It is Rasārṇava-sudhākara of Śīṅga-bhūpāla which Mallinātha cites in his com. on Kumāra. For this work see above p. 239.

41. Rasākara, cited by Mallinātha on Megha-dūta (ed. ibid. p. 87, 97).

42. Rasika-sarvasva, cited by Nārāyaṇa on Gīta-govinda v. 2; also by Rucipati in his comm. on Anargha-rāghava (NSP ed.) p. 13.

43. Rahasya, probably an abbreviation of some more definite title, cited by Mallinātha on Kirāta iii. 60, xiv. 40, on Śītu xiii. 10.

44. Śṛṅgāra-kaustubha. Rice 288 (Aufrecht i. 660b).


46. Śṛṅgāra-taraṅgini. Oppert 2465; Rice 288 (= Aufrecht i. 660b).

47. Śṛṅgāra-pavana. Oppert 5766 (Aufrecht i. 661a).

48. Śṛṅgāra-maṇjarī. Aufrecht i. 661a.

49. Śṛṅgāra-vidhi. Oppert 5680 (Aufrecht i. 661a).

50. Śṛṅgāra-ratnākara. Aufrecht ii. 158a.

It is not always clear, from the citations or descriptions in the catalogues, whether some of the works on Rasa and Śṛṅgāra noted here are really works on Poetics or partake of the nature of erotic Kāvyā. But care has been taken to exclude the latter wherever possible.

Among recent publications (in Sanskrit) on Poetics, produced late in the 19th century, may be mentioned:


3. Alamkāra-maṇi-hāra by Śrīkṛṣṇa Brahmacarīn, published in Mysore Govt. Oriental Series in 4 vols, nos. 51, 85, 68, 72. The author is called Kṛṣṇabrahmatantra Parakāla-
śvāmin, a recent pontiff of the Parakāla Śrīvaiṣṇava Math in Mysore.

(4) Kāvyadīpikā of Kānticandra Mukhopādhyāya Vidyāratna (ed. Calcutta 1870, 1886, with a comm. by Jivananda Vidyasagar 1919; ed. Haridatta Sastri, Lahore 1939, with Skt. and Hindi commentary). It is a compilation for beginners from Mammaṭa and other authors by a modern writer belonging to the 19th century.

CONCLUSION

(1)

An attempt has been made in the foregoing pages not only to indicate the diversity as well as immensity of Sanskrit Alamkāra literature, but also to settle its relative chronology as a workable basis for an historical treatment. If we leave aside its unknown beginnings and Bharata, the historic period of its growth covers broadly a thousand years from 800 to 1800 A.D. It is marked by a speculative activity, surprising alike for its magnitude and its minuteness. This activity in its early stage centres in Kashmir, to which place belong most of the famous and original writers on Poetics. We do not indeed know the place of origin of the two earliest writers, Bharata and Bhāmaha, but immediately after them we find Vamana, Udbhaṭa, Rudraṭa, Mukula, Ānandavardhana, Lollāṭa, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, Abhinavagupta, Kṣemendra, Kuntaka, Mammaṭa and Ruyyaka flourishing in Kashmir. The only important exception is found in Dāṇḍin who was probably a South Indian writer. Coming to later times we find the study extending itself to Central India, Gujarāt, the Dekkan and Bengal. In South India, no doubt, this study was kept alive by a succession of brilliant, if not very original, writers; but these contributions of later times, though greater in bulk and sometimes superior in a certain acuteness, never supersede the volume of original work done in Kashmir, which may be fittingly regarded as the home-land, if not the birthplace, of the Alamkāra-sāstra. The writers of Central India, Gujarāt, the Dekkan and Bengal only carry on the tradition, as well as acknowledge the authority, of the Kashmirian originators of the discipline.

(2)

Although our history covers a period of more than a thousand years, it is yet marked by several well-defined stages.
With the date of Ānandavardhana, we arrive for the first time at a distinct landmark in its chronology as well as its history; and we may take it as the central point from which we may proceed backward and forward, although the system of Ānandavardhana itself was raised to almost exclusive recognition by the classical work of Mammaṭa. The mutual relation of this system to the other systems flourishing before and after Ānandavardhana furnishes the best and safest criterion for the orientation of the divergent streams of thoughts and tendencies, which gather together in one clear, dominant and finally authoritative doctrine in Mammaṭa. Indeed, one of the obvious objects of Ānandavardhana’s work was not only to fix the new principle of Dhvani in poetry, but also to work up and rationalise into a synthetic and comprehensive system the already accumulated ideas, elaborated by previous thinkers but flowing through different channels in the respective systems of Bhāmaha, Vāmana and the post-Bharata dramaturgic Rasa-writers; while Mammaṭa gathered the results up and uttered them in the convenient and concise form of a systematic text-book.

( 3 )

Although in Bhāmaha’s Kāvyālāmkāra, the earliest known work on Poetics, we meet for the first time with a more or less systematic scheme of Poetics, there is enough evidence to show that it must have been preceded by a period, covering perhaps several centuries, of unknown beginnings. All that we know of this period consists of glimpses of rhetorical speculations, such as we find in Bharata, in the recorded opinions of (or stray references to) pre-Bhāmaha writers like Medhāvin, or in such treatises on Alamkāra as was presumably utilised by the Kāvya-poets in general and by Bhaṭṭi in particular. This period begins with the enumeration and definition of only four poetic figures, ten Guṇas and ten Doṣas, but ends with the elaborate characterisation of thirty-eight independent figures in Bhaṭṭi. But what is important to note
in this period is Bharata's more or less elaborate exposition of Dramaturgy, and incidentally of Rasa, which element however, is considered not in relation to Poetry and Poetics, but in connexion with Drama and Dramaturgy.

This is followed by a comparatively brief but important period of extraordinary fertility and creative genius, beginning with Bhāmaha and ending with Ānandavardhana, in which we find most of the fundamental problems of Sanskrit Poetics discussed and settled in their general outlines. We have, on the one hand, Bhāmaha, Udbhāta and Rudraṭa, devoting themselves to the consideration of those decorative devices of poetic expression which are known as Alāmkāras (poetic figures), and confining themselves chiefly to an external art or theory of adornment, from which the discipline itself takes its name and its original tradition. Daṇḍin and Vāmana, on the other hand, emphasise in poetry the objective beauty of representation realised by means of what they call Mārga or Rīti (roughly 'diction') and its constituent excellences, the ten Guṇas. Both these systems, which emphasise respectively the elements of Alāmkāra and Rīti in poetry, content themselves with the working out of the outward forms of expression, the advantages of which were considered sufficient for poetry. They point out the faults to be avoided and the excellences to be attained, and describe the poetical embellishments which should enhance its beauty, insomuch so that the whole discipline came to receive the significant designation of Alāmkāra-śāstra or the Science of Poetical Embellishment.

Side by side with these early writers, however, we have the commentators on Bharata (like Lollaṭa, Śaṅkuka and others) who were bringing into prominence the aesthetic importance of Rasa, the consideration of the moods, sentiments and feelings, which we find reacting upon and influencing even the theorists of rival persuasion (e.g. Dāṇḍin, Udbhāta, Vāmana and Rudraṭa) who betray themselves more and more alive to the significance of this element in poetry.
But the discussion of Rasa appears to have been, so far, confined chiefly to the sphere of the dramatic art, and its bearings on poetry were not fully realised until the Dhvanikāra and Ānandavardhana had come into the field.

These new theorists, headed by Ānandavardhana, maintain that no system of Poetics, like no system of Dramaturgy, can entirely ignore the moods, feelings and sentiments as essential factors in poetry, and must therefore find an important place for Rasa in its scheme. What was thus already established in the drama was taken over and applied to poetry, profoundly modifying, as it did, the entire conception of the Kāvya. The Rasa came to be considered as the "essence" (ātman) of poetry; and in order to harmonise it in poetic theory, the new school evolved a theory of "suggestion" (dhvani) as the means of its expression. Not satisfied, however, with working up the concept of Rasa into their system, the new theorists devoted themselves to the examination of the already accumulated ideas of Alamkāra and Rīti (with its constituent Guṇa and Doṣa), with a view to correlate them to the new idea of Dhvani (and Rasa), and thus by synthesis evolve a comprehensive theory of Poetics.

The interval between Ānandavardhana and Mammaṭa was taken up in settling precisely the details of the new system, which was raised to almost exclusive recognition by the final text-book of Mammaṭa. Its success was so complete that the new concept of Dhvani was unquestionably accepted by most later writers, and the systems which emerged after Mammaṭa could no longer be strictly regarded as entirely independent systems.

(4)

But a new theory, however systematic or comprehensive, is never accepted without some opposition. Ānandavardhana's system, no doubt, absorbed and overshadowed in course of time all the earlier systems; but in the interval between Ānandavardhana and Mammaṭa, while it was still
striving for supremacy, we find a few vigorous but short-lived reactionary movements which refused to accept Ānandavardhana's new interpretation. Thus, we have Kuntaka who strove to make Bhāmaha's concept of Vakrokti elaborate and comprehensive enough to include the new ideas; Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka who raised his voice on behalf of the Rasa-systems against their acceptance; and Mahimabhaṭṭa who attempted to settle the new concept of Dhvani with the technical process of logical inference. All these writers, however, do not deny the newly established doctrine of Dhvani, but they try to explain it in terms of already recognised ideas. In spite of these nonconformist schools, however, whose feeble opposition languished for want of support even in the time of Mammaṭa, the system of Poetics, as finally outlined by Ānandavardhana and worked out in detail by Mammaṭa and his followers, was established without question in almost all writings from the 12th century downwards. Here and there we have some surviving exponents of some old tradition, like the Vāgbhaṭas or the followers of Bhoja, as well as specialised departments which stood apart like the group of Kavi-śikṣā-writers or the erotic Rasa-writers; but in the main, the creative days of the science were over, and no new theory forthcoming, the system of Ānandavardhana, as represented by Mammaṭa, reigned supreme, even influencing, to an obvious extent, the writers who would pretend to stand apart.

( 5 )

These considerations, which will become clearer as we proceed in our study of details in the next volume of this work will enable us to fix the rough outlines of the history of Sanskrit Poetics and divide it, for convenience of treatment, into several periods in conformity to chronology and the stages of development through which its doctrines passed. The dim beginnings of the discipline, like the beginnings of most other departments of Indian speculation, are hidden from us, until it issues forth in the works of Bharata and
Bhāmaha in a more or less self-conscious form. Then starts a period, ending with Ānandavardhana, which may be characterised as the most creative stage in its history, a stage in which the dogmas and doctrines of the different systems were formulated and settled in their general outlines, giving us at least four different systems which emphasise respectively the theories of Rasa, of Alamkāra, of Rīti and of Dhvani in poetry. To this period belong Bhāmaha, Udbhāta and Rudrāṭa, Daṇḍin and Vāmana, the commentators on Bharata (Lollaṭa, Śaṅkuka and others), the Viṣṇu-dharmottara and Agni-purāṇa, and lastly, the Dhvanikāra and Ānandavardhana. Between Ānandavardhana and Mammaṭa, we have a third definitive period which ends with the ultimate standardisation of a complete scheme of Poetics, with the Dhvani-theory in its centre, in which the divergent gleams of earlier speculations are harmonised into a focus, and which finds itself finally set forth in a well-defined and precise form in the text-book of Mammaṭa. To this period also belong reactionary theorists, like Kuntaka and Mahimabhaṭṭa, as well as Bhoja who carries on the same tradition as that of the Agni-purāṇa, and Dhanañjaya who writes on Dramaturgy. The period which follows this is necessarily a scholastic period of critical elaboration, the chief work of which consists in summarising and setting forth in a systematic form (generally after Mammaṭa) the results of the final speculations, and also in indulging in fine distinctions and hair-splitting refinements on minute questions. This stage, therefore, is marked by great scholastic acumen, if not by remarkable originality or creative genius; but at the same time it denotes a progressive deterioration of the study itself. The branching-off of some specialised and practical groups of writers from the main stem is to be explained as due rather to this degenerate spirit of the times than to any real split in the domain of poetic theory or to any desire for independent thinking. It is also the age of numberless commentators, and of commentators on commentators, who busied themselves with the
hardly inspiring task of explanation, of expansion or restriction of the already established rules. We have also now a number of popular writers who wanted to simplify the study for general enlightenment, the lowest stage being reached when we come to the manuals and school-books of quite recent times.

(6)

We may, therefore, conclude here by broadly indicating the bearings of the chronological results of this volume on our enquiry in general, in the light of which (as well as in the light of what follows in the next volume) we may tentatively put forward a rough division of the different periods of our history, noting the different groups of writers comprised in them, with a view to facilitate the study of the problems which will confront us in the next volume:

I. From unknown Beginnings to Bhāmaha. (Formative Stage).

II. From Bhāmaha to Ānandavardhana. Circa middle of the 7th to the middle of the 9th century. (Creative Stage).
   (1) Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa and Rudraṭa (ālasākāra-theory).
   (2) Daṇḍin and Vāmana (ṛiti-theory).
   (3) Lollaṭa, Saṇkuka, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and others (rasa-theory).
   (4) The Viṣṇu-dharmottara and Agni-purāṇa.
   (5) The Dhvanikāra and Ānandavardhana (dhvanī-theory).

III. From Ānandavardhana to Mammaṭa. Circa middle of the 9th to the middle of the 11th century. (Definitive Stage).
   (1) Abhinavagupta
   (2) Kuntaka
   (3) Rudrabhaṭṭa
   (4) Dhanañjaya and Dhanika
(5) Bhoja

(6) Mahimabhaṭṭa

IV. From Mammaṭa to Jagannātha. Circa middle of the 11th to the 18th century. (Scholastic Stage).

(1) Mammaṭa, Ruyyaka and Viśvanātha (including Hemacandra, Vidyādhara, Vidyānātha, Jayadeva, Appayya and others).

(2) The Vāgbhaṭas and Keśava Miśra.

(3) The writers on Rasa, especially Śṛṅgāra: Śāradātanaya, Śīṅga-bhūpāla, Bhānudatta, Rūpa Gosvāmin and others.

(4) The writers on Kavi-śikṣā: Rājaśekhara, Kṣemendra, Arisimha and Amaracandra, Deveśvara and others.

(5) Jagannātha.

(7)

Looking at the question from another point of view, we may classify the systems of Poetics broadly into (1) Pre-dhvani (2) Dhvani and (3) post-Dhvani systems, taking Dhvani-theory as the central landmark. In the Pre-dhvani group, we include all writers (flourishing before Ānanda-vardhana), mentioned in Groups I and II above, with the exception of the Dhvanikāra and Ānandavardhana, with whose names the Dhvani-system is associated. In the Post-dhvani systems may be comprised the followers of the Dhvani-system from Mammaṭa to Jagannātha, together with reactionary or unorthodox authors like Kuntaka or Mahimabhaṭṭa, as well as the writers on Śṛṅgāra and on Kavi-śikṣā. On the other hand, the systems of Poetics have been grouped, on the basis of the particular theory emphasised by a particular group of writers, into (1) the Rasa School (2) the Alamkāra School (3) the Rīti School and (4) the Dhvani School. The convenience of this classification is obvious, but it is doubtful whether we may safely apply the term "school" to indicate affiliation to a particular
system of opinion, when we consider that one has to admit a great deal of mutual and (to a certain extent) inevitable contamination of the different “schools”, which makes the existence of any particular school by itself almost impossible. Thus, the “Dhvani School” admits Rasa and Alamkāra as important factors of poetry, which are thus not exclusively monopolised by the so-called Alamkāra and Rasa Schools. It is doubtful, again, if a Rasa School, properly so-called was at all founded by Bharata, who is taken as its original exponent, or a similar Alamkāra School by Bhāmaha. All that we can say is that Bharata and Bhāmaha laid stress on the elements of Rasa and Alamkāra which became in course of

1 Sovani in Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume pp. 387f. Reliance has been placed on Ruyyaka’s review of previous opinions and Samudrabandha’s classification. But Ruyyaka only takes the concept of dhvani or pratiyamāna artha as the starting point and considers how far it was accepted, explicitly or implicitly, by his predecessors. Samudrabandha, commenting on this passage, speaks of five paksas or theses, including the dhvani-theory (which he calls the last paska) with which his author identifies himself. His classification is based upon the conventional theory that poetry consists of a “special” disposition of word and its sense (visīṣṭa sabda and artha). This speciality, in his opinion, may be realised by putting emphasis on their (1) dharm (inherent characteristic) (2) vyāpāra (operation) and (3) vyañgya (suggestiveness). In the first case, the dharm may proceed from alamkāra and guna (i.e. riti). In the second case, the vyāpāra may consist of bhāṣita-prakāra or bhogikaraṇa. Thus, we get five standpoints associated respectively with the names of Udbhya, Vāmana, Kuntaka, Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka and Ānandavardhana. This classification, though very significant, is obviously overlapping and historically incorrect. The vyañjanā, it may be objected, which is taken as one of the bases of differentiation, is admittedly as much a vyāpāra as bhāṣitī postulated by Kuntaka. Besides, Kuntaka, as a matter of fact, develops Bhāmaha’s idea of vakrokti as bhāṣitī-valicitya and therefore may be properly included among those who put emphasis on alamkāra. Similarly, Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka describes bhoga as a peculiar function (dharm) or process by which Rasa is said to be realised; and therefore he is in reality an exponent of the Rasa-theory as an interpreter of Bharata’s dictum on Rasa.
time established ideas in the realm of Poetics. As a rule, each great writer who puts forward, consciously or unconsciously, a new theory, takes over from his predecessors those ideas which have stood the test of criticism and which he can combine in a self-consistent system of his own. In this way, really valuable ideas have been generally adopted, although sometimes other ideas, perhaps of the same author, have by common consent been rejected. This is illustrated by the case of the Vakrokti-jīvitakāra, whose theory of Vakrokti was universally rejected, although the main principle (analysis of an Almaṅkāra) for which he was contending is accepted by Ruyyaka and others. It is not maintained here that the history of Sanskrit Poetics consists of only one stream of development, and that within it we have mere currents and counter-currents. The latter were indeed very important, but they never succeeded in forming into separate rivers; and the different channels originating independently or breaking away from the main course ultimately merge into one dominant and clear stream.
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P. 4.  Footnote 1, line 2.  Read kaniyāṃsaṃ.
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P. 274.  Add after line 15: Kṛṣṇāvadhūta also wrote a drama called Iḥāmṛga or Sarva-vinoda in four Acts dealing with Śṛṅgāra, Bībhatṣa, Ḥāsyā and Vairāgya.