vol. II. Mad. Ms. pp. 409-410 & 420. This has been explained in the Doṣa chapter in this thesis and in my paper on Aucitya also. It is Aucitya that lies at the basis of this principle of Anityatva of Doṣa. The *Sāhityadarpaṇa* is the one later work which treats of this topic of the Vaiśeṣika guṇa of Bhoja. It says :

अनुकारे च सर्वेषां दोषानां नैव दोषता । VII. 32.
अन्येषामपि दोषाणामित्यौचित्यान्मनीषिभिः ।
अदोषता च गुणता ज्ञेया चानुभयात्मता ॥ VII. 31.

Bhoja takes all that Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Rudraṭa have said upon this subject and adds much more. He shows all the Doṣas, of Pada, Padārtha and Vākyārtha becoming Guṇas, each with a definition and illustration.

Bhoja gives 24 Śabdaguṇas which are taken also as the 24 Arthaguṇas. Of these, ten are the old ones in Daṇḍin and Vāmana. In the definitions of these, once as Śabdaguṇa and again as Arthaguṇa, Bhoja combines Daṇḍin and Vāmana. Some of his new Guṇas, Bhoja creates out of the definitions of these ten Guṇas themselves in Daṇḍin and Vāmana. For instance,

Bhoja casts away Vāmana's idea of Śabdasamādhi as Ārohāvaroha, only to take it as the new Guṇa called Gati. This we shall see by and by.

The following are the 24 Guṇas given by Bhoja :

Śleṣa, Prasāda, Samatā, Mādhurya, Sukumāratā, Arthavyakti, Kānti, Udāratva, Udāttatā, Ojas, Aurjitya, Preyas, Suśabdatā, Samādhi, Saukṣmya, Gāmbhīrya, Vistara, Saṅkṣepa, Sammitatva, Bhāvikatva, Gati, Rīti, Ukti and Praudhi.

Śabdaguṇas.

Śleṣa : Vāmana is followed.

Prasāda : Vāmana's clumsy notion of Śabdaprasāda as Śaithilya co-existent with Ojas is cast away by Bhoja and Daṇḍin's definition of Prasāda as 'Prasiddhārtha' is followed.

Samatā : Daṇḍin is followed.

Mādhurya : Daṇḍin's conception of Mādhurya as Anuprāsa of an agreeable variety and as Agrāmyatā is abandoned and Vāmana's idea of Śabdamādhurya as Pṛthakpadatā is accepted.

Sukumāratā : Daṇḍin is followed. Vāmana's Śabdasukumāratā agrees with this. The illustration given by Daṇḍin is taken by Bhoja.

Arthavyakti : Daṇḍin is followed.

Kānti : Vāmana is followed. Daṇḍin does not have an aspect of Kānti which can be related to Śabda. Hence Bhoja resorts to Vāmana. This principle Bhoja follows throughout.

Audārya : Vāmana's description of it as Vikaṭatva and the dance of words is taken by Bhoja.

Udāttatā : Udāttatā and Udāratā are identical in Daṇḍin, and Vāmana did not have two such Guṇas. Bhōja makes two Guṇas out of the two synonyms, gives the former according to Vāmana and the latter according to Daṇḍin. In Daṇḍin himself, there are two kinds of Udāratā, Utkṛṣṭaguṇapratīti and Ślāghyaviśeṣaṇayoga. The latter can be related to Śabda and Bhoja takes it as the Śabdaguṇa of Udāttatā. As we shall see presently, the other Udāratā in Daṇḍin is utilised by Bhoja for defining the Udāratā and Udāttatā of Artha.

Ojas : Daṇḍin's Ojas which is Samāsabhūyastva is taken.

Aurjitya : Having followed Daṇḍin on Ojas, Bhoja creates this Guṇa of Aurjitya defined as Gāḍhabandhatva out of Vāmana's Ojas of Śabda. This is another way by which Bhoja creates new Guṇas.

Preyas : This is an altogether new Guṇa of Bhoja. It is defined as follows : प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानं चाटूक्तौ यद्विधीयते। It is the use of words expressing love. It is said to occur in Cāṭus. The definition consists of what Daṇḍin said of his Preyolaṁkāra. It is not easy to understand how Bhoja included it among the Guṇas.

Suśabdatā : This is the old Sauśabdya ; Suptiṅ vyutpatti. This is made a Guṇa for the first time. See Alaṁkāra chapter.

Samādhi : Vāmana neglected Daṇḍin's Samādhi, Anyadharmāropa ; he gave a new idea, Ārohāvaroha, to define Śabdasamādhi, Daṇḍin is followed by Bhoja and Śabdasamādhi is given by Bhoja as Anyadharmāropa.

Saukṣmya : This is another altogether new Guṇa of Bhoja. It is defined as follows :

अन्तस्सज्जल्परूपत्वं शब्दानां सौक्ष्म्यमुच्यते ।

We can gather from the illustration and Bhoja's comments thereon that this Guṇa means an expression meaning one thing on the surface and having within an idea of a different nature. Ratneśvara illustrates this Guṇa by comparing it to the stone in which the form of horse, elephant etc. which the sculptor is going to draw out is in Sūkṣmāvasthā.

Gāmbhīrya : This again is a new Guṇa of Bhoja. It is an expression having Dhvani. Bhoja defines this as ध्वनिमत्ता तु गाम्भीर्यम् । Dhvani is made here a Guṇa. It must be noted how it is made a Śabda guṇa. In his comments, Ratneśvara gives Bhoja's classification of Dhvani into Śabda dhvāni and Artha dhvani in his *Śṛ. Pra.*

Vistara : This is also a new Guṇa of Bhoja. Bhoja defines it as high-flown expression.

व्यासेनोक्तिस्तु विस्तरः । Bhoja.

यत्र स्तोकेऽपि वाच्ये वचनपल्लवश्चमत्कारकारी तत्र स एव गुणकक्षाधिरोहणक्षम इति शब्दगुणेषु युक्तो विवेक्तुम् । Ratneśvara.

This is the same as a variety of Vāmana's Arthaguṇa or Ojas, the expression of a word in a sentence, पर्ये वाक्यवचनम् . Ratneśvara says so :

एतेन पदार्थे वाक्यरचनमिति यदन्यैर्गुणान्तरमभिहितं तद्विस्तारमेकमेव । p. 57.

Ratneśvara also mentions here that it is this that is called Pallava. It is then not different from the Padakṛtā variety of Bhoja's Śabdālaṁkāra called Racanā, under which also Ratneśvara refers to Pallava and quotes from some writer the following two Anuṣṭubhs on it :

न वा तामन्तरेण लाकूलादीनामभिमतास्ते ते विशेषाः प्रतीयन्त इति पल्लवप्रतिष्ठैव हि सरस्वती सहृदयानावर्जयतीति—

'वाक्यप्रतीतिमात्रार्थमुपात्तेषु पदेषु यः ।
उपस्कारः पदैरन्यैः पल्लवं तं प्रचक्षते ॥
अपल्लवं तु यद्वाक्यं कविभ्यस्तन्न रोचते ।
प्रयुज्यते तथाभूतमुदीच्यैः कविगर्हितम् ॥ p. 157.

Under Vivakṣā in his *Śṛ. Pra.* (Chap. VII) Bhoja has a verse which refers to this Guṇa of Vistara as well as the Guṇas of Samkṣepa and Sammitatva.

क्वचित्स्वल्पेऽप्यर्थे प्रचुरवचनैरेव रचना
क्वचिद्वस्तु स्फारं कतिपयपदैरर्पितरसम् ।
यथावाच्यं शब्दाः क्वचिदपि तुलायामिव धृताः
त्रिभिः कल्पैरेवं कविवृषभसन्दर्भनियमः ॥

Samkṣepa : This new Guṇa of Bhoja is the opposite of Vistara. It is brief or condensed expression and corresponds to what Vāmana says is a variety of the Prauḍhi which is the Arthaguṇa of Ojas. 'Vākyārthe ca padābhidhā'. Bhāmaha has an idea similar to this Samkṣepa or condensed expression towards the end of chapter V.

कथमेकपदेनैव व्यज्येरन्नस्य ते गुणाः ।
इति प्रयुञ्जते सन्तः केचिद्विस्तरभीरवः ॥ Śl. 60.

Sammitatva : This is another new Guṇa of Bhoja. This is neither Vistara nor Samkṣepa. It is equal expression. This Guṇa means more. It is the 'mutual commensurateness' of Śabda and Artha, which writers have called Śabdārtha Sāhitya, Śabdārtha Sauhārda, Śabdārtha Saubhrātra and Vāgartha Pratipatti. I have dealt with this Sammitatva of Bhoja in the chapter on Sāhitya. Bhoja defines and explains it thus :

यावदर्थपदत्त्वं च संमितत्वमुदाहृतम् ।
अत्र अर्थस्य पदानां च तुलाधृतवत्तुल्यत्वेन संमितत्वम् ।

Bhāvikatva : This is a Vākya-guṇa for the first time in Bhoja, who defines it as follows :

भावतो वाक्यवृत्तिर्या भाविकं तदुदाहृतम् ।

This Guṇa is related to Bhāva and Rasa and will be examined in the Rasa section. Ratneśvara takes it as the expressional flux of emotional tide.

हर्षादिभावितचेतसो हि वीचिप्राया उक्तिभेदाः प्रादुर्भवन्ति × × × । × × × प्रवर्तन्ते हि लौकिकानां स्नेहार्थानामुत्कलिकाप्राया वाचः, स्वदन्ते च । यथा–इयं गेहे लक्ष्मीः pp. 58-9.

Gati : This is Ārohāvaroha, Vāmana's Śabda samādhi. It must be noted that Bhoja also illustrates it by a Śikhariṇī verse. Ratneśvara says here that some take this Ārohāvaroha as a metrical quality and that it must be taken as the quality of the 'Svaras' and Bhoja himself says : अत्र पूर्वार्धे स्वरस्यारोहादुत्तरार्धे चावरोहादृतिः । But the difference between the two Ardhas is not plain. Ratneśvara adds that one must feel this Guṇa in the verses, that this is an 'Ānubhavika guṇa' : सोऽयमानुभविको गुणः । p. 59.

Rīti : This new Guṇa of Bhoja is Prakrama nirvāha whose absence is the flaw called Prakrama bhaṅga.

उपक्रमस्य निर्वाहो रीतिरित्यभिधीयते ।
अत्र प्रत्येकपदानन्तरं नव्यो विनिवेशात्क्रमाभेदो रीतिः ।

This is a Guṇa or a feature of beauty only sometimes. If stuck to and carried out to a length, it becomes monotonous and unbearable. Ratneśvara rightly points out :

— क्वचिच्छोभावहो भवति । अत एवात्र नात्यन्तनिर्वाहोऽभिमतः । p. 60.

Ukti : Another new Guṇa of Bhoja. I have examined all the concepts in Bhoja called Ukti in the chapter on Ukti. This is not any particularised

Guṇa of restricted scope ; it stands for charming poetic expression itself. Bhoja's definition tries to narrow it but fails to do so and Ratneśvara is plain that it means the peculiar expression of a thousand varieties which are the creations of the poetic genius.

लोकोत्तरास्सन्ति हि भणितिप्रकाराः लोकप्रसिद्धाः । × × एतत्प्रसिद्धिव्यतिक्रमेण तु या काचित्कविप्रतिभया भणितिराकृष्यते सा भवति लोकोत्तरा । × × × कविसहृदयानामेव तादृशोक्तिपरिचयसंभवात् । p. 60.

Praudhi : This is the last new Guṇa of Bhoja. It was seen at the beginning of this section that Bhavabhūti and Yaśovarman mentioned Praudhi. Vāmana gives Praudhi as the Artha guṇa Ojas. Bhoja makes it the well-known Pāka, Nālikera pāka, Mṛdvīkā pāka etc. Ratneśvara quotes here Vāmana's verse on Pāka as the unalterability of the words. One cannot meddle with the poet's expression and try to substitute other words in the place of some. A poet should write in such a manner that those words alone which he has used there are effective and none else. Ratneśvara says :

उक्तेर्वाक्यस्यायं पाकः सा प्रौढिः । शब्दानां पर्यायपरिवर्तासहत्वं पाकः । यदाह–'यत्पदानि त्यजन्त्येव परिवृत्तिसहिष्णुताम् । तं शब्दन्यायनिष्णाताः शब्दपाकं प्रचक्षते ॥' इति

Vāmana. p. 32, Vanivilas ed.

× × × ×

भवति हि सहृदयानामेवमन्यत्पदं नास्तीति व्यवहारः । Pp. 61-62. *Ibid.*

Arthaguṇas :

Śleṣa : This is Vāmana's Arthaśleṣa. While Vāmana describes it as Ghaṭanā and Karma-Kauṭilya-anulbaṇatva-upapattiyoga, Bhoja says : तेषां श्लेष इति प्रोक्तः संविधाने सुसूत्रता. Bhoja means the same thing as Vāmana as his illustration (which is the same as that given by Vāmana) and remarks on it show. Ratneśvara expressly relates Bhoja and Vāmana in his comments on this Guṇa.

'घटना श्लेषः' इति सूत्रयित्वा क्रम–कौटिल्य–अनुल्बणत्वोपपत्तियोगः घटनेति वामनेन व्याख्यातम् । अस्यार्थः—इदं कृत्वा इदं कर्तव्यमिति क्रमः । तत्रैव कौटिल्यं लोकातिगामिनी वक्रता । अवक्रयोः शब्दार्थयोः वचनमात्रत्वात् । अतिमात्रतया प्रतिभासाभावः अनुल्बणत्वम् । कथमेवमर्थः सङ्गच्छत इत्यनुपपत्तिसमाधानौपयिकविशेषनिवेशनमुपपत्तिः । तथा च क्रमेण कौटिल्येन अनुल्बणतया उपपत्त्या योजनमर्थस्य श्लेष इति । तत्र संविधानक्रमानुल्बणत्वे [न] सूत्रशब्देनोपात्ते ; स्वपदेन (सुपदेन ?) कौटिल्यमुक्तम् । अघटमानस्येव वाक्यार्थस्य बुद्धिचातुर्येण घटनेति वाक्यार्थः । p. 63.

Prasāda : Arthaprākaṭya. From the illustrative verse and Bhoja's comments thereon, it is clear that this is altogether a new idea of Bhoja. The illustration is a description of the Sun. But the Sun itself is not mentioned in it. Several Viśeṣaṇas describing the various conditions associated with the rising sun are described and from this it is very clear that the Sun is described.

—अनुक्तोऽपि सूर्यलक्षणोऽर्थः प्रकटमुपलक्ष्यते ।

Samatva : This is the Guṇa of observing the natural order of things as found in the world while describing them ; this follows Vāmana. When this order is not observed, the Doṣa of Kramabhaṅga results.

Mādhurya : This is also a new conception of Bhoja. Bhoja defines it as sweet-temperedness or mildness even in anger.

माधुर्यमुक्तमाचार्यैः क्रोधादावप्यतीव्रता ।

This has nothing to do with Vāmana's Arthamādhurya which is Ukti vaicitrya. The Mādhurya spoken of by Bhoja is more a Guṇa of the Nāyaka or the Nāyikā to be treated under Sāmānyābhinaya. Bharata has this same Mādhurya in that place in his *Nāṭyaśāstra.*

सर्वावस्थाविशेषेषु दीप्तेषु ललितेषु च ।
अनुल्बणत्वं चेष्टायां माधुर्यमिति कीर्तितम् ॥ XXIV. 27.

Saukumārya : This is almost similar to that of Vāmana, Apāruṣya. Bhoja gives it as Aniṣṭhuratva.

Arthavyakti : Same as in Vāmana. For further discussion on Arthavyakti, see section on Bhoja and Svabhāvokti.

Kānti : Same as in Vāmana.

Udāratā and Udāttatā : Bhoja defines the two as follows :

भूत्युत्कर्ष उदारता ।
आशयस्य य उत्कर्षस्तदुदात्तत्वमिष्यते ।

This is the Udātta alaṁkāra as described by Daṇḍin in II. 300.

Ojas : Vāmana is abandoned here and Bhoja gives his own original Ojas here. Its significance is not clear at all, the commentary giving us as little help as the text.

Aurjitya : Bhoja defines it as 'Rūḍhāhaṁkāratā'.

The definition is what Daṇḍin gave for Ūrjasvi alaṁkāra. Bhoja refers here to the dignified attitude of great persons, who refer to themselves with an exalted 'We'. (एते वयम्)

Preyas : प्रेयस्त्वर्थेष्वभीष्टता ।

Nothing more is clear here except that this is expression emanating from love.

Suśabdatā : This is Vāmana's Saukumārya of Artha, and is only the roundabout way of saying unpleasant things. E.g., saying Yaśaśśeṣa for Mṛta ; Dīrghanidrā for death and so on.

Samādhi : This has nothing to do with Vāmana's 'Arthadṛṣṭi'. Bhoja defines it as artfulness and exhibiting one's feeling artfully by adopting some pretext.

व्याजावलम्बनं यत्तु स समाधिरिति स्मृतः ।

This again is hardly any definite Guṇa of expression. Bhoja illustrates it with the verse in *Śākuntala* दर्भाङ्कुरेण चरणः etc.

Saukṣmya : This is the presence of some subtle meaning in expression. This seems to be a case of Dhvani of Vastu or Rasādi.

'सौक्ष्म्यमित्युच्यते तत्तु यत्सूक्ष्मार्थाभिदर्शनम् ।'

'अत्र × × दंपत्योरनुरागलक्षणस्य सूक्ष्मार्थस्य दर्शनात्सौक्ष्म्यम् ।'

Ratneśvara '× × व्यतिरेकरूपकिलकिञ्चिताख्यश्रृङ्गारभावोन्मेषः ।'

Gāmbhīrya : This is expression containing technical ideas pertaining to Śāstras. शास्त्रार्थसव्यपेक्षत्वं गाम्भीर्यमभिधीयते ।

Vistara : विस्तरोऽर्थविकाशः स्यात् ।
This is 'elaboration.'

Samkṣepa : This is summing up in a few words.

Sammitatva : This looks like the Śabda guṇa of that name, but Bhoja's illustration and explanation of it make its meaning very much restricted. The illustrative verse cited by Bhoja describes Śiva having the sickle-moon on his head and Pārvatī having Śiva's nail-print on her bosom ; these two, the sickle-moon and the nail-print together make the letter of the Praṇava, and it is appropriate that the two parts of the Praṇava are on the two centres of meditation, the Brahmarandhra and the heart ; this equal and proper apportioning of the Praṇava is the Artha guṇa of Sammitatva !

Bhāvikatva : This is Vyājokti and the illustration is the artful utterance of a loose woman who, while going astray, misleads her husband into the belief that she was going for some legitimate purpose such as bringing water. As a Guṇa, this again is unintelligible. This is nothing but Rudraṭa's Bhāvālaṁkāra.

Gati : गतिस्सा स्यादवगमो योऽर्थादर्थान्तरस्य तु ।
This is clearly a case of Dhvani. In explaining it, Ratneśvara uses the comparison of the resonance of bronze, Anusvānadhvani.

Rīti : This is also another kind of Krama, observing the order of things found in nature.

Ukti : This is another kind of Bhaṅgi bhaṇiti. This is merely Vakratā or Vaicitrya and no definite Guṇa is perceptible here.

Prauḍhi : In the definition, this is the writer's successful expression of the idea which he undertakes to convey. In his comments however, Bhoja comes round to one of the varieties of the Prauḍhi given by Vāmana as the Arthaguṇa of Ojas. It is the expression of a large mass of ideas in the smallest number of words possible. Ratneśvara says :

कवेरभिमतस्य भूयसोऽप्यर्थस्य स्वल्पेनैव वाक्येन प्रतिपादनम् प्रौढिः । × × इत्यादिको भूयानर्थः स्तोकेन वाक्येनोपनीत इति । p. 74.

Of these Guṇas of Śabda and Artha, Bhoja has attached some importance to the ten Guṇas of old. One of his Vākya doṣas is called Arītimat and it is defined as the reverse of the nine Guṇas, Śleṣa etc., Śleṣādi nava guṇa viparyaya. Samādhi is omitted here.

गुणानां दृश्यते यत्र श्लेषादीनां विपर्ययः ।
अरीतिमदिति प्राहुः तत् त्रिधैव प्रचक्षते ।
शब्दार्थोभययोगस्य प्राधान्यात्प्रथमं त्रिधा ॥ *S. K. Ā.* I. 28-29.

Bhoja defines the Viparyaya of each and illustrates. These nine guṇas are classified into three sets, those of Śabda, of Artha and of both. Śleṣa, Samatā and Saukumārya belong to Śabda ; their Viparyayas also pertain to Śabda ; Kānti, Prasāda and Arthavyakti belong to Artha. Ojas, Mādhurya and Audārya belong to both Śabda and Artha. The following table shows the Guṇas and their Viparyayas.

Śleṣa × Śaithilya ; Samatā × Vaiṣamya ; Saukumārya × Kaṭhoratva ; Prasāda × Aprasannatā ; Arthavyakti × Neyārthatva ; Kānti × Grāmyatva. Ojas × Asamastatā ; Mādhurya × Anirvyūḍhatva ; Audārya × Niralaṁkāra. Most of the matter in this section is taken from chapter I of the *Kāvyādarśa* of Daṇḍin. The illustration of the unpronounceable, Kaṭhora or Kṛcchrodya, is not from Daṇḍin but from Bhāmaha, I. 46. Daṇḍin's Mādhuryaviparyaya, Grāmya, is given by Bhoja as the Viparyaya of Kānti. Daṇḍin, for no good reason, I. 59, which illustrates Bandhapāruṣya and Śaithilya through bad Anuprāsa as pointed out by Daṇḍin in I. 60 is completely taken over by Bhoja but given as the Viparyaya of Ojas. Bhoja gives it so because it is the uncompounded nature, Samāsābhāva, that is responsible for the bad effect of the verse. Bhoja's Mādhurya viparyaya is the absence of his own Guṇa Rīti and has no basis in Daṇḍin. Though without much meaning, Bhoja reproduces here Daṇḍin's two verses on Mādhurya in general and on Anuprāsa mādhurya. Bhoja gives the two verses of Daṇḍin on Udāratā and interprets them in his own way. He says that description of things must be either beautiful in wording or in the portrayal of some charming aspect of the thing. If neither is present, the expression is bald and has no charm ; it is Niralaṁkāra, the Viparyāya of Audārya. This is not to be traced in Daṇḍin.

The third class of Guṇas in Bhoja are the Vaiśeṣika Guṇas or Doṣa guṇas of which I have spoken already. See Doṣa chapter and my paper on Aucitya. See the above chapter on Bhoja and Aucitya also.

There is a work called *Śṛṅgāra sāra* in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS Library, written by one Veṅkaṭanārāyana Dīkṣita. The work dates after Vidyānātha from whom, besides many others, it borrows. This work does not treat of the Guṇas,—Śleṣa etc. though it mentions the Komalā Rīti, otherwise called the Vaidarbhī, as "Daśaprāṇa samanvitā." It has a small section on Guṇas but here the work deals with only the Vaiśeṣika guṇas of Bhoja, those Doṣas which become Guṇas according to the principle of Aucitya. (Mad. MS. R. 12958. 23. 3. 16).

Bahurūpamiśra, author of a commentary on the *Daśarūpaka* (Mad. MS. R. 3670 & R. 4188) follows Bhoja on Guṇas. He gives the three classes of Guṇas of Bhoja and all the Guṇas of the three classes as given by Bhoja. (P. 105 R. 4188).

तत्र त्रिविधा गुणाः शब्दगुणाः, अर्थगुणाः, वैशेषिकगुणाश्चेति। × × ये स्वतो दोषास्सन्तोऽपि विषयवशेन रसानुगुण्येन वा गुणत्वं भजन्ते, ते वैशेषिका गुणा इति। तत्र भरतमुनिना दश गुणा उद्दिष्टाः × × भोजेन अन्ये गुणाश्चतुर्दश उक्ताः।

At the end, Bahurūpa gives Bhoja's view also, that Guṇas are also Alaṁkāra, Alaṁkāra of the class called Svabhāvokti. See Alaṁkāra chapter and my paper on Bahurūpamiśra's Daśarūpaka vyākhyā. *JOR.*, Madras Vol. VIII. pp. 324-5.

Acyuta rāya, a recent writer and author of *Sāhityasāra,* published by the Nirnaya Sagar Press, accepts only three Guṇas, the three of Ānanda, mentions the additional Guṇas of Bhoja found in the *S. K. Ā.* and shows how all of them can be brought under these three Guṇas or cases of Dhvani or Alaṁkāra. (Chap. VII. sls. 198-208).

Both in the *S. K. Ā.* and the *Śr. Pra.* Bhoja makes, with reference to the samsṛṣti of Guṇas, a classification of the three classes of Guṇas into Sollekha and Nirullekha. See *S. K. Ā. V.* pp. 614-615. He does not explain this classification and its meaning can be made out from Bhoja using these expressions 'Ullekha' and 'Anullekha' during his treatment of the Śabdālaṁkāra yamaka in ch. II. *S. K. Ā.*, pp. 173-4. Both Ratneśvara and Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha explain 'Ullekhin' as "standing out prominently" and 'Anullekha' as being the opposite. My attention to this explanation was drawn by Mm. Prof. S. K. SASTRI.

It was noted above, how under the Doṣa Arītimat, Bhoja speaks specially of nine of the ten old Guṇas, omitting Samādhi. He seems to place them on a special footing by that treatment. In a similar manner Bhoja separates the three Guṇas of Ānanda, Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda and subscribes also to Ānanda's view of Guṇa, in his own way. Though apparently a big plodding compiler, Bhoja does disclose some critical faculty when we examine him minutely. His big list of 24 Guṇas, he classifies into three classes, two of which are intimately, inseparably and inevitably associated with Rasas and the third is purely of Śabda and Artha, a viewpoint which, we saw above, Abhinava put forward in his Abhinavabhāratī. The first two classes are Rasārambhaka and Rasa bhāva-ārabdha, manifesting Rasa and manifested by Rasa or Bhāva. Speaking of the Saṁkara of Guṇas with Rasas in a verse, Bhoja says that one can talk of a poet combining the two only in the cases of the third set of Guṇas which he introduces specially and not in the cases of the first two which come into being along with the Rasas and at once. They are 'Apṛthag yatna nirvartya,' while the third set of Guṇas is 'Pṛthag yatna nirvartya.' Bhoja says :

यत्र × × अपृथग्यत्ननिर्वर्त्यानां गुणरसानां वाक्ये सन्निवेशः तत्र सङ्करव्यवहारो न प्रवर्तते। तद्यथा—

मधुरं रसवद् वाचि वस्तुन्यपि रसस्थितिः।
येन मायन्ति कवयः मधुनेव मधुव्रताः॥
कामं सर्वोऽप्यलङ्कारो रसमर्थं निषिञ्चतु।
तथाप्यग्राम्यतैवैनं भारं वहति भूयसा॥(Both from Daṇḍin, I. 51 & 62.)

शृङ्गार एव मधुरः परः प्रह्लादनो रसः ।
तन्मयं काव्यमाश्रित्य माधुर्यं प्रतितिष्ठति ॥
शृङ्गारे विप्रलम्भाख्ये करुणे च प्रकर्षवत् ।
माधुर्यमार्द्रतां याति यतस्तत्राधिकं मनः ॥

रौद्रादयो रसा दीप्त्या लक्ष्यन्ते काव्यवर्तिनः ।
तद्व्यक्तिहेतू शब्दार्थावोजोऽधिष्ठाय तिष्ठति ॥
समर्पकत्वं काव्यस्य यत्तु सर्वरसान्प्रति ।
स प्रसादो गुणो ज्ञेयः सर्वसाधारणक्रियः ॥ (Ānandavardhana, II. 8-11).

सेयं गुणानां रसारम्भकत्वे सङ्गराप्रसिद्धिः । एवं रसानां गुणारंभकत्वेऽपि । तद्यथा-रूढाहंकारता और्जित्यम्, भावतो वाक्यवृत्तिर्भाविकत्वम्, क्रोधादावप्यतीव्रता माधुर्यम्, आशयोत्कर्ष उदात्तत्वम्, अर्थस्य अभीष्टतमता प्रेयः, दीप्तरसत्वं कान्तिः इति । (Pp. 628-9, *S. K. Ā.* This text is produced in the *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II, pp. 397-9).

Here Bhoja follows Ānanda completely, incorporating his verses into his own text. Only Bhoja adds to Ānanda's Mādhurya, Daṇḍin's Agrāmyatā mādhurya. Agrāmyatā has been emphasised by Bhoja often and there can be no poetry devoid of it ; hence there is no place where Agrāmyatā mādhurya is not present. Similarly, Mādhurya is the Guṇa of the two aspects of Śṛṅgāra and the Karuṇa Rasas and it cannot have a separate existence from them. Ojas is similarly fused with Raudra and such other Rasas. Prasāda, like Agrāmyatā mādhurya, must exist everywhere, along with every Rasa. Without it, there is no realisation of Rasa. Thus there can be no talk of Saṁkara between these Rasas and these three Guṇas ; and there is no Saṁkaravyavahāra for Agrāmyatā Mādhurya and Prasāda in any part of Kāvya. These are Rasārambhaka or Rasa-manifesting Guṇas.

There is the second set of Guṇas which are invariably and inevitably manifested as a consequence of certain Rasas, Rasārabdha. These are Aurjitya which is 'Rūḍhāhaṁkāratā,' Bhāvika which is a case of Bhāva, Mādhurya which is softness in expression even in a stress of anger, dignity of mind which is Udāttatva, Preyas which is love for an object and Kānti which is Rasa guṇa pre-eminently, 'Dīpta rasatva.' These also are 'Apṛthag yatna niṣpanna' and do not have Saṁkara. That is, they are not said to be mixed or combined with Rasas.

Bhojas Prabandha guṇas.

The concept of Guṇa is taken by Bhoja not only with Śabda and Artha in a Vākya, but also with Śabda and Artha in a Prabandha as a whole. Rasāviyoga or the eternal presence of a Rasa in a poetic composition as a whole is secured by the same means as Rasāviyoga by avoiding Doṣas, and by securing Guṇas and Alaṁkāras, in the Prabandha. Thus, there are two sets of Doṣas, Guṇas and Alaṁkāras, those of the Vākya and those of the Prabandha. The changing or the modifying of the original story to suit the Rasa is the Doṣahāna of Prabandha. What are the Guṇas of Prabandha ?

Bhoja says on p. 411 of the *Śṛ. Pra.*

गुणोपादानं तु वक्ष्यमाणप्रबन्धभेदानां सम्यक्श्लक्ष्णयोगेन **संविधानसुसूत्रता** ।
Vol. II. Mad. Ms. Chap. XI.

After describing the different kinds of work, the many varieties of drama and poetic composition, Bhoja comes again to the topic of Prabandha guṇa on p. 430. The Guṇas of the Prabandha are of three classes, of Śabda, of Artha and of both. Bhoja enumerates them and then defines each and gives illustrations.

तत्र महाकाव्यादौ यथासंभवम् (अ)संक्षिप्तग्रन्थत्वम्, अविषमबन्धत्वम्, (श्रव्यवृत्तत्वम्), अनतिविस्तीर्णसर्गादित्वम्, श्लिष्टसन्धित्वं चेति शब्दगुणाः ।

चतुर्वर्गफलायत्तत्वम्, चतुरोदात्तनायकत्वम्, रसभावनिरन्तरत्वम्, विधिनिषेधव्युत्पादकत्वम्, सुसूत्रसंविधानकत्वमित्यर्थगुणाः ।

रसानुरूपसन्दर्भत्वम्, पात्रानुरूपभाषत्वम् अर्थानुरूपच्छन्दस्त्वम्, समस्तलोकरञ्जकत्वम्, सदलङ्कारवाक्यत्वम् इत्युभयगुणाः । (*Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II, pp. 430-1).

The explanation of each of these Guṇas follows :

तत्र असंक्षिप्तग्रन्थत्वमित्यनेन ग्रन्थगौरवमाचक्षाणः कथारसविच्छेदशङ्किनां मनांस्यावर्जयति। अविषमबन्धत्वमित्यनेन शब्दसन्दर्भवेदिनां मनोमुदमादधाति । श्रव्यवृत्तत्वमित्यनेन यद्यपि पद्यभेदत्वान्महाकाव्यादेः सर्वापि चतुष्पदी समाकृष्टा, तथापि यान्येव श्रुतिसुखमुपजनयन्ति वृत्तानि तान्येन निबन्धनीयानीति दर्शयन् श्रोतृजनं प्रोत्साहयति । अनतिविस्तीर्णसर्गादित्वमित्यनेन ग्रन्थविस्तरभीरूणां चित्तमाकर्षयति । सुश्लिष्टसन्धित्वमित्यनेन तु सर्गादीनां परस्परमेकवाक्यतया महावाक्यात्मकस्य प्रबन्धस्योपकारित्वं दर्शयति ।

चतुर्वर्गफलायत्तत्वमित्यनेन चत्वारो वर्गा धर्मार्थकाममोक्षाः त एव व्यस्तास्समस्ता वा फलम्, तत्सन्धानोपायविषयं महाकाव्यादीति ज्ञापयन् मुक्तकादिभ्यो भेदमाचष्टे । चतुरोदात्तनायकत्वमित्यनेन कथाशरीरव्यापिनः नायकस्य धर्मार्थकाममोक्षेषु वैचक्षण्यमभिदधानः आशयविभूत्योरुत्कर्षमभिदधाति । रसभावनिरन्तरत्वमित्यनेन रसग्रहणेनापि तत्कारणभूतानां भावानां परिग्रहे, पृथग्भावग्रहणेन रसभावानां परस्परं कार्यकारणभावमभिदधत्, रसेभ्यो भावाः, भावेभ्यो रसाः, रसेभ्यश्च रसा इति नैरन्तर्यस्य रसभाव-(बहुलत्व साध्यत्वेन) भोजनस्यै (स्ये) व एकरसस्य प्रबन्धस्यापि वैरस्यमपाकरोतीति । विधिनिषेधव्युत्पादकत्वेन तु गुणवतो नायकस्य उत्कर्षप्रकाशनेन दोषवतश्चोच्छेदप्रदर्शनेन जिगीषुणा गुणवतैव भाव्यम्, न दोषवतेति व्युत्पादयति । सुसूत्रसंविधानकमित्यनेन प्रोक्तलक्षणा वक्ष्यमाणलक्षणाश्च पदार्थास्तथा निबन्धनीयाः यथा प्रबन्धस्य शोभायै भवन्तीति कवीन् शिक्षयति ।

रसानुरूपसन्दर्भत्वमित्यनेन रतिप्रकर्षे कोमलः, उत्साहप्रकर्षे प्रौढः, क्रोधप्रकर्षे कठोरः, शोकप्रकर्षे मृदुः, विस्मयप्रकर्षे तु स्फुटः शब्दसन्दर्भो विरचनीयः इत्युपदिशन् "नैकमोजः प्रसादो वा रसभावविदः कवेः" (Māgha, II. 83) इति ख्यापयति । पात्रानुरूपभाषत्वमित्यनेन उत्तमपात्राणि संस्कृतेन, उत्तमाधमानि प्राकृतेन, मध्यमानि शौरसेन्या, जघन्यान्यपभ्रंशेन, तदपराणि मागधिकया भाषन्त इति ज्ञापयन् भिन्नभाषेषु भाषाचित्राणामवकाशं ददाति । अर्थानुरूपच्छन्दस्त्वमित्यनेन शृङ्गारे द्रुतविलम्बितादयो, वीरे वसन्ततिलकादयः, करुणे वैतालिकादयः, रौद्रे स्रग्धरादयः, सर्वत्र शार्दूलविक्रीडितादयो निबन्धनीयाः इत्युपदिशति । समस्तलोकरञ्जकत्वमित्यनेन अलौकिकतां परिहरन् कीर्तिप्रीतिनिबन्धनस्य (प्रबन्धस्य) प्रतिष्ठया कवेः प्रयासवैयर्थ्यमपाकरोति । सदलङ्कारवाक्यत्वमित्यनेन तु यद्यप्युपात्तलक्षणानां शब्दार्थो-

भयगुणानां स्वरूपसौन्दर्येणैव काव्यशोभाकरत्वम्, तथापि अलङ्कारवत्त्वेव एनं भारमुद्वोढुमलमित्येतदुपर्युपदेश उपपादयति ।

तेऽमी शब्दार्थोभयगुणाः महाकाव्येषु रसावियोगहेतवो भवन्ति ।*

Bhoja gives here a list of features which go to make up the best poem. It is almost a statement of the criticism of the work as whole. Śabda guṇas are the physical or formal features ; Artha guṇas pertain to the content and theme ; the Ubhaya guṇas embrace both. Of the Śabda guṇas, two deal with size. The Mahākāvya is an epic and it proposes to portray a great theme and as such, must be of sufficient length. It cannot be a minor poem. This Guṇa is called Asamkṣiptagranthatva. Side by side with insistence on this Guṇa, one should bear in mind that the epic must not be very long and become stupendous, for, none will ever read it fully. The Sargas must not be each very long. This Guṇa is called Anativistīrṇa sargatva. The Guṇa called Aviṣama bandhatva is not well explained by Bhoja. Śravyavṛttatva is a Guṇa of the metre. The Mahākāvya must be written in such metres only as are sweet to the ear. Though the theme is big and variety in metre all over is necessary, one should not resort to the unheard of metres, deficient in musical quality. Related to this is the Ubhayaguṇa of Arthānurūpacchandastva which also refers to metre. The situations should forge their own metre. The very metre must be suggestive of the Rasa of that canto. The ideas should express themselves in appropriate and suggestive metres. Thus, the Viyoginī is suited for Karuṇa and so on. The last Śabdaguṇa is Śliṣṭa sandhitva which is a structural Guṇa ; Bhoja says that each canto must run into the next and all must fit themselves in the main theme like words in a sentence.

The Arthaguṇas emphasise the essence of a Mahākāvya, the hero, his greatness, development of Rasas and the social purpose of poetry namely the educating of man in the fourfold aim of all humanity, Caturvarga vyutpatti. The epic is different from the sundry Muktakas and minor poetry by the grandeur of its theme. It is heroic and this quality is emphasised by the first Guṇa of Caturodāttanāyakatva. The Guṇa called Rasabhāvanirantaratva emphasises that the whole poem shall have one Rasa as its main motif ; but in the development of that one Rasa through the story, all the rich variety of human sentiments shall be intricately portrayed without hindrance to the unity of Rasa. Two of the Arthaguṇas emphasise the fruit or the social end of poetry, Caturvarga phalāyattatva and Vidhi niṣedha vyutpādakatva. An epic must show man in action in pursuit of one or more of the four Puruṣārthas. The theme of an epic is the problem of these four aims of man and not the passing sentiments recorded in Muktakas. Finally, the epic should depict how the good ultimately succeeds and evil ultimately perishes and thus should instruct that one desirous of happiness here and hereafter should strive to be good like the hero and must never be like the

* See Hemacandra, *K. A.* and *Vyā.* pp. 334-337, where this text from the *Śṛ. Pra.* is reproduced.

villain in the story. The last Arthaguṇa is a general one which we shall consider at the end.

The Ubhayaguṇas pertain to both Śabda and Artha. They relate Śabda and Artha with each other and lay emphasis on some principles of harmony and appropriateness, Aucitya. The first is Rasānurūpasandarbhatva. The collocation of words as well as the conceiving of ideas must be in perfect harmony with the Rasa. Sandarbha applies to both Śabda and Arthā. Thus this Guṇa emphasises Vṛttyaucitya and Rītyaucitya. The next Guṇa of Pātrānurūpabhāṣatva is explained by Bhoja as the quality pertaining only to drama, though Bhoja is generally describing here the features of a Mahākāvya only. Hence it is, that while reproducing these in his work, Hemacandra omits this item. In a drama, this Guṇa emphasises the Lokadharmī of each character speaking in his or her own proper tongue. This is not possible in a narrative epic which is in one language from beginning to end. Of the next Ubhayaguṇa which is 'metre suited to the idea' we have already spoken. The two other Guṇas of this class stand on a different footing. One of these two goes along with the Arthaguṇa applying to the secondary aim and purpose of poetry viz., Puruṣārtha vyutpatti ; it is Samastaloka rañjakatva and emphasises, not the secondary end of Vyutpatti but the primary end of poetry, the immediate end named Ānanda.

Lastly, we have to examine the Arthaguṇa called Susūtra samvidhānakatva and the Ubhayaguṇa, Sadalaṁkāra vākyatva. The former according to Bhoja's explanations reviews all the Guṇas of the three sets given above and says that the Guṇas must find their proper places and they must be so well knit that the work as a whole may have great beauty. The Ubhayaguṇa of Sadalaṁkāravākyatva has nothing to do with the Guṇas. It emphasises that the Guṇas by themselves are not enough and that there are other features like the Guṇas viz., Prabhandhālaṁkāras. Their presence is the Guṇa of Sadalaṁkāravākyatva. This last is strange and absolutely unnecessary.

These features of the Prabandha are called Guṇas by Bhoja because they contribute to the beauty of the poem. These are not wholly Bhoja's original idea. Though dealing with them as Guṇas and in three sets is certainly a novel idea of Bhoja, the features themselves are those given by Daṇḍin in his description of the Mahākāvya in chapter I of his *Kāvyādarśa*. Thus, Asaṁkṣipta granthatva, Śravyavṛttatva, Anativistīrṇa sargatva, Śliṣṭasandhitva, Caturvargaphalopetatva, Caturodāttanāyakatva, Rasabhāvanirantaratva, Samastalokarañjakatva and Sadalaṁkāravākyatva are all borrowed from Daṇḍin's description of the Mahākāvya.

चतुर्वर्गफलोपेतं चतुरोदात्तनायकम् ।
× × ×
अलङ्कृतमसंक्षिप्तं रसभावनिरन्तरम् ।
सर्गैरनतिविस्तीर्णैः श्रव्यवृत्तैस्सुसन्धिभिः ॥
सर्वत्र भिन्नवृत्तान्तैरुपेतं लोकरञ्जकम् ।
काव्यं कल्पान्तरस्थायि जायेत सदलङ्कृति ॥ *K. Ā.* I. 12-19.

The rest of the features characterising the Mahākāvya in Daṇḍin's description of it are taken by Bhoja as the Alaṁkāras of Prabandha which are dealt with in the Alaṁkāra section. The verses of Daṇḍin on Mahākāvya are themselves quoted fully as a final review at the end of the eleventh chapter of the *Śṛ. Pra.*

Ratneśvara.

Ratneśvara, the commentator of Bhoja's *S. K. Ā.* deserves some attention in a history of Guṇas. He does not follow the Kāśmīrakas, though he uses some of Ānanda's verses on Guṇas. Similarly, he borrows from and differs also from Vāmana on the same subject of Guṇa.

He first considers that nine of the ten old Guṇas Śleṣa etc. without Samādhi are responsible for an expression being Vakra, poetically beautiful and consequently Kāvya. Here he slightly follows Vāmana but expresses himself in a phraseology familiarised by Kuntaka.

एतद् (श्लेषादिगुण) योगाद् वाक्यं वक्रारूपतामासाद्य काव्यव्यपदेशं लभते ।

Ratneśvara here seems to accept only nine Guṇas, those of Daṇḍin without Samādhi, and these as the more important Guṇas. For, he says that an expression becomes Kāvya and gets the necessary strikingness or Vakratā only by the introduction of these nine Guṇas. In the absence or in the case of the Viparyaya or reverse of these, Ratneśvara says that the thing becomes Kāvyābhāsa, the Rīti being broken. Rīti, he takes according to Vāmana, as Gunavat pada racanā and as Ātman. 'Ātman' here means 'essential,' 'Sārabhūta.'

तेषां गुणानां भङ्गः काव्याभासत्वपर्यवसायी दोषः । **ते (गुणाः) च श्लेषादयो नवैव ।** तेषामन्यतमाभावे काव्यस्याभासत्वात् । तेषां हि विपर्यये रीतिरवश्यं भज्यते । तस्या गुणवत्पदरचनारूपत्वात् । × × रीतिः साररूपतया काव्यस्यात्मेत्युच्यते । pp. 24-25.

That Ratneśvara attaches special importance to these *nine* Guṇas is plain from his saying again twice :

गुणाः श्लेषादयः **काव्य-अव्यभिचरिणो नव ।** p. 133.

श्लेषादयो **नव** गुणाः, तैर्गुम्फिता (वैदर्भी) । p. 134.

It can also be said that Ratneśvara completely follows Vāmana in considering Rīti as the essence. This Rīti is only the nine Guṇas mingled together to produce something like the Pānaka rasa of Citrāsvāda, a description of Rīti which is borrowed by Ratneśvara from Abhinava's Locana.

Ratneśvara follows Bhoja in considering Guṇas as Mukhya śobhāhetu and Alaṁkāras as Amukhyaśobhāhetu. He refutes the theory that Guṇas are Rasadharmas and Alaṁkāras, Dharmas of Śabdārtha. He says that such a classification can hold good only if Rasa is accepted as Pradhāna everywhere. He does not accept it as Pradhāna everywhere. Rasa is not present everywhere but Guṇas are present everywhere. If Guṇas should hang by Rasa, Guṇas which are invariably associated with Kāvya, they would have to become Anitya. If Guṇas are called Rasāvalambins because they are intended

for the sake of awakening Rasa, Alaṁkāras also must be taken as Raṣāvalambins.

रसावलंबिनो गुणाः, शब्दार्थावलंबिनस्त्वलङ्कारा इति काश्मीरकाः । तदगमकम् । तथा हि—यदि काव्यस्य रसप्रधानात्मकतामाश्रित्यायं विभागः [अलङ्कारा अपि तर्हि तत्प्रवणा एव] अथ नायं नियमो यत्सर्वत्र रसः प्रधानमिति । तदात्र गुणेष्वपि कथं तदालम्बननियमः ? किञ्चात्र प्रसादादिवत् श्लेषादयोऽपि शब्दार्थगता एव प्रत्यभिज्ञायन्ते, तत्कथमयं विभागः ? यद्यपि शब्दार्थाः (शब्दार्थगताः) ज्ञायन्ते तथापि रसप्रवणा इति चेत् (अलङ्कारा अपि तर्हि तत्प्रवणा एव) । किमिदं रसप्रवणत्वम् ? रसाश्रितत्वं तावन्न संभवत्येव । रसप्रतीतिपर्यवसानं च यथाकथञ्चिदलङ्कारेष्वपि तुल्यमिति अविचारितरमणीयोऽयं मार्गः ।

p. 43.

Ratneśvara similarly refutes Vāmana's distinction of Guṇas from Alaṁkāras, as Śobhāhetu and Śobhātiśayahetu. Both are Śobhākara and hence it is, Ratneśvara says, Bhoja made them (the Guṇas) also Alaṁkāras. But one difference Ratneśvara accepts, following the text of Bhoja. It is that Guṇa is more important, Mukhya, than Alaṁkāra and that a verse with the former and devoid of the latter has yet poetry in it.

उद्भूतगुणं तु स्फुटालङ्कारहीनमपि चमत्कारमावहत्येव ।

× × यतो गुणयोगो मुख्यः, ततः प्रथममुद्दिष्टो लक्षितश्च ।

In the above quoted criticism of the Kāśmīrakas' theory of Guṇa, Ratneśvara has also shown that since Prasāda, Mādhurya and Ojas appear as Guṇas of Śabda and Artha even as Śleṣa and the rest, there is no meaning in showing a partiality to the three alone, separating them as Rasaguṇas from the rest.

किञ्चात्र प्रसादादिवत् श्लेषादयोऽपि शब्दार्थगता एव प्रत्यभिज्ञायन्ते, तत्कथमयं विभागः ?

p. 43.

Thus Ratneśvara rejects the theory that Guṇas are only three, the view held by the Kāśmīrakas i.e., followers of Ānanda. He says

'माधुर्यौजःप्रसादास्त्रय एव गुणाः' इति ध्वनिकारस्य मतं निरस्यति, चतुर्विंशतिरिति ।

Ratneśvara would take Bhoja himself as refusing to accept Ānanda's position ; but we have seen above how Bhoja appreciates Ānanda's view of Guṇas being Rasadharmas and three in number ; Bhoja incorporates Ānanda's idea and his verses into his own scheme and text, and introduces a division in his Guṇas called Rasārambhaka guṇas which are the three, Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda. Ratneśvara himself utilises Ānanda's definitions of the three Guṇas. He considers Guṇas as Rasavyañjaka, certain Guṇas being suggestive of certain Rasas only. He says, Mādhurya is suggestive of Śṛṅgāra and Karuṇa ; he calls both these Rasas Madhura, though he gives Mādhurya as a quality of Śabda and Artha.

शृङ्गारकरुणौ हि मधुरौ, ततस्तद्व्यञ्जकोऽर्थोऽपि मधुरः । p. 64.

On p. 29 Ratneśvara speaks of Mādhurya, quoting Ānanda's definition of it. Under the Doṣa called Asamasta, the Viparyaya of Ojas in the section on the Arītimat doṣa (p. 28), Ratneśvara accepts Ānanda's Ojas and quotes his definition of it as the Dharma of Raudra. But, Ānanda is

interpreted differently, his Ojas being taken as Praudhi. This Praudhi again is not Vāmana's Artha Ojas. Ratneśvara has his own notion of Ojas and Praudhi. He says :

शब्दार्थयोः उचिता प्रौढिरोजः। × × शब्दस्य तु (प्रौढिः) पारुष्यशैथिल्यव्यतिकरलक्षणा। सा च क्वचित् समासदीर्घतया व्यज्यते। × × क्वचिदन्यथापि व्यज्यते। p. 28.

Under the Doṣa called Mādhurya vyatyaya, he says

शब्दार्थयोश्चित्तद्रुतिविधायित्वं माधुर्यम्।

It is also given as the Ārdratā of the mind, following Ānandavardhana. It is said to occur in expressions suggesting Śṛṅgāra and Karuṇa.

सा च शृङ्गारकरुणान्यतरप्रकाशानुगुणव्यापारावेशेन भवति। p. 29.

and he quotes Ānandavardhana's two verses on Mādhurya. Thus, though Ānandavardhana is often used by him, Ratneśvara is definite in his statement that Guṇa pertains to Śabda and Artha.

As we noted above, Ratneśvara holds that an utterance attained the Vakratā necessary for becoming Kāvya by the presence of the nine Guṇas Śleṣa etc. Otherwise, the utterance becomes Kāvyābhāsa. He seems also to identify this general and necessary Vakratā with Rīti ; for in the absence of the nine Vakratā-producing Guṇas, Rīti is said to be lost. There is then the Doṣa Arītimat. Though at the beginning Ratneśvara holds thus all the nine as Vakratāprayojaka, he selects the ninth viz., Audārya specially and considers it as the means of producing the Vakratā which is necessary to make an expression Kāvya. For, in its absence, we have a bald statement, the flaw called Analaṁkāra. He says :

काव्यरूपताप्रयोजकं शब्दार्थयोः वक्रता उदारता। न हि वक्रतामन्तरेण काव्यपदवीप्राप्तिः। p. 30.

Later, in the Śabdaguṇaprakaraṇa, he picks out Samādhi and gives it this same special position. He considers this one Guṇa as infusing the necessary Vakratā.

सम्यगाधानमारोपणं समाधिः। सम्यक्त्वं च वक्रता, लोकातिगत्वम् × × । p. 54.

Ratneśvara has criticised Ānandavardhana, but his views are very confused. He interprets Bhoja according to circumstance and he discloses lack of systematic exposition and uniformity of opinion. He borrows from Ānandavardhana and Vāmana, all the while criticising them. Though Bhoja clearly follows Vāmana, he interprets Bhoja as criticising Vāmana. Though Bhoja adopts Ānandavardhana's theory of Guṇa into his own system, Ratneśvara interprets Bhoja as criticising Ānandavardhana. Ratneśvara does not accept Rasa as Pradhāna everywhere. He means that there are places in Kāvyas, where Guṇas and Alaṁkāras alone are important and prominent. But this does not mean that Rasa is not all in all in poetry for him. For, in interpreting the text of Bhoja 'Kāvyasarvasva' in one place, he says that

'Kāvyasarvasva' is the manifestation of Rasa : काव्यसर्वस्वं रसप्रकाशः This manifestation of Rasa is due to the first Śabdaguṇa called Prasāda. He says

प्रसादो द्विधा–वाच्यविषयः प्रतीयमानविषयश्च । तत्र प्रतीयमानविषयो यथा–'एवं वादिनि देवर्षौ etc. अत्र श्रुतावगतादेव वाक्यात् लज्जादयः हस्तदत्ता इव प्रकाशन्ते । pp. 44-45.

Cases of Rasa and Dhvani are considered Guṇa by Ratneśvara following Bhoja. On p. 102 Ratneśvara says :

ध्वननव्यापारोन्मेषाश्च गुणत्वलाभः ।

Following Vāmana, he holds Rīti as 'Sāra' in poetry and this Rīti is the Vakratā given by the nine Guṇas. Thus Rīti and Vakratā are identical. With Vakratā, Ratneśvara begins to follow Kuntaka.

वक्रत्वं च अलङ्कार इति । p. 116.

अवक्रयोः शब्दार्थयोः वचनमात्रत्वात् । p. 63.

He holds the Kāvyasvarūpa to be Vakratā and Alaṁkāra as Vakratā and that, without it, there can be no poetry. He takes Vāmana's Kauṭilya in his Arthaguṇa, Śleṣa, as this Vakratā.

The Agnipurāṇa.

The Alaṁkāra section in the *Agnipurāṇa* contains a chapter on Guṇas (346). Even as on Alaṁkāra, on Guṇa also, the writer of this section draws upon Bhoja. Guṇa, he says, is very important and that, without it, even Alaṁkāras are useless, an idea borrowed from Vāmana and Bhoja. Then he says that Guṇas are positive and must be accepted. They cannot be dismissed as the absence of Doṣas. He accepts Bhoja's two main sets of Guṇas, Sāmānya and Vaiśeṣika. The latter, he does not deal with in chapter 346 but deals with in chapter 347 devoted to the Doṣas. The Sāmānyaguṇas are divided into those of Śabda and Artha and both. The Śabdaguṇas are given as seven, Arthaguṇas as six and Ubhaya guṇas as six. The text of the *Agni Purāṇa* in the Anandasrama edition is highly corrupt and I may draw attention here to my article on *Rīti and Guṇa in the Agni Purāṇa* in the *IHQ.*, X, 1934, pp. 767-69, in which I suggested many corrections and interpretations which have since been adopted by writers. In that paper there, I examined the verses dealing with the Guṇas on pp. 776-779. The Purāṇa gives the seven Śabda Guṇas thus :

शब्दमाश्रयते काव्यं (व्य) शरीरं यः स तद्गुणः ।
श्लेषो लालित्यगांभीर्ये सौकुमार्यमुदारता ।
सत्येव यौगिकी (?) चेति गुणाः शब्दस्य सप्तधा ॥ 346/5-6.

Of these, Śleṣa, Lālitya, Gāmbhīrya, Saukumārya and Udāratā are the five Guṇas which are clear. What 'Satyeva yaugikī' means is not known. While describing these Śabda Guṇas one after another, the Purāṇa does not speak anything relating to this passage "Satyeva yaugikī" but has instead the definition of 'Ojas' as the sixth Guṇa. The definitions have only six Guṇas, corresponding to the six Artha Guṇas and six Ubhaya Guṇas. "Satyeva Yaugikī" has a variant "Rūḍhiśca Yaugikī" but the likelihood is that the

whole line needs correction or reconstruction. Mm. Prof. S. K. SASTRI would reconstruct it as "sattvam ca yaugikam ceti" and take 'sattva' as a variety of udāttatā and 'yaugika' as Sāmāsika or Ojas (Yoga = samāsa); thus accepting seven Guṇas in all. The definition of Lālitya is obscure; in the definition of Gāmbhīrya, the expression '—लेख्यमुत्तानशब्दकम्' must be '—लेख्यनुत्तानशब्दकम्' Anuttāna means Gambhīra. Again in the definition of the same Guṇa, the text 'तदेवान्येषु शब्दताम्' must be 'तदेवान्ये सुशब्दताम्'. The Purāṇa includes Suśabdatā in Gāmbhīrya and stands alone in this respect. Audārya is defined in the line उत्तानपदतौदार्यं युतं श्लाघ्यैर्विशेषणैः। 'Ślāgya viśeṣaṇa yoga' is one of the two varieties of Daṇḍin's Udāratva. 'Uttānapadatā' of the Purāṇa is evidently corrupt. In the definition of Ojas, 'Padyādijīvitam' must be 'Gadyādijīvitam,' and in the additional description of Ojas in the second line आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्तमोजसैकेन पौरुषम्, the Purāṇa records Ānanda's view of Ojas as the Guṇa of Raudra and Vīra.

The six Artha Guṇas are Mādhurya, Samvidhāna, Komalatva, Udāratva, Prauḍhi and Sāmayikatva. Mādhurya follows Bhoja's Artha Mādhurya, Samvidhāna, which is defined संविधान परिकरः स्यादपेक्षितसिद्धये, is the same as the Samvidhāna susūtratā, a Prabandha guṇa of Bhoja, or it may be Bhoja's Arthaśleṣa which also is described as 'Samvidhāna susūtratā.' Udāratva which is "Āśaya sauṣṭhava" is one of the varieties of Daṇḍin's Udāratva. Prauḍhi is the full delineation or Poṣa of Artha or the power of the poet to develop the idea contemplated; it is the same as Bhoja's Arthaguṇa of that name. The next Guṇa, Sāmayikatva, may mean the suggestion by the poet of an etymology as in

क्षतात् किल त्रायत इत्युदग्रः
क्षत्रस्य शब्दो भुवनेषु रूढः। *Raghu.* II.
यथा प्रह्लादनाच्चन्द्रः०—" *Raghu.* IV.

But one must prefer to take it as the reverse of the Doṣa Asāmayika (see *Agnipurāṇa*, 347/10-11) which is the same as the Doṣa Rūḍhi cyuta of Bhoja. Sāmayika hence means 'Rūḍher acyuta.'

The six Ubhayaguṇas of the Purāṇa are Prasāda, Saubhāgya, Yathāsaṁkhya, Praśasyatā, Pāka and Rāga.

शब्दार्थावुपकुर्वाणो नाम्नोभयगुणः स्मृतः।
तस्य प्रसादः सौभाग्यं यथासंख्यं प्रशस्यता।
पाको राग इति प्राज्ञैः षट् प्रपञ्च (ञ्चा:) विपश्चिताः॥ 346/18-19.

Saubhāgya is only another name for the first variety of Daṇḍin's Udāratā; and the name 'Saubhāgya' is taken from Kuntaka. *V. J.* pp. 74-77.

उत्कर्षवान्गुणः कश्चिद्यस्मिन्नुक्ते प्रतीयते।
तत्सौभाग्यमुदारत्वं प्रवदन्ति मनीषिणः। 346/20.

It is another stroke of eccentricity that made this writer hold Yathāsaṁkhya which is Anūddeśa * and which all the writers have held as an Alaṁkāra, as

* On the correction of the corrupt passage defining this Yathāsaṁkhya, see my article on *Rīti and Guṇa in the Agnipurāṇa, IHQ.*, X. p. 778.

a Guṇa of Śabda and Artha ; or it may be Bhoja's Arthaguṇa, Rīti which is the observance of the natural order (Krama) of things when describing them. Praśasyatā or Prāśastya is Bhoja's Artha guṇa Suśabdatā which is the use of delicate and periphrastic expressions to mitigate the effect of depressing and tormenting ideas such as death. Says Bhoja :

अदारुणार्थपर्यायः दारुणेषु सुशब्दता।

This writer chooses to call this Prāśastya and says of it similarly

समये वर्णनीयस्य दारुणस्यापि वस्तुनः।
अदारुणेन शब्देन प्राशस्त्यमुपवर्णनम् ॥ 346/29-30.

The next is the well-known concept of Pāka which as a Śabda guṇa, Bhoja defines as Prauḍhi.

उक्तेः प्रौढः परीपाकः प्रोच्यते प्रौढिसंज्ञया।

The *Agnipurāṇa* puts Bhoja's definition thus :

उक्तैः परिणतिः क्वापि पाक इत्यभिधीयते।

and then mentions the several Pākas, Mṛdvīka, Nālikera, etc. The last Ubhaya guṇa is Rāga. Of this Bhoja treats in connection with love as its varying degrees of maturity. पाकाद्याः प्रेमभक्तयः in ch. V. *S. K. Ā.*

Ratneśvara, while commenting upon Śabda guṇa pāka in Bhoja, says that there are also the Artha pākas of the same nature dealt with in Chapter V.

एत एव अर्थपाकाः पञ्चमे प्रकारान्तरेण प्रतिपादयिष्यन्ते।

These are Nīlī rāga, Kasumbha rāga etc. What is wonderful in this Purāṇa making it an Ubhaya guṇa called Rāga.

Thus, an examination of the Guṇa section also shows how the compiler of the Alaṁkāra section in the *Agnipurāṇa* borrowed a great deal from Bhoja and how the whole section is a mix-up.

Viśveśvara's Camatkāracandrikā.

Viśveśvara, author of the *Camatkāracandrikā* and court-poet of Simhabhūpāla, the author of the *Rasārṇavasudhākara*, follows Bhoja in respect of Guṇas with one difference regarding one Guṇa. Bhoja gives Guṇas as twenty-four and Viśveśvara accepts twenty-three of them. He omits Bhoja's Prauḍhi which is a new name for Pāka. प्रौढिरुक्तेः परीपाकः He separates this and deals with it in a separate section along with similar general subjects, Rīti, Vṛtti and Śayyā, which Bhoja has brought under his Śabdālaṁkāras.

Chapter IV, Section I of the *Camatkāracandrikā* deals with Guṇas.

श्लेष प्रसाद समता माधुरी सुकुमारताः।
अर्थव्यक्तिरुदारत्वमोजः कान्तिरुदारता ॥
प्रेयान्समाधिरौर्जित्यं सौम्यं (सौक्ष्म्यं) गांभीर्यविस्तरौ।
संक्षेपः शब्दसंस्कारः भाविकत्वं च संमतः (संमितिः) ॥
गत्युक्तिरीतयः काव्ये ते त्रयोविंशतिर्मताः। Mad. MS. R. 2679.

Śabdasaṁskāra is Sauśabdya. Sammiti is Sammitatva.

Prakāśavarṣa's Rasārṇavālaṁkāra.

As on other topics, on Guṇas also, Prakāśavarṣa follows Bhoja completely. See my paper on Prakāśavarṣa's *Rasārṇavālaṁkāra, JOR,* Madras, Vol. VIII p. 269.

Bahurūpamiśra's Daśarūpakavyākhyā.

It has already been noticed how Bahurūpamiśra follows Bhoja completely in his commentary on Dhanañjaya's *Daśarūpaka.* See above and my article on his *Daśarūpakavyākyā, JOR,* Vol. VIII. p. 324.

Vidyānātha.

Vidyānātha follows Bhoja to some extent. In Chapter VI of his *Pratāparudrīya,* he gives the twenty-four Guṇas of Bhoja. The order of enumeration is slightly different and there is no classification of these into śabda guṇas and Artha guṇas. Most of the definitions are taken from Bhoja's *S. K. Ā.* Vidyānātha points out that some only of these twenty-four are by themselves excellences, the others being Guṇas only as the reverses of certain Doṣas and that hence some writers do not accept those of the latter category as Guṇas. Illustrations given by Vidyānātha for the various Guṇas are mostly on the model of those in the *S. K. Ā.*

The reason for Vidyānātha not classifying Guṇas as śabda guṇas and Artha guṇas is that he does not accept Artha guṇas at all. He considers Guṇa as Saṁghaṭanāśraya.

एतेषां गुणानामर्थगतत्वमपि केचिदिच्छन्ति । प्राचामाचार्याणां मतेन सङ्घटनाश्रयत्वमेव गुणानाम् । तदुक्तमलङ्कारसर्वस्वे 'सङ्घटनाधर्मत्वेन शब्दार्थधर्मत्वेन गुणालङ्काराणां व्यवस्थानम्' इति । अनयैव भङ्ग्या गुणालङ्काराणां निरूपितः स्वरूपभेदः । *Pratāparudrīya,* p. 242.

Kumārasvāmin points out that it will be difficult to take certain Guṇas with Artha. This is the first time we meet with such a view.

बहूनां पदानामेकपदवदवभासमानत्वादिलक्षणे श्लेषादौ अर्थगतत्वस्य दुर्घटत्वादिति भावः । p. 242.

There is no rule that one and the same set of Guṇas must be twice taken as pertaining to both śabda and Artha. But it must also be added that there is no meaning in denying Artha guṇas completely. If Vidyānātha had analysed his Guṇas of śabda reproduced from Bhoja, he would have found that many naturally link themselves with Artha and not with śabda. Some are even no Guṇas at all. Thus Vidyānātha's views on Guṇa are

1. There are twenty-four Guṇas as given by Bhoja.
2. But some do not accept certain of these Guṇas since they are only the absence of certain flaws and are not positive excellences.
3. Guṇas are to be taken with śabda and Saṁghaṭanā.
4. Some have Artha guṇas but Vidyānātha does not accept them.
5. The Guṇas differ from Alaṁkāras; the former are Saṁghaṭanāśraya and the latter śabdārthāśraya.

6. The general definition of Guṇa and Alaṁkāra is that both of them are beautifying features of Kāvya.

Vidyānātha thus follows the pre-Ānanda view, and does not say that the Guṇas are three and that they are Rasa dharmas. But Kumārasvāmin says that though Vidyānātha obviously follows the ancients he is at heart only a follower of Ānanda. For, his Śleṣa and other Guṇas can be included here and there in others and his Guṇas can be reduced to the three,—Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda. This, Vidyānātha himself meant at the beginning of Ch. II. For, Vidyānātha there compared Guṇas of Kāvya to Guṇas like courage which do not pertain to man's body and which, in the words of Vidyānātha, are Ātmotkarṣāvaha.

वस्तुतस्तु × × अन्तर्भावे श्लेषादिगुणानां रसधर्मत्वम्। अलङ्काराणां तु शब्दार्थधर्मत्वमिति विद्यत एव स्वरूपभेद इति रहस्यम्। अत एव स्वयमेवोक्तवान् काव्यप्रकरणे—

हारादिवदलङ्काराः तत्र स्युरुपमादयः।
श्लेषादयो गुणास्तत्र शौर्यादय इव स्थिताः।
आत्मोत्कर्षावहाः— II. 2-3.

Pratāparudrīya, p. 243. Balamanoramā edn.

Keśavamiśra.

Keśavamiśra, author of the *Alaṁkāraśekhara* (Kāśi Edn.), treats of Guṇas in III. 1 pp. 21-28. Following Bhoja, he considers Guṇa as more important than Alaṁkāra.

गुणयोगस्तयोर्मुख्यो गुणालङ्कारयोगयोः।
and अलङ्कारसहस्रैः किं गुणो यदि न विद्यते।

We have pointed out, in the next chapter on Bhoja's conception of Alaṁkāra, the extent to which Keśavamiśra is indebted to Bhoja on Alaṁkāra. Keśavamiśra does not accept Bhoja wholesale and borrows only a little according to his own mind. He chooses a few of Bhoja's Guṇas and casts the rest away. The notable point is that many of the Guṇas chosen by him are not of the traditional ten of śleṣa etc., but from those fourteen which Bhoja added. Bhoja's classification of Guṇas into those of śabda and Artha and the Vaiśeṣika guṇas is accepted by Keśava. The śabda guṇas are given as five : Saṁkṣiptatva, Udāttatva, Prasāda, Ukti and Samādhi.

संक्षिप्तत्वमुदात्तत्वं प्रसादोक्तिसमाधयः।
अत्रैवान्यसमावेशात् पञ्च शब्दगुणाः स्मृताः॥

Of these Prasāda, Samādhi and Udāttatva are the three old Guṇas. The other two are Bhoja's Saṁkṣepa and Ukti. Keśava adds that the other Guṇas are included in these, and this is only a conventional remark, it being impossible to include the rest in these five. The Artha guṇas are only four : Bhāvikatva, Suśabdatva, Paryāyokti, and Sudharmitā ; and it is said that the rest are included herein.

भाविकत्वं सुशब्दत्वं पर्यायोक्तिः सुधर्मिता ।
चत्वारोऽर्थगुणाः प्रोक्ताः परे त्वत्रैव सङ्गताः ॥

Following some authority, perhaps the Buddhist writer Śripāda whom he quotes, Keśava says that since some Guṇas are identical with some Alaṁkāras, some others with the absence of certain Doṣas, those besides these four are unnecessary. Bhāvikatva and Suśabdatva are the same Arthaguṇas as in Bhoja. Paryāyokti is a name familiar to us as an Alaṁkāra but here it is used by Keśava as a substitute for Bhoja's Arthaguṇa called Rīti, which is the description of things and their aspects in the same order as found in the world. According to Keśava's own statement, Rīti or Paryāyokti can be dismissed, for it is only the absence of the Doṣa Kramabhaṅga. The Arthaguṇa, Prasāda, of Bhoja is made into the fourth Arthaguṇa called Sudharmitā and Keśava's definition of it is based on Bhoja's text. It is the Dhvani of an object by the description of its attributes.

Keśava accepts Bhoja's Vaiśeṣikaguṇas and the principle underlying them.

Candrāloka.

The *Candrāloka* accepts only eight guṇas—Śleṣa, Prasāda, Samatā, Samādhi, Mādhurya, Ojas, Saukumārya and Udāratā. The work includes Kānti in Śṛṅgāra and Arthavyakti in Prasāda.

शृङ्गारे च प्रसादे च कान्त्यर्थव्यक्तिसङ्ग्रहः । IV. 10.

Jayadeva would have been more logical if he had included Kānti, not in Śṛṅgāra only, but in Rasa as such. For, Vāmana does not define Kānti as Dīpta śṛṅgāratva but only as Dīpta rasatva and though he illustrates with a Śṛṅgāra verse, he says in his Vṛtti that one can see this Guṇa in other Rasas also. एवं रसान्तरेष्वप्युदाहार्यम् । Similarly, it would have been more logical to include Arthavyakti in Svabhāvokti-alaṁkāra than in Prasada. See above—chapter on Bhoja and Svabhāvokti, Vol. I. part 1, pp. 142-3.

In his definitions, Jayadeva follows Vāmana mostly. He takes Śleṣa both as Śabdaguṇa and Arthaguṇa. The latter is described as Ghaṭanā (Vāmana). Samatā is defined in two ways : Alpasamāsatva, which is an original view and the use of the same Rīti or the same Samāsajātī (Rīti as Samāsajāti is a view following that of Rudraṭa) throughout in a verse. Alpasamāsatva is one kind of Samatā. The other definition is a kind of Svarānuprāsa. वर्णावैस्तुल्यनाथवा । Samādhi is taken as—अर्थमहिमा लसद्धनरसात्मना— which is original. It is not illustrated. Mādhurya is taken as Arthaguṇa only, even as Samādhi. It is described according to Vāmana as Ukti vaicitrya. Ojas is taken only as an Artha guṇa and Vāmana is followed on it. On Saukumārya also Vāmana is followed ; so also on Udāratā, which, however, is taken only in relation to Artha. Śleṣa is taken in relation to both Śabda and Artha. Prasāda, Samatā and Saukumārya are taken only as Guṇas of Śabda ; and Samādhi, Mādhurya, Ojas and Udāratā only as Arthaguṇas.

Kavikarṇapūra Gosvāmin.

Kavikarṇapūra Gosvāmin in his *Alaṁkārakaustubha* accepts only the three Guṇas of Ānanda and says that the other seven are included in these three. While mentioning the other seven, he omits the old Saukumārya and mentions Prauḍhi, which, as a separate Guṇa, Bhoja alone gives, though Vāmana speaks of it as the meaning of Artha ojas.

Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta.

It is the question of Rasavad-alaṁkāra and the discussion of how and when Rasa actually becomes an Alaṁkāra that leads on Ānandavardhana to the topic of Guṇa in the second Uddyota of his *Dhva. Ā.* to clearly state the Kāvya ātman and the relation of Alaṁkāras and Guṇas to that Ātman.

यः पुनरङ्गी रसो भावो वा सर्वाकारमलङ्कार्यः स ध्वनेरात्मा ।

किञ्च— तमर्थमवलम्बन्ते येऽङ्गिनं ते गुणाः स्मृताः ।
अङ्गाश्रितास्त्वलङ्कारा मन्तव्याः कटकादिवत् ॥

ये तमर्थं रसादिलक्षणमङ्गिनं सन्तं अवलम्बन्ते ते गुणाः शौर्यादिवत् । वाच्यवाचकलक्षणानि अङ्गानि ये पुनः आश्रिताः ते अलङ्कारा मन्तव्याः कटकादिवदिति । Dhva. Ā. II. p. 78.

So long as they had not formulated the soul of Poetry, the ancients could not distinguish properly Guṇa from Alaṁkāra. Crude theories of differentiation they advanced and did not realise that the real reason for their trouble in not realising the difference between the two lay in their lack of insight into the real soul of poetry. Going no deeper than the surface, the Vācya-Vācaka, they found that both Guṇa and Alaṁkāra gave beauty to it. Some said that since that was so, there was little difference between the two ; or the two differed slightly, Guṇa being the Dharma of the collocation as a whole and Alaṁkāra of Śabda and Artha. Someone else proposed the view that Guṇas were Śobhāhetu, Nitya, and Kāvyatva gamaka, while Alaṁkāras were for extra beauty, Śobhātiśayahetu and Anitya. They realised only this much that both imparted beauty to Kāvya. To what in Kāvya do they impart beauty is the vital question. The ancients, who held to the form of Poetry, said that Rasa also beautified only the Vācya-vācaka and hence was an Alaṁkāra. Thus the logical end of this was that in Kāvya, the only two major topics were Guṇa and Alaṁkāra, the main single subject being kāvya śobhā hetu ; and in this big sense, the word Alaṁkāra itself was used, thus making it comprehend within itself Guṇa also. The ancients were "Alaṁkārikas" in the strictest sense of the term. They saw Alaṁkāra everywhere ; they moved in an 'Alaṁkāra prapañca'.

This inability to make a more scientific definition of Guṇa and Alaṁkāra and a differentiation of a substantial nature between the two was due to their blindness to the fact that Guṇa and Alaṁkāra are relative terms and that they mean a Guṇin and an Alaṁkārya. Kāvya like man, has two constituents, body and soul. The Vācya-vācaka, the form of poetry, the words and their meanings—these constitute the body or śarīra of poetry. Of a conception of some soul, Ātman, in Poetry, we have just a glimpse in Vāmana. He stumbled

upon something more than Guṇa or Alaṁkāra, upon Rīti. Rasa was known long before but that too was made Alaṁkāra, form alone being the thing for the ancients. The neo-critics came and disturbed these calm vagaries. They hold that the Vācya-vācaka is the Śarīra of poetry, its Aṅga, and the Aṅgin or the Ātman is Rasa. The Śarīra is subordinate and is considered to have life only so long as there is the Aṅgin or the Ātman called Rasa. A Kāvya is soulless, mere verbal vomit, if there is no Rasa in it, if the poet sits only to play with sounds, to jingle and to pun. Rasa being the Aṅgin, it can never be Aṅga, just as the Ātman can never be Śarīra. All cases of Rasa in Kāvya are not Rasavad-alaṁkāra as Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin or his late followers considered. There can be places in poetry where there is no Alaṁkāra, if only one can give the name Alaṁkāra its proper connotation, without putting under it all things under the sun. Alaṁkāra need not be everywhere. Alaṁkāra is not invariably concomitant with Kāvyatva. Its presence is 'Vyabhicarita.' Cases of Rasas are cases of Rasas only. But there are instances where it is possible to subordinate Rasa and use it even as an Alaṁkāra is used, as a means of beautification of another idea, which, in that particular case, is not Rasa but something else. Thus, in Cāṭus where the Bhāva, viz., love for a king or in Stotras of God where the Bhāva called Bhakti is the main idea suggested by a description of the Vīra Rasa or the Śṛṅgāra Rasa of the king or God, the Rasas, Vīra and Śṛṅgāra, are effectively used for the sake of adorning and ornamenting the main idea of love or devotion to king or God. Here, Rasa is used as Alaṁkāra. In such cases Rasa is Alaṁkāra. Here is the proper scope of the name Rasavad-alaṁkāra.

This being clearly formulated that Kāvya must have an Aṅgin, a Guṇin and an Alaṁkārya, to have Guṇa and Alaṁkāra, the problem of the differentiation of Guṇa and Alaṁkāra came as a matter of course to be solved. In the world, we see that Alaṁkāras like dress and jewels rest on the Śarīra and are for the beauty of the body. The body may not need them, being itself beautiful. Ornaments as such have little beautifying capacity by themselves. Beauty consists in Aucitya. A woman in love (Rati) wishes to enthral her lover; wants to please him and decks her body with ornaments. One sees her and says, she is in a joyous mood, she is evidently preparing to meet her lover. Ornaments have their logic in suggesting the mind, the Manobhāva. Sometimes, when there is no Bhāva, ornamentation may slowly induce the Bhāva to spring up but if the mind is absolutely devoid of Bhāva, Alaṁkāra is completely meaningless. If temperaments are such as to be enthralled by response of Bhāva only, in those cases there is no need for any Alaṁkāra. Inner joy may exuberantly express itself in outer decoration but extravagant outer decoration becomes a hindrance to the realisation of Rasa; even if it is present, it does not count. There is a saying in Tamil which puts the thing finely: "Cast away the nose-pearl which hinders the kissing." Thus Anaucitya of Alaṁkāra is in both extremes, where there is full Bhāva and where there is no Bhāva at all; in the one case it is unnecessary and in the other case, useless.

रक्ते विरक्ते च वरे वधूनां
निरर्थकः कुङ्कुमपत्रभङ्गः। *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta.*

For the poet's attention is in Rasa. Not only Alaṁkāras but Guṇas of narrower connotation like Śleṣa of Śabda also, like the Mārdava and Aśaithilya of a Nāyikā's body, become meaningless in the absence of the essential thing, the Aṅgin, Guṇin, Alaṃkārya, which is the Ātman, viz., Bhāva or Rasa.

कल्या मूर्तिः कुलममलिनं यौवनं रूपसंपत्
सौभाग्यर्द्धिः प्रियवचनताशालिवैदग्ध्ययोगः।
शालीनत्वं विनयपरतेत्यङ्गनाभूषणं यत्—
तत्प्रेमार्द्रं प्रणयिनि मनो नास्ति चेत्—नास्ति किञ्चित्॥[1]

Quoted by Bhoja at the beginning of the Rasa section in the *Śṛ. Pra.* to emphasise the importance of Rasa.

Therefore, the scope of Alaṁkāra is very limited, and if it is to be rendered sensible, it has to be related to a soul whose body it is to beautify. Even as an ornament on the body beautifies the body and through it helps the presentation of a Bhāva, so also an Alaṁkāra in Poetry.

Guṇas of Kāvya resemble Guṇas of men like bravery, courage, straightforwardness, sweetness of temper etc. These rest in a place deeper than the body. Certain physical conditions, certain kinds of the build of the body, certain physical poses, particular ways of walking etc., can suggest the Guṇas of a man's character. But these Guṇas do not belong to the well-built body or the dignified pose or the stately walking. One's courage pertains to his soul, and so also in the world of Kāvya regarding the Guṇas of Kāvya. This discrimination alone provides any intelligible distinction between Guṇas and Alaṁkāras. Only in this view of a soul of poetry different from its Śarīra can one maintain any difference between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra. If Śarīra alone is recognised and everything accepted as its beautifying element, there can be no tangible difference between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra. If the Ātman, as distinct from *Śarīra,* is realised and accepted, there can be this differentiation that Guṇas pertain to the Aṅgin named Rasa and Alaṁkāras to the Aṅga, the Vācya-vācaka.

गुणालङ्कारव्यवहारश्च गुणिन्यलङ्कार्ये च सति। स च अस्मत्पक्ष एवोपपन्न इत्यभिप्रायेणाह।
Locana, p. 78.

Guṇas are thus established as Dharmas of the Ātman, the Rasas. But how is it that there is the usage, the Vyavahāra, that words are sweet, Madhura? Ānandavardhana replies that this Vyavahāra is through Upacāra. The Guṇa called Mādhurya is the Dharma of both phases of Śṛṅgāra and of Karuṇa. Words and ideas having the power to suggest the Mādhurya of these Rasas are also called, through extension, Madhura.

1. "Be she fairer than the day,
Or the flower mead in May,
If she thinks not well of me,
What care I how fair she be". George Wither.

एतदुक्तं भवति—वस्तुतो माधुर्यं नाम शृङ्गारादे रसस्यैव गुणः। तन्मधुराभिव्यञ्जकयोः शब्दार्थयोरुपचरितम्। मधुर-शृङ्गार—रसाभिव्यक्तिसमर्थता शब्दार्थयोर्माधुर्यमिति हि तल्लक्षणम्।

Locana. III Ud. p. 79.

The older writers, Udbhaṭa and his followers, held Guṇas as pertaining to the collocation, as Saṁghaṭanāśraya, a view that persists till such a late time as Vidyānātha's. When summing up the old view as Pūrvapakṣa, Ānandavardhana says in Uddyota I. p. 5 :

सङ्घटनाधर्माश्च माधुर्यादयः, तेऽपि प्रतीयन्ते।

Abhinavagupta explains this text clearly that the old writers held the features of the words themselves to be Anuprāsa and other Śabdālaṁkāras, and the features of the word-collocation, Śabda saṁghaṭanā, to be Śabdaguṇas ; the features of the Artha separately to be Arthālaṁkāras and of the Arthasaṁghaṭanā to be Arthaguṇas. Thus, while Alaṁkāras belong to the Śabda and Artha themselves, the Guṇas pertain to Śabdārtha saṁghaṭanā. The former is of the Avayavas and the latter is of the Avayavin.

तथापि द्विविधं चारुत्वम्, स्वरूपमात्रनिष्ठं, संघटनाश्रितं च। तत्र शब्दानां स्वरूपमात्रकृतं चारुत्वं शब्दालङ्कारेभ्यः। संघटनाश्रितं तु शब्दगुणेभ्यः। एवमर्थानां स्वरूपमात्रनिष्ठमुपमादिभ्यः, संघटनापर्यवसितं त्वर्थगुणेभ्य इति—।

Ānandavardhana established the real Āśraya of Guṇa as Rasa and said that Guṇas can be spoken of in relation to Śabda through Upacāra. Even when the Guṇas are spoken of in relation to Śabda, the distinction however should be kept in mind. They are never on a par with Anuprāsa, Śabdālaṁkāra, pertaining to Śabda. The Guṇas are greater, being related more to Artha and through it to Rasa and if they are said to be of Śabda also, it is just like talking of Śaurya as existing in a hero's physical frame.

ननु यदि सङ्घटना गुणानां नाश्रयः, तत् किमालम्बना एते परिकल्प्यन्ते। उच्यते, प्रतिपादितमेवैषामालम्बनम्।

'तमर्थमवलम्बन्ते येऽङ्गिनं ते गुणाः स्मृताः।

× × × ×

अथवा भवन्तु शब्दाश्रया एव गुणाः। न चैषामनुप्रासादितुल्यत्वम्। यस्मादनुप्रासादयोऽनपेक्षितार्थविस्ताराः शब्दधर्मा एव। शब्दधर्मत्वं चैषाम् अन्याश्रयत्वेऽपि शरीराश्रयत्वमिव शौर्यादीनाम्।

P. 135, Ud. III. *Dhva. Ā.*

Udbhaṭa would ask, if Guṇas are not Dharmas of Saṁghaṭanā, they should be of Śabda and Artha since there is nothing else to be their Āśraya. If that is so, what difference is there between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra ? The reply is that there *is* some other Āśraya, the Aṅgin, the Ātman of Kāvya named Rasa. It is Aviveka, and it is also permissible through Upacāra, if one speaks of the Ātmaguṇa as Śarīraguṇa.

शब्दार्थालम्बनत्वे हि तदलङ्कारेभ्यः को विशेष इति उक्तं चिरन्तनैरिति भावः। × ×

अपि तु भवत्वेषामविवेकिनामभिप्रायेणापि शब्दधर्मत्वं, शौर्यादीनामिव शरीरधर्मत्वम्। अविवेको ऽपचारफलत्वविभागं विवेक्तुमसमर्थः। तथापि न कश्चिद्दोष इत्येवं परमेतदुक्तं भवति। × ×

उपचारेण यदि शब्देषु गुणाः तत्रेदं तात्पर्यं— शृङ्गारादिरसाभिव्यञ्जकवाच्यप्रतिपादनसामर्थ्यमेव शब्दस्य माधुर्यम् । तच्च शब्दगतं विशिष्टघटनयैव लभ्यते ।

So the Guṇas primarily pertain to Rasa and are brought into relation with Śabda and Saṁghaṭanā through Upacāra and spoken of as Śabdadharma and Saṁghaṭanādharma. Just as words and even sounds also suggest, so also Saṁghaṭanā suggests. That is, there is Dhvani in Saṁghaṭanā ; there is Asamlakṣyakramadhvani.

यस्त्वलक्ष्यक्रमव्यंग्यः ध्वनिर्वर्णपदादिषु ।
वाक्ये संघटनायां च स प्रबन्धेऽपि दीप्यते ॥ III. 2.

How does a Saṁghaṭanā suggest Rasa ? Saṁghaṭanā varies with Guṇas. It depends upon Guṇas ; it is the embodiment of certain Guṇas. It suggests those Guṇas and the Rasas to which those Guṇas pertain. The Rasa is the controlling factor, the Niyāmaka. A Saṁghaṭanā may suggest Mādhurya and through that Śṛṅgāra rasa. That means that in Śṛṅgāra rasa, the Saṁghaṭanā, if it is to be suggestive, must have the Guṇa called Mādhurya. In Raudra the Saṁghaṭanā will be Ojasvinī. This Rasaucitya is however to be slightly modified by the larger Aucitya of Vaktā and Vācya.

गुणानाश्रित्य तिष्ठन्ती माधुर्यादीन् व्यनक्ति सा ।
रसांस्तन्नियमे हेतुरौचित्यं वक्तृवाच्ययोः ॥ III. 6. *Dhvā. Ā.*

We need not consider here the Aucitya of the speaker and the context ruling Saṁghaṭanā but shall restrict ourselves to the suggestiveness of the Saṁghaṭanā and its relation to Guṇa. Saṁghṭanā does suggest Rasa. What is its relation to Guṇa ? Certain writers hold that Saṁghaṭanā and Guṇa are not different while others hold the two to be different. The latter set of writers differ again among themselves ; some say that Saṁghaṭanā is Guṇāśraya and others that Saṁghaṭanā is the Āśraya of Guṇas. Of these views, if Saṁghaṭanā and Guṇas are identical or if Guṇas are Saṁghṭanāśraya, there is a danger that like Saṁghaṭanā, Guṇa also will become ' Aniyata viṣaya '. That is, Guṇas, we know, have their definite scope ; Mādhurya in Śṛṅgāra and Karuṇa ; Ojas, Raudra and Adbhuta. Saṁghaṭanā is of three kinds, Asamāsa, Madhyamasamāsa and Dīrghasamāsa. These have no defined scope. As for instance, it cannot be said that Dīrghasamāsa occurs only in Raudra. They are seen often in Śṛṅgāra also. Similarly, Asamāsa saṁghaṭanā is not restricted to Śṛṅgāra but is found in Raudra also. So Saṁghaṭanā is Aniyataviṣaya. As a consequence, if Guṇa is to be identical with or dependent upon Saṁghaṭanā, it will, contrary to its own nature, become Aniyataviṣaya. Therefore neither can Guṇas be of the form of Saṁghaṭanā i.e., they cannot be identical with Saṁghaṭanā, nor can they be Saṁghaṭanāśraya. Their real Āśraya is Rasa, though Upacāra makes it possible to bring the Guṇa in relation to Saṁghaṭanā and Śabda also.

It may be objected that if Guṇas are Śabdāśraya, they are also Saṁghaṭanāśraya or Saṁghaṭanārūpa since there are no Śabdas which are not in the form of collocation, i.e. Asaṁghaṭita. It is through Saṁghaṭanā that

śabdas have to give a meaning and to suggest a Rasa. It is replied that this is not a necessary consequence. It is only Asaṁghaṭita śabdas that can be accepted (through Upacāra) as Āśraya for Guṇas. Saṁghaṭanā need not peep in here. Mere sounds are suggestive. If a Vākya suggesting Rasa has to be necessarily in a Saṁghaṭanā, the Saṁghaṭanā can never be said to be the Āśraya of the Guṇas. For, Saṁghaṭnās are Aniyata. Their nature is not definite as that of Guṇas, and indefinite things like that cannot be said to be the Āśraya of Guṇas. So it is only śabdas, without any reference to the Saṁghaṭanā, which is by nature Aniyata, that are the Āśraya of Guṇas. By Upacāra, Guṇas can be made to be śabdāśraya ; never Saṁghaṭanāśraya even by Upacāra.

The critic then objects that Saṁghaṭanā cannot be said to be always Aniyata. As regards Mādhurya and Śṛṅgāra, it may be said that no particular Saṁghaṭanā can be said to be the only Vyañjaka of that Rasa, since all the three kinds of Saṁghaṭanās are found in Śṛṅgāra. But as regards Ojas, it must be accepted that there is a Niyama. For, an Asamāsa saṁghaṭanā is never the Āśraya of Ojas. The reply to this is that the notion of Ojas as Dīrghasamāsa is mere traditional indiscretion and that there is Ojas in such verses as यो यः शस्त्रम् etc. even though there is no Dīrghasamāsa. Therefore, one view will conclude that Guṇas and Saṁghaṭanās are not identical and that they are different ; and that Guṇas are not Saṁghaṭanāśraya.

तस्मादन्ये गुणाः अन्या च संघटना, न च संघटनामाश्रिताः गुणा इत्येकं दर्शनम् ।

Dhva. Ā. P. 173.

The objector again says that, as regards Ojas at least, Niyataviṣayatva must be accepted for the Saṁghaṭanā. In the verse यो यः शस्त्रम् there is the fault of lack of proper Saṁghaṭanā. There is Vyabhicāra of the Niyama that Ojas *must* have Dīrghasamāsa saṁghaṭanā. If we do not clearly see the fault in the verse, it is due to the fact that the poet's śakti hides this technical flaw. Ānanda does not accept this veiled compliment to Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa's śakti. He rejects the point saying that Sahṛdayas do not see any Vyutpatti-doṣa in the verse. If it is contended that, in that case, there is no Ojas in that verse, well, let it be even so. There is no Ojas but there is Prasāda and the Rasa is most clear. There is no Acārutva. It is so because of the more comprehensive Aucitya of Vaktā and Vācya. Further, it is a verse in a drama to be enacted, Abhineyārtha. Much more than Ojas, the Guṇa of the Rasa of that situation, it is Prasāda, the Guṇa of all Rasas, that is important in a drama or Abhineyārtha. This is Viṣayaucitya and this must also be taken into consideration. From this point of view there is no flaw in this verse.

Thus, from the point of view of Rasas, there is Niyama, only as regards Guṇas. For them alone are Rasas Niyāmaka. From the stand-point of Rasa, Saṁghaṭanā has no Niyama, i.e. Rasas are not Niyāmaka for Saṁghaṭanā. But it is not that Saṁghaṭanā has absolutely no Niyama ; a more comprehensive Niyama for it, more comprehensive than that of Rasa, has to be pointed out. That Niyāmaka is Vaktā, Vācya, Viṣaya etc. Even in

the view that Saṁghaṭanā and Guṇa are identical, such a bigger Niyāmaka other than Rasa must be accepted, more so, in the view that holds the two separate.

तस्माद्गुणव्यतिरिक्तत्वे गुणरूपत्वे च संघटनायाः अन्यः कश्चिन्नियमहेतुः वक्तव्य इत्युच्यते ।
Dhva. Ā. P. 138.

From the point of view of this comprehensive Niyāmaka, Saṁghaṭanā also is Niyataviṣaya. Saṁghaṭanā is suggestive, Vyañjaka, only from the point of view of this Niyama of Vaktā, Vācya and Viṣaya. This comprehensive Aucitya applies to Guṇas also. Though Rasas are Niyāmakas for Guṇas, we have to postulate a larger and a more comprehensive Niyama than pure Rasaucitya for Guṇa sometimes. Or, rather, everywhere, it is not absolute Rasaucitya that controls Guṇas but only modified Rasaucitya, Rasaucitya modified by Prakṛtyaucitya, the nature of the character and context from which one cannot isolate Rasa. Thus in the Śṛṅgāra of Bhīma, there will be some Auddhatya and it will not be that Mādhurya of the case of Arjuna. The difference is due to the difference in their natures, Uddhata and Lalita. Even so, the anger of Yudhiṣṭhira will have little of that Auddhatya which characterises Bhīma's anger. Yudhiṣṭhira's calm nature modifies the general Ojas of his anger.

Since the larger Aucitya of Vaktā, Vācya and Viṣaya applies to Guṇas also in this manner, the same Niyamas apply to both Guṇas and Saṁghaṭanās in the view that the two are identical. In the view that Saṁghaṭanā is Guṇāśraya also, there is little difficulty in accepting the Niyāmakas of Guṇas as the Niyāmakas of Saṁghaṭanā also. In the third view that holds Guṇas as Saṁghaṭanāśraya also, there is little difficulty in accepting the Niyamas to be given by Ānandavardhana, since they are the Niyamas also for Guṇas.

तस्माद्गुणाव्यतिरिक्तत्वे गुणव्यतिरिक्तत्वे वा सङ्घटनाया यथोक्तादौचित्याद् विषयनियमोऽस्ति इति तस्या अपि रसव्यञ्जकत्वम् । तस्माच्च रसाभिव्यक्तिनिमित्तभूतायाः योऽयमनन्तरोक्तो नियमहेतुः, स एव गुणानामिति नियतो विषय इति गुणाश्रयेण व्यवस्थानमप्यविरुद्धम् । P. 140. *Dhva. Ā.* III.

यदि गुणाः सङ्घटनैकरूपाः, तथापि गुणनियम एव संघटनाया नियमः । गुणाधीनसङ्घटनापक्षेऽप्येवम् । सङ्घटनाश्रयगुणपक्षेऽपि संङ्घटनाया नियामकत्वेन यद्वक्तृवाच्यौचित्यं हेतुत्वेनोक्तं, तद्गुणानामपि नियमहेतुरिति पक्षत्रयेऽपि न कश्चिद्विप्लवः इति तात्पर्यम् ॥ P. 140. *Locana.*

This Saṁghaṭanā-grantha in the third Uddyota of the *Dhvanyāloka* is a very clumsy section. Ānanda adopts here a serpentine style, the best style for confusing the readers. As a matter of fact, he is not very serious about the relation of Guṇa to Saṁghaṭanā, whether the two are identical or different or Guṇa is Saṁghaṭanāśraya or Saṁghaṭanā is Guṇāśraya. His fundamental conception is that Guṇas are Rasadharmas and that they can be brought into relation with Śabda through Upacāra and that they can never be said to be *dependent* on Saṁghaṭanā, Saṁghaṭanāparādhīna. As Rasadharmas, the Guṇas have Rasas as Niyāmakas and they have also the other Niyāmakas like the Aucitya of Vaktā, Vācya, Viṣaya etc. Saṁghaṭanā is also Rasavyañjaka through some Niyama. That Niyama is not however Rasa,

since the rule connecting certain kinds of Saṁghaṭanā to certain Rasas, such as the Dīrgha samāsa saṁghaṭanā to Raudra, shows Vyabhicāra. Nor is Saṁghaṭanā absolutely Aniyata; its Niyama is the more comprehensive Aucitya of the context. This analysis of Ānanda dispels from Guṇas unintelligible associations. It casts off ancient definitions of Guṇas involving dependence on Saṁghaṭanā. Ānanda relates Guṇas to the Guṇin or the Aṅgin, the Ātman which is Rasa. But, Bhāmaha defined the Guṇa of Ojas as Dīrghasamāsa saṁghaṭanā.

केचिदोजोऽभिधित्सन्तः समस्यन्ति बहून्यपि ।
यथा मन्दारकुसुमरेणुपिञ्जरितालका ॥

This definition makes Ojas the name of Samāsabhūyastva, without any reference to Rasa. Thus, this Ojas can be in Śṛṅgāra and actually the illustration of Bhāmaha for Ojas is a case of Śṛṅgāra. (Ānanda. *Dhvanyāloka*, p. 135.) In this case Guṇas will be either identical with Saṁghaṭanā or determined by and dependent on Saṁghaṭanā. Then the name Guṇa has little significance. Guṇa like the Śaurya of man belongs to the Ātman i.e., Rasa. It cannot be of Śabda or of Saṁghaṭanā and from this it follows that the Guṇas of Rasa cannot be more than three. Guṇas are not ten or more. They are only three, Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda. Of these, Prasāda is the Guṇa of all Rasas and it must be present everywhere. Even the Mādhurya of Śṛṅgāra may be present but if there is no Prasāda, the Śṛṅgāra rasa is not manifested. This Prasāda is not mainly of Śabda or Artha, but is of Rasa. It is the quality of quick emotional infection or spreading, the quality of quick spreading seen in the fire on dry wood.

समर्पकत्वं काव्यस्य यस्तु सर्वरसान्प्रति ।
स प्रसादो गुणो ज्ञेयः सर्वसाधारणक्रियः ॥

प्रसादस्तु स्वच्छता शब्दार्थयोः । स च सर्वरससाधारणो गुणः सर्वरचनासाधारणश्च व्यङ्ग्यार्थापेक्षयैव मुख्यतया व्यवस्थितः इति मन्तव्यः । *Dhva. Ā.* p. 82.

सर्वासु च संघटनासु प्रसादाख्यो गुणो व्यापी । स हि सर्वरससाधारणः सर्वसंघटनासाधारणश्चेत्युक्तम् । प्रसादातिक्रमे ह्यसमासापि संघटना करुणविप्रलंभरौद्रौ न व्यनक्ति । *Dhva. Ā.* p. 140.

समर्पकत्वं सम्यगर्पकत्वं हृदयसंवादेन प्रतिपत्तॄन् प्रति स्वात्मावेशेन व्यापकत्वम् । झगिति शुष्ककाष्ठाग्निदृष्टान्तेन । [अकलुषोदक दृष्टान्तेन च तदकालुष्यम्] प्रसन्नत्वं नाम सर्वरसानां गुणः । उपचारात्तु तथाविधे व्यङ्ग्येऽर्थे यच्छब्दार्थयोः समर्पकत्वं तदपि प्रसादः । *Locana* II. Ud. p. 82.

Such Śabda and Artha as have the quality of quickly delivering the Rasa are also described through Upacāra as having Prasāda.

Ojas, as we have seen above, was defined by the ancients in such a manner as to make it identical with or dependent on long Samāsa. Prasāda and Mādhurya also were defined by Bhāmaha in that manner, though in Daṇḍin these two Guṇas came to be defined in a different manner. But Ojas is defined all through its history from Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin downwards, by Bhoja and by others, as Samāsabhūyastva. Vāmana in the midst of these makes a solitary cry that Ojas is Gāḍhabandha. Bhāmaha says that this Ojas

which is Dīrghasamāsa is characteristic of certain writers : "Kecid ojo 'bhidhitsantaḥ". He gives two kinds of writers, one loving Mādhurya and Prasāda and refraining from long compounds.

माधुर्यमभिवाञ्छन्तः प्रसादं च सुमेधसः ।
समासवन्ति भूयांसि न पदानि प्रयुञ्जते ॥ II. 1.

and another loving Ojas and using long compounds

केचिदोजोऽभिधित्सन्तः समस्यन्ति बहून्यपि । II. 2.

Bhāmaha does not want to stamp these into two separate styles with the name of Vaidarbha and Gauḍa. He is against that kind of treatment of the subject. He refutes the view that the former is good and the latter bad. Without mentioning the names he simply says that certain writers resort to single or uncompounded words for the sake of Mādhurya and Prasāda while others compound very much for the sake of Ojas. Bhāmaha likes both, if both have Alaṁkāra, good meaning, and are decent and uninvolved. (I. 35) If Gauḍiyā should have these excellences, it is good. If Vaidarbhī is devoid of these, even that is bad. And Vaidarbhī, loving Mādhurya, must have restraint and also respect for idea as much as the other Mārga. If not, its mere pleasing sense for the ear cloys. It is only like some song. (I. 34) Thus, in Bhāmaha, we see that though he does not accept any narrow compartment attitude towards style, being led by the nose as it were by two catch-words, Vaidarbha and Gauḍa, he yet indicates at the beginning of chapter II in the course of his brief treatment of Guṇas, that one set of writers prefer a style with little compounds, while the other prefers a style with long compounds ; that of the former, the Guṇas are Mādhurya and Prasāda and of the latter, the Guṇas is Ojas. In Daṇḍin, it is definitely stated that Ojas, as long compounds, is a darling of the Gauḍas. Outside verse, in prose, whether they are Vaidarbhas or Gauḍas, writers use Ojas. Daṇḍin considers Ojas as the life of prose ! The Vaidarbhas do not resort to it in verse while the Gauḍas are addicted to it even in verse. (I. 80-84) Sometimes there occur stray instances of Samāsa even in a Vaidarbha verse but even then it will be a Vaidarbha's Samāsa, its essential feature being uninvolvedness. (Hṛdya anākula Ojas—I. 83). Thus the old writers connected Ojas with the two current styles called the Vaidarbhī and the Gauḍī and spoke of it as being absent from the one and present in the other. In both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, Ojas is identical with or dependent upon the Dīrghasamāsa saṁghaṭanā. Ānandavardhana took up this Ojas and cut off from it all these ideas. He said that Ojas is Dīpti, flaring up. It is not a Guṇa of Śabda or of the collocation of long compounds. It is a Rasaguṇa, the Guṇa of the Raudra and Adbhuta Rasas in the main. Just as Prasāda is seen in all Rasas, this Ojas is seen in Raudra and Adbhuta as the flaring up or the flaming up of the heart. It is to be seen in Vīra also.

रौद्रेत्यादि । आदिशब्दः प्रकारे । तेन वीराद्भुतयोरपि ग्रहणम् । Locana. p. 80.

This Guṇa of the Sahṛdaya's heart seen in the realisation of the Raudra, Adbhuta and Vīra Rasas, can be suggested by long compounds, as well as by

a collocation of no compounds. Older critics contended that Ojas was Dīrghasamāsa saṁghaṭanā, itself identical with or dependent on it and that the Dīrghasamāsa saṁghaṭanā alone could suggest Raudra Rasa and that if a verse of Raudra was not in compounds, it was a case of the poet's lapse in Vyutpatti. Ānanda casts off this view by linking Guṇa to Rasa and shows how, in such cases of Raudra not having long compounds, Sahṛdayas who are not obsessed with the traditional ideas of long compounds manifesting Ojas and Raudra, do feel the Ojas.

रौद्रादयो रसा दीप्त्या लक्ष्यन्ते काव्यवर्तिनः ।
तद्व्यक्तिहेतू शब्दार्थावाश्रित्यौजो व्यवस्थितम् ॥

रौद्रादयो हि रसाः परां दीप्तिम् उज्ज्वलतां जनयन्तीति लक्षणया त एव दीप्तिरित्युच्यते । तत्प्रकाशनपरः शब्दो दीर्घसमासरचनालङ्कृतं वाक्यम् । यथा–" चश्चद्भुजभ्रमित ०—" । तत्प्रकाशनपरश्चार्थोऽनपेक्षितदीर्घसमासरचनः प्रसन्नवाचकाभिधेयो यथा–" यो यः शस्त्रं बिभर्ति ०—" इत्यादौ द्वयोरोजस्त्वम् । *Dhva, Ā.* II. pp. 80-81.

Ojas related to Śabda through Upacāra or Śabda capable of presenting Ojas *may* be 'long compounds'. Artha capable of presenting Ojas need not be couched in long compounds. Artha has its own Dīpti in spite of an uncompounded Vācaka. In such cases, the Śabdas have only the Guṇa of Prasāda (of course through Upacāra). Ojas of Artha (through Upacāra) *can* be couched in long compounds.

Coming to Mādhurya,—the ancient Bhāmaha defined it as sweetness and absence of compounds.

श्रव्यं नातिसमस्तार्थं काव्यं मधुरमिष्यते ।

Mādhurya became Śrutyanuprāsa and Agrāmyatā in Daṇḍin. It got itself freed from the Asamāsa Saṁghaṭanā to which Bhāmaha tied it. It continued to have Śravyatā as part of its connotation. Śravyatā is not meant as absent from Ojas. For, Bhāmaha does not say so actually. He only says that in the style where there is little of compounds, where there is Prasāda as well as Mādhurya, Śravyatva is in abundance. This style is very sweet to the ear. Vāmana exactly gave Śabda Mādhurya as absence of Samāsa or the use of single uncompounded words, Pṛthakpadatā. His Arthaguṇa Mādhurya, which is Uktivaicitrya, can be ignored. Mādhurya was thus related to the Asamāsa Saṁghaṭanā, Śrutyanuprāsa and Agrāmyatā. Ānandavardhana made it the Guṇa of Śṛṅgāra pre-eminently. This Mādhurya has two phases. It is sweetness in Śṛṅgāra; in Vipralaṁbha and Karuṇa it takes the aspect of Ārdratā, extreme suppleness or melting of the heart. Thus Mādhurya is more and more in the ascending order in Śṛṅgāra (Saṁbhoga), Vipralaṁbha and Karuṇa. As we shall see in a further section, we have a third phase of this Mādhurya viz., the Mādhurya of Śānta. Ānanda never gave Mādhurya as the Guṇa of Śānta. Those who developed him made Śānta also a Madhura rasa. Its Mādhurya is of a separate kind. In realisation, Śāntarasa being the Rasa of Brahman-experience, has an unworldly Mādhurya. It is Mādhurya of the heart devoid of all miseries.

शृङ्गार एव मधुरः परः प्रह्लादनो रसः ।
तन्मयं काव्यमाश्रित्य माधुर्यं प्रतितिष्ठति ॥

शृङ्गार एव रसान्तरापेक्षया मधुरः प्रह्लादहेतुत्वात्प्रह्लादनः । तत्प्रकाशनपरशब्दार्थयोः काव्यस्य स माधुर्यलक्षणो गुणः । श्रव्यत्वं पुनरोजसोऽपि साधारणमिति ।

शृङ्गारे विप्रलम्भाख्ये करुणे च प्रकर्षवत् ।
माधुर्यमार्द्रतां याति यतस्तत्राधिकं मनः ॥ *Dhva. Ā.* II. p. 79.

Mādhurya and Ojas, Ārdratā and Dīpti, are the two main Guṇas, standing opposite to each other. Prasāda pertains to all Rasas. These two, Mādhurya and Dīpti divide the Rasas into two sets : Śṛṅgāra and Karuṇa on the one hand having nothing but Mādhurya, and Raudra, Vīra and Adbhuta on the other having nothing but Ojas. As regards the other Rasas, Hāsya, Bhayānaka and Bībhatsa, Abhinava tries to show that there is a varying proportion of Mādhurya and Ojas. Hāsya being an ancillary in Śṛṅgāra has Mādhurya and Ojas also in an equal degree since it is of the form of the expansion of the heart. In Bhayānaka and Bībhatsa, the Vibhāvas have Ojas and hence Ojas predominates.

एवं माधुर्यदीप्ती परस्परप्रतिद्वन्द्वितया स्थिते शृङ्गारादिरौद्रादिगते इति प्रदर्शयता तत्समावेश-वैचित्र्यं हास्यभयानकबीभत्सशान्तेषु दर्शितम् । हास्यस्य शृङ्गाराङ्गतया माधुर्यं प्रकृष्टम्; विकासधर्म-तयात्रौजोऽपि प्रकृष्टमिति साम्यं द्वयोः । भयानकस्य मग्नचित्तवृत्तिस्वभावेऽपि विभावस्य दीप्ततया ओजः प्रकृष्टम्, माधुर्यमल्पम् । बीभत्सेऽप्येवम् । *Locana*, p. 82.

Hāsya need not be an ancillary to Śṛṅgāra only. It can be introduced in other Rasas as well. It is mainly of the form of Vikāsa and springing from Ānanda, it can be justified that it has Mādhurya and Dīpti as Abhinava says. But, as regards Bhayānaka and Bībhatsa, there is strain in accepting the Samāveśa vaicitrya of Mādhurya and Ojas or in holding even a little amount of Mādhurya in them. Both of them are of the form of mental depression, Magnatā. There is difficulty in completely attributing to Rasa, the quality of its Vibhāva. Bībhatsa can be from such a Vibhāva as a woman. When a Yogin flies away from a woman and his loathing for carnal pleasure is depicted, the Vibhāva is not necessarily one of Ojas. He may think not of her fine form but only of the absolute final worth of her body in terms of blood, germs, the five Bhūtas, bones, flesh etc., and feel loathsomeness. The Vibhāvas here are loathsome, Jugupsya. They are not exactly of the form of Ojas. In the case of Bhayānaka, there is a great possibility of Ojas in Vibhāvas. For Raudra is the proper cause of Bhayānaka. But, the Ojas of the Vibhāvas cannot be the Guṇa of the resultant Rasa of Bhayānaka. The quality of the heart in Bhayānaka and Bībhatsa are thus not Dīpti but Magnatā and Saṅkoca. Some such cittavṛtti and Guṇa corresponding to it must be recognised for these two. Speaking of the four-fold nature of the mind in connection with the four primary Rasas producing four secondary Rasas, Dhanañjaya says that Bībhatsa is of the form of Kṣobha, agitation. (IV. 43-45.)

Though Ānandavardhana did not speak of the Guṇa of Śāntarasa, Abhinava did. He said :

शान्ते तु विभाववैचित्र्यात् कदाचिदोजः प्रकृष्टम्, कदाचिन्माधुर्यमिति विभागः।

The text is poor and we have not been given much idea by Abhinava here. Here again the Guṇa of the Vibhāva is attributed to Rasa also,—a questionable procedure. Further, there is no Vyavasthā in the Vibhāva of Śānta. From another aspect and more logically, the later writers establish Mādhurya as the Guṇa of Śāntarasa. Śānta should be the supreme type of Mādhurya.[1]

In my paper on the four Vṛttis, I have shown, how dramatic themes, even as actions in the world, can be divided into two main classes, the soft and the wild, the tender and the terrible,—Masṛṇa and Lalita as opposed to Āviddha and Udbhaṭa. These two divide dance into Lāsya,—the Sukumāra variety and Tāṇḍava,—the Uddhata variety. So also in the Daśarūpakas, dramas are Sukumāra or Uddhata. Kaiśikī vṛtti predominates in the former and Ārabhaṭī in the latter. The basis is Vyavahāra or Itivṛtta which is of the form of Rasa. The Rasas themselves form into two classes in dramas. This in Kāvya has its counterpart in the Guṇa of the Rasa. Getting behind Vṛtti, we find Guṇas in Rasas. Thus Śṛṅgāra is Madhura, hence Masṛṇa and Sukumāra and hence has Kaiśikī as its vṛtti. Raudra is Ojas and hence is Uddhata and has Ārabhaṭī. Thus in Kāvya, the analysis yields Rasas, then Guṇas and then Vṛttis and lastly Rītis. The first controls the rest up to the last. In Śṛṅgāra there is Mādhurya, the Guṇa. It is embodied in an Arthavyavahāra which is in accordance with Mādhurya and that Arthavyavahāra is the Vṛtti of Kaiśikī. Its corresponding Śabdavyavahāra is the Rīti, the Vaidarbhī. See my paper on Vṛttis.

According to Abhinavagupta who states Ānanda more explicitly, the Guṇas are of the form of realisation in the Sahṛdaya. They are attributed to the Rasas realised and through them to Artha and Śabda. Such Guṇas are only three, Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda.

एवं माधुर्यौजःप्रसादाख्यो गुणा उपपन्नाः भामहाभिप्रायेण। ते च प्रतिपत्तृ-आस्वादमया मुख्यतया, तत आस्वाद्य उपचरिता रसे, ततः तद्व्यञ्जकयोः शब्दार्थयोरिति तात्पर्यम्। एवमस्मत्पक्ष एव गुणालङ्कारव्यवहारो विभागेन उपपद्यत इति—। *Locana* II. p. 82.

Guṇas are thus Cittavṛttis ; they are the names of the Vṛttis Kaiśiki etc. from a different aspect. Naming a particular mental state is by the rule of predominance ; for Druti which is Mādhurya is a feature present in all kinds of Rasa realisation ; so also, there is Vikāsa and Vistara in all kinds of Rasa realisation.

Rājaśekhara.

In the very beginning of his *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*, Rājaśekhara says that he devotes the penultimate section of his proposed treatise to Guṇas, Gunaupādā-

1. See pp. 51-52 my '*Number of Rasas*' Adyar Library Series.

nika, i.e. on Guṇopādāna. This section along with the others, except the first, is lost to us.

In Chapter IV of his *Kāvyānuśāsana*, Hemacandra deals with Guṇas. He follows Ānandavardhana and accepts only three Guṇas, and these, as Rasa dharmas. He briefly states in his Vṛtti that Guṇas are not five or ten but only three. He takes up this bit of his Vṛtti and elaborately states in his commentary the ten Guṇas of Śabda and Artha according to Bharata, Daṇḍin and Vāmana. Maṅgala's view is also referred to in the course of the discussion. The style of the passages here resembles that of Rājaśekhara in his *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*. Firstly Bharata's view is given with the words 'Iti Bharataḥ'. Then others' refutations follow. The results are summarised then and there. The names of the several authors on Guṇa are referred to then and there, 'Iti Vāmanīyāḥ' and so on. The impression is created while reading this portion that Rājaśekhara is the original author of this critical survey of Guṇas and that Hemacandra reproduces the whole thing from the *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* which is now lost to us except for its first chapter. There is however no additional evidence except the fact that Hemacandra is a great borrower and that from the available chapter of the *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* itself he has borrowed six times, all the cases being mostly wholesale reproduction.

Hemacandra.

On Guṇas. Hemacandra is a follower of Ānanda and he draws upon Mammaṭa and probably from Rājaśekhara also as we have suggested above. He establishes the Rasāśrayatva of Guṇas through Anvaya and Vyatireka. This argument of his is worked out of a verse and the Vṛtti thereon in Ānandavardhana and out of Abhinava's Locana on them. Closing his discussion on Guṇas in Uddyota II, pp. 82-3, Ānanda says :

श्रुतिदुष्टादयो दोषा अनित्या ये च सूचिताः ।
ध्वन्यात्मन्येव शृङ्गारे ते हेया इत्युदाहृताः ॥

अनित्या दोषाश्च ये श्रुतिदुष्टादयः सूचिताः तेऽपि न वाच्यार्थमात्रे न च व्यङ्ग्ये शृङ्गारे, शृङ्गारव्यतिरेकिणि वा ध्वनेरनात्मभावे । किं तर्हि ध्वन्यात्मन्येव शृङ्गारे अङ्गितया व्यङ्ग्ये ते हेया इत्युदाहृताः ॥ अन्यथा हि तेषामनित्यदोषतैव न स्यात् । *Dhva. Ā.*

बीभत्सहास्यरौद्रादौ त्वेषाम् अस्माभिरुपगमात् शृङ्गारादौ तु वर्जनाद् अनित्यत्वं समर्थितमेवेति भावः ।
Locana, p. 83.

There are some faults Śrutiduṣṭa and Aślīla. They are not as such Doṣas. They are Doṣas only in Śṛṅgāra and such others. Śrutiduṣṭa in Bībhatsa and Raudra, and Aślila in Śṛṅgāra ābhāsa and Hāsya are Guṇas. They are thus Anitya doṣas. Their Anityatva and Doṣatva are related to the particular Rasa in which they are Doṣa and in which they are not. Therefore the Rasas decide their character and the avoidance of them is prescribed only with reference to the Ātman of Rasa. This argument is utilised by Ānanda to show the existence of Ātman. Ānanda adopts many an argument to prove the existence of Rasa-Dhvani as Ātman. He proves that the Ātman is a necessity

if the terms Guṇa and Alaṁkāra are to be rendered intelligible, if the name Rasavadalaṁkāra is to become sensible, and finally if Śrutiduṣṭa and other Doṣas are to be held as Anitya doṣas. This Hemacandra utilises and develops into an argument to prove that Guṇas pertain to Rasa.

ते (गुणाः) च रसस्यैव धर्माः उपचारेण तु तदुपकारिणोः शब्दार्थयोरुच्यन्ते । रसाश्रयत्वं च गुणदोषयोरन्वयव्यतिरेकानुविधानात् । तथा हि यत्रैव दोषाः, तत्रैव गुणाः, रसविशेषे च दोषाः, न तु शब्दार्थयोः । यदि हि तयोस्स्युः तर्हि बीभत्सादौ कष्टत्वादयो गुणा न भवेयुः, हास्यादौ च अश्लीलत्वादयः । अनित्याश्चैते दोषाः । यतो यस्याङ्गिनस्ते दोषाः, तदभावे न दोषाः तद्भावे तु दोषाः इत्यन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां गुणदोषयोः रस एवाश्रयः । *K. A.* p. 16.

Guṇas are like Doṣas and exist in the same place. Doṣas are in Rasas and not in Śabda or Artha. If the Doṣa called Kaṣṭa should be in Śabda, then that Pada which is Kaṣṭa will eternally be Duṣṭa. So also a Pada will have to be eternally Aślīla. The real fact is that these Doṣas are Guṇas in Bībhatsa and Hāsya. So the Doṣas are Anitya, Doṣas not by themselves but with reference to the Rasa of the context. Hence, that whose presence or absence makes them Doṣa or Guṇa is their Āśraya.

Hemacandra says that of Guṇa and Alaṁkāra, the former is more important since there can be Kāvyas without the latter, provided those cases have Guṇas.

Sūtra : अदोषौ सगुणौ सालङ्कारौ च शब्दार्थौ काव्यम् ।

Vṛtti : चकारो निरलङ्कारयोरपि शब्दार्थयोः क्वचित्काव्यत्वव्यापनार्थः ।

Vyākhyā : अनेन काव्ये गुणानामवश्यंभावमाह । तथा हि अनलङ्कृतमपि गुणबहुलं स्वदते, यथोदाहरिष्यमाणं 'शून्यं वासगृहम्' इत्यादि । अलङ्कृतमपि निर्गुणं न स्वदते । P. 16.

न चालङ्कृतीनामपोद्धाराहाराभ्यां वाक्यं दुष्यति पुष्यति वा ।
× × × गुणानामपोद्धाराहारौ तु न संभवत इति ।
P. 17.

This he says to show how Alaṁkāras exist through Samyoga and Guṇas through Samavāya, to refute Udbhaṭa's contention that both exist through Samavāya. Hemacandra also refutes Vāmana by showing how verses which have no Guṇas at all may be Kāvya and verses which have many Guṇas may not be Kāvya. (See p. 17 *K. A. Vyākhyā*).

As regards the three Guṇas, Hemacandra considers Mādhurya is of the highest degree in Vipralaṁbha, a little less in Karuṇa, and still less in Śānta. शान्तकरुणविप्रलम्भेषु सातिशयम् । This is one of the views recorded by Jagannātha.

Coming now to the commentary (pp. 194-201) of Hemacandra on his own text with which we began the section, we have already referred to the discussion about the ten Guṇas in it which, we suggested, Hemacandra took from Rājaśekhara. In these discussions, sometimes Daṇḍin is presented as refuting Vāmana. It is anachronistic but the whole discussion contains Pūrvapakṣas and Khaṇḍanas fashioned only in an imaginative manner. None

of the ancients refuted definitely others' views on Guṇas. Maṅgala is first cited as criticising Bharata's idea of Ojas. But Maṅgala's idea of Ojas is not given and Daṇḍin is next referred to as refuting Bharata's Ojas. Maṅgala and Vāmana are next quoted as refuting Daṇḍin's idea of Ojas. From here we may take it that Maṅgala took Ojas as Gāḍhatva, like Vāmana. Maṅgala is no more quoted. The names occurring in the rest of the text are only Vāmana, Daṇḍin and Bharata. To the authors' criticisms of one another, the text adds its own criticism. The line of criticism seen in Mammaṭa is followed. Certain things are shown to be no Guṇa at all, being Vaicitrya or Vaidagdhya of a very general nature ; certain others are Alaṁkāras etc., and certain others are dismissed as absence of flaws.

The value of this part of Hemacandra's commentary is enhanced by his reference to strange views on Guṇas which we do not find referred to anywhere else.

Five Guṇas as Pāṭhadharmas.

On p. 200, after a critical scrutiny of the ten old Guṇas, Hemacandra says :

ओजःप्रसादमधुरिमाणः साम्यौदार्ये च पञ्चेत्यपरे ।

Even earlier, he referred to the view of five Guṇas. This view holds Ojas, Prasāda, Mādhurya, Sāmya and Audārya as the five Guṇas. And these are curiously held by their advocates not as Guṇas in the sense in which we have been talking of Guṇa till now, but as Pāṭhadharmas. Hemacandra thoroughly pooh-poohs this theory. The advocates of this theory hold that 'non-stop' reading is Ojas, reading with stops here and there is Prasāda, reading with rise and fall, perhaps in a sing-song manner, is Mādhurya, clear and perfect reading with proper pronunciation (Sthāna) is Audārya and reading in neither too low nor too high a pitch is Sāmya.

यददर्शि(त)विच्छेदं पठतामोजः, विच्छिद्य पदानि पठतां प्रसादः, आरोहावरोहतरङ्गिणि पाठे माधुर्यम्, ससौष्ठवमेव स्थानं पठताम् औदार्यम्, अनुच्चनीचं पठतां साम्यमिति । तदिदमलीकं कल्पनातन्त्रं, यद्विषयविभागेन पाठनियमः स कथं गुणनिमित्त इति । P. 200.

The Guṇas as Pāṭhadharmas may refer to the speeches of the text in dramas and we saw above under Bharata how the definitions of some Guṇas in Bharata might be taken to refer to speaking also.

Five Guṇas as Metrical Qualities.

Another interesting view then given by Hemacandra is that some consider these five Guṇas given above as belonging to certain metres : Ojas in Sragdharā etc., Prasāda in Indravajrā, Upendravajrā etc., Mādhurya in Mandākrāntā etc., Samatā in Śārdūlavikrīḍita etc., and Audārya in the Viṣamavṛttas. Hemacandra criticises this view also as of those who have not seen much poetry ; for he shows cases where these metrical associations are Vyabhicarita.

छन्दोविशेषनिवेश्या गुणसंपत्तिरिति केचित् × × × ×
× × सोऽयमनवगाहितप्रयोगाणां विभागक्रमः । Pp. 200-201.

In the section on Vāmana, we have referred to the views of those who considered Guṇas as Pāṭhadharmas and to Samādhi in Vāmana as a Guṇa of the metre.[1]

Kuntaka.

Kuntaka is a valuable name in the history of Guṇas and his treatment of the concept is full of originality.

In I. 22, Kuntaka defines Bandha thus :

वाच्यवाचकसौभाग्यलावण्यपरिपोषकः ।
व्यापारशाली वाक्यस्य विन्यासो बन्ध उच्यते ॥

In defining Bandha in this manner, Kuntaka has spoken of two features which he himself calls Guṇas. They are Saubhāgya and Lāvaṇya. They have been given as Guṇas of both Śabda and Artha, of Vācaka and Vācya. He says on the above Kārikā :

वाच्यवाचकयोर्द्वयोरपि वाच्यस्य अभिधेयस्य, वाचकस्य च शब्दस्य वक्ष्यमाणं सौभाग्यलावण्यलक्षणं यद्गुणद्वयं, तस्य परिपोषकः, पुष्टतातिशयकारी ।

He then briefly indicates the nature of these two Guṇas. We speak of the Saubhāgya of women consisting in their beautiful qualities fulfilling themselves by contributing to the delight of their lovers.

प्रियेषु सौभाग्यफला हि चारुता । Kālidāsa, *Kumāra Sambhava*, V.

So also the Saubhāgya of Śabda and Artha consists in their fulfilling themselves by achieving that for which they are intended. That is, they must be for the delectation of the Sahṛdaya by most effectively developing the Rasa. This is the chief virtue of Śabda and Artha even as Saubhāgya of women. Next only to this comes Lāvaṇya, the beauty of Śabda and Artha as such, even as Lāvaṇya of Women.

सौभाग्यं प्रतिभासंरम्भफलभूतं चेतनचमत्कारित्वलक्षणम्, लावण्यं सन्निवेशसौन्दर्यम्—। P. 43.

Both these qualities of Saubhāgya and Lāvaṇya are comprehended in the Sāhitya and the Śabdārtha-pāramārthya, which have been dealt with by Kuntaka earlier in the same chapter. Kuntaka promises to speak of these two qualities again in a further context. In the meantime he speaks of three Mārgas or styles and the Guṇas pertaining to them. To this set of Guṇas constituting the Mārgas, we shall come last. After giving the different Guṇas that characterise the three Mārgas, Kuntaka again speaks of two general Guṇas. Here it is that we must expect him to treat again at

1. The text of Hemacandra's commentary on his own *Kāvyānuśāsana* above referred to is almost reproduced by Māṇikyacandra in his Saṁketa on Mammaṭa. The Saṁketa is dated 1160 A.D. and Hemacandra was born in 1088-89 A.D. He became Sūri and Ācārya in 1110 A.D. and passed away in 1173 A.D. It is likely that the text of Māṇikyacandra having a critique of the ten old Guṇas is borrowed from Hemacandra. (See also P. K. Gode's article on Mammaṭa and Hemacandra in the J. of the Tanjore S. M. Library, Vol. I. No. 1 pp. 9-13).

length of the two general Guṇas Saubhāgya and Lāvaṇya. Kuntaka, however, leaves Lāvaṇya, having treated of it as a minor Guṇa pertaining to a variety of Mārga. We shall examine later this Lāvaṇya and the Lāvaṇya of the Mārga called Sukumāra. The two major guṇas of all poetic expression spoken of by Kuntaka in the further context are not Saubhāgya and Lāvaṇya, but Saubhāgya and Aucitya.

Beginning with Kārikā 53 and going up to the end of the first Unmeṣa, Kuntaka deals with the two Guṇas of Aucitya and Saubhāgya, which he calls 'Sādhāraṇaguṇa' in the phraseology of Daṇḍin to distinguish them from the Guṇas that go to distinguish Mārgas. For Daṇḍin calls the Mārgavibhājaka-guṇas 'Asādhāraṇa (guṇa) alaṁkāras' and the figures of speech pertaining to all Mārgas, 'Sādhāraṇa alaṁkāras.' Says Kuntaka :

एवं प्रत्येकं प्रतिनियतगुणग्रामरमणीयं मार्गत्रितयं व्याख्याय साधारणगुणस्वरूपव्याख्यानार्थमाह । p. 72.

In Kārikās 53 and 54, Kuntaka elucidates the nature of the concept of Aucitya of which Ānanda has said so much in the third chapter of his work. Kuntaka relates it to his Sāhitya and Saubhāgya. The concepts of Aucitya and Saubhāgya as general Guṇas are applied by Kuntaka to Pada, Vākya, Prakaraṇa and Prabandha.

अनन्तरोक्तस्य गुणद्वयस्य विषयं प्रदर्शयति ।
एतत् त्रिष्वपि मार्गेषु गुणद्वितयमुज्ज्वलम् ।
पदवाक्यप्रबन्धानां व्यापकत्वेन वर्तते ॥ I. 57.

एतद्गुणद्वितयमौचित्यसौभाग्याभिधानम् उज्ज्वलमतीव भ्राजिष्णु पदवाक्यप्रबन्धानां त्रयाणामपि व्यापकत्वेन वर्तते सकलावयवव्याप्त्यावतिष्ठते । क्वेत्याह त्रिष्वपि मार्गेषु सुकुमारविचित्रमध्यमाख्येषु । P. 76.

सौभाग्यमपि पदवाक्यप्रकरणप्रबन्धानां प्रत्येकमनेकाकारकमनीयकारणकलापकलितरामणीयकानां किमपि सहृदयसंवेद्यं काव्यैकजीवितमलौकिकचमत्कारकारिसंवलित(त)या अनेकरसास्वादसुन्दरं सकलावयवव्यापकत्वेन काव्यस्य गुणान्तरं परिस्फुरतीत्यलमतिप्रसङ्गेन । Pp. 77-78.

I. 53-54 define Aucitya :

आजसेन स्वभावस्य महत्त्वं येन पोष्यते ।
प्रकारेण तदौचित्यम् उचिताख्यानजीवितम् ॥
यत्र वक्तुः प्रमातुर्वा वाच्यं शोभातिशायिना ।
आच्छाद्यते स्वभावेन तदप्यौचित्यमुच्यते ॥

In ideas as well as in the use of words, there is to be appropriateness or Aucitya. In presenting things and men, in Svabhāvollekha, the ideas introduced must be appropriate to the character, theme and Rasa. Aucitya is, as Kuntaka says in the first Kārikā, Ucitākhyāna. This is what Kṣemendra says in his *Aucityavicāracarcā*. उचितस्य च यो भावः तदौचित्यं प्रचक्षते ।
The very life of poetic expression is this Aucitya and Kuntaka calls it Jīvita.

उचिताभिधानजीवितत्वात् वाक्यस्य —।

Both Abhinava and Kṣemendra speak of Aucitya as the Jīvita. Kuntaka illustrates Aucitya in six verses and Anaucitya in four verses of Kālidāsa himself and remarks that he pointed out Anaucitya only in the master-poet who had immense Śakti besides Vyutpatti, and not in any other poet depending upon Vyutpatti only. He means to say that the expressions of the latter abound in Anaucitya (p. 77). At the beginning of Unmeṣa II Kuntaka speaks of the Aucitya of Varṇas (p. 80). On p. 84 he speaks of Śabdālaṁkāraucitya where he says that if by special effort, a poet exerts himself in Śabdālaṁkāras he ruins Aucitya and through it ruins Sāhitya.[1] Kuntaka then explains Saubhāgya, expanding the brief description of it given already. It is the guṇa which emphasises the idea that all features of poetic expression must fulfil the purpose for which they are intended.

इत्युपादेयवर्गेऽस्मिन् यदर्थं प्रतिभा कवेः ।
सम्यक् संरभते तस्य गुणस्सौभाग्यमुच्यते ॥
सर्वसंपत्परिस्पन्दसंपाद्यं सरसात्मनाम् ।
अलौकिकचमत्कारकारि काव्यैकजीवितम् ॥

Just as he called Aucitya, Jīvita, he also calls Saubhāgya, Kāvyajīvita.

Coming now to the Guṇas that distinguish the various Mārgas, i.e., the Asādhāraṇaguṇas : Kuntaka recognises that style is the embodiment of the qualities, Guṇas, and that Guṇas are the more basic features. He says in Unmeṣa II under Kārikā 5 :

तत्र गुणानाम् आन्तरतम्यात् प्रथममुपन्यसनं, गुणद्वारेणैव मार्गानुसरणोपपत्तेः । p. 85.

Not only are Kuntaka's Mārgas original but his Guṇas of the three Mārgas also are somewhat original. Firstly, he speaks of the Sukumāra mārga and its Guṇas. The Sukumāra mārga is a restatement of the old Vaidarbhī. Its first Guṇa is Mādhurya, then come Prasāda, Lāvaṇya and Ābhijātya. The first two are old ones and the latter two, new. The Guṇa called Mādhurya applies both to Śabda and Artha and comprises 'Asamstapadatva,' 'Śrutiramyapadatva' and 'Uktivaicitrya.'

एवं सुकुमाराभिधानस्य मार्गस्य लक्षणं विधाय तस्यैव गुणान् लक्षयति—

असमस्तमनोहारि पदविन्यासजीवितम् ।
माधुर्यं सुकुमारस्य मार्गस्य प्रथमो गुणः ॥

The first line mentions three minor features making up Mādhurya. The first is contained in the words 'Asamastapada,' no Samāsa or very little Samāsa.

असमस्तानि समासवर्जितानि ।

असमस्तशब्दोऽत्र प्राचुर्यार्थः, न समासाभावनियमार्थः ।

This kind of Mādhurya is taken from Vāmana who gives Śabdamādhurya as Pṛthakpadatva and absence of long Samāsa.

पृथक्पदत्वं माधुर्यम् । Vāmana III. 1. 20. समासदैर्घ्यनिवृत्तिपरं चैतत् । *Ibid.* Vṛtti.

1. On Kuntaka and Aucitya, see my paper on Aucitya ; also above, Vol. I. Part 1, p. 107.

The second aspect of Mādhurya is contained in the word 'Manohāri' in the Kārikā which Kuntaka interprets thus :

मनोहारीणि हृदयाह्लादकानि **श्रुतिरम्यत्वेन अर्थरमणीयत्वेन** च यानि पदानि सुप्तिङन्तानि, तेषां विन्यासः etc.

This Śrutiramyatva is the reverse of the old Doṣa of Śrutikaṣṭa ; it is emphasised by the word 'Śravya' in Bhāmaha's definition of Mādhurya and forms part of Daṇḍin's Śrutyanuprāsamādhurya.

The idea 'Artharamaṇīyatva' in the above explanation must be taken with the third aspect of Mādhurya contained in the Kārikā in the word Vinyāsa which is interpreted in the Vṛtti as Sanniveśavaicitrya. Commenting upon an illustration for Mādhurya, he says

अत्र पदानाम् **असमस्तत्वं शब्दार्थरमणीयता विन्यासवैचित्र्यं** च त्रितयमपि चकास्ति।

Thus, these constitute Mādhurya and of these the last, Vinyāsavaicitrya, is to be related to Artharamaṇīyatva, and it gives the Mādhurya of Artha, even as Śabdaramaṇīyatva taken along with 'Asamastapadatva' gives us the Mādhurya of Śabda. In that case, the third becomes the Uktivaicitrya which is the Arthaguṇa Mādhurya of Vāmana. (Vāmana III. 2. 10).

The next quality of the Sukumāra style is Prasāda and there is little change in its conception in Kuntaka. He shows how, even when the Vakroktis are introduced, those Alaṁkāras must have the Guṇa of Prasāda.

The third Guṇa is Lāvaṇya :

वर्णविन्यासविच्छित्ति पदसन्धानसंपदा।
स्वल्पया बन्धसौन्दर्यं लावण्यमभिधीयते॥

The Lāvaṇya of Bandha or collocation is a result of mild Śabdālaṁkāras, of Varṇavinyāsa, both of which come off easily and do not cost much special energy, Nāti nirbandha nirmita. Kuntaka means here the physical beauty of a verse on hearing which, as in the case of a song, one is thrilled, even before making out its meaning. It is this Guṇa of which he speaks in an Aṇtara śloka on p. 29 :

अपर्यालोचितेऽप्यर्थे **बन्धसौन्दर्यसंपदा**।
गीतवद् हृदयाह्लादं तद्विदां विदधाति यत्॥ I. 37.

Of this Guṇa especially Kuntaka says that it cannot be sufficiently conveyed through words and that it can be known only by experience.

अत्र सन्निवेशसौन्दर्यमहिमा हृदयसंवेद्यो न व्यपदेष्टुं पार्यते। p. 54.

Of this again he says on p. 56 :

तस्य बन्धसौन्दर्यमेव अव्युत्पन्नपदार्थानामपि श्रवणमात्रेणैव हृदयहारित्वस्पर्धया व्यपदिश्यते।

The fourth Guṇa of the Sukumāra mārga is the Ābhijātya of words. This Guṇa is explained as 'Śrutipeśalatva,' dulcet to the ear, 'Cetasā susparśa,' easy and pleasant for the heart to reach, and 'Svabhāvamasṛṇacchāya,' with a delicate beauty existing by nature. This Guṇa again can only be felt and cannot be more concretely explained through words.

Of these four Guṇas, we can clearly see how Lāvaṇya and Ābhijātya overlap with Mādhurya and all together stand for the same composite effect of sensuousness.

The same four Guṇas are again taken as pertaining to the style called the Vicitra. But their connotation now differs. Kuntaka explains the Vicitra mārga and its Guṇas in Kārikās 44-48 and in the Vṛtti thereon. Mādhurya of the Vicitra mārga contains more Vaicitrya ; that is, Ukti vaicitrya as regards Artharamaṇīyatva. As applied to Śabdas, it means greater vigour in the Vicitra mārga. In the Sukumāra mārga, all the words are sweet and the Bandha is Sarvakomala, and has a tendency to become liable to the flaw called Śaithilya. This Śaithilya is eliminated in the Vicitra mārga and the Bandha is rendered more 'Bandhura.' Kuntaka here derives much from Daṇḍin.

वैदग्ध्यस्यन्दि माधुर्यं पदानामत्र बध्यते ।
याति यत्यक्तशैथिल्यं बन्धबन्धुरताङ्कताम् ॥ I. 44.

Here 'Vaidagdhyasyandi' is interpreted as 'Vaicitrya samarpaka' ; 'Tyakta śaithilya' as 'Ujjhita komala bhāva' and 'Bandha bandhuratā' as 'Sanniveśa saundarya.'

The second Guṇa of the Vicitramārga, Prasāda, is likewise interpreted very briefly. It is first given as Asamastapadatva with slight Ojas or Samāsa. Kuntaka follows Vāmana here who speaks of Ojah-prasāda samplava.

असमस्त पदन्यासः प्रसिद्धः कविवर्त्मनि ।
किञ्चिदोजः स्पृशन् प्रायः प्रसादोऽयत्र दृश्यते ॥

Another kind of Prasāda, where the idea of one word is clarified by another and of one sentence by another, is also given by Kuntaka here. Further the illustration makes it clear that this Prasāda is the appropriate delineation of an idea, Arthollekha, for clearly and completely conveying a picture.

गमकानि निबध्यन्ते वाक्ये वाक्यान्तराण्यपि ।
पदानीवात्र कोऽप्येष प्रसादस्यापरः क्रमः ॥

The third Guṇa, Lāvaṇya, of the Vicitra mārga is of a different nature from the Lāvaṇya of the Sukumāra mārga.

अत्रालुप्तविसर्गान्तैः पदैः प्रोतैः परस्परम् ।
ह्रस्वैः संयोगपूर्वैश्च लावण्यमतिरिच्यते ॥ p. 47.

Here the feature contained in the words पदैः प्रोतैः परस्परम् is the old Śleṣa, many words knit together so well that it looks as if they are one word.

मसृणत्वं श्लेषः । यस्मिन् सति बहून्यपि पदानि एकपदवद् भासन्ते ।
Vāmana, *K. A. Sū. & Vṛ.* III. i. 10.

Kuntaka explains himself thus : परस्परम् अन्योन्यं प्रोतैः संश्लेषं नीतैः ।
The other aspects of Lāvaṇya are given as 'Aluptavisargāntatva' 'Hrasvapadatva' and 'Samyogapūrvapadatva.' Finally he says that the Lāvaṇya of the Sukumāra mārga is heightened or made Atirikta by these features in

the Vicitra mārga. The three features given together, besides Śleṣa, promote Ojas. So, in the technique of the old writers, we can understand this Lāvaṇya of the Vicitra mārga as produced by Śleṣa and Ojas. The fourth, Ābhijātya, of the Vicitra mārga is explained as the Guṇa of the words being neither too soft nor too harsh.

यत्नातिकोमलच्छायं नातिकाठिन्यमुद्वहत् ।
आभिजात्यं मनोहारि तदत्र प्रौढिनिर्मितम् ॥ I. 48.

In applying the same four Guṇas to the two Mārgas, Kuntaka has not clearly expressed himself. The Sukumāra is in essence a style in which there is natural elegance and grace, born of the poet's Pratibhā or genius mainly. The Vicitra is the Sukumāra itself burnished up, highly coloured with flights of figures, a style in which special decoration is resorted to and which is the product more of the art and technical skill of the poet, his Vyutpatti. The Alaṁkāras abound in the latter Mārga and hence additional Vaicitrya also, while in the former there is minimum Alaṁkāra and Vaicitrya, there being only the portrayal of the beautiful Rasa and the Svabhāva of men and things. Even so, the qualities of the Vicitra mārga are only those of the Sukumāra but exhibiting greater Vaicitrya ; there is some additional Ojas and Uktivaicitrya ; generally speaking, the same Guṇas are in the Vicitra in a greater measure and with great Vaicitrya. This, Kuntaka clearly states at the end of his treatment of the Vicitra mārga.

एवं सुकुमारविहितानामेव गुणानां विचित्रे कश्चिदतिशयः संपाद्यत इति बोद्धव्यम् ।
आभिजात्यप्रभृतयः पूर्वमार्गोदिता गुणाः ।
अत्रातिशयमायान्ति जनिताह्लार्यसंपदः ॥ p. 69.

Of these four Guṇas of Kuntaka, Mādhurya and Prasāda are old ones and in treating of them he derives much from Daṇḍin and Vāmana as has been shown above. Besides these two, he has taken one of the Guṇas of the Vaidarbhī of Daṇḍin, viz., Sukumāratā and has named his own first Mārga itself by that Guṇa. Besides having Sukumāratā in the name of his first Mārga, he speaks of Saukumārya while explaining the Guṇa, Lāvaṇya, also :

शब्दार्थसौकुमार्यसुभगः सन्निवेशमहिमा लावण्याख्यो गुणः कथ्यते । p. 54.

He further speaks of Masṛṇatva, while explaining Ābhijātya of the Sukumāramārga ; but that has nothing to do with the Masṛṇatva which is Vāmana's Śleṣa. It is allied to the ideas of Saukumārya in Daṇḍin and Vāmana. While speaking of Mādhurya in the Vicitra mārga, Kuntaka mentions the Śaithilya of Daṇḍin. In the next Guṇa, Prasāda, he accepts and includes the Ojas of old writers meaning Samāsa.

'किञ्चिदोजः स्पृशन्' Kārikā 45.
'तथाविधस्यौजसः समासवती वृत्तिः 'ओजः' शब्देन चिरन्तनैरुच्यते ।

And he follows Vāmana in maintaining a case of style with Prasāda and Ojas mixed up.

तदयमत्र परमार्थः—पूर्वस्मिन् प्रसादलक्षणे सति, ओजस्संस्पर्शमात्रमिह विधीयते । p. 67.

Thus Kuntaka who refutes actually the old Mārgas does not completely cast away the old Guṇas.

Two main sets of Guṇas are thus accepted by Kuntaka, Sādhāraṇa and Asādhāraṇa. The former belong to all Kāvyas in general and the latter belong only to particular Mārgas. Saubhāgya, Lāvaṇya and Aucitya constitute the former class and Mādhurya, Prasāda, Lāvaṇya and Ābhijātya, the latter. The latter are used in both the Sukumāra and Vicitra mārgas with a difference of meaning.

An examination of the *Vakroktijīvita* discloses the fact that Kuntaka followed the ancient conception of Guṇa also being Alaṁkāra, since he considers these Guṇas to be so many varieties of Vakratā. That Aucitya, one of his Sādhāraṇaguṇas, is of the form of Vakratā is said by himself.

तत्र पदस्य तावदौचित्यं बहुविधभेदभिन्नो वक्रभावः । स्वभावस्य आजसेन प्रकारेण परिपोषणमेव वक्रतायाः परं रहस्यम् । p. 76.

In the instance given for illustrating the Guṇa, Saubhāgya, Kuntaka shows Upacāravakratva, Pratyayavakratva, Samvṛtivakratva, and Kārakavakratva. Mādhurya results from Varṇavinyāsavakratva. Finally, Kuntaka says clearly that Guṇas also are Alaṁkāras and Alaṁkāra means Śobhākaradharma or Vakrokti.

अलङ्कारशब्दः शरीरस्य शोभातिशयकारित्वान्मुख्यतया कटकादिषु वर्तते, तत्कारित्वसामान्यादुपचारादुपमादिषु, तद्वदेव च तत्सदृशेषु गुणादिषु— । p. 3.

Thus, Kuntaka has interesting agreements with Bhoja and these we have elaborately set forth in the section on Bhoja and Vakrokti. (Vol. I. Part 1, pp. 126-134).

Kṣemendra.

Another out of the way treatment of the concept of Guṇa deserves notice here. As a follower of the system of Ānanda, Kṣemendra must have treated of the Guṇas in his lost *Kavikarṇikā*. In the *Aucityavicāracarcā*, he has nothing original to say on Guṇas. It is his minor work, the *Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa*, that has made us include his name in this account of the Guṇas.

In the fourth section of the *Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa*, Kṣemendra deals with Guṇa-doṣa-vibhāga. He speaks of a new kind of three Guṇas, simple and general.

तत्र शब्दवैमल्यमर्थवैमल्यं रसवैमल्यमिति त्रयः काव्यगुणाः । शब्दकालुष्यम्, अर्थकालुष्यम्, रसकालुष्यमिति काव्यदोषाः । सगुणं, निर्गुणं, सदोषं, निर्दोषं, सगुणदोषं च काव्यम् ।

He says that there are three Guṇas of Kāvyas, clarity of Śabdas, clarity of Artha and clarity of Rasa. Prasāda is the prime requisite of all poetry. So it is that Kṣemendra, speaking of poetry in general and its dominantly needed quality, speaks of Vaimalya in the three departments of Śabda, Artha and Rasa. Some verses are simple in words; yet their meaning as a whole is involved. The Śabda Vaimalya will be judged from the point of view of Artha. Similarly Arthavaimalya will be judged from the ease with which Rasa is

realised from a verse. Arthavaimalya can also be seen separately in verses which have a simple meaning in spite of lack of clarity in words. Rasavaimalya is the most important of the three and the other two are only for its sake. Rasavaimalya is illustrated by Kṣemendra by a verse of his own describing the moonrise from which description of Uddīpana vibhāva, Śṛṅgāra is roused. But Kṣemendra means by Rasavaimalya much more. The Rasa-realisation must not be impeded by working in irrelevant things, and many principles of Rasa-aucitya are comprehended in it, even as all Śabdaguṇas and Arthaguṇas are included in Śabdavaimalya and Arthavaimalya. Kṣemendra illustrates the Doṣa called Rasakāluṣya, the reverse of Rasavaimalya, by an instance having Prakṛtyanaucitya.

रसकालुष्यं यथा भट्टनारायणस्य वेणीसंहारे भानुमत्या नकुलप्राणिस्वप्नदर्शने पाण्डवनकुलस्वैरसंगमेर्ष्यासद्भावः चक्रवर्तिमहिष्याः सामान्यनीचवनितावत् ।

Acyutarāya.

A strange conception of Guṇas is to be had in the recent book *Sāhityasāra* of Acyutarāya published by the Nirṇayasāgara Press. It takes Guṇas as something like topics or subject-heads. There is as much difference between the Guṇas of others and Acyutarārya's Guṇas as between Kaṇāda's and Akṣapāda's Padārthas. Acyutarāya says that poetry has six Guṇas viz., Dharmas, Rasas, Lakṣaṇas, Rītis, Alaṁkāras and Vṛttis.

धर्मा रसा लक्षणानि रीत्यलङ्कृतिवृत्तयः ।
रसिकाह्लादका ह्येते काव्ये सन्ति च षड् गुणाः ॥ I. 20.

To distinguish these new 'Guṇas' from the old Mādhurya etc., he gives the old Guṇas the name Dharmas, because Ānanda has decided that Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda are Rasadharmas.

Mammaṭa.

Having examined the views on Guṇas which are out of the way, we come to Mammaṭa whose work is the earliest we have now, which worked out the theory of Guṇas formulated by Ānandavardhana, by refuting other Guṇas and by dismissing them, some as Alaṁkāras etc., and some as the reverses of Doṣas. Mammaṭa follows Ānanda and Abhinava completely and refutes Udbhaṭa and Vāmana on Guṇa ; defines the three Guṇas Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda and then discusses the ten Guṇas of Daṇḍin, Vāmana and their followers.

कुतस्त्रय एव न दशेत्याह—

केचिदन्तर्भवन्त्येषु, दोषत्यागात्परे श्रिताः ।
अन्ये भजन्ति दोषत्वं कुत्रचित्—न ततो दश ॥

Three ways are shown to eliminate the other Guṇas. One : certain Guṇas can be included in the three, Mādhurya or Ojas or Prasāda. Two : some of them are only the absence of certain flaws and as such need not be accepted

as positive Guṇas. Three : a few others are sometimes no Guṇas at all ; on the other hand they are positive Doṣas that have to be avoided.

Mammaṭa brings Śleṣa, Samādhi, Udāratā and Prasāda, the Śabdaguṇas as defined by Vāmana, within Ojas. The Mādhurya of Śabda defined by Vāmana as Pṛthakpadatva is included in the Rasamādhurya which can be extended to Śabda through Upacāra. Arthavyakti is included in Prasāda. Samatā of Śabda is dismissed on the ground of its being Doṣa sometimes. It is said by Mammaṭa that Śamatā is monotony and hence Doṣa, since the Rīti must often change with the ideas. This however is unfair to the old critics, since Samatā of a Rīti means only Samatā within a limited sphere ; all Guṇas and Doṣas are Vaiśeṣika. Saukumārya and Kānti, Mammaṭa says, need not be recognised, since they are the absence of the two Doṣas of Kaṣṭatva and Grāmyatva. Vāmana's various kinds of Prauḍhi forming his Arthaguṇa called Ojas are dismissed as mere Vaicitrya and no Guṇa.

—इति या प्रौढिः ओज इत्युक्तं तद्वैचित्र्यमात्रं न गुणः ।

Prasāda is the absence of the Doṣa called Adhikapadatva ; Mādhurya of Anavīkṛtatva ; Saukumārya of Amaṅgalatva and Udāratā of Aślīlatā and Grāmyatā. Here, the bit of the Kārikā 'केचिदन्तर्भवन्त्येषु' must be taken, as Māṇikyacandra interprets it, that some are included in *these*, *these* meaning Guṇas, Rasadhvani and Alaṁkāra. In accordance with this interpretation, we find Mammaṭa dismissing Arthavyakti as Svabhāvokti-alaṁkāra and Kānti as Rasadhvani and Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya. The Arthaguṇa, Śleṣa, is nothing definite, being only some Vaicitrya. Samatā is only the absence of the Doṣa, Vaiṣamya. Samādhi of Artha, which is Arthadṛṣṭi is, Mammaṭa says, absurd as a Guṇa.

Mammaṭa follows Ānandavardhana and holds that Guṇas are Rasa dharmas, and are brought into relation with Śabda through Upacāra. They are not really Śabdāśraya.

अत एव माधुर्यादयो रसधर्माः समुचितैर्वर्णैः व्यज्यन्ते, न तु वर्णमात्राश्रयाः ।

He developed the suggestions contained in the *Dhvanyāloka* and the *Locana*, criticised Udbhaṭa's theory of the identity of Guṇa and Alaṁkāra and of both subsisting in Kāvya through Samavāya. He criticised also Vāmana's differentiation of the two.

Of the nature of the three Guṇas, Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda, some additional ideas are given by Mammaṭa. He, for the first time, casts off Abhinavagupta's statement regarding the Guṇa of the Śānta rasa and says that Śānta has the maximum Mādhurya. According to him, the order of Mādhurya ascends from Saṁbhoga śṛṅgāra to Śānta through Vipralaṁbha and Karuṇa. Mammaṭa thinks that there is more Mādhurya in Vipralaṁbha than in Karuṇa.

आह्लादकत्वं माधुर्यं शृङ्गारे द्रुतिकारणम् ।
करुणे विप्रलंभे तत् शान्ते चातिशयान्वितम् ।

On this point of the relative degree of Mādhurya in these three, Ānanda gives the order Saṁbhoga, Vipralaṁbha and Karuṇa. Other views change the

order and these are briefly stated in the *Rasagaṅgādhara*. One prominent view given by Jagannātha is that in Vipralaṁbha, Karuṇa and Śānta there is more Mādhurya than in Saṃbhoga, but among Vipralaṁbha, Karuṇa and Śānta there is no difference in the degree.

संभोगश्रृङ्गारात् करुणविप्रलंभशान्तेषु अतिशयितमेव, न पुनस्तत्रापि तारतम्यम् ।
P. 53 K. M. Edn.

Similarly as regards Ojas also, there is a slight change in Mammaṭa. Ānanda gave Ojas as the Guṇa of Raudra and similar Rasas ; Abhinava gave the other Ojas-Rasas as Vīra and Adbhuta. Mammaṭa, however, says that Ojas, which is Dīpti, is primarily of Vīra ; a greater degree of it is in Bībhatsa and it is greatest in Raudra. Thus, he puts Bībhatsa in the place of the Adbhuta given by Abhinava.

दीप्त्यात्मविस्तृतेर्हेतुः ओजो वीररसस्थिति ।
बीभत्सरौद्ररसयोः तस्याधिक्यं क्रमेण च ॥

Jagannātha paṇḍitarāja follows Mammaṭa, though Mammaṭa's view is not correct. There is little Dīpti in Bībhatsa, but much in Adbhuta.

Jagannātha.

In later times, the *Rasagaṅgādhara* began to enjoy a position which the *Kāvyaprakāśa* had in an earlier stage. On Guṇas, as on many other subjects, Jagannātha has little to offer originally but he restates the best accepted ideas and does some 'Pariṣkāra' here and there, removing slight hitches and difficulties in the system of Ānanda and Abhinava as condensed by Mammaṭa. On Guṇas, he introduces a small innovation, just as in the theory of Rasa-realisation, where he introduces Advaita-ideas. He adopts, as usual and in keeping with his age, some methods of Navya Nyāya and discusses the Pramāṇa by which Guṇas are known as Dharmas of Rasa. The pūrvapakṣa shows how neither Pratyakṣa nor Anumāna can be the means of knowing that.

The Advaitic conception of Ātman, its related ideas having been introduced even in the theory of Rasa, affects the concept of Guṇa in Jagannātha. The Ātman of Kāvya, like Ātman, is Nirguṇa ; there can be therefore no Guṇas at all. The Ātman, Rasa, has the Upādhis called Rati etc., and Mādhurya and other Guṇas can be the Guṇas of these Upādhis. There is no proof for this and this may also be disputed since there cannot be one Guṇa in another. Then, how is it that we say, 'Śṛṅgāra' is Madhura ? Jagannātha gives his Pariṣkāra through the 'Prayojkatā-saṃbandha'. In Āyurveda, some Mūlikā like the Aśvagandhā is said to be 'Uṣṇa' ; it means that, if taken in Aśvagandhā produces heat in the body ; it is Uṣṇatā-prayojaka. So also Śṛṅgāra is Mādhurya-prayojaka or Druti-prayojaka. And what is this Prayojakatva ? It belongs to Saṁghaṭanā, Śabda, Artha and Rasa. Thus can the Vyavahāra be explained. This Prayojakatva (necessary antecedence, remote as well as immediate) is so comprehensive that there is no difficulty in accepting Vyavahāra which speaks of the Guṇas of Śabda and Artha. It also obviates the necessity of postulating Upacāra for explaining Guṇas in connection with Śabda and Artha.

किञ्चात्मनो निर्गुणतया आत्मरूपरसगुणत्वं माधुर्यादीनामनुपपन्नम्। एवं तदुपाधिरत्यादिगुणत्वमपि। मानाभावात्, पररीत्या गुणे गुणान्तरस्य अनौचित्याच्च। अथ शृङ्गारो मधुर इत्यादिव्यवहारः कथमिति चेत्, एवं तर्हि द्रुत्यादिचित्तवृत्तिप्रयोजकत्वं, प्रयोजकतासंबन्धेन द्रुत्यादिकमेव वा माधुर्यादिकमस्तु। व्यवहारस्तु 'वाजिगन्धा उष्णा' इति व्यवहारवद् अक्षतः। प्रयोजकत्वं च अदृष्टादिविलक्षणं शब्दार्थरसरचनागतमेव ग्राह्यम्। अतो न व्यवहारातिप्रसक्तिः। तथा च शब्दार्थयोरपि माधुर्यादेरीदृशस्य सत्त्वाद् उपचारो नैव कल्प्य इति तु मादृशाः। P. 55.

Jagannātha would not accept Guṇas as Dharmas of Ātman, which is Rasa, nor would he say that they are Dharmas of Śabdārtha. He would say that Śabdārtha, Racanā and Rasa, all produce Mādhurya and other Guṇas which are the states of the mind. All of them go to produce that kind of Cittavṛtti called Guṇa which is also equivalent to the Cittavṛtti itself. Mādhurya is nothing but Druti. Guṇas cannot be called Rasa-dharmas since Ātman is Nirguṇa. A comprehensive Prayojakatā-saṃbandha must be accepted to explain the three Vyavahāras connecting the Guṇas with Rasa, Racanā and Śabdārtha. If this is accepted, there is no need for Upacāra to explain Guṇa in Śabdārtha and Racanā. For, the basis of Upacāra would be the Mukhya-vṛtti in Ātman. That being illogical, Upacāra elsewhere is meaningless. Guṇas spoken of as pertaining to Śabdārtha are also intelligible if only the logical Prayojakatā-saṃbandha is accepted.

Having put this modified view of the old critics' theory of Guṇas, of which he accepts that aspect which makes Guṇas only three in number but rejects that which makes them Rasa-dharmas, Jagannātha puts forward the view of the very ancients, 'Jarattaras', Daṇḍin and Vāmana, of the latter especially. In defining each of these ten Guṇas of Śabda and Artha, Jagannātha makes slight changes for the better and improves upon Vāmana. Thus "औज्ज्वल्यं कान्तिः" is explained by Jāgannātha as अविदग्धवैदिकादिप्रयोगयोग्यानां पदानां परिहारेण प्रयुज्यमानेषु पदेषु लोकोत्तरशोभारूपमौज्ज्वल्यं कान्तिः।

He casts away Vāmana's Ārohāvaroha and gives a new definition for Samādhi :

but adds inaccurately बन्धगाढत्वशिथिलत्वयोः क्रमेणावस्थापनं समाधिः
अनयोरेव प्राचीनैरारोहावरोहव्यपदेशः कृतः।

In defining the ten as Arthaguṇas especially, he introduces much change. As for instance, in Śleṣa. He also finally states how Mammaṭa and others criticise these Guṇas and establish the three only as Guṇas.

Prabhākara, a very late writer, says in his *Rasapradīpa* :

वस्तुतस्तु गुणानां वस्तुधर्मत्वं शब्दार्थमात्रधर्मत्वं चेति निवेदितं मया अलङ्काररहस्ये, तत एव अवगन्तव्यम्। P. 8. Sarasvatībhavan Studies.

Prabhākara's *Alaṁkārarahasya*, where he says he has dealt with this subject fully, is not available to us now. Prabhākara considers Guṇas as Vastu-dharmas and as Dharmas of Śabdārtha. Perhaps there is some mistake in the text and a 'Na' is omitted before 'Vastu-dharmatvam'; otherwise we must

take that Prabhākara held Rasa and Vastu as totally different and unrelated, and attributed Guṇas only to the latter as also to Śabdārtha. Perhaps he recognised two sets of Guṇas, the three Guṇas of Mādhurya, Ojas and Prasāda as Vastu dharmas and the ten Guṇas or more as Śabdārtha dharmas.

Some such distinction is really necessary. We can appreciate the view of Ānanda of Guṇas being Rasa-dharmas and being only three in number brought into relation with Śabda and Artha through Upacāra. But we must separate these three Guṇas as a different category, the greater Guṇas, pertaining to the Ātman named Rasa. Side by side with these, there is no harm in accepting ten Guṇas of Śabda and Artha as features of style. Abhinavagupta, in explaining the concept of Lakṣaṇa in his *Abhi. Bhā.* according to the third view, makes such a differentiation of Guṇas into two sets. Vide above and also my Paper on Lakṣaṇā. Mammaṭa and others need not try to dismiss or include these Guṇas in one or the other of the three. No doubt, certain Guṇas of the ancients overlap and some are no Guṇas at all being very general, comprehensive and of the form of some variety of Vaicitrya. Surely some of them can be discarded. As regards Guṇas that overlap, it must be realised that there is a good deal of a poet's appreciation of poetry in these Guṇas, some differing from others only because of small shades of difference. The function of the Rasika, beyond being immersed in his own mute joy, is to explain and render into verbal account his appreciation and judgment. Nicer aspects shall have each a special name and every shade shall be described in a rich vocabulary. There is no meaning in putting many things in a lump under one name Mādhurya or Ojas. Economy of phraseology is not the end but fuller and richer expression of literary experience and appreciation which, when done as it ought to be done, is itself literature and is the work of an artistic mind as imaginative as the poet's. The same applies to the vain logic that says that certain Guṇas need not be recognised, they being only the absence of certain flaws. Their being so need not obviate the necessity of their existence. It is dry Tarka that Tamas or Darkness can be dismissed as no padārtha, since it is only the Abhāva of light or Tejas. That line is bad for literary critics to pursue. The positive Mādhurya etc. also can be shown as unnecessary by accepting certain other Doṣas as their reverses. Instead of having a Doṣa-prakaraṇa and a Guṇa-prakaraṇa, Alaṃkāra works can become briefer by omitting one of the two, because Guṇa or Doṣa is only the reverse or Viparyaya of the other. Regarding the other argument that Mādhurya of Śrutyanuprāsa (Daṇḍin) need not be accepted because Anuprāsa has been accepted among Śabdālaṃkāras, Kānti need not be accepted as Dīpta-rasatva has been accepted as Rasadhvani and Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya, that Artha vyakti need not be a Guṇa since there is Svabhāvokti alaṃkāra—this argument is of the same nature as that which dismisses Guṇas as Doṣa-abhāvas. These critics have not realised that one thing can be stated in terms of another. How is Kānti as a Guṇa of the nature of Dīpta-rasatva unnecessary, if one says that cases of that Guṇa are cases of Rasadhvani? Let there be Rasadhvani but can we not sum up that result in terms of Guṇa? A verse is *brilliant* because it has Rasadhvani; a

verse is *Madhura* because it has *Śrutyanuprāsa* ; Svabhāvokti verses derive their life only from the Guṇa of Arthavyakti. Of a similar nature is Bhoja's Śabda-guṇa of Gāmbhirya, which is quality of 'having Dhvani.' The Guṇa-Gāmbhīrya is not 'gatārtha' or 'nirarthaka' by the acceptance of Dhvani. The verses having Dhvani are said to be *profound*, Gambhīra. Gāmbhīrya is a result of Dhvani, the resultant beauty. One cannot appreciate a verse having Dhvani by prosaically saying that the verse has Dhvani, Dhvani of this kind and that. He says that the verse is *profound*, Gambhīra, and that is literary appreciation, and the natural mode of it. From this point of view we can even re-understand the ancients' view of Rasas as beautiful Alaṁkāras, of Lakṣaṇas and certain Dhvanis also as Alaṁkāras or Guṇas. As for instance, the same verse can be enjoyed as having Samāsokti alaṁkāra and the Guṇa of Samādhi (Daṇḍin). While it is beautiful literary appreciation to call an expression Vakrokti, saying that it is a case of Sādṛśyamūlalakṣaṇā is pedantic and nothing more. As the acceptance of Sādṛśyamūlalakṣaṇā does not make Daṇḍin's Samādhi guṇa and Vāmana's Vakrokti alaṁkāra unnecessary, even so in the cases of those Guṇas which are attempted to be dismissed as included in the three Guṇas, in certain Doṣābhāvas, certain Alaṁkāras or in Rasadhvani.

CHAPTER XVII

BHOJA'S CONCEPTION OF ALAṀKĀRA

काव्यशोभाकरान्धर्मानलङ्कारान् प्रचक्षते ।

Daṇḍin II. 1.

I. Bhoja's Śabdālaṁkāras ; description and review ; explanation of Bhoja's conception of śabdālaṁkāra ; writers who accepted Bhoja's śabdālaṁkāras ; comparison with Mahima Bhaṭṭa ; critics of Bhoja's śabdālaṁkāras.

II. The Distinction *Śabda* Alaṁkāra, *Artha* Alaṁkāra and *Ubhaya* Alaṁkāra ; the history of the distinction,—Bharata, Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Vāmana, Udbhaṭa ; Rājānaka Tilaka's commentary on Udbhaṭa's *KASS.* and the origin of the theories of this distinction in that commentary : " Yadvaicitrya ", " Anvayavyatireka " and " Āśrayāśrayibhāva " ; Mammaṭa × Ruyyaka and Anvayavyatireka × Āśrayāśrayibhāva ; the attitude of later writers ; the ground of distinction adopted by Bhoja.

III. Bhoja's Arthālaṁkāras and Ubhayālaṁkāras.

IV. Samsṛṣṭi : the history of Samsṛṣṭi and Saṁkara ; those that hold one of the two and those who hold both differentiating the two, Samsṛṣṭi the greatest Alaṁkāra in Bhoja. Bhoja's followers.

V. Bhoja's view that Guṇas and Rasas are also Alaṁkāras. The concept of " Nānā-alaṁkāra-samsṛṣṭi " in Bhoja ; Guṇas and Alaṁkāras that are inseparably fused with Rasas ; Alaṁkāra is of three classes, Svabhāvokti, Vakrokti and Rasokti. Alaṁkāra must be *beautiful.*

VI. Bhoja's Prabandha Alaṁkāras,—of Śabda, Artha and both ; Bhoja's source—Daṇḍin ; comparison with Kuntaka's Prabandha-vakratā. Hemacandra borrows these features of Prabandha from Bhoja.

In the period that lies between Bharata and Bhāmaha, where we see only solitary silhouettes like Medhāvin, some of the 36 Lakṣaṇas of Bharata had crossed the small boundary and made the rank of Alaṁkāras swell more and more from the slender number of three in Bharata. When we have the first definite sight in Bhāmaha, we find some Lakṣaṇas yet in the transition stage. Thus, Bhāmaha says that Āśīs, which is a Lakṣaṇa in Bharata, is held by some as Alaṁkāra. Bhaṭṭi takes it so and illustrates it. Daṇḍin accepts it as an Alaṁkāra. Hetu is another Lakṣaṇa now struggling to become an Alaṁkāra. Bhāmaha dismissed it as having no right to become an Alaṁkāra since it has, on the whole, no Vakrokti in it. Daṇḍin would take the challenge and with a vengeance call it Uttamabhūṣaṇa, excellent Alaṁkāra. Udbhaṭa followed Bhāmaha. Rudraṭa recognised it as one of the Vāstava set of Alaṁkāras. Mammaṭa followed Udbhaṭa and Bhāmaha, and said that there could be no Alaṁkāra in Hetu, which is a bald statement and that, if there was any

poetry in Rudraṭa's illustration for Hetu, it was due to the Śabdālaṁkāra present there. Bhāmaha often refers to Alaṁkāras as having been given by others. The one definite fact emerging out of the fight over the chronology of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin is that both based their books on literature that preceded them and that the two differ, the one accepting one set of facts and the other, another. Leaving aside the evolution and career of particular Alaṁkāras, in the history of Alaṁkāra, two important questions dominate the early period. They are, (1) the scientific classification of figures into those of Śabda and those of Artha and (2) the scientific differentiation of Alaṁkāras from Guṇas on the basis of a clear formulation of the respective positions of these two elements in Kāvya.

Taking the second question first, we find in Bharata 36 Lakṣaṇas, 4 Alaṁkāras, 10 Doṣas and 10 Guṇas clearly given. Bharata has not indicated the distinction between Guṇas and Alaṁkāras. As further work in Alaṁkāra proceeded, the subject of the real nature and position of these two elements was recognised as a problem by Vāmana who followed up Daṇḍin's remark and offered some differentiation. Udbhaṭa and Vāmana were authors of rival schools. The former definitely denied difference between these two concepts. Vāmana tried to draw some distinction but compromised by holding two kinds of notions of the word Alaṁkāra, a bigger and a smaller one, the bigger as big as all beauty, Saundarya, in Kāvya. The confusion on the nature of these two concepts was completely removed by the *Dhvanyāloka*, but there were scholars after the time of Ānanda who still chose to stick to the old school. One such is Pratīhārendurāja, in himself a problem, being a commentator on Udbhaṭa, who follows completely Vāmana on the difference between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra. Bhoja is another writer of this kind, a very widely read scholar who utilised all the writers. Bhoja is an encyclopædic writer and his writings are marked with a distinct passion for elaboration. Another feature of his writing is his trying to take up all views and somehow accommodate them in his own scheme. His conception of Alaṁkāra is indeed strange. We are accustomed in early literature to see Guṇa considered as Alaṁkāra, and also Rasas, Vṛttis, Lakṣaṇas and Sandhyaṅgas. Daṇḍin considered all beautifying features as Alaṁkāra. Bhoja followed him completely and even 'out-Daṇḍinned' Daṇḍin. Most of the topics in Alaṁkāra Śāstra are held to be Alaṁkāra by Bhoja.

It has already been pointed out in the previous chapter how Bhoja follows Vāmana and quotes him on the nature of the difference between Guṇa and Alaṁkāra. Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha, commentator on Bhoja's *S. K. Ā* (Mad. Ms.), puts Bhoja's position clearly thus :

> नियतो धर्मो गुणः, आगमापायी अलङ्कारः ।
> जातिवद्भूतेरपि अर्थौचित्यादिभिः आगमापायित्वात् अलङ्कारत्वसंभवः । p. 28.

Bhoja classifies Alaṁkāras into three classes, those of Śabda, of Artha and of both. We will examine the Alaṁkāras themselves first and then come to the classification. Bhoja defines Śabdālaṁkāra thus :

ये व्युत्पत्त्यादिभिः शब्दमलङ्कर्तुमिह क्षमाः ।
शब्दालङ्कारसंज्ञास्ते ज्ञेया जात्यादयो बुधैः ॥

They are Śabdālaṁkāras which adorn Śabda by reason of Vyutpatti etc. Vyutpatti and the like are intended to comprehend, as Bhoja's commentator, Ratneśvara, points out, language etc. in the fold of Alaṁkāra.

विविधा उत्पत्तिः लोपागमविकारादिप्रपञ्चः । अत एव हि संस्कृतादिजातयो व्यवतिष्ठन्ते । आदिग्रहणात् गुरुलघुसन्निवेशादयः गद्यात्मवच्छेदाः त्रयोविंशतिरुपात्ताः । वाक्यकर्णादिसाम्यादियं संज्ञा प्रवृत्तेत्याह—शब्दालङ्कारसंज्ञा इति । p. 121

Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha says in his commentary that Vyutpatti is seen in the Śabdālaṁkāras like Mudrā and that by 'Ādi', Bhoja means features that produce Alaṁkāras,—Aucitya, Krama, Vīpsā etc. Krama, Vīpsā etc., can be compared to Bharata's Lakṣaṇas and Bhoja's own Vākya dharmas. Both of them are Alaṁkāra-upayogi dharmas.

व्युत्पत्त्यादिना प्रकृतिप्रत्ययभेदादिना । × × × × ×
औचित्यक्रमवीप्साप्रभृतयोऽलंकारोपयोगिनः धर्मा गृह्यन्ते । तत्र मुद्रादिषु व्युत्पत्तिः, जात्यादिष्वौचित्यं गुंफनादिषु क्रमः, अनुप्रासादिषु वीप्सेत्यादयः । तेषु तेषु अलङ्कारेषु तत्तत्प्रयोजका धर्मा ऊहनीयाः ॥

Mad. Ms. p. 25. *S. K. Ā Vyā.*

Bhoja gives 24 Śabdālaṁkāras :

Jāti, Gati, Rīti, Vṛtti, Chāyā, Mudrā, Ukti, Yukti, Bhaṇiti, Gumphanā, Śayyā, Paṭhiti, Yamaka, Śleṣa, Anuprāsa, Citra, Vākovākya, Prahelikā, Gūḍha, Praśnottara, Adhyeya, Śravya, Prekṣya and Abhineya.

Of these we are already familiar with Śleṣa, Yamaka, Anuprāsa and Citra of various kinds as Śabdālaṁkāras. Though not as Śabdālaṁkāras, we already know the concepts of Rīti and Vṛtti, and have also met with the words Bhaṇiti, Gumphanā and Śayyā. Ukti, Gumphanā, Bhaṇiti,—these ordinarily have no distinction but mean generally the collocation or Samghaṭanā of poet's words. Similarly, we have heard of Prahelikā and Gūḍha and of Abhinaya as action in drama and of Śravya and Prekṣya as the two classes of poetic composition. Of a kind of Mudrā as the favourite word with which a poet marks the last verse of each canto of his epic, we have already heard ; but Bhoja's Mudrā is of a different nature. The totally new names we come across here are Jāti, Gati, Chāyā, Mudrā, Paṭhiti and Vākovākya.

1. *Jāti.* The first Śabdālaṁkāra is really the Aucitya of Bhāṣā or language. A proper use of the various languages with changes to suit the situation adds to the beauty of the work and hence it is that the choice and proper employment of Jāti or language is considered an Alaṁkāra here. That language is Śabda and that it should therefore be naturally a Śabdālaṁkāra need no explanation. Says Bhoja :

सा त्वौचित्यादिभिर्वाचामलङ्काराय जायते ॥

and Ratneśvara explains :

नन्ववश्यं शब्देन संस्कृताद्यन्यतमेन भवितव्यम् ? तत् कोऽत्र कवेः शक्तिव्युत्पत्त्योरंशः येन अलङ्कारता स्यात् ? इत्यत आह—सेति ।

Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha also says (p. 28, Mad. Ms. *S. K. Ā. Vyā.*)

जातिवद्भूतेरपि अर्थौचित्यादिभिः आगमापायित्वात् अलङ्कारत्वसंभवः ॥

Aucitya of language is of two kinds as applied to those who speak and to that which is spoken, Vaktṛ-aucitya and Viṣayaucitya. Bhoja briefly indicates what Bharata has dealt with in respect of drama. The use of Sanskrit and other languages according to characters (in drama) is one kind of the Śabdālaṁkāra of Jāti. Certain parts of the country speak only certain dialects and observing that fact is another kind of Bhāṣā-aucitya of Jātyalaṁkāra. Here Bhoja is indebted to Rājaśekhara who has dealt with the topic of Bhāṣās in two places in his *Kāvyamīmāṁsā*. Rājaśekhara slightly touches the dialects of the different places in chapter VII while dealing with Paṭhana or the proper way to read. He shows how people of different places read. In chapter X again, the subject of Bhāṣā-niyama is taken up by Rājaśekhara. Bhoja borrows from both places and adapts. The Jātiśabdālaṁkāra of Bhoja is derivable from Rājaśekhara, pp. 48-49 where he says : एकोऽर्थः संस्कृतोक्त्या etc. See section on Bhoja and Aucitya and my paper on Aucitya.

Bhoja classifies language into six kinds, Śuddhā, Sādhāraṇī, Miśrā, Saṁkīrṇā, Nānyagāminī and Apabhraṣṭa. The Śuddhā is flawless Sanskrit according to a single system of grammar and the Sādhāraṇī is speech following two systems of Sanskrit grammar. Bhoja however recognises that a poet has his own liberty, for he says regarding his own further elaboration of Jāti

प्रायिकं चैतत् । तेन कवेरभिप्रायशक्त्यादिभ्यः सर्वा अपि सर्वप्रयोज्या भवन्ति । p. 125.

Even the Apabhraṣṭa is introduced by the poet when low characters have to be portrayed.

सेयमपशब्दप्रयोगतः अपभ्रष्टाप्यविद्वद्भिः श्रोत्रियाद्यैः प्रयुज्यत इत्यपभ्रष्टा जातिः । अस्या अपि चानुकरणे साधुत्वमिष्यते । p. 128.

Thus, this Jātyalaṁkāra or Bhāṣaucitya is based on realism, Prakṛti and Lokadharmī. See my paper on Lokadharmī, *JOR*, Madras, VIII, p. 62.

Ratneśvara points out another kind of Bhāṣāniyama based on convention that certain types of literature are in certain languages only. In drama, the poet can change the languages according to the characters. But, in a Sargabandha Mahākāvya, it is all Sanskrit. The Bṛhatkathā is completely in Paiśācī. Even though Uttama characters figure in it, Khaṇḍakathā and Parikathā are in Prākṛt only[1]. The Sandhibandha is in Apabhramśa only. Certain poems, by virtue of their theme, are written in Prākṛt only. Thus Śṛṅgāra gāthās are often in Prākṛt.

यत्र प्रकृतिनिर्वहणोचितविशेषाभिसन्धानेन कविरन्यथा प्रवर्तते । यथा मालत्याम् संस्कृतमाश्रित्य "एषोऽस्मि भोः कार्यवशात् प्रयोगवशाच्च प्राकृतभाषी संवृत्तः इत्यादि । यत्र वा कवेः व्युत्पत्तिकृतः भाषाविपर्यासः शक्त्या तिरस्क्रियते । यथा मृच्छकटिके विटस्य मध्यमपात्रस्यापि संस्कृतोक्तिः यत्र

1. The K. M. Edn. of the *S. K. Ā.* reads here corruptly Parakathā for Parikathā and Vastubandha for Sandhibandha. Mistakes of this kind are numerous in that edition.

वा प्रबन्धौचितीपरवशाः संस्कृतादिजातयो विपर्यस्यन्ते। यथा सर्गबन्धादौ मध्यमादेरपि संस्कृतमेव, खण्डकथापर(रि)कथादौ उत्तमादेरपि प्राकृतमेव, बृहत्कथादौ पैशाचमेव, वस्तुबन्धादौ (सन्धिबन्धादौ)[1] अपभ्रंश एवेति॥ *Ratneśvara* p. 125.

2. *Gati.* The second Śabdālaṁkāra, Gati, is the Aucitya of the medium in verse, prose or the mixed style of Campū.

पद्यं गद्यं च मिश्रं च काव्यं यत्सा गतिः स्मृता।
अर्थौचित्यादिभिः सापि वागलंकार इष्यते॥

Each of these three has its own distinct beauty and suitability to certain themes. Bhoja says : गद्यां गद्यामियं देवी विचित्रा हि सरस्वती and adds that certain poets excel in a certain medium ; for instance, Bāṇa does not shine in verse as much as in prose. Ratneśvara points out some Arthaucitya. Themes like the description of forest look beautiful only in prose. He also points out that the Gati-niyama is also sometimes conventionally fixed in literature. Ākhyāyikā and kathā shall be in prose, Sargabandha in verse and a Campū and a Nāṭaka in the mixed style of prose and verse. (P. 129. Ratneśvara does not follow Bhoja on Kathā. Bhoja says in his Śṛ. Pra. Chap. XI that a Kathā may be in prose or verse, but Ratneśvara says that, like the Ākhyāyikā, the Kathā also is in prose.)

Bhoja has also another kind of Gati meaning movement, gait or flow, —quick, slow, quick-slow and so on.

द्रुता विलम्बिता मध्या द्रुतविलम्बिता, and द्रुतमध्या मध्यविलम्बिता।

This applies to verse as well as prose. Writing verse or prose in the Gati appropriate to the situation is a Śabdālaṁkāra. This kind of Gati, in verse, when pursued still, takes Bhoja naturally to metres, and in prose, to the Rītis and the Vṛttis. (II. 22-26).

Among Guṇas also, Bhoja gives a Gati. The Śabdaguṇa, Gati, means Vāmana's Śabdaguṇa samādhi, Āroha-avaroha, typically discernible in Śikhariṇī verses.

3. *Rīti.* It is called also Mārga. It is the familiar concept taken by Vāmana as the soul of poetry and elaborately dealt with for the first time by Daṇḍin. Bhoja classifies Rītis into six, Vaidarbhī, Pāñcālī, Gauḍīyā, Āvantikā, Lāṭīyā and Māgadhī. He follows Vāmana and utilises his verses on Vaidarbhī, Gauḍiyā and Pāñcālī. He introduces three hybrid Rītis, the Āvantikā standing between the Pāñcālī and the Vaidarbhī, the Lāṭīyā which is the mixture of all Rītis and Māgadhī which consists in not sustaining a Rīti begun.

Elsewhere, in the section on Anubhāvas in the *Śṛ. Pra.*, Bhoja recognises only four Rītis, omitting the Āvantikā and the Māgadhī. He follows Rājaśekhara on the description of the Vaidarbhī, Gauḍīyā and Pāñcālī in that section. Bhoja also accepts that Rītis are Guṇātmaka when he says in chapter V. of the *S. K. Ā.* p. 622 and in the corresponding place in Chapter XI of the *Śṛ. Pra.*—

1. See footnote on page 364.

गुणैर्हि गुणभूतैरेव अलङ्काराः प्राय आरभ्यन्ते, तद्यथा–'अस्पृष्टा दोषमात्राभिः' ॥

Bhoja has a Guṇa also called Rīti which he defined as 'Upakramanirvāha',

उपक्रमस्य निर्वाहो रीतिरित्यभिधीयते ।

See also section on Bhoja and the Rītis in this thesis, Vol. I., part 1, pp. 196-201.

4. *Vṛtti.* This is the well-known concept of the Nāṭyaśāstra that goes along with Rīti in poetics. While Rīti is Rasocita-śabda-vyavahāra, Vṛtti is Rasocita-artha-vyavahāra. This, Bhoja accepts, when he defines each Vṛtti as such and such Artha-sandarbha. How Bhoja then calls it a Śabdālaṁkāra passes comprehension. The suitable employment of Vṛtti can be called Alaṁkāra, in the larger sense of the term. Bhoja has two more Vṛttis added to the four of Bharata, Madhyamakaiśikī and Madhyama-ārabhaṭī. These two have no more significance than making up the number of Vṛttis into the favourite and uniform number of six. In the chapter on drama, XII, in the *Śṛ. Pra.*, Bhoja accepts only five Vṛttis, the fifth there being the Vimiśrā, the mixed. In the Anubhāva chapter, Bhoja accepts only four. See my paper on the Vṛttis; also pp. 201-5, Vol. I, part 1 of this thesis.

5. *Chāyā.* Just as in Anukaraṇa in drama, the language of each person is imitated, so also in the speech itself, the manner of each person is imitated and this is Chāyā. Children have a manner of talk; mad men a style of prattle; there are sayings and maxims of the world that enrich language; the use of these is Chāyā.

अन्योक्तीनामनुकृतिः छाया सापीह षड्विधा ।
लोकच्छेकार्भकोन्मत्तपोटामत्तोक्तिभेदतः ॥

Lokokticchāyā is such expression as लोचने मीलयित्वा used by Kālidāsa in the *Meghasandeśa.* Chekokti is the favourite expressions and phrases of the Chekas or Vidagdhas. Arbhakokti is the speech of children :

किं स स्वर्गतरुः कोऽपि यस्य पुष्पं निशाकरः ।
ते वृक्षाः कीदृशा मातर्येषां मुक्ताफलं फलम् ॥

This infant naivete is really Arthālaṁkāra, if it is Alaṁkāra at all. If imitation of a child's speech should be counted among Śabdālaṁkāras, only the imitation of the verbal mistakes of the child should be taken as Śabdālaṁkāra. The two classes Unmattokti and Mattokti are the imitations of the manners of the Unmatta Nāyikā and the mad man. Poṭokti is the adoption by a low-bred woman, of the style of a high-bred lady.

Ratneśvara points out in the commentary here that imitation, plagiarism, living upon other poets' ideas, adaptation of one's expression by another called Chāyopajīvana is also held to be the Chāyālaṁkāra by some!

अत्र केचिदन्यच्छायायोनिजमपि काव्यं छायालंकारव्यवहारभूमिमाहुः । P. 140.

6. *Mudrā.* It is the presence of the poet's rich ideas at a certain point in a word, in a sentence, in the case-ending, in number, in gender etc.

साभिप्रायस्य वाक्ये यद् वचसो विनिवेशनम् ।
मुद्रां तां मुत्प्रदायित्वात् काव्यमुद्राविदो विदुः ॥

We know of Mudrā in Sāhitya as the sealing of a piece with the name of the poet and the last verse of each canto with the poet's favourite word. A Mudrālaṁkāra is mentioned in the *Kuvalayānanda* as cases in which the poet weaves also into the verse the name of the metre, the name of the patron etc. Bhoja's Mudrā-śabdālaṁkāra differs. It is the strikingness of the several parts of expression. Bhoja himself gives a derivation of the word Mudrā based on Akṣaravarṇasāmya. Ratneśvara explains Mudrā by the simile of a ring.

अत एव अङ्गुलीयादिमुद्रेव मुद्रेत्युच्यते ।

It looks like a button and when pressed, throws out a flood of beautiful ideas compressed within it. While this can be granted as some Alaṁkāra pertaining to Artha, it cannot be understood as a Śabdālaṁkāra. If it should be argued that the ideas are got from the Śabdas and hence it is a Śabdālaṁkāra, it has to be replied that no expression is possible without Śabda.

As Ratneśvara points out, Mudrā is really a case of Dhvani. It is the Padaprakāśya, Vākyaprakāśya, Vibhaktiprakāśya and other Dhvanis in Uddyota III of Ānanda's work. Ratneśvara says so :

मुद्रैव पदादिप्रकाश्यध्वनिव्यवहारभूमिरन्येषाम् ॥

Bhoja illustrates Padamudrā with the expression

निर्माल्यं नयनश्रियः कुवलयम् etc ; and Ratneśvara clearly points out :

निर्माल्यादिपदानामत्यन्ततिरस्कृतवाच्यानाम् अतिविच्छायत्वादिलक्षणाद्वारेण लावण्यविशेषध्वननात् सहृदयहृदयावर्जकानां निवेशो दृश्यते ।

The other Mudrās of Vākya, Vibhakti and Vacana are similar cases of Dhvani. The fifth and sixth Mudrās are curious. The fifth is Samuccayamudrā and it is illustrated by the use of the past tense in the case of future, to suggest one's wish etc., according to the Sūtra आशंसायां भूतवच्च. Thus the well-known passage in the Gita मदर्थे त्यक्तजीविताः is a case of Samuccayamudrā. Bhoja illustrates it with the following verse from the lost poem *Hayagrīvavadha.*

जातश्चायं मुखेन्दुस्ते भ्रुकुटीप्रणयी पुरः ।
गतं च वसुदेवस्य कुलं नामावशेषताम् ॥

How this is named Samuccaya is also explained by Bhoja with some strain. The sixth is Samvṛtti mudrā. When one stops in the middle of narration with some idea supposed in his heart, it is said to be Samvṛtti. As for instance,

मणिरत्नं प्रसेनस्य तवानार्येण विष्णुना ।
लब्धं येनाद्य योगेन तेन किं कीर्तितेन वः ॥

and Bhoja explains it thus :

अत्र ' कथापि खलु पापानामलमश्रेयसे यतः ' ततः ' किं तेन वः कीर्तितेन ' इति साभिप्रायसंवृत्तिकरणादियं संवृत्तिमुद्रा ।

Samvṛtti is only Samvṛti or concealing. This resembles the Lakṣaṇā called Anukta-siddhi in Bharata and the Vakṣyamāṇaviṣaya Ākṣepa Alaṁkāra of Bhāmaha which is illustrated by a similar verse :

अहं त्वां यदि नेक्षेय क्षणमप्युत्सुका ततः ।
इयदेवास्त्वतो ऽन्येन किमुक्तेनाप्रियेण ते ॥

In the *Śṛ. Pra.* Bhoja quotes similar verses as instances of Vākyaśeṣa. See above, Chapter on Dhvani in this thesis, Vol. I. part I, pp. 179-180.

7. *Ukti.* Ukti is a classification of utterances into Injunction, Prohibition, Setting Alternatives etc. This is a narrow conception of Ukti, which name signifies poetic expression as such. As usual, Bhoja gives six varieties here, Vidhi, Niṣēdha, Adhikāra, Vikalpa, Niyama and Parisaṁkhyā. Vidhi, Niyama and Parisaṁkhyā are taken as defined in the Mīmāṁsā-Śāstra.

Pratiṣedha, the second variety of this Ukti is a Lakṣaṇa in Bharata. In later times, we have two Arthālaṁkāras called Vidhi and Niṣedha, though they are defined in a different manner. *Vide Kuvalayānanda.*

Bhoja has a Guṇa of Śabda as well as of Artha called Ukti which is more easily capable of equation with the striking poetic expression as such. See ch. on Ukti in this thesis, Vol. I. part 1, pp. 114-118.

8. *Yukti.* We are familiar with a Yukti in the 36 Lakṣaṇas of Bharata. Here we come across a Śabdālaṁkāra of that name whose import is very comprehensive and perplexing. It is thus defined :

अयुज्यमानस्य मिथः शब्दस्यार्थस्य वा पुनः ।
योजना क्रियते यासौ युक्तिरित्युच्यते बुधैः ॥

Ratneśvara elaborately explains it.

तत्र 'गामभ्याज शुक्लां दण्डेन' इत्यादीनां लोके गृहीतव्युत्पत्तीनामेव यद्यपि काव्यानुप्रवेशः तथापि भङ्गीभणितिसनाथान्येव काव्यपद्धतिमध्यासते इत्यप्रहतानामुपादेयत्वे यत्रापाततः परस्परमन्वयो न प्रतिभासते तत्रावश्यं कविना स्वाभिप्रायप्रतिच्छन्दकभूतविशेषनिवेशनेन विवक्षितवाक्यार्थप्रतीत्यस्खलनं विधेयम्, अत एव वैचित्र्यादलङ्कारता । × × × योजना, अन्वयोपयिकरञ्जकविशेषनिवेशनम्, तस्य विषयः । Ratneśvara p. 148.

As can be expected, Bhoja divides Yukti into six kinds. Yukti or clever introduction may be through a word, an idea, a sentence, or its meaning. These four relate to Vākya and the other two relate to Prabandha. They are called Prakaraṇa yukti and Prabandha yukti. Both of these look like Hetūtprekṣālaṁkāra. The most confusing of these six is the first called Padayukti which is divided into four sub-classes.

योगकारणपर्यायाङ्गाङ्गिभावपरम्पराः ।
पदयुक्तेर्निमित्तं स्युः निरूढाः पदसिद्धये ॥

It is the concatenation of words of Yoga rūḍhi, of Paryāyas or circumlocutory expressions, of ideas of which the preceding is the cause of the succeeding and of which one is Aṅga and the other is Aṅgin. Thus, 'Jambhajid-dvipa' is a series of Yoga rūḍhis. Sometimes poets do not use the simple word but

substitute for it long synonyms. Thus Gaṅgā is not mentioned by a simple straight name but is called by a descriptive synonym like "Bhūteśa maulisrak" and "Amaradhunī" and so on. This is Paryāya yukti. Bhoja gives the illustration of "Hayāṅganāsya hutabhuk" for Vaḍavāgni. Ratneśvara says:

हयाङ्गनेति वडवापर्यायः, आस्यमिति मुखपर्यायः, हुतभुगिति अनलपर्यायः। सेयं पदपरम्परा पर्यायताप्रतिसन्धानेन अभिमतवडवामुखानलप्रतीतिं करोति॥

Other examples of Paryāya yukti are Rathāṅganāman for Cakravāka etc. Such usages however must be moderate. There may not be much beauty in such expression. On the other hand, there is the danger of the meaning becoming most obscure. The texts will become puzzles and illustrations for the Doṣa called kliṣṭa which Bhoja illustrates with a similar case.

विजितात्मभवद्वेषिगुरुः to mean सूर्यः। विना गरुत्मता जित इन्द्रः, तदात्मभवः अर्जुनः, तद्द्वेषी कर्णः, तद्गुरुः पिता सूर्यः।

This is called also by the name Gūḍhārtha doṣa in Bharata.

पर्यायशब्दाभिहितं गूढार्थमभिसंहितम्।

Poets have always indulged in it and Rudraṭa says that it can be tolerated in certain cases and considered to be free from the flaws of Sasamśaya and Apratīta. Chapter VI. 13 p. 64.

पदमपरमप्रतीतं यद्यौगिकरूढशब्दपर्यायैः।
कल्पितमर्थे तस्मिन् यथाश्वयोषिन्मुखार्चिष्मान्॥

The *Āryādviśatī* or *Lalitāstavaratna* of Durvāsas and the *Pañcaśatī* of Mūka[1] afford innumerable illustrations for *beautiful* Paryāya yuktis. Some seem to have taken it as an Alaṁkāra called Paryāyokti (different from the wellknown Alaṁkāra of that name) and poet Rāmabhadradīkṣita has written a century of verses on Rāma with circumlocutory expressions called *Paryāyokti niṣyanda.*[2]

The second Yukti is Padārtha yukti or the introduction of apparently contradictory ideas. It is illustrated by a verse describing the Ardhanārīśvara mūrti, combining within itself opposite aspects, male-female, terrible-beautiful and so on.

अत्र × × विरुद्धजातियोजना × × विरुद्धक्रियायोजना × × विरुद्धगुणयोजना × × विरुद्धद्रव्ययोजना च दृश्यते॥ P. 150.

This resembles a kind of Arthālaṁkāra like Virodha and can hardly be a Śabdālaṁkāra. The next is Vākya yukti. It seems to be the name for elliptic expressions, so uttered for effect and in tense emotion and in which much is left or concealed in one or two pregnant words. The means of this Vākya yukti are said to be four, Garbha, Nigarbha, Samvṛtti, and Samuccaya. The last two are features introduced in the Mudrā dealt with above. Samvṛttī yukti is the use of expressions like "Āstām", "Kim aparam" etc., and Samuc-

1. Available in print in the K. M. Gucchakas.
2. Available in print in a collection of Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita's Stotras, Sarasvatī Vilas Series No.6. Tanjore, 1932.

caya yukti is the joining of two sentences with the conjunction "Ca"! Garbha-vākya-yukti is thus illustrated :

'वदन्त एव हि वयं रोमाञ्चिताः पश्यत'

And the last word here "Paśyata" is called Nigharbha vākya yukti. The next, Vākyārtha yukti is the expression with (*a*) "Yat-tat" (*b*) the frequentative repetition of verb and (*c*) intensive repetition of a verb.

यत्तदादेरुपादानं क्रियाभ्याससमुच्चयौ ।
क्रियासमभिहारश्च वाक्यार्थान्युञ्जते मिथः ॥ *S. K. Ā.*, II. 49.

The mention of the same action with reference to many things,

शालामश्च तमङ्गमश्च वलभीमश्चेति वेश्माश्चति ।

is Kriyābhyāsa-vākyārtha yukti. It really passes one's understanding how these like the use of "Yat" and "Tat" can be any Alaṁkāra. After this detailed examination of many odd things loosely put together under the vague term Yukti, interpreted elastically into Yojanā, we feel very confused about the exact nature of it as conceived by Bhoja. Knitting of words, ideas, sentences etc. and the introduction of imaginative and exaggerated conceits—these are covered by the Yuktis of Pada, Padārtha, Vākya, Vākyārtha, Prakaraṇa and Prabandha Yuktis. Poetry itself as a whole will be Yukti! The well-knit plot itself is Yukti. Bhoja seems to say 'Yes' when he adds in his exposition of Vākya yukti an 'etc.' at the end : "Evam ādayaḥ".

हेतवो वाक्ययुक्तीनां क्रियताम् **एवमादयः** । II. 48.

Ratneśvara interprets this "etc." as the Vīthyaṅgas, Sandhyaṅgas, the five Sandhis, the five Artha prakṛtis, and the five Avasthās, (all pertaining to Drama). All these are Yukti.

एवमादयः इति तद्यथा बीज्यङ्गानि त्रयोदश प्रस्तावनापरिचेयानि । सन्ध्यङ्गानि विलासाद्यानि चतुष्षष्टिः। सन्धयश्च रूपकावयवभूताः मुखप्रतिमुखगर्भविमर्शनिर्वहणाख्याः पञ्च । etc.[1]

S. K. Ā. Vyā. p. 151.

9. *Bhaṇiti.* Bhaṇiti is generally taken as the poet's beautiful expression called also Ukti. Bhoja creates a new Śabdālaṁkāra of that name. Ratneśvara realises the point that the name is very wide in connotation and says in his comments on Bhaṇiti :

'उक्तिप्रकारो भणितिः'– "उक्तीति । उक्तिरभिधानम् । ×× सा सर्ववाक्यसाधारणी कथमलङ्कारः इत्याशंक्य प्रकारपदम् । प्रकारः भङ्गीरूपता(-रूपः ?)अलौकिक(:)शास्त्रीयवचनातिगामी विशेषः । स एव कैश्चित् अव्याप्तिमननुसन्दधानैः अलङ्कारसामान्ये उक्तः । P. 152.

Ratneśvara considers it not as a comprehensive name synonymous with Alaṁkāra or poetic expression in general but to be 'Avyāpta' in Kāvya. That is, it is one kind of Alaṁkāra only. But as he proceeds, he says all sorts of things, says that it is Utprekṣā, the poet's imagination, the peculiar turns of the poet's expression and so on. For expressing a Vidhi, the poet expresses

1. The text in the Kāvyamālā Edn. is mistaken in many places. Here especially, it is very corrupt, the punctuations being wrong. I have given a reconstructed text.

a Niṣedha and vice versa ; the poet again makes impossible things look like possible and turns the whole world as he likes. Ratneśvara grows eloquent and quotes :

किन्त्वस्ति काचिदपरापि पादानुपूर्वी
यस्यां न किञ्चिदपि किञ्चिदिवावभाति । etc.
यथास्मै रोचते विश्वं तथैव परिवर्तते । etc.

The former is quoted by Vāmana at the end of his work, I. ii. The second is quoted by Bhoja in Chapter VII of the *Śṛ. Pra.* under Vivakṣā. This Bhaṇiti is said to be of six kinds, Sambhava, Asambhava, Viśeṣa, Samvṛtti (this idea being used here for the third time), Āścarya, and Kalpanā. Sambhava bhaṇiti is such Utprekṣās as the conceiving of moonlight as liquid, capable of being filled up in a pot and carried. In the eighth canto of the *Kumārasambhava,* Kālidāsa describes the first shoots of the moon's light as capable of being plucked like the shoots of flower-trees to serve as Karṇapūra. Air is conceived by him in the *Śākuntala* as capable of being embraced and Vālmīki and, following him, Bāṇa conceive the air as capable of being drunk.

मेघोदरविनिर्मुक्ताः कलहारसुखशीतलाः ।
शक्यमञ्जलिभिः पातुं वाताः केतकिगन्धिनः ॥ *Kiṣkindhā.* 28. 10.

अभिनवपटुपाटलामोदपरिमलं न केवलं जलं जनस्य, पवनमपि पातुमभूदभिलाषो दिवसकर-सन्तापात् । *Harṣcarita* II.

These are cases of Bhoja's Sambhava bhaṇiti. Asambhava bhaṇiti is the figurative description of impossible effects and situations enjoyed in a dream etc. as illustrated by the verse :

क्व पेयं ज्योत्स्नांभो वदनबिसवल्लीसरणिभिः
× × × ×
कथं स्वप्नः साक्षात् कुवलयदृशं कल्पयतु ताम् ॥

To put it prosaically, it means it is as impossible to see actually the beautiful damsel seen in a dream as to drink through the lotus-tubes of our faces the water of moonlight.

The third is Viśeṣa bhaṇiti, which involves Daṇḍin's Samādhi guṇa.

रेवतीदशनोच्छिष्टपरिपूतपुटे दृशौ ।
वहन् हली मदक्षीबः पानगोष्ठ्यां पुनातु वः ॥

Here 'Daśana-Ucchiṣṭa', used for 'Cumbita', is said to purify the eyes of Balarāma. We have another illustration in the *Mattavilāsa prahasana,* where the toddy shop is described as a Yajñavāṭa and the drunkards are said to purify their tongues with a wash of the liquor. According to one recension, which is followed by Maṅgala, this can be called the Ojo-guṇa of Bharata, which is the exaltation of an inferior object, Nyūna vastu, with dignifying attributes. See previous chapter on Guṇas.

The next Bhaṇiti is called Samvṛtti bhaṇiti and is not clear. From the illustration, we can say this much that it involves Atiśayokti. The example given by Bhoja is a verse from the *Vikramorvaśiya* : आभरणस्याभरणम् etc. Bhoja explains that there is some 'suppression' here (Samvṛtti) and gives this as a case of expressing Niṣedha for Vidhi.

The fifth called Āścarya bhaṇiti does not differ much from the second, Asambhava bhaṇiti. In its illustrations, the Bhāva of Vismaya or the Adbhuta rasa is used for a passionate description of the beloved. The case involves also Viṣamālaṁkāra, strange things resulting from incongruous causes.

ज्योतिर्भ्यस्तदिदं तमः समुदितम् etc.

The last is Kalpanā bhaṇiti which is related to the third called Samvṛtti bhaṇiti. It is illustrated by the following :

दृश्यं दृशां सहस्रैः मनसामयुतैर्विभावनीयं च ।

The beauty of a beloved is here suggested. The Vācya by itself has no import except the suggested idea and this is a case of Atyantatiraskṛtavācyadhvani. That this is a case of Dhvani is clear from what Ratneśvara says of it at the end :

सेयं भणितिः विधिनिषेधप्रसङ्गे निषेधघटकद्वारा
विधिरूपा भवतीत्यास्तां विस्तरः । P. 155.

Prakāśavarṣa, who accepts many of these Śabdālaṁkāras of Bhoja, says in his *Rasārṇavālaṁkāra* that this Bhaṇiti is Vakratā in general.

भणितिर्वक्रता सा तु विदग्धजनवल्लभा ।

10. *Gumphanā*. This is stringing together of a certain kind, with reference to Śabda, Artha, Krama, Paryāya, Pada and Vākya.

वाक्ये शब्दार्थयोः सम्यग्रचना गुम्फना स्मृता ।

Śabda-gumphanā is the introduction of onomatopœic words as in the well-known verse in which the sound of a water-pot rolling down a staircase is reproduced. Artha gumphanā is given as the second variety of this Śabdālaṁkāra ; Bhoja does not realise the self-contradiction involved in holding this *Artha* gumphanā as a *Śabda* alaṁkāra. The illustration given by Bhoja is the description of the eight Mūrtis of Śiva in a manner in which one leads to another. There is some kind of arrangement of the ideas here but where does not such arrangement occur in poetry ? The next variety of Gumphanā is the introduction of the idea of Krama. It is called Krama-gumphanā. The next is Paryāya gumphanā and its illustration shows the use of several synonymous words for one object. The next variety called Pada gumphanā is exuberance of expression found in poets when they descibe forests, mountains etc. in a style made sonorous with the Ojas of long compounds. The use of special words for the sake of verbal effect and of Vṛtti and Rīti, though they may not help the ideas very much, is said to be Pada gumphanā. This is Alaṁkāra only within bounds ; overdone as in latter-day poetry, it becomes a vice. Such expression with moderation really

beautifies. It is called Pallava and Ratneśvara quotes two verses here on this Pallava. The absolutely needed and bare minimum of words is found only in bald and business speeches. The poet's expression is like a spring-plant, with sprouts all over.

वाक्यप्रतीतिमात्रार्थमुपात्तेषु पदेषु यः ।
उपस्कारः पदैरन्यैः पल्लवं तु प्रचक्षते ॥
अपल्लवं तु यद्वाक्यं कविभ्यस्तन्न रोचते ।
प्रयुज्यते तथाभूतमुदीच्यैः कविगर्हितम् ॥

Bhoja describes the Gumphanā as Racanā in the *S. K. Ā* but in the *Śṛ. Pra.* he calls the figure itself by the name Racanā. This variety of it named Pada-racanā is taken by Bhoja from the *Kāvyamīmāṁsā* of Rājaśekhara, p. 17, where the latter gives a kind of poet called Racanā-kavi. The illustration in the *S. K. Ā.* for the Pada-gumphanā is the same as given by Rājaśekhara for his Racanā-kavi.

Vākya-gumphanā is the effective expression or succinct expression of a large mass of ideas in a few pregnant words.

इह महतोऽर्थस्य अल्पीयसा ग्रन्थेन अभिधानमिति व्युत्क्रमेणापि ग्रन्थलाघवाय रचित इतीयं वाक्यरचना ।

This seems to be the opposite of the Yukti called Paryāya-yukti which can be likened to Vāmana's Artha-ojas of the variety "Padārthe Vākyaracanā"; and Vākya-gumphanā which is compression of a sentence into a word, is "Vākyārthe ca padābhidhā", in Vāmana's words. Bhāmaha gives a similar idea in V. 60.

कथमेकपदेनैव व्यज्येरन्नस्य ते गुणाः ।
इति प्रयुञ्जते सन्तः केचिद्विस्तरभीरवः ॥

11. *Śayyā.* We are familiar with this concept in poetry as the 'Maitrī' of words and the impossibility of changing any part of an expression. Vidyānātha says :

या पदानां परान्योन्यमैत्री शय्येति कथ्यते ।

Some writers consider this immutability as Pāka. Vidyādhara says

अनवरतमभ्यस्यतामेव कवीनां वाक्यानि पाकमासादयन्ति । पाकस्तु रसोचितशब्दार्थनिबन्धनम् । श्रवणसुधास्यन्दिनी पदव्युत्पत्तिः पाक इत्यन्ये । पदानां परिवृत्तिवैमुख्यं पाक इत्यन्ये ।

Ekāvalī, p. 22.

Avantisundarī pooh-poohed it as incapacity, Aśakti.

But the ideas in this new Śabdālaṁkāra of Bhoja called Śayyā are different and pathetically poor. It is said to be the introduction in the story of events past, present and future. This is an Alaṁkāra !

शय्येत्याहुः पदार्थानां घटनायां परस्परम् ।

The first classification contains three kinds. (1) Prakrāntaghaṭanā-śayyā is illustrated by the following verse from the *Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa.

स तथेति प्रतिज्ञाय विसृज्य कथमप्युमाम् ।
ऋषीञ्ज्योतिर्मयान् सप्त सस्मार स्मरशासनः ॥

The next step to be taken by Śiva towards the celebration of his marriage is to send the seven Sages to Himavān for arranging the marriage. This is Prakrānta and its mention is Prakrāntaghaṭanā-śayyā ! Aprakrāntaghaṭanā-śayyā is the opposite of the former. This is the introduction of an extraneous thing, as for instance, an illustrative story in the midst of some narration. The third, Atikrāntaghaṭanā, is said to be the reference to the past. Even past events like death, dream etc. are introduced in the course of the story. How can any story banish the past or any preceding event ? The illustration given by Bhoja is from Abhinanda's *Rāmacarita* and 'remembrance' is the point in the verse.

स्मृतिद्वारेण घटनाद् अतिक्रान्तघटना ।

How this is Śayyā and Alaṁkāra and above all Śabdālaṁkāra, Bhoja alone can understand.

Another principle now classifies Śayyā further. The fourth variety of Śayyā is Padaghaṭanā and this is some verbal ingenuity. When Rāvaṇa cut and threw his faces into fire, Śiva uttered the exclamation "hā" and this completed the "Svā" uttered by Rāvaṇa before cutting, thus completing the necessary word for Homa, viz., "Svāhā". Instances of this 'Ghaṭanā' occur in Cāṭus and Rājaprasastis and Stotras. The Prastāvanās of some dramas also have ingenious arrangement of letters to give the names of the poet, drama etc. The fifth variety is Vākyaghaṭanā and is said to be the Ekavākyatā of two ideas in a verse, one being the relevant idea and the other a supporting illustration or some such thing. The illustration cited is the verse हंस प्रयच्छ मे कान्ताम् etc. in the *Vikramorvaśīya* where the second line gives the law of theft to support the first one.

The last is an "etc." class, called Prakīṇaghaṭanā. All sorts of things can be brought under this. Bhoja cites one example of a Cāṭu praising a damsel. In Cāṭus, a person is described through Śleṣa and such other devices as the embodiment of various things, a combination of all seasons, of all Grahas etc. The *Vāsavadattā* describes a woman as being 'a combination of all Grahas' and the *Ubhayābhisārikā* of Vararuci describes a courtesan as the embodiment of all the Padārthas of the Vaiśeṣika system. These cases are Prakīṇaghaṭanā. Bhoja comments upon it elaborately and shows how Prakīṇa or miscellany here can be taken to include the various Śabdavṛttis, Mukhyā, Gauṇī, Lakṣaṇā, Tadbhāvāpatti, Upacarita and Lakṣitalakṣaṇā.

12. *Paṭhiti.* Paṭhiti is reading. What it means as a Śabdālaṁkāra in Bhoja is the writing of verses which when read otherwise with a change of stop and intonation, give a different idea.

काकुस्वरपदच्छेदभेदाभिनयकान्तिभिः ।
पाठो योऽर्थविशेषाय पठितिः सेह षड्विधा ॥

It is the changing of the meaning of a sentence from one thing to another.

'किंचिदेकपरतया प्रवृत्तमुच्चारणम् अर्थान्तरविवक्षया यदन्यथा क्रियते सा पठितिः ॥"

This changing is effected by six means, Kāku, Svara, Padaccheda, Padabheda, Abhinaya and Kānti.

In chapter VII of the *Śṛ. Pra.* (Vol. II. pp. 22-31.) Bhoja treats of the subject under the head Vivakṣā in word and poetry, depending on Kāku etc., Prakaraṇa etc., and Abhinaya etc. See above, Vol. I. Part I, pp. 19-20. He gives there the same instances as cited here under the Paṭhiti-śabdālaṁkāra for Kāku, Svara and Viccheda. He classifies the Viccheda into many varieties there.

Bharata emphasises the necessity to read with the proper Kāku. He divides it into Sākāṅkṣā and Nirākāṅkṣā. It is one of the six Pāṭhyaguṇas given by Bharata. A text which has the occasion for the employment of Kāku is the Śabdālaṁkāra called Kākupaṭhiti, according to Bhoja. Ratneśvara divides Kāku into Vidhikāku and Niṣedhakāku. The case of a Vākya in which there is a possibility of two meanings by two different Kākus is not taken here; it is left as the variety called Kākuvakrokti to come under the Śabdālaṁkāra to be described, viz., Vākovākya. Svara is also dealt with among Pāṭhyadharmas by Bharata. Bhoja illustrates Svarapaṭhiti with the word 'Dṛṣṭe' in a verse which has to be read with Plutasvara. Bharata speaks of seven Svaras in Pāṭhya.

Padaccheda is the third Paṭhiti. This has affinity with the sixth Pāṭhyaguṇa referred to by Bharata called 'Ṣaḍaṅga' of which the first is Viccheda. Padaccheda is illustrated by the well-known verse which Kālidāsa introduces from the *Rāmāyaṇa* into his *Vikramorvaśīya.*

सर्वक्षितिभृतां नाथ दृष्टा सर्वाङ्गसुन्दरी ।
रामा रम्ये वनान्तेऽस्मिन् मया विरहिता त्वया ॥

By stopping it at a certain point and making a different Anvaya, the same is got as the reply of the mountain. This Ccheda will involve Sabhaṅgaśleṣa profusely. Padaccheda is an inevitable consequence of the Bhaṅgaśleṣa variety of the Śleṣa which Bhoja has recognised as a Śabdālaṁkāra. Ratneśvara gives here additional information from Bhoja's *Śṛ. Pra.* chapter VII and from Vāmana IV. i. 3-7. Various varieties of Viccheda or Bhaṅga are mentioned by him from Bhoja and Vāmana. The illustrations given by Ratneśvara are those given by Bhoja in the *Śṛ. Pra.* Chap. VII. Vol. II. pp. 26-27.

The fifth Paṭhiti is Abhinayapaṭhiti, cases of verses which are read with the accompaniment of some action to specify the meaning of certain words. Thus, there are expressions like 'so much food' which has to be accompanied by the action of the hand showing the volume exactly meant by 'so much'.

अत्र इयन्मात्रस्तनादीनां तथाभूतहस्ताभिनयैः सह पठनात् तथाविधार्थविशेषो गम्यते ।

Bhoja is indebted for this idea of Abhinayapaṭhiti to Rudraṭa. Speaking of the Doṣa called Asamartha in Padas, Rudraṭa said that certain words of general and mainfold import are sometimes used but they are not Asamartha since their restricted and definite meaning is arrived at immediately by Pra-

karaṇa, neighbouring words and *Abhinaya*. The last is illustrated with a verse with such words as 'Etāvat' and 'Iyat'. This is not utilised by Bhoja in the Doṣaprakaraṇa under Asamartha, nor in the section on Vaiśeṣika guṇas but Bhoja makes the Śabdālaṁkāra of Abhinaya-paṭhiti out of this text of Rudrata.

यत्पदमभिनयसहितं कुरुतेऽर्थावेशेषनिश्चयं सम्यक् ।
नैकमनेकार्थतया तस्य न दुष्येदसामर्थ्यम् ।
शब्दानामत्र सदानेकार्थानां प्रयुज्यमानानाम् ।
निश्चीयते हि सोऽर्थः प्रकरणशब्दान्ताभिनयैः ॥

उदाहरणम्—

सा सुन्दर तव विरहे सुतनुरियन्मात्रलोचना सपदि ।
एतावतीमवस्थां याता दिवसैरियन्मात्रैः ॥

Namisādhu comments :

प्रसृत्यभिनयेन विशाललोचनेति निश्चीयते । तथैतावतीं अवस्थां यातेति । अत्रोर्ध्वीकृतकनिष्ठिकाङ्गुल्या कृशत्वं प्रतीयते । दिवसैरियन्मात्रैरित्यत्र पञ्चाङ्गुलीदर्शनेन स्वरूपत्वं चेति ।

Ch. VI. pp. 62-63.

In the Arthālaṁkāra section, Bhoja gives this Abhinaya as a species of the Arthālaṁkāra called Upamāna which is one of the Pramāṇas of the Mīmāmsakas made into an Alaṁkāra by Bhoja. In that place, besides Abhinaya, Ālekhya, Mudrā and Pratibimba are referred to as varieties of Upamānālaṁkāra.

In defining Vyañjanā, Vidyādhara says in his *Ekāvalī* that the scope of Abhidhā is restricted by the Liṅgas, Samyoga etc. given by Bhartṛhari in the two well-known Kārikās. The last here is 'Svarādayaḥ'. The 'Ādi' at the end is taken by Vidyādhara to include many others such as *Abhinaya*. This Abhinaya of hand accompanying such words as *Iyat*, *Idṛk* etc., decides their meaning and they must be spoken with their Abhinaya. The Apadeśa which Bhoja next mentions is also taken and illustrated by Vidyādhara.

The next Paṭhiti is Apadeśa found in such statements :

इतः स दैत्यः प्राप्तश्रीः नेत एवार्हति क्षयम् ।

and this is also a kind of Abhinaya, as Bhoja himself says.

अपदेशोऽप्यभिनयविशेष एव ।

The last is Kāntipaṭhiti referring to cases in which words having letters like *Va* and *Ba* which for purposes of Śleṣa and Yamaka and also according to grammatical convention, are considered as having no difference. Thus 'Avalambanam' and 'Abalam vanam' in a verse can be read as if they are the same words. This is profusely seen in Yamaka and Ratneśvara points this out as an Aṅga in Yamaka.

अत्र यमकेन संसृष्टिरस्य बोद्धव्या ।

Bhoja gives also another view of Paṭhiti held by some other writers. It is '*mutatis mutandis*', adaptation, Ūha, changing a word or words and

repeating the same verse. In the *Śṛ. Pra.* this subject is dealt with under Vivakṣā, sub-variety called Vākyānyathātva. P. 28. Vol. II. Chap. VII. (See above Vol. I Part I, p. 20).

13. *Yamaka.* This is no surprise to us, it being an old Śabdālaṁkāra. On the whole, 59 varieties of it are given by Bhoja.

14. *Śleṣa.* Rudraṭa considers Śleṣa as a Śabdālaṁkāra, but having a variety which is Arthālaṁkāra also. Udbhaṭa recognised Śabdaśleṣa as well as Arthaśleṣa.

द्विविधेरर्थशब्दोक्तिविशिष्टं तत्प्रतीयताम् ।

Bhoja recognises two varieties, a Śabdālaṁkāra and an Ubhayālaṁkāra. Of Śabdaśleṣa Bhoja has the usual six varieties,—of Prakṛti, Pratyaya, Vibhakti, Vacana, Pada and Bhāṣā. Rudraṭa gave eight kinds, these six plus Varṇa and Liṅga. Bhoja brings Liṅgaśleṣa under Prakṛtiśleṣa and Varṇaśleṣa under Padaśleṣa.

15. *Anuprāsa.* Bhoja treats of this old Śabdālaṁkāra elaborately. Of its many varieties, he praises Śrutyanuprāsa, taking the suggestion from Daṇḍin.

प्रायेण श्रुत्यनुप्रासः तेष्वनुप्रासनायकः ।
सनाथैव हि वैदर्भी भाति तेन विचित्रिता ॥

Bhoja has some extravagant eulogy on this Anuprāsa alaṁkāra, in general.

निवेशयति वाग्देवी प्रतिभानवतः कवेः ।
पुण्यैरमुमनुप्रासं ससमाधिनि चेतसि ॥ II. 73.

यथा ज्योत्स्ना चन्द्रमसं यथा लावण्यमङ्गनाम् ।
अनुप्रासस्तथा काव्यमलङ्कर्तुमयं क्षमः ॥ II. 76.

उपमादिविमुक्तापि राजते काव्यपद्धतिः ।
यद्यनुप्रासलेशोऽपि हन्त तत्र निवेश्यते ॥ II. 106.

कुण्डलादिविमुक्तापि कांता किमपि शोभते ।
कुङ्कुमेनाङ्गरागश्चेत् सर्वाङ्गीणः प्रयुज्यते ॥ II. 107.

Another variety of Anuprāsa given by Bhoja is Vṛttyanuprāsa which is the recurrence of the consonants of the same varga, many times in a verse. The following is Kavargānuprāsa :

कांते कुटिलमालोक्य कर्णकण्डूयनेन किम् ।
काम कथय कल्याणि किंकरः करवाणि किम् ॥

Bhoja relates the varieties of this Vṛttyanuprāsa with the various provinces in India. The Kavarga anuprāsa is held to be a favourite in the Karṇāṭaka country ! All this is very imaginary. When overdone, this Vṛttyanuprāsa becomes intolerable. Bhoja himself says that the repeated consonants must not be harsh and that one must not repeat the same letter for a great length nor repeat it at frequent intervals.

अकठोराक्षरादानं नातिनिर्वहणैषिणः (ता)।
अशैथिल्यं च सत्कर्तुं वृत्त्यनुप्रासमीशते ॥ II. 81.

This Vṛttyanuprāsa is newly met with by us in Bhoja. Bhoja speaks then of the other well-known Vṛtti or Anuprāsajāti, Kaṭhorā, Komalā etc. called also Nāgarikā, Upanāgarikā and Grāmyā (Udbhaṭa). Bhoja gives twelve such kinds with illustrations but concludes that they need not be separately considered since they are not separate from Guṇas and Vṛttis.

इति द्वादशधा वृत्तिः कैश्चिद्या कथितेह सा।
न गुणेभ्यो न वृत्तिभ्यः पृथक्त्वेनावभासते ॥

See the last section of my paper on the Vṛttis, *JOR*, VII. pp. 104-112.

16. *Citra.* This is the well-known Śabdālaṁkāra, comprising the verbal feats of Ekākṣara, the Bandhas of various kinds etc. Bhoja deals with it elaborately.

17. *Vākovākya.* This Śabdālaṁkāra is dialogue, Uktipratyukti.

उक्तिप्रत्युक्तिमद्वाक्यं वाकोवाक्यं प्रचक्षते।
द्वयोर्वक्त्रोस्तदिच्छन्ति बहूनामपि सङ्गमे ॥

This is divided into six kinds : Ṛjūkti, Vakrokti, Vaiyātyokti, Gūḍhokti, Praśnottarokti and Citrokti. The Ṛjūkti is again divided into Grāmyā and Upanāgarikā. It is ordinary dialogue. Vakrokti, the next variety, was a separate Śabdālaṁkāra in Rudraṭa. Rudraṭa divided it into Śleṣavakrokti with Padabhaṅga and Kākuvakrokti with Kāku. Cunning dialogue, witty repartee, one outwitting the other by a play on the same words or by splitting the words differently or by a different Kāku,—this is the second variety of Bhoja's Vākovākya, called Vakrokti. Rājaśekhara criticised Rudraṭa's Kāku-vakrokti-Śabdālaṁkāra. He said that Kāku is a Pāṭhadharma and it cannot be a Śabdālaṁkāra.

काकुवक्रोक्तिनाम शब्दालङ्कारोऽयम् इति रुद्रटः। अभिप्रायवान् पाठधर्मः काकुः स कथमलङ्कारो स्याद् इति यायावरीयः ॥ *K. M.* I. VII.

Ānandavardhana made Kāku a case of Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya. (*Dhvanyāloka*, III. p. 212). Bhoja made this Vakrokti of Rudraṭa a variety of a bigger Śabdālaṁkāra called Vākovākya. Bhoja further divided Vakrokti into Nirvyūḍha and Anirvyūḍha. For the first, Bhoja gives the same verse which Rudraṭa gave for Śleṣavakrokti. Nirvyūḍha-vakrokti is sustained Vakrokti, the whole verse being full of it to the end. The second is its opposite, Anirvyūḍha, unsustained.

Bhoja has no Kākuvakrokti. He refers to Kāku as being employed in the first kind of Vākovakya called Ṛjūkti and has already given a variety of the Paṭhiti-Śabdālaṁkāra for Kāku. See above.

The other varieties of Vākovākya are Vaiyātyokti divided into Svābhāvikī and Naimittikī ; Gūḍhokti into Mukhyā and Gaunī ; Praśnottarokti into Abhidhīyamāna-hṛdyā and Pratīyamāna-hṛdyā and Citrokti into Citrā and Vicitrā !

18, 19 and 20. *Prahelikā, Gūḍha* and *Praśnottara.* These are the well-known riddles and puzzles of various kinds which are for entertainment in social gatherings and for contest with rivals. They are not legitimate in Kāvya proper.

21. *Adhyeya.* This inaugurates a series of strange Śabdālaṁkāras. How these are Alaṁkāras and further Alaṁkāras of Śabda, Bhoja alone can understand. Adhyeya is thus defined :

यद्विधौ च निषेधे च व्युत्पत्तेरेव कारणम् ।
तदध्येयं विदुस्तेन लोकयात्रा प्रवर्तते ॥ II. 150.

The idea is not clear, and further his classification and illustration convey a different idea altogether. Just as Rājaśekhara classified poets into Uktikavis, Śāstrakavis and so on, so also Bhoja classifies here poetic expressions into Kāvya, Śāstra and Itihāsa. Three mixed classes are then added, Kāvyaśāstra, Kāvyetihāsa and Śāstretihāsa, only to make up the required number, six.

Poetry is, according to the oft quoted lines of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, different from Śāstra and Itihāsa or Ākhyāna because of its emphasis on Vyāpāra with the subordination of Śabda and Artha. Śabda and Artha are respectively emphasised in Śāstra and Ākhyāna. In poetry itself, there are occasions for the introduction of Śāstra and Itihāsa and with reference to those places, there are places which are instances of pure poetry. When the heroine is described according to the Sāmudrika śāstra, the case will be one of Śāstra and Kāvya. The description of the dance by Paṇḍitakauśikī in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* in the verse "अङ्गैरन्तर्निहितवचनैः etc." and the description of music in the *Nāgānanda* in the verse "व्यक्तिव्यञ्जन etc." are cases of Śāstra in Kāvya. In the opening act of the *Śākuntala* the maids tell Duṣyanta the story of the birth of Śakuntalā and the introduction of this historical narration is a case of Itihāsa in Kāvya. As different from these two, Kāvya is a case where the character of Kāvya alone as Ukti-pradhāna is emphatic. The other three varieties of the Adhyeya-śabdālaṁkāra are born of the inter-mixture of these three. See above, Vol. I. p. 115.

Commentary is absolutely absent under these heads and it is not possible to understand how this classification into Kāvya, Śāstra, Itihāsa etc. is an Alaṁkāra of Śabda. How Bhoja calls this Adhyeya or how these alone are intended for Vyutpatti is not known.

22, 23 and 24. *Śravya, Prekṣya* and *Abhineya.* Now Bhoja makes types of literature into Alaṁkāra, giving a restricted meaning to their names. These have little to do with Śravya kāvya or poem and refer only to parts of drama. In a drama, certain things are done and seen, certain said and heard. The 'heard' is said to be the Śabdālaṁkāra called Śravya.

Bhoja takes the three kinds of Maṅgala at the beginning, namely, Āśis, Namaskriyā and Vastunirdeśa, the Nāndī and thirdly, the two kinds of music called Ākṣiptikā and Dhruvā ; altogether six kinds as the varieties of Śravya-śabdālaṁkāra.

The benedictory verse marking the beginning of a poem or a drama is given as a Prabandhālaṁkāra by Bhoja in Chapter XII of the *Śṛ. Pra.* Daṇḍin counts the same Āśis as a Vākyālaṁkāra in *K. Ā.* Chapter II. 357.

Bhoja says that all these are only for the joy of the ear, perhaps as a contrast to the previous Śabdālaṁkāra, covering cases intended for Vyutpatti.

श्रव्यं तत्काव्यमाहुर्यत् नेक्ष्यते नाभिधीयते ।
श्रोत्रयोरेव सुखदं भवेत्तदपि षड्विधम् ॥

आशीर्नान्दी नमस्कारः वस्तुनिर्देश इत्यपि ।
आक्षिप्तिका ध्रुवा चेति शेषोऽप्येयं भविष्यति ॥ *Ś. K. Ā.* II. 152-3.

The three kinds of Maṅgala, as applied to Kāvya, have no meaning as Śravya-śabdālaṁkāra. All Kāvya is Śravya and therefore we must take this Śravya-śabdālaṁkāra as applying to drama only. Nāndī, Ākṣiptikā, and Dhruvā clearly pertain to drama, the first to the pūrvaraṅga and the other two to all parts of the drama. Nāndī is the Nāndī verse. Ākṣiptikā seems to be the name of a song, Giti viśeṣa ; Raṅganātha dikṣita says so in his commentary on Act IV of the *Vikramorvaśiya.* It is seen in that drama when Citralekhā enters with her friend and then again when Purūravas enters. Therefore we can take it as a song appearing at the entrance of characters. Bhoja gives a different meaning for Ākṣiptikā. He gives a prākṛt Gāthā on the face of Goddess Mahālakṣmī as illustration and says that it is sung only for the sake of the introduction of its particular tune, the subject of the song being of no account. It seems from this that certain situations in dramas were done on the background of some Rāga sung from within the stage by the orchestra. The particular Rāga alone being the point, an Ākṣiptikā giti with some idea but in the definite and required Rāga seems to have been sung. Bhoja says :

सेयमभिधित्सितरागविशेषप्रयोगमात्रफलं वचनमाक्षिप्तिका । *Ś. K. Ā.* p. 262.

It is a pity that Bhoja is not more elaborate on this very interesting subject. The last Śravya-element is Dhruvā or Dhruvāgāna. There are five Dhruvās, Prāveśikī, Naiṣkrāmikī, Āntarā, Prāsādikā and Ākṣepikī and they are respectively sung at the entrance and exit of characters and during their stay on the stage. The Dhruvās are for purposes of informing the audience of the scene, situation and character, the mood of the character, and to give the connecting links etc. Says Bhoja :

सेयं पात्रप्रवेशरसानुसन्धानादिप्रयोजना ध्रुवा ।

See below the chapter on Bhoja and Nāṭya Śāstra.

The next Śabdālaṁkāra is Prekṣya, things to be seen and situations devoid of speech.

यदाङ्गिकैकनिर्वर्त्यमुज्झितं वाचिकादिभिः ।
नर्तकैरभिधीयेत प्रेक्षणक्ष्वेडिकादि तत् ॥ *S. K. Ā.*

प्रेक्षानिमित्तं वाचिकाद्यभिनयरहितमाङ्गिकैकनिर्वर्त्यं प्रस्थानडोम्बलिकादिवाक्यं प्रेक्ष्यम् । *Śṛ. Pra.*

What is this vākya which is devoid of Vācikābhinaya and is only seen and is thus a Śabdālaṁkāra ? Bhoja classifies it into six, Lāsya, Tāṇḍava, Chalika.

Sampā, Hallīsaka and Rāsa. He also adds Kṣvedika etc., sport, feat and exercise. Does Bhoja consider their descriptions in Kāvya as the Śabdālaṁkāras of these names?—Lāsya as the description of the graceful dance; tāṇḍava-prekṣya-śabda-Alaṁkāra as the description in a Kāvya of the virile dance of Tāṇḍava? and Sampālaṁkāra when Sampā is described? Chalika is the dance which is half-graceful and half-vigorous, mixture of Tāṇḍava and Lāsya. Sampā is the Chalika of the Kinnaras. Hallīsaka is a circle of dancers, with one male in the middle like Kṛṣṇa in the midst of the Gopīs. Rāsa has not much difference from Hallīsaka but Bhoja quotes a perplexing verse on Rāsa for illustration and says in the end :

तदिदं हल्लीसकमेव तालबन्धविशेषयुक्तं रास एवेत्युच्यते ।

See below Chapter on Bhoja and Nāṭya Śāstra.

The last and the twenty-fourth Śabdālaṁkāra is called Abhineya. It is not explained how Abhineya differs from Prekṣya. Abhineya also is for seeing. Bhoja gives under Abhineya Śabdālaṁkāra the passages in compositions which give scope for the six kinds of Abhinaya : Āṅgika, Sāttvika, Āhārya, Vācika, Sāmānya and Citra. The last two, as varieties of Abhinaya, are unnecessary. See chapter on Bhoja and Nāṭya Śāstra.

Now for a review of these twenty-four Śabdālaṁkāras of Bhoja : We are already familiar with Anuprāsa, Yamaka, Śleṣa, Vakrokti (which is made part of a bigger Alaṁkāra by Bhoja), Citra and Prahelikā, Praśnottara and Gūḍha. It is not known how Bhoja lost sight of Punaruktavadābhāsa which would have served to increase the number of the Śabdālaṁkāras. Vakrokti is made a variety of Vākovākya or dialogue and this does not put it better. For, Vakrokti is possible everywhere and Bhoja has restricted its scope by making it a variety of dialogue. We are also familiar with the two concepts of Rīti and Vṛtti though not as Śabdālaṁkāras. Daṇḍin mentions Vṛtti and its aṅgas as Alaṁkāra and considers the Guṇas which distinguish Rītis as Alaṁkāra. But he did not call them Śabdālaṁkāra. It is understandable that Rīti is a Śabdālaṁkāra but Bhoja does not seem to realise the contradiction involved in describing Vṛtti as Arthasandarbha and holding it as Śabdālaṁkāra. Bhoja has here a very wide conception of Alaṁkāra and there is almost nothing in Kāvya which is not Alaṁkāra to him. New and narrow significances are attached by Bhoja to the concepts of Bhaṇiti, Gumphanā and Śayyā which he makes into three Śabdālaṁkāras. Some of the varieties of these are very general and some very trifling. The first two Śabdālaṁkāras of Jāti and Gati mean that the Aucitya of launguage and the form, prose, verse and Campu (prose-verse)—constitute Alaṁkāra. Bhoja's commentators clearly point out that these are Alaṁkāras because they are principles of Aucitya. Just as he makes Aucitya yield some Śabdālaṁkāras, Bhoja makes Dhvani also give him some Śabdālaṁkāras. Chāyā emphasises realism and the imitation of the characteristic expressions of the various kinds of persons. Mudrā śabdālaṁkāra is a clear case of Dhvani. Ukti classified into Vidhi, Niṣedha etc. according to the Mīmāṁsā seems to be Arthālaṁ-

kāra. As a matter of fact, many of the instances of Bhoja's Śabdālaṁkāra are Arthālaṁkāras. Yukti is very wide, comprehending almost anything in a poem or drama. Ratneśvara clearly points out its wide scope. Paṭhiti is a Śabdālaṁkāra made out of the Pāṭhyaguṇas mentioned by Bharata. The most un-understandable of Bhoja's Śabdālaṁkāras are Adhyeya, Śravya-Prekṣya and Abhineya. Further, Bhoja wants to classify all his Śabdālaṁkāras into a uniform number of six sub-varieties. This is not possible, for all cases cannot be expected to be of a sixfold nature. But Bhoja introduces some kind of item to help him to arrive at a uniform number. He gives a class of 'miscellaneous' (Prakīṇa) to make up the required number in some cases.

Bhoja follows Daṇḍin largely in his conception of Alaṁkāra. Bhoja describes at the end of the section on Śabdālaṁkāra that anything which pleases by its mere Śabda, any beauty due merely to the word, is Śabdālaṁkāra.

चतस्रो विंशतिश्चैताः शब्दालङ्कारजातयः ।
शब्दसन्दर्भमात्रेण हृदयं हर्तुमीशते ॥ II. 158.

But even this condition is not satisfied by many of Bhoja's so-called Śabdālaṁkāras. Many of them are Arthasandarbhas and cases of Arthavaicitrya and do not have anything to do with Śabda. Again a few of the Alaṁkāras are related to Prakaraṇa and Prabandha and cannot come under Vākyālaṁkāras. The Alaṁkāras of Prakaraṇa and Prabandha are separately mentioned by Bhoja.

It is interesting to examine how Bhoja came to conceive his Śabdālaṁkāra in this manner. It is seen everywhere that Bhoja chose to follow Daṇḍin completely. Daṇḍin's conception of Guṇa as Alaṁkāra is accepted by Bhoja with the quotation of Daṇḍin's verses to that effect. Now, Bhoja thought that everything given by Daṇḍin is Alaṁkāra, everything that Daṇḍin dealt with in Chapter I, even before the treatment of the two Mārgas and the ten Guṇas. Daṇḍin there speaks of Sanskrit, Prākrit, Apabhraṁśa and Paiśācī (language, Bhoja's Jāti), the division of poems and compositions on the basis of the form, Gadya, Padya and mixed (Bhoja's Gati) and of Abhineyārtha as different from Śravya Kāvya (Bhoja's Śravya and Prekṣya Śabdālaṁkāras).

Did Bhoja have any follower in respect of these strange Śabdālaṁkāras of his? Yes; there were a few writers who followed Bhoja and took some of his Śabdālaṁkāras :—

The Agnipurāṇa.

The Alaṁkāra section of the *Agnipurāṇa* draws upon Bhoja for Alaṁkāra, as for other subjects also. It incorporates into its text verses of Bhoja. It accepts Bhoja's three classes of Alaṁkāras, of Śabda, Artha and both. It does not however accept all the twenty-four Śabdālaṁkāras surveyed above, but takes only nine of them, Chāyā, Mudrā, Ukti, Yukti, Gumphanā, Vākovākya, Anuprāsa, Citra and Duṣkara,

ये व्युत्पत्त्यादिना शब्दमलङ्कर्तुमिह क्षमाः । (Bhoja's words)
शब्दालङ्कारमाहुस्तान् काव्यमीमांसकोविदाः ॥
छाया (१) मुद्रा (२) तथोक्तिश्च (३) युक्तिः (४) गुम्फनया (५) सह ।
वाकोवाक्यम्(६) अनुप्रासः (७) चित्रम् (८) दुष्करमेव च ॥ (९)
ज्ञेया नवालङ्कृतयः शब्दानामित्यसंकरात् ॥ Ch. 342

The *Agnipurāṇa* reduces also the sub-varieties of most of these. Chāyā is given only four varieties, Loka, Cheka, Arbhaka and Matta Uktis, omitting Bhoja's Poṭā and Unmatta Uktis. Bhoja's Śayyā is quietly included in Mudrā without any argument.

अभिप्रायविशेषेण कविशक्तिं विभ्रण्वती ।
मुत्प्रदा (मुद्रा) धिनीति सा मुद्रा सैव शय्यापि नो मते ॥

The six varieties of Ukti and Yukti in Bhoja are reproduced. Bhoja's Racanā is included in Gumphanā :

गुंफना रचना चर्य्या (सैव or शय्या (?)) शब्दार्थक्रमगोचरा ।

Viśveśvara.

Viśveśvara, the author of the *Camatkāracandrikā*[1] (Mad. Ms. R. 2679) and court-poet of Śiṅgabhūpāla, follows Bhoja almost completely on Alaṁkāras. He accepts Bhoja's threefold classification of Alaṁkāras into those of Śabda, Artha and both. He however takes only some of the twenty-four Śabdālaṁkāras of Bhoja. He first of all separates Rīti and Vṛtti and treats of them as subjects on a par with Pāka and Śayyā as concepts of more general significance than Alaṁkāra. Of the rest, Viśveśvara accepts eleven :

अत्र शब्दगताः प्राज्ञैः एकादश समीरिताः । Ch. VI.

They are Chāyā, Mudrā, Yukti, Śleṣa, Anuprāsa, Gumphanā, Citra, Yamaka, Vākovākya, Gūḍha and Praśnottara. He reduces also the sub-varieties of these in numbers. He introduces some modifications also. Chāyā is considered by him as of three kinds only and as being the imitation of Nāgarikokti, Grāmyokti and Sāmānyokti, the style of expression of the cultured, the vulgar, and of the general idioms, maxims and proverbs of the world. Only two varieties of Mudrā are given, of Pada and Vacana. Yojanā or Yukti is only of four kinds, of Pada, Vākya, Prakaraṇa and Prabandha viśeṣas.

Bahurūpamiśra.

Bahurūpamiśra, author of a commentary on the Daśarūpaka (Mad. Ms.) follows Bhoja on Alaṁkāras. He gives Bhoja's conception of Sāhitya and other subjects. He accepts the three classes of Śabda, Artha and Ubhaya Alaṁkāras of Bhoja and gives Bhoja's twenty-four Alaṁkāras of each of these three classes. (P. 106, Mad. Ms. R. 4188). See my article on Bahurūpamiśra, *JOR.*, VIII, pp. 325-6.

1. For an account of this work, see my article, *Annals BORI*, XVI, pp. 131-9,

Prakāśavarṣa.

Prakāśavarṣa, author of the *Rasārṇavālaṁkāra* (Mad. MS.), follows Bhoja on Alaṁkāras, his work being a summary of the *Śṛ. Pra.* See my article on Prakāśavarṣa's *Rasārṇavālaṁkāra, JOR.*, VIII, pp. 269-270.

Prakāśavarṣa accepts eighteen Śabdālaṁkāras, seventeen of which are from Bhoja's list of twenty-four and one is his own. He accepts the following of Bhoja : Jāti, Rīti, Vṛtti, Racanā, Ghaṭanā, Mudrā, Chāyā, Yukti, Bhaṇiti, Śravyatā, Śleṣa, Citra, Praśnottara, Prahelikā, Anuprāsa, Yamaka, Gūḍhokti (Bhoja's Gūḍha). The 18th added by Prakāśavarṣa is Aucitya. Seven Śabdālaṁkāras of Bhoja are omitted by Prakāśavarṣa : Gati, Ukti, Paṭhiti, Vākovākya, Adhyeya, Prekṣya and Abhineya.

Keśavamiśra.

Keśavamiśra, the author of the *Alaṁkāraśekhara*, takes some ideas from Bhoja with some modifications. He picks out Rīti, Ukti and Mudrā out of the twenty-four Śabdālaṁkāras of Bhoja and constitutes them into what he calls the three Bahiraṅgas, the external essentials of Kāvya. This concept of Bahiraṅga is a new one and has no more meaning than the creation of a convenient head under which some general ideas can be grouped. Keśava's Bahiraṅgas are four, the fourth being Vṛtti, viz. the Śabda vṛttis of Abhidhā, Lakṣaṇā and Vyañjanā. He treats of Rīti, Ukti and Mudrā in the second *marīci* where he describes them as the life of poetry.

रीतिरुक्तिस्तथा मुद्रा वृत्तिः काव्यस्य जीवितम् ।

At the end of this *marīci*, he calls the three only Kāvya-bahiraṅgas.

इत्यलङ्कारशेखरे उपक्रमरत्ने रीत्यादिबहिरङ्गत्रयमरीचिः ।

Keśava has changed the nature of Ukti. It is not the Ukti of Bhoja divided into Vidhi, Niṣedha etc. but it is the Chāyā of Bhoja. Keśava rejects two of the six Chāyās of Bhoja, Matta and Vaiyātya. He has thus only four kinds of Ukti or Chāyā.

लोकच्छेकाभैकोन्मत्तभेदादुक्तिश्चतुर्विधा ।

The illustrations are mostly the same as in the *S. K. Ā.* Mudrā is the same as in Bhoja and Keśava gives a prose Anuvāda of its definition by Bhoja.

विन्यासविशेषवशाद् यत्राभिप्रायविशेषलाभेन मुदो हर्षस्य उत्पत्तिः सा मुद्रा ।

Two of the six varieties of Bhoja are omitted. Keśava recognises Mudrā of Pada, Vākya, Vibhakti and Vacana only. The illustrations are mostly the same.

Keśava says in the last verse of this chapter that in another work of his called *Alaṁkārasarvasva*, he has dealt with the purpose of these three, Rīti, Ukti and Mudrā and their relation to Rasa. The work is unfortunately lost to us.

प्रयोजनं यथैतासां रसमैत्री च विस्तरः ।
तथालङ्कारसर्वस्वे सप्रपञ्चमदर्शयम् ॥

In *marīci* X, Keśava treats of the Śabdālaṁkāras where he gives eight of them: Citra, Vakrokti, Anuprāsa, Gūḍha, Śleṣa, Prahelikā, Praśnottara and Yamaka. These are however Alaṁkāras of Śabda given by others also. In Vakrokti, which is a variety of Vākovākya in Bhoja, Keśava includes the Vākovākya of Bhoja. He has rejected completely the other Śabdālaṁkāras of Bhoja.

Vāsudeva.

Vāsudeva, the commentator on Rājaśekhara's *Karpūramañjarī* (K.M. 4) refers in his comments on the Nāndī verse, to Bhoja's conception of Rīti and Vṛtti and the Guṇas as Alaṁkāras, the former two as Śabdālaṁkāra. Rājaśekhara mentions the Rītis in his Nāndī verse and in commenting upon them, Vāsudeva says (p. 2) :

वैदर्भ्याद्या रीतयः शब्दालङ्काराः । * * * *
एवमन्ये कैशिक्यादयः शब्दालङ्कारा ज्ञेयाः । ' ध्वनिमत्ता तु गाम्भीर्यम् '
इत्युक्तत्वात् गाम्भीर्यादयो गुणाश्च । केचित्तु रीत्यादीनामपि गुणत्वं मन्यन्ते ।

Vāsudeva follows Bhoja here. The reference to writers who considered Rītis as Guṇas is to Namisādhu. See above, chapter on Guṇas.

Mahādeva.

Mahādeva, commentator on the *Kādambarī* (see PETERSON'S *Notes* p. 112), says in his comments on the 8th introductory verse, in explanation of the word ' Śayyā ' occurring there :

कथापक्षे शय्या शब्दालङ्कारः । उक्तं च स. क. आ. — ॥

and quotes the three verses of Bhoja enumerating the Śabdālaṁkāras. Bhoja it is who considers Śayyā as a Śabdālaṁkāra.

Rāghavabhaṭṭa.

Rāghavabhaṭṭa, another well-known scholiast, says in his commentary on the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* (p. 4, N. S. Edn.) while commenting on the Nāndī verse :

भोजेन तु रीतीनां शब्दालङ्कारान्तर्गतत्वमेवोक्तं ' जातिर्गती रीतिवृत्ती ' इति ।

Appayyadīkṣita.

The *Kuvalayānanda* of Appayya Dīkṣita has two Arthālaṁkāras called Lokokti and Chekokti (89th and 90th). These two are the two varieties mentioned by Bhoja under his Śabdālaṁkāra called Chāyā.

Mahimabhaṭṭa.

While classifying and enumerating the various kinds of Anaucitya of Śabda and Artha, Mahimabhaṭṭa says in his *Vyaktiviveka*, that even metre must be examined from the point of view of Rasaucitya ; that metre, like Yamaka or Anuprāsa, must certainly be appropriate to Rasa ; and that the Anaucitya of metre in the shape of ' jar ', Duśśravatva, is a case of Śabda-anaucitya.

दुःश्रवत्वमपि वृत्तस्य शब्दानौचित्यमेव, तस्याप्यनुप्रासादेरिव रसानुगुण्येन प्रवृत्तेरिष्टत्वात् ।
V. V. p. 37. T. S. S.

Mahimabhaṭṭa here puts metre on a par with Yamaka and Anuprāsa, Śabdālaṁkāras. The statement implies that metre is a Śabdālaṁkāra. It is similar to Anuprāsa and other Śabdālaṁkāras in function. He realises that metre however does not involve expressive words as other instances of Alaṁkāra, and hence is not in the same position as other Śabdālaṁkāras.

केवलं वाचकत्वाश्रयमेतन्न भवतीति न तत्तुल्यकक्ष्यतया उपात्तम् ।

He however says definitely that metre is a Śabdālaṁkāra. While commenting on a verse from the *Kumārasambhava*, he says :

अत एव यमकानुप्रासयोरिव वृत्तस्यापि शब्दालङ्करत्वमुपगतमस्माभिः । P. 45. T. S. S.

That this second passage refers to the passage quoted by us previously, is known from the commentary which says :

उपगतमस्माभिरिति–दुःश्रवत्वमपि वृत्तस्य शब्दानौचित्यमेव, तस्यापि अनुप्रासादेरिवेत्यादि वदद्भिः । Com. p. 25. T. S. S.

In this respect, Mahimabhaṭṭa agrees with Bhoja who considers the appropriate employment of the form, verse, prose, or prose-verse as the Śabdālaṁkāra called Gati.

Two important writers have taken notice of these strange Śabdālaṁkāras of Bhoja and criticised them. They are Hemacandra and Bhaṭṭa Gopāla.

Hemacandra.

At the end of the chapter on Alaṁkāra, Hemacandra says in his *Kavyānuśāsana* that Bhoja recognised numerous other Alaṁkāras of Śabda and Artha, that some of them are included in those recognised by himself (Hemacandra), some are of no charm at all, and that some are very general, being of the nature of Kāvya itself.

जाति गति रीति वृत्ति च्छाया मुद्रोक्ति युक्ति भणिति गुंफना शय्या पीति (पठिति) वाक्येवाक्य (वाकोवाक्य) अध्येया (य) प्रेक्ष्यगेय (श्रव्य) अभिनेयानि शब्दालङ्काराः, सम्भवप्रत्यक्षागमोपमानार्थापत्त्यभावलक्षणाश्चार्थालङ्काराः ये भोजराजेन प्रतिपादिताः ते के [न] विदुक्तेष्वेवान्तर्भवन्ति; केचिच्च कथनापि चमत्कारं नावहन्ति, केचिच्च ये (ते) काव्यशरीरस्वभावा एवेति न सूत्रिताः ।
K. A. Vyā. Ch. VII. p. 295. K. M.

Bhaṭṭa Gopāla.

Bhaṭṭa Gopāla, commentator on the *Kāvyaprakāśa*, (T. S. S.) says at the beginning of his commentary on the Śabdālaṁkāra chapter that others mention numerous other Śabdālaṁkāras which however are not Śabdālaṁkāras really, *pertaining as they do to Artha also.*

पठन्ति शब्दालङ्कारान् बहूनन्ये मनीषिणः ।
परिवृत्तिसहिष्णुत्वात् न ते शब्दैकभागिनः ॥

This is evidently a criticism of Bhoja's Śabdālaṁkāras.

II

The Distinction into Śabdālaṁkāra, Arthālaṁkāra and Ubhayālaṁkāra

Bharata gave only the Yamaka Śabdālaṁkāra in his list of four Alaṁkāras, the other three of which are Arthālaṁkāras. Bharata gave ten kinds of Yamaka with definitions and illustrations. There is however no mention of the word Śabdālaṁkāra or the differentiation of this from Arthālaṁkāra. Bhāmaha, in chapter II, in the first list of Alaṁkāras, adds one more Śabdālaṁkāra called Anuprāsa. In Bhāmaha and in his follower and commentator, Udbhaṭa, we do not find the scientific treatment of Alaṁkāras in two classes as Śabdālaṁkāras and Arthālaṁkāras; but the Alaṁkāras are enumerated by them in bunches of three and four, in a quasi-historical manner. Bhāmaha gives a refined and unrefined type of Anuprāsa and adds that some have a third kind of Śabdālaṁkāra called Lāṭānuprāsa. He simplifies Yamaka by giving only five kinds of it, and including the rest in the five. Though there is no express mention by him of the distinction between Śabda and Artha Alaṁkāras, Bhāmaha records a view of his predecessors connected with this topic.

रूपकादिमलङ्कारं बाह्यमाचक्षते परे ।
सुपां तिङां च व्युत्पत्तिं वाचां वाञ्छन्त्यलङ्कृतिम् ॥
तदेतदाहुः सौशब्द्यं नार्थव्युत्पत्तिरीदृशी ।
शब्द-अभिधेयालङ्कार-भेदादिष्टं द्वयं तु नः ॥

"Just as even a beautiful face does not shine without ornaments, so also a Kāvya; hence, certain writers elaborately laid down Rūpaka and other figures. But certain others said that the Alaṁkāras Rūpaka etc. were not so important, were Bāhya, external, and that the real adornment of expression (Vācām alaṁkṛti) is the correct and beautiful Sup and Tiṅ, the words themselves. That is, a school of Ālaṁkārikas attached greater importance to Śabda and called Sauśabda the important Alaṁkāra of expression. It is to this period in the history of Sanskrit Poetics that we have to refer the following verse of Māgha :

नालम्बते दैष्टिकतां न निषीदति पौरुषे ।
शब्दार्थौ सत्कविरिव द्वयं विद्वानपेक्षते ॥ *Ś. V.* II. 86.

Māgha protests against the aggravated importance of either Śabda or Artha, the question of the comparative importance of which is similar to the philosophical problem of fate versus free will. Māgha answers that like the sane practical man of action, the poet needs both Śabda and Artha on both of which does poetry depend. Bhāmaha himself says as regards these two views that he would classify these Alaṁkāras into those of Śabda and of Artha (Abhidheya) and accept both. That is, both Śabda and Artha must be adorned and both are important. The Alaṁkāra of the former is Sauśabdya etc. and that of the latter is Rūpaka etc. Jinasena thus echoes the view of Bhāmaha ;

केचिदर्थस्य सौन्दर्यमपरे पदसौष्ठवम् ।
वाचामलङ्क्रियां प्राहुः तद् द्वयं नो मतं मतम् ॥ *Ādipurāṇa.*

In the first set of figures opened in chapter II, Bhāmaha says

अनुप्रासस्सयमकः रूपकं दीपकोपमे ।

Of these, the first two are Śabdālaṁkāras, though Bhāmaha does not call them so or treat of them separately. The rest of the work of Bhāmaha up to the end of chapter III is devoted to Arthālaṁkāras. Towards the end of chapter V Bhāmaha says that Alaṁkāras are of Artha and Śabda.

वाचां वक्र–अर्थ–शब्द–उक्तिरलङ्काराय कल्पते । V. 66.

Chapter VI called Śabda-śuddhi treats of the first mentioned Śabdālaṁkāra called Sauśabdya which a school of early writers considered as of great importance. He speaks of such expressions as are permissible in Kāvya and which are sweet to the ear and pregnant with meaning. He praises the sheer beauty of consonant sounds that excels all other figures of speech.

अतिशेते त्वलङ्कारमन्यं व्यञ्जनचारुता । VI. 28.

He speaks of the beauty of the 'Ṇic Prayoga' in places like 'Śabalayanti'. These he considers as Śabdālaṁkāra.

एवं णिचः प्रयोगस्तु सर्वत्रालङ्कृतिः परा[1] । VI. 66.

Thus the Śabdālaṁkāras as such mentioned by Bhāmaha are Sauśabdya, Anuprāsa and Yamaka. He definitely speaks of two sets of Alaṁkāras called Śabdālaṁkāras and Artha or Abhidheya Alaṁkāras.

The fate of this Sauśabdya is interesting. Early writers held it high as *Āntarā*laṁkāra as against Rūpaka etc. dismissed as *Bāhyā*laṁkāra. When we examine the sixth chapter of Bhāmaha, on Śabdaśuddhi or Sauśabdya, we would see that it contains the seeds of many of the later numerous Śabdaguṇas, Śrutisukha etc. The Alaṁkāra Sauśabdya itself became a Śabdaguṇa in course of time. There is no trace of it in Daṇḍin, but Vāmana speaks of Suptiṅ Samskāra at the end of III. 2 and says that, by itself and without Pāka, which is the clear and complete presence (Sphuṭatva and Sākalya) of the Guṇas, Suptiṅ samskāra is detestable.

गुणस्फुटत्वसाकल्ये काव्यपाकं प्रचक्षते ।
चूतस्य परिणामेन स चायमुपमीयते ॥
सुप्तिङ्संस्कारमात्रं यत् क्लिश्रवस्तुगुणं भवेत् ।
काव्यं मृन्नाकपाकं स्याद् जुगुप्सन्ते जनास्ततः ॥

The conception of Śabda-samskāra or Sauśabdya itself as an Alaṁkāra is clearly foreshadowed in a verse of Vālmīki in the Sundara kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa :

दुःखेन बुबुधे सीतां हनुमान्नलङ्कृताम् ।
संस्कारेण यथा हीनां वाचमर्थान्तरं गताम् ॥ 15.39.

1. Cf. Mallinātha, commenting upon the expression 'द्विषां विघाताय' in *Kirātārjunīya*, I. 3. says that the peculiar grammatical Prayoga here is also an Alaṁkāra :

"तथापि प्रयोगवैचित्र्यविशेषस्याप्यलङ्कारत्वादेवं व्याचक्षते ।"

The last section, the fifth, of Vamāna is devoted, like the last chapter of Bhāmaha, to Śabdaśudhhi. There is this difference between the treatment in Bhāmaha and that in Vāmana. Bhāmaha treats of Sauśabdya and shows how Śabdaprayogas can be made to *beautify* Kāvya but Vāmana treats of it from the point of view of grammatical purity only, Śuddhi *as such*. Maṅgala, perhaps Vāmana's contemporary, whose views exhibit some similarity with those of Vāmana but who is in the main a bold free-thinker, opined differently from Vāmana. We are indebted to Rājaśekhara for Maṅgala's opinion on Sauśabdya. Rājaśekhara says :

सततमभ्यासवशतः सुकवेः वाक्यं पाकमायाति । कः पुनरयं पाकः ? इत्याचार्याः । 'परिणामः इति मङ्गलः । कः पुनरयं परिणामः ? इत्याचार्याः । सुपां तिङां च भवः(प्रि)या व्युत्पत्तिः इति मङ्गलः । सौशब्द्यमेतत्, 'पदनिवेशनिष्कम्पता पाकः' इत्याचार्याः ।

Pāka is maturity of poetic power which the poet attains by constant writing of poetry. Maṅgala calls it Pariṇāma and explains it as the sweet Vyutpatti of Sup and Tiṅ, i.e., beautiful wording. This Suptiṅ vyutpatti is the Sauśabdya we are considering. Bhoja makes it a Śabdaguṇa.

व्युत्पत्तिः सुप्तिङां या तु प्रोच्यते सा सुशब्दता । I. 72.

Bhoja separates Pāka as the Guṇa called Prauḍhi, and Ratneśvara explains that Suptiṅ samskāra is not Pāka or a variety of Pāka even. Perhaps the second reference is to Vāmana.

उक्तः प्रौढः परीपाकः प्रोच्यते प्रौढिसंज्ञया । *S. K. Ā.* I. 77.

"पदानामावापोद्वापाभ्यां सन्निवेशचारुत्वेन योऽभ्यासिको नालिकेरपाकः मृद्वीकापाकः इत्यादिः वाक्यपरिपाकः सा प्रौढिरित्युच्यते ।" *Ratneśvara.*

सुप्तिङ्संस्कारलक्षणस्तु वार्ताकपाकः कैश्चिदुक्तः, स तु सुशब्दतालक्षणगुण एव ।
Ratneśvara.

In respect of Śabdālaṁkāras, there is further advance in Daṇḍin who devotes a separate chapter to them. He treats of them in chaper III. Rather, he treats in chapter III of Yamaka and Citra only. Even in chapter I while describing the ten Guṇas, he speaks of Anuprāsa and the Yamaka in connection with the Gauḍamārga which loves the former very much. Here Daṇḍin defines Anuprāsa and illustrates it. I. 52, 53, 55-58. Yamaka is mentioned in I. 61 but is left for treatment in a subsequent section, the third chapter. Daṇḍin does not mention Sauśabdya nor does he devote any section to Śabdaśuddhi. Towards the end of chapter III Daṇḍin says :

शब्दार्थालङ्क्रियाः चित्रमार्गाः सुकरदुष्कराः ।
गुणा दोषाश्च वाक्यानामिति संक्षिप्य दर्शिताः ॥

The understanding of features like Guṇa, Doṣa and Alaṁkāra as belonging to Śabda and to Artha *separately* is clearer in the time of Udbhaṭa and Vāmana. In his *KASS* however, Udbhaṭa does not give his Alaṁkāras under two main heads as Śabdālaṁkāras and Arthālaṁkāras but gives them after the manner of Bhāmaha in Vargas. He has one more Śabdālaṁkāra in the

opening Varga viz., Punaruktavadābhāsa. Under Śleṣa, he has two varieties, of Śabda and of Artha.

द्विविधैरर्थशब्दोक्तिविशिष्टं तत्प्रतीयताम्। IV.

Beyond this there is no attempt to define Śabdālaṁkāra or to indicate its difference from Arthālaṁkāra. Udbhaṭa, like Bhāmaha, gives his Alaṁkāras in a quasi-historical manner. Tilaka remarks in his *Vivcka* on Udbhaṭa :

वर्गैर्वर्गैरलङ्कारोपादानं चिरन्तनालङ्कारकृतामल्पदर्शितां प्रकटयितुम्। Mad. Ms. p. 1.

Vāmana classifies Guṇas into Śabdaguṇas and Arthaguṇas and makes a small statement on the difference between the two in III. ii.

वाच्यवाचकद्वारेण शब्दार्थगुणानां भेदं दर्शयति।

He clearly separates the Śabdālaṁkāras and the Arthālaṁkāras and treats of them in two separate chapters. Under Śleṣa, he does not speak of its two varieties. Soon, the flood-light of the *Dhvanyāloka* made clear most minute points and scholars began to define how an Alaṁkāra (or Guṇa or Doṣa) was classed as belonging to Śabda or to Artha. Two theories developed, the "Āśraya-āśrayi bhāva" theory and the "Anvaya-vyatireka" theory. The two had their beginnings in Rājānaka Tilaka's commentary on the *KASS* of Udbhaṭa. There, Tilaka gave certain principles by which Alaṁkāras were decided as belonging to Śabda or Artha. It is the discussion on the Śleṣālaṁkāra, its definition and illustration in Udbhaṭa that brought the issue to a head and produced the result of a clear formulation of the principle of the classification of Alaṁkāras into those of Śabda and those of Artha. Śleṣa was the most discussed Alaṁkāra of that time. Under it, Tilaka has the relevant discussion. Out of this text of Tilaka, Mammaṭa formulated the Anvaya-vyatireka theory in his *K. Pra.*, ninth Ullāsa, under Śleṣa. Ruyyaka, son of Rājānaka Tilaka, at the end of his *Alaṁkāra Sarvasva*, propounded the other theory of Āśrayāśrayi bhāva which is also derived from Tilaka's text. Jayaratha, in his *Vimarśinī* on the *AS here*, refers us to Tilaka's commentary on Udbhaṭa where he would take Tilaka as having propounded the Āśrayāśrayi bhāva theory.

एतच्च उद्भटविवेके राजानकतिलकेन सप्रपञ्चमुक्तमिति ग्रन्थविस्तरभयान्नेहास्माभिः प्रपञ्चितम्।

But as a matter of fact, the phrase Āśrayāśrayi bhāva is not found in Tilaka. At the end of the discussion, Tilaka's remarks tend to end in such a view. But in the body of the discussion, he uses the phrase and the idea of 'Anvaya-vyatireka'. The text of Tilaka is found reproduced to some extent by Mammaṭa who follows Tilaka. That Mammaṭa follows Tilaka is plain, and Vidyācakravartin also observes to that effect. Thus the actual advancing of the two theories are by Mammaṭa and by his commentator and independent writer Ruyyaka. The former puts forward that Guṇas, Doṣas and Alaṁkāras are characterised as Śābda or Ārtha by the principle of Anvaya and Vyatireka. Ruyyaka took certain parts of his father's text and developed therefrom the theory of Āśrayāśrayi bhāva, criticising Mammaṭa's Anvaya-vyatireka theory.

Without definitely propounding any theory, Tilaka spoke of the differentiation of Alaṁkāras into Śābda and Ārtha, by the way, in his examination of Udbhaṭa's definition and illustration of Śleṣa in its two varieties called Śabdaśleṣa and Arthaśleṣa. Earlier, under Rūpakālaṁkāra, giving a clearer illustration of the Ekadeśa vivarti type, Tilaka himself gives a verse having Śliṣṭa paramparita rūpaka and says of it that, though through Śabda, it is only Artha that is adorned, it is a case of Śabdālaṁkāra only since the activity of the poet for the sake of Alaṁkāra is only in Śabda.

अत्र शब्दमुखेन अर्थस्य विचित्रत्वेऽपि मुख्यतः कविप्रतिभासारंभ(संरंभ)गोचरस्य शब्दस्य वैचित्र्यमिति शब्दालङ्कारत्वं युक्तम् । ग्रन्थगौरवभयात्तु न प्रतनुमः । किञ्चित्तु श्लेषस्थाने वक्ष्यामः ।
Mad. Ms. p. 14.

Under Śleṣālaṁkāra, he fulfils his promise. Here he formulates a more basic theory than either Anvayavyatireka or Āśrayāśrayi bhāva. He says : Alaṁkāra is Vaicitrya. The poet's imagination takes some activity for the introduction of this Vaicitrya in some place. Which is the object of the poet's activity ? Which is the place to which is directed the activity for Vaicitrya ? If that object or place should be Śabda, that is a case of Śabdālaṁkāra ; if it should be Artha, it is Arthālaṁkāra.

न च ' भास्करविराजिते 'त्यर्थश्लेष उपपन्नः । वैचित्र्यमलङ्कारः अभिधीयत इति कविप्रतिभासंरंभगोचरार्थोऽलङ्कार्यः, तद्धर्मश्चालङ्कारः । न च भास्वदित्यादौ अर्थस्संरंभगोचर इति शब्दस्य अलङ्कृतत्वम् ।
Mad. Ms. p. 50.

How is it to be decided that in a particular case the object of the poet's activity for Alaṁkāra is Śabda or Artha ? Here Tilaka postulates that it is decided by Anvaya and Vyatireka. Thus, Tilaka mentions the Anvayavyatireka theory as an additional means helping the basic principle, though not as the basic principle itself.

काव्ये दोषगुणालङ्काराणां च शब्दार्थगत (त) या अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां विभागः क्रियते । न च भानुर्दीप्यमानादिशब्दसद्भावेऽलङ्कारोऽत्रेति शब्दान्वयव्यतिरेकानुविधायिनोऽस्य शब्दालङ्कारत्वमेव युक्तम् ।

In Udbhaṭa's illustration of Arthaśleṣa

' स्वयं च पल्लवाताम्रभास्वत्करविराजिता '

Tilaka has once proved that there is no Arthaśleṣa, but only Śabdaśleṣa, since the object of ' Kavi pratibhā samrambha ' is only Śabda and not Artha. Here, in the same instance, he again proves that it is a case of Śabdaśleṣa only, by putting forward the argument that in Kāvya, Guṇa, Doṣa or Alaṁkāra is classified into Śābda or Ārtha by the principle of Anvaya and Vyatireka. If we say " Bhānu dīpyamānā etc." instead of " Bhāsvatkara virājitā ", there is no such Alaṁkāra. The Alaṁkāra in the former disappears on the change of words, i.e., in the absence of the words. So, since the Alaṁkāra here depends upon the presence or otherwise of certain words, it is a case of Śabdālaṁkāra. From this passage it can be plainly taken that Tilaka propounded the theory

repeating the same verse. In the *Śṛ. Pra.* this subject is dealt with under or to Artha.

Tilaka dismisses thus the view of Udbhaṭa and Pratīhārendurāja that the above is an instance of Arthālaṁkāra. Tilaka takes the whole verse as a case of Śabdaśleṣa, divides it into two varieties, and calls the first line Abhaṅgaśleṣa and the second line Sabhaṅgaśleṣa. For a case of Arthaśleṣa, Tilaka gives a new illustration. आकृष्यादावमन्दग्रहम् etc. He also points out that in the illustration of Udbhaṭa

अबिन्दुसुन्दरी नित्यं गलल्लावण्यबिन्दुका ।

the Alaṁkāra is the Śabdālaṁkāra virodha, Śleṣa being only "Pratibhāta-mātra" and not "Prarūḍha". Such cases of Śabdālaṁkāra are possible also in Upamā and Samuccaya, as Rudraṭa has said in his Śabdālaṁkāra prakaraṇa IV. 32.

स्फुटमर्थालङ्कारावेतौ उपमासमुच्चयौ किन्तु ।
आश्रित्य शब्दमात्रं सामान्यमिहापि सम्भवतः ॥

Tilaka quotes this verse and the two illustrations from Rudraṭa here. The whole passage of Tilaka need not be reproduced here since the same is almost reproduced by Mammaṭa. Mammaṭa refers to the expressions "वैचित्र्यमलङ्कारः" and "कविप्रतिभासंरंभगोचरत्वम्" in Tilaka. He also mentions Tilaka's classification of the halves of Udbhaṭa's verse into Sabhaṅga and Abhaṅga Śleṣas. He also refers to the Śabdālaṁkāra of Virodha in "Abindusundarī etc." He quotes Rudraṭa for the same purpose. He adopts the principle of Anvaya-vyatireka, expressed almost in the same words. Mammaṭa simply reproduces from Tilaka. For a case of pure Arthaśleṣa, instead of the big verse in Tilaka, Mammaṭa has a small one. They both consider Arthaśleṣa to be in those cases only, where the Śleṣa is not lost even when words are changed.

When he concludes, Tilaka replies to a criticism. If the Anvaya-vyatireka theory is accepted, the critic says, the word Śabdālaṁkāra must be interpreted as Alaṁkāra through Śabda शब्दमूल-अलङ्कार and not as Alaṁkāra of Śabda—शब्दस्य अलङ्कारः. Since the Alaṁkāra is said to result as a consequence of the presence of a word and to disappear on the disappearance of the word it must be said that that Alaṁkāra is achieved through the word, by means of the word, Śabda-mūla. It cannot be said by the upholders of the Anvaya-vyatireka theory that a certain Alaṁkāra is *of* the Śabda or *of* the Artha but can only be said that it is *through* Śabda or *through* Artha. Śabda or Artha may be the Karaṇa but surely Alaṁkāra is the *Dharma* of either Śabda or Artha. The decision that Alaṁkāra is Śabda Dharma or Artha Dharma is impossible if one resorts to the Anvaya-vyatireka theory which decides only the Mūla-mūli bhāva or Kāraṇa-kārya bhāva. In reply to this criticism, Tilaka says that he must here resort to the basic principle given first viz., "Yadvaicitryatvam"; Vaicitrya is Alaṁkāra; if that Vaicitrya in a particular case be of Śabda, it is a case of Śabdālaṁkāra.

एवमादौ शब्दमूलोऽलङ्कारः, न तु शब्दस्य अलङ्कार इति चेत्, उक्तमत्र—वैचित्र्यमलङ्कार इति, यद्वैचित्र्यं तस्य अलङ्कार इति यथोक्तमेव साधु। Mad. Ms. p. 51, (corrected text).

This "Yadvaicitryatva" will culminate, if explained, in the Āśrayāśrayibhāva theory. It is thus this concluding portion of Tilaka that has been developed by his son Ruyyaka into the Āśrayāśrayibhāva theory, the necessity for it being the same above-given criticism against Anvaya-vyatireka in Tilaka.

Therefore, in many cases contended as Arthālaṁkāras, Tilaka proves Śabdālaṁkāratva. But in his answer to the critics who pointed out that Tilaka would then have to explain Śabdālaṁkāra as Śabdamūlālaṁkāra, Tilaka had to give another theory called Yadvaicitryatvam which is in essence his son's Āśrayāśrayibhāva. If Tilaka adopts it, he must modify his view of those illustrations which he holds only as Śabdaśleṣa, for the Vaicitrya there belongs as Dharma to Artha also. To this Tilaka replies, "Yes; Vaicitrya in those cases belongs to Artha also but let them not be called pure Arthālaṁkāras; for their Alaṁkāratva depends upon the Anvaya of Śabda. So put them as Ubhayālaṁkāras."

भवन्तु वा परमेवंभूता उभयस्यालङ्काराः नार्थस्येति विचार्यमेतद्विद्वद्भिः, न तु झटित्यसूयितव्यम्।
Tilaka's Com. on Udbhaṭa, p. 51 (Mad. Ms. Corrected Text).

Mammaṭa propounds the Anvayavyatireka theory in Chapter IX:

इह दोषगुणालङ्काराणां शब्दार्थगतत्वेन यो विभागः सोऽन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यामेव व्यवतिष्ठते। तथा हि कष्टत्वादि-गाढत्वादि-अनुप्रासादयो व्यर्थत्वादि-प्रौढ्यादि-उपमादयश्च तद्भावतदभावानुविधायित्वादेव शब्दार्थगतत्वेन व्यवस्थाप्यन्ते।

And he proceeds to discuss Śleṣa with the illustration given in Udbhaṭa and says, adopting the basic principle of 'yadvaicitryatva' and 'Kavipratibhāsamrambha gocaratva', that if this principle is not adopted, all Śabda doṣas, Śabda guṇas and Śabda alaṁkāras will have to be taken as belonging to Artha, because Doṣa, Guṇa and Alaṁkāra, even of Śabda, refer only to Artha.

किञ्च वैचित्र्यमलङ्कार इति य एव कविप्रतिभासंरंभगोचरः तत्रैव विचित्रतेति, सैवालङ्कारभूमिः। अर्थमुखप्रेक्षित्वमेषां शब्दानामिति चेत्, अनुप्रासादीनामपि तथैवेति तेऽप्यर्थालङ्काराः किं नोच्यन्ते; रसादिव्यञ्जकस्वरूपवाच्यविशेषसव्यपेक्षत्वे हि अनुप्रासादीनामलङ्कारता। शब्दगुणदोषाणामपि अर्थापेक्षयैव गुणदोषता। अर्थगुणदोषालङ्काराणां शब्दापेक्षयैव गुणदोषता।

Similarly, since Artha cannot be thought of without Śabda, Guṇa, Doṣa and Alaṁkāra of Artha will have to be assigned to Śabda also.

अर्थगुणदोषालङ्काराणां शब्दापेक्षयैव स्थितिरिति तेऽपि शब्दगतत्वेन उच्यन्ताम्।

Again at the end of this chapter Mammaṭa gives two varieties of Punaruktavadābhāsa, one of Śabda and the other of both Śabda and Artha and says as regards the two that it is the presence and absence, Anvaya and Vyatireka, that decides the question:

अत्र एकस्मिन् पदे परिवर्तिते नालङ्कार इति शब्दाश्रयः, अपरस्मिंस्तु परिवर्तितेऽपि स न हीयते इत्यर्थनिष्ठ इत्युभयालङ्कारोऽयम्।

He advances the same argument under Śleṣa :

अर्थश्लेषस्य तु स विषयः यत्र शब्दपरिवर्तनेऽपि न श्लेषत्वखण्डना, यथा—
" स्तोकेनोन्नतिमायाति स्तोकेनायात्यधोगतिम् । अहो सुसदृशी वृत्तिः तुलाकोटेः खलस्य च ॥ "

Ruyyaka puts his theory of Āśrayāśrayibhāva at the end of his *Sarvasa* thus :

लोकवदाश्रयाश्रयिभावश्च तदलङ्कारनिबन्धनम् । अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ तु तत्कार्यत्वे प्रयोजकौ । न तदलङ्कारत्वे । तदलङ्कारप्रयोजकत्वे तु श्रौतोपमादेरपि शब्दालङ्कारत्वप्रसङ्गात् । तस्मादाश्रयाश्रयिभावेनैव चिरन्तनमतानुसृतिरिति भद्रम् ।

As we observed above at the close of the consideration of the view of Tilaka, Ruyyaka here says that the Anvaya-vyatireka theory proves only that Śabda or Artha is the Kāraṇa. Resorting to that theory, we can only say that a certain Alaṁkāra is the Kārya of Śabda or Artha. If the Alaṁkāra of a Śabda is due to the presence of a Śabda i.e. to the Anvaya of a Śabda, then Śrautopamā which is due to the Anvaya of '*Iva*' will be a case of Śabdālaṁkāra. There is no Alaṁkāra or special figurative beauty added to the instance by its becoming a Śrautopamā with the Anvaya of the word '*Iva*.' *So there is no Alaṁkāra there in* '*Iva*' and it will be contradictory and absurd if one has to say of it that since there is Iva-śabdānvaya there, it is a case of Śabdālaṁkāra. Further, Śrautopamā can never be anything but an Arthālaṁkāra. So the Anvaya-vyatireka theory must be cast off. This is made clear by Jayaratha also.

ननु तुल्यत्वेऽपि काव्यशोभातिशयहेतुत्वे कश्चिदलङ्कारः शब्दस्य कश्चिदर्थस्य कश्चिदुभयस्येति कुतः पुनरयं प्रतिनियम इत्याशंक्याह–लोकवदित्यादि । लोके हि योऽलङ्कारः यदाश्रितः स तदलङ्कारतया उच्यते यथा कुण्डलादिः कर्णाद्याश्रितः तदलङ्कारः । एवमिहापि शब्दाद्याश्रितः तदलङ्कार इति सिद्ध एव विषयविभागरूपः प्रतिनियमः । यत्त्वन्यैः (मम्मटाद्यैः) अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ तदलङ्कारनिबन्धनत्वेन उक्तौ तदयुक्तमेवेत्याह—अन्वयेत्यादि । एवं हि श्रौतोपमायामिवादिशब्दान्वयव्यतिरेकानुवर्तनात् तत्कार्यत्वमेव, न पुनस्तदलङ्कारत्वम् । तस्याविशेषात् । अर्थस्य पुनरलङ्कृतत्वात् तदलङ्कारत्वमेव युक्तमिति तात्पर्यार्थः । + + + आश्रयाश्रयिभावेनेति उपस्कार्योपस्कारकभावेनेत्यर्थः । तेन योऽलङ्कारः यदुपस्कारकः स तदलङ्कार इति पिण्डार्थः ।

In Śrautopamā, the thing really adorned with Alaṁkāra is Artha. The presence of '*Iva*'-śabda does not contribute or add to the Alaṁkāra—beauty but is only the Kāraṇa of the case becoming a Śrautopamā. So the adorned object, Artha or Śabda, decides whether the adorning Alaṁkāra is Śābda or Ārtha. Thus the Āśrayāśrayibhāva is also called Upaskāryopaskāraka-bhāva, the essence of which is Tilaka's " Yadvaicitrayatva."

Does Mammaṭa (or Allaṭa) speak of this theory of Āśrayāśrayibhāva ? Yes, Mammaṭa (Allaṭa) mentions it and explains that even to determine the Āśrayāśrayibhāva, one has got to use Anvaya-vyatireka and hence, it is better to distinguish Śabdālaṁkāra from Arthālaṁkāra through the Anvaya-vyatireka theory. This Mammaṭa (Allaṭa) does towards the end of the tenth chapter after finishing the Arthālaṁkāras. He also points out here that, even as Punaruktavadābhāsa and Paramparitarūpaka, Arthāntaranyāsa etc., will also

be Ubhayālaṁkāras ; if they are dealt with among Arthālaṁkāras, it is because Artha-vaicitrya dominates in them.

कुतः पुनरेष नियमः यदेतेषां तुल्येऽपि काव्यशोभाहेतुत्वे कश्चिदलङ्कारः शब्दस्य, कश्चिदर्थस्य, कश्चिदुभयस्येति चेत्, उक्तमत्र यथा काव्ये दोषगुणालङ्काराणां शब्दार्थोभयगतत्वेन व्यवस्थायाम् अन्वयव्यतिरेकावेव प्रभवतः, निमित्तान्तरस्याभावात् । + + एवं च यथा पुनरुक्तवदाभासः परंपरितरूपकं चोभयोर्भावाभावानुविधायितया उभयालङ्कारौ, तथा शब्दहेतुकार्थान्तरन्यासप्रभृतयोऽपि द्रष्टव्याः । अर्थस्य तु तत्र वैचित्र्यमुत्कटतया प्रतिभासते इति वाच्यालङ्कारमध्ये वस्तुस्थितिमनपेक्ष्यैव लक्षिताः । **योऽलङ्कारो यदाश्रितः स तदलङ्कार** इत्यपि कल्पनायाम् अन्वयव्यतिरेकावेव समाश्रयितव्यौ, तदाश्रयमन्तरेण विशिष्टस्य **आश्रयाश्रयिभावस्य** अभावाद् इत्यलङ्काराणां यथोक्तनिमित्त एव परस्परव्यतिरेको ज्यायान् ॥

In his comments here, Nāgoji plainly says that scientifically speaking, all Alaṁkāras are Ubhayālaṁkāras.

Later writers have followed one or the other, the *Alaṁkārasarvasva* or the *K. Pra.* Both of these works gave a few cases of Ubhayālaṁkāra. The *K. Pra.* gives an Ubhyālaṁkāra variety of Punarukatavadābhāsa. The *Alaṁkārasarvasva* says at the end :

तत्र शब्दालङ्कारा यमकादयः । अर्थालङ्कारा उपमादयः । उभयालङ्कारा लाटानुप्रासादयः । संसृष्टिसङ्करप्रकारयोरपि कयोश्चित् तद्रूपत्वात् ।

Ruyyaka says that Lāṭānuprāsa etc. are Ubhayālaṁkāras as also Samsṛṣṭi and Saṁkara. Jayaratha in explaining 'Lāṭānuprāsā*dayaḥ*' says :

आदिग्रहणाद् अनन्वयश्लेषादीनां ग्रहणम् ।

Thus Ananvaya and Śleṣa also are Ubhayālaṁkāras, and the total number of this class is thus only five. This view is generally followed and only these few are considered as Ubhayālaṁkāras by later writers. Thus Vidyānātha says :

तत्र प्रथमं शब्दार्थोभयगतत्वेन द्वैविध्यमलङ्कारवर्गस्य ।

and Kumārasvāmin explains :

उभयालङ्काराः लाटानुप्रासोभयसंसृष्ट्यादयः ।

The bulk of Alaṁkāras is given by these writers as Arthālaṁkāras, Upamā, Rūpaka etc. Bhoja's position in respect of the classification of Alaṁkāras into those of Śabda and those of Artha is more logical. We saw how, generally, only a few instances like Lāṭānuprāsa, Śleṣa Ananvaya, Saṁkara, and Samsṛṣṭi are considered as Ubhayālaṁkāra. Bhoja considers most of the Alaṁkāras given by others under Arthālaṁkara as really Ubhayālaṁkāras. He however does not say how he classifies his Alaṁkāras into the three classes of Alaṁkāras of Śabda, Artha, and both (Ubhaya). Vyutpatti etc. which adorn Śabda are called Śabdālaṁkāra by Bhoja.

ये व्युत्पत्त्यादिना शब्दमलङ्कर्तुमिह क्षमाः ।
शब्दालङ्कारसंज्ञास्ते ज्ञेया जात्यादयो बुधैः ॥ *S. K. A.* II. 2.

There is no charm in them due to Artha.

× × शब्दालङ्कारजातयः ।
शब्दसन्दर्भमात्रेण हृदयं हर्तुमिशते ॥ *S. K. Ā.* II. 158.

Pure Arthālaṁkāras are those Vyutpatti etc. which have given charm to Artha.

अलमर्थमलङ्कर्तुं ये व्युत्पत्त्यादिवर्त्मना ।
ज्ञेया जात्यादयः प्राज्ञैः तेऽर्थालङ्कारसंज्ञया ॥ III. 1. *S. K. Ā.*

विशिष्टा उत्पत्तिः व्युत्पत्तिः जातेरवच्छेदकः प्रकारः । आदिशब्दात् विविधशक्तिप्रतिबन्धादयो विभावनाद्यवच्छेदाः त्रयोविंशतिः । *Ratneśvara* (p. 265.)

व्युत्पत्तिः प्रकृतिप्रत्ययादीनामर्थविशेषज्ञानम् । आदिशब्देन वाक्यार्थविशेषपदार्थस्वभावतत्साम्यविरोधप्रभृतीनां (ग्रहणम्) । तत्र प्रकृतिप्रत्ययार्थविशेषज्ञानं हेत्वलङ्कारादिषु । वाक्यार्थज्ञानं विभावनादिषु । स्वभावज्ञानं जातौ । अन्यत्सामान्यविरोधादिषु । एवमन्यत्राप्यूहनीयम् ।
Bhaṭṭa Narasiṁha (p. 85, Mad. Ms.).

When Bhoja uses the expression 'charm of Śabda or Artha' (Śabdam alaṁkartum, artham alaṁkartum), he takes as the basis of his classification the 'yadvaicitrya' or 'kavipratibhā-samrambha gocara', which we found enunciated as the basic principle by Tilaka.

Ratneśvara says in his comments on the above verse :

अर्थशोभानिवृ(र्वृ)त्तिहेतुः विच्छित्तिरर्थालङ्कार इति स्फुटलक्षणम् ।

This would mean that Hetu bhāva is involved in Bhoja's definition of Śabdālaṁkāra and Arthālaṁkāra and would make us conclude that Bhoja would also accept the Anvaya-vyatireka theory.

That 'kāryakāraṇa bhāva' and the 'Anvaya-vyatireka' principle also are understood in some other remarks of Bhoja will be shown below.

III.

Bhoja's Arthālaṁkāras and Ubhayālaṁkāras

The Alaṁkāras which Bhoja considers as pure Arthālaṁkāras are : Jāti, (Svabhāvokti), Vibhāvanā, Hetu, Ahetu, Sūkṣma, Uttara, Virodha, Sambhava, Anyonya, Parivṛtti, Nidarśana, Bheda, Samāhita, Bhrānti, Vitarka, Mīlita, Smṛti, Bhāva, Pratyakṣa, Anumāna, Āptavacana or Āgama, Upamāna, Arthāpatti and Abhāva,—24.

Of these, the stock which Bhoja already had comprises Jāti, Vibhāvanā, Hetu, Ahetu, Sūkṣma, Uttara, Virodha, Anyonya, Parivṛtti, Nidarśana, Samāhita, Bhrānti, Mīlita, Smṛti and Bhāva. As we shall also see, as we proceed further, and as will be pointed out in the section on Bhoja and Rudraṭa, Bhoja derived a great deal from Rudraṭa for his Alaṁkāra prakaraṇa. The only new Alaṁkāras which Bhoja has introduced here are the six Pramāṇas of Jaimini and Sambhava. Bheda and Vitarka are only the old Vyatireka and Sandeha. The six Pramāṇas, and Sambhava, Bhrānti, Smṛti and Vitarka are forms of cognition and are therefore unquestionably Arthālaṁkāras,

having nothing to do with Śabda. Of the others, Ahetu, Uttara, Anyonya, Mīlita, Bhrānti, Smṛti and Bhāva are borrowed from Rudraṭa. Jāti, Vibhāvanā, Hetu, Sūkṣma, Virodha, Parivṛtti, Nidarśana and Samāhita are as old as Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin.

The following points in Bhoja's description of these Alaṁkāras deserve notice :

1. Bhoja strangely includes the Kāraṇamālā of Rudraṭa's Vāstava set in his own Ahetu. (P. 284, *S. K. Ā.*).

2. The definitions of the Alaṁkāras are, many of them, those found in Daṇḍin, with slight changes wherever necessary.

3. Viṣama is included in Virodha. As pointed out by Bhoja and Ratneśvara, Asaṁgati, Pratyanīka and Adhika are others included in Virodha.

4. Uttara is thus defined : पदार्थानां तु यः सारः ।

Thus the two Alaṁkāras Uttara and Sāra of Rudraṭa's Vāstava set are put together as one by Bhoja.

5. The definitions and classifications of Alaṁkāras derived from Śāstras, the six Pramāṇas, and Smṛti etc. are all in Śāstraic terminology. In the case of Sambhava, Bhoja leaves the Sambhava known as a Pramāṇa. He considers it as being not different from Anumāna. Bhoja's Sambhava is almost like Utprekṣā in definition and illustration.

6. Nidarśana is taken as Dṛṣṭānta. Bhoja has no Alaṁkāra called Dṛṣṭānta.

7. His new Alaṁkāra, Bheda, is only a new name for the old Vyatireka.

8. In Bhrānti, Bhoja includes some other varieties of Bhrānti, Bhrāntimān, Bhrāntimālā, Bhrāntyatiśaya and Bhrāntyanadhyavasāya.

9. Vitarka is the old Saṁśaya or Sasandeha.

10. Mīlita is defined as वस्तुना वस्त्वन्तरतिरस्कार and under it are brought Pihita, Apihita, Tadguṇa and Atadguṇa.

11. Bhāva is the same Alaṁkāra of that name found in Rudraṭa's Vāstava set.

12. Under Upamāna, Abhinaya, Ālekhya, Mudrā and Pratibimba—strange Alaṁkāras,—are included.

13. Abhāva is treated in all its varieties known in the Nyāya śāstra.

From the above examination we see that even the few which appear as newly introduced by Bhoja are only new names for the old. Sometimes Bhoja's new name is the basic principle or the more comprehensive idea under which similar Alaṁkāras can be easily brought. Therefore the only additions made by Bhoja are the six Pramāṇālaṁkāras. It can be seen that in respect of the other figures, Bhoja has made considerable simplification.

It is the more comprehensive and general principles or ideas that go to distinguish the Arthālaṁkāras that are referred to by Bhoja by the expression 'Vyutpattyādi'. These conditions other than Vyutpatti are mentioned as twenty-three by Ratneśvara. (*S. K. Ā. Vyā.* p. 265, see text quoted above). Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha says in his commentary on the *S. K. Ā.* (Mad. Ms. p. 85 :—see text

quoted above) that these 'Vyutpattyādis' are Prakṛti-pratyayādi-artha viśeṣa-jñāna, Vākyārthajñāna, Svabhāvajñāna, Sāmyajñāna, Virodhajñāna etc.

Bhoja's Ubhayālaṁkāras.

All the other Alaṁkāras known in Alaṁkāra śāstra as Arthālaṁkāras are considered by Bhoja as Ubhayālaṁkāra and not as pure Arthālaṁkāra. Rudraṭa points out in IV. 32, that there is an element of Śabdālaṁkāra in Upamā and Samuccaya. This verse is quoted by Rājānaka Tilaka in his discussion on the principle of classification of Alaṁkāra into that of Śabda and that of Artha. Towards the end of his discussion, it has been pointed out above, Tilaka says that many of the Alaṁkāras discussed by him and held by others as Arthālaṁkāras can never be purely Arthālaṁkāras; they are really Ubhayālaṁkāras. This is realised by Bhoja. Ruyyaka and Jayaratha fear that if the Anvaya-vyatireka theory is adopted, Śrautopamā would become a Śabdālaṁkāra. Not only Śrautopamā, all Upamā and many others also are taken as Ubhayālaṁkāra by Bhoja. In his comments on this discussion at the end of the *K. Pra.*, referred to above, Nāgoji does not fight shy of the logical conclusion of Mammaṭa's view and boldly says that as a matter of fact, all Alaṁkāras are Ubhayālaṁkāras.

वास्तवं सिद्धान्तसिद्धं तु सर्वेषामुभयालङ्कारत्वमिति बोध्यम् ।

Describing an Ubhayālaṁkāra, Bhoja says :

शब्देभ्यो यः पदार्थेभ्यः उपमादिः प्रतीयते ।
विशिष्टोऽर्थः कवीनां ता उभयालङ्क्रियाः प्रियाः ॥

Artha is Viśiṣṭa, i.e., Vicitra, striking, and the Alaṁkāra which gives that strikingness is brought about through both words and ideas शब्देभ्यः पदार्थेभ्यो विशिष्टः अर्थः. Alaṁkāras that are made out as much from the Śabda as from Artha are Ubhayālaṁkāras. This follows the Kāryakāraṇabhāva or Anvaya-vyatireka principle.

This class also consists of 24 Alaṁkāras :

Upamā, Rūpaka, Sāmya, Saṁśayokti, Apahnuti, Samādhyukti, Samāsokti, Utprekṣā, Aprastutastuti, Tulyayogitā, Ullekha, Sahokti, Samuccaya, Ākṣepa, Arthāntaranyāsa, Viśeṣa, Pariṣkṛti (Parikara), Dīpaka, Krama, Paryāya, Atiśaya, Śleṣa, Bhāvika and Samsṛṣṭi.

Sāmya is derived from Rudraṭa's Aupamya set. But in Rudraṭa it is a small idea. Bhoja enlarged its scope and put under it all those figures which are not Upamā or Rūpaka but in which Aupamya is suggested. This considerably reduces the number of figures for, Bhoja brings under Sāmya the following Alaṁkāras : Dṛṣṭāntokti, Prapañcokti and Prativastūkti, the first and the third being Dṛṣṭānta and Prativastūpamā. Prapañcokti is various other kinds of Aupamya seen in cases where there is no '*Iva*' etc. The colophon to this section gives the same Sāmya as Sāmānya. (*S. K. Ā.* P. 379).

Samādhi, new as an Alaṁkāra in Bhoja, is only the Samādhi guṇa of Dandin, being अन्यधर्माणामन्यत्रारोपणम्. Bhoja adds here that some call this same Mīliṭa,

In this section also, Daṇḍin's definitions are taken wherever they can be utilised.

Bhoja includes in Utprekṣā the new Alaṁkāra called Mata introduced by Rudraṭa in his Aupamya set.

Daṇḍin has two Alaṁkāras called Leśa and Vyājastuti. Bhoja accepts the former and includes in it the latter.

Ākṣepa is also called Pratiṣedhokti by Bhoja and it occurs in cases of prevention, expressed or suggested.

Rudraṭa gave in his Aupamya set Arthāntaranyāsa, Ubhayanyāsa and Pratyanīkanyāsa as three Alaṁkāras. Bhoja includes the latter two in the former. He includes here another Alaṁkāra called Pratīkanyāsa also.

Parikara is also called Pariṣkṛti. Bhoja gives in the Parikara section a curious and obscure view of Parikara as exceptionally high-flown and extraordinarily striking cases of Upamā, Rūpaka etc. (*S. K. Ā.* pp. 444-5). Bhoja includes under Parikara the figure called Ekāvalī also.

Atiśaya is praised by Bhoja after the manner of Daṇḍin. Daṇḍin's text is appropriated by Bhoja.

The Ubhayālaṁkāra called Bhāvika in Bhoja differs considerably from the Bhāvika in Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha. Bhoja takes Bhāvika as : 1. Svābhiprāyakathana, 2. Anyabhāvanā, and 3. Anyāpadeśa. An Alaṁkāra called Udbheda is here included by Bhoja as not being different from Bhāvika.

Samsṛṣṭi comprehends Saṁkara also. It has two main varieties, Vyakta and Avyakta, the Vyakta being Tila-taṇḍula and Chāyādarśa and the two Avyakta varieties being Kṣīra-jala and Pāmsu-pānīya. The latter are cases of Saṁkara for others. Bhoja has a third variety of Samsṛṣṭi, Vyakta-avyakta and it is of two kinds, Narasimha and Citravarṇa.

The above-given account of the three sets of Alaṁkāras of Bhoja are based on the *S. K. Ā.* and there is practically no difference between the *S. K. Ā.* and the *Śṛ. Pra.* on this subject. There are some minor differences which are here noted :

In the *Śṛ. Pra.* Bhoja supplements his description of the three classes of Alaṁkāras by comparing them to three kinds of female make-up and toilet. The Śabdālaṁkāras are called Bāhya and are compared to clothes, garlands and ornaments. The Arthālaṁkāras are called Āntara, internal, and are compared to manicuring, dressing of the hair in various ways etc. The Ubhayālaṁkāras are called Bāhyābhyantara and are compared to bath and perfuming the body with Dhūpa and sandal.

तेषु बाह्याः वस्त्रमाल्यविभूषणादयः, आन्तरा दन्तपरिकर्मनखच्छेदालककल्पनादयः, बाह्याभ्यन्तराः स्नानधूप (विलेपनादयः) *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II. P. 266.

Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha, who is well acquainted with the *Śṛ. Pra.*, says in his *S. K.Ā. Vyākhyā* :

ये काव्यशरीरं कामिनीशरीरमिव हारादयो बहिष्ठा भूषयन्ति ते शब्दालङ्काराः
Mad. Ms. p. 25

ये पुनरान्तराः काव्यशरीरस्य कामिनीशरीरस्येव कलाभियोगादयः । P. 85, *Ibid.*

काव्यशरीरस्य कामिनीशरीरस्येव ताम्बूलोपयोगादयः बाह्याभ्यन्तरपरिष्कारत्वेन उभयालङ्कार-शब्देन वाच्याः । P. 107. *Ibid.*

The 24 Śabdālaṁkāras of the *S. K. Ā.* are here given in a different order, a few of them with a change in the name. Jāti, Gati, Rīti, Vṛtti, *Racanā, Ghaṭanā,* Mudrā, Chāyā, Yukti, Ukti, Bhaṇiti, Paṭhiti, Śravyatva, Prekṣyatva, Abhineyatva, Adhyeyatva, Vākovākya, Praśnottara, Prahelikā, Gūḍha, Citra, Śleṣa, Yamaka, and Anuprāsa.

Racanā is the name of the Gumphanā of the *S. K. Ā.* The word is given as a synonym in the *S. K. Ā.* itself.

Ghaṭanā is the name for the Śayya of the *S. K. Ā.* The name is given as a synonym in the *S. K. Ā.* itself.

In Chāyā, the six classes are differently given in the *Śṛ. Pra.* : Lokokti, Chekokti, *Mugdhokti,* Poṭokti, *Skhalitokti,* and *Asamañjasokti.* The Arbhakokti of the *S. K. Ā.* is renamed Mugdhokti. Mattokti is called Skhalitokti and Unmattokti, Asamañjasokti.

Beyond these few minor differences, there is little difference in the treatment of the 24 Śabdālaṁkāras in the two works. The treatment in the *Śṛ. Pra.* is briefer, Bhoja rushing over the whole subject. The treatment in the cases of Jāti, Gati, Yamaka, Anuprāsa and Citra, elaborately dealt with in the *S. K. Ā.*, is very brief. Each is not defined in one or more Anuṣṭubh verses as in the *S. K. Ā.*, but in brief prose passages.

At the end of the Śabdālaṁkāra sections however, the *Śṛ Pra.* adds something. It has some Anuṣṭubhs making some general observations on these 24 Śabdālaṁkāras :

इह शिष्टानुशिष्टानाम्०—
इदमन्धं तमः कृत्स्नम्०—

These two are from the *K. Ā.* of Daṇḍin and are according to Bhoja, in praise of Jāti, the first Śabdālaṁkara which is Languages. Then Bhoja tries to indicate metaphorically the place of each Śabdālaṁkāra and the whole thing is an extravaganza.

गतयस्तस्य यास्तिस्रः द्रुतमध्यसमन्विताः (विलम्बिताः) ।
लयान् पदगतेः प्राहुः ता गीतेर्गीतवा(वे)दिनः ॥
रीतयो वाङ्मयप्राणाः हृदयं तस्य वृत्तयः ।
रचनादित्रयं मूर्तिः अनुप्रासस्तु जीवितम् ॥ (!)
उक्तयो दैवतं छाया मुद्रा भणितयो धृतिः (?) ।
पठितिः श्रव्यता पे (प्रे) क्षाभिनयोऽध्ययनं धृतिः ॥
श्लेषः पुष्णाति सर्वासु प्रायो वक्रोक्तिषु श्रियम् । (Daṇḍin)
वाकोवाक्येन हृष्यन्ति मनांसि कृषतामपि ।
विनयेन विना का स्त्री का नि (शा शशिना विना) ।
(Bhāmaha, I. 4 with 3rd foot changed)
(विना य)मकचित्राभ्यां कीदृशी वाग्विदग्धता ॥ (!)
गूढ गूढचतुर्थानि (दि ?) वादिनां दर्पशान्तये ।

प्रश्नोत्तरं तु नाम्नापि विदग्धमुखमण्डनम् ॥
क्रीडागोष्ठीविनोदेषु तज्ज्ञैराकीर्णमन्त्रणे ।
परव्यामोहने चापि सोपयोगाः प्रहेलिकाः ॥
यथामति यथायुक्ति यथौचित्यं यथारुचि ।
कवेः पात्रस्य चैतासां प्रयोग उपपद्यते ॥

Then the verses on Jāti and Gati in the *S. K. Ā.* are introduced and finally is given Bhāmaha's verse at the end of Chapter I of his *K. Ā.* which compares the poet to the skilful garlander who examines the flowers, chooses them and then weaves the garland.

Prakāśavarṣa, the summariser of the *Śṛ. Pra.*, follows Bhoja here in his *Rasārṇavālaṁkāra.* He also gives a set of similar verses of his own which try to compare the various Śabdālaṁkāras to various aspects of the form of goddess Sarasvatī in the vain hope that such a comparison would go to define the significance of each.

जातिस्तदत्र वाग्देव्याः मूर्तिस्तज्ज्ञै (रुदाह) ता ।
रीतयस्त्वङ्गसौन्दर्यं लावण्यमथ वृत्तयः ॥
रचना घटना देव्याः कुण्डले परिकीर्तिते ।
दयामुद्रा तु मुद्रैव छाया माल्यमुदाहृतम् ॥
युक्तिं हारावलिं प्राहुः भणितिं मेखलां पुनः ।
.....कङ्कणश्रेणीं श्लेषचित्रे तु नूपुरौ ॥
लीलाकमलमौचित्यं वासः प्रश्नोत्तरं परम् । etc., etc.

In the enumeration of the Arthālaṁkāras also, the *Śṛ. Pra.* changes the order and the names in a few cases. The Uttara of the *S. K. Ā.* which we pointed out to be the Sārālaṁkāra is actually called *Sāra* in the *Śṛ. Pra.* We also pointed out how the Nidarśana in the *S. K. Ā.* is Dṛṣṭānta, and Bheda, only Vyatireka. These two are called Dṛṣṭānta and Vyatireka in the *Śṛ. Pra.*

At the end of this section Bhoja gives two verses, saying that he dealt with the Alaṁkāras only briefly, since his predecessors like Bhāmaha and Vāmana had dealt with them.

The Ubhayālaṁkāra section in the *Śṛ. Pra.* opens with the following prose passage which explains the meaning of Ubhayālaṁkāra.

शब्दविशेषद्वारकोऽर्थविशेषः येषु प्रतीयते (त) उभयालङ्काराः ।

There is little difference in respect of the Ubhayālaṁkāras between the two works.

At the end again, Bhoja indicates how he classifies Alaṁkāras into Śabdālaṁkāra, Arthālaṁkāra and Ubhayālaṁkāra.

इह हि इवादिशब्दैस्सादृश्यादि प्रतीयते ।
अर्थोऽस्मात्सूरयः प्राहुः उभयालङ्कृतीरिमाः ॥

He further points out that the Arthālaṁkāras are superior to the Śabdālaṁkāras and that a poet must favour the Ubhayālaṁkāras more than the other two and above all, he must prefer Saṁsṛṣṭi.

अलङ्क्रिया यास्त्विह शब्दसंश्रयाः ततोऽर्थभूषाभ्यधिकं प्रकृष्यते ।
ततोऽभिरूपामुभयोरलङ्कृतिं वदन्ति संसृष्टिरतोऽभिशोभते ॥

IV

Samsṛṣṭi.

It has been recognised by all critics from Ānandavardhana downwards that in the combination of Alaṁkāras, there are two cases, Saṁkara and Samsṛṣṭi, the former resembling a chemical compound and the latter, a mechanical mixture. The two combined things are not discernible in the former while they are discernible in the latter. So it is said क्षीरनीरयोरिव सङ्करः, तिलतण्डुलयोरिव संसृष्टिः. Bhoja does have this distinction of two kinds of combining, Avyakta and Vyakta, but chooses to call both by the same name of Samsṛṣṭi or Saṁkara.

Bhāmaha says of Samsṛṣṭi that it is born of the combining of many figures, that it is a great ornament, gives in illustration two verses, and ends by saying that other cases of Samsṛṣṭi can likewise be made.

वरा विभूषा संसृष्टिः बह्वलङ्कारयोगतः ।
रचिता रत्नमालेव सा चैवमुदिता यथा ॥

* * * *

अन्येषामपि कर्तव्या संसृष्टिरनया दिशा । III. 49-52.

Bhāmaha thus did not give any analysis of Samsṛṣṭi. The idea of combining two or more figures was not analysed into the intimate Saṁkara and the less intimate Samsṛṣṭi. All cases of combination were called Samsṛṣṭi.

Daṇḍin gave two kinds of Samsṛṣṭi, Aṅgāṅgibhāva and Samakakṣya at the end of chapter II.

Vāmana also spoke of Samsṛṣṭi only.

अलङ्कारस्यालङ्कारान्तरयोनित्वं संसृष्टिः । *K. Ā. S.* IV. iii. 30.

He means by it combination in general.

संसृष्टिः संसर्गः संबन्ध इति । *Vṛtti. Ibid.*

Rudraṭa on the other hand does not use the word Samsṛṣṭi but, in the same sense, uses the word Saṁkara or Samkīrṇa. Rudraṭa's Saṁkara is both kinds of combinations, like milk and water, and like rice and sesamum. Rudraṭa gives the two kinds but calls them by the same name.

एषां तु चतुर्णामपि सङ्कीर्णानां स्युरगणिता भेदाः ।
तन्नामानस्तेषां लक्षणमंशेषु संयोज्यम् ॥
योगवशादेतेषां तिलतण्डुलवच्च दुग्धजलवच्च ।
व्यक्ताव्यक्तांशत्वात् सङ्कर उत्पद्यते द्वेधा ॥ *K. Ā.* X. 24-25.

Rudraṭa is the first to give us an analysis of the combinations into two, one in which the combined units are separately discernible and another in which they are both indistinguishably blended. He is the first to give the examples of Tilataṇḍula and Dugdhajala. But he calls both Saṁkara.

Udbhaṭa gives Samsṛṣṭi as well as Saṁkara. He says of Samsṛṣṭi :

अलङ्कृतीनां बहूनां द्वयोर्वापि समाश्रयः ।
एकत्र निरपेक्षाणां मिथस्संसृष्टिरुच्यते ॥

He does not write in the terminology found in Rudraṭa which later writers followed, but in independent phraseology. He says that in Samsṛṣṭi, the figures in the combination are mutually Nirapekṣa, independent, neither helping nor being helped by the others. Saṁkara is given differently earlier in Ch. V.

अनेकालङ्कृतीयोल्लेखे समं तदुत्त्यसंभवे ।
एकस्य च ग्रहे न्यायदोषाभावे च सङ्करः ॥
शब्दार्थवर्त्यलङ्कारा वाक्य एकत्र भासिनः ।
संङ्करो वैकवाक्यांशप्रवेशाद्वाभिधीयते ॥
परस्परोपकारेण यत्रालङ्कृतयः स्थिताः ।
स्वातन्त्र्येणात्मलाभं नो लभन्ते सोऽपि सङ्करः ॥ V. 20-25. *K. A. S. S.*

In these three verses, Udbhaṭa gives four varieties of Saṁkara, Sandeha saṁkara, Śabdārthavarti-alaṁkāra saṁkara, Ekaśabdābhidhāna saṁkara and Anugrāhyānugrāhaka saṁkara, according to Pratīhārendurāja. These four classes of Saṁkara have been accepted and are very clearly expounded by Abhinavagupta in his *Locana* on pp. 40-41. In Sandeha saṁkara, two or more Alaṁkāras are present ; all of them cannot be held at the same time. That is, when we speak of a verse of Sandeha saṁkara as having one figure, we have to leave out of account the other figure. The acceptance of one of the two nullifies the other and any one of them can be held at different times. This is the meaning of Udbhaṭa's words समं तदुत्त्यसंभव. The next condition of Sandeha saṁkara given by Udbhaṭa's is a corollary of the former. When two Alaṁkāras can be shown to exist there, they are found to stand on equal footing with equal importance. Thirdly, one may call the instance by any one of the two, there being no reason why one name should be preferred. This is the import of the third condition.

' एकस्य च ग्रहे न्यायदोषाभावः ' Udbhaṭa.
न्यायः साधकं प्रमाणम् । दोषो बाधकं प्रमाणम् । Pratīhārendurāja.

Abhinavagupta's examples are better and explanations more lucid. The readings of these three verses of Udbhaṭa quoted by him slightly differ. Abhinava says of this Sandeha saṁkara, as applied to an illustration of his own verse, that in it there are two Alaṁkāras, Rūpaka and Upamā, which cannot be held to exist simultaneously and for choosing or rejecting one, there is no reason.

इति रूपकोपमोल्लेखात्, युगपद्द्वयासंभवात्, एकतरपक्षत्यागग्रहणे प्रमाणाभावात् सङ्कर इति– ।
p. 41.

The second variety of Saṁkara is the combination of an Arthālaṁkāra and Śabdālaṁkāra. The third is the combination of more than one Arthālaṁkāra. This is called in the Locana एकवाच्यांशे अनेकोऽर्थालङ्कार. These several

Arthālaṁkāras sometimes become the fourth variety called Anugrāhyānugrāhaka saṁkara, when one Alaṁkāra helps another.

Mammaṭa also accepts this analysis but simplifies it. He gives the names slightly differently. The first variety given by him is Aṅgāṅgibhāva saṁkara. It is the fourth variety of Udbhaṭa. Mammaṭa himself interprets Aṅgāṅgibhāva as Paraspara anugrāhya-anugrāhakatā. The next variety given is Sandeha saṁkara, in the definition of which he reproduces the essential part of Udbhaṭa's verse with a slight modification.

एकस्य च ग्रहे न्यायदोषाभावादनिश्चयः । X. 54.

Mammaṭa recognises only three varieties of Saṁkara, the third being one that includes both the second and the third of Udbhaṭa. It is explained by him as the presence of two figures in the same place. One Śabdālaṁkara may be combined with one Arthālaṁkāra or the two may be both Arthālaṁkāras. In either case, two Alaṁkāras are available in the same verse and Mammaṭa calls this Ekapadapratipādyatā. This is also known as Ekavācakānupraveśa. Mammaṭa says that Saṁkara is only of these three varieties. He means that if further subdivisions are introduced, it will become endless, since minor species are infinite. This has been followed completely by the *Alaṁkāra sarvasva* and consequently by all other writers. But Bhoja in the middle stands by himself. Though none is more aware than Bhoja of the varieties and different kinds of an idea like the combination of figures, yet he accepts for combination of Alaṁkāras only one name amidst the Ubhayālaṁkāras, viz. Samsṛṣṭi, a name which he is going to raise to great status by calling it the greatest Alaṁkāra. He uses the word Saṁkara as a synonym of Samsṛṣṭi in a few cases, but in the section on Samsṛṣṭi Alamkāra, he holds it as a species of Samsṛṣṭi. His classification is somewhat original. Besides that classification, Bhoja, while explaining Samsṛṣṭi in Prabandha as a whole, Prabandhanānālaṁkāra Samsṛṣṭi, quotes Daṇḍin's verse on Samsṛṣṭi and his two varieties, Aṅgāṅgibhāva and Samakakṣyatā. The Aṅgāṅgibhāva Samsṛṣṭi of Daṇḍin is the Saṁkara of the same name in Mammaṭa. It is the Anugrāhyānugrāhaka saṁkara of Udbhaṭa. The other variety of Samakakṣya includes all the other varieties of Saṁkara, the remaining two of Mammaṭa and three of Udbhaṭa.

Bhoja follows all and notes all the various kinds of combination. He combines Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana who speak of Samsṛṣṭi only, with Rudraṭa who speaks of Saṁkara only. To Bhoja, Saṁkara and Samsṛṣṭi mean the same thing. While interpreting the term Nānālaṁkāra samsṛṣṭi, he speaks of it as Rasaguṇālaṁkāra *saṁkara.* He adopted Rudraṭa and added the third variety called Vyaktāvyakta.

संसृष्टिरिति विज्ञेया नानालङ्कारसङ्करः ।
सा तु व्यक्ता तथाव्यक्ता व्यक्ताव्यक्तेति च त्रिधा ॥
तिलतण्डुलवद्व्यक्ता छायादर्शवदेव च ।
अव्यक्ता क्षीरजलवत् पांसुपानीयवच्च सा ॥

व्यक्ताव्यक्ता च संसृष्टिः नरसिंहवदिष्यते ।
चित्रवर्णवदन्यस्मिन् नानालङ्कारसंकरे ॥ *S. K. A.* IV. 88-90

In the above verses, Samsṛṣṭi and Saṁkara mean the same thing. In the class of Vyakta saṁkara, to which one will not give the name Saṁkara but will give only the name Samsṛṣṭi, Bhoja has two varieties. The mixture as of rice and sesamum is already given by Rudraṭa. Bhoja adds a variety like the mirror and the reflection in it. In the Avyakta saṁkara to which the name Saṁkara applies properly, Bhoja has besides the old Kṣīranīra, a second variety called Pāmsupānīya saṁkara. Vyaktāvyakta also has two varieties, Narasimha and Citravarṇa. All these can be called either Samsṛṣṭi or Saṁkara. As a rule, Bhoja calls the figure itself Samsṛṣṭi, and its several kinds, Saṁkara. He says Nānālaṁkārasamsṛṣṭi and gives its varieties as Rasaguṇasaṁkara, Guṇālaṁkārasaṁkara, Rasālaṁkārasaṁkara etc.

At the end of the Alaṁkāra section, in the *Śṛ. Pra.*, Bhoja praises Samsṛṣṭi as the most beautiful Alaṁkāra. संसृष्टिरतोऽभिशोभते । As a matter of fact, Samsṛṣṭi is the one and only Alaṁkāra of Bhoja. Bhoja has taken Guṇas, the figures and the Rasas as Alaṁkāras. The Rasas are held to be most important and the other two as their means. Rasa in a Kāvya is to be secured by Guṇas and Alaṁkāras which are both of them Alaṁkāras. Therefore, the combination of manifold 'Alaṁkāras' is the greatest means of Rasāviyoga in Kāvya.

यद्यपि प्रसङ्गतः तत्र (तन्त्र)युक्त्या तत्र तत्र उपवर्णितः तथापि गुणालङ्कारसन्निवेशविशेषजन्यत्वात् नानालङ्कारसंसृष्टावेव प्रकृष्टत्वं लभते । *Śṛ. Pra.*

In the *S. K. Ā.* also, he says in chapter V. 11 : नानालङ्कारसंसृष्टेः प्रकाराश्च ।

In a Vākya, as in a body, Guṇas and Alaṁkāras are not each singly present nor does each appear one by one. The nature of poetry like that of the body is that it possesses at the same time many Guṇas and Alaṁkāras present in combination and enjoyed by us simultaneously. What we percieve is the sum total of numerous features. There is no place in poetry where there are no Alaṁkāras. This is rendered possible by the fact that Bhoja takes Guṇa also as Alaṁkāra and under Alaṁkāra itself brings such features as Rītis, Vṛttis etc. Therefore, the one fact about poetry is Nānālaṁkāra samsṛṣṭi which Bhoja calls the greatest Alaṁkāra, Prakṛṣṭabhūṣaṇa.

प्रायेण हि गुणानामिव शब्दार्थोभयालङ्काराणामनुप्रासजातिरूपकादीनां काव्ये शरीरेष्विव कटककेयूरकुण्डलादीनां केवलानामदर्शनात्, संसृष्टिरेव प्रकृष्टं भूषणमवधार्यते । ततश्च भोजन इव मधुराम्ललवणकटुकानाम्, वेष इव वस्त्रानुलेपनमाल्यविभूषणानाम्, धूप इव चन्दनागरुकर्पूरसिद्धकानाम्, सङ्गीत इव नृत्तवाद्यपाठ्यानाम्, प्रेमणीव कोपानुशयप्रसादसङ्गमसुखानाम्, गार्हस्थ्य इव धर्मार्थकाममोक्षसाधनानुष्ठानानाम्, वाक्यशरीरेऽपि रूपकादीनां संसृष्टिरेव विशेषतः स्वदमाना रसावियोगहेतुर्भवति । अतः प्रागुपदिष्टमपि यत्नतः प्रपञ्च्यते । *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II. pp. 356-7.

Bahurūpamiśra says in his commentary on the Daśarūpaka (Mad. Ms. R. [illegible] 104):

[illegible] नालङ्कारवशात् संसृष्टिवशादेव [illegible] मीयः ।

Though in a case of the development of Rasa there is Samyoga or Saṁkara of Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins, Bhoja says, it is not a case of Samsṛṣṭi or Saṁkara ; for, Vibhāvas etc. are not Alaṁkāra ; Rasa is Alaṁkāra, and Vibhāvas etc. are Arthaguṇas bringing Rasa into existence. This is explained in a further section.

There are cases of Guṇas and Alaṁkāras which are very intimately fused with Rasa. As for instance, the Guṇas of Mādhurya, Prasāda and Ojas, Bhāvika, Preyas and Aurjitya and the Alaṁkāra of Rītis and certain other Alaṁkāras which naturally come off to the poet when he is filled with Rasa are not cases of Saṁkara of Guṇas and Alaṁkāras with Rasa. This has once been explained in the previous chapter on Guṇas and will be explained also in a further context in this chapter. The name Samsṛṣṭi or Saṁkara applies to cases where the Guṇa or Alaṁkāra is Pṛthaksiddha, where the Guṇa or Alaṁkāra is specially and consciously introduced by the poet.

Bhoja's Artha and Ubhaya Alaṁkāras and other writers

It was noticed above at the end of the examination of Bhoja's Śabdālaṁkāras that Hemacandra notices the six Pramāṇālaṁkāras introduced by Bhoja as Arthālaṁkāras and criticises them as devoid of charm. The criticism is repeated by Māṇikyacandra.

The *Agnipurāṇa* gives only eight Arthālaṁkāras, Svarūpa (Svabhāvokti), Sādṛśya, Utprekṣā, Atiśaya, Vibhāvanā, Virodha and Hetu. The eighth is missing in the text. The Ubhayālaṁkāras in the *Agnipurāṇa*, which are six, have nothing to do with Bhoja's Ubhayālaṁkāras.

Viśveśvara accepts in his *Camatkāracandrikā* only twenty of the Arthālaṁkāras of Bhoja. He omits four of the six pramāṇas of Jaimini, made Alaṁkāras by Bhoja, Pratyakṣa, Upamāna, Śabda and Abhāva. These are described in chapter VII. In chapter VIII, Viśveśvara accepts all the twenty-four Ubhayālaṁkāras described by Bhoja. There is a small difference. Under Leśa, Bhoja says that Vyājastuti is not different from Leśa and Viśveśvara preferes to take the main Alaṁkāra as Vyājastuti. While speaking of the last Ubhayālaṁkāra called Saṁkara, Viśveśvara mentions Bhoja by name.

In Chapter IV of his *Rasārṇavālaṁkāra*, Prakāśavarṣa speaks of 28 Arthālaṁkāras, adding four to Bhoja's 24. The four added items are however only those that Bhoja has shown as included in his 24. Under the Arthālaṁkāra of Āgama, Prakāśavarṣa treats of the four Puruṣārthas and their varieties which subjects Bhoja treats of in four big chapters as the four varieties of his Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra Rasa, in his *Śṛ. Pra.* (Chaps. XVIII-XXI). The Ubhayālaṁkāra chapter of the *Rasārṇavālaṁkāra* is missing in the Madras manuscript.

V.

Guṇas and Rasas are also Alaṁkāras.

Bhoja explains the numerous varieties of the Samsṛṣṭi of several Alaṁkāras, Nānālaṁkāra samsṛṣṭi, in chapter V of the *S. K. Ā.* and chapter XI of

his *Śṛ. Pra.* In explaining the phrase *Nānā*laṁkāra samsṛṣṭi[1] he quotes Daṇḍin and explains how Guṇas and Rasas are also Alaṁkāra.

तत्र 'अलङ्कारसंसृष्टेः' इत्येव वक्तव्ये नानालङ्कारग्रहणं गुणरसानामुपसंग्रहार्थम् । तेषामपि हि काव्यशोभाकरत्वेन अलङ्कारत्वात् । यदाह—

काव्यशोभाकरान् धर्मानलङ्कारान् प्रचक्षते । etc. (Daṇḍin.) *S. K. Ā.* p. 621.

तत्र 'काव्यशोभाकरान्' इत्यनेन श्लेषोपमादिवद् गुणरसभावतदाभासप्रशमादीनप्यनुगृह्णाति । मार्गविभागकृद्गुणानामलङ्क्रियोपदेशेन श्लेषादीनां गुणत्वमिवालङ्कारत्वमपि ज्ञापयति । p. 612.

Bhoja has increased the number of Guṇas and he considers that his additional Guṇas also are Alaṁkāras according to Daṇḍin himself. Bhoja seems to opine that it is not that Daṇḍin did not know the existence of other Guṇas besides the ten Śleṣa etc., but he restricted himself to the ten Guṇas which helped to distinguish Mārgas. Therefore, when Daṇḍin calls those ten Guṇas, Alaṁkāras, he means that other Guṇas also are Alaṁkāras. The infinity of Alaṁkāras is expressly mentioned by Daṇḍin himself.

" इति श्लेषादीनां दशानामेव मार्गविभागकारितां ब्रुवन् काव्यशोभाकरत्वेन गुणान्तराणामप्यलङ्कारत्वमुपकल्पयति । तदाह 'कस्तान् कात्स्न्र्येन वक्ष्यति" । युक्तमिदमुक्तम् । P. 612.

Having proved the Guṇas as Alaṁkāras according to the view of Daṇḍin that any beautifying feature in Kāvya is Alaṁkāra, Bhoja proceeds to show how according to Daṇḍin, Rasas also are Alaṁkāras.

Says Bhoja :

अयुक्तं त्विदमुक्तं रसानामलङ्कारेति, तेषां गुणानामिव अलङ्कारव्यपदेशाभावात् ।
नायुक्तम् । युक्तोत्कर्षाणामूर्जस्विरसवत्प्रेयसामलङ्कारेषु उपदेशात् । तद्यथा—

प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानं रसवद्रसपेशलम् ।
ऊर्जस्वि रूढाहारं युक्तोत्कर्षं च तत् त्रयम् ॥ (K. Ā. Daṇḍin. II. 275).

Thus, Rasas also are Alaṁkāras by virtue of their being Kāvyaśobhākara dharma. The further interpretations Bhoja gives to this verse of Daṇḍin and how he tries to extract out of that verse the ideas connected with his new Alaṁkāra theory of Rasa and a criticism of Bhoja's interpretation of this verse are to be found in the Rasa chapter of this thesis.

Bhoja has held all the features of poetry and all items recommended as Upādeya, Guṇas, Alaṁkāras and Rasas in the main, as Alaṁkāras. The last which is the most important is to be developed to its fullest extent only by the intermixture of the former two, Guṇas and Alaṁkāras, both of which are however called by the same name Alaṁkāra. Thus, mixture of Alaṁkāra of various kinds, Nānālaṁkāra samsṛṣṭi, is the one means of securing Rasa. Bhoja adds here that though there is no place in Kāvya where this Nānālaṁkāra samsṛṣṭi is absent, the name Samsṛṣṭi cannot be applied to the intermixture and interplay of the Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins. For,

1. Though the scope of this Nānālaṁkāra samsṛṣṭi is largely extended by Bhoja, the phrase itself is borrowed by him from Daṇḍin's verse on Samsṛṣṭi, *K. Ā.* II. 351.

they are not Alaṁkāras and, like Padārthas in a Vākya, they are merely the means of Rasa which is like Vākyārtha ; and Rasa is Alaṁkāra.

Another place in Kāvya where there is no Samsṛṣṭi is the case of Aṅgāṅgibhāva among Guṇas, Alaṁkāras and Rasas, as also cases of Virodhi rasas. Bhāvas are mixed with Alaṁkāras, Guṇas and Bhāvas, and their mixture is called Samsṛṣṭi or Saṁkara ; but there is no such Samsṛṣṭi or Saṁkara between Bhāvas on the one hand and Rasas and Rasābhāsas on the other. For, Bhāvas are Aṅgas to Rasas. Rasa has no Saṁkara with Rasābhāsa since the two are inimical to each other.

Where a poet consciously introduces two figures or two features, one to support and help the other, there we have Samsṛṣṭi of the variety called Aṅgāṅgibhāva. But where we cannot see the two as introduced by the poet with effort, where one is inevitably connected with the other by nature, there the two are fused together into one and there the name Samsṛṣṭi should not be applied. As for instance, in the case of an Arthāntaranyāsa, the figure Hetu is inevitably present giving rise to Arthāntaranyāsa. It should not be called a case of Samsṛṣṭi between those two Alaṁkāras. The above is put in the following manner by Bahurūpamiśra.

अतो रसावियोगहेतुत्वेन गुणालङ्कारावुपादातव्याविति । अत्र दोषवर्जनेन तदभावात्मकाः केचिद्गुणाश्चालङ्काराश्च अयत्नसिद्धा भवन्ति । अयत्नसिद्धगुणालङ्कार (व्यापाराश्च) न पृथक्प्रयत्नापेक्षिणः । येऽपि च पृथक्प्रयत्नमपेक्षन्ते तेऽपि तत्तद्रसपोषाय तत्र तत्र यत्नेन व्युत्पादयितव्या इति ।

D. R. Vyā. Mad. Ms. R. 4188. p. 104.

There is a valuable and large principle of literary criticism lying under the burden of all this technical statements made by Bhoja. Bhoja makes this difference regarding his Guṇas and Alaṁkāras. He calls Mādhurya, Ojas, Prasāda, Bhāvika, Preyas and Aurjitya as six special Guṇas standing on a different footing from the rest. Their speciality is that they are inevitably and inseparably fused with Rasas. They are either productive of Rasas or are produced by Rasas, Rasārambhaka or Rasārabhya. Between these Guṇas and their Rasas, it cannot be said that the poet introduces the mixture or Samsṛṣṭi. The same applies to Alaṁkāras also. There are certain figures of speech which are introduced by the poet with conscious and extra effort, with a desire to decorate. There are other figures which are not introduced by the poet with special effort and which come flowing along with the current of Rasa. That is, these Alaṁkāras are irremovably related to Rasas. Of these which are organically present along with Rasas, it cannot be said that they are in Samsṛṣṭi with their Rasas. Here, as in the case of the abovesaid Guṇas, Bhoja adopts and adapts some verses of Ānandavardhana. See the previous chapter on Guṇas. Ānandavardhana speaks of the admissible figures in Dhvani (*अलङ्कारो ध्वनौ मतः*) in chapter II and elaborates some principles of Alaṁkāra-aucitya. The essence of his Alaṁkāra samīkṣā has been used by Bhoja. Reproducing Ānanda, Bhoja says :

रसवन्ति हि वस्तूनि सालङ्काराणि कानिचित् ।
एकेनैव प्रयत्नेन निर्वर्त्यन्ते महाकवेः ॥

रसाक्षिप्ततया यस्य बन्धः शक्यक्रियो भवेत् ।
अपृथग्यत्ननिर्वर्त्यः सोऽलङ्कारः प्रकृष्यते ॥
रसभावादिविषयविवक्षाविरहे सति ।
अलङ्कारनिबन्धो यः स कविभ्यो न रोचते ॥ V. 173-5. *S. K. Ā.* p. 631.

On pp. 404-5 of Vol. II. Chap. XI. of the *Śṛ. Pra.* Bhoja says the same thing, quoting some more verses on the same subject of Alaṁkāras which are intimately connected with Rasas. See above chapter on Dhvani, Vol. I. Part 1, p. 160.

These Alaṁkāras that come of themselves to the poet in his Rasa-filled state are not said to be Samsṛṣṭa with Rasa, even as the Guṇas that are vitally connected with Rāsas. Even when they are introduced with slight effort, they should be seen to be helpful to Rasa ; otherwise they are useless and good poets discard such Alaṁkāras. Though Alaṁkāra has to subserve Rasa, there may be cases where the Alaṁkāra shines out prominently. That is, we have cases of Rasālaṁkāra Saṁkara which are either Rasapradhāna or Alaṁkārapradhāna. An expression is Rasapradhāna when the character in emotional action is himself the speaker. But when a third man or the poet himself describes a man in emotion, he resorts to a more figurative language, expression embellished with Guṇas and Alaṁkāras, expression which is Alaṁkārapradhāna. This is also a suggestive and valuable idea. Bhoja suggests here that there should be less of Alaṁkāra when the character himself speaks in his emotion, and that one can indulge to some extent in Alaṁkāra when a third man describes the emotional state of a character. Says Bhoja in his *S. K. Ā.* pp. 631 and 634 :

तत्र रसालङ्कारसङ्करो द्विधा—रसप्रधानोऽलङ्कारप्रधानश्च । तयोर्योऽनुभवित्रैव वर्ण्यते स रसप्रधानः । P. 634.

य उदासीनेन वर्ण्यते सोऽलङ्कारप्रधानः, स हि रसभावादेः सङ्करप्रकारमभिधित्सु स्वभावोक्तिं वक्रोक्तिं वावलम्बते । P. 631.

In the *Śṛ. Pra.* he says that there is no Samsṛṣṭi in cases where the mixture of the two is natural, cases of Apṛthaksiddhatva and Ārabhya-ārambhakatva between Guṇas or Alaṁkāras and Rasas.

यत्र पुनरपृथक्सिद्धयोरेव अलङ्कारयोः (रसभावयोः) वा आरम्भकत्वेन आरभ्यत्वेन च अवस्थितयोः स्वाभाविक उपश्लेषः तत्र सङ्करव्यवहारो न प्रवर्तते । P. 371. Vol. II.

यत्र पृथक्सिद्धयोरुक्तिबलाद् उपकार्योपकारकत्वादिना अङ्गाङ्गिभावः अवस्थाप्यते, तत्रैव संसृष्टिः ।

In a small intervening section Bhoja says in his *Śṛ. Pra.* that logical propositions like धूमोऽग्नेः are no Alaṁkāra since Alaṁkāra in general has to be a feature, adding *beauty* to Kāvya. He quotes Daṇḍin's definition of Alaṁkāra काव्यशोभाकरान् धर्मान् अलङ्कारान् प्रचक्षते । with an emphasis on "*Śobhā*" as the primary characteristic without which a case cannot be an Alaṁkāra. See my paper on Kriyā kalpa in *JOR.* VIII, pp. 130-132 ; see also above, Vol. I. Part 1, pp. 122-3.

An edition of a portion of the Alaṁkāra Text
in the Śṛ. Pra. Vol. II. Pp. 370-2.

I. ननु च सर्वेषामप्युपादेयानां काव्यशोभाकरत्वाद् अलङ्कारत्वे व्यवच्छेद्याभावात् सङ्करः संसृष्टिरित्येतावदेव वाक्यं भवति। विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद् रसनिष्पत्तिरिति विभावादिसंकरस्यापि संसृष्टित्वं प्राप्नोति, तदलङ्कारग्रहणेन निवर्त्यते। न हि विभावादयोऽलङ्काराः, अपि तु भावरसतदाभासानाम् तदलङ्काराणामभिनिष्पत्तिहेतवोऽर्थविशेषाः।

नन्वेवमर्थगुणत्वादमीषामप्यलङ्कारत्वं प्राप्नोति? सत्यमेतत्। किन्तु अन्यपरतया उपादीयमानाः तत्रैव न्यग्भवन्ति। न वाक्यार्थाप्रतीतौ पदार्थाः पृथक् स्फुरन्तीति।

II. तत्र भावानाम् अलङ्कारैः गुणैर्भावैश्च सङ्करो भवति, न रसतदाभासैः तेषां तदङ्गत्वात्[1], (आभासानां तु विरोधात्)। रसानामलङ्कारैः गुणैः रसभावैश्च सङ्करो भवति, न भावरसाभासैः, भावानां रसाङ्गत्वात्, आभासानां तु रसविरोधात्।

आभासानाम् अलङ्कारैः गुणैः आभास(सै)श्च सङ्करो भवति, न रसभावैः विरोधिभाव-अङ्गभावाभ्यामेवेति।

ननु च अङ्गाङ्गिनोस्सङ्करव्यवहाराभावे कथमुक्तम्–

"अङ्गाङ्गिभावावस्थानं सर्वेषां समकक्ष्यता।
इत्यलङ्कारसंसृष्टेः लक्षणीया द्वयी गतिः॥ (*Kāvyādarśa* II. 360).

इति, उदाहृतं च 'आक्षिपन्त्यरविन्दानि' इत्यादि? उच्यते; यत्र पृथक्सिद्धयोरुक्तिबलात् उपकार्योपकारकत्वादिना[2] अङ्गाङ्गिभावः अवस्थाप्यते तत्रैव संसृष्टिः। यत्र पुनरपृथक्सिद्धयोः एव अलङ्कारयोर्भावरसयोर्वा[3] आरम्भकत्वेन आरभ्यत्वेन च अवस्थितयोः स्वाभाविक उपश्लेषः तत्र सङ्करव्यवहारो न प्रवर्तते। यथा अनन्तर एवोदाहरणे हेत्वर्थान्तरन्यासयोः। अर्थान्तरन्यासो हि हेतुनैव आरभ्यते, यदाह–

ज्ञेयस्सोऽर्थान्तरन्यासः वस्तु प्रस्तुत्य किञ्चन।
तत्साधनसमर्थस्य न्यासो योऽन्यस्य वस्तुनः॥ (*K. Ā.* Daṇḍin. II. 169).

तत्र अर्थान्तरन्यास इति लक्ष्यनिर्देशः। वस्तु प्रस्तुत्य किञ्चन, तत्साधनसमर्थस्य न्यासो योऽन्यस्य वस्तुनः इति लक्षणनिर्देशः। वस्तु प्रस्तुत्य, अन्यस्य वस्तुनः, एतावत्युच्यमाने घटोऽस्तीत्यत्रापि प्रसङ्गः, तदर्थमाह तत्साधनसमर्थस्येति।

III. न चैतद्वाच्यं धूमोऽयमग्नेरित्यत्रापि अर्थान्तरन्यासः प्रसजेत्। यद्यपि धूमस्योत्पाद्यस्य साधनसमर्थोऽग्निः तथापि "काव्यशोभाकरान् धर्मानलङ्कारात् प्रचक्षते।" (*K. Ā.* II. 1) इत्येऽतदपि सर्वालङ्कारसाधारणं लक्षणमनुवर्तितव्यम्। तस्मिन् सति सर्वालङ्कारजातयः वक्रोक्त्यभिधानवाच्या भवन्ति। तदुक्तम्

वक्रत्वमेव काव्यानां परा भूषेति भामहः।
श्लेषः पुष्णाति सर्वासु प्रायो वक्रोक्तिषु श्रियम्॥

1. 'आभासानां तु विरोधात्' seems to be missing here.
2. For this reading see the Duplicate MS.
3. For this reading see the Duplicate MS.

ननु चैवं सति विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद् रसनिष्पत्तिरित्यादिना न भवितव्यमेवालङ्कारेण । नैवम् ; त्रिविधः खल्वलङ्कारवर्गः वक्रोक्तिः स्वभावोक्तिः रसोक्तिरिति । तत्र उपमाद्यलङ्कारप्राधान्ये वक्रोक्तिः, गुणप्राधान्ये[1] स्वभावोक्तिः, विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगात्तु रसनिष्पत्तौ रसोक्तिरिति ।

Then, Bhoja briefly explains the names Vibhāva, Anubhāva, Vyabhicāribhāva and Sthāyibhāva and takes one by one the illustrations of Daṇḍin for the eight Rasavadalaṁkāras. These constitute the third Varga of Bhoja's Alaṁkāra named Rasokti.

Then Bhoja propounds his new theory of Rasa at the end of which he says : एवमस्थापिते गुणरसतदाभासभावानामलङ्कारत्वे षट्प्रकारः अलङ्कारसङ्करः संभवति ।

P. 388. Vol. II.

Here he finally says that he has held and proved Guṇas and Rasas as Alaṁkāras.

In this section in the *Śṛ. Pra.*, Bhoja has explained an idea of his which he has simply mentioned in the *S. K. Ā.*, ch. V. In one of his Kārikās in ch. V. of the *S. K. Ā.*, Bhoja says that the realm of poetic expression falls into three departments, according as it is dominated by Guṇas, Alaṁkāras or Rasas. The three are called Svabhāvokti, Vakrokti and Rasokti and the last is the best and the most beautiful.

वक्रोक्तिश्च रसोक्तिश्च स्वभावोक्तिश्च वाङ्मयम् ।
सर्वासु ग्राहिणीं तासु रसोक्तिं प्रतिजानते ॥ *S. K. Ā.*, p. 475.[2]

It is in the *Śṛ. Pra.* that Bhoja explains the idea in this verse. It is Vakrokti when expression is dominated by the Alaṁkāras Upamā, Rūpaka etc. It is Svabhāvokti when there is the prominence of neither Alaṁkāra nor Rasa i.e. when the expression is dominated by Guṇas. For, the Guṇas are eternally and inseparably associated with poetry and are present even when Alaṁkāras are absent. Svabhāvokti is the case in which there is the least amount of Vakrokti and so Bhoja says that the next department of poetic expression is that dominated by Guṇas called Svabhāvokti. The third department called Rasokti is expression in which is depicted the interplay of Vibhāvas etc., calling forth Rasa. All these three are the three kinds of Alaṁkāra. Thus the whole realm of poetic expression is Alaṁkāra to Bhoja. A critical examination of this view of Bhoja, how this marks an advance over Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, and how this position of Bhoja has been related to Bhāmaha's conception of poetry as Vakrokti and Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's conception of poetry as Vyāpārapradhāna by Bahurūpamiśra, has all been explained and stated

1. श्लेषादिगुणप्राधान्ये. Duplicate MS.

2. Dhanapāla, who flourished in the Court of Bhoja, knows this Rasokti of Bhoja and praises it as the best among Uktis or Bhaṇitis, in his *Tilakamañjarī*.

" रसोक्तिमिव भणितीनामधिकमुद्भासमानाम् " p. 130 K. M. edn.

Viśveśvara's *Camatkāracandrikā* gives a recast of the above verse of the *S. K. Ā.*

चिरं जीवतु वक्रोक्तिः स्वभावोक्तिश्च तिष्ठताम् ।
रसोक्तिरेव काव्यानि (व्येषु) ग्राहिणीति मतिर्मम ॥ Mad. MS. P. 70.

at great length in the sections on Ukti, Svabhāvokti, Vakrokti, and Bhoja and Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka in Vol. I. Part I of this thesis and in my paper on Bahurūpamiśra published in the *J.O.R.*, Madras, VIII., p. 325.

VI.

Bhoja's Prabandhālaṁkāras.

Just as there is Rasa in a Vākya and just as Rasa in a Vākya is secured by the avoidance of the Doṣas of a Vākya, and the securing of Guṇas and Alaṁkāras of a Vākya, so also Rasa is secured in a Prabandha as a whole. That is, Prabandha-rasāviyoga has also to be secured by Prabandha doṣahāna and Prabandha-nānālaṁkāra saṁsṛṣṭi. This subject is very briefly dealt with in chapter V of the *S. K. Ā.*, in some Kārikās in the beginning and in a very small section in the end.

वाक्यवच्च प्रबन्धेषु रसालङ्कारसङ्करान् ।
निवेशयन्त्यनौचित्यपरिहारेण सूरयः ॥
चतुर्वृत्त्यङ्गसंपन्नम्०— *S. K. Ā.*, V. 126-137.

वाक्यवदेव प्रबन्धेषु अनौचित्यपरिहारेण गुणालङ्कारसन्निवेशो भवति । *S. K. Ā.*, p. 642.

On pp. 642-3 of the *S. K. Ā.*, Prabandha-doṣahāna is dealt with ; and then Bhoja says (p. 643) :

(प्रबन्धे) गुणोपादानं तु सम्यग्गुणयोगेन संविधाने सुसूत्रता ।

With this small line, Prabandhaguṇas are dismissed and then Bhoja takes up Prabandhālaṁkāras. The Vṛttis and their Aṅgas which are Alaṁkāra to Bhoja are dealt with up to p. 647. Then running comments on the features of Mahākāvya taken from Daṇḍin's description of Mahākāvya are given by Bhoja on pp. 647-8 with which the work ends. That is, the last subject dealt with is Prabandhālaṁkāras. But, Bhoja does not systematically deal with the subject of Prabandhaguṇas and Prabandhālaṁkāras in the *S. K. Ā.* He does not enumerate the features of the Mahākāvya under the two heads of Prabandhaguṇa and Prabandhālaṁkāra but does so in the *Śṛ. Pra.* where the whole subject is very elaborately dealt with, in Chap. XI.

सोऽयं वाक्यविशेषयोः (विषयो) रसावियोग उक्तः । प्रबन्धविषय उच्यते । सोऽपि दोषहानगुणोपादानेन अलङ्कारसङ्करेण च प्रकाशमानो मनीषिणां मनःप्रहर्षहेतुर्भवति । P. 410. Vol. II.

After illustrating Prabandha-doṣahāna which is the changing of the story in the original to suit the purpose of Rasa, Bhoja briefly says that Guṇas and Alaṁkāras must then be added to secure beauty. Bhoja quotes here a verse from the Prastāvanā to the lost *Rāmābhyudaya* of Yaśovarman, a small bit of which is quoted by Ānanda also. See my paper on Aucitya previously referred to.[1]

औचित्यं वचसां प्रकृत्यनुगतं सर्वत्र पात्रोचिता
पुष्टिः स्वावसरे रसस्य च कथामार्गे न चातिक्रमः ।

1. See *Dhva. Ā.* III Ud. p. 148 where the bit 'कथामार्गे न चातिक्रमः' is quoted.

शुद्धिः प्रस्तुतसंविधानकविधौ प्रौढिश्च शब्दार्थयोः
विद्वद्भिः परिभाव्यतामवहितैः एतावदेवास्तु नः ॥

Bhoja then gives the several Prabandhaguṇas and Prabandhālaṁkāras in three sets as pertaining to Śabda, Artha and both. The guṇas of Prabandha have already been noticed in the previous chapter on Guṇas. The following are the three sets of Alaṁkāras of Prabandha :

नमस्काराद्युपक्रमत्वम्, संबन्धादिमदादिवाक्यत्वम्, दुष्करसंस्कृतादिवाक्यत्वम्, भिन्नवृत्तसर्गान्तत्वम्, कविभावाङ्कितसमाप्तित्वम् इति शब्दालङ्काराः ।

नगराश्रमशैलसैन्यावासार्णवादिवर्णनम्, ऋतुरात्रीन्दुर्कास्तमयचन्द्रोदयादिवर्णनम्, नायकनायिकाकुमारसहायवाहनादिवर्णनम्, मन्त्रदूतप्रयाणसंग्रामाभ्युदयादिवर्णनम्, वनविहारजलक्रीडामधुपानरतोत्सवादिवर्णनम् इत्यर्थालङ्काराः ।

बीजबिन्दुपताकाप्रकारीकार्योपकल्पनम्, गर्भाङ्कचूलिकाङ्कावतारविष्कम्भकप्रवेशकविधानम्, देशकालपात्रचेष्टाकथान्तरानुषञ्जनद्विसन्धानमार्गद्वयानुवर्तनम्, इत्युभयालङ्काराः । Vol. II. P. 431.

As can be clearly seen, many of these three kinds of Prabandhālaṁkāras are only restatements of the points in Daṇḍin's description of a Mahākāvya.

सर्गबन्धो महाकाव्यम् उच्यते तस्य लक्षणम् ।
आशीर्नमस्क्रिया वस्तुनिर्देशो वापि तन्मुखम् ॥

× × × ×

नगरार्णवशैलर्तुचन्द्रार्कोदयवर्णनैः ।
उद्यानसलिलक्रीडामधुपानरतोत्सवैः ॥
विप्रलंभैर्विवाहैश्च कुमारोदयवर्णनैः ।
मंत्रदूतप्रयाणादिनायकाभ्युदयैरपि ॥ etc. *K. Ā.* I. 14-9.

Hemacandra completely borrows from Bhoja here. In chapter VIII, while defining the Śravyakāvya variety called Mahākāvya, Hemacandra says :

पद्यं प्रायः संस्कृतप्राकृतापभ्रंशग्राम्यभाषानिबद्ध-भिन्नवृत्तांतसर्गाश्वाससन्ध्यवस्कन्धकबंधं सत्संधि शब्दार्थवैचित्र्योपेतं महाकाव्यम् । P. 330. *K. Ā.*

P. 334 : शब्दवैचित्र्यं यथा-असंक्षिप्तग्रन्थत्वम्, अविषमबन्धत्वम्, अनतिविस्तीर्णपरस्परनिबन्धसर्गादित्वम्, आशीर्नमस्कारवस्तुनिर्देशोपक्रमत्वम्, वक्तव्यार्थतत्प्रतिज्ञानं तत्प्रयोजनोपन्यास कविप्रशंसासुजनदुर्जनस्वरूपवदादिवाक्यत्वम्, दुष्करचित्रादिसर्गत्वम्, स्वाभिप्रायस्वनामेष्टनाममङ्गालांकितसमाप्तित्वमिति ।

P. 335 : उभयवैचित्र्यं यथा चतुर्वर्गफलोपायत्वम्, चतुरोदात्तनायकत्वम्, रसभावनिरंतरत्वम्, विधिनिषेधव्युत्पादकत्वम्, सुसूत्रसंविधानकत्वम्, नगराश्रमशैलसैन्यावासार्णवादिवर्णनम्, ऋतुरात्रिंदिवार्कास्तमयचंद्रोदयादिवर्णनम्, नायकनायिकाकुमारवाहनादिवर्णनम्, मन्त्रदूतप्रयाणसङ्ग्रामाभ्युदयादिवर्णनम्, वनविहारजलक्रीडामधुपानमानापगमरथोत्सवादिवर्णनम् इति ।

P. 336 : उभयवैचित्र्यं यथा रसानुरूपसन्दर्भत्वम्, अर्थानुरूपच्छन्दस्त्वम्, समस्तलोकरञ्जकत्वम्, सदलङ्कारवाक्यत्वम्, देशकालपात्रचेष्टाकथान्तरानुषञ्जनम् मार्गद्वयानुवर्तनं चेति ।

In these, Hemacandra takes as much as he can from Bhoja and gives them in his own way. He is a faithful follower of Abhinavagupta and of the

Prasthāna inaugurated by Ānandavardhana, and cannot follow Bhoja who calls everything an Alaṁkāra. So he casts off Bhoja's classification of these features into Guṇas and Alaṁkāras, calls them neither Guṇas nor Alaṁkāras but simply Vaicitrya. But he accepts Bhoja's classification of these features into those of Śabda, those of Artha and those of both. This certainly simplifies Bhoja's scheme of division of the features into Guṇa and Alaṁkāra, which division was however good in so much as the class of Guṇas constituted the more important features, more vitally related to the nature of Mahākāvya than the other class of Alaṁkāras. But, this attitude of his, Hemacandra forgets towards the end while explaining the Ubhayavaicitrya called Sabdālaṁkāra vākyatva. In his commentary here, he reproduces Bhoja completely and holds these features as Guṇas and Alaṁkāras. Vide p. 337 and commentary lines 4 and 5. Hemacandra's *K. Ā.*

Another point to be noted is that Hemacandra who appreciates Bhoja's labours, slightly modifies him in certain places and slightly adds to Bhoja's list in some places. Thus the Śabdālaṁkāra of Bhoja called Binnavṛtta sargāntatva is separated by Hemacandra ; it is not included in the list of the features called Vaicitrya but is given as a major feature in the definition of a Mahākāvya itself, along with the comprehensive feature called śabdārthavaicitrya. The Śabdaguṇa of Bhoja called Anativistīrṇa sargāditva is elaborated by Hemacandra into Anativistīrṇa Parasparanibaddha sargāditva. The Śabdālaṁkāra called Sambandhādimadādivākyatva is also similarly elaborated. In Maṅgalācaraṇa, Hemacandra accepts only the three old varieties, Āśis, Namaskāra and Vastunirdeśa, and omits those given by Bhoja newly. The Śabdaguṇa Śravyavṛttatva is omitted by Hemacandra and the Ubhayālaṁkāra of the five Sandhis is also separated and given as part of the definition of the Mahākāvya itself at the very beginning. In commenting on these, Hemacandra reproduces Bhoja's *Śṛ. Pra.* with all its illustrations. PP. 334-337. See section on Bhoja and Hemacandra.

Bhoja then explains one by one these Alaṁkāras of Prabandha with illustrations. The first Śabdālaṁkāra is the beginning of the Kāvya. Daṇḍin gave three kinds of beginning, Āśis, Namaskriyā, and Vastunirdeśa. Bhoja adds to these Stuti and Vastūpakṣepa.

तत्र नमस्काराद्युपक्रमत्वमित्यनेन नमस्कारः, स्तुतिः, आशीः, वस्तुनिर्देशः, वस्तूपक्षेप इत्युपलक्ष्यते ।

Namaskāra is illustrated by the *Harṣacarita*, Stuti by *Raghuvaṁśa*, Āśis by *Harivilāsa*, a lost Mahākāvya, Vastunirdeśa by the lost *Hayagrīvavadha* of Meṇṭha and Vastūpakṣepa by the lost Prākṛta kāvya called *Mārīcavadha*.

The second Śabdālaṁkāra is Sambandhādimad-ādivākyatva.

संबन्धादिमदादिवाक्यत्वमित्यनेन स्ववंशादिकीर्तनम्, वक्तव्यार्थप्रतिज्ञानम् तत्प्रयोजनोपन्यासम्, कविप्रशंसा दुर्जनसुजनस्वरूपमित्यादयः संगृह्यन्ते ।

This second item, like the previous one, was overdone in later Mahākāvyas. In illustrating Kaviprasaṁsā, Bhoja mentions a lost Prākṛt poem called *Rāvaṇavijaya*.

The third Śabdālaṁkāra is explained as the cantos devoted to the feats of various Bandhas, as in Bhāravi, Māgha and others.

The next Śabdālaṁkāra is the ending of a canto in a different metre, a practice followed by poets from Vālmīki downwards. While illustrating this, Bhoja has valuable remarks which are all discussed in the last chapter of this thesis on Works and Authors referred to in the *Śṛ. Pra.*

The next is the marking of the last verse of each canto with some favourite word. Such marks are classified into (i) one's favourite idea, (ii) one's own name, (iii) some favourite name of the author, (iv) some auspicious word and (v) benediction.

स्वाभिप्रायाङ्कता, स्वनामाङ्कता, इष्टनामाङ्कता, मङ्गलाङ्कता, आशंसाङ्कता ।

The illustrations are valuable. Āḍhyarāja (mentioned also by Bāṇa) is said to have the mark Dhairya ; Sarvasena, the author of the Prākṛt poem *Hari-vijaya*, has the mark of the word Utsāha ; and Pravarasena, Anurāga. Rāja-śekhara is said to have his own name in the last verse of each canto of his *Haravilāsa* and so also two other poets named Govinda and Caturmukha. The latter is the author of an Apabhramśa kāvya called *Abdhimathana*. As instances of Maṅgalāṅka, Bhoja says *Kṛṣṇacarita* has Abhyudaya, *Uṣāharaṇ* has Jaya, and Pañcaśikha *Śūdrakakathā* has Ānanda. The last class of endings called Āśamsāṅka does not properly belong to this set, being illustrated by the Bharatavākya of Dramas. So it is that Hemacandra omits it.

The Arthālaṁkāras are completely derived from Daṇḍin's description of the Mahākāvya.

The first of the Ubhayālaṁkāras of Prabandha is the perfect development of the plot through its five Sandhis and five stages. It is called by Bhoja बीजबिन्दुपताकाप्रकरीकार्यकल्पनम् । In his description of the Mahākāvya, Daṇḍin has this bit— सुसन्धिभिः । This is taken by Bhoja as a Guṇa and as meaning in Mahākāvya the close relation between one canto and another. Naturally, Daṇḍin's "Susandhi" must be taken to refer to this Ubhayālaṁkāra of Bhoja, the five Sandhis, Mukha etc. But, Daṇḍin does not explicitly speak of the Sandhis of drama in Mahākāvya though in chapter II he gives the dramatic Lakṣaṇas, Vṛttyaṅgas and Sandhisandhyaṅgas as Alaṁkāras. Bhāmaha says that the Mahākāvya has five Sandhis ;

पञ्चभिस्सन्धिभिर्युक्तं नातिव्याख्येयमृद्धिमत् ।

Bhoja must be taken to follow Bhāmaha. Bhoja follows Bhāmaha in another case also. While explaining the Arthālaṁkāra of the Prabandha called the introduction of Mantra, Dūta, Prayāṇa etc., Bhoja says that, since above all, the Mahākāvya should be able to educate men more in Artha than in other Puruṣārthas, Mantra, Dūta etc. must be introduced. He says :

मन्त्रदूतप्रयाणसङ्ग्रामाभ्युदयवर्णनमित्यनेन अर्थप्रधानचेष्टानामुपदेशात् चतुर्वर्गफलत्वेऽपि भूयसार्थोपदेशकृत् महाकाव्यादिकं भवतीत्यभिधत्ते । p. 439.

This is an Anuvāda of Bhāmaha's verse incorporated by Bhoja into his own text given above.

चतुर्वर्गाभिधानेऽपि भूयसार्थोपदेशकृत् । P. 21.

Bhoja illustrates the five Sandhis, Mukha etc. as existing not only in a Kāvya but also in Vākya both in his *S. K. Ā.* and *Śṛ. Pra. S. K. Ā.*, p. 647, shows the five Sandhis in the verse :

कथमपि कृतप्रत्यासत्तौ प्रिये स्खलितोत्तरे etc.

The *Śṛ. Pra.* does so twice or thrice in different contexts.

The Praveśaka, Viṣkambhaka, Aṅkāsya, Aṅkāvatarana and Cūlikā which are the methods of developing the story, suggesting the plot, hiding what ought to be hidden, summarily narrating uninteresting and long events, are then given as Ubhayālaṁkāra. Hemacandra omits this, since this pertains only to drama and as he deals only with the Mahākāvya.

The next Ubhayālaṁkāra is Deśa kāla pātra ceṣṭā kathāntarānuṣsañjana. This emphasises the idea that a Mahākāvya must envisage many places and scenes of action, past, present and future, many characters, many kinds of activities etc. This quality distinguishes the Mahākāvya from the khaṇḍa-kāvya.

The next Ubhayālaṁkāra is Dvisandhāna. It is said to be of three kinds, Double Entendre in Vākya, Prakaraṇa and Prabandha. The first is Śleṣa in a Vākya ; the second is an ambiguous situation and the third is whole Kāvyas like the *Rāghava Pāṇḍavīya* containing two stories. Bhoja gives here the valuable information that Daṇḍin wrote a Dvisandhānakāvya on the stories of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Bhārata.

तृतीयस्य यथा दण्डिनो धनञ्जयस्य वा द्विसन्धानप्रबन्धौ रामायणमहाभारतार्थावनुबन्धाति (?)
Vol. II. p. 444.

Two more varieties of Dvisandhāna are then illustrated and Hemacandra omits this also.

The last Prabandha-ubhayālaṁkāra is the method of bringing out the glory of the hero. Daṇḍin gives two methods and Bhoja borrows them. See Daṇḍin I. 21 and 22. These two are the Mārgas meant by Bhoja in his last Ubhayālaṁkāra called ' Mārgadvayānuvartana.' The two verses of Daṇḍin on this subject are also quoted by Bhoja. In this connection, Bhoja discusses in the *Śṛ. Pra.* the theme of Mahākāvya as the depicting of the fall of the vicious anti-hero and the prosperity of the virtuous hero.

Bhoja says of these features of Prabandha that it is not absolutely necessary that every one of them should be introduced. This part of the text of Bhoja is based on the following verse of Daṇḍin.

न्यूनमप्यत्र यैः कैश्चिदङ्गैः काव्यं न दुष्यति ।
यद्युपात्तेषु संपत्तिराधयति तद्विदः ॥I. 20.

In the end of this chapter, Bhoja says that he has not exhausted Prabandhālaṁkāras and that he would deal with others in the next chapter.

वाक्यप्रबन्धानुगतोऽयमुक्तो मया समासेन रसावियोगः ।
अथेह येऽर्था न विवेचिताः पृथक् विभज्य ते केचिदुदाहृियन्ते ॥ P. 449. Vol. II.

The next chapter deals with drama and its four sets of 64 Aṅgas. These four sets of 64 Aṅgas are : 5 Ārambhavidhis, 5 Arthaprakṛtis, 5 Avasthās, 5 Samsthās, 5 Samavasthās and 5 Sandhis ; 5 Vṛttis, and 25 Pravṛttihetus ; 10 Lāsyāṅgas, 13 Vīthyaṅgas, 16 Vṛttyaṅgas ; 21 Sandhyantaras, 4 Patākāsthānas, 64 Sandhyaṅgas and 64 Lakṣaṇas. All these are Prabandhālaṁkāras and the view is based on the verse of Daṇḍin, II. 366.

यच्च सन्ध्यङ्गवृत्त्यङ्गलक्षणाद्यागमान्तरे ।
व्यावर्णितमिद चेष्टमलङ्कारतयैव नः ॥ II. 366.

Kuntaka's position has striking similarity with that of Bhoja in respect of the concept of Alaṁkāra and with reference to the Prabandha-features. Kuntaka has two sets of features called Prakaraṇa vakratā and Prabandhavakratā, many of whose varieties correspond to the Prabandhaguṇas and Prabandhālaṁkāras of Bhoja. This has been pointed out in the chapter on Bhoja, Vakrokti and Kutaka. See above, Vol. I. Part I, pp. 127-129.

Just as the word Vakrokti is developed by Kuntaka, the word Alaṁkāra is developed by Bhoja. To Bhoja, all features which give charm to the Kāvya are Alaṁkāras, and to Kuntaka all such features are aspects of Vakratā. In the history of the Alaṁkāraśāstra, these two words Alaṁkāra and Vakrokti have the greatest destiny. It was expressed by Bhāmaha that Alaṁkāra was Vakrokti. These two words emphasise two aspects. Alaṁkāra emphasises the functional aspect and Vakrokti, the mode of operation, the form and the actual nature of the figures. The former found its 'prophet' in Bhoja in Malwa and about his time the latter found its 'prophet' in Kuntaka in Kashmir in the North. Bhoja did not choose the name Vakrokti as a name co-extensive with poetic expression because he was a greater follower of Daṇḍin, following whom Bhoja gave Vakrokti as one of three departments of Alaṁkāra, viz. the class Upamā, Rūpaka etc. Kuntaka eliminated Svabhāvokti and the Rasokti as the Alaṁkārya Svabhāva and Rasa, and held all the features adorning those two as various forms of Vakrokti.[1]

1. Just as Kuntaka called his work Vakroktijīvita, Bhoja could have called his work, Alaṁkāraprakāśa. He called his work *Śṛ. Pra.* because he propounded in it his peculiar and new theory of Śṛṅgāra (Ahaṁkāra) as the one Rasa. But we may suggest that, from the point of view of this view of Bhoja of Alaṁkāra also, the name Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa is appropriate. Śṛṅgāra is always the Rasa of Ujjvalaprakṛtis. It is Ujjvalaveṣātmaka. Bharata says :

यथा च यत्किञ्चिल्लोके शुचि मेध्यमुज्ज्वलं दर्शनीयं वा भवति, तच्छृङ्गारेण उपमीयते । यस्तावदुज्ज्वलवेषः सश्रृङ्गारवानित्युच्यते । *N. S. VI.*

This connection of the word Śṛṅgāra, with brilliant dress and ornaments is clearly borne out by the semantics of the word Śṛṅgāra. In course of time the word is used to mean Alaṁkāra. It means definitely *decoration* of an elephant, and Mūka kavi uses the word "Śṛṅgārita" in the sense "Alaṁkṛta".

तुङ्गाभिरामकुचभरश्रृङ्गारितमाश्रयामि काञ्चीगतम् ।

In Tamil, it means decoration with ornaments. Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa can therefore be, in view of Bhoja's view of Alaṁkāra,—interpreted as Alaṁkāraprakāśa.

CHAPTER XVIII

BHOJA'S CONCEPTION OF RASA IN THE *S. K. Ā.*

The *S. K. Ā.* is the earlier work of Bhoja in Alaṁkāra. The *Śr. Pra.* followed, as an amplification, and also as a more systematic exposition of the original ideas of Bhoja on various subjects, notably Rasa. It is chapter V of the *S. K. Ā.* which is elaborated into the bulk of the *Śr. Pra.* The new theory of Rasa had already risen in Bhoja's mind in the *S. K. Ā.* and the very opening verses of chapter V of the *S. K. Ā* state this theory.

रसोऽभिमानोऽहङ्कार शृङ्गार इति गीयते ।
योऽर्थः तस्यान्वयात् काव्यं कमनीयत्वमश्नुते ॥
विशिष्टादृष्टजन्मायं जन्मिनामन्तरात्मसु ।
आत्मसम्यग्गुणोद्भूतेः एको हेतुः प्रकाशते ॥
शृङ्गारी चेत् कविः काव्ये जातं रसमयं जगत् ।
स एव चेदशृंगारी नीरसं सर्वमेव तत् ॥ *S. K. Ā* V. 1-3.

Poetry is beautiful because of the presence of Rasa, and Rasa is called Śṛṅgāra, Abhimāna and Ahaṁkāra. It is by reason of the experiences of many births that we get it in our souls. It is the germ from which other qualities grow. It is the inner Tattva of Ego, the idea in man of the 'I', Ahaṁkāra. It is man's love for his own Self; it is that which makes him take even pain as pleasure.

(येन) रस्यते यः (येन) अनुकूलवेदनीयतया दुःखमपि सुखत्वेन अभिमन्यते, येन रसिकैरहङ्क्रियते, येन शृङ्गम् उच्छ्रयो रीयते, स खलु तादृशोऽस्ति × × × ।"

Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha's *S. K. Ā. Vyākhyā*, V. 1-3. (Mad. MS.)

By virtue of this sense of Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra-Rasa in the poet, the whole world is rendered beautiful by him. Its absence makes everything stale. This is the Ahaṁkāra-Abhimāna-Śṛṅgāra-Rasa theory which Bhoja is going to elaborate in the *Śr. Pra.*

As elaborately explained in the sub-section under Samsṛṣṭi in the chapter on Bhoja's Conception of Alaṁkāra, Bhoja holds Guṇas, Alaṁkāras and Rasas to be Alaṁkāras. He follows Daṇḍin here. It is known very well that Daṇḍin considers Guṇas and Rasas also as Alaṁkāras, because they are also factors which contribute to the beauty of the Kāvya, Kāvyaśobhākara dharma. Bhoja says that he has the sanction of Daṇḍin for holding Guṇas and Rasas as Alaṁkāras and he quotes the following verse of Daṇḍin :

प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानं रसवद्रसपेशलम् ।
ऊर्जस्वि रूढाहङ्कारं युक्तोत्कर्षं च तत् त्रयम् ॥ *K. Ā.* II. 275.

Bhoja says that here Rasavat, Preyas and Ūrjasvi are given as Alaṁkāras and this sanctions the view that Rasas also are Alaṁkāras.

युक्तोत्कर्षाणाम् ऊर्जस्विरसवत्प्रेयसामलङ्कारेषु उपदेशात् । *S. K. Ā.* p. 613.

According to Bhoja, this simple verse of Daṇḍin has some subtle meaning. When these three are 'Yuktotkarṣa', they are called Rasas and Rasavad alaṁkāras, and when they are not so (when they are Ayuktotkarṣa), they are only Guṇas and are accordingly called Preyas, Bhāvikatva, and Aurjitya. While explaining this verse, Bhoja gives us something more of his new Rasa theory. He says :

तत्र 'ऊर्जस्वि रूढाहङ्कारम्' इत्यनेन आत्मविशेषनिष्ठस्य उत्कृष्टादृष्टजन्मनः अनेकजन्मानुभव-संस्काराहितदृढिम्नः संग्रामे (समग्रात्म) गुणसंपदुत्पाद–अतिशयहेतोः अलं(हं)कारविशेषस्य उपसंग्रहात् **अहङ्कारभिमानशृंगार–अपरनाम्नो रसस्य** मानमयविकाररूपेण अभिमानिनां मनसि जाग्रतः **परां कोटिम्** उपवर्णयति ।

'रसवद्रसपेशलम्' इत्यनेन विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसात्त्विकसंयोगाद् रसनिष्पत्तिरिति रत्यादिरूपेण अनेकधाविर्भवतः अभिवर्धमानस्य परप्रकर्षगामिनः **शृङ्गारस्य मध्यमावस्थां** सूचयति ।

'प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानम्' इत्यनेन समस्तभावमूर्धाभिषिक्तायाः रतेः परप्रकर्षाधिगमाद् भावनाधिगमे भावरूपतामुल्लंघ्य प्रेमरूपेण परिणतायाः उपादानात् भावान्तराणामपिपरप्रकर्षाधिगमे रसरूपेण परिणतिरिति ज्ञापयन् **अहङ्कारस्य उत्तरां कोटिम्** उपलक्षयति । सर्वेषामपि हि रत्यादिप्र-कर्षाणां रतिप्रियो रणप्रियः परिहासप्रियः अमर्षप्रिय इति प्रेम्ण्येव पर्यवसानं भवति । *S. K. Ā.* p. 613.

Daṇḍin's verse simply says that there are three Alaṁkāras called Preyas, Rasavad and Ūrjasvi, and these are of a special kind and *stand on a higher level, since they are connected with Bhāvas.* But Bhoja quotes it and utilises it for his own purpose, pushing into it all his new wine. The Rasavat of Daṇḍin is the Alaṁkāra of the eight Rasas. Preyas is an Alaṁkāra of Prīti and Bhakti, and as such, it is dealt with by Daṇḍin along with the first Rasavat of the Bhāva called Rati. Thus even in Daṇḍin, we can see the relation between Preyas and the first Rasavat of Śṛṅgāra. Ūrjasvi has nothing to do with Preyas, but can be related to the third Rasavat of Vīra. But even that is not indicated by Daṇḍin. Bhoja, however, takes all the three together as three aspects of the same Rasa. He begins from the end. Ūrjasvi which is defined as 'Rūḍhāhaṁkāra' is the Rasa of the basic or fundamental phase of the one Rasa which, in the shape of Alaṁkāra and Abhimāna, is in every soul, as a result of the experiences of previous births. This Abhimāna or Ahaṁkāra or Śṛṅgāra develops into dignity, self-respect, and a love for one's self, Māna, illustrated by the verse given as illustration for Ūrjasvi. This Ahaṁkāra-phase is called the 'Parākoṭi' of Rasa. The next stage is called 'Madhyamāvasthā' where the one basic Ahaṁkāra Rasa manifests itself as Abhimāna for several outward objects with which it has come into contact. The one Rasa thus multiplies into many Bhāvas. This is the stage where the several Bhāvas, which rose out of the one Ahaṁkāra,

themselves develop to a state of climax attended by their respective developing conditions. These developed Bhāvas of the middle stage are really Bhāvas though they are in climax, but can be secondarily called Rasa for, the one Ahaṁkāra-Rasa extends its character of Rasa to these also. This is the stage where Rati, Hāsa, Utsāha etc., attain to the developed state of Śṛṅgāra, Hāsya, Vīra etc., and it is this stage that is referred to by the words in Daṇḍin's verse "रसवद्रसपेशलम्". The third and final stage is found in the words "प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानम्", which describe Preyas. It is called the 'Uttarākoṭi'. Here all the Bhāvas, Rati etc., which attain individual Prakarṣa become one unitary Rasa called Preman. That is, the Prakarṣa of Rati, Hāsa etc., is only Preman. The several Rasas of the middle stage get synthesised, so to say, in the one Rasa of Preman. Thus Ahaṁkāra or Abhimāna of the first stage becomes Abhimāna for various outward objects and becomes the manifold Bhāvas of Rati etc., and those Bhāvas themselves develop into respective Rasas and culminate in Love or Preman through which they again pass into the first fundamental Rasa of Ahaṁkāra. Bhoja explains that all Bhāvas are fundamentally of the form of Love ; the warrior of Vīra rasa fights because he *loves* fight (Raṇa-priya); the clown *loves* to laugh (Hāsapriya) ; and so on.

Thus we have two stages called the Parā and the Uttarā Koṭis where Rasa is only one. We are there in a monistic Pāramārthika stage. Between these two is the Vyāvahārika stage, the stage of practical politics where alone we have Rasa-pluralism. The third stage is only a return of the several manifestations of the middle stage, the several Vikṛtis, to the first stage again, to the one Prakṛti. This third stage is, strictly speaking, unnecessary ; for, it means only the involution of the evolved.

According to this theory, Bhoja has one fundamental Rasa, then a number of Bhāvas all capable of becoming Rasas themselves, though the name Rasa applies to them only through Upacāra, and lastly he has the one Rasa of Preman. It must be noted that in this theory, the word 'Ahaṁkāra' is not used in the sense of egotism but as a philosophical concept meaning Ego. Similarly, Śṛṅgāra used as a synonym of this Ahaṁkāra must not be confused with the developed climax-state of the first Bhāva of Rati between man and woman. Śṛṅgāra here means Love Absolute, Love Subjective, Love Objectless. It is also called Abhimāna because it is this that is responsible for making beings enjoy as pleasure even painful things. Since man thinks pain to be pleasure, it is called Abhimāna. It is called Ahaṁkāra because of the refinement of self-consciousness in the Rasikas. It is called Śṛṅgāra because it takes one to the peak of cultural perfection and is itself the summit.

"येन रस्यते, येन अनुकूलवेदनीयतया दुःखमपि सुखत्वेन अभिमन्यते, येन रसिकैरहंक्रियते, येन शृंगम् उच्छ्रयो रीयते, स खलु तादृशोऽस्ति × × ।"

Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha on *S. K. A.* V. 1.

Similarly, Rasa also is used in two significances by Bhoja. Primarily Rasa is only one and is the one element of Ahaṁkāra. Secondarily it is the developed states of Rati, Hāsa etc. This secondary Rasa is of the middle stage, that is, the stage with which the other Ālaṁkārikas concern themselves ; it is in that stage that they carry on the discussion whether Rasas are eight or nine or more, whether Rasas are from Bhāvas or *vice versa* and so on.

In this middle stage, Bhoja would recognise not merely eight Rasas, not only one or two more Rasas, but would recognise as many Rasas as there are Bhāvas ; for, to him, all the Bhāvas are equal. There is no distinction among them that eight or nine of them are 'permanent' (Sthāyins), thirty-three are transient (Sañcārins), and eight are Sāttvikas. All of them are born of the one Ahaṁkāra ; all of them can become Sthāyins, all of them are according to circumstances Sañcārins ; and all of them are Sāttvikas because they are all mind-born, Sattva meaning nothing more than mind. It is here that Bhoja differs most from the accepted view of the number and nature of Rasas.

In *S. K. A.* V. 13, Bhoja says that Rasa becomes the various Bhāvas of Rati etc. Immediately he says in the next verse that the Bhāvas that thus arise out of Rasa are eight Sthāyins.

आलम्बनविभावेभ्यः स्वेभ्यस्स्वेभ्यस्समुन्मिषन् ।
रसो रत्यादिरूपेण भाव इत्यभिधीयते ॥
रतिर्हासश्च शोकश्च क्रोधोत्साहौ भयं तथा ।
जुगुप्सा विस्मयश्चाष्टौ स्थायिभावाः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥ 13-14.

One would at once suppose that Bhoja dismisses even Śānta and belongs to the school which recognises only eight Rasas. The fact is different. It is to illustrate his point that he first gave eight Sthāyins. In V. 23, he says that Garva, Sneha, Dhṛti, and Mati are Sañcārins in Rati but they are Sthāyins in the Rasa Uddhata, Preyas, Śānta and Udātta. What are these four new Rasas ? In V. 9-11, Bhoja gives a list of topics on Rasa, one of which is 'Viśeṣa' (Sl. 9). Viśeṣa means 'varieties of Rasa', i.e., Bhoja wants to say that Rasas are not eight only but there are others also like Uddhata, Śānta, Preyasa and Udātta. Bhoja takes up the topic of Viśeṣa on p. 511 where he says in Kārikā 164 that Rasas are Śṛṅgāra and the other seven plus Śānta, Udātta, Uddhata and Preyas. In the previous verse Bhoja says that he has explained Rati and other Rasas and will now proceed to speak of some more varieties of Rasa.

Preyas. Bhāmaha mentions it as an Alaṁkāra in the same varga with Rasavat ; and Daṇḍin classes it with Rasavat and Ūrjasvi, putting all the three on a higher footing as different from other Alaṁkāras. But soon Preyas gained greater importance, and in Rudraṭa we find it already numbered as one of the Rasas. Bhoja illustrates and explains it. It is to provide a Sthāyin for this Rasa that he recognises a Sañcārin named Sneha in V. 16.

" यदेव रोचते मह्यं तदेव कुरुते प्रिया ।
इति वेत्ति न जानाति तत् प्रियं यत् करोति सा ॥

अत्र **वत्सलप्रकृतेः** धीरतया ललितनायकस्य प्रियालंबनविभावादुत्पन्नः **स्नेहस्थायिभावः** विषयसौकुमार्यात्मप्रकृत्यादिभिरुद्दीपनविभावैः उद्दीप्यमानः समुपजायमानैः मोहधृतिस्मृत्यादिभिः व्यभिचारिभावैः अनुभावैश्च संसृज्यमानः निष्पन्नः **प्रेयान्** इति प्रतीयते ।

रतिप्रीत्योरपि अयमेव मूलप्रकृतिरिष्यते, यदित्यमाहुः—

अहेतुः पक्षपातो यः तस्य नास्ति प्रतिक्रिया ।
स हि स्नेहात्मकः तन्तुः अन्तर्मर्माणि सीव्यति ॥ " P. 514; *S. K. Ā.*

Preyas is the same as Prīti or Vātsalya. Bhoja follows Rudrata regarding its Sthāyin. Rudraṭa says :

स्नेहप्रकृतिः प्रेयान् । XV. 17.

Bhoja also follows Daṇḍin and holds Preyas as very closely related to Rati and Śṛṅgāra. Both are 'Ahetu pakṣapāta' or 'Nirvyāja manovṛtti' as Rudraṭa puts it, but differ in this that while Rati is Sāmprayogika, Preyas is non-sexual love. Bhoja gives it as underlying sexual love also.

Śānta. The Śānta Rasa which many accept as the ninth, but which Bhoja excluded in the first set of eight Rasas, he introduces here. The peculiarity to be noted in his description of this Rasa is that he holds for it a new Sthāyin namely Dhṛti. He says, others hold Śama as its Sthāyin but it makes no difference, for Śama is only a kind of Dhṛti. He says :

अन्ये पुनरस्य शमं प्रकृतिमामनन्ति, स तु धृतेरेव विशेषो भवति । *S. K. Ā.* P. 515.

Udātta. While Bhoja had precedents for introducing Preyas and Śānta, he had none when he mentioned Udātta and Uddhata among his Rasas. Udātta is the Rasa of magnanimity. He describes it and illustrates it thus :

" साधारण्यान्निरातङ्कः कन्यामन्योऽपि याचते ।
किं पुनर्जगतां जेता प्रपौत्रः परमेष्ठिनः ॥ '

अत्र रामस्य **उदात्तप्रकृतेः** निसर्गत एव तत्त्वाभिनिवेशिनी **मतिः** नाकृत्यविषये प्रवर्तते न च प्रवृत्ता उपारमति, सा च सीतेयं मम स्वीकारयोग्येत्येवंरूपेण प्रवृत्ता रावणप्रार्थनालक्ष्मणप्रोत्साहनाभ्याम् उद्दीप्यमाना समुपजायमानचिन्तावितर्कवीडावहित्थस्मृत्यादिभिः कालोचित्तोत्तरानुमीयमानैश्च विवेकचातुर्यौदार्यधैर्यादिभिः संसृज्यमाना **उदात्तरसरूपेण** निष्पद्यते ।" P. 515.

Bhoja gives this Udātta Rasa as developing from the Sthāyin called Mati which is ' Tattvābhiniveśinī '. The Sthāyin is ' the truthful bent of the mind '. But this seems to be unsatisfactory ; for, such Sthāyin would mean knowledge and would be more relevant in Śānta Rasa. Earlier, while describing the Vyabhicārin Mati, Bhoja says :

शास्त्रोक्तार्थानुसन्धानाद् अर्थनिर्धारणं मतिः । P. 502.

This Mati produces Samyagjñāna or Śama both of which other writers have held as Sthāyins for Śānta. Bhoja himself in a later context, while giving

the varieties of Mati, gives Śama as one of its varieties.

मतिविशेषः शमो यथा । P. 523.

Uddhata. This is the second altogether new Rasa introduced by Bhoja. He holds it as developing from the Bhāva of Garva which is given as its Sthāyin.

" अपकर्ताहमस्मीति मा ते मनसि भूद् भयम् ।
विमुखेषु न मे खड्गः प्रहर्तुं जातु वाञ्छति ॥ '

अत्र मया अस्य अपकारः कृत इति यच्चेतसि भयं, तन्मा भूत् 'पराङ्मुखेषु मे खड्गः कदाचिदपि न प्रहर्तुमुत्सहते ' इति सर्वदैव रूढोऽहङ्कारः प्रतीयते । सोऽयं **गर्वप्रकृतिः उद्धतो नाम रसाः ।** "

The above-given illustration is given by Daṇḍin to illustrate Ūrjasvi which Daṇḍin defines as ' Rūḍhāhaṁkāra '. Since Garva and Ahaṁkāra go together Bhoja takes it as illustration for his Uddhata Rasa. This would also mean that Bhoja simply converted Daṇḍin's Ūrjasvi into his Uddhata Rasa.

Bhoja adds here that certain writers (whose identity we do not know) consider Ūrjasvi and Udātta as identical and illustrate Ūrjasvi differently eliminating Garva from it.

" केचित् पुनः—' आस्थामालंब्य नीतेषु वशं क्षुद्रेष्वरातिषु ।
व्यक्तिमायाति महतां माहात्म्यमनुकंपया ॥ '

इत्येवं उर्जस्वीत्युदात्तपक्षे निक्षिपन्तः पूर्वोक्तमेव गर्वप्रकर्षोदाहरणं ' धृतायुधो यावदहम् ' इत्याद्युद्धतनिष्पत्तौ वर्णयन्ति । " P. 515.

In the *Śṛ. Pra.* he calls Udātta rasa by the name Ūrjasvi and similarly holds Śama as the Sthāyin of Śānta instead of Dhṛti. That is, what has been given here in the *S. K. Ā.*, as the view of others is given as the main view of Bhoja himself in the *Śṛ. Pra.*

This section of the fifth chapter of the *S. K. Ā.* would make one suppose that Bhoja recognises 12 Rasas, adding to the 8 old Rasas four more of which two are already Rasas in others' writings and two are entirely introduced by Bhoja newly. But, this also is not a fact. It has been explained above how in Bhoja's theory of Rasa, the one Ahaṁkāra produces the 49 Bhāvas, Rati etc., and among these 49, there is no difference. All of them are Sañcārins and Sthāyins according to the situation. This is the Madhyamāvasthā of Rasa. It is to illustrate this view of his that all the Sañcārins can be Sthāyins and thereby Rasas, that Bhoja picks out 4 Vyabhicārins, Sneha, Dhṛti or Śama, Mati and Garva, and shows that they develop into the four Rasas of Preyas, Śānta, Udātta and Uddhata. Bhoja really means that there are other Rasas, even as these Udātta and Uddhata, developing from the other Bhāvas.

Though the view is not expounded with elaborate arguments in this chapter in the *S. K. Ā.*, it is seen throughout in the *S. K. Ā.* chapter V. There

are places which prove that Bhoja held the view which Rudraṭa held in an earlier time that all Bhāvas become Rasas. As we shall see in the next chapter on Bhoja's Conception of Rasa in the *Śṛ. Pra.*, Bhoja actually quotes Rudraṭa's text (*K. A.* XII. 4). We meet with passages in *S. K. Ā.* V which take for granted our knowledge of Bhoja's view that all Bhāvas are fit to become Rasas. We meet with here Sañcārins and Sāttvikas in the great state of Rasa. It is in the section on the Saṁkara of Rasa with Guṇa and Alaṁkāra beginning with p. 624 that these numberless additional and new Rasas are seen. On p. 627 *S. K. Ā.*, Bhoja gives the following Rasas :

"अत्र वीर-औद्धत्य-स्वातन्त्र्यरसानाम् आनन्दप्रशम-पारवश्यरसैः × × × ।"

On p. 629 Bhoja mentions Sādhvasa, Vilāsa, Anurāga and Sangama as Rasas.

"———साध्वस विलास-अनुराग संगमरसैः———। "

On the same page Lāvaṇya and Vilāsa are mentioned as Rasas :

"———लावण्यविलासवर्णनीयरसयोश्च———।"

On p. 630 four Rasas are mentioned, Rati, Amarṣa, Viṣāda and Jugupsā. Perhaps Bhoja here means the Rasas of Śṛṅgāra, Raudra, Karuṇa and Bībhatsa, though he does not clearly say so. On the same page Nirveda is also mentioned as a Rasa.

"———चत्वारश्च रत्यमर्षविषादजुगुप्सात्मानो रसः———।"
"———रसस्तु निर्वेद एवैकः———।"

On p. 631 we find as Rasas, Rati, Utkarṣa, Dhṛti, Utkaṇṭhā Āvega, Vismaya, Mati, Vitarka, Cintā, Capalatā, Hāsa, Utsāha, Stambha, Gadgada, Unmāda, Vrīḍā, Avahittha, Bhaya and Śaṅkā numbering twenty.

"———रसास्तु रत्युत्कर्षहर्षधृत्युत्कण्ठावेगविस्मयमति वितर्कचिन्ताचपलताहासोत्साहस्तंभगद्गदोन्मादव्रीडावहित्थभयशङ्काः विंशतिः———। "

On p. 636 we find Praharṣa as a Sthāyi bhava reaching to the climax of a Rasa named Ānanda.

"———प्रहर्षस्थायिभावे × × × प्रकर्षारोपणात् **आनन्दरसताम्** **आपद्यमाने स्थायिनि** × × × ।"

Earlier also, Bhoja says in explaining Rasasaṁkara (on p. 492) that Harṣa is a Rasa on par with those developing from Bhaya, Śoka, Vismaya and Krodha. Harṣa is the Sthāyin and Mud, in the illustrative verse 'Mudā vikasitam' meaning Ānanda, is the Rasa.

"———भयशोकविस्मयक्रोधहर्षैः अपि रसान्तरैः———। " p. 492.

On p. 493 we find Roṣa mentioned as a Rasa.

"अत्र योषिति रोषाख्यरसान्तरतिरस्कारात्———।" p. 493.

On p. 494 Bhoja mentions Lajjā and Roṣa as two Rasas appearing and sub-

siding in the Rasa of Rati. रतावेव लज्जारोषरूपरसान्तरयोः प्रशमो यथा। He mentions here the residual Roṣa rasa found in Rati rasa.

रतावेव रोषरूपरसस्य शेषो यथा। p. 494.

On pp. 498-500 Bhoja illustrates Sāttvikas becoming Rasas having the same name, Stambha rasa, Romāñca rasa and so on. Similarly all the Vyabhicārins are given as Rasas, Ūha, Smṛti etc.

Thus there is not any Bhāva which is not a Rasa for Bhoja. This is a strange view indeed which considers even Sāttvikas as Rasas. Bhoja however seems to realise that, to attain to Prakarṣa when alone Rasa results, a Bhāva has to be attended by other subsidiary developing emotional conditions. But these do not exist in the case of Sāttvikas which are themselves subsidiary conditions qualifying and contributing to the development of other major emotional states. Bhoja says that there is a difference between the Rasas from Sāttvika bhāvas and the Rasas from Rati and similar Bhāvas. The difference is that since the former are Sāttvikas, which are by nature attendant upon other major Bhāvas, they do not have attending and developing subsidiary emotional conditions.

"अयं च पुष्टोऽपि सात्त्विकत्वात् सदैव अन्यानुयायीति नानुभावादिभिरनुबध्यते।"
"अस्यापि सात्त्विकत्वाद् अन्यानुबन्धादयो न जायन्ते।" p. 498.

But what does Bhoja mean by calling these Rasas? If they are not attended by other conditions, how do they attain Prakarṣa to become Rasas? And what is the meaning in belittling in this manner the import of the name Rasa itself? When Bhoja says they are not attended upon, themselves being attendants upon others, it is only another way of saying that they are not Rasas. Similar are the cases of Bhoja's illustrations of Vyabhicārins as Rasas. He calls all Bhāvakāvya, Rasakāvya. Besides the 49 Bhāvas, many others like Vilāsa, Svātantrya and Pāravaśya have also been taken as Rasa. If however Bhoja thinks that all these are Rasas because of being enjoyed—'Rasanād rasatvam eṣām' as Rudraṭa says—surely anything in Kāvya or Kāvya as a whole can be called Rasa, even as Bhoja called every beautifying feature in Kāvya, Alaṁkāra by virtue of its being 'Kāvyaśobhākara dharma'. A more elaborate criticism of Bhoja's Rasa theory is reserved for the next chapter.

Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha's commentary on *S. K. Ā.* V clearly explains Bhoja's theory that all the forty-nine Bhāvas are Rasas. Commenting on *S. K. Ā.* V. 23 where Bhoja gives four Sañcārins that become Sthāyins, Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha says :

य एते स्थायितया व्यभिचारितया चोक्ताः ते ति(किं) नियमेन एवंरूप(पाः)?—नेत्याह। **रतावि**ति। (*S. K. Ā.* V. 23) ये स्थायितया उक्ताः भा(हा)सादयः, ते रतौ शृङ्गाराख्यास(रसे) विशेषात्मना परिणतिभाजि स्थायित्वं परित्यज्य व्यभिचारिणो भवन्ति। ये च व्यभिचारिणः गर्वस्नेहधृतिमतयः ते उद्धत-प्रेयः-शान्त-उदात्ताख्येषु रसविशेषेषु व्यभिचारित्वं [अ] परित्यज्य स्थायिन एव भवन्तीति।" P. 152, Mad. MS.

Extracts from Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha's commentary on the fifth chapter of the *S. K. Ā.* on Rasa are given in a supplement at the end of this section.[1]

Therefore, Bhoja recognised in his *S. K. Ā.* first eight, then twelve, and then numerous Rasas.[2]

Who are the later writers who have taken notice of or criticised or accepted Bhoja's views on Rasa?

Daṇḍin illustrates the figure Ūrjasvi thus :

अपकर्ताहमस्मीति मा ते मनसि भूद् भयम्।
विमुखेषु न मे खड्गः प्रहर्तुं जातु वाञ्छति ॥
एवमुक्त्वा परो युद्धे निरुद्धो दर्पशालिना।
पुंसा केनापि तज्ज्ञेयम् ऊर्ज्वस्वीत्येवमादिकम् ॥ *K. Ā.* II. 293-4.

Commenting on these, Taruṇavācaspati says :

"'ऊर्जस्वि' इत्येतदलङ्कारः गर्वस्थायिभावः उद्धतरस इति, प्रेयो रसः प्रीतिस्थायिभावः प्रेयानलङ्कार इति केचित्कथयन्ति। तेन रसात्मकत्वेन 'युक्तोत्कर्षं च तत् त्रयं' इत्युक्तम् ॥"

1. It is a pity that we do not have Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha's commentary on the *S. K. Ā.* fully. It is evident in the small part of his commentary on the fifth chapter that has been spared to us that he has seen and understood the *Śṛ. Pra.* and gives a correct interpretation of Bhoja's strange ideas on Rasa.

2. In the section on Painting in his Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra, Bhoja mentions eleven Rasas.

रसानाम्(स्य ? थ) वक्ष्यामो दृष्टीनां(वोइ ?)लक्षणम्।
तदायत्ता यतश्चित्रे भावव्यक्तिः प्रजायते ॥
शृङ्गारहास्यकरुणाः रौद्रप्रेयोभयानकाः।
वीर (प्रत्ययाक्षौ ? अहंप्रत्ययाख्यौ) च बीभत्सश्चाद्भुतस्तथा ॥
शान्तश्चैकादशेत्युक्ता रसाश्चित्रविशारदैः।

S. A. S. Gaek. Edn., Vol. II, Ch. 82, 1-3.

Besides Preyas and Śānta, Bhoja has given here one new Rasa which is unfortunately lost in the corrupt text. A definition of these Rasas follows where one hopes to find out this eleventh Rasa but here again two verses are missing and the new Rasa is lost in this gap (p. 298). The corrupt line which reads वीरप्रत्ययाक्षौ has been happily reconstructed by Prof. Mm. S. Kuppuswami SASTRI as वीराहंप्रत्ययाख्यौ. It is quite intelligible to say that Bhoja recognised a Rasa called 'Ahampratyaya'. We saw above that he recognises in the *S. K. Ā.* two new Rasas called Udātta and Uddhata. Bhoja refers to another view regarding Udātta that some take it as identical with Ūrjasvi and give Ahaṁkāra as its Sthāyin. Uddhata rasa is one developing from Garva and it is possible to combine Udātta-Ūrjasvi with Uddhata and their Sthāyins Ahaṁkāra and Garva. Besides Bhoja expounds both in the *S. K. Ā.* and the *Śṛ. Pra.* the theory of one fundamental Rasa, named Ahaṁkāra. All these are combined in the one 'Ahampratyaya' of the Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra. Therefore 'Ahampratyaya', the eleventh Rasa in the *S. A. S.* refers to Ahaṁkāra-Abhimāna-Śṛṅgāra Rasa, to Udātta-Ūrjasvi and to Uddhata Rasas.

Earlier, while commenting on the text of Daṇḍin II. 275 "प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानम्" Taruṇavācaspati says : केचित् प्रेय इति रसवद् वर्णयन्ति, उद्धतमिति च। (p. 151 Madras Edn.). Taruṇavācaspati refers here surely to Bhoja who is the author who holds the Uddhata Rasa. Bhoja again is the author who makes Daṇḍin's Preyolaṁkāra into the Rasa of Preyas. Taruṇavācaspati is slightly mistaken in his statement. He equates Ūrjasvi and Uddhata, the one Ahaṁkārātmaka and the other Garvasthāyika. Though in the *S. K. Ā.* Bhoja has given rise to some confusion on the other name of the Udātta Rasa, he is very clear in his *Śṛ. Pra.* that what is synonymous with Ūrjasvi is Udātta, and it is Ūrjasvi whose Sthāyin is Ahaṁkāra and it is not Uddhata that is otherwise called Ūrjasvi. Similarly, Taruṇavācaspati makes a mistake when he gives Prīti as the Sthāyin of the Preyorasa ; Bhoja gives Sneha but the two do not differ.

Kavikarṇapūragosvāmin, in his Alaṁkārakaustubha, says in the fifth kiraṇa :

भोजस्तु वत्सलप्रेमभ्यां एकादश रसानाचष्टे–वात्सल्ये ममकारः, प्रेमणि चित्तद्रवः स्थायी एकादशैव दृश्ये श्रव्येऽपि च रसिकसंसदः प्रेष्ठाः। P. 123 Varendra Res. Soc. Edn. of S. Bhattacarya ; p. 145, Illustrations of these two Rasas.

Kavikarṇapūragosvāmin certainly refers here not to the *Śṛ. Pra.* of Bhoja but only to the *S. K. Ā.* But while stating Bhoja's view of Rasa, the author seems to have written without seeing the *S. K. Ā.* For, while we can understand a writer saying that Bhoja recognised twelve Rasas, we cannot understand how Kavikarṇapūragosvāmin says that Bhoja recognised eleven Rasas, with the two additional Rasas as Preyas and Vatsala. Vātsalya itself is not any new Rasa introduced by Bhoja but it is existing since the time of Rudraṭa. Preman or Preyas and Vātsalya do not differ. The Rasas newly introduced by Bhoja are Udātta and Uddhata of which Kavikarṇapūragosvāmin had not heard. Further, the author says that Mamakāra is the Sthāyin for Vātsalya but Bhoja gives Sneha. Higher Mamakāra, and even that never in this name but only as Ahaṁkāra and Abhimāna, Bhoja gives as a Rasa lying at the root of all other Rasas. Lower Mamakāra, Bhoja gives as Sthāyin for the Ūrjasvi Rasa with the name Ahaṁkāra in his *Śṛ. Pra.* which corresponds to the Udātta Rasa of his *S. K. Ā.* with Mati as its Sthāyin. Kavikarṇapūra says of Preman that its Sthāyin is Cittadrava. Firstly, there is no Rasa in the *S. K. Ā.* as Preman. Corresponding to his one fundamental Ahaṁkāra, Bhoja does give Preman as the culmination of all other Rasas and as representing the Uttarakoṭi of Rasa. Besides this Preman, Bhoja recognises a Preyas of the Madhyamāvasthā with Sneha or Prīti as its Sthāyin but that is not different from Vātsalya. It is not also understandable how Cittadrava can be the Sthāyin of Preman. Many other Rasas are of the form of Cittadrava. So, every bit of information given by Kavikarṇapūragosvāmin as Bhoja's view of Rasa is wrong. He had seen neither the *S. K. Ā.* nor the *Śṛ. Pra.* but when he says regarding Prema Rasa, as a votary of the Vaiṣṇavite school of Alaṁkāra of Bengal :

प्रेमरसे सर्वे रसा अन्तर्भवन्तीत्यत्र महीयानेव प्रपञ्चः × × × तथा च

" उन्मज्जन्ति निमज्जन्ति प्रेम्ण्यखण्डरसत्वतः ।
सर्वे रसाश्च भावाश्च तरङ्गा इव वारिधौ ॥ pp. 145-6.

he gives almost the same idea of Preman as found in Bhoja's *Śṛ. Pra.*

Two writers really saw the *S. K. Ā.* ch. V and said something regarding Bhoja's view of Rasa. They are Viśveśvara, the author of the *Camatkāracandrikā*, and his patron King Simhabhūpāla, the author of the *Rasārṇavasudhākara.*

Viśveśvara used the *S. K. Ā.* for writing his Camatkāracandrikā. On Doṣas, Guṇas and Alaṁkāras, he almost follows Bhoja. On Rasa, Viśveśvara does not follow Bhoja and holds Rasas to be only eight, dismissing Śānta even. But in some general aspects of Rasa, Viśveśvara takes something from the *S. K. Ā.* He says of Rasa

तदन्वयेन काव्यश्रीः कमनीयत्वमश्नुते ।

which is simply a recast of *S. K. Ā.* V. 1

योऽर्थः तस्यान्वयात् काव्यं कमनीयत्वमश्नुते ।

Bhoja says in *S. K. Ā.* V. 8 that of the three Uktis in Poetry namely, Svabhāvokti, Vakrokti and Rasokti, the Rasokti is the most charming :

वक्रोक्तिश्च रसोक्तिश्च स्वभावोक्तिश्च वाङ्मयम् ।
सर्वासु ग्रहिणीं तासु रसोक्तिं प्रतिजानते ॥

and Viśveśvara recasts this verse of Bhoja thus :

चिरं जीवतु वक्रोक्तिः स्वभावोक्तिश्च तिष्ठताम् ।
रसोक्तिरेव काव्येषु ग्राहिणीति मतिर्मम ॥ pp. 69-70. Mad. MS.

The stages of Rasa development given by Bhoja in *S. K. Ā.* V, 9-11, are taken by Viśveśvara.

सत्तास्फुरत्तानुबन्धः निष्पत्तिः पुष्टिसङ्करौ ।
ह्रासाभासौ शमःशेषः इत्युक्ता हि रसोक्तयः ॥

Viśveśvara also borrows *S. K. Ā.* V, 27.

Viśveśvara never criticised Bhoja, though he could not accept Bhoja's views. But his patron who also held only eight Rasas, dismissing Śānta also, criticises Bhoja for recognising any Rasa beyond the eight. In a separate section in this thesis on Bhoja and Śiṅgabhūpāla, I have indicated the places in the *Rasārṇavasudhākara* where Bhoja and his *S. K. Ā.* and *Śṛ. Pra.* are referred to or criticised or followed by Śiṅgabhūpāla. The fifth criticism of Bhoja in the *Rasārṇavasudhākara* pertains to Rasa. Śiṅgabhūpāla says here that Bhoja recognised four additional Sthāyins and Rasas named Garva, Sneha, Dhṛti, and Mati, and Uddhata, Preyas, Śānta and Udātta, their Rasas respectively.

भोजेनोक्ताः स्थायिनोऽन्ये गर्वः स्नेहो धृतिर्मतिः ।
स्थास्नुखे उद्धतप्रायः (प्रेयः) शान्तोदात्तरसेष्वपि ॥

तत्र स्नेहो रतेर्भेदः स्त्रीपुंसेच्छात्मकत्वतः ।
अन्ये पोषासहिष्णुत्वान् नैव स्थायिपदोचिताः ॥ pp. 168-9.

Preyān is a Rasa older than Bhoja and all writers who reject it advance the same argument that it is unnecessary to accept it as a distinct Rasa, it being but an aspect of Rati. Śiṅgabhūpāla says the same thing. His criticism of Śānta also is not anything new, for Śānta is a Rasa older than Bhoja and many before Śiṅgabhūpāla have refuted it. Of the three Sthāyins, Garva, Dhṛti and Mati, Śiṅgabhūpāla says as a point of common criticism applicable to all the three that they cannot be developed.

अन्ये पोषासहिष्णुत्वान् नैव स्थायिपदोचितः । p. 170.

He examines Bhoja's illustration of Garva developing into the Uddhata Rasa. He comes to the conclusion that there is no Garva in the instance but only Pauruṣa sāttvika bhāva. He says, even in case one insists on the presence of Garva in it, that Garva is not the main Bhāva but is only the Sañcārin qualifying the Sthāyin, the Sthāyin of Raudra, namely Krodha.

न तावदत्र गर्वः, पूर्वम् अपकर्तारं पश्चाद् भीतं द्विषन्तम् आलोक्य जातया समरविमुखं न हन्मि माभैषीरिति वाक्यसूचितया नीचे दयया कस्यचिद् वीरसार्वभौमस्य शोभनः पौरुषसात्त्विकभावः प्रतीयते ।

यदि वा, अभीतमपि शत्रुं भीतो यदि, तर्हि पलायस्वेत्यधिक्षिपति इति गर्व इति चेत्, अस्तु वा गर्वः । तथापि असत्यभीतिकल्पनारूपचित्ताध्यवसायप्रकाशनद्वारेण शत्रुवधक्रोधमेव पुष्णाति ।

किञ्च विमुखाप्रहाररूप-आत्मसंभावनारूपगर्वस्य असत्यभीतिकल्पनोपबृंहणादेष भावकानां वैरस्याय न केवलं, स्वादाभावाय चेति, नास्मिन्नुदाहरणे गर्वस्य स्थायित्वम् उपपद्यते ।

p. 170. *R. A. S.* T. S S.

The following is Śiṅgabhūpāla's criticism of Śānta and its proposed Sthāyins :

"अत्र तावदनुकूलदारसिद्धिजनिताया धृतेस्तु रतिपरतन्त्रत्वमाबालगोपालप्रसिद्धम् ।

ननु वस्तुतत्त्वालोचनादिभिरस्याः स्थायित्वं कल्प्यत इति चेत्, न । नैस्पृह्यवासनावासिते भावकचित्ते विभावादिष्वापि नैस्पृह्योन्मेषाद् धृतेर्मूलच्छेदप्रसङ्गत् ।

अर्थसम्पत्तिजनिता धृतिस्तु अगृध्नुलक्षणलोकोत्तरत्वप्राप्तिव्यवसायरूपमुत्साहमनुसरन्ती वीरोपकरणतामाप्नोति इति नात्र धृतेः स्थायित्वम् ।

धृतिस्थायित्वनिराकरणसंरंभेनैव नष्टस्तद्विषयः शमस्थायी कुत्र वा लीनो न ज्ञायते ।"

p. 171. *Ibid.*

Śiṅgabhūpāla advances here four arguments against Dhṛti or Śama being a Sthayin. First, if contentment or tranquillity should be of the Gṛhastha who has secured a wife who is very congenial to him, the Dhṛti or Śama born of this domestic harmony is not a separate Sthāyin by itself, but is only an ancil-

lary Bhāva helping the major Bhāva of Rati which is the Sthāyin. This criticism, however, applies only to a limited number of cases where Śānta exhibits itself in a Gṛhastha. The second argument against Śānta is an old one. If Dhṛti or Śama is born of Tattvajñāna and is of the form of Naiṣpṛhya, no activity, no drama is possible. The third argument of Śiṅgabhūpāla is directed against Dhṛti in the second Puruṣārtha of Artha. He replies that a man who is materially contented and unavaricious wants to attain greatness called 'Lokottaratva', 'being above the common run'. The effort to attain to this greatness is some Utsāha, and hence this Dhṛti is a Bhāva ancillary to Vīra rasa. This is sheer quibbling. Any Pravṛtti dharma, and many activities of the Nivṛtti mārga also, can be reduced to some kind of Utsāha. Vīra rasa will swallow all other Rasas and we can attempt at a 'Vīra-synthesis', since no activity is possible without Utsāha. It is the height of far-fetchedness to equate unavariciousness with Utsāha. Śiṅgabhūpāla adds at the end that what he has said of Dhṛti holds good for Śama also.

Bhoja's Udātta rasa and its illustration are then taken up for criticism. Mati in the illustrative verse is either a Sañcārin in Rati there, or is again only a kind of Utsāha of Rama for attaining 'Lokottaratva'. This Utsāha is a veritable panacea!

"अत्र तावत् सीताविषया आत्मस्वीकारयोग्यत्वनिश्चयरूपा रामस्य मतिस्तु रतेरुत्पत्तिमात्रकारणमेव, तदनिश्चये रतेरनौचित्यात्। अत्र न्यायः। साधारण्यनिश्चयो मतिः। तस्याः स्थायित्वमिच्छाम इति चेत्, न। सा हि रावणविषयलक्ष्मणासूयादोषनिराकरणद्वारेण कार्यकर(ण?णा)पराङ्मुखीभावलक्षणलोकोत्तरत्वप्राप्तिव्यवसायरूपं रामोत्साहं भावकास्वादयोग्यतया प्रोत्साहयति।

तदष्टावेव विज्ञेयाः स्थायिनो मुनिसम्मताः।" p. 172. *R. A. S.* T. S. S.

It is clear from his reference to and criticism of Bhoja's Miśra vṛtti that Śiṅgabhūpāla had access to the *Śṛ. Pra.* But in this place where he criticises Bhoja's additional Rasas, Śiṅgabhūpāla is referring to and quoting only from the *S. K. Ā.* The line

स्थास्नुरेवोद्धत प्रायः(प्रेयः)शान्तोदात्तरसेष्वपि। p. 169. *R. A. S.*

is Bhoja's *S. K. Ā.* V. 23. Further, Śiṅgabhūpāla gives Dhṛti as the Sthāyin of Śānta, Mati of Udātta, and gives the Udātta rasa as Udātta itself; this is in accordance with the *S. K. Ā.* only, and not the *Śṛ. Pra.* The latter gives Śama as the Sthāyin of Śānta and calls the Udātta, Ūrjasvi giving its Sthāyin as Ahaṁkāra.

Even the *S. K. Ā.* Ch. V has not been carefully examined by Śiṅgabhūpāla. Credit no doubt goes to Śiṅgabhūpāla for being the only writer to note and criticise Bhoja's Udātta and Uddhata rasas. But, if Śiṅgabhūpāla had seen the fifth chapter of the *S. K. Ā.* more minutely, he would have seen that Bhoja made the Sāttvikas and all the Sañcārins into Rasas and what is more, added such new Rasas like Svātantrya, Pāraśva, Vilāsa etc. The fifth Vṛtti of Bhoja which Śiṅgabhūpāla criticises is not the greatest thing Bhoja said in his *Śṛ. Pra.* The theory of the one and only real Rasa

of Ahaṁkāra, the theory of all the forty-nine Bhāvas as born of this one Ahaṁkāra, the theory that though these Bhāvas Rati etc. may attain Prakarṣa, they are strictly only Bhāvas, and can be called Rasas only in a secondary sense, that among the forty-nine Bhāvas there is no pre-ordained distinction into peers and plebeians, and all the forty-nine belong to a democracy with equal chances to become Sthāyins, and that they are therefore dual in personality as Sthāyins and Sañcārins, and that as a result of this, Rasas are not restricted in number—these Śiṅgabhūpāla does not notice at all.

Modern scholars have erred in the same manner as uninformed writers like Kavikarṇapūragosvāmin, and the many others of old I have reviewed below in the chapter on Bhoja and his Successors. One can understand scholars not being in the know of the things said in the long lost and only recently discovered, and yet unpublished, *Śṛ. Pra.* but what is strange is that no recent writer on Alaṁkāra has correctly given Bhoja's view of Rasa as found in his *S. K. Ā.*, a work which is easily available being in print now for a long time.

Mr. Abhaya Kumar GUHA writing on 'Rasa Cult in Caitanyacaritāmṛta' in the *Asutosh Silver Jubilee Volume* III, says on p. 375 :

"Another rhetorician, Bhojarāja, adds one more, *e.g.* Preman (love). Thus according to Bhojarāja, eleven Rasas in all." That is, this writer says that Bhoja himself added to the eight plus Śānta (nine), one more Rasa named Preman. This is wrong as can be seen from what has been given above as Bhoja's view of Rasa in the *S. K. Ā.* Nor is this true of the *Śṛ. Pra.* If Premān is the same as Preyas and is Vātsalya, Bhoja is not the writer who added it ; it was Rudraṭa. What Bhoja added was Udātta and Uddhata, if we can say that Bhoja put forward twelve Rasas. Really, Bhoja recognised numberless Rasas.

Dr. S. K. DE, on p. 347 of Vol. II of his *Skr. Poetics*, makes a similar mistake. He says that Bhoja, in his encyclopædic *S. K. Ā.* "mentions as many as *ten* Rasas" "including Śānta and Preyas". On p. 264, Vol. II, Dr. DE says of the fifth chapter of the *S. K. Ā.* that "Bhoja mentions here as many as *ten* Rasas, adding the Śānta and the Preyas (the last occurring also in Rudraṭa) to the eight orthodox Rasas mentioned by Bharata." Dr. DE is doubly wrong here. Not only Preyas but Śānta also is found in Rudraṭa ; as a matter of fact, it appears even in Udbhaṭa. Secondly, it is not Śānta and Preyas or these alone that Bhoja adds. What exactly must be noted as the Rasas added by Bhoja are Udātta and Uddhata ; for we can say in a way that Bhoja gave in the middle of his argument an indicative list of twelve Rasas, his final view however being either one or numerous Rasas.[1]

1. See also my book *The Number of Rasas*, Adyar Library Series, pp. 19, 45, 46, 65, 66, 67, 70, 80, 109, 119-128, 132, 154, 159, 160, 161, 167, 168, 169, 173, 175.

Extracts from

Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha's Commentary on Bhoja's S. K. Ā. (Madras Ms.)

Chapter V—Rasa.

P. 147. "एवम् अलङ्कारयोगमुक्त्वा रसावियोगपदं, रसस्वरूपं तदुपयोगं च तावदाह **रस इति**। (येन) रस्यते, यैः(येन) अनुकूलवेदनीयतया दुःखमपि सुखत्वेन अभिमन्यते, येन रसिकैः अहंक्रियते, येन श्रृङ्गं उच्छ्रयो रीयते, स खलु तादृशोऽस्ति सर्वजनस्वसंवेदन(सिद्धः) तत्तदुपाधिना(तेन)तेन रसाभिमानादिशब्देन अभिधीयमान(:)स्वादात्मा(।)तस्य प्रतिपाद्यता(रा)मादिपात्रगतस्य संविधानेन (औ)चित्यवशेन यद्योजनं सामकारव्येन (रामकाव्येन), तस्मादन्वयात् काव्यं कमनीयं भवति सामाजिकहृदयानुकारी भवति।

ननु न पात्रगतो रसः, तस्य अतिवृत्तत्वात्; किन्तु सामाजिकगतः, एषां वर्तमानत्वात्,(का)-व्यस्य अतत्परत्वाच्च; न खल्विति(खल्वति)वृत्ता रामादयः कथं रसिकाः स्युः इति कवयः काव्यं निर्मिते(निर्मिमते) (।)अपि तर्हि सामाजिकाः कथं रसभाजः स्युरिति। तस्मात् समाजिकगतो रसः, न पात्रगतः।

मैवम्। सामाजिकगतस्य रसस्य किमुत्पादकं, किं वा ज्ञापकमिति वाच्यम्। उच्यते काव्यमेव ज्ञापकम् उत्पादकं च। तथा हि–सुकविनिर्मितः काव्यसन्दर्भः सामाजिकहृदये विभावानुभावस्थायिसात्त्विकसञ्चारणा(रिणः)साक्षादिव समर्पयति। तेऽमी सामग्रीभूताः तत्र रसमारभन्ते। तस्मात् रससामग्री प्रापकतया काव्यमेव तदुत्पादकं तन्मूलविभावादिबोधकतया तदेव ज्ञापकं चेति। p. 148.

नैतदेवम्। कथं हि काव्यप्रतिपादिताः विभावादयः सामाजिकगतस्य रसस्य कारणम्? करणहीनाः(कारणं हि) कार्यनियतप्राग्भावि। काव्यश्रवणसमये[ये] विभावादीनां सत्त्वमेव दुस्सम्पादं, दूरे नियमः। तद्ज्ञानं तावदस्तीति चेत्, किमतः? न हि विभावादिज्ञाने रसनिष्पत्तिः, किन्तु तत्स्वरूपेणैव विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगात् रसनिष्पत्तिरिति उक्तत्वात्। ज्ञान(य)मानतयैव विभावादेः कारणत्वमिति चेत्, किं स्थाय्यादीनामपि (किं काव्यादीनामपि तथा;) तथैवेति चेत्, तर्हि अन्यसम्बन्धिनो विभावादयः काव्ये ज्ञाप्यमानाः सामाजिकचेतसि प्रमोदहेतवः इति, आयातं(काव्यत्वं) नीरसस्यापि। तथात्वे को दोषः? सामाजिकहृदयंगतः प्रमोद एव काव्ये रसशब्दालम्बनमिति चेत्, मैवं। तर्ह्ययं पारिभाषिको रसशब्दः गौणतया प्रयोगासम्भवात् (पात्रगतो न स्यात्। अतः) पात्रगत एव मुख्यो रसः, सामयिकशब्दस्तु (सामाजिके रसिकशब्दस्तु) गौण इति।

किञ्च शब्दव्यापारः एक एव निष्पादकः बोधकश्चेति दुर्घटं, निष्पत्त्युत्तरकालत्वात् बोध[क]स्य, शब्दस्य च विरम्यव्यापारवशात्(विरहात्)। तस्मात् पात्रगत एव रसः, काव्यप्रतिपादितः सामाजिकैरनुभूयत इति।

यदि पात्रभूताः रामादय एव रसिकाः, कथं तर्हि सामाजिकानां रसिकत्वव्यपदेशः, कथं रसोत्पादनाय काव्यप्रवृत्तिः? उच्यते। रसस्य पात्रगतत्वेऽपि कविः तदुचितैः शब्दैः सामाजिकचेतसि साक्षादिव रसं समर्पयति। तत्समर्पितं रसमनुभवन्तः सवि(संविदास्वादा)तिशयेन विस्मृतस्वपरभेदास्ते, तदनुभव p 149 (जनित)प्रमोदस्य तदुचितस्तम्भ तन्त्र(तनू)रुहोद्भेदादिप्रापकस्य भाजनं भवन्ति। त एते रसिकत्वव्यपदेशा(शं)पादनाया(आस्वादयन्ति।) तदुत्पादन एव तात्पर्यं काव्यस्यापि।

ननु तर्हि उत्पाद्येतिवृत्तेषु काव्येषु का वात्मी(वार्ता)? न हि तत्र रसाश्रयः पात्रमस्ति; केवलं कविकौशलेन कल्प्यते; उच्यते। (न कवि)ना सदेव वक्तव्यमिति नियमः, अतात्पर्यात्। किन्तु सदसद्वा।

पात्रं रसाश्रयतया प्रतिपाद्यमानं यदि सहृदयहृदयप्रमोदाय स्यात्, तावतैवासौ चरितार्थस्स्यात्, अर्थव्यक्तिवत्। यथा स्वरूपस्य साक्षाद् भणनात्मनि अर्थव्यक्तिगुणे सन्तम् असन्तं वा अर्थं तथा प्रतिपादयन्नेव कविः श्रोतृजनचित्तमनुरञ्जयति, नार्थस्य सत्त्वमपेक्षते, तद्वदिहापि। तत्र प्रतिपाद्यमानात् जातीयेऽपि(प्रतिपाद्यमानसजातीयेऽपि) तावत्तथाविध सत्त्वमस्तीति चेत्, तद्वदिहापि समानम्। तस्मात् पात्रगतस्यैव रसस्य सामाजिकप्रमोदात्(प्रमोदोत्पाद)नपरतया सम्यक् प्रतिपादनमेव काव्ये रसान्वयः। स एव च तस्य का(क)मनीयताहेतुरिति तस्य हेतुं कार्यं चाह–**विशिष्टेति**।

Kārikā 2. अयं रसः जन्मिनाम् अन्तरात्मसु विशिष्टेन केनापि अदृष्टेनैव जन्यते, यद्बलात् न सर्वोऽपि जनः रसिको भवति। ननु(न तु)रत्यादिभिः स्थायिभावैः। अत्र हेतुः, **एक इति**। यदि हि रत्यादिभिरसौ जायेत, तदानीम् एको न स्यात्, तेषां बहुत्वात्।

ननु अष्टावेव रसाः रसादिभिः(रत्यादिभिः)स्थायि p. 150 भिरुत्पन्नाः? मैवम्। स्थायिनामेव कथमष्टत्वमुच्यते? काव्यार्थसम्भेदे सति विकासविस्तारक्षोभविक्षेपैः शृङ्गार(रादि)फलभूतैः श्रोतृणां चतुरवस्थं मनो जायते। ताभिः चतसृभिरप्यवस्थाभिः काव्यप्रतिपादितरत्यादिसहिताः शृङ्गाराद्याः चत्वारो रसाः निष्पन्ना ज्ञायन्ते। आरब्धशृङ्गारादिरसाभिः ताभिः पुनः अपरे चत्वारो हास्यकरुणभयानकाद्भुता जायन्ते। अतोऽष्टौ रसा इति।

मैवम्। चतुरवस्था(स्थ)त्वे मननस्य(मनसः) चत्वार एव रसाः स्युः, नाष्टौ। अवेदिति (पूर्वोदित)रसास्तु अवस्था [द्य]न्तरैः पुनरपि रसान्तराण्यारब्धानि व्यञ्जयन्तीति चेत्, तर्हि अष्टावेव रसा(ः) [न्तराः] इति नियमः कुतः? भावान्तराण्यपि सहायीकृत्य यावद्भावम् एकोनपञ्चाशद् रसाः व्यञ्जयन्तु; न व्यञ्जयन्ति, भावान्तराणां अस्थायित्वादिति चेत्, अष्टावेव स्थायिन इति कुतः? तावतामेव स्वादात्मकत्वादिति चेत्, किमेतेष्वनुस्यूतः एकः स्वादात्मा? तर्हि अनक्षरमिदमुक्तम्, एतेषां कूटस्थ एक एव स्वादात्मा। एते च तद्विशेषा इति। कथं चतुरवस्थत्वमपि मनसः न भाविकं (सम्भावितम्)? विकासात् विस्तरस्य विक्षोभात् विक्षेपस्य च अनर्थान्तरत्वात्। नार्थाविकारात् (विकासात्मक)शृङ्गारस्य(रात्) (हास्या)भिव्यक्तिरपि कथम्? आनन्दात्मकत्वात् शृङ्गारस्य, तस्य च मनोनिमीलनात्मकत्वात्।[1]

यदा(यथा)शोकक्रोधजुगुप्साभयादीनि स्वादात्वकतया स्थायित्वं प्रतिपत्स्यन्धा(प्रतिपद्य रसान्) आरभन्ते, तथा किमपरा र्थं(द्धं)गर्वस्नेहधृतिमतिप्रभृतिभिः?

अत्र(अतः) सर्वेषां कूटस्था (स्थः)एक एव स्वादात्मा, स एवैषामात्मगामिनां गुणानाम् उद्भवहेतुः। एतैरेव कार्यभूतैः स परेषां प्रकाशते। स्वयं तु स्वानुभवसिद्धः संविधानौचित्यवशेन च पात्रगतस्सन् सामाजिकैरनुभूयत इति सर्वमनवद्यम्।

Page 15. Kārikā 3. यदि पात्रगतस्यैव रसस्य प्रतिपादकमात्रं काव्यं, किमिति तर्हि किञ्चित् सरसं किञ्चिन् नीरसं भवति। तत्र **शृङ्गारी चेदिति** व(र)चयितुः कवेः सारस्यवैरस्ये एव काव्ये रसान्वयतदभावयोः तन्त्रम्। न पात्रगते रसस्य सत्त्वासत्त्वे इत्यर्थः।

1. The second criticism that from Śṛṅgāra which is Ānandātmaka and Vikāsātmaka, Hāsya which is Manonimīlana and Vikāra, cannot be produced, is based on Bhoja's own description of Hāsya in the *S. K. Ā.* V (p. 475):

न्यङ्गव्रीडादिभिश्चेतोविकारो हास उच्यते।

Kārikās 4, 5 and 6. कथं तन्त्रत्वमित्यत्र तद्विभावितः(तद्विभावयोः ?) शब्दार्थयोः रसास्फुरणास(ग्राम्यतायां रसास्फुरणात्)तदग्राम्यतायां तत्स्फुरणाच्चेत्याह–**पश्येत्यादिना** श्लोकत्रयेण । तत्र प्रथमेन शब्दग्राम्यतातद्विपर्ययौ दर्शितौ । (द्वितीय)तृतीयाभ्याम् अर्थग्राम्यतातद्विपर्ययाविति ।

Kārikā 7. शब्दार्थयोः किमग्राम्यतामात्रेण रसान्वयो निर्वहति, नेत्याह–नवोत्थः(**नवोऽर्थः**) इति । न केवलं तदग्राम्यतातन्त्रेण श्र(वण)निर्मा(र्वा)णश्रुत्यनुप्रासालौकिकार्था(र्थं)वचनादिभिरपीत्यर्थः । अग्राम्यतैव रसान्वये प्रधानं, श्रव्यबन्धादयस्तु तत्सहकारिण इति भावः । उक्तं हि—"कामं सर्वोऽप्यलङ्कारो रसमर्थे" इति (Daṇḍin *K. Ā.* I. 62).

Kārikā 8. कतिविधा सूक्तिः ? का च तत्र प्रधानम् ? तत्राह **वक्रोक्तिश्चेति** । अलङ्कारप्रधाना वक्रोक्तिः, रसप्रधाना रसोक्तिः, गुणप्रधाना स्वभावोक्तिरिति ।

Kārikās 9-12. एवम् उक्तमूलस्य काव्ये रसस्य विभूतिप्रकारान् उद्दिशति ।

Kārikā 13. उद्देशक्रमेण दर्शयन् प्रथमं तावत् भावं दर्शयति **भाव इति, आलम्बनविभावेभ्यः स्वेभ्य इति** । यद्यप्ययं विशिष्टादृष्टजन्मा तथापि(तत्)तदालम्बनवेद्यः तत्तद्रत्यादिभावेन उन्मिषन् रसो भाव इति व्यवह्रियते ।

Karikā 14. इत्येवं भावसामान्यं लक्षयित्वा विभजन् स्थायिभावानुद्दिशति– **रतीति** ।

Kārikā 15. सात्त्विकानुद्दिशति—**स्तम्भेति** ।

Kārikās 16-18. व्यभिचारिण उद्दिशति—**स्मृतिरिति** ।

Kārikā 19. शब्दनिर्वचनपूर्वं स्थायिभावानां सामान्यलक्षणमाह–**चिरमिति** । ये चित्ते संस्कारात्मना चिरमवतिष्ठन्ते, p. 152 अनुबन्धिभिः व्यभिचारी(रि)सात्त्विकादिभिः सम्बद्धय प्रबुद्धाः शृङ्गारादिरसविशेषत्वं प्रतिपद्यन्ते, ते स्थायिभावा इति ।

Kārikās 20-22. * * * * * * * * *

Kārikā 23. य एते स्थायितया व्यभिचारितया च उक्ताः ते किं नियमेन एवंरूपाः ? नेत्याह–**रताविति** । ये स्थयितया उक्ताः भा(हा)सादयः, ते रतौ शृङ्गाराख्यरसविशेषात्मना परिणतिभाजि स्थायित्वं परित्यज्य व्यभिचारिणो भवन्ति । ये च व्यभिचारिणः गर्वस्नेहधृतिमतयः ते उद्धतप्रेयश्शान्तोदात्ताख्येषु रसविशेषेषु व्यभिचारित्वं परित्यज्य स्थायिन एव भवन्तीति । P. 152.

CHAPTER XIX

BHOJA'S CONCEPTION OF RASA IN THE *ŚR. PRA.*

रसोऽभिमानोऽहंकारः शृंगार इति गीयते ।
योऽर्थः तस्यान्वयात् काव्यं कमनीयत्वमश्नुते ॥ Bhoja's *S. K. Ā.*, V. I.

I. The place of Rasa in Bhoja's scheme of Poetics ; explanation of the term Rasa-aviyoga.

Rasa is considered by Bhoja as Rasavad alaṁkāra or Rasokti, one of the three departments of poetic expression or Ukti, the other two being Vakrokti (Alaṁkāras) and Svabhāvokti (Guṇas). Criticism of Bhoja's derivation of his view of Rasas as Ahaṁkāra from a verse of Daṇḍin (Preyaḥ priyatarākhyānam....yuktotkarṣam ca tat trayam) and of Bhoja's further interpretation of Daṇḍin's expression 'yuktotkarṣa' and the equation of the three Rasas with three Guṇas.

The meaning of the word 'Rasavat'.

The Āśraya of Rasa.

II. Number of Rasas accepted by Bhoja.

Refutation by Bhoja of Bharata's scheme of four Prakṛti Rasas producing four derivative Rasas.

Consideration of the eight Rasas of Bharata ; addition of four more ; Bhoja's view that all the 49 Bhāvas are capable of becoming Sthāyins and Rasas ; the names Sthāyin, Vyabhicārin and Sāttvika apply to all the 49 Bhāvas ; similar view of earlier writers,—Mātṛgupta, Lollaṭa, Rudraṭa, and a view referred to by Dhanañjaya ; new Rasas spoken of by Bhoja, Pāravaśya, Svātantrya etc.

Criticism of Bhoja's view of Rasa ; strange views on Rasa recorded in the *Locana* and the *Rasagaṁgādhara* ; *Pāravaśya* etc. criticised ; Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas as Rasas criticised ; what is Bhāva, Sthāyibhāva and Rasa ? Abhinavagupta's clear exposition of the distinction of Sthāyin and Vyabhicārin.

III. The other extreme : Bhoja denies Rasatva to Rati etc. ; Ratyādiprakarṣa is not Rasa ; Ahaṁkāra, the one and only Rasa.

Three phases of the fundamental Rasa of Ahaṁkāra : a. Ahaṁkāra-Abhimāna-Śṛṅgāra ; b. Prakarṣa of the 49 Bhāvas ; and c. their synthesis in Preman.

Explanation of Rasika.

Vedic, Puranic, and Philosophic ideas corresponding to Bhoja's idea of the one Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra Rasa.

Ideas in Bharata corresponding to Bhoja's theory of Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra as pertaining to the four Puruṣārthas.

IV. Bhoja's explanation of Rasika; comparison and contrast with Abhinavagupta's explanation of Sahṛdaya and Bharata's definition of Prekṣaka. Difference in human nature and character correlated to diversity in literary taste and judgment and to the diversity in dramatic types.

V. The nature of the Śṛṅgāra in the Rasa-Śṛṅgāra equation of Bhoja. Confusion in the minds of authors between Bhoja's new and strange Śṛṅgāra and the well-known Śṛṅgāra.

Passages in the *Śṛ. Pra.* which create such a confusion.

The real relation between the two Śṛṅgāras. Bhoja's glorification of 'Rati-prakarṣa Śṛṅgāra' side by side with the glorification of Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra.

VI. Bhoja's Rasa theory, the Sāṁkhya philosophy, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, Abhinavagupta and Madhusūdana Sarasvatī.

VII. The phases of Rasa,—Prakṛṣṭa, Bhāva and Ābhāsa.

Explanation of Bharata's Rasa sūtra, the action of Vibhāvas of both kinds, Saṁcārins and Sāttvikas, the Niṣpatti and the Upacaya of Rasa.

VIII. Bhoja and Western Parallels.

IX. Bhoja's Rasa theory and the *Agni Purāṇa.*
Bhoja's Rasa theory and Śāradātanaya.

X. Sanskrit Texts :
a. The *Śṛ. Pra.* on Rasa.
b. Three extracts from the *Abhinavabhāratī.*

Rasa is one of the elements comprehended in the Sāhitya of Bhoja which, as far as the poetical part of it is concerned, is the absence of flaws, the presence of excellences, the addition of figures and the *non-divorce from Rasa.* This fourfold Sāhitya lifts the grammatically related word and sense, 'Śabdārtha', into Poetry. Bhoja lays emphasis on all the four. He quotes Daṇḍin "तदल्पमपि नोपेक्ष्यम् etc." and Bhāmaha "नाकवित्वमधर्माय etc." and emphasises that the poet should try to see that his poetry does not have even a single flaw. Guṇas, he holds, like Vāmana, as inseparably united with Kāvya. Following Daṇḍin, he calls Guṇas, Alaṁkāras, Rasas and many other things also Alaṁkāra which concept has attained the greatest proportions in Bhoja's *Śṛ. Pra.* But, all the time, Bhoja is aware of the importance of Rasa. In his *S. K. Ā.* he says that Rasa is greater than Guṇa and Alaṁkāra, that Rasokti is of greater charm than Svabhāvokti (Guṇa) or Vakrokti (Alaṁkāra).

वक्रोक्तिश्च रसोक्तिश्च स्वभावोक्तिश्च वाङ्मयम् ।
सर्वासु ग्राहिणीं तासु रसोक्तिं प्रतिजानते ॥ *S. K. Ā.*, V. 8.

In his *Śṛ. Pra.* he says that though a piece of composition is flawless and is adorned with Guṇas and Alaṁkāras, it is Rasa that is the greatest factor of

beauty, and that the poet should see that no part of his composition is devoid of it. For, in its absence, all other beauties are in vain, even as all the graces and gifts of nature of a woman are in vain, if she has no love. Says Bhoja at the beginning of chapter XI of the *Śṛ. Pra.* :

निर्दोषस्य गुणवतोऽलङ्कृतस्य च काव्यशरीरस्य कामिनीशरीरस्येव शोभातिशयनिष्पत्तौ रसावियोग एव प्रकृष्ट उपायो गीयते।

कल्या मूर्तिः कुलममलिनं यौवनं रूपसंपत्
सौभाग्यर्द्धिः प्रियवचनताशीलवैदग्ध्ययोगः।
शालीनत्वं विनयपरतेत्यङ्गनाभूषणं यत्
तत्प्रेमार्द्रं प्रणयिनि मनो नास्ति चेत् नास्ति किञ्चित् ॥ p. 352, Vol. II.

In a different context Abhinavagupta quotes the following verse of his own, which can be compared to the one quoted by Bhoja above :

समस्तगुणसंपदः सममलंक्रियाणां गणैः
भवन्ति यदि भूषणं तव तथापि नो शोभसे।
शिवं हृदयवल्लभं यदि यथातथा रञ्जयेः
तदेव ननु वाणि ते जगति सर्वलोकोत्तरम् ॥ *Locana*, p. 75

Neither Guṇa nor Alaṁkāra forms her essential beauty ; but only her love. There is thus no doubt that Bhoja attaches the greatest importance to Rasa. Following Vāmana, he gives the Arthaguṇa Kānti as a Guṇa of Rasa, Dīpta-rasatva. And Guṇas, Bhoja considers as inseparably associated with Kāvya. Bhoja actually says that like Guṇas, the Rasas are in eternal relation with Kāvya.

नित्यो हि काव्ये गुणयोग इव रसावियोगः। p. 369. *Śṛ. Pra.*

But Bhoja is a follower of the ancient view-point of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. Bhoja does not feel that the supremacy of Rasa is affected by holding it as comprehended in Alaṁkāra. As we shall see presently, Bhoja calls Rasa Rasavad-Alaṁkāra or Rasokti, one of the three departments of poetic expression, the other two departments being natural description (Svabhāvokti) and figurative description (Vakrokti). We do not find in Bhoja-literature the philosophical terminology of Śarīra and Ātman with respect to the expression and the emotional content, Śabdārtha and Rasa, which we are familiar with in post-Ānandavardhana Kāśmīrian Alaṁkāra literature. In the passage quoted above from the *Śṛ. Pra.*, we see Bhoja using the expression Kāvya *śarīra* of which he thinks Rasa is the greatest means of beautification. Rasa is placed on a par with Guṇa and Alaṁkāra though considered superior to both of them. But in the verse which Bhoja quotes for comparison, we find Rasa compared to the love of a woman's heart. Guṇas are compared here to the Guṇas of the woman and it should be taken that Alaṁkāras are compared (it is implied) to the ornaments on her body. This is purely Kāśmīrian, but still, while theoretically expounding the subject of Rasa,

Bhoja calls Rasa Alaṁkāra. He applies the name Alaṁkāra to it because he follows Daṇḍin's definition of Alaṁkāra as any element that beautifies poetry, Kāvya-śobhākara-dharma. It would thus seem that Bhoja makes Rasa also Vācya-śobhākara. But it cannot be forgotten that he makes Rasa the chief element and subordinates both Guṇa and Alaṁkāra (and in the latter Rītis, Vṛttis etc., are included) to it as the means of its securing.

How is this Rasa to be secured? How is its non-divorce from the composition, Aviyoga, to be achieved? The poet has to see that Rasa is not absent, not only from verse or sentence, Vākya, but also from the poem as a whole, Prabandha. The means to secure this Rasa-aviyoga in Vākya as well as Prabandha are the avoidance of flaws, Doṣa-hāna, the taking in of Guṇas, Guṇādāna, and the adding of figures, Alaṁkāra-yoga. Though, generally speaking, all flaws have to be avoided, all Guṇas and Alaṁkāras have to be utilised, the poet has to see that he does not fail to avoid certain flaws which are specially antagonistic to Rasa namely, all kinds of vulgarity, Aślīla-amaṅgala-ghṛṇāvadartha-grāmya, to take in among Guṇas the Guṇa of Kānti and among Alaṁkāras (of Śabda) the Rītis and the Vṛttis. These three are most related to Rasa. He says in the *Śṛ. Pra.* (p. 356, Vol. II):

तस्य अवियोगो द्विधा–वाक्यविषयः, प्रबन्धविषयश्च। तयोर्वाक्यविषयः अश्लीलामङ्गलघृणावदर्थ-ग्राम्यमित्यादिदोषहानेन, दीप्तरसत्वं कान्तिरित्यादिगुणोपादानेन, कैशिकीवैदर्भीत्यलंकारयोगेन च।

and in the *S. K. Ā.* :

पश्यति स्त्रीति वाक्ये हि न रसः प्रतिभासते। (शब्दग्राम्य)
विलोकयति कान्तेति व्यक्तमेव प्रतीयते॥ (शब्द-अग्राम्य)

कन्ये कामयमानं मां न त्वं कामयसे कथम्। } अर्थग्राम्य
इति ग्राम्योऽयमर्थात्मा वैरस्यायैव कल्पते॥ }
कामं कन्दर्पचण्डालो मयि वामाक्षि निर्दयः। } and
त्वयि निर्मत्सरो दिष्ट्येत्यग्राम्यार्थो रसावहः॥ } अर्थ–अग्राम्य

नवोऽर्थः **सूक्तिरग्राम्या** श्राव्यो बन्धः स्फुटा श्रुतिः।
अलौकिकार्था युक्तिश्च रसमाहर्तुमीशते॥ V. Śls. 4-7.

Since Guṇas are also Alaṁkāra and since in a given piece of poetry, we do not separately see one or the other element of Alaṁkāra but feel and enjoy only the combined presence of all, the combination of all the Alaṁkāras, Nānālaṁkāra-saṁsṛṣṭi is the greatest means of securing Rasa-aviyoga.

—तथापि नानालङ्कारसंसृष्टावेव प्रकृष्टत्वं लभते।" P. 357, Vol. II. (See also Alaṁkāra Chapter above).

Just as in a Vākya, in a Prabandha or work as a whole, Rasāviyoga is secured by Doṣa-hāna, Guṇādāna and Alaṁkāra-yoga. There are Doṣas, Guṇas and Alaṁkāras of a work as a whole. When a story from the epics or the well-known story-books like the *Bṛhatkathā* is taken by a poet and changes suitable to the Rasa are introduced by the poet by eliminating those

bits of the story that are inappropriate to the Rasa which he wants to delineate, the poet is said to have avoided theme-flaws, Prabandha-doṣas. Bhoja illustrates from many dramas how the original story has been altered by poets. This Prabandha-doṣa-hāna is the first means of securing Prabandha-rasa-aviyoga. The features that go up to make the story of a poem or drama, well-knit and embellished with all excellences, constitute the Guṇas and the Alaṁkāras of the Prabandha.

"सोऽयं वाक्यविषयो रसावियोग उक्तः। प्रबन्धविषय उच्यते। सोऽपि दोषहानेन गुणोपादानेन अलंकारसंकरेण च प्रकाशमानो मनीषिणां मनःप्रहर्षहेतुर्भवति। **तत्र दोषहानमनौचित्यादिपरिहारेण**[1] यथा—मायाकैकेयीदशरथाभ्यां रामः प्रवासितः न मातापितृभ्यामिति निर्दोषदशरथे × × × × × × × × । P. 410. Vol. II.

एवमन्यदपि दोषहानमुदाहार्यम्। गुणोपादानं तु वक्ष्यमाणप्रबन्धभेदानां **सम्यक् इलक्ष्णयोगेन संविधान [क] स (सु) सूत्रता**। तेष्वेव नगरार्णववर्णनादीनां सन्निवेशप्राशस्त्यमलंकारसंकर इति। तदुक्तम्—

औचित्यं वचसां प्रकृत्यनुगतं, सर्वत्र पात्रोचिता
पुष्टिः स्वावसरे रसस्य च, कथामार्गे न चातिक्रमः।
शुद्धिः प्रस्तुतसंविधानकविधौ, प्राढिश्च शब्दार्थयोः,
विद्वद्भिः परिभाव्यतामवहितैरेतावदेवास्तु नः॥[2] P. 411."

"तत्र गुणो द्वेधा, शब्दगुणः, अर्थगुणश्च।
अलंकारोऽपि शब्दालंकारः अर्थालंकारश्च।
ताभ्यामुभयगुणालंकारो व्याख्यातः।
तत्र महाकाव्यादौ etc.[3]" P. 430 ff

These features are mentioned as Guṇas and Alaṁkāras so far as an epic poem, Mahākāvya, is concerned. In a drama, the Avasthās, Artha-prakṛtis, Sandhis and their Aṅgas, the Lakṣaṇas—all these are Alaṁkāras of Prabandha. That is, Bhoja requires that every bit of the work shall contribute towards establishing the eternal presence of Rasa in it. Every feature of the poem and the drama is for the sake of Rasa; for, Alaṁkāra is given as the supreme means of the end called Rasa.

In accordance with his allegiance to Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin (to the latter in a larger measure), Bhoja considers the Rasas as Rasavad-alaṁkāra or Rasa-ukti, expression dominated by Rasa, Rasa-pradhāna. He definitely explains Rasokti as the expression or Vākya in which Rasa is portrayed through

1. See ch. on Aucitya in my *Some Concepts of Alaṁkāra Śāstra*, Adyar Library Series, pp. 204-6, 218-9, 234.

2. This verse is from the prologue of Yaśovarman's *Rāmābhyudaya*; the bit 'Kathāmārge na cātikramaḥ' is quoted by Ānandavardhana. See ch. on Aucitya, *ibid.*, pp. 204-6.

3. I have quoted the texts on these Prabandha-guṇas and Prabandha-alaṁkāras of Śabda, Artha and both and explained them in the chapters on Guṇa and Alaṁkāra. See above pp. 321-324 and 412-417. See also the chapter on Bhoja and Vākrokti, pp. 127-9.

the conditions developing it namely, Vibhāva, Anubhāva and Vyabhicāribhāva.

विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगात्तु रसनिष्पत्तौ रसोक्तिरिति। P. 372, Vol. II. *Śṛ. Pra.*

That is, what Ānandavardhana and his followers would call a case of Rasa, Bhoja would call a case of Rasokti. This Rasokti, as has often been pointed out above, is one department of poetic expression or Ukti, the other two being Vakrokti and Svabhāvokti, expressions figurative and natural. All these three are three kinds of the poet's beautiful expression, i.e., three kinds of Alaṁkāra. Bhoja quotes Daṇḍin here and, following him, considers the Guṇas and the Rasas also as Alaṁkāra. I have already explained this position of Bhoja fully in the chapter on Bhoja's Conception of Alaṁkāra, (p. 407, above) where I have also quoted the relevant text from Bhoja. On page 388 Bhoja says :

"एवमवस्थापिते गुणरसतदाभासभावानामलंकारत्वे—" *Śṛ. Pra.* II.

When all these features of beauty in Kāvya are Alaṁkāra, there is nothing but Alaṁkāra in the realm of poetry. In a given place, having Guṇas, Śabdālaṁkāras, Arthālaṁkāras and Rasas, what we have, according to Bhoja, is the combined presence of various kinds of Alaṁkāra, Nānā-Alaṁkāra-Samsṛṣṭi, and therefore, as mentioned already, this one fact of Nānā-Alaṁkāra-Samsṛṣṭi is the sole means of securing Rasa-aviyoga in poetry.

But there is this difference between Bhoja's position and the positions of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin ; and Bhoja's position is a distinct advance. In Bhāmaha we had the state of affairs which included under the concept of Vakrokti the two other concepts of Svabhāvokti and Rasavad-alaṁkāra. That is, by virtue of this strikingness characteristic of a poet's expression, even the so-called natural description and the portrayal of pure emotion also were classed as Vakra-ukti, striking expression. Daṇḍin followed and separated Svabhāvokti, since it involved least deviation from the existing nature of things. He divided the realm of poetic expression into Vakrokti and Svabhāvokti and the latter, he described as Ādyā Alaṁkṛtiḥ, since it served as the basis for the further operation of the poet's skill in the line of Vakrokti. But Daṇḍin still had the Rasas under Vakrokti. This was felt to be illogical, for if the delineation of Rasa can be clubbed together with another, it can with propriety be linked with Svabhāvokti and not Vakrokti. For, while Svabhāvokti described the nature of things as they were, Raskoti described the nature of emotions as they were. As different from these two, Vakrokti described both the nature of things and emotions in a figurative manner. So Bhoja made the more scientific analysis and released the Rasas from being kept under Vakrokti. Bhoja therefore had three Uktis, Svabhāva-, Vakra- and Rasa Uktis. This has been explained at length in the chapters on Ukti, Svabhāvokti, Vakrokti, and Bhoja's Conception of Alaṁkāra. (See above pp. 116-7, 121, 143-4 and 411. See also ch. on Svabhāvokti in my *Some Concepts of Alaṁkāra Śāstra,* pp. 103, 109).

It was noted above that, to prove that Rasas also are Alaṁkāra, Bhoja quoted the verse of Daṇḍin प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानम् etc. Daṇḍin mentions here three Alaṁkāras, Preyas, Ūrjasvi and Rasavad. And Daṇḍin remarks that these three are superior युक्तोत्कर्षं च तत् त्रयम्. This is also plain from his combining the three together. It has been pointed out by his commentator that the speciality or superiority attached to these three is due to their being of the form of Bhāvas and Rasas. This is also the straight and plain meaning of Daṇḍin's remark, युक्तोत्कर्षं च तत् त्रयम्. Bhoja made Preyas and Ūrjasvi into his Preyān and Udātta Rasas and brought them under Rasavad. Thus he did not have the three separately.

Bhoja exploits this verse for establishing his new-found Ahaṁkāra theory of Rasa having three phases. He puts a strained meaning upon the expression 'Yuktotkarṣam ca tat trayam'. Bhoja says that the three, Preyas, Rasavad and Ūrjasvi become Rasas and Ahaṁkāra when they are 'Yuktotkarṣa' and when they are not 'Yuktotkarṣa' they are Guṇas called Preyas, Bhāvikatva, and Aurjitya. See pp. 613-4. *S. K. Ā.* (The passage occurs in the same manner in Chapter XI of the *Śṛ. Pra.*). It is very difficult to understand what Bhoja is driving at here. Daṇḍin's meaning of the Utkarṣa is plain, as has been explained above. How are the three Yuktotkarṣas when they are Rasas, and how do they lose their Utkarṣa and become the Guṇas which Bhoja gives as corresponding to them? Bhoja equates here Preyorasa with the Guṇa Preyas, Rasavad with Bhāvika guṇa and Ūrjasvi with Aurjitya guṇa. Bhoja seems to forget here how he had defined these three Guṇas in the Guṇa section in their two aspects as pertaining to Śabda and Artha.

Taking Ūrjasvi, we can see that by the Ūrjasvi rasa, Bhoja means first of all the Udātta rasa characterising the Dhīrodātta hero and then the Ahaṁkāra which is his new Rasa. This Ahaṁkāra can be considered to be Yuktotkarṣa, for Bhoja considers it as the summit (Śṛṅgāra : येन शृङ्गं रीयते) and as lying at the root of all the good qualities of man. He says in the *Śṛ. Pra.*

1. सर्वात्मसंपदुदयातिशयैकहेतुः ।
2. शृङ्गारो हि नाम × × आत्मगुणसंपदामुत्कर्षबीजम् × ×
3. अनेकजन्मानुभवजनितात्तु संस्कारादुत्कृष्यते ।

Corresponding to this Ūrjasvi, Bhoja gives the Guṇa of Aurjitya as Ayuktotkarṣa. Does he mean Śabda-aurjitya or Artha-aurjitya? The former, he cannot mean, for it is defined as Gāḍha bandhatva. He must therefore mean Artha-aurjitya. And he defines, illustrates and explains it thus :

रूढाहंकारता और्जित्यं, यथा—
उमा वधूर्भवान् दाता याचितार इमे वयम् ।
वरः शंभुरलं ह्येष त्वत्कुलेद्भूतये विधिः ॥
अत्रेमे वयं इत्यात्मान्वितव्रतचर्यादिसमुत्थप्रौढाहंकारप्रतिपादनादौर्जित्यम् ॥

This corresponds to his conception of the Udātta rasa of the Dhīrodātta which he calls by the very name Ūrjasvi in *Śṛ. Pra.* and holds as the manifestation of Ahaṁkāra, in such cases as the dignified personal reference by the plural 'We'. The same definition of the Ūrjasvi-alaṁkāra or Rasa given by Daṇḍin is taken here as the definition of the Guṇa of Aurjitya and Ratneśvara not only makes no difference but even identifies Ūrjasvi and Aurjitya as referring to the same, new, basic Ahaṁkāra Rasa of Bhoja.

Similarly, taking Preyas, the Artha-guṇa Preyas is absolutely irrelevant here. The Śabda-guṇa is defined as 'प्रियतराख्यानम्.' This is Daṇḍin's definition of Preyo-rasa or Preyolaṁkāra and here also we are not able to see the difference of Yuktotkarṣatva and Ayuktotkarṣatva between the Rasa and the Guṇa.

We shall examine the pair Bhāvikatva and Rasavat. The Śabdabhāvika is thus defined and illustrated :

भावतो वाक्यवृत्तिर्या भाविकं तदुदाहृतम् । यथा–'एह्येहि वत्स रघुनन्दन पूर्णचन्द्र etc.' अत्र **हर्षवशाद् अनौचित्येनापि** 'वन्देऽथवा चरणपुष्करकद्वयम्' इत्यादीनामुक्तत्वात् भाविकत्वम् ॥

P. 58, *S. K. Ā.*, I.

Ratneśvara, in his comments upon this, explains Bhāvika as the flow of words from a heart filled with emotion, Bhāva.

हर्षादिभावितचेतसो हि वीचिप्रायाः उक्तिभेदाः प्रादुर्भवन्ति, यैरप्रत्यूहमेव भावोऽभिव्यज्यते । तदिदमुक्तं या भावतो वाचः काव्यरूपायाः प्रवृत्तिः सैव भाविकम् ।

All Vācika-abhinaya is thus Bhāvika. Bhoja points out that it is utterance under *stress* of emotion. Ratneśvara gives another illustration where Rāma's joy breaks into wave after wave of loving expression, इयं गेहे लक्ष्मीः etc. (*Uttararāmacarita*). This is not a case of Bhāva-kāvya, for the Viśrānti here is only in Rasa. Where does the occasion for the Ayuktotkarṣa come at all ?

Bhoja's Artha-bhāvika is a minor variety of Vyājokti, a clever speech intended to deceive others. This is not relevant here for our discussion of Bhāva as Rasālaṁkāra and as Guṇa.

It also seems that if Bhoja wanted to equate the three Rasas with the three Guṇas, he must have equated the former with the latter as pertaining to Artha (Artha-guṇas) and not to Śabda (Śabda-guṇas)

Thus we can clearly see that, when at a later stage, Bhoja thought of pushing new wine into Daṇḍin's verse and put up some meaning on Daṇḍin's phrase 'Yuktotkarṣam ca tat trayam' by equating Preyas, Rasavad and Ūrjasvi Rasālaṁkāras with the three Guṇas of Preyas, Bhāvika and Aurjitya with the difference of the presence and absence respectively of Utkarṣa, he forgot completely how he had defined the three Guṇas in the Guṇa section.

As is clear from Ratneśvara's elucidation of these three Guṇas, Bhoja is repeating himself, even as he does in the case of the Rīti and the Vṛtti. Bhoja treats of the Rīti two times in the *Śṛ. Pra.*, once as Śabdālaṁkāra and

again as Anubhāva. Vṛtti, Bhoja treats of three times, once as Śabdālaṁkāra, a second time in the chapter on Drama and lastly under Anubhāvas. Similarly, we must accept that in the three Guṇas of Aurjitya, Preyas and Bhāvika, he is treating of the Bhāvas and the Rasas themselves which he is going to deal with in a further section. Rasa enters into Bhoja's scheme through many doors : once as the Artha-guṇa Kānti which, following Vāmana, Bhoja defines as a case of Dīpta-rasa ; again as the Artha-guṇa Aurjitya ; and again as the Śabda-guṇas of Preyas and Bhāvika ; these in addition to its main treatment under the heading Rasa-aviyoga. Similar is the case of Dhvani in the *Śṛ. Pra.* It comes first as the Guṇa of Śabda called Gāmbhīrya and then under Tātparya. That under these three Guṇas Bhoja means the Bhāvas and the Rasas themselves is plain from Ratneśvara's comments thereon which simply give succinctly under those Guṇas Bhoja's conception of Rasa, with the same expressions as used by Bhoja in the *Śṛ. Pra.* Therefore Bhoja's interpretation of the last foot of Daṇḍin's verse on these three Rasālaṁkāras is an after-thought and is difficult to be explained or justified.[1]

The Meaning of the Word Rasavad.

In Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, the word Rasavad must have meant the expression or Alaṁkāra *having* Rasa. The case is similar to the names of some of the other Alaṁkāras *Sa*sandeha, Bhrānti*mān*, etc. Bhoja explains the word thus : The suffix can be a 'Matvarthīya', possessive suffix or the 'Vat' which is used according to the Sūtras तेन तुल्यं क्रिया चेद् वतिः, तत्र तस्येव. The Matvarthīya is strictly inexplicable, because Rasas pertain to sentient beings and not to inanimate Kāvya ; but it can be explained in a way. Bhoja says that Kāvya can be called Rasavad, since it emanates from Rasa, i.e., it is the expression of characters who have Rasa. The case of Vat in the second sense also seems to be apparently inexplicable. For, the Kāvya is not comparable with Rasa nor is there anything in Kāvya which is like something which Rasa has. रस इव, रसस्येव वा। न च रसैस्तुल्यं वर्तते।

But even this can be explained. Bhoja says that this 'Vat' is used according to the Sūtra 'Tadarham'. That which is capable of expressing Rasa is Rasavad.

1. Bhoja goes into the grammar of the question also in his remarks on this verse of Daṇḍin and what it means for him. He explains the Matup suffix in all these words, Preyas, Rasavad and Ūrjasvi, and explains the significances of Bhūmā, Nindā, Praśamsā, Nityayoga, Atiśāyana and Saṁsarga with respect to these words as Guṇas and as Rasālaṁkāras. Nindā is absolutely out of question in respect of these three either as Guṇas or as Alaṁkāras (Rasas). Bhūmā and Atiśāyana apply to Ūrjasvi and Rasavad as Rasālaṁkāras and Praśamsā, Nityayoga and Samsarga, as Guṇas. In the case of Preyas, it is Atiśāyana as Guṇa, and as Rasālaṁkāra, its utkarṣa as contrasted with the Guṇa of the same name, is to be made out not by the suffix in the word itself, but externally from the qualifying expression 'yuktotkarṣam ca tat trayam.'

रसवतो रामादेर्यद्वचनं, तद्रसमूलत्वात् रसवत् ।
रसान् प्रतिपादयितुं यदर्हति तद्रसवत् ।[1] P. 370. Vol. II.

The Āśraya of Rasa.

It will be plain when we go into the new Ahaṁkāra theory of Rasa of Bhoja that the cultured individual as such is the seat of Rasa. The Ātman of the Rasika is the Āśraya of Rasa. The Rasika may be the spectator and the connoisseur, the poet, or the characters like Rama in the story. Thus primarily sentient and cultured beings are the seat of Rasa.

रसा हि सुखदुःखावस्थारूपाः । ते च शरीरिणां चैतन्यवतां, न काव्यस्य । तस्य शब्दार्थरूपतया अचेतनत्वेन etc. P. 369, Vol. II, *Śṛ. Pra.*

It is out of the Rasa called Ahaṁkāra in a character like Rāma that all his feelings arise. These feelings also are Rasa. The poetry which expresses these feelings can also be called the seat of Rasa. The actor who acts the character of the story is also Rasavān. The poet who expresses these feelings is also Rasavān.

रसवतो रामादेः यद्वचनं तद् रसमूलत्वाद् रसवत् । अभेदसमध्यारोपाच्च कविना अनुक्रियमाणस्य तस्य अनुकरणमपि रसवत् । P. 370, Vol. II, *Śṛ. Pra.*

शृङ्गारी चेत्कविः काव्ये जातं रसमयं जगत् ।
स एव चेदशृंगारी नीरसं सर्वमेव तत् ॥ *S. K. Ā.*, V.

cf. Abhinavagupta. कविर्हि सामाजिकतुल्य एव । तत एवोक्तं 'शृङ्गारी चेत् कविः' इत्याद्यानन्दवर्धनाचार्येण । *Abhi. Bhā.* p. 295, Vol. II.

To Bhoja, Rasa, *as ordinarily understood,* means what it meant to Daṇḍin and Lollaṭa, the Prakarṣa of the Sthāyi bhāva. It is in the character, in the poet, in the actor, and in the composition. To him Rasa does not mean *primarily only* the æsthetic subjective Samvāda of the Sahṛdaya and thus to him the Sahṛdaya is not the *only primary* seat of Rasa. Of his main concept of Rasa as the one principle of Ahaṁkāra underlying all feelings and activities, by which characters come into various moods, the poet is enabled to portray them, the actor is enabled to enact them, and the Rasika is enabled to enjoy them, the seat is the soul of all cultured men.

आत्मस्थितं गुणविशेषमहंकृतस्य
शृंङ्गागारमाहुरिह जीवितमात्मयोनेः ।
तस्यात्मशक्तिरसनीयतया रसत्वं
युक्तस्य येन रसिकोऽयमिति प्रवादः ॥ *Śṛ. Pra.*

1. Kuntaka has elaborately discussed the concept of Rasavad and the meaning and significance of the suffix in the word. He places it alongside with Svabhāvokti as Alaṁkārya and refuses to call it Alaṁkāra. He does not also accept the accepted meaning of Rasavad-alaṁkāra or Rasālaṁkāra as expounded by Ānandavardhana. Vide *V. J.* (De's Edn.) III. 10 pp. 156-166. See also pp. 174-7.

Bhoja clearly says that all men are not Rasikas. It is not all men that have the Rasa of Ahaṁkāra or Śṛṅgāra in them. One has to come by it, as by genius, by birth and one must have done numerous good deeds in the past lives to possess it.

किमेते रत्यादयः स्वेभ्यः स्वेभ्यः आलम्बनेभ्यः उत्पद्यमानाः सर्वस्याप्युत्पद्यन्ते, उत कस्यचिदेव। यदि तावत् सर्वस्य, तदा सर्वं जगद् रसिकं स्यात्। न चैतदस्ति, यतः कश्चिद्रसिकः कश्चित्तु नीरसो दृश्यते। न च दृष्टविपरीतं शक्यमनुज्ञातुम्। अतो न सर्वस्य रत्यादयो जायन्ते, अथ कस्यचित्। तत्र निमित्तमभिधानीयम्। तद् दृष्टमदृष्टं वा स्यात्। न तावद् दृष्टम्, अनुपलभ्यमानत्वात्। अदृष्टं तु साधारणम्, असाधारणं वा। साधारणे पूर्व एव दोषः, सर्वं जगद्रसिकं स्यादिति। असाधारणं तु प्रत्यगात्मगतानादिवासनानुबन्धिधर्मकार्यं भवितुमर्हति। *Śṛ. Pra.*, Vol. II.

The character, the actor, the poet, and the spectator must all be such Rasikas. If the poet is not one endowed with this Rasa, his Kāvya becomes Nīrasa ; if he has it, he renders the whole world Sarasa or Rasamaya. Bhoja quotes, putting his own meaning of Ahaṁkāra on the word Śṛṅgāra, the following verse of Ānandavardhana :

शृङ्गारी चेत्कविः काव्ये जातं रसमयं जगत्।
स एव चेदशृङ्गारी नीरसं सर्वमेव तत्॥ *S. K. Ā.*, V. 3.

Through Paramparā-sambandha, the poetic composition can also be called the seat of Rasa or Rasavat.[1]

Bhoja's Criticism of the Theory of Four Secondary Rasas From Four Primary Rasas.

Bharata says that of the eight Rasas, four are primary and that the other four rise out of the four primary Rasas.

तेषामुत्पत्तिहेतवः चत्वारो रसाः। तद्यथा—शृङ्गारो, रौद्रो, वीरो, बीभत्स इति। अत्र—

शृङ्गाराद्धि भवेद्धास्यः रौद्राच्च करुणो रसः।
वीराच्चैवाद्भुतोत्पत्तिः बीभत्साच्च भयानकः॥
शृङ्गारानुकृतिर्या तु स हास्यस्तु प्रकीर्तितः।
रौद्रस्य चैव यत्कर्म स ज्ञेयः करुणो रसः॥

1. Bhoja explained the word Rasika as one having Rasa, giving here the derivation of the possessive suffix of 'Matup'. It must be noted here that some theory of Rasa in drama, denoting a stage of development far advanced than the crudity involved in the habitual research-explanations of the words 'Śaubhika' and 'Granthika' occurring in the *Mahābhāṣya*, is presupposed by Patañjali in his Bhāṣya on V. ii. 95, where he gives as illustration the expression "रसिको नटः". This must mean that as an exhibitor of feelings, the actor is called Rasika, one having Rasa ; or as a master of his art and as one omniscient of the workings of emotion, he is a man of taste and æsthetic understanding ; for we have here a Matup suffix on the word Rasa. रसः अस्य अस्तीति रसिकः।

वीरस्यापि च यत्कर्म सोऽद्भुतः परिकीर्तितः ।
बीभत्सदर्शनं यत्र ज्ञेयः स तु भयानकः ॥ *N. Ś.* VI.

When Śṛṅgāra is imitated, Hāsya is produced, i.e., Śṛṅgāra-anukāra is the Vibhāva of Hāsya. The acts in Raudra result in Karuṇa; Raudra is Karuṇa's Vibhāva. The warrior's deeds of valour produce wonder, i.e., Vīra is the Vibhāva of Adbhuta. Bībhatsa-sights bring fear, i.e., Bībhatsa produces Bhayānaka. Bhoja states this scheme of Janya-janaka rasas of Bharata, illustrates it and then criticises it.

यथा चैते भावेभ्यो रसाः रसेभ्यो भावाः, तथा रसेभ्यश्च रसा भवन्तीति भरताचार्यः । तत्र शृङ्गाराद्धास्यरसनिष्पत्तिर्यथा—॥ × × × वीरादद्भुतनिष्पत्तिर्यथा × × × रौद्रात्करुणनिष्पत्तिर्यथा— × × × बीभत्साद्भयानकनिष्पत्तिर्यथा × × × एतच्चायुक्तम् । *Śṛ. Pra.*, Vol. II, pp. 376-7.

Bhoja gives his criticism on pp. 378-381. The four Prakṛti-rasas cannot be held to be the Vibhāvas of the four other Rasas respectively. For, we actually find instances of Anvaya and Vyatireka Vyabhicāra. From Śṛṅgāra, we do not have Hāsya as a rule and we see Hāsya being produced from elsewhere also. Instances there are where Karuṇa is produced from Rati and not all cases of Raudra produce Karuṇa. Nor is Karuṇa the only Rasa that is produced by Raudra. Raudra can cause Bhayānaka much more than Bībhatsa can do. Adbhuta can arise from Śṛṅgāra and even in Vīra, the Uttama prakṛtis have no Adbhuta at all. But Bhoja accepts Bharata when he says that the imitation of Śṛṅgāra produces laughter but Bhoja adds that one should not restrict the imitation to Śṛṅgāra because imitation as such and of anything and of any Rasa produces Hāsya.

अथोच्यते 'शृङ्गारानुकृतिर्येह स हास्यो रस इष्यते'
तर्हि 'वीरस्यानुकृतिर्येह सोऽपि हास्य इतीष्यताम् ॥ *Śṛ. Pra.*, Vol. II, p. 380.

Thus, with the above-noted limitations and modifications Bharata's scheme can be accepted, as one that does not state the things thoroughly but only indicates. As for instance, Bharata mentions in connection with the origin of Hāsya, the imitation of Śṛṅgāra only, because we find Hāsya in a large measure in love-dramas, as an auxiliary to love. Therefore it is that without posing himself as a critic of Bharata but as a commentator on his text, Abhinavagupta has explained Bharata thus: 'Hāsya is produced by the semblance and imitation, Ābhāsa and Anukāra, of Śṛṅgāra and this is indicative of the fact that the Ābhāsa and Anukāra of any Rasa will give rise to Hāsya.' Nor is Śṛṅgāra productive of Hāsya only; it gives rise to Karuṇa through Vipralambha as in the case of Rati in Canto IV of the *Kumārasambhava*. It gives rise to Vīra and Adbhuta. Raudra produces Karuṇa but Karuṇa is produced from other causes also. Vīra no doubt produces

Adbhuta but it produces fear also in the hearts of the enemies, even as Hāsya in the clown promotes love in the Nāyaka towards the Nāyikā who laughs at the clown's pranks. There is no rule that Bhayānaka is produced from Bībhatsa alone though, no doubt, the Vibhāvas of Bībhatsa may be the Vibhāvas of Bhayānaka also. Further, the Śṛṅgāra given by Bharata as one of the four Prakṛtis can itself be a Janya rasa. For, cases of Vīra produce Śṛṅgāra as in the stories of warriors, princes and heroes ; Abhinavagupta gives Draupadī's Svayamvara as an instance. Thus Bharata's text must be taken to mean as indicating a study of Rasas from the point of view of their inter-relation, of how emotions are closely related and of how one leads to another. (See *Abhi. Bhā.* Gaek. Edn. Pt. I, ch. vi. 296-299 ; the Gaek. Edn. being full of mistakes, I have given at the end of this section an edition of the relevant portion of the *Abhi. Bhā.* purified, with the help of Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri.) And Bhoja himself accepts that one Rasa is the Vibhāva of another, though no invariable or hard and fast rule between any two Rasas can be established.

हेतुत्वं तु तदुत्पत्तौ तस्यापि न निवार्यते ।

* * *

इत्यालम्बनहेतुभ्यो विभावेभ्यो न भिद्यते ॥[1] P. 381. Vol. II. *Śṛ. Pra.*

1. The *Daśarūpaka* (IV. 43-44 p. 123) holds that the Citta has four different kinds of states Vikāsa, Vistara, Kṣobha and Vikṣepa. These four are the states of the four Rasas which Bharata gives as the Prakṛti or primary Rasas, Śṛṅgāra, Vīra, Bībhatsa and Raudra. From these four, four others arise, for they also are of the same mental condition of Vikāsa etc. respectively.

D. R.—

स्वादः काव्यार्थसंभेदाद् आत्मानन्दसमुद्भवः ।
विकाशविस्तरक्षोभविक्षेपैस्स चतुर्विधः ॥
शृङ्गारवीरबीभत्स रौद्रेषु मनसः क्रमात् ।
हास्याद्भुतभयोत्कर्षकरुणानां त एव हि ॥
अतस्तज्जन्यता तेषामत एवावधारणम् ।

चतुर्धा चित्तभूमयो भवन्ति । तद्यथा शृङ्गारे विकासः, वीरे विस्तरः, बीभत्से क्षोभः, रौद्रे विक्षेप इति । तदन्येषां चतुर्णां हास्याद्भुतभयानककरुणानां स्वसामग्रीलब्धपरिपोषाणां त एव चत्वारः विकासाद्याः चेतसः संभेदाः । अत एव—"शृङ्गाराद्धि भवेद्धास्यः × × × बीभत्साच्च भयानकः ॥" इति । हेतुहेतुमद्भाव एव संभेदापेक्षया दर्शितः, न कार्यकारणभावाभिप्रायेण; तेषां कारणान्तरजन्यत्वात् । 'शृङ्गारानुकृतिर्या तु स हास्य इति कीर्तितः ।' इत्यादिना विकासादिसंभेदैकत्वस्यैव स्फुटीकरणादवधारणमपि । अत एव अष्टाविति संभेदानां भावात् ।

The *Daśarūpaka* supposes that Śṛṅgāra and Hāsya are Vikāsa ; Vīra and Adbhuta, Vistara ; Bībhatsa and Bhayānaka, kṣobha ; and Raudra and Karuṇa, Vikṣepa. Bhaṭṭanāyaka and Abhinavagupta have given only three mental states, Druti, Vistara and Vikāsa. Śṛṅgāra and Hāsya are Vikāsa ; Vīra and Adbhuta are Vistara and in these two cases we can justify an equation. But Bhaya is not the same

Bhoja's Critique of the Old Ideas on Rasa.

After having criticised in this manner Bharata's verses on the four Prakṛti Rasas producing four other derivative Rasas, Bhoja applies himself to the task of examining all the forty-nine Bhāvas given by Bharata in three classes of eight Sthāyins, thirty-three Vyabhicārins and eight Sāttvikas. He begins to seriously think of what made Bharata separate eight of them and give them the special position of Sthāyins with the right to become Rasas, put thirty-three Bhāvas as Vyabhicārins or Sañcārins attending like servants upon the eight Sthāyins, and lastly, give a small class of eight such servant-bhāvas as Sāttvikas. Bharata says in his Bhāvādhyāya, the seventh :

तत्राष्टौ भावाः स्थायिनः, त्रयस्त्रिंशद् व्यभिचारिणः, अष्टौ सात्विका इति त्रिभेदाः। एवमेते काव्यरसाभिव्यक्तिहेतव एकोनपञ्चाशद् भावाः प्रत्यवगन्तव्याः। × × × ×

Bharata says that eight Bhāvas are Sthāyins, thirty-three Vyabhicārins and eight Sāttvikas. Bharata himself then asks the question that if Rasas are produced by all these forty-nine Bhāvas coming into interplay, why should it be that only eight are capable of becoming Rasas. In answer, he asks another question : When all are men, why should certain men become kings or masters, while the rest obey and serve them ? The eight Bhāvas are called Sthāyins and they become Rasas because they are, by nature, major and the thirty-three Bhāvas are only subservient to those eight, because they are by nature minor. The former are permanent by nature and the latter transient by nature.

अत्राह—यदि काव्यार्थसंश्रितैः विभावानुभावव्यञ्जितैः एकोनपञ्चाशद्भावैः सामान्यगुणयोगेन अभिनिष्पद्यन्ते रसाः, तत्कथं स्थायिन एव भावाः रसत्वमाप्नुवन्ति ? उच्यते; यथाहि—

× × × × × ×

यथा नराणां नृपतिः शिष्याणां च यथा गुरुः।
एवं हि सर्वभावानां भावः स्थायी महानिह॥

Kṣobha as that of Bībhatsa. Raudra is not Vikṣepa but is Dīpti, similar to the Vistara of Adbhuta. Karuṇa is similar to Vipralambha śṛṅgāra as Ānandavardhana says and is the height of Druti. Therefore the justification or the explanation of the scheme of four primary Rasas producing four other Rasas on the basis of the respective identity of the mental states of those Rasas does not seem to be correct.

Criticising this scheme of four primary mental states responsible for four primary and four secondary Rasas, which is given as an argument by somebody for proving the existence of eight Rasas, Bhaṭṭa Nṛsimha, commentator on Bhoja's *S. K. Ā.* (Mad. MS.) says that the states of mind cannot be four, for Vikāsa and Vistara are identical, as also Vikṣobha and Vikṣepa. Hence there can be only two primary states. He however does not accept two, but gives only one state called Rasa or Svāda. See extracts from his Commentary appended to the previous chapter on Bhoja's Conception of Rasa in the *S. K. Ā.*

These eight alone were considered as capable of being nourished into the relishable state called Rasa. The Vyabhicārins were held to be incapable of being so nourished. But Rudraṭa thought this ruling to be rather arbitrary. He said : Rasa is so called because it is enjoyed रसनाद् रसत्वमेषाम्— and Bharata also says so :

अत्राह–रस इति कः पदार्थः। उच्यते-आस्वाद्यत्वात्।

N. Ś. VI, p. 289, Gaek. Edn. I.

This quality of relishability pertains also to the other Bhāvas. So Rudraṭa considered Nirveda and other Vyabhicārins also as Rasas besides the eight Sthāyins. He even considered the eight Sāttvikas also to be capable of becoming Rasas. Rudraṭa said :

रसनाद्रसत्वमेषां मधुरादीनामिवोक्तमाचार्यैः।
निर्वेदादिष्वपि तन्निकाममस्तीति तेऽपि रसाः॥

Bhoja's mind flows along this current of thought. Bhoja quotes this verse of Rudraṭa and views like him that all the forty-nine Bhāvas can be Rasas, provided poets develop them.

To begin with, Bhoja says that Rasas are not eight only ; there are four more Rasas, Śānta, Preyas, Udātta or Ūrjasvi and Uddhata.

न चाष्टावेवेति नियमः, यतः शान्तं, प्रेयांसम्, उद्धतम्, ऊर्जस्विनं च केचिद्रसमाचक्षते। तन्मूलाश्च किल नायकानां धीरशान्त धीरललित धीरोद्धत धीरोदात्त व्यपदेशाः। × × ×

अत्र शमप्रकृतिः शान्तः, स्नेहप्रकृतिः प्रेयान्, गर्वप्रकृतिरुद्धतः, अहंकारप्रकृतिः पुनरोजस्वीति शृङ्गारादिवदेतेष्वपि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगो द्रष्टव्यः।

अन्ये त्वाहुः[1] सर्व एव रत्यादयः विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसञ्चारिसंयोगाद् उत्पद्यमानाः भूमानमापन्ना रसीभवन्ति। तथाहि—

'रसनाद् रसत्वमेषाम् × × तेऽपि रसाः॥ (रुद्रटालङ्कारे)

सर्वेषां च तुल्ये रसत्वे रत्यादीनामेव परप्रकर्षगामिनां शृङ्गारव्यपदेश इति न घटते।[2]

Śṛ. Pra. Vol. II. pp. 377-8.

1. 'Tu' is used here in the sense of 'Ca'.

2. Rudrabhaṭṭa's *Śṛṅgāratilaka* also holds the view found in the *Rudraṭālaṁkāra* that the Vyabhicārins and the Sāttvikas also are capable of becoming Rasas. At the end of the enumeration of the Vyabhicārins, Rudrabhaṭṭa says :

त्रयस्त्रिंशदिमे भावाः **प्रयान्ति च रसस्थितिम्।** I. 14.

At the end of the enumeration of the eight Sāttvikas, he says :

भावा **एवातिसंपन्नाः प्रयान्ति रसतामिमे।**

Bhoja makes a slight change in the list of forty-nine Bhāvas. He omits Bharata's Apasmāra and Maraṇa and in their place gives Īrṣyā and Śama.[1] Out of this list of Vyabhicārins, Bhoja first chooses two, Śama and Garva, and shows them as capable of becoming the Sthāyins which develop into the Śānta and Uddhata rasas. In his *S. K. Ā.* he has enumerated Sneha as a Vyabhicārin, omitting Śama which he includes as a sub-variety under Dhṛti which is itself held as the Sthāyin of Śama in the *S. K. Ā.* That Sneha is pointed out as another Sañcārin becoming the Sthāyin for the Preyo rasa. In the *S. K. Ā.* the Ūrjasvi Rasa of which the *Śṛ. Pra.* gives Ahaṁkāra as the Sthāyin is given as the Udātta Rasa with the Vyabhicārin Mati becoming its Sthāyin.

रतौ सञ्चारिणः सर्वान् गर्वस्नेहौ धृतिं मतिम् ।
स्थास्नूनेवोद्धतप्रेयःशान्तोदात्तेषु जानते ॥ *S. K. Ā.*, V. 23.

Having pointed out these four Vyabhicārins becoming Sthāyins and Rasa to illustrate his point, Bhoja says in his *Śṛ. Pra.* that all Bhāvas can be taken to the state of Prakarṣa and made Rasa with their respective Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins.

ग्लान्यादयोऽपि हि श्रमादिभिः परं प्रकर्षम् आरोप्यन्ते । *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II. p. 354.
हर्षादिष्वपि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगस्य विद्यमानत्वात् । *Ibid* p. 355.
रत्यादीनामेकोनपञ्चाशतोऽपि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगात्
परप्रकर्षाधिगमे रसव्यपदेशार्हता । *Ibid* p. 381.

Not only are the Vyabhicārins capable of becoming Sthāyins and Rasa but Sāttvikas also. Therefore the classification of Bharata of the forty-nine

1. P. 86. *K. A.* Hemacandra mentions Dambha, Udvega, Kṣut and Tṛṣṇā as additional Vyabhicārins which can be included in one or the other of the thirty-three. P. 177, *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra proposes the additional Vyabhicārins Kṣut, Tṛṣṇā, Maitrī, Muditā, Śraddhā, Dayā, Upekṣā, Arati (the Gaek. Edn. is not correct in its reading here), Santoṣa, Kṣamā, Mārdava, Ārjava, Dākṣiṇya etc. (The *Nāṭyadarpaṇa's* conception of Rasa and its ideas on other related issues is an interesting study by itself). Śiṅgabhūpāla criticises extra Vyabhicārins like Udvega, Sneha, Dambha and Irṣyā. Bhānudatta proposes the additional Vyabhicārin of Chala. Bhānudatta proposes also an additional Sāttvika namely, Jṛmbhā, yawning. Vādijaṅghāla on Daṇḍin I. 18. रसभावनिरन्तर says सञ्चारिव्यभिचारिभेदाः चतुस्त्रिंशत् । He thus gives thirty-four Vyabhicārins. Rūpagosvāmin, in his scheme of Madhura rasa, accepts at first the traditional thirty-three Vyabhicārins and adds afterwards thirteen more general Vyabhicārins and again another special list of some more additional Vyabhicārins under some individual Rasas. See Dr. S. K. De "The Bhaktirasa śāstra of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism", *I. H. Q.* Dec. 1932. p. 633. De adds that the thirteen general Vyabhicārins added by Rūpagosvāmin are included by himself in one or the other of the thirty-three traditional Vyabhicārins.

See also my *Number of Rasas*, Adyar Library Series, pp. 158-162.

In the *Śṛ. Pra.* Bhoja gives Preyorasa as having Sneha as its Sthāyin and Ūrjasvi with Ahaṁkāra as its Sthāyin. These two Bhāvas are not enumerated at all by Bhoja in the *Śṛ. Pra.* Bhāvas for other strange Rasas spoken of by him both in the *S. K. Ā.* and in the *Śṛ. Pra.* are not given (by him) definitely anywhere.

Bhāvas into eight fixed Sthyāyins, thirty-three Vyabhicārins and eight Sāttvikas goes. All of them are Sthāyins or Sañcārins according to time, circumstance, condition and nature of man. If a poet nourishes them with their suitable attendant emotional circumstances of the nature of Vibhāvas etc., even the Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas become Rasas. When one Bhāva becomes Sthāyin and Rasa, the rest become its Vyabhicārins. Even the so-called Sthāyins and so-called Sāttvikas are Vyabhicārins inasmuch as, in a given Rasa, all of them appear to heighten it. Again, all the forty-nine are Sāttvikas since all of them are born of Manas, and Manas it is that is called Sattva.

नन्वष्टौ स्थायिनः, अष्टौ सात्विकाः, त्रयस्त्रिंशद् व्यभिचारिणः इति ब्रुवते। न तत् साधु। यतोऽमीषामन्यतमस्यैतैरेव परस्परं निर्वर्त्यमानत्वात् कश्चित् कदाचित् स्थायी, कदाचित्तु व्यभिचारी। अतोऽवस्थावशात् सर्वेऽप्यमी व्यभिचारिणः, सर्वेऽपि च स्थायिनः, सात्विका अपि सर्व एव, मनःप्रभवत्वात्। अनुपहतं हि मनः सत्त्वमिति उच्यते। *Śr. Pra.* Vol. II. pp. 354-5.

Before Abhinavagupta and before Ānandavardhana, Lollaṭa held such a view of Rasa. We learn of such a position of his from two references to it in the *Abhi. Bhā.* Lollaṭa held that the threefold classification of the forty-nine Bhāvas had not much meaning, that according to circumstance, any Bhāva could become Rasa, that Sthāyitva and Vyabhicāritva were names of states and not arbitrarily fixed names of certain Bhāvas only and that as a matter of fact Rasas were infinite, though according to vogue in literary circles, only eight or nine were being spoken of.

एतावन्त एव च रसा इत्युक्तं पूर्वम्। तेन आनन्त्येऽपि पार्षदप्रसिद्धया एतावतामेव प्रयोज्यत्वमिति यद् **भट्टलोल्लटेन** निरूपितं तदवलेपेन अपरामृश्येत्यलम्।

Abhi. Bhā. p. 299, Gaek. Edn., Pt. I.

तेन **रसान्तरसंभवेऽपि** पार्षदप्रसिद्धया संख्यानियम इति यदन्यैरुक्तं (लोल्लटादिभिः) तत्प्रत्युक्तम्। *Ibid.* p. 341.

That the three names Sthāyin, Vyabhicārin and Sāttvika are interchangeable is also pointed out by Abhinavagupta himself.

तेषां तु योग्यतावशाद् यथायोगं स्थायिसञ्चारिविभावानु (दि?) रूपता संभवति। *Ibid.* p. 343.

जुगुप्सां च व्यभिचारित्वेन शृङ्गारे निषेधन्मुनिः (p. 307) भावानां सर्वेषामेव स्थायित्वसञ्चारित्व–चित्ततत्ताजत्व(means सात्त्विकत्व) अनुभावत्वानि योग्यतोपनिपतितानि शब्दार्थबलाकृष्टानि अनुजानाति। *Ibid.* p. 334.

It is writers like Lollaṭa who held that, since Vyabhicārins also can become Rasas, they have their own Vyabhicārins. Abhinavagupta says :

अन्ये तु—× × × इति व्यभिचारिणामपि च व्यभिचारिणो भवन्ति। यथा निर्वेदस्य चिन्ता, श्रमस्य निर्वेद इत्यादि निरूपयन्ति॥ *Ibid.* p. 346.

These writers and interpreters of Bharata therefore held that Bharata did not give the number of the Sthāyins. Says Abhinavagupta : " स्थायिषु संख्या नोक्ते-

त्यपरे।" This 'Apare' refers to writers like Lollaṭa with whom Rasas were numerous and consequently the Sthāyins were also numerous.

It can be understood easily that Sthāyins also are Vyabhicārins. That is why that having once described them as Sthāyins developing into Rasa in the sixth chapter on Rasa, Bharata again describes them in the seventh, the Bhāvādhyāya. And certainly Sthāyins become Vyabhicārins; Hāsa comes up to help Śṛṅgāra; Vīra and Adbhuta come up in Śṛṅgāra. Bhānudatta says :

स्थायिनोऽपि व्यभिचरन्ति। हासः शृङ्गारे। रतिः शान्तकरुणहास्येषु। भयशोकौ करुणशृङ्गारयोः। क्रोधो वीरे। जुगुप्सा भयानके। उत्साहविस्मयौ सर्वरसेषु व्यभिचारिणौ। *Ras. Tar.* V.

The commentary on the *Vyaktiviveka* also says :

स्थायिनामपि व्यभिचारित्वं भवति। यथा रतेर्देवादिविषया(याः), हासस्य शृङ्गारादौ, शोकस्य विप्रलंभशृङ्गारादौ, क्रोधस्य प्रणयक्रोपादौ, विस्मयस्य वीरादौ, उत्साहस्य शृङ्गारादौ, भयस्याभिसारिकादौ, जुगुप्सायाः संसारनिन्दादौ, शमस्य कोपाभिहतस्य प्रसादोद्गमादौ।" Pp. 11-12. TSS.

And Abhinavagupta says that in Śānta rasa, all the Sthāyins from Rati to Vismaya become Vyabhicārins :

तत्त्वज्ञानं च सकलभावान्तरभित्तिस्थानीयं सर्वस्थायिभ्यः स्थायितमं **सर्वा रत्यादिकाः चित्तवृत्तीः व्यभिचारीभावयन्** etc. p. 337.

Earlier, he says that Bharata's text itself grants this, that Sthāyins become Vyabhicārins. The advocates of Nirveda as the Sthāyin of Śānta say that since Bharata's text prohibits Jugupsā as a Vyabhicārin in Śṛṅgāra, it implies that all Sthāyins become Vyabhicārins also. See p. 307, Gaek. Edn., Pt. I.

व्यभिचारिणश्चास्य आलस्यौग्र्यजुगुप्सावर्जाः।
जुगुप्सां च व्यभिचारित्वेन शृङ्गारे निषेधन्॥ etc. p. 334.

Again we find on p. 270 : "स्थायिन एते तु व्यभिचारिणोऽपि भवन्ति।"

The *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* says on p. 176 : "—स्थायिनः क्रमात्। III. 126.

× × तेनामी (स्थायिनः) रसान्तराणां व्यभिचारिणः अनुभावाश्च भवन्ति, तत्रैषामागन्तुकत्वेन स्थायित्वाभावात्॥

The list of Vyabhicārins itself contains such Bhāvas as Trāsa, Viṣāda, and Amarṣa which are only lower degrees, 'Vyabhicārin-grades', of the Sthāyins Bhaya, Śoka and Krodha. Śārṅgadeva clearly puts the matter thus :

रत्यादयः स्थायिभावाः स्युर्भूयिष्ठविभावजाः।
स्तोकैर्विभावैरुत्पन्नाः त एव व्यभिचारिणः॥
रसान्तरेष्वपि तदा यथायोगं भवन्ति ते।
यथा हि हासः शृङ्गारे रतिः शान्ते च दृश्यते॥
वीरे क्रोधः भयं शोके जुगुप्सा च भयानके।
उत्साहविस्मयौ सर्वरसेषु व्यभिचारिणौ॥

On this point there is no controversy. Similarly also regarding the applicability of the name Sāttvika to all the Bhāvas. Surely Sattva means Manas and as all Bhāvas are mental moods, they are all Sāttvikas. Sāttvika also means, from the point of view of the actor, to whom also as Abhinavagupta points out often (see p. 346, Gaek. Edn., Pt. I.) Bharata's *Nāṭya Śāstra* is given as practical teaching, those Bhāvas in the acting of which the actor has to enter into the mind and show. Though such acting is common to all Bhāvas, it is true of most of the Sāttvikas for, a tear has to be shown by an actual tear and horripilation by horripilation. Says Bharata on this point :

अत्राह–किमन्ये भावाः सत्त्वेन विना अभिनीयन्ते यस्माद् उच्यते एते सात्त्विका इति। अत्रोच्यते, एवमेतत्। कस्मात्—

इह हि सत्त्वं नाम मनःप्रभवम्। तच्च समाहितमनस्त्वादुच्यते मनसः समाधौ सत्त्वनिष्पत्तिर्भवतीति। तस्य च योऽसौ स्वभावः रोमाञ्चाश्रुवैवर्ण्यादिलक्षणः यथाभावोपगतः स न शक्यो अन्यमनसा कर्तुमिति। लोकस्वभावानुकरणाच्च नाट्यस्य सत्त्वमीप्सितम्।

एतदेवास्य सत्वं दुखितेन प्रहृष्टेन वास्रुरोमाञ्चौ प्रदर्शयितव्यौ इति कृत्वा सात्विका भावा इत्यभिव्याख्याताः॥ *N. Ś.*, VII.

Śiṅgabhūpāla also says :

सर्वेऽपि सत्वमूलत्वाद् भावा यद्यपि सात्त्विकाः।
तथाप्यमीषां सत्त्वैकमूलत्वात् सात्त्विकप्रथा। *R. A. S.* I. 310.

On this point also there is no quarrel with Bhoja. The only point that must be refuted is his view, following that of Rudraṭa and Lollaṭa, that all Bhāvas can become Sthāyins and consequently Rasas. This we shall criticise in due course.

Now, Bhoja goes farther than both Rudraṭa and Lollaṭa who perhaps restricted themselves to the forty-nine Bhāvas found in Bharata and claimed only all of them as Rasas. Bhoja goes further and calls almost anything Rasa. He has a tendency to always enlarge the scope and meaning of terms. He speaks like Daṇḍin of Alaṁkāra as generally anything which gives beauty to a poem and brings under this Kāvyaśobhākaradharma-Alaṁkāra Guṇa, Figure, Rasa, Vṛttis, Sandhis, Lakṣaṇas etc. So also Bhoja enlarges the meaning of the word Rasa as anything relished, on the basis of the root-meaning of the word itself. रसनाद् रसः। आस्वाद्यत्वात् रसः। Thus he speaks in the *Śṛ. Pra.*, as also in Chapter V of the *S. K. Ā.*, of Ānanda rasa developing from Harṣa as its Sthāyin. He quotes the *Amaruka* verse दृष्टे लोचनवर्त्मना and calls this an instance of Harṣa sthāyin developing into Ānanda rasa. *Śṛ. Pra.*, Vol. II, p. 394.

भावप्रशमसंकरो यथा—
दृष्टे लोचनवर्त्मना × × पादस्पृशि प्रेयसि। (Amaru)

अत्र कस्याश्चित् + + मानवत्याः **प्रियदर्शनालम्बनविभावादुत्पन्ने** प्रकृष्टरतिप्रभवे **प्रहर्षस्थायिभावे** तत्पाश्वोपसर्पणादिभिरुद्दीपनविभावैः उद्दीप्यमाने, समुत्पद्यमानेषु पुलकादिषु सुखात्मकेषु

व्यभिचारिषु × × × परप्रकर्षारोपणाद् आनन्दरसताम् आपद्यमाने स्थायिनि— etc.
(See also *S. K. Ā.* p. 636.)

And this same Ānanda rasa is held by him as the Rasa portrayed in the bit "Mudā vikasitam" at the end of the well-known verse राहोश्चन्द्रकलामिव etc., in the Śmaśānāṅka of the *Mālatīmādhava*. He gives a verse from the *Uttararāmacarita* विरोधो विश्रान्तः etc., (VI. 11) and holds as present in it the Rasas called Auddhatya, Svātantrya, Ānanda, Praśama and Pāravaśya.

अत्र वीर–औद्धत्य–स्वातन्त्र्यरसानाम्

आनंद-प्रशम-पारवश्य रसैः तिरस्क्रियमाणानाम् etc. pp. 394-5. Vol. II. *Śṛ. Pra.*
Vide p. 627, *S. K. Ā.* V.

On p. 399, Vol. II, *Śṛ. Pra.*, Bhoja quotes the verse अस्मिन्नगृह्यत पिनाकभृता and points out here the Rasas Sādhvasa, Vilāsa, Anurāga and Saṁgama.

"—साध्वसविलासानुरागसंगमरसैः अतिशय्यन्त इति—"
(Vide also p. 629, *S. K. Ā.*)

On p. 400, Vol. II, *Śṛ. Pra.* and on p. 630, *S. K. Ā.* he points out Nirveda as a Rasa in a certain verse. रसस्तु निर्वेद एवैकः । The largest number of such Rasas is found on p. 400 of *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II, (p. 431, *S. K. Ā.* V). Here a number of Vyabhicārins are simply called Rasas.

रसास्तु रत्युत्कर्षधृत्युत्कण्ठा आवेगविस्मयमतिवितर्कचिन्ताचपलताहासोत्साहस्तम्भगद्गदोन्माद-व्रीडावहित्थभयशंकाः —।"

In these places we meet with such things as Sādhvasa, Vilāsa, Pāravaśya etc., as Rasas besides Sāttvikas and Vyabhicārins. Sthāyins for these are not found given anywhere in the list of forty-nine Bhāvas or elsewhere in Bhoja. Here also Bhoja was not without companions and predecessors. In the *Abhi. Bhā.* we find that some held new Rasas with certain new Bhāvas as their Sthāyins which Bhāvas are not found in Bharata's list of forty-nine. Thus Bhakti, Śraddhā and Laulya were proposed as Rasas.

आर्द्रतास्थायिकः स्नेहो रस इति त्वसत् । × × × एषैव **गर्धस्थायिकस्य लौल्यरसस्य** प्रत्याख्याने सरणिर्मन्तव्या । × × एवं भक्तावपि वाच्यम् । P. 342, *Abhi. Bhā.*

अत एव ईश्वरप्रणिधानविषये **भक्तिश्रद्धे** × × ×
अङ्गमिति न तयोः पृथग्रसत्वेन गणनम् P. 450, *ibid.*

And the *Daśarūpaka* records a view that some considered Mṛgayā and Akṣa, hunt and dice, as two Rasas.

मृगयाक्षादयो रसाः ।

The *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* (Gaek. Edn., p. 163) records views which held other Rasas, Vyasana, Duḥka and Sukha.

संभवन्ति त्वपरेऽपि यथा गर्धस्थायी लौल्यः, आर्द्रतास्थायी स्नेहः **आसक्तिस्थायि व्यसनम्, अरतिस्थायि दुःखं, सन्तोषस्थायि सुखमित्यादि** केचिदेषां पूर्वोक्तेष्वेव अन्तर्भावमाहुः ।
See also p. 177.

Mṛgayā and Akṣa rasas especially mentioned by the *Daśarūpaka*, match Bhoja's Pāravaśya, Svātantrya, Saṁgama and other Rasas.

Criticism of this View of Rasa.

We shall first examine the first four Rasas which Bhoja brings in to show the insufficiency of Bharata's eight, viz., Śānta, Preyas, Udātta and Uddhata. These four Rasas are given by him even in the *S. K. Ā.* (Chapter V. See previous chapter). But it is only in the *Śṛ. Pra.* that Bhoja relates these four to the four recognised types of heroes. He says that the Dhirodātta, Dhīroddhata, Dhīralalita and Dhīraśānta are characterised by four Rasas, Udātta or Ūrjasvi, Uddhata, Preyas and Śānta. Bhoja feels these as a necessity. For, without some Rasa as their character, these four types cannot be distinguished. It is as if to explain the long recognised classification of character into these four types that Bhoja formulates these four Rasas. He says :

"न च अष्टावेवेति नियमः, यतः शान्तं प्रेयांसमुद्धतमूर्जस्विनं च केचिद् रसमाचक्षते। तन्मूलाश्च किल नायकानां (धीरशान्त) धीर ललित धीरोद्धत धीरोदात्त व्यपदेशाः। तेषु

धीरप्रशान्ताश्रयः शान्तो यथा—

सर्वाः सम्पत्तयस्तस्य संतुष्टं यस्य मानसम्।
उपानद्गूढपादस्य ननु चर्मास्तृतैव भूः॥

धीरललिताश्रयः प्रेयान् यथा—

यदेव रोचते मह्यं तदेव कुरुते प्रिया।
इति वेत्ति न जानाति तत्प्रियं यत्करोति सा॥

धीरोद्धताश्रय उद्धतो यथा—

धृतायुधो यावदहं तावदन्यैः किमायुधैः।
यद्वा न सिद्धमस्त्रेण मम तत्केन सेत्स्यति॥ (वेणीसं० III. 46).

धीरोदात्ताश्रय ऊर्जस्वी यथा—

अपकर्तोहमस्मीति मा ते मनसि भूद् भयम्।
विमुखेषु न मे खड्गः प्रहर्तुं जातु वाञ्छति॥ *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II, pp. 377-8.

In this study of Bhoja of a type of character as based on the one dominating Rasa of that character, an imaginative mind can see a shift of emphasis from Rasa to character. Broadly and very roughly speaking, western literature, and modern Indian literature which has taken the spirit from the former, belong to what one may call the character-paddhati, and Sanskrit literature to the Rasa-paddhati. Though the two, character and Rasa, cannot be separately spoken of as two absolutely different things, character being only the substratum of Rasa and Rasa being the distinguishing mark of character, yet one can clearly see the point in the differentiation of the two literatures. When Bhoja wanted to relate a type of man to a Rasa and to define character by Rasa, one hopes that if pursued, this line would have resulted in a lot of literary criticism of the nature of character-study so

common in western critical literature. But the thing stops there except for a slight dawn of the tendency in Bhoja's equation of the four types of characters with four distinct Rasas. This thread we will take up in a further section.

The fourfold equation itself must be examined critically. The Śānta and Preyas are not new Rasas introduced by Bhoja. We have the Śānta from the time of Ubdhaṭa and the Preyas since the time of Rudraṭa. The former is the Rasa related to the fourth and the greatest Puruṣārtha of Mokṣa. Preyas is the Rasa of non-sexual love, friendship, affection etc. It is Udātta or Ūrjasvi and Uddhata that Bhoja has newly introduced here.

In the *Śṛ. Pra.* Bhoja classifies his one Rasa of Ahaṁkāra into four main Ahaṁkāras or four main Śṛṅgāras corresponding to the four Puruṣārthas. He thus speaks of Dharma śṛṅgāra, Artha śṛṅgāra, Kāma śṛṅgāra and Mokṣa śṛṅgāra. These are purely *activities* as such towards the attainment of the four Puruṣārthas. But Bhoja examines them in the case of the life of a married individual, i.e., as four kinds of Love. He uses the word 'Śṛṅgāra' in the higher as well as in the lower sense. To these he devotes four chapters where he describes how Dharma śṛṅgāra is the Rasa of the character called Dhīrodātta, Artha śṛṅgāra, of Dhiroddhata, Kāma śṛṅgāra, of Dhīra lalita, and Mokṣa śṛṅgāra, of Dhīra śānta.

The equation of Dhīra śānta with the Śānta rasa is not on all fours. For, according to the recognised meaning of the names of these four types of heroes, Dhīra śānta does not mean one striving to attain Mokṣa but only a kind of Śṛṅgāra nāyaka, a Brahmin or a merchant. The *Mṛcchakaṭika* has the Dhīra Śānta hero in Cārudatta. He is not striving to attain Mokṣa. The Śānta rasa however has greater scope ; nay, it primarily applies to cases of activity towards the attainment of the fourth Puruṣārtha. It might be said that one could strive to attain Mokṣa as a Gṛhastha and that in that case, Śānta became a variety of Śṛṅgāra. It is in that sense that Bhoja takes it in his chapter on Mokṣa śṛṅgāra. But it has to be remembered that there are also other varieties of Mokṣa-ward activity. Bhoja equates the Dhīra lalita with Preyo rasa here. In the chapter on the third Puruṣārtha śṛṅgāra, i.e. Kāma śṛṅgāra, Bhoja gives its hero as Dhīra lalita. That means an equation of Dhīra lalita with the first Rasa of Rati-śṛṅgāra. This seems to involve a contradiction, for the Preyo rasa with which Bhoja equates the Dhīra lalita is non-sexual love, Prīti, Bhakti, Sneha, Vātsalya etc., and not love towards a woman. The Dhīra lalita however is only a Śṛṅgāra nāyaka like Udayana. But Bhoja defines Preyas more fundamentally as the deeper aspect of love as such which includes love for women also. Bhoja considers Preyas as the 'Mūla' for Rati as well as Prīti. Hence, we can justify this equation also. Bhoja considers the Dhorodātta who is the hero of Dharma śṛṅgāra according to the chapter on Dharma śṛṅgāra, as characterised by Udātta or Ūrjasvi rasa. Of this Rasa, the Sthāyin is 'Tattvābhiniveśinī mati' according to the *S. K. Ā.* and Ahaṁkāra according to the *Śṛ.*

Pra. The Uddhata rasa is said to characterise the Dhīroddhata who is given later as the hero of Artha śṛṅgāra. In the four chapters on the four Puruṣārtha śṛṅgāras Bhoja takes great pains to show how his distribution of the four types of heroes to these four aspects of Ahaṁkāra is to be justified. He explains the 'Dhairya' involved in the four Rasas in four different ways and he also explains the consequences of the Citta dharma of the four types of heroes, Udāttatā, Auddhatya, Lālitya and Śama, as permeating their activities towards their respective Puruṣārthas. But in all these big chapters, there is not a single reference to the first given equation of the four types of heroes with the four Rasas of Śānta, Preyas, Udātta and Uddhata.

Criticism of the Other New Rasas.

Regarding the Rasas Pāravaśya, Svātantrya, Vilāsa etc., one can clearly see that only a very diluted sense of the word Rasa can justify them. Rasa has to be taken as Camatkāra and things like Svātantrya, Sādhvasa etc., giving Camatkāra can be taken as Rasas. These are very minor or very major, minor like the Vilāsa which Bharata gives as an Alaṁkāra of a woman and major like Saṁgama which is a phase of Śṛṅgāra. The difficulty is also felt by Bhoja of finding suitable names for these Rasas, as also suitable Sthāyins. In none of these cases does Bhoja mention the Sthāyin. In the case of Nirveda, he says the Rasa also is Nirveda. If Nirveda is the Sthāyin, the Rasa has to be of another name, as Bhoja himself has given in the case of Ānanda rasa from Harṣa sthāyin. The Bhāvas themselves are simply called Rasas and no difference is made between them and their Prakarṣa which alone is Rasa. And then the list is hopelessly overlapping and indiscriminate. Bhoja speaks of Anurāga rasa. What is this beyond Śṛṅgāra? He similarly mentions a Saṁgama rasa and what is this beyond the Sambhoga aspect of Śṛṅgāra? Sādhvasa which he mentions as a rasa is only a manifestation of the Vyabhicārin Trāsa and the Sthāyin Bhaya. Pāravaśya etc. are Anubhāvas which are infinite and which, Bharata says, cannot be enumerated and must be taken from the world.

तत्र विभावानुभावौ लोकप्रसिद्धौ लोकस्वभावानुगतत्वाच्च तयोर्लक्षणं नोच्यतेऽतिप्रसङ्गनिवृत्त्यर्थम्। भवति चात्र श्लोकः—

लोकस्वभावसंसिद्धा लोकयात्रानुगामिनः।
अनुभावाः विभावाश्च ज्ञेयास्त्वभिनये बुधैः॥ *N. Ś.* VII. p. 349.

As we shall see in a further section, the word Rasa, Bhoja says, can be applied only to Ahaṁkāra by virtue of which we enjoy ourselves, our mental conditions and their projections in the world outside, but that, by extension or Upacāra, the name Rasa can be applied to the Prakarṣa-state of all the Bhāvas. Even this Prakarṣa is not shown by Bhoja in the cases of these strange Rasas. Earlier, Bhoja says that all the forty-nine Bhāvas become Rasas on attaining Prakarṣa by the interplay of their respective Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins.

रत्यादीनामेकोनपञ्चाशतोऽपि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगात् परप्रकर्षाधिगमे रसव्यपदेशार्हता । *Śṛ. Pra.* p. 381, Vol. II.

Such 'Vibhāva-anubhāva-vyabhicāri-samyoga' with the Sthāyin is not shown in any of these cases. As a matter of fact, it is impossible to show in these cases the Sthāyin and the attendant circumstances like Vyabhicārins. What is worse, many of them are not Bhāvas at all, but are like Mṛgayā and Akṣa mentioned by the *Daśarūpaka*. If these also are to be Rasas, we have to define Rasa as 'Rasyamāna-aṁśa', even as Daṇḍin defined Alaṁkāra as Śobhākaradharma. Such is the very general meaning of the word Rasa in our daily non-technical parlance; but what is to be noted is that such a general and extended use of the word Rasa is as old as Mātṛgupta who speaks of Rasa as pertaining to speech, dress etc., in drama.

रसास्तु त्रिविधा वाचिकनेपथ्यस्वभावजाः ।
रसानुरूपैरालापैः श्लोकैर्वाक्यैः पदैस्तथा ॥
नानालंकारसंयुक्तैः **वाचिको रस** इष्यते ।
कर्मरूपवयोजातिदेशकालानुवर्तिभिः ॥
माल्यभूषणवस्त्राद्यैः **नेपथ्यरस** उच्यते ।
रूपयौवनलावण्यस्थैर्यधैर्यादिभिर्गुणैः ॥
रसः स्वाभाविको ज्ञेयः स च नाट्ये प्रशस्यते ।

Quoted by Rāghavabhaṭṭa on *Śākuntala*.[1]

Here, in the text quoted by Rāghava bhaṭṭa, Mātṛgupta applies the name Rasa to Anubhāvas. Vācikābhinaya, Āhāryābhinaya, Svabhāvābhinaya or Sāmānyābhinaya—these are all Anubhāvas. These are not Rasa but only one of the conditions, namely Anubhāvas, which nourish Rasa. The logic in calling these also Rasa is that they also are relished separately and that they also give Camatkāra though they are, like Padas in a Vākyārtha, but part of Rasa. Bharata himself speaks of Nepathya rasa, Vācika rasa etc.

शृङ्गारं त्रिविधं विद्याद् वाङ्नेपथ्यक्रियात्मकम् ।
अङ्गनेपथ्यवाक्यैश्च हास्यरौद्रौ त्रिधा स्मृतौ ॥ Ch. VI. 77. Kasi Edn.

1. *Cf.* The *Bhā. Pra.* of Śāradātanaya, Ch. III, pp. 64-65, Śṛṅgāra of Vāg. Aṅga and Kriyā.

भावगर्भं रहस्संविन् मधुरं नर्मपेशलम् ।
सुवृत्तं श्रवणानन्दि **शृङ्गारो वाचिको** मतः ॥
वासोऽङ्गरागभूषाभिः माल्यैर्युक्तं प्रसाधितम् ।
प्राप्तयौवनमङ्गं यत् **शृङ्गारः स्यात् स आङ्गिकः** ॥
दन्तच्छेद्यं नखच्छेद्यं मणितं सहसीत्कृतम् ।
चुम्बनं चूषणं भावो हेलादिः केलयोऽपि च ॥
शयनाद्युपचारश्च तथा संगीतकक्रिया ।
इत्यादिभावैः कथितः **शृङ्गारः स्यात् क्रियात्मकः** ॥

Not only can such a view be justified on the basis of the general and extended use of the word Rasa to all these things but it can also be justified on more weighty grounds. When Rasa is Niṣpanna, Rasa, like the milky ocean or the salt ocean, makes everything that falls into it, itself. Says Śiṅgabhūpāla :

क्षीराब्धिवन्नयन्त्यन्यान् स्वात्मत्वं स्थायिनो हि ते ।

Says the *Daśarūpaka* :

आत्मभावं नयत्यन्यान् स स्थायी लवणाकरः ।

The Vibhāvas etc. are considered as the waves :

मज्जन्तश्च निमज्जन्तः कल्लोलास्ते यथार्णवे ।
× × × × ×
पुष्णन्ति स्थायिनं स्वांश्च तत्र यान्ति रसात्मताम् ॥

Quoted in the *Ratnāpaṇa*, p. 161.

Even as waves or as Padārthas according to others' phraseology, they are Rasātmaka and hence can be called Rasas. Bhoja also says while describing the Upacaya of Rasa :

"यथा लवण [रस] आम्लादयः स्वसंयोगिनः मृद्वीकादीनपि आत्मरूपतां नयन्तः उपचीयन्ते, तथा रत्यादीनि विभावादीनप्यात्मरूपतां नयन्ति उपचीयन्ते ।" *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II. p. 385.

In the next phase, Bhoja says that though each of these three, Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins, differ in nature, they become identical and get merged in the one flood of Rasa.

रसता रसेनैव सामान्यं भवति । *Ibid.*, p. 385.

That some considered the drama itself as Rasa, some others the Vibhāvas alone as Rasa, still others the Anubhāvas alone as Rasa, another set of writers, all these put together as Rasa,—is recorded by Abhinavagupta in his *Locana* and at a very late time, by Jagannātha Paṇḍita. Such abject confusion there prevailed. The *Locana* says :

"अपरे तु पुनः × × ×तन्नाट्यमेव रसाः ।" "अन्ये तु शुद्धं विभावम्, अपरे तु शुद्धमनुभावम्, केचित्तु स्थायिमात्रम्, इतरे व्यभिचारिणम्, अन्ये तत्संयोगम्, एके अनुकार्यं, केचन सकलमेव समुदायं रसमाहुरित्यलं बहुना ।" P. 69.

Jagannātha Paṇḍita says :

विभावादयः त्रयः समुदिता रसः इति कतिपये । त्रिषु य एव चमत्कारी स एव रसः, अन्यथा तु त्रयोऽपि नेति बहवः । भाव्यमानो विभाव एव रस इति अन्ये, अनुभावस्तथातथा इति इतरे । व्यभिचार्येव तथा तथा परिणमतीति केचित् ।" P. 28. *R. G.*

Vibhāvas cannot be Rasas, for, they are objects and individuals. Surely, such 'Jaḍas' as the moon and the spring season which are the kindling (Uddīpana) Vibhāvas cannot be Rasas. So also the hero and the heroine themselves as such cannot be called Rasas. Similarly, it is impossible for

Rudraṭa, Namisādhu or Bhoja to hold the Sāttvikas also as Rasas. The Sāttvikas are not exactly Bhāvas or feelings. They are the physical effects of feelings. How can a tear be a Bhāva? How can a tear be the theme of a poem, a Sthāyin? How is it to be nourished into a Rasa and what feeling is this tear? Is it due to Ānanda or to Duḥkha or to nothing except dust? Such things as the Sāttvikas are not '*final*' in themselves, being common to many other more major things. They are further Bāhya-anubhāvas, physical manifestations, and hence are Jaḍas. Abhinavagupta says that the Sāttvikas cannot be called Bhāvas at all strictly, though we speak of Sāttvika *bhāva* etc. The name Bhāva primarily applies only to mental states, the Sthāyins and the Vyabhicārins. Says he :

"भावशब्देन तावत् चित्तवृत्तिविशेषा एव विवक्षिताः × ×× ये त्वेते ऋतुमाल्यादयो विभावाः बाह्याश्च बाष्पप्रभृतयः अनुभावाः ते न भावशब्दव्यपदेश्याः"

Ch. VII, p. 343, Gaek. Edn., Pt. I.

Bhoja himself considers the Sāttvikas as Bāhya.

"बाह्याः स्वेदरोमाश्वाश्रुवैवर्ण्यादयः"

Bhānudatta also says : शारीरस्तु सात्विकभावादिः। *R. T.*

As noted above, Bhoja does not give the Sthāyin and the Rasa definitely and differently in the case of a 'Sāttvikabhāva-Rasa' of his. He simply says 'Aśru rasa'. And commenting on an instance of his 'Stambha-rasa' he says : अयं च पुष्टोऽपि सात्त्विकत्वात् सदैव अन्यानुयायीति नानुभावादिभिरनुबध्यते। *S. K. Ā.*, V. Of 'Romāñca-rasa' he says :

अस्यापि सात्त्विकत्वाद्, अन्यानुबन्धादयो न जायन्ते। *S. K. Ā.*, V. P. 498.

This is giving up the case. It is a contradiction to say that it is Rasa, it is Puṣṭa, but is devoid of further attendants, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins. Though Rasa, it is unattended and what is worse, it is itself attending upon and tending towards another,—not only Ananubaddha but also Anyānuyāyī! Rasa is Svatantra, 'Svāmin' as Bharata says and anything which is "unfollowed" and "follows another" is a mere Bhāva, Vyabhicārin or Sāttvika. A description of Stambha is not Rasa but is only a description of the Sāttvika-bhāva Stambha which will ultimately suggest Śṛṅgāra rasa or Adbhuta rasa as the case may be. With Rasa alone does our mind rest and not with a Sāttvika or even with a Vyabhicārin, both of which are always subservient to a Sthāyin. The Sthāyin is capable of being variegated by subsidiary Vyabhicārins, Vaicitrya-saha ; but a Sāttvika at least is incapable of such Vaicitrya.

Similarly, Bhoja considers all cases of Bhāva as Rasa. As has been pointed out already, all Vyabhicarins cannot become Sthāyins and Rasas. Nidrā, Supta, Mada,—these can never be Rasas by themselves. Vyabhicārin is one that is Anyamukha-prekṣī, Asvatantra, Apradhāna, and Samāna to many more major Bhāvas called Sthāyins. There can be no Viśrānti of the

mind, no final mental rest, with, say, Glāni. Says Bhoja, Glāni also can be developed to its Prakarṣa with Śrama and other Vyabhicārins. But how can fatigue stand by itself? At once arises the question, why is he fatigued? But when it is described that Rāma is fatigued, one does not say that the case is Rāmaglāni-rasa, but says that Rāma is fatigued by search after his lost Sītā; and thus the case is one of Vipralambha śṛṅgāra rasa. When one gives that, no more question arises. That is what Bharata means by his distinction of Sthāyins from Vyabhicārins by the simile of King and the Subjects, Master and Servants, Leader and Followers. To be Rasa, a Bhāva has to be Pradhāna. Apradhānatā is a bar to a Bhāva being relished or developed to Prakarṣa. Vairasya or Hāsya results, if a writer works at Glāni as the one theme of a work. So Abhinavagupta postulates Apradhānatva as a bar to Rasa-realisation and in that connection explains the rationale of the classification of Bhāvas into Sthāyins and Vyabhicārins and of considering a few only as Sthāyins. *Abhi. Bhā.* pp. 283-5, Gaek. Edn. Pt. I.

अप्रधाने च वस्तुनि कस्य संविद्विश्राम्यति। तस्यैव प्रत्ययस्य प्रधानान्तरं प्रत्यनुधावतः स्वात्मनि अविश्रान्तत्वात्। **अतो अप्रधानत्वं जडे विभावानुभाववर्गे, व्यभिचारिनिचये च संविदात्मकेऽपि नियमेन अन्यमुखप्रेक्षिणि**। तदतिरिक्तः स्थाय्येव चर्वणापात्रम्।

तथा हि ग्लानोऽयमित्युक्ते कुत इति हेतुप्रश्नेन अस्थायिता अस्य सूच्यते।

It is therefore impossible to grant Bhoja's contention that all the Vyabhicārins can be Rasas. Regarding Harṣa, Bhoja himself says while describing the Ānanda-rasa said to come out of it :

अत्र कस्याश्चित् × × मानवत्याः प्रियदर्शनालम्बनविभावादुत्पन्ने प्रकृष्टरतिप्रभवे प्रहर्षस्थायिभावे × × × आनन्दरसतामापद्यमाने *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II. p. 394.

What does Bhoja mean by the Harṣa sthāyin rising out of the Rati sthāyin? It only means that Harṣa is not a Sthāyin and that the verse cited is an instance of not any new Ānanda rasa but only of Śṛṅgāra rasa of whose Sthāyin, Rati, Harṣa is a Sukhātmaka-vyabhicārin, the case being Saṁgama and not Vipralambha.

From this extreme of "all-rasas," Bhoja goes to the other extreme and says : *None of these really deserves the name Rasa. They are called Rasa only by courtesy. The real Rasa is only one. Not even the nourished state of climax or Prakarṣa of Rati, Hāsa etc., is Rasa.* If Rati, Hāsa, Śoka etc., are deemed Sthāyins and Harṣa, etc. are denied that status, well can even Rati etc. be denied the name Sthāyin. If they are Sthāyins, well can Harṣa and other Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas be Sthāyins and Rasas. A Bhāva is a Sthāyin because of its permanence and importance, because of the nature of characters or because of the power of the kindling conditions. If certain men are by nature angry, certain are by nature anæmic and hence always fatigued and tired, and Glāni also can be developed into Rasa with suitable Vyabhicārins etc. Therefore none of these is really Sthāyin, not even Rati and the other seven. Even if they attain Prakarṣa they are only Bhāvas

for, they are still in the sphere of Bhāvanā, the process of context-limited contemplation. They are subject to the limitations of names and such other factors and can be recognised as Bhāvas of such and such name and nature. But real Rasa is transcendental enjoyment and it has no such name as Śṛṅgāra, Vīra etc. Rasa transcends the sphere of Bhāvanā. It is part of man's soul or spirit, enjoyed only in his spirit, without name or form. That which makes it enjoyable is the ultimate reality called Ahaṁkāra or the sense of Ego or 'I' in man which is the mark of the development of character, of the perfection of man's nature and of the level of his culture. It is the distinguishing feature of man's personality, his character and culture. This Ego-consciousness is the first germ from which is every other emotion born. It is the Ātman's love for itself, Atma-rakti and Ātma-kāma. Hence it is that the Veda says :

"कामस्तदग्रे समवर्ततााधि मनसो रेतः प्रथमं यदासीत् ।"
"सोऽकामयत बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति"

Says Śāradātanaya :

या चेयमिच्छा जगतां सिसृक्षोः परमात्मनः ।
विषयाक्ता रतिः सैव शृंगार इति गीयते ॥ P. 55. *Bhā. Pra.*

This Love of Self exhibits itself as love for outward objects. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* declares :

आत्मनस्तु कामाय सर्वं प्रियं भवति ।

When this Ahaṁkāra or Self-love comes into contact with outward objects, it is born thousandfold, into a world of Bhāvas, all of which are enjoyed by man only by this power of Ahaṁkāra. One who has this sense developed in him is Rasika and one who has this not is a rustic or a brute. The Sahṛdaya or the Rasika, the poet and the characters are permeated by this Ahaṁkāra which is the basis of all the manifestations of the mind. Every Bhāva in its lower degree or higher degree of Prakarṣa only helps to heighten the ever-glowing light of this inner Rasa of man's Ego, like flames of a fire emblazing the fire more and more.

Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra is called also Abhimāna because it imparts its quality of pleasure to all experiences, including pain. It is also called Śṛṅgāra, because it is itself the peak (Śṛṅga) and takes man to the peak of perfection. येन शृंगं रीयते, स शृंगारः । From this basic Rasa which alone is Sthāyī, permanent in the real sense, and which alone is Rasa, the relished and that which makes us relish other Bhāvas also, there arise the forty-nine Bhāvas Rati etc. The Ahaṁkāra-Abhimāna-Śṛṅgāra is the Pūrvakoṭi. It is the basis or the substratum, one end. From it arise the Bhāvas which, attended by their own Vyabhicārins, Anubhāvas and Vibhāvas, reach a climax and reaching that, nourish only the Ahaṁkāra rasa. Thus, though themselves Prakṛṣṭa, they are really Vyabhicārins for the one Rasa of Ahaṁkāra. By courtesy of course, the name Rasa can be given to their Prakarṣa also. This is the stage of Vyavahāra and here we have a plurality of Rasas. This is the

world which all the other Ālaṁkārikas deal with. Bhoja calls this the Madhyamāvasthā of his Rasa, the middle stage, the manifest stage. This is the stage of many Bhāvas from the one Rasa.

रसाद् भावाः एकोनपञ्चाशत् ।

This is also the stage in which the Bhāvas attain the Prakarṣa when they are called Rasas and hence in this same stage also we have Rasas from Bhāvas. भावेभ्यो रसाः ।

It is in this stage that Bhoja holds not only all the Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas but such things also as Vilāsa, Sādhvasa, Pāravaśya etc. as Rasas. For, to him, all are alike Bhāvas, Śṛṅgāra alone being the Rasa. The third stage of Rasa is called by Bhoja the Uttarakoṭi, the other end. It is a synthesis of all these scattered Bhāvas again in a phase of the fundamental Ahaṁkāra, the phase called Preman. That is, the Bhāvas return to the one Rasa from which they sprung up. They pass the Bhāvanā-stage after attaining Prakarṣa and dissolve in the Rasa of Ahaṁkāra through the stage of Preman. In the stage of Preman, every Bhāva is a kind of love, Preman, and finally every kind of love is a kind of love of Ātman, Ahaṁkāra, Abhimāna or Śṛṅgāra.

एतेन रूढाहंकारता रसस्य **पूर्वा कोटिः** । रत्यादीनामेकान्नपञ्चाशतोऽपि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगात् परप्रकर्षाधिगमे **रसव्यपदेशार्हता** रसस्यैव **मध्यमावस्था** । प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानमिति उपलक्षणेन यथा रतेः प्रेमरूपेण परिणतिः तथा भावान्तराणामपि परमपरिपाके प्रेमरूपेण परिणतौ रसैकायनमिति रसस्य **परमा काष्ठा** इति प्रतिष्ठितं भवति । P. 351.

रसन्त्विह प्रेमाणमेवामनन्ति सर्वेषामपि हि रत्यादिप्रकर्षाणां रतिप्रियो रणप्रियोऽमर्षप्रियः परिहासप्रियः इति प्रेम्ण्येव पर्यवसानात् ।" P. 352 *Śṛ. Pra.*, Vol. 2.

Bhoja holds that his new theory of this triple-aspected Rasa, Ahaṁkāra, Bhāvaprakarṣas and Preman, is based on Daṇḍin's verse on the three emotion-figures called Ūrjasvi, Rasavat and Preyas.

प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानं रसवद्रसपेशलम् ।
ऊर्जस्वि रूढाहंकारं युक्तोत्कर्षं च तत् त्रयम् ॥

Bhoja takes the verse from the end. This verse is first cited by Bhoja to prove that Rasas also are Alaṁkāras and is used immediately to prove his new Rasa theory. " Ūrjasvi Rūḍhāhaṁkāram " is taken as indicating the well developed and firmly established imperishable Tattva of Ahaṁkāra in the soul of the cultured man. It is taken as the Ahaṁkāra or Ego of the Pūrvakoṭi of Bhoja which is the germ from which the multi-branch tree of emotion grows, and by which we are Rasikas. This Ahaṁkāra is the one and only true Rasa enabling us to enjoy anything in this world. It is not due to any visible cause but is the result of a number of good deeds in our past births as a result of which it is begotten in our souls. This is in nature Love Absolute and when coming into contact with various objects of the outside world, it becomes love or Abhimāna for various objects. The process can be exa-

mined and analysed from the outward object. Bhoja gives here a beautiful illustration. A man is glanced at by a beautiful damsel and at once he goes into ecstasies over himself and *bows again and again to himself.* The love for the woman is because he loves himself as being loved by her. *He congratulates himself.*

अहो अहो नमो मह्यं यदहं वीक्षितोऽनया।
मुग्धया त्रस्तसारङ्गतरलायतनेत्रया॥ *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II. pp. 366-7.

We find the same idea if we analyse the ordinary expressions of men when they attain some prized object : "I should congratulate myself, I am proud of it" and so on. The Upaniṣad says :

"आत्मनस्तु कामाय सर्वं प्रियं भवति।"
"सोऽयमात्मा श्रेष्ठश्च प्रेष्ठश्च।"

The *Bhāgavata* also says :

सर्वेषामपि भूतानां नृप स्वात्मैव वल्लभः।
इतरेऽपत्यवित्ताद्याः तद्वल्लभतयैव हि॥ X. A. 14. 50.

"King, it is one's own soul that is the dearest for all beings ; it is because of their love for their Selves that children, wealth etc. are dear to them." Bhoja analyses our experiences and arrives at this fact of Ahaṁkāra which enables us to enjoy, and from this fact of its being the root cause of our enjoyment, he calls it Rasa. It is called Śṛṅgāra not only as one that takes man to the acme of perfection but also because it is Love, it is the very life of Ātmayoni or Kāma. Kāma is not meant here as sexual love, even as Śṛṅgāra is not used by Bhoja here in the sense of love between man and woman and even as Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra here is not egotism.

"आत्मस्थितं गुणविशेषमहङ्कृतस्य
शृङ्गारमाहुरिह जीवितमात्मयोनेः।
तस्यात्मशक्तिरसनीयतया रसत्वं
युक्तस्य येन रसिकोऽयमिति प्रवादः॥" *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. I. Intro. verses.

"तत्र 'ऊर्जस्वि रूढाहंकारम्' इत्यनेन आत्मविशेषनिष्ठस्य उत्कृष्टादृष्टजन्मनः अनेकजन्मानुभवसंस्काराहितदृढिम्नः समग्रात्मगुणसंपदुदयातिशयहेतोः अलं(हं)कारविशेषस्य उपसङ्ग्रहाद् अहंकारा[द]भिमानशृङ्गाराद्यपरनाम्नः रसस्य मानमयविकाररूपेण अभिमानिनां मनसि जाग्रतः **पूर्वां कोटिम्** उपवर्णयति। यदाह

सत्त्वात्मनाममलधर्मविशेषजन्मा
जन्मान्तरानुभवनिर्मितवासनोत्थः।
सर्वात्मसंपदुदयातिशयैकहेतुः
जागर्ति कोऽपि हृदि मानमयो विकारः॥ *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 366.

"शृङ्गारो हि नाम विशिष्टेष्टदृष्टचेष्टाभिव्यञ्जकानामात्मगुणसंपदामुत्कर्षबीजं बुद्धिसुखदुःखेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नसंस्कारातिशयहेतुः आत्मनोऽहंकारविशेषः **सचेतसा** रस्यमानः रस इत्युच्यते। यदस्तित्वे रसिकः, अन्यथात्वे नीरस इति॥" *Ibid.*, p. 353.

All men are not called Rasikas and some explanation must be found for calling only a choice few Rasikas. Rasika means one who has Rasa in him. Bhoja says that this cannot be due to any known cause; it is due to past Dharma and it is Śṛṅgāra, Ahaṁkāra, Abhimāna. He adds that according to the Satkāryavāda of the Sāṁkhyas, if the Rasika enjoys or Rasa manifests in him, it must be present in him as a Guṇa of his Ātman.

'असाधारणं तु प्रत्यगात्मगतानादिवासनानुबन्धि धर्मकार्यं भवितुमर्हति, तच्च आत्मनोऽहंकारगुणविशेषं ब्रूमः। स शृङ्गारः सोऽभिमानः स रसः॥ *Śṛ. Pra.*, Vol. 2, pp. 355-6.

'तथा हि योऽयं लोके रसोऽस्यास्तीति रसिकोऽयं रसिकोऽयमिति विना मधुरादीन् केषुचिदेव पुरुषविशेषेषु निरपवादः प्रवादः' स नान्तरेण प्रत्यात्मवेदनीयं रसाह्वयवस्तुसम्बन्धमुपपद्यते।

'स एव प्रमाणत्रयोपन्यासहेतुः वक्तुरभिप्रायः प्रतीयमानः प्रमाणत्रयोपन्यासादिना च **सांख्यदर्शनाश्रयेण च शृङ्गारः सन्नेव** आविर्भवति। न त्वसन्नुत्पद्यते॥ P. 113. Vol. 2, *Śṛ. Pra.*

Bhoja thus explains his own verse quoted above :

अथात्मनि प्रतिबिम्बताद्वारेण अवस्थितस्य अहंकारगुणविशेषस्य धर्मार्थफलभूततृतीयपुरुषार्थजीवितस्य शृङ्गारस्याभिमानापरनाम्नः यान्याविर्भावकारणानि यानि च तत्कार्याणि तान्यनन्तरश्लोकेन निर्दिशति। सत्त्वात्मनाममलजन्मविशेषजन्मेत्यादि।

तत्रायमात्मनोऽनुपहतेभ्यः सुकृतविशेषेभ्यः उत्पद्यते। उत्पन्नस्य सर्वस्यात्मा। आत्मगुणसंपदः वक्ष्यमाणलक्षणाया उदयहेतुर्भवति। अनेकजन्मानुभवजनितात्तु संस्कारादुत्कृष्यते, उत्कृष्टश्चायमात्मगुणसम्पद एव अतिशयहेतुर्भवति। स चायमेक एव एवंविधोऽभिमानात्मा **प्रकृतिविकर** आत्मविशेषाणां तमोनिर्भेदस्थानेषु प्रतिबिम्बरूपेण सुप्त इव प्रतिबुध्यत इति वाक्यार्थोऽभिधीयमानः। एकहेतुरित्यनेन च हेत्वन्तराभावमात्मगुणसंपदः प्रदर्शयन् **अयमेव चतुर्वर्गकारणमिति** ज्ञापयति। जागर्ति वा। जागर्ति च सुप्तप्रबोधदृष्टान्तेन तस्यानाविर्भावावस्थायामपि स्तिमितरूपेण अवस्थानाद् अविद्यमानतां निराकरोति। कोऽपीत्यनेन अद्भुतप्रदर्शनद्वारेण तदुत्कर्षसम्पत् जन्मसहस्रेणाप्यनाख्येयेति ख्यापयति। मानमय इत्यनेन चास्याभिमानात्मनोऽभिमान एव मूलमिति अन्यावष्टंभं निराचष्ट इति। Pp. 43-4, Vol. 2, *Śṛ. Pra.*

Ratneśvara briefly puts this in his commentary on *S. K. Ā.* I. pp. 67-68 on the Artha guṇa Aurjitya which also Bhoja defines as "Rūḍha ahaṁkāra."

ऊर्जितशब्दोऽहंकृते प्रसिद्धः। तात्कालिकनिमित्तोपनिपाते वासनाविकाशात् तमोनिर्भेदस्थानेषु सुप्तप्रबुद्ध इव स्थायिभिरसंसृज्यमानः प्रथमप्रादुर्भूतः अभिमानः अहंकारः इत्युच्यते। रूढः सूक्ष्मावस्थोऽद्वितीयामाविर्भावदशामापन्नोऽहंकारो यस्य सः रूढाहंकारः।

Bhoja takes some instances of concrete emotions, the eight Rasas along with Ūrjasvi and Preyas as illustrated by Daṇḍin and analysing them, shows that they are all manifestations or forms of the fundamental germinal quality of the soul of man, Ahaṁkāra.

यथा ऊर्जस्विनि अपकर्तारमिति यत्ते चेतसि भयं (तन्माभूत्) न मे खड्गः पराङ्मुखेषु कदाचिदपि प्रहर्तुमुत्सहते इति **रूढोऽहंकारः प्रतीयते**,

सैषावन्ती मयात्रैव जन्मनि लब्धेति धिक् ते वृथाप्रतिज्ञो मानपरिग्रह इति,

उर्वीमजित्वा कथं पार्थिवो भवेयमिति,

न मया ईदृशाः शाखिनः कदाचिदपि दृष्टाः इति,
अनेन मे द्रौपदी केशेषु आकृष्टेति,
धन्यो मघवा यस्येदं तदायुधम् इति,
या मे देवी चितामध्यास्त इति,
धिक् कौणपाः शोणितं अन्त्रभूषणाः पिबन्तीति,
अस्ति मे सन्तोषः मनस इति,
यथेयं मे प्रिया तथाहमप्यस्याः, यतो मदनुकूलमेवैषा चेष्टत इति,
मयि धृतायुधे किमायुधान्तरैरिति,
सर्वत्रैवाहंकारः प्रतीयते ।" *Śṛ. Pra.*, Vol. 2, pp. 381-2.

This Ahaṁkāra is said to manifest itself first as Abhimāna and is also otherwise called by that very name. It is because the next phase of Ego is the projection of it into love for an object. In the ordinary plane of Vyavahāra, love is called Abhimāna because of its being enjoyed by our heart which considers or thinks the object to be pleasurable though in fact it may be painful. When there is nothing in the object itself to warrant for bliss, the Rasa enjoyed must then be located in ourselves. Thus the projection of our sense of Rasa over an object is Abhimāna. All love is of the form of Abhimāna. Bhoja quotes in illustration a Gāthā of which the following is the Chāyā :

दुःखदातापि सुखं जनयति यो यस्य वल्लभो भवति ।
दयितनखदूयमानयोः विवर्धते स्तनयोः रोमाञ्चः ॥

Śṛ. Pra. Vol. II, p. 353.

And Bhoja explains it :

मनोऽनुकूलेनु दुःखादिषु सुखाभिमानः रसः ।

Says Vātsyāyana :

अनभ्यस्तेष्वपि पुरा कर्मस्वविषयात्मिका ।
सङ्कल्पाज्जायते प्रीतिः या सा स्यादाभिमानिकी ॥[1]

All love is born of Abhimāna and Samkalpa and therefore it is that the God of Love is called Samkalpa-yoni. It is the extension of the masochism we find in Nakhakṣata, Dantakṣata, Angamarda, and other varieties of Kuṭṭamita. And Kāma is thus defined and described :

१. संकल्परमणीयस्य नाम काम इति स्मृतम् ।
२. काम जानामि ते मूलं संकल्पात् किल जायसे । (M. Bhārata).
३. कामः सर्वमयः पुंसां स्वसंकल्पसमुद्भवः । (*Sivapurāṇa.* Quoted by Bhagavan Das in his *Science of Emotions.*)

1. On all sense of Sukha being Ābhimānika and Saṅkalpaja, see also the *Tripurārahasya*, Jñāna Khaṇḍa, ch. 4, Ślo. 6-82 ; see esp. śl. 77 :

अभिमानमृते नैष सुखहेतुर्भवेत् क्वचित् ।

There is an interesting story in the *Daśakumāracarita* on this idea of Kāma as Samkalpa. In the sub-story of Nimbavatī in Ucchvāsa VI the question is asked, "What is Love?" and the answer is given : "Love is Samkalpa." To illustrate this, the story of Nimbavatī is told.

कः कामः?– संकल्पः । कामो नाम संकल्पः ।

तथा दृष्ट्वा रत्नवती कनकवतीति भावयतः तस्यैव बलभद्रस्य अतिवल्लभा जाता । तद्भवीमि कामो नाम संकल्पः ।

This Kāma, Ahaṁkāra, Abhimāna or Śṛṅgāra of the Pūrvakoṭi then passes into manifold Bhāvas in the Madhyamāvasthā. The first major manifestation of the Ahaṁkāra is into the four kinds of man's attachment to and pursuit after the four aims or springs of all human action, the Puruṣārthas, Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. Bhoja had already said that this Ahaṁkāra or Abhimāna lies at the basis of Caturvarga चतुर्वर्गैककारणम्. Bhoja therefore classifies the Śṛṅgāra into Dharma śṛṅgāra, Artha śṛṅgāra, Kāma śṛṅgāra and Mokṣa śṛṅgāra, meaning the respective activities of man towards the achievement of the four Puruṣārthas. Chapter XIII briefly describes these four at the beginning and again Chapters XVIII to XXI of the *Śṛ. Pra.* deal with these at great length, a chapter being devoted to each.

This idea is found even in Bharata, who says that Kāma (absolute love) is the first root-Bhāva from which all other Bhāvas arise. Bhoja, however, does not quote Bharata or indicate his having taken any inspiration from Bharata. Bharata says :

प्रायेण सर्वभावानां कामाश्रिष्यत्तिरिष्यते ।
स चेच्छागुणसंपन्नो बहुधा काम इष्यते ॥

धर्मकामोऽर्थकामश्च मोक्षकामस्तथैव च ।
स्त्रीपुंसयोस्तु संयोगः यः कामः (कामकामः) स तु संस्मृतः ।
यः स्त्रीपुरुषसंयोगे रतिसंयोगकारकः ।
स शृङ्गार इति ज्ञेयः उपचारकृतः शुभः ॥

Sāmānyābhinaya chapter. Chapter XXIV.
Kāsi. Edn. Śls. 90-92 and K. M. Edn. Chapter XXII. Śls. 89-93.

And earlier we find in Bharata the classification of Śṛṅgāra into Dharma śṛṅgāra, Artha śṛṅgāra and Kāma śṛṅgāra. These three are spoken of as characterising the Samavakāra which depicts the three in three separate parts.

त्रिविधश्चात्र विधिज्ञैः पृथक् पृथक् कर्मयोगविहितार्थः ।
त्रिविधाकृतिशृङ्गारो ज्ञेयो धर्मार्थकामकृतः ॥

यत्र तु धर्मे प्रार्थितमात्रं हितं भवति साधितं बहुधा ।
प्रतिनियमतपोयुक्तं ज्ञेयोऽसौ धर्मशृङ्गारः ॥

अर्थस्येच्छायोगाद् बहुधा चैवार्थतोऽर्थशृंगारः ।
स्त्रीसंप्रयोगविषयेष्वयथार्थमपीष्यतेऽभिरतिः ॥

कन्याविलोभनं वा प्राप्तं स्त्रीपुंसयोस्तु रम्यं वा ।
निभृतं वा सावेगं जानीयात् कामशृङ्गारम् ॥

Chapter XX. Kāśi. Edn. 76-79.

The Kāvyamālā Edn. gives some better readings :

त्रिविधश्चात्र विधिज्ञैः पृथक् पृथक् कार्ययोगविहितार्थः ।
शृङ्गारः कर्तव्यो धर्मे चार्थे च कामे च ॥
यत्र तु धर्मसमापकमात्महितं भवति साधनं बहुधा ।
व्रतनियमतपोयुक्तो ज्ञेयोऽसौ धर्मशृङ्गारः ॥
अर्थस्येच्छायोगाद् बहुधा चैवार्थतोऽर्थशृङ्गारः ।
स्त्रीसंप्रयोगविषयेष्वयथार्थमपीष्यते हि रतिः ॥
कन्याविलोभनकृतं प्राप्तौ स्त्रीपुंसयोस्तु रम्यं वा ।
निभृतं सावेगं वा यस्य भवेद्वा कामशृङ्गारः ॥ Chapter XX. 118-121.

Bharata's idea that all Bhāvas spring from Kāma and that Kāma is all in all is seen in various texts.

काममय एवायं पुरुषः[1] *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* IV. iv. 5.

Says Manu :

न चैवेहास्त्यकामता ।[1]
यद् यद् हि कुरुते किञ्चित् तत् तत् कामस्य चेष्टितम् ।
अकामस्य क्रिया काचित् दृश्यते नेह कर्हिचित् ॥

The *Śivapurāṇa* says :

कामः सर्वमयः पुंसां स्वसंकल्पसमुद्भवः[1]

It identifies Kāma with the Ānanda of Brahman.

आनन्दममृतं दिव्यं परं ब्रह्म तदुच्यते ।
परमात्मेति चाप्युक्तं विकाराः कामसंज्ञिताः ॥

Śivapurāṇa, Dharmasamhitā, VIII.[1]

The Maṅgala śloka of the *Jayamaṅgalā* on the *Kāmasūtras* also speaks of the Kāmas of Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa.

नमो धर्मार्थकामेभ्यः तत्कामेभ्यो नमोनमः ।
त्रिवर्गमोक्षकामेभ्यः ॥

The *Bhāgavata* speaks of all the four Puruṣārthas as four Kāmas. (VIII, Gajendra stava).

यं धर्मकामार्थविमुक्तिकामाः भजन्त इष्टां गतिमाप्नुवन्ति ।

Even Mokṣa is love for Mokṣa, Mumukṣā. The *Mahābhārata* says that God Love prides over his powers and says to the sages that if they try to kill him

1. All quoted by Bhagavan Das in his *Science of Emotions*, pp. 387-397.

in the shape of Dharma, Artha and Kāma, he yet clings to them as the yearning, the Kāma, for Mokṣa.

यो मां प्रयतते हन्तुं मोक्षमास्थाय पण्डितः ।
तस्य **मोक्षरतिस्थस्य** नृत्यामि च हसामि च ॥

(Aśvamedha parvan. Adh. 13.)

The *Bhagavadgītā* also calls the Mokṣa-ward mind "love for Ātman," Ātmaratī.

यस्त्वात्म**रतिरेव** स्याद् आत्मतृप्तश्च मानवः ।
आत्मन्येव च संतुष्टः तस्य कार्यं न विद्यते ॥

And on this score, Abhinavagupta points out in his *Abhi. Bhā.* the possibility of making a superior variety, a spiritual aspect, of the first Sthāyin Rati itself, the Sthāyin of Śānta rasa. (See p. 336 *Abhi. Bhā. Gaek.* Edn. Pt. I.).

The activities of man in the direction of the attainment of the four aims (Puruṣārthas) spread into manifold forms. Numerous Bhāvas arise out of these. All the forty-nine Bhāvas given by Bharata as sufficient to comprehend the whole world of major and minor emotions arise out of the one Ahaṁkāra rasa. According to the character of an individual and the conditions he is in, one or the other Bhāva characterises him as his permanent Bhāva. It becomes Sthāyin and attains nourishment when attended by the ancillary Bhavas; and attaining that climax, each such Sthāyin again dissolves into Ahaṁkāra or by its own heightening, heightens only the ever glowing light of that Ahaṁkāra. The Ahaṁkāra-tattva is in the middle like fire and all the Bhāvas which are its own manifestations glow around it like flames and heighten its brilliance.

"रत्यादयोऽर्धशतमेकविवर्जिता हि
भावाः पृथग्विधविभावभुवो भवन्ति ।
अहङ्कारतत्त्वमभितः परिवारयन्तः
सप्तार्चिषं द्युतिचया इव वर्धयन्ति ॥ *Śṛ. Pra.*, Ch. I.

'स **अहङ्कारः** सोऽभिमानः स रसः । तत एते रत्यादयो जायन्ते । तैश्चायं प्रकर्षप्राप्तैः सप्तार्चिरर्चिश्चयैरिव प्रकाशमानः **अहङ्कारिणामेव** स्वदते ।' *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 356.

Says Bhoja at the end of Chapter XIV of the *Śṛ. Pra.* (Vol. III. P. 82) after describing the several Bhāvas :

एते रत्यादयो भावाः **अहङ्कार**व्यक्तिहेतवः ।

Commenting on the Artha guṇa Kānti, Ratneśvara says in his *S. K. Ā. Vyākhyā* (P. 66)

रसोऽभिमानात्मा **अहङ्कारः** तस्य दीप्तत्वं, विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिभिः सम्यक् सञ्चलितेन स्थायिना निरन्तरमुपचीयमानस्य परमकोटिगमनम् । × × × स्वात्मनि तु सहसा आविर्भवत्सात्विकप्रतिपादनेन जीवितसर्वस्वाभिमानात्मकरतिस्थायिभावप्रकाशने × × × × × अनुरागेण लक्ष्यते, सप्तार्चिरिवार्चिषा उपचीयत इत्यनुरागलक्षणः ।

This stage is called the Madhyamāvasthā, the Vyavahāra-daśā with which only other writers concern themselves. It is in this stage that the discussion on the number of Rasas goes on. Bhoja is of opinion that though Rasas are many, the name Rasa can apply to them only through Upacāra, the primary significance of that name being only one, the inner Ahaṁkāra. Therefore Bhoja says that even when Bhāvas attain Prakarṣa they are only in the realm of Bhāvanā and can be called only Bhāvas, with their definite names, characteristics etc. Says Ratneśvara in commenting on Bhoja's Śabdaguṇa Bhāvika which is expression of Bhāva, in *S. K. Ā.*, I. p. 58 :

"**भावनादशापन्ना चित्तवृत्तिर्भावः**। भावना वासना व्याप्तिरित्यनर्थान्तरम् । तथा हुच्यते (भरतेन) अनेन गन्धेन रसेन वा सर्वं भावितमिति ॥ "

Madhusūdanasarasvatī says in his *Bhaktirasāyana* that in the presence of objects producing Kāma, Krodha etc., the Citta melts and takes the form of the object. It is this 'Vastu-ākāratā' of the Citta that is called 'Vāsanā', 'Samskāra', 'Bhāva' and 'Bhāvanā'.

द्रुते चित्ते विनिक्षिप्तः स्वाकारो यस्तु वस्तुना ।
संस्कारवासनाभावभावनाशब्दभागसौ ॥ *Bh. R.*, I. 6.

Rasa is that which is beyond this stage of Bhāvanā and it is one, not many. It is one Ahaṁkāra which alone is permanent and is fit to be called Sthāyin and Rasa. It is by this Ahaṁkāra's Anupraveśa, permeation, that the Prakarṣas or developed states of Rati etc., are enjoyed. To those developed states also which we enjoy by the extension of Ahaṁkāra, we apply the name Rasa secondarily. What is here strange really is that Bhoja applies this secondary Rasatva to the Sāttvikas and such conditions as Sādhvasa, Saṁgama, and Pāravaśya.

'शृङ्गारवीरकरुणाद्भुतरौद्रहास्य–
बीभत्सवत्सलभयानकशान्तनाम्नः ।
आम्नासिषुः दश रसान् सुधियो, वयं तु
शृङ्गारमेव रसनाद्रसमामनामः ॥

वीराद्भुतादिषु च येह रसप्रसिद्धिः
सिद्धा कुतोऽपि वटयक्षवदाविभाति ।
लोके गतानुगतिकत्ववशादुपेता–
मेतां निवर्तयितुमेष परिश्रमो नः ॥

अप्रातिकूल्यिकतया मनसो मुदादेः
यःसंविदोऽनुभवहेतुरिहाभिमानः ।
ज्ञेयो रसस्स रसनीयतयात्मशक्तेः
रत्यादिभूमनि पुनर्वितथा रसोक्तिः ॥' *Śṛ.* Pra., Ch. I.

'न रत्यादिभूमा रसः' किं तर्हि ? शृङ्गारः । शृङ्गारो हि नाम * * * * आत्मनोऽहंकार-विशेषः * * * । रत्यादीनामयमेव प्रभव इति । शृङ्गारिणो (अहंकारिणो) हि रत्यादयो जायन्ते, न

अशृङ्गारिणः। शृङ्गारी हि रमते, स्मयते, उत्सहते, स्निह्यतीति। ते तु भाव्यमानत्वाद् भावा एव, न रसाः। यावत्संभवं हि भावनया भाव्यमानो भाव एवोच्यते। भावनापथमतीतस्तु रस इति।

मनोऽनुकूलेषु दुःखादिषु आत्मनः सुखाभिमानो रसः। स तु पारम्पर्येण सुखहेतुत्वाद् रत्यादिभूमसु उपचारेण व्यवह्रियते। अतो न रत्यादीनां रसत्वम्, अपि तु भावनाविषयत्वाद् भावत्वमेव।"

Śṛ. Pra., Vol. I, pp. 354-55.

"यदप्युक्तं परप्रकर्षगामी रत्यादिभावो रसः इति तदप्यसारम्। ग्लान्यादिष्वपि तदुपपत्तेः। ग्लान्यादयोऽपि हि श्रमादिभिः परं प्रकर्षमारोप्यन्ते। न ते स्थायिन इति चेत्, स्थायित्वमेषामुत्पन्नतीव्रसंस्कारत्वम्; तीव्रसंस्कारोत्पत्तिश्च विषयातिशयान् नायकप्रकृतेश्च; प्रकृतिश्च त्रिधा; सात्त्विकी, राजसी, तामसी च। तद्वशाच्च तथाविधानुभवभावनोत्पत्तिः। ततश्चैषां स्थायित्वव्यपदेश इति॥" *Ibid.*, p. 355.

"नन्वष्टौ स्थायिनः, अष्टौ सात्त्विकाः, त्रयस्त्रिंशद् व्यभिचारिणः इति ब्रुवते, न तत्साधु। यतोऽमीषामन्यतमस्य एतैरेव परस्परं निर्वर्त्यमानत्वात् कश्चित् कदाचित् स्थायी, कदाचित्तु व्यभिचारी। अतोऽवस्थावशात् सर्वेऽप्यमी व्यभिचारिणः, सर्वेऽपि च स्थायिनः, सात्त्विका अपि सर्व एव, मनःप्रभवत्वात्। अनुपहतं हि मनः सत्त्वमित्युच्यते।"

"यच्चोक्तम् 'विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगात् स्थायिनो रसत्वम्' इति तदपि मन्दम्, हर्षादिष्वपि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगस्य विद्यमानत्वात्।

"तस्माद् रत्यादयः सर्व एवैते भावाः, शृङ्गार एव एको रस इति। तैश्च सविभावानुभावैः प्रकाशमानः शृङ्गारः विशेषतः स्वदते।" *Ibid.*, pp. 354-5.

"भावाः सञ्चारिणो ये च स्थायिनो ये च सात्त्विकाः।
सविभावानुभावास्ते शृङ्गारस्य प्रकाशकाः॥
प्रकृतिजमभिमानसंज्ञं सममनुभावविभाववर्गः।
स्वमवसरमुपेयिवानुपास्ते नृपतिमिवाधिकृतेषु नीतिवर्गः॥"

Śṛ. Pra., Vol. III, p. 236, end of Ch. 17.

Slightly modifying Bharata's simile of kings and subjects to explain through illustration the division into Sthāyins and Vyabhicārins, Bhoja calls Ahaṁkāra the King upon whom all other Bhāvas attend like state-policies, Nīti-vargas.

But that the name Rasa can apply, secondarily at least, to the Prakarṣas of Rati etc., is expressly said by Bhoja himself.

स तु पारम्पर्येण सुखहेतुत्वाद् रत्यादिभूमसु उपचारेण व्यवह्रियते।

The Prakarṣas of Rati etc. are also called Rasas because

1. They are also relished (रस्यन्ते), though this relishability or Rasyamānatā in them is ultimately due only to Ahaṁkāra which is the substance of which they are made.

2. Just as the one Rasa of Ahaṁkāra is attended by the forty-nine Bhāvas which give Prakarṣa to it, like flames to a fire, so also, the respective Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins attend upon Rati etc. and give them Prakarṣa.

3. Just as the one Ahaṁkāra Rasa produces the forty-nine Bhāvas, so also the Sthāyins, Rati etc., produce their Sañcārins and Anubhāvas. It is out of the mind that has taken the form of a Sthāyin like Rati that other states like Nirveda and other Vyabhicārins and such effects as the Anubhāvas are born.

Says Bhoja :

यद्यपि शृङ्गार एवैको रसः, तथापि तत्प्रभवा ये रत्यादयः तेऽप्युद्दीपनविभावैरुद्दीप्यमानाः, तदनुप्रवेशादेव, संचारिणाम् अनुभावानां च निमित्तभावमुपयन्तः रसव्यपदेशं लभन्ते । यथा ह्यभिमानः रत्यादीनां निमित्तं चेतसा रस्यमानो रसः, तथा रत्यादयोऽपि हर्षधृतिचिन्तौत्सुक्यादीनां मनोवाक्कायशरीरारम्भाणां च निमित्तम् अभिमानानुप्रवेशेनैव चेतसा रस्यमानाः रसा इत्युच्यन्ते ।

P. 392. Vol. II. *Śṛ. Pra.*

Therefore what Bharata and others hold as Rasas are only the Prakarṣas of these Bhāvas of Rati etc., and to them Bhoja would apply the name Rasa only by courtesy. He would also differ on the point of the number of Rasas which he does not give as eight or nine but as many as the forty-nine Bhāvas themselves and many more.

'रसवद् रसपेशलम्' इत्यनेन विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद् रसनिष्पत्तिरिति रत्यादिरूपेण अनेकधाविर्भवतः अभिवर्धमानस्य परप्रकर्षगामिनः शृङ्गारस्य मध्यमावस्थामवस्थापयति । यदाह- रत्यादयोऽर्धशतमेकविवर्जिता हि०-

तद्यथा-अत्रान्तरे किमपि वाग्विभवातिवृत्त०- (*Mālatīmādhava*, I.)

Śṛ. Pra. Vol. II. p. 367.

Bhoja's conception of Rasa is peculiar. He calls Ahaṁkāra Rasa but does not say whether it is itself the Sthāyin. Generally the view is that Rasa is an aesthetic concept, a subjective transcendental (Alaukika) state and that it is manifested by the presentation of a Sthāyin which is Bhāva of the world and is objective and touches the corresponding Sthāyin in the heart of the responsive onlooker. So it is that the Sthāyin and the Rasa are differently named ; Rati becomes Śṛṅgāra, Hāsa becomes Hāsya, and so on. So it is that objecting to Śama as the Sthāyin of Śānta rasa, the critics of Śānta say that Śama and Śānta are synonyms (paryāyas) and Abhinavagupta replies that there is the difference between the two as Sthāyin and Rasa, the Siddha and the Sādhya, the Laukika and the Alaukika.

"शमशान्तयोः पर्यायत्वं तु हासहास्याभ्यां व्याख्यातम्, सिद्धसाध्यतया, लौकिकालौकिकत्वेन, साधारणासाधारणतया च वैलक्षण्यं शमशान्तयोरपि सुलभमेव ॥"

Abhi. Bhā. Gaek. edn. I. p. 336.

This was clear to every writer on Rasa but it seems that such a clear distinction was not present in Bharata's text itself. Lollaṭa and Śaṅkuka did not have such a distinction. It was the Sthāyin itself that got the name Rasa. Says Bharata :

एवमेते स्थायिभावाः रससंज्ञाः प्रत्यवगन्तव्याः । N. Ś. VI.

So it is, says Śaṅkuka, that in the Rasa-niṣpatti-sūtra the word 'Sthāyin' is not found. It is merely the Sthāyin of the world that is called Rasa when imitated. Daṇḍin and Lollaṭa applied the name Rasa to the Sthāyin itself when it is 'Samyukta', Puṣṭa or Prakṛṣṭa or Udrikta by means of Vibhāvas etc. Says Bahurūpamiśra in his commentary on the *Daśarūpaka* :

एवं तावत् स्थायिन एव अवस्थाविशेष इत्युक्तम् ।

P. 87. Mad. MS. R. 4188.

Bhoja followed these writers. He has not got two different departments as Laukika and Alaukika. Therefore all are Bhāvas and are as much Rasas. The difference is that the Bhāvas had to be made Rasas by taking them to Prakarṣa through the Samyoga of Vibhāvas etc. But even this Prakarṣa and Vibhāvādi-samyoga is not shown by Bhoja in many cases. He simply calls many things Rasas and does nothing more. We can take that the Ahaṁkāra itself is the Sthāyin of the one basic Rasa of Bhoja. It can be said that its name in the state of Rasa is Śṛṅgāra and that the conditions which Bhoja says are for its nourish,—namely, the forty-nine Bhāvas which arise out of it, surround it like flames and go to brighten more that central fire and are called Rati etc.,—are the Sañcārins of this one Sthāyin of Ahaṁkāra, of this one Rasa of Śṛṅgāra. But this Bhoja does not say ; we have said it, taking some suggestions from Bhoja's text and developing his idea on his own lines.

Even in the view of those writers like Abhinavagupta and his followers with whom Rasa is Alaukika and primarily applies as name only to the experience in the heart of the spectator, the word Rasa is applied through secondary extension to the mood depicted in the poem, the Sthāyi-prakarṣa and to the Pātras or characters. It must however be clearly understood that such application is strictly secondary. Similarly, it cannot be held that Bharata did not have in his mind that the play as such is directed towards the spectator and his heart. So also, Bhoja held his one Rasa of Ahaṁkāra to reside as much in the Pātras as in the poet and in the spectator. If the spectator has this Ahaṁkāra-rasa, it follows that he has the other minor Rasas from Rati etc., also. Though we do not find in Bhoja the shifting of the ground of the discussion on the vital factor in Rasa to the heart of the Sahṛdaya as we find in Abhinavagupta, we do find Bhoja holding the Rasika as the primary seat of Rasa. He also holds that the Rasika is a rare person and is born as rarely as the genius who creates poetry and drama. But he does not restrict the name Rasika to the reader of poetry or the spectator of drama but applies it to all cultured votaries of art, the poet, the characters in a composition, the actors, and the spectators. That the poet also is the seat of Rasa in the same manner as the spectator can be seen from a statement of Abhinavagupta which places the poet on the same par with the Sāmājika ; and Abhinavagupta quotes here the verse of Ānandavardhana, which Bhoja also utilises for the same purpose.

कविर्हि सामाजिकतुल्य एव । अत एवोक्तं 'शृङ्गारी चेत्कविः' इत्याद्यानन्दवर्धनाचार्येण ।

P. 295. *Abhi. Bhā.* Gaek. Edn. Pt. I

Bhoja never went to the extent of some writer whom Bahurūpamiśra quotes in his commentary on *Daśarūpaka* as holding the view that it is the Rasa of the Pātras that is the real Rasa and that the Rasa of the Sāmājika is but a semblance of it, Rasa-ābhāsa. That is the logical extreme of the old view of Rasa being nothing but the Puṣṭi of the Sthāyin in the poem or drama.

केचित्तु रामादिगत एव रसः काव्यप्रतिपाद्यः, सामाजिकगतस्तु रसाभास इति प्रतिजानते। तत्तु वयं न मृष्यामहे। P. 83. Mad. Ms. *D. R. Vyā.* R. 4188.

Bhoja emphasised the idea of Bhāvanā, a stage in which the Bhāvas are contemplated upon and after this Bhāvanā or imaginative and sympathetic communion that the thing called Rasa or bliss manifests in the Rasika's heart. This concept of Bhāvanā, I think, means also that the nourished Sthāyin of the poem or a drama, of the book or of the stage, produces the subjective condition of the bliss of Rasa in the spectator's heart. We can say that Bhoja's position is not against holding Rasa as Alaukika and Sāmājikāśraya inasmuch as it is the result of the Bhāvanā of the Sthāyin in its nourished state, as the *Prapañcahṛdaya* puts it. (*T. S. S.* XLV, pp. 55-56.)

"नटनं भावविशेषः। तद्भावनया नाट्यरसो जायते। तत्र रतिभावनया शृङ्गाररसो जायते, हासभावनया हास्यरसः etc."

The third stage of Rasa which Bhoja calls the Uttarakoṭi is the culmination of all the forty-nine Bhāvas which arose out of Ahaṁkāra in Preman which again is only a phase of Ahaṁkāra. It is again the text of Daṇḍin out of which this idea is sought and extracted by Bhoja.

"प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानम्" इत्येनेन समस्तभावमूर्धाभिषिक्ताया रतेः परप्रकर्षाधिगमाद् भावनापथातिक्रमे भावरूपतामुल्लंघ्य प्रेमरूपेण परिणतायाः उपादानाद् भावान्तराणामपि परप्रकर्षाधिगमे रसरूपेण परिणतिरिति ज्ञापयन् अहंकारस्य उत्तरां कोटिमुपलक्षयति। यदाह—

आभावनोदयमनन्यधिया जनेन
यो भाव्यते मनति भावनया स भावः।
यो भावनापथमतीत्य विवर्तमानः
साहंकृते हृदि परं स्वदते रसोऽसौ॥
यदेव रोचते मह्यं तदेव कुरुते प्रिया।
इति वेत्ति न, जानाति तत् प्रियं यत्करोति सा।

Śṛ. Pra. Vol. II, pp. 367-8.

All Bhāvas get nourished into a kind of love in the end.

रसन्त्विह प्रेमाणमेवामनन्ति। सर्वेषामेव रत्यादिप्रकर्षाणां रतिप्रियः, रणप्रियः, अमर्षप्रियः, परिहासप्रिय इति प्रेम्ण्येव पर्यवसानात्॥ *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II, p. 352.

Thus to sum up :

1. Rasa is one ; it is Ahaṁkāra, Abhimāna, Śṛṅgāra. It is in everybody who is cultured. It is impossible to explain the name Rasika otherwise

than by accepting that the gifted connoisseur or the æsthetic soul has in him the rare quality of Rasa, imbedded in his soul, as a result of the good deeds of his past lives.

2. This Rasa is the basic factor. It is this we enjoy everywhere in the shape of other Bhāvas ; for, all known Bhāvas like Rati etc., are born out of this. रसाद् भावाः। The whole world of Bhāvas is a Vivarta of this one Tattva of Ahaṁkāra.

This alone is Sthāyin and Rasa. The rest, the forty-nine Bhāvas, which are its transfigurations and manifestations go to kindle up and make the Ahaṁkāra-fire glow more and more.

4. The forty-nine Bhāvas arising out of the one Ahaṁkāra rasa have their own state of Prakarṣa when any one of them is Sthāyin and others, its Vyabhicārins. Even when they are Prakṛṣṭa they do not cease to be Bhāvas and really do not deserve to be called Rasas except through Upacāra; Rasatva comes to them by the permeation, Anupraveśa, of the Ahaṁkāra.

5. These Upacāra rasas of Śṛṅgāra, Vīra, Hāsya etc., are of three forms, Prakṛṣṭa, Bhāvarūpa and Ābhāsa.

स शृंगारः, सोऽभिमानः, स रसः । तत एते रत्यादयो जायन्ते । × × × तदुपाधिश्चायमुपजायमानो रसः त्रिधा विख्यायते प्रकृष्टो, भावरूपः, आभासश्च । *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II, p. 356.

6. The Ahaṁkāra stage, which is the root, is called the Pūrvakoṭi, the earliest form of Rasa. The next stage when it becomes manifest into varied Bhāvas as a result of contact with the objects of the world is the Madhyamāvasthā. Here all the forty-nine Bhāvas continue to be Bhāvas though they attain Prakarṣa. The dictum of others that Bhāvaprakarṣa is Rasa is not *strictly* accepted. A Bhāva is a Bhāva even if it is Prakṛṣṭa.

(1) न रत्यादिभूमा रसः । किं तर्हि ? 'शृङ्गारः' ।

(2) रत्यादिभूमनि पुनर्वितथा रसोक्तिः ।

(3) यतोऽमी रत्यादयः परं प्रकर्षमारूढाः भावा एव न रसाः ।

(4) यदपि च गदितं प्रकर्षगामी भवति रसो रतिविस्मयादिरेव ।
तदपि न समञ्जसं, प्रकृष्टाः प्रतिनिजभेदममी हि सर्व एव ॥

(5) रसः शृङ्गार एवैकः भावाः रत्यादयो मताः ।
प्रकर्षगामिनोऽपीह प्रेमग्लानिश्रमादिवत् ॥

7. Since Rasa is one, there is no question of Rasas coming out of Rasas. Bharata derives four Rasas from four primary Rasas. Bhoja points out the limitations of that scheme of Prakṛti-Vikṛti Rasas and accepts it with its limitations in his Madhyamāvasthā. In their strict sense, the formulae "रसेभ्यो भावाः, रसेभ्यो रसाः, भावेभ्यो रसाः are not accepted by Bhoja. "रसेभ्यो भावा इत्यप्ययुक्तम् । नहि बहवो रसाः, अपि तु एक एव शृंगारो रसः ।"
Śṛ. Pra. Vol. II, p. 378.

"अतो यत्किञ्चिदेतत्, भावेभ्यो रसाः, रसेभ्यो भावाः, रसेभ्यश्च रसा इति। किं पुनरिह-न्याय्यम्? यथा उपवर्णितं पुरस्तात्–अप्रातिकलिकतया मनसो मुदादेः

यः संविदोऽनुभवहेतुरिहाभिमानः।
ज्ञेयो रसस्स रसनीयतयात्मशक्तेः
रत्यादिभूमनि पुनर्वितथा रसोक्तिः॥

एतेन "रूढाहंकारता" रसस्य पूर्वा कोटिः। रत्यादीनामेकोनपञ्चाशतोऽपि विभावानुभावव्यभि-चारिसंयोगात् परप्रकर्षाधिगमे रसव्यपदेशार्हता रसस्यैव मध्यमावस्था।" *Ibid.*, p. 381.

"रसानां तु वीराद्भुतादीनां निरस्तत्वात् कथमिव एकः शृङ्गारः अनेकसाध्यं संकरव्यवहारं वर्तयति? उच्यते। यद्यपि शृङ्गार एवैको रसः तथापि तत्प्रभवा एव रत्यादयः तेऽप्युद्दीपनविभावैरुद्दीप्यमानाः तदनु-प्रवेशादेव सञ्चारिणामनुभावानां च निमित्तभावमुपयन्तः **रसव्यपदेशं** लभन्ते। यथा ह्यभिमानः रत्यादीनां निमित्तं चेतसा रस्यमानो रसः, तथा रत्यादयोऽपि हर्षधृतिचिन्तौत्सुक्यादीनां मनोवाक्कायबुद्धि-शरीरारंभाणां च निमित्तम्, अभिमानानुप्रवेशेनैव चेतसा रस्यमाना रसा इत्युच्यन्ते॥" *Ibid.*, p. 392.

8. This Madhyamāvasthā is the Vyāvahārika stage where alone the other Ālaṁkārikas are carrying on their discussions. Bharata's Sthāyins, Vyabhicārins etc., the Rasa sūtra, the dicta भावेभ्यो रसाः, स्थायिप्रकर्षो रसः, all apply to this stage. As a matter of fact, Bhoja, brought to his Madhya-māvasthā, has little to fight with any Ālaṁkārika.

9. But there is one great difference : whereas all writers accept that within the forty-nine Bhāvas, there is a varying degree of inherent permanence and that only a few are Sthāyins and others only Vyabhicārins, Bhoja says that Sthāyitva is not inherent in a few Bhāvas ; any of the forty-nine can be Sthāyin according to character and circumstance and the poet's effort. When one becomes Sthāyin, the others attend upon it. Thus Rasas are practically not eight or nine or ten or twelve, but forty-nine. Nay, even more ; for, Bhoja mentions such Rasas as Pāravaśya, Svātantrya etc., for which Bhāvas are not found in the list of forty-nine Bhāvas. Fundamentally, however, none of these, not even Rati etc., can be Sthāyin fit to become Rasa. Ahaṁkāra is the only Rasa.

10. When the one Ahaṁkāra rasa gets scattered into forty-nine and more emotional manifestations and each of them has attained a climax, there is again a synthesis. As the climax is reached, all Bhāvas become Preman or a kind of love from where they pass into the Ahaṁkāra rasa. That is, Rasa is one and unitary. It has no name except Rasa. The names Rati etc. pertain to the lower state of Bhāvanā. It is much below the state of Rasa, i.e. in the state called Bhāvanā, that the one Rasa gets into diverse forms with many delimiting characteristics. Beyond the path of Bhāvanā of definite and named Bhāvas is the experience of the bliss of Rasa in our own souls lit by the spark of Ahaṁkāra, as part of our very souls.

11. Such Rasa or Ahaṁkāra and the whole world of Bhāvas emanating therefrom characterise all cultured hearts, of the Sahṛdaya, of the poet or of the spectator. The cultured man as such is the seat of this Rasa.

Bhoja does not restrict himself to the art of drama and poetry but explains culture itself, taking one's polished and refined behaviour and bearing itself in the world as art supreme. The conception of Ahaṁkāra also as an inner love of the Ātman for itself makes all expression a process of self-fulfilment. This Rasa is called Śṛṅgāra because it takes man to the acme of refinement and is itself the greatest achievement. येन शृंगं रीयते स शृंगारः। Bhoja closes his magnum opus with the following verses on his new-found Ahaṁkāra over which he goes into exhilarations every now and then.

. . . . . तारका।
अविदग्धा यथा गोष्ठी निःशृङ्गारा (तथाङ्गना) ॥
यथांशुमाली पी(वी)तांशुः यथानर्चिर्हुताशनः।
यथाप्रतापो नृपतिः अशृङ्गारस्तथा पुमान् ॥
यथेन्दुना निशा भाति निशाभिश्च (यथा शशी)।
(अङ्गनाभिश्च शृङ्गारः) शृङ्गारेण तथाङ्गना ॥
यथा तडिदनंभोदा पयोदैस्त(डितं विना)।
(अहंकृतिर)शृङ्गारा शृङ्गारश्च (रश्च) अनहंकृतिः ॥

P. 917, Vol. IV. End of Chapter XXXVI *Śṛ. Pra.*

The Rasa theory expounded by Bharata in a brief manner had regularly been applied to Kāvya and writer after writer was investigating the exact import of Bharata's Sūtra on the manifestation of Rasa. Theorists from Lollaṭa were vigorously examining the Rasa Sūtra and by the time of Abhinavagupta a very acceptable explanation was achieved. The Dhvani theory had been made the essence of poetry and Rasa-realisation but of this literature in Kashmere on the subject of Rasa, barring the *Dhvanyāloka*, Bhoja shows the least acquaintance. There is not the slightest indication of Bhoja's knowledge of Abhinavagupta the end of whose literary career coincided with the beginning of Bhoja's. Of knowledge of Udbhaṭa, Lollaṭa, Śaṅkuka and Bhaṭṭanāyaka, no trace is seen in the *Śṛ. Pra.* In Mālva, in the court of his own predecessor, Dhanañjaya had written expounding the Bhāvanā and Bhoga theory of Rasa which Bhaṭṭanāyaka expounded in Kashmere. Even this Bhoja did not take up. The authorities for Bhoja are the ancients. He goes to Bharata and Daṇḍin and the only other writer whom he quotes and considers in the formulation of his own Rasa theory is Rudraṭa, who just preceded Ānandavardhana. Ānandavardhana had expounded the subject of Rasa to a very large extent in his *Dhvanyāloka* and had established that Rasa was manifested through suggestion. Bhoja is no doubt aware of Ānandavardhana's work. He takes up Ānandavardhana's Dhvani and reproduces Ānandavardhana's illustrative verses for some varieties of Dhvani. Two of Ānandavardhana's Kārikās on Dhvani are reproduced by Bhoja. Ānandavardhana's Kārikās on Alaṁkāra-aucitya and on Guṇas in Uddyota Two are also reproduced by Bhoja. But Ānandavardhana did not influence Bhoja's Rasa theory. Nor does Bhoja criticise Ānanda-

vardhana. Bhoja rarely discusses in the manner in which others do, though perhaps the largest discussion on any topic of Alaṁkāra in the *Śṛ. Pra.* is on Rasa. Bhoja often writes like the older writers, simply affirming his ideas and without following them up with a polemic.

Bhoja began his speculations on Rasa from thinking deeply over the import of the word Rasika in use in the world. Like any Naiyāyika he started with Vyavahāra which he wanted to explain. People called only a few cultured souls Rasikas. What does the word Rasika mean? It must mean that the individual has Rasa. रसः अस्य अस्तीति रसिकः। It is by virtue of this Rasa in him that one is considered cultured and tasteful and the others not, on account of its absence in them. The word Rasika did not simply mean the man in the state of an enjoyer of poetry and drama but was applied by Bhoja to man as man. That is, it is an attribute referring to *some excellence in man's personality which goes to make up the grace that distinguishes his behaviour in society from that of another who is called Nīrasa.* This quality which makes Rasikas of men must be one single Rasa and cannot differ with each man. If analysed, it is found to be the very Ego of man himself, the Aharnkāra tattva in his psychological being. The Aharnkāra tattva is the root from which all Bhāvas of the mind arise. It is the first we catch sight of in man. It is because of a low beat of this pulse of Aharnkāra that a man is considered less developed. *Its finest development makes for culture, creative power and appreciative faculty.* So, that is Rasa. This one Rasa is in man, in the poet, character, actor and spectator. It is as a result of this Tattva that one is able to enjoy. Without it there cannot be an enjoyer of poetry among men ; no writer of poetry who is not Nīrasa, can be without it. This is a heritage to us from the good deeds of our past lives.

आत्मस्थितं गुणविशेषमहंकृतस्य
शृङ्गारमाहुरिह जीवितमात्मयोनेः।
तस्यात्मशक्तिरसनीयतया रसत्वं
युक्तस्य येन रसिकोऽयमिति प्रवादः॥
सत्त्वात्मनाममलजन्मविशेषजन्मा
जन्मान्तरानुभवनिर्मितवासनोत्थः।
सर्वात्मसंपदुदयातिशयैकहेतुः
जागर्ति कोऽपि हृदि मानमयो विकारः॥

This Aharnkāra is not one of the vices we know of *viz.*, haughtiness and egotism. By Aharnkāra is meant Ego, not egotism. It is Sāttvika. Says Bhoja that it is the peculiar virtue we gain by good deeds done during countless births which makes us more and more Sāttvika. सत्त्वात्मनाममलजन्म-विशेषजन्मा etc. When this sense of I and man's excellence, his personality and individuality is not developed, we call the man a rustic, a Grāmya. *Bhoja means by Rāsikya the full bloom of one's emotional nature as emanating from Aharnkāra. As such, it produces the power to get into other's moods,*

the power for sympathy. Thus alone can be explained Bhoja's definition of Rasika as having any connection with the man of literary taste. The definition of Rasika given by Bhoja is not like that given by Abhinavagupta of Sahṛdaya. Abhinavagupta does not explain culture or man as such, but pointedly defines how one becomes a fit literary enjoyer. In his explanation is contained no Puṇyakarman of the previous birth or the consequent increase of Sattvaguṇa. These are, however, to be understood. His explanation of Sahṛdaya contains the most satisfactory theory of literary appeal also. The very preference of the name Sahṛdaya heightens the value of Abhinavagupta's contribution. The word Sahṛdaya is not found in the *Śṛ. Pra.* There is only one instance of a use of the synonymous word Sacetas where Bhoja says that the Sacetas enjoys his Ahaṁkāra. सचेतसा रस्यमानः (p. 353. Vol. II). The word Rasika is no doubt found in Abhinavagupta but Sahṛdaya is the favourite word in Kashmerian literature. It is thus explained in the *Locana* by Abhinavagupta.

"येषां काव्यानुशीलनाभ्यासवशाद्विशदीभूते मनोमकुरे वर्णनीयतन्मयीभवनयोग्यता ते हृदयसंवादभाजः सहृदयाः" P. 11.

Bhoja lands on this idea of mind becoming pure and mirror-like only once and that in his Mangala-śloka on Gaṇeśa. He says that when mind becomes pure like a mirror, rich and grand ideas and words flash forth.

यत्पादपङ्कजरजःपरिमार्जितेषु चेतस्सु दर्पणतलामलतां गतेषु ।
शब्दार्थसंपद उदारतराः स्फुरन्ति विघ्नच्छिदेऽस्तु भगवान् सगणाधिनाथः ॥

Śṛ. Pra. Vol. I. Ch. I.

There are those who are capable of quick emotional response, हृदयसंवादभाजः. It is this Hṛdayasamvāda or Cittasamvāda which is Rasa and Ānanda ; for, it is absorption and absorption lifts us up from this mundane world and gives us repose, Viśrānti, which is bliss, Ānanda.

"हृदयसंवादः आस्वादः" *Abhi. Bhā.* Gaek. edn. I. p. 324.

And Bharata himself has shown this as the definition of the spectator, Prekṣaka.

यस्तुष्टे तुष्टिमायाति शोके शोकमुपैति च ।
दैन्ये दीनत्वमभ्येति स नाट्ये प्रेक्षकः स्मृतः ॥ *N. Ś.* Ch. 27. Śl. 55.

So when Abhinavagupta uses the word Rasika, he uses it as a synonym of Sahṛdaya. The word Rasika is, no doubt, explained as one who has Rasa. But Rasa is not taken by Abhinavagupta as it is taken by Bhoja, namely, as Ahaṁkāra which enables one to enjoy all things in the world but as the Rasa that has been realised by him by reading a poem or seeing a drama. That is, it means the enjoyment of poetry and drama by sympathy. This Cittasamvāda or Rasa makes one have the same heart as the poet or as the character on the stage and in the poem and so it is that he is called Sacetas and Sahṛdaya. But all men cannot respond to all emotions and so it is that Abhinavagupta says that only certain Rasas appeal to certain people. There-

fore it is that Love is of the widest appeal. Therefore it is that critics of Śānta say that there is almost none who will relish its presentation and Abhinavagupta replies that those who are quietistic and spiritual by temperament respond to Śānta rasa and in their case Śṛṅgāra and other Rasas do not have any appeal. The Bhayānaka does not appeal to the brave, to Uttamaprakṛtis. The Uttama has Vira rasa and he likes not Raudra rising from Krodha which is baser.

'ननु सामाजिकानां तथाभूतराक्षसादिदर्शने कथं क्रोधात्मक आस्वादः । उच्यते—**हृदयसंवाद आस्वादः** । क्रोधे च हृदयसंवादः तामसप्रकृतीनामेव सामाजिकानामिति दानवादिसदृशाः तन्मयीभूताः एवान्यायकारिविषयं क्रोधमास्वादयन्तीति न किञ्चिदवद्यम् ।'

Abhi. Bhā. Gaek. edn. I. p. 324.

'हृदयसंवादोऽपि तथाविधतत्त्वज्ञानबीजसंस्कारभावितानां भवत्येव, यद्वक्ष्यति—'मोक्षे चापि विरागिणः' इति । सर्वस्य न सर्वत्र हृदयसंवादः, भयानके वीरप्रकृतेरभावात्' । *Ibid.*, p. 340.

It is because Hṛdaya-samvāda cannot be had in minor non-permanent feelings that Bharata distinguishes emotions into Sthāyins and Vyabhicārins. This is the reason why much of minor poems of a very subjective nature giving images of all the passing clouds of the mind of the poet, as we find in English literature, is not found in the Sanskrit literature. Therefore it is that certain very minor poems are not able to evoke the feelings of the readers. Similarly, it is by this principle of Hṛdaya-samvāda that we can explain the wide difference in literary tastes and judgments, how one nation's poetry is not appealing in the same degree to another and how one generation's excellent verse falls flat on the ears of the next generation ; and in the same generation, one school of poetry takes the performance of another school as Kāvya-ābhāsa. For, nations and generations have their emotional character and have their special things of appeal. But just as a poet is asked to handle the Sthāyi-bhāvas, so also the poet aiming at immortality has always touched the vital human emotions which characterise man as such, whatever nation he may belong to and whatever he may change into in the flux of generations. The classics treat of the permanent, universal passions. Even in these classic passions, we have the difference in taste and appeal. On this is based Bharata's classification of character into Uttama, Madhyama and Adhama, Dhīraodātta, Dhīroddhata, Dhīralalita and Dhīraśānta and all the study of Prakṛti and Śīla. Says Abhinavagupta : (*Abhi. Bhā.* Gaek. edn. I.) :

एवं च रत्यादिनां प्राधान्यम् । हासादीनां × × न प्राधान्यम् । अत एव अनुत्तमप्रकृतिषु बाहुल्येन हासादयो भवन्ति । पामरप्रायः सर्वोऽपि हसति, शोचति, परनिन्दामाद्रियते, अल्पसुभाषितत्वेन च सर्वत्र विस्मयते । × × × जात एव हि जन्तुरियतीभिः संविद्भिः परीतो भवति । × × × न ह्येतच्चित्तवृत्तिवासनाशून्यः प्राणी भवति । केवलं कस्यचित् काचिदधिका चित्तवृत्तिः, काचिदूना, कस्यचिदुचितविषयनियन्त्रिता, कस्यचिदन्यथा । तत्काचिदेव पुमर्थोपयोगिनीत्युपदेश्या । तद्विभागकृतश्च उत्तमप्रकृत्यादिव्यवहारः ।

Hence it is that Bhoja feels the necessity of finding out one characterising Rasa for each of the four types of heroes, Dhīrodātta etc. The classification

of character, Bhoja feels, becomes intelligible only by postulating four different Rasas as dominating the characters as their distinguishing marks and as their permanent moods. Thus he speaks of the Udātta, Uddhata, Preyas and Śānta as the Rasas of the four kinds of heroes.

Says Bharata and following him Abhinavagupta, that no doubt Citta-samvāda is Rasa ; and a Rasika or Sahṛdaya is one who can have it. But all men do not have Citta-samvāda in all Rasas. There is the difference in character. As a class, the Rākṣasas and the Dhīroddhatas like Bhīma are personalities of the Raudra rasa. Women and children as a class belong to the world of fear.

यस्तुष्टे तुष्टिमायाति शोके शोकमुपैति च ।
दैन्ये दीनत्वमभ्येति स नाट्ये प्रेक्षकः स्मृतः ॥
न चैते गुणाः सर्वे एकस्मिन् प्रेक्षके स्मृताः ।
तस्माद् बहुत्वात् ज्ञानानामल्पत्वादायुषस्तथा ॥
उत्तमाधममध्यानां संकीर्णानां तु संसदि ।
न शक्यं मध्यमैर्ज्ञातुमुत्तमानां विचेष्टितम् ॥
× × × ×
तुष्यन्ति तरुणाः कामे विदग्धाः समयाश्रिते ।
अर्थेष्वर्थपराश्चैव मोक्षेष्वथ (चापि) विरागिणः ॥
नानाशीलाः प्रकृतयः शीले नाट्यं प्रतिष्ठितम् ।
शूरा बीभत्सरौद्रेषु नियुद्धेष्वाहवेषु च ॥
धर्माख्यानपुराणेषु वृद्धास्तुष्यन्ति नित्यशः ।
बाला मूर्खाः स्त्रियश्चैव हास्यनैपथ्ययोस्सदा ॥
एवं भावानुकरणैर्यो यस्मिन्प्रविशेन्नरः ।
प्रेक्षकस्स तु मन्तव्यः गुणैरेतैरलङ्कृतः ॥ *N. Ś.* 27. 55-62.

So it is that Abhinavagupta, the commentator with fine ideas, says that it is to appeal to different types of character that Bharata has devised the different kinds of Rūpakas and in one Rūpaka itself, different Rasas are introduced for variety and for securing appeal to maximum number of spectators.

ननु तादृशि (शान्तप्रधाने) प्रयोगे वीरस्य कः आस्वादः । उच्यते—यत्रायं निबध्यते तत्रावश्यं पुरुषार्थोपयोगिनि शृंगारवीराद्यन्यतममस्त्येव । तन्निष्ठस्तेषामास्वादः । यत्रापि प्रहसनादौ हास्यादेः प्रधानता, तत्राप्यनुनिष्पादिरसान्तरनिष्ठ एवास्वादः । भिन्नभिन्नाधिकार्यास्वादोद्देश एव रूपकभेदचिन्तने निमित्तमिति केचित् । *Abhi. Bhā.* Gaek. edn. p. 340 (reconstructed).

Cf. *Bhāvaprakāśa*, Chapter II, p. 40.

यथा नृणां तु सर्वेषां सर्वेऽपि मधुरादयः ।
भुक्ता रसात्मतां यान्ति देशकालादिभेदतः ॥
× × × ×
तेषु कस्यापि शृंगारः हास्यः कस्यचिदेव सः ।
अद्भुतस्स च कस्यापि कस्यापि करुणो भवेत् ॥

एवं संकरतोऽन्योन्यं देशकालगुणादिभिः ।
शृंगाराद्याः सदस्यानां भवन्ति ह्लादना यतः ॥

× × × ×

प्रकृतीनां च भिन्नत्वाद् अवस्थादिविभेदतः ॥

This point has been very well realised by Bhoja who takes his stand on the difference in character and circumstance in his discussion on Rasa. He says that certain emotions become permanent (Sthāyins) not arbitrarily and by themselves, but with reference to character especially, and other conditions also, like the environments or Uddīpana vibhāvas.

स्थायित्वमेषाम् उत्पन्नतीव्रसंस्कारत्वम्, तीव्रसंस्कारोत्पतिश्च विषयातिशयान् **नायकप्रकृतेश्च** । प्रकृतिश्च त्रिधा, सात्त्विकी, राजसी, तामसी च । तद्वशाच्च तथाविधानुभवभावनोत्पत्तिः, ततश्चैषां स्थायित्वव्यपदेश इति ।" *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II. p. 354.

Though Bhoja is correct when he correlates differences in character to Rasa, he is wrong while he puts this argument to prove that Glāni etc. can also become Rasas. That is absurd as has been shown already. We have here drawn attention to the fact of how Bhoja has landed upon the difference in character as forming an essential element in literary and dramatic emotional appeal as pointed out by Bharata and Abhinavagupta.

It must have been sufficiently plain by this time that the one and only Rasa which Bhoja accepts and which he calls Śṛṅgāra is not the Sāmprayogika-śṛṅgāra, the love in the ordinary sense, sex-love, which is the first of the eight Rasas given by Bharata and all other writers and which is the Prakarṣa of Rati. Bhoja's one and only Rasa Śṛṅgāra is Ahaṁkāra or Abhimāna. It is not produced by the prakarṣa of Rati but Rati and all other Bhāvas are produced from it; and the Prakarṣas of all the Bhāvas culminate in this Śṛṅgāra, and not the Prakarṣa of Rati alone. Just as Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra or Abhimāna which is the one Rasa is not egotism but is the psychological concept of Ego, so also Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra is not the Śṛṅgāra of man and woman in love. No doubt there is the Prakarṣa of Rati to which also the names Śṛṅgāra and Rasa are applicable in a secondary sense. To distinguish the two we can say that the Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra, the real Rasa, is the Paramārtha śṛṅgāra or the higher Śṛṅgāra and that called sex-love and its climax, Rati-prakarṣa, is the lower Śṛṅgāra. Therefore all the old Sanskrit writers who took Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra as the first of their own eight or nine Rasas, the ordinary Śṛṅgāra, and all modern research scholars who have expressed the same opinion are entirely mistaken. The work is called *Śṛ. Pra.* because of the chief theme of the work which is the Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra, the theory of which alone being the one Rasa is the main thesis of Bhoja in the work.

No doubt, a large part of the second half of the work is devoted to the elaboration of the well-known lower Śṛṅgāra. But Bhoja's new Rasa theory, which the *Sāhitya mīmāmsā* describes as "Śṛṅgāra advaita",[1] is not a syn-

1. See TSS CXIV p. 161.

thesis of the generally known eight or nine Rasas in the lower Śṛṅgāra. There is however some ground for confusion between the two Śṛṅgāras. Bhoja himself gives room for this confusion by some clumsiness in his treatment. What Bhoja really wants to find out is that principle which is at the root of all emotions and that factor which distinguishes the man of taste and by virtue of which the cultured man enjoys poetry and all the elements of emotional appeal in nature. He finds this fundamental principle in what he calls Ahaṁkāra. This simply corresponds to what other Ālaṁkārikas like Abhinavagupta describe as 'Rasa-realisation', the one undivided nameless experience of Joy. Whatever be the Upādhi or occasioning condition in the poem or in the drama, be it the Rati sthāyin or any other Sthāyin, what we have is an ineffable bliss which transcends all name. We call it Śṛṅgāra or Vīra because we want to distinguish it at a later stage by its Upādhi, its Sthāyin, for purposes of literary criticism. Abhinavagupta makes this clear.

पूर्वत्र बहुवचनमत्र चैकवचनं प्रयुञ्जतोऽस्यायमाशय :—एक एव तावत्परमार्थतो रसः सूत्रस्थानीयत्वेन रूपके प्रतिभाति । तस्यैव पुनर्भागदशा विभागः । सोऽपि च न तदेकमुखप्रेक्षितामतिवर्तते । एतच्चोद्देश-ऐवास्माभिरभिहितचरम्, अभिधास्यते चाग्रे—॥ *Abhi. Bhā.* Gaek. Edn. I. p. 273.

Thus Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra is on a par with the Rasa-realisation described by others. Bhoja might well have stopped with discovering this fundamental principle of Ahaṁkāra. But he proceeds to call it Śṛṅgāra, at the same time allowing the Prakarṣa of the Rati-sthāyin also to be called by the same name of Śṛṅgāra. He troubles himself unnecessarily to refute Bharata's scheme of eight Rasas, Bharata's theory that Rasa is the intensification of the Sthāyin and that Rasa arises therefore from the Bhāvas (भावेभ्यो रसाः). Bhoja himself says that once it is accepted that the Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra alone is Rasa, the name Rasa can be extended to Śṛṅgāra, Vīra etc., and the name Sthāyin also to Rati etc. The only point on which there was any need for him to criticise others is the number of Sthāyins ; for according to him, Sthāyins are not as few as eight or nine but as many as forty-nine. Bhoja must have adopted two distinct names, one for the higher Śṛṅgāra and the other for the lower.

That Bhoja intended to keep the two Śṛṅgāras quite distinct is obvious from his statement that Rati also is born of Śṛṅgāra. Further, though as regards his Parākoṭi of Pāramārthika stage, his principle is that Bhāvas are produced from the one Rasa रसाद् भावाः, it is acceptable to him in the middle stage to say that Rasas are born of Bhāvas—भावेभ्यो रसाः. He has, however, given room for confusion by saying once that *Vīra and others* are not Rasas but Śṛṅgāra alone ; he ought to have said here that none of the old Rasas, Śṛṅgāra, Vīra etc. are Rasas ; Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra alone is Rasa.

1. अतः सिद्धमेतद्-रत्यादयः शृङ्गारप्रभवा एव एकोनपञ्चाशद्भावाः । वीरादयो मिथ्यारसप्रवादाः । *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. I. Ch. I.

2. वीराद्भुतादिषु च येह रसप्रसिद्धिः etc. *ibid.* Ch. I.

Here, Bhoja gives rise to the misapprehension that he denies the rank of Rasa only to Vīra and other six or seven well-known Rasas while he is prepared to treat the lower Śṛṅgāra, the Prakarṣa of Rati as the only Rasa. But he will disillusion our minds at once by saying that he means not the first Rasa of old, the Śṛṅgāra from Rati-sthāyin, but means that even that Rati and Rati-prakarṣa as much as Utsāha-prakarṣa and others do not deserve the names Sthāyin and Rasa.

१ रत्यादिभूमनि पुनर्वितथा रसोक्तिः । *Śṛ. Pra.* Ch. I.

२ रत्यादयो यदि रसाः स्युरतिप्रकर्षे
हर्षादिभिः किमपराद्धमतद्विभिन्नैः । *Ibid.* Ch. I.

तत्र केचिदाचक्षते रतिप्रभवः शृङ्गार इति, वयं तु मन्यामहे रत्यादीनामयमेव प्रभव इति ।
Ibid. Vol. II. p. 354.

The question whether Rasas produce Bhāvas or Bhāvas produce Rasas or both produce both according to circumstances is discussed by Bharata himself and all the three views are recorded in his text as being held by writers. From Bharata's text, his Rasa-sūtra and his exposition of the process of Sthāyins becoming Rasas (in Chapter VI स्थायिभावान् रसत्वमुपनेष्यामः), it is plain that the general principle is that Rasas are produced from Bhāvas. भावेभ्यो रसाः And this is acceptable to the Dhvani theorist also. All this discussion in Bharata and other writers would apply to what is called by Bhoja his Madhyamāvasthā. The Rasa meant in these questions : 'किं भावेभ्यो रसाः, उत विपरीतम्, उत परस्परं तेऽभिनिर्वर्तयन्ति' is not identical with Bhoja's one basic Rasa of Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgara, but refers to what is to him the Vyāvahārika rasa, the Aupacārika rasa, the Rasa of the Madhyamāvasthā, the Prakarṣa of Rati and other Bhāvas. Regarding these Vyāvahārika rasas, Bhoja must accept the dictum that Rasas are produced from Bhāvas— भावेभ्यो रसाः and he does accept it. But he also comments adversely on this dictum under the wrong impression that it is applied to his Pāramārthika rasa. When he states the Pūrvapakṣa

केचिदाचक्षते रतिप्रभवः श्रृंगार इति

the writers referred to do not mean calumny on his basic causal Śṛṅgāra nor do they want to pull it down by calling it a product of Rati. They only mean Bhoja's own Rati-prakarṣa which also is a Śṛṅgāra and a Rasa.

Again, he similarly disputes the view that Rasas are the Sthāyins developed into a relishable state through the delineation of Vibhāvas etc. He wants to maintain that all the Bhāvas, Rati etc., even in their Prakarṣa, only manifest Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra. This however does not prevent him from saying at a later stage that Rati etc., when they reach their own Prakarṣa, may be called Rasas and to their case, the Rasaniṣpatti Sūtra of Bharata applies completely. Thus there is confusion in Bhoja between his own Pāramārthika rasa and Vyāvahārika rasa when he criticises the Prakarṣa theory of Rasa as embodied in Bharata's Sūtra.

Similarly, Bhoja need not have criticised Bharata's scheme of four Prakṛti Rasas producing four other Rasas. It is a scheme which indicates a certain principle and as explained clearly by Abhinavagupta and as pointed out by Bhoja also, it can be accepted with the modifications suggested. But Bhoja falls upon it to begin with, because it says that Rasas are produced by Rasas : रसेभ्यो रसाः. Surely this applies to the stage of Vyavahāra where one Rasa can be the Vibhāva of another Rasa, Rasa being the Prakarṣa of Bhāva. But Bhoja chooses to take the principle as one which would go against his new and unique Rasa of Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra and so replies :

"अतो यत्किंचिदेतद्, भावेभ्यो रसाः रसेभ्यो भावाः रसेभ्यश्च रसा इति । किंपुनरिह न्याय्यम् ? यथोपवर्णितं पुरस्तात् ।

अप्रातिकूलिकतया मनसो मुदादेः यः संविदोऽनुभवहेतुरिहाभिमानः ।
ज्ञेयो रसस्स रसनीयतयात्मशक्तेः रत्यादिभूमनि पुनर्वितथा रसोक्तिः ॥" *Ibid.* p. 381.

"रसेभ्यो भावा इत्यप्ययुक्तम् । न हि बहवो रसाः । अपि तु एक एव शृंगारो रस इत्यग्रतोऽपि प्रबन्धेन प्रतिपादयिष्यते । *Śṛ. Pra.*, Vol. II, p. 378.

Again confusion appears in the text in another place. Bhoja is discussing Bharata's dictum of four Prakṛti-rasas producing four other Rasas. He takes up the first pair of Janya-janaka *viz.*, Hāsya produced from Śṛṅgāra शृङ्गारादि भवेद् हास्यः It is plain that the Śṛṅgāra here mentioned refers to the Vyāvahārika-śṛṅgāra, the Ratiprakarṣa of Bhoja's Madhyamāvasthā and not to the Paramārtha-śṛṅgāra of the Parākoti. But Bhoja criticises this, taking Bharata's Śṛṅgāra as his own Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra.

प्रकृतिभूतेभ्य इति पक्षः, तत्रापि किं शृंगाराद्धास्यो जायते, उत शृंगार एव हास्यो भवति । किञ्चातः यदि शृंगाराद्धास्यो जायते, तदिष्यत एव । न ह्यशृङ्गारिणः कश्चिदपि प्रकर्षगामी अप्रकर्षगामी वा (भावः) संभवति । शृंगारी हि रमते (रतिः) उत्सहते (उत्साहः–वीरः) हसति (हासः–हास्यः) विस्मयते (विस्मयः–अद्भुतः) जुगुप्सते, शोचति, बिभेति, शाम्यति, स्निह्यति, गर्वायते, अभिमन्यते (उदात्तरसः) इति । *Śṛ: Pra.* Vol. II. p. 380.

Leaving aside these confusing passages, it can be seen from the texts quoted previously which clearly expound Bhoja's theory that Bhoja's new theory of one Rasa does not mean the glorification of the old Śṛṅgāra, the first of the accepted eight or nine Rasas. It is also clear from Bhoja's classification of his Śṛṅgāra into Dharma śṛṅgāra, Artha śṛṅgāra, Kāma śṛṅgāra and Mokṣa śṛṅgāra by which the mere *activities* themselves of man in the direction of these four Puruṣārthas, Dharma-icchā, Artha-icchā, Kāma-icchā and Mokṣa-icchā or Mumukṣā,—a scheme in which what we generally call Śṛṅgāra or love between man and woman, the Rasa produced from Rati, is the third Śṛṅgāra viz., Kāma Śṛṅgāra. Says Bhoja :

विभावानुभाव व्यभिचारि संयोगात् [वि] प्रकर्षमापद्यमानः प्रधान···(भा)वो रतिर्नाम कामशृङ्गाराख्यां लभते । P. 733. Vol. IV. Ch. 32. *Śṛ. Pra.*

Even here Bhoja does not avoid some confusion. Within the ordinary Śṛṅgāra which is Kāma śṛṅgāra in Bhoja's scheme, there are the varying

sub-classes of Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. The Kāma sub-variety of Kāma śṛṅgāra will be that of a lover like Udayana or that of a libertine like Agnivarṇa. Dharma-kāma-śṛṅgāra will be the sublime love of a Gṛhastha who is an Ekapatnīvrata. Artha-kāma śṛṅgāra will be the love of a man for material considerations, like Udayana's marriage with Padmāvatī or one's love to his own wife for the reason that going astray or moving with courtesans will ruin health or wealth ; it can also be sex-relations with women other than one's wife who do not cost one either health or wealth. Mokṣa śṛṅgāra is a higher aspect of Dharma śṛṅgāra in which a Gṛhastha with his Pativratā is one striving for liberation. Says Bhoja :

1 तदेतद् धर्मशृंगारे धीरोदात्तस्य चेष्टितम् ।
स्वाकीया नायिका चास्मिन् धीरोदात्तश्च नायकः ॥
Śṛ. Pra. Verses at the end of Ch. 18 on Dharma śṛṅgāra. Vol. III. p. 263.

स्वकीयैव नायिका धर्मशृंगाराङ्गम् । same ch.

2 धीरोद्धत्तस्य वृत्तेऽस्मिन् अर्थशृङ्गारसंश्रये ।
उद्धतो नायकः सर्वा स्त्री—॥ [1]
Śṛ. Pra. Ch. 19. Vol. III. p. 298.

3 ललितो नायकः सर्वा योषिद् वृत्तिस्तु कैशिकी (कामशृंगारे)
Ibid., end of Ch. 20. Vol. III. p. 325.

4 **आत्मीया कान्ता** शान्तश्च नायकः । (मोक्षशृ०). [2]
Ibid. Vol. III. p. 337.

1. There seems to be contradiction here when Bhoja gives all women as Nāyikā in Artha śṛṅgāra. As he himself says in the section on Dharma śṛṅgāra and as Vātsyāyana also says, Veśyās, Punarbhūs and whores are Artha-viruddha. Perhaps, Bhoja thinks not of Śṛṅgāra compatible with wholesome considerations of Artha, but thinks of the procurability of everything for one of wealth or force.

2. Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra examine this point in their *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* while describing the three Śṛṅgāras of Dharma, Artha and Kāma in connection with the Samavakāra. They say :

कामशृंगारः—परस्त्री कन्या च । न पुनः स्वदाराः, वेश्या वा । यथा—शक्रस्य अहल्या । स्वदारादौ हि धर्मस्याप्यनुप्रवेशेन केवलस्यैव कामस्य फलहेतुभावो न स्यात् । P. 125.

Bhoja means a pleasure seeker by his hero of Kāma śṛṅgāra and so considers any woman as heroine there. Rāmacandra, on the other hand, opines that in Svadāra or one's own legal and Vaidic wife, the Śṛṅgāra becomes Dhārmic and in courtesans and other public women also there is not pure love but only love mixed with Dharma; for it is not sinful to have relations with avowed public women. The height of pure Kāma is therefore found to exist in the relations with other men's wives, Paradāra, or the unmarried women who are courted, Kanyā. It is also true that in Veśyās who receive men for money, Kāma, which is mutual love, is absent and there is only Kāma spoilt by Artha. This is the idea behind the well known verse of the Bhāgavatas which conceives of greatest attachment in the simile of Parastri rati, "योषा जारमिव." Dāmodaragupta also says in his *Kuṭṭanimata* (Śl. 812)

Thus the four Śṛṅgāras, pertaining to the four Puruṣārthas, are also described as four sub-varieties of the one Kāma śṛṅgāra ; for in each case Bhoja takes the life of a married man and gives the variety of hero and heroine. The confusion is seen here. For all the four types of the higher Śṛṅgāra are taken at the same time as four kinds of the lower Śṛṅgāra. He takes Śṛṅgāra in both senses. In the beginning of each of the four chapters (18-21) which treat of the four types of Śṛṅgāras of Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa, he first describes Śṛṅgāra as Ahaṁkāra and describes the Puruṣārthas themselves with definitions and classifications. Thus Dharma is first described as follows :

धर्मो नाम श्रुतिस्मृतिविहिताचारः प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिरूपः ।

Śṛ. Pra. Vol. III. p. 237.

Artha is thus defined :

अर्थो नाम आत्मनः सुखसाधनानां कलत्रमित्रादीनाम् आजर्नम् ।

Ibid. p. 264.

Kāma śṛṅgāra is defined as Kāma and above all, the definition of Mokṣa cannot be mistaken. The last is described as man's endeavour for Mokṣa, knowing himself fit for it. It is Mokṣa śṛṅgāra because it is *activity* towards attaining Mokṣa ; Mokṣa, however, is a state where there is no activity and consequently no Śṛṅgāra or Ahaṁkāra ; the stage of striving when Ahaṁkāra helps one to do things is Mokṣa śṛṅgāra.

तत्त्वज्ञानान्निःश्रेयसाधिगमो मोक्षः । P. 329.

गार्हस्थ्येऽपि तदधिगमयोग्यताभिमानः मोक्षशृङ्गारः । Vol. III, p. 326.

इत्यादियोग्यचेतसोऽभिमानः स मोक्षशृङ्गार इत्युच्यते । तन्निवृत्तौ चास्य अहंकारविरहान् मोक्ष एवेति । यावदहंकारवान् तावादयं मोक्षशृङ्गारी । विरहिताहंकारस्तु मुक्त एवेति । यथा *

* * यथा च–'मयि जीवत्यहंकारे पुरुषः पञ्चविंशकः । तत्त्वज्ञानोपपन्नोऽपि न मोक्षं गन्तुमर्हति ॥' (*ibid.* p. 330).

Therefore activity towards Mokṣa is Mokṣa Śṛṅgāra ; Bhoja treats of under it the pure type of Jnāna mārga as in the cases of Sannyāsins and also of the

that in one's own wife, love is Dharma ; it is deficient in courtesans also ; real enjoyment or Kāma is only in that union which one gets with great difficulty with others' women. The very obstacles attach the two more to each other ; and the very idea of sin attached to it increases the pleasure ; for, the prohibition of No, 'Na', is always sweet to man. Says Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita (*Śānti Vilāsa*) :

प्रायो नेतिश्रुतिविषयता विश्वमाधुर्यहेतुः ।

Bharata also remarks : (XXIV. 199 Kasi. Edn.)

यद्वामाभिनिवेशित्वं यतश्चैव निवार्यते ।
दुर्लभत्वं च यन्नार्याः सा कामस्य रतिः परा ॥

But Bhoja must be taken to have classified on the basis of Prādhānya. For we cannot say anything more than that in a class, those features predominate. In Kāma śṛṅgāra, pure pursuit of Kāma predominates. Slight overlapping cannot be avoided.

Karmayogin's path ; similarly he speaks of the Gṛhastha-mumukṣu and it is in this (latter) connection that he says that the hero is Dhīra praśānta and the heroine his own wife married according to Vedic rites.

Thus in treating of the four Puruṣārtha-śṛṅgāras also which are the four Abhimānas or Ahaṁkāras for the four Puruṣārthas, Bhoja brings in the confusion between the two Śṛṅgāras. He takes all of them to begin with as pure Puruṣārthas but while ending, makes all the four varieties of Kāma śṛṅgāra itself (i.e. the Śṛṅgāra we generally mean and which is Rati-prakarṣa and the first of the Rasas of Bharata and others).

Another circumstance contributing to the confusion of the two Śṛṅgāras is that Bhoja glorifies both. His Ahaṁkāra is glorified by him as the one Rasa and at the same time the minor Śṛṅgāra born of Rati also is glorified by Bhoja. This glorification of Rati-śṛṅgāra is however nothing new. Writers have always held love as the greatest of sentiments and it is called Ādima rasa. Literature is eloquent on its supremacy and dramaturgy and poetics deal only with it. It is the monarch of all Rasas as Kumārasvāmin puts it : "—रससार्वभौमः शृङ्गारः—" P. 44 *P. R. Vyā.* Bālamanoramā Edn. Says Rudraṭa :

अनुसरति रसानां रस्यतामस्य नान्यः
सकलमिदमनेन व्याप्तमाबालवृद्धम् ॥ *K. A.* XIV. 38.

Numerous later writers raise the question of how any other Rasa except Śṛṅgāra can be held to be relishable and how the name Rasa can apply to any other sentiment except Śṛṅgāra. And, as can be seen from the chapter on Bhoja and his Successors, later writers who had no direct access to the big forest of the *Śṛ. Pra.* or did not have any clear grasp of what Bhoja actually said on Rasa amidst the thousand things he said in the *Śṛ. Pra.*, held that Bhoja recognised Śṛṅgāra as the only Rasa because it is the only relishable Rasa, even as Mādhurya is the only relishable taste. Bhoja did not hold Śṛṅgāra as the one Rasa for this reason ; and his one Rasa Śṛṅgāra is not the Śṛṅgāra which these writers think of. But, like many other writers, Bhoja paid special attention to Rati and to the Śṛṅgāra developing from it because experience shows it to be the greatest among the forty-nine Bhāvas. The *Jayamaṅgalā* on Vātsyāyana says :

"तत्र धर्मार्थयोः हेतुत्वात् काम एव फलभूतः
प्रकृष्टः पुरुषार्थ इति कामवादिनः" । P. 1, *K. S.*

And Bhoja also says :

तत्रापि धर्मार्थशृंगारयोः हेतुभूतत्वात्
कामशृंगार एव फलभूतत्वात् प्रधानः ॥ *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. III, p. 350.

This Bhoja says at the beginning of Chapter XXII which opens a special and further elaboration of the subject of Kāma śṛṅgāra, though it had already been described once in Chapter XX. In Chapter XI he says of Rati that it is the king of Bhāvas :

समस्तभावमूर्धाभिषिक्तायाः रतेः ।

At the end of Chapter XIII which is devoted to the treatment of Rati Bhoja glorifies Rati thus :

सैष भावो रतिर्नाम कामकल्पद्रुमाङ्कुरः ।
सौहृदाङ्कुरकन्दश्च द्विप्रकारोऽपि दर्शितः ॥
भावान्तरेभ्यस्सर्वेभ्यो रतिभावः प्रकृष्यते ।
कविवर्गः समग्रोऽपि तमेनमनुधावति ॥[1] *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. III, p. 33.

And very large treatment is given in the *Śṛ. Pra.* to this Rati-prakarṣa-śṛṅgāra. Chapter XIII treats of it first in all its varieties and is called Rati prakāśa. Chapter XV treats of its Ālambana vibhāvas, the types of heroes and heroines pertaining to Rati ; the chapter is called Ratyālambana-vibhāva-prakāśa. Chapter XVI deals with its Uddīpana vibhāvas ; XVII, Anubhāvas ; XX, Kāma śṛṅgāra, i.e., Rati-prakarṣa ; XXII, again begins a section on this same Śṛṅgāra ; Chapters XXII-XXXVI (the very end of the work) deal with the numerous aspects pertaining to the various kinds of the two divisions of Rati, Sambhoga and Vipralambha. Thus out of the thirty-six chapters of the work, nineteen deal with Rati-śṛṅgāra. Eight chapters have to be left apart as devoted to grammatical and quasi-grammatical questions. Ninth and tenth chapters go to Doṣas, Guṇas and Alaṁkāras. The twelfth is devoted to drama ; fourteenth to a description of the 48 Bhāvas other than Rati ; and chapters XVIII, XIX and XXI to a description of Dharma, Artha and Mokṣa Śṛṅgāras. The proportion can now be seen clearly.

Another point on which there is bound to be confusion is a really serious aspect of the question. The point is not merely one of an uncritical mind confusing the two Śṛṅgāras which are quite different as the parent and one of the 49 children ; but is one of a critical mind realising that between the parent and his eldest offspring, there is so much in common that the two Śṛṅgāras have some real identity revealing itself on a minute analysis. The third stage of Rasa, Bhoja says, is the 'Paramā kāṣṭhā' or 'Uttarā Koṭi'

1. *Cf. Mahābhārata*, Śānti Parvan :

श्रेयः पुष्पफलं काष्ठात् कामो धर्मार्थयोर्वरः ।
कामो धर्मार्थयोर्योनिः कामश्चाथ तदात्मकः ॥

Quoted by Bhagvan Das in his *Science of Emotions.*

Cf. also M. B. GREENBIE, *Personality*, p. 257. "After all, there is only one real emotion, and that is love. Most other feelings are love sickened or hurt. Envy and jealousy are both jaundiced love. One is attracted to someone or something, and, instead of admitting it directly, and taking pleasure in the fact that somebody has something fine, one turns the attraction into self-torture. Anger is usually outraged love. Fear and anxiety, even the psycho-analysists tell us, are of the form of sick-love. The full elucidation of this important fact must be left for the Freudians and the metaphysicians." What GREENBIE has said is also the basis of the concept of Vyabhicāri-bhāva formulated by Bharata.

where all Bhāvas are a kind of love. If a man has Rati, it means he loves to love a woman ; if he laughs, he loves to laugh ; if he fights, he loves to fight. All Bhāvas are thus synthesised in Preman which however is only another name of Kāma or Śṛṅgāra, a name of Abhimāna or Ahaṁkāra. Taking cue from this 'Uttarā koṭi' where a synthesis of all Bhāvas in Preman, which is only a subtler phase of Rati, takes place, the *Agnipurāṇa* clearly states a Rati-synthesis. It holds the Tattvas thus : Ātman, Ānanda, then Ahaṁkāra, Abhimāna and Rati. Of this Rati, Hāsa etc. are the Bhedas. See *A. P.* 339/Śl. 1-6. See also below the section on Bhoja's Rasa theory and the *Agni purāṇa.*

Bhoja calls his Ahaṁkāra Rasa, Abhimāna. Rati itself is, in essence, Abhimāna. The principle of Abhimāna-sukha is that variety of Rati called Ābhimānikī as in such masochistic acts like Kuṭṭamita must be extended to love in general. Love proceeds from Abhimāna or Samkalpa. Love is Manasija and Manas itself is Samkalpātmaka. Samkalpa is the origin of Kāma and whether it is Kāma for Dharma, Artha, Kāma or Mokṣa, it is all one Kāma throughout. Thus the philosophical concept of Kāma is almost synonymous with Bhoja's absolute Śṛṅgāra, Abhimāna or Ahaṁkāra. It is in this sense that Bharata uses Kāma when he says :

प्रायेण सर्वभावानां कामान्निष्पत्तिरिष्यते

and says, long before Bhoja thought of it, that Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa are all forms of love, Kāma.

धर्मकामोऽर्थकामश्च मोक्षकामस्तथैव च ।
स्त्रीपुंसयोस्तु संयोगः यः कामः (कामकामः) स तु संस्मृतः ॥

So it is that the Vedas say : कामस्तदग्रे समवर्ततााधि मनसो रेतः प्रथमं यदासीत् ।
Rv. V. X.

and : आत्मनस्तु कामाय सर्वं प्रियं भवति ॥ *Bṛ. Ār. Upaniṣad.*

Therefore it is that Bhoja says that his Ahaṁkāra Śṛṅgāra is the very life of Love, Ātmayoni, which he explains clearly as Ratiprakarṣa-Śṛṅgāra.

आत्मस्थितं गुणविशेषमहंकृतस्य
शृंगारमाहुरिह **जीवितमात्मयोनेः** ।

अहंकारगुणविशेषस्य धर्मार्थफलभूततृतीयपुरुषार्थजीवितस्य शृंगारस्य अभिमानापरनाम्नः—

Thus Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra can be shown to be the rarefied essence of the ordinary Śṛṅgāra or love and hence the two Śṛṅgāras are not absolutely unrelated.

Bhoja's Rasa Theory and the Sāṁkhya.

As has been pointed out above, Bhoja, in his mental struggle to understand what exactly the word Rasa meant, landed on the word Rasika in common use connoting certain persons of developed taste. He started with the grammatical explanation of the word Rasika. The word means one who

has Rasa in him. Bhoja adds that this he also found out by the Sāṁkhya theory of causation : सदेव उत्पद्यते. When on reading poetry or witnessing drama, a Sahṛdaya has Rasa manifesting in his heart, the Rasa produced comes from nowhere else except his own soul.

स एव प्रमाणत्रयोपन्यासहेतुः वक्तुरभिप्रायः प्रतीयमानः प्रमाणत्रयोपन्यासादिना च सांख्यदर्शनाश्रयेण च श्रृंगारः सन्नेव आविर्भवति, न त्वसन्नुत्पद्यते ॥' P. 43, Vol. II.

This Rasa is learnt from the Śabdapramāṇa of Bhoja's own words ; the Pratyakṣa that proves its existence is our own experience ; and by Arthāpatti also its existence in the soul of man is assumed or postulated on the basis of the Satkāryavāda of the Sāṁkhyas that if there was no Rasa already in our hearts, it could not have been manifested. Bhoja bases his theory on these three Pramāṇas of Śabda, Pratyakṣa and Arthāpatti. The only Śabda which he could quote as Āptavacana is his own text आत्मस्थितं गुणविशेषमहं-कृतस्य etc. The last Pramāṇa, Arthāpatti, refers to the Satkāryavāda of the Sāṁkhyas which Bhoja adopts and on whose basis, he argues that what does not already exist cannot be manifested ; and this shows how through Arthāpatti also, the pre-existence of Rasa in the soul of man may be established.

Thus it is to the Satkāryavāda of the Sāṁkhyas that Bhoja is indebted in respect of his Rasa theory, according to his own statement. But, I think, Bhoja owes more to the Sāṁkhya than he has himself admitted. For, the concept of Ahaṁkāratattva in our souls as the root cause of all relish and the germ from which all Bhāvas arise is the third manifestation of the Sāṁkhyas' Prakṛti—प्रकृतेर्महान्, ततोऽहङ्कारः, from which Ahaṁkāra are produced the ten Indriyas, Manas and the five Bhūta-tanmātrās. This Ahaṁkāra is called Abhimāna also in Sāṁkhya.

अभिमानोऽहंकारः तस्माद्द्विविधः प्रवर्तते सर्गः ।

Īśvarakṛṣṇa Kārikā, 24.

Thirdly, his indebtedness to Sāṁkhya thought is seen in another aspect of his Rasa theory. It is the Sāṁkhya which speaks of our Buddhi as being made up of the three strands or Guṇas of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. The first, Sattva, is Sukhātmaka.

प्रीत्यप्रीतिविषादात्मकाः etc., *Īśvarakṛṣṇa* 12.

"तत्र प्रीत्यात्मकं सत्त्वं, प्रीतिः सुखं तदात्मकम् इति ।"

This Sattvaguṇa must be made to predominate in our character by incessant good deeds that purify us during the many migrations of our souls through numerous bodies. In the aspect of its nature as Prīti and Sukha, this Sattvaguṇa can be called Rasa and Āsvāda. And Bhoja says expressly that his new Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra-rasa is an excellence in ourselves pertaining to our Sattvaguṇa.

सत्त्वात्मनाममलजन्मविशेषजन्मा
जन्मान्तरानुभवनिर्मितवासनोत्थः ।

सर्वात्मसंपदुदयातिशयैकहेतुः
जागर्ति कोऽपि हृदि मानमयो विकारः ॥

And this is the faculty in us, this manifestation of Sāttvika-Ahaṁkāra, that enables us to enjoy ourselves, other persons, other feelings and other objects. This fact of Bhoja having derived his ideas from the Sāṁkhya is plain from Bhoja's own comments in chapter VII on his own verse सत्त्वात्मनाम् etc., where he says that Ahaṁkāra or Abhimāna is a Prakṛtivikāra reflecting Ātman. See extracts at the end of this chapter.

A strange coincidence is the view of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka who also holds the Rasāsvāda as due to the manifestation of the Sattvaguṇa in a predominating degree over others.

"—रसोऽनुभवस्मृत्यादिविलक्षणेन रजस्तमोऽनुवेधवैचित्र्यबलाद् हृदि (द्रुति) विस्तर विकासलक्षणेन सत्त्वोद्रेकप्रकाशानन्दमयनिजसंविद्विश्रान्ति [वि] लक्षणेन परब्रह्मास्वादसविधेन भोगेन परं भुज्यत इति" P. 279, Gaek. Edn., Pt. I., *Abhi. Bhā.*

And in explaining the Rasāsvāda in Karuṇa at least, Abhinavagupta also is of this same opinion and follows this same Sāṁkhya idea of Guṇas ; he says that Duḥkha is Rajoguṇa, Cāñcalya,—चलं च रजः—(*Īśvarakṛṣṇa* 13.) and Sukha is its removal, leading to Viśrānti or repose which is one of the characteristics of Sattvaguṇa, the Guṇa which is Laghu, Prakāśa and Prītyātmaka.

तथा हि एकघनशोकसंविच्चर्वणेऽपि लोकेऽस्ति स्त्रीलोकस्य हृदयविश्रान्तिः अन्तरायशून्यविश्रान्ति शरीरत्वात् सुखस्य । अविश्रान्तिरूपतैव दुःखम् । तत एव कापिलैः दुःखस्य चाञ्चल्यमेव प्राणत्वेनोक्तम् रजोवृत्तितां वदद्भिः इत्यानन्दरूपता सर्वरसानाम् ।

P. 283, *Abhi. Bhā.* Gaek. Edn., Pt. I.

In respect of the pleasurable emotions, however, Rasa is described as the very Ātman itself whose Ānanda manifests when the barriers against its manifestation are removed. Says Jagannātha : भग्नावरणा चिदेव रसः. The appeal of poetry is to man and to the embodied soul as such and the æsthetic Rasa is not exactly Ātmānanda Rasa or Brahmānanda Rasa, but only comparable to it. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, in the passage quoted above, says 'परब्रह्मास्वादसविधेन' The *Saṅgītaratnākara* of Śāṁgadeva says : (VII. 1266.)

ब्रह्मसंविद्विसदृशी * * * संविद् ।

and Kallinātha comments upon it :

'नानारत्यादिसङ्गमाद् बहुधाभूतरत्यादिस्थायिभावसंबन्धादेतोः ब्रह्मसंविदो वैसादृश्यमुक्त्वा अंशान्तरैः सच्चिदानन्दरूपैः तत्सादृश्यमप्याह—॥ P. 814, Ānandāśrama Edn.

Kāvyarasa is surely Prāpañcika but one of the noblest of such delights also, being, in a way, Alaukika, supermundane. It is enjoyed by us with our Antaḥkaraṇa as Jīvas and Samsārins and not as Muktas who have shed their Antaḥkaraṇa and have become one with the Ānanda that is Ātman. Therefore

it would not be wrong to say that it is the quality of Sattvaguṇa which is Laghu, Prakāśaka and Prītyātmaka in the embodied Jīva, by which he enjoys. Between the purely Sattva-dominated Buddhi and the Ātman, there is not much difference. Says Patañjali (III. 55.)

सत्त्वपुरुषयोः शुद्धिसाम्ये कैवल्यमिति ।

Therefore, to adopt Sattva in its purest and highest form (Sattvodreka) or the pure Ātman itself as the ultimate basis of Rasa-manifestation would not make any material difference. While Abhinavagupta and other writers take their stand on the nature of the Ātman itself, Bhoja chooses to find the basic principle of his Rasa theory in the Sāttvika buddhi. Ātman itself, in perfect repose, when the ripples of the various mental conditions or emotions have not risen, is Abhinavagupta's fundamental basis. But in Bhoja's theory the individual self, qualified by his Sattva-dominated Antaḥkaraṇa and the element of Self-Love or Ahaṁkāra, and otherwise in a condition of perfect repose and not yet subject to any of the emotional agitations, is the basis. Even in Śāntarasa for which Abhinavagupta goes as far back as the Ātman itself, Bhoja stops with the Sāttvika Ahaṁkāra ; for he says Mumukṣā is Śāntarasa, and Mukti itself is not within the scope of our study. But the fundamental similarly between the two views of Abhinavagupta and Bhoja cannot be overlooked. Abhinavagupta says and many others accept that Rasa as such is only one. So it is that Bharata used the singular 'न हि रसादते कश्चिदर्थः प्रवर्तते' remarks Abhinavagupta. Āsvāda is of the identical nature of Ānanda in all Rasas. Coming down from this stage, we have the Upādhis like Rati, Hāsa etc., which differentiate this one Ānanda of Rasa into Śṛṅgāra (from Rati), Hāsya (from Hāsa) and so on. (*Abhi. Bhā.* pp. 269 & 273). Therefore the various well-known distinctions of Rasa belong to the lower world of Vyavahāra. When we go above it, there is only one nameless Rasa, a mere bliss, in which we lose ourselves and do not know of anything else, within or without. Bhoja makes almost the same statement with a slight change. He holds that the name Rasa can strictly apply only to that supreme state of bliss in which we become completely absorbed. And it can be only one. Below that stage, we cannot say we have the Rasas as conditioned by Rati etc., for, these Aupādhika-rasas do not deserve to be called Rasas ; they are merely Bhāvas, still in the state of Bhāvanā.

आभावनोदयमनन्यधिया जनेन
यो भाव्यते मनसि भावनया स भावः ।
यो भावनापथमतीत्य विवर्तमानः
साहंकृते हृदि परं स्वदते रसोऽसौ ॥

There is some similarity here between Bhoja and Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka also. The latter is not quoted by Bhoja but the 'Bhāvya-bhāvaka-sambandha' theory between Rasa and Kāvya is the theory of Dhanañjaya and Dhanika also and Bhoja who came immediately after them, was, in all likelihood, acquainted with it. Anyway none is quoted and though there

is no clue to actual borrowing, it can be seen that small threads of thought in the fabric of Bhoja's theory show affinities to Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's theory. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka it is who analysed Bharata's description of Bhāvas and Bharata's Vyutpatti of the word Bhāva : काव्यार्थान्भावयन्तीति भावाः and arrived at a power in poetic and dramatic expression called Bhāvanā. This power releases the universal emotion localised in the narrated or enacted story and presents the pure Bhāva as such, which the Sahṛdaya enjoys by the power of Bhoga or Bhogīkaraṇa, called up in his self by the manifestation of Sattvaguṇa. This Sattvaguṇa and the bliss of Rasa enjoyed therein find a place in Bhoja's theory which says that Rasa is enjoyed and is called such only at this stage when it passes into our self. हृदिपरं स्वदते रसोऽसौ। This one Svāda or enjoyment born of Sattvaguṇa— सत्त्वात्मनाम् etc., is similar to Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's Bhoga. What is the difference between Bhoga and Āsvāda or Rasana? This stage of Āsvāda of Rasa in our hearts is after the stage called "Bhāvanā", and so far, both agree. The principle of Sādhāraṇīkaraṇa is not stated anywhere expressly by Bhoja. But it is implied in his statement that even if Bhāvas have been nourished and have been brought to Prakarṣa, they are yet Bhāvas, Rati etc., as long as they are in the state of Bhāvanā. This state of Bhāvanā can be called the state of contemplation, of the Bhāvas as specified by their contexts. After this, there is no context-limited contemplation but only a losing of oneself in one's self, Ego, inner bliss, which is Rasa-realisation.

Madhusūdana Sarasvatī explains Rasa on the basis of psychology as expounded by the Sāṁkhya system from which, as we saw above, not only did Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and Bhoja borrow, but Abhinavagupta also took something. His treatment is independent and he does not link himself up to Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka or to any other writer.

Prakṛti of which all things are manifestations is the composite of the three strands or Guṇas or tendencies called Sattva, Rajas and Tamas of which the characteristics are happiness, misery, and stupor, ignorance, infatuation or delusion, Sukha, Duḥkha and Moha. Mind also is of this three-fold nature. Therefore, Rati is Sāttvika, Krodha is Rājasa and Śoka is Tāmasa. But how are these Rasas? How do those two Sthāyins which are Rājasa and Tāmasa, *viz.*, Krodha and Śoka become Rasa? That is, how do they partake of Sattva when alone they become Rasa and relishable? Madhusūdana Sarasvatī is plain in his statement that, for a Sthāyin to become Rasa, it has to become Sāttvika. Sattva alone can manifest bliss which is not of the form of the other two Guṇas. So Madhusūdana Sarasvatī says that when these Sthāyins as presented in a Kāvya attain Prakarṣa or Udriktatva and produce a melting of our heart, they partake of Sattva and become Sukhamaya, thus attaining Rasatva. But Madhusūdana Sarasvatī is not clear on this point of how Rājasa and Tāmasa Bhāvas become Sāttvika and consequently Rasa. He takes his stand on experience which however shows an enjoyment in drama of even Krodha and Śoka, and

on the basis of this Anubhava he says that they become Sattva in part, though they continue to be in their real nature Rājasa and Tāmasa. This however spoils the case and Madhusūdana Sarasvatī has to say, *quite contrary to the generally accepted notions, that Rasāsvāda or Ānanda therefore necessarily differs in quantity and quality in such cases.*

तमोरजःसत्त्वगुणाः मोहदुःखसुखात्मकाः ।
तन्मयी प्रकृतिर्हेतुः सर्वं काव्यं च तन्मयम् ॥

× × ×

एवं सति सुखाकारः प्रविष्टो मानसो यदा ।
तदा स स्थायिभावत्वं प्रतिपद्य रसो भवेत् ॥ I, 15-18.

क्रोधादिभावस्यापि रजस्तमोमिश्रितत्वोद्रेकनिबन्धनचित्तद्रुतिफलितत्वात् सुखमयत्वमिति अभिप्रायः, द्रवीभावस्य सत्त्वधर्मत्वात्, तं विना च स्थायिभावासंभवात्, सत्त्वगुणस्य च सुखरूपत्वात्, सर्वेषां भावानां सुखमयत्वेऽपि रजस्तमोंशमिश्रणात् तारतम्यम् अवगन्तव्यम्। अतो न सर्वेषु रसेषु तुल्यसुखानुभवः॥
P. 22., *Bhaktirasāyana.*

This position differs from Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka would not have said that Rasatva differs in the case of some Bhāvas. He postulated the Bhāvanā Śakti for poetic expression and dramatic action by which the Bhāvas are made transcendental and universal, and the third power in us called Bhoga which is the manifestation of the Sattvaguṇa through the impact of the above-said Bhāvanā reaches out the universalised Bhāvas and make us enjoy them. Bhoja's position also differs from Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's. What Madhusūdana Sarasvatī says regarding Bhāvas in their Laukika state that some of them are of the form of misery, Duḥkha rūpa, would appear to be not unacceptable to Bhoja. For Bhoja says रसा हि सुखदुःखावस्थारूपाः । But by Rasas here, Bhāvas are meant and to Bhoja Ahaṁkāra is the only Rasa. This Ahaṁkāra rasa is Sāttvika and by its permeation (Āveśa or Anupraveśa) our minds are in a position to enjoy the Prakarṣas of Rati etc. Every theory says that Rasa is of the nature of bliss; but to be frank, every theory leaves us here in vague words.[1]

1. It was noted above that the great philosopher Madhusūdana Sarasvatī is of opinion that it is impossible to hold complete Rasatva of a totally blissful nature in Krodha and Śoka and he clearly said that there are degrees in the bliss of Rasa. It was also noted that there is a passage in Bhoja which appears to say that Rasas are of the form of conditions pleasant as well as unpleasant.

रसा हि सुखदुःखावस्थारूपाः

But it has been explained that Bhoja means here not Rasas exactly but only Bhāvas. Abhinavagupta clearly explains, as has been already pointed out, how even in the case of Śoka, Rasa is of the form of bliss. But certain writers seem to have accepted the position that among Rasas, there is a difference that some are of the form of happiness while others are of the form of misery. The *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* says in Kārikā 109 "सुखदुःखात्मको रसः" and adds in the Vṛtti arguments to support this view. Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra say that it is against experience to say that Karuṇa, Bhayānaka, Bibhatsa and Raudra are of the form of pleasure. The Camat-

Madhusūdana Sarasvatī further points out that according to the Saṁkhyas the seat of enjoyment which is Manas is Āhaṁkārika, which can be compared with Bhoja's Rasa or enjoyment being called Ahaṁkāra.

"यद्यपि सांख्यानामाहंकारिकं मनः ब्रह्मवादिनां तु मते भौतिकमिति महान् विशेषः, तथापि विषयाकारग्राहकत्वं समानमिति तुल्यवदुभयोरुपन्यासः" P. 24, *Bha. Ras.*

Madhusūdana Sarasvatī explains Rasa according to the Vedānta also, where Brahman is considered as Paramānandasvarūpa. Not only are Bhakti and Śānta of this same nature of Paramānanda but even other Rasas also. For, all Ānanda is Its manifestation.

I think that the point regarding the Sattvaguṇa involved in Rasa-realisation can thus be explained. The imaginative activity of aesthetic contemplation called Bhāvanā following the reading of a poem or the witnessing of a drama is a Sāttvika activity. It is the making of our own hearts take the shape of what is presented in the poem or drama. This is Sattva. This is how even Rājasa and Tāmasa Bhāvas like anger and sorrow come to be Sāttvika. The Sāṁkhya term Sattva is used in this context with a specialised meaning imported into it and equated with Sattva well known in dramaturgy as meaning "Tanmayībhavana" *Cf. Saṅgītaratnākara*, VII, 23.

सात्त्विकः सात्त्विकैर्भावैः भावुकेन विभावितः ।

and Kallinātha on it. (P. 627. Ānandāśrama Edn.)

---

kāra experienced on witnessing plays depicting them is however due to the exellence of the performance of the actors and perhaps critics who hold these Rasas also to be pleasurable confuse the Camatkāra produced by the skill of the dramatist and the actors with the emotions depicted. It is to witness the excellence of the art of the poet and the actor that people crowd to see even such plays though nothing but unhappiness is produced in the hearts while witnessing them. These four Rasas resemble the hot and sour tastes which also add to the tastes of the dishes as much as the taste of sweetness. If by imitation and presentation by actors, the unpleasant feelings are said to become pleasant, it is clear that the actor's art is hopelessly deficient, showing a thing in its opposite nature. See also my *Number of Rasas*, pp. 155-7.

There is a work in manuscript named *Rasakalikā* in the Madras Govt. Oriental Mss. Library (R. 2241) which is by Rudrabhaṭṭa and is the same as the work of that name quoted by Vāsudeva on the *Karpūramañjarī*. (See my *Number of Rasas*, p. 53). This work agrees with the view of the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* that Rasas are both pleasant and unpleasant. It considers Karuṇa and others as Duḥkharūpa and attributes our interest in witnessing plays depicting them to our mental absorption in the acting going on before us. So the Rasa of Karuṇa is of a peculiar kind and is particularly due to, not to the nature of the emotion itself, but to our contemplation of the art with which an actor presents it.

करुणामयानामप्युपादेयत्वं सामाजिकानाम्, रसस्य सुखदुःखात्मकतया तदुभयलक्षणत्वेन उपपद्यते । अत एव तदुभयजनकत्वम् । एवंविधस्याप्युपादेयत्वम् अन्वयव्यतिरेकगम्यत्वमिति । रसा नायकाश्रिता एव सामाजिकैर्नटचेष्टया काव्यश्रवणेन च साक्षाद् भाव्यन्ते । समनुभाव्यमानास्तं तम् अनुभवं जनयन्ति । परगतरससम्यग्भावनया अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां निरतिशयानन्दजनकत्वमिति तत्र प्रवृत्तिरपि घटत इति सर्वं रमणीयमिति" ॥ *Mad. Ms.*, Pp. 51-52.

भावुकेन भावनाव्यापारवता नटेन प्रेक्षकेन च ।

Some such suggestion can be taken from the term Sāttvika and the idea of Sattva in the concept of Sāttvika bhāvas, in view of what Śāradātanaya says of the Sāttvikabhāvas.

मनः सत्त्वमधिष्ठाय तत्तदिन्द्रियगोचरान् ।
बुद्धिमाश्लिष्य विषयान् उपभुङ्क्ते स्वभावतः ॥
त्रिधा सत्त्वं भवेद् बुद्धिज्ञानानन्दविभेदतः ।
तद्भावभावनात्मा स्यात् परदुःखादिसेवया ॥
परस्य सुखदुःखादेः अनुभावेन चेतसः ।
तद्भावभावनं येन भवेत्तदनुकूलतः ।
तत्सत्त्वं तेन निर्वृत्ताः सात्त्विका इत्युदीरिताः ।

The name Sāttvika and its significance can thus be extended to apply to aesthetic response, Cittasamvāda or Tadbhāva-bhāvanā also.

To sum up :

1. As to Mātṛgupta and many others whose views the *Locana* and the *Rasagangādhara* record, any element in Kāvya contributing to our Camatkāra is Rasa to Bhoja.

2. Among these, the 49 Bhāvas are especially Rasas.

3. All these 49 Rasas are however Rasas only through Upacāra, being, in the strict sense, only Bhāvas.

4. The 49 Bhāvas which pertain to all developed characters are born of the supreme Ego. They are in the characters whom poets handle ; they are in the poets who write and they are in the composition which the poets write and in which those characters figure. When a dramatic composition is enacted, the actors have them and when spectators see them, provided they are Rasikas, themselves cultured and developed, they enjoy the Rasas presented to them. Thus, all these men are seats of Rasas.

5. When a poem is read and a drama is seen, we contemplate upon the Bhāvas. After this contemplation or Bhāvanā, we relish and enjoy and at this stage, all Bhāvas have passed into the state of one indivisible, unitary and nameless Tattva of Bliss ; this is Rasa, *par excellence.*

It must be admitted that Bhoja does not fully explain the problem of literary and dramatic appeal. What he does is the finding out of the root of all Bhāvas, the root of enjoyment, and the prime cause of the development of character and personality. This he calls Abhimāna, Ahaṁkāra and Śṛṅgāra. That life (Loka) should be kept distinct from art (Kāvya) though they are related to each other, that Kāraṇa etc. in life become Vibhāvas etc. in Kāvya, that an objective Sthāyin suggests a subjective Sthāyin, that there exists the third and greatest fact to be considered *viz.*, the reader and the spectator, that Rasa is really his enjoyment, that he has a Cittasamvāda which is absorption, repose and bliss, Viśrānti and Rasa,—these are not ex-

plained at all by Bhoja. The Sūtra विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद्रसनिष्पत्तिः is explained with reference to the text of poetic and dramatic expression only,—how a certain Sthāyin is described to reach its highest development by the description of its Vibhāvas etc. Everything here is dealt with as if poetry and drama stand by themselves, whereas the crux of the matter is the spectator's delight. The real enquirer should shift the ground of primary enquiry to the Sahṛdaya. Leaving such matters untouched, Bhoja wanders in woodlands in search of his fairy of Ahaṁkāra. It is sheer extravagance; and supremely pleased with his discovery he thinks he breaks into Vedic eloquence when he announces his discovery :

स श्रृङ्गारः, सोऽभिमानः, स रसः ![1]

He has attacked in vain Bharata's scheme of four Rasas from four others, taking his text in a sense which he did not mean; and after making all this fuss, he has accepted this scheme with the limitations and modifications necessarily coming up in a statement which was only intended to be illustrative and not exhaustive. His attack upon the theory of Rasas from Bhāvas is futile; for, it refers not to his Ahaṁkāra-śṛṅgāra rasa but only to his secondary Rasas of Ratiprakarṣa etc., and in respect of which he himself does accept that theory. Above all, he loses his balance while descending from the summit of Ahaṁkāra and holds every imaginable thing as Rasa. The poet, the character, the actor, and finally the spectator—these are not definitely taken up as distinct factors with reference to which the problem of Rasa has to be solved. Instead, only one factor viz., man, looms large in Bhoja's theory of Rasa. In this one fact viz., Rasika or the cultured man as such, in whom character is developed and individuality marked, Bhoja attempts to synthesise all the above mentioned factors and this attempt results in a mess and jumble of aesthetic and non-aesthetic elements. It is this lack again of the discrimination between the self-regarding pleasures of ordinary life and the ineffable bliss of aesthetic enjoyment that detracts greatly from the value of Bhoja's speculation in art criticism. When a Śṛṅgārī, or Ahaṁkārī or a Rasika sees a play or reads a poem, he enjoys it through his Rasa or Ahaṁkāra, a peculiar faculty with which a few blessed men are endowed. This is all that can be definitely taken as Bhoja's contribution. If we have explained the process of this enjoyment also to a little extent according to Bhoja and have dilated on related ideas, it is not on the basis of any clear text of Bhoja where he tackles the main problem proper and clearly analyses the question, but only on the basis of certain suggestions derived by us from Bhoja's epigrammatic verses on Ahaṁkāra accompanied by his own amplification which is far from adequate.

Three stages of Rasa were described in the foregone sections. They are Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra, Ratyādiprakarṣa and Preman-Ahaṁkāra. From the first

1. Thinking perhaps of Vedic expressions like :

स ब्रह्म स शिवः सेन्द्रः सोऽक्षरः परमः स्वराट् ।

all the 49 Bhāvas arise; so the same Rasa thus comes to assume the form of the 49 Bhāvas. The 49 Bhāvas themselves have their Bhāva state and then the Prakarṣa, when any one of them becomes the Sthāyin and is subserved by the rest. The state of Prakarṣa of these Bhāvas also means nothing more than the Prakarṣa of Ahaṁkāra. The secondary Rasa or the Rasa of the Madhyamāvasthā has three aspects, Prakarṣa, Bhāvarūpa already mentioned, and Ābhāsa. Prakṛṣṭa is Rasa that is 'Niṣpanna', emerged or developed as is described in the Rasa-niṣpatti-sūtra of Bharata. The Prakṛṣṭa is the Rasa which is in the hero, for in a story, it is only his Rasa that is main and can be developed to the end. 'Bhāvarūpa' is undeveloped Rasa. It is also the state of the emotions in the subsidiary themes in a story which cannot be developed to the extent to which the hero's Rasa is developed. The third is 'Ābhāsa' or semblance. It is the Rasa in non-human beings, and in a whole story or theme, the Rasa of the Pratināyaka like Rāvaṇa. These three are again of two kinds, pertaining to Vākya and to Prabandha.

तदुपाधिश्चायमुपजायमनो रसः त्रिधा विख्यायते । प्रकृष्टः, भावरूपः, आभासश्च । तत्र यः कथाशरीरव्यापिनः उत्तमनायकस्य तथाविध एव विषये जायते स प्रकृष्टः । मध्यमस्य य उपजायते न प्रकर्षमासादयति स भावरूपः । यश्च तिरश्चां प्रतिनायकादीनां चोपजायते स शृङ्गाराभासः ।

Śṛ. Pra., Vol. II, p. 356.

In a further section, Bhoja calls these Jātibhedas of Rasa. Even as fire is of various kinds in lightning, in earth and in our stomach, so also has Rasa such forms as Ābhāsa and Bhāva.

अथ यथैकस्याप्यग्नेः भौमदिव्यौदर्यादयो जातिभेदाः * * *
तथा एकस्यापि रसस्य भावरसतदाभासादयः जातिभेदाः * * ।

Ibid. p. 386.

Taking the Madhyamāvasthā of the 49 secondary Rasas, Bhoja explains Bharata's Rasa-sūtra. To him, the position is the same as it was to Bharata, Daṇḍin and Lollaṭa, the Sthāyin itself is Rasa when it attains Prakarṣa. The Sūtra is somewhat explained when Bhoja says :

रत्यादीनामेकोनपञ्चाशतोऽपि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगात् परप्रकर्षाधिगमे रसव्यपदेशार्हता । *Śṛ. Pra.*, Vol. II, p. 381.

He thus explains an instance of Harṣasthāyin becoming Ānandarasa by the action of the Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins.

अत्र कस्याश्चित् * * * मानवत्याः **प्रियदर्शनालम्बनविभावादुत्पन्ने प्रकृष्टरतिप्रभवे प्रहर्षस्थायिभावे** तत्पार्श्वोपसर्पणादिभि**रुद्दीपनविभावैरुद्दीप्यमाने** समुत्पद्यमानेषु पुलकादिषु **सुखात्मकेषु व्यभिचारिषु** नयननिमीलनाधोमुख्यनीवीस्रंसनादिभि**रनुभावैः** परप्रकर्षारोपणाद् **आनन्द रसताम्** आपद्यमाने **स्थायिनि**— *Śṛ. Pra.* Vol. II, p. 394.

And this corresponds to the view of Lollaṭa and the Cirantanas, old writers (Daṇḍin), as given in the *Abhinavabhāratī*, P. 274, Gaek. Edn. Pt. I.

In a special section, Bhoja explains the Rasasūtra in a series of beautiful similes.

There is Abhimāna in the mind ; when objects confront it, the Abhimāna takes the shapes of the objects and according as the objects are pleasant or otherwise, the Bhāvas, Rati, Krodha, Śoka etc. are born. The process is respectively similar to the Candrakānta stone flowing out in the presence of the moon (Rati); the Sūryakānta blazing forth on the sight of the sun (Krodha); and the Sphaṭika melting in the proximity of Karpūra (Śoka). This explains Ālambanavibhāva.

Just as the sea becomes boisterous at moon-rise, just as disease increases by bad diet, just as a rogue creates more michief when he gets to his aid one more of his own class, so also Uddīpanavibhāvas create trouble first (Kṣobha), then increase the suffering more and more. The Uddīpanas are thus Kṣobhakas, Abhivardhakas, and Pratikūlas, agitating, inflaming and adverse. This explains Uddīpanavibhāva.

Then out of these Sthāyibhāvas created and kindled respectively from Rasa by Ālambana and Uddīpana Vibhāvas, arise Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins. These are of the form of the Bhāva itself, though they differ in name and form. The Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins (the Sāttvikas are included in the latter) are of two kinds, internal and external, Ābhyantara and Bāhya. The Ābhyantara-vyabhicārins are Cintā, Autsukya etc., and the Bāhya-vyabhicārins are the eight Sāttvikas. The two differ in the way in which the stump and branches of a tree differ from the leaves, flowers and fruits of the same tree ; flood, whirl, bubble and wave are Ābhyantara-*vivartas* of water ; Bāhya-vyabhicārins and Anubhāvas are like the *Viparināmas* of water like the pearl, the foam and the hail. The Vivarta is transfiguration and the Viparṇāma is transformation. Smaraṇa, Icchā, Dveṣa and Prayatna are the inner or Ābhyantara-anubhāvas and the Bāhya-anubhāvas are those born of Manas, Vāk, Buddhi and Śarīra. The acting or imitation of these Vyabhicārins and Anubhāvas of both classes is called Abhinaya—Sāttvika, Āṅgika, Vācika, Citra and Sāmānya.

What is the relation between the Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins and Rasa according to Bhoja ? Bhoja seems to follow Ānandavardhana to a slight extent. He describes them as holding the status of Padas or Padārthas in a Vākya or Vākyārtha. That is, the former are for the sake of the latter ; they are Rasapara ; their Tātparya is Rasa. This Tātparya is identical with Dhvani according to Bhoja. (See Dhvani chapter in Vol. I of this book). Bhoja describes Vibhāvas etc. as Arthaguṇas but they are not themselves Alaṁkāras ; for, Rasa alone is Alaṁkāra and Vibhāvas etc. are subservient to Rasa.

"विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद् रसनिष्पत्तिरिति विभावादिसंकरस्यापि संसृष्टित्वं प्राप्नोति, तदलंकारग्रहणेन निवर्त्यते । न हि विभावादयोऽलंकाराः । अपि तु भावरसतदाभासानाम् अलंकाराणाम् अभिनिष्पत्तिहेतवः अर्थविशेषाः ।

नन्वेवमपि अर्थगुणत्वाद् अमीषामप्यलंकारत्वं प्राप्नोति ? सत्यमेतत्, किन्तु अन्यपरतया त उपादीयमानाः तत्रैव न्यग्भवन्ति । न वाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तौ पदार्थाः पृथक् स्फुरन्तीति ॥"

Śṛ. Pra. Vol. II, p. 370.

In the section describing the varieties of dramatic composition also, Bhoja gives two classes, the Daśarūpakas and two more constituting the class depicting Rasa, and the Uparūpakas constituting the class depicting Bhāvas; the former depicting Rasa is called *Vākyārthābhinaya* and the latter depicting Bhāvas is called *Padārthābhinaya.* Thus Bhoja calls the Bhāvas Padārthas, and Rasa, Vākyārtha and his position is a bridge over the views of both Dhanañjaya-Dhanika and Ānandavardhana. (See Dhvani chapter.)

How do these Vibhāvas etc. combine with (Samyoga) or act upon Sthāyins to produce (Niṣpatti) Rasa? Here also Bhoja uses a series of metaphors which however beautiful do not clarify the issue. This much seems clear. The Sthāyin is unmanifest Rasa. Rasa is present in it in a form which cannot be relished. But by the play of Vibhāvas etc. upon it, it manifests itself and comes to a form in which it can be relished. For, Bhoja gives the simile of the Niṣpatti of juice from sugarcane, of oil from sesamum, of butter from curds and of fire from wood.

The next stage, Bhoja says, is that Rati and other Sthāyins when they get nourished or rather when they are becoming Rasas, they do so, converting all the time the Vibhāvas etc. also into Rasas. Those conditions themselves which make the Sthāyin into Rasa dissolve so to say in Rasa and become Rasa. Thus, everything at this stage is Rasa.

Many such Rasas combine to produce Rasa-saṁkara, even as many tastes go to make up drinks.

In the course of such a manifestation, the Rasas have the stages of mere birth, Utpatti, nourishment, Abhivṛddhi, and firmness, Sthairya.

The texts on these are to be found at the end of the chapter, a perusal of which will make matters clearer. See also chapter on Bhoja's Similes in Vol. II of this book.

Other details regarding Rasas and Bhāvas, and their manifold and minute analysis, especially regarding Rati and Śṛṅgāra, can be had in the elaborate Notice of the Contents of the *Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa* given above in Part I of this Vol., pp. 31-69.

Bhoja and Western Parallels.
Abercrombie.

It has been noted above that Bhoja would not hold the Bhāvas, Rati etc., as Rasa even though they might attain the state of relishable climax,—Prakarṣa. They are even then, Bhoja says, in the state of Bhāvanā with recognisable names and forms. Rasa is what transcends this stage of Bhāvanā; it is Bhāvanā-patha-atīta, above all the conditions of names and forms, which particularise absolute emotion into Rati, Hāsa etc. Rasa is

the one nameless bliss, revolving in our souls which are animated by the spark of Ahaṁkāra.

यो भावनापथमतीत्य विवर्तमानः
साहङ्कृतौ हृदि परं स्वदते रसोऽसौ ।

This transcendental Rasa is given by Bhoja as the fundamental Ego, the sense of 'I' or man's self-consciousness, called Ahaṁkāra. This is the germ from which all other Bhāvas emanate. This inner absolute Love transforms itself into external and objectivised emotions of love (for woman), laughter, anger etc.

रत्यादीनामयमेव प्रभव इति ।

It lies at the very root of our life, as the very driving force. It is the main fourfold manifestation of this Ahaṁkāra that is called the activity of man towards the four aims or springs of all human action, Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. Bhoja thus speaks of Dharma Śṛṅgāra, Artha Śṛṅgāra, Kāma Śṛṅgāra and Mokṣa Śṛṅgāra.

It is this Ahaṁkāra Rasa that endows all the grace of culture and well-being upon man. It is the refinement of character. Its presence makes one Rasika. It is born innate in souls as a result of good deeds in the past lives. That is, one has to come by it, as by genius, by birth. It is the central fire which all other emotions of man surround like flames and heighten into greater splendour.

सप्तार्चिषं द्युतिचया इव वर्धयन्ति ।

The poet has it and presents it in poetry and the tasteful connoisseur enjoys it as depicted in art.

शृङ्गारी चेत् कविः काव्ये जातं रसमयं जगत् ।

"शृङ्गारो हि नाम विशिष्टेष्टचेष्टाभिव्यञ्जकानाम् आत्मगुणसम्पदाम् उत्कर्षबीजं, बुद्धिसुखदुःखेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नसंस्काराद्यतिशयहेतुः आत्मनोऽहङ्कारविशेषः सचेतसा रस्यमानः रस इत्युच्यते । यदस्तित्वे रसिकः, अन्यथा नीरस इति ।

तैश्चायं प्रकर्षप्राप्तैः सप्तार्चिरर्चिश्चयैरिव प्रकाशमानः शृङ्गारिणामेव स्वदत इति ।

As if putting in a nutshell some of these ideas of Bhoja on the psychological factor in literature and art, L. Abercrombie says in an essay on the Function of Poetry in Drama :

"Anyhow the innermost reality, the one with which art is most dearly concerned is what is commonly called the *spiritual reality*. For the purpose of this discussion, however, let me use a name which allows it to be more easily handled. Let me call it the *emotional reality* by which I do not entirely mean the *plane of such named and recognisable emotions as love, anger, hate,* but rather the *general substratum to all existence, emotion nameless* and *unappointed*. This is the layer of *flame* which is the closest we can get to the *central fire,* to the *Will to live,* or whatever you like to call it. And an impression of this *profound emotional reality is what art must con-*

vey...." What Abercrombie calls the plane of such named and recognisable emotion as love, anger, hate is the state of Bhāvanā of Bhoja. The 'spiritual reality' or 'emotional reality' which he calls 'emotion nameless' and describes as the will to live and as 'the substratum to all existence' is Bhoja's one Rasa of Ahaṁkāra-Abhimāna-Śṛṅgāra. Abercrombie also employs the imagery of central fire, employed by Bhoja :

सप्तार्चिषं द्युतिचया इव वर्धयन्ति ।

Creative genius, poetic creation and connoisseurship are held by Bhoja as the blessings endowed by this Ahaṁkāra-Rasa and Abercrombie also holds this inner and profound spiritual or emotional reality as what art must convey.

Psycho-analysis Literature.

Striking parallel to Bhoja's thought is found in Freudian Psycho-analysis. While there are points of contact between the two, it must be borne in mind, Bhoja's thought is more thorough, less obsessed with sex, and more philosophical.

Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra can be called the Ego, Id or Libido of the psycho-analysts. The Libido is divided into two, the Ego-libido and the Object-libido. The object of the former is the subject itself. The latter is the former externalised and directed to an object. This Ego-libido or in-turned-libido is Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra which is the love of the Ātman for itself. When it flows out over the external objects of the world it becomes Abhimāna for various objects. In this form of Abhimāna, the same Ego-libido is object-libido.[1]

The Libido is the general Ahaṁkāra comprehending all forms of love. " By the term Libido, Freud designates a quantitative and changeable energy of the sexual instinct which is directed to an object. It comprises not only sexual love (our Rati), but self-love (our Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra), love for parents and children, friendship and devotion to concrete and abstract ideas " (our Preyas, Śraddhā, Vātsalya and Bhakti).[2] Bhoja explains all Bhāvas as a form of Preman or love, Hāsa as love for Hāsa, Vīra as love for Vīra and so on and all these Bhāvas and the Preman in which all of them dissolve are manifestations of the Ahaṁkāra. Therefore Bhoja's Libido of Ahaṁkāra comprises much more than what has been above given by the psycho-analyst as comprehended by his Libido.

Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra has been shown above in the main section as self-love, Ātma-kāma and the text of the Upaniṣad आत्मनस्तु कामाय सर्वं प्रियं भवति was quoted in that connection. It was also pointed out how Bhoja quotes a beautiful verse which shows a man congratulating himself and bowing to himself, because he had been glanced at by a lady. The love of the lady

1. *Psycho-Analysts To-day* (an edition of Essays of various Authors, by S. LONARD).

2. Page 108, Footnote. " Psycho-analysts to-day ".

resolves into love for himself as the object of her love. Another verse also is quoted by Bhoja to illustrate Māna in which a lady is proud of herself as the wife of a great warrior. She loves herself as the beloved of her lover. This train of ideas appears under the concept of Narcism in Freudian Literature. Wittels says in his work "Sigmund Freud," in the chapter on Narcism (pp. 202-3).

"But everyone is in love with himself. He possesses in his libido a transmutable energy, with the aid of which he has brought to pass *the most splendid achievements of civilization.*[1] Nevertheless, the first and the most obvious application of the libido is towards one's own self, body and spirit. While a man prizes a beloved, and passionately overestimates her value, there is another object of libido which he overvalues even more grossly, more persistently and with greater conviction. He values himself at a higher rate than any outward object of sexual desire. * * * * * We need merely "scratch" the surface of the mind, and narcism comes to light."

On p. 212, the same author says : "Inasmuch as a permanent fixation on the beloved can only come about through an over-flow of the lover's personality into that of the beloved, a great love always presupposes a vigorous Ego. *That is why I consider the idea of the Ego and the idea of Narcism to be identical. What we love and worship in another is our own Ego, which we have exteriorised into the other's personality.*"

He says on pp. 214-5 that Freud has analysed and found love for one's child as love for one's self. Do not the Vedas declare : आत्मा वै पुत्रनामासि ?

On self-love or "Narcism", an old saying of the Talmudic rabbis is quoted on p. 109 of the work "Psycho-analysts To-day" edited by S. Lonard. The saying runs thus : "If I am not for me, who will be for me?" It is the same idea expressed the other way, "I love everything, because I love myself" आत्मनस्तु कामाय सर्वं प्रियं भवति। M. G. Greenbie says in the work "Personality" (p. 180) : "To some extent we are romantic figures to ourselves. One's attempt to be a personality is, in some measure, an attempt to make the world share one's own deluded vision of the incomparable self." Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra lying at the root of all other emotions is thus echoed by Horace Carncross, in the last chapter called Love and Ego, of his work "The Escape from the Primitive" :

"Moreover it is a fact that deep down, below complete consciousness, the individual is in love with himself. We speak of him as being Narcistic

1. *Cf.* Bhoja. सर्वात्मसम्पदुदयातिशयैकहेतुः *Śṛ. Pra. I.* आत्मसम्यग्गुणोद्भूतेः एको हेतुः प्रकाशते। *S. K. A.* V. 2 शृङ्गारो हि नाम × × × आत्मगुणसंपदाम् उत्कर्षबीजम् × × × ।" *Śṛ. Pra.* XII.

But most of these writers drag down this high concept of self-love, which Bhoja gives as explaining culture, refinement, artistic imagination and civilization in general, and which Bhoja says is the germ from which all Bhavas or emotions arise (and which may be said to soar into high philosophy in such Vedic texts as आत्मनस्तु कामाय etc, कामस्तदग्रे समवर्तत, सोऽकामयत etc., Bhoja emphasises that it is a manifestation of the Sattvaguṇa and that it is born in us only as a result of many pure deeds in past lives. Perhaps the name Narcism and the legend of the Greek Narcissus who loves his image is the unhappy cause of this kind of treatment of self-love or inverted-libido or Ego-libido in Psycho-analysis. Thus, Horace Carncross drives the idea to the corner and holds it as antagonistic to love. He holds that a strong Narcism is against love for another and postulates the two opposites, Ego × Love. Bhoja on the other hand would attribute love to it and explain love by it. Further, many of the writers on psycho-analysis suppose that Narcism is a 'stage' in a man's sexual life. They mention boyhood as dominated by it. According to Bhoja, there is no stage of life, no department of human activity which is not 'informed' by this inner principle of "Ātma-Kāma" and "Ātma-Rati". It is this which makes all life and activity understandable. A perverse meaning, of course, can be put upon it, even as one can misinterpret Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra as Egotism and haughtiness and Superiority-complex and his Śṛṅgāra and Kāma used in the higher sense as carnal love. Even Libido, the absolute factor of Love as such, can be misinterpreted as libidinousness. It is in this manner that Samuel D. Schmalhausen gives, in his work "*Our Changing Human Nature*", Narcism as the explanation for the self-preserving tendency, war neuroses, vanity and even self-depreciation (p. 38). On the other hand, this ego's love for itself has a large foundation and that love permeates the whole field of emotions. It is not a theory of "distorted human nature" as the last mentioned writer calls it, but a fact of common human nature, the inner fact which is the solvent of all human emotional activity.

Bhoja's Rasa theory and the Alaṁkāra Section in the Agni Purāṇa.

The section on poetics in the *Agnipurāṇa* draws upon numerous writers and presents to us an uncritical 'Tila Taṇḍula' mixture, a mere faggot of ideas extracted from here and there and loosely put together. The view that it is a work of the pre-Ānandavardhana period and that Ānandavardhana himself borrows two verses from it has to be given up. The fact is that the section is later than not only Ānandavardhana but Bhoja also.[1]

Prof. P. V. Kane's *Introduction to the Sāhitya darpaṇa* has not drawn attention to the similarity between the Alaṁkāra section in the *Agnipurāṇa* and Bhoja. Prof. Kane assigns this section to a period slightly later than Ānandavardhana. Dr. De notes the similarity but concludes wrongly. Dr.

1. See also Dr. Sankaran, *Theories of Rasa and Dhvani*, Madras University, pp. 35-39, as also my article on Riti and Guna in the Agnipurāṇa, *IHQ*. Vol. X, pp. 767-779.

De says on p. 103, Vol. I. of the *Sanskrit Poetics* that there are "*anonymous appropriations*" of parts of this section of the *Agnipurāṇa* by Bhoja. On p. 149, at the end of the section, he makes a less definite statement that both the Alaṁkāra section of the *Agnipurāṇa* and Bhoja embody a tradition of opinion which in many respects stands apart from the orthodox Kasmerian school. On p. 334 of Vol. II., he says that Bhoja's *Śṛ. Pra.* follows the tradition of the *Agnipurāṇa*. These mean that the *Agnipurāṇa* expounds a definite system of a nature different from that of the well-known Kasmerian one. The loose collection of all kinds of ideas of Alaṁkāra topics available in the *Agnipurāṇa* represents no definite tradition. If it has many affinities with Bhoja and differs from the Kasmerian tradition, it borrows freely from the Kasmerian school also. Much cannot and need not be made of the Alaṁkāra section in the *Agnipurāṇa*. Dr. De also takes it as the source of Bhoja whom he accuses of unacknowledged borrowing. Quite the reverse is the fact. It is not a Purāṇa-compiler who sets himself to fashion new theories on such subjects of the Alaṁkāra Śāstra as Rasa and Alaṁkāra, but only regular Ālaṁkārikas who engage themselves constantly in discussing problems connected with literature. If the *Agnipurāṇa* had borrowed from so many sources as Bharata, Daṇḍin, Bhāmaha, Ānandavardhana, *Tantra vārttika, Amarakośa* etc., and is not an original work at all, how is it original only in a certain part from which Bhoja is said to borrow! An examination of the Alaṁkāra section of the *Agnipurāṇa* reveals that Bhoja's *S.K.Ā.* and *Śṛ. Pra.* are utilised by the compiler and that the date of the compilation in the Purāṇa is later than Bhoja.

In a separate section on Bhoja and the *Agnipurāṇa* and in the chapters on Alaṁkāra and Guṇa, I have discussed those parts of the Alaṁkāra section in the Purāṇa other than that on Rasa. It is said that the Rasa section in the *Agnipurāṇa* elaborates the Śṛṅgāra Rasa and as such is akin to Bhoja's work or is thus the source of Bhoja; and some writers refute this and point out this fact as proving its similarity to the *Śṛṅgāra tilaka*. We have to point out that this is no speciality of the *Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa, the Śṛṅgāra tilaka* or the *Agnipurāṇa*. Almost all Rasa treatises have only taken up Śṛṅgāra as illustration and elaborated it. The fact to be noted is the Śṛṅgāra elaborated in these works and the Śṛṅgāra which forms the main subject after which Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa* is named are different.

Chapter 339 Śls. 1-6, *Agnipurāṇa*, gives the description of Rasa thus :

अक्षरं परमं ब्रह्म सनातनमजं विभुम् ।
वेदान्तेषु वदन्त्येकं चैतन्यं ज्योतिरीश्वरम् ॥
आनन्दस्सहजस्तस्य व्यज्यते स कदाचन ।
व्यक्तिः सा तस्य चैतन्यचमत्काररसाह्वया ॥
आद्यस्तस्य विकारो यः सोऽहंकार इति स्मृतः ।
ततोऽभिमानस्तत्रेदं समाप्तं भुवनत्रयम् ॥
अभिमानाद् रतिः सा च परिपोषमुपेयुषी ।
व्यभिचार्यादिसामान्यात् (संयोगात्) शृङ्गार इति गीयते ॥

तद्भेदाः काममित्रैर हास्याद्या अप्यनेकशः ।
स्वस्वस्थायिविशेषोऽथ (षोत्थ) परिघो(पो) यस्वलक्षणाः ॥
सत्त्वादिगुणसन्तानाज् जायन्ते परमात्मनः ।

In this, three ideas pertain to Bhoja's conception of Rasa. Bhoja elaborately sets forth his new Ahaṁkāra-Rasa and vehemently criticises Bharata and the accepted notions of Rasa and as such must have himself been responsible for his theory. It is not likely that a standard and special writer on the special branch of knowledge of Alaṁkāra pilfered his theory from a Purāṇa, containing an incoherent heaping of ideas from various writers. If Bhoja had borrowed from the Purāṇa, well can it be held that the *Tantra vārttika*, Bhartṛmitra, *Amarakośa*, Bharata, Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Ānandavardhana borrowed from this Ārṣa source of a Purāṇa ! The fact is the compiler of the Purāṇa drew for the poetics-section from all standard Alaṁkāra works including those of Bhoja.

The Rasa theory in the 339th chapter of the *Agnipurāṇa* is not exactly identical with that expounded by Bhoja in his *Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa*. It is an eclectic theory which has combined a prominent tendency of the well-known established Alaṁkāra tradition inaugurated in Kashmere with that which Bhoja rather solitarily strove to establish. The *Agnipurāṇa* first starts with Brahman, its nature of bliss, which, from the point of view of poetics, is called Camatkāra and Rasa. This monistic idea is seen in the system of the Kashmerian writers as developed and followed by most Ālaṁkārikas. The idea of æsthetic Rasa being equal to Brahmāsvāda is spoken of by all writers, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, Abhinavagupta and all the followers of the latter. This Advaitic thought is significantly absent from Bhoja's exposition which follows the Sāṁkhya in the main and has affinities with Nyāya also. For, Bhoja takes his stand on Sattvaguṇa, on the reflection of the Ātman in Prakṛti, Pratibimba, and on Ahaṁkāra as the first Prakṛti-vikāra. He follows the Naiyāyika prakriyā also when he considers Buddhi, Sukha etc., including this Ahaṁkāra which is the essence of our psychological nature, as the *Guṇa* of Ātman. The *Agnipurāṇa* combines the two views and does away with the small difference between the Sāṁkhya and the Advaitic approaches. It holds the Ahaṁkāra of Bhoja as the first Vikṛti of the Ānanda or Rasa which is the nature of Ātman. This Ahaṁkāra takes the aspect of Abhimāna and from Abhimāna is Rati produced. This Rati is the chief Bhāva. It is the Bhāva that develops into the Śṛṅgāra Rasa. All the other Bhāvas, Hāsa etc., are only forms (Bhedas) of this Rati. Thus, here is an apparent deviation from Bhoja. Bhoja clearly says that from Ahaṁkāra born of the Sattva of Ātman is born not only Rati but all the other 48 Bhāvas also. The *Agnipurāṇa* brings in Ahaṁkāra and Abhimāna but has omitted to say that the same is also called Śṛṅgāra. It has not also classified this Ahaṁkāra (Śṛṅgāra) into Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa Śṛṅgāras though in chapter 342, the Purāṇa says that Rati-śṛṅgāra is developed in four ways, Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa.

धर्मार्थकाममोक्षेषु शृङ्गार उपजीयते ।

And for this, the Purāṇa may be indebted to Bharata himself, to the Daśarūpaka chapter where Bharata gives three types of Śṛṅgāras pertaining to Dharma, Artha and Kāma and to the Sāmānyābhinaya chapter where Kāma is described as Dharmakāma, Arthakāma, Kāmakāma and Mokṣakāma. The *Agnipurāṇa* omitted to say that the Ahaṁkāra itself is called Śṛṅgāra with a view perhaps to remove the confusion which will arise, and as a matter of fact has arisen as has been elaborately discussed in the previous section, between this supreme Śṛṅgāra and the other and lower Śṛṅgāra developing from Rati. Perhaps the *Agnipurāṇa's* modified statement of Bhoja's theory marks a stage which leads to the confusion of later writers between Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra and Rati-Śṛṅgāra. For, in a way, the *Agnipurāṇa* identifies Rati with Ahaṁkāra-Abhimāna and holds all the Bhāvas beginning with Hāsa as forms of Rati.[1] Thus there is a direct and clear synthesis of all Bhāvas in Rati-Śṛṅgāra and Rati-Śṛṅgāra is held as the emanation called Abhimāna coming out of Ahaṁkāra. It would mean the ultimate identification of the ordinary and well-known Śṛṅgāra with Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra, but the Purāṇa actually propounds only the theory of Rati-Śṛṅgāra alone being the one Rasa[2] —a theory which many late writers who had not dived deep into Bhoja's sea-like *Śṛ. Pra.* or had no access even to it, mistook as the theory expounded by Bhoja in his work *Śṛ. Pra.*

In a way it can be said that the writer on Alaṁkāra in the *Agnipurāṇa* derived what he said of Hāsa and others as being only aspects of Rati from Bhoja himself. Bhoja, it has been pointed above, held three states of his Rasa, Parakoṭī, Madhyamāvasthā and Uttarakoṭī. In the last, he held all Bhāvas as forms of Preman, a kind of subtle love. He did not exactly identify it with Rati which is Sāmprayogikī ; he speaks in his Preman-synthesis of not only Hāsapriya, Raṇapriya, Utsāhapriya etc., but also of Ratipriya. Bhoja identifies Preman as Ahetu pakṣapāta, Sneha etc., and as underlying Rati and Prīti. But, as such, it cannot be totally alien to the fundamental nature of Rati. Preman is only rarefied Rati. It is from this point of view that I explained previously, brushing aside the uncritical and ill-informed writers' confusion between Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra and the well known Rati-Śṛṅgāra, that a critical examination reveals an underlying unity of Love, Kāma or Ātmayoni, among all kinds of love, Rati, Preman, Abhimāna or Ahaṁkāra. So it is that Bhoja says that his Ahaṁkāra is the very life and breath of Ātmayoni.

1. S. K. De says on p. 256, Vol. II. *Skr. Poetics* : "From conceit, pleasure of which Śṛṅgāra (love), Hāsya (laughter) and other Rasas are modifications." This should be rather thus: "From conceit, pleasure (Rati) which develops into the Śṛṅgārarasa with its Vibhāvas etc. ; of this Rati-Śṛṅgāra, other Sthāyins and Rasas like Hāsa-Hāsya etc. are modifications."

2. See my book '*The Number of Rasas*'. Adyar Library, pp. 170-171.

आत्मस्थितं गुणविशेषमहंकृतस्य
शृङ्गारमाहुरिह जीवितमात्मयोनेः । *Śṛ. Pra.* I.

If Bhoja synthesised Rati, Hāsa etc., in Preman and all these again in Ahaṁkāra, the *Agnipurāṇa* synthesised Hāsa etc., in Rati and merged that Rati in Abhimāna and Ahaṁkāra.

It has been shown above how the Purāṇa modifies Bhoja's view of Rasa and grafts on to it the Advaitic Brahman also. In other respects also the difference is seen clearly.

1. Bhoja takes pains to refute Bharata's scheme of four Prakṛti Rasas producing respectively four other Rasas. But the *Agnipurāṇa* accepts Bharata's scheme incorporating into its Rasa-chapter the verse of Bharata :

शृङ्गाराज्जायते हासः रौद्रात्तु करुणो रसः ।
वीराच्च द्भुतनिष्पत्तिः स्माद् बीभत्साद् भयानकः ॥

2. Bhoja does not stop with the nine Rasas. He claims that there are Udātta, Uddhata, Preyas and other Rasas including all the Vyabhicārins, Sāttvikas etc. The Purāṇa enumerates only nine Rasas, the eight plus Śānta. But the text of the Purāṇa at once confuses itself and gives in Śl. 12 only eight Rasas.

The *Agnipurāṇa* describes Rasa, as such, in only 54 verses. After the above examined general remarks running to 12 verses, it describes the nine Sthāyins, eight Sāttvikas and 33 Vyabhicārins, up to Śl. 34. After that the Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas are described in 20 verses with reference to Śṛṅgāra. In chapter 342 there are six verses (4-9) dealing with Śṛṅgāra. Here Bhoja's scheme of four Sambhoga-varieties with four corresponding Vipralambhas is mentioned. Therefore it cannot be held that an exclusive or elaborate treatment of Śṛṅgāra is a feature of this Purana ; and it can also be seen that but for the addition of Abhimāna-Ahaṁkāra, there is nothing in the section on Alaṁkāra which discloses a school different from the Kashmerian. The truth therefore is that this section in the *Agnipurāṇa* has culled from all available sources, including Bhoja.

Bhoja's Rasa Theory and Śāradātanaya.

The whole question of the relation between Bhoja's *Śṛ. Pra.* and Śāradātanaya's *Bhāvaprakāśa* is dealt with in a subsequent chapter and here, I shall discuss the question only as far as Rasa is concerned. Dr. De says on p. 148 of Vol. I of his *Poetics* that Śāradātanaya's *Bhāvaprakāśa*, dealing with the same subject as treated in the *Śṛ. Pra.*, constitutes really a summary of the important chapters of Bhoja.

Śāradātanaya follows Śaivism on the basis of which he explains the Jīvātman's enjoyment of the world and the spectators' enjoyment of drama through Rāga, Vidyā and Kalā. He says this towards the end of chapter II. pp. 52-

53. His work falls in the regular succession of Alaṁkāra works of the Kashmerian tradition and here there is mention of Śaṅkuka, Lollaṭa and other Rasa-theorists. These two writers are not accepted and Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka is followed. The latter's Bhāvya-bhāvaka sambandha as expounded by Dhanañjaya and Dhanika is accepted by Śāradātanaya. (Pp. 52-53). In the end, he pays homage to Abhinavagupta and says that he followed him, though this is not completely true. (P. 313). Two glaring cases of deviation from Abhinavagupta are the discarding of his theory of Rasa-manifestation through Dhvani and the omission of Śāntarasa. The refusal to accept Śānta (Ch. I. pp. 26-27 and Ch. II. p. 47) is against even Bhoja. In this respect Śāradātanaya follows Dhanañjaya and Dhanika.

Śāradātanaya does not follow Bhoja who holds all the Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas as Sthāyins and Rasas.

स्थायिन्युन्मग्ननिर्मग्नाः तथैव व्यभिचारिणः ।
पुष्णन्ति स्थायिनं स्वांश्च तत्र यान्ति रसात्मताम् ॥
यद्यपि स्याद्रसात्मत्वं तेषां क्वापि कदाचन ।
अस्थिरत्वाद् अथैते स्युः नाट्याद्यनुपयोगिनः ॥
तस्माद्दृष्टाविति**मतं स्थायिनो** नाट्यवेदिनाम् ।

× × ×

भावसाधारणत्वेऽपि निर्वेदाद्यैः न शक्यते ।
स्थायित्वमात्मनो नेतुम् अतादृप्यस्वभावतः ।
यत्र क्वचित् स्यात् तत्पोषो वैरस्यायैव कल्पते ।
अतो नाट्यविदाम् अष्टावेवात्र स्थायिनो मताः ॥ P. 26 *G. O. S.* Edn.

Thus following Abhinavagupta on Vyabhicārins, Śāradātanaya has criticised the view of Rudraṭa which latter, Bhoja has adopted in his *Śṛ. Pra.*

One of the views on the origin of Rasa described by Śāradātanaya is however related to Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra theory. In chapter II. pp. 41-48, Śāradātanaya gives the following view : There is the Paramātman or Ātman having three 'Prabhās' Jñānaprabhā, Ānandaprabhā and Kriyāprabhā. The inner Samvit or Jñāna and Ānanda are self-realisable. In the shape of Ahaṁkāra or Abhimāna for outward objects, the inner Jñāna and Ānanda manifest themselves through the outward objects which we come to know and enjoy. The Jīva gets his Prāṇa from the Kriyā-prabhā. Jñāna and Ānanda are of the form of the Sattvaguṇa. From the interplay of the three Guṇas of Prakṛti, Mahān, Buddhi, Ahaṁkāra, five Tanmātrās, the ten Indriyas and Manas are all born. Here the Sāṁkhya prakriyā is explained. The Ahaṁkāra whose activity (Vṛtti) is Abhimāna i.e., that power by which it helps Buddhi, is explained as the sense of I and Mine.

अहंकारोऽभिमानेन बुद्धेरुपकरोति यः ।
यो ममेति ग्रहः सोऽयम् अभिमान इतीरितः । P. 42.

It passes over through the Indriya to outward objects and according to the nature of the object, becomes the various Rasa Śṛṅgāra etc.

अहंकारस्य वृत्तिर्या सोऽभिमानः प्रकीर्तितः ।
साभिमानात्मिका वृत्तिः तत्तदिन्द्रियगोचरा ॥
बाह्यार्थालम्बनवती शृङ्गारादिरसात्मताम् ।
याति तत्र विभावादिभेदाद् भेदं प्रयाति च ॥ P. 43.

When there are Lalita or graceful Vibhāvas, there arises out of Ahaṁkāra a certain form of happiness dominated by Sattva and Rajas. Such a state of mind is called Śṛṅgāra. In a similar manner are other Rasas born. The three Guṇas, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, vary with the varying nature of the external objects which produce the Rasas out of Ahaṁkāra. But Ahaṁkāra and Abhimāna remain the same.

This view, Śāradātanaya does not say, is expounded in Bhoja's *Śr. Pra.*, but says that it is expounded in a semi-purāṇic work called the *Yogamālā saṁhitā* in which Śiva teaches Rasa and Nāṭya to Sūrya.

ईदृशी च रसोत्पत्तिः मनोवृत्तिश्च शाश्वती ।
कथिता **योगमालायां संहितायां** विवस्वते ॥
शिवेन ताण्डवं लास्यं नाट्यं नृत्तं च नर्तनम् ।
सर्वमेतदशेषेण **संहितायां** प्रदर्शितम् ॥ P. 45.

According to this view, only eight Rasas are recognised, Śānta being left out. This is given as the view of Brahmā also.

तस्मान्नाट्यरसा अष्टाविति पद्मभुवो मतम् ।

This Brahmā is none else than he who figures in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata :

I. 1. नाट्यवेदं प्रवक्ष्यामि ब्रह्मणा यदुदाहृतम् ।
VI 16. एते ह्यष्टौ रसाः प्रोक्ता द्रुहिणेन महात्मना ।
VI. 79. रसं वीरमपि प्राह ब्रह्मा त्रिविधमेव हि ॥

and these references in Bharata may refer to the views contained in the earlier work called *Brahma Bharata*. After giving this view Śāradātanaya gives another, expounded by Vāsuki to Nārada.

उत्पत्तिस्तु रसानां या पुरा वासुकिनोदिता ।
नारदस्योच्यते सैषा प्रकारान्तरकल्पिता ॥ P. 47.

This view is the same as that given from the *Yogamālā saṁhitā*. It starts with Ahaṁkāra. The element of Ahaṁkāra persists in all Rasas. When the mind is in Rajas and comes into contact with graceful (Lalita) objects, the Ahaṁkāra becomes Śṛṅgāra. Thus other Rasas are born. The difference between this view and that said to be expounded in the *Yogamālā saṁhitā* is that this recognises the Śāntarasa which it holds as born in the mind bereft of Rajas and Tamas and established in Sattva, a mind that has ceased to be contaminated by outward objects and is in a purely subjective condition.

रजस्तमोविनाशात्तु सत्त्वावस्थात् सचित्ततः ।
मनागस्पृष्टबाह्यार्थात् शान्तो रस इतीरितः ॥ P. 48.

From the above, we see that the bringing in of Ahaṁkāra into the consideration of Rasa is all that is similar to what Bhoja has said. And this is attributed by Śāradātanaya to a Saṁhitā called *Yogamālā* where Śiva teaches Nāṭya to Sūrya. The same is attributed to Vāsuki also who teaches the same subject to Nārada with the difference that Vāsuki accepts Śānta ; and the work in which Vāsuki's view is given is not mentioned.[1] Personally, I do not attach any value to references of similar nature in Śāradātanaya's *Bhāvaprakāśa*. The claim of the *Yogamālā saṁhitā* or the work in which Vāsuki figures is as vain as that of the *Agnipurāṇa* which latter is at least available to us. Bhoja is emphatic in saying that he is responsible for propounding the new Ahaṁkāra-theory and in the face of this and his vehement exposition of his theory, it is difficult to believe that the out-of-the-way and unheard of *Yogamālā saṁhitā* is the source of this theory. Śāradātanaya summarises the theory of Dhvani as expounded by Ānandavardhana in chapter VI, (pp. 173-4) and it is strange that Śāradātanaya refers here to some unknown work called *Kalpavallī* as the source of this information ! Similar is his attribution of the Ahaṁkāra-idea to two unknown works.

There are differences between Bhoja's theory and the theory said to be taken from the *Yogamālā*. Bhoja does not add to the framework of his theory any Śivāgama-thought in the shape of Jīvātman, Paramātman, the three Prabhās of Jñāna, Ānanda and Kriyā. The exposition contained in the *Bhāvaprakāśa* no doubt clearly explains the Sāṁkhya element in Bhoja's theory and elaborates how Ahaṁkāra becomes Abhimāna and on contact with respective outward objects becomes Śṛṅgāra etc. But the difference is great and plain. The *Yogamālā* accepts only eight Rasas and Vāsuki only nine. The Preman-synthesis of the Uttarakoṭī of Rasa, the calling of Ahaṁkāra itself by the name Śṛṅgāra, its classification into the four Śṛṅgāras of the four Puruṣārthas, the holding of all Bhāvas as Rasas—these of Bhoja are entirely absent from these theories in Śāradātanaya. The main idea in Bhoja that Ahaṁkāra it is that is really Rasa and that Rati, Hāsa etc. are not Rasa even if they attain Prakarṣa and can be called Rasa only secondarily, is also absent from Śāradātanaya. The *Yogamālā* and Vāsuki suppose Rasa to be the Pariṇāma of Ahaṁkāra and this theory of transformation no doubt agrees with Bhoja's Rasa of Madhyamāvasthā. Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra has not only this stage in which Ahaṁkāra ramifies itself into manifold manifestations but stands separate also as Rasa by itself. These manifestations themselves are mere Bhāvas, even in Prakarṣa. Śāradātanaya says that according to these two views from *Yogamālā* and Vāsuki, Rasa is Manovṛtti. This is wholly opposed to Bhoja's view ; for, to Bhoja, such Manovṛttis can only be Bhāvas, being still in the state of Bhāvanā. Beyond that stage is the realm of Ahaṁkāra and in it is the relish called Rasa.

1. See also my '*Number of Rasas*', pp. 4, 11, 12, on Vāsuki.

So, the two views given by Śāradātanaya have just taken the Ahaṁkāra-idea from Bhoja and have followed in general the well-known current of ideas on Rasa.

That Śāradātanaya's *Bhāvaprakāśa* does not constitute a summary of the *Śṛ. Pra.*, and that compared to Śāradātanaya's borrowings from other sources like the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, the *Daśarūpaka* and the *Kāvyaprakāśa*, the borrowings from Bhoja are small, can also be seen from pp. 64-68 of Mr. K. S. Ramaswami SASTRI's Introduction to the Gaek. Edn. of the *Bhāvaprakāśa*.

TEXT OF THE *ŚR. PRA.*

Extracts on Rasa.

I

Śṛ. Pra., Vol. I, Pp. 1-3, Mad. Ms.

" आत्मस्थितं गुणविशेषमहंकृतस्य
शृङ्गारमाहुरिह जीवितमात्मयोनेः ।
तस्यात्मशक्तिरसनीयतया रसत्वं
युक्तस्य येन रसिकोऽयमिति प्रवादः ॥

सत्त्वात्मनाममलधर्मविशेषजन्मा
जन्मान्तरानुभवनिर्मितवासनोत्थः ।
सर्वात्मसम्पदुदयातिशयैकहेतुः
जागर्ति कोऽपि हृदि मानवतो (–मयो) विकारः ॥[1]

तात्पर्यमेव वचसि ध्वनिरेव काव्ये
सौभाग्यमेव गुणसम्पदि वल्लभस्य ।
लावण्यमेव वपुषि स्वदतेऽङ्गनायाः
शृङ्गार एव हृदि मानवतो जनस्य ॥

शृङ्गारवीरकरुणाद्भुतरौद्रहास्य-
बीभत्सवत्सलभयानकशान्तनाम्नः ।
आम्नातिषुर्दश रसान् सुधियो, वयं तु
शृङ्गारमेव रसनाद् रसमामनामः ॥

1. *Cf. S. K. A.* V, 61. 2.
विविधोदष्टजन्मायं जन्मिनामन्तरात्मसु ।
आत्मसम्यग्गुणोद्भूतेरेको हेतुः प्रकाशते ॥

वीराद्भुतादिषु च येह रसप्रसिद्धिः
सिद्धा कुतोऽपि वटयक्षवदाविभाति ।
लोके गतानुगतिकत्ववशादुपेता
मेतां निवर्तयितुमेष परिश्रमो नः ॥

अप्रातिकूलिकतया मनसो मुदादेः
यस्संविदोऽनुभवहेतुरिहाभिमानः ।
ज्ञेयो रसः स रसनीयतयात्मरक्तेः (–शक्तेः)[1]
रत्यादिभूमनि पुनर्वितथा रसोक्तिः ॥

रत्यादयोऽर्धशतमेकविवर्जिता हि
भावाः पृथग्विधविभावभुवो भवन्ति ।
शृङ्गारतत्त्वमभितः परिवारयन्तः
सप्तार्चिषं द्युतिचया इव वर्धयन्ति ॥

आभावनोदयमनन्यधिया जनेन
यो भाव्यते मनसि भावनया स भावः ।
यो भावनापथमतीत्य विवर्तमानः
साहंकृतौ हृदि परं स्वदते रसोऽसौ ॥

रत्यादयो यदि रसाः स्युरतिप्रकर्षे
हर्षादिभिः किमपराद्धमतद्विभिन्नैः ।
अस्थायिनस्त इति चेद् भयहासशोक–
क्रोधादयो वद कियच्चिरमुल्लसन्ति ॥

स्थायित्वमत्र विषयातिशयान्मतं चेत्
चिन्तादयः कुत उत प्रकृतेर्वशेन ।
तुल्यैव सात्मनि भवेत्, अथ वासनायाः
सन्दीपनात्, तदुभयत्र समानमेव ॥

"अतस्सिद्धमेतत्—रत्यादयः शृङ्गारप्रभवा एव एकोनपञ्चाशद्भावाः; वीरादयो मिथ्यारसप्रवादाः; शृङ्गार एवैकः चतुर्वर्गैकारणम्, स रस इति ।

स च अनुभवैकगम्यत्वाद् असर्वविषयत्वाच्च दुरवसेयः, सम्यगभिनयेषु वा विदग्धशैलूषैः प्रदर्श्यमानः सामाजिकैरवधार्यते, प्रबन्धेषु वा महाकविभिः यथावदाख्यायमानः विदुषां मनीषाविषयमवतरति ।"

1. The reading आत्मरक्तिः yields fruitful results in our attempts to understand the new Rasa of Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra of Bhoja but the correct reading, however, is only Ātmaśakti as found elsewhere and as proved by the following in the first verse also ; तस्यात्मशक्तिरसनीयतया.

II

Pp. 42-44, Vol. II.

From the verses above given, Bhoja picks out the first two and explains their significance in chapter VII at the end of the section on Dhvani.

Sl. आत्मस्थितं etc.

"आत्मस्थितं गुणविशेषमहङ्कृतस्येत्यादि। अत्र "आत्मस्थितं गुणविशेषमहंकृतस्य स्मृङ्कारमाहुरिह जीवितमात्मयोनेः" इत्याप्तोपदेशरूप आगमः। "तस्यात्मशक्तिरसनीयतया रसत्वम्" इति संज्ञार्थानुगामिप्रत्यात्मवेदनीयं प्रत्यक्षम्। "युक्तस्य येन रसिकोऽयमिति प्रवादः" इत्यर्थापत्तिरूपमनुमानम्। तथाहि-योऽयं लोके रसोऽस्तीति रसिकोऽयं रसिकोऽयमिति विना मधुरादीन् केषुचिदेव पुरुषविशेषेषु निरपवादः प्रवादः, स नान्तरेण प्रत्यात्मवेदनीयं रसाह्वयवस्तुसम्बन्धमुपपद्यते।

× × ×

"—स एव प्रमाणत्रयोपन्यासहेतुः वक्तुरभिप्रायः प्रतीयमानः प्रमाणत्रयोपन्यासादिना च सांख्यदर्शनाश्रयेण स्मृङ्कारः सन्नेव आविर्भवति। न त्वसन् उत्पद्यते।"

Sl. सत्त्वात्मनाम् etc.

"अथ आत्मनि प्रतिबिम्बद्वारेण अवस्थितस्य अहंकारगुणविशेषस्य धर्मार्थफलभूततृतीयपुरुषार्थजीवितस्य स्मृङ्कारस्याभिमानापरनाम्नो यान्याविर्भावकारणानि यानि च तत्कार्याणि तान्यनन्तरश्लोके निर्दिशति—सत्त्वात्मनाममलधर्मविशेषजन्मेत्यादि।

तत्रायमात्मनामनुपतेभ्यः (तत्रायमात्मनोऽनुपहतेभ्यः) सुकृतविशेषेभ्य उत्पद्यते। उत्पन्नस्य सर्वस्यात्मा। आत्मगुणसंपदो वक्ष्यमाणलक्षणायाः उदयहेतुर्भवति। अनेकजन्मानुभवजनितात्तु संस्कारादुत्कृष्यते। उत्कृष्टश्चायं आत्मगुणसम्पद एव अतिशयहेतुर्भवति।

स चायमेक एव एवंविधोऽभिमानात्मा प्रकृतिविकार आत्मविशेषाणां[1] तमोनिर्भेदस्थानेषु प्रतिबिम्बरूपेण सुप्त इव प्रतिबुध्यत इति वाक्यार्थोऽभिधीयमानः, एकहेतुरित्यनेन च हेत्वन्तराभावमात्मगुणसंपदः प्रदर्शयन् अयमेव चतुर्वर्गकारणमिति ज्ञापयति। जागर्ति वा जागर्ति च सुप्तप्रबोधदृष्टान्तेन तस्य अनाविर्भावावस्थायामपि स्तिमितरूपेण अवस्थानादविद्यमानतां निराकरोति। कोऽपीत्यनेन अद्भुतप्रदर्शनद्वारेण तदुत्कर्षस्स्ववत् (—सम्पत्) जन्मसहस्रेणाप्यनाख्येयेति ख्यापयति। मानमय इत्यनेन च अस्य अभिमानात्मनः अभिमान एव मूलमिति अन्यावष्टम्भं निराचष्ट इति।"

III

P. 352, Vol. II, Chap. XI.

"निर्दोषस्य गुणवतोऽलङ्कृतस्य च काव्यशरीरस्य कामिनीशरीरस्येव [2]शोभातिशयनिष्पत्तौ रसावियोग एव प्रकृष्ट उपायो गीयते।

---

1. *Cf.* Ratneśvara on Bhoja's Guṇa called "Aurjitya" which is defined as "रूढाहंकारता" in *S. K. Ā.* I, p. 67.

"ऊर्जितशब्दः अहंकृते प्रसिद्धः, तात्कालिकनिमित्तोपनिपाते वासनाविकाशात् **तमोनिर्भेदस्थानेषु सुप्तप्रबुद्ध इव** स्थायिभिः संसृज्यमानः प्रथमप्रादुर्भूतोऽभिमानोऽहंकार इत्युच्यते।"

2. Readings in another copy of Chs. IX-XI of the *Śṛ. Pra.* Mad. Ms. R. 3785 :—

सौभाग्यातिशय-

कल्या मूर्तिः कुलममलिनं यौवनं रूपसम्पत्
सौभाग्यर्द्धिः प्रियवचनताशीलवैदग्ध्ययोगः ।
शालीनत्वं विनयपरतेत्यङ्गनाभूषणं यत्
तत् प्रेमार्द्रं प्रणयिनि मनो नास्ति चेन् नास्ति किञ्चित् ॥

किञ्च—

अलङ्कृताप्यन्वय[1]शीलभूषणैर्न शोभते मां[2] प्रति तावदङ्गना ।
बिभर्ति यावत्प्रमदासमागमे न शूरभा[3]र्याधृतगर्वितं शिरः ॥[4]

IV

Śṛ. Pra., Vol. II, Mad. Ms., pp. 352-357, Chap. XI.

"रसं त्विह प्रेमाणमेवामनन्ति, सर्वेषामेव हि रत्यादिप्रकर्षाणां रतिप्रियो रणप्रियोऽमर्षप्रियः परिहासप्रिय इति प्रेम्ण्येव पर्यवसानात् ।

अहेतुः पक्षपातो यः तस्य नास्ति प्रतिक्रिया ।
स हि स्नेहात्मकस्तन्तुः अन्तर्भूतानि सीव्यति ॥

ततो हि—यदेव रोचते मह्यं तदेव कुरुते प्रिया ।
इति वेत्ति न; जानाति तत्प्रियं यत्करोति सा ॥[5]

अपि च—अकिञ्चिदपि कुर्वाणः सौख्ये दुःखान्यपोहति ।
तत्तस्य किमपि द्रव्यं यो हि यस्य प्रियो जनः ॥[6]

दुःखं दन्ते विसुहं जणेइ जो जस्य वल्लहो होइ ।
दइअणहदूमिआणवि वड्ढइ त्थणआण रोमञ्चो ॥

[दुःखं दातापि सुखं जनयति यो यस्य वल्लभो भवति ।
दयितनखदूयमानयोरपि वर्धते स्तनयो रोमाञ्चः ॥][7]

तदुक्तम्—

अप्रातिकूलिकतया मनसो मुदादेः
यस्संविदोऽनुभवहेतुरिहाभिमानः ।
ज्ञेयो रसस्स रसनीयतयात्मशक्तेः
रत्यादिभूमनि पुनर्विततथा रसोक्तिः ॥

---

1. रूप. 2. अन्याम्. 3. शूरमार्याव्रतगर्वितम्.
It may be शूरभार्यादृतगर्वितं शिरः or शूरभार्याधृतिगर्वितं शिरः ।

4. This verse illustrates the Ahaṁkāra in Love, the lady's pride or "Self-Love" in being conscious of her being the wife of a great warrior.

5. 6. 7. These three verses point out the Abhimāna in Love. The third, the Gāthā, is quoted in the *S. K. Ā.* also, where it reads slightly differently. Vide p. 429. The Chāyā there is :

यो यस्य हृदयदयितो दुःखं ददपि स सुखं ददाति ।
दयितनखदूनयोरपि वर्धते स्तनयो रोमाञ्चः ॥

Re. verse 5, 'yad eva rocate mahyam etc.', compare Victor Hugo, *Hernani*, Act V, Sc. 3, Hernani speaking to his beloved Dona Sol : "Whate'er thou dost is well."

ननु इदानीमेवोक्तं रतिप्रियो रणप्रियोऽमर्षप्रियः परिहासप्रिय इति रत्यादिप्रकर्षाणां प्रेम्ण्येव पर्यवसानात् रसमिह प्रेमाणमामनन्तीति, तत्कथमुच्यते—"रत्यादिभूमनि पुनर्वितथा रसोक्तिः" इति? उच्यते—न रत्यादिभूमा रसः किंतर्हि? शृङ्गारः। शृङ्गारो हि नाम विशिष्टेष्टदृष्टचेष्टाभिव्यञ्जकानाम् आत्मगुणसम्पदाम् उत्कर्षबीजं[1] बुद्धिसुखदुःखेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नसंस्काराद्यतिशयहेतुः आत्मनोऽहंकारविशेषः सचेतसा रस्यमानो रस इत्युच्यते, यदस्तित्वे रसिकोऽन्यथात्वे नीरस इति। तदाविर्भावहेतवश्च तत्प्रभवा एव भावाः। ते च एकोनपञ्चाशत्—

[2]रतिः, हर्षः, रोमाञ्चः, धृतिः, गर्वः, हासः, मदः, उत्कण्ठा, चिन्ता, स्मृतिः, मतिः; वितर्कः, उत्साहः, क्रोधः, अमर्षः, असूया, ईर्ष्या, उग्रता, जुगुप्सा, विस्मयः, निद्रा, सुप्तम्, प्रबोधः, चपलता, आलस्यम्, भयम्, शङ्का, त्रासः, वेपथुः, व्रीडा, अवहित्थम्, स्तम्भः, ग्लानिः, स्वेदः, व्याधिः, उन्मादः, श्रमः, शोकः, विषादः, वैवर्ण्यम्, दैन्यम्, स्वरभेदः, आवेगः, अश्रु, मोहः, प्रलयः, जाड्यम्, निर्वेदः, शमः, इति।

तत्र केचिदाचक्षते—रतिप्रभवः शृङ्गार इति। वयं तु मन्यामहे रत्यादीनामयमेव प्रभव इति। शृङ्गारिणो हि रत्यादयो जायन्ते, न अशृङ्गारिणः, शृङ्गारी हि रमते, स्मयते, उत्सहते, स्निह्यतीति। ते तु भाव्यमानत्वाद् भावा एव, न रसाः। यावत्संभवं हि भावनया भाव्यमानो भाव एवोच्यते, भावनापथमतीतस्तु रस इति।

मनोऽकूलेषु दुःखादिषु आत्मनः सुखाभिमानो रसः। स तु पारम्पर्येण सुखहेतुत्वाद् रत्यादिभूमसु उपचारेण व्यवह्रियते। अतो न रत्यादीनां रसत्वम्, अपि तु भावनाविषयत्वाद् भावत्वमेव।

यदप्युक्तं परप्रकर्षगामी रत्यादिभावो रसः इति, तदप्यसारम्। ग्लान्यादिष्वपि तदुपपत्तेः। ग्लान्यादयोऽपि हि श्रमादिभिः परं प्रकर्षमारोप्यन्ते। न ते स्थायिन इति चेत्, स्थायित्वमेषां (उत्पन्नतीव्रसंस्कारत्वम्), [उत्पन्न] तीव्रसंस्कारोत्पत्तिश्च विषयातिशयात् नायकप्रकृतेश्च। प्रकृतिश्च त्रिधा, सात्त्विकी, राजसी, तामसी च, तद्वशाच्च तथाविधानुभवभावनोत्पत्तिः। ततश्चैषां स्थायित्वव्यपदेश इति।

ननु अष्टौ स्थायिनः, अष्टौ सात्त्विकाः, त्रयस्त्रिंशद् व्यभिचारिणः इति ब्रुवते, न तत् साधु; यतोऽमीषामन्यतमस्य एतैरेव परस्परं निर्वर्त्यमानत्वात् कश्चित् कदाचित् स्थायी, कदाचित्तु व्यभिचारी। अतोऽवस्थावशात् सर्वेऽप्यमी व्यभिचारिणः, सर्वेऽपि च स्थायिनः, सात्त्विका अपि सर्व एव, मनःप्रभवत्वात्; अनुपहतं हि मनः सत्त्वमित्युच्यते।

यच्चोक्तं 'विभावानुभावव्यभिचारियोगात् स्थायिनो रसत्वम्' इति, तदपि मन्दम्; हर्षादिष्वपि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगस्य विद्यमानत्वात्।

तस्माद् रत्यादयः सर्व एवैते भावाः, शृङ्गार एव एको रस इति। तैश्च सविभावानुभावैः प्रकाश्यमानः शृङ्गारः विशेषतः स्वदते।

1. Following the Naiyāyika prakriyā, Bhoja calls all these the Guṇas of Ātman.

2. Bhoja does not believe in the theory that of the 49 Bhāvas, 8 are Sthāyins, 33 Vyabhicārins and 8 Sāttvikas. Hence he does not enumerate the 49 in three separate sets, as others do.

Note also that Bhoja omits two of Bharata's Vyabhicārins, Apasmāra and Maraṇa and gives in their place, Irṣyā and Śama. Cf. S. K. A. V, Śl. 16-18 where śama is left out and Irṣyā and Sneha are given in the place of Apasmāra and Maraṇa.

तत्र केचिदाहुः—नायं रसः शृङ्गाराख्यो रत्यादिभिरभिव्यज्यते । अपि तु आलम्बनविभावादुत्पन्नः रत्यादिरेव उद्दीपनविभावादिभिः परं प्रकर्षमापन्नः रसीभवन् शृङ्गारादिसंज्ञां लभते इति । त एवं प्रष्टव्याः—किमेते रत्यादयः स्वेभ्यः स्वेभ्यः आलम्बनेभ्यः उत्पद्यमानाः सर्वस्याप्युत्पद्यन्ते । उत कस्यचिदेव; यदि तावत्सर्वस्य तदा सर्वं जगद् रसिकं स्यात्, न चैतदस्ति । यतः कश्चिद्रसिकः कश्चित्तु नीरसः दृश्यते; न च दृष्टविपरीतं शक्यमनुज्ञातुम् । अतो न सर्वस्य रत्यादयो जायन्ते । अथ कस्यचित् । तत्र निमित्तमभिधानीयम् । तत् दृष्टमदृष्टं वा स्यात् । न तावत् दृष्टं, अनुपलभ्यमानत्वात् । अदृष्टं तु साधारणं, असाधारणं वा । साधारणे पूर्व एव दोषः, सर्वं जगत् रसिकं स्यादिति । असाधारणं तु प्रत्यगात्मगतानादिवासनानुबन्धिधर्मकार्यं भवितुमर्हति । तच्चात्मनोऽहङ्कारगुणविशेषं ब्रूमः । [1]स शृङ्गारः, सोऽभिमानः, स रसः । तत एते रत्यादयो जायन्ते । तैश्चायं प्रकर्षप्राप्तैः सप्तार्चिरार्चिश्चयैरिव प्रकाशमानः शृङ्गारिणामेव स्वदत इति ।[2]

तदुपाधिश्चायमुपजायमानो रसः त्रिधा विख्यायते, प्रकृष्टो, भावरूपः, आभासश्च । तत्र यः कथाशरीरव्यापिनः उत्तमनायकस्य तथाविध एव विषये जायते, स प्रकृष्टः । मध्यमस्य य उपजायते, न प्रकर्षमासादयति, स भावरूपः । यश्च तिरश्चां प्रतिनायकादीनां च उपजायते, स शृङ्गाराभासः ।

तस्य विभागो द्विधा । वाक्यविषयः प्रबन्धविषयश्च । तयोर्वाक्यविषयः[3] अश्लीलामंगलघृणावदर्थग्राम्यमित्यादिदोषहानेन, [4]दीप्तरसत्वं कान्तिरित्यादिगुणोपादानेन, कैशिकीवैदर्भीत्यलङ्कारयोगेन च यद्यपि प्रसंगतः तत्र(तन्त्र)युक्तया तत्र तत्र उपवर्णितः, तथापि गुणालङ्कारसंनिवेशविशेषजन्यत्वान् नानालङ्कारसंसृष्टावेव प्रकृष्टत्वं लभते ।

प्रायेण हि गुणानामिव शब्दार्थोभयालंकाराणाम् अनुप्रासजातिरूपकादीनां काव्ये शरीरेष्विव कटककेयूरकुण्डलादीनां केवलानाम् अदर्शनात्, संसृष्टिरेव प्रकृष्टं भूषणमवधार्यते । ततश्च भोजन इव मधुराम्ललवणषाडवानाम्, वेष इव वस्त्रानुलेपनमाल्यविभूषणानाम्, धूप इव चन्दनागरुकर्पूरसिद्धकानाम्, संगीत इव नृत्तवाद्यपाठ्यानाम्, प्रेमणीव कोपानुशयप्रसादसंगममुखानाम्, गार्हस्थ्य इव धर्मार्थकाममोक्षसाधनानुष्ठानानाम्, वाक्यशरीरेऽपि रूपकादीनां संसृष्टिरेव विशेषतः स्वदमाना रसावियोगहेतुः भवति । अतः प्रागुपदिष्टापि यत्नतः प्रपञ्च्यते ।

V

Pp. 365-370, Vol. II, Chap. XI.

[5]तत्रालङ्कारसंकरः, (अलंकार) संसृष्टिरित्येव वक्तव्ये नानाग्रहणं गुणरसादीनामपि अलङ्कारताप्रतिपत्त्यर्थं, तेषामपि काव्यशोभाकरत्वेन अलङ्कारत्वात्, यदाह—

1. *Cf. S. K. Ā.* V,

रसोऽभिमानोऽहंकारः शृङ्गार इति गीयते ।
योऽर्थः, तस्यान्वयात् काव्यं कमनीयत्वमश्नुते ।

2. *Cf.* Ratneśvara on Bhoja's Arthaguṇa Kānti in *S. K. Ā.* I.

रसोऽभिमानात्मा शृङ्गारः × ×
× × सप्तार्चिरिव अर्चिषा उपचीयत इति अनुरागलक्षणः । p. 66.

3. For the corresponding text in *S. K. Ā.*, see Ch. V, Śls. 4-7. Śl. 4 points out Grāmyatā and Agrāmyatā of śabda ; Śls. 5-6 point out Grāmyatā and Agrāmyatā of Artha. Śl. 7 is of general significance. See above, p. 438.

4. See footnote Two, Ratneśvara on Kānti.

5. Vide *S. K. Ā.* V, pp. 612-614 for the corresponding portion.

'काव्यशोभाकरान्धर्मानलङ्कारान्प्रचक्षते।
ते चाद्यापि विकल्प्यन्ते कस्तान्कात्स्न्र्येन वक्ष्यति ॥'
(काव्यादर्श. II. 1)

अपि च—'काश्चिन्मार्गविभागार्थमुक्ताः प्रागप्यलंक्रियाः।
साधारणमलङ्कारजातमद्य प्रदर्श्यते ॥' II. 3

तत्र काव्यशोभाकरान् इत्यनेन श्लेषोपमादिवद् गुणरसतदाभासतत्प्रशमानप्यनुगृह्णाति। मार्गविभागकृद्गुणानां अलंक्रियोपदेशेन श्लेषादीनां गुणत्वमिव अलङ्कारत्वमपि बोधयति। किञ्च—

'श्लेषः प्रसादः समता माधुर्यं सुकुमारता।
अर्थव्यक्तिरुदारत्वम् ओजःकान्तिसमाधयः ॥

इति वैदर्भमार्गस्य प्राणा दश गुणाः स्मृताः।
तेषां विपर्ययः प्रायो लक्ष्यते गौडवर्त्मनि ॥' (*K. Ā.* I).

इति श्लेषादीनां दशानामेव मार्गविभागकारितां ब्रुवता काव्यशोभाकरत्वेन गुणान्तराणामपि अलङ्कारत्वम् उक्तं भवति। तदाह—'कस्तान् कात्स्न्र्येन वक्ष्यति' इति। युक्तमिदम्; अयुक्तं तु रसादीनामलङ्कारतेति। तेषां गुणानामिव अलङ्कारव्यपदेशाभावात्। नायुक्तम्; युक्तोत्कर्षाणाम् ऊर्जस्विरसवत्प्रेयसाम् अलंकारेषु उपदेशात्। तथथा—

प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानं रसवद्रसपेशलम्।
ऊर्जस्वि रूढाहंकारं युक्तोत्कर्षं च तत् त्रयम् ॥'

तत्र '**ऊर्जस्वि रूढाहंकारम्**' इत्यनेन आत्मविशेषनिष्ठस्य उत्कृष्टादृष्टजन्मनः अनेकजन्मानुभवसंस्कारासादितद्रढिम्नः समग्रात्मगुणसम्पदुदयातिशयहेतोः अलं(अहं)कारविशेषस्य उपसंग्रहाद् अहंकारा[द]भिमानश्चङ्कारायपरनाम्नो रसस्य मानमयविकाररूपेण अभिमानिनां मनसि जाग्रतः पूर्वां कोटिम् उपवर्णयति—यदाह—

'सत्त्वात्मनाममलधर्मविशेषजन्म।
जन्मान्तरानुभवनिर्मितवासनोत्थः।

सर्वात्मसम्पदुदयातिशयैकहेतुः
जागर्ति कोऽपि हृदि मानमयो विकारः ॥'

अहो अहो नमो मह्यं यदहं वीक्षितोऽनया।
मुग्धया त्रस्तसारङ्गतरलायतनेत्रया ॥

तथा च—

तिष्ठन्त्या जनसंकुलेऽपि सुदृशा सायं गृहप्रांगणे
तत्कालं मयि निस्सहाकुलतनौ बाहौ मृदु प्रेङ्खति।

हीनम्राननयैव लोलसरलं निःश्वस्य तत्रान्तरे
प्रेमार्द्राः शशिखण्डपाण्डिममुषो मुक्ताः कटाक्षच्छटाः ॥

'**रसवद् रसपेशलम्**' इत्यनेन विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद् रसनिष्पत्तिरिति रत्यादिरूपेण अनेकधाविर्भवतः अभिवर्धमानस्य परप्रकर्षगामिनः श्चङ्कारस्य मध्यमावस्थाम् अवस्थापयति।

यदाह—

रत्यादयोऽर्धशतमेकविवर्जिता हि
भावाः पृथग्विधविभावभुवो भवन्ति ।
शृङ्गारतत्त्वमभितः परिवारयन्तः
सम्राजिषं द्युतिचया इव वर्धयन्ति ॥

तथथा—

अत्रान्तरे किमपि वाग्विभवातिवृत्त-
वैचित्र्यमुल्लसितविभ्रममायताक्ष्याः ।
तद् भूरिसात्त्विकविकारमपास्तधैर्य-
माचार्यकं किमपि मान्मथमाविरासीत् ॥

यथा च—

राहोश्चन्द्रकलामिवाननचरीम् इत्यादि. (मालतीमा०)

'प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानम्' इत्यनेन समस्तभावमूर्धाभिषिक्तायाः रतेः परप्रकर्षाधिगमाद् भावनापथातिक्रमे भावरूपतामुल्लङ्घ्य प्रेमरूपेण परिणताया उपादानात् भावान्तराणामपि परप्रकर्षाधिगमे रसरूपेण परिणतिरिति ज्ञापयन् अहङ्कारस्य उत्तरां कोटिम् उपलक्षयति । यदाह—

आ भावनोदयमनन्याधिया जनेन
यो भाव्यते मनसि भावनया स भावः ।
यो भावनापथमतीत्य विवर्तमानः
साहंकृतौ हृदि परं स्वदते रसोऽसौ ॥

तथथा—

यदेव रोचते मह्यं तदेव कुरुते प्रिया ।
इति वेत्ति न; जानाति तत् प्रियं यत् करोति सा ॥

यथा च—

अद्वैतं सुखदुःखयोरनुगतं सर्वास्ववस्थासु यत्
विश्रामो हृदयस्य यत्र, जरसा यस्मिन्नहार्यो रसः ।
कालेनावरणात्ययात् परिणते यत्प्रेमसारे स्थितं
भद्रं तस्य सुमानुषस्य कथमप्येकं हि तत्प्राप्यते ॥
(उत्तर. रा. च. १.)

'युक्तोत्कर्षं च तत् त्रयम्' इत्यनेन अयुक्तोत्कर्षाणां त्रयाणां ऊर्जस्वित्सवत्प्रेयसां गुणत्वमेव, नालंकारत्वमिति ज्ञापयति । तथाहि—और्जित्यं, भाविकत्वं, प्रेयः इति पदैः त्रयोऽप्येते गुणेषूपदिष्टाः । कुतः पुनरेतत्, यदेकदा ऊर्जस्विरसवत्प्रेयसाम् अलंकारत्वम्, अन्यदा गुणत्वम्? उच्यते—

भूमनिन्दाप्रशंसासु नित्ययोगेऽतिशायने ।
संसर्गेऽस्तिविवक्षायां भवन्ति मतुबादयः ॥' इति

यथा गोमान् देशः, वाचालो बटुः, वाग्मी विपश्चित्, क्षीरिणो वृक्षाः, बलवान् भटः, दण्डिमती शालेति । तत्र ऊर्जस्विरसवतोः अलङ्कारत्वविवक्षायाम् अतिशायने भूम्नि वा मत्वर्थीयः । गुणत्वविवक्षायां नित्ययोगयोः इत्यपि द्रष्टव्यम् । नित्यो हि काव्ये गुणयोग इव रसादियोगः । गुणवतो रसवतश्च

निश्चितैवास्य प्रशंसा । संसर्गस्तु गुणानामवश्योपादानेन । निन्दा पुनर्दोषग्रहणेन बाधिता नावतरति । प्रेय इत्ययं तु आतिशायनिकः । तदाह—'प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानम्' इति । ननु अलंकारेषु गुणेषु वा प्रेय इति रूपाभेदात् कथमलङ्कारत्वे तदुत्कर्षप्रतीतिः ? यथा 'युधिष्ठिरः श्रेष्ठतमः कुरूणाम्' इति । तत्र आतिशायनिकान्तरेण तद्वतिरिति चेद् इहापि 'युक्तोत्कर्षं च तत् त्रयम्' इति वाक्यान्तरेण भविष्यति। न वातिशायनिकाः स्वार्थातिरिक्तं किमपि ब्रुवते, अपि तु प्रकृत्युपात्तमेव प्रकर्षादिकं गमयन्ति । स्वार्थिकेषु तेषां विधानात् ।

"अथ रसवदिति किं मत्वर्थीयः ? उत वतिः ? किम्वातः ? यदि मत्वर्थीयः, मत्वर्थानुपपत्तेस्तदभावः । रसा हि सुखदुःखावस्थारूपाः । ते च शरीरिणां चैतन्यवतां, न काव्यस्य, तस्य शब्दार्थरूपतया अचेतनत्वेन भूमनिंदादीनामभावात्। अथ वतिः वत्यर्थानुपपत्तेस्तदभावः । तेन तुल्यं क्रिया चेद्वतिः, तत्र तस्येव । न च रसैस्तुल्यं वर्तत इति रसवत् । नापि रस इवात्र, रसस्येव वास्य किञ्चिदस्तीति ।

ययेच्छसि तथास्तु, अस्तु वा तावन्मत्वर्थीयः । ननु चोक्तं मत्वर्थाभावात् तदनुपपत्तिः । रसवतो रामादेर्यद्वचनं तद्रसमूलत्वाद् रसवत् , अभेदसमध्यारोपाच्च कविना अनुक्रियमाणस्य तस्य अनुकरणमपि रसवत् ।

अथवा पुनरस्तु वतिः । ननु चोक्तं वत्यर्थानुपपत्तेः न वतिः । अत्रापि नानुपपत्तिः । 'तदर्हम्' इति वचनात् वतिः भविष्यति । रसान् प्रतिपादयितुं यदर्हति तद्रसवत्, अर्हति च रसवद्रामादिवचनम् अनुक्रियमाणमभेदसमध्यारोपाद् रसान् प्रतिपादयितुमिति रसवद् भवति ।"

VI.

ननु च सर्वेषामप्युपादेयानां काव्यशोभाकरत्वाद् अलङ्कारत्वे व्यवच्छेद्याभावात्, संकरः संसृष्टिरित्येव वाक्यं (च्यं) भवति, विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद् रसनिष्पत्तिरिति विभावादिसंकरस्यापि संसृष्टित्वं प्राप्नोति, तदलङ्कारग्रहणेन निवर्त्यते, न हि विभावादयः अलङ्काराः, अपि तु भावरसतदाभासानाम् अलङ्काराणाम् अभिनिष्पत्तिहेतवः अर्थविशेषाः ।

नन्वेवमपि अर्थगुणत्वाद् अमीषामप्यलङ्कारत्वं प्राप्नोति, सत्यमेतत्, किं तु अन्यपरतया त उपादीयमानाः तत्रैव न्यग्भवन्ति, न वाक्यार्थप्रतीतौ पदार्थाः पृथक् स्फुरन्तीति । p. 370.

" नन्वेवं सति विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद् रसनिष्पत्तिरित्यादिना न भवितव्यमेवालङ्कारेण, नैवम्। त्रिविधः खल्वलंकारवर्गः—वक्रोक्तिः, स्वभावोक्तिः, रसोक्तिरिति । तत्र उपमाद्यलंकारप्राधान्ये वक्रोक्तिः, सोऽपि गुणप्राधान्ये स्वभावोक्तिः, विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगात् तु रसनिष्पत्तौ रसोक्तिरिति ।"

तत्र द्विविधो विभावः, आलम्बनविभावः, उद्दीपनविभावश्च । तयोरालम्बनविभावः इष्टानिष्टसंदर्शनादिः, यमालम्ब्य सुखश्च दुःखश्च उत्पद्यते । तेन सुखदुःखविषयेणानुभवेन स्मरणहेतुः संस्कारो जन्यते । संस्कारप्रबोधहेतवः पुनः उद्दीपनविभावाः ऋतुमाल्यविलेपनादयः । तैः प्रतिबुद्धसंस्कारस्य स्मरणेच्छाद्वेषप्रधानाः बुद्धिशरीरारम्भाः तेऽनुभूयमानत्वाद् अनुभावाः । तैरेवमभिवर्धमानः ईप्सितमर्थमासादयन् जिहासितं जिहासन् सुखात्मकैः व्यभिचारिभिः हर्षधृतिस्मृतिमतिप्रभृतिभिः संसृज्यमानः समासादितोत्तरोत्तर(वृद्धी) रत्यादिस्थायिभावः शृङ्गारप्रभव एव संभोगशृङ्गारादिरसरूपतामधिगच्छति । स एव त्वीप्सितानवाप्तौ जिहासितस्य (अ)हानाद् दुःखात्मकैः व्यभिचारिभिः चिन्तौत्सुक्यावेगनिर्वेदादिभिः संसृज्यमानः दुःखात्मकविप्रलम्भशृङ्गारादिरसरूपतामध्यास्ते ।

तत्र रतेः शृङ्गारनिष्पत्तिर्यथा–

[1] मृतेति प्रेत्य संगन्तुं यया मे मरणं मतम् ।
सैषावन्ती मया लब्धा कथमन्त्रैव जन्मनि ॥ (का० आ० II. 280)

अत्र आवन्त्या वासवदत्ताया आलम्बनविभावभूतायाः सकाशादुत्पन्ने वत्सेश्वरस्य रतौ स्थायिनि भावे तस्याः पुनर्जीवनादिभिरुद्दीपनविभावैः उद्दीप्यमाने, समुत्पन्नेषु हर्षधृतिस्मृतिवितर्कप्रभृतिषु सुखात्मकेषु व्यभिचारिषु, सम्भोगशृङ्गारतां प्राप्ते स्थायिनि यदेतदनुभावरूपमृत्योरिव (रूपं मृतेत्यादिवचनं) वत्सेश्वरस्य तच्छृङ्गाररसादुपजायमानं रसवदुच्यते ।

हासाद् हास्यनिष्पत्तिर्यथा—

इदमम्लानमानायाः लग्नं स्तनतटे तव ।
छायतामुत्तरीयेण नवं नखपदं सखि ॥ (का०. आ०. II. 289)

अत्र काश्चित् सखीं पूर्वं भर्तरि परिगृहीतमानां नखपदाङ्कितस्तनीम् आलम्बनविभावभूताम् उपालभमानायाः कस्याश्चित् सख्या उत्पन्ने हासस्थायिभावे तदीयमानपरिग्रहस्मरणादिभिः उद्दीपनविभावैः उद्दीप्यमाने, समुत्पन्नेषु शंकावहित्थहर्षेगवूदादिषु व्यभिचारिषु परप्रकर्षाधिगमाद् हास्यरसतामापन्ने स्थायिनि यदेतदम्लान(यदेतदिदमम्लान)मानादिवचनं तद्धास्यरससमुद्भूतं रसवदुच्यते ।

उत्साहाद्वीरनिष्पत्तिर्यथा—

अजित्वा सार्णवामुर्वीम् अनिष्ट्वा विविधैर्मखैः ।
अदत्त्वा चार्थमर्थिभ्यः भवेयं पार्थिवः कथम् ॥ (का० आ० II. 284)

अत्र वसुधाविजयादेरालम्बनविभावादुत्पन्ने स्थायिनि उत्साहभावे तेजःस्थैर्यादिभिः उद्दीपनविभावैः उद्दीप्यमाने समुत्पन्नेषु स्मृतिवितर्कप्रभृतिषु व्यभिचारिषु परप्रकर्षाधिगमाद् वीररसतामापन्ने स्थायिनि, वीररसात्मनः पुंसः यदेतद् अजित्वेत्यादिवचनं तद् वीररसाद् उपजायमानं रसवदुच्यते ।

विस्मयाद् अद्भुतनिष्पत्तिर्यथा—

अंशुकानि प्रवालानि पुष्पं हारादिभूषणम् ।
फलं मधूनि हर्म्याणि शाखा नन्दनशाखिनाम् ॥ (का० आ० II. 290)

अत्र शाखिनां प्रवालपुष्पफलशाखासम्पत्तिः निजरूपम्, नन्दनशाखिनां पुनः प्रवालादिस्थानेषु अंशुकहारमधुमन्दिराणि; तदेतदाश्चर्यमेतेषाम्, अतश्चैते (भ्यः) आलम्बनविभावेभ्यः कस्यचित् देवभूमिगतस्य उत्पन्ने विस्मयस्थायिभावे तदीयावयवदर्शनादिभिः उद्दीपनविभावैः उद्दीप्यमाने, समुत्पन्नेषु हर्षरोमोद्गमस्वेदगद्गदादिषु व्यभिचारिषु परप्रकर्षाधिगमाद् अद्भुतरसत्वमापन्ने स्थायिभावे तद् अंशुकानि प्रवालानि इत्यादिवचनं तदद्भुतरसाद् उपजायमानं रसवदुच्यते ।

क्रोधाद् रौद्रनिष्पत्तिर्यथा—

निगृह्य केशेष्वाकृष्टा कृष्णा येन ममाग्रतः ।
सोऽयं दुःशासनः पापो लब्धः किं जीवति क्षणम् ॥ (का० आ० II. 282)

अत्र दुःशासनालम्बनविभावाय क्रुध्यतः भीमसेनस्य पूर्वमुत्पन्ने क्रोधस्थायिभावे तदवाप्तेः स्मर्यमाणसमक्षकृतद्रौपदीकेशकर्षणादिभिः उद्दीपनविभावैः उद्दीप्यमाने समुत्पन्नेषु असूयावेगवेपथुभ्रमादिषु दुःखात्मकेषु व्यभिचारिषु परं प्रकर्षमधिरूढे रौद्ररसतामापन्ने स्थायिनि यदेतद् भीमसेनस्य निगृह्येत्यादि वचः, तद् रौद्ररसाद् उपजायमानं रसवदुच्यते ।

---

1. Cf. *S. K. A.* V. pp. 512-515.

भयाद् भयानकनिष्पत्तिर्यथा —

इदं मघोनः कुलिशं धारासंनिहितानलम्।
स्मरणं यस्य दैत्यस्त्रीगर्भपाताय कल्पते ॥ (का० आ० II. 291)

अत्र महेन्द्रकुलिशाद् धारासंनिहितानलाद् आलम्बनविभावात् स्मर्यमाणादपि दैत्यस्त्रीणामुत्पन्ने भयस्थायिभावे तद्विभिन्नदानवमरणस्मरणादिभिः उद्दीपनविभावैः उद्दीप्यमाने, समुत्पन्नेषु स्वेदस्तम्भवैवर्ण्यवेपथुप्रभृतिषु व्यभिचारिभावेषु स्थायिनः भयानकरसतामापन्नस्य गर्भपातादिभिः अनुभावैर्विभाव्यमानस्य स्वस्वरूपसूचकं यदेतद् इदं मघोनः कुलिशम् इत्यादिवचनं तदपि तन्मूलत्वाद् रसवदुच्यते।

शोकात् करुणनिष्पत्तिर्यथा—

यस्याः कुसमशय्यापि कोमलाङ्गया रुजाकरी।
साधिशेते कथं देवी हुताशनवतीं चिताम् ॥ (का० आ० II. 286)

अत्र चालम्बनविभावभूताद् देवीमरणाद् उत्पन्ने शोकस्थायिभावे चितानिवेशनहुताशनज्वालादिभिः उद्दीपनविभावैः उद्दीप्यमाने समुत्पन्नेषु निर्वेदग्लानिचिन्तास्तम्भादिषु व्यभिचारिषु प्रकर्षात् करुणरसतामापन्ने स्थायिनि करुणरसवतो नायकस्य यदेतद् अस्याः (यस्याः) कुसुमशय्यापीत्यादिवचनं, तत् करुणरसाद् उपजायमानं रसवदुच्यते।

जुगुप्साया बीभत्सनिष्पत्तिर्यथा —

पायम्पायं तवारीणां शोणितं पाणिसम्पुटैः।
कौणपाः सह नृत्यन्ति कबन्धैरान्त्रभूषणाः ॥ (का० आ० II. 228)

अत्र आलम्बनविभावभूतेभ्यः कौणपेभ्यः कस्यचिद् राज्ञः विजयशंसिनः पुंसः उत्पन्ने जुगुप्सास्थायिभावे शिरश्छेदविगलद्रुधिरधारापरिप्लुतप्रणर्तितकबन्धान्त्रभूषणशोणितपानादिभिः उद्दीपनविभावैः उदीप्यमाने समुत्पन्नेषु भयावेगशंकावहित्थादिषु व्यभिचारिषु परांकोटिमधिरूढे बीभत्सरसताम् आपन्ने स्थायिनि यदेतत् पायम्पायम् इत्यादिवचनं तद् बीभत्सरसाद् उपजायमानं रसवदुच्यते।

एवमेते अष्टावेव रसाः रत्यादयो भूमानमापन्नाः शृङ्गारवीरादिव्यपदेशं लभन्ते।[1]

Pp. 372-376.

VII

Criticism of the old theory and statement of Bhoja's new theory.

न च अष्टावेवेति नियमः, यतः शान्तं प्रेयांसमुद्धतमूर्जस्विनं च केचिद् रसमाचक्षते, तन्मूलाश्च किल नायकानां (धीरशान्त) धीरललित धीरोद्धत धीरोदात्त व्यपदेशाः। तेषु

धीरप्रशान्ताश्रयः शान्तो यथा—

सर्वास्सम्पत्तयस्तस्य संतुष्टं यस्य मानसम्।
उपानद्गूढपादस्य ननु चर्मास्तृतैव भूः ॥[2]

---

1 This is Pūrvapakṣa; the Siddhānta follows. Bhoja accepts as many Rasas as there are Bhāvas, though only in his Madhyamāvasthā, where the word Rasa is used only by courtesy.

2. Cf. Bhāgavata, VII, xv. 17.

सदा संतुष्टमनसः सर्वाः सुखमया दिशः।
शर्कराकण्टकादिभ्यः यथोपानत्पदः शिवम् ॥

धीरललिताश्रयः प्रेयान् यथा—

यदेव रोचते मह्यं तदेव कुरुते प्रिया ।
इति वेत्ति न, जानाति तत् प्रियं यत्करोति सा ॥

धीरोद्धताश्रयः उद्धतो यथा—

धृतायुधो यावदहं तावदन्यैः किमायुधैः ।
यद्वा न सिद्धमस्त्रेण मम तत् केन सेत्स्यति ॥ (वेणी० 3.46)

धीरोदात्ताश्रय ऊर्जस्वी यथा—

अपकर्ताहमस्मीति मा ते मनसि भूद् भयम् ।
विमुखेषु न मे खड्गः प्रहर्तुं जातु वाञ्छति ॥

अत्र च शमप्रकृतिः शान्तः, स्नेहप्रकृतिः प्रेयान्, गर्वप्रकृतिरुद्धतः, अहंकारप्रकृतिः पुनरोजस्वीति शृङ्गारादिवदेतेष्वपि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगो द्रष्टव्यः ।

अन्ये [1]त्वाहुः — सर्व एव रत्यादयो विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद् उत्पद्यमानाः भूमानमापन्नाः रसीभवन्ति । तथा हि—

रसनाद्रसत्वमेषां मधुरादीनामिवोक्तमाचार्यैः ।
निर्वेदादिष्वपि तन् निकाममस्तीति तेऽपि रसाः (रुद्रट० का० अलं० XII. 4)

सर्वेषां च तुल्ये रसत्वे रत्यादीनामेव परप्रकर्षगामिनां शृङ्गारवीरव्यपदेश इति न घटते, तथा नाममात्रं भिद्यते । तदुक्तम्—

वीराद्भुतादिषु च येह रसप्रसिद्धिः
सिद्धा कुतोऽपि वटयक्षवदाविभाति ।
लोके गतानुगतिकत्ववशादुपेताम्
एतां निवर्तयितुमेष परिश्रमो नः ॥

यदि च रत्यादयः प्रकर्षगामिनः भावा एव (न) रसाः, कथमुच्यते भावेभ्यो रसा इति । भावेभ्यो रसा इत्यप्ययुक्तम्, नहि बहवो रसाः, अपि तु एक एव शृङ्गारो रसः इत्यग्रतोऽपि प्रबन्धेन प्रतिपादयिष्यते ॥ Pp. 377-378.

VIII

Bharata's scheme of four Rasas from four Primary Rasas criticised.

" यथा चैते भावेभ्यो रसाः, रसेभ्यो भावाः, तथा रसेभ्यश्च रसा भवन्तीति भरताचार्यः तत्र शृङ्गाराद् हास्यरसनिष्पत्तिर्यथा—

स एष भुवनत्रयप्रथितसंयमः शंकरः
बिभर्ति वपुषाधुना विरहकातरः कामिनीम् ।
अनेन किल निर्जिता वयमिति प्रियायाः करं
करेण परिपीडयन् जयति जातहासः स्मरः ॥

वीरादद्भुतनिष्पत्तिर्यथा—

सम्प्रत्येव हि गोग्रहे यदभवत् तत् तावदाकर्ण्यताम्
एतत्ते हृदयं स्पृशामि यदि वा साक्षी तवैवात्मजः ।

---

1. तु is used in the sense of च. Rudraṭa's position is in complete consonance with Bhoja's. We can even say that Rudraṭa was one of Bhoja's inspirers. Or, " Tu " contrasts Rudraṭa's view of numerous additional Rasas with the immediately preceding view of four additional Rasas only.

एकः पूर्वमुदायुधैः सुबहुभिः दृष्टः, ततोऽनन्तरं
यावन्तो वयमाहवप्रणयिनः तावन्त एवार्जुनाः ॥

रौद्रात् करुणनिष्पत्तिर्यथा—

सत्त्वभ्रंशविषादिभिः कथमपि न्रस्तं क्षणं वेत्रिभिः
दृष्टो दृष्टिनिपातजिह्मितमुखैः अभ्याहृतः प्रक्रमः ।
रामान्वेषणतत्परः परिजनैरुन्मुक्तहाहारवं
कन्यान्तःपुरमेव हा प्रविशति क्रुद्धो मुनिर्भार्गवः ॥ (महावीर० 2.20)

बीभत्साद् भयानकनिष्पत्तिर्यथा—

आन्त्रप्रोतबृहत्कपालनलकक्रूरक्वणत्कंकण-
प्रायप्रेङ्खितभूरिभूषणरवैः आघोषयन्त्यम्बरम् ।
पीतच्छर्दितरक्तकर्दमघनप्राग्भारघोरोल्लस-
व्यालोलस्तनभारभैरवपुः बन्धोद्धतं धावति ॥ (महावीर० 1.35)

Criticism :

" यच्चोक्तं रसेभ्यश्च रसा इति, तत्र यद्यालम्बनविभावभूतेभ्य इति मतं, तदा

शृङ्गारात्तु भवेद्धास्यः रौद्रात्तु करुणो रसः ।
वीराच्चैवाद्भुतो नाम बीभत्सात्तु भयानकः ॥

इति नियमो न घटते । यतः शृङ्गारादन्यतोऽपि हास्य उत्पद्यमानः दृश्यते यथा—

हस्तालम्बितमक्षसूत्रवलयं कर्णावतंसीकृतं
स्रस्तं भ्रूयुगमुन्नमय्य रचितं यज्ञोपवीतेन च ।
संनद्धा जघने च वल्कलपटी पाणिश्च धत्ते धनुः
दृष्टं भो जनकस्य योगिन इदं दान्तं विरक्तं मनः ॥[1] (बा. रा. 1.53)

शृङ्गारादपि न दृश्यते—

चिन्ता[म] णिअदइअसमाअमम्मि कअमन्तुआइ भरिउण ।
सुण्णं कलहाअन्ती सहीहि कण्णा ण ओहसिआ ॥ (गाथा– 1.60)
(चिन्तानीतदयितसमागमे कृतमन्युकानि स्मृत्वा ।
शून्यं कलहायमाना सखीभी रुदिता न उपहसिता ॥)[2]

रौद्रादन्यतोऽपि करुणो दृश्यते । यथा—

आर्द्रं नागाजिनमवयवप्रन्थिमद् बिभ्रदंसे
रूपं प्रावृड्घनरुचि महाभैरवं दर्शयित्वा ।
पश्यन् गौरीं भयचलकरालम्बितस्कन्दहस्तां
मन्ये प्रीत्या द्रुत इव भवान् वज्रदेहोऽभिजातः ॥[3]

1. Here Hāsa is produced from a Vīrālambana ; in Abhinava's language, we have here Hāsya produced by Vīrābhāsa or Vīra-anaucitya,

2. The situation here is too pathetic for laughter. The thin border between Comedy and Tragedy is crossed. The situation does not produce laughter, but produces only tears : रुदिता न उपहसिता ।

3. Here, Karuṇa is produced in Śiva from Śṛṅgāra for Pārvatī and Vātsalya for Skanda : प्रीत्या द्रुतः ।

रौद्रादपि न दृश्यते । यथा—

निरीक्ष्य संरम्भनिरस्तधैर्यं राधेयमाराधितजामदग्न्यम् ।
असंस्तुतेषु प्रसभं भयेषु जायेत मृत्योरपि पक्षपातः ॥ [1] (किरात० 3.21)

वीरादन्यतोऽप्यद्भुतो दृश्यते । यथा—

कासु कहेदुक्कोपत्तिअइअपुप्फाओ
पिअसंगमिसहिणठणसस.....संपुट.....[2]

वीरादपि (न) दृश्यते । यथा—

नैतच्चित्रं यदयमुदधिश्यामसीमां धरित्रीं
एकः कृत्स्नां नगरपरिघप्रांशुबाहुर्भुनक्ति ।
आशंसन्ते सुरयुवतयः सक्तवैरा हि दैत्यैः
अस्याधिज्ये धनुषि विजयं पौरुहूते च वज्रे ॥[3] (शाकु० II.)

बीभत्सादन्यतोऽपि भयानको दृश्यते । यथा—

यस्मिन्ननैश्वर्यकृतव्यलीकः पराभवं प्राप्त इवान्तकोऽपि ।
धून्वन् धनुः कस्य रणे न कुर्यान् मनो भयैकप्रवणं स भीष्मः ॥[4]
(किरात० 3.19)

बीभत्सादपि न दृश्यते । यथा—

तत्क्रूरदन्तकरपत्रनिकृत्तसत्त्वसंघातनिस्सरदसृक्प्लुतकूर्चगुच्छम् ।
वक्त्रं वपुश्च विकृताकृति दीर्घबाहोरार्येण राक्षसकुतूहलिना न दृष्टम् ॥[5]
(महावी० च. 5.29)

अथ प्रकृतिभूतेभ्य इति पक्षः, तत्रापि किं शृङ्गाराद् हास्यो जायते, उत शृङ्गार एव हास्यो भवति? किञ्चातः?—यदि शृङ्गाराद् हास्यो जायते, तदिष्यत एव न [6]शृङ्गारिणः कश्चिदपि (भावः) प्रकर्षगामी अप्रकर्षगामी वा संभवति। शृङ्गारी हि रमते, उत्सहते, हसति, विस्मयते, जुगुप्सते, शोचति, बिभेति, शाम्यति, स्निह्यति, गर्वायते, अभिमन्यत इति।

अथ रतिप्रकृतिरेव हास्यरसीभवति, तन्न घटते, शृङ्गारस्य हास्यव्यपदेशाभावात्। अथोच्यते—

शृङ्गारानुकृतिर्येह स हास्यो रस इष्यते ।
तर्हि—वीरस्यानुकृतिर्येह सोऽपि हास्य इतीष्यताम् ॥

1. Here, only Bhaya is produced from Raudra.
2. A case of Adbhuta from Śṛṅgāra. Indistinct.
3. Here, Vīra does not produce wonder and the poet himself denies wonder in the words नैतच्चित्रम्
4. A case of Bhaya from Raudra.
5. Here, Utsāha or Vīra emanates from Bībhatsālambana. Rāma, being an Uttama prakṛti, there is no possibility of fear. The verse itself denies fear in the words न दृष्टम्.
6. This Śṛṅgāra is Bhoja's Ahaṁkāra and not the Ratiprakarṣa Śṛṅgāra, Bhoja confuses himself here.

एतेन रौद्रात्तु करुणो रस इत्यपि प्रत्युक्तम्। न हि रौद्रात् करुणो जायते। नापि रौद्रः करुणो भवति। अथ रौद्रस्य यत्कर्म करुणः स निगद्यते।

तथापि–न रौद्रकर्म करुणः, कारणं करुणस्य तत्॥

एतेन वीरकर्मापि न भवेदद्भुतो रसः।
हेतुत्वं तु तदुत्पत्तौ तस्यापि न निवार्यते॥
बीभत्सदर्शनात् यः स्यात् स भवेत्तु भयानकः।
इत्यालम्बनहेतुभ्यो विभावेभ्यो न भिद्यते॥

अतो यत् किञ्चिदेतत् भावेभ्यो रसाः, रसेभ्यो भावाः, रसेभ्यश्च रसा इति। किं पुनरिह न्याय्यम्? यथा उपवर्णितं प्राक्—

अप्रातिकूल्किकतया मनसो मुदादेः
यः संविदोऽनुभवहेतुरिहाभिमानः।
ज्ञेयो रसः स रसनीयतयात्मकशक्तेः
रत्यादिभूमनि पुनर्वितथा रसोक्तिः॥

एतेन 'रूढाहंकारता' रसस्य **पूर्वा कोटिः**, रत्यादीनामेकोनपञ्चाशतोऽपि विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगात् परप्रकर्षाधिगमे रसव्यपदेशार्हता रसस्यैव **मध्यमावस्था**।'प्रेयः प्रियतराख्यानम्' इत्युपलक्षणेन यथा रतेः प्रेमरूपेण परिणतिः, तथा भावान्तराणामपि परमपरिपाके प्रेमरूपेण परिणतौ रसैकायनमिति रसस्य **परमा काष्ठा** इति प्रतिष्ठितं भवति। तथा हि–

यथा ऊर्जस्विनि अपकर्तोहमिति यत्ते चेतसि भयं, न मे खड्गः पराङ्मुखेषु कदाचिदपि प्रहर्तुमुत्सहत इति रूढोऽहङ्कारः प्रतीयते,

सैषावन्ती मयात्रैव जन्मनि लङ्घेति धिक् कृते वृथाप्रतिज्ञो मानपरिग्रह इति,
उर्वीविजयाद्यकृत्वा कथं पार्थिवो भवेयमिति,
न मया ईदृशाः शाखिनः क्वचिदपि दृष्टा इति,
अनेन मे द्रौपदी केशेषु आकृष्टेति,
धन्यो मघवा यस्यैतदायुधम् इति,
सा मे देवी चितामध्यास्ते इति,
धिक् कौणपाः शोणितमान्त्रभूषणाः पिबन्तीति,
अस्ति मे सन्तोषो मनस इति,
यथेयं मे प्रिया तथाहमप्यस्याः, यतो मदनुकूलमेवैषापि चेष्टत इति,
मयि भूतायुधे किमायुधान्तरैरिति,
सर्वत्रैव **अहंकारः** प्रतीयते। Pp. 381-382.

IX.

Taking the Madhyamāvasthā of Rasa, where Rati and the other 48 Bhāvas attain Prakarṣa by the interplay of their Vibhāvas etc., Bhoja explains the action of Vibhāvas etc. and the Niṣpatti of Rasa.

कथं पुनः विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद् रसनिष्पत्तिः? उच्यते–यथा इन्दुसंनिधेः गण्डकः स्यन्दते, यथा अर्कसंनिधेः सूर्यकान्तो ज्वलति, यथा कर्पूरसंनिधेः स्फटिको विलीयते, तथा तेभ्यस्तेभ्या

आलम्बनविभावेभ्यः तदाकारपरिणतेन्द्रियबुद्ध्युपाधियोगिनोऽभिमानिमनसः, ते ते रतिक्रोधशोकादयो भावाः समुत्पद्यन्ते[1]। ते रत्यादयो यथा—

आश्चर्यमुत्पलदृशो वदनामलेन्दु-
सांनिध्यतो मम मुहुः जडिमानमेत्य ।
जात्येन चन्द्रमणिनेव महीधरस्य
संधार्यते द्रवमयो मनसो विकारः । (मालती० III. 5)

क्रोधादयो यथा—

तेनाथ नाथ दुरुदाहरणातपेन
सौम्यापि नाम परुषत्वमभिप्रपन्ना ।
जज्वाल तीक्ष्णविशदाः सहसोद्विरन्ती
वागर्चिषस्तपनकान्तशिलेव सीता ॥ (अभिनन्द-रामचरितम् 19.89)

शोकादयो यथा—

अथेदं रक्षोभिः कनकहरिणच्छद्मविधिना
तथा वृत्तं पापैः व्यथयति यथा क्षालितमपि ।
जनस्थाने शून्ये विशदकरुणैः आर्यचरितैः
अपि ग्रावा रोदित्यपि दलति वज्रस्य हृदयम् ॥ (उत्तर० 1.28)

[2]अथ इन्दूदये यथा समुद्रः क्षुभ्यति, यथा अपथ्यसेवया व्याधिः अभिवर्धते, यथानार्यसंनिधेः (अ)साधुरधिकं दुःखाकरोति, तथा तेभ्यस्तेभ्यः उद्दीपनविभावेभ्यः तत्तदनुभवसंस्कारयोगिनः मनसः तत्तद्भावाभिवृद्धये ते ते विकारा उपजायन्ते । ते तत्क्षोभे यथा—

विललाप स बाष्पगद्गदं सहजामप्यपहाय धीरताम् ।
अभितप्तमयोऽपि मार्दवं भजते कैव कथा शरीरिषु ॥ (रघु० 8.43)

तदभिवृद्धौ—तमुदीक्ष्य रुरोद सा भृशं स्तनसम्बाधमुरो जघान च ।
स्वजनस्य हि दुःखमग्रतो विवृतद्वारमिवोपजायते ॥ (कुमार. 4.26)

तत्प्रातिकूल्ये—इदमप्युलभवस्तुप्रार्थनादुर्निवारं
प्रथममपि मनो मे पञ्चबाणः क्षिणोति ।
किमुत मलयवातोन्मूलितापाण्डुपत्रै-
रुपवनसहकारैः दर्शितेष्वंकुरेषु ॥ (विक्रमो० 2.6)

[3] "अथ यथा एकस्यापि भूरुहादेः काण्डस्कन्धशाखाविटपादयः प्रकाराः, पल्लवपत्रपुष्पफलसम्पदादयो विकाराः; एकस्य अम्भसः प्रवाहावर्तबुद्बुदतरङ्गादयो विवर्ताः, मुक्ताफलफेनलवणकरकादयो विपरिणामाः, एकस्यापि ध्वनेः तारमध्यमन्द्रकुट्टादयो भेदाः, वर्णपदवाक्यकूजितादयः अवच्छेदाः, एकस्यापि वायोः प्रवहावहपरिवहादयः स्कन्धाः, प्राणापानव्यानादयोऽनुबन्धाः, तेभ्यस्तेभ्य उपाधिभ्यो जायन्ते, तथा एकस्यापि रतिक्रोधशोकादेः तेभ्यस्तेभ्य उपाधिभ्यः ते [भ्यस्] ते [भ्यः] अनुभावव्य-

1. Here the Ālambana Vibhāva is explained in a series of similes. स्यन्दते is Śṛṅgāra ; ज्वलति is Vīra ; विलीयते is Karuṇa.

2. Here the three stages in the heightening caused by the Uddīpana Vibhāva are described : Kṣobha, Abhivṛddhi and Atiduḥkhīkaraṇa.

3. Explanations of Vyabhicārins and Anubhāvas.

भिचारिणश्चाभ्यन्तरा बाह्याश्च व्यवस्थासंग्रहाभ्याम् उपग्रहन्ते । तत्र आभ्यन्तरा व्यभिचारिषु चिन्तौत्सुक्यावेगवितर्कादयः, बाह्याः स्वेदरोमाश्वाश्रुवैवर्ण्यादयः, अनुभावेषु आभ्यन्तराः स्मरणेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नाः, बाह्या मनोवाग्बुद्धिशरीरारम्भाः । त उभयेऽनुक्रियमाणाः सात्त्विकाङ्गिकवाचिकाचित्रसामान्याभिनयव्यपदेशं लभन्ते । तेषु रतिप्रभा(भ)वा यथा—

विवृण्वती शैलसुतापि भावम् अङ्गैः स्फुरद्बालकदंबकल्पैः ।
साचिक्रियाचारुतरेण तस्थौ मुखेन पर्यस्तविलोचनेन ॥ (कुमार. III. 68)

क्रोधप्रभा(भ)वा यथा—

प्रत्यग्रारिकृताभिमन्युनिधनप्रोद्भूततीव्रक्रुधः
कीर्णा बाष्पकणैः पतन्ति धनुषि व्रीडाजडा दृष्टयः ।
पार्थस्याकृतशात्रवप्रतिकृतेः अन्तः शुचा मुह्यतः
हा वत्सेति गिरः स्फुरन्ति न पुनर्निर्यान्ति कण्ठाद्बहिः ॥

शोकप्रभा(भ)वा यथा—

मातर्मांतर्दलति हृदयं ध्वंसते देहबन्धः
शून्यं मन्ये जगदविरलज्वालमन्तर्ज्वलामि ।
सीदन्नन्धे तमसि विधुरो मज्जतीवान्तरात्मा
विष्वड्मोहः स्थगयति कथं मन्दभाग्यः करोतु ॥ (मालती० 9.10)

[1] "अथ यथा इक्षुभ्यो रसः, सर्षपेभ्यस्तैलम्, धातुभ्यो हिरण्यम्, अश्मभ्यो लोहं, दध्नो नवतीतं, काष्ठतोऽग्निः, तेभ्यस्तेभ्यः यन्त्राग्निमन्थसंयोगेभ्यः निष्पतन्ति, तथा स्वेभ्यः स्वेभ्यः विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगेभ्यः रतिक्रोधशोकादिभ्यः ते ते रसाः निष्पद्यन्ते। यथा—

राहोश्चन्द्रकलामिवाननचरीं दैवात् समासाद्य मे
दस्योरस्य कृपाणपाणिपतनाद् आच्छिन्दतः प्रेयसीम् ।
आतङ्काद् विक लं द्रुतं करुणया विक्षोभितं विस्मयात्
कोधेन ज्वलितं मुदा विकसितं चेतः कथं वर्तते ॥ (मालती० V. 23)

अथ यथा लवण [रस] (म्लादयः) मृद्वीकादीनपि आत्मरूपतां नयन्त उपचीयन्ते, तथा रत्यादीनि [व] विभावादीनप्यात्मरूपतां नयन्त उपचीयन्ते । [2] यथा—

कस्स भरिसि त्ति भणिए को मे अत्थित्ति जप्पमाणाए ।
उव्वेग्गरोइरीए अंहे वि रुआपिआ तीए ॥ (गाथा० 4.89.)
[कस्य स्मरसीति भणिते को मे अस्तीति जल्पमानया ।
उद्विग्नरोदनशीलया वयमपि रोदितास्तया ॥]

अथ यथा सर्पिर्मधुजतूच्छिष्टादीनां पार्थिवानां, घनतुहिनकरकादीनाम् आप्यानां, त्रपुसीसरजतादीनां तैजसानाम्, अग्निसंयोगाद् द्रवता अद्भिः सामान्यं भवति, तथा विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिणां संयोगाद् रसता रसेनैव सामान्यं भवति ।[3] यथा—

1. Explanations of Niṣpatti of Rasa.
2. The next stage after Rasa-niṣpatti is Rasa-upacaya when Vibhāvas etc. all become one Rasa. Cf. Daśarūpaka : आत्मभावं नयत्यन्यान् स स्थायी लवणाकरः ।
Śiṅgabhūpāla : क्षीराब्धिवन्नयत्यन्यान् स्वात्मानं स्थायिनो हि ते ॥
3. This also refers to the same stage of Rasa-upacaya.

विलपन्निति कोसलाधिपः करुणार्थग्रथितं प्रियां प्रति ।
अकरोत्पृथिवीरुहानपि स्रुतशाखारसबाष्पदुर्दिनान् ॥ (रघु० 8.69)

अथ यथा ओषधिरसेभ्यः मधुनिष्पत्तिः, यथा मधुरादिभ्यः षाडवोत्पत्तिः, गुडादिभ्यः आसवोत्पत्तिः, तथा तेभ्यः तेभ्यः रससामान्येभ्यः रसविशेषाभिनिर्वृत्तिः । [1] यथा—

यातो विक्रमबाहुरात्मसमतां प्राप्तेयमुर्वीतले
सारं सागरिका ससागरमहीप्राप्त्येकहेतुः प्रिया ।
देवी प्रीतिमुपागता च भगिनीलाभाज्जिताः कोसलाः
किं नास्ति त्वयि सत्यमात्यवृषभे यस्मिन्करोमि स्पृहाम् ॥ (रत्नावली. 4.21)

अथ यथा एकस्याप्यग्नेः भौमदिव्यौदर्यादयः जातिभेदाः दाहालोकपाकादयोऽर्थक्रियाः सन्दृश्यन्ते, तथा एकस्यापि रसस्य भावरसतदाभासादयो जातिभेदाः, उत्कण्ठाभिषङ्गनिर्वृत्त्यादयः अर्थक्रियाः, उत्पादाभिवृद्धिस्थैर्यादयोऽवस्थास्समुपलभ्यन्ते । [2] तत्र भावो यथा—

हरस्तु किञ्चित् परिलुप्तधैर्यः चन्द्रोदयारम्भ इवाम्बुराशिः ।
उमामुखे बिम्बफलाधरोष्ठे व्यापारयामास विलोचनानि[3] ॥ (कुमार० 3.67)

रसो यथा—

तं वीक्ष्य वेपथुमती सरसाङ्गयष्टिः
विक्षेप एव पदम्———इत्यादि[4] ॥ (कुमार० 6.85)

आभासो यथा—

आः सीते पतिगर्वविभ्रमभरभ्रान्तभ्रमद्भ्रान्धव–
प्रध्वस्तस्मितकान्तिमत् तव तदा जातं यदेतन्मुखम् ।
सम्प्रत्येष हठात् तदेव कुरुते केशोच्चयाकर्षण–
व्यश्रोत्तानितलोल्लोचनपतद्बाष्पप्लुतं रावणः[5] ॥

उत्कण्ठा यथा—

पशुपतिरपि तान्यहानि कृच्छ्राद्
अगमयदद्रिसुतासमागमोत्कः ।
कमपरमवशं न विप्रकुर्युः
विभुमपि तं यदमी स्पृशन्ति भावाः ॥ (कुमार० 6·95)

अभिषङ्गो यथा—

लीनेव प्रतिबिम्बितेव लिखितेवोत्कीर्णरूपेव च
प्रत्युप्तेव च वज्रलेपघटितेवान्तर्निखातेव च ।

1. A synthetic Rasa made out of many.
2. Each Rasa has three Jātis, Bhāva, Rasa and their Ābhāsa ; three kinds of fruit as in the case of Love, उत्कण्ठा अभिषङ्ग and निर्वृति; and three stages उत्पाद, अभिवृद्धि and स्थैर्य.
3. Eg. of mere Bhāva, not developing. Kāma is burnt at once.
4. See S. K. A. p. 490. Instance of Niṣpanna Rasa.
5. Ābhāsa of Rasa, being Pratināyakāśraya : पात्रानौचित्याद् आभासः.

सा नश्चेतसि कीलितेव विधिखैः चेतोभुवः पञ्चभिः
चिन्तासन्ततितन्तुजालनिबिडस्यूतेव लग्ना प्रिया ॥ (मालती० V. 10)

निर्वृतिर्यथा—

जगति जयिनस्ते ते भावा नवेन्दुकलादयः
प्रकृतिमधुराः सन्त्येवान्ये मनो मदयन्ति ये ।
मम तु यदियं याता लोके विलोचनचन्द्रिका
नयनविषयं जन्मन्येकः स एव महोत्सवः ॥ (मालती० I. 36)

उत्पादो यथा—

उत्पत्तिर्देवयजनाद् ब्रह्मवादी नृपः पिता ।
सुप्रसन्नोज्ज्वला मूर्तिः अस्याः स्नेहं करोति मे ॥ (महावीर० I. 21)

अभिवृद्धिर्यथा—

कान्ते तल्पमुपागते विगलिता नीवी स्वयं बन्धनात्
तद्वासः श्लथमेखलागुणधृतं किञ्चिन्नितम्बे स्थितम् ।
एतावत् सखि वेद्मि साम्प्रतमहं तस्याङ्गसंगे पुनः
कोऽसौ कास्मि रतं च किं कथमिति स्वल्पापि मे न स्मृतिः ॥ (अमरुक० 101).

स्थैर्यं यथा—

अद्वैतं सुखदुःखयोरधिगतं सर्वास्ववस्थासु यद्
विश्रामो हृदयस्य यत्र, जरसा यस्मिन्नहार्यो रसः ।
कालेनावरणात्ययात् परिणते यत् प्रेमसारे स्थितं
भद्रं तस्य सुमानुषस्य कथमप्येकं हि तत् प्राप्यते ॥ (उत्तर०–1. 39)

भावविशेषो यथा—

शत्रोः सागरलङ्घनं किमपरं द्वारोपरोधः पुरे
दोर्दण्डा अपि मे त एव कुलिशक्षुण्णाद्रिदग्रन्थयः ।
सर्वं सोढमिदं वृथैव हि मया सीताप्रसक्तात्मनः
पापो ध्वस्तमनोरथस्तु(थोऽस्तु ?)सरलं दृष्टोऽपि नाहं तया ॥ [1]

रसविशेषो यथा—

कोपो यत्र भ्रुकुटिरचना, विग्रहो यत्र मौनं,
यत्रान्योन्यं स्मितमनुनयो, दृष्टिपातः प्रसादः ।
तस्य प्रेम्णः तदिदमधुना वैशसं पश्य जातं
त्वं पादान्ते लुठसि न च मे मन्युमोक्षः खलायाः ॥ (अमरुक० 32)[2]

1. Eg. of Nirveda in Rāvaṇa, sterile and not developing.

2. The Rasaviśeṣa here is Roṣa. See *S. K. A.* p. 493 where this verse is quoted. Roṣa and other Bhāvas are "Rasas", though only secondary, to Bhoja. See also p. 511, *S. K. A.*

आभासविशेषो यथा—

आपृष्टासि व्यथयसि मनो दुर्बला वासरश्रीः
एह्यालिङ्ग क्षपय रजनीम्, एकिका चक्रवाकी ।
नान्यासक्तो न खलु कुपितो नानुरागच्युतो वा
दैवाधीनस्तदिह भवतीमस्वतन्त्रस्त्यजामि ॥[1]

Pp. 382-388, Vol. II, *Śṛ. Pra.* Ch. XI.

X.

Rasa Saṅkara :

" अस्तु नाम गुणानां शब्दार्थदोषगुणभेदात् त्रैविध्ये निरुल्लेखतया सोल्लेखतया च संकरव्यवहारः, रसानां तु वीराद्भुतादीनां निरस्तत्वात् कथमिव एकः शृङ्गारः अनेकसाध्यं संकरव्यवहारं वर्तयति ?

उच्यते; यद्यपि शृङ्गार एव एको रसः तथापि तत्प्रभवा एव रत्यादयः । तेऽप्युद्दीपनविभावैः उद्दीप्यमानाः तदनुप्रवेशादेव सञ्चारिणाम् अनुभावानाञ्च निमित्तभावमुपयन्तः रसव्यपदेशं लभन्ते । यथा ह्यभिमानः रत्यादीनां निमित्तं चेतसा रस्यमानो रसः, तथा रत्यादयोऽपि हर्षधृतिचिन्तौत्सुक्यादीनां मनोवाक्कायशरीरारम्भाणाञ्च निमित्तम् अभिमानानुप्रवेशेनैव चेतसा रस्यमाना रसा इत्युच्यन्ते ।

युगपदभिधाने च संकरव्यवहारं कल्पयन्ति । ते तु उत्पत्तौ भावाः, प्रकर्षे रसाः, विपर्यये भावरसाभासाः, प्रविलये तत्प्रशमाः, इति प्रभिद्यमानाः संकीर्यन्त इति ।

तत्संकरः षोढा—भावसंकरः, रससंकरः, भावाभाससंकरः, रसाभाससंकरः, भावप्रशमसंकरः, रसप्रशमसंकर इति । P. 392. Vol. II.

XI.

Ānanda and other new Rasas.

[2]भावप्रशमसंकरो यथा

दृष्टे लोचनवर्त्मना मुकुलितं पार्श्वस्थिते वक्त्रवन्
न्यग्भूतं बहिरासितं पुलकवत् स्पर्शं समातन्वति ।
नीवीबंधवदागतं शिथिलतां संभाषमाणे ततः
मानेनापसृतं ह्रियेव सुदृशः पादस्पृशि प्रेयसि ॥ (अमरुक० 160)

अत्र कस्याश्चित् सखीविख्यातमानसंविधानकाया(संविधानकोपात्) मानवत्याः प्रियदर्शनालम्बनविभावादुत्पन्ने प्रकृष्टरतिप्रभवे **प्रहर्षस्थायिभावे** तत्पार्श्वोपसर्पणादिभिरुद्दीपनविभावैः उद्दीप्यमाने, समुत्पद्यमानेषु पुलकादिषु सुखात्मकेषु व्यभिचारिषु, नयननिमीलनाधोमुख्यनीवीस्रंसनादिभिरनुभावैः परप्रकर्षारोपणाद् आनन्दरसताम् आपद्यमाने स्थायिभावे,

प्रबलविरोधिभावान्तरोदयाद् एतेभ्य एव कारणेभ्यः प्रतिक्षणं अपचीयमानयोः लज्जारोषयोः प्रशमौ समकक्ष्यतया क्षीरनीरवत् संकीर्यमाणौ प्रतीयेते ।

1. This Ābhāsa viśeṣa is another variety of Rasa-ābhāsa, described in non-human beings and things, तिर्यगाद्याश्रय.

2. Cf. *S. K. A.*, V., p. 636.

ii. रसप्रशमसंकरो यथा—

विरोधो विश्रान्तः प्रसरति रसो निर्वृतिघनः
तदौद्धत्यं क्वापि व्रजति विनयः प्रह्वयति माम् ।
झटित्यस्मिन्दृष्टे किमपि परवानस्मि यदि वा
महार्घस्तीर्थानामिव हि महतां कोऽप्यतिशयः ॥ (उत्तर० VI–11.)

अत्र **वीरौद्धत्यस्वातन्त्र्यरसानाम् आनन्दप्रशमपारवश्य** रसैः तिरस्क्रियमाणानां पट इव नीलादिभिः सितादीनां प्रशमे रामदर्शनप्रभावोद्भवे लवस्य **विस्मयातिशय प्रशम**जन्मनि वागारम्भानुभावोपमादौ चित्रवर्णवत् संकीर्यमाणः समुपलभ्य[न] ते[1] ।

iii. रसप्रधानो (गुणरससंकरः) यथा—

अस्मिन्नगृह्यत पिनाकभृता सलीलम्
आबद्धवेपथुरधीरविलोचनायाः ।
विन्यस्तमङ्गलमहौषधिरीश्वरायाः
स्रस्तोरगप्रतिसरेण करेण पाणिः ॥ (किरात० V. 33).

अत्र श्लाघ्यविशेषणयोगः उदात्तत्वं, बन्धविकटत्वमुदारता, अर्थप्राकट्यं प्रसादः, दीप्तरसत्वं कान्तिः, इति गुणाः ,

साध्वस-विलास-अनुराग-संगमरसैः अतिशय्यन्त इति रसप्रधानः[2] ।

iv. P. 399. In the next instance लावण्यम् and विलासः are given as two Rasas—" —लावण्यविलासवर्णनीयरसयोश्च " see also p. 269, S. K. Ā., V.

v. P. 400. Śṛ. Pra. p. 630. S. K. Ā., V. " —रसस्तु निर्वेद एकैकः–"

गुणाधिको (गुणरससंकरो) यथा[3]—

कमलमनम्भसि कमले च कुवलये च तानि कनकलतिकायाम् ।
सा च सुकुमारसुभगेत्युत्पातपरम्परा केयम् ॥

अत्र कमलमनम्भसि कमले च कुवलये तानि कनकलतिकायाम् इत्यन्यधर्माणाम् अन्यत्रारोपणं समाधिः, 'सा च सुकुमारसुभगेत्युत्पातपरम्परा केयम्' इत्यश्लीलमङ्गलार्थौ दोषगुणावपि × × × × × दीप्तरसत्वं कान्तिरिति गुणा दश ; **रसास्तु रत्युत्कर्षधृत्युत्कण्ठावेगविस्मयमतिवितर्कचिन्ता-चपलताहासोत्साहस्तम्भगद्गदोन्मादव्रीडावहित्थभयशंकाः विंशतिः**, वागारम्भानुभावे शृङ्गारिणः प्रियाचाटुकारस्य कस्यचित् प्रतीयन्त इति रसाधिकः । P. 40.

XII.

On Anubhāvas.

Vol. III. Chap. XVII. P. 208.

तत्र विभावैः प्रबुद्धसंस्कारस्य नायकादेः ये स्मृतीच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नजन्मानः मनोवाग्बुद्धिशरीरारम्भाः **तेऽनुभूयमानत्वात्** रत्यादीनां **अनन्तरभवनाय (भवनाच्च)** अनुभावाः ।

(अनुभूयमानत्वात् अनुभावाः , अनु = पश्चात् भावात् च अनुभावाः)

1. See *S. K. A.*, V. P. 627.
2. See *S. K. A.*, V. P. 629.
3. See *S. K. Ā.*, V. P. 631.

Corresponding to this, the S. K. Ā. says :

स्मृतीच्छायत्नजन्मानः मनोवाक्कायसंश्रयाः ।
विलासा ये वरस्त्रीणां ज्ञेया लीलादयस्तु ते ॥

× × × ×

पश्चाद्भावानुभूतिभ्यां स्मरणाद्यनुभाववत् । pp. 477-8. 40-43.

XIII.

All the 49 Bhāvas feed the one central Tattva of Ahaṁkāra. Bhoja concludes his treatment of all Bhāvas thus :—

भावास्सञ्चारिणो ये च, स्थायिनो ये च, सात्त्विकाः ।
सविभावानुभावास्ते **शृङ्गारस्य प्रकाशकाः** ॥
प्रकृतिभव(ज)भिमानसंज्ञं
सममनुभावविभाववर्गाः (र्गः) ।
स्वमवसरमुपेयिवानुपास्ते
नृपतिमिवाधिकृते नु (षु) नी वि (ति) स (व) र्गः ॥
Chap. 17. Vol. III. p. 236.

XIV.

Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa Śṛṅgāras.

1. Dharma Śṛṅgāra.

Chap. 18. Vol. III. 237.

धर्मशृङ्गारः, अर्थशृङ्गारः, कामशृङ्गारः, मोक्षशृङ्गारः इति यदुक्तं, तदिदानीं व्याख्यायते । तत्र धर्मो नाम श्रुतिस्मृतिविहिताचारः प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिनियमरूपः etc.

सोऽयं प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिनियमरूपः श्रुतिस्मृतिविहिताचारो धर्मः । यथोच्यते—

प्रेत्य चेह च यत्कर्म क्रियमाणं गुणावहम् ।
वाङ्मनःकायनिष्पन्नं स धर्म इति कीर्त्यते ॥

तत्र प्रवर्तमानस्य तराम्यानतिमानो (श्रुतिस्मृतिविहितवाक्यावतिक्रमा**भिमानो**) धर्मशृङ्गारः । ”

At the end of chap. 18, we find

तदेतत् धर्मशृङ्गारे धीरोदात्तस्य चेष्टितम् ।
मनोवाक्कायचेष्टाभिः स्पष्टमेवोपवर्णितम् ॥
पाञ्चालीभारतीप्राच्याः रीतिवृत्तिप्रवृत्तयः ।
स्वकीया नायिका वा (चा) स्मिन् धीरोदात्तश्च नायकः ॥ (p. 263).

II.

Artha Śṛṅgāra.

Chap. 19. p. 264.

अर्थो नाम आत्मनः सुखसाधनानाम् कलत्रमित्रादीनाम् अर्जनम् । P. 267 त्रिवर्गावाप्तिसाधक-.....क्षमं सोऽर्थः अपदिश्यते ।

प्रवृत्तौ तदवाप्ति (अर्थावाप्ति) अभिमानः अर्थशृङ्गारः ।
विद्याद्यर्थार्जने तदुपायपूर्विकायां प्रवृत्तौ तदनतिक्रमाभिमानः अर्थशृङ्गारः ॥

III.

Kāma Śṛṅgāra.

Ch. 20. P. 302.

तत्र सामान्यविशेषकामार्थिनः धीरललितादेः नायकस्य तदनुकूलायां प्रवृत्तौ तदुपायानतिक्रमेण एतदनुभवाभिमानः कामशृङ्गारः ।

IV.

Mokṣa Śṛṅgāra

Ch. 21. P. 326.

तत्त्वज्ञानान्निःश्रेयसाधिगमो मोक्षः । × × × पुरुषस्य च शास्त्रोक्तैरुपायैः तत्त्वज्ञानादिभिः निःश्रेयसमीहमानस्य गार्हस्थ्येऽपि तदधिगमयोग्यताभिमानो मोक्षशृङ्गारः । तथाहि-अस्ति मे मोक्षाधिगमे योग्यता; अधीतानि मया मोक्षशास्त्राणि × × × × × प्रसीदन्ति चित्तवृत्तयः × × इत्यादिः योग्यचेतसोऽभिमानः मोक्षशृङ्गारः ।

"—इत्यादिर्योग्यचेतसोऽभिमानः स मोक्षशृङ्गार इत्युच्यते । तन्निवृत्तौ चास्य अहंकारविरहात् मोक्ष एवेति । यावदहंकारवान् तावद् अयं मोक्षशृङ्गारी; विरहिताहंकारस्तु मुक्त एवेति । यथा-× × × ×

यथा च—मयि जीवत्यहङ्कारे पुरुषः पञ्चविंशकः ।
तत्त्वज्ञानोपपन्नोऽपि न मोक्षं गन्तुमर्हति ॥ " p. 330. Vol. III.

X.

On Kāma Śṛṅgāra.

1. Vol. III. P. 350. Ch. 22.

तत्रापि धर्मार्थशृङ्गारयोः हेतुभूतत्वात् (-भूतयोः) कामशृङ्गार एव फलभूतत्वात् प्रधानः ।

2. Vol. IV. P. 733. Ch. 32.

विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगात् [वि] प्रकर्षमापद्यमानः प्रधान.....(भा)वो रतिर्नाम कामशृङ्गाराख्यां लभते ।

XIV.

As it opens, the Śṛ. Pra. closes with verses on Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra.

1. — ... ... तारका ।
अविदग्धा यथा गोष्ठी नि (*) शृङ्गारा (तथाङ्गना) ॥
2. यथांशुमाली पी (वी) तांशुः यथानर्चिर्हुताशनः ।
यथाप्रतापो नृपतिः अशृङ्गारस्तथा पुमान् ॥
3. यथेन्दुना निशा भाति निशाभिश्च (यथा शशी) ।
(अङ्गनाभिश्च शृङ्गारः) शृङ्गारेण तथाङ्गना ॥
4. यथा तटिदनम्भोदा पयोदस्त (टितं विना) ।
अहंकृतिरशृङ्गारा [:] शृङ्गाराच्च (रश्च) अनहंकृतिः ॥

5. रसः शृङ्गार एवैकः भावा रत्यादयो मताः ।
प्रकर्षगामिनोऽपीह प्रेमग्लानिश्रमादिवत् ॥

p. 917. Vol. IV. End of Ch. 36 and of the Śṛ. Pra. itself.

Here is given the text of the Abhinavabhāratī of Abhinavagupta on the Nāṭyaśāstra on three subjects : i. The deciding of certain Bhāvas as Pradhāna, i.e. important and others as subsidiary. ii. The question of one Rasa producing another. And iii. The question whether Rasas are from Bhāvas or *vice versa*, or they produce each other mutually. These three texts are referred to in the foregone discussion on Rasa.

The text of the Abhinavabhāratī need not be reproduced here when the section relevant to our discussion is already available in print in Vol. I of the edition of the Nāṭyaśāstra with the Abhinavabhāratī in the Gaekwad Series, but for the fact that the text as printed in the Edition referred to is corrupt in some places. Same is the case with the edition of a portion of the Abhinavabhāratī bearing on Rasa by Dr. S. K. De in the Asutosh Mukherjee Silver Jubilee Volume. The section on Rasa in the Abhinavabhāratī in the MS. of the Madras Oriental MSS. Library was carefully studied by Dr. A. Sankaran, during whose research studentship, Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri corrected and decided the text in the Madras MS. to some extent. The MS. was again gone through by me with his help and the portions concerned with my study have been determined, with the aid, sometimes of Hemacandra.

I give below the corrected text. The portions corresponding to the following three extracts appear in Vol. I of the N. Ś. Gaek. Edn. on pp. 283-285, 296-299 and 293-295 ; and in Dr. S. K. De's publication of a part of the Rasa section in the Asutosh Mukherjee S. J. Volume, pp. 248-249. In the footnotes I have given the various readings available (1) in the Madras MS. referred to a 'M', (2) in Hemacandra (pp. 64 and 77-78) referred to as 'H', (3) in Dr. S. K. De's publication of a portion of the Abhinava bhāratī referred to as 'D' and in the Gaek. Edn. referred to as 'G'.

I

॥ अप्रधानत्वशङ्कानिरासः ॥

अप्रधाने च वस्तुनि कस्य संविद् विश्राम्यति, तस्यैव प्रत्ययस्य प्रधानान्तरं प्रत्यनुधावत स्वात्मनि अविश्रान्तत्वात्[1] । अतोऽप्रधानत्वं[2] विभावानुभाववर्गे व्यभिचारिनिचये[3] च संविदात्मकेऽपि नियमेन[4] अन्यमुखप्रेक्षिणि सम्भवतीति तदतिरिक्तः स्थाय्येव तथा चर्वणापात्रम्[5] । तत्र पुरुषार्थनिष्ठाः काश्चित् संविद इति प्रधानम् । तद्यथा—रतिः कामतदनुषङ्गिधर्मार्थनिष्ठा, क्रोधः तत्प्रधानेष्वर्थनिष्ठः,

1. M. स्वात्मनि ज विश्रान्तत्वात्. G. विश्रान्तत्वात्. D. विश्राम्यत्वात् । 2. न would be better here instead of the Avagraha. 3. M. व्यभिचारिणि च ये । 4. M. नियमे नाव्यमुख । D. and H. नियमेन नान्यमुख । 5. D. "स्थाय्येव । तथा च etc."

कामधर्मपर्यवसितोऽप्युत्साहः, समस्तधर्मादिपर्यवसितः तत्त्वज्ञानजनितनिर्वेदप्रायो[6]ऽपि भावो मोक्षोपाय इति तावदेषां प्राधान्यम् ।

यद्यपि चैषाम्[7] अन्योन्यं गुणभावोऽस्ति तथापि तत्तत्[8] प्रधाने रूपके तत्तत्प्रधानं[9] भवतीति रूपकभेदपर्यायेण सर्वेषां प्राधान्यमेषां लक्ष्यते । अदूरभागाभिनिविष्टदृशस्तु[10] एकस्मिन्नपि प्राधान्यम् ।

तत्र सर्वेऽमी सुखप्रधानाः स्वसंविच्चर्वणरूपस्यैकघनस्य प्रकाशस्य आनन्दसारत्वात् । तथा हि एकघनशोकसंविच्चर्वणेऽपि लोकेऽस्ति स्त्रीलोकस्य[11] हृदयविश्रान्तिः, अन्तरायशून्यविश्रान्तिशरीरत्वात् सुखस्य[12], अविश्रान्तिरूपतैव दुःखम् । तत एव कापिलैः दुःखस्य चाश्वत्थ्यमेव प्राणत्वेनोक्तम् [13]रजोवृत्तितां वदद्भिरित्यानन्दरूपता सर्वरसानाम् । किन्तु उपरञ्जकविषयवशात् तेषामपि कटुकतास्पर्शोऽस्ति वीरस्येव[14] । स हि क्लेशसहिष्णुतादिप्राण एव ।

एवं रत्यादीनां प्राधान्यम् । हासादीनां तु सातिशयं सकललोकसुलभविभावतया उपरञ्जकत्वमिति न[15] प्राधान्यम् । अत एव अनुत्तमप्रकृतिषु बाहुल्येण हासादयो भवन्ति[16] । पामरप्रायः सर्वोऽपि हसति शोचति परनिन्दामाद्रियते[17] [18]अल्पसुभाषितस्त्वेन च सर्वत्र विस्मयते । रत्याद्यङ्गतया तु पुमर्थोपयोगित्वमपि स्यादेषाम् । एतद्गुणप्रधानभावकृत एव च दशरूपकादिभेद इति वक्ष्यामः । स्थायित्वं चैतावतामेव । जात एव हि जन्तुरियतीभिः संविद्भिः परीतो भवति । तथा हि "दुःखसंश्लेषविद्वेषी सुखास्वादनसादरः" इति न्यायेन सर्वो रिरंसया व्याप्तः स्वात्मनि उत्कर्षमानितया[19] परमुपहसन् अभीष्टवियोगसन्तप्तः तद्धेतुषु कोपपरवशः अशक्तौ च ततो भीरुः किञ्चिदार्जिजीषुरपि[20] अनुचितवस्तुविषयवैमुख्यात्मकतया क्रान्तः किञ्चिदनभीष्टीतयाऽभिमन्यमानः तत्तत्स्वकर्तव्यदर्शनसमुदितविस्मयः किञ्चिच्च जिहासुरेव जायते । न ह्येतच्चित्तवृत्तिवासनाशून्यः प्राणी भवति । केवलं कस्यचित् काचिदधिका चित्तवृत्तिः काचिदूना कस्यचिदुचितविषयनियन्त्रिता कस्यचिदन्यथा । तत्काचिदेव पुमर्थोपयोगिनीत्युपदेश्या । [21]तद्विभागकृताश्च उत्तमप्रकृत्यादिव्यवहारः ।

ये पुनरमी ग्लानिशङ्काप्रभृतयश्चित्तवृत्तिविशेषाः ते समुचितविभावाभावात्[22] [23]जन्मन्येऽपि न [24]भवन्त्येव । तथा हि – रसायनमुपयुक्तवतो[24] मुनेः ग्लान्यालस्यश्रमप्रभृतयो नोत्तिष्ठन्ति । [25]यस्यापि भवन्ति विभाववलात् तस्यापि हेतुप्रक्षये क्षीयमाणाः संस्कारशेषतां[26] नावश्यमनुबध्नन्ति । उत्साहाद-

6. M. and G. प्रायोविभावः D. प्रायविभावः 7. M., D. and G. चैषामप्यन्योन्यं । 8. M. and D. तत्प्रधाने । 9. D. संभवतीति. 10. M. अदूरभागादिनिविष्टदृशस्तु. H. अदूरभागाभिनिविष्टदृशातु D. अदूरभागादिनिविष्टदृशा तु । 11. M. लोकेऽस्ति लोकस्य. H. D. and G. लोके स्त्रीलोकस्य । 12. सुखस्य is absent in M., H., D., and G. Without it, the sense is not clear. 13. It would be better if there is a 'तस्य' before 'रजोवृत्तितां'. 14. M. and D. तेषामपि कटु किं नास्ति स्पर्शो वीरस्य. H. केषामपि कटुपित्तास्पर्शोऽस्ति वीरस्येव. G. केषामपि कटु किं नास्ति । स्पर्शो वीरस्य । 15. न is absent in M., H., D., and G. but without it, the sense is not clear. 16. H. बहुला न हासादयः G. बाहुल्येन न हासादयः । 17. M. परं निन्दात्माद्रियते. H. and G. विभेति परनिन्दामाद्रियते। 18. H. and D. स्वल्पसुभाषितत्वेन G. अल्पसुभाषित्वेन. 19. M. and G. उत्कर्षमानीतया. 20. M. अजिजीषुरपिचित. D. जिगीषुरपिजित. G. जिगृषुरपि अनुचित. 21. M. D. and G. तद्विभावकृतश्च । 22. D. समुचितविभावात् । 23. M. and D. जगन्मध्येऽपि । 24. H. (p. 83) रसायनमुपयुक्तचेतोग्लान्यालस्य० । 25. H. D. and G. यस्यापि वा । 26. M. संस्कारशेषकान्तात् । संस्कारक्षेपतान्तात् ।

यस्तु संपादितस्वकर्तव्यतया[27] प्रलीनकल्पा अपि संस्कारशेषतां नातिवर्तन्ते। कर्तव्यान्तरविषयस्योत्साहादेः अखण्डनात्। यथाह पातञ्जले[28]–"न हि चैत्र एकस्यां स्त्रियां रक्त इति अन्यासु विरक्तः" इत्यादि (व्यासभाष्ये–२·४)। तस्मात् स्थायिरूपचित्तवृत्तिसूत्रस्यूता एवामी व्यभिचारिणः स्वात्मानमुदयास्तमयवैचित्र्यशतसहस्रधर्माणं प्रतिलभमानाः रक्तनीलादिसूत्रस्यूतविरलभागोपशोभन[29]संभावितभङ्गीसहस्रगर्भस्फटिककाचाभ्रक[30]पद्मरागमरकतमहानीलादिमयगोलकवत् तस्मिन् सूत्रे स्वसंस्कारवैचित्र्यमनिवेशयन्तोऽपि तत्सूत्रकृतमुपकारसन्दर्भं बिभ्रतः[31] स्वयं च विचित्राः[32] स्थायिसूत्रं च विचित्रयन्तोऽन्तरान्तरा शुद्धमपि स्थायिसूत्रं प्रतिभासावकाशमुपनयन्तोऽपि पूर्वापरव्यभिचारिरत्नच्छायाशबलिमानमवभ्रम्यमानयन्तः[33] प्रतिभासन्त इति व्यभिचारिण उच्यन्ते। तथा हि ग्लानोऽयमित्युक्ते कुत इति हेतुप्रश्नेन [34]अस्थायितास्य सूच्यते। न तु राम उत्साहशक्तिमानित्यत्र हेतुप्रश्नमाहुः। अत एव विभावास्तत्रोद्बोधकाः सन्तः स्वरूपोपरञ्जकत्वं विदधानाः [35]रत्युत्साहादेः उचितानुचितत्वमात्रमावहन्ति, न तु तदभावे सर्वथैव ते निरुपाख्याः, वासनात्मना सर्वजन्तूनां तन्मयत्वेनोक्तत्वात्। व्यभिचारिणां तु स्वविभावाभावे नामापि नास्तीति। वितनिष्यते चैतद्यथायोगं व्याख्यावसरे। एवमप्रधानत्वनिरासः।

(Abhinavabhāratī, ch. 6).

॥ रसानामुत्पाद्योत्पादकप्रकारः ॥

तत्रोत्पत्तिं तावदाह–तेषामित्यादिना। तेषां रसानाम् उत्पत्तौ हेतवः सूचकाश्चत्वारः। रसानामुत्पाद्योत्पादकप्रकारो यावान् सम्भवति स चतुर्भिरेव सूचित इति यावत्। तथा हि तदाभासत्वेन तदनुकाररूपतया हेतुत्वं शृङ्गारेण सूचितम्। यतो विभावाभासादनुभावाभासाद् व्यभिचार्याभासात् रत्याभासे प्रतीते चर्वणाभाससारः शृङ्गाराभासः। कामनाभिलाषमात्ररूपा हि रतिरत्र व्यभिचारिभावो न स्थायी। तस्य तु स्थायिकल्पत्वेनाभाति। तद्वशाद् विभावाद्याभासता। अतश्च स्थाय्याभासत्वं रतेः। यतो रावणस्य सीता द्विष्टा मय्युपेक्षिका[1] वेति हृदयं नैव स्पृशति। तत्स्पर्शे त्वभिमानोऽस्य[2] विलीयत एव[3]। मयीयं रक्तेति तु[4] निश्चयोऽप्यनुपयोगी। [5]कामजमोहसारत्वात् शुक्तौ रूप्याभासवत्। यद्यपि—

दूराकर्षणमोहमन्त्र इव मे तन्नाम्नि याते श्रुतिं
चेतः कालकलामपि प्रसहते नावस्थितिं तां विना।
एतैराकुलितस्य विक्षतरतेरङ्गैरनङ्गाकुलैः
सम्पद्येत कथं तदाप्तिसुखमित्येतन्न वेद्मि स्फुटम्॥

27. M. संपादितस्वश्च कर्तव्यतया. G. संपादितस्वावश्यकर्तव्यतया। 28. M. H. D. & G. all have only 'यथाह पतञ्जलिः'. It has been suggested above that it should be 'यथाह पातञ्जले' in view of the fact that the passage does not form part of Patañjali's Sūtra but forms part of Vyāsa's Bhāṣya thereon. 29. M. विरलभावो..... भन. D. विरलभावो.....भनासंभावित. G. विरलभावोपलंभन 30. M. काचभ्रमक. D. काचाभ्र. G. काच भ्र (भ्रा ?) मक. 31. M. and D. विभुतमः 32. M. D. and G. विचित्रार्थस्थायिसूत्रं. 33. M. and D. उपहयन्तः G. उपधयन्तः 34. Vide H. p. 84. स्थायी तस्य सूच्यन्ते। D. and G. स्थायितास्य सूच्यते। 35. D. इत्युत्साहादेः।

1. M. द्विष्टा मय्युपेक्षिका वेति हृदयं नैव स्पृशतीति. G. द्विष्टामप्युपेक्षिका वेति हृदयं नैव स्पृशतीति। 2. M. अस्यापि. G. अस्याः। 3. M. इति एव। 4. M. मतिश्च यो ह्यन्वययोनि॰ G. तु निश्चयो ह्यनुपयोगी। 5. M. कामजमोहसारत्वात्।

इत्यादौ रावणकाव्ये[6] तावति रत्याभासतैव, न तु हासः स्फुरति । तथापि [7]सीतालक्षणो विभावः रावणवयः[8] प्रकृतिविरुद्धश्च[9] । चिन्तादैन्यमोहादिको[10] व्यभिचारिगणः[11] अश्रुपातपरिदेवितादि चानुभावजातम् अनौचित्यात् तदाभासरूपं सत् हास्यविभावरूपम्; तदुक्ष्यते[12] 'विकृतपरवेषालङ्कार' (ना. शा. ६) इत्यादि । एवं तदाभासतायाः[13] प्रकारः शृङ्गारेण सूचितः । तेन करुणाद्याभासेष्वपि हास्यत्वं सर्वेषु मन्तव्यम् । अनौचित्यप्रवृत्तिकृतमेव हि हास्यविभावत्वम् । तत्र अनौचित्यं सर्वरसानां विभावानुभावादौ सम्भाव्यते । तेन व्यभिचारिणामप्येषैव वार्ता । अत एव संवित्स[14]त्त्वनिपुणैश्चिरन्तनै रसभावतदाभासव्यवहारस्तत्र क्रियते । [15]अमोक्षहेतावपि तदाभासतायां शान्ताभासो हास्य एव । प्रहसनरूपस्य अनौचित्यत्यागः सर्वपुरुषार्थेषु व्युत्पाद्यः । एतच्च लक्षणे वक्ष्यते । तत्र हास्याभासो यथास्मत्पितृव्यस्य वामनगुप्तस्य—

लोकोत्तराणि चरितानि न लोक एष
सम्मन्यते यदि किमत्र वदाम नाम ।
यत्त्वत्र हासमुखरत्व[16]ममुष्य तेन
पार्श्वोपपीडमिह को न विजाहसीति ॥

एवं यो यस्य न बन्धुः तच्छोके करुणोऽपि हास्य एवेति सर्वत्र योज्यम् । अद[17] एवोदाहरणम् । एवमन्यत्तेनानुमेयमिति मुनिना यथाग्रहणं कृतम् । यदीयफलानन्तरं द्वितीयरसोऽवश्यंभावी तस्योदाहरणं रौद्रः । रौद्रस्य हि फलं वधबन्धादि; तद्विभावकेन अवश्यं करुणेन भाव्यम् । यथा वेणी-संहारे—

अथैवावां रणमुपगतौ तातमम्बां च दृष्ट्वा
भ्रातस्ताभ्यां शिरसि विनतोऽहं च दुःशासनश्च ।
तस्मिन् बाले प्रसभमरिणा प्रापिते तामवस्थां
पित्रोः पार्श्वं व्यपगतघृणः किन्नु वक्ष्यामि गत्वा ॥

एवं रौद्रानन्तरं न[18] नियमेन भयानकः । [19]न शृङ्गारानन्तरं नियमेन करुणः । व्याप्रियते त्वसौ तज्जन्मनि, यथा तापसवत्सराजे वासवदत्तादाहाद् वत्सराजस्य । ननु तत्र रते[20]र्वि[21]च्छेदात् बन्धुताकृतः शोकः; नैतत् करुणोत्पत्तिकालेऽपि[22] हि क्रोधस्य [23]विच्छेद एव । यदाह—

'निर्वाणवैरिदहनाः प्रशमादरीणां नन्दन्तु पाण्डुतनयाः' (वेणीसं.) इति । न च बन्धुतामात्रं हेतुः । एवं हि सति—

उत्कम्पिनी भयपरिस्खलितांशुकान्ता
ते लोचने प्रतिदिशं विधुरे क्षिपन्ती ।
क्रूरेण दारुणतया सहसैव दग्धा
[24]धूमान्धितेन दहनेन न वीक्षितासि ॥ (ता. व. रा. 2-16.)

---

6. G. वाक्ये । 7. M. and G. सीताविभावलक्षणं । 8. M. रावणादयः 9. M. and G. विरुद्धं । 10. M. and G. मोहादिकं । 11. M. and G. गणं । 12. M. 'तदुक्ष्यते' is missing. 13. M. and G. आभासतया. 14. G. सत्तत्व । 15. G. आमोक्षहेतौ । 16. M. मुखरत्वं G. मुखतस्त्वं । 17. G. एतदेव । 18. M. and G. न is absent. 19. M. and G. न is absent. 20. M. and G. अरतेः । 21. G. अविच्छेदात् । 22. G. कालेऽपि । 23. M. अविच्छेदः 24. G. धूमान्धितेन ।

इत्यादौ ते इति प्राणभूतं[25] निरुपयोगतां गमितं स्यात्। रतिप्रलापेषु च[26] शृङ्गार एव करुणस्य जीवितम्[27] 'हृदये वससि' इत्याद्युक्तिषु।

एवं वीराद्भुतानकोत्पत्तिः यथा 'कर्णस्यात्मजमग्रतः शमयतः भीतं जगत्फाल्गुनात्' (वेणी. ५·५)। यत्त्वत्र श्रीशङ्कुकेनोक्तं नात्र उत्साहस्य व्यापार इति तदसत्। एवं हि निर्विषय एव उत्साहः स्यात्। कर्तव्याननुसन्धानाद् युद्धवीरे च [28]परपराजयजनितः प्रतापापरपर्यायः शत्रुहृदयदाहदायी तद्वनितादिषु भयानक एव जीवितम्। यथा—

स पातु वो यस्य हतावशेषास्तुल्यवर्णाञ्जनरञ्जितेषु।
[29]शृङ्गारसाम्येऽपि च विस्रसन्ति दैत्यास्त्वकान्तानयनोत्पलेषु॥

[30]नियमेन तु भवतीति वक्तव्यम्। नियमश्चकारेणोक्तो रौद्रादित्यानन्तर्यसूचकपश्चम्यनन्तरं प्रयुक्तेन। यस्तु रसो रसान्तरं फलत्वेनाभिसन्धाय प्रवर्तते तस्योदाहरणं वीरः। महापुरुषोत्साहो हि जगद्विस्मयफलाभिसन्धानेनैव। यथा "दोर्दण्डाश्चितचन्द्रशेखरधनुर्दण्डावभङ्गोद्यत' (वीरचरिते) इत्यादि। रौद्रस्तु परविनाशं फलत्वेनाभिसन्धाय प्रवर्तते। न करुणमिति शेषः। विदूषकहासस्तु नायिकाहासं फलत्वेन अभिसन्धत्ते इति मन्तव्यम्। यस्तु रसः तुल्यविभावत्वनियमेन रसान्तरं हि परमाक्षिपति तस्योदाहरणं बीभत्सः। तस्य हि ये [31]विभावा रुधिरप्रभृतयः तेऽवश्यं भयहेतवः—तथा तद्व्यभिचारिणो, मरणमोहापस्मारायाः तदनुभावास्तु मुखविकूणनादयः। यथा वेणीसंहारे— 'संस्तभ्यन्तां निहतदुश्शासनपीतशेषशोणित[32]स्नपितबीभत्सवृकोदरदर्शनवैक्लव्यस्खलितप्रहरणानि रणाद् विद्रवन्ति बलानि' इति (वेणीसं. ४)। एवं तदाभास[33]तदनुकारेण रसान्तराक्षेपकत्वे शृङ्गार उदाहरणम्। तेन शृङ्गारानुकृतिरित्यत्र तुशब्दो वीप्सायाम्। द्वितीयो हेतौ। तेनैवं [34]योजना। या अनुकृतिः स हास्यो यतः प्रकीर्तितः [35]ततः एवंविभावको हास्य इति शेषः। तद्यथा-शृङ्गारा[36], अर्श आद्यच्, शृङ्गारवत्यनुकृतिरित्यर्थः। यत्त्वत्र शृङ्गारादद्भुतोत्पत्तेराशङ्कां ददशुः 'दृशः पृथुतरीकृताः' (रत्ना. २–१५) इत्याद. तन्निर्मूलमेव। उदयने हि शृङ्गारः, ब्रह्मणि विस्मयसम्भावना। सा च न तात्कालिकत्वेन नोत्तरकालिकत्वेन, किन्तु पूर्वतरमेवेति न किञ्चिदेतत्।

[37]परंपराफलत्वेन रसान्तराक्षेपे रौद्र उदाहरणम्। रौद्रस्य यत्कर्म फलात्मकं वधादि चकारात्तस्य यत्कर्म फलरूपं स एव करुणः। एवकारेण अत्यन्तव्यवहितां परम्परां पराकरोति। समनन्तरफलत्वेन रसान्तराक्षेपे [38]वीरस्यापीति उदाहरणम्। [39]चस्सन्नियोगे, वीरस्य सम्यङ् निकटं यत्फलं सोऽद्भुतः [40]परितः समन्तात् या कीर्तिः यशः प्रतापरूपा ततो हेतोः। अपिशब्दात् शृङ्गारोऽपि वीरस्यानन्तरं फलं, द्रौपदीस्वयंवरादौ। सहभावेन रसान्तराक्षेपे बीभत्स उदाहरणम्। यदेव बीभत्सस्य दर्शनं विभावादिरूपं स एव भयानकः, तद्विभावत्वाद् उपचारस्य सहभावप्रतीतिः फलम्। तमेव च[41]शब्दो द्योतयति। तुः पूर्वतो विशेषमाह।" (Abhinavabhāratī, ch. 6).

25. G. There is an additional word here "पदं"। 26. G. has in addition 'कुमारसंभवे'। 27. M. gives only the Pratīkas of the illustrative verses but G gives the whole verses. 28. G. 'पर' is not found. 29. G. लावण्ययुक्तेष्वपि 30. G. 'इत्यादिषु' is found in addition. 31. G. भावाः। 32. M. and G. पीत। 33. M. and G. तद् द्वारेण। 34. M. and G. योजनाया। 35. M. and G. 'ततः' is absent. 36. M. and G. शृङ्गार आर्यं। 37. G. परस्पर। 38. M. and G. 'वीरस्यापीति' is absent. 39. M. त्वस्या नियोगः G. त्वस्या सन्नियोगः। 40. M. विपरीतः। 41. M. च is absent.

किं रसेभ्यो भावाः, उत भावेभ्यो रसः, उत परस्परमभिनिर्वृत्तिः ?

यदेतदुक्तं रसतत्त्वं तदेवोपक्षोपयितुमुपक्रमते—अन्नाहेत्यादिना चोद्यमुखेन। नर्तकगतेभ्यो रसेभ्यो भावाः [1]सामाजिके; यथा करुणाच्छोकः, ततो विभावाद्युपचितसामाजिके करुण इति रसाद्भावो भावाद्रस इति सन्देहः। अत एव परस्परमपि जन्म कालभेदेनेति तृतीयः पक्षः। यदि वा नट एव राम एव वा पूर्वं भावः तत उपचये रसः ततोऽप्युप (प्याप) [2]चये भाव इत्येवं पक्षत्रयोत्थानम्। इदं चासत्, एवंभूतस्य रसस्वरूपस्य निराकृतत्वात्।

श्रीशङ्कुकस्त्वाह—अनुकर्तरि रसानास्वादयतो[3]ऽनुकार्ये भावप्रतीतिः प्रयोगे। लोके प्रकृती रसं निष्पादयतीति द्वितीयपक्षो नाट्याचार्याभिप्रेतशिक्षानुसारेण। अत एव तृतीयोऽपि सम्भवति। एतदप्यसत्। न हि सामाजिकोऽनुकार्यानुकर्तृविभागमवैति। [4]दूषितश्चानुकरणवादः।

तस्मादित्थमेतत्—किं रसेभ्यो भावाः उत विपर्ययः, आहो अन्योन्यजनकतेति त्रयः प्रश्नाः। आहोशब्दो भिन्नक्रमः। विभावादिभ्यस्तावद्रसनिष्पत्तिरुक्ता स [5]एव द्वितीयः पक्षोऽभ्युपगतः[6] पूर्वम्। एतच्च कथम्? न हि लोके विभावानुभावादयः केचन भवन्ति, हेतुकार्यावस्थामात्रत्वाल्लोके तेषाम्। अथ त एव रसनोपयोगित्वे विभावादिरूपतां प्रतिपद्यन्ते। तर्हि रसप्रसादात् भावा विभावादयः। अथोच्यते विभावादिप्रसादाद् रसः यथोक्तं प्राक्, रसप्रसादाच्च[7] विभावादिरूपत्वम्। तर्हि परस्पराश्रयत्वम्। इतरेतराश्रयाणि च न प्रकल्पन्ते इति आक्षेपः।

अत्र सिद्धान्तमाह दृश्यते हीति। प्रमदादयः प्रतीताः सन्तः रसास्वादं विदधते यथोक्तं प्राक्। अतो न रसेभ्यो भावाः। भावशब्दार्थपर्यालोचनया चैतदेवोपपन्नमिति श्लोकेनाह—नानाभिनयैः सम्यक् बद्धान् हृदयं गतान् भावयन्ति सम्पादयन्ति रसान् तस्माद् भावाः। नन्वेतद्भावशब्द[8]प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तं, न तत्प्रकृतं किञ्चिदुक्तमित्याशङ्क्य प्रकृते योजयितुमाह—नानाद्रव्यैरिति। व्यज्यत इति [9]व्यञ्जनं चानुपानादि रसोऽत्राभिप्रेतः। बहुविधैरिति व्यञ्जनस्योपलक्षणम्; अभिनयैरित्यस्य वा विशेषणम्। एवंस्थितपक्षमुसंहरति—न भावहीनोऽस्ति रस इति। अत्र चोद्यवादी स्वाशयमुन्मीलयति—न भावो रसवर्जित इति। लोके हि न कश्चिद् विभावादिव्यवहार इति भावः। अथ उत्तरमाह — परस्परकृता सिद्धिस्तयोरभिनये[10] भवेत्। अभिनये साक्षात्कारे सम्पन्ने तदुपयोगितया विभावादिव्यपदेशः इत्यतो या परस्परकृता सिद्धिः सा [11]भवेदिति सम्भाव्यते। एवं भूतमितरेतराश्रयण[12]मदूषणमित्यर्थः। अत्रैव दृष्टान्तमाह—व्यञ्जनौषधिसंयोग इति। व्यञ्जनौषधिसंयोगोऽन्नं च कर्तृ यथा परस्परमन्योन्यं कर्मभूतं स्वादुतां नयेत् तथा भावा रसाश्चान्योन्यं भावयन्ति भावान् कुर्वन्ति, [13]विभावादिव्यपदेश्यान् कुर्वन्तीत्यर्थः। एतदुक्तं भवति—एकत्रैकदा क्रियायामन्योन्याश्रयत्वं दोषो न तु क्रियाभेदे। यथा व्यञ्जनादिसंयोगेनान्नस्याम्लादिरसवत्ता क्रियते, अन्नेन वा आश्रयरूपेण सता व्यञ्जनसुखभोग्यता[14] क्रियते, एवं भावैः रस्यमानता। रसैश्च विभावादिव्यपदेश्यता कारणादीनाम्। यथा पटापेक्षया तन्तवः पटकारणमिति व्यपदेश्याः, तन्त्वपेक्षया पटः कार्यो, न चेतरेतराश्रयं, तथा प्रकृतेऽपीति।

1. G. नर्तकगतेभ्यो भावास्सामाजिकैः। 2. M. and G. अभ्युपचये, अप्यपचये। 3. M. and G. आस्वादयते. Both M. and G. are very badly punctuated. 4. G. दूषितस्चानुकरणवादः 5. M. एष. 6. M. and G. अभ्युपगतपूर्वमेतच्च कथं। 7. M. and G. रसप्रसादाच्च। 8. G. शब्दः। 9. G. व्यञ्जनः M. व्यञ्जनश्चानुपाभिरसः। 10. M. and G. अभिनयः। 11. G. भद्र भवेति M. भद्रभवती। 12. M. and G. इतरेतराश्रयजमदूषणं। 13. G. भावादिव्यपदेश्यान्। 14. G. योग्यता।

नटव्यापारः । सैव संवित्परमार्थतो रसः । सामाजिक[illegible] विभावादिप्रतीतिरिति प्रयोजने नाट्ये काव्ये सामाजिकधियि च [illegible]। कविगतो रसः । कविर्हि सामाजिकतुल्य एव । तत एवोक्तं 'शृङ्गारी चेत्कविः' इत्यानन्दवर्धनाचार्येण । ततो वृक्षस्थानीयं काव्यम्, तत्र पुष्पस्थानीयो अभिनयादिनटव्यापारः, तत्र फलस्थानीयः सामाजिकरसास्वादः । तेन रसमयमेव विश्वम् ।

अत्र च विज्ञानवादो, द्विधाभिधानं, स्फोटतत्त्वं, सत्कार्यवादः, एकत्वदर्शनम् इत्यादि च द्रष्टव्यं[21] इति केचित् । वयं तु प्रकृतानुपयोगिश्रुतलवसन्दर्शनमिथ्याप्रयाससंश्रयमक्षिप्तपूर्विण इत्यास्ताम् ।

अन्ये तु बीजादिव भावाद् रसवृक्षः, ततोऽप्यभिनयकुसुमसुन्दरात् फलमिव भावः प्रतीत्या भुज्यत इति व्याचक्षते । तैः प्रकृतविरुद्धं सर्वं व्याख्यातम् । एवं हि भावस्यैव उपक्रमपर्यवसानवर्तित्वमुक्तं स्यादित्यास्तां चैतत् । एवं त्रयोऽपि पक्षाः कथंचिदुपगता अभिप्रायवैचित्र्येणेति तात्पर्यम् ।

(Abhinavabhāratī, ch. 6).

15. इति is absent in both M. and G. 16. M. The Pratika 'यथेत्यादिना' is absent and in its place is seen the whole verse of Bharata. 17. M. स्थितः 18. M. and G. तन्मूलत्वादि 19. M. ते एव न व्याख्यानार्हाः । G. त (क ?) तरे व । 20. G. स्थानीयात् । 21. M. and G. इतिकेचित् is absent.

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी, पुस्तकालय
L.B.S. National Academy of Administration, Library
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE
यह पुस्तक निम्नांकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है।
This book is to be returned on the date last stamped

दिनांक Date	उधारकर्त्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.	दिनांक Date	उधारकर्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.

891.2
Rag

112452
अवाप्ति संख्या
ACC. No..... 19319 .....
वर्ग संख्या पुस्तक सं.
Class No..... Book No.....
लेखक
Author Raghavan, V.
शीर्षक
Title..... Bhoja's Srngara prakas

19319
891.2 LIBRARY
Rag LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI
National Academy of Administration
MUSSOORIE

Accession No. 112450

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double price shall be paid by the borrower.

Help to keep this book fresh, clean & moving