CHAPTER X

WRITERS ON KAVI-SIKṢĀ

The small group of writers who deal with the theme of kavi-sikṣā ("education of the poet") does not, strictly speaking, come directly under general Poetics, but deserves notice, partly from the reputation and authority enjoyed by some of these authors but chiefly because it displays a peculiar tendency which emphasises one aspect of Poetics as a discipline, namely, its practical object which developed side by side with the theoretical consideration of general principles. These treatises do not deal with the conventional topics of Poetics, with its theories, dogmas and definitions, but they are meant chiefly as manuals to guide the poet in his profession, their primary object being kavi-sikṣā or instruction of the aspiring poet in the devices of the craft. It is difficult, in the absence of data, to determine the origin of this school, but the attitude adopted is significant, being almost co-extensive with what may be supposed to have been the original standpoint of Poetics itself as a more or less mechanical Ars Poetica1. The ancient as well as the modern writers on general Poetics, no doubt, touch occasionally upon the question of the practical training of the poet2; and it is not improbable that this in course of time formed the object of a separate study and multiplied these convenient handbooks, of which necessarily we possess comparatively late specimens.

(1)

Kṣemendra

Kṣemendra's two works, Aucitya-vicāra-carca and Kavi-kaṇṭhābharaṇa, which may be conveniently grouped here, are

---

1 See above pp. 33-34 and footnote 3
2 See above pp. 42f.
curious and valuable in many respects. In his theory of Aucitya\(^3\) or propriety, he takes as his thesis, mainly, Ānand-davardhana’s treatment of the same question with reference to Rasa which is crystallised in the oft-quoted verse from the Dhvanyāloka: “There is no other circumstance which leads to the violation of Rasa than impropriety; the supreme secret of Rasa consists in observing the established rules of propriety”\(^4\). To depict Rasa, it is necessary to observe the rules of propriety; and the subject, which is anticipated by Bharata (who, for instance, speaks of the proper employment of anubhāvas), may take various forms according as it relates to the subject-matter, the speaker, the nature of the sentiment evoked or the means employed in evoking it. We have already noted that this theme has been discussed topically at some length by the formulators of the Dhvani-theory, by Mañimabhaṭṭa, as well as by most post-dhvani writers who consider it generally in connexion with rasa-doṣas. Ḵṣemendra develops and pushes the idea to its extreme, and speaks of Aucitya as the essence of Rasa (rasa jivitabhūta), and as having its foundation in the charm or aesthetic pleasure (camatkāra) underlying the relish of Rasa. The Alamkāra and Guṇa in poetry are justified by and receive their respective significance from this element which may, therefore, be fittingly regarded as the ‘soul’ of poetry\(^5\). That which is suitable or conformable to another is called ucita in its relation to that object\(^6\). This Aucitya may have application with reference to various points in a poem, such as word (pada), a sentence (vākyā), the sense of the composition as a whole (prabandhārtha), its literary excellences (guṇas) its

3 V. Raghavan (Some Concepts pp. 194-257) gives an able and detailed account of the history of Aucitya.

4 anacitīyād rte nānyad rasa-bhaṅgasya kāraṇam|
prasadhdacitīya-bandhas tu rasasyopaniṣat parā /

5 ed. Kāvyamāla, Guchhaka i, pp. 115-16.

6 ucitam prāhur acāryāḥ sadṛṣṭaṃ kila yasya yat, explained by the gloss as: yat kila yasyāntīraṇaṁ tad ucitam ucyate.—On the theory of Pāka and Śayya. allied to the theory of Aucitya, see above pp. 240-41.
poetic figures (alamkāras), the Rasa or the sentiment in a poem, the employment of the verb (kriyā), the use of the case (kāraka), of the gender (liṅga), of the number (vacana), of preposition, adjective, particles (upasarga), or considerations of time and place (deśa and kāla) etc.; and the cases of application are dogmatically summarised as twenty-seven in number ( śl. 8-10). The treatment of each of these cases is accompanied by profuse illustrations of every point from the works of various poets, the favourite method being first to cite examples of verses which comply with a rule and then adduce one or two examples of verses which do not do so. There is hardly anything original in the theory itself; for though it rightly insists upon a standard of propriety in poetic expression, it ultimately resolves itself into assuming a more or less variable criterion of taste or personal appreciation, which Ānandavardhana and others admit as sahyādayatva, but which is bound to be, as it is, rather vaguely defined and therefore incapable of exhaustive formal treatment. It is really the province of taste or criticism rather than of Poetics proper.

At the same time, the fact must not be overlooked that works of this nature in Sanskrit, ostensibly meant as they are for the guidance of the aspiring poet, display, in their discussion of what is right and proper in poetry, a tendency towards genuine criticism, taken apart from the beaten paths of orthodox Poetics; and they set up in their naive way a standard, whatever it may be, of taste and critical judgment. No doubt, most writers on general Poetics, betray some critical acumen and give us a great deal of critical or semi-critical matter while considering the application of a rule or principle, especially in the chapters on Doṣa and Guṇa; but their outlook is often and necessarily limited by their confining themselves to rigid rules and specific definitions.7

7 The growth of artificial poetry, we have seen, made the technical analysis of rhetoric and instruction of it, a necessity; but rhetoric involves (and sometimes becomes identical with) criticism; and it is
Kṣemendra’s work, in this respect, possesses a unique value, and the part of his treatment which discusses the illustrative verses is extremely interesting as an evidence of “appreciation” which is comparatively rare in Sanskrit. Kṣemendra deals out praise and censure, within his limits, as a true critic who is no respecter of persons; even the honoured names of Amaru, Kālidāsa or Bhavabhūti make no difference. In more than one instance, he illustrates two sides of a question, regarding both merit or defect laid down by a rule, by different verses from his own work; and in some cases he does not hesitate to go against orthodox opinion¹. Whatever may be the intrinsic value of his critical dicta, some of which may appear too trivial or crude to us, he shows a wide acquaintance with the whole range of classical Sanskrit Poetry and an undoubtedly cultured taste. If the common saying that a bad poet often turns out to be a good critic carries any wisdom in it, it is very apt in the case of Kṣemendra whose critical powers cannot indeed be ignored.

almost impossible for Ālamkārikas, who also theorised on principles, not to busy themselves with the forms and general phenomena of literature. Thus, most works, whether on general poetics or on rhetoric, do involve some amount of criticism which could not be avoided. It must also be borne in mind that our modern ideas of Aesthetics, Poetics or Rhetoric are not sharply distinguished in these old authors, nor was there any well-defined notion of the respective spheres of these studies. The theorists drew their ideas of poetry mainly from existing classical Sanskrit literature which, though magnificent in partial accomplishment, was not fully equipped for purposes of general criticism. The absence of some other literature for comparison—for later Prakrit and allied specimens are mainly derivative—was a serious drawback. This will explain partially why their outlook is so limited, and their principles and definitions so stereotyped.

¹ E.g., while discussing the question of propriety of the contents of a composition, he cites (p. 120) from Kumāra-saṃbhava viii—which canto he accepts as Kālidāsa’s—and severely censures the poet’s manner of describing the amours of Hara and Pārvatī in terms of ordinary dalliance, against the authority of Ānandavardhana who defends (p. 137) it against the imputation of vulgarity.
Kṣemendra's other work, Kavi-kaṇṭhābharana, though less interesting, is equally remarkable for its refreshingly novel treatment. Kṣemendra postulates two impulses for the attainment of poetic capacity, viz. divine help (divyaprayatna) and individual effort (pauruṣa). The first includes prayer, incantation and other heavenly aids; but from the latter standpoint, he classifies three groups of persons with whom instruction in the art of poetry is concerned, viz. those who require little effort (alpa-prayatna-sādhya), those who require great effort (kṛcchra-sādhya), and those in whom all effort is fruitless (asādhya), and sums up by saying that the capacity for poetry is vouchsafed only to the fit and few. The next chapter discusses with illustrations the question of borrowing or plagiarism, a theme which is just touched upon in the fourth chapter of the Dhvanyāloka but which is dealt with extensively by Rājaśekhara.

Kṣemendra divides

9 A sketch of this work will be found in Kṣemendra's Kavi-kaṇṭhābharana by J. Schönberg (Wien 1884), pp. 9f. The five saṃdhis or sections of this work deal respectively with the following themes: (i) attainment of poetry by an unpoetical person (akaveḥ kaṭavyāptih), (ii) instruction of the poet already gifted (śikṣā prāpta-grah kaveḥ), (iii) strikingness (camatkṛtī), and the faults and excellences of poetry, (iv) familiarity which a poet should possess with other arts and sciences as a source of charm to his poetry (paricaya-cāruta).

10 Cf Vāmana l. 2. 1-5; Rājaśekhara iv.

11 Bāṇa (Harṣa c. i. 5-6) distinctly condemns poetasters and plagiarists. Vāmana appears to be the first writer on Poetics who in his classification of Artha refers to the question of plagiarism.

12 In Anandavardhana’s opinion, the province of poetry is unlimited, in spite of the fact that hundreds of poets have composed works for centuries; but the thoughts of two inspired poets may bear certain resemblance, which may be like that between an object and its reflection between a thing and its picture, or between two human beings. The first two kinds of resemblance should be avoided, but the third is charming (iii 12-13)

13 In ch. xi-xii. For a summary of his views see V. M. Kulkarni, Sanskrit Writers on Plagiarism in JOS, iii (1954), pp. 403-411. Rājaśekhara declares that “there is no poet that is not a thief, no merchant that does not steal, but he who knows how to hide his theft flourishes without
poets from this point of view into those who imitate the general colour of a poet’s idea (chāyopajīvin), those who borrow a word or a verse-line (padaka- and pāda-upajīvin), or an entire poem (sakalopajīvin) and lastly, those who borrow from sources considered universally as legitimate (bhuvanopa-jīva, e.g. Vyāsa). Then he lays down elaborate rules for regulating the life, character and education of the poet. This is followed by a discussion of camatkāra or poetic charm, without which, we are told, no poetry is possible, and an illustration (by means of examples draw from the works of various poets) of its tenfold aspect, according as it appeals with or without much thought (avicārita-ramanīya or vicāryamāna-ramanīya14), resides in a part or in the whole composition, appertains to the sound, the sense or both, or relates to the poetic figure, to the sentiment, or to the well-known nature of the theme. Then we come to the treatment of the excellences and defects with reference to the sense (artha), the verbal expression (śabda), or the poetic sentiment (rasa) involved; and the work is rounded off by indicating the extent of knowledge which a poet must possess and giving a long list of the arts and sciences in which he must be proficient, which is thus set forth: tatra tarka-vyākaraṇa-bharata-cāṇakya-vātsyāyana-bhārata-rāmāyaṇa-mokṣopāyātmajāṇa-ḥātuvāda- ratnaparīśā-vidyāka-ijotiṣa-dhanurveda-gaja-turaga-puruṣa- lakṣaṇa-dyūṭendrājāla-prakīrtiṣeu paricayaḥ kavi-sāmrājya- vyaśajanaḥ. This rapid summary of the contents of this work reproach”. He deals with two kinds of plagiarism, namely, that which should be avoided and that which should be adopted. In his opinion, a poet may be a creator (Utpādaka) or an adapter (Parivartaka), or a coverer up (Āchādaka) or a collector (Saṃgrāhaka). He who sees something new in word and sense and writes up something old may be accounted a great poet. Rājasekhara accordingly gives an elaborate classification of Artha so far as it is Anya-yoni, Nihnutā-yoni or As-yoni from the point of view of plagiarism. See below under Rājasekhara.

14 Rājasekhara attributes a dictum to Udbhaṭa which says that the sense may be vicārita-suntī or avicārita-ramanīya, according as it is found in the Śāstra or the Kāvyā respectively. See above p. 59, fn 33.
will show that it hardly puts forward any special claim as a work of great theoretic importance, but that its value consists not in its substance but in its treatment of practical issues, its careful and minute illustration of every point by examples taken from various poets, with not a little amount of knowledge and critical discernment.\footnote{For Kṣemendra’s satiric and didactic works see S. K. De, Aspects of Sansk. Lit. Calcutta 1959, pp. 279-83 and Hist. of Sansk. Lit., Calcutta 1947, pp. 404-410.}

\section*{(2)}

\textit{Arisimha, Amaracandra and Devesvara}

The \textit{Kāvyaka-lpa\-tā-\vrtti} of Arisimha and Amaracandra and the \textit{Kavi-kalpalata} of Devesvara, written in imitation of that work, need not detain us long. They are essentially treatises on the composition of verses, including a practical treatment of prosody and rhetoric. They furnish elaborate hints on the construction of different metres, on the display of word-skill of various kinds, on \textit{jeu de mots} and tricks of producing double meaning, conundrums, riddles, alliterative and rhyming verses, and various other devices of verbal ingenuity, concluding with a chapter on the construction of similes and enumeration of parallelisms for the purpose of ordinary comparisons. It gives also a list of kavi-samayas or conventions observed by the poets, and states in detail what to describe and how to describe it. These decadent treatises, therefore, offer such adventitious aids for ready-made poetry, as may—to take a particular point—be afforded, for instance, by a modern rhyming dictionary or works of similar nature.

A summary of the main topics dealt with in the \textit{Kāvyaka-lpatalā} and its \textit{\vrtti} will make the standpoint clear and give an idea of the general scope and nature of such works. The first \textit{pratāna} of this work is called \textit{chandah-siddhi} (prosody)
and consists of five sections on (i) the construction of the anusṭubh metre (anusṭubh-śāsana), (ii) enumeration of the principal metres, shifts in grammatical forms of the verb, Prakrit loan-words (where Hemacandra seems to be superficially quoted), transmutation of one's own or another poet's ideas into the same or different metres, conversion of one metre into another, caesura (yati), the whole section being generally entitled chandobhyāsa, (iii) use of expletive particles and words for filling up the verse (chandah-pūraṇa), such as śrī, sam, sat, drāk, vi, pra etc. (sāmānya-śabdaka), (iv) argumentation, pointed sayings, subjects of laudation or vituperation, interrogations, e.g. in kula-śāstrādi, sva-śāstrādhyayana-prathā etc. (vāda), (v) subjects for descriptive poetry, how to describe the king, his ministers, the prince, the army, battle and hunting, as well as a city, a village, a garden, a lake and so forth; enumeration of the kavi-samayas (varṇya-sthiti). The second chapter, called śabda-siddhi treats of etymology, derived meanings of compounds, alliteration and rhyme in the middle of a verse, with a list of words suitable for this purpose, enumeration of sambhandhin expressions; denoted, indicated and suggested meanings, showing the influence of the Dhvani school. The next chapter, entitled śleṣa-siddhi, upon play on words of various kinds, consists of the following sections: (i) composing of words in such a way that they can be read differently according as they are divided, with a list of ślesopayogi words, (ii) a kind of śleṣa occurring in the description of an object by analogies, in which the same quality or condition has to be traced in the same words or in synonyms, (iii) cases of double meaning, produced by homonyms, capable of widely different interpretations, (iv) ambiguity produced by similarity of inflections of different origins, (v) surprises of different kinds, such as verses in which the same consonant or vowel is repeated in each syllable, verses spread out in diagrams to be read in different ways, e.g. according to the move of the knight in chess etc:—a subject which is treated in some detail, for
instance, in the *Vidagdha-mukha-maṇḍana* of Dharmadāsa Sūri\(^{16}\). The last chapter, called *artha-siddhi*, is devoted to the construction of similes, ellipsis and similar figures, and gives long lists of parallelisms arising from like conditions or attributes of the objects compared, e.g. the lips may be compared to the coral, to the bimba fruit or fresh-blown twigs and so forth.

A large part of this treatment is repeated in Keśava’s *Alamkāra-śekhara*, as well as in Devesvara’s *Kavi-kalpalatā*, the latter work being directly modelled on the *Kāvyā-kalpalatā* with considerable plagiarism of passages *in extenso*. These works, therefore, do not require any separate notice. Keśava’s text (see vol. i, pp. 220-21 above) deals, besides this, with the ordinary topics of Poetics, set forth as the views of his master Śauddhodani, but in substance and form it follows the views of Mammaṭa, Hemacandra and the Vāgbhaṭas; it thus possesses hardly any claim to originality either in theory or in treatment. Most of the works of Jaina authors, even including those of Hemacandra and the Vāgbhaṭas, are written apparently from the practical standpoint of composing a suitable text-book, and they always, in their discussion of general principles, incorporate hints on matters helpful for the practical working out of poetry\(^{17}\).

(3)

*Rājaśekhara*

Although written in a fanciful style and hardly presenting one systematic theory, Rājaśekhara’s *Kāvyā-mīmāṃsā* may be noticed here, inasmuch as it mixes up the topics of *kavi-śikṣā* with those of Poetics proper, at the same time giving us a somewhat rambling treatment of various extraneous matters.

16 The subject is dealt with as early as Daṇḍin, Rudraṭa, and the *Agni-purāṇa*.

17 E.g. Hemacandra, pp. 5-15, 126-135; the younger Vāgbhaṭa pp. 38-68. Both borrow largely from Keśemendra and Rājaśekara.
The work is also remarkable for its varied collection of different opinions, as well as for the light it throws on the literary practices of a certain period. Its views cannot be directly connected with any particular school, but it is quite possible that its author follows in the main a tradition of opinion inherited from his literary ancestors, whom he frequently quotes as the Yāyāvariyaś.

The origin of Poetics is attributed by Rājaśekhara to the Supreme Being and the celestials, and he claims a very high position for the discipline, which is regarded as the seventh aṅga without which the significance of Vedic texts cannot be grasped. The self-born Śrīkanṭha taught this science to his sixty-four will-born disciples, among whom the most venerable was the Kāvyapuruṣa, born of Sarasvatī, who figures as the nominal hero of this half-allegorical work. As Prajāpati set him to promulgate the science to the world, he imparted it to his seventeen divine pupils, Sahasrākṣa and others, who embodied it in eighteen separate adhikaranaś on the portions learnt by each. Our author seeks to set forth in one book, consisting of eighteen adhikaranaś, the substance of these teachings which were in his time, to some extent, lost. If we are to accept this plan of the author, only the first adhikarana on kavi-rahasya exists of this ambitious work. The Kāvyapuruṣa, from whom metrical speech first began and who stands symbolically for the spirit of poetry, is the son born to the goddess of learning, Sarasvatī, as the result of her long penance on the Himālayas. In order to keep the boy company, Sasasvatī creates Sāhitya-vidyā as his bride who follows him and wins him over. On this slight conceit the book proceeds to set forth its peculiar doctrines, including in its desultory scope various literary remarks and dogmas, as well as topics like general geography, conventions observed by poets, a disquisition on the seasons, an account of kavi-gos̐hī and other relevant and irrelevant subjects.

18 See vol. i, pp. 1-2.
The work begins (ch. ii) by dividing literature (vāhmaya) into śāstra (both human and revealed) on the one hand, and kāvya, on the other. It enumerates the different śāstras and defines their nature and form, including under the revealed śāstras the Vedas, the Upaniṣads, and the six aṅgas (the Yāyāvariyaśas taking Aḷamkāra-śāstra as the seventh), and comprehending under human śāstras the Purāṇas, Itihāsa, Ānvikṣikī, the two Mīmāṃsās and the Smṛtis. It then mentions fourteen (or eighteen) vidyā-sīhānas, bringing under it several technical and philosophical disciplines. The meanings of the terms sūtra, vṛtti, bhāṣya, samikṣā, tīkā, pāñjikā, kārikā and vārttika, which are the different forms or styles of the śāstras, are then explained, incidentally giving an etymological definition of sāhitya-vidyā. Then, after a digression (ch. iii) on the fable of the Kāvya-puruṣa, the author goes on to deal (ch. iv) with the different kinds of pupils to whom a knowledge of the science can be imparted, viz. buddhimat and āhārya-buddhi, the latter of whom may be again anyathā-buddhi and durbuddhi, and discusses in this connexion the force of ṣakti (genius), pratibhā (poetic imagination), vyutpatti (culture) and abhyāsa (practice). The Yāyāvariyaśas think that ṣakti is the only source of poetry and it gives rise to pratibhā and vyutpatti; but others hold that the aid of concentration (samādhi) and practice (abhāṣa) is also required. The pratibhā may have a twofold aspect, according as it is creative (kārayitrī) or discriminative (bhāvayitrī). The creative faculty may be natural (sahaja), adventitious (āhārya) or acquired by instruction (aupeṣṭika), and poets are accordingly classified as sārasyata, ābhāyasika and aupeṣṭika. The discriminative faculty (bhāvakatva) is distinguished from the poetic (kavitva). The bhāvaka may be either 'the discontented' (arocakīnāḥ, i.e. those who possess the faculty but

19 See above p. 37, fn 5.
20 Defined as: yā śabda-grāmam artha-sārtham aḷamkāra-tantram
mukt-mārgam anyad api taṅhāvidham adhiḥdayam pratibhāsayati sā
pratibhā.
require to be guided). 'those feeding on grass' (ṣatṛṇābhyaśava- 
hārīṇaḥ, i.e., vulgar persons absolutely devoid of the faculty\textsuperscript{21}), 'the envious' (matsariṇaḥ) and lastly, 'the really discerning' (tattvābhinivesaṁaḥ) who are rare.

In the next chapter (ch. v) we have elaborate classifications of the poet from different points of view. Poets may be grouped generally into three classes, the śāstra-kavi, the kāvya kavi and the ubhaya-kavi. The śāstra-kavi may either compose the śāstra, or produce kāvya-effect in the Śāstra or śāstra-effect in the Kāvya. The kāvya-kavi is classified elaborately, if not very logically, into eight groups, viz. rācanā-kavi, śabda-kavi, artha-kavi, alaṃkāra-kavi, ukti-kavi, rasa-kavi, mārga-kavi, and śāstrārtha-kavi. Then we have an enumeration of ten grades of apprenticeship through which a poet has to pass until he becomes a kavi-rāja, which is indeed not the highest distinction but which, according to Rājaśekhara who was himself so designated, indicates a status even higher than that of a mahākavi. Elsewhere in ch. x, he gives an account of the test or literary examination of poets for such honour and recognition, in which the successful poet was conveyed in a special chariot and crowned with a fillet (paṭṭa-bandha). He speaks also of purity of body, speech and thought necessary for a poet, and describes the house of the poet, his attendants, his writing materials, the division of his whole day into eight parts and duties appropriate thereto. The chapter under discussion concludes with a reference to the theory of pāka\textsuperscript{22}, of which as many as nine varieties, named after the taste of different fruits, are mentioned.

The next chapter (ch. vi) deals with the word and the sentence, and their functions grammatical, logical or otherwise. In this connexion Rājaśekhara states that a sentence possessing the literary excellences (gunas) and embellished by poetic figures (alaṃkāras) constitutes poetry (gunavat alaṃkṛtām ca vākyam

\textsuperscript{21} Cf Vāmana 1. 2. 1-3.
\textsuperscript{22} See above pp. 240-42.
eva kāvyam, p. 24). If any definite conclusion can be drawn from this statement, Rājaśekhara, in general theory, appears to recognise tacitly the position of the Rīti school; for in this sentence he reproduces Vāmana's well-known dictum (kāvyā-
sabdō'yaṁ gunālāṁkāra-samskṛtayoh śabdārthayor varītate, on i. 1. 1). This is supported also by the apparent disfavour he shows towards the view of Udbhata and Rudraṭa, as well as by the marked partiality attached to the opinions of Maṅgala and Vāmana, whose classification of Rīti is accepted on p. 31. It is true that his school lays special stress also on Rasa23, and like most writers coming after Ānandavardhana, Rājaśekhara does not fail to bring Rasa into prominence. This makes it difficult to take his work as framed definitely for any particular system. But it is clear that his sympathies ally him with the older Rīti and Rasa schools, rather than with the new school of Ānandavardhana who, though cited at p. 16, does not appear to have influenced his views greatly. It is probable that he is following some old tradition, which stands apart from orthodox schools, but which has many things in common with the older currents of thought and opinion.

The rest of the work, devoted to topics of a similar character, does not throw any further light on his general view of Poetics. The seventh chapter, which comes next, analyses modes of speech on a novel basis, having reference to the promulgation of different religious doctrines, into brāhma, śaiva and vaisnava, with their sectarian subdivisions; and after a brief mention of the three Rītis of Vāmana24, we have some remarks on Kāku and on the methods of reading or pronunciation of different peoples, incidentally discussing the question of appropriate language and style of gods.

23 E.g. kim tu rasavata eva nibandho yuktah, na nirasasya p. 45.
24 Rājaśekhara's account of the origin of Rītis is curious. He says that on account of the Sāhiya-vidyā's wanderings through various countries, different poetic forms evolved themselves. the important among them being the three Rītis mentioned by Vāmana.
Apsarasas, Piśācas etc. The eighth chapter enumerates the sources or auxiliaries of poetry (kāvyā-yonayāḥ), already referred to by Bhāmaśa (i. 9) and Vāmana (i. 3), such as the scriptures, the law-books, the epics, the Purāṇas etc., and gives a long list of arts and sciences, as well as philosophical systems, which contribute to the content of poetry\(^{24}\). The next chapter (ch. ix) is concerned with the possible themes of poetry, topically referred to by Ānandavardhana (p. 146), according as it deals with incidents and personages, human, divine, or pertaining to the lower world (pātāla), by themselves or in different combinations. But he adds that the subject-matter must be rasavat. The tenth chapter speaks of the conduct of a poet, his household and surroundings, his daily duties and routine of work; it then proceeds to speak of the king who patronises him, and one of whose duties is to call assemblies of poets and scholars. Two very interesting chapters (xi-xii) follow on the elaborate\(^{25}\) classification of the different shades of borrowing or plagiarism (harana), with reference respectively to borrowing of words and borrowing

25 These are: śrutī, smṛtī, itihāsa, purāṇa, pramāṇa-vidyā, samaya-vidyā, rāja-siddhānta-trayī (artha-sāstra, nātya-sāstra and kāma-sāstra), loka, viracana (= kavi-manjū-nirmitam kathā-tantram arthamātrang vā), and prakīrtanā (miscellaneous, like hasti-śikṣā, ratna-paṛīkṣā, dhanurveda etc.). In ch. x. he speaks of (i) kāvyā-vidyās, viz. nāma-dhātu-pārāyana (=grammar), abhidhāna-kōṭa (lexicon), chantō-vicitī (prosody) and alāṃkāra (poetics), (ii) sixty-four kalās, called upāvidyās (accessory studies) and (iii) kāvyā-māṭaraḥ, viz. kavi-rūpṇidhi, deśa-vārttā, vidagdha-vāda, loka-yātra, vidvad-goshti, and purātana-kavi-nibandha.

26 Hemacandra (pp. 86) and Vāgībhaṭa (pp. 12f) plagiarise and reproduce this portion of Rājaśekhara's treatment and draw also partly upon Kaśmendra (see above p. 287f). On these passages, see F. W. Thomas in Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, pp. 379-383). To Ānandavardhana's classification of three kinds of resemblance which may be found in two poets (see above p. 287 fn 12) these writers add a fourth kind, viz. “foreign-city-entrance” likeness (parapura-praveśa-pratimātā), i. e. where there is substantial identity, but the garnishing is widely different. And of these four kinds, the superiority is in the ascending order.
of ideas. A verse is cited towards the end which says that there is hardly any poet who does not 'steal' from others, but the best of stealing is cleverly concealing the fact. But mere reflection or copying of ideas is condemned as unpowetical (so'yaṃ kaver akavita-dāyi sarvathā pratibimba kalpaḥ pariharaniyāh, p. 68). The true poet is said to be one who discovers something novel in the expression of words and ideas, as well as restates what is old. The next chapter (ch. xiii), therefore, details thirty-two different modes by which plagiarism or literary borrowing may be skilfully turned to advantage (a question which must have assumed some importance in Rājaśekhara’s time), all the points in these interesting chapters being profusely illustrated by examples drawn from the works of various poets. This discussion is followed by three chapters (ch. xiv-xvi) on the established poetic conventions (kavi-samaya), with reference to countries, trees, plants, flowers etc., as well as about intangible things (e.g. a smile should always be described as white). There are two more chapters (ch. xvii-xviii) on geography (desa-vibhāga) and the seasons (kāla-vibhāga) respectively, the former mentioning the countries, rivers, mountains etc. of India, the products peculiar to each, the colour and complexion of various peoples, and the latter describing the winds, flowers and birds, and actions appropriate to various seasons.

This bare outline of the eighteen chapters of the Kāvyamīmāṃsā, so far as it is available and actually published, will make it clear that nearly the whole of its content falls, strictly speaking, outside the province of general Poetics, whose conventional topics have thus far been hardly ‘touched upon. At the same time, some of the subjects dealt with by Rājaśekhara have been referred to, if not elaborately dealt
with, by even orthodox writers like Vāmana; and the unique evidence of the comparatively early work of Rājaśekhara on this topic, written ostensibly in conformity with some old tradition, will go to support the hypothesis that sāhitya or the art of poetry originally included in its comprehensive scope all such varied literary topics, until there was a gradual branching off of kavi-śikṣā as an allied but separate discipline, and a limiting of the Śāstra itself to the discussion of more or less general principles. In themselves, however, these topics are extremely interesting and throw a great deal of light on some of the literary aspects of classical Sanskrit Poetry and its practice. They are made all the more delightful reading by Rājaśekhara’s concise but easy and picturesque style, especially as it is enriched by judiciously selected and varied illustrations, very unlike the conventional illustrations one meets with in an ordinary text-book on Poetics.