

**KUNTAKA'S EVALUATION
OF
SANSKRIT LITERATURE**

**Thesis
Submitted to the University of Calicut
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN SANSKRIT**

NIKITHA. M

**DEPARTMENT OF SANSKRIT
UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT**

2018

Dr. C. RAJENDRAN

Professor (Retd.)

Department of Sanskrit

University of Calicut

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled **Kuntaka's evaluation of Sanskrit literature** is a record of bona-fide work carried out by **Nikitha. M**, under my guidance and supervision, submitted to the University of Calicut for the award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sanskrit. It is also certified that this thesis has not previously formed the basis for the award of any degree, diploma or fellowship or other similar title or recognition in any university or institution.

C.U. Campus

15-11-2018

Dr. C. RAJENDRAN

(Supervising Teacher)

DECLARATION

I, Nikitha. M, hereby declare that this thesis entitled **“KUNTAKA’S EVALUATION OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE”** submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sanskrit in the faculty of Language and Literature in the University of Calicut has not been previously formed for degree, diploma or fellowship or other similar title or recognition in any university or institution.

C.U. Campus

15-11-2018

NIKITHA. M

Preface

Kuntaka is a famous literary critic of ancient Indian literature. His *Vakroktijīvita*, a classic in Sanskrit poetics contains, apart from a novel literary theory, much analysis and evaluation of Sanskrit literature, which is accepted by the world of connoisseurs. His unbiased nature towards poets and literature is remarkable. No other Sanskrit rhetorician tries to evaluate a text as a whole as done by Kuntaka. One exception to this is Ānandavardhana, who tries to establish the dominant sentiments of the epics like *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* respectively as *karuṇa* and *śānta*. This reveals the relevance of Kuntaka's approach to Sanskrit literary criticism, which is often criticized for its lack of historic approach. Kuntaka uses his six varieties of figurativeness (*vakratās*) to assess the literary composition from its phoneme level to the text as a whole.

This thesis titled **Kuntaka's evaluation of Sanskrit literature** is an attempt to examine Kuntaka's approach as a critic to Sanskrit Literature. It comprises five chapters in addition to introduction and conclusion. The introduction discusses about the origin and development of Sanskrit poetics, previous works on Kuntaka and scope of the study. The first chapter entitled ***Vakroktijīvita: A Synoptic Survey***, as the name indicates, is a review of the contents mentioned in ***Vakroktijīvita***. The second chapter entitled **Kuntaka's assessment of Kālidāsa** is a close study of Kuntaka's observation, criticism and modifications in the compositions of Kālidāsa. Following three chapters are Kuntaka's

evaluation of various branches of Sanskrit literatures like *Mahākāvya*s, dramas, *Śatakas* and anthologies.

I wish to express my deep gratitude to my supervising teacher, Dr. C. Rajendran, Professor of Sanskrit (Retd.), University of Calicut, whose constant guidance and valuable suggestion inspired and helped me to materialize the dream of completing this thesis. I would like to thank Dr. N. K. Sundareswaran, Head of the Department of Sanskrit, University of Calicut, for his continuous support. I am also grateful to all the teachers of the department for the encouragement and motivation rendered to me. I wish to thank the non-teaching staff of the department for providing all the timely help.

I am also grateful to the department librarian, Mrs. Shakeela Kari, for providing me with ample support. I am thankful to the officials of C.H Mohammed Koya library for their help. I also thank the numerous libraries from which I could collect data which were very valuable for my research.

It would be really unkind if I do not thank my family who stood as pillars for me to lean on during the difficult phases of my research. I am also thankful to all the research fellows of the Department of Sanskrit as well as of the University for imparting energy and support throughout the research period. I also thank Bina Photostat for the technical support rendered.

C.U Campus
15-11-2018

Nikitha. M

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	i-ii
Introduction	1-15
Chapter 1 : <i>Vakroktijīvita</i> : A Synoptic Survey	16-58
1.1 Date of Kuntaka	17
1.2. The concept of <i>vakrokti</i> in earlier poeticians	18
1.3. A brief sketch of the contents of <i>Vakroktijīvita</i>	20
1.3.1. Purpose of poetry according to Kuntaka	21
1.3.2. Kuntaka's definition of poetry	23
1.3.3. The concept of figures according to Kuntaka	24
1.3.4. Kuntaka's views on <i>Rasa</i>	26
1.3.5. Kuntaka's concept of <i>sahṛdaya</i>	27
1.3.6. Styles or <i>Mārgas</i>	28
1.3.7. Qualities or <i>Guṇas</i>	30
1.3.8. Six divisions of <i>Vakratā</i>	32
1.3.8.1. Phonetic figurativeness or <i>varṇvinyāsavakratā</i>	33
1.3.8.2. Lexical figurativeness or <i>padapūrvārdhavakratā</i>	34
1.3.8.3. Grammatical figurativeness or <i>pratyayavakratā</i>	39
1.3.8.4. Sentential figurativeness or <i>vākyavakratā</i>	43
1.3.8.5. Contextual figurativeness or <i>prakaraṇavakratā</i>	44
1.3.8.6. Compositional figurativeness or <i>prabandhavakratā</i>	52
Chapter 2 : Kuntaka's appraisal of Kālidāsa	59 – 127
2.1. Kālidāsa in Kuntaka's treatment	59
2.2. <i>Meghadūta</i>	62
2.2.1. Instance given for <i>arthaḥ</i>	63
2.2.2. Example given for <i>ābhijātya</i>	65
2.2.3 Instance of metaphorical figurativeness	66
2.2.4 Example for grammatical figurativeness	68
2.3. <i>Mahākāvya</i> s of Kālidāsa	69

2.3.1. <i>Raghuvamśa</i>	69
2.3.1.1. Instances of contextual figurativeness	70
2.3.1.2. Kuntaka's criticism of <i>Raghuvamśa</i>	78
2.3.1.3. Instance given for 'arthah'	80
2.3.1.4. Example of sentential figurativeness	81
2.3.1.5. Tender style	82
2.3.1.6. Examples for Qualities	86
2.3.1.7. Examples cited for lexical figurativeness	90
2.3.2. <i>Kumārasambhava</i>	94
2.3.2.1. Contextual Figurativeness	95
2.3.2.2. Lexical figurativeness	96
2.3.2.3. Kuntaka's Criticism of <i>Kumārasambhava</i>	98
2.3.2.4. Kuntaka's praiseworthy observations on <i>Kumārasambhava</i>	99
2.3.2.5. Tender style	100
2.3.2.6. Rejection of <i>svabhāvokti</i>	102
2.4. Kuntaka and Dramas of Kālidāsa	104
2.4.1. <i>Abhijñānaśākuntala</i>	104
2.4.1.1. Compositional figurativeness	104
2.4.1.2. Contextual figurativeness	105
2.4.1.3. Sentential figurativeness	108
2.4.1.4. Grammatical figurativeness	112
2.4.2. <i>Vikramorvaśīya</i>	113
2.4.2.1. Contextual figurativeness	113
2.4.2.2. Sentential figurativeness	115
2.4.2.3. Grammatical figurativeness	119
2.5. Conclusion	120

Chapter 3 : Kuntaka's estimation of *mahākāvyas* of other poets **128 – 180**

3.1. <i>Kirātārjunīya</i>	130
3.1.1. Compositional figurativeness	133
3.1.2. Contextual figurativeness	137
3.1.3. Kuntaka's appreciation of individual verses of Bhāravi	139
3.1.4. Other innovations of Bhāravi untouched by Kuntaka	150
3.2. <i>Śīsupālavadha</i>	152
3.2.1. Compositional figurativeness	155
3.2.2. Contextual Figurativeness	157
3.2.3. Kuntaka's appreciation of individual verses in <i>Śīsupālavadha</i>	159
3.3. Prakrit <i>mahākāvyas</i>	164
3.3.1. <i>Harivijaya</i>	164
3.3.2. <i>Gauḍavaho</i>	168
3.4. Conclusion	171

Chapter 4 : Kuntaka's evaluation of Sanskrit plays of other poets **181 – 219**

4.1. <i>Tāpasavatsarāja</i>	182
4.1.1. Contextual figurativeness	182
4.2. <i>Bālarāmāyaṇa</i>	183
4.2.1. Contextual figurativeness	183
4.2.2. Kuntaka's evaluation of a single verse	183
4.3. <i>Veṇīsamhāra</i>	186
4.3.1. Compositional figurativeness	187
4.3.2. Kuntaka's criticism of <i>Veṇīsamhāra</i>	188
4.4. <i>Uttararāmacarita</i>	189
4.4.1. Compositional figurativeness	189

4.4.2. Contextual figurativeness	190
4.4.3. Kuntaka's evaluation of single verses	193
4.5. <i>Mālatīmādhava</i>	195
4.5.1. Kuntaka's evaluation of single verses	195
4.6. <i>Mudrārākṣasa</i>	198
4.6.1. Compositional figurativeness	198
4.6.2. Contextual figurativeness	199
4.7. <i>Nāgānanda</i>	200
4.7.1. Compositional figurativeness	201
4.8. <i>Pādatāḍitaka</i>	202
4.8.1. Kuntaka's evaluation of a single verse	202
4.9. Lost plays cited by Kuntaka	203
4.9.1. <i>Udāttarāghava</i>	204
4.9.2. <i>Puṣpadūṣitaka</i>	206
4.9.3. <i>Rāghavānanda</i>	207
4.9.4. <i>Abhijñānājānaki</i>	208
4.9.5. <i>Mahānāṭaka</i>	210
4.10. Conclusion	212
Chapter 5 : Kuntaka's evaluation of some stray verses	220 – 249
Chapter 6 : Kuntaka's assessment of verses cited in Śatakas and Anthologies	250 – 281
6.1. <i>Śatakas</i>	250
6.1.1. <i>Sūryaśataka</i>	251
6.1.2. <i>Śṛṅgāraśataka</i>	252
6.1.3. <i>Amaruśataka</i>	254
6.2.4. <i>Bhallaṭaśataka</i>	258

6.2. Anthologies	263
6.2.1. <i>Subhāṣitaratnakośa</i>	265
6.2.2. <i>Gāthāsaptaśatī</i>	274
6.3. Conclusion	277
Gnere-wise lists of works cited by Kuntaka	282 – 283
Conclusion	284 – 298
Bibliography	299 – 313
Appendix-I	314 – 322
Some lost plays mentioned by Kuntaka	
Appendix-II	323 – 329
Some other <i>Mahākāvya</i>s mentioned by Kuntaka	

INTRODUCTION

Literary theory and literary criticism are an integral part of literary studies. Literary criticism is the concentrated judgement, study and interpretation of imaginative literature. It approaches a particular literary text in both thematic and structural way. It helps to bring forth the literary tradition, recent literary developments etc. in an exciting way. The practical approach of literary criticism helps to unravel the literary attitude of the audience concerning the past and contemporary literary tradition. Skilled critics provide their own views, ideas and conclusions about a literary composition. The ultimate aim of literary criticism should not be mere evaluation of literature. It should contribute something for the progress of society.

It is obvious that the idea of beauty is the source of all aesthetic theory. The beginning of western aesthetics was in ancient Greece with Plato and Aristotle. Aristotle opines that poet is a creator and not a mere imitator as supposed by Plato. Aristotle's poetics starts with the definition of imitation. According to him, imitation is not just mimicry but it is reproduction through imagination. Longinus's '*On the sublime*' is one of the significant treatises of western literary criticism. In this text, he stresses the importance of the relation between nature and art. He opines that art is perfect when it seems to be nature, and nature hits the marks when she contains art hidden in her. Aim of both the western and eastern aestheticians is to examine the nature of literature, and the secret of its appeal.

Sanskrit literary criticism is generally referred to as *alañkāraśāstra*. It signifies the harmonious blend of aesthetics, poetics and rhetorics. A literary critic has the power of accurate judgement connected with an excellent literary taste. A critic should be aware of the exact aim of an artist too. Freud opines that an artist is free to choose and modify his images and form. The function of poetry is to provide pleasure along with moral instruction. The oblique beauty helps to increase the charm of imaginative world of a poet and produce inexplicable delight to *sahṛdayas*.

Origin and development of Sanskrit poetics

In Sanskrit literature scattered information about poetics is first availed from some *Purāṇas* like *Agnipurāṇa* and *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*. But the history of poetics starts from Bharata the renowned author of *Nāṭyaśāstra*¹ and almost ends with Jagannātha Paṇḍita's *Rasagaṅgādhara*.² *Nāṭyaśāstra* is an encyclopedic manual of theatre arts dealing with almost all the aspects of drama and dramaturgy. Bharata's main contribution to Sanskrit poetics is his *rasasūtra*. It explains the genesis of *rasa* and it is accepted as a formula for explaining the aesthetic experience of arts. It is notable that no concept in western poetics is as much important as *rasa* in Indian poetics. Some other poetic texts that evolved after *Nāṭyaśāstra* are *Kāvyañālañkāra* of Bhāmaha³ and Rudraṭa,⁴ *Kāvyañādarśa* of Daṇḍin,⁵ *Kāvyañālañkārasūtravṛtti* of Vāmana,⁶ *Kāvyañāprakāśa* of Mammaṭa⁷ and *Sāhityadarpaṇa* of Viśvanātha.⁸ In *Kāvyañālañkāra*, Bhāmaha establishes poetic figure or *alañkāra* as major element in poetry. Rudraṭa, author of *Kāvyañālañkāra* is the final representative of *alañkāra* School. According to Daṇḍin, all the

attributes adding beauty to poetry are *alañkāra*. Vāmana, the protagonist of *rīti* school gives a systematic theory of poetics in his text *Kāvyañāñkārasūtravṛtti*. He was the first rhetorician who had great urge to search for the soul of poetry. Mammaṭa, Viśvanātha and Jagannātha Paṇḍita are the ardent followers of *dhvani* theory of Ānandhavardhana.

Poetics texts deal with the topics like purpose of poetry, definition of poetry, figures of speech etc. Apart from the topics mentioned above, some other topics are also discussed in poetic texts. Bhoja's *Śṛñgāraprakāśa*⁹ discusses about grammar. The texts like *Alañkārasarvasva*¹⁰ and *Kuvalayānanada*¹¹ discuss only figures of speech. The poetic text named *Kāvyañimāmsā* of Rājaśekhara¹² deals with topics like instruction to the poets, poetic conventions etc. Some other prominent poetic texts in Sanskrit are *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandhavardhana,¹³ *Vyaktiviveka* of Mahimabhaṭṭa,¹⁴ *Vakroktijīvita* of Kuntaka¹⁵ and *Rasagañgādhara* of Jagannātha Paṇḍita.¹⁶ *Dhvanyāloka* with the commentary of *Locana* of Abhinavagupta is a widely discussed poetic text in Sanskrit literature in Indian tradition. Vāmana talks about arrangement of word as soul of poetry. Taking a step further Ānandhavardhana establishes the deeper essence of meaning as the soul of poetry. *Vyaktiviveka* written in 11th Century C.E. postulates a new theory named *anumitivāda*. Mahimabhaṭṭa establishes that *dhvani* is the same as the logical process of inference. *Abhinavabhāratī* of Abhinavagupta, a commentary on *Nāṭyaśāstra* is yet another notable poetic text of Sanskrit literature. Abhinavagupta was a man of acute intellect and encyclopedic scholarship. *Abhinavabhāratī* discusses all the matters discussed in *Nāṭyaśāstra*. *Vakroktijīvita* adorns a prominent

position among the rhetoric works of post-dhvani period as it paved an independent and original path for itself in Sanskrit poetics.

Kuntaka and *Vakroktijīvitā*

Kuntaka wrote his *Vakroktijīvitā* in 10th Century C.E., in between the composition of the two poetic texts *Dhvanyāloka* and *Vyaktiviveka*. He propounds *vakrokti* school of Sanskrit literary criticism. *Vakrokti* is the imaginative turn given to expressions (*vaidagdhyaḅhaṅgībhāṇitī*). This unique poetic text discusses the six varieties of figurativeness propounded by Kuntaka in four *unmeṣas*. They are 1. Phonetic figurativeness 2. Lexical figurativeness 3. Grammatical figurativeness 4. Sentential figurativeness 5. Contextual figurativeness and 6. Compositional figurativeness. Through his final variety, Kuntaka tries to evaluate a text as a whole. Every large composition is the combination of few micro sentences. So phonemes constitute the primary structure of a literary composition. Kuntaka's six types of figurativeness are really helpful to analyze the texts from its smallest phoneme to the largest compositional structure.

Sanskrit rhetoricians always quote individual verses to illustrate various concepts of poetics. Most of the rhetoricians composed verses themselves to illustrate the poetic concepts. Some of them drew illustrative verses from literary works. But the Sanskrit rhetoricians were not keen on analyzing a complete literary work. Kuntaka stood out from other rhetoricians in this aspect. His criticism took into its fold both the criticism of individual verses as well as complete literary works. He critically evaluates the whole work and also suggests some possible changes in the texts from which he had drawn illustrations. Critics like

S.K De and N.V Krishnawarrier opine that the main aim of Sanskrit criticism focused on the interpretation of sentences and not on a complete work. He maintains that it is really a drawback of Sanskrit literature that there is no such work, which tries to evaluate a text as a whole. As an answer to this criticism, Dr. Kunjunni Raja says in his text named '*Bhāṣādarśanavum caritravum*' that the evaluation of the discussion of *aṅgīrasa* by Ānandavardhana in his *Dhvanyāloka* and the criticism of whole compositions by Kuntaka based on compositions reveal attempts to evaluate a text as a whole.

Kuntaka goes through all major and minor works of Sanskrit literature and extracts the most suitable verse for each and every situation. Kuntaka's selection of verses from both major and minor works reveals his keen literary appraisal in Sanskrit literature. The works cited by Kuntaka include *Raghuvamśa*, *Kumārasambhava*, *Meghasandēśa*, *Uttarārāmacarita*, *Mahāvīracarita*, *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, *Kirātārjunīya*, *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, *Harṣacarita*, *Mudrārākṣasa*, *Veṅīśamhāra*, *Śīsupālavadha*, *Nāgānanda*, *Viddhaśālabhaṅjika*, *Puṣpadūṣitaka*, *Hayagrīvavadha*, *Māyāpuṣpaka*, *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*, *Abhijñānajānaki*, *Chalitarāma*, *Pratimāniruddha* and *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*. It was already said that he not only quotes from the works of master poets like Kālidāsa, Māgha, Bhāravi etc., but also from the less known works like *Abhijñānajānaki* and *Chalitarāma*. Kuntaka brings forth the knowledge of various major and minor Sanskrit literary texts. It is through Kuntaka's citation that many texts are now known. Texts like *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*, *Pratimāniruddha* etc. are now known only through the references made by Kuntaka.

Kuntaka never hesitates to appreciate the poets for their interesting and innovative concepts put forth in their works. At the same time he had the boldness to criticize the master poets like Kālidāsa. The minute analysis of the examples from literature clearly indicates the critical acumen of Kuntaka as a literary critic. All these facts evidently establish Kuntaka as a unique literary critic in the history of Sanskrit poetics.

Among Sanskrit rhetoricians Kuntaka deserves a unique position as his approach in literary criticism is novel and unquestionable due to his genuine assessment of literature. Many of the citations he makes are rare and beautiful. He is the only critic who provides literary criticism in its wide sense among the rhetoricians of the history of Sanskrit poetics. He is a typical example for analyzing literary merits of poetry unbiasedly. *Vakroktijīvita*, thus is a mine of information of authors and works known to Kuntaka.

Review of literature

Nothing much was known about the epoch making work named *Vakroktijīvita* until 1923, when S. K. De, a renowned scholar of Indian poetics had published the first two chapters of this text. He published that fragmentary portion with the help of two original incomplete transcript obtained from Madras govt. manuscripts library. K Krishnamoorthy opines that a lost Malayalam manuscript was the original source of Madras manuscripts. In the same year, another famous scholar of Indian poetics named P.V Kane also published a text depending on the two incomplete manuscripts and the published work of S. K. De. In 1928 De published a revised new edition of the text including the third chapter with the help of another manuscript obtained

from Jain Bhandars at Jaisalmer. Then after twenty seven years i.e. in 1955 another edition of *Vakroktijīvita* with four *unmeṣas* has been published by one Dr. Nagendra of Delhi university with Hindi commentary of Acharya Viśveśvar. Then in 1967, Raddhe Shyam Mishra published a text in Chowkhamba Sanskrit series with Hindi translation and a commentary named *Prakāśa*. This was mere replica of the text published by De. Then in 1977 with great difficulty K. Krishnamoorthy, professor of Karnataka University published four *unmeṣas* of *Vakroktijīvita* with the help of manuscripts and paper scripts of Madras manuscripts library and also with a text named *Kalpalataviveka* of an unknown authorship. Then in 2009, Chattanatt Acyutanunni, former Professor of Malayalam department of Calicut University published a Malayalam translation of the text depending on the text of K. Krishnamoorthy. These were the milestones in the history of the publication of the text *Vakroktijīvita*. Absence of strong commentaries and its incompleteness never reduce the relevance of a text. As Krishnamoorthy said it is sure that the text is almost completed. The effort taken by all these scholars are highly appreciable otherwise an epoch making work of Sanskrit poetics must be in oblivion.

The present thesis focuses on the literary analysis of Kuntaka. K. Krishnamoorthy and Chattanatt Acyutanunni in their texts explicitly stated the name of the text of the verses cited by Kuntaka. This is really helpful in finding out the names of literary texts quoted by Kuntaka. Among these texts, some of them are now lost and some verses are anonymous. This makes the study of lost works more crucial. The huge composition named *Indian kāvya literature* of A.K Warder also helps to find out brief information about some rare works like *Puṣpadūṣitaka*,

Hayagrīvavadha etc. Some old lost Rāma plays edited by Dr. V. Raghavan help to trace out some information about some lost dramas like *Māyāpuṣpaka*, *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*, *Abhijñānājānaki*, *Chalitarāma* etc. Moreover brief information about the text named *Udāttarāghava* is availed from “*Rāmakatha*”.¹⁷

Kuntaka has taken examples from the anthologies like *Subhāṣitāvalī*, *Sūktimuktāvalī*, *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* etc. and also from some *śatakas* like *Sūryaśataka*, *Amarukaśataka* etc. Moreover there are fifteen Prakrit verses in his text. The anthologies are really a store house of stray verses. The anthologies mentioned below really help to ascertain the verses indicated by K. Krishnamoorthy. The anthologies are *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* of Śrīdhara¹⁸, *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* compiled by Śārṅgadara¹⁹, Vallabhadeva’s *Subhāṣitāvalī*²⁰ and *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* of Vidyākara²¹.

Dr. C. Rajendran’s monograph titled *Kuntaka* is also a good reference for further study. This book contains four chapters. The first chapter named Kuntaka and his magnum opus gives a clear picture of Kuntaka and brief structure of the text *Vakroktijīvita* and also the names of the literary texts cited by Kuntaka. In the next chapter on poets and poetry, the viewpoint of Kuntaka on the combination of word and sense, qualities, styles etc. The third chapter named *Vakrokti*- the poetic art gives a clear picture of six types of figurativeness propounded by Kuntaka with illustration. The last chapter named a critical evaluation gives a picture of Kuntaka as a literary critic mainly focusing on the works of Kālidāsa.

The article named ‘Subhāṣita-saṅgraha-s and inscriptions as source of poetry’ of Ludwik Sternbach help to attain information about the anthologies of Sanskrit literature. He had given the name of twenty different anthologies. He had also given a detailed study of the relevance of the anthologies and inscription in the field of Sanskrit poetry. Yet another articles named ‘Ānandavardhana, Dhanika and Kuntaka on the *Abijñānaśākuntala*’ in *Studies in Sānskrit Sāhitya-Śāstra* of V.M. Kulkarni.²² This article gave a brief analysis of the context and verses of *Abijñānaśākuntala* cited by Kuntaka. Some other articles in the same book named ‘some aspects of Prakrit verses in Alaṅkāra works’ and ‘*The Harivijaya of Sarvasena*’ helped as a good reference material for the present thesis. Some other papers which rendered information are- *Kālidāsa-an assessment by Kuntaka*²³, *Variant Readings of Kālidāsa’s verses in Kuntaka’s Vakroktijīvitā*²⁴, *A Reference to the Mahānāṭaka*²⁵, *Vakrokti vaibhavam* of Archanakumaridube etc.²⁶

Some of the thesis works written based on *Vakroktijīvitā* are as follows- ‘*A Study of Stylistics in Sanskrit Poetics with special references to Kuntaka*’ written by T. Vasudevan. The effort he had taken is explicit in this stunning research work. The first chapter named the stylistic approaches to literary language introduces some of the important sources and methods of modern stylistics mainly in their linguistic and literary perspectives so as to serve as a background for the interpretation of stylistic thought in Sanskrit. The aim of the second chapter is a general analysis of certain areas in Sanskrit poetics which are agreeable to the western stylistic concepts. The third chapter is an analytical outline of *Vakroktijīvitā*. Next chapter is a comparison of some western concepts

of stylistics with some of the stylistics concepts of Kuntaka and other Sanskrit poeticians. Fifth chapter is a comparative study of the phonological, lexical and syntactic aspects of poetic languages as conceived by some of the western stylisticians with the corresponding levels of figurativeness mentioned by Kuntaka. Sixth chapter is a brief analysis of the general nature of figurative expressions, metaphorical transfer and a number of rhetorical figures like simile, metaphor and paradox as conceived by the modern stylisticians and Sanskrit poeticians. The final chapter examines various aspects of discourse analysis and narratology which seem more or less relevant in the study of Sanskrit stylistics as found in Kuntaka.

Another research work based on *Vakroktijīvitā* is 'Kuntaka a critical study' submitted by Suchitra Mandal in 1990. Its first chapter discusses the various concepts of poetry prevalent in the treatise of different rhetoricians prior to Kuntaka. Second chapter is a comprehensive evolution of the idea of *vakrokti* as noticed by early rhetoricians preceding Kuntaka. The third chapter is an estimate of *rīti* concept as treated by the early propagators of *rīti* and Kuntaka's novelty of perusal in this respect. Fourth chapter deals mainly with Kuntaka's concept of some figurativeness. The final chapter is a precise exhibition of various contributions made by Kuntaka in the field of literary criticism in Sanskrit.

Other theses from the Department of Sanskrit, Karnataka University, Dharwar is 'Kuntaka's contribution to Sanskrit poetics' of Shikaripura Krishnamurthy submitted in 1985. This thesis is divided into four parts. First part gives an introduction to Kuntaka and his text.

Second part is a brief summary of *Vakroktijīvita* covering the complete contents of the four *unmeṣas*. A critical estimate of *Vakroktijīvita* is given in the third part. Here Kuntaka's concept of *vakrokti* in relation with various poetic concepts like *guṇa*, *rīti*, *alaṅkāra* etc. are analyzed. Fourth part presents the conclusion of the present thesis and also tries to judge Kuntaka as a critic. Another thesis from the same university is 'Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka a comparative study' submitted by Hemalatha B. Deshpande in 1967. First chapter is an analysis of the concept of *bhakti* of various Sanskrit rhetoricians. Second chapter is a historical analysis of *alaṅkārya* and *alaṅkāra* in *kāvya*. The forgoing chapters respectively discusses about *rīti*, *guṇa*, *rasa* and comparison of *dhvani* and *vakrokti*. Final chapter is an analysis of the practical criticism of *Dhvanyāloka* and *Vakroktijīvita*.

Yet another thesis is 'The concept of Vakrokti in Sanskrit Poetics- A Critical survey' submitted by Sri Suryanarayana in 2006. The first chapter of this thesis presents major schools of Sanskrit poetics, general definition of *vakrokti* and its multi-dimensional implications. Second chapter describes the view of different theorists on *Vakrokti*. The third chapter exposes Kuntaka's theory of *vakrokti*. The fourth chapter is an analysis of *vakrokti* in relation to various literary concepts like *mārga*, *rasa* etc. The fifth chapter focuses on the striking similarities between *dhvani* and *vakrokti* perspectives. Final chapter is brief analysis of fundamental aspects of practical criticism as showed by Kuntaka.

There is a post-doctoral dissertation on *Vakroktijīvita* named as 'Kuntaka's vakrokti siddhānta: towards an appreciation of English Poetry' by Shravan K Sharma, professor of Department of English,

Gurukula Kangri University, Haridwar. This was published in 2004 by Shalabh Publishing house, Meerut. It is divided in to eight chapters. First chapter gives a brief analysis of the term *vakrokti* in the view of Sanskrit rhetoricians. The final chapter is a conclusion. The six chapters in between them discuss the various sub varieties of six figurativeness of Kuntaka as conceived in the poems of western poets like Wordsworth, Shelly, W. H. Auden, Keats, T.S. Eliot etc. This study reveals the relevance of Sanskrit poetics in the present time and also affirms that English poetry also bears striking features like six figurativeness propounded by Kuntaka.

Aim and objectives of the present study

1. The first aim of the present study is to document all the literary works cited and alluded to in *Vakroktijīvitā* and to identify the anonymous works.
2. Secondly the present study will focus on the manner in which Kuntaka analyses Sanskrit literature.
3. The thesis will also examine the empirical acumen of Kuntaka as reveals in his analysis of Sanskrit literature. On short, the work will be an attempt to look upon *Vakroktijīvitā* as a document of practical criticism as against the hitherto studies which form in his concept of *vakrokti* as a literary theory.

Research design

Various chapters of the present thesis discuss Kuntaka's critical evaluation of the literary texts and their authors that he used to cite

verses and contexts. These citations help to examine the historical and aesthetical achievements through Kuntaka. The present thesis initially gives a brief introduction about some available works written based on *Vakroktijīvitā*. The scope of the present thesis is also mentioned here. It contains six chapters other than introduction and conclusion. The first chapter is a synoptic survey of the text *Vakroktijīvitā*. Then the following chapters analyse Kuntaka's assessment of various poets and their compositions. Kuntaka's assessment of the compositions of Kālidāsa, *Mahākāvya*s, dramas, stray verses and anthologies are discussed in the next five chapters respectively.

Scope of study

Most previous studies on *vakrokti* analyze the theory in the light of modern stylistics. *Vakrokti* theory was applied to study various English poems. There are only a very few studies which analyse Kuntaka as a practical critic. Most of them devote a chapter or two for such a study. An intensive assessment of Kuntaka as a literary critic has not been done yet. It thus gives scope for such an intensive and critical study to analyze Kuntaka's critical acumen. Kuntaka's literary merit is also explicit in some minor works and anthologies etc. cited by him. So the present thesis aims to bring forth the literary genius of Kuntaka in assessing literary works. As other Sanskrit rhetoricians, Kuntaka also cites numerous verses from the vast literature of Sanskrit. But Kuntaka tries to evaluate each and every text with sharp critical acumen. His analysis of illustrations reveals his insight in to the heart of poetic charm. This gave Kuntaka unique position in the history of Sanskrit literature. Kuntaka is considered to be a rare rhetorician because of his obviously

independent ideas and also his keen observation of poetry. That is why K. Krishnamoorthy gave him the title ‘practical literary critic’. Practical criticism is one of the important aspects of poetics. It is the application of poetic theory to the existing literary works. The present study attempts to assess Kuntaka as a practical literary critic.

¹ R.S.Nagar (Ed.). *Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharatamuni*, vol-1-4, Parimal Publications, Delhi, 1983.

² Pt.Badarinath Jha and Pt. Madan Mohan Jha (Ed.). *Rasagangadhara of Paṇḍitarāja Jagannāta*, Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi.

³ Naganatha Sastry. P.V. *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra of Bhāmaha*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, Second edition-1970.

⁴ Pandit Rāmadeva Sukla. *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra of Rudrata*, Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi.

⁵ Yogeawaradatt Sharma, *Ācārya Daṇḍhi-Kāvyaḷadarśa*, Nag Publishers, Delhi, 1999.

⁶ Haragovinda Shastri. *Kāvyaḷaṅkārasūtra of Ācārya Vāmana*, Chowkhamba Surabhārati Prakashan, Varanasi.

⁷ Sri Harisankara Sarma. *Kāvyaḷprakāśaḥ*, Chowkhamba Prakashan, varanasi

⁸ Acharya Shesharaja Sharma Regmi, *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, Chowkhamba Krishnadas academy, Varanasi.

⁹ M.M. Rewāprasād Dwivedi. *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa by Bhojarāja*. Vol.I and Vol.II, Indira Gandhi National Centre For The Arts, New Delhi and Kālidāsasamsthāna, Varanasi, 2007.

¹⁰ R.C.Dwivedi. *Alaṅkārasarvasva-Saṅjīvinī*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1965.

¹¹ D. Bhalashankar Vyas, *Kuvalayānanda of Appayadīkṣita*, Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi.

¹² Ganga Sagar Rai (Ed.). *Kāvyaḷmīmāṃsa of Rajaśekhara*, Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi.

¹³ Acharya Jagannath Pathak. *Dhvanyaloka of Sri Anandavardhanacharya*, Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi.

¹⁴ Brahmananda Tripathi. (Ed.). *Vyaktiviveka of Rājānaka Mahimabhata*, The Chaukhamba Surabharati Prakashan, Varanasi, 2005.

-
- ¹⁵ K.Krishnamoorthy. *The Vakrokti-jīvita of Kuntaka*, Critically edited with variants, Introduction and English translation, Karnatak University, Dharwad, 1977.
- ¹⁶ Badainath Jha and Madan Mohan Jha(Ed.). *Rasagaṅgādhara of Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha*, Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi, Second Edition-2012.
- ¹⁷ Fr. Camille Bulcke. *Rāmakatha*, Kerala Sahitya Academy, Trissur, 1978.
- ¹⁸ Sures Chandra Banerji (Critical Ed). *Saduktikarṇāmṛta of Śrīdharadāsa*, Firma K.L Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, 1965.
- ¹⁹ Peterson, Petor. (Ed.). *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*. Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, Delhi, 1987.
- ²⁰ Peter Peterson (Ed.). Vallabhadeva's *Subhāṣitāvalī*, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1961.
- ²¹ D.D. Kosambi and V.V. Gokhale (Ed.). *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* of Vidyākara, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1957.
- ²² V.M. Kulkarni. *Studies in Sānskrit Sāhitya-Śā*, B.L. Institute of Indology, Patan.
- ²³ Rajendran, C. Pratyabhijñā. Vol. II, Issue. 1-2, Jan-Dec 2015. pp.63-69.
- ²⁴ Shanbhag, D.N. Centenary Commemoration Volume, Vol.XVI. Oriental Research Institute, Mysore, 1992. pp-20-24.
- ²⁵ De, S.K. Jhā Commemoration Volume, Poona Oriental Series No.39, Oriental Book agency, Poona, 1937.
- ²⁶ Visva samskr̥tam 42/1-2, March-June 2005.

CHAPTER 1

VAKROKTIJĪVITA: A SYNOPTIC SURVEY

Like many poeticians preceding and succeeding him, Kuntaka has cited several works of Sanskrit literature to demonstrate his theory of *vakrokti*. It is therefore necessary to analyse Kuntaka's theory of *vakrokti* in order to appreciate the context in which such quotations are made, which will help us to fully appreciate his critical acumen. In this chapter, the various aspects of Kuntaka's theory of *vakrokti* are examined to serve as a backlog for the analysis of his critical practice.

Poetics in India has been the medium used by the rhetoricians to express their appreciation and criticism of poetry. Systematic investigation of the essence of literature is one of the aims of poetics. In Sanskrit poetics, there have been many investigations on the essence of poetry. Accordingly, we can discern eight different schools of thought. They are 1. The *Rasa* school 2. The *Alaṅkāra* school, 3. The *Guṇa* school, 4. The *Rīti* school 5. The *Vakrokti* school 6. The *Aucitya* school 7. The *Dhvani* school and the 8. *Anumāna* school. They have discussed some of the modern problems of aesthetic like creative process, structure of poetry, literary genre and response to poetry. Their valuable contribution to eastern aesthetics is really appreciable.

Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, a text on dramaturgy and poetics must be the source of inspiration for the later writers on poetics. Among the eight schools, the school of *vakrokti* is propounded by Kuntaka, a rhetorician of the latter half of the 10th century C.E. Kuntaka's concept of *vakrokti*

attains a unique position in Sanskrit poetics, among the works written after the establishment of *dhvani* theory by Ānandavardhana through the *Dhvanyāloka* of 9th century C.E. Kuntaka's innovative and original thinking is said to be one of the main reasons for the prominence of *vakrokti* school.

1.1. Date of Kuntaka

Kuntaka does not provide any information about himself in his works like most of the other Sanskrit rhetoricians. His date has been fixed at the latter half of the 10th century C.E on the basis of some external evidences. He quotes profusely from the works *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana of 9th century C.E. and from *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, *Viddhaśālabhañjika* etc. of Rājaśekhara of first half of 10th Century C.E. Moreover Mahimabhaṭṭa, a rhetorician of 11th century C.E. and the author of *Vyaktiviveka*, has criticized Kuntaka and the concept of *vakrokti* in some respects. All these references have helped to fix his date. The title *rājānaka* which meant 'almost a king' was given to Kuntaka just as it was given to the other Kashmirian poets like Ānandhavardhana and Mahimabhaṭṭa. This makes it clear that Kuntaka is also a Kashmirian.

There is a controversy about the dates of Kuntaka and Abhinavagupta, the author of the commentaries named *Locana* on *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandhavardhana and the *Abhinavabhāratī* on *Nāṭyśāstra* of Bharata. In his text, *The history of Sanskrit Poetics*, P.V. Kane quotes the opinion of some scholars like Dr.P.C. Lahiri and Dr. Mookerjee that Abhinavagupta is indebted to Kuntaka. Kane supports

the arguments of Dr.V. Raghavan and Dr. Sankaran that there is no adequate information to support the indebtedness of Abhinavagupta to Kuntaka.¹ Though there has been no exact solution for the problem of fixing their dates, it is interesting to note that there are numerous parallel passages in their works. Unfortunately, they did not mention each other in their works. This, in fact, points to the assumption that most probably they were contemporaries.

1.2. The concept of *vakrokti* in earlier poetics

It was Bhāmaha who introduced the term *vakrokti* in Sanskrit poetics. On his *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra*, he states:

*saiṣā sarvaiva vakroktiranayārtho vibhāvyate/
yatnosyām kavinā kāryaḥ kolaṅkāro 'nayā vinā//²*

“This peculiar method of statement (*vakrokti*) is found everywhere (i.e, in other *alaṅkāras*). By this, meanings are rendered beautiful. Poets should be assiduous in cultivating it. Where is the *alaṅkāra* without this?”³

Ānandavardhana cites this verse in his *Dhvanyāloka*. He states that all figurativeness should be included in *atiśayokti* or in *vakrokti*. He also says that the figurativeness devoid of *atiśayokti* and *vakrokti* is mere figurativeness. *Atiśayokti* of Ānandavardhana is similar to the *vakrokti* of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. According to him, poetry devoid of *atiśayokti* and *vakrokti* is considered as a bad one. However, it was Kuntaka who developed this concept in a full-fledged manner in his *Vakroktijīvita*. Bhāmaha says that *vakrokti* is a delicate turn given to expression which distinguishes poetic expression from ordinary converse. The term

vakrokti has been differently interpreted by different scholars without explaining its exact meaning. Kuntaka in *Vakroktijīvitā* says, *vakrokti* is ‘*vaidagdhya bhaṅgībhaṅiti*’. It can be translated as ‘the artistic turn of speech’⁴, which means dexterous expression of something in a most attractive way, i.e. the selection of most striking form of expression in a particular context though the word has numerous meanings. Most of the early rhetoricians used the term *vakrokti* in some way or the other. Thus Daṇḍin divided the poetry in to two viz, *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti* and he defines it as:-

*śleṣaḥ sarvāsu puṣnāti prāyo vakroktiṣu śriyam/
dvitā bhinnam svabhāvoktiḥ vakroktiśceti vāṇmayam//*⁵

To Vāmana, *vakrokti* is only a figure of speech consisting of metaphor based on similarity.

*sādrśyāllakṣaṇā vakrokti*⁶

The example cited for it is as follows:-

*unmimīlam kamalam sarasīnām kairavam ca na mimīla muhūrtāt*⁷

Here the poet imposed the action of opening and closing of eyes on flowers due to their similarity.

Bhoja, the poet who belonged to the same period of Kuntaka, has also used the term *vakrokti*. He gave a definition of poetry related to *vakrokti* in the sixth chapter of his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* as follows:-

*yadavakram vacaḥ śāstre loke ca vaca eva tat/
vakram yadarthavādātau tasya kāvyamiti smṛtiḥ//*⁸

Bhoja in his *Sarasvatīkaṅṭhābharaṇa* divided the speech into three as *vakrokti*, *rasokti* and *svabhāvokti*.

*vakroktiśca rasoktiśca svabhāvoktiśceti vāṅmayam/
sarvānugrāhiṇī tāsū rasoktim pratijānate*⁹

Though there are some early rhetoricians who have already discussed about *vakrokti*, it is Kuntaka who considered *vakrokti* as the soul of poetry and developed it in a different and beautiful manner. Kuntaka defines *vakrokti* as follows:

*ubāvetāvalaṅkāryau tayoh punaralaṅkṛtiḥ
vakroktireva vaidaghyabaṅgībhaṅitirucyate*¹⁰

“Both these are the ‘adorned’. Their adornment consists in the poetic process known as artistic turn of speech”. Here the term ‘both’ indicates the word and sense.

1.3. A brief sketch of the contents of *Vakroktijīvita*

There was no information about *Vakroktijīvita* for a long time but for some quotations and references found in some poetics texts like *Alaṅkārasarvasva* of Ruyyaka and *Sāhityadarpaṇa* of Viśvanātha Kavirāja. In 1923 Dr. S.K. De published the first two *unmeṣas* of the text. The next two *unmeṣas* were also published by him in 1928¹¹. *Vakroktijīvita* is the only available work of Kuntaka. It is divided in to four chapters named *unmeṣas*. As most of other poetical texts, it is also written in the form of *kārikā*, *vṛtti* and *udāharaṇa* taken from various sources. In the first *unmeṣa*, Kuntaka has elaborated the basic concepts of poetry like its definition and purpose with a brief introduction to

vakrokti and its six varieties. The second *unmeṣa* deals with detailed study of the first three varieties of *vakratā*. *Vākyavakratā* is elaborated in the third *unmeṣa*. The last two types of *vakratā* are explained in detail in the fourth *unmeṣa*.

1.3.1. Purpose of poetry according to Kuntaka

Most of the Sanskrit poetic works discuss about the purpose of poetry, cause of poetry, definition of poetry etc. in detail. Kuntaka has given three verses for explaining the purposes of poetry in the first chapter. The first one is as follows:

dharmādisādhanopāyaḥ sukumārakramoditaḥ
*kāvya-bandhobhijātānām hṛdayāhlādakāraḥ*¹²

“A poetic composition created with an eye to beauty is not only a means for the inculcation of values like righteousness, but also a delight to the hearts of the elite.”¹³

According to Kuntaka, one of the purposes of poetic composition is to delight and instruct the princes as they are the future protectors of their country. Since they enjoy many luxuries, they may be reluctant to understand the ethics and morality by studying difficult *śāstras*. But they would be interested in reading poetry due to its simplicity and attractiveness. They easily imbibe the values of life-like righteousness, wealth, enjoyment and liberation by reading poetry. Thus poetry helps in shaping their character. So a good poet should include the values of life like righteousness, wealth, enjoyment and emancipation in their compositions; otherwise it will be a mere pleasurable pastime to the princes. Though there are numerous *śāstras* giving values of life, their

presentation is not as inspiring as in poetry because poetry delights and instructs the people simultaneously. The second verse runs as follows:

*vyavahāraparispandasaundaryam vyavahāribhiḥ
satkāvyādhigamādeva nūtanaucityamāpyate//*¹⁴

“Participants in the affairs of life can come to appreciate the beauty of life-activity in a new light, viz. an appropriate pattern imposed by the poet, only by means of good poetry.”¹⁵

Through this second purpose of poetry, Kuntaka says that a poet should include in his poetic composition, the good conduct to be practiced by the ministers and other members associated with the king, at the time of explaining the moral values of a king. Such portrayal of good conduct would really help the readers to understand the proper behavior of people belonging to different categories. Yet another one is given below:

*caturvargaphalāsvādamapyatikramya tadvidām
kāvyāmṛtarasenāntaścamatkāro vitanyate//*¹⁶

“Apart from the enjoyment of the benefits of the four-fold values, there is the immediate sense of delight produced in the reader as a result of his enjoying the nectar of poetry.”¹⁷

Here Kuntaka says that apart from attainment of the four-fold aims of life, the primary function of poetry is the inner delight of readers. The readers enjoy the nectar of poetry. Kuntaka also says that everyone cannot do this and only those who have an aesthetic sense can enjoy it. The instructions laid down in *śāstras* are difficult to understand but

poetry gives sudden delight to the readers, which gives poetry a higher position than the *śāstras*.

1.3.2. Kuntaka's definition of poetry

In Sanskrit poetics there are two different opinions about the definition of poetry among the rhetoricians, some of them opine that only words can make poetry and some others suggest that both word and meaning make poetry. Some famous rhetoricians who accept only word as poetry are Daṇḍin and Jagannātha Paṇḍita. Daṇḍin defines poetry as '*śarīram tāvadiṣṭārthavyavacchinnā padāvalī*', Viśvanātha in his *Sāhityadarpaṇa* defines it as '*vākyam rasātmakam kāvyam*' and Jagannātha paṇḍita conceives it as '*ramaṇīyārtha pradipādakaḥ śabdaḥ kāvyam*'. Those who regard poetry as both word and meanings are Bhāmaha, Vāmana, Rudraṭa, Mammaṭa, Ānandavardhana, Hemacandra, Vidyādhara, Vidyānātha and Kuntaka. The definition of poetry according to Kuntaka is as follows:-

*śabdārthau sahitaū vakrakavivyāpārasālīni/
bandhe vyavasthitau kāvyam tadvidāhlādakāriṇi//*¹⁸

“Poetry is that word and sense together enshrined in a style revealing the artistic (lit, out-of-the-way) creativity of the poet on the one hand and giving aesthetic delight to the man of taste on the other”¹⁹

After explaining the purpose and cause of the poetry, Kuntaka commences his text with a detailed description on the definition of poetry taking word by word. According to him both word and meaning are essential for a good poem; as the poem having both *śabda* and *artha*

should only be delightful to the connoisseur. It is to be noted that Kuntaka's language and style of writing is simple and beautiful. He tries to explain the meaning of every word and interprets them in a clear and distinct manner without leaving any doubts in the minds of the readers.

1.3.3. The concept of figures according to Kuntaka

In Kuntaka's definition of poetry the term '*vakrakavivyaṅpāraśālīni*' denotes the six types of figurativeness mentioned by him. His *vākyavakratā* or sentential figurativeness discusses the wide varieties of figures of speech. Kuntaka has given an elaborate discussion about figurativeness in the third *unmeṣa*. He rejects some figures which were widely accepted by the early rhetoricians and also suggests new definitions for certain figures. Moreover he maintains that some figures like *ananvaya*, *parivṛtti*, *nidarśanā* etc. were merely varieties of *upamā* and thus refuses to accept them as separate figures. Though the early rhetoricians from Bharata to Ānandavardhana also tried to discuss about *alaṅkāras*, it is Kuntaka who gave a detailed study of it. Kuntaka accepted twenty one *alaṅkāras*. They are *rasavat*, *dīpaka*, *rūpaka*, *aprastutapraśamsā*, *paryāyokta*, *vyājastuti*, *utprekṣā*, *atiśayokti*, *upamā*, *śleṣa*, *vyatireka*, *virodha*, *sahokti*, *dṛṣṭānta*, *arthāntaranyāsa*, *ākṣepa*, *vibhāvanā*, *sasandeha*, *apahnuti*, *samsṛṣṭi* and *saṅkara*. Moreover he has the boldness to refute some *alaṅkāras* of early rhetoricians. He tries to suggest new definitions for them. Kuntaka's view about few *alaṅkāras* is given below. Innovative definition given by Kuntaka for *sahokti* with illustration is given below.

Bhāmaha in his *Kāvyaṅkāra* gave the definition of *sahokti* as:-

*tulyakālam kriye yatra vastudvayasamāśraye/
padenaikena kathyete sahoktiḥ sā matā yathā*²⁰

“Where simultaneously, two actions are attributed to two objects by a same using a single expression then we have the *alañkāra sahokti*.”²¹

The example cited for this by Bhāmaha is mentioned below.

*himapātāviladiśo gāḍhāliṅganahetavaḥ/
vṛddhimāyānti yāminyaḥ kāmīnāṃ prītibhiḥ saha*²²

“The night that obscures the quarters by snowfall and makes one long for close embraces lengthens just like the amours of lovers.”

According to Kuntaka the figure of speech used in this verse is *upamā* because here the similarity between the night and the amours of lovers are delighting the readers. If there is no such similarity, the plain words like ‘the teacher reads with the student’ and ‘the father stands with his son’ etc. will also be considered as *sahokti* even when they do not have any charm at all. So refuting the definition given by Bhāmaha, Kuntaka propounded a new one which is as follows:-

*yatraikenaiva vākyena varṇanīyārthasiddhaye
uktiryugapadarthānām sā sahoktiḥ satām matā*²³

According to Kuntaka, two meanings expressed at the same time by a single sentence to enrich the beauty of the described subject is *sahokti* and one of the examples for it is given below.

*he hasta dakṣiṇa mṛtasya śiśordvijasya
jīvātave viṣṛja śūdramunau kṛpāṇam/
rāmasya pāṇirasi nirbharagarbhakhinna-
devīvivāsanapaṭoḥ karuṇā kutaste//²⁴*

For explaining *sahokti*, Kuntaka quotes a beautiful verse from *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti, here the poet has incorporated two meanings simultaneously in a same sentence very brilliantly. The first idea conveyed here is, it is the hand of Rāma who very cruelly banished his pregnant wife without any mercy. So it is proper for Rāma to be merciless once again to kill the *śūdra* sage, though it is undeserving, in order to protect the dead child of a Brāhmin. The second idea of this verse is, if the hand of Rāma is reluctant to kill the *śūdra* sage thinking that he himself is kind and generous, it will never be acceptable because it is the hand of such Rāma who has already proven his cruelty by banishing his innocent wife at the time of her advanced pregnancy. So the killing of the sage is an easier thing for Rāma and it will also never depreciate his quality. Here in both the meanings, the word Rāma possesses an unexplainable *rūḍhivaicitryavakratā* by enriching the sentiment of love-in-separation.

1.3.4. Kuntaka's views on *Rasa*

Kuntaka includes *rasa* in some varieties of *vakratas* like *vākya*, *prabandha* and *prakaraṇavakratā*. The keen evaluation of the examples cited for the contextual and compositional figurativeness will make it clear that Kuntaka gives importance to the sentiments like *karuṇa*, *vipralambha* etc. According to Kuntaka, *rasa* is always an *alaṅkārya* and not an *alaṅkāra* and he criticizes Ānandavardhana, who gave a

subordinate position to *rasa* in his *rasavadalaṅkāra*. This stand taken by Ānandavardhana seems to contradict his own views on *rasa* where he gives prominence to *rasadhvani* and considers it as the soul of poetry. But it is doubtless that Kuntaka always considered *rasa* to be the most important element in poetry. This is clear from a statement that he had used in connection with *prakaraṇavakratā*, which is as follows:-

*nirantararasodgāragarbhāsandharbhanirbharāḥ/
giraḥ kavīnām jīvanti na kathāmātramāśritāḥ*//²⁵

Here Kuntaka says that the words of poets live not merely depending on the story but also on the continuous flow of *rasa*.

In the third *unmeṣa*, Kuntaka maintains that *rasavat* is not an *alaṅkāra* but an *alaṅkārya*. If the sentiment erotic is considered as an *alaṅkārya*, there should be something as *alaṅkāra* and vice versa, but it is difficult to make such a distinction. In all other figures there is a clear distinction between *alaṅkāra* and *alaṅkārya*, but it is impossible in the case of *rasavat*. So *rasa* can never be considered as an *alaṅkāra*. Though there are no direct references to the nature of *rasa* and the process of *rasāsvāda* in *Vakroktijīvita*, Kuntaka employs the concept of *rasa* in his analysis of verses taken as examples of *vakratā*. Kuntaka is seen to provide a prominent place to *rasa* in his analysis of poetic charm.

1.3.5. Kuntaka's concept of *sahṛdaya*

In the end of the second chapter, Kuntaka has very beautifully depicted the importance of *sahṛdaya*. It is doubtless that everyone cannot enjoy the charm of poetry, only those who have some aesthetic sense in them can enjoy it and they are known as *sahṛdayas*. It is also familiar

that the main aim of poetics is *sahṛdayahṛdayāhlāda*. The verse of Kuntaka is as follows:-

*vāgvalyāḥ padapallavāspadadayā yā vakrodbhāsinī
vicchittiḥ sarasatvasambaducitā kāpyujvalā jṛmbhate/
tāmālocya vidagdaṣaṭpadagaṇair vākyaprasūnāśrayam
sphārāmodamanoharam madhu navotkaṇṭhākulam pīyatām//²⁶*

“Poetic speech is a veritable creeper, with words as leaves, forming the bases for (symmetrical) beauty striking with artistic turn adding to the wealth of feelings and sentiments in a most striking manner. May the bee-like connoisseurs appreciate it and collect the profusely fragrant and sweet honey, from the sentence-blossoms, and enjoy it with ever-increasing zest.”²⁷

Here Kuntaka compares the poetic speech with a creeper and he says that by only seeing the tender leaves of that creeper, the bees become happy at the thought of the future flowering of this creeper and the sweet honey it would produce. Similarly the connoisseur should have the tendency to find out the artistic turn of speech or *vakratā* in the whole sentence by only knowing the artistic beauty of a word.

1.3.6. Styles or *Mārgas*

Kuntaka also discussed about *mārgas* or styles by giving numerous examples. The word *rīti* is used by Vāmana in his *Kāvyaḷaṅkārasūtravṛtti* instead of the word *mārga* for denoting style. According to Vāmana, unique composition of words is *rīti* and is divided in to three as *vaidarbhī*, *gaudīyā* and *pāñcālī*.

viśiṣṭā padaracanā rītiḥ /²⁸

sā tredhā vaidarbhī, gaudīyā, pāñcālīceti /²⁹

These divisions are given according to the places named Vidarba, Gauḍa, and Pāñcāla respectively. *Vaidarbhī* and *gauḍī* are the two styles accepted by Daṇḍin in his *Kāvyaḍarśa*. Both Vāmana and Daṇḍin also compare *vaidarbhī* as best, *pāñcālī* and *gauḍīyā* as inferior. Kuntaka objects these divisions because there must be endless styles depending on the endless places of this world. He also suggests that it is not proper to categorize the *mārgas* as good, mediocre and bad as each style has its own charm. There is no need to accept such compositions as poetry which has a little or no beauty at all. After refuting the divisions of styles made by early rhetoricians Kuntaka establishes his own method.

santi tatra trayo mārgāḥ kaviprasthānahetavaḥ /

sukumāro vicitrāśca madhyamaścobayātmakaḥ /³⁰

According to him there are three poetic styles, they are *sukumāra* (tender), *vicitrā* (variegated), and *madhyamā* (intermediary). Kuntaka opines that the poetic style is based on the nature of the poet and not on the places of the poet as opined by the early rhetoricians. The tender style is that which the master poet like Kālidāsa followed. Kuntaka compares the poets who move through the elegant or tender style as the bees moving through the forest full of blossomed flowers. He includes the poet Sarvasena and Kālidāsa also as the follower of the tender style.

Kuntaka says that the variegated style is the most difficult style and only some scholarly poets have been able to walk through it. Creation of poetry following this style is equal to the movements of

warriors through the sharp edges of weapons. Here the unsatisfied poets add figures one after another for revealing their genius. The followers of it mentioned by Kuntaka are Bāṇabhaṭṭa, Bhavabhūti and Rājaśekhara. These poets who come under the category of intermediary style are those who would like to create poetry following both the elegant and brilliant styles. Kuntaka does not give a detailed description and the followers of this styles are Māṭṛgupta, Māyurāja, Mañjīra. It is interesting to note that here we cannot find the categorization as good, mediocre and bad but the three styles mentioned by Kuntaka have their own unique beauty.

1.3.7. Qualities or *Guṇas*

Kuntaka tries to connect some poetic qualities like *mādhurya* (sweetness), *prasāda* (perspicuity), *lāvaṇya* (grace), and *ābhijātya* (nobility) to the styles, but the nature of the four *guṇas* differs from style to style. The use of uncompounded simple and pleasant words is the specialty of sweetness of the tender style. Here perspicuity signifies the clarity of meaning and the beautiful arrangements of poetic composition is grace. The use of beautiful and pleasant words is the specialty of nobility. In variegated style, the absence of loose composition i.e. *śaidilyābhāva* is the nature of sweetness and the avoidance of compound words with a touch of *ojas* is *prasāda* (perspicuity). The skillful use of letters in a striking manner and the avoidance of too hard and too soft letters in a composition are the specialty of the qualities respectively of grace and nobility of variegated style. This is given in a tabular form as follows:-

Styles	Qualities			
	<i>mādhurya</i> (sweetness)	<i>prasāda</i> (perspicuity)	<i>lāvaṇya</i> (grace)	<i>ābhijātya</i> (nobility)
<i>sukumāra</i> (tender)	Uncompounded simple and pleasant words	Clarity of meaning	Beautiful arrangements of poetic composition	Use of beautiful and pleasant words
<i>vicitrā</i> (variegated)	Absence of loose composition i.e. <i>śaidilyābhāva</i>	Avoidance of compound words with a touch of <i>ojas</i>	Skillful use of letters in a striking manner	Avoidance of too hard and too soft letters in a composition
<i>madhyamā</i> (intermediary)	Beautiful combination of the qualities of both the styles			

The beautiful combination of the qualities of both the styles is the specialty of the intermediary style. Kuntaka thus elaborates the qualities that each style possesses. But this elaboration seems to create certain difficulties. The narrow distinction between the qualities at times seems blurred to the readers.

Aucitya (propriety) and *saubhāgya* (spendour) are two general poetic qualities propounded by Kuntaka as his own, which are common to the three styles. *Aucitya* (propriety) is the expression of inherent nature of things and in *saubhāgya* (spendour) the poetic imagination plays an important role.

Styles	Qualities	
	<i>aucitya</i> (propriety)	<i>saubhāgya</i> (spendour)
<i>sukumāra</i> (tender)	Propriety is the expression of inherent nature of things	The poetic imagination plays an important role in spendour
<i>vicitrā</i> (variegated)		
<i>madhyamā</i> (intermediary)		

Kuntaka never merely follows the methods used by his ancestors. He always analyze them minutely and sometimes suggests possible modifications if essential. Otherwise he propounds his own new ideas. These things make Kuntaka an outstanding one among Sanskrit rhetoricians. His unique contributions of qualities and figure of speeches are really praiseworthy.

1.3.8. Six divisions of *Vakratā*

In the first *unmeṣa*, Kuntaka has given a brief description of six *vakratās* like 1. Phonetic figurativeness (*Varṇavinyāsavakratā*) 2. Lexical figurativeness (*Padapūrvārdhavakratā*) 3. Grammatical figurativeness (*Pratyayavakratā*) 4. Sentential figurativeness (*Vākyavakratā*) 5. Contextual figurativeness (*Prakaraṇavakratā*) 6. Compositional figurativeness (*Prabandhavakratā*) and has given a detailed description in the following chapters. This division of Kuntaka is really a gradual progress from simple to complex that is from phoneme to a complete text itself. The first one starts with the use of phonemes, the smallest unit

of language and the group of phonemes makes the second variety. In the third variety the words comprises some grammatical influences and in the fourth *vakratā* the combination of words make a sentence. The fifth division named contextual figurativeness is a combination of sentence and in the last variety the groups of context make a composition i.e. *prabandha*.

1.3.8.1. Phonetic figurativeness or *varṇvinyāsavakratā*

The second chapter starts with the detailed description of phonetic figurativeness. Different types of arrangements or repetitions of consonants in a particular method create this *vakratā*. Kuntaka mentions several types of phonetic figurativeness. One is based on the repetition of one, two or more syllables at short intervals. Other varieties are repetition of conjunctions with nasals, repetition of the words like ‘t’, ‘l’, ‘n’, and also the repetition of consonants with the sound ‘r’. One example to showing the repetition of one, two or more syllables as follows:-

*bhagnailāvallarīkāstaraḷitakataḷīstambatāmbūlajambū-
jambīrāstālatālīsaralataralatā lāsikā yasya jahruḥ /
olahelāviśakalanajaḍāḥ kuḷakaccheṣu sindhoḥ
senāsīmantinīnāmanavarataratābhyāsātāntīm samīrāḥ //³¹*

Here the consonant ‘l’ in the first and third line and ‘s’ in the fourth line and also the syllables ‘*tāla-tālī*’ in the second line, ‘*rata-rata*’ in the fourth line, ‘*tamba-tāmba*’, ‘*jamba-jamba*’ in the first and second line, ‘*ralata-ralata*’ in the second line show the repetition of one, two or more syllables respectively.

1.3.8.2. Lexical figurativeness or *padapūrvārdhavakratā*

The second chapter also contains the detailed description of next two *vakratās* like lexical figurativeness and grammatical figurativeness. Lexical figurativeness makes *vakratā* using the root *subantaḥ* or nouns and *tiñantaḥ* or verbs. It is divided into nine types as conventional word (*rūḍhi*). It is equal to the *arthāntarasaṅkramitavācyadhvani* of Ānandavardhana. Other varieties of lexical figurativeness are figurativeness related to synonym (*pariyāya*), metaphorical figurativeness (*upacāra*), attributive words (*viśeṣaṇa*), figurativeness of concealment (*samvṛti*), figurativeness related to expressive techniques (*vṛtti*), figurativeness related to root or verb (*bhāva*), figurativeness related to gender (*liṅga*), and figurativeness related to verb (*kriyā*).

An example for *rūḍhivaicitryavakratā* is:-

*tadā jāyante guṇā yadā te sahrdayairgrhyante/
ravikiraṇānugrhitāni bhavanti kamalāni kamalāni//³²*

The second line says that the lotuses become lotuses only when it is blessed by the rays of sun. According to Ānandavardhana there is *arthāntarasaṅkramitavācyadhvani* in the second word *kamala*, but according to Kuntaka the beauty of the second word *kamala* is due to *rūḍhivaicitryavakratā*. This is one of the varieties of *rūḍhivaicitryavakratā*. Through this Kuntaka suggests the unimaginable or an extraordinary quality to the second word *kamala*.

The *pariyāyavakratā* is of different kinds namely selection of the most suitable synonym in a particular context, and the selection of a synonym which give extreme delights to a particular context because of

its inherent beauty. An example for showing the most suitable word for a context is as follows:-

*nābhiyoktumanṛtam tvamiṣyase kastapasviviśikheṣu cādarah /
santi bhūbhṛti hi na śarāḥ pare ye parākramavasūni vajriṇaḥ //*³³

“I would not like to fight with you for nothing. And what regard do the arrows of hermits deserve? I have other arrows of mine in my mountain store and they from the wealth of the thunder-weilding god’s prowess.”³⁴

This is a verse from *Kirātārjunīya* of Bhāravi and is a conversation between the hunter and Arjuna, who disguised as an ascetic. They argue for the ownership of the arrow that killed a pig. Here though having thousands of words to denote the word Indra, Bhāravi uses the word *Vajrin* to increase the charm through *pariyāvākratā*. Here the hunter refers to Indra as the Lord of celestial who always keeps *vajrāyudha* with himself. His particular skill or expertise in using the arrows shows the extraordinary strength of arrows than *vajrāyudha*. Moreover the word ascetic is also beautiful, which also makes it obvious that everyone had respect towards the arrows of great warriors but none had any respect for the arrows of an ascetic.

In *upacāravakratā*, the poets superimpose the qualities of extremely different objects like concreteness and abstractness, liquidity and solidity, sentient and non-sentient etc. Superimposition of animate objects to inanimate objects is almost equal to the Ānandhavardhana’s *atyantatiraskṛtavācyā*, the division of *avivakṣitavācyadhvani*. One of the examples to show the *upacāravakratā* of Kuntaka is as follows:-

*gacchantīnām ramaṇavasatim yoṣitām tatra naktam
 ruddhāloke narapatipathe sūcibhedhyaistamobhiḥ/
 saudāminyā kanakanikaṣasnigdayā darśayorvīm
 toyotsarggastanitamukharo māsmabhūrvikḷavāstāḥ//³⁵*

“There, when the sight will be obstructed by pitchy darkness on the high road, show the ground (path) by flashes of lightning charming like a streak of gold on a touch-stone, to the women going at night to the dwelling of their lovers; water but don’t you be resounding with thunder and the downpour for they are timid.”³⁶

In this verse the word *sūcibhedhyaistamobhiḥ*, which means the darkness that can be pierced with a needle, is really a beautiful expression used by Kālidāsa in his *Meghadūta*. Kuntaka cites this as an example of *upacāravakratā*, because through this the poet attributes the concrete nature to abstract darkness. According to Kuntaka proper uses of such *vakratās* always reveals the genius of poets and are plenty in the works of all great poets.

Beauty is added to a noun or a verb in a sentence through the epithets given to them is known as *viśeṣanavakratā*, for eg:-

*śuciśītāḷacandrikāplutāściraniḥśabdamanoharā diśaḥ/
 praśamasya manobhavasya vā hr̥di kasyāpyatha hetutām yayuḥ//³⁷*

It means that the quarters of the sky is flooded in the bright and cool sunlight and is also beautiful for its long silence; such quarters create either quietude or love in everyone’s mind. This is an example of the epithet given to a noun, here the epithet given to the quarters really gives pleasure to the mind of all *sahr̥daya*’s.

The concealment of the matters through pronouns or so forth in order to create *vaicitrya* or an extraordinary charm to a sentence is known as *samvṛtivakratā*, for e.g:-

*tathā ruditam kṛṣṇa viśākhayā rodhagadgadagirā/
yathā kasyāpi janmaśate 'pi ko 'pi mā vallabho bhavatu*³⁸

This verse shows the depth of the pathos of Rādhā after the separation of Kṛṣṇa. Here Rādhā weeps so intensely that it makes everyone to think that nobody may become the beloved of anyone even once in a hundred births. In the first line of this verse, the reason of the sorrow of Rādhā is concealed through the word '*tathā*' and later in the second line the poet makes it clear. This adds an unexplainable beauty to this verse.

The beauty of *vṛtti* where the adverbial compound or *avyayībhāva* *samasas* like *kṛt*, *taddhita* etc. shines forth is known as *vṛttivaicitrya vakratā*. For e.g:- '*madhye'ṅkuram pallavāḥ*'.³⁹ Here the word *aṅkuramadyam* is normally used, but Kuntaka has uses *madhye'ṅkuram* as *avyayībhāva* for getting extra charm in the sentence. According to *pāṇinīya sūtra* '*pāre madhye ṣaṣṭhyā vā*' (2.1.18) '*pāramadhyāśabdaṣṣṭhyantena saha vā samasyete*', '*pāre madhye iti na saptamyantayorgrahaṇam*'. Here the word '*vā*' denotes the *ṣaṣṭhītatpuruṣaḥ*.

Kuntaka quotes another example of this is '*pāṇḍimni magnam vapuḥ*'⁴⁰, here Kuntaka uses the *taddhita* '*pāṇḍimni*' for getting extreme charm to the context. According to the *Pāṇinīya sūtra* '*varṇadṛḍhādibhyaḥ shyañca*' (5.1.123) '*ṣaṣṭhyantebhyo varṇavājibhyo*

ḍḍhādibhyaśca bhāve shyañca syādityarthaḥ’ eg:-śauklyam, śuklimā and *dārḍyam, draḍhimā*. Here the sutra named ‘*ḥḥvādibhyaḥ imanjivā*’ (5.1.122) is also used, ‘*ḥḥvādibhyaḥ ṣaṣṭhyantebhyaḥ bhāve imanjivā syādityarthaḥ*’.

Another variety of *padapūrvārdhavakratā* is *liṅgavaicitryavakratā* or specialty in gender. Here the poet uses two different genders to denote a single idea in order to make the sentence more attractive for e.g.:- ‘*maithilī tasya dārāḥ*’⁴¹, Here the word *maithilī* is in feminine gender and is singular also, but the word *dārāḥ* is in masculine gender and in plural. Another example of this is ‘*etām paśya purastaḥīm*’⁴², the word *taḥī* can be used in the three genders as *taḥaḥ, taḥam* and *taḥī*, but the poet deliberately uses the feminine gender in order to enhance the beauty of the sentence. According to the poets, the feminine name itself is beautiful.

*sati liṅgāntare yatra strīliṅgam ca prayujyate/
śobhāniṣpattaye yasmānnāmaiva strīti peśalam*/⁴³

“Even when other genders could be used, if the feminine is preferred, it contributes to beauty; since even the name of a woman is pleasing.”⁴⁴

From the keen evaluation of these *vakratas* it will be clear that Kuntaka is well versed in grammar also. Moreover the next and the third *vakratā* named *pratyayavakratā* as the name itself suggests the power of the grammatical specialties to express beautiful meanings. Kuntaka clearly demonstrates how various grammatical aspects are incorporated in the *kāvya*s to produce charm and special meanings. It is doubtless that

in his *Vakroktijīvita* the grammatical peculiarities and poetic charm seem to lie entangled with each other.

Other two varieties of *padapūrvārdhavakratā* are *bhāva* and *kriyā*. In *bhāvavakratā*, a process yet to be accomplished is described as it is already accomplished for getting an extreme charm to that particular verse. As the name itself indicates, *kriyāvakratā* means creating *vaicitrya* of verbs through the particular use of subject, epithet, object etc. It is of five different types, one example of this is as follows:-

krīḍārasena rahasi smitapūrvamindorlehkām
vikṛṣya vinibadhya ca mūrdhni gauryāḥ/
kimśobhitāhamanayeti pinākapāṇeh
prṣṭasya pātu paricumbanamuttaram vah//⁴⁵

“Pulling out in a sportive mood the crescent of the moon-crested Śiva, Gaurī smiled and said, am I beautified by this, my dear? Śiva covered her with kisses in reply. May this scene protect us.”⁴⁶

The kiss of Śiva may protect everyone, which was given as an answer to the question of Pārvatī whether the crescent was beautiful for her. Here if Śiva says yes or something else as an answer to her question, there would not be any charm in this verse. Here the verb kiss of the subject Śiva adds an extreme beauty to this particular verse. Śiva did so because there is no word capable to explain the beauty of Pārvatī instead of a kiss.

1.3.8.3. Grammatical figurativeness or *pratyayavakratā*

Grammatical figurativeness creates *vakratā* through the peculiar

use of affixes, which are mainly divided into six varieties as tense (*kāla*), case (*kāraka*), number (*saṅkhyā*), person (*puruṣa*), voice (*upagraha*) and *pratyaya*.

In the *vakratā* where time has got its extreme beauty because of the utmost presence of propriety is known as *kālavakratā*. For example:-

*samaviṣamanirviśeṣā samantato mandamandasanjārāḥ/
acirādbhaviṣyanti panthāno manorathānāmapi durlaṅghyāḥ//^{A7}*

Here a young separated lover, who is already tormented by the pangs of separation, thinks about the depth of the pangs of separation in the upcoming rainy season. Here the lover is anxious about his future and the word *bhaviṣyanti* denoting the future tense creates a special charm, which is known as *kālavaicitryavakratā*.

Interchange of *kārakas* based on their importance and unimportance is known as *kārakavakratā*. An example for this is a last line from one of the verse of *Mahānāṭaka*, which is as follows:-

*yācñām dainyaparigrahapraṇayinīm nekṣvākavaḥ śikṣitāḥ
sevāsamvalitaḥ kadā raghukule maulau nibaddho'ñjaliḥ /
sarvam tadvihitaḥ tadāpyudadhinā naivoparodhaḥ kṛtaḥ
pāṇiḥ samprati me haṭhāt kimaparaḥ spraṣṭuḥ dhanurdhāvati//^{A8}*

“The Ikṣvākus have never been trained in anything like beggary which delights in humiliating oneself. Has anyone ever known an instance of scion of Raghus raising his folded hands in abject supplication? Yet all this has been done (by me i.e Rāma). But the ocean

shows no consideration at all. There is no other go left now. Hence my hand rushes all of a sudden to wield the bow.”⁴⁹

Here instead of saying that he would like to take the arrows with his hands, the poet says that his hand rushes to wield the bow. Here the poet considers the subject as hand which creates a special charm to this particular context.

When the poet deliberately interchanges the numbers for creating *vaicitrya* is known as *sañkhyāvakratā*. Here the poet uses singular or dual number in the place, where actually other number is essential. He may use two different numbers in a same sentence for creating this type of *vakratā*. As an example to this, Kuntaka quotes the last line from one of the famous verses from *Abhijñānaśākuntala* of Kālidāsa, which is:-

*vayam tattvānveṣānmadhukara hatāstvam khalu kṛtī*⁵⁰

Here the poet uses the word *vayam* instead of saying *aham*, which means the poet use plural ‘we’ instead of the singular ‘I’ for indicating that Duṣyanta is really a stranger to Śakuntalā and also shows that there is no deep relation between them at that moment.

In certain situations the poet deliberately uses the third person in the place of first and second person for attaining extra charm to the particular context is known as oblique beauty of person or *puruṣavakratā*. Moreover the use of noun in the place of pronoun is also a division of this *vakratā*. Kuntaka quotes a verse from *Tāpasavatsarāja* as an example to oblique beauty of person. Here for the sake of the Kingdom, king Udayana was forced to marry Padmāvati but the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa feels it difficult to convey this directly to the queen

Vāsavadattā, then he says that ‘*jānātu devī svayam*’.⁵¹ Here instead of saying ‘you’ the *madhyamapuruṣa sarvanāma* the poet used *prathamapuruṣa* for enhancing the poetic charm.

Sometimes in particular situations when both the *ātmanepada* and *parasmaipada* affixes are suitable, the poet chooses the most suitable one among them for creating an extraordinary aesthetic delight and it is known as *upagrahavakratā*. For eg:-

*tasyāpareṣvapi mṛgeṣu śarān mumukṣoḥ
karṇāntametya bibhīde nibiḍo’pimuṣṭiḥ/
trāsātimātracaṭulaiḥ smarayatsunetraiḥ
prauḍhapriyānayanavibhramaceṣṭitāni//*⁵²

“About to discharge arrows on the other deer also as he was, the tightened grip of his fist (on the bowstring) beside the ear loosened of its own accord. For, then their eyes exceedingly tremulous in fright reminded him of the sweet glances of his beloved expert in love”⁵³

Here the poet intent to say that the king Daśaratha withdraws his arrows from some deer’s in the forest because their eyes resemble the eyes of his beloved. But instead of saying in such a manner the brilliant poet says that seeing such resemblance the bowstring of Daśaratha loosened itself without taking any deliberate attempt from him. For denoting *ātmanepada* the poet used the word ‘*bibhīde*’ in the verse mentioned above.

Where a new suffix is added to a usual suffix to create striking beauty is known as *pratyayavakratā*. For eg:-

*līnam vastuni yena sūkṣmasubagam tattvam girā kṛṣyate
nirmātum prabavenmanoharamidam vācaiva yo vā bahiḥ/
vande dvāvapi tāvaham kavivarau vandetarām tam punar-
yo vijñātapariśramo ’yamanayorbhārāvatārakṣamaḥ//⁵⁴*

This is an unknown verse from an unknown poet. Here the poet says that:-

“Worthy is the poet who can draw the subtle essence of beauty hidden in nature. Worthy is the master of speech who can create things of beauty by his own words. Both are poets great and he salutes them indeed. But his best salutation goes to a third one who can know their labour and relieve them of their burden.”⁵⁵

For showing the extreme salutation to the poet, the author of this verse used the word *vandetarām*, which create a striking beauty to this context.

These are some important varieties of *pratyayavakratā*. Kuntaka also says that *padavakratā* is an another variety of *pratyayavakratā*, here the *upasargas* (prepositions) and *nipātas* (indeclinables) suggest that *rasas* are the one and only essence of a sentence or a poem

1.3.8.4. Sentential figurativeness or *vākyavakratā*

The third chapter is a detailed description of sentential figurativeness and he included all figurativeness in this section. Kuntaka says about it as:-

*vākyasya vakrabhāvo'nyo bhidyate yaḥ sahasradhā/
yatrālaṅkāravargo'sau sarvopyantarbhaviṣyati//*⁵⁶

Krishnamoorthy translated it as 'art in a whole sentence admits of a thousand varieties. In it is included the whole lot of figure of speech'.⁵⁷

According to Kuntaka, sentential figurativeness is a unique skill of a poet like an overall beauty of a painting, which is distinct or unique from its constituent elements like canvas, lines, paints etc. Likewise the beauty of a sentence is distinct from its constituent elements like words, meaning etc. and which will only delight the connoisseurs. He also says that the poets never create anything which is non-existent in the world. They just give an extraordinary charm by their poetic excellence to the already existing objects. Then thereafter these things begin to appear as if they are entirely innovative and which make one to think that it is actually invented right now for the first time. Thus the poets reign as the creators in the poetic world. This idea is reflected in a verse from *Dhvanyāloka*:-

*apāre kāvyasamsāre kavireva prajāpatiḥ/
yathāsmāi rocate viśvam tathedam parivartate//*⁵⁸

Which means the poet is the only creator in the endless poetical world because all things in the world revolve according to his wish.

1.3.8.5. Contextual figurativeness or *prakaraṇavakratā*

Changes in particular context for making the situation more attractive comes under contextual figurativeness. In the first variety of contextual figurativeness, Kuntaka shows the technique used by poets to depict the energetic performance of some characters without revealing

their importance and specialty until the middle of a work. Here the poet tries to keep the suspense for a long time and reveals it only at the proper time. Such suspense helps to create some curiosity in the mind of readers also. Moreover breaking of the suspense at the proper time by explaining the unbelievable generosity or some other good qualities of an ideal character will definitely delight the readers.

One of the examples cited by Kuntaka for this figurativeness is from the fifth canto of *Raghuvamśa* wherein the conversation between Kautsa and Raghu is taking place after the *viśvajit* sacrifice conducted by Raghu. In this sacrifice, Raghu offers all his possessions without leaving even a bit and at that time Kautsa, the disciple of Varatantu, approaches him to ask fourteen thousand crores of gold coins as a present to his teacher. Kautsa starts to return from Raghu after understanding his pathetic situation but Raghu stops him and advises him to live in the fire house for two or three days till he could give the money to Kautsa. He does not reveal his aim that he should earn sufficient money from fighting Kubera, the god of wealth. But Kubera himself showered boundless wealth from heaven to Raghu before the fight and Raghu offered all of this to Kautsa.

Here Kālidāsa brilliantly depicts the generosity of Raghu in its maximum extent because here Raghu compelled Kautsa to convey his need though he had nothing in his hand and then he also offered to Kautsa all the wealth that he obtained from Kubera without keeping anything for himself. Moreover nobility of Kautsa is also appreciable because he hesitates to accept more than what is essential to give to his teacher. Until this canto, Kālidāsa depicted Raghu as a normal ideal hero

explaining some of his energetic activities and then in the fifth canto Kālidāsa unexpectedly depicts the generosity of Raghu and also of Kautsa in an extreme beautiful manner to please the readers.

There are two divisions in the second variety. First one is the addition of an innovative concept in the new plot apart from its original source. Kuntaka cites *Abhijñānaśākuntala* as an example to this. It is well known that this is a plot taken from the well-known source *Mahābhārata*, but in *Mahābhārata* there is no any explanation for the forgetfulness of Duṣyanta towards Śakuntalā. For avoiding such impropriety and making this drama more interesting Kālidāsa add the innovative concept of the curse of sage Durvāsa as the reason of the forgetfulness of Duṣyanta and this really contribute perfection to this drama instead from the impropriety find in *Mahābhārata*. Here at the time of the arrival of sage Durvāsa to the hermitage of Śakuntalā, she did not give due respect to him because she was lost in thought of her beloved Duṣyanta and was unaware about the arrival of the sage. Being humiliated by this Durvāsa cursed Śakuntalā that the person would never remember her though being reminded. After the request of her companions Durvāsa gave a boon that the person will remember her only after seeing something like a souvenir. Unfortunately Śakuntalā lost her ring on the way back to Duṣyanta's plea. Later he gets that ring from a fisherman. Thereafter Duṣyanta starts to remember all the previous things and feels very miserable. He then gives up all the pleasures of the palace life and spends his time by looking at the portrait of Śakuntalā drawn by him. Undoubtedly this innovative concept made *Śākuntala* the best one among the Sanskrit plays.

In the second division of this second *vakratā* the poet makes some developments in the new plot from its original source. For example in *Rāmāyaṇa*, Rāma went to catch the golden deer and then Lakṣmaṇa goes to help him by the compulsion of Sītā. But according to the author of *Udāttarāghava*, it is not proper for Rāma to chase the golden deer when his younger brother Lakṣmaṇa was with him. Moreover it is also not proper that Lakṣmaṇa goes to help his elder brother Rāma when he hears Rāma's cry. For avoiding such impropriety the author of *Udāttarāghava* changed the context and here first of all Lakṣmaṇa goes to catch the deer and only then Rāma went to help him by hearing the cry of Lakṣmaṇa. This is really a proper development made by the poet to make this plot attractive and also to delight the readers.

The interrelation between segments of the whole compositions is the further variety of contextual figurativeness. Here the connection between two or more incidents of various sections may lead to the intended conclusion of a poet. This is not an easy task and is possible only to a poet who has extraordinary creative genius. One example cite for this is from *Puṣpadūṣitaka*. In the second act after returning from his long journey Samudradatta eagerly goes to meet his wife Nandayantī very secretly but the watchman named Kuvalaya happens to see him. So as a bribe Samudradatta offers his ring to Kuvalaya. Then in the fourth act Kuvalaya conveys these matters to Sāgaradatta, the father-in-law of Nandayantī. Hearing this, Sāgaradatta suspects the chastity of Nandayantī. On seeing the ring he comes to know that it is none other than his son and becomes happy. Here the inter-relation between the

incidents help to prove the chastity of Nandayantī and the plot became really appealing.

Another instance of this variety is taken from a famous drama *Uttararāmacarita*. In the first act for pleasing Sītā in her advanced pregnancy, Rāma shows some portraits of their former life spend in forest. Here he explains that the victorious *jṛmbaka* missile was handed down from great sages to him and this in all means will protect Sitā's progeny. Then in the fifth act the use of Lava's *jṛmbaka* missile against the armies of Chandraketu helps him to recognize the identity of Lava.

In the next variety, Kuntaka explains the uniqueness of a brilliant poet while explaining same fact frequently. One of the examples cite for this is from *Raghuvamśa*, here the pathetic plight of Daśaratha is explained in numerous verses delineating the sentiment *karuṇa*. It is enough to say that Daśaratha killed a young ascetic, mistaking him as an elephant. Then the father of the young ascetic cursed Daśaratha that he would also die due to grief caused by the loss of his son. But such a statement will completely taint the prestige of the king of the solar dynasty and will not please the readers. For avoiding such impropriety the brilliant Kālidāsa depicts Daśaratha as a king having great compassion towards all creatures and not as a cruel hunter. He is shown to have withdrawn his arrows from the pairs of birds and animal that reminds him of his beloved many times. Having such great qualities it is unfair that Daśaratha happens to kill a young ascetic near the Tamasā River even after seeing some ascetics engaged in some religious austerities. Here avoiding the impropriety of sudden and unfair act of Daśaratha, Kālidāsa says that sometimes even great personalities,

afflicted with passion, also move towards wrong path. Another notable fact is that, no one will become happy by hearing a curse. But Daśaratha considers this curse as a blessing for him because he had been waiting for a long time to have a child. Here the poetic excellence of Kālidāsa is highly remarkable because only a master poet can depict such unfair incidents very convincingly in such a brilliant way to delight the readers.

The incidents essential for a *mahākāvya* according to the definition given by Daṇḍin are the description of mountain, ocean, raises of sun and the moon, water sport etc.⁵⁹ In the next variety of figurativeness, Kuntaka substantiates how these small incidents are helpful in the development of the main theme. As an example to this contextual figurativeness, Kuntaka cites the water sport of Kuśa from *Raghuvamśa*. Here at the end of the water sport Kuśa comes to know that he had lost his favorite armlet. A fisherman then informs him that it must be in the hand of Kumuda, the king of serpent. Kumuda with her sister Kumudvatī then appears before Kuśa fearing the arrow of Kuśa. Kumuda then presents the armlet along with her sister Kumudvatī saying that she eagerly took his armlet at the time of her ball-play. Here, before explaining the water sport, Kālidāsa describes the summer season for showing the necessity of water sport and this incident leads to the union of Kuśa and Kumudvatī. Later they are blessed with a child named Atithī, which ensure the continuity of the solar race. Here Kālidāsa has very beautifully connected each and every situation for the continuous development of the plot. It shows how the small incidents are helpful to the main theme by the gradual explanation of summer season, water sport, union of Kuśa and Kumudatī etc.

In the next variety of *prakaraṇavakratā* the poet exclusively incorporates the main sentiment of the play only in one act and the sentiment is not seen to be dominant in any other act. Kuntaka cites an example for this from *Vikramorvaśīya*. Love in separation, the dominant sentiment of the play, is very beautifully depicted in the *unmādāṅka* of *Vikramorvaśīya* more than in any other act. Being separated from Urvaśī, Purūravas is completely out of his sense and starts to behave like a mad man. On seeing the rainy cloud and rainbow Purūravas thinks that it is a demon with a bow in his hand and that the arrows of the demon will not pierce his heart so painfully as the showering of the rain. Moreover he says that the lightning of the sky can be seen for at least one minute or two, but not his beloved Urvaśī. Here the sentiment love in separation is very touchingly depicted in this act than in any other act of this play. This is really a beautiful example cited by Kuntaka for contextual figurativeness because from this it is clear that a context or an act contribute a lot to the beauty of the whole work.

In another variety of contextual figurativeness, Kuntaka explains how a small incident becomes helpful in the development of the main theme. For example in the sixth act of *Mudrārākṣasa* a person under the play of Cāṇakya, acted like committing suicide pretending as if he had not noticed the presence of Rākṣasa. On Rākṣasa's compulsion, the person mention about the reason of committing suicide. He says that as one of his friends wants to die before the execution of his friend Candanadāsa, he too would like to do the same. Though understanding the diplomacy, Rākṣasa also believed this person and decided to go to rescue the life of Candanadāsa offering his own body and this is what Cāṇakya actually expected to happen for Rākṣasa to surrender.

A play within a play which is also known as *garbhāṅka* sometimes contributes an extraordinary charm to the whole plot, which is another variety of contextual figurativeness. Here the actors also play the role of a spectator and it will really delight the readers though they have a passive role with some minute expressions. Including such a *garbhāṅka* in a drama is really a great task and only a brilliant one can depict it properly. As one of the examples to this, Kuntaka cites the *garbhāṅka*, the seventh act of the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti. Here the pathetic plight of pregnant Sītā who is left alone in the forest by Lakṣmaṇa on the advice of Rāma is very beautifully depicted as *garbhāṅka*. In the play within a play Sītā cries deeply and says that she would end her life jumping in to the river Bhāgīrathī because nobody is there to rescue her from the wild beasts. Here Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa as spectators really shed tears seeing Sītā's helpless situation and doubtlessly their artistic innovation will cause charm to the readers too.

The organic unity of junctures or *sandhis* like *mukha* and *pratimukha* etc. in a plot for the continuity of the story is the final variety of compositional figurativeness, Kuntaka reminds that there should not be a deliberate attempt to incorporate the junctures but it should be natural so as to please the readers. For example in the first act of *Puṣpadūṣitaka* the hero Samudradatta feels great grief throughout his journey because of the separation from his wife and also for not asking due farewell from her. In the second act, after returning from his journey Samudradatta approaches her wife Nandayantī very secretly by giving his ring as a bribe to the watchman. But here the author does not reveal the reason of the secret meeting of Samudradatta with his wife. In the

third act, Nandayantī is banished by Sāgaradatta, her father-in-law, suspecting her of losing her chastity. In the fourth act, by seeing the ring given to Kuvalaya by Samudradatta, Sāgaradatta comes to know that she was pregnant from his own son. Repenting the cruel banishment of his daughter-in-law at the time of her advanced pregnancy, he went forth a pilgrimage. In the fifth act Nandayantī came to know about the welfare of Samudradatta from Kuvalaya and then the proper reunion of all the characters in the sixth act results in the natural organic unity of each incidents by following the rules of junctures laid down in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

1.3.8.6. Compositional figurativeness or *prabandhavakratā*

The fourth *unmeṣa* of *Vakroktijīvita* has a detail description about contextual and compositional figurativeness. The text ends incompletely after the explanation of the different kinds of compositional figurativeness. This figurativeness is mainly divided in to seven types. Kuntaka suggests this figurativeness for beautifying the dramas, *mahakāvya*s, *ākhyāyikā*s etc.

The first variety of compositional figurativeness occurs when a poet constructs a plot of his own taken from a well-known source changing the sentiment of the new plot according to his wish. For example the dominant sentiment of *Mahābhārata* is tranquility or *śānta*. *Veṅīsamhāra* contains a plot taken by Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa from *Mahābhārata* and the playwright applied the heroic sentiment or *vīra* to this new play instead of *śānta*. Apart from *Mahābhārata*, *Veṅīsamhāra* ends with the victory of pāṇḍava's, after facing all of their difficulties.

This novel application of sentiment makes this play delightful to the readers.

In the second variety, a hero primarily achieves a single goal and then incidentally he also attains many other equally important goals. For example in *Nāgānanda*, the ideal one Jīmūtavāhana offers his own body and saves a serpent named Śaṅkhacūda from Garuḍa. Through this Jīmūtavāhana not only saves a single serpent but also the whole race of serpent. Moreover he happened to meet his parents and wife and also attains the kingship of *Vidhyādhara* kingdom.

In another type of compositional figurativeness an unimportant incident disturbs the normal flow of the main story and then gradually it reveals that which will become helpful in the completion of the main story without disturbing the *rasa* of the main plot. For example in *Śiśupālavadha*, Māgha beautifully expresses the confusing state of mind of Kṛṣṇa because it is his duty to kill Śiśupāla, who is the extreme source of evil. At the same time Kṛṣṇa was invited by Yudhiṣṭira for attending *rājasūya* sacrifice. In the beginning of this *mahākavyā* after having the perplexing state of mind, Kṛṣṇa decides to attend the *rājasūya* sacrifice of Yudhiṣṭira. Here the readers may think that the plot is deviating from its primary function that is to kill Śiśupāla. Māgha solves this dilemma by making Kṛṣṇa's decision to participate in the *rājasūya* sacrifice, wherein Śiśupāla will also be present. Such confused state of mind of Kṛṣṇa is not depicted in any source book and the ultimate success and victory of Yudhiṣṭira will undoubtedly please the spectators. Kuntaka never hesitates to appreciate the skill of Māgha because he creates such situation for making his *kāvya* more attractive.

In another variety of compositional figurativeness a poet tries to avoid all unpleasant things of original source which comes afterwards and depicts a story brilliantly by only explaining the victory and prosperity of a hero. A poet can start his work by explaining the whole story of the main source but he should conclude his work only by explaining the overall victory and prosperity of the hero, because the poetic purpose is to depict the hero as an ideal one and explains achievement in an interesting manner to delight the readers. For example, in *Kirātārjunīya*, Bhāravi brilliantly explains the victory of Arjuna against Śiva after explaining the greatness of Yudhiṣṭira avoiding all other unimportant things of *Mahābhārata* like Bhīṣma's defeat by Arjuna with Śikhaṇḍin in his front and the cutting down of Karṇa's head when he was uplifting the chariot immersed in the mud etc. Kuntaka appreciates the skill of Bhāravi because from among the numerous heroes like Kṛṣṇa, Yudhiṣṭira, Karṇa, Bhīma etc. Bhāravi takes upon Arjuna alone as the hero in his *Kirātārjunīya* and developed it in an interesting manner by avoiding all unpleasant things to avoid a negative impression about the ideal character for making the story more attractive.

Selection of the proper title of a work is also a variety of this figurativeness. Kuntaka says that a poet should never concentrate only on the themes of a work but also on the title of a work. He also says that the title should never be a mere name which directly indicates the story of a particular work like *Hayagrīvavadha*, *Śīsupālavadha*, *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*, *Rāmacarita* etc. But it should create curiosity and reflect the essence of that work. Kuntaka cites *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, *Mudrārākṣasa*, *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*, *Puṣpadūṣitaka*, *Pratimāniruddha* etc. as

examples. In these works the readers may feel that the title is not suitable to this theme until the important thread of this work which signifies the title is revealed. This really delights the spectators and they appreciate the poet because proper naming of a work itself signifies the creative talent of a poet.

In another variety, the great poets compose different literary works based on an identical theme. Each one must have distinctness from others because of their artistic skill. In Sanskrit there are numerous works written based on the epics like *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata*. As an example of the works written based on *Rāmāyaṇa* are *Udāttarāghava*, *Vīracarita*, *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, *Māyāpuṣpaka*, *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* etc. Undoubtedly all these works depict different sentiments and all the incidents described in them possess unique charm in spite of being taken from the same source. This reveals the creative genius of the authors of these works.

Kuntaka ends his text by explaining the last variety of compositional figurativeness. The great poets impart instructions in a unique style. Depiction of insoluble victory of Cāṇakya in *Mudrārākṣasa* and the new plan made by Yaugandharāyaṇa in *Tāpasavatsarāja* for preservation of their kingdom are the beautiful and apt instances taken by Kuntaka for this variety.

Kuntaka's *Vakroktijīvita* deserves a unique position in Sanskrit poetics with its originality and charming ideas. Kuntaka comes to the field of literary theory after Ānandavardhana, who is considered as a trend setter in Sanskrit poetics with his epoch making work *Dhvanyāloka*. Similarity of the division of *dhvani* like *varṇadhvani*,

padadhvani etc. with the divisions of *vakratās* like *varṇavinyāsavakratā*, *padapūrvārdhavakratā* etc. may develop a feeling that *vakrokti* is a mere repetition of *dhvani* theory of Ānandavardhana. But Kuntaka was not ready to follow his predecessors. He always stood aloof from them and established his theory of *vakrokti* in a unique manner. He is incomparable in his aesthetic sensibility. It is also interesting to note from his text *Vakroktijīvita* that Kuntaka is not only a great rhetorician but also an eminent scholar in Sanskrit literature, because he has given numerous examples from various literary works to substantiate his arguments. No other rhetorician tries to evaluate a text entirely as done by Kuntaka. One exception to this is Ānandavardhana, who tried to establish the dominant sentiment of *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* respectively as *karuṇa* and *śānta* in his text *Dhvanyāloka*. But Ānandavardhana does not try to analyse classical Sanskrit poems, dramas etc. Kuntaka is the lone literary critic, who tries to assess most of the literary genres in classical Sanskrit. He also tries to explain how an example is suitable for a particular context. The compositional figurativeness itself reveals that Kuntaka tries to evaluate the Sanskrit literary text very keenly and completely. Moreover he also suggests some possible alternation to particular contexts without considering the stature of its author. Most importantly, he never loses sight of the theoretical implications of his poetic philosophy when analyzing contemporary poetry. These things make Kuntaka unique in the history of Sanskrit poetics.

-
- ¹ P.V Kane, *History of Sanskrit poetics*, p.p.235-236.
- ² Acharya Jagannath Pathak, '*Dhvanyaloka of Sri Anandavardhanacharya*', p.499.
- ³ P.V Naganatha Sastry, *Kāvyaśaṅkārā of Bhāmaha*, p.49.
- ⁴ K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakrokti-jīvitā of Kuntaka*, p.308.
- ⁵ Dandin, *Kāyādarśam*, 2-363, p.88.
- ⁶ Shri Hargovinda Shastri, *Kāvyaśaṅkārāsūtra of Ācārya Vāmana*, p.172.
- ⁷ Bechana Jhā., *Kāvyaśaṅkārāsūtra of Ācārya Vāmana*, p.164.
- ⁸ V. Ragavan, '*Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*', p.117.
- ⁹ Kameshwar Nath Misra, '*Saraswatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa of Bhoja*', p.335.
- ¹⁰ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit,p.20.
- ¹¹ P.V Kane, '*History of Sanskrit poetics*', p.225.
- ¹² K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit,p.3, In all the chapters metrical verses and their translations and also most of the illustrative verses are taken from K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakrokti-jīvitā of Kuntaka*.
- ¹³ ibid,p.289.
- ¹⁴ ibid,p.4.
- ¹⁵ ibid,p.290.
- ¹⁶ ibid,p.5.
- ¹⁷ ibid,p.291.
- ¹⁸ ibid,p.6.
- ¹⁹ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit,p.292.
- ²⁰ P.V Naganatha Sastry, op.cit, p.67.
- ²¹ idem.
- ²² idem.
- ²³ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit,p.227.
- ²⁴ idem.
- ²⁵ ibid,p.252.
- ²⁶ ibid,p.123.
- ²⁷ ibid,p.409.
- ²⁸ Shri Haragovinda Shastri, '*Kāvyaśaṅkārāsūtra of Ācārya Vāmana*' p.15.
- ²⁹ ibid,p.16.
- ³⁰ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit, p.40.
- ³¹ ibid,p.75
- ³² ibid,p.83.

-
- ³³ *ibid*,p.86.
- ³⁴ *ibid*,p.374.
- ³⁵ *ibid*,p.94.
- ³⁶ M.R.Kale, *The Meghadūta of Kālidāsa*,p.71
- ³⁷ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.97.
- ³⁸ *ibid*,p.100.
- ³⁹ *ibid*,p.31.
- ⁴⁰ *idem*.
- ⁴¹ *idem*.
- ⁴² *ibid*,p.32.
- ⁴³ *ibid*,p.106.
- ⁴⁴ *ibid*,p.392.
- ⁴⁵ *ibid*,p.48.
- ⁴⁶ *ibid*,p.334.
- ⁴⁷ *ibid*,p.308.
- ⁴⁸ *ibid*,p.116.
- ⁴⁹ *ibid*,pp.401-402.
- ⁵⁰ *ibid*,p.315.
- ⁵¹ *ibid*,p.317.
- ⁵² *ibid*,p.319.
- ⁵³ *ibid*,p.405.
- ⁵⁴ *ibid*,p.120.
- ⁵⁵ *ibid*,p.406.
- ⁵⁶ *ibid*,p.35.
- ⁵⁷ *ibid*,p.321.
- ⁵⁸ *ibid*,p.130.
- ⁵⁹ *sargabandho mahākāvyaṃ ucyate tasya lakṣaṇam etc.*
Dandīn, *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1-14,p.20.

CHAPTER 2

KUNTAKA'S APPRAISAL OF KĀLIDĀSA

Kālidāsa has a special place in Kuntaka's world of literature. Kuntaka has selected the maximum number of verses from Kālidāsa. Kuntaka objectively analyses the verses and works of Kālidāsa. Kuntaka's genius as a literary critic is clearly revealed in his analysis of Kālidāsa. Thus it is very essential to look into Kuntaka's observations on Kālidāsa to assess his critical acumen.

2.1. Kālidāsa in Kuntaka's treatment

Kālidāsa occupies a unique place in the history of Sanskrit and world literature. He has won world wide fame as a poet and a playwright. There is no trustworthy information about the personal history of this eminent scholar. However large number of works are ascribed to him, depending on his ideas and style of writings, the works ascribed to him by some modern scholars are two *mahākāvyas* like *Raghuvamśa*, *Kumārasambhava*, two *khaṇḍakāvya*s like *Meghadūta*, *Ṛtusamhāra* and three dramas like *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, *Vikramorvaśīya* and *Mālavikāgnimitra*. Kālidāsa's compositions reveal his all-round proficiency in the field of knowledge like *Purāṇas*, Epics, Prosody, *Arthaśāstra*, Grammar, Medicine etc. Like the poems of Wordsworth, the compositions of Kālidāsa also have intense relation between man and nature. Another specialty of Kālidāsa is that he presents familiar stories with his own innovations. For instance in *Raghuvamśa*, besides describing the tale of Rāma, the poet has given detailed description of

kings like Dilīpa, Raghu, Aja etc. Vālmīki has already depicted the life of Rāma beautifully in *Rāmāyaṇa*. Moreover his brilliant and sole depiction of the minor story of *Śākuntala* found in *Mahābhārata* into a beautiful drama is also gorgeous. There is no stop-gap for him in the literary world.

Even when Kuntaka chose to criticize him, he does not hide his deep sense of admiration towards the poet. Kuntaka has selected 94 verses from Kālidāsa. It is notable that among the works of Kālidāsa, Kuntaka does not cite any verse from *Ṛtusamhāra* and *Mālavikāgnimitra*. The reason for the avoidance of *Mālavikāgnimitra* and *Ṛtusamhāra* is not very explicit. There are some controversies regarding Kālidāsa's authorship of *Ṛtusamhāra*. Some other scholars considered *Ṛtusamhāra* as the first and immature work of Kālidāsa. Likewise *Mālavikāgnimitra* is considered as the first drama written by Kalidasa. *Mālavikāgnimitra* and *Ṛtusamhāra* happen to be the least cited works of Kālidāsa in Sanskrit poetics. Moreover other masterpieces of Kālidāsa offer great scope for citations due to the beauty of verses and depth of theme. May be because of these reasons obviously Kuntaka followed the masterpieces of Kālidāsa. This shows that Kuntaka is very particular in choosing examples for each situations of his work. Among the 94 verses, 48 are from *Raghuvamśa*, 20 from *Kumārasambhava* and 12 verses from *Abhijñānaśākuntala*. Kuntaka has also selected 9 verses from *Vikramorvaśīya* and 5 verses from *Meghadūta*.

The poetic works like *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, *Sāhityadarpaṇa* have cited verses from all the works of Kālidāsa except *Ṛtusamhāra*. Moreover Ānandavardhana and Mammaṭa also take numerous instances from the

master poet except from *Ṛtusamhāra* and *Mālavikāgnimitra*. It is seen that lot of instances are taken from the works of Kālidāsa to explain the sentient object as non sentient one and vice versa. One of the beautiful instance cited by Kuntaka from *Meghadūta* is ‘the darkness that can pierce through the needle’. This is one of the beautiful instances taken by Kuntaka to explain metaphorical figurativeness. Kuntaka always stands in a high position than any other rhetorician. Unlike other poeticians who quote any small portion to illustrate some techniques of expressions, Kuntaka cites larger segments from Kālidāsa and goes deeper into the philosophy and aesthetics of Kālidāsa.

Kuntaka does not cite many instances for compositional figurativeness from Kālidāsa, through which the entire assessment of the work is possible. Either he may think the instances cited for contextual figurativeness are enough to bring forth overall beauty of the work or according to him there is no need to assess the works of Kālidāsa as a whole because every sensitive reader is aware of its entire beauty. Kuntaka suggests that choice of proper title of a work is also considered as one of the varieties of compositional figurativeness and cites the name *Abhijñāśākuntala* for it. Kuntaka uses his compositional figurativeness once in the works of master poet to suggest the beauty of the title *Abhijñāśākuntala*. It seems that Kuntaka would like to bring forth the essence of Kālidāsa as a poet of the use of beautiful figures of speech or tender style. It is well known that Kālidāsa is known as the poet of tender style. For proving this Kuntaka cites large number of verses from Kālidāsa for explaining various figures of speech and different varieties of tender style.

2.2. *Meghadūta*

The title *Meghadūta* itself reveals the theme of this poem. It is a gorgeous lyrical poem of Kālidāsa which had no similar predecessors. Many *sandēśakāvya*s were written in Sanskrit literature under the influence of *Meghadūta*. A certain yakṣa, hero of this poem, was cursed by his master due to deviation from his duty. The yakṣa was sent away for a year to a distant place. Thus he gets separated from his beloved. In this poem, the hero wishes to deliver message to his beloved through a cloud. He instructs the cloud about the way it should travel so as to reach his lover. Kālidāsa has suggested the path of the cloud from Rāmagiri to Alaka through yakṣa's instruction to cloud. This poem is divided into two parts as *pūrvamegha* and *uttaramegha*. It contains 115 verses composed in *mandākrānta* metre.

Most probably Kālidāsa got threads from the *Purāṇas* and Epics for writing it. In *Rāmāyaṇa*, Rāma sent Hanuman to Sītā as a messenger by giving a signet ring as evidence. In *Mahābhārata* a swan acts as a messenger between Nala and Damayantī. Here in both cases the animated objects were acted as the messengers. Unlike, Kālidāsa creates an inanimate object like cloud as a messenger. The name *Meghadūta* itself can connect to the metaphorical figurativeness, one of the varieties of lexical figurativeness of Kuntaka because here Kālidāsa gave the function of a sentient one to the non sentient object like the cloud.

Among the works of Kālidāsa, Kuntaka selects least number of verses from *Meghadūta*. He cites five verses from it. Among them few beautiful verses of *Meghadūta* like *bharturmitram*... for explaining the

sahṛdayahṛdayāhḷāda of *arthaḥ* and *gacchantīnām*...as an instance of metaphorical figurativeness etc. are given below. Though Kuntaka does not cite verses from *Meghadūta* for explaining the principal figurativeness like contextual and compositional figurativeness, he is successful in unveiling the charm of the minute aspects of the verses of the poem. His choice of verses for substantiating other figurativeness like lexical, grammatical etc. is also really marvelous.

2.2.1. Instance given for *arthaḥ*

In the first *unmeṣa*, Kuntaka gives detailed definition for *śabdaḥ* and *arthaḥ* after completing a general discussion. He says:-

*śabdo vivakṣitārthaikavācako 'nyeṣu satsvapi/
arthaḥ saḥṛdayāhḷādakāri svaspandasundaraḥ//¹*

Though there are countless expressions for a particular word, the poet uses only one and the best word for exactly conveying what he intended. This word is known as 'word' or '*śabdaḥ*' in literature. Likewise the poet chooses one function of an object to delight the readers, though it has numerous functions. It should either enrich the impressiveness or enrich the sentiment of a described subject. It is known as '*arthaḥ*' or 'sense'. The first verse cited from *Meghadūta* is for showing the specialty of '*arthaḥ*'.

*bharturmitram priyamavidhave viddhi māmambuvāham
tatsandeśāddhṛdayanihitādāgatam tvatsamīpam/
yo vṛndāni tvarayati pathi śrāmyatām proṣitānām
mandrasnigdhairdhvanibhirabalāveṇimokṣotsukāni//²*

“O you, who are not a widow, know me to be a cloud, your husband’s dear friend, come to you with his messages treasured up in my mind—a cloud that urges on their way, by deep and pleasant sounds, multitudes of wearied travelers eager to unloose the braids of their wives.”³

Here Kālidāsa depicts this particular verse as cloud’s words to the wife of *yakṣa*. The cloud says that her husband is still alive and introduces himself as his best friend. The cloud approached her by bearing her husband’s message in its heart. The duty of the cloud is to urge the group of travellers with grand and gentle sounds in order to make them eager to loosen the hair of their beloveds. This is one of the most beautiful verses in *Meghadūta*. Kuntaka explicitly states the charm of this verse in his *Vakroktijīvita* in order to specify ‘*arthah*’. In this verse the cloud addresses the wife of *yakṣa* as ‘*avidhave*’, which is really pleasing to her because it denotes that her husband is still alive. Kuntaka appreciates this word of address used by Kālidāsa. The cloud then introduces himself as (*bharturmitram*) ‘your husband’s friend’ and not a mere friend but (*priya*) ‘a close friend’, by saying so the cloud reveals his trustworthiness. Thus grabbing her attention and consoling her, the cloud announced the main message that he was there with the message from her husband. The epithet ‘*hṛdayanihitād*’ which means keeping in my heart, denotes the cloud’s concern in keeping a message suited to a reliable friend.

Then Kuntaka says that there may be a doubt, as to why this duty of messenger was assigned to the cloud though there were lots of other

talented persons. The answer is that the cloud alone was apt for this particular job because he is a carrier of water (*ambuvāham*) by nature, which undoubtedly denotes the cloud's expertise in carrying something. Moreover the cloud fastens the fatigued herds of travellers separated from their beloveds with his harsh and sweet sounds. Here the plural in the word 'herds' denotes repetition of such favours by the cloud. The sound of the cloud resembles the enticing words of a brilliant envoy. The cloud has done such help to the travellers on (*pathi*) the way. Again the cloud is voluntarily helping even the unfamiliar persons too. Thus it is sure that he will never hesitate to help a dear friend. The epithet given to the herds are '*abalāveṇimokṣotsukāni*' those who are eager to knot down the hair of their beloveds and which denotes the traveler's extreme love towards their wives. The word '*abalā*' denotes the women's inability to endure the separation from their beloveds.

The whole verse thus intends to portray that the cloud himself had taken the pledge to help the grieving lovers who were parted by fate. This is really the fundamental soul of *Meghadūta*. Thus by giving such a keen explanation of this verse Kuntaka reveals the unparalleled beauty of the verse. Kuntaka brings out the connotations of each word used by Kālidāsa in this verse. It is better to say that no other example is as beautiful as the one depicting the '*sahṛdayāhḷāda*' of '*arthah*'.

2.2.2. Example given for *ābhijātya*

Kuntaka selects the second verse from the *pūrvamegha* as an example for the quality named nobility (*ābhijātya*). The definition given for *ābhijātya* by Kuntaka is given below:-

*śrutipeśalatāśāli susparśamiva cetasā/
svabhāvamasṛṇacchāyamābhijātyam pracakṣate//⁴*

“That which is smooth on the ear, and capable as it were of intimate embrace by thought and which is a naturally sparkling shade of loveliness, is spoken of as having the excellence called classicality”⁵

*jyotirlekhāvalayi gaḷitam yasya barham bhavānī
putraprītyā kuvalayadaḷaprāpi karṇe karoti/
dhautāpāṅgam haraśaśirucā pāvakeṣṭam mayūram
paścādadrighaṇagurubhirgarjitairnartayethāḥ//⁶*

Kuntaka cites the first two lines of this verse as an example of *ābhijātya*. It means that Goddess Pārvatī puts the fallen plume of the peacock of her son Skanda, having circles of sparkle, on her ear, which is actually adorned by the leaf of lotus, due to her affection towards her son. Through this, the poet very touchingly depicts the affection of a mother towards his son. These stanzas really give pleasure to the mind of connoisseurs and also act as nectar to their ears. Thus undoubtedly it becomes one of the suitable examples for *ābhijātya*.

2.2.3. Instance of metaphorical figurativeness

Kuntaka cites the third verse from *Meghadūta* as an example of metaphorical figurativeness. The definition given by Kuntaka for it is given below:-

*yatra dūrāntare 'nyasmātsāmānyamupacaryate/
leśenāpi bhavet kāñcidvaktumudriktavṛttitām//
yanmūlā sarasollekhā rūpakādiralaṅkṛtiḥ/
upacārapradhānāsau vakratā kāciducyate//⁷*

“Wherein even when the two are far apart from each other, a common attribute, however slight, is metaphorically superimposed in order to indicate that the resemblance is very close and which forms the basis for various pleasing and inventive figures of speech headed by the name ‘beauty of metaphorical expression’.”⁸

The example chosen for it is as follows:-

*gacchantīnām ramaṇavasatim yoṣitām tatra naktam
ruddhāloke narapatipathe sūcibhedyāistamobhiḥ/
saudāminyā kanakanikaṣasnigdhayā darśayorvīm
toyotsarggastanitamukharo māsmabhūrviklavāstāḥ//⁹*

These are the words of *yakṣa* towards the cloud. The verse means that the damsels are going to their lovers through the king’s highway on the dark night, which can pierce through the needle. Then the *yakṣa* advises the cloud to light the way of the damsels with lightning like a gold stripe on the touch stone, but not frighten them with heavy shower or thunder because they are very timid. This verse becomes one of the beautiful example of metaphorical figurativeness through the use of the term ‘*sūcibhedyāistamobhiḥ*’ (the darkness that can pierce through the needle). It is sure that only a concrete thing can pierce through the needle but not an abstract one. But here the poet metaphorically depicted the abstract darkness as a concrete one with his poetic excellence to relish the connoisseur. There are numerous such examples in the works of great poets. Whatever it is, the beauty of this particular verse is appealing.

2.2.4. Example for grammatical figurativeness

Kuntaka selects yet another verse from *Meghadūta* as an example of one of the varieties of grammatical figurativeness. The definition given for it by Kuntaka is given below:-

*āgamādiparispandasundaraḥ śabdavakratām/
paraḥ kāmapi puṣṇāti bandhacchāyāvidhāyinīm//¹⁰*

“Beauty of augment and so forth contributes a new charm to style by making for a striking originality in respect of composition.”¹¹

The example given for it is as follows:-

*jāne sakhyāstava mayi manaḥ sambhṛtasnehamasmā-
ditthambhūtām prathamavirahe tāmaham tarkayāmi/
vācālam mām na khalu subhagammanyabhāvaḥ karoti
pratyakṣam te nikhilamacirādbhrātaruktam mayā yat//¹²*

“I know your friend’s heart overflows with love for me. Hence, I fancy her plight to be so wretched. O brother, it is not my pride which makes me boast. Soon your own eyes will be able to verify what I said.”¹³

These are the words of *yakṣa* towards the cloud. Through the preceding verses of this particular verse, *yakṣa* sensitively explains the sad plights of his beloved due to his absence. Then *yakṣa* justifies through this verse that he was not merely boasting and the cloud will clearly see it soon after reaching there. Here the term ‘*subhagammanyabhāvaḥ*’ signifies the speciality of grammatical figurativeness in this verse. According to the *pāṇinīya sūtra* of

‘*ātmamāne khaśca*’ (3.2.83) the affix ‘*khaś*’ comes after the verb ‘*man*’ means ‘to think’, here the sense of the affix being ‘thinking himself as such’. The word ‘*ātmamāne*’ means ‘thinking of one’s own self’ and ‘*ātmānam subhagam manyate iti subhagammanyah*’, here the *āgama* ‘*am*’ (*mum*) is used in the word *subhaga*. In *mumādi* the *ādi śabda* denotes the *āgama* ‘*namul*’ (*am*). Such grammatical peculiarities used in a single term create charm to the whole verse and beauty of each single verse contributes charm to the whole work. Kuntaka had done his job well by choosing an apt verse for this particular context. Moreover the composer of this verse also deserves appreciation for such a beautiful composition. Another verse cited by Kuntaka is also seen as an example of one of the varieties of grammatical figurativeness. ‘*yena śyāmam vapuratiratām kāntimāpatsyate te*’¹⁴. These are the words of *yakṣa* towards the cloud. *Yakṣa* says that the cloud can see the fragment of the bow of Indra with numerous mixed gems rising before him from an ant hill. This will provide a charm to the blackish body of the cloud like the charm of cowherd’s guised Lord Kṛṣṇa with peacock plume. In this verse the word ‘*atitarām*’ provides a unique charm to this verse. Though Kuntaka had selected only few verses from *Meghadūta*, he succeeds in bringing forth the essence, grammatical peculiarities etc. of the verses to delight the readers.

2.3. *Mahākāvya*s of Kālidāsa

2.3.1. *Raghuvamśa*

Like other works of Kālidāsa, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Purāṇa* etc. are the sources of *Raghuvamśa*. It describes the story of solar dynasty and as the

name indicates it gave prominence to the king Raghu, the son of Dilīpa. This *mahākāvya* gives a clear picture of both the good and bad rulers. It is famous that Kālidāsa is a poet of tender style. For proving this Kuntaka deliberately cites four verses as examples for it. He has also cites few verses as an example for the qualities like *prasāda* (perspicuity), *lāvaṇya* (grace), *aucitya* (propriety) etc. Another notable fact is that Kuntaka boldly pointed out the hidden impropriety found in *Raghuvamśa*. This is really a brave attempt from a rhetorician like Kuntaka. No one else had shown such boldness to criticize the master poet like Kālidāsa. Kuntaka has selected forty eight verses from *Raghuvamśa* to substantiate his various arguments. Kuntaka cites examples for his three figurativeness like lexical figurativeness, sentential figurativeness and contextual figurativeness from it. Though he had selected numerous verses from it, he had not made it an example for compositional figurativeness. But Kuntaka's selection of verses for contextual figurativeness is really valuable. Through contextual figurativeness itself Kuntaka tries to bring forth the essence of *Raghuvamśa* in its maximum level.

2.3.1.1. Instances of contextual figurativeness

Changes in particular context for making the situation more attractive comes under contextual figurativeness. In the first variety of contextual figurativeness, Kuntaka shows the technique used by poets to depict the energetic performance of some characters without revealing their importance and speciality until the middle of a work. Here the poet tries to keep the suspense for a long time and reveals it only at the proper time, such suspense helps to create some curiosity in the mind of readers

also. Moreover breaking of the suspense at the proper time by explaining the unbelievable generosity or some other good qualities of an ideal character will definitely delight the readers. Kautsa, a disciple of Varatantu approaches Raghu for seeking the fee for his teacher. But unfortunately at that time Raghu has donated whole of his wealth in a sacrifice named *viśvajit*. Knowing this Kautsa says that he will seek his teachers fee elsewhere.

*etāvatuktvā pratiyātukāmam śiṣyam maharshernṛpatirṇiṣidhya/
kim vastu vidvangurave pradeyam tvayā kiyadveti tamanvayuṅkta//¹⁵*

“But the king prevented the great sage’s disciple, who after saying this was about to depart and said learned sir, what thing do you mean to give to your preceptor and how much of it”¹⁶

A few verses after it are instances of this variety of contextual figurativeness. First of all the teacher of Kautsa denied to accept anything from his disciple. Then after getting irritated by the compulsion of Kautsa, the teacher asked fourteen crore gold coins as fee. After hearing the need of Kautsa, Raghu requests him to stay till three or four days in his holy and renowned fire sanctuary though he is conscious of his empty hand. He also admitted that he would make an effort to fulfill the desire of Kautsa. Then he had decided to fight with Kubera, the god of wealth. Knowing this Kubera showered splendid gold to Raghu. Raghu offered all the weath he has got from Kubera without keeping a little in such his pathetic state. Kautsa was hesitated to take more than what he had requested. Thus both Raghu and Kautsa fight each other for proving their sincerity. The people of Ayodhyā had praised the behavior of both of them.

The few lines indicating these facts of fifth canto are considered as the highlight of *Raghuvamśa*. Through this Kālidāsa gradually reveals the generosity of Raghu in a beautiful manner. The conversation between Raghu and Kautsa show the greedless and truthful mind of both of them. That will really attract the mind of readers. Kālidāsa's poetic skill is explicit through the depiction of Raghu's ideal nature. Through this he keeps justice to his title. Kuntaka's skill in selecting few verses from *Raghuvamśa* for showing the contextual beauty is really remarkable.

Sometimes the poet may be forced to explain same factors like the raising of the sun, moon, etc. repeatedly. In such a situation, a brilliant poet uses new sentiments and figures of speech for differentiating each one and this comes under a variety of contextual figurativeness. Similarly the poets were forced to explain same sentiments like pathetic etc. again and again in different places. So they should provide a new touch of creative originality. It is easy to say that Daśaratha killed the son of an old and blind sage in his hunting excursion. For avoiding such impropriety, Kālidāsa starts to explain the delicate nature of Daśaratha for alleviating his sin. Here a few beautiful verses cited by Kuntaka for substantiating his arguments are given below:-

vyāghrānabhīrabhimukhotpatitān guhābhyaḥ
phullāsanāgraviṭapāniva vāyuruṅṅān/
śikṣāviśeṣalaghuhastatayā nimeṣā-
*ttūṅīcakāra śarapūritavaktrarandhrān/*¹⁷

“By reason of the activity of hand acquired by long practice the fearless king made the tigers, as they rushed against him out of caves, the

quivers (for his arrows) by filling in a moment the hallows of their mouth with arrows, like the fore-branches of the flowering Asana trees broken down by the wind.”

This verse makes it clear that Daśaratha was an expert in hunting. It also shows the Daśaratha’s fearlessness and passion in hunting. The yet another verse cited by Kuntaka from *Raghuvamśa* is as follows:

*api turagasamīpādutpatantam mayūram
na sa rucirakalāpam bāṇalakṣīcakāra/
sapadi gatamanaskaśchinnamālyānukīrṇe
rativigaḷitabandhe keśapāśe priyāyāḥ//¹⁸*

“Having at that moment been put in mind of the braided hair of his beloved queen interspersed with variegated flowers and the knot of which was made loose in amatory sports, the king did not aim his arrow at the peacock though hopping about his horse, and wearing a beautiful plumage.”

Yet another verse says that the archer Daśaratha, who was as mighty as god Indra, having seen the female deer covering the body of her beloved aimed by him, withdrew his arrows though it was drawn near to his ear. He did so because his heart was being obsessed with pity due to his awareness about the value of love. From these two verses it is clear that though Daśaratha was passionate towards hunting, he was highly compassionate towards delicate creatures. Moreover his intense love towards his wives is also well explicit here.

*atha jātu rurorḡhītavartmā vipine pārśvacarairalakṣyamāṇaḥ/
śramaphenamucā tapasvigādhām tamasām prāpa nadīm turaṅgameṇa//¹⁹*

“Then once upon a time taking the path of a deer in the forest unobserved by his side-walkers, he got to the river Tamasā crowded by ascetics, with his horse foaming through fatigue.”

Daśaratha happened to kill an ascetic boy hearing the sound of drinking water, mistaking it as an animal. This is really unbelievable. The word ‘*tapasvigādhām*’ indicates the calmness and reliability of that particular place. So actually there is no reason to support the cruel deed of Daśaratha in any way. But it is not fair to depict a king of solar dynasty in such a way. Depiction of this particular context is unavoidable too, because it leads to the curse episode which is crucial to the progress of the story. So the maser poet with his poetic excellence tries to portray Daśaratha’s qualities using the next verse, which is as follows:-

*nṛpateḥ pratiśiddhameva tatkr̥tavānpanktiratho vilaṅghya yat/
apathe padamarpayanti hi śrutavanto ’pi rajonimīlitāḥ//²⁰*

“What Daśaratha did transgressing the rule was indeed strictly forbidden to a king; for even learned men when blinded by passion step into a wrong path”.

Thus Kālidāsa brilliantly explains the evil deed of Daśaratha. Being annoyed by the death of their son, the old parents cursed him that he will also die of sorrow connected to his son. No one will consider a curse as a blessing. But according to Daśaratha it felt like a shower of nectar. He was suffering from childlessness for a long time. So

undoubtedly this curse gave him an expectation of having a child, then he says like this:-

*śāpopyadr̥ṣṭatanayānanapadmaśobhe
sānugraho bhagavatā mayi pātito 'yam/
kṛṣyām dahannapi khalu kṣitimindhaneḍḍhaḥ
bījprarohajanāṁ dahanaḥ karoti/*²¹

“To me who have not yet seen the loveliness of a son’s lotus-like face, even the curse itself inflicted by your divine self is attended with blessing. Indeed fire inflamed by fuel makes the arable soil the producer of shoots from seed, though it burns (the soil).”

Only a master poet can create such a thoughtful concept. It is not proper for an ideal king to do such a crime in his conscious mind. So the poet first of all depicted his deep passion in hunting. Then he depicts the king’s concern for living beings. This will help the readers to think that such a compassionate man will never deliberately commit such a wrong deed. Again the poet supports the king by saying that even sometimes due to bad luck good people go astray. Thus Kālidāsa very convincingly justified Daśaratha instead of barely saying that he had mistakenly killed a blind ascetic boy. By the keen evaluation of the gradual development of these verses, it will be clear that Kālidāsa brilliantly paved the way for alleviating the sin of Daśaratha. But his future life shows that it is difficult to alleviate the consequence of the sin. Citing this beautiful situation once again, Kuntaka succeeded in bringing forth yet another poetic excellence of Kālidāsa.

In yet another variety of contextual figurativeness, Kuntaka shows how the incidents like rising of sun and moon, water sport etc., the integral parts of a *mahākāvya* create charm to the plot. Here Kuntaka cites the water sport of Kuśa from *Raghuvamśa* as an example to it.

*athāsya ratnagrathitottarīyamekāntapāṇḍustanalambihāram/
niśvāsahāryamśukamājagāma gharmmahprijāveṣamivopadeṣtum//²²*

“Then come (set in) the hot season, as it were, to give his beloveds instructions in point of dress in which the upper garment was intervoven with jewels, garlands were pendant on capable of being blown away even by the breath.”

*athormmilolonmādarājahamse rodholatāpuṣpavahe sarayvāḥ/
viharttomicchā vanitāsakhasya tasyāmbhasi grīṣmasukhe babhūva//²³*

“Once he took a fancy to sport with young women in the water of the Sarayū, which was pleasant in the hot season, which carried with it flowers of the creepers on its banks and which had intoxicated swans anxious to swim in its waves.”

Before explaining the water sport, through these verses Kālidāsa denotes the arrival of summer season which naturally indicates the need of the water sport. Kuśa is completely indulgent in the enjoyment of his water sport with beautiful damsels. So he came to know about the loss of his armlet only at the end of it. As Kuśa is very fond of his armlet, he has made a thorough enquiry about it. From a fisherman Kuśa came to know that it is taken by Kumuda, the serpent king living in the nether world.

Then for the protection of his life Kumuda says these words to Kuśa, when he took his bow towards him with the arrow of great eagle

for the search of his armlet. Kumuda says that he knows that Kuśa is the son image of Viṣṇu and his birth as a human incarnation on earth is for fulfilling one of his duties. So Kumuda does not wish to create any displeasure to Kuśa. He also adds that his younger sister Kumudvatī looking upward for the ball that she had knocked with her hand, while she saw an armlet falling from above like a star from the firmament and took it with great inquisitiveness. Kumuda says to Kuśa that the armlet which has a mark of wound by the scratch of bowstring and also the bolt for the protection of earth will surely reunite with his hand. He further requests Kuśa to accept Kumudvatī as a companion of him so that she can dedicate herself for a long time to the service of his feet. After their marriage they beget a child like the knowledge attaining clarity in the early morning. Here the gradual development of summer season, water sport, the union of Kuśa and Kumudvatī and the birth of Atithi show how a small incident lead to the main theme of the plot.

Here all incidents selected for the variety of contextual figurativeness are highly significant. Depiction of generosity of Raghu, the effort taken to alleviate the sin of Daśaratha, connection of the small incident of water sport of Kuśa to the main plot etc. are some of the soul elements of *Raghuvamśa*. Thus Kuntaka had done a great job to lead readers attention towards the essence of *Raghuvamśa* through his *Vakroktijīvita*. At the same time it is a duty of a critic to bring forth the impropriety hidden in the compositions. Complete evaluation of text and sharp acumen helps a critic to full fill his duty sincerely. Kuntaka's unravel of appreciable and minute improprieties found in *Raghuvamśa* are given below.

2.3.1.2. Kuntaka's criticism of *Raghuvamśa*

Kuntaka cites the following verses to show how the impropriety found in a single sentence becomes irritating to the connoisseurs. Though other rhetoricians cite verses from Kālidāsa it is sure that nobody tries to evaluate him in such a minute way. A sensitive reader with sharp intellect can assess a widely acceptable master poet without humiliating him. Nobody can blame Kuntaka for his bold attempt, because Kuntaka's keen observation of Kālidāsa is really appreciable.

*puram niṣādādhipatestadetadyasmin mayā maulimaṇim vihāya/
jaṭāsu baddhāsvarudat sumantraḥ kaikeyi kāmāḥ phalitāstaveti//²⁴*

“Here is the town of the Niṣadās in which when I tied my matted hair having first put aside the crown, Sumatra began to weep exclaiming, O Kaikeyi, you desires have been completely fulfilled”.

Here Kuntaka says that it is not proper for an ideal king like Rāma to remember such an incident. It is well known that Rāma is considered as a man of forgiveness and compassion. If Rāma recollects the cruel deeds of Kaikeyī even after overcoming all the adversities, it will surely diminish the value of Rāma. This reveals Kuntaka's keen acumen on literary analysis. Very few rhetoricians have attempted to criticize the master poet. Kuntaka definitely deserves appreciation for such bold attempt and beautiful observation.

Kuntaka again points out other faults found in Kālidāsa's works. Another verse cited by him also helped to show, how the inappropriateness found in a part will affect a work as a whole. In

Raghuvamśa a king named Dilīpa and his wife Sudakṣiṇā were in grief of not having a child. Sage Vasiṣṭha advised them to look after a cow named Nandinī. He advised so because the reason of their childlessness was a result of the king’s failure to give due respect to the mother of Nandinī. One day Nandinī decided to examine the King. Soon there appeared a lion which started to attack the cow. For keeping his vow Dilīpa offered himself instead of the cow. Then astounding Dilīpa, the lion asked him in human voice:-

*athaikadhenoraparādhacaṇḍād guroḥ kṛśānupratimād bibheṣi/
śakyo’sya manyurbhavatāpinetum gāḥ koṭīśaḥśparśayatā ghaṭodhnīḥ//²⁵*

“But if you fear to meet the great displeasure of your single-cowed preceptor, who is the very image of fire, it is in your power to allay his anger by presenting him crores of cows, whose udders are as big as pitchers of water (i.e having ample and full udders).”

Here the words of lion are not astounding, because he just wants to tease the king. The king is even ready to bestow his own life for keeping his promise. The impropriety pointed out by Kuntaka is in the answer of the king to this question and the verse is as follows:-

*katham nu śakyānunayo maharṣir viśrāṇanādanyapayasvinīnām/
imāmanūnām surabheravehi rudraujasā tu prahr̥tam tvayāsyām//²⁶*

“And again how is it possible to avert the wrath of the great sage by offering othr cows? Know that this cow is in no way inferior to Surabhi, and it is only through the influence of the god Rudra that you have been able to attack her.”

According to Kuntaka, the words of Dilīpa are highly improper. This verse means that the king Dilīpa and his master are ready to give the life of this cow if other cows existed having same qualities. Kuntaka criticizes this description of Kālidāsa by saying that impropriety of a small thing will also affect a work as a whole like a cloth which becomes completely spoilt though burnt only at one end.

Such beautiful observations of Kuntaka will really inspire the readers to reread the texts and think about the minute improprieties of Kālidāsa. The bold and beautiful observation of Kuntaka is highly praiseworthy. It reveals that even the works of great personalities are completely free of poetic blemishes. So through his minute critical assessment Kuntaka reminds the poets to take utmost care in their compositions. Some other individual verses cited from *Raghuvamśa* in certain situations are given below.

2.3.1.3. Instance given for ‘*arthah*’

Kuntaka cites the following verses from *Raghuvamśa* to substantiate the importance of ‘*arthah*’ mentioned in his definition of poetry. In the definition of poetry given by Kuntaka the word ‘*arthah*’ denotes that the things with its own refreshing beauty should delight the readers.

*tāmabhyagacchadrutitānusārī muniḥ kuśedhmāharaṇāya yātaḥ/
niṣādaiddhāṇḍajadarśanothaḥ ślokatvamāpadyata yasya śokaḥ//²⁷*

“The poet who had gone out to collect Kuśa and holey fuel, and whose outburst of the feeling of grief caused at the sight of a bird struck

by a fowler, took the form of a verse, went towards her following the direction of the sound of weeping.”

Here it is Vālmīki who ultimately finds Sītā in the forest. Kālidāsa depicts the affectionate heart of the sage by referring to the killing of a bird among two, the incident which led him to the composition of the verse *mā niṣāda* and consequents of the composition of *Rāmāyaṇa*. In this way the poet beautifully brings forth the melting heart of the sage, who had seen Sītā in such a pathetic plight. Thus instead of using a mere noun, the tenderness depicted by the poet in the sage will doubtlessly be relished by the readers by the endorsement of the sentiment of pathos. Such an attempt of the poet is really appreciable.

2.3.1.4. Example of sentential figurativeness

Sentence is a group of words including *avyaya*, *kāraka* etc. The assessment of an entire verse is possible at the sentential level. This is a step higher to phonetic and lexical figurativeness. Kuntaka includes the whole variety of figures of speech in it. Through this verse, poet brings forth the pathos of Sītā in an artistic manner without expressing directly.

*upasthitām pūrvamapāsyā lakṣmīm vanam mayā sārđhamasi prapannaḥ/
tvāmāśrayam prāpya tayā nu kopāt sođhāsmi na tvadbhavane vasanti//²⁸*

“Because on a former occasion when you went to the forest with me, you discarded the goddess of royal glory that came over to you, therefore now that I have got a place in your house, she out of great malice does not suffer me to dwell there.”

These are the messages sent by Sītā to her husband with a heart full of sorrow, when she has been abandoned by Rāma after attaining his throne back. Sītā says that she cannot imagine that a man like Rāma, who once decided to go to the forest along with her rejecting the goddess of wealth, can commit such a bad deed even in dream. Here the poet portrays Sītā and the goddess of wealth as co-wives. So obviously as a revenge arising out of the natural jealousy among the co-wives, the goddess of wealth could not bear the presence of Sītā in Rāma's home. Here Sītā actually would like to ask Rāma that even after keeping her along with him in bad times, the present rejection without due reason in his prosperous times is proper or not. The poetic charm hidden in this verse is really appreciable.

2.3.1.5. Tender style

Kuntaka cites yet another verse as an example of tender style. At the time of defining the tender style Kuntaka says that:-

*sukumārābhidhaḥ so'yam yena satkavayo gatāḥ/
mārgeṇotphullakusumakānaneva ṣaṭpadāḥ/²⁹*

“Such is the style called ‘the elegant’ (tender) which master-poets follow like bees roving along the grove of full-blown blossoms.”

Through this Kuntaka means that the poets like Kālidāsa followed this style to create their masterpieces. By comparing this style to the forest full of bloom, he attributes the natural loveliness of flowers to this style. Obviously the bees must attract the lovely flowers. Through this Kuntaka indicates the immense desire of the poets to take out the essence

of the speech like the bees seeking honey from the flowers. He also says about the tender style that:-

*yat kiñcanāpi vaicitryam tatsarvam pratibhodbhavam/
saukumāryaparispandasyandi yatra virājate/^{β0}*

“Wherein every element of beauty is a result of the poet’s imagination alone and succeeds in conveying flashes of gentle race.”

The instance taken for it is as follows:-

*pravṛddhatāpo divaso ’timātramatyarthameva kṣanadā ca tanvī/
ubhau virodhakriyayā vibhinnau jāyāpatī sānuśayāvivāstām*/^{β1}

“The day with its heat excessively increased and the night excessively atenuated, both looked like husband and wife estranged by contry behavior consequent upon their love-quarrel and afterwards filled with remorse.”

This verse is one of the beautiful examples to point out the poet’s accidental use of figures of speech like *śleṣa* (paronomasia). Here the words like ‘*pravṛddhatāpaḥ*’ and ‘*tanvī*’ directly produce only the meaning of the charming nature of the day and night respectively and nothing else. But through the poetic excellence, there is also another meaning within it. Those meanings should attract the connoisseurs and deserve the appreciation of the critics. The words like ‘*virodhaḥ*’ and ‘*vibhinnau*’ are the words, which bring another meaning in it. Here the word ‘*virodhaḥ*’ signifies the absence of the co-existence of the day and the night. The word ‘*vibhinnau*’ indicates the different nature of the day and night. On the other hand, in the case of simile the jealous quarrel

between the husband and wife is ‘*virodhaḥ*’ and their staying away from each other due to anger denotes through the word ‘*vibhinnau*’. Moreover the words like ‘*atimātram*’ and ‘*atyartham*’ denote the intensity of the emotions in both the cases. It is always difficult to create the charm of paronomasia but here Kālidāsa has deliberately produced the charm.

In general the beauty of *sukumāra mārga* (tender style) is due to the creative imagination of the poet and not any deliberate artificial incorporation of charms. The beauty of it will attract the mind of sensitive readers. The second definition given for tender style by Kuntaka is as follows:-

*bhāvasvabhāvaprādhānyanyakkṛtāhāryakauśalaḥ/
rasādiparamārthajñamanaḥsamvādasundaraḥ//³²*

“Where studious technical skill is superseded by the prominence given to the inner nature of things, where beauty is felt due to sympathy by men of taste who are experts in enjoying sentiments etc.”³³

The examples chosen for each line of this definition are respectively given below:-

*tasya stanapraṇayibhirmuhureṇaśāvair-
vyāhanyamānahariṇīgamanam purastāt/
āvīrbabhūvakuśagarbhamukham mṛgāṇām
yūtham tadagrasaragarvitakṛṣṇasāram//³⁴*

“Before him appeared a herd of deer the motion of hinds in which was now and then impeded by the fawns eager to suck their udders, with

mouths having Kuśa-grass in them, and at the head of which was a proud black-antelope.”

In this verse Kālidāsa has depicted the natural traits of the herds of deer. The verse represents a life-like picture before the readers. For retaining the natural charm of this verse the poet has deliberately avoided the incorporation of figure of speech and other artificial adornments. Yet another verse is as follows:-

*pūrvānubhūtam smaratā ca rātrau kampottaram bhīru tavopagūḍham/
guhāvisārīṅnyativāhitāni mayā kathañcid ghanagarjitāni//^{β5}*

“And where, O timid lady, remembering your embraces accompanied by with tremor (i.e remembering how you rushed in my arms being terrified by the thundering), which I had enjoyed before, with great difficulty did I pass (with complacency) the roar of clouds that rolled in the caves of the mountain.”

These are the words of Rāma towards Sītā. Through the second line of the definition of tender style, Kuntaka means that the tender style should delight the minds of those who are proficient in enjoying the sentiments etc. Kuntaka includes the erotic too among the sentiments. The readers, who knew the highest secret of erotic sentiment, relish the aesthetic beauty of the verses taking it as their own experiences. Here Kuntaka also points out that all the verses representing the conversation of Rāma to Sītā at the time of their return after killing Rāvaṇa can be cited as the examples of tender style, as the verses depict have the deep sufferings of Rāma, which he had experienced before during the separation from Sītā.

2.3.1.6. Examples for Qualities

Kuntaka cites yet another verse as an example for the quality named perspicuity (*prasāda*) of the tender style. The definition given for it and the example cited are respectively given below:-

*akleśavyañjitākūtam jhagityarthasamarpaṇam/
rasavakroktivīṣayam yatprasādaḥ sa kathyate//*³⁶

“The excellence called ‘perspicuity’ is that which brings out the poet’s intent without any effort on the reader’s part, which conveys the meaning in an instant as it were, and which is concerned with sentiments and artful speech.”³⁷

Here Kuntaka means that there should be no difficulty to understand the meaning of a verse by its first reading. Especially there should be no strain in the case of sentiments like love etc. and also in figures of speech. In general, in *prasāda*, the words should be uncompounded which would give meanings directly. If there is any compound word in it, that should be easily intelligible too. Here the word ‘*ākūtam*’ means beauty.

*anena sārddham viharāmburāśestīreṣu tāḍīvanamarmareṣu/
dvīpāntarānītalavaṅgapuṣpairapākṛtasvedalavā marudbhiḥ//*³⁸

Sunandā tells these words to Indumatī during her *svayamvara*. ‘Get pleasure with him on the seashore, where the palm groves whisper and also where the drops of sweat are wiped out by the breeze that brings the scent of clove flowers from the far off islands.’ Kuntaka presents the above verse as one of the best examples for perspicuity of the tender

style. It is also clear from this verse that the inexplicable beauty of her face due to various painted designs increases by the pearl like sweat drops of her. There is some confusion regarding the poetic qualities mentioned by Kuntaka. Some of the traits found in one quality is said to be found in another quality too. Thus the line of demarcation of qualities is seen to overlap over each other. For instance, the use of un-compounded words is a feature of both perspicuity and sweetness in the tender style. Whatever it is, the beauty of the selected verse is really marvelous.

Kuntaka takes another verse from *Raghuvamśa* to illustrate the quality named grace (*lāvanya*) of tender style. He defines grace of tender style as:-

*varṇavinyāsavicchittipadasandhānasampadā/
svalpayā bandhasaundaryam lāvanyamabhidhīyate//*³⁹

“When even a little beauty in respect of alliterative syllables and in the choice of diction results in the charm of syntax and contributes to the strikingness of style, we have the excellence called grace”.⁴⁰

The significance of *lāvanya* is the beauty of the construction of sentence, which is denoted through the word ‘*bandha*’ in the definition. It means that there should be beautiful arrangements of syllables and words of both nouns and verbs. Their arrangements should seem to be natural and not a deliberate or forceful creation of the poet. In general, *lāvanya* represents excellent sentence construction with the tenderness of sound and sense. Kuntaka cites the following verse as its example:-

*snānārdramukteṣvanudhūpavāsam vinyastasāyantanamallikeṣu/
kāmo vasantātyayamandavīryaḥ keśeṣu lebhe balamaṅganānām//^{A1}*

“The God of love whose strength was diminished owing to the departure of Vasanta (the spring) again acquired it in the hair of young ladies, which were unbraided on account of their being wet by bathing and in which evening-jasmine-flowers were woven after making them (i.e hair) perfumed.”

This verse does not have any complex word or meaning. Undoubtedly this verse creates the impression of tenderness to the ears of the listeners without any complexity. The meaning of the verse is really attractive. It is clear that the Cupid becomes active in spring season and later he becomes inactive. So the poet beautifully says that after the spring season the Cupid has got strength in the hairs of damsels decorated with jasmine and so on. Here the poet means that the decorated hairs of damsels are as beautiful as the spring season.

Kuntaka cites yet another verse from *Raghuvamśa* also as an example of *lāvanya* of the tender style. These are the words of Sunandā towards Indumatī about king Aja at the time of Indumatī’s marriage ceremony.

*mahendramāsthāya mahokṣarūpam yaḥ samyati prāptapinākilīlaḥ/
cakāra bāṇairasurāṅganānām gaṇḍasthalīḥ proṣitapatralekhāḥ//^{A2}*

“Playing the Pinākin in battle by mounting upon the great Indra in the form of a great bull, he by means of his arrows rendered the cheeks of the Asura females, devoid of amorous paintings.”

Here Kuntaka cites only the second line of this verse as an example to it. The beautiful arrangements of syllables and words and the accidental composition of the poet etc. make this verse an apt example for *lāvaṇya*.

After citing few examples for *lāvaṇya* of the tender style, Kuntaka quotes another verse from *Raghuvamśa* as an example of the quality named propriety (*aucitya*). One of the definitions given for propriety is that wherein the primary meaning is concealed by the excessive charming nature of the speaker or the listener. This verse is an example for the concealment of primary meaning by the speaker.

*śarīramātreṇa narendra tiṣṭhannābhāsi tīrthapratipāditarddhiḥ/
āraṇyakopāttaphalapasūtiḥ stambhena nīvāra ivāvaśiṣṭaḥ//⁴³*

“Standing in body only, with your wealth given away to worthy recipients, you shine forth, Oh lord of people, like a *nīvāra* plant, its produce of crops appropriated by foresters, left within its stem.”

These are the words of Kautsa, a disciple of a sage named Varatantu after knowing Raghu’s gift of his entire wealth in a sacrifice named Viśvajit. Here Kautsa compares the king with *nīvāra* plant. This strengthens the appropriateness of the situation. The generosity of the king is the primary meaning of this verse which is clouded by the beauty of the simile. Thus by concealing the primary meaning by extremely beautiful temperament of the speaker, it becomes an apt example of propriety. The qualities like propriety and splendour mentioned by Kuntaka are common to the three styles. Both of them are highly infused in the word, sentence, and the work as a whole.

2.3.1.7. Examples cited for lexical figurativeness

Then Kuntaka cites two verses as an example of the first variety of lexical figurativeness named ‘art in beautifying conventional sense’ (*rūḍhi*). This variety says that “When common denotation of words is seen to expand to include connotation of even impossible attributes imagined by the poet, or to include a hyperbolic excess of even an existing attribute as result of the poet’s intent to shower extraordinary belittlement or extraordinary glorification of the theme, we get what is called ‘art in beautifying conventional sense’. Kuntaka says that it is of various kinds due to the diversity of suggested attributes and cites the below mentioned verse as one of the example to it.

*gurvartthamartthī śrutapāradṛśvā rakhoḥ sakāśādanavāpya kāmam/
gato vadānyāntaramityayam me mā bhūt parīvādanavāvatārah//⁴⁴*

“Asking wealth for his preceptor, a certain suitor who had seen the other ends of learning went to another donor not obtaining his object of wish from Raghu. Let there not be this new (first) rise of a reproach about me.”

These are the words of Raghu, who gifted his whole wealth in his sacrifice named *viśvajit*, for the disciple of Varatantu named Kautsa. He says that here the word ‘Raghu’ denotes the generosity and virtues of valour in its extreme level in the three worlds. It is not to think that the words denoting the name have only some specific meanings. It can convey various special and significant meaning as intended by the poet like the analogy of melody and note in music. After discussing ‘art in beautifying conventional sense’ Kuntaka cites two verses as an example

of the second variety of lexical figurativeness named figurativeness related to synonym. One of it is as follows:-

*bhūtānukampā tava cediyaṃ gaurekā bhavet svastimatī tvadante/
jīvan punaḥ śāsavadupaplavebhyaḥ prajāḥ prajānātha piteva pāsi//^{A5}*

“If your compassion for living beings should prevail, only this single cow would live happily after you die. If, on the other hand, you should live, O Lord of people, you would ever rescue the people like a father from their distresses.”

Lion tells these words to king Dilīpa, who requests to accept himself instead of the cow named Nandinī. Giving up of life due to the compassion of this single cow is improper. The people may consider Dilīpa as a ridiculous one. But if he is alive, he can protect all the people of this universe from danger at any time. The word ‘*piteva*’ strengthens the pitiable position of the king if he had committed self sacrifice. Apart from this primary meaning, there is also a suggestive sense. It is indispensable that the lord of the people should never deviate from his duties. Here the poet uses the word ‘*prajānātha*’ to denote that the king was being reluctant from his duties. The intended suggestive sense mentioned here is that it is sure that if Dilīpa is reluctant to protect the single cow from a weaponless lion then he cannot protect the people of this earth.

In this verse the synonym used by the poet like ‘*prajānātha*’ and the simile ‘*piteva*’ convey some meanings, which is impossible to be explained through any other words. According to this variety of ‘figurativeness related to synonym’ (*paryāyavakratā*) the meaning has

an unexplainable element in it. In this verse, Kuntaka beautifully depicts the suggested meaning hidden in it. These synonyms indicate the responsibility of Dilīpa towards his people, both as a strict ruler and affectionate father. This verse reminds that the duty of a king is to protect the whole people of his country, not to die by protecting a single creature. Kuntaka’s keen acumen makes him stand a step ahead of the other rhetoricians.

Two other verses are also cited to discuss the figurativeness related to gender (*liṅgavakratā*). According to this variety the poet selects one particular gender on the basis of the idea that is to be conveyed for enhancing its beauty. Through these verses Rāma expresses his grief that he had faced when Sītā had been taken away by the demon Rāvaṇa.

*tvam rakṣasā bhīru yato ’panītā tam mār̥gametāḥ kṛpayā latā me/
adarśayan vaktumaśaknuvantyaḥ śākhābhirāvarjitapallavābhiḥ//⁴⁶*

“O timid one, when you were kidnapped by the demon (and I was looking for you), the way (by which you were taken away) was kindly pointed to me by these creepers here; though unable to speak, they stretched out their branches with the leaves bent down significantly.”

Here the poet means that though the plants are unable to talk as they pointed out the way by stretching down the branches with their tender leaves. The direct meaning of the first verse is that the creepers were crushed down due to the hurried steps of Rāvaṇa at the time of forcible abduction of Sītā, which helps to the guess the way where Rāvaṇa has taken her. But the excellence of the poet makes a verse more

attractive. Here Kālidāsa says that it seems that due to their special consideration towards females, the creepers were showing the way by stretching down their branches. The poet expressed so because the creepers cannot speak anything due to their inanimate nature. So they did it in the way the dumb people show something by raising their tender hands. The main attraction here is the poet's deliberate use of the feminine word 'latā' to catch the attention of connoisseur.

*mṛgyaśca darbhāṅkuranirvyapekṣāstavāgatijñam samabhodayanmām/
vyāpārayantyo diśi dakṣiṇasyāmutpakṣmarājini vilocanāni//⁴⁷*

“The female deer also, giving up their interest for the blades of wild grass, directed me better as I was still not sure of the way you had gone. They turned their eyes, with upraised eyelashes, towards the south.”

Through this verse the master poet proved his poetic skill by taking a step further. There he says about the glance of female deers as it is showing the way of Rāvaṇa. Kuntaka cites both these verses for the same instance, among them second one is more reliable. Here an animated deer is showing the way which was not perfectly mentioned by inanimate creepers because they have more consciousness than the creepers. The deers had shown the way by giving up their interest in the food of wild grass and also by looking towards the northern direction. The poet again deliberately used the feminine gender 'mṛgyaśca' to strengthen the poetic charm and to delight the readers. Here poet expresses these ideas charmingly with the help of the indirect poetic fancy. The use of feminine gender in both cases is highly aesthetic

though the words related to trees and animals can use in any gender. From these it is clear that Kuntaka has cited large number of verses from *Raghuvamśa* among the works he has chosen. His attempt to assess this text is admirable.

Thus it is clear that not only contextual figuraiveness, through which evaluation of entire work is possible but also the explanation of single verses cited from *Raghuvamśa* is stunning. Critics can never point out all the beauty and drawbacks of the compositions. They indicate some of the beautiful instances and the rest should be delineated by the readers themselves. One of the beautiful innovations made by Kālidāsa from *Rāmāyaṇa* is in the thirteenth canto of *Raghuvamśa*. On the way back to Ayodhyā after rescuing Sītā from Laṅkā, Rāma explains to her about some events and the places they had spent at the time of their exile. Kuntaka cites one verse from there *puram niṣādādhipate* this as one of the variety of contextual figuraiveness. According to Kuntaka modification or innovations from the original source come under the variety of contextual figuraiveness.

2.3.2. Kumārasambhava

As the name indicates *Kumārasambhava* discusses about the story of the birth of *kumāra*, the son of Lord Śiva and Pārvatī. The penance of Pārvatī in *Kumārasambhava* is a message to the mankind. Because Pārvatī is unable to attain the mind of lord Śiva though she is blessed with wealth, power, prestige, extreme beauty etc. At last she attains lord Śiva only through her great penance. This reveals the triviality of more pleasure and the hardship and purity of asceticism. The works of

Kālidāsa is not only a mere entertaining one but also have numerous moral messages to the mankind.

It is notable that Kuntaka selects twenty verses from *Kumārasambhava* for explaining his contextual figurativeness, tender style and various figures of speeches. Moreover Kuntaka criticize Kālidāsa by pointing out the improper word showered by Cupid towards Indra. Kuntaka's observation of *Kumārasambhava* is also praiseworthy. Kuntaka's assessment of *Kumārasambhava* is discussed below in detail.

2.3.2.1. Contextual Figurativeness

The proper and gradual development of the story of *Kumārasambhava* is selected as an example of one of the varieties of contextual figurativeness by Kuntaka. He defines one of the varieties of contextual figurativeness as:-

“The art of the dramatic plot should be pleasing by the construction of delightful ‘junctures’ (*sandhis*); each part should be organically related to each other, the succeeding one following the preceding one. It should not be vitiated by any excessive craze for observing rules even when they are inopportune. Only in such cases, the episode will reveal a unique charm of originality.”⁴⁸

The first canto describes the childhood, budding youth of Pārvatī and also her worshipful homage to Śiva by command of her father. In the second canto the gods approaches Brahman for a solution to kill the demon Tārakāsura. Brahman says to them that the son of Śiva can only kill that demon. The proper mate of Śiva is Pārvatī, so the solution for

this problem is the marriage of Śiva and Pārvatī. The third canto describes the burning of Cupid and fourth the lamentation of Ratī. The great penance of Pārvatī after wounded by the rejection of Śiva and the experiment and conversation of disguised Śiva are the subject matter discussed in the fifth canto. Then in the sixth canto by the request of Pārvatī, Śiva deposes the seven sages to ask Pārvatī from her father Himālaya. The marriage of Śiva with Pārvatī is depicted in the seventh canto. Thus gradual progress of the themes and junctures make it an apt example for this particular variety of Kuntaka's contextual figurativeness. Through this variety, Kuntaka brilliantly assess the overall charm of the text.

2.3.2.2. Lexical figurativeness

Kuntaka cites two verses from *Kumārasmbhava* as an example of the figurativeness related to concealment (*samvṛtivakratā*), one of the varieties of lexical figurativeness (*padapūrvārdhavadakratā*). In this figurativeness sometimes the matter conceals through pronouns. Sometimes the poet feel that the beauty of something may lost due to their direct explanation and conceals it brilliantly for creating extreme charm. For instance:-

*darpaṇe ca paribhogadarśinī pṛṣṭhataḥ praṇayino niṣeduṣaḥ/
vīkṣya bimbamanubimbamātmanaḥ kāni kāni na cakāra lajjayā//⁴⁹*

“And while observing in a mirror (the marks of) enjoyment when she saw immediately behind her own reflection that of her lover seated at the back,-what was it that she did not do in shame.”⁵⁰

Here instead of saying what she had done in shame, the poet just brilliantly said what she did not do with shame. Undoubtedly this method is really beautiful in expressing certain things where words are not enough to tell something. Only a brilliant poet can handle it properly. Such concealment of words creates unexplainable charm to this verse otherwise it will never be as much attractive as this. In figurativeness related to concealment sometime poet conceals something naturally or deliberately thinking that it is highly improper to say something directly. For instance:-

*nivāryatāmāli kimapyam vaṭuḥ punarvivakṣuḥ sphuritottarādharah/
na kevalam yo mahato 'pabhāṣate śṛṇoti tasmādapi yaḥ sa pāpabhāk//⁵¹*

“O friend, stop this boy who seems desirous of saying something, as his upper lip is quivering. Not only he who talks ill of the mighty, but also he who listens to him, is a sinner.”⁵²

These are the words of Pārvatī towards her companion. Here Śiva, disguised as an ascetic showers harsh words about lord Śiva for testing Pārvatī. Getting irritated by his speech Pārvatī order her friend to stop him. Humiliation of the lord of this universe is considered as a great sin. So the poet conceals it through such intelligent words of Pārvatī. Thus the both verses taken for explaining the figurativeness related to concealment from this *mahākāvya* is noteworthy. There are numerous such verses in the works of great poets. This is one of the beautiful techniques used by great poets to bring forth charm of a verse in its maximum level. Kuntaka's incorporation of such beautiful concept like

figurativeness related to concealment in his varieties of figurativeness and his hunt for apt instances for it is marvelous.

2.3.2.3. Kuntaka's Criticism of *Kumārasambhava*

Kuntaka criticizes Kālidāsa by taking two verses from *Raghuvamśa* and one from *Kumārasambhava*. Here Kuntaka points out the impropriety of Kālidāsa through this verse.

*kāmekapatnīm vratadukhaśīlām lolam manaścārutayā praviṣṭām/
nitambinīmicchasi muktalajjām kaṅṭhe svayamgrāhaniṣaktabāhum//*⁵³

“What lady (having full buttocks), austere stickinh to (or, paining you by her keeping) the vow of chastity, who has made a niche in your unsteady (lustful) mind by her beauty, do you wish to twine her arms round your neck, of her own accord, abandoning all (sense of) shame?”⁵⁴

These are the words of Cupid towards Indra. There is a story that once Indra was fascinated by the charm of Ahalyā and he approached her disguising as her husband. Cupid said the above verse by keeping this incident in his mind. According to Kuntaka it is improper to humiliate lord of heaven in such a manner. There may have numerous improper situations in the works of minor poets. But it is very rare in the works of master poets like Kālidāsa. A person with sharp acumen can only find it out from the great poets. The disgrace from Cupid towards Indra in a council of Indra is really improper because Indra is the lord of heaven. The impropriety brought forth by Kuntaka is really remarkable.

2.3.2.4. Kuntaka's praiseworthy observations on *Kumārasambhava*

One of the commendable observations of Kuntaka on a single verse of *Kumārasambhava* is given below. Kuntaka says that both *śabda* and *artha* can make poetry. According to him, *śabda* means the most suitable word which alone can convey the exact intended meaning of a poet though there may be numerous substitute words for it.

*dvayam gatam samprati śocanīyatām samāgamaprātthanayā kapāliṇaḥ/
kalā ca sā kāntimatī kalāvatastvamasya lokasya ca netrakaumudī//⁵⁵*

“By their earnest (desire) for union with Śiva, two things have now become objects of commiseration: that bright digit of the moon, and thyself who art the moonlight of the eyes of this world.”⁵⁶

These are the words of disguised Śiva to Pārvatī for testing the intensity of her love towards him. Here it is notable that for denoting Śiva, Kālidāsa uses the word Kapāliṇaḥ. Though there are numerous words to denote Śiva like Hara, Pinākiṇaḥ and so on. Pinākiṇaḥ means of the one who holds bow called Pināka. This is a casual word for denoting Śiva and is not creating any appeal to the readers. For irritating Pārvatī the utmost disgustful word for denoting Śiva is pertinent. The word Kapāliṇaḥ, means of the one who has human skull (as the begging vessel), which only can create extreme revulsion towards Śiva. Kālidāsa's such praiseworthy use of synonym is pointed out and appreciated by Kuntaka. Moreover here ‘*dvayam gatam samprati śocanīyatām*’ also offer appeal to the readers. This means that before, only the moon is longing for the union of Śiva but now Pārvatī is also

wishing the same. The word *prārthana* is also significant. Because if the union between Śiva and Pārvatī is accidental it is acceptable but her obsession for the union is ridiculous. The *matup pratyayas* like *kalāvat* and *kāntimat* create unexplainable beauty. The words like ‘you’ and the ‘digit’ is also beautiful because they denote the beauty competition between them. The each words of this verse are ear nectar to the hearers. Any other synonyms of these words never can create as charm as these words. Thus Kuntaka’s selection of this verse to point out the speciality of ‘śabda’ is significant. Such minute but noteworthy observations of Kuntaka makes him unique one in Sanskrit literary history.

2.3.2.5. Tender style

Kuntaka cites three verses from *Kumārasambhava* as an example of tender (*sukumāra*) style. Among them two beautiful instances are discussed here. One of the definitions of tender style and the instance given for it is as follows:-

*amlānapratibhodbhinnanavaśabdārthabandhuraḥ/
ayatnavihitasvalpamanohārivibhūṣaṇaḥ*⁵⁷

“That charming style where fresh words and meanings both blossom forth by virtue of poet’s undimmed imagination, where ornaments are few and yet lovely as they come in without effort.”⁵⁸

*bālenduvakrāṅyavikāśabhāvād babhuḥ palāśānyatilohitāni/
sadyo vasantena samāgatānām nakhakṣatānīva vanasthalīnām*⁵⁹

“The palāśa buds, extremely red and curved like the young moon, not being blossomed, soon shone like red marks of nails on (the persons of) the forest-sites united with the vernal season (their lover).”⁶⁰

Here the poet compares the spring with a man and woodland with a maiden. Kuntaka selects this as an example of tender style because the words like *bālenduvakrāṇi*, *atilo hitāni*, *sadyo vasantena samāgatānām* are used only for the description of nature but they combine smoothly with the figure of speech *nakhakṣatānīva*. Here the poetic excellence purely reflects the words of the poet. They are not deliberately incorporated but feel as if the sprouts of a plant and should delight the readers. The normal arrangement of sound, sense and the absence of complex figure of speech make it an apt example for tender style. Kuntaka cites yet another verse as an instance of perspicuity of tender style. The definition given for it and the example are respectively given below.

*akleśavyaṅjitākūtam jhagityarthasamarppaṇam/
rasavakroktiviṣayam yatprasādaḥ sa kathyate//⁶¹*

“The excellence called ‘perspicuity’ is that which brings out the poet’s intent without any effort on the reader’s part, which conveys the meaning in an instant as it were, and which is concerned with sentiments and artful speech.”⁶²

*himavyapāyādviśadādharaṅgānāpāṅḍurībhūtamukhacchavīnām/
svedodgamaḥ kimpuruṣāṅganānām cakre padam patraviśeṣakeṣu//⁶³*

“Perspiration made its appearance on the ornamental paintings (on the persons) of the Kinnara ladies, the complexion of whose faces was

slightly yellow and whose lips looked bright (not being smeared with wax), owing to the passing away of the wintry season.”⁶⁴

The easy accessibility of the meaning of this verse and the uncompounded words etc. make this verse a perfect example for perspicuity of tender style. Thus Kuntaka cites few beautiful verses as instances of tender style from both *Raghuvamśa* and *Kumārasmbhava*. Kuntaka’s such apt citations also help to prove Kālidāsa as a poet of tender style.

2.3.2.6. Rejection of *svabhāvokti*

Some ancient rhetoricians accepted *svabhāvokti* as a figure of speech. According to them natural traits of a thing is adorned and beauty added to it is adornment. Kuntaka did not accept *svabhāvokti* as adornment. Then he says as an answer to those whom accepts *svabhāvokti* as an adornment that writing poetry is not a job of wasting time. It should always delight the connoisseur. He also opines that the description of a subject should have its own peculiarities. Otherwise the addition of any figure of speech to it will feel as if the painting on an improper canvas. Kuntaka says at the time of describing the natural charm of an object that it should better to avoid the figure of speeches. He says so because improper addition of figures of speech will definitely spoil the actual beauty of an object. So the adorned object can be compared with a beautiful damsel. A damsel never wears excessive ornaments at the time of taking bath, leading ascetic life during the separation from her husband and also at the end of the amorous sports. In these situations natural beauty of the damsel is attractive. Likewise at the

time of describing natural traits of things, there is no need of deliberate incorporation of figure of speeches. For instance:-

*tām prāṇmukhīm tatra niveśya tanvīm kṣaṇam vyalambanta puro niṣaṅṅāḥ/
bhūtārthaśobhāhriyamāṇanetrāḥ prasādhane sannihite'pi nāryaḥ*//⁶⁵

“Having seated that girl of a slender frame upon it, so that she faced the east, the ladies sitting before her, having their eyes attracted by real (i.e unartificial) beauty, delayed for some time, though the articles of decoration were at hand.”⁶⁶

This verse is in the seventh canto of *Kumārasambhava* while the companions of the goddess Pārvatī adorning her for her marriage. Through this verse Kālidāsa would like to bring forth the natural beauty of goddesses Pārvatī. So he here fancies that may the adornments will diminish the beauty of Pārvatī. Kuntaka wants to prove that *svabhāvokti* can not be an adornment by indicating the insignificance of figure of speech while describing the natural traits of things. Kuntaka's boldness in objecting the early rhetoricians' view without following them blindly is also a reason for the uniqueness of Kuntaka in the realm of Sanskrit literature.

It is notable that Kuntaka does not cite instances from *Kumārasambhava* for explaining his figurativeness like phonetic, grammatical and compositional. But it is admirable that Kuntaka unraveled the overall beauty of this *mahākāvya* through his contextual figurativeness, sentential figurativeness etc. So absence of the compositional figurativeness never lessens the charm of this *mahākāvya*. Kuntaka also cites few other verses from Kālidāsa to reject some figures of speech like *preyas*, *parivṛtti*, *vibhāvanā*. As in the case of

Raghuvamśa here also Kuntaka cites lot of verses for explaining tender style and some figure of speeches. Kuntaka's bold attempt of criticism and his plausible changes in certain words are some notable things in *Kumārasambhava*. Moreover the instances taken for explaining figurativeness related to concealment, one of the varieties of lexical figurativeness is really noteworthy. Kuntaka also cites excellent instances from the dramas of Kālidāsa like *Abhijñānaśākuntala* and *Vikramorvaśīya*. They are being discussed below.

2.4. Kuntaka and Dramas of Kālidāsa

2.4.1. *Abhijñānaśākuntala*

Abhijñānaśākuntala, the master piece of Kālidāsa has the quality of both poetry and drama. The thread of the drama is taken from *Mahābhārata*, but the innovative techniques of Kālidāsa took its fame all over the world. The episode of curse and the introduction of the characters like Anasūyā, Priyamvadā, Śārṅgarava, Śāradvata, Sānumatī etc. emerged from the poetic imagination of Kālidāsa. The charm of this drama from its original source is like the new sprouts and blossoms of dried tree after rain. Kuntaka cites twelve verses from *Śākuntala*. As in the case of *mahākāvya*'s, Kuntaka cites verses from *Śākuntala* also for depicting contextual figurativeness and some figure of speeches etc.

2.4.1.1. Compositional figurativeness

According to Kuntaka, selection of proper title of the work also comes under the variety of compositional figurativeness. Straight forward titles of a composition like *Śiśupālavadhā*, *Rāmacarita* are not

appealing. According to him, such titles will never produce any charm to the work. Title of every composition should signify the soul of the theme. For signifying the beauty of a title he suggests the names like *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, *Mudrārākṣasa* etc. Kuntaka's observation is valuable because some time people choose an unfamiliar novel, films etc. only being fascinated by its title. Kuntaka has selected numerous instances from the works of Kālidāsa for substantiating his five varieties of figurativeness except phonetic figurativeness. One and only work taken for discussing compositional figurativeness of Kālidāsa is *Abhijñānaśākuntala*. In this drama the ring play an important role for the smooth development of the theme. So the title given to this drama will definitely fascinate the readers while reading this masterpiece.

2.4.1.2. Contextual figurativeness

According to Kuntaka a beautiful context is enough to contribute extreme charm to a whole work. This is what he called as contextual figurativeness. Through one of the variety of it he says that:-

“When a poet is constructing a plot of his own, based though it might be on a well-known source, if he succeeds in infusing even a small streak of originality, the beauty gained thereby will be singular. Even an episode too can shine forth as the vital essence of the work as a whole, brimful of sentiments reaching their utmost limit.”⁶⁷

For substantiating his argument Kuntaka cites a context from *Śākuntala*. The original story of *Śākuntala* in *Mahābhārata* is really a small and bare story. In the original source, Duṣyanta forgets Śākuntala without any strong reason. It is the duty of a poet to depict a literary

piece with an ideal hero. Otherwise it will adversely affect the society. So for avoiding such impropriety Kālidāsa brilliantly depicts a curse episode and thus provided a strong reason for Duṣyanta's forgetfulness. The curse is as follows:-

*vicintayantī yamananyamānasā taponithim vetsi na māmupastitham/
smariṣyati tvām na sa bodhito 'pi san kathām pramattaḥ pratham kṛtāmiva//*⁶⁸

“That person, thinking of whom, with a mind regardless of anything else, you notice not me, a treasure of penance, come here-he will not remember you though reminded (by you), just as an intoxicated man does not (remember) the talk made before (while drunk).”⁶⁹

These words are the curse of the great sage named Durvāsa towards Śakuntalā because she had not noticed the sage's arrival and does not receive him properly as she is immersed in the thoughts of her beloved. This curse episode is one of the noticeable innovations made by Kālidāsa in *Śākuntala*. By the request of her friends, the sage somehow modified the curse that it will last till the king happens to see the signet ring given to her. Unfortunately on the way back to the king she lost her ring in a river while taking bath. Then there arose some dramatic incidents that a fish swallows the ring being attracted by the red stone in it thinking it as a flesh. Then a fisherman caught the fish and happened to see the ring and at last bestows it to Duṣyanta. Thus Kālidāsa succeeds in depicting an extremely beautiful plot filled with sentiments to delight the readers. Such incidents really help to increase the beauty of the entire play. Through this curse episode Kālidāsa depicts Duṣyanta as an ideal hero. Another notable incident of this play is that a beautiful song sung

by Hamsapadikā at the proper time helped to arouse a complete nostalgic mood in the mind of readers.

*ramyāṇi vīkṣya madhurāmśca niśamya śabdān
paryutsukī bhavati yatsukhitopi jantuḥ/
taccetasā smarati nūnamabodhapūrvam
bhāvasthirāṇi jananāntarasauhrdāni//⁷⁰*

“When a being, although in enjoyment or happiness, becomes perturbed on seeing charming objects or on hearing agreeable sounds, then, indeed, he mentally remembers, without being conscious (of the fact), the associations (friendships) of past lives remaining permanently impressed (on the mind).”⁷¹

Even Duṣyanta does not have the memories of Śakuntalā, he has some great unexplainable feeling in him. Moreover the incidents like the agony of Śakuntalā while she has been rejected by Duṣyanta, his inability to recognize Śakuntalā even after the removal of her veil, Śakuntalā’s attempt to reminds the king by saying some of their former amorous secrets, and at last the repentance of Duṣyanta with considerable moderation after getting the ring etc. will really delight the readers. The depiction of pathetic condition of Duṣyanta through the words of *kañcukī* is noteworthy. Duṣyanta discards all his special decorations but wore only a golden armlet in his left forearm, his lover lip became reddish due to his heaving sighs, his eyes became very tired by sleeplessness due to the anxious thought of his beloved, his slimness remain unnoticed due to his natural grace like a polished gem.

Duṣyanta says these words by looking the picture of Śakuntalā drawn by him. ‘Oh! Bee if you touch the *bimba* fruit like lip of my beloved, which is softer than the tender leaf of a younger plant and is even very gently drunk by me in amorous sports, I will imprison you in the interior portion of a lotus.’ There are also some other verses in the text to delineate the pathetic plight of Duṣyanta. Such verses will create an intense feeling in the mind of whole readers. The modifications to the original story consisting of the curse episode and repentance of Duṣyanta after getting the ring helps Kālidāsa to depict Duṣyanta as an ideal hero. This drama has been subjected to the study and analysis by various scholars in later years. Kuntaka’s analysis of this drama can be seen as a first attempt to analyse the beauty of the drama as a whole.

Kuntaka cites only the curse episode as the variety of contextual figurativeness. There are some other incidents like introduction of the characters like Anasūyā, Priyamvadā, Śārṅgarava, Śāradvata, the episode of Sānumatī and the fisherman are also beautiful modifications made by the master poet. Kuntaka would like to point out the most fascinating instance to get the attention of the readers. Through this all other small incidents can envisage the readers themselves.

2.4.1.3. Sentential figurativeness

In the third *unmeṣa* Kuntaka has given a detailed description about sentential figurativeness. Before discussing it in detail he has briefly mentioned about the figurativeness find in the words of a sentence. Kuntaka defines it as follows:-

*rasādidyotanam yasyāmupasarganipātayoḥ/
vākyaikajīvitatvena sāparā padavakratā//⁷²*

“In a poem where the prepositions and indeclinables (*upasargas* and *nipātas*) are employed only to suggest *rasas* as the sole essence of a poem as a whole, we have what may be called another type of ‘word-beauty’.”⁷³

Kuntaka cites yet another verse from *Śākuntala* as an instance to this. The verse is as follows:-

*muhuraṅgulisamvṛtādharoṣṭham
pratiśedhākṣaravikḷavābhirāmam/
mukhamamsavivartti pakṣmaḷākṣyāḥ
kathamapyunnamitam na cumbitam tu//⁷⁴*

In this verse Kālidāsa beautifully depicts Duṣyanta’s intense passion towards Śakuntalā after seeing her in a hermitage at first time. Duṣyanta is deeply fascinated by the beauty of Śakuntalā and regrets to miss his first chance to kiss the beautiful maiden. In this verse ‘*tu*’ strengthen the repentance of Duṣyanta and also provide extreme charm to this particular verse. Thus though the word ‘*tu*’ situated in a particular place of this verse it contributes beauty to the whole verse.

In the third *unmeṣa* after discussing the three entities associated with poetry like word, content and process of communication (*śabda*, *artha* and *uktivaicitrya*), Kuntaka then categorize the things described. He defines it as follows:-

*bhāvānāmaparimlānasvabhāvaucityasundaram/
cetanānām jaḍānām ca svarūpam dvividham smṛtam//*

*tatra pūrvam prakārābhyām dvābhyāmeva vibhidyate/
surādisimhaprabhṛtiprādhānyetarayogataḥ//⁷⁵*

“Subject of poetry described in all their undimmed propriety and beauty of nature come to be classed under two heads, namely, the sentient and non-sentient. Of these the first class can be subdivided again under two heads-god’s etc. and lions etc. These may be either primary or subsidiary in the poet’s treatment.”⁷⁶

The first i.e., the primary kind is made beautiful by a spontaneous presentation of emotions like love. The second is rendered lovely by a description of the animals etc. in a way natural to their species.

*mukhyamakliṣṭaratyādiparipoṣamanoharam/
svajātyujitahevākāsamullekhojvalam param//⁷⁷*

“The first i.e., the primary kind is made beautiful by a spontaneous presentation of emotions like love. The second is rendered lovely by a description of the animals etc. in a way natural to their species.”⁷⁸

Kuntaka cites the next verse of *Śāṅkuntala* as an example to the second variety mentioned above. In this variety the poets beautifully describes the individual character of each species appropriate to their genus, very naturally and aesthetically for appealing the readers. Theverse mentioned below reveals Kālidāsa’s excellence in explaining the natural traits of a deer. The verse *grīvābhaṅgābhirāmam...*⁷⁹ will really bring forth the clear picture of a deer while reading it.

“Flinging a glance ever and anon at the pursuing chariot in a way graceful on account of the bending of his neck, having with the major portion of his hinder part entered the fore part of his body through the fear of the descent of an arrow, and strewing his path with half-chewed *darbha* grass dropping from his mouth gaping through exhaustion, behold how he, on account of his lofty boundings, traverse more through the sky, and less on the ground.”⁸⁰

These makes clear that Kuntaka was very careful in taking verses for every minute explanation. He had selected few verses for explaining certain figures of speeches like *dr̥ṣṭāntaḥ*, corroboration (*arthāntaranyāsa*) and *apahnuti*. The instance for explaining figurativeness named poetic concealment or *apahnuti* is given below. According to this figurativeness as its name indicates, the natural quality of the described subject is concealed for endowing some unique nature to it.

*tava kusumaśaratvam śītaraśmitvamindor-
dvayamidamayathārtham dr̥śyate madvidheṣu/
visṛjati himagarbhairagnimindurmayūkhais-
tvamapi kusumabhāṇān vajrasārīkarōṣi//*⁸¹

“Your having flowery arrows, and the moon’s cool rays: both these things appear to be untrue in the case of persons like me; (for) the moon showers fire with rays having cold in the interior; and you, too, make your flower-arrows have the hardness of adamant.”⁸²

These are the words of Duṣyanta after having deep love towards Śakuntalā. In this verse the poet brilliantly depicts the poetic

concealment through suggestive way but not directly. Here the poet applies hardness and cruel nature to the already delicate natured objects like flower-arrows of cupid and moon rays. Kuntaka's appraisal of this drama is explicit by his citation for both minute observations and contextual analysis. Through the contextual analysis, Kuntaka leads the attention of the readers in to the soul of this drama.

2.4.1.4. Grammatical figurativeness

The first verse cites from *Śākuntala* by Kuntaka is an example of figurativeness related to number (*saṅkhyāvakratā*), one of the varieties of grammatical figurativeness. When the poet deliberately interchanges the numbers for creating *vaicitrya* is known as *saṅkhyāvakratā*. Here the poet uses singular or dual number in the place, where actually other number is essential. He may use two different numbers in a same sentence for creating this type of *vakratā*. As an example to this, Kuntaka quotes the last line from one of the famous verses from *Abhijñānaśākuntala* of Kālidāsa, which is:-

vayam tattvānveṣānmadhukara hatāstvam khalu kṛtī//⁸³

These are the words of Duṣyanta to the bee when he sees the bee moving around the face of a beautiful girl, who attracted Duṣyanta at the first sight in a hermitage. He says that we are discontented by the search of the truth about this girl but the bee indeed is blessed. Because the bee repeatedly touches the tremulous eye of that girl with its corner moving playfully, humming smoothly in her ear feeling as if it is whispering a secret to her. Though she is waving her hand the bee is drinking her lower lip, the sole treasure of pleasure. Here the poet uses the word

vayam instead of saying *aham*, which means the poet uses the plural ‘we’ instead of the singular ‘I’ for indicating that Duṣyanta is really a stranger to Śakuntalā and also shows that there is no any deep relation between them at that moment. Such interchange of number will create an inexplicable beauty to the verse and surely entertain the readers.

2.4.2. Vikramorvaśīya

The primary source of the story of Urvaśī and Purūravas is *Ṛgveda*. The different versions of the story is found in the *Śatapatabrāhmaṇa*, *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, *Matsyapurāṇa*, *Bṛhaddevatā*, *Kathāsaritsāgara* etc. It is only Kālidāsa who had moulded this famous story as a beautiful dramatic piece. Kuntaka cites nine verses from *Vikramorvaśīya* for substantiating contextual figurativeness and few figures of speech. Some importants among them are given below.

2.4.2.1. Contextual figurativeness

Through one of the varieties of contextual figurativeness Kuntaka says that in one particular act or in canto the poet reveals the main sentiment of that particular composition. The splendor of that particular composition is completely unique from its preceding or following act or cantos. This canto must be considered as the essence of that composition. Moreover this canto will help to understand the overall spirit of the main sentiment of the composition and should contribute unique creativity to the whole work. For demonstrating this particular variety, Kuntaka cites two beautiful contexts. One of them is the arm fight between Śiva and Arjuna from *Kirātārjunīya*. That is really a beautiful context. Yet another context choosed by Kuntaka for this variety is from this drama.

The beautiful context selected by Kuntaka for revealing the essence of *Vikramorvaśīya* is given below. Purūrava in raving mad due to the separation of Urvaśī and mistaken the cloud as a demon and says:-

“King-Hold, you wicked fiend, hold where are you going, taking my beloved? Ha, from the mountain peak up-flying he rains showers of arrows on me. (Looking closely)’. This is a fresh cloud ready to shower, and not a haughty fiend girt in armour. This here is the heavens rainbow striding a vast length and not a (warrior’s) bow stretched out; and this a pelting shower of rain that is so sharp and not a volley of arrows; while this is only a flash of lightning gleaming like a streak of gold on the touch-stone, and not my beloved Urvaśī.”⁸⁴

Thus the beginning of the fourth act reveals the mad emotion of the king due to his deep love towards Urvaśī. Kuntaka’s appropriate interpretation of the above mentioned verse is remarkable. He says that the king feels that the attack of the new cloud is highly dangerous than the attack of a demon with arrows. The arrows will not pierce in to his heart with so difficulty as the new raindrops. Again, the king feels that even the lightning can be seen at least a moment in the sky but in the case of his beloved even such momentary stability is also unimaginable. Moreover some other verses found in the fourth act that is given below will help to strengthen the beauty of this contextual figurativeness.

In *Vikramaorvaśīya* once Purūravas along with Urvaśī went to Gandamādana groves for pleasure. There Purūravas looked intently on a vidyādhara damsel named Udayavatī. She was playing with the sand of the shore of Mandakinī. Being irritated by this, Urvaśī entered the

Kumāra grove, which was forbidden to women and changed as a creeper. Then onwards Purūravas starts to find out her by asking every sentient and non sentient beings.

*tiṣṭhet kopavaśāt prabhāvapihitā dīrghamna sā kupyati
svargāyotpatitā bhavenmayi punarbhāvārdramasyā manah/
tām harttum vibudhadviṣo 'pi na ca me śaktāḥ purovarttinīm
sā cātyantamagocaram nayanayoryātetī ko 'yam vidhiḥ//⁸⁵*

‘May be she is invisible with her supernatural power due to anger, but her anger does not remain too long. Or she may have flown to heaven, but her heart is so passionate towards me. Even the demons do not have the courage to abduct her in my presence. Even though she is still invisible to my eyes, what a destiny is this!’

Here without knowing the exact reason of her absence he is fancying certain facts suitable to her nature. Then thinking logically he will deny the reason and again fancies another one. Through such delineation of pathetic plight of Purūravas, the sentiment of love in separation reaches its maximum extent. The depiction of mad state of Purūravas in the fourth act using the sentiment love in separation helps to consider this act as soul of this drama by comparing other acts. So undoubtedly this is one of the apt instances selected by Kuntaka from *Vikramorvaśīya*.

2.4.2.2. Sentential figurativeness

In the third *unmeṣa* Kuntaka says that:-

“There is also another kind of artistic beauty. It glows with the natural as well as the acquired skills of the poet. It results in the imaginative original creations which are extra ordinary.”⁸⁶

Sometime the poet would like to depict the general nature of object without adding any embellishment to it. Sometimes they prefer to add some adornments through their poetic skill to enrich the charm of the objects described. Here Kuntaka selects a beautiful verse of Kālidāsa to show how both the natural as well as the learned knowledge of a poet add charm to a verse. These are the words of Purūravas to himself at the first sight of Urvaśī.

*asyāḥ sargavidhau prajāpatirabhūccandro nu kāntadyutiḥ
śṛṅgāraikarasaḥ svayam nu madano māso nu puṣpākaraḥ/
vedābhyāsajadaḥ katham nu viṣayavyāvṛttakautūhalo
nirmātum prabhavenmanoharamidam rūpam purāṇo muniḥ//⁸⁷*

‘In the formation of such beautiful damsel, was the bright rayed moon become the forger or the cupid, who himself enjoys only in love or the spring season. How can an old sage, who had become dull through the chanting of Vedas and who had also detached from worldly pleasures can succeed in creating such a charming form.’

Through this verse the poet bring forth the extreme beauty of the heavenly nymph Urvaśī. Here the poet suspects about the creator of Urvaśī and fancies her beauty as a new creation. The lovely radiance and the good nature of moon make to suspect the moon as the creator. Then the poet suspects the creator of the damsel as Cupid, the god of love and spring, the abode of numerous flowers. The other three but not Brahman are able to create such a beautiful damsel. Brahman is dull with chanting

mantras so it is impossible for him to create such a radiant being. He is also completely reluctant from sensual desires and so cannot create such a lovely woman. Moreover his old age makes him averse to makes such a delicate one. Here the figure of speech named poetic fancy along with poetic doubt enriches the natural beauty of a damsel. Thus Kuntaka makes it clear how a verse having natural as well as the acquired skills of the poet should delight the readers.

It is already discussed that the subject matter of the poets is either sentient or non sentient beings. In sentient beings the primary section have the description of gods etc. and the secondary section include the description of animals, birds etc. Kuntaka also opines that the non sentient objects like water, spring etc. contribute their own for the rise of sentiments. Here Kuntaka opines that the primary one should beautify with the spontaneous arrangement of the emotions like love. Trough the verse *tiṣṭhet kopavaśāt...* Kuntaka proves how the sentiments like love in separation of the heavenly beings entertain the readers. Then through the verse mentioned below poet depicts how the non sentient spring season strengthen sentiment of love in its utmost position.

*idamasulabhavastuprārthanādurnivāram
prathamamapi mano me pañcabāṇaḥkṣiṇoti/
kimuta malayavātonmūlitāpāṇḍupatrai-
rupavanasahakārairdarśiteṣvaṅkureṣu//⁸⁸*

These are the words of king Purūravas while suffering the love sick. He says that ‘the cupid had already pierced his mind, which was difficult to withdraw from its deep desire for unattainable object. Then what would be his state by seeing the new sprouts of the mango tree of

the garden, the pallid leaves of which was blown away by the northern breeze.’ In the second canto after the meeting of the heavenly nymph Urvaśī, Purūravas was being highly disturbed by the Cupid. As a solace to this love sick he prefers to sit in solitude. So he would like to go to the Pramadavana. But he realizes that the signs of the spring season will fortify his sorrow.

Kuntaka cites yet another verse as an example of concurrent occurrence (*sahokti*). Description of two different subjects simultaneously through single sentence is known as concurrent occurrence.

*sarvakṣitibhṛtām nātha dṛṣṭā sarvāṅgasundarī/
rāmā ramyā vanoddeśe mayā virahitā tvayā//⁸⁹*

“O lord of mountains, have you seen that lovely woman, beautiful in all limbs, in this charming forest, severed from me?”⁹⁰

This is a question of the king Purūravas towards the mountains. The same verse also interprets as an answer of mountains to the king that they had seen the lovely women separated from him. Here two meanings are incorporated together with a single sentence to enrich the beauty of the sentiments like love in separation. Here Kuntaka says that there is no need to doubt it with paronomasia (*śleṣa*) because of having two meanings attached to it. In paronomasia either a single meaning or both have supremacy. But in concurrent occurrence (*sahokti*) two or more meaning are subordinate to a dominant meaning. Moreover like a light in a lamp paronomasia simultaneously express two meaning through a single word but not in concurrent occurrence. Concurrent occurrence

gives the second meaning through the repetition of the same sentence. These factors make the distinction between concurrent occurrence and paronomasia clear. Thus it can be considered as one of the best examples of concurrent occurrence. In this verse an emendation is seen in the third word of the second line as *vanānte'smin* instead of *vanoddeśe*.

2.4.2.3. Grammatical figurativeness

While discussing grammatical figurativeness Kuntaka says that sometimes the propositions and indeclinables employed in a poem suggest the sentiments. According to him it is also a type of word beauty. For instance:-

*ayamekapade tayā viyogaḥ priyayā copanataḥ suduḥsaho me/
navavāridharodayādahobhirbhavitavyam ca nirātapatvaramyaiḥ*⁹¹

‘All of a sudden he has suffered the intolerable painful separation from his beloved and also it appeared to be a pleasant day by the presence of the new rain cloud extenuating the intense heat.’

Here the poet describes the separation from the beloved and the advent of the rainy season as converging at the same time using the proposition ‘ca’. It delineates an unexplainable beauty like the fire and the southern wind, which has the capacity to burst the fire. Thus in this verse the twice used proposition ‘ca’ creates unexplainable charm to it.

Among the cited works of Kālidāsa the dramas like *Śākuntala* and *Vikramorvaśīya* also have considerable merit. There are some resemblances in choosing verses from the dramas. Kuntaka uses the verses from both the dramas to illustrate few similar instances like

contextual figurativeness, grammatical figurativeness, sentential figurativeness etc. Through the description of contextual figurativeness, Kuntaka tries to bring forth the essence of these dramas in its maximum level. Such beautiful composition of Kālidāsa is highly remarkable. This indicates the reason why Kālidāsa always reign supreme among Sanskrit poets. Unlike Kuntaka no one else tries to evaluate Kālidāsa as beautifully as this. As a critic Kuntaka completely keep justice to evaluate Kālidāsa.

The themes of Kālidāsa show that he was being highly influenced by the great epics and Purāṇas for writing all of his masterpieces. But it is also believed that some purāṇas were written after him. So there is also a possibility of his influence on some *Purāṇas*. Whatever it is his unique depiction and characterisation gave him the title *kavikulaguru*. In all his works a curse plays an important role to the innovative development of the theme from its original sources. Moreover the calm and pleasant atmosphere of heritages and the life of ascetics are also unavoidable object in his composition.

2.5. Conclusion

The foregoing discussion makes it clear that Kuntaka holds Kālidāsa in high esteem, even though he is not a blind admirer of him. As a practical literary critic, Kuntaka does not hesitate to indicate the defects in the works of the master poet. Kuntaka's appreciation and criticism of Kālidāsa are genuine and admirable. He cites large number of verses from the works of Kālidāsa to illustrate tender style and sentential figurativeness. It is notable that Kuntaka uses his five *vakratas* except phonetic figurativeness for evaluating the works of Kālidāsa.

These are the common factors discussed in the selected works of Kālidāsa. The explanation of sentient and non sentient objects, the subject matter of the poet and contextual figurativeness are the other common factor discussed in the works of Kālidāsa except *Meghadūta*. For evaluating Kālidāsa, Kuntaka uses compositional figurativeness only once for indicating the beauty of the title *Abhijñānaśākuntala*. Kuntaka's all other observations on Kālidāsa are found in contextual figurativeness. Contextual figurativeness helps to evaluate the works of Kālidāsa at a comprehensive level.

The proper assessment of a great poet like Kālidāsa is not an easy task. But from the above instances it is clear that Kuntaka had done justice in evaluating him properly. The unique attempt made by a rhetorician like Kuntaka to point out some notable verses will help to bring forth the greatness and also at the same time some small drawbacks of the master poet. From the keen evaluation of Kuntaka's judgement of Kālidāsa, it is clear that the uniqueness of Kuntaka is mainly due to three reasons. One of them is his boldness in criticizing the master poets. Another one is his boldness in breaking the theory of early rhetoricians with apt explanation and the suggestion of new one in its place by replacing the old one. Yet another reason is his propriety in making plausible innovative changes in certain situations.

One of his innovative changes is found in *Raghuvamśa*. For explaining the beauty of tender style, Kuntaka cites a verse beginning with *jyābandhaniṣpandabhujena yasya* etc. from *Raghuvamśa*. Here Kuntaka has used the word 'daśānanena', while Mallinātha and other commentators have used 'lañkeśvareṇa' in this verse. Here the two

epithets used for Rāvaṇa are *nirjitavāsava* and *daśānana*. The miserable plight of Rāvaṇa is mentioned through two compound words. They are ‘*jyābandhaniṣpandabhujena*’ and ‘*viniḥśvasadvaktraparampareṇa*.’ Shanbag in one of his articles⁹² opines that by comparing the two epithets respectively with these two compound words, it is clear that ‘*daśānana*’ is far better than ‘*lañkeśvareṇa*’. Moreover in a single verse of *Vikramorvaśīya* a word *vanānte’smin* is changed by *vanoddeśe*. Like wise in the verse *darpaṇe ca parihogadarśinī*... of *Kumārasambhava*, the word *vīkṣya* was used instead of *prekṣya* without hampering the meaning. This reveals that there are some minute variant readings in the verses of the master poets like Kālidāsa in the poetic works. May be the variant readings are the innovation made by either the editor or the author of that particular text. Here it is better to think that Kuntaka has changed the synonym of a word without deviating the meaning of the verse to increase the charm of it.

Kuntaka brings forth yet another poetic excellence of Kālidāsa through the depiction of the hunting episode of Daśratha. Actually there is no reason to support the cruel deed of Daśaratha in his hunting episode. But according to Kālidāsa, it is unfair to depict a king of solar dynasty in a wrong way. Description of this hunting episode is essential, because it leads to the curse episode which is fundamental to the progress of the story. So Kālidāsa with his poetic excellence tries to portray Daśaratha’s qualities using few verses. First of all Kālidāsa depicts Daśaratha’s profound excitement in hunting. Then he depicts king’s concern of living beings like peacock, deer etc. This will help the connoisseurs to think that such a kindhearted man will never deliberately

commit such a sin. Then for protecting Daśaratha, the master poet opines that even sometimes due to bad luck good people also go in a wrong way. Thus Kālidāsa very convincingly save the fame of Daśaratha instead of saying that he mistakenly killed a young blind ascetic boy. These make clear that Kālidāsa brilliantly absolves Daśaratha of his sin. Moreover in *Raghuvamśa* Daśaratha says that the curse fallen on him is like a blessing because of his childlessness. This is also one of the beautiful incidents cited by Kuntaka to reveals the poetic excellence of Kālidāsa.

Another notable nature of Kuntaka is that most probably he is the only rhetorician who had shown the boldness to criticize Kālidāsa. Kuntaka points out the impropriety of Kālidāsa by citing two incidents from *Raghuvamśa* and one from *Kumārasambhava*. In *Raghuvamśa* Kuntaka criticizes Kālidāsa because of the depiction of Rāma's remembrance of the bad deed of Kaikeyī even after his victory. Another one is Dilīpa's answer to the lion. In *Kumārasambhava*, Kuntaka points out the impropriety in the harsh words showered by Cupid towards Indra. These incidents are discussed above. Suppose here Kālidāsa may want to show that sometimes even great personalities have such weakness. But according to Kuntaka a great poet should always be conscious in the depiction of ideal characters. Kuntaka does not tolerate minute faults of the ideal heroes because it will adversely influence the readers. A poet can easily influence the people of a society. A sincere critic should be a good judge. These observations of Kuntaka prove that as a critic he always would like to uphold moral values. At the same time it is clear that the aim of Kuntaka was not to humiliate the master poet

through his criticism. The selection of large number of verses from Kālidāsa shows Kuntaka's acceptance of Kālidāsa. Kuntaka just fulfills his duty as a sincere critic without considering the stature of the poets.

¹ K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvitā of Kuntaka*, p.14.

² C.R. Devadar, *Works of Kālidāsa*, Vol-II, P.37.

³ M.R.Kale, *The Meghadūta of Kālidāsa*, p.161.

⁴ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit, p.50.

⁵ ibid, p.336.

⁶ ibid, p.16.

⁷ ibid, p.93.

⁸ ibid, p.381.

⁹ ibid, p.14.

¹⁰ ibid, p.102.

¹¹ ibid, p.389.

¹² ibid, p.102.

¹³ ibid, p.35.

¹⁴ M.R.Kale, op.cit, p.32.

*ratnacchāyāvvyatikara iva prekṣyametatpurastād-
valmīkagrāt prabhavati dhanuḥkhaṇḍamākhaṇḍalasya/
yena śyāmam vapuratiratām kāntimāptasyate te
barheṇeva sphuritarucinā gopaveśasya viṣṇoḥ//*

¹⁵ Pt.Ramachandra Jha(Ed.). *Raghuvamśamahākāvyaṃ of Mahakavikalidas*, p.201.

¹⁶ Gopal Raghunath Nandargikar (Ed.). *The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa*, p.130.

In this chapter all the translation of the verses of *Raghuvamśa* are taken from it.

¹⁷ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit, p.260.

¹⁸ idem.

¹⁹ ibid, p.261.

²⁰ idem.

²¹ ibid, p.262.

²² ibid, p.264.

²³ ibid, p.263.

-
- ²⁴ *ibid*,p.71.
²⁵ *idem*.
²⁶ *idem*.
²⁷ *ibid*,p.17.
²⁸ *ibid*,p.36.
²⁹ *ibid*,p.43.
³⁰ *idem*.
³¹ *ibid*,p.44.
³² *ibid*,p.43.
³³ *ibid*,p.329.
³⁴ *ibid*,p.46.
³⁵ *ibid*,pp.46-47.
³⁶ *ibid*,p.48.
³⁷ *ibid*,p.334.
³⁸ *ibid*,p.49.
³⁹ *idem*.
⁴⁰ *ibid*,p.335.
⁴¹ *ibid*,p.50.
⁴² *idem*.
⁴³ *ibid*,p.68.
⁴⁴ *ibid*,p.85.
⁴⁵ *ibid*,p.91.
⁴⁶ *ibid*,p.107.
⁴⁷ *ibid*,p.108.
⁴⁸ *ibid*,p.566.
⁴⁹ *ibid*,p.100.
⁵⁰ M.R. Kale, *The Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa*, p.215.
⁵¹ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.101.
⁵² M.R. Kale, *op.cit*,p.197.
⁵³ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.72.
⁵⁴ M.R. Kale, *op.cit*,p.178.
⁵⁵ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.27.
⁵⁶ M.R. Kale, *op.cit*,p.195.
⁵⁷ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.43.
⁵⁸ *ibid*,p.329.

-
- ⁵⁹ *ibid*,p.45.
- ⁶⁰ M.R. Kale, *op.cit*,p.180.
- ⁶¹ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.48.
- ⁶² *ibid*,p.334.
- ⁶³ *ibid*,p.49.
- ⁶⁴ M.R. Kale, *op.cit*,p.181.
- ⁶⁵ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.126.
- ⁶⁶ M.R. Kale, *op.cit*,p.206.
- ⁶⁷ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.541.
- ⁶⁸ *ibid*,p.249.
- ⁶⁹ M.R. Kale, *The Abhijñānaśākuntala of Kālidāsa*, p.123.
- ⁷⁰ *ibid*,p.250.
- ⁷¹ *ibid*,p.161.
- ⁷² K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,.p.120.
- ⁷³ *ibid*,p.406.
- ⁷⁴ *ibid*,p.121.
- ⁷⁵ *ibid*,p.137.
- ⁷⁶ *ibid*,pp.423-424.
- ⁷⁷ *ibid*,p.138.
- ⁷⁸ *ibid*,p.424.
- ⁷⁹ *grīvābhaṅgābhirāmam muhuranupatati syandane baddhadṛṣṭiḥ
paścārdhena praviṣṭaḥ śarapatanaḥ bhūyasā pūrvakāyam/
dharbhairardhāvalīdhaiḥ śramavivṛtamukhabhramśibhiḥ kīṛṇavatmā
paśyodagrāplutatvādvīyati bahutaram stokamurvyām prayāti/*
- ⁸⁰ M.R. Kale, *op.cit*, p.15.
- ⁸¹ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.237.
- ⁸² M.R. Kale, *op.cit*, p.89.
- ⁸³ *cālāpāṅgām dṛṣṭim sprśasi bahuśo vepathumatīm
rahasyākhyāyīva svanasi mṛdu karṇṇāntikacarah/
karau vyādhunvatyāḥ pībasi ratisarvasvamadhamam
vayam tattvānveṣānmadhukara hatāstvam khalu kṛtī//*
- ⁸⁴ C.R. Devadhar, *Vikramorvaśīya of Kālidāsa*, p.105.
- ⁸⁵ *ibid*,p.138.
- ⁸⁶ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,.p.415.
- ⁸⁷ *ibid*,p.130.

⁸⁸ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit., p.142.

⁸⁹ ibid, p.229.

⁹⁰ C.R. Devadhar, op.cit, p.117.

⁹¹ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit., p.121.

⁹² The name of the article is '*Variant Readings of Kālidāsa's verses in Kuntaka's Vakroktijīvita.*' It is in the Centenary Commemoration Volume, Vol.XVI. p.22.

CHAPTER 3

KUNTAKA'S ESTIMATION OF MAHĀKĀVYAS OF OTHER POETS

The *mahākāvyas* indicate the genre of Indian epic court poetry in Sanskrit literature. It consists of ornate and lengthy descriptions of battle, love, description of nature etc. Though there are many definitions given for *mahākāvyas* by different rhetoricians, the most famous one in Sanskrit is given by Daṇḍin. He is the author of a famous poetic work named *Kāvyādarśa* written in 7th century C.E. The definition starts as '*sargabandho mahākāvyamucyate tasya lakṣaṇam*' etc.¹ It says that a *mahākāvya* should begin with a benediction, homage or indication of subject matter. The plot should be based either upon a well-known legend or some historical fact. It should contain the descriptions of the town, the mountain, the season, rising of moon and sun, love scenes, war expeditions, battle and victory of hero etc. He also indicates that absence of any one or two of these elements in the definition will not spoil the essence of the *mahākāvya*.

Some of the scholars opine that the name *mahākāvya* first appeared in the colophons of *Buddhacarita*, *Saundarānanda*, *Setubandha*, *Kumārasambhava*, *Raghuvamśa* etc.² It is said that the word *mahākāvya* is synonymous with *sargabandha* as the Sanskrit rhetoricians commence the definitions of *mahākāvya* with the term *sargabandha*. *Rāmāyaṇa* is the first poem which is seen to be divided

into *sargas*. This might have been the source of inspiration for coining of the word *sargabandha*. *Mahākāvya*s have been composed in Sanskrit, Prakrit, Pāli and Apabhramśa.

Many *mahākāvya*s like Aśvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita* and Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa*, *Kumārasambhava* were composed before the age of Daṇḍin. Daṇḍin would have formulated the definition of *mahākāvya* being influenced by the beautiful compositions of these poets. The definitions formulated by rhetoricians like Daṇḍin set frameworks for the future poets. The main emotion or *rasa* plays an important role in *mahākāvya*. Though all the emotions have a possibility, most of the rhetoricians opine that love or heroic should preferably be the main sentiment. Viśvanātha suggests that tranquility (*Śānta*) can also be made the principle emotion.

Kuntaka has chosen verses from various Sanskrit *mahākāvya*s like *Kirātārjunīya*, *Śiśupālavadhā*, *Raghuvamśa* and *Kumārasambhava* for substantiating the various aspects of figurative speech as epitomizes by *vakrokti*. Moreover while discussing two different varieties of compositional figurativeness, Kuntaka mentions the name of the two *mahākāvya*s, *Rāmacarita* and *Hayagrīvavadhā*. He has also chosen a few verses from two Prakrit *mahākāvya*s named *Harivijaya* of Sarvasena and *Gauḍavaho* of Vākpatirāja. This chapter discusses Kuntaka's criticism of the *mahākāvya*s as a whole as well as the verses chosen from them. Kuntaka's evaluation of the compositions of Kālidāsa had already discussed, so that is not included in this chapter.

3.1. *Kirātārjunīya*

Among the *mahākāvya*s chosen by Kuntaka for criticism, *Kirātārjunīya* of Bhāravi has an important position. Kuntaka has selected fourteen verses from *Kirātārjunīya* to substantiate his different arguments. Besides evaluating these individual verses, Kuntaka has tried to evaluate the text on a bigger canvas. He sheds his attention on the choice of the hero, incorporation of the main sentiment, beauty of various episodes, the selection of the plot and the additions as well as the omissions made by the poet in the plot etc. This clearly reveals Kuntaka's attempt to unravel the beauty of the *Kirātārjunīya* as a whole.

There are different opinions about the date of Bhāravi. It is mostly accepted as the 5th or 6th century C.E. *Kirātārjunīya* is the only available work of Bhāravi. It has eighteen cantos and the story is taken from the *Mahābhārata*. Bhāravi beautifies it with his own poetic skill in a distinct manner. Among the eighteen cantos the smallest one is the fourth one and has 38 verses. The eleventh one is the biggest canto which comprises 81 verses. *Vīra* or heroic is the main sentiment of this *mahākāvya* and *śṛṅgāra*, *raudra* etc. are the subordinate sentiments. The fight between *kirāta* and Arjuna is the core theme of the poem. This justifies the title *Kirātārjunīya*.

The story of this *mahākāvya* starts at the time of exile of pāṇḍavas for fourteen years after the Kurukṣetra war. It opens with the message of one of the spies of Yudhiṣṭhira about the righteous rules of Duryodhana. In the latter half of the first chapter, Draupadī provokes Yudhiṣṭhira to fight against his enemies. The second canto is a dialogue

between Yudhiṣṭhira and Bhīma. In the third canto, sage Vyāsa advises Arjuna to acquire supreme powers and weapons from lord Śiva through penance. The chapters from four to ten deal with different topics like description of autumn season, the mount Himalaya, features and attempts of heavenly beauties to disturb the penance of Arjuna, the sun set etc. The proper incorporation of subordinate sentiments without disturbing the flow of the main sentiment is essential for a composition. Ānandhavardhana says it in *Dhvanyāloka*:-

*uddīpanaprasāmane yathāvasaramantarā/
rasasyārabdhaviśrānteranusandhānamaṅginaḥ/*^β

“This brings about both the high tide of sentiment and its low ebb appropriately in the work; preserving the unity of the principal sentiment from beginning to end.”⁴

The descriptions of nature, seasons etc. found in the middle cantos of the poem have been moulded into the text in such a manner that they do not hamper the gradual development of the main sentiment.

In the eleventh canto, Indra, having heard about the victory of Arjuna from the heavenly nymphs, disguised as a sage, advises Arjuna to pray to lord Śiva for his success. The twelfth canto describes Arjuna’s severe penance for winning the favour of Śiva. The thirteenth and fourteenth cantos are conversations between *vanecara*, one of the subordinates of disguised Śiva (*kirāta*) and Arjuna about the arrow that was shot on the wild beast (*varāha*). In the fifteenth canto Bhāravi depicts the battle between lord Śiva and Arjuna. The sixteenth canto depicts the dilemma of Arjuna by seeing the excellent fighting skill and

dexterity of Śiva. The last two cantos are devoted to the description of the great battle between Śiva and Arjuna. In the last canto, Śiva reveals his original form and offers *pāśupatāstra* and *dhanurveda* to Arjuna. At last Arjuna goes to his own place after attaining the other bows from the gods like Indra. In this way it was but natural that Bhāravi would achieve great success through this composition on account of including ingredients that are essential for a *mahākāvya* in a judicious manner.

Bhāravi has brilliantly discussed about various aspects of polity in the first three cantos as well as in the thirteenth and fourteenth cantos. The notable feature of this *mahākāvya* is that Bhāravi developed a small theme from *Mahābhārata* into an epic poem. Selection of episodes, gradual development of rasa and portrayal of Duryodhana as a good ruler are some of the innovations brought by Bhāravi. Such innovations make Bhāravi adorn a unique position in Sanskrit literature.

The *Mahābhārata* has numerous heroes like Kṛṣṇa, Yudhiṣṭhira, Karṇa, Bhīma etc. Avoiding such great heroes Bhāravi shows the boldness to highlight Arjuna in his *Kirātārjunīya* and developed it in an interesting manner by avoiding all unpleasant things explained in the original source to avoid a negative impression on the ideal character. In *Kirātārjunīya*, the depiction of Arjuna is seen to be different from the original epic. No other critic in Sanskrit criticism appreciated Bhāravi for considering Arjuna as the hero of his *Kirātārjunīya* as done by Kuntaka. Ānandavardhana establishes the main sentiments of *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* respectively as *karuṇa* and *śānta*. But he does not discuss any other literary piece like *Kirātārjunīya*. No other rhetorician has tried to evaluate a work completely and properly as

Kuntaka did, taking cue from Ānandavardhana. Kuntaka comments on Bhāravi's skill in the incorporation of suitable elements that nourish the sentiment of valour at appropriate places. The context of arm-fight between Arjuna and Śiva is quoted as an illustration by Kuntaka. Bhāravi's boldness and cleverness in depicting a *mahākāvya* with heroic as the main sentiment is also highly appreciable. The dramas like *Veṅīsamhāra* of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa, *Mahāvīracarita* of Bhavabhūti, *Dūtaghaṭokaca*, *Ūrubhaṅga* etc. of Bhāsa have heroic as the main sentiment. Kuntaka's discussion about the compositional figurativeness and the contextual figurativeness of *Kirātārjunīya* is strikingly original. These two are adequate to make an overall assessment of a particular text.

3.1.1. Compositional figurativeness

The final variety of figurativeness named compositional figurativeness (*prabandhavakratā*) is the exact realm for discussing the complete evaluation of a text. Kuntaka cites single lines from three verses to ascertain one of the varieties of compositional figurativeness. The definition given for this variety is as follows:-

*trailokyābhinavollekhanāyakotkarṣapoṣiṅā/
itihāsaikadeśena prabandhasya samāpanam//
taduttarakathāvarttivirasatvajihāsayā/
kurvīta yatra sukaviḥ sā vicitrāsya vakratā/ᶜ*

A poet can start his work by explaining the whole story of the main source but he should conclude his work only by explaining the overall victory and prosperity of the hero, because the poetic purpose is

to depict the hero as an ideal man and highlight his achievements in an interesting manner by avoiding other repulsive things to delight the readers. This is one of the varieties of compositional figurativeness. This view expressed by Kuntaka corresponds to Ānandavardhana's opinions in *Dhvanyāloka*:-

*itivṛttavaśāyātām tyaktvānanuḡṇā sthitim/
utprekṣyāpyantarābhīṣṭarasocitakathonnayah//⁶*

“If, in a theme, adapted from a traditional source, the poet is faced with situations conflicting with the intended sentiment, his readiness to leave out such incidents and inventing in their place even imaginary incidents with a view to delineating the intended sentiment.”⁷

For instance, the following passages in *Kirātārjunīya* can be cited. Here Kuntaka just cites the single stanzas of these verses. So only the translations of the stanzas cited by Kuntaka are given below.

*dviṣām vighātāya vidhātumicchato rahasyanuḡñāmadhigamya bhūbhṛtaḥ/
sa sauṣṭhavaudāryaviśeṣaśālīnīm viniścitārthāmiti vācamādade//⁸*

“For equipping himself to destroy the enemies, Arjuna took the king's permission in secret.”⁹

*vidhisamayaniyogāddīptisamhārajihvam
śīthilavasumagādhe magnamāpatpayodhau/
riputimiramudasyodīyamānam dinādau
dinakṛtamiva lakṣmīstvām samabhyetu bhūyah//¹⁰*

“Like the sun rising at the morning, overthrowing his darkness-foe, let glory attend on the same mission.”¹¹

*yayā samāsāditasādhanena suduścarāmācaratā tapasyām/
ete durāpam samavāpya vīryamunmūlitāraḥ kapiketanena//¹²*

“All the said warriors mighty will be destroyed root and branch by Arjuna when he obtains the most difficult divine missile”¹³

The meaning of the first line of the first verse is that Arjuna secretly attains the permission from Yudhiṣṭira for doing penance, who himself has some plans to annihilate the enemies. The meaning of the second line of the second verse is that let the goddess of wealth approach Yudhiṣṭira alone like the rising morning sun by wiping out the enemy, means the darkness. The second line of the third verse means that after attaining the powerful *pāśupata* bow through great penance, Arjuna would terminate all the enemies.

Bhāravi, at the outset, paints a general picture of the events that preceded the penance of Arjuna through the episode of *vanecara*. This creates a background on which Bhāravi starts to focus upon the heroic Arjuna. For this, he explains the fight between the disguised Śiva and the great warrior Arjuna, who lost everything in the game of dice, who has great anger due to the various humiliations heaped upon Draupadī, who has got advice from sage Vyāsa to acquire the divine missiles, and who starts his austerities to attain the *pāśupata* etc. In this fight Bhāravi has succeeded in depicting the valour of Arjuna. Thus Bhāravi highlights the importance of the hero of this *kāvya* brilliantly.

Bhāravi depicts the greatness of Arjuna in a different and attractive manner. Arjuna alone had to fight with the great god Śiva even before attaining the divine missile named *pāśupata*. Even lord Śiva was

astonished and bewildered when he was taken by Arjuna in his hand and thrown up to dangle in the air at the time of their arm-fight. It is notable that only after this fierce fight, Arjuna attained the divine *pāśupata*. Moreover the discus-armed lord Kṛṣṇa is Arjuna's charioteer. He can protect Arjuna from all the perils. But from the *Mahābhārata* it is explicit that Arjuna of such great prowess had done some improper deeds in the war. Kuntaka points out some of them like Arjuna, with the support of Bhīma and others, treacherously defeated the old aged Bhīṣma by placing Śikhaṇḍin before him. At that moment, Bhīṣma remarks "these are the arrows of Arjuna and surely not of Śikhaṇḍin". This really indicates that it was a cowardly act by Arjuna. Secondly Arjuna cut down the Bhūriśravas's arm when he was engaged in some other action. Thirdly he beheaded Karṇa, who was lifting his chariot that was sunk in the mud of the battle field. Arjuna engages in such actions even when he is aware of the laws of the battlefield. Bhāravi has avoided the description of these inappropriate actions of Arjuna to idealize him as a great warrior. Kuntaka appreciates this skill of Bhāravi in employing one of the varieties of compositional figurativeness. Kuntaka praises Bhāravi's genius in selecting the appropriate episodes which would enhance the sentiment of valour. Here Kuntaka again proves his proficiency to evaluate literary works by comparing them with the original story from which theme of the current poem has been taken.

Bhāravi also brings forth some other innovations to highlight the importance of Arjuna. In *Mahābhārata*, Vyāsa advises a mantra named *pratismṛti* to Yudhiṣṭhira. Yudhiṣṭhira in turn gives this advice to Arjuna. This mantra would help to defeat the enemies. Unlike in

Mahābhārata, in *Kirātārjunīya*, Vyāsa directly advises Arjuna to reform austerities for fighting against his enemies. Bhāravi might have also thought that a mortal human being is not enough to take the role of opponent to show the power of Arjuna, so he brilliantly introduces Lord Śiva himself as the rival.

3.1.2. Contextual figurativeness

Kuntaka cites a verse from the poem in the first *unmeṣa* as an example of contextual figurativeness. One of the varieties of contextual figurativeness is the inclusion of a completely innovative context to the new plot apart from the original story to increase its aesthetic delight or the development of already described episode brilliantly by his poetic skill.

*itivṛttaprayukte'pi kathāvaicitryavartmani/
utpādyalavalāvaṇyādanyā lasati vakratā//¹⁴*

“When a poet is constructing a plot of his own, based though it might be on a well-known source, if he succeeds in infusing even a small streak of originality, the beauty gained thereby will be singular.”¹⁵

*tathā yathā prabandhasya sakalasyāpi jīvitam/
bhāti prakaraṇa kāṣṭhādhirūḍharasanirbharam//¹⁶*

“Even as an episode too can shine forth as the vital essence of the work as a whole, brimful of sentiments reaching their utmost limit.”¹⁷

In the thirteenth canto of *Kirātārjunīya*, after killing the wild boar at the same time by Arjuna and disguised Śiva, one of the subordinates of Śiva had a heated argument with Arjuna. Bhāravi uses a number of

verses to depict the argument abounding in brilliant and polite words. The suggestive meaning hidden behind the scholarly speech is to persuade Arjuna to fight against Kirāta. The subordinate persuades Arjuna to give back Śiva's arrow which actually killed the boar. When Arjuna understands this point he says:-

*prayujya sāmācaritam vilobhanam bhayam vibhedāya dhyaḥ pradarśitam/
tathābhiyuktam ca śīlīmukhārthinā yathetarannyāyamivāvabhāsate//¹⁸*

“You have used persuasion, temptation and even threat to cause division in my mind. And while claiming this arrow, you have so spoken that what is unjust appears as if it were just.”¹⁹

Such type of persuasion is not seen in the original source book, only a mutual argument between the *Kirāta* and Arjuna is mentioned there. A character like the subordinate of *Kirāta* and his indirect and mild persuasion is Bhāravi's innovation and it is undoubtedly one of the beautiful instances for contextual figurativeness. Only those who have the real knowledge of both the epic *Mahābhārata* and *Kirātārjunīya* can pin point out such innovation. So Kuntaka's selection of this particular context as an example of contextual figurativeness again firmly proves Kuntaka's sharp acumen in poetic analysis.

Kuntaka cites yet another instance from *Kirātārjunīya* as an example of the one of the varieties contextual figurativeness. The definition given for this variety of contextual figurativeness is as follows:-

*yatrāṅgirasaniṣyandanikaṣaḥ ko'pi lakṣyate/
pūrvottarairasampādyah sāṅkāteḥ kāpi vakratā//²⁰*

According to Kuntaka due to this type of figurativeness, in one particular act or canto the poet exhibits the main sentiment of that composition; the beauty of it can never be found in the preceding or following act or cantos. This canto must be the soul of that composition. This canto will help readers to understand the overall essence of the main sentiment of the composition and should contribute unique artistic beauty to the whole work. Kuntaka cites the arm-fight between Arjuna and Śiva from the *Kirātārjunīya* as an instance of it. In this fight they did not use any objects for protection like armour. So obviously Arjuna has got the opportunity to exhibit his power of his arm. The power and valour of Arjuna is projected by the poet by depicting lord Śiva being thrown up in the air by the power of Arjuna's arm. Thus the poet successfully brings forth the heroic sentiment to the peak through such incidents in the fifteenth canto of *Kirātārjunīya*. This particular canto is enough to attract the attention of the readers than any other cantos.

3.1.3. Kuntaka's appreciation of individual verses of Bhāravi

Kuntaka's views about Bhāravi and the citations taken from *Kirātārjunīya* is discussed here in detail. Kuntaka, in the beginning of the first *unmeṣa*, establishes that neither word nor sense alone can make poetry. So a doubt may arise as to how in *aprastutaprasāmsa* mere sense or meaning gives delight to the readers. He makes it clear by saying that a subject which flashes at first in the mind of poet is like a rough stone. He then polishes it with beautiful language and produces it in his composition to attract the readers. The same idea can be depicted in two different ways by a brilliant poet as well as a novice poet. For showing this, Kuntaka cites two verses, one from the efficient poet Bhāravi and

other from an unknown poet. The verse from Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya* is given first.

*māninījanavilocanapātānuṣṇabhāṣpakaluṣānanugṛhṇan/
mandamandamuditaḥ prayayau kham bhītabhīta iva śītamayūkhaḥ//²¹*

“Slowly and softly the moon does rise, as if he were gripped with fear. Exposed to the burning glance of damsels bathed in hot and streaming tears.”

Though there are numerous other *mahākavyas*, which beautifully describes the moon rise, Kuntaka selects the above verse from the ninth canto of *Kirātārjunīya* in this particular context. According to the *Pāṇinia sūtra* ‘*nityavīpsayoḥ*’ (8.1.4) the word will double itself for denoting repetition when the affix ‘*ṇamul*’ (*am*) combines with the root.²² In the second line ‘*mandamandam*’, the word used by Bhāravi is an example to it. From this it is clear that the poets incorporate various grammatical aspects in the *kāvya*s to bring about charm and deeper connotations. Moreover the poet gives shape to a description which is brief and precise. Undoubtedly this reveals Kuntaka's sensibility in choosing perfect examples suitable for the contexts. Kuntaka compares this verse of Bhāravi with a verse of unknown authorship. Here Kuntaka just says that the verse of Bhāravi is beautiful and not the latter one. He does not give ample explanation for the reason of the beauty of this verse. Perhaps Kuntaka leaves it to the imagination of the *sahṛdaya*. The other verse of unknown authorship quoted by Kuntaka is:-

*kramādekadvitriprabhṛtiparipāṭīḥ prakāṭayan
kalāḥ svairam svairam navakamalakandāṅkurarucaḥ/
purandhrīṅām preyovirahadahanoddīpitadṛśām
kaṭākṣebhyo bibhyannibhṛta iva candro'bhyudayate//²³*

Though both the verses explain the beauty of the moon rise, the first verse depicts it very beautifully and pleasantly than the second one. In the second verse the epithets given to the moon are lengthy and hence charmless. The first line itself (*ekadvitriprabhṛti...*) indicates this impropriety. Such verses never delight the connoisseurs but only create boredom. Yet another verse cited from *Kirātārjunīya* by Kuntaka is as an example of propriety (*aucitya*). Deviating from the usual scheme of poetic virtues Kuntaka is known to have enunciated two qualities named propriety and grace (*aucitya* and *saubhāgya*). He defines propriety as:-

*yatra vaktuḥ pramāturvā vācyam śobhātiśāyinā/
ācchādyate svabhāvena tadapyaucityamucyate//²⁴*

Wherein the primary meaning is concealed either by the excessively charming nature of the speaker or the listener is also known as propriety. For illustrating propriety Kuntaka chose a verse from *Kirātārjunīya*. It is as follows:-

*nipīyamānastabakā śilīmukhairaśokayaṣṭiścalabālapallavā/
viḍambayanti dadṛśe vadhūjanairamandadaṣṭauṣṭhakarāvadhūnanam//²⁵*

“With clusters of blossoms sucked by bees and tender leaves waving in the breeze, the Aśoka branch seemed to imitate the hands of maidens warding off lovers from kissing them hard.”

This is an example of propriety where the nature of listener conceals the primary meaning. Here the maidens (the listener) feel their own love experience in the natural swinging of the *Aśoka* branch. Such aesthetic experience of the maidens makes the readers feel as if the primary meaning indicates the description of the *Aśoka* branch, being clouded by it. Here undoubtedly the identification of the maiden's own beautiful experience with that of the *Aśoka* branch creates the charming quality named propriety (*aucitya*) mentioned by Kuntaka. Again in the third *unmeṣa*, Kuntaka cites this verse as an example of *upamā* in word (*padārthopamā*) by using the indicators like 'iva' etc.

The figurativeness related to synonym (*paryāyavakratā*) is of different kinds, selection of the most suitable synonym in a particular context, and the selection of a synonym which gives extreme delight to a particular context because of its inherent beauty etc. To illustrate this point Kuntaka cites the following verse from *Kirātārjunīya*.

*nābhiyoktumanṛtam tvamiṣyase kastapasviviśikheṣu cādarah/
santi bhūbhṛti hi naḥ śarāḥ pare ye parākramavasūni vajriṇaḥ//²⁶*

“I would not like to fight with you for nothing. And what regard do the arrows of hermits deserve? I have other arrows of mine in my mountain store and they from the wealth of the thunder-wielding god's prowess.”

This verse of Bhāravi is a conversation between one of the subordinates of the disguised Śiva and Arjuna. They argue for the ownership of the arrow that killed a wild boar. Here Kuntaka appreciates Bhāravi for his apt use of the synonyms like 'vajrin' and 'tapasvin'

respectively for Indra and Arjuna in the guise of the ascetic. Though having thousands of words to denote the word Indra, Bhāravi used the word ‘vajrin’ (who possess thunder bolt) to increase the charm through the figurativeness related to synonym. Here the hunter refers to Indra as the Lord of celestials who always keep *vajrāyudha* with himself and also his particular skill in using the arrows which are extraordinarily powerful. Moreover the word ‘*tapasvin*’ or ascetic is also apt. The word makes it obvious that everyone had respect towards the arrows of great warriors but none had any respect for the arrows of an ascetic. Here another intention of the poet, which is indicated through the words of hunter is that as they were in the mountain of great ‘vajrin’ and are blessed with lot of weapons and there is no need to blame him falsely for an arrow. The hunter or the subordinate of disguised Śiva wants to prove that he is always talking about the truth and not just accusing Arjuna.

Kuntaka cites another verse from the poem as an example of the figurativeness of concealment (*samvṛtīvakratā*), one of the divisions of lexical figurativeness. This type of figurativeness is simply concealing impropriety, i.e. something which sounds improper when brought forth by direct expression.

*durvacam tadatha mā sma bhūnmṛgastvayyasau yadakariṣyadojasā
nainamāśu yadi vāhinīpatiḥ pratyapatsyata śitena patriṇā//²⁷*

“It is indeed difficult to express what this mighty beast would have done to you, had it not been shot down in time by the commander of our army with his sharp arrows. May that evil not befall you (any time in future too).”

Here Bhāravi very brilliantly conceals the idea of the slaying of Arjuna. It is really improper to directly say such an inauspicious thing about a great warrior like Arjuna. He intends to say that the wild boar may have killed him if it has not been killed by the Kirāta. There are numerous such examples in the works of Kālidāsa, Bhāravi etc. Here Kuntaka's selection of verse from *Kirātārjunīya* for this particular context is apt and beautiful. Kuntaka cites yet another verse as an example of the figurativeness named illuminator (*dīpaka*) which he defines as:-

*aucityāvahamamlānam tadvidāhlādakāraṇam/
 aśaktam dharmmamarthānām dīpayad vastu dīpakam//
 ekam prakāśakam santi bhūyāmsi bhūyasām kvacit/
 kevalam pañktisamstham vā dvividham paridṛśyate//²⁸*

An object which illuminates the function of a described thing having full of propriety, innovativeness, power to delight the connoisseurs and denoting the suggested meaning of a word is known as illuminator (*dīpaka*). It is of two types, single or numerous. That is, here either a single object illuminates many things or numerous objects may be illuminating many other things. The second type of illuminator is of three types.²⁹

The example taken from *Kirātārjunīya* is for the second variety of the second type of illuminator. According to this variety, the first one illuminates the second one and the second illuminates the third and so on and an example is given below. Here the preceding one becomes the object and the succeeding one becomes the subject.

*śuci bhūṣayati śrutam vapuḥ praśamastasya bhavatyalamkriyā/
praśamābharaṇam parākramaḥ sa nayāpāditasiddhibhūṣaṇaḥ//³⁰*

“Spotless learning the body adorns and learning’s ornament is calmness; calmness is adorned by heroism and that by successful diplomacy.”

According to this variety, the succeeding one illuminates the preceding one and this goes forth as a series.’ So undoubtedly this is one of the pertinent examples for illuminator.

According to Kuntaka, some figures like *ananvaya*, *parivṛtti*, *nidarśanā* etc. are simply different varieties of simile (*upamā*). Thus he refuses to accept them as separate figures. Kuntaka quotes the following verse as an example of *nidarśanā* and then he establishes that it is none other than simile. Kuntaka cites the definition given by Bhāmaha in his *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra* for *nidarśanā*. It is given below:-

*kriyayaiva viśiṣṭasya tadarthasyopadarśanāt/
jñeyā nidarśanā nāma yathevavatibhirvinā//³¹*

Nidarśanā indicates a special meaning using verb without using words like ‘*iva*’, ‘*yathā*’ and the suffix ‘*vat*’ etc. which are usually employed to signify similarity. But sometimes in *padārthopamā*, the resemblance between the *upamāna* and *upameya*, situated in one particular part of a sentence is denoted directly. Either the *upamāna* or the *upameya* of the same sentence have some resemblance with another attribute of the another object of the latter half of the same verse. In such a situation, in order to depict their similarity, the poet uses the words

like *iva* etc. more than once. Kuntaka illustrates this with the following verse from *Kirātārjunīya*.

*niryāya vidyātha dinādiramyād bimbādivārkkasya mukhānmaharṣeḥ/
pārthānanam vahnikaṇāvadātā dīptiḥ sphuratpadmamivābhipede//*³²

“The love got out from the sage’s face like luster from the lovely morning sun, bright like sparks of glowing fire and entered Arjuna’s face at once like sunshine making the lotus bloom.”³³

Here in the first half of the verse the *upamāna* and *upameya* respectively are the luster of the morning sun and love of the sage. Then Kuntaka says that here either the above mentioned *upamāna* or *upameya* could be related to another nature of another object of the latter half of the verse based on their resemblance. This is shown again using the word ‘*iva*’ etc. In the latter half of the verse, Arjuna’s face is compared to lotus. The love entering the face of Arjuna from the face of the sage resembles the luster of the morning sun entering the blooming lotus.

From this it is clear that the *upamāna* and *upameya* of the first half of the verse can be related to another nature of another object of the latter half. In the first sentence ‘*iva*’ is used in the word ‘*bimbādivārkkasya*’ and in the next sentence it is again used in the word ‘*sphuratpadmamivābhipede*’. Thus in the latter half, ‘*iva*’ is again used to show the resemblance between the Arjuna’s face receiving the sage’s love and the blooming lotus touched by the sun’s rays. The verse actually contains two pairs of *upamāna* and *upameya*. But the charm of the verse lies in the fact that these two pairs do not stand separately.

They are connected to one another through a relation based on resemblance. This is one of the most difficult, but beautiful verses cited by Kuntaka from Bhāravi to substantiate his arguments.

As an example of the description of the concurrent occurrence (*sahokti*), Kuntaka cites two consecutive verses from the ninth canto of *Kirātārjunīya*. In this canto Bhāravi beautifully depicts certain things like sun set, moon rise, love sickness and the anger and union of certain lovers etc. The definition given for the description of the concurrent occurrence by Kuntaka is as follows:-

*yatraikenaiva vākyena varṇanīyārthasiddhaye
uktiryugapadarthānām sā sahoktiḥ satām matā//³⁴*

According to him, *sahokti* is the fact of expressing two ideas or images, simultaneously, by a single sentence to enrich the beauty of the described subject. Kuntaka propounded this new definition for *sahokti* after refuting the definition accepted by the early rhetoricians arguing that theirs was akin to simile. It is one of the appreciable characteristics of Kuntaka that he does not blindly follow the celebrated early rhetoricians and he exhibits boldness to indicate the impropriety found in them. He puts forth a new definition with an appropriate example too. Kuntaka's uniqueness in the realm of Sanskrit poetics is undoubtedly due to these reasons. The example given for *sahokti* is as follows:-

*ucyatām sa vacanīyamaśeṣam neśvare paruṣatā sakhi sādhvī/
ānayainamanunīya katham vā vipriyāṇi janayannanuneyah//*

*kim gatena na hi yuktamupaitum kaḥ priye subhagamānini mānaḥ/
yoṣitāmiti kathāsu sametaiḥ kāmibhirbahurasā dhṛtirūhe//³⁵*

This is a conversation between a heroine and her friend; here at first the heroine says, ‘speak out everything to him whatever you would like to say’. Hearing this, the friend replies that it is not proper to be harsh to one’s husband. Then the heroine asks her to bring him back through persuasion. The friend says that it is difficult to persuade one who is misbehaving with us. The heroine replies that there is no use of approaching him and it is improper too. Then the friend says, ‘Oh beautiful one! Do not be angry with your beloved’. The lovers enjoyed listening to such conversations between the women. These are the conversation between the heavenly nymphs described in the ninth canto of *Kirātārjunīya*.

Here both the heroine and her friend are so intimate; the friend tries to make the union of the hero and the heroine in her own way. This makes clear that the aims of both of the friend and heroine are same. But both of them express it with different meanings through a single sentence. In the description of concurrent occurrence, single sentence should be used instead of two sentences to convey the intended meaning and make it more attractive. In these two verses, the question and answer of the heroine and her friend are expressed in each single sentences. Though these verses are a little bit difficult to understand from its first reading, the example chosen by Kuntaka is appropriate and deserves appreciation.

Again Kuntaka quotes two verses from the ninth and eighth cantos of *Kirātārjunīya* as examples of the figure of speech named poetic doubt (*sasandeha*). He defines poetic doubt as:-

*yasminnutprekṣitam rūpamutprekṣāntarasambhavāt
sandehameti vicchityai sasandeham vadanti tam//³⁶*

Here already accepted poetic fancy is getting suspected because there are also some other poetic fancies having the same features. Such doubtfulness is for creating extreme aesthetic delight and is known as the figure of speech named poetic doubt. The example chosen by Kuntaka is:-

*rañjitā nu vivadhāstaruśailāḥ nāmitam nu gaganam sthagitam nu/
pūritā nu viṣameṣu dharitrī samhṛtā nu kakubhastimireṇa//³⁷*

“Are all the trees and hills painted black? Or is the sky bent down or stilled? Or the earth’s depths filled up and leveled? Or all quarters rolled together by darkness?”

Here the poet beautifully presents a doubt on the cause of the dark colour of the trees and mountains, the covering of the sky etc. to various other reasons in a touching manner. The second verse cited as an example of poetic doubt is given below:-

*nimīladākekaralolacakṣuṣām priyopakaṇṭham kṛtagātravepathuḥ/
nimajjatīnām śvasitoddhatastanaḥ śramo nu tāsām madano nu paprathe//³⁸*

“Near their lovers, as the ladies bathed with closing eyes, reeling and rolling looks with bodies shivering and bosoms heaving. One of the two was evident as the cause either fatigue (of water-sport) or love.”

Here also the poet beautifully presents doubt as to whether the reason for the shivering of the damsel's body is either due to love or tiredness. Through these two verses, Bhāravi beautifully depicts the darkness and the symptoms of love seen in the damsel with the help of the figure of speech named poetic doubt. Kuntaka's selection of these verses for this particular context is really substantial.

3.1.4. Other innovations of Bhāravi untouched by Kuntaka

Kirātārjunīya contains many innovative episodes which can be regarded as illustrations of contextual and compositional figurativeness. But Kuntaka does not mention each of these innovations. He just indicates a few and leaves the rest to the sensible readers. Some of those innovative episodes in the poem which are not mentioned by Kuntaka are explained here.

Bhāravi has given a detailed description about the positive nature of Duryodhana by showing his good behavior and concern to his people. In the *Vanaparvan* of *Mahābhārata* there are only few verses that show the greatness of Duryodhana. But in *Kirātārjunīya*, Bhāravi devotes the first half of the first canto for the detailed description about the statecraft of Duryodhana. The two verses denote the greatness of Duryodhana in the *Vanaparvan* is given below:-

*sarve kauravasainyasya suputrāmātyasainikāḥ/
samvibhaktā hi mātrābhir bhogairapi ca sarvaśaḥ//
duryodhanena te vīrā mānitāśca viśeṣataḥ/
prāṇāmstyakṣyanti samgrāme iti me niścītā matih//³⁹*

Through this verse, Yudhiṣṭhira brings forth that all the officers of the army of the Kauravas like sons, ministers etc. have been honoured by Duryodhana with the proper division of wealth and luxuries. Here Yudhiṣṭhira tells Bhīma that they will really sacrifice their life for their master Duryodhana as they have been properly honoured by him. These seem to be the threads that inspire Bhāravi to devote the first canto for depicting the greatness of Duryodhana's reign in detail. There are also some other instances in *Mahābhārata*, which show the greatness of Duryodhana.⁴⁰ These hints are beautifully developed by Bhāravi to enrich the plot of *Kirātārjunīya*. This is one of the beautiful instances which show the poetic genius of Bhāravi, which helps him to indicate the might of the enemy of the Pāṇḍavas. This knowledge about Duryodhana's power helps Yudhiṣṭhira to be more cautious in the preparation of war. He comes to know that they have a mighty enemy to fight in the battle. This becomes a reason for Arjuna to do penance so as to acquire powerful weapons which would help them to defeat Duryodhana and his men. Thus the description of Duryodhana's strength at the outset of the poem, helps in laying a strong foundation for the whole plot.

Another notable innovation made by Bhāravi is the introduction of the forester (*vanecara*) episode. From *Kirātārjunīya*, it is clear that the episode of *vanecara* is an indispensable part of the plot. The depiction of the sincerity of the *vanecara* and his ample explanation of matters to his master will really delight the readers. This episode is really marvelous and it supports the innovative course of this *mahākāvya*. Undoubtedly this proves the poetic genius of Bhāravi. The *vanecara* episode is one of

the best examples for the contextual figurativeness of Kuntaka. But Kuntaka does not point out this episode as an example of contextual figurativeness. Bhāravi also introduces many new characters in the poem. When Arjuna goes to Indrakīla mountain for penance, the poet introduces a *yakṣa* who acts a guide to him. A set of heavenly nymphs persuades Arjuna to withdraw from the penance. All these characters who are born out of the poet's imagination add beauty to the work as a whole.

3.2. *Śiśupālavadhā*

Śiśupālavadhā is a famous *mahākāvya* in Sanskrit written by Māgha. It has twenty cantos and one thousand six hundred and fifty verses. Māgha does not give much information about himself except the name of his father and grandfather respectively as Dattaka and Suprabhadēva. Māgha must be not later than Ānandavardhana, because Ānandavardhana cites one or two verses from *Śiśupālavadhā* and most probably assigned him to the latter half of the 7th century C.E. It is another *mahākāvya* like *Kirātārjunīya* whose theme has been adapted from *Mahābhārata*. There are lot of similarities between *Śiśupālavadhā* and *Kirātārjunīya* in plot construction, division of cantos, inclusion of subject matter etc. This makes it clear that Māgha wrote this *mahākāvya* on the model of *Kirātārjunīya* of Bhāravi. The theme of it is taken from the *sabhāparvan* of the *Mahābhārata*. This story is also found in *Bhāgavata* and briefly in the *Purāṇas* like *Padmapurāṇa*, *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*. It is believed that the demon named Hiraṇyakaśipu in his next birth became Rāvaṇa. He was again

born as Ś́isupāla. Though it is written on the model of *Kirātārjunīya*, it has its own unique beauty.

In the first canto Nārada approaches Kṛṣṇa with the message of Indra to kill the demon named Ś́isupāla. In the second canto, Māgha explains the dilemma of Kṛṣṇa whether he should attend the Rājasūya sacrifice conducted by Yudhiṣṭhira or he should kill Ś́isupāla. Moreover the words of Uddava make it clear that Māgha was well versed in statecraft too. The third canto is a journey of Kṛṣṇa towards Indraprastha. The fourth canto has the detailed description of the Raivataka Mountain. The subject matter of the next canto is the arrival and enjoyment of Kṛṣṇa and his army in the Raivataka Mountain. The sixth canto has the beautiful description of six different seasons. The next two cantos respectively describe the enjoyment of the *yādava* damsels in the forest and the water sports of the *yādavās* with their beloveds. Māgha describes the sun set, moon rise etc. in the ninth canto. The tenth canto has the depiction of drinking parties and different amorous-sports.

The eleventh canto gives the beautiful description of the morning. The twelfth canto has the beautiful picture of the setting out of the army of Kṛṣṇa and their passing over of the river *Yamunā*. The eagerness of the women of Dvārakā to watch Kṛṣṇa is the subject described in the thirteenth canto. Next canto explains the sacrifice and the worship of Kṛṣṇa and here Māgha express his skill in the fields like philosophy, *mīmāmsā* and *karmakāṇḍa*. In the fifteenth canto Ś́isupāla shower hard words towards Kṛṣṇa, Bhīṣma and Yudhiṣṭhira by arousing anger due to their worship towards Kṛṣṇa. In the sixteenth canto the

envoy of Śiśupāla conveying the harsh message of him that either Kṛṣṇa should surrender him or ready to prepare for a battle. Next canto depicts the preparation of the *yādavas* for the fight being annoyed by the words of the envoy of Śiśupāla. The eighteenth canto gives the description of the battle between the armies of Kṛṣṇa and Śiśupāla. The description of the duel fight between Kṛṣṇa and Śiśupāla along with their armies is described in the nineteenth canto. In the twentieth canto poet ends the story of this *mahākāvya* by the description of the extermination of the devil Śiśupāla by Kṛṣṇa.

There have been controversies regarding the influence of this poem over *Bhāgavata*. There are some uncertainties about the date and authorship of *Bhāgavata*. The language of this Purāṇa is different from other Purāṇas and it comprises of some Vedic and non-pāṇinīyan usages. Kunjunni Raja in his *sanskṛita sahitya charitram* presents a view which says that it was written by Vopadeva of 13th century C.E. But according to him it was written after 9th century C.E, because Śaṅkarācārya does not cite from it; instead he cites from *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. The text is believed to have its origin from south India. Setting aside the controversies, the most accepted view is that *Bhāgavata* was written after Māgha. *Bhāgavata* also describes the dilemma of Kṛṣṇa inspired from Māgha, but Jarāsandha is mentioned as the demon, instead of Śiśupāla. The uniqueness of Māgha is clear from his brilliant depiction of the dilemma of Kṛṣṇa which is not found in the original source. The sayings like *upamā kālidāsasya...māghe santi trayo guṇāḥ, navasargagate māghe navaśabdo 'pi na vidyate* etc. denote the value of Māgha. The use of vocabulary of Māgha is highly appreciable. Because as far as possible

Māgha does not use a word for the second time for denoting the same meaning. The situations illustrated by Kuntaka from this *mahākāvya* to substantiate his two important *vakratas* like contextual and compositional figurativeness are given below:-

3.2.1. Compositional figurativeness

Kuntaka cites the below mentioned two verses for explaining one of the varieties of compositional figurativeness. The definition given for this particular variety is as follows:-

*pradhānavastusambandhatirodhānavidhāyinā/
kāryāntarāntarāyeṇa vicchinnavirasā kathā//
tatraiva tasya niṣpattirnibandharasojjvalām
prabandhasyānubadhnāti navām kāmapi vakratām//⁴¹*

“Supposing the even flow of the main story has been broken and its sentiment impaired by the intrusion of some incident whose connection with the main story is almost indiscernible; the poet might give the incident such a turn that it will become inevitable for the conclusion of the main story and thus maintain the unbroken course of ‘*rasa*’ and invest his whole work with a very unique novelty thereby.”

For substantiating this variety Kuntaka cites a beautiful instance from this *mahākāvya* and is as follows:-

*tadindrasandiṣtamupendra yadvacaḥ kṣaṇam mayā viśvajanīnamucyate/
samastakāryeṣu gatena dhuryatāmahidviṣastadbhavatā niśamyatām//⁴²*

These are the words of Nārada towards Kṛṣṇa. ‘Nārada says that he is going to announce the message of Indra within a second, which is helpful to the whole world. Kṛṣṇa, who always solves the problems of Indra, should hear this message.’ From this verse Nārada starts to discuss about the cruel deeds of Hiraṇyakaśipu, Rāvaṇa and Śiśupāla for making Kṛṣṇa’s anger towards Śiśupāla through certain verses. At last, hearing such encouraging words, Kṛṣṇa’s anger aroused towards Śiśupāla, which is explained through the verse given below:-

*omityuktavato ’tha śārṅgiṇa iti vyāhrtya vācam nabha-
stasminnutpatite puraḥ suramunāvindoḥ śriyam bibhrati/
śatrūṇāmaniśamvināśapiśunaḥ kruddhasya caidyam prati
vyomnīva bhrukuṭicchhalena vadane ketuścakārāspadam//⁴³*

Nārada departed to the ether after saying those words. ‘Bearing the beauty of the moon and hearing the words of Nārada, Kṛṣṇa says ‘om’ means ‘it will happen so’. Then his anger gets aroused towards Śiśupāla of Kṛṣṇa. The star named Dhūmaketu, like in the sky, which denotes the annihilation of the enemies, took position by disguising as an eyebrow in the face of Kṛṣṇa.’

In the first canto, through these verses Māgha beautifully denotes that the primary theme of this *kāvya* is the assassination of Śiśupāla. But at the same time Kṛṣṇa was being called for attending the sacrifice conducted by Yudhiṣṭhira. After the discussion about this matter with Uddhava and Balarāma, Kṛṣṇa decided to attend the rājasūya sacrifice of Yudhiṣṭhira. Then the journey of Kṛṣṇa towards Indraprastha etc. are described in certain cantos. So the readers may feel that the poet has

completely deviated from the main theme. But then in the fifteenth canto, Śiśupāla showers harsh words towards Kṛṣṇa and others, unable to tolerate the worship being given to Kṛṣṇa by Yudhiṣṭira, Bhīṣma etc. Śiśupāla has got a boon that he will not be killed until he commits hundred faults. He completed his hundred and one faults through the showering of his harsh words. Actually Kṛṣṇa is waiting for the proper time to kill him. Thus the poet after indicating the main theme in the first canto, discusses it again after a long gap. This makes the readers to think that the poet has completely deviated from the main theme. But it is brought to the fore again surprisingly again. It is impossible to point out such beautiful techniques applied by the poet by reading only one or two cantos of the *kāvya*s. This reveals Kuntaka's complete vision of this particular text.

Kuntaka again signifies that the straight forward title given to this *mahākāvya* is charmless. The poet should take utmost care in selecting the name of title because the name itself plays an important role in the overall beauty of a composition. Title name should be connected with the pivotal incident of that composition. Straight forward title of a composition never creates any curiosity in the mind of readers. According to Kuntaka, the relevance of the name of title should be reveal only while going through the text.

3.2.2. Contextual Figurativeness

In one of the varieties of contextual figurativeness, Kuntaka says that the incorporation of appropriate junctures that have some continuous relation between the succeeding one and the previous one will really contribute to the extreme charm of dramatic plot construction. He also

reminds that the deliberate incorporation of junctures only for satisfying the rules of junctures said by Bharata will never contribute any charm to a literary work, instead it would adversely affect the plot. He describes this point as:

*mukhādisandisamhlādi samvidhānakabandhuram/
pūrvottarādisāṅgatyādaṅgānām viniveśanam//
na tvamārgagrahagrastavarṇakāṅgaiḥ kdarthitam/
vakratollekhalāvaṇyamullāsayati nūtanam//⁴⁴*

Here as an example for the inappropriate incorporation of episodes to satisfy the traditional frameworks, Kuntaka quotes the situation from *Śīsupālavadhā* which describes the city of Dvārakā when Kṛṣṇa commences his journey towards Indraprastha. In *Mahābhārata* there are no descriptions about the journey of Kṛṣṇa towards Indraprastha and the places he has travelled etc. But the epic just mentions that Kṛṣṇa reached Indraprastha travelling through few places. *Bhāgavata* gives a more detailed description that Kṛṣṇa travelled in a chariot having a flag with a symbol of Garuḍa accompanied by some armies. He passed some cities like Ānarta, Sauvīra, some mountains and some rivers like Dviṣadvatī and Sarasvatī, the capitals of the kings of Pāñcāla and Matsyadeśa etc. Māgha gave a lengthy description of the journey in ten cantos. In *Śīsupālavadhā*, Kṛṣṇa starts his journey in the third canto and reach Indraprastha only in the twelfth canto. In these ten cantos, Māgha beautifully incorporates all the descriptions essential for a *mahākāvya* like the six seasons, moonrise, amorous-sports, drinking parties etc. Most of the other critics except Kuntaka appreciate such attempt of Māgha as he describes the recipes of *mahākāvya* in unique

and innovative style. But Kuntaka firmly points out that such long description of Dvārakā is really improper. The bold opinion presented by Kuntaka is highly remarkable because such a long description contribute nothing for the further development of the story. Māgha develops this portion through seven hundred sixty six verses in ten cantos, which is mentioned in *Māhābhārata* only through the first portion of two verses. In *Bhāgavata*, it is described through ten verses. Through pointing out such impropriety Kuntaka again proves his critical acumen.

3.2.3.Kuntaka's appreciation of individual verses in *Śiśupālavadha*

The first verse cited by Kuntaka from this *mahākāvya* is as an example to show the disagreement between the words. It is from the tenth canto. He cites this verse also as an example of the figure of speech named *dīpaka*, which is as follows:-

*cārutā vapurabhūṣayadāsām tāmanūnavayauvanayogaḥ/
tam punarmakaraketanalakṣmīstām mado dayitasaṅgamabhūṣaḥ//⁴⁵*

“Beauty adorned their body and was (adorned) in turn by the upsurge of blooming youth; youth again (adorned) by charm of love; and charm itself by drunkenness (adorned) by union with the beloved.”

Here the first one illuminates the second one, but in the second line the poet uses a compound word by saying that the fascinating love is being adorned by the drunkenness caused by the union with the beloved. This will really hampers the charm of this verse and does not delight the connoisseur, moreover it breaks the flow of the figure *dīpaka*. So

Kuntaka suggests a simple and apt solution by saying that it is better to avoid the compound word and just say that the fascinating love being adorned by the union of beloved. This is really a beautiful assessment of Kuntaka; here he never firmly criticizes Māgha; he just points out the impropriety found in a single verse. Thus Kuntaka thrice pointed out the impropriety of *Śísupālavadha*. Such observation of Kuntaka reveals that undoubtedly he is a brilliant literary critic.

One of the varieties of Kuntaka's phonetic figurativeness is same as that of the rhyme (*yamaka*) of the early rhetoricians and the definition given for it by Kuntaka is as follows:-

*samānavarṇamanyārtham prasādi śrutipeśalam/
aucityayuktamādyādiniyatasthānaśobhi yat//
yamakam nāma kopyasyāḥ prakāraḥ paridṛśyate/
sa tu śobhāntarābhāvādiha nātipratanyate//⁴⁶*

It has same sound with different meaning and will express the meaning of the sentence without any difficulty by being agreeable to the ear. Moreover it should be apt to express the nature of the described subject though there may be difficulty in satisfying the rhyme. The repetition of sound should be at particular intervals like in the beginning, middle or at the end of the each lines of a verse. Then Kuntaka says that it is almost equal to the rhyme and it has no special charm except its beauty in the use of words and so he does not explain it in detail. Here Kuntaka does not directly cite any particular verse for the rhyme but just says that the some verses of the fourth canto of *Śísupālavadha* and some verses found at the place of description of spring season in *Raghuvamśa* are rare examples of it. An example from *Śísupālavadha* is given below:-

*vahati yaḥ paritaḥ kanakasthalīḥ saharitā lasamānanavāmśukaḥ/
acala eṣa bhavāniva rājate sa haritālasamānanavāmśukaḥ//⁴⁷*

This is the twenty first verse of the fourth canto of *Śiśupālavadhā* and here the poet uses the word ‘*saharitā lasamānanavāmśukaḥ*’ twice in different meanings. This verse means that the Raivataka Mountain with new glittering rays is bearing the golden yellow colour earth in the four directions and it shone like the new yellow dressed Lord Kṛṣṇa. Here in the first line the word ‘*haritā*’ means ‘*hariteti ca dūrvāyām haridvarṇayute’nyavat’ iti viśvaḥ (kośaḥ)*,⁴⁸ and ‘*lasamāna*’ means ‘*dīpyamāna*’ or glittering and then ‘*navāmśukaḥ*’ means ‘*nūtanakiraṇaḥ*’ or new rays. In the second line ‘*sa*’ means the already said Raivataka Mountain and ‘*haritālasamānanavāmśukaḥi*’ means *ākāśalatāsamānanūtanambaro vā pītāmbara iti bhāvaḥ. ‘haritālam dhātubhede strī dūrvākāśarekhayoḥ’ iti medinī.*⁴⁹ Thus the verses of the fourth canto of this *mahākāvya* show the beauty of the rhyme as said by Kuntaka. It is the thorough knowledge about a text, which helps Kuntaka to points out such examples without any doubt. Kuntaka cites yet another portion of a verse as an example of *viśeṣaṇavakratā*.

*sasmāra vāraṇapatirvinimīlitākṣaḥ
svecchāvihāravanavāsamahotsavānām//⁵⁰*

“With eyes closed, the lordly elephant recalled old memories of free sports and mighty pleasers in the forest.”⁵¹

Here the epithet given to the word ‘*sasmāra*’ is very apt. Here the epithet *svecchā* etc evokes the memories of the sportive part times of the elephant in the forest.

Yet another verse cited by Kuntaka as an instance of *tulyayogitā*, accepted by the early rhetoricians and also for *kalpitopamā* is given below:-

*ubhau yadi vyomni prthak pravāhāvākāśagaṅgāpayasaḥ patetām/
tenopamīyeta tamālanīlamāmuktamuktālatamasya vakṣaḥ//⁵²*

“If in the sky, two streams could flow downward from Gaṅgā in parallel courses, then could one cite it as a comparison for his chest so dark as the Tamāla tree with a dangling bright pearl-necklace.” According to Kuntaka, *tulyayogitā* is none other than *upamā*. Vāmana in the fourth *adhikaraṇa* of his *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra* define *kalpitopamā* as:-

guṇabāhulyataśca kalpitā//⁵³

Depending upon the abundance of the quality, the similarity of *upamāna* and *upameya* is considered and so it is called as *kalpitopamā*. It has got the name *kalpitopamā* because the *upamāna* should always an imagination of a poet. Definition given for *tulyayogitā* in Bhāmaha’s *Kāvyālaṅkāra* is as follows:-

*nyūnasyāpi viśiṣṭena guṇasāmyavivakṣayā/
tulyakāryakriyāyogādityuktā tulyayogitā//⁵⁴*

‘In *tulyayogitā* though the one object like *upameya* is inferior in quality, it is explained as achieving deeds equal to the other object.’ In the verse mentioned above the concept of heavenly Ganges is the

imagination of the poet and the quality of it is much *greater* than the *upameya*. So it can undoubtedly be cited as an example of both *tulyayogitā* and *kalpitopamā*.

While discussing compositional figurativeness, Kuntaka mentioned only the names of some literary works without citing any verse from them. According to Kuntaka, the way to reveal one's poetic genius is not only through the depiction of innovative incidents, but also through the proper naming of a composition. Kuntaka says about this as:-

*āstām vastuṣu vaidagdhī kāvye kāmapi vakratām/
pradhānasamvidhānāñkanāmnāpi kurute kavīh//⁵⁵*

Kuntaka disagrees with the straight forward titles given to the compositions and he cites the names of such works like *Hayagrīvavadha*, *Śīsupālavadha*, *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*, *Rāmānanda* and *Rāmacarita*. He says that such titles do not create any charm but the title denoting some of the vital essence of that particular composition is highly significant. Some of the examples of such innovative titles are *Abhijñāna-śākuntala*, *Mudrārākṣasa*, *Pratimāniruddha*, *Māyāpuṣpaka*, *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* etc. Kuntaka does not mention the author of these works. Among them some of the works are well-known and some of them are less important. Here are the names of *mahākāvya*s mentioned by Kuntaka are *Śīsupālavadha*, *Rāmacarita* and *Hayagrīvavadha*. *Śīsupālavadha* has discusses already. Kuntaka does not give any information about *Rāmacarita* and *Hayagrīvavadha* except its name. Brief information about them is given as appendix. Some Prakrit *mahākāvya*s cited by Kuntaka are discussed below.

3.3. Prakrit *mahākāvyas*

The literary analysis of Kuntaka includes vast fields like dramas, *kāvyas*, anthologies etc. It also includes verses from some Prakrit works and few unknown Prakrit verses. The Prakrit *mahākāvyas* were written on the model and the influence of Sanskrit *mahākāvyas*. Most of the characters in Prakrit *mahākāvyas* are from the real life of the people. Some important Prakrit *mahākāvyas* are *Setubandha* or *Rāvaṇavaho* by Pravarasena written in between 4th century C.E and 5th century C.E, *Kumārapālacarita* of Hemacandra Sūri, *Kamsavadha*, *Uṣāniruddha* etc. *Setubandha* is considered to be the first and ornately fulfilled *mahākāvya* written in Mahārāṣtri Prakrit. Rāmapāṇivāda is the author of *Kamsavadha* as the evidence available from its colophons. Based on some linguistic and stylistic similarities between *Kamsavadha* and *Uṣāniruddha*, it is surmised that Rāmapāṇivāda is also the author of *Uṣāniruddha* too. Rāmapāṇivāda was born in 17th century C.E in south Malabar. There are also some other Prakrit *mahākāvyas* available only through some poetic works but not in detail. They are *Arjunacarita* of Ānandavardhanācārya, *Kuvalayāśvacarita*, *Śauricarita* of unknown authorship etc. The Prakrit works mentioned by Kuntaka are a *mahākāvya* named *Harivijaya* of Sarvasena, a historical *mahākāvya* named *Gauḍavaho* of Vākpatirāja and also an anthology named *Gāthāsaptaśatī* of Hāla.

3.3.1. *Harivijaya*

Harivijaya is a completely lost work and very little information about it is available through some citations in the works like

Sarasvatīkaṇṭābharaṇa and *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* of Bhoja.⁵⁶ It is a Prakrit *mahākāvya* of Sarvasena written in Mahārāṣṭri Prakrit. In the beginning of his *Avantisundarīkathā* Daṇḍin mentions about *Harivijaya* and comments that Sarvasena, the author of *Harivijaya* is most probably identical with the king Sarvasena, the founder of the younger branch of the Vākāṭakas.⁵⁷ If this is true, the date of *Harivijaya* can be assigned to the beginning of the 4th Century C.E. It is the only work ascribed to him.

Kuntaka cites a single verse from *Harivijaya* in the third *unmeṣa* as an example of sentential figurativeness. He opines that writing poetry is not a ridiculous job and has given a definition about it that it should delight the connoisseur. He adds that the adornments like *upamā*, *rūpaka* etc. will never add any charm to the subject matter as if the paintings on an improper canvas, if the subject matter is not excellent or attractive. Then Kuntaka compares the subject-matter with a damsel because she wears only some ornaments at the time of taking bath, leading ascetic life, during separation from her husband and also at the end of amorous sports. In such situations the natural beauty of the damsel is really attractive. Likewise when the poet starts to describe the natural beauty of the content there is no need of any adornment to it. That is why poets depict the subjects like budding youth of a girl, the advent of the spring season, its enrichment and its completion etc. without adding any figures of speech. In such natural depictions, the poets use only their extreme skill of the spontaneous overflow of their sentential figurativeness. For illustrating it Kuntaka cites a verse from *Harivijaya*. The verse is as follows:-

*sajjayati surabhimāso na tāvadarppayati yuvatijanalakṣyasahān/
abhinavasahakāramukhān navapallavapatralānanaṅgasya śarān/*⁵⁸

“The month of spring keeps ready but does not fling the arrows of Cupid, with sharp heads of new mango buds and feathers of fresh leaves, at young women that targets are.”

Here it is clear that there is no need of any figurativeness for the beautiful description of this spring season. Here if the poet takes any deliberate attempt to incorporate any figurativeness for showing his skill in using them, it will surely spoil the natural beauty of this verse. So Kuntaka’s selection of this verse for this particular situation is apt and beautiful.

In the third *udyota* of *Dhvanyāloka*, Ānandhavardhana says that a poet can add new sentiment to a plot taken from any epics deviating from the main sentiment of that particular epic for avoiding the impropriety found in it and also for making the context more attractive. As an example to this he mentioned the works of Kālidāsa, *Harivijaya* of Sarvasena and his own *mahākāvya* named *Arjunacarita*.⁵⁹ Abhinavagupta makes it clear in his *locana* by saying that the description of marriages of the kings like Aja in *Raghuvamśa* and the description of Arjuna’s *pātālavijaya* in the *Arjunacarita* are not seen in the epics. Likewise he says about *Harivijaya* that ‘*harivijaye kāntānunayāṅgatvena pārijātaharaṇādinirūpitamitihāseṣvadṛṣṭamapi*.’⁶⁰ Moreover Ānandhavardhana cited the verse given above and says that this is from Sarvasena’s *Harivijaya*. The words of Ānandavardhana are the only evidence which ascribes this verse to *Harivijaya* and this verse is not

available in the works like *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* and *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* of Bhoja. Ānandhavardhana cites this verse as an example of *kavinibaddha vakṛ praudhoktimātranīspannaśarīrah*, one of the division of suggestiveness found in the *arthaśaktyudbhavānuraṇanarūpavyaṅgyadhvaniḥ*.⁶¹ From this it is clear that both Kuntaka and Ānandavardhana cite the same verse almost for the same concept.

Apart from this verse, Kuntaka mentions about Sarvasena at the time of discussing the styles or *mārgas*. Here after refuting the divisions of styles made by early rhetoricians Kuntaka establishes his own method. According to him there are three poetic styles, they are tender (*sukumāra*), variegated (*vicitrā*), and intermediary (*madhyamā*). Kuntaka opines that the poetic style is based on the nature of the poet and not on the places of the poet as opined by the early rhetoricians like *gauḍī*, *pāñcālī* etc. The tender style is that which was followed by the master poet Kālidāsa. Kuntaka compares the poets who move through the elegant or tender style as the bees moving through the forest full of blossomed flowers. He has included the poet Sarvasena also as the follower of this tender style. ‘*sahajasaukumāryasubhagāni kālidāsasarvasenādīnām kāvyāni dṛśyante, tatra sukumāramārgasvarūpam carcanīyam iti*.’⁶² This is really an appreciation of Kuntaka about Sarvasena because he compares him along with the master poet Kālidāsa. These things show that Kuntaka also has a positive attitude towards Sarvasena and his work.

These things obviously indicate that Sarvasena and his work have got an enviable position in Sanskrit literature. It is also clear that

this Prakrit *mahākāvya* almost satisfies all the needs of a *mahākāvya*. It is unfortunate that many famous poets and their works have now been lost. We came to know about some poets and their verses only through some anthologies and citations. The notable contribution of some rhetoricians like Ānandavardhana, Kuntaka, Bhoja etc. is that the information about some lost works came to the light only through their citations. Moreover the appreciation by the famous rhetoricians like Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Kuntaka gave wide popularity to the composition of Sarvasena.

3.3.2. *Gauḍavaho*

It is a Prakrit historical *mahākāvya* of Vākpatirāja. The date of the author is somehow assigned to the 8th century C.E. because it was written after the death of the Yaśovarman in 750 century C.E. The title given to the author is Kavirāja. *Madhumathavijaya* is the other work of the poet, written long before *Gauḍavaho* but unfortunately it is not available. *Utprekṣā* is the master piece figure of speech of Vākpatirāja like the *upamā* of Kālidāsa.⁶³ *Gauḍavaho* got attention only in 1887 when a scholar named S.P. Pandit brought out the edition of this work. It consists of almost 1209 *gāthas*. Unlike other *mahākavyas* like *Raghuvamśa*, *Kumārasambhava*, it is not divided into cantos. It is a continuous arrangement of *gāthas* in *ārya* metre. The main aim of writing this poem is to celebrate the victory of Yaśovarman against a Gauḍa king. Kuntaka cites three verses from this *kāvya*, the first one is as follows:-

*gaganam ca mattamegham dhārāluḷitārjjunāni ca vanāni/
nirahañkāramṛgāñkā haranti nīlā api niśāh//*⁶⁴

“The sky steeped with drunken clouds, the Arjuna trees in the woods trembling in the downpour, the prideless moon that appears and the dark night too cause delight.”

Kuntaka cites this verse, which is also cited by Ānandavardhana as an example for *atyantatiraskṛtavācyadhvani*, as an example of metaphorical figurativeness (*upacāra vakratā*), the division of lexical figurativeness (*padapūrvārdhavakratā*). Here the qualities like drunkenness and humility are really sentient in nature but here the poet applied these qualities to non-sentient objects for delighting the readers. Kuntaka also says that such types of *vakratā* can be found in the works of lots of great poets. It is also doubtless that this verse is apt for this context. From the keen evaluation of the cited verses of Kuntaka, it is clear that he had taken utmost care in choosing the verses.

Yet another verse quoted by Kuntaka from *Gauḍavaho* is an example of sentential figurativeness. According to Kuntaka, sentential figurativeness is a unique skill of a poet like an overall beauty of a painting, which is distinct or unique from its constituent elements like canvas, lines, paints etc. Likewise the beauty of a sentence is distinct from its constituent elements like words, meaning etc. and which will only delight the connoisseur. Poetic skill is regarded as the important factor of having a subtle shade of art in the word or sentence.

*āsamsāram kavipuṅgavaiḥ pratidivasagr̥hītasāro ’pi/
adyāpyabhinnamudra iva jayati vācām parispandah/*⁶⁵

This beautiful verse cited by Kuntaka from *Gauḍavaho* says that though the poets drew out the essence of speech from the beginning of

the world, still the speech triumphs as an unbroken seal as before. Here actually the poet means that though the poets in the past did not take out the exact essence of the word, no one can attain anything from the unopened word. But for the first time his genius has opened the hidden essence and so from now the unbroken seals will be opened. In this manner the speech attains triumphs by getting the success of the unique genius of a poet. Kuntaka cites another verse from *Gauḍavaho* as the example of *utprekṣā* (poetic fancy). He defines poetic fancy as:-

*sambāvanānumānena sādṛśyenobhayena vā/
nirvarṇyātīśayodrekapratipādanavāñchayā//
vācyavācakasāmarthyākṣiptasvārthairivādibhiḥ/
tadiveti tadeveti vādibhirvācakam vinā//
sammullikhitavākyārthavyatiriktārthayojanam/
utprekṣā kāvyatattvajñairalañkaraṇamucyate//⁶⁶*

Due to the poetic desire of conveying the extraordinary nature of a described subject due to the way of fancying or by the way of similarity or by the combination of both of it, either by the help of a indicative word ‘*iva*’ denotes ‘it is like this’ or ‘it is this itself’ or by the suggestive meaning, the meaning of a well-conceived matter described quite apart from it is known as poetic fancy. Here similarity is of two types 1. natural 2. imaginary. The third and last verse cited from *Gauḍavaho* is the example of the combination of both the natural and imaginary. It is as follows:-

*niḥśvāsāḥ kṣaṇavirahe sphuranti ramaṇīnām surabhayastasya/
kṛṣṭahrdayasthitakusumabāṇamakaraṇdaleśā iva //⁶⁷*

The meaning of this verse is that even the momentary separations from their lovers create sweet sighs in the lady beloveds and this seems to be the droplets of honey that struck in the heart even after taking out the flower-arrows by the cupid. Here the first line denotes that the sweet sigh of the ladies due to momentary separation is really a natural description and compare this with the droplets of honey that get struck in the heart even after taking out the flower-arrows by the cupid is an imaginary concept. So Kuntaka's selection of this example for this particular context is striking. From the evaluation of three verses cited from this, it is clear that Kuntaka has a positive attitude towards these verses. The verses are selected for describing sentential and lexical figurativeness.

3.4. Conclusion

The *mahākāvya*s cited by Kuntaka in *Vakroktijīvita* are *Raghuvamśa*, *Kumārasambhava*, *Śiśupālavadha*, *Kirātārjunīya*, *Gauḍavaho*, *Harivijaya*, *Hayagrīvavadha* and *Rāmacarita*. Among them there are six poems other than those of Kālidāsa. Kuntaka had cited fourteen verses from *Kirātārjunīya* and seven from *Śiśupālavadha*. Two Prakrit poems cited by him are *Gauḍavaho* and *Harivijaya*. He cites three verses from *Gauḍavaho* and one from *Harivijaya*. He just cites the name of *Hayagrīvavadha* and *Rāmacarita* for showing lack of beauty in straight forward titles given to a composition. He also indicates the impropriety in the title *Śiśupālavadha*. But at the same time he does not indicate the impropriety in the titles *Gauḍavaho* and *Harivijaya*. They also signify the topic of the composition through straight forward titles.

Kuntaka explains four *vakratas* except lexical and grammatical figurativeness by citing verses from both *Kirātārjunīya* and *Śīsupālavadhā*. Among the *mahākāvyas* it is only from *Śīsupālavadhā* and *Kirātārjunīya*, Kuntaka take instances for substantiating both contextual and compositional figurativeness. These can be seen as attempts to assess the entire composition. A comprehensive approach is adopted by Kuntaka while analyzing these types of figurativeness. The work as a whole is taken and the components which add to its beauty are analyzed by Kuntaka. From these two kinds of figurativeness, Kuntaka's deep insight into both *Kirātārjunīya* and *Mahābhārata* is well revealed. Moreover he had cited few verses from both these *mahākāvyas* to substantiate different varieties of sentential figurativeness. The verses cited for explaining the figures of speech like *dīpaka* and the varieties of lexical figurativeness from these two *mahākāvyas* are remarkable. These are some similarities found in Kuntaka's evaluation of these two masterpieces.

At the same time there is a notable difference in the observations of Kuntaka on these two *mahākāvyas*. Kuntaka selects fourteen verses from *Kirātārjunīya* and its half from *Śīsupālavadhā*. The striking difference is that the great critic, who has boldly criticized even the master poet Kālidāsa, does not criticize and does not point out any impropriety in Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya*. This reveals Kuntaka's acceptance of Bhāravi and his work. Kuntaka's observations become a valuable guide in revealing the literary merit of this *mahākāvya*. At the same time Kuntaka, is never shy of pointing out the impropriety found in *Śīsupālavadhā*. Actually there is no need to assess Kuntaka's acceptance

of a text based on his appreciation and criticism. He does not conceal his deep sense of admiration towards Kālidāsa though pointing out some impropriety hidden in his compositions.

In *Kirātārjunīya*, Bharavi's innovative concepts like the selection of Arjuna as a hero and beautiful depiction of arm fight between Arjuna and Kirāta are really apt. The persuasive words of Kirāta towards Arjuna to fight against him and the portrayal of Śiva as a rival are also significant. Moreover his observation on single verses selected for illustrating figurativeness related to synonym, figurativeness of concealment etc. are also really beautiful. No other critic tries to highlight these beautiful facts hidden in it, Kuntaka unravels the essence of poem for the connoisseurs. It is interesting to note that in the first *unmeṣa*, Kuntaka compares a verse of Bhāravi with a verse of an unknown poet. The verse starts with *kramādekadvitriprabhṛtiparipāṭīḥ prakāṣayan* etc. The same verse is in the anthology named *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* of Śrīdaradāsa with a little change in the beginning as *asāveka* instead of *kramādeka* and is ascribed to Rājaśekhara. But the available texts of Rājaśekhara do not have this verse. This makes to assume that either this is his stray verse or it is written by some other Rājaśekhara.

The critic's eye of Kuntaka analyses the beauty of figure of speech, use of epithets etc. found in the verses of *Śiśupālavadhā*. At the same time Kuntaka boldly points out the impropriety of Māgha. Māgha gave a lengthy description of the journey in ten cantos. Most of the other critics except Kuntaka appreciate such attempt of Māgha as he describes the recipe of *mahākāvya* in unique and innovative style. But Kuntaka

firmly points out that such long description of Dvārakā is really improper. The bold opinion presented by Kuntaka is highly remarkable because such a long description contribute nothing for the further development of the sentiment at hand. He also suggests simple and beautiful solution to rectify the impropriety while discussing an example of the figure of speech named *dīpaka*. Kuntaka also points out the lack of charm in the title of this poem. He says that the straight forward titles like *Śiśupālavadhā* etc. do not create any charm. Thus Kuntaka thrice points out the impropriety of *Śiśupālavadhā*.

The Prakrit *mahākāvya*s, from which Kuntaka selects verses, are used to discuss the sentential figurativeness. Kuntaka cites a single verse from *Harivijaya* for substantiating sentential figurativeness. Moreover he cites the name of Sarvasena along with Kālidāsa as practitioner in tender style. Apart from sentential figurativeness, Kuntaka cites an instance from *Gauḍavaho* also for illustrating the variety of lexical figurativeness. As in *Harivijaya*, Kuntaka does not quote the name of the author of *Gauḍavaho* anywhere in *Vakroktijīvita*. Though *Gauḍavaho* is not divided in to cantos like other *mahākāvya*s, it fulfils almost all other requirements that are essential for a *mahākāvya*. Selection of one or two verses from a literary work reveals Kuntaka's perfection of choosing most suitable verses from each and every context. He could have depended only on the works of master poets like Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Māgha etc. But avoiding such impropriety Kuntaka goes through all major and minor works of Sanskrit literature and extracts most apt verses in every context. Moreover apart from other rhetoricians Kuntaka tries to evaluate the works completely. It is clear from the text *Vakroktijīvita*

that Kuntaka has the boldness to criticize even the master poet Kālidāsa. Undoubtedly these things make Kuntaka unique in the history of Sanskrit literature.

Kuntaka does not cite *Naiṣadha* of 12th Century C.E as it is of later origin. He does not cite any verses from the famous *mahākāvya*s like *Buddhacarita* and *Saundarananda* of Aśvaghōṣa. He also avoids some other *mahākāvya*s like *Bhaṭṭikāvya* of Bhaṭṭi, *Setubandha* of Pravarasena etc. It is well known that there are some great resemblances between the works of Kālidāsa and Aśvaghōṣa. Kuntaka may also have a firm belief about the priority of Kālidāsa like most of the other Sanskrit poets. Moreover the aim of Aśvaghōṣa was to propagate theory of Buddhism through his compositions. Suppose these may be the reasons for the avoidance of the works of Aśvaghōṣa.

The speciality of *mahākāvya*s is that they take a small portion from some epics or something else and develops it in an innovative way to delight the connoisseur. This is what all the western and eastern poets do. Homer did not depict the complete story of the Troy war in his works like *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. He has chosen a small portion from it and developed it in an attractive manner. The poets should take utmost care in avoiding the unpleasant and improper things that may lessen the beauty or quality of the poem and the hero. Moreover in *mahākāvya*s the poets brilliantly incorporate matters of polity. This will be useful to some princess those who are reluctant to read texts like *Manusmṛti*, *Arthaśāstra* etc. This is what Kuntaka said through one of the purposes of poetry. No other rhetorician takes such pains to go through all fields

of literature for the perfection of the composition of his poetics text as done by Kuntaka.

The story of a *mahākāvya* either gives the detailed account of a single hero or numerous heroes of the same race. Though not as a whole, the main sources of *mahākāvyas* in Sanskrit and Prakrit are *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata*. Among the *mahākāvyas* mentioned above, Kuntaka does not vehemently criticize anyone. He has just pointed out few improprieties found in *Śiśupālavadhā* which really brings forth Kuntaka's keenness in observation. Kuntaka's skill in selecting the compositions of the both famous and novice poets and evaluating them without any bias is really marvelous. It is the beauty of literary work that matters to Kuntaka. The notable contribution of the rhetoricians like Kuntaka, Bhoja etc. is that the information about some lost works came to light only through citations. So their contribution to Sanskrit literature is indispensable. Kuntaka has not only given information about the lost Prakrit *kāvyas* but also other numerous lost works like *Udāttarāghava*, *Puṣpadūṣitaka*, *Māyāpuṣpaka*, *Abhijñānākī*, etc. So the study of Kuntaka's evaluation of literature deserves a unique position in the realm of Sanskrit.

¹ *sargabandho mahākāvyamucyate tasya lakṣanam* etc.

Dandin, *Kāvyaḍarśa*, 1-14, p.20.

² Ramji Upadhyaya, *Sanskrit and Prākṛt mahākāvyas*.

³ K. Krishnamoorthy (critical Ed.), *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana*, p.136.

⁴ *ibid*, p.137.

⁵ K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakrokti-jīvitā of Kuntaka*, p.276.

⁶ Acharya Jagannath Pathak, *Dhvanyāloka of Sri Anandavardhanacharya*, p.360.

⁷ *ibid*,pp.134-135.

⁸ Ācārya śrīnivāsa śarmā, *Kirātārjunīyam*,p.3.

⁹ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.571.

¹⁰ Ācārya śrīnivāsa śarmā, *op.cit*,p.26.

¹¹ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.571.

¹² Ācārya śrīnivāsa śarmā, *op.cit*,p.63.

¹³ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.572.

¹⁴ *ibid*,p.248.

¹⁵ *ibid*,p.540.

¹⁶ *ibid*,p.248.

¹⁷ *ibid*,p.540

¹⁸ *ibid*,p.38.

¹⁹ *ibid*,p.324.

²⁰ *ibid*,p.266.

²¹ *ibid*,p.9.

²² The third variety of figurativeness named grammatical figurativeness of Kuntaka creates *vakratā* through the peculiar use of affixes, which is mainly divided into six varieties as *kāla* (tense), *kāraka* (case), *sañkhyā* (number), *puruṣa* (person), *upagraha* (voice) and *pratyaya*. As an example to the final variety named *pratyayavakratā*, Kuntaka cites some verses having repetition. One example of it is ‘*pāyam pāyam kalācīkṛtakadalidalam*’ from *Meghadūta*.

²³ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.9.

²⁴ *ibid*,p.68.

²⁵ *idem*.

²⁶ *ibid*,p.86.

²⁷ *ibid*,p.101.

²⁸ *ibid*,p.172.

²⁹ The three-fold division of the second type of *dīpaka* (*dīpaka* in a series) are ‘several ones are illuminated by several’ or ‘one illuminates a second and that a third in a serial order’ or ‘the illuminated ones will in their turn be illuminators’.

³⁰ *ibid*,p.175.

³¹ T.Bhaskaran, *Kāvyaśāstrakāram*,p.88.

³² K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.216.

³³ *ibid*,p.507.

³⁴ *ibid*,p.227.

³⁵ *ibid*,p.228.

³⁶ *ibid*,p.234.

³⁷ *ibid*,p.235.

³⁸ *ibid*,p.235.

³⁹ Sukthankar, (critical Ed.), *The Mahābhārata*, Vol.III,ch.3.37.11,p.122.

⁴⁰ One of the verses of *Udyogaparvan* depicts the greatness of Duryodhana. The verse means that the Duryodhana is surrounded by old men, true men and also by wicked men. He would even give gifts to his enemies and so he would never withdraw the gift given to the Brahmans. The verse is given below:-

santyeva vṛddhāḥ sādhave dhārtarāṣṭre
santyeva pāpāḥ pāṇḍava tasya viddhi/
dadyādripoścāpi hi dhārtarāṣṭraḥ
kuto dāyāt lopayedbhrāḥmaṇānām//

⁴¹ *idem*.

⁴² Pt Sivadutta Dādhīca (Ed.), *Śisūpālavadha of Māgha*,p.16.

⁴³ *ibid*,p.28.

⁴⁴ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.272.

⁴⁵ *ibid*,p.12.

⁴⁶ *ibid*,p.81.

⁴⁷ Pt. Sivadutta Dadhīca (Ed.), *op.cit*,p.96.

⁴⁸ Srī Rāmjīlāl Śarmā, *Śisūpālavadha*,p.318.

⁴⁹ *idem*.

⁵⁰ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.97.

⁵¹ Srī Rāmjīlāl Śarmā, *op.cit*,p.385.

⁵² *ibid*,p.204.

⁵³ Shri Gopendra Tripurahar Bhupal, *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra of Ācārya Vāmana*,p.146.

⁵⁴ P.V.Naganatha Sastry, *Kāvyālaṅkāra of Bhāmaha*,p.64.

⁵⁵ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.281.

⁵⁶ Bhoja in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* cites from three Prakrit *mahākāvya*s named *Rāvaṇavijaya*, *Harivijaya* and *Setubandha*. The metre known as *skandaka* is found to be widely used in Prākṛt *mahākāvya*s and these three poems are also written using the same metre. This really helps to find out the

verses of these *mahākāvya*s from the works of Bhoja. Among them the one which is completely available is the *Setubandha* also known as *Rāvaṇavaho* of Pravarasena written in the first half of the 5th Century C.E. Unfortunately only one verse is traced out as the verse of *Rāvaṇavijaya*, the work of an unknown author from *Sṛṅgāraprakāśa*. Approximately 125 verses can be traced as the verses of *Harivijaya* from the works of Bhoja.

At the time of discussing the definition of *mahākāvya*, Bhoja quotes certain instances from *Harivijaya* like *nagaravarṇanam yathā Harivijaya-Rāvaṇavijayā-Śiśupālavadhā-Kumārasambhavādau, nāyakavarṇanam yathā Harivijaya-Raghuvamśādau, arkāstamayavarṇanam Kumārasambava-Harivijaya- Setubandhātau, prayāṇam tridhā-svaśaktyapacaye, paravyasane, abhimatārthasidhaye ca/* Here *abhimatārthasidhaye yathā Viṣṇoḥ parijātaharaṇāya Harivijaye, rtuvarṇane śaradvasantagrīṣmavarṣādivarṇanāni Setubandha-Harivijaya-Raghuvamśā-Harivamśādau* etc. Such profuse use of citations from *Harivijaya* by Bhoja is really an appreciation of this work. The same things are also cited by Hemacandra in his *Kāvyaṇuśāsana*.

The theme of *Harivijaya* is the forcible removal of the *pārijāta* tree from the heaven by Lord Kṛṣṇa for pleasing his wife Satyabhāmā. Once Kṛṣṇa offers a garland of *pārijāta* flowers to Rukmiṇī without being asked by her. This arouses anger and jealousy on Satyabhāmā. For pleasing Satyabhāmā, Kṛṣṇa fights against Indra for getting the Pārijāta tree and then brings the tree and plants it in front of the mansion of Satyabhāmā. This story is found in the works like *Harivamśa*, *Viṣṇupūrāṇa* and *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* with small variations. But in these works, Kṛṣṇa's attempt in appeasing the anger of Satyabhāmā (*kāntānunayatva*) is not seen. It is really a beautiful and innovative theme of Sarvasena, because he incorporates the sentiment of love both in union and in separation in an attractive manner in this *kāvya* deviating from the epics. This innovation of Sarvasena makes him acquire the appreciation of some rhetoricians like Ānandhavardhana and Abhinavagupta.

⁵⁷ V.M. Kulkarni, *Bhoja and The Harivijaya of Sarvasena*, p.8.

⁵⁸ V.M. Kulkarni, loc.cit.

⁵⁹ Acārya Jaggannath Pathak, *Dhvanyāloka*, p.368.

⁶⁰ idem.

⁶¹ Acārya Jaggannath Pathak, op.cit,p.275.

⁶² K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit,p.66.

⁶³ N.G. Suru (Ed.) ,*Gauḍavaho*,p.viii.

⁶⁴ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit,p.94.

⁶⁵ ibid,p.134.

⁶⁶ ibid,p.189.

⁶⁷ ibid,p.190.

CHAPTER 4

KUNTAKA'S EVALUATION OF SANSKRIT PLAYS OF OTHER POETS

Kuntaka cites large number of various dramas including the dramas of great poets like Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti etc. and also of some unknown dramatists. No other rhetorician has taken such effort in wide range. It is possible for Kuntaka to choose sufficient instances only from the dramas of famous dramatists. But his keen observation, utmost perfection and also his unbiased nature in citing examples make him go ahead to analyze also the rare dramas. The famous dramas cited by Kuntaka are *Uttararāmacarita*, *Mālatīmādhava*, *Mahāvīracarita*, *Mudrārākṣasa*, *Vēṅīsamhāra*, *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, *Viddhaśālabhañjika*, *Tāpasavatsarāja*, *Nāgānanda*, *Pādatāḍitaka* and *Ratnāvalī*. Apart from this, Kuntaka cites numerous lost dramas like *Rāmānanda*, *Rāmacarita*, *Māyāpuṣpaka* etc. Many of them are written based on *Rāmāyaṇa*. Among them the dramas written based on *Mahābhārata* are *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*, *Pratimāniruddha*. One of the lost dramas written based on Jain literature is *Puṣpadūṣitaka*. The analysis of these dramas becomes more difficult than the famous dramas as the title of the dramas are cited without giving much detail. But Kuntaka's analysis of drama will be incomplete without discussing them. An attempt is made here to assess Kuntaka's evaluation of other dramas.

4.1. *Tāpasavatsarāja*

The author of this drama is Māṭṛrāja also known as Anaṅgharṣa. The verses of this drama are cited by Ānandavardhana, Rājaśekhara, Abhinavagupta, Kuntaka, Mammaṭa etc. Bhavabhūti mentions about Māṭṛrāja in his *Mālatīmādhava* and Ānandavardhana in his *Dhvanyāloka* cites a verse of Māṭṛrāja. From such external evidence, the date of this work is assigned to the second half of the 8th century C.E. This drama is written based on the popular tale named the story of Udayana. Udayana story is also discussed by Bhāsa in his *Pratijñāyugandarāyaṇa* and *Svapnavāsavadatta*, Harṣa in his *Ratnāvalī* and *Priyadarśikā*, Subandhu in his *Vāsavadattā* etc. In this drama Udayana decides to commit suicide in Prayag after knowing the death of Vāsavadattā. Then somehow he spares his life and wanders as an ascetic. Finally he finds out Vāsavadattā in a hermitage. Then he explains the story of the marriage between Udayana and Padmāvatī. The dramatist creates pathos in explaining this story in a touching manner. The language of this drama is simple and beautiful.

Kuntaka cites thirteen verses from this drama. He cites few verses from third to sixth act depicting the sad plight of Udayana after losing his dear wife Vāsavadattā in a fire, which is falsely created by minister Yaugandharāyaṇa according to their secret plan. This is a six act drama, so citing verses from most of these acts makes it clear that Kuntaka was familiar with the complete text.

4.1.1. Contextual figurativeness

Kuntaka chooses few verses of this drama to explain one of the

varieties of contextual figurativeness. In this variety, he points out the brilliance of the great poet in their unique depiction while explaining the same thing yet again. The pathetic feelings of Udayana increases while seeing the plants which were dear to the queen being burnt down by the same fire, which burnt the queen's apartment. Udayana feels that the plants are more sincere than him because they followed her in her death. And he is still living. Udayana criticizes himself with deep pain and shame for this. Udayana also says that the fire that burnt the jasmine like tender body of Vāsavadattā has subsided. But still it burns the hard hearted one like him. Such expression of Udayana definitely intensifies the particular poignant situation. Udayana is sure that it is impossible to meet her beloved because of her demise. Yet like a mad one he imagines that she is in front of him, Udayana seeks many ways to contemplate her. At last Udayana decides to drown himself in the river Yamunā. Depiction of such frequent action of following his beloved really adorns the context and strengthens the feeling of pathos. Kuntaka has successfully traced the development of pathos through various instances in the drama.

4.2. *Bālarāmāyaṇa*

Bālarāmāyaṇa of Rājaśekhara is a ten act play. It describes the story of early life of Rāma till his return from Laṅkā along with Sītā after killing Rāvaṇa. Rājaśekhara modified the story of *Rāmāyaṇa* while writing this play. In this play the playwright emphasizes the love of Rāvaṇa towards Sītā than his cruelty. It is a great task to express the whole story of *Rāmāyaṇa* in ten acts. But Rājaśekhara takes the risk to depict *Rāmāyaṇa* in ten acts without losing its charm. His other works

are a *saṭṭaka* named *Karpūramañjari* and a *nāṭika* named *Viddhaśālabhañjikā*. He has also written a drama known as *Bālabhārata* and a famous poetic work *Kāyamīmāmsā*. From some available evidences his date may be fixed between the last quarter of the ninth century and the beginning of the tenth century C.E.

Kuntaka cites two from *Viddhaśālabhañjikā* and fourteen verses from *Bālarāmāyaṇa*. *Viddhaśālabhañjika* is a four act *nāṭika*. This is an imaginary love story between the prince Vidyādharamalla with two princesses named Mṛgāṅgavallī and Kuvalayamāla.

4.2.1. Contextual figurativeness

One of the notable points about this drama is a variety of contextual figurativeness. In this variety, Kuntaka explains how a play within a play contributes extreme charm to the whole plot. In the third act of *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, Rāvaṇa eagerly watches the marriage of Sītā depicted on the stage. On seeing the marriage of Sītā with Rāma, Rāvaṇa gets angry and asks as to who has the power to accept Sītā while Rāvaṇa is alive. Hearing the words of Rāvaṇa, Prahastha reminds him that this is a drama and not reality. Thus here someone as a spectator watch his own story performed by the actors. This will really evoke excitement in real spectator and they are interesting to watch the reaction of those spectators whom are watching their own role on the stage. As the name indicates this *garbhāṅga* is really small and complete essence of the whole plot.

4.2.2. Kuntaka's evaluation of a single verse

Among the fourteen verses cited from *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, his striking

observation is undoubtedly in this particular verse. Kuntaka cites this particular verse for showing the absence of aesthetic pleasure in a verse.

*sadyaḥ purīparisare 'pi śirīṣamṛdvī
sītā javātrricaturāṇi padāni gatvā/
gantavyamadya kiyadityasakṛdbruvāṇā
rāmāśruṇaḥ kṛtavatī prathamāvatāram//¹*

“Even on the outskirts of the city, the delicate girl Sītā who had walked hardly three or four steps, started asking Rāma more than once; How much more distance remains to be covered yet? Where-upon tears were brought for the first time in Rāma’s eyes.”²

According to Kuntaka, it is not proper for an ideal heroine to ask such a question. He also opines that she should not utter these words even when she has such a thought. Moreover very first complaint itself is enough to shed tears in Rāma and it is not necessary for Sītā to repeat her complaint. So Kuntaka suggests plausible modification here as *avaśam* instead of *asakṛt*. It is sure that such keen observation and criticism of Kuntaka will really help the poets to take utmost care in their compositions.

Rājaśekhara makes lots of modifications in his drama from original source. One of the main innovation is the depiction of the marriage of Sītā as mentioned before. Another notable innovation is the depiction of disguised demons Māyāmaya and Śūrpaṇakhā as Daśaratha and Kaikeyī for inducing Rāma for exile. Thus the poet tries to protect Daśaratha and Kaikeyī from their blames. Other innovations are the presence of Bharata in Ayodhyā at the time of exile of Rāma, depiction

of artificial Sītā in front of Rāvaṇa, his sad plight due to the separation of Sītā, completion of the entire war in Laṅkā within five days etc. Kuntaka could have cited these innovations as an instance to the second variety of contextual figurativeness. He says that the inclusion of a new idea or development from original source will render extreme charm to a composition. There are a lot of innovations in this drama, but the uniqueness of this drama lies in the *garbhāṅka*. Thus Kuntaka brings forth the beauty of this drama by citing this particular context. Beauty of other innovations can be envisaged by the readers themselves.

4.3. *Veṅīsamhāra*

Veṅīsamhāra of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa is a six act drama written based on some incidents of *Mahābhārata*. It is the one and only work ascribed to the author. It was written either at the end of the seventh century C.E or beginning of the eighth century C.E. The main sentiment of this drama is the heroic (*vīra*). It describes the story of return of the Pāṇḍavas to Indraprastha after their thirteen year exile. In the fifth act of *Veṅīsamhāra*, the grief of Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Gāndhārī are very touchingly depicted. This dramatic piece reveals that the playwright was well versed in *Mahābhārata*, *Arthaśāstra*, philosophy etc. The poeticians like Vāmana, Bhoja, Danañjaya, Ānandavardhana, Mammaṭa also cite instances from *Veṅīsamhāra*.

The theme of this drama is in the sabhāparvan of *Mahābhārata*. Draupadī was dragged by the hair in to assembly by Duśśāsana while she had been staked by Yudhiṣṭira in gambling. Bhīma vowed while seeing the insult of Draupadī that he will kill all the kauravas. He also says that he will drink the blood of Duśśāsana and tie up the hair of

Draupadī by dipping his hands in the blood of Duśśāsana. In the title *Veṇīsamhāra*, the word ‘veṇī’ means hair and ‘samhāra’ means destruction. The meaning of the title can interpret in different ways like tying up of hair, destruction of kauravas due to the hair. Thus the title of this play is connected with the pivotal incident of this play. In one of the varieties of compositional figurativeness (*prabandhavakratā*), Kuntaka says that significant title that is connected with the pivotal incident of the plot will also delight the readers. As an example to the variety of it, Kuntaka cites the works like *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, *Mudrārākṣasa* etc. Even though Kuntaka does not points out the beauty of the title *Veṇīsamhāra*, it deserve the appreciation of the connoisseur.

4.3.1. Compositional figurativeness

Kuntaka cites this drama as an instance of one of the varieties of compositional figurativeness. According to this variety, deviation of sentiment from its original source contributes to the charm of the whole work. Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa has done this by using heroic sentiment in this drama. It is well known that Ānandavardhana established the dominant sentiment of *Mahābhārata* as tranquility (*śānta*). Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa even taking the theme of *Veṇīsamhāra* from *Mahābhārata*, boldly changed the sentiment of this dramatic piece in to heroic (*vīra*) to delight the readers. He depicted the triumph of Bhīma against Duryodana at the end of this drama. Moreover Bhīma tied up the hair of Draupadī with the blood of Duśśāsana. This novel end of the drama is accepted by the world of connoisseur. Kuntaka’s indication of the beauty of this drama is noteworthy. Other dramas like *Mahāvīracarita* of Bhavabhūti,

Dūtaghaṭokaca and *Ūrubhaṅga* of Bhāsa have also depicted with the heroic sentiment.

4.3.2. Kuntaka's criticism of *Veṅīsamhāra*

At the same time, Kuntaka criticizes Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa for his deliberate attempt to incorporate all the junctures laid down by the dramatic originator like Bharata. For satisfying *pratimukha* in the second act, the poet incorporates an incident of dream. There Duryodhana overhears the words of his wife Bhānumatī that Nakula tries to remove her upper garment forcefully. Hearing those words Duryodhana gets agitated and starts to raise his sword against her. Just then Bhānumatī declares to her companions that no sooner she woke up from her dream by hearing the morning song. Here actually Bhānumatī speaks about mongoose through the word Nakula. She had a dream that a mongoose had eaten up hundred snakes and then followed her to attack her. But Duryodhana without hearing the entire conversation considered Nakula as the son of Mādri. Moreover the poet has depicted the amorous sports between Duryodhana and Bhānumatī. According to Kuntaka while a great war is going on outside, the presence of Duryodhana in the harem and a single word with deep passion to her wife is also improper. In such instance impropriety in the depiction of amorous sports is obvious. Moreover Kuntaka also points out the impropriety of suspecting the fidelity of his wife without properly understanding her mind. Such observations of Kuntaka reveal his insight in characterization.

Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa has also brought in a lot of modifications and innovations in his drama. One of the modifications is at the introduction of the demon named Cārvāka. In the original source, at the end of the

battle, Yudhiṣṭhira takes decision to fight Duryodhana. But in this drama the decision is taken by Bhīma. The theme denoted through the title itself is also a beautiful contribution of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa. The entire second and fifth acts are the innovation of the poet. The vow of Bhīma that the *Veṅṅīsamhāra*, the deceit played by the demon Chārvāka on Yudhiṣṭhira etc. are some other innovations of the poet. All these modifications and innovation can be brought under the varieties of contextual figurativeness.

4.4. *Uttararāmacarita*

Uttararāmacarita is a seven act drama. It is the most beautiful composition among the three dramas of Bhavabhūti. It describes the story of the second half of *Rāmāyaṇa* dealing with the abandonment of Sītā by Rāma. Bhavabhūti is one of the famous dramatists in Sanskrit literature belonging to 8th century C.E. He is famous of his three works like *Mahāvīracarita*, *Uttararāmacarita* and *Mālatīmādhava*. The sentiments of the two dramas *Mahāvīracarita* and *Uttararāmacarita* respectively are *vīra* and *karuṇa*. The two dramas are written based on the story of Rāma. The absence of jester is one of the specialties of his dramas. The role of jester in Sanskrit dramas is to entertain the king and to support him for his secret love. Rāma plays do not usually have jesters.

4.4.1. Compositional figurativeness

Kuntaka takes an instance from this drama for explaining the first variety of compositional figurativeness. The definition given for it is as follows:

*itivr̥ttānyathāvr̥ttararasasampadupekṣayā/
rasāntareṇa rāmyeṇa yatra nirvahaṇam bhavet//
tasyā eva kathāmūrterāmūlonmīlitaśriyaḥ/
vineyānandanīṣpattiyai sā prabandhasya vakratā//³*

“When there is a departure from the enriched *rasas* of the source-book and a new delightful *rasa* is delineated by the poet at the conclusion of his work, so that the delight of the readers is ensured, we should regard it as beauty of a whole work.”⁴

For instance, the sentiment of *Rāmāyaṇa* is pathos. At the end, Sītā is taken away to the nether world by goddess of earth. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa end their life in Sarayū river. This creates great pangs in the mind of readers. Sanskrit dramaturgy always prefers a happy end. Bhavabhūti brilliantly crafts a happy end for this drama by depicting love in union of Rāma and Sītā, and also by depicting the heroic performance of their son Lava etc. Kuntaka’s citations from this drama is discussed below.

4.4.2. Contextual figurativeness

Kuntaka cites few verses from this drama as an example of one of the varieties of contextual figurativeness and its definition is as follows:-

*prabandasyaikadeśānām phalabandhānubandhavān/
upakāryopakartṛtvaparispandaḥ parisphuran//
asāmānyasamullekhaḥpratibhāpratibhāsinaḥ/
sūte nūtanavakratvarahasyam kasyacitkaveḥ//⁵*

“An organic unity which strikingly underlies the various incidents

described in different parts of the works leading to the ultimate end intended, each bound to the other by a relation of mutual assistance, reveals the essence of creative originality which is most aesthetic only in the case of a very rare poetic genius who is endowed by nature with the gift of an extraordinary inventive imagination.”⁶

In the first act, Rāma and Sītā along with Lakṣmaṇa watch the portraits painted on the wall for removing the melancholy state of Sītā. Lakṣmaṇa first of all shown the famous *jṛmbaka* missile handed down from Agnideva to Viśvāmitra and from Viśvāmitra to Rāma for destructing Tāṭakā. Sītā gave veneration to this missile by the advice of Rāma. Then Rāma says to Sītā that this auspicious missile will be beneficial to her progeny. Later on, in the fifth act Lava applied this missile against the army of Chandraketu, the son of Lakṣmaṇa. Realizing the use of *jṛmbaka* missile of Lava, Chandraketu said this to Sumantra:-

*vyatikara iva bhīmo vaidyutastāmasaśca
praṇihitamapi cakṣurgrastamuktam hinasti/
abhilikhitamivaitat sainyamaspandamāste
niyatamajitavīryam jṛmbhate jṛmbhakāstram//*⁷

“A dreadful combination, as if of darkness and lightning, baffles the eye, although directed towards an object, as it is lit up and suddenly obscured; moreover, this army stands motionless as if painted in a picture; verily it is the *jṛmbhaka* missile, of unlimited power, that is at work.”⁸

Thus Lava’s use of *jṛmbhaka* missile helps to recognize him as the son of Rāma and Sītā. Here the incident of the first act supports Lava’s

recognition scene of the fifth act in an unexplainable manner. In this drama Rāma's recognition of his own child touches the readers' heart. So the incident of the first act acts as a supporting context to bring forth the main aim of the story. In this variety it is well explicit that beauty does not lie in a single context but is interrelated. Only a brilliant poet can incorporate such connection between the contexts without a deliberate attempt.

*sāmājikajanāhḷādanirmmāṇanipuṇairnaṭaiḥ/
tadbhūmikām samāsthāya nirvarttitanāṭāntaram//
kvacitprakaraṇasyāntaḥ smṛtam prakaraṇāntaram/
sarvaprabandhasarvasvakalpām puṣhṇāti vakratām//⁹*

“When actors, expert in the art of pleasing the audience, are seen to play the role of an audience themselves on the stage with other actors performing, such a play-episode within a play-episode may be regarded as illustrating a literary art which beautifies the entire drama exquisitely.”

Here the actors also play the role of a spectator and it really delights the readers though they have a passive role with some minute expressions. Inclusion of such a *garbhāṅka* in a drama is really a great task and only a brilliant one can depict it properly. As one of the examples to this, Kuntaka cites the *garbhāṅka* from the seventh act of the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti. Here the pathetic plight of pregnant Sītā who is left alone in the forest by Lakṣmaṇa on the advice of Rāma is very beautifully depicted as *garbhāṅka*. In the play within a play Sītā cries deeply saying that she would end her life by jumping in to the River Bhāgīrathī because there is nobody to rescue her from the wild

beasts. Here the actors Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa now playing the role of spectators really shed the tears seeing Sītā's helpless situation and doubtlessly this artistic innovation will cause charm to the readers too.

4.4.3. Kuntaka's evaluation of single verses

One of the verses cited from this drama by Kuntaka is as an example of *sahokti*. Bhāmaha in his *Kāvyaśālikāra* gave the definition of *sahokti* as:-

*tulyakālam kriye yatra vastudvayasamāśraye/
padenaikena kathyete sahoktiḥ sā matā yathā//¹⁰*

It means where simultaneously two actions relating to two different subjects are denoted by a same word is known as *sahokti*. The example cited for this by Bhāmaha is mentioned below.

*himapātāviladiśo gāḍhāliṅganahetavaḥ/
vṛddhimāyānti yāminyaḥ kāmīnām prītibhiḥ saha//¹¹*

“The night that obscures the quarters by snowfall and makes one long for close embraces lengthens just like the amours of lovers.”

According to Kuntaka it is similar to *upamā* because here the similarity between the night and the amorous of lovers are delighting the readers. If there is no such similarity the plane expressions like ‘the teacher reads with the student’ and ‘the father stands with his son’ etc. will also be considered as *sahokti* even when they do not have any charm at all. So refuting the definition given by Bhāmaha, Kuntaka propounded a new one which is as follows:-

*yatraikenaiva vākyena varṇanīyārthasiddhaye/
uktiryugapadarthānām sā sahoktiḥ satām matā//¹²*

According to Kuntaka, *sahokti* means, two meanings are expressing at the same time by a single sentence to enrich the beauty of the described subject. Kuntaka cites the incident of Rama's killing of a *śūdra* sage named Śaṃbūka for explaining his *sahokti* and it is given below.

*he hasta dakṣiṇa mṛtasya śiśordvijasya
jīvātave visṛja śudramunau kṛpāṇam/
rāmasya pāṇirasi nirbharagarbhakhinna
devīvivāsanapaṭoḥ karuṇā kutaste//¹³*

“O my right hand, to bring back to life. The dead child of a pious Brahmin, let fall thy sword on the *śūdra* sage! Indeed thou art Rāma's hand, one who banished even his innocent queen, in a sad state of advanced pregnancy. How can there be any pity in thee?”

For explaining *sahokti*, Kuntaka quotes a beautiful verse from *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti, here the poet incorporates two meanings simultaneously in a same sentence very brilliantly. The first idea conveyed here is that it is the hand of Rāma who very cruelly banished his pregnant wife without any mercy. So it is proper for Rāma to be merciless once again to kill the *śūdra* sage, though it is undeserving, in order to protect the dead child of a Brahmin. The second idea of this verse is, if the hand of Rāma is reluctant to kill the *śūdra* sage thinking that he himself is kind and generous, it will never be acceptable because it is the hand of such Rāma who has already proven

his cruelty by banishing his innocent wife at the time of her advanced pregnancy. So the killing of the sage is an easier thing for Rāma and it will also never depreciate his quality. Here in both the meanings, the word Rāma possesses an unexplicable *rūḍhivaicitryavakratā* by enriching the sentiment of love-in-separation.

4.5. *Mālatīmādhava*

Mālatīmādhava is a *prakaraṇa* with an invented plot. But some of the incidents described in it have resemblance to the incidents of *Kathāsaritsāgara* written based on Guṇāḍhya's *Bṛhatkatha*. It is divided in to ten acts and discusses the life of the middle class people, below the rank of royalty. It is a love story between Mālatī, daughter of the minister Bhurivasu and Mādhava, son of another minister Devavrata. So obviously its main sentiment is *śṛṅgāra*.

4.5.1. Kuntaka's evaluation of single verses

Kuntaka cites only two verses from *Mālatīmādhava* for substantiating his argument. Though he does not cite any instance from this drama for contextual and compositional figurativeness, his observation of single verses is praiseworthy. In Kuntaka's definition of poetry, *sahitau* means the harmony between one word and another and also between one meaning and another. According to him discordance between the word and meaning will completely spoil the beauty of a verse. Kuntaka cites a verse from *Mālatīmādhava* to show the loss of beauty due to the discord between the meaning. In the fifth act of *Mālatīmādhava* a demon named Aghoraghaṇṭa and his pupil Kapālakuṇḍalā were in a search of a beautiful maiden as an offer to their

goddess. They kidnapped Mālatī for this purpose. Mādhava, the hero reached there by hearing a cry for help. Then Mādhava says these words towards Aghoraghaṇṭa, while he is going to kill Mālatī.

*asāram samsāram parimuṣitaratnam tribhuvanam
nirālokaṃ lokam maraṇaśaraṇam bāndhavajanam/
adarpaṃ kandarpaṃ janānayanānirmāṇaphalam
jagajjīrṇāraṇyam kathamasi vidhātum vyavasitaḥ//¹⁴*

“Lost is the charm in life, robbed is the universe of its best jewel, sightless is the world made; now death is the only succour for kinsfolk. Humbled is the love-god, and in vain are the eyes of people made; the globe itself will be a dying forest, when you accomplish your nefarious intent.”¹⁵

In this verse meaning of each word beautifully depicts the extreme beauty of a heroine and so it contributes charm to the whole verse. But among them a single sentence stating that ‘death is the only succour kinsfolk’ does not contribute any charm to this verse. Thus this verse can never entertain the connoisseurs. According to Kuntaka the poetic excellence of a poet should work hard to make each single sentence of a verse attractive. He also says that it is not an easy task to suggest an apt alternative instead of the dull sentence mentioned in it. Then he suggests a substitute phrase, which is ‘*vidhimapi vipannādbhutavidhim*’. It means that “the creator is aggrieved by the death of his best handiwork”.¹⁶ Here without merely criticizing the verse Kuntaka suggests a beautiful solution for avoiding its impropriety. It is considered as one of the beautiful modifications made by Kuntaka in a verse.

Another verse taken from this *prakaraṇa* is given below. While discussing the varieties of simile, Kuntaka denotes that the simile will be of two kinds in the case of compound words as 1) implied and 2) expressed. Then he cites a verse from *Mālatīmādhava* as an instance of the second variety. These are the words of Mādhava to his friend Makaranda and his servant Kaḷahamsa, after seeing Mālatī in a Cupid festival.

*yāntyā muhurvalitakandaramānanam ta-
dāvṛttavṛttaśatapatranibham vahantya/
digdho'mṛtena ca viṣeṇa ca pakṣmaḷākṣyā
gāḍham nikhāta iva me hṛdaye kaṭākṣaḥ//¹⁷*

“As she went arching her neck often, her face like a lotus bloom whirled all round, the glance of my thick-browed beloved seemed to be dipped in nectar and poison and stuck deep in my heart as it were.”¹⁸

The compound words in this verse are *muhurvalitakandaramānanam* and *āvṛttavṛttaśatapatranibham*. Here the poet compares the face of the damsel with a lotus and for this purpose he directly expresses the word *nibham* means equal. Thus it will become one of the apt examples of this particular variety of simile. It is famous that Kuntaka is unique due to his plausible suggestion of new word or sentence for increasing the charm of a particular verse. Here also Kuntaka has done appreciable change for keeping the harmony between the meanings of a verse. Thus Kuntaka's observation of a single verse as well as the whole composition is equally admirable. Though Kuntaka has

selected only two verses from this drama, his observation on them is noteworthy.

4.6. *Mudrārākṣasa*

Mudrārākṣasa of Viśākhadatta is a seven act drama written in sixth century C.E. It is based on the political intrigues of Cāṇakya, minister of Candragupta to win over Rākṣasa, the minister of Nandas to his side. Unlike in most of the Sanskrit dramas, the erotic sentiment and humour have no role in this particular play. There is no female character in this play except the significant presence of Candanadāsa's wife. The playwright brilliantly handled the development of the plot following the canons of *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Viśākhadatta brilliantly depicts the political problems, actions and counteraction etc. Contextual and compositional figurativeness is used by Kuntaka to evaluate this play.

4.6.1. Compositional figurativeness

Kuntaka cites the name of this drama for one of the varieties of compositional figurativeness. Kuntaka opines that straight forward title never contribute any charm to a composition. The names of a title itself also possess an important role in an overall beauty of a composition. For substantiating it, he cites the name of the works like *Mudrārākṣasa*, *Abhijñānaśākuntala* etc. Rākṣasa was a former minister of Nandas, by whose annihilation Cāṇakya had secured the throne for his king Candragupta. Rākṣasa was a firm and devoted minister, who kept his loyalty towards his master. The cunning Cāṇakya would like to win over Rākṣasa to his side. Cāṇakya accomplished his wish through a signet ring of Rākṣasa coming in to his possession. Once Nipuṇaka, a spy of

Cāṇakya wanders as an ascetic and reaches the house of Candanadāsa, where the family of Rākṣasa was staying. From there Nipuṇaka happened to pick up a ring of Rākṣasa and bestow it to Cāṇakya. This incident is the pivot on which the story hangs. It is easy to assess the story of a composition which have straight forward title like *Hayagrīvavadha*, *Rāmacarita* etc. But the essences of the names like *Mudrārākṣasa*, *Abhijñānaśākuntala* etc. came to realize while going through the entire text. While reading the text, the brilliance of the choice of the title will fascinate the readers.

Kuntaka also points out through his variety of compositional figurativeness that the ability of great poets in depicting a new political strategy in their work using their sharp intelligence will delight the readers. He cites *Mudrārākṣasa* and *Tāpasavatsarāja* as examples to it. In *Mudrārākṣasa* the political machinations used by both Rākṣasa and Cāṇakya are highly appreciable. In *Tāpasavatsarāja* poet uses an innovative technique like the fake death of Vāsavadattā for the ultimate triumph of Udayana. In both works, a fresh form of political strategy applied by the poets is really significant. Kuntaka very critically brings out this aspect in his evaluations.

4.6.2. Contextual figurativeness

Kuntaka takes a small episode from *Mudrārākṣasa* for discussing one of the varieties of contextual figurativeness. Through this variety, Kuntaka depicts how such a small incident like an unknown man's suicide attempt leads this drama in to its fulfillment by the brilliance of poet Viśākhadatta. Though knowing all the diplomacy, Rākṣasa also believes the person sent by Cāṇakya and decides to go to rescue the life

of Candanadāsa offering his own body. In the sixth canto an unknown man pretends as he is going to commit suicide in front of Rākṣasa according to the play of Cāṇakya. From that unknown man Rākṣasa came to know the reason of his suicide is due to his passion towards his friend named Viṣṇudāsa, who gone out of the city deciding to sacrifice himself in to the fire. Viṣṇudāsa decided to do so because his friend Candanadāsa will be executed for sheltering the family of Rākṣasa. Though both Cāṇakya and Rākṣasa were great diplomatists, still Rākṣasa believes the deeds of that unknown man sent by Cāṇakya. Through this Viśākhadatta makes clear that ultimate triumph fall in a single hand in a fight. Thus Cāṇakya win his plan by the possession of Rākṣasa with his side.

4.7. *Nāgānanda*

Nāgānanda is a five act drama written by Śrīharṣa in 7th century C.E. He also wrote two *nāṭikas* known as *Priyadarśikā* and *Ratnāvalī*. Kuntaka cites a single verse from *Ratnāvalī* but not from *Priyadarśikā*. *Nāgānanda* is the most interesting one among the three plays of Śrīharṣa. The original source of *Nāgānanda* is considered to be Bṛhatkathā. *Nāgānanda* has two distinct parts. The first part depicts the love affair of Jīmūtavāhana and Malayavatī. The second half depicts the noble self sacrifice of Jīmūtavāhana. In *Nāgānanda*, the playwright adds all the ingredients essential for a good drama. He depicts the emotions of self sacrifices and charity in an attractive manner. In this drama once the hero, Jīmūtavāhana happened to see a plenty of bones of serpents killed by Garuḍa, whom the serpent King Vāsuki offered each serpents every day for his meal. For protecting the rice of serpents Jīmūtavāhana

sacrifices himself. At last he protects the whole race of serpents and also attains his family and Kingdom.

4.7.1. Compositional figurativeness

Kuntaka cites *Nāgānanda* for explaining one of the varieties of compositional figurativeness. Through this variety, Kuntaka explains how a hero primarily achieves a single goal and then incidentally he also attains many other equally important deeds. In *Nāgānanda*, the ideal one Jīmūtavāhana offers his own body and saves a serpent named Śaṅkhacūḍa from Garuḍa. Jīmūtavāhana did so because once he happened to hear a lament of a serpent that it was her son's turn that day to be the prey of Garuḍa. Then Garuḍa begins to eat Śaṅkhacūḍa without realizing that this is not a serpent. Garuḍa become remorseful when he came to realize the prey he started to eat was a great Vidyādhara princess. Afterwards Garuḍa take a vow of non-violence. Through this Jīmūtavāhana not only saves a single serpent but also the whole race of serpents.

In this drama the sole aim of hero named Jīmūtavāhana is to protect a serpent. But with his own infinite greatness, he happens to protect the whole race of serpents by changing the mind of Garuḍa. Moreover he happens to meet his parents and wife and also attains the kingship of Vidyādhara kingdom. In this manner though the mind of hero is completely in the pursuit of a single aim, infinite other good incidents, which the hero did not aimed also come flooding in front of hero by his virtue. According to Kuntaka, such innumerable achievements contribute extreme literary beauty and should delight the readers. Through depicting it, the poet would like to say that the ultimate

results of virtue and self-sacrifice will be universal and individual well being. Including such unique depiction of moral message of a drama, which helps the complete evaluation of a text, Kuntaka again proved his minute power of observation and analysis.

4.8. *Pādatāḍitaka*

Pādatāḍitaka is a *bhāṇa* of Śyamilaka and includes under the title *caturbhāṇi*. The other three are *Padmaprābhṛtaka* of Śūdraka, *Dhūrtaviṭasamvāda* of Īśvaradatta and *Ubhayābhisārika* of Vararuci. These are one act humorous monologues. Another variety of having the same satirical nature is *prahasanas*. The notable difference between the *prahasana* and *bhāṇa* is that the former has greater scope for satire and comedy and the latter has abundance of erotic sentiment. The main topic discussed in the categories of *rūpaka* like *bhāṇa* and *utsṛṣṭikāṅka* are the message of love. The works like *Abhinavabhāratī*, *Aucityavicāracarccā* have cited verses from *Pādatāḍitaka*. Date of Śyamilaka is uncertain, but some external evidences help to surmise that he was lived in the 9th century C.E.

4.8.1. Kuntaka's evaluation of a single verse

Kuntaka cites a single verse from *Pādatāḍitaka* as an instance of sweetness (*mādurya*) of intermediary style (*madyama mārga*). Sweetness of intermediary style has the qualities of both the tender (*sukumāra*) and variegated (*vicitra*) style. The verse cited from *Pādatāḍitaka* is as follows:-

velānilairmṛdubhirākulitākāntā
gāyanti yasya caritānyaparāntakāntāḥ/
līlānatāḥ samavalambya latāstarūnām
hintālamāliṣu taṭeṣu mahārṇṇavasya//¹⁹

“On the shores of the mighty ocean, studded with palm-groves, the bells on the west-cost lean against shrubby trees, and sing his mighty deeds with curls waving in the gentle sea-breeze.”²⁰

According to Kuntaka, the quality named sweetness of tender style should not possess too many compounds and also it should attract the mind of readers not only with charming words but also with beauty of their sense and charming usage. The sweetness in variegated style should be relieved of loose texture. The verse mentioned above is free from numerous compound words and loose texture. So it has the features of the quality named sweetness of both tender and variegated style. Undoubtedly it should delight the readers with its charming usage and meaning. Thus it is considered as the fine instance for the sweetness of intermediary style. The variant readings are found in the third line. The available text of *Pādatāḍitaka* has the word *utkaṇḍitāḥ* instead of *līlānatāḥ*. The word *līlānatāḥ* is suited to *latāstarūnām*. So the proper change made by Kuntaka or the scribe is highly significant.

4.9. Lost plays cited by Kuntaka

There are numerous minor plays in Sanskrit literature but their entire texts are now in oblivion. The information about these texts is obtained only through some citations from poetic texts. Moreover the texts like *Indian kāvya literature* of A.K Warder, ‘*Some old lost Rāma*

plays’ of V. Raghavan, ‘*Rāmakatha*’ of Kamil Bulke also threw some light for them. Some of the old lost plays cited by Kuntaka like *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*, *Chalitarāma*, *Udāttarāghava* etc. are also in the texts like *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* etc. But some of them like *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*, *Pratimāniruddha* etc. came to light only through Kuntaka. Among these minor dramas Kuntaka cites one or two verses from only three like *Rāgavānanda*, *Abhijñānājānaki* and *Hanumannāṭaka*. He cites *Udāttarāghava* and *Puṣpadūṣitaka* for discussing contextual figurativeness. Details of these dramas are given below. Remaining dramas are mentioned only through their title for discussing two varieties of compositional figurativeness. Kuntaka’s overall assessment of these texts is impossible due to lack of verses taken from them. So brief information about these dramas is given as appendix.

4.9.1. *Udāttarāghava*

There is no exact information about this drama. Some of its citations are found in *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, *Sāhityadarpaṇa* etc. It is conjectured that most probably it is written by one Anaṅgahaṛṣa Māyurāja of 8th century C.E. and he is the son of King Narendravardhana. Rājaśekhara says about Māyurāja as follows:-

*māyurājasamo nānyo jajñe kalacuriḥ kaviḥ/
udanvataḥ samuttasthuḥ kati vā tuhināmśavaḥ//²¹*

“No poet was born in the Kalachuri family who equaled Māyurāja. This is not surprising; for how many moons have sprung from the ocean.”²²

This drama has six cantos and its story starts with the exile of Rāma up to the return of Rāma in to the Ayodhyā after killing Rāvaṇa. In it a few demons personifying as some character belongs to the side of Rāma and gave some false information too. For example in the fourth canto one demon personifying as Hanuman and inform Sugrīva that Rāvaṇa killed Sītā. Hearing this sad plight of Sītā, Sugrīva wished to enter in to the fire after bestowing the kingdom to Aṅgada. But the entering of real Hanuman at the proper time rescued Sugrīva from his deed.

The speciality of this drama is the innovation found in the abduction of Sītā. Here first of all Lakṣmaṇa goes to kill the golden deer. At that moment Rāvaṇa, approaching Rāma and Sītā, disguises as an ascetic and blames Rāma for letting Lakṣmaṇa alone for killing the golden deer. While another disguised demon enters the hut and tells them that the golden deer that Lakṣmaṇa is chasing is a demon in disguise. Only after hearing this, Rāma went to seek Lakṣmaṇa keeping Sītā aside to the disguised ascetic.

As an example for contextual figurativeness Kuntaka discusses this instance from *Udāttarāghava*. Here the poet makes some developments in the new plot from its original source. For example in *Rāmāyaṇa*, Rāma goes to catch the golden deer and then Lakṣmaṇa goes to help him by the compulsion of Sītā. But according to the author of *Udāttarāghava*, it is not proper for Rāma to chase the golden deer when his younger brother Lakṣmaṇa was with him. Moreover it is also not proper that Lakṣmaṇa goes to help his elder brother Rāma when he hears Rāma's cry. For avoiding such impropriety the author of *Udāttarāghava*

changed the context and here first of all Lakṣmaṇa goes to catch the deer and only then Rāma went to help him by hearing the cry of Lakṣmaṇa. This is really a proper innovation made by the poet to make this plot attractive and also to delight the readers. Kuntaka's selection of this particular situation for explaining his concept of contextual figurativeness is also highly appreciable.

From some citations it seems that for writing this drama, Māyurāja wished to omit some blemishes found in the original source. The context mentioned above is one of its best instances. Moreover in this drama, the poet avoided Rāma's deceitful killing of Vālin as mentioned in *Rāmābhyudaya*. Danika in *Daśarūpāvaloka* says it as 'chadmanā vālivadho māyurājenodāttarāghave pariyaktaḥ'.²³ The poet's beautiful depiction of the dilemma of Rāma in a single verse is also praiseworthy. After hearing the pathetic cry of Lakṣmaṇa, Rāma got confused that either he would went out to the search of Lakṣmaṇa or to protects Sītā. Thus Māyurāja tries to refine some portions of *Rāmāyaṇa* according to his will. This is really a bold and beautiful attempt of the poet.

4.9.2. Puṣpadūṣitaka

Among the lost dramas, Kuntaka cites *Puṣpadūṣitaka* as instance for his final varieties like contextual and compositional figurativeness. Some brief information of it is available from the citation of Kuntaka. Moreover the citations of other rhetoricians like Abhinavagupta, Rāmacandra Guṇcandra etc. signifies the literary merit of this drama. *Puṣpadūṣitaka* is a lost six act Jain drama written in Sanskrit by one

Brahmayaśas or Brahmayaśasvāmin. This is a story of Samudradatta and Nandayantī.

In the first act, Sāgaradatta, father of Samudradatta happens to hear a rumour about the virtue of Nandayantī, while his husband is abroad. In the second act Samudradatta secretly visits his wife Nandayantī by giving his ring as a bribe to the guard. Due to the unavailability of the complete text it is not clear about the reason of the secrecy of Samudradatta's visit with his own wife. In the third act the father in law has driven Nandayantī to the forest hearing her gathering with a stranger. Then in the fourth act from the guard Kuvalaya, who has been away from Sāgaradatta, shows the ring he had as a bribe. Sāgaradatta fills with great remorse by realizing his son's ring. He curses himself of his cruel banishment of Nandayantī, the daughter of Vijayadatta in her advanced pregnancy. Kuntaka cites the interrelation between the ring episode of second and fourth act as an instance of contextual figurativeness. In the fifth act Kuvalya conveys Nandayantī about the welfare of his husband Samudradatta. The final act ends with the reunion of husband and wife in a dramatic way.

Apart from the lost dramas mentioned in these two varieties of compositional figurativeness, Kuntaka also cites some other minor plays in some other situations. Information about some other Rāma plays quoted by Kuntaka for different contexts is given below. They are *Rāghavānanda*, *Abhijñānājanaki* and *Mahānāṭaka*.

4.9.3. Rāghavānanda

There is not much information about this play. Other rhetoricians

like Mammaṭa, Bhoja, Abhinavagupta etc. also cite the same verse in their works. The anthology named *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* ascribed this verse to Viśākhadatta. If Viśākhadatta, the author of *Mudrārākṣasa* is also the author of *Rāgavānanda* or the ‘*Joy of Rāghava*’, it was written before 9th or 10th century C.E. Citation of Bhoja and Abhinavagupta also prompt us to surmise that it was written before 10th century C.E. Kuntaka cites a single verse from it. It is as follows:-

*rāmo ’sau bhuvaneṣu vikramaguṇaiḥ prāptaḥ prasiddhim parā-
masmad bhāgyaviparyayādyadi param devo na jānāti tam/
vandīvaiṣa yaśāmsi gāyati marudasyekabāṇāhati-
śreṇībhūtaviśālatālavivarodgīrṇaiḥ svaraiḥ saptabhiḥ//²⁴*

“This is Rāma, so famous in the worlds for his heroic feats, though his majesty (Rāvaṇa) is not aware of him by our misfortune! Here is the wind-god himself singing his glory like a bard, with all the seven notes produced while passing out of the hollows of the row of giant *Tāla* trees struck by a single shot of his.”²⁵

Kuntaka cites it as an example of conventional word, one of the varieties of lexical figurativeness. Here the word Rāma does not merely indicate the name of a king of Ayodhyā but it suggestively indicates an extraordinary heroism done by him. This is equal to the *arthāntarasankramitavācyadhvani* of Ānandavardhana.

4.9.4. *Abhijñānājanakī*

Kuntaka cites three verses from this drama as an instance to the first variety of contextual figurativeness. According to this variety, depiction of beauty of unlimited enthusiasm of some characters will

contribute charm to the whole work. The poet keeps this particular context as suspense till the conclusion. The verses cited by Kuntaka for showing the inspiring words of monkeys are given below:-

*śailāḥ santi sahasraśaḥ pratidiśam valmīkakaḥpā ime
doraṇḍāśca kaṭhoravikramarasa krīḍāsamutkaṇṭhitāḥ/
karṇāsvāditakumbhasambhavakathāḥ kim nāma kallolinī
kānte goṣpadapūraṇe ’pi kapayaḥ kautūhalam nāsti vaḥ/*²⁶

“Mountains there are in thousand on all sides, but they are no more than ant-hills for you. Your massive arms are itching indeed for the joyous sport of thick battle. No doubt you have heard the old story of sage Agastya who drank up the ocean. This filling in the ocean is no better than filling in a small puddle. Monkeys, why don’t you show interest in it?”²⁷

*āndolyante kati na girayaḥ kandukānandamudrām/
vyātanvānāḥ kapiparisare kautukotkarṣatarṣāt/
lopāmudrāparivṛḍhakathābhijñātāpyasti kim tu
vrīḍāveśaḥ pavanatanayocchiṣṭasamsparśanena/*²⁸

“Among monkeys here, many are already playing with mountains as if they were balls with great pleasure and eagerness. They also are quite aware of the story of Agastya, the husband of Lopāmudrā, But only they are upset by shame at the prospect of touching the leavings of Hanūmat.”²⁹

Kuntaka chooses the inspiring words of Nīla and Jāmbavan from the third act of *Abhijñānājanakī* for explaining it. The monkeys are unaware of their strength to build a bridge across the ocean. At that

moment Nīla says to them that the mountains are just like the ant-hills and balls. Moreover he reminds the story of Agastya who drank up the ocean. He also added that their reluctance in doing it is due to their shame to touch the leavings of Hanūmat that is Laṅkā but not of their inability. Jāmbavat's reply to the words of Rāma that the monkeys are unable to build a bridge across the ocean is also highly inspiring. It is thus:-

*anaṅkuritanissīmamanorathapathesvapi/
kṛtinaḥ kṛtyasamrambhamārabhante jayanti ca//³⁰*

“Even in avenues beyond the reach of one's boundless desires, the great start their worthy efforts and achieve success too.”³¹

Undoubtedly it is sure that these are really beautiful inspiring words. The interesting fact is that Kuntaka chooses the instances from lost composition for a particular contextual figurativeness. Such attempt makes clear Kuntaka's effort in selecting most significant example for each context.

4.9.5. Mahānāṭaka

Mahānāṭaka is also known as *Hanuman-nāṭaka*, there is no certainty about the authorship of this drama. The verse at the end of this drama says that it is written by Sri Hanumān, the famous Puranic legend and the son of *vāyu*. Some scholars opine that it is written by one Dāmodaramiśra of 11th century C.E. It is also known as *chāyā-nāṭaka* or shadow play. It attains a unique position in Sanskrit dramatic literature because of its incorporation of all sentiments in a single drama. Most of its portions are written in the form of verse and a little in prose. Its verses

are mostly in the nature of epic than dramatic character. Max Muller opines about it that it rather than an epic than a true drama³². Absence of *vidūṣaka* and Prakrit verses are other notable features of this drama. It consists of fourteen chapters. De opines that this drama is included in the category of the last division named *samgraha* (entire), the division of dramas propounded by Subandu. Śāratātanaya in is *Bhāvaprakāśa* informs the five kinds of divisions of drama of Subandu. Subandu does not define this last variety more clearly. He says about it as ‘*sarva-vṛtti-viniṣpannam*’ and ‘*sarva-lakṣana-samyutam*’. This means that it has all the dramatic *vṛttis* that are fully developed and all the technical *nāṭaka-lakṣanas*.³³

But a keen evaluation of the text makes it clear that the verses found in *Hanumannāṭaka* are a complete replica of some other Sanskrit texts. The famous verse *snigdha śyāmala kānti...* of *Mahānāṭaka* is taken from the *Rāmābhyudaya* of Yaśovarman.³⁴ It is quoted in *Dhvanyāloka* as an example of *artthāntarasamkramitavācyadhvani*. The verses of *Mahānāṭaka* is also taken from the works like *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, *Mahāvīracarita*, *Anargarāghava*, *Prassannarāghava* and other known and unknown Rāma plays. Moreover the author depends on the anthologies like *Subhāṣitāvalī*, *Śārṅgadarapaddhati* etc. It is also a possibility that either the *Mahānāṭaka* mentioned by Subandu is different from the text available now or it existed in a different form in his time. Kuntaka cites two verses from this dramatic piece. One of them is as follows:

snigdaśyāmaḷakāntiliptaviyato velladvalākā ghanā
vātāḥ śīkariṇaḥ payodasuhṛdāmānandakekāḥ kaḷāḥ/

*kāmam santu dṛḍham kaṭhorahṛdayo ramo'smi sarvvaṃ sahe
vaidehī tu katham bhaviṣyati hahā hā devī dhīrā bhava//³⁵*

Here in the word 'vellad', the affix 'śatr', denoting the present tense and not the past or future and is creating a beautiful grammatical figurativeness named *pratyavakratā*. Kuntaka then explains beauty of instruments of action by taking another instance from this drama. It is "pāṇiḥ samprati me haṭhāt kimaparam spraṣṭum dhanurdhāvati//". Here the poet's intention was just to say that Rāma would like to take the bow with his hand. But deviating from the normal way, the poet brilliantly says that his hand rushes to exert the bow by considering hand as a subject. There are lots of such examples in the compositions of great poets. Actually such expressions make a poem distinct from the common world.

4.10. Conclusion

The examination of these dramatic pieces shows that Kuntaka cites twenty six different dramas in his text. But it is notable that he did not cite any verse from the plays of Bhāsa. At least *Svapnavāsavadatta* and *Pratijñāyugandharāyaṇa* were available at the time of Kuntaka. Still there is no exact reason why Kuntaka ignored these famous plays of Bhāsa. Whatever it is among the different literary genres, dramas have an esteemed position. He selects some lost dramas written based on *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Mahābhārata* and a Jain drama named *Puṣpadūṣitaka*, one of the well known *prakaraṇa* named *Mālatīmādhava* and a *bāṇa* named *Pādatāḍitaka* along with the famous dramas like *Veṅṅīsamhāra*, *Mudrārākṣasa* etc. Though there are numerous dramas, Kuntaka was

very conscious in selecting them in every situation. Kuntaka's citations of large number of dramas of both famous and rare dramatists reveal that he has no partiality towards any particular dramatists. The best platform for Kuntaka to bring forth his final varieties like contextual and compositional figurativeness to an optimum level is dramas.

It is well known that *Tāpasavatsarāja* is a drama written by Anaṅgahaṛṣa Māṭṛrāja. The name of the author is given in the beginning and end of this drama. Unfortunately there is no more information about the author except his name. In the introduction of *old lost Rāma plays*, V. Raghvan says that he has got a manuscript of *Udāttarāghava* but does not give any information about it. With the help of this manuscript, Camille Bulcke, in *Ramakatha*, says that *Udāttarāghava* was most probably written in 8th Century C.E by one Anaṅgahaṛṣa Māṭṛrāja. Citation of verses from *Tāpasavatsarāja* of various rhetoricians like Kuntaka, Abhinavagupta, Ānandavardhana etc. helps to assign the date of *Tāpasavatsarāja* is before 9th Century C.E. Resemblance of the date and name of the author of both these dramas makes one surmise that it was written by the same person.

Likewise it is seen that *Rāghavānanda*, an old lost drama was written by Viśākhadatta. There is no exact evidence to prove that either this Viśākhadatta is none other than the author of *Mudrārākṣasa* or someone else. Kuntaka cites a single verse *rāmo'sau bhuvaneṣu* from *Rāghavānanda*. Bhoja's citation of the same verse in *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* helps V. Raghavan to say that this verse is from *Rāghavānanda*. But still the author of this work is unknown. An anthology named *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* ascribed this verse to Viśākhadatta.

The reliability of anthologies is limited but not completely negligible. Citation of *Rāghavānanda*'s verse of Bhoja and Kuntaka helps to assign its date before 10th century C.E. It is believed that *Mudrārākṣasa* was also written in between 6th or 7th century C.E. These things help to conjecture that both *Mudrārākṣasa* and *Rāghavānanda* were written by same author. This reveals that still a lot of rare dramas of even some famous writers are also in oblivion. So the efforts taken by the rhetoricians like Kuntaka should always be regarded as very valuable. Their attempt helps us to find out the details of those texts.

Yet another resemblance in the name of authors is seen in the works like *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* and *Hayagrīvavadha*. Both are written by one Meṇṭha. The authorship of *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* is just conjectured as Meṇṭha but not certain. Likewise there is no certainty about the date of *Hayagrīvavadha*. But some external evidence helps to assume that it was written before 10th Century C.E. Camille Bulcke says that *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* was written in the beginning of 9th Century A.D. Resemblance in name and date prompt to guess that either it is written by same person or two different persons having same name.

Kuntaka's evaluation of *Veṇīsamhāra* and *Nāgānanda* reveals that he always uphold principles of propriety. In *Veṇīsamhāra*, Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa has depicted the amorous sports between Duryodhana and Bhānumatī while a great war was happening outside. Kuntaka firmly criticizes such impropriety of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa. In *Nāgānanda*, Kuntaka appreciates the self-sacrifice of the hero Jīmūtavāhana, through which he attains many goals of his life. Indication of impropriety in the words of Sītā in *Bālarāmāyaṇa* also shows that Kuntaka never tolerates

improper behavior from an ideal character. Kuntaka also appreciates the authors of *Mudrārākṣasa* and *Tāpasavatsarāja* for their depiction of new way of political strategy in their work for delighting the readers. Kuntaka's propriety in making plausible innovative changes in *Mālatīmādhava* like 'vidhimapi vipannādbhutavidhim' and a minute, but beautiful emendation found in the verse of *Pādatāḍitaka* are also praiseworthy.

A large number of compositions have been mentioned without any further details. Their brief analysis has been given here. Detail information is given as appendix. Kuntaka cites few unique literary pieces written based on *Rāmāyaṇa*. They are *Rāmābhyudaya*, *Udāttarāghava*, *Vīracarita*, *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*, *Māyāpuṣpaka* etc. Here Kuntaka just cites the names of these texts for showing the uniqueness of the texts though they are written based on the same source. By the analysis of the available information on these texts, it is clear that the innovations made by the poets are amazing. Moreover, according to Kuntaka, unique title of a work plays a significant role in contributing to the charm of the work as a whole. It should be related to the pivotal incident discussed in the plot. The examples given for such beautiful titles are *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, *Mudrārākṣasa*, *Pratimāniruddha*, *Māyāpuṣpaka*, *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*, *Chalitarāma* and *Puṣpadūṣitaka*. Among them the lost dramas are *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*, *Rāmānanda*, *Māyāpuṣpaka*, *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*, *Chalitarāma* and *Puṣpadūṣitaka*, *Rāmābhyudaya* and *Udāttarāghava*. In them all are Rāma plays except *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*, *Pratimāniruddha* and *Puṣpadūṣitaka*. *Puṣpadūṣitaka* is the one and only Jain drama cited by Kuntaka. There is not much information about these

dramas except their names. Their names indicate that *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya* and *Pratimāniruddha* were written based on *Mahābhārata*.

Kuntaka cites the minor dramas like *Chalitarāma*, *Māyāpuṣpaka*, *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* *Pratimāniruddha* and *Puṣpadūṣitaka* as instances of beautiful title given to a composition. The pivotal incident discussed in *Chalitarāma* is the treachery of two demons towards Rāma by giving false news about the character of Sītā. So the title *Deceived Rāma* is apt to this drama. In *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* Rāvaṇa's witchcraft is the main theme that leads the story. But it is not clear how the title named *Puṣpadūṣitaka* is connected with the story because of the unavailability of the text. Unavailability of the complete text of *Pratimāniruddha* also makes it difficult to assess connection of this title with its theme. Likewise In *Māyāpuṣpaka*, the word *māyā* means illusion and *puṣpaka* signifies the flying chariot of Kubera. But from the available quotations it is impossible to find out the significance of the illusory chariot in this play. Kuntaka's citation of them in this particular context makes sure that there must be connection between the title and pivotal incident described in it. Name of texts cited in these two varieties of compositional figurativeness are *Māyāpuṣpaka* and *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*.

Kuntaka's suggestion of the title of a work without citing any verse makes it difficult to identify the works. There may arise some doubts about the names of *Vīracarita* and *Rāmacarita* cited by Kuntaka. In *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* the author says that the sudden end of a sentiment while it is flowing well is improper. An instance taken for it is from a drama named *Vīracarita*. Here the word fight between Rāma and Paraśurāma, which was enriched by the heroic sentiment, was

interrupted by the words of Rāma that ‘*kañkaṇamocanāya gacchāmi*. In the second act of *Mahāvīracarita* the word fight between them was interrupted by *kañcukī* by saying ‘*devyaḥ kañkaṇamocanāya militā rājan varaḥ preṣyatām*’. Moreover in the first *viveka* of *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* the author says that for making Rāma an ideal hero, Bhavabhūti brilliantly avoids deceitful killing of Vālin in *Vīracarita*. Undoubtedly this prompts us to think that title given as *Vīracarita* is none other than *Mahāvīracarita* of Bhavabhūti. Absence of citation of verses makes difficult to ascertain the work *Rāmacarita* is either *Uttararāmacarita* or some other *Mahākāvya*. But Kuntaka cites some other situation explicitly from *Uttararāmacarita*. So *Rāmacarita* mentioned by Kuntaka is different from it.

Among these dramas some of them like *Mahānāṭaka*, *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*, *Rāmānanda* are considered as shadow-plays. The first drama considered as a shadow play is *Dharmābhyudaya* of Meghaprabhācārya. Unfortunately its date has not been fixed. It is sure that there may be some purpose for the creation of shadow plays otherwise there is no need to create such replica of something. Sometimes it was created for reciting in particular occasions or festivals. S.K De opines that *Mahānāṭaka* is notorious for its shameless plagiarism.³⁶ Most of its verses are taken from *Rāmabhyudaya*, *Subhāṣitāvalī* etc.

The depiction of the anxious words of Lava by seeing the golden statue of Sītā in *Chalitarāma* that ‘*ayekathamiyamambā rājadvāramāgatā, kathamiyam kāñcanamayī*’ is one of the beautiful instances that untouched *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa*. Though there are lots of

innovative themes in these Rāma plays created by the poets, they never tried to change the main sentiment like the *Veṅīsamhāra* of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa from *Mahābhārata*. One of the contributions of Kuntaka to Sanskrit literature is his citation of verses from some rare works. Such attempts helped to bring some rare works to light. It also inspires the scholars for its further enquiry and study. The partial information of these Rāma plays is available from some citations also from other poetics texts like *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, *Dhvanyāloka* etc. and from some anthologies like *Subhāṣitāvalī*, *Sūktimuktāvalī* etc. From these it is clear that the different and unique composition based on a same story is appreciable. It reveals the poetic imagination of various poets. Such types of works also have their own place in literary genre. There is no need to avoid them considering them as a replica of something. This is what Ānandavardhana said in *Dhvanyāloka* that:- *dr̥ṣṭapūrvā api hyarthāḥ kāvye rasaparigrahāt/ sarve nava ivābhānti madhumāsa iva drumāḥ*³⁷ It means that “Even trite subjects in poetry will put on a new freshness if they get into touch with sentiment just as the same trees appear quite new with the advent of spring.”³⁸ The reach of the present day best seller novels written based on the life of Rāma and Śiva like *The skion of iksvaku* and *The immortals of Meluha* etc. also reveal the same.

¹ K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakrokti-jīvitā of Kuntaka*, p.19.

² *ibid*,p.306.

³ *ibid*,p.275.

⁴ *ibid*,p.569.

-
- ⁵ ibid,p.252.
- ⁶ ibid,p.545.
- ⁷ Ramashankar Tripathi, *Uttarārāmacharita of Mahakavi Bhavabhuti*, p. 386.
- ⁸ M.R. Kale, *The Uttarārāmacarita of Bhavabhūti*, p.56.
- ⁹ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit,p.270.
- ¹⁰ P.V Naganatha Sastry, *Kāvyaśālikāra of Bhāmaha*, p.67.
- ¹¹ ibid, p.67.
- ¹² K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit,p.227.
- ¹³ idem.
- ¹⁴ ibid,p.11.
- ¹⁵ ibid,p.297.
- ¹⁶ ibid,p.298.
- ¹⁷ ibid,p.199.
- ¹⁸ ibid,p.490.
- ¹⁹ ibid,p.65.
- ²⁰ ibid,p.351.
- ²¹ V.V. Mirashi, *Bhavabhūti*,p.368.
- ²² idem.
- ²³ idem.
- ²⁴ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit,p.27.
- ²⁵ ibid,p.314.
- ²⁶ ibid,p.246.
- ²⁷ ibid,p.538.
- ²⁸ ibid,p.246.
- ²⁹ idem.
- ³⁰ ibid,p.246.
- ³¹ ibid,p.538.
- ³² S.K.De, *Aspects of Sanskrit literature*, p.216.
- ³³ S.K.De, *A Reference to the Mahānāṭaka*, Jhā Commemoration Volume, Poona oriental Serial No.39.pp142-143.
- ³⁴ ibid,p.221.
- ³⁵ ibid,pp.83-84.
- ³⁶ S.K.De, op.cit, p.227.
- ³⁷ Dr.K. Krishnamoorthy (Ed.). *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana*,270.
- ³⁸ ibid,p.271.

CHAPTER 5

KUNTAKA'S EVALUATION OF SOME STRAY VERSES

In *Vakroktijīvita*, Kuntaka cites numerous stray verses. There is no certainty about the original sources of some stray verses cited by him. The verses are familiar through some anthologies like *Sūktimuktāvalī*, *Subhāṣitāvalī*, *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* and *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*,¹ which were compiled after Kuntaka. But Kuntaka's citation of verses found in those anthologies make it clear that those verses were prevalent in his time or even before him. But unfortunately no other source material is available to trace the exact origin of those verses. Thus here it is difficult to trace the emendation made by Kuntaka. Kuntaka's evaluation of these particular verses is not negligible.

One of the examples cited by Kuntaka is later found in *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* is as follows:-

damṣṭrāpiṣṭeṣu sadyaḥ śikhariṣu na kṛtaḥ skandhakaṇḍūvinodaḥ
sindhuṣvangāvagāḥ khūrakūharagaḷattucchatoyeṣu nāptaḥ /
labdāḥ pātāḷapaṅke na luṭhanaratayaḥ potramātropayukte
yenoddhāre dharitryāḥ sa jayati vibhūtāvigniteccho varāhaḥ//²

“Uniquely triumphant is the great boar whose natural impulses had to remain unfulfilled on account of his own greatness, at the time of bringing up the submerged earth out of the ocean. Since mountain peaks came to be pulverized at the very touch of his tusk. He could not enjoy

the game of scratching his itching shoulder. Since the ocean's water-level could not go beyond the cavity of his hoofs. He had to forego the pleasures of a hearty batch. Since the mire was so shallow that only the snout could touch it. He had to deny himself the pleasure of a joyous rolling”³.

Kuntaka cites this example to substantiate the importance of ‘*arthah*’ mentioned in his definition of poetry. In the definition of poetry given by Kuntaka the word ‘*arthah*’ denotes that the things with its own refreshing beauty should delight the readers. This is really a perfect example in this context. The verse describes the inability of the boar to do his natural impulses. This depiction helps in suggesting the greatness of the boar with great aesthetic beauty. Such refreshing beauty of the meaning of this verse undoubtedly delights the readers. Yet another verse later found in *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* is given below:-

*etanmandavipakvatindukaphalaśyāmodarāpāṇḍura-
prāntam hanta puṇindasundarakarasparśakṣamam lakṣyate/
tatpallīpatiputi kuñjarakulam kumbābayābhyartthanā-
dīnam tvāmanunāthate kucayugam patrāmśukairmā pidhāḥ//⁴*

“O daughter of the village chief, please don't cover up your breast with leaf-clothings. Its bulge looks all white while the nipple is as dark as the black berry ripe in good time. It has become strong enough to bear the clasp of the best youth among hunters. Hence, the herd of elephants is humbly praying to you to save the glory of their temples (by not outgrowing them).”⁵

As an example of the quality named *lāvanya* of *vicitra mārga*, Kuntaka quotes this verse. The nature of *lāvanya* of the *vicitra mārga* is that there must be a harmonious combination of words, absence of the elision of final aspirates and also have short syllables preceding conjunct consonants. This example satisfies all these features because there is no deliberate addition of words and in the second line, the poet has used the short syllables like ‘śa’ and ‘la’ before the conjunct consonant ‘kṣa’. Through the final word ‘*pidhāḥ*’, the presence of final aspirates is well explicit. Here the poet very beautifully portrays this verse as the words of herds of elephant to the daughter of the village chieftain, asking her not to cover her beautiful breast by the leaves because they may get a chance to escape from the hunter, who would be eager to touch her breast.

Kuntaka cites this verse once again as an example of phonetic figurativeness (*varṇavinyāsavakratā*). In this variety of phonetic figurativeness Kuntaka uses the repetition of new words in the different lines of verses instead of the repetition of same words in each line for creating extreme charm to a verse. To illustrate one of the varieties of lexical figurativeness Kuntaka again cites the following verse, which is later found in *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*.

*yāte dvāravatīm tadā madhuripau taddattajhampānatām
kālindījalakelīvañjuḷalatāmālambya sotkaṅṭhayā /
tad gītam gurubāṣpagadgadalasattārasvaram rādhayā
yenāntarjalacāribhirjalacarairapyutkamutkūjitam//⁶*

“When kṛṣṇa went away to Dvārakā, anxious Rādhā besought the support of the water-reed bent by his shake in the river Yamunā,

hallowed by water sports in his company earlier. She sang such mournful strains in a high-pitched voice with tear filled eyes and choking throat that all the aquatic creatures moving in that stream started crying in distress.”⁷

Kuntaka cites this verse as an example of the fifth variety of lexical figurativeness (*padapūrvārdhavakratā*) i.e. beauty of concealment of art (*samvṛtīvakratā*). The naming of this *vakratā* is also proper because here the poet conceals the essence of the verse very brilliantly. Here Kuntaka says that sometimes the poet may feel that a subject will lose its charm by direct expression and thus try to conceal the essence through a pronoun. He would make it clear later through some other clauses. As an example to this, Kuntaka cites this beautiful verse. This verse means that after the departure of Kṛṣṇa to Dvāraka, Rādhā deeply sung that song, leaning on the water reed of the river Yamunā that is hanging down by the constant shaking by Kṛṣṇa. She sung it in such a way that it makes all other creatures of that river also cry.

In the beginning of the third line, the poet uses the words ‘*tad gītā*’. Here the poet conceals the speciality of the song by using the pronoun ‘*tad*’ and only in the latter half of the verse the poet makes it clear by saying that the song makes all other creature of that river cry. In this way the poet beautifully depicts the charm of concealment of art and Kuntaka’s effort to find out such perfect example for this particular context is also commendable. Yet another verse cited by Kuntaka found in this anthology is given below:-

*tarantīvāṅgāni skhaladamalalāvāṅyajaladhau
pradhimnaḥ prāgalbhyam stanajaghanamunmudrayati ca/
dṛśorlīlārambhāḥ sphuṭamapavadante saraḷatā-
maho sāraṅgākṣyāstaruṇimni gāḍhaḥ paricayaḥ//⁸*

“The limbs appear to swim in the surging sea of youthful charm. Breasts and hips unseal the affluence of development. The coquettish graces of the glances clearly dislodge simplicity. Oh, the maiden’s acquaintance with youth is very close indeed.”⁹

Kuntaka cites this verse as an example of beauty of action (*kriyāvaicitryavakratā*). Through this variety of lexical figurativeness, Kuntaka superimposes a nonexistent feature of an object due to similarity. This verse beautifully depicts the beauty of the limbs of a maiden at the time of the advent of her youth. First of all, the poet says that the limbs of the beautiful lady are swimming (*tarantī*) in the ocean. Here the poet imposes sentient nature like swimming to non-sentient objects like the limbs of a maiden. Then the poet says that her breast and hips unwrap (*unmudrayati*) the prosperity of progress. Here the poet considers the breast and hips as subject and compare it with the sentient being. Here the poet shows how man opens something at a proper time after keeping it with him for a long time. Likewise the beauty of her breast and hips reveal themselves at the advent of her youth after concealing them in her childhood. The next line of this verse says that her glances refute (*apavadante*) its simplicity. Some new movements of her eyes suited to her youth indicate that she has lost her innocent glances that she had in her childhood. Here a damsel’s transformation from her childhood to youth is compared through *lakṣanā*. The three

verbs like *tarantī*, *unmudrayatī*, *apavadante* create unexplainable beauty of art in this verse. In this way the three actions have its utmost beauty by the use of metaphorical application.

Kuntaka cites this verse again in two contexts. He cites this verse as an example of a single verse having different types of *vakratā*. Here the three verbs like *tarantī*, *unmudrayati*, *apavadante* denote three different types of *vakratas* like *kriyāvaicitrya*, *kārakavaicitrya* and *kālavaicitrya* respectively in a single verse. Thirdly he cites it as an example of one variety of *utprekṣā*, here Kuntaka attributes some of its own functions to inactive objects by considering it as a subject. The extraordinary power of the poet in depicting the function of non-sentient object makes it appear as doing the functions of sentient subjects to the mind of preceptors.

One of the verse cited by Kuntaka later found in *Sūktimuktāvalī* is as follows:-

*dinamavasitam viśrāntāḥ smastvayā marukūpa he,
paramupakṛtam vaktum joṣam hṛiyā na vayam kṣamāḥ/
bhavatu sukṛtairadhvanyānāmaśoṣajalo bhavā-
niyamapi punaśchāyābhūyā tavopataṭam śamī//¹⁰*

Kuntaka cites this verse as an example of *vyājastuti*. He defines it as follows:-

*yatra vācyatayā nindā vicchittyai prastutasya sā/
stutirvyaṅgyatayā caiva vyājastutirasau matā//¹¹*

The definition of this figure of speech in *Kuvalayānanda* is as follows:-

*ukirvyājastudirnindāstutibhyām stutinindayoḥ*¹²

In *vyājastuti* either the praise is expressed by obvious strong criticism or the disapproval is expressed by the obvious praise. Kuntaka cites this verse for *vyājastuti* having praise as primary meaning and the disapproval as suggestive meaning. Here someone says to the well of a desert that:-

“The day is over, rested we are by your kindness, o desert-well. Your favours galore we cannot state. Overcome by shyness as we are. We wish your water never dries up by the good luck of the wayfarers. Also that śamī tree beside you will always provide good shade.”

Here the poet directly praises the generosity of a person, but the suggestive meaning of it reveals the ungenerous nature of that person. So undoubtedly this is one of the best and beautiful examples for *vyājastuti*. Kuntaka cites yet another verse as an example of *śabdaśleṣa*, one of the varieties of *Śleṣālaṅkāra*.

yena dhvastamanobhavena balijitkāyaḥ purāstriḅṛtaḥ
yaścodvṛttabhujāṅgahāraḅalayo gaṅgām ca yo ’dhārayat/
yasyāhuḥ śaśimacchirohara iti stutyam ca nāmāmarāḥ
*pāyātsa svayamandhakakṣayakarastvām sarvado-mādhavaḥ*¹³

In the ninth *prakāśa* of *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, Bhoja also cites this verse as an example of *śabdaśleṣa*.¹⁴ Ānandavardhana also cites this for the same, he opines about it as “If two ideas are manifest (simultaneously)

as a result of the power of the word, we have only an instance of double entendre (śleṣa)".¹⁵ There are different opinions about śleṣālaṅkāra among the rhetoricians. The definition given by Kuntaka for śabdaśleṣa is as follows:-

*tulyaśabdasmṛterarthaḥ tasmādanyaḥ pratīyate/
śabdasyodbhūtanāṣṭatvāt smṛtiḥ sarvatra vācikā//¹⁶*

When hearing a single word, we have got another meaning of it only by the remembrance of another word of the same sound. The sound gets destroyed soon after it is produced, the remembrance of its past existence alone is the denotation of the meaning everywhere.

Among the two meanings, the first one praises Lord Śiva. “He by whom the god of love was destroyed, by whom the very body of Bali’s enemy was turned in to a shaft, whose necklaces and bracelets are serpents forsooth, who bore the celestial River on his head, and whose holy title ‘the moon crested Hara’ is praised by all the gods, may that slayer of Andhaka and the spouse of Pārvatī preserve thee.”

The same verse also beautifully praises Lord Viṣṇu in another way. “He, the unborn, by whom the cart-demon was killed, whose body that conquered Bali was in to a woman’s form changed, who slew the proud serpent Kāliya, who held aloft the mountain as well as the earth, whose holy name, ‘the beheader of Dragon’s head’, is glorified by all the gods, and who was himself the cause of the destruction of Yādavas, may that all-giver Mādhava preserve the.”

In this way the poet beautifully incorporates the actions of both Lord Śiva and Viṣṇu in a single verse properly. Moreover by hearing a

single word, another meaning of the same word is grasped. In this manner this verse becomes one of the best examples for *śabdaśleṣa* cited by Kuntaka. He again cited the third and final verse of this anthology as an example of *asatyabhūtārthaśleṣa*. In this variety of *śleṣa* the contextual meaning would be unreal. The example of it is given below:-

*dṛṣṭyā keśava goparāgahṛdayā kiñcinna dṛṣṭam mayā
tenaiva skhalitāsmi nātha patitām kim nāma nālambase/
ekastvam viṣameṣu khinnamanasām sarvābalānām gatiḥ
gopyevam gaditaḥ sa leśamavatādgoṣṭhe hasantyā hariḥ//¹⁷*

“O Kṛṣṇa, nothing was seen by me, blind as I was by the dust raised by cows (also, as I was drawn by love for the cow-herd), hence I have stumbled (also, strayed away from morality): and why don’t you, O lord, give support to a fallen one? (also, why don’t you behave like a husband towards me?). Are you not the only succour for the frail women, whose minds are troubled by uneven paths (also, whose minds are troubled by the love-god)? Thus in the cow-pen was Hari addressed, by the cowherdess with equivocal words: may he preserve us for long!”¹⁸

The verse signifies the words of a woman. One of the meanings of the verse is that she could not see anything due to dust raised by the cows and so she stumbled down. She asks the Lord why he was not supporting the fallen one. He was the sole protector of all the women, whose minds are in trouble in some pathetic situations. (The other meaning of this verse is that she could not see anything due to her love blindness and so she trembled down in to a wrong path. She asks why he

is not accepting the position as her. He was the only protector of all the women whose minds were troubled by Cupid, the god of love). Thus Lord Kṛṣṇa, about whom the *gopikas* converse with a smile keeping some intention in her mind in *Ampāṭī*, may protect this entire universe. Here the poet beautifully depicts the prayer of a helpless woman towards Kṛṣṇa as the contextual meaning, but which is unreal. The real meaning of it is the love of *gopikas* towards Kṛṣṇa. This makes it clear that the poet succeeded in incorporating the *asatyabhūtārthaśleṣa* in this verse.

Dhvanyāloka has the same verse as an example of *arthaśleṣa*. Ānandavardhana opines that “Even a suggested figure will not become an instance of resonant suggestion based on the power of the word if it also gets expressed at the same time by other expressions. In such instances we will find only an expressed figure like Evasive speech”¹⁹ and then he cites the above mentioned verse as an example for it.

Two verses cited in *Vakroktijīvitā* are later found in both *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Vallabhadeva and *Sūktimuktāvalī* of Jalhaṇa. Among them, the first one is very familiar because it is cited in most of the poetic texts as an instance of the figure of speech *samāsokti*. But Kuntaka cites this verse as an example of *rasavadalaṅkāra*. The definition given for *rasavadalaṅkāra* is already discussed before. The example given for it is as follows:-

*upoḍharāgeṇa vilolatārakam tathā gṛhītam śaśinā niśāmukham/
yathā samastam timirāmsukam tayā puro ’pi rāgādgaḷitam na lakṣitam*//²⁰

The meaning of the verse is that the moon (the lover) glowing red due to deep passion takes possession of the face of the night (face of the

heroine) having twinkling stars. At that moment the darkness disappears in the east (she did not even notice that the entire black garment of her has slipped off in front of her) which is not noticed due to illumination (due to deep passion).

Here the prominent subject is the description of moon and the night and here the poet brilliantly incorporates the relation of the lovers without direct denotation by the help of the figure of speech called metaphor (*rūpaka*). The *śleṣa* stands as subordinate to metaphor making this verse an apt example for *rasavadalaṅkāra* according to Ānandavardhana.

It is familiar that the depiction of irrelevant subject through the explanation of relevant subject is known as *samāsokti*. The definition given for *samāsokti* in *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra* and *Kāvyaḷarśa* is given below respectively.

*yatroktau gamyate 'nyo 'rthastatsamānaviśeṣaṇaḥ/
sā samāsoktiruddiṣṭā samkṣiptārthatayā yathā//²¹*

Where the irrelevant subject is explained briefly using the same epithet of relevant subject is called as *samāsokti* by the scholars.

*vastu kiñcidabhipretyatattulyānyavastunaḥ/
uktiḥ samkṣeparūpatvāt sā samāsoktirīṣyate//²²*

Some another similar subject is explained briefly by keeping either the irrelevant or relevant thing in mind is called *samāsokti*.

In the above mentioned verse, the irrelevant subject like the relation of lovers is pictured brilliantly by the poet through the relevant

subject like the description of the beautiful night. It is really difficult to differentiate *samāsokti* and *aprustutaprasāmsā* both of them are almost equal. Kuntaka firmly object the existence of *samāsokti* and he says that:-

*samāsokti sahoktiśca nālañkāratayā matā/
alañkārāntaratvena śobhāsūnyatayā matā//²³*

According to Kuntaka, *samāsokti* and *sahokti* are not figures of speech because they have the nature of other figure of speeches and also they did not possess any poetic charm too.

Kuntaka cites the next verse as an example of ‘praise of the in apposite’ (*aprustutaprasāmsā*) and the definition of it is already given in this chapter and the example of it is as follows:-

*lāvaṇyasindhuraparaiva hi keyamatra
yatrotpalāni śāśinā saha samplavante/
unmajjati dviradakumbhataṭī ca yatra
yatrāpare kadalikāṇḍamṛṇāladaṇḍāḥ//²⁴*

This is an exclamatory remark of a man on seeing a beautiful woman in the sea shore. He exclaims that which is the beautiful river that was never seen before? and here the blue lotuses float along with the moon, the head of the elephants has reached its pinnacle, the stems of the plantain tree and the stems of the lotuses are also seen. Then he compares the beautiful river to the damsel, the blue lotuses to her eyes, her face to the moon, the head of the elephant to her breast, the stem of the plantain tree to her thighs and also the shoots of the lotuses to her hands. Here by the support of the irrelevant subject in the sentence like

the description of the river, the intended subject of the poet like the beauty of a maiden is manifested based on their similarity. In this way, the poet beautifully brings about *aprustutaprasāmsā* in this verse and Kuntaka's selection of this verse for this particular context is also significant. This verse is also cited by Vāmana in his *Kāvyaḷaṅkārasūtravṛtti* of Vāmana.

One of the verses later found in the section named *viyogipralāpāḥ* among the 163 sections of *Śārngadharaḷpaddhati* is as follows.

*nidrānimīlitadrśo madamantharāyā
nāpyartthavanti na ca yāni nirarthakāni/
adyāpi me varatanormadhurāṅi tasyā-
stānyakṣarāṅi hṛdaye kimapi dhvananti//²⁵*

“With eyes closing in drowsiness, her gait slowed down by drink, that lovely one uttered such sweet expressions, neither meaningful nor meaningless, which still suggest something in my heart even now.”

Kuntaka cites this verse as the example of figurativeness of concealment (*samvṛtivakratā*), one of the variety of lexical figurativeness (*padapūrvārdhavakratā*). Here the word ‘something’ denotes the unexplainable delight by hearing the sweet voice of the damsel, which can only be experienced but not be expressed. Moreover the pronoun ‘such’ denotes the sweet voice coming in the memory of that delightful experience. The epithet ‘meaningless’ indicates that it is unexplainable but can only be experienced and also the same is expressed as ‘nor meaningless’, which really contributes extreme delight

to the context and hence it helps in avoiding the incoherence (*apārthakatvadoṣa*). The second verse from this anthology is as follows:-

*unnidrakokanadareṇupīśaṅgitāṅgā
guñjanti mañju madhupāḥ kamalākareṣu/
etacchakāsti ca ravernavabandujīva-
puṣpacchadābhamudayācalacumbi bimbam//²⁶*

“Bees hum sweetly in lotus lakes with their bodies reddened by the pollen of full-blown lotuses. And here shines the orb of the sun on the summit of the Eastern Mount like a flower bunch of hibiscus glowing all red.”

Kuntaka cites this verse as an example of one of the varieties of phonetic figurativeness (*varṇavinyāsavakratā*), where the consonants like *sparśas* (‘ka’ to ‘ma’) combines with the nasals (the fifth one in the series of consonants from ‘ka’ to ‘ma’) like *ṅa, ña, ṇa, na* and *ma*. Here in the end of the first line the consonants combine with the nasal ‘*ṅa*’ and in the beginning of the second line it combines with ‘*ña*’ and also in the last line the combination of consonants with the nasal ‘*ma*’ is also clear. In *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*, this verse comes under the section named the description of sun.

It is interesting to note that these two simple and beautiful verses cited by Kuntaka are later found in *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*. Kuntaka cited these verses for substantiating one of the varieties of his first two figurativeness named phonetic figurativeness and lexical figurativeness. This is really an encyclopedic work having numerous verses belonging to various topics.

Some important verses cited by Kuntaka are later compiled in *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Vallabhadeva. They are given below. Kuntaka cited a verse to illustrate that both word and meaning make poetry. A small deficiency of either word or meaning will never spoil the charm of poetry. For showing this, Kuntaka uses the word ‘*sahitau*’ or ‘togetherness’ in his definition.

tato’ruṇaparispandamandīkṛtavapuḥ śaśī /
dadhre kāmāparikṣāmakāminīgandapāṇḍutām//²⁷

This is the first verse under the title ‘*atha prabhātavarṇam*’ of *Subhāṣitāvalī*. This verse means that the full moon which gradually lost its reddishness attains the pallor of the cheek of a lady lover, who becomes slim due to love sickness. Here through the comparison of paleness of the moon and the cheek of the lady lover, the poet uses the *arthālaṅkāra* or adornments of thoughts. The *śabdālaṅkāra* or adornments of expression is also satisfied by the use of *lāvaṇya*, the beauty of the proper use of syllables and words. Kuntaka cites the same verse also as an example of *upamā* in word expressed through predicate (*ākhyātapadapratipādyapadārthopamā*).

Kuntaka cites the second example of this anthology as his first variety of figurativeness named phonetic figurativeness. It is familiar that the poetic world stands as unique from the ordinary world through the artistic use of language by efficient poets with their poetic genius. Like-wise the beauty in the arrangements of syllables will surely act as nectar to the *sahṛdayas*. There are different varieties in this phonetic figurativeness. The repetition one, two or more syllables at particular interval is one of its varieties.

*eko dvau bahavo varṇā badhyamānāḥ punaḥ punaḥ/
svalpāntarāstridhā soktā varṇavinyāsavakratā//²⁸*

The example of it is given below:-

*prathamamaruṇacchāyastāvattataḥkanakaprabhas-
tadanu virahottāmyattanvīkapolataladyutiḥ/
prasarati tato dhvāntadhvamsakṣamaḥ kṣanadāmukhe
sarasabisinīkandacchedacchavirmṛgalāñchanāḥ//²⁹*

“At first reddish, then golden yellow, later like pale cheek of a maid love-lorn, next as white as a lotus shoot just cut, the rising moon goes on to remove darkness”

This verse is undoubtedly perfect example of phonetic figurativeness. Such beautiful arrangement of syllables is called as ‘alliteration’ by ancient theorists. Here the repetition of ‘ma’ in ‘prathamamaruṇa’ ‘tta’ in ‘virahottāmyattanvī’ and ‘la’ in ‘kapolataladyutiḥ’ etc. are some of the instances of alliteration found in this verse. Yet another verse found in this anthology is as follows:

*vriḍḍāyogānnatavadanayā sannidhāne guruṇām
baddhotkampastanakalaśayā manyumantarniyamya/
tiṣṭhetyuktam kimiva na tayā yatsamutsṛjya bāṣpam
mayyāsaktaścakitahariṇīhāri netratribhāgaḥ//³⁰*

“In the presence of elders, she stood abashed with downcast face; her buxom breasts heaved and shook. Yet she swallowed her agitation and turned on me a tearful glance revealing only a third of her gleaming

eye lovely like that of a deer in fright. Was it not a tantamount to tell her telling me -remain?”

Kuntaka cites this verse as an example of *viśeṣaṇavakratā*, one of the divisions of *padapūrvārdhavakratā*. Here the epithet used by the poet of the eyes of a heroine because of her embarrassment due to presence of elders is that ‘the eyes of a deer in fright’. It is clear from this verse that the beauty of this verse depends on the beautiful epithet used by the poet. The apt and beautiful selection of this particular verse for this situation by Kuntaka is really appreciable. He again cites the same verse as a variety of *kriyāvaicitryavakratā*, which is another division of *padapūrvārdhavakratā* in the same way. Another verse from *Subhāṣitāvalī* is as follows:-

ittham jaḍe jagati ko nu bṛhatpramāṇa-
karṇaḥ karī nanu bhaveddhvanitasya pātram/
ityāgata jhaṭiti yo’linamunmamātha
mātaṅga eva kimataḥ paramucyate’sau//³¹

“In such an insensitive world, who else is there with ear so large and hand so long to deserve my musical plea? so thinking did the bee approach him. But the elephant at once blotted him out. After all, is he not a Mātaṅga, (‘butcher’ as well as ‘elephant’) what more need we say”

Kuntaka cites this verse as an example of figurativeness related to synonym (*pariyāyavakratā*), one of the variety of lexical figurativeness (*padapūrvārdhavakratā*). Through this variety, Kuntaka says that the primary meaning can be beautified with the support of some other

beauties like paranomastic beauty (*śleṣa*) etc. Here the word ‘*mātaṅga*’ directly indicates only an elephant, but paranomastically it also denotes abutcher (*caṇḍāla*), which is a non-contextual meaning. This type of *vakratā* will also create a special charm like the metaphorical identification called ‘the Punjabi is a bull’. In such situations, the relation between the contextual and non-contextual meaning should be either of epithet or of simile. This is what Anandavardhana in his *Dhvanyāloka* states that:-

*ākṣipta evālaṅkāraḥ śabdaśaktyā prakāśate/
yasminnanuktaḥ śabdena śabdaśaktyudbhavo hi saḥ//³²*

“Only that instance wherein is present a figure that is not expressed directly by any word but solely by the suggestive power of the itself, should be regarded as suggestion based on the power of the word.”³³

Kuntaka also cites the above mentioned verse as an example of figurativeness related to gender (*liṅgavaicitryavakratā*). In this verse the poet uses two different genders to denote a single idea in order to make the sentence more attractive. In the second line the poet uses *karṇaḥ karī* for making the verse attractive. Here in a single sentence, the poet has used both the masculine and feminine gender for creating beauty through figurativeness related to gender. Thus this verse is best example for both the figurativeness related to synonym and figurativeness related to gender.

Kuntaka cites yet another verse as an example of one of the varieties of *vicitra mārga* or the variegated style propounded by Kuntaka.

In this variety, Kuntaka says that the poets sometimes adds one or more figures of speech in a single verse without being satisfied by the charm of that particular verse just like adding beautiful pearls on a garland. Here the two figures of speech used by the poet are *rūpaka* and *sandeha*.

*kim tārūṇyataroriyam rasabharodbhinnā navā mañjarī
līlāprocchalitasya kim laharikā lāvaṇyavārāmnidheḥ/
udgāḍhotkalikāvatām svasamayopanyāsaviśrambhiṇaḥ
kim sākṣādupadeśayaṣṭirathavā devasya śṛṅgāriṇa//³⁴*

Here the poet asks in a suspicious manner that “Is this perchance a new tendril brimming with fresh juice sprung forth from the tree of youth? Or is it a little wave from the ocean of grace thrown up in its gentle undulation? Or is it the instructor’s rod in the hand in the hand of the love-god who is out to give lessons in his subject to persons overwhelmed by longing”.

Here the two figures of speech like *rūpaka* and *sandeha* make the verse more attractive. He cites the same verse five times in this text but always uses it to explain the figure of speech mentioned in it in different places for discussing sentential figurativeness. Yet another verse cited by Kuntaka is given below.

*āsvarlokāduraganagaram nūtanālokalakṣmīm
vyātanvadbhiḥ kimiva sitatām ceṣṭitaistenanītam/
apyetāsām dayitavirahe vidviṣatsundarīṇām
yairānītā nakhapadamayī maṇḍanā pāṇḍimānam//³⁵*

“From paradise to the netherworld what is there left unwhitened by your deeds ever new to the eye? They have whitened even the

ornamental nail marks on the bodies of your enemy's wives parted from their lovers.”

Kuntaka cites this verse as an example of figurativeness related to expressive techniques (*vṛttivaicitryavakratā*).

*avyayībhāvamukhyānām vṛttīnām ramaṇīyatā/
yatrollasati sā jñeyā vṛttivaicitryavakratā//³⁶*

This is the definition given by Kuntaka for the figurativeness related to expressive techniques. The beauty of *vṛtti* where the adverbial compound or *avyayībhāvasamasa* like *kṛt*, *taddhita* etc. shines forth is known as figurativeness related to expressive techniques. In the verse mentioned above, the word *pāṇḍimānam* used in the last line creates a unique beauty of *vṛtti* rather than the synonyms of its likes *pāṇḍutva*, *pāṇḍutā* etc.

*naikatra śaktiviratiḥ kvacidasti sarve
bhāvāḥ svabhāvapariniṣṭhitatāratamyāḥ/
ākalpamaurvadahanena nipīyamāna-
mambhodhimekacuḷakena papāvagastyāḥ//³⁷*

“Capacity is not limited to an individual. All beings on earth exhibit high and low degrees of capacity by nature. That is why Agastya was able to empty in one sip the ocean itself to exhaust which the submarine fire struggles for ages.”

This is an example of one of the varieties of figurativeness related to verb (*kriyāvaicitryavakratā*). In this variety one subject excels in an action from the other subject doing the same action. In the above verse,

Agastya drank the ocean in a sip using his constant determination and effort. This really creates an unexplainable beauty related to verb rather than the same action performed by the submarine fire. Kuntaka has cited large number of verses from this anthology. Yet another one describes as follows:

*kim hāsyena na me prayāsyasi punaḥ prāptaścirāddarśanam
keyam niṣkaruṇa pravāsarucitā kenāsi dūrīkṛtaḥ/
svapnānteṣviti te vadan priyatamavyāsaktakaṇṭhagraho
buddhvā roditi riktabāhuvalayastāram ripustrījanaḥ//³⁸*

“Oh ruthless one, why all these teasing, there is no meeting between us for a long time and again should not be part from me, why you would like to live in faraway places and who is the one living far away attracting you, lamenting thus, the wives of your enemies embraced their beloveds in dream and but once they wake from their sleep, they cried loudly seeing their empty hands.”

Ānandavardhana cites this verse as an example of *śuddha* type of *rasavadalaṅkāra*. According to him, *rasavadalaṅkāra* is of two types *śuddhaḥ* and *saṅkīrṇaḥ*. Separable union of subordinate *rasas* or *alaṅkāras* from the dominant sentiment in *rasavadalaṅkāra* is known as *śuddhaḥ* and their inseparability is known as *saṅkīrṇaḥ*. It is found in *locana* as ‘*śuddhaḥ iti, rasāntareṇāṅgabhūtenālaṅkāraṅtareṇa vā na miśraḥ āmiśrastu saṅkīrṇaḥ*’.³⁹ Here the sentiment *karuṇa* is subordinate to the eulogy of the king and the two sentiments are well explicit and are not inseparably mixed with each other. But according to Kuntaka, *rasavad* is always an *alaṅkārya* and not an *alaṅkāra*. Thus Kuntaka says that the main sentiment of this verse is none other than *karuṇa* or pathos.

In the second *pariccheda* of his *Kāvyaḍarśa*, Ācārya Daṇḍin has given the definition of three figures of speech named *preyas*, *rasavat* and *ūrjasvi* through a single verse. It is given below and it shows that *preyas* means pleasing speech.

*preyaḥ priyatarākhyānam rasavad rasapeśalam/
ūrjasvi rūḍhāhaṅkāram yuktotkarṣam ca tat trayam//⁴⁰*

After refuting that *rasavat* is not an adornment but an adorned, Kuntaka objects the figure of speech named *preyas* almost in the same manner. He refutes the opinions of earlier rhetoricians and establishes that *preyas* is also not an adornment but an adorned. He then cites following verse for proving his point.

*indorlakṣma smaravijayinaḥ kaṅṭhamūlam murāriḥ
diṅnāgānām madajalamaṣībhāñji gaṅḍasthalāni/
adyāpyurvīvalayatilaka śyāmaḷimnānuliptā-
nyābhāsante vada dhavaḷitam kim yaśobhistvadīyaiḥ//⁴¹*

“The moon’s spot as well as Śiva’s throat, Lord Viṣṇu’s body and the temples of the elephants of the quarters dripping inky ichor. All these appear pitch black as ever before. O lord of the earth! say, what then has your fame whitened, as it spreads?”

In this verse, the sweet praise (of the king) or *preyas* is adorned and ‘ironic praise’ (*vyājastuti*) is adornment. There is no need to doubt the existence of the two figures of speech like ‘merged figure’ (*samsṛṣṭi*) and the ‘mixed figure’ (*saṅkara*) here because of the presence

of *preyas* and *vyājastuti*. He again cites this verse at the time of discussing *vyājastuti*.

In the third *unmeṣa*, Kuntaka discusses *rasavadalaṅkāra* in a different perspective. He says that the figure of speech which functions like *rasa* as it permeates poetry with *rasa* and creates poetic delight to the connoisseur is called *rasavadalaṅkāra*. It is defined as:-

*rasena varṭtate tulyam rasavattvavidhānataḥ/
yo'laṅkāraḥ sa rasavat tadvidāhḷādanirmiteḥ//^{A2}*

One of the examples of *rasavadalaṅkāra* is given below.

*aindram dhanuḥ pāṇḍupayodhareṇaśaraddadhānārdranakhakṣatābham/
prasādayantī sakalaṅkamindumtāpam raverabhyadhikam cakāra//^{A3}*

“The lady autumn with white bosom (also-cloud), bearing thereon the rainbow like a lover’s new nail-cut; and wooing the moon, spotted as he was roused the ire (heat) of the burning sun!”

The natural beauty of autumn is the dominant subject described here. The poet modifies it beautifully with the help of *utprekṣā* which in turn helps in making the verse *rasavat*. *Utprekṣā* is an *alaṅkāra* which signifies things in a suggestive way avoiding the direct denotations like ‘as though and like’ etc. Here the poet makes the prominent meaning more attractive by using the word ‘spotted’ (*sakalaṅkaḥ*) with paronomasia (*śleṣa*) and also saying ‘white bosom (cloud) bearing the rainbow like a lover’s new nail cut’ etc. with both paronomasia and simile by supporting *utprekṣā*. Moreover the poet also says that by pleasing the spotted one, she roused the jealousy of another lover. In this

way by incorporating the behavior of an unjustifiable woman using the figure of speech metaphor (*rūpaka*), the poet again adds an extreme charm to this verse. Here too the dominant figure of speech is *utprekṣā* and the other figures like simile are subordinate to it.

Here Kuntaka perfectly explains how this verse is apt to this particular context. This is one of the major features of Kuntaka, which is not found in other rhetoricians. They just cite a verse without explaining their aptness to the context. But a drawback of Kuntaka is that he did not follow the same method throughout his text and sometimes says that it needs no further explanation because a *sahṛdaya* can grasp it without explanation. Kuntaka cites the yet another verse as an example of a figure of speech named ‘praise of the inapposite’ (*aprustutapraśamsā*). Kuntaka defines it as:-

*aprustutopi vicchittim prastutasyāvatārayan/
padārtho vātha vākyārthaḥ prāpyate varṇanīyatām//
yatra tatsāmyamāśritya sambandhāntarameva vā/
aprustutapraśamseti kathitāvasāvalamkṛtiḥ//⁴⁴*

Here sometimes the unintended subject came to be depicted by describing the beauty of the intended subject. When the particular intended meaning is expressed through the word meaning or sentence meaning by the similarity of the unintended and intended subjects or by any other relation is known as ‘praise of the in apposite’ (*aprustutapraśamsā*).

*chāyā nātmana eva yā kathamasāvanyasya niṣpragrahā
grīṣmoṣmāpadi śītalāstalabhuvī śparśo ’nilādeḥ kutaḥ/*

*vārttā varṣāśate gate kila phalam bhāvīti vārtteva sā
drāghimṇā muṣitāḥ kiyacciramaho tālena bālā vayam//⁴⁵*

“When there is no shade for itself, how can it provide shade to others? When the scorching summer comes, we can’t have cool breeze below that tree. They talk that it bears fruit after a hundred years are passed, but it is nothing but loose talk; alas how long, we have been deceived by the mere height of the palm-tree.”

Here the poet brilliantly depicts some weakness of a palm tree without directly denoting the bad qualities of an intended person through some of their similarities. Thus the poet beautifully incorporates the figure of speech named *aprastutaparaśamsā*. Moreover this figure of speech also helps to avoid the impropriety in blaming the person directly.

Kuntaka cites yet another verse as an example of *sūkṣmālaṅkāra*. Kuntaka does not consider *sūkṣma* as an *alaṅkāra*. Bhāmaha also says that *hetu*, *sūkṣma*, *leśa* are not adornments because they do not have any aesthetic turn of speech at the time of assigning the entirety of an idea. Then Kuntaka cites the *kārika* given by Bhāmaha.

*hetuśca sūkṣmo leśo ’tha nālaṅkāratayā mataḥ/
samudāyābhideyasya vakroktyanabhidhānataḥ//⁴⁶*

Daṇḍin in his *Kāvyaḍarśa* given the definition for the figure of speech *sūkṣma* as:-

iṅgitākāralakṣyo ’rthaḥ saukṣmyāt sūkṣma iti smṛtaḥ//⁴⁷

Minute expressions of self opinion through the facial or physical

gestures is known as *sūkṣmālaṅkāra*. Most of such gestures are used when something that is improper to be conveyed in the presence of elders like conveyance of the secret meeting time between the lovers etc. The example given for it is as follows:-

*saṅketakālamanasam viṭam jñātvā vidagdhayā/
hasannetrārpitākūtam līlāpadmam nimīlitam//^{A8}*

This verse means that by understanding the mind of her secret lover that he was eager to know their meeting time, the clever damsel closed her toy-lotus as giving message with a smiling glance. Through this the heroine beautifully conveyed that the evening is the proper time for their meeting through closing the lotus by standing in front of the elders. It is taken as an example for *sūkṣmālaṅkāra* by earlier rhetoricians. But Kuntaka does not accept this view. He says the subject described in the verse itself is the adorned. Thus it cannot become an adornment.

Dhvanyāloka has the same verse wherein Ānandavardhana says that “a context wherein one meaning is made to suggest another by taking the assistance of denotative power will not be an instance of this type of (*arthaśaktyudbhavo nāmānusvānopamāvyāṅgya dhvaniḥ*) suggestion”.⁴⁹ He cites the above mentioned verse as an example to it. In this verse the suggestive element is the closing of the lotus and it is expressed through words. So it does not come under the division of suggestion (*dhvani*) according to Ānandavardhana.

Kuntaka’s selection of stray verses has helped in regaining the name of some lost works or some rare poets. Their literary merits were

also recognized by such evaluations. It is doubtless that in the case of stray verses the contextual analysis is difficult. But the verses selected by Kuntaka for each and every situation is apt and beautiful and the absence of the contextual analysis never lessens the charm of any verse in any context. Most of the verses in them have their own uniqueness.

¹ ***Saduktikarṇāmṛta***

It consists of two thousand three hundred and eighty (2380) verses and is compiled by one Śrīdaradāsa, son of Vaṭudāsa in the 12th century C.E. It is also known as *Sūktikarṇāmṛta* which means the *Ear-nectar of nice sayings*. The verses of this anthology were composed by 446 poets and they are divided into five sections named as *pravāhas*. The five *pravāhas* are again subdivided into numerous sub-sections known as *vīcis*. Every *vīcis* consists of five verses too. The five *pravāhas* are named respectively as *amara* or *deva-pravāha*, *śṛṅgāra-pravāha*, *cāṭu-pravāha*, *āpadeśa-pravāha* and *uccāvaca-pravāha*. It has verses from four hundred and eighty five poets. The compiler of this anthology worked under Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal. The verses of this anthology are composed by Bengali poets like Dhoī, Jayadeva etc. This anthology consists of large number of *vaiṣṇava* verses because of the compiler's *vaiṣṇava* preference. Kuntaka cites four examples from *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* and uses some of them in two or three different situations.

Sūktimuktāvalī

The author of *Sūktimuktāvalī* is Jalhaṇa and it is also known as *Subhāṣitamuktāvalī*, which means a chain of pearls of beautiful sayings. Though the authorship is attributed to Jalhaṇa, it is said that it is compiled by one Vaidya Bhānu Paṇḍit at 12th century C.E. The complete name of Jalhaṇa is Arohaka Bhagadatta Jalhaṇa Deva and he was the son of Lakṣmīdeva. *Sūktimuktāvalī* consists of two thousand seven hundred and ninety (2790) verses and it is arranged on one hundred and thirty three sections on the basis of subject discussed in it. The topics discussed in it are poets and poetry,

wealth, generosity, union, separation, love, sorrow, fate, royal service etc. It also contains a section of traditional verses discussing about Sanskrit poets and poetry. The number of authors and works cited in this anthology is more than two forty. Information about the family of Jalhaṇa is available from some beginning verses of this anthology. There is another anthology of the same name as *Subhāṣitamuktāvalī* of one Puruṣottamadeva, there is also a Bengali author of the same name. But it is not sure whether both are identical or not.

Śārṅgadharapaddhati

Another famous anthology is *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* of Śārṅgadhara, the son of Dāmodara. It was written in 13th century C.E having four thousand six hundred and eighty nine (4689) verses under one hundred and sixty three (163) sections. These sections include the topics like *dhanurvedaḥ*, *gāndharvaśāstram*, *vṛkṣāyurvedaḥ*, *viśāpaharaṇam*, *bhūtavidyā*, *haṭhayogaḥ* etc. Approximately three hundred authors and works were cited in this anthology. This compilation contains the verses of the famous poets like Kālidāsa, Māgha, Bhartṛhari, Murāri, Amaruka, Jayadeva, Bhavabhūti etc. The subject matter and its arrangements are closely connected with the other two anthologies like *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Vallabhadeva and *Sūktimuktāvalī* of Jalhaṇa. Moreover it contains large number of same verses from *Subhāṣitāvalī* and *Sūktimuktāvalī*. The name of this text is sometimes confused with the *Āyurvedic* text named *Śārṅgadharasamhitā*.

Subhāṣitāvalī

The author of *Subhāṣitāvalī* is Vallabhadeva. He wrote this text being inspired by *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* of Śārṅgadhara. This anthology has three thousand five hundred and twenty seven (3527) verses in one hundred and one sections or *paddhatis*. The verses of this work discuss about different seasons, love, beautiful natural sceneries, wisdom of the world, witty sayings etc. The verse of this anthology is from more than three hundred and sixty poets. Vallabhadeva is one among the numerous poets of this anthology, but it is not certain if these verses are his own or taken from earlier compositions. It contains more than eight verses from *Jānakīharaṇa* of Kumāradāsa. It possesses great importance in literary history. It is believed that Vallabhadeva

is a Kashmirian and most of the poets of this composition are from North India. Vallabhadeva cites Johnarāja, a contemporary writer of Sultan Zainalabdin of Kashmir who lived in between 1417-67 century C.E. From this it is assumed that Vallabhadeva lived after this period and the date of *Subhāṣitāvalī* is mostly assigned to 15 century C.E.

It is notable that there is another anthology of the same name of Śrīvara, son or disciple of Jonarāja. It sometimes get confused with the *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Vallabhadeva. Both these works belong to the same period. This anthology contains stanzas of more than 380 poets.

² K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakrokti-jīvitā of Kuntaka*, p.17.

³ *ibid*,p.304. In this chapter all the translation of verses are taken from K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakrokti-jīvitā of Kuntaka*.

⁴ *ibid*,p.63.

⁵ *ibid*,p.349.

⁶ *ibid*,p.99.

⁷ *ibid*,p.387.

⁸ *ibid*,p.111.

⁹ *ibid*,p.397.

¹⁰ *ibid*,p.186.

¹¹ *ibid*,p.185.

¹² T.K Ramachandra Aiyar, *The Kuvalayananda of Appayya Dikshita*, p.102.

¹³ *ibid*,p.219.

¹⁴ M.M.Prof.Rewāprasāda Dwivwdī(cri Ed.), *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa of Bhoja*, Vol-1, p.477.

¹⁵ K.Krishnamoorthy,(cri Ed.),*Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana*, p.73.

¹⁶ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.219.

¹⁷ *ibid*,p.220.

¹⁸ *ibid*,p.512.

¹⁹ *ibid*,p.77.

²⁰ *ibid*,p.165.

²¹ P.V.Naganatha Sastri, *Kāvyaśālikāra of Bhāmaha*,p.47.

²² Acharya Ranchandra Mishra (Ed.). *Kāvyaśādarśa of Mahākavi Daṇḍī*,p.146.

²³ K. Krishnamoorthy, *op.cit*,p.224.

²⁴ *ibid*,p.183.

-
- ²⁵ *ibid*,p.30.
- ²⁶ *ibid*,pp.75-76.
- ²⁷ *ibid*,p.10.
- ²⁸ *ibid*,p.74.
- ²⁹ *ibid*,p.27.
- ³⁰ *ibid*,p.30.
- ³¹ *ibid*,p.88.
- ³² Acārya Jaggannath Pathak,*Dhvanyāloka*,p.251.
- ³³ K.Krishnamoorthy,op.cit.,p.73.
- ³⁴ *ibid*,p.55.
- ³⁵ *ibid*,p.103.
- ³⁶ *idem*.
- ³⁷ *ibid*,p.110.
- ³⁸ *ibid*,p.151.
- ³⁹ Acārya Jaggannath Pathak, op.cit.,p.203.
- ⁴⁰ Acharya Ranchandra Mishra (Ed.).op.cit,p.180.
- ⁴¹ K.Krishnamoorthy,op.cit.,p.155.
- ⁴² *ibid*,p.165.
- ⁴³ *ibid*,p.168.
- ⁴⁴ *ibid*,p. 182.
- ⁴⁵ *ibid*,p.183.
- ⁴⁶ P.V.Nagananda Sastri, *Kāvyaśālikāra of Bhāmaha*,p.49.
- ⁴⁷ Acharya Ranchandra Mishra (Ed.).op.cit,p.175.
- ⁴⁸ K.Krishnamoorthy,op.cit.,p.242.
- ⁴⁹ *ibid*,p.85.

CHAPTER 6

KUNTAKA'S ASSESSMENT OF VERSES CITED IN ŚATAKAS AND ANTHOLOGIES

In Kuntaka's literary world, stray verses also play a significant role. Unlike in the case of other compositions, it is difficult to assess stray verses because contextual analysis of these verses poses many difficulties. So here it is only possible to focus on the evaluation of the single verses rather than the text as a whole. However, from the appraisal of the verses found in them, it is sure that some of them give great aesthetic and moral appeal. They also help to understand the social condition and culture that was prevalent at the time of a particular poet. This shows that Kuntaka does not ignore any type of compositions. This renders Kuntaka utmost perfection in choosing appropriate examples. Some of them are taken from few śatakas and anthologies. Interestingly some other verses were later compiled in to various anthologies.¹

6.1. Śatakas

Some famous śatakas in Sanskrit literature are *Nītiśataka* and *Vairāgyaśataka* of Bharṭṛhari, *Devīśataka* of Bāṇa, *Sūryaśataka*, *Śṛṅgāraśataka* and *Amaruśataka*. It is believed that as the name indicates śatakas are the collection of hundred verses of a single poet. But sometimes more than hundred verses are also found in them. The subject matter of śatakas is numerous which includes erotic, devotional, philosophical, moral teachings etc. Kuntaka's selection of verses from

śatakas has an important role. He cites verses from the *śatakas* like *Sūryaśataka*, *Śṛṅgāraśataka*, *Amaruśataka* and *Bhallaṭaśataka*. Kuntaka cites only one verse from both *Sūryaśataka* and *Śṛṅgāraśataka* and two verses from *Amaruśataka* and *Bhallaṭaśataka*.

6.1.1. *Sūryaśataka*

The author of *Sūryaśataka* is Mayūra. Thus it is also known by the name *Mayūraśataka*. It is believed that Bāṇa was a relative and contemporary of Mayūra. From this, the date of the text is assigned to the first half of 7th century C.E. It is also believed that Mayūra was the court poet of the king Harṣavardhana. As the name indicates, it contains hundred verses of the Sun god. There is a belief about this *śataka* that the poet was cured of his leprosy by composing this eulogy of sun. In this *śataka*, Mayūra discusses about the rays, the horses, the charioteer, the chariot and the orb of the sun god respectively. *Sūryaśataka* made him a renowned poet. He wrote these verses in *sragdharā* metre. Kālidāsa has also written five or ten verses using the metre *sragdharā* in his entire composition. Other poets generally do not give much prominence to this metre. But his excellent language and themes really shine vigorously in this metre. One and only verse cited by Kuntaka from *Sūryaśataka* is as follows:-

śīrṇṇaghrāṇāṅghripāṇirvraṇibhirapaghanairgharḥvyaktaḥoṣān
dīrghāghrātānaghaughaiḥ punarapī ghaṭayatyeka ullāghayan yaḥ /
gharmmāmśostasya vo'ntardviguṇaghanaghrṇānidhvanirvignavṛtter-
dattārghāḥ siddhasamghairvidadhatu ghrṇayaḥ śīghramamhovighātam/

In one of the varieties of *varṇavinyāsavakratā*, Kuntaka says that harsh syllables should not be used for the preparation of a verse and then he cites this example to show how the use of harsh syllables of a verse hampers its charm. *Sūryaśataka* is a widely accepted work in Sanskrit literature, but not many rhetoricians had tried to criticize it. Here Kuntaka does not criticize the meaning of the verses, but he boldly points out the harsh and unpleasant use of syllables used by the poet Mayūra. A keen evaluation of the text *Sūryaśataka* makes it clear that the point of view of Kuntaka is exactly right. All the verses of this work are written with some harsh syllables using *sragdharā* metre. Kuntaka reminds that both word and meaning are essential for a beautiful composition. Every poet should take utmost care in it otherwise it will hamper the taste of connoisseur.

6.1.2. *Śṛṅgāraśataka*

Kuntaka also cites one verse from *Śṛṅgāraśataka*. The author of *Śṛṅgāraśataka* is Bhartṛhari and his other two *śatakas* are *Nītiśataka* and *Vairāgyaśataka*. These three *śatakas* are together known as *śatakatraya* in Sanskrit literature. Bhartṛhari is not only a poet but also a grammarian and a philosopher. There are different opinions about the date and identity of Bhartṛhari.³ *Śṛṅgāraśataka* reminds the *Amarukaśataka* of Amaruka by its subject. But undoubtedly Bhartṛhari excels Amaruka in his keen observation of the common aspects of love. But in the case of expressing deep emotions and intensity of feelings, it is Amaruka who undoubtedly excels Bhartṛhari.

Kuntaka opines that writing poetry is a dignified job. He has given a definition about poetry that it should delight the connoisseur. He adds

that the adornments like *upamā*, *rūpaka* etc. will never add any charm to the subject matter as if paintings on an improper canvas, if the subject matter is not excellent or attractive. Then Kuntaka compares the subject-matter, which need to be adorned like a damsel, because she wears only a few ornaments at the time of taking bath, leading ascetic life during separation from her husband and also at the end of amorous sports. In such situations the natural beauty of the damsel is really attractive.

Kuntaka cites a verse from Bhartṛhari in the beginning of the third *unmeṣa* while he started to give a detailed description about sentential figurativeness.

smitam kiñcinmugdham taralamadhuro dṛṣṭivibhavaḥ
parispandho vācāmviralavilāsoktisarasaḥ /
gatānāmārambhaḥ kisalayitalīlāparimalaḥ
sprśantyāstāruṇyam kimiva hi na ramyam mṛgadṛśaḥ//⁴

The verse means that the smile, glance, speech and walk of a maiden at the beginning of her youth are extremely gentle, tremulous and sweet. The verse concludes by saying that nothing is unattractive in a maiden in her advent youth. According to Kuntaka when the poet starts to describe the natural beauty of content there is no need of any adornment to it. That is why the poets depict the subjects like budding youth of a girl, the advent of the spring season, its enrichment and its completion etc. without adding any figure of speeches. In such natural depiction of matters, the poets use their extreme skill of spontaneous overflow of their sentential figurativeness. The verse mentioned above is its best example. There are slight difference in the words found in the

original text of *Śṛṅgāraśataka* from the verse cited by Kuntaka. The verse of the text is as follows:-

*smitam kincidvakre saralataralo dṛṣṭivibhavaḥ
parispando vācāmabhinavavilāsoktisarasah/
gatānāmārambhaḥ kisalayitalīlāparikaraḥ
spṛśantyāstārunyam kimiha nahi ramyam mṛgadṛśah//⁵*

From this it is clear that Kuntaka has made slight modifications in this verse for making it more attractive. It is really appreciable of Kuntaka that he had chosen *Śṛṅgāraśataka* only for quoting this single and beautiful verse. There is no need of more evidence to show the utmost care Kuntaka has taken in choosing examples for each and every situation. At the same time it is notable that Kuntaka does not quote from the other two *śatakas* of Bhartṛhari. In the fourth *udyota* of *Dhvanyāloka* Ānandavardhana cites this verse as an example to show the beauty brought about by suggestion in a subject, often described by earlier poets. The verse comes under the category of *atyantatiraskṛtavācyadhvani* one of the divisions of *avivakṣitavācyadhvani*.⁶

6.1.3. *Amaruśataka*

Another *śataka* cited by Kuntaka is *Amaruśataka*. There is no certainty about the place and other details about the life of Amaru. *Amaruśataka* is written by a king named Amaru or Amaru. It is a love lyric like *Śṛṅgāraśataka* of Bhartṛhari. But Bhartṛhari depicts the general aspects of love and women related to life. Unlike this, Amaru only deals with the relation between lovers and does not sketch the general

concepts of love and life. It is a belief that once Śaṅkarācārya was defeated in an argument because of his inability to express his knowledge in *kāmaśāstra* or science of love. Then for learning *kāmaśāstra* his soul entered in to the body of dead king Amaru, keeping his own body in a hole of a tree and he had enjoyed with the queens. Recordings of his experience with the queens resulted in the creation of *Amaruśataka*. *śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre is largely used in it. Amaru was perhaps the first person who has given wide popularity to this metre in the field of lyric poetry.

The popularity of this *śataka* increased as verses from it were cited by Ānandavardhana and Vāmana in their works. Ānandavardhana says in *Dhvanyāloka* that the stray verses of Amaru are as good as big compositions due to their emotional appeal. This also helps in calculating the approximate date of *Amaruśataka* also. The earliest anthology named *Subhāṣitaratnaśośa* of Vidyākara, which belongs to the end of the 10th century C.E, has few verses from *Amaruśataka*. In some of them their authorship is explicitly stated but some of the verses are anonymously cited. Abhinavagupta, in both of his commentaries namely *Locana* and *Abhinavabhāratī*, cites verses anonymously from it.⁷ With the support of such external evidences it is believed that the date of *Amaruśataka* is before 8th century C.E.

This is an excellent work giving importance to erotic sentiment. Each and every verse in it is unique and complete. There are numerous commentaries on it. Some of them suggest that the verses in it have the double sense of erotic and philosophy. So others suggest that it is rhetorical in nature. In most of the lyrics, world of plants and animals is

incorporated with artistic beauty. Here the poet gives beautiful descriptions about Red Aśoka, lotus and the birds like Cātaka, Cakora, Cakravāka etc. There is a saying about *Amaruśataka* that one verse in it is equal to a hundred great poems.⁸ Kuntaka cites one of the beautiful verses of Amaruśataka as an example of *sañkhyāvākratā* or oblique beauty of number, the one of the variety of grammatical figurativeness. The verse is as follows:-

*kapole patrālī karatalanirodhena mṛditā
nīpīto niśvāsairayamamṛtahṛdyo'dhararasah/
muhūḥ kaṇṭhe lagnastaraḷayati bhāṣpaḥ stanataḥīm
priyo manyurjātastava niranurodhe na tu vayam/ḥ*

“The paintings on the cheek are faded by the pressure from the palm of your hand. This juice of lips, so sweet as nectar, is quaffed by your sighs. The tear that clasps the neck so often has made the edge of your bosom throb. O hard-hearted one, anger has become your darling, not we.”¹⁰

These are the words of a lover towards his beloved. Amaruśataka concludes this verse by saying a very beautiful sentence that now the anger has become your beloved one and not ‘we’. Kuntaka’s keen observation made him select this verse as an example of oblique beauty of number. Here instead of saying the singular ‘not I’ or ‘*na tvaham*’ the poet deliberately uses the plural ‘not we’ or ‘*na tu vayam*’ for strengthening the strangeness between the lovers at the time of their anger. In *sañkhyāvākratā* for creating *vaicitrya* either the poet uses plural in the place of singular or he uses two different numbers in a same

sentence. So obviously Kuntaka's selection of this particular verse is praiseworthy. The yet another verse cited from this *śataka* is given below:-

*kṣipto hastāvalagnaḥ prasabhamabhihato 'pyādadāno 'mśukāntam
grhṇan keśeṣvapāstaścaraṇanipatito nekṣitaḥ sambhrameṇa/
āliṅgan yo 'vadhūtastripurayuvatibhiḥ sāsrune trotpalābhiḥ
kāmiṅvārdrāparādhaḥ sa dahatu duritam śāmbhavo vaḥ śarāgniḥ//¹¹*

“Let the fire of Śiva's shaft burn down our sins, a shaft imitating a lover caught while deceiving his beloved. Though shaken off by the queens of Tripura with tearful eye-lilies, it would cling fast to their hands. Though pushed away, it would hold on to hem of their skirts. Though thrust aside by the hair (also of its feather), It would fall at their feet, but unnoticed in their flurry. Though pushed back, it would hug them verily.”

Here Kuntaka cites the opinion of the famous rhetorician Ānandavardhana that the *rasavadalaṅkāra* can be defined as wherein the main purport of the verse or sentence (*alaṅkārya*) is something other than *rasa* and *rasa* itself is considered as an *alaṅkāra*.

*pradhāne 'nyatra vākyārthe yatrāṅgam tu rasādayaḥ/
kāvyē tasminnalaṅkāro rasādiriti me matiḥ//¹²*

In the second *udyota* of *Dhvanyāloka* Ānandavardhana says that the *rasādiralaṅkāraḥ* is divided into two as *śuddha* and *saṅkīrṇa*. He cites this verse as an example of *saṅkīrṇa* type of *rasādiralaṅkāraḥ*. In the first variety, the subordinate *rasa* should be one and in the latter type the subordinate *rasa* can be more than one. This verse gave prominence

to the utmost greatness of lord Śiva and it is embellished by the sentiments of pathos by depicting the sad plight of queens of a demon. So undoubtedly this verse is an apt example for *sañkīrṇa* type of *rasādiralañkāraḥ* according to Ānandavardhana.

But in the same verse Kuntaka gave prominence to the sentiment pathos, though the victory of the *tripurariṇi* (Lord Śiva) is very relevant and there is no possibility of the existence of subordinate sentiment *īrṣyāvīpralamba*. Thus Kuntaka firmly objects to the opinion of Ānandavardhana. According to Kuntaka, *rasa* is always *alañkārya* and never an *alañkāra*. The second is one of the most frequently used verses by most of the rhetoricians in their works for *rasavadalañkāra*.

Though Kuntaka had selected only two verses from it, his observation is praiseworthy. It is appreciable that he did not merely followed Ānandavardhana. He had the boldness to object the predecessors and to express his own opinion. This is undoubtedly one of the magnificent features of Kuntaka.

6.1.4. Bhallaṭaśataka

Bhallaṭaśataka is the next *śataka* cited by Kuntaka. As the name indicates the author of *Bhallaṭaśataka* is Bhallaṭa. It contains one hundred and eight (108) verses of different metres. Bhallaṭa is a Kashmirian poet and the name of his patron is King Sankaravarman. Sankaravarman ruled Kashmir from 883 to 902. This helps to assign the date of Bhallaṭa as 8th or 9th century C.E. This is an allegorical poem i.e. *anyāpadeśa* or *anyokti*. Through this, the poet gives moral messages and advices to the birds, animals, trees etc. The famous Kashmirian

rhetoricians like Abhinavagupta, Kṣemendra, Kuntaka etc. are cited some verses from this anthology. Moreover the anthologies like *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* and *Śārngadharaṣṭakā* contain few verses from it. The king was speaking in *apabramśa* and did not know Sanskrit. Sankaravarman was an autocrat and he did not support any poet including Bhallaṭa. They were compelled to find out a way to earn their livelihood. But the uneducated received large amounts from the king. The discrepancies, which were prevalent at that time is indirectly expressed by Bhallaṭa beautifully through this *śataka*.

Kuntaka cites three verses from *Bhallaṭaśataka* in the first *unmeṣa* of *Vakroktijīvitā*. He uses one of the examples to substantiate two different situations. According to Kuntaka, *śabda* means the exact expression that denotes the intended meaning of a poet even when there are numerous words to express the same thing. Kuntaka has used one example of *Bhallaṭaśataka* to substantiate the importance of the word *śabda*.

kallolavellitadṛṣṭaparūṣaprahārai-
ratnānyamūni makarākara mā'vamamsthāḥ/
kim kaustubhena bhavato vihito na nāma
yācñjāprasāritakaraḥ puruṣottamo 'pi//¹³

Here the poet says that “O ocean, don't you slight these gems within you by pelting them with stones dashed down by waves. Did not a single gem, the Kaustubha, turn the Lord himself in to beggar before you with hands outstretched.”

The general quality of an object is not enough to convey some particular feature of that objects. Here the poet starts to explain the qualities of gems in general, then in the second half of the verse he narrows down and pictures the specialty of a single gem *kaustubha*. If a poet wants to explain the importance of *kaustubha* gem there is no need to discuss about the general qualities of the gems. In this verse there is no harmony from beginning to end. So Kuntaka boldly points out the lack of beauty of this verse because of its discrepancy. Here Kuntaka reminds that poets should always be conscious about the harmony between the lines. The yet another verse taken from *Bhallaṭaśataka* is given below:-

*nāmāpyanyatarornimīlitamabhūttattāvadunmīlitam
prasthāne skhalataḥ svavartmani vidheranyat grhītaḥ karaḥ/
lokaścāyamadrṣṭadarśnakṛtā drgvaiśasādudhṛto,
yuktam kāṣṭhika lūnavān yadasi tāmāmṛālimākālikīm//¹⁴*

“O wood cutter, you have done well indeed in cutting down that unseasonal mango bush. It had obscured all, even the names of the other trees. You have given a helping hand as it were to the creator who had stumbled at the outset on his own highway. The world too is saved from an eyesore at seeing something unseen before.”

Kuntaka cites this verse of *Bhallaṭaśataka* as an example of one of the varieties of *vicitra mārga* or the brilliant style propounded by Kuntaka. In this variety, Kuntaka says that sometimes the poets adds one or more figures of speech in a single verse without being satisfied by the charm of the particular verse just like adding beautiful pearls on a garland. Here the two figures of speech used by the poet are

aprustutaprasāmsā and *vyājastuti*. The definition of these figures of speech in *Kuvalayānanda* is respectively as follows:-

*aprustutaprasāmsā syād yatra prastudāśayā*¹⁵
*ukirvyājastudirnindāstudibhyām studinindayoḥ*¹⁶

Where a poet describes a non-relevant object keeping the relevant thing in mind is known as *aprustutaprasāmsā*. In *vyājastuti* either praise is expressed by obvious strong criticism or disapproval is expressed by obvious praise. In this verse the poet indirectly expresses the failure of a generous man through the non-relevant mango tree using *aprustutaprasāmsā*. Moreover the poet directly praises the falling down of a mango tree or the generous man keeping strong criticism through *vyājastuti*. The selection of this verse of Kuntaka for this particular situation is highly appreciable. Yet another verse cites from it is as follows:-

ko'yambhrāntiprakārastava pavana padam lokapādāhatīnām
tejasvivrātasevye nabhasi nayasi yat pāmsurūpūram pratiṣṭām/
yasminnutthāpyamāne janayanapathopadravastāvadāstām
*kenopāyena sahyo vapuṣi kaluṣatā doṣa eṣa tvayaiva*¹⁷

“O wind, how is this caprice of yours to be explained? You are conferring upon the mass of dust, trodden down by the feet of all and sundry, the highest status of glory in the sky enjoyed only by men of valour! Leave alone the pain caused by it to the eyesight of the onlookers. By what means would you endure the defilement of your own body.” Kuntaka cites this verse also an example of *aprustutaprasāmsā*.

In this verse a generous man engaged in helping the poor people is suggested by the poet in a suggestive way with his poetic genius. The effective creativity of the poet makes even suggestive sense feel as the primary meaning. Because of this reason there is no need to doubt it as a paronomasia or *śleṣa*, moreover here the primary meaning is not as important as the suggestive meaning.

The text *Vakroktijīvitā* of Krishnamoorthy has shown the reference of this verse as an anthology named *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Vallabhadeva. But it is notable that the 95th verse of *Bhallaṭaśataka* has the same verse. The date of *Bhallaṭaśataka* (8th or 9th century C.E) is much earlier than the *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Vallabhadeva (15th century C.E). So doubtlessly this verse can be assigned to the text *Bhallaṭaśataka*. Krishnamoorthy has pointed out the 60th and 83rd verses of *Bhallaṭaśataka* as cited by Kuntaka and then it is not clear how this verse went unnoticed. Here the emendation is seen only in a single word of the last line ‘*kenopāyena sādhyo*’ as seen in the *Bhallaṭaśataka*. Kuntaka amends it as ‘*kenopāyena sahyo*’. In this verse the word ‘*kenopāyena sahyo*’ is pertinent because ‘how the wind itself tolerates the dirtiness created by the dust’ is appropriate. Thus in this verse either the change made by Kuntaka or the scribe is really appreciable.

It is notable that for perfection of his of choice examples Kuntaka goes through the small branch of Sanskrit literature like *śatakas*. It is already said that the verses in them gave lots of beautiful moral messages than any other great poems. So their scope in Sanskrit literature is not negligible. Kuntaka who had made some beautiful modification in the verse of great poets like Kālidāsa also made essential

modifications in these *śatakas* too. It reveals his unbiased approach towards poets and every branch of literature. Every poet and poetry has their own unique features. But only a critic with sharp acumen can find out it. He can only extract the beauty and drawback hidden in it. He should also have the great intellect to depict it as he imbibed. Kuntaka's approach towards minor branch of literature too is praiseworthy.

6.2. Anthologies

Generally anthology is a collection of literary works chosen by the compiler, and the literary works may include short stories, plays, songs etc. Most of the anthologies in Sanskrit are compilation of verses from various sources. The authorship of some of the verses found in them can be assigned to a definite poet or a definite source, but the sources of a majority of verses in the anthologies are completely unknown. So from this it can be assumed that the verses may have been either transmitted orally or its original source may have been irretrievably lost. The exact categorization of anthologies is really not an easy task because there are numerous anthologies of the same name. Among them some are anonymous too. There may be same verses in different anthologies. The uncertainty of date, authorship and the work from which it is taken etc. makes this categorization more crucial. The only notable feature of anthologies is that they preserve a wide variety of small poems of various known and unknown poets which would otherwise have been irrecoverably lost. Another notable feature of anthologies is that all verses found in them are not of unknown poets, but they also contain verses from the unpublished works of famous poets. From this, it is clear that we have lost numerous great compositions of some early poets. It is

very difficult to preserve all the knowledge of the past properly, though there are different types of preservative techniques from very early periods. It is well known that the information about numerous lost works is available only through valuable quotations and anthologies.

In Sanskrit literature, there are large numbers of anthologies. They are the collections or compilations of poems from various authors from various literatures. But it is unfortunate that there are some uncertainty about the name and authorship of the anthologies. In some anthologies there is no exact information about the author and the work from which the poem was taken, but some anthologies give such information. Many lost lyrics and didactic poems came to light only through some anthologies. *Padyāvalī* of Rūpagosvāmin, *Subhāṣitahārāvalī* of Harikavi, *Padyaveṇī* of Veṇīdatta, *Vidyākarasahasraka* of Vidyākaramiśra, *Subhāṣitasudhānidhi* of Sāyaṇa etc. are some of the name of the anthologies other than the anthologies cited by Kuntaka in his *Vakroktijīvitā*. Kuntaka take few verses from the anothologies like *Subhāṣitaratnakośa*, and *Gāthāsaptaśatī*. Details about Kuntaka's evaluation of verses from these anthologies are given below.

It is interesting to note that apart from *śatakas* other stray verses are taken from anthologies like *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* and *Gāthāsaptaśatī*. Some other stray verses cited by Kuntaka are later compiled in some anthologies like *Subhāṣitāvalī*, *Saduktikarṇāmrta*, *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*, *Sūktimuktāvalī*.

6.2.1. *Subhāṣitaratnakośa*

Subhāṣitaratnakośa is the earliest available anthology. It is also known as *Kavīndravacanasamuccaya*. At the beginning there is neither any information regarding the name nor any further details about this anonymous work. It is compiled by Vidyākara, a Buddhist monk of Bengal. It is most probably compiled at the end of the 10th century C.E. or at the beginning of 11th century C.E. This compilation contains five hundred and twenty five (525) verses of one hundred and thirteen poets.¹⁸ It is arranged into different sections known as *vrajyas*. The authors who have cited verses from this compilation are Mayūra, Vākpatirāja, Rājaśekhara, Kuntaka etc. This anonymous work was hidden in the form of a manuscript in Nepal in 12th century C.E.

The editor of this compilation, F.W Thomas, gave the title *Kavīndravacanasamucchaya* to this anonymous work. The first verse of this anthology starts with the word as *nānākavīndra-vacanāni*. It is believed that most probably this prompted the compiler to name the anthology as *Kavīndravacanasamuccaya*. This anthology gives information about some rare poets like Vallāṇa, Buddhākaragupta etc. No information about these poets can be found in any other source material. One portion of the work gives information about Buddha and another part gives description about Avalokiteśvara. The remaining sections deal with the topics as found in other anthologies like love, conduct of life, description of summer and the rainy season etc. Most of the poets of this anthology belong to the time before 10th century C.E. The edited text of *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* of D.D. Kosambi and V.V. Gokhale contains 1738 verses of different poets. Kuntaka cites five

verses from this anthology and quotes some of these verses more than once. The verses of *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* used by Kuntaka for substantiating different situations are given below.

The definition of poetry of Kuntaka is as follows:-

*śabdārthau sahitau vakrakavivvyāpāraśālīni/
bandhe vyavasthitau kāvyam tadvidāhlādakāriṇi//¹⁹*

Kuntaka gave the expansion of the word *bandhe* of this definition as:-

*vācyavācakasaubhāgyalāvaṇyaparipoṣakaḥ
vyāpāraśālī vākyasya vinyāso bandha ucyate//²⁰*

The diction or *bandhaḥ* means a brilliant use of sentence by heightening the general qualities like grace (*saubhāgya*) and sensuous beauty (*lāvaṇya*) of both the word and meaning. According to Kuntaka, grace (*saubhāgya*) brought out by the selection of most appropriate words or by some other element through his poetic skill. Sensuous beauty (*lāvaṇya*) means beauty of the proper use of syllables and words. As an example to this, Kuntaka cites a verse of *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* (465th verse).

*datvā vāmakaram nitambaphalake līlāvalanmadhyayā
prottuṅgastanamamsacumbicibukam kṛtvā tayā māmprati/
prāntapotanavendranīlamanīmanmuktāvalīvibhramāḥ
sāsūyam prahitāḥ smarajvaramuco dvitrāḥ kaṭākṣacchaṭāḥ//²¹*

“Placing her left hand on her broad hip, his waist turning archly, stretching forward her high breast and with her chin toughing the

shoulder, she threw at me longingly two or three flashes of side looks. They bore the grace of a pearl necklace with blue sapphires strung at the edges and brought love-fever on me.”

Here a simple glance of a young lady towards her lover is very poetically portrayed by the poet. Here Kuntaka’s selection of Vidyākara’s verse is proper for this situation because the selection and arrangements of the syllables and words are highly aesthetical. The use of letters like the combination of *sparsā* or mute consonants with the last consonant of their group, the medium length compounds, the combination of ‘r’ and ‘ṇ’ with short vowels, harmonious diction etc. helps the reader to relish *śṛṅgārarasa*.

*mūrdhni vargāntyagāḥ sparśā aṭavargā raṇau laghū/
āvṛttirmadhyavṛttirvā mādhurye ghaṭanā tathā//²²*

In the edited text of *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* of D.D. Kosambi and V.V. Gokhale this verse has some variant readings, which is as follows:-

*dattvā vāmakaram nitambaphalake līlāvalanmadhyayā
vyāvṛttastanamaṅgacumbicibukam sthitvā tayā mām prati/
antarvisphuradindranīlamaṇimanmuktāvalīmāmsaḷāḥ
saprema prahitāḥ smarajvaramuco dvitrāḥ kaṭākṣacchaṭāḥ//²³*

The emendation made by Kuntaka does not make any drastic change from the original meaning but they surely made the verse more beautiful through small changes like ‘*prottuṅgastanamamsacumbicibukam*’ instead of ‘*vyāvṛttastanamaṅgacumbicibukam*’ and ‘*sāsūyam prahitāḥ*’ instead of ‘*saprema prahitāḥ*’ etc. For bringing extreme charm to a verse

undoubtedly high breast is really beautiful than the separated breast so ‘*prottuṅgastanam*’, the change made by Kuntaka is apt than ‘*vyāvṛttastanam*’. ‘*Aṅgacumbicibukam*’ means the chin touching the limbs and Kuntaka specifies the body as *amsa*, it is much realistic because at the time of turning the face the chin can only touch the shoulder and not any other part of the body. Here the changes will really help to increase the overall beauty of the verse.

The next verse of *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* is taken as an example to the expansion of *tadvidāhlādakāriṇī*, which is defined by Kuntaka as:

*vācyavācakavakroktitritayātīśayottaram/
tadvidāhlādakāritvam kimapyāmodasundaram//²⁴*

According to Kuntaka, the ultimate delight of poetry is something beyond the three elements of poetry like *vācyā* or meaning, *vācaka* or word, *vakrokti* or artful expression. Kuntaka takes the following verse as an example to substantiate his argument.

*hamsānām ninadeṣu yaiḥ kavalitairāsajyate kūjatā-
manya ko ’pi kāṣāyakaṇṭhaluṭhanādāghargharo vibhramaḥ/
te sampratyakaṭhoravāraṇavadhūdantāṅkuraspardhino
niryātāḥ kamalākareṣu bisinīkandāgrimagrathayaḥ//²⁵*

“The tapering buds of lotus-bulbs are in full bloom in the lotus ponds. They are now rivalling in their beauty the small sprouting tusk of a young cow-elephant. It is by swallowing these that swans acquire a unique shrillness of note in their songs, the astringent taste clearing their throats (like medicine).”

The beauty of this verse undoubtedly lies not only in its words, meaning or in artful expression, the beauty of this verse is unique and beyond these three elements.

Kuntaka sometimes says that there is no need of further explanation of a verse for a sensitive reader and never substantiates how this verse became charming. The reason for this may be either that particular verse was very frequently used one in his time or was cited many times in any of the famous texts. Thus being a *sahṛdaya* himself, he would have avoided the mere explanation of the charm of the verses. Kuntaka cites this verse in three other situations for explaining the quality named grace (*lāvanya*), and also for explaining phonetic figurativeness and sentential figurativeness. There is a variant reading of this verse in the second line, which is as follows:-

kāṣāyakaṅṭhalīṭhanādāgharharo nisvanaḥ/²⁶

Here the word ‘*liṭhanād*’ may be the error done by the poet or scribe or someone else and instead of ‘*nisvanaḥ*’, Kuntaka uses the word ‘*vibhramaḥ*’ because this is suitable to the just previous word ‘*āgharharo*’ due to alliteration.

Kuntaka has given ten different definitions for the variegated style. Among them, he says that:-

*pratīyamānatā yatra vākyārthasya nibadhyate/
vācyavācakavṛttibhyām vyatiriktasya kasyacit*/²⁷

It means that where something cannot be expressed directly, it communicates with suggestive sense. It is completely distinct from the

communicative use of meanings and the denotative use of words. For instance:-

*vaktrendorna haranti bāṣpayasām dhārā manojñām śriyam
niśvāsā na kdarthayanti madhurām bimbādharasya dyutim/
tasyāstvadviraha vipakvalavalīlāvaṇyasamvādinī
chāyā kāpi kapolayoranudinam tanvyāḥ param puṣyati//²⁸*

“No streaming tears besmirch the pleasing charm of her moon like face. No sighs disturb the sweet sheen on her lips so red as the bimba fruit. During this separation from you, only the colour of the maiden’s cheeks is changing, day by day, to resemble most the pallid glow of faded lavālī flower.”

Here a companion of a heroine telling the hero about the condition of the heroine in his absence. Such suggestive statement creates a suspicious state of mind in hero. The suggestive way used by the poet is noteworthy. Here the poet makes it clear that the heroine is not wasting time by shedding tears or making sighs and her beauty is increasing gradually. In this way the poet very easily and brilliantly creates the suspicious state of mind in the hero through the words of her companion. The selection of such beautiful verses by Kuntaka is really notable.

Here there is variant reading only in the last word of the last sentence. In the original text, ‘*param śuṣyati*’²⁹ can be found instead of ‘*param puṣyati*’. The suggestiveness can be created only through the word ‘*puṣyati*’. If the poet says that the beauty of her cheek is decreasing day by day because of the searation from her lover, there will not be any suggestive sense in this verse. So the apt and beautiful change made by

Kuntaka is appreciable. Another verse cited from this anthology is as follows:-

*śvāsotkampatarāṅgiṇi stanataṭe dhautāñjnaśyāmaḷāḥ
kīryante kaṇaśaḥ kṛśāṅgi kimamī bāṣpābhasām bindavaḥ/
kimcākuñjitaṅṭharodhakuṭilāḥ karṇāmṛtasyandino
huṅkārāḥ kaḷapañcamapraṇayinastruṭyanti niryānti ca/*⁰

“O gentle maid, why is it that these drops of your streaming tears, darkened by the collyrium washed by them, are made to break up into particles as they hit the region of your bosom made billowy by heaving breaths? How is it that your moans, resembling the cuckoo’s notes in sweetness, bathing the hearer’s ears with heavenly music, and uneven by forced suppression on the throat, are breaking loose and bursting out?”

Kuntaka cites this verse in two contexts. First, he cites this as an example of metaphorical figurativeness (*upacāravakratā*), the division of lexical figurativeness (*padapūrvārdhavakratā*) because in the first line on the basis of general similarity the liquid nature like billowy is applied to the solid bosom. Kuntaka then cites this example for showing the nature of sensuous beauty (*lāvaṇya*) of the variegated style (*vicitra mārga*). The nature of sensuous beauty of the variegated style is that there must be a harmonious combination of words, absence of the elision of final aspirates and also have short syllables preceding conjunct consonants. In the third line the short syllable ‘ku’ is used before the conjunct consonant ‘ñji’ and ‘ka’ before ‘ṅṭha’ and also ‘pa’ before ‘ñca’ in the fourth line etc. Thus it is clear that the selection of the verse for these particular situations is apt.

In the original text the variation is only in a single word of the third line, there the poet uses ‘śrotrāmṛta’ instead of ‘karṇāmṛta’. This simple change is apt because the word *śrotrāmṛtam* is difficult to pronounce and surely the soft word *karṇāmṛtam* makes this verse more attractive. The last verse cited by Kuntaka from this anthology is:-

*teṣām gopavadhūvilāsasuhṛdām rādhārahasākṣiṇām
kṣemam bhadra kalindaśailatanayātīre latāveśmanām/
vicchinne smaratalpakalpanamṛduchedopayoge’dhunā
te jāne jaraṭhībhavanti vigalannīlatviṣaḥ pallavāḥ/³¹*

Here Kṛṣṇa asks Uddhava after reaching Dvārakā from Ambāṭī that “How do they do, those bower-huts, o friend, on the banks of river Yamunā? Those who were the companions of the sports of cowherdesses and those witnessed Rādhā’s amours. Now that none will pluck them soft to turn them in to beds of love. I am afraid that all those fresh green leaves do lose their greenness and become old”.

Kuntaka cites this verse as an example of sentential figurativeness (*vākya vakratā*). The essence of the poetic elements like subject, embellishment and sentiment needs poetic skill. Among them embellishment deserves utmost necessity of poetic skill, otherwise it would look like a bare figure of speech in poetic descriptions. Kuntaka cites this example to indicate the subject or facts being beautified by artistic skill of a poet. Actually this verse discusses about a mere subject relating to common life like a bower-hut and it is very difficult to add any sentiment in it. But the author of this verse makes this ordinary subject very attractive by his poetic skill. In the second *udyota* of

Dhvanyāloka, Ānandavardhana cites this to substantiate that the non-sentient things become attractive by adding sentient nature to them.

From some works, Kuntaka cites only very few verses. In such situations it is really a difficult task to make a clear idea about Kuntaka's opinion of that particular text as a whole. But from the works of Kālidāsa, Bhāravi etc. he cites numerous examples and it becomes helpful to assess an overall opinion of Kuntaka about that text. Difficulty of such assessment will be more in the works like anthologies, because it is only a compilation of verses of different poets. So sometimes only one verse of a single poet is available and this will not be sufficient to evaluate that poet. Kuntaka's minute observation of the individual verses has helped him to select the most suitable verse in various situations. This shows Kuntaka's perfection in the art of criticism and poetic analysis.

Kuntaka has chosen some of the beautiful verses found in Vidyākara's anthology. From these, it is clear that Kuntaka has a positive attitude towards the verses included in the anthology of Vidyākara. He has unveiled the beauty of many of the verses found in it and his selection of verses for each situation seems appropriate. Such keen evaluation of Kuntaka is really laudable.

Apart from these anthologies Kuntaka cites three verses from one famous Prakrit anthology named *Sattāsi* or *Gāthāsaptasatī*. Brief information about the text and the verses of it are given below.

6.2.2. *Gāthāsaptasatī*

It is a Prakrit anthology of Sātavāhana Hāla of middle of the 1st century C.E. It is written in Mahārāṣṭri Prakrit. As the name indicates it consists of seven hundred verses composed in *ārya* metres. It really lost its own individual beauty due to some interpolations and emendations. The theme of *Gāthāsaptasatī* is closely related to the life of common people. The characters of this work include common people like a farmer and his wife, village headman and his daughter, householder, his wife and children etc. Descriptions about kings are rarely mentioned in it. Hāla loves the language of common masses and he is really an exception in standing against *devabhāṣa* though in power. This makes the composition of *Sattāsi*, the Prakrit word of *Gāthāsaptasatī*. This is one of the older works displaying creativity with in a conventional frame work. This is not a complete composition of the poet himself, but he collected them from his previous and contemporary writers. Hāla mentions at least the names of 398 poets. Though it is really erotic in nature, it discusses about various topics like common life of the village people, particularly of the Deccan region and perfect depiction of the nature etc.

This anthology has description of the rivers like Yamunā, Narmadā, Godāvarī, Revā, Tapti etc. Moreover it also discusses about the flowers like Kuravaka, Kadamba, Puṇḍarīka etc. and the birds likes Śārikā, peacock, swan, crow etc. and the animals likes Cow, Elephant, Lion etc. A glance at this anthology makes us to think that the compiler had aimed to give advice to the human beings for well behavior. One of the older commentators named Gaṅgādhara had written the important and early commentary of this anthology.

*ratikelihrtanivasanakarakisalayaruddhanayanayugalasya/
rudrasya tritīyanayanam pārvatīparicumbitam jayati//³²
(raikelihiaṅasaṅa karakisalaaruddhaṅaṅjuaḷassa
ruddassa taiaṅaṅam pavvaiparicumbiam jaai)*

“When Rudra disrobed her during amorous sports, Pārvatī closed a couple of his eyes with her tender palms and gave a (sudden) kiss on his third eye, which indeed triumphs.”

Kuntaka cites this verse as an example of figurativeness related to verb (*kriyāvaicitryavakratā*), one of the variety of lexical figurativeness (*padapūrvārdhavakratā*). Goddesses Pārvatī covered the two eyes of Lord Śiva with her two hands. The third eye of Śiva is victorious because apart from the other two eyes it is covered by the kiss of Pārvatī. It is really a beautiful and apt example for figurativeness related to verb. Here the verb used by the poet ‘triumph’ for the third eye will really delight the connoisseurs.

Kuntaka cites the next verse as an example of one of the varieties of the brilliant style (*vicitra mārga*) propounded by Kuntaka, the definition given for it is as follows:-

*yadapyanūtanollekham vastu yatra tadapyalam/
uktivaicitryamātreṅa kāṣṭhām kāmapi nīyate//³³*

In this variety, Kuntaka says that sometimes a dull subject due to its overuse will rise to a unique height of excellence merely through artistic expression.

*anyad laṭabhatvamanyaiva ca kāpi varttanacchāyā/
 śyāmā sāmānyaprajāpate rekhaiva ca na bhavati//³⁴
 (aṅṅam laḍahattaṅam aṅṅaccia kāvi vattaṅacchāā
 sāmā sāmāṅṅpaā vaiṅo reha ccia ṅa hoi)*

“Unlike others is her sprightliness and her bearing again is unlike the rest. The lovely maiden cannot be the work of the general creator, not one jot or little.”³⁵

Here the poet just describes the beauty of a maiden but in a different and charming style with his artistic excellence in order to attract the connoisseur. This verse is not in present available texts of *Gāthāsaptaśatī*. Kuntaka’s observation would not get wrong, so the manuscript available to him must possess this particular verse. Later this verse may in oblivion either due to scribal error or something else.

Kuntaka cites the third and final verse from *Gāthāsaptaśatī* as an example of beauty in the speciality of tense (*kālavaicitryavakratā*), one of the varieties of grammatical figurativeness (*pratyayavakratā*). When time or tense become beautiful due to the presence of utmost propriety, it comes under the division of this type of figurativeness. According to grammarians, it is the expressions like ‘*laṭ*’ which denotes the present tense. Here actually an efficient poet creates a beautiful chemistry between the subject and the propriety of time.

*samaviṣamanirviśeṣā samantato mandamandasañcārāḥ/
 acirādbhaviṣyanti panthāno manorathānāmapi durlaṅghyāḥ//³⁶
 (samavisamaṅivvisesā samantao mandamandasañcārā
 airā hohinti pahā maṅorahāṅam pi dullaṅghā)*

“Ups and downs in the roads will all be leveled, Journeys everywhere become slow and slower still. Before long, they will exceed the reach of even of one’s mind-chariots.”

Here a lover bears the extreme pangs of the separation from his beloved. By imagining the future, the lover is also unable to bear the beauty of his circumstances, the stimuli that increase his pangs of separation. He says these words with dilemma that soon the reverie might also not be able to overcome the main road. In this verse ‘*hohinti*’ (*bhaviṣyanti*), the word denoting the future tense enhances the charm of this verse. There is no variant reading in the verses cited by Kuntaka from *Gāthāsaptasatī*.

In *Dhvanyāloka* Ānandavardhana cites the same verse as an example of suggestiveness of tense. From such situations, it is clear that Kuntaka was undoubtedly influenced by Ānandavardhana. But Kuntaka never blindly imitates him. He developed his own theory taking inspiration from Ānandavardhana and acquired a unique position in the realm of Sanskrit.

These are some minute but beautiful observations of Kuntaka on few verses found in some *śatakas* and anthologies. Beautiful emendations made by either Kuntaka or the scribes are also discussed. Some other verses cited by Kuntaka were included in the anthologies compiled after him.

6.3. Conclusion

Kunaka has cited many verses from anthologies and *śatakas*. Moreover he had also selected large number of verses from unknown

sources. They are given as appendix. Complete evaluation of a work is impossible through the analysis of stray verses alone. So they have no relevance in analyzing the contextual and compositional figurativeness. Kuntaka used these stray verses to substantiate his first four varieties figurativeness namely phonetic, lexical, grammatical and sentential. Kuntaka takes five verses from *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* and three from *Gāthāsaptaśatī*. He also takes single verses from *Sūryaśataka* and *Śṛṅgāraśataka*, two and three verses respectively from *Amarukaśataka* and *Bhallaṭaśataka*.

Subhāṣitaratnakośa and a Prakrit anthology named *Gāthāsaptaśatī* were the anthologies compiled before Kuntaka. So the analysis of variant readings is only possible in *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* and *Gāthāsaptaśatī*. There are some variant readings in the verses of the original text of *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* from poetic works. It reveals that it is not only sufficient to consult only some manuscripts while editing the works but comparison of some poetic works will also help to take more plausible decision. May be variant readings are the innovation made by either the editor or the author of that particular text. But it is sure that its comparison with other available evidence will surely help to take much more plausible decision. Whatever it is, beautiful modification made by Kuntaka is highly significant and apt to the particular context.

Kuntaka minutely evaluated the verses found in anthologies and *śatakas*. This shows that he selects most suitable verses from various sources for illustrating different concepts. This also reveals that he not only followed written texts but also the verses prevalent at that time through oral transmission or by some other means. Ānandavardhana and

Kuntaka had taken same verses for discussing *rasavadalaṅkāra*. Another notable fact is that most of the stray verses were quoted to illustrate different figures of speech mentioned in *Vakroktijīvita*.

Kuntaka's observation on few verses taken from *śatakas* like *Sūryaśataka*, *Śṛṅgāraśataka*, *Amaruśataka* and *Bhallaṭaśataka* are praiseworthy. He selects most suitable verses for every situation. Ānandavardhana also cites verses from the *śatakas* like *Śṛṅgāraśataka*, *Amaruśataka* and *Bhallaṭaśataka* in his *Dhvanyāloka*. *Bhallaṭaśataka* is not as famous as other three *śatakas* and it came to be known through the citation of Kuntaka and Ānandavardhana. Here Kuntaka has done both criticism and appreciation of different verses of the same work and this reveals his keen evaluation of each verse. He never criticizes a work from the point of view of just one charmless verse found in it and also does not blindly appreciate a work on seeing a single beautiful verse. He completely goes through a composition and extracts the best for every situation.

The contributions of the authors of these *śatakas* and the compilers of the anthologies are not negligible. Most of the verses would be in the oblivion if Kuntaka would not have cited them. So the evaluations done by Kuntaka by going through relatively less important works along with the composition of the master poets are really commendable. These evaluations show Kuntaka's ability to analyse minute aspects of the verses and bring out their literary beauty. Thus these minute observations indicate the critical acumen and literary taste possessed by Kuntaka as a literary critic.

¹ The difference between anthologies and *śatakas* is that the anthologies are the collected verses of different poets but the verses of *śatakas* are of a single poet. They can be included in a single category as they have similar style of writing and description of matter.

² Ramakant Tripathi(Ed.), *Sūryaśatakam of śrī Mayūra Bhaṭṭa*, p.4.

³There are also some controversies about the authorship of the *śatakas* like *Amaruśataka* of Amaruḥ and the *śatakatrayas* of Bharṭṛhari. Amaruḥ is often considered as identical to the Vedānta philosopher Śaṅkarācārya and Bharṭṛhari, the author of *śatakatrayas* to the grammarian Bharṭṛhari, who has wrote *Vākyapadīya* and the commentary on *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali and a treatise on the philosophy of language.

⁴ K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakrokti-jīvitā of Kuntaka*, p.127.

⁵ Swami Jagadishwaranand Saraswati(Ed.), *Bharṭṛharishatakam*, p.76.

⁶ Acārya Jaggannath Pathak, op.cit,pp.559-560.

⁷ ibid,p.80.

*ekasmin śayane parāṅmukhatayā vītottaram tāmyato-
ranyonyasya hṛdisthitepyanunaye saṃrakṣatorgauravam/
daṃpatyoḥ śanakairapāṅgavalanāmiśrībhavaccakṣuṣo-
rbhagno mānakaliḥ sahāsarabhasavyāvṛttakaṅṭhagraham//*

⁸ C. Kunhan Raja, *Amaruśatakam*, p.4.

⁹ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit,p.117.

¹⁰ ibid,p.403. In this chapter all the translations are taken from K.

Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvitā of Kuntaka*.

¹¹ ibid,p.150.

¹² K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit,p.149.

¹³ ibid,p.14.

¹⁴ ibid,p.55

¹⁵ T.K Ramachandra Aiyar, op.cit,p.96.

¹⁶ ibid,p.102.

¹⁷ ibid,p.54.

¹⁸ S.N Dasgupta, and S.K. De, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, pp.412-413.

¹⁹ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit,p.6.

²⁰ ibid, p.38.

²¹ ibid,p.p.39.

²² Ganganatha Jha. *Kāvya prakāśa of Mammata*,p.311.

²³ Vidyākara, *Subhāṣitaratnakośa*, (Ed). D.D. Kosambi and V.V. Gokhale, p.54.

²⁴ K. Krishnamoorthy, op.cit, p.39.

²⁵ *ibid*, pp.39-40.

²⁶ *ibid*, p.35.

²⁷ *ibid*, p.53.

²⁸ *ibid*, pp.59-60

²⁹ *ibid*, p.62.

³⁰ *ibid*, p.63.

³¹ *ibid*, p.136.

³² *ibid*, p.32.

³³ *ibid*, p.53.

³⁴ *ibid*, p.57.

³⁵ *ibid*, p.343.

³⁶ *ibid*, p.114.

Genre-wise list of works cited by Kuntaka

	Work	Author	No. of verses	No. of context	Period
I	Anthologies				
1	<i>Subhāṣitaratnakośa</i>	Vidyākara(c)	5		+10
2	<i>Gāthāsaptaśatī</i>	Vallabhadeva	12		+1
II	Śatakas				
1	<i>Amaruśataka</i>	Amaruka	2		+7
2	<i>Sūryaśataka</i>	Mayūra	1		+7
3	<i>Śṛṅgāraśataka</i>	Bhartṛhari	1		+7
4	<i>Bhallaṭaśataka</i>	Bhallaṭa	3		+9
III	Dramas				
1	<i>Uttararāmacarita</i>	Bhavabhūti	3		+7
2	<i>Mālatīmādhava</i>	''	2		+7
3	<i>Vīracarita</i>	''			+7
4	<i>Bālarāmāyaṇa</i>	Rājaśekhara	15		+10
5	<i>Viddhaśālabhañjika</i>	''	2		+10
6	<i>Abhijñānaśākuntala</i>	Kālidāsa	12		R ¹
7	<i>Vikramaorvaśīya</i>	''	9		R
8	<i>Mudrārākṣasa</i>	Viśākhadatta	1	1	+6
9	<i>Rāghavānandha</i>	''	1		+9
10	<i>Veṇīśamhāra</i>	Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa		2	+7
11	<i>Tāpasavatsarāja</i>	AnaṅgahaṛṣaMāṭṛrāja	13		+8
12	<i>Udāttarāghava</i>	''			+8
13	<i>Nāgānanda</i>	Śrīharṣa		1	+7
14	<i>Ratnāvalī</i>	''	1		+7
15	<i>Pādatāḍitaka</i>	Śyāmilaka	1		+9
16	<i>Pāṇḍavābhyudaya</i>	Unknown			U ²
17	<i>Rāmānanda</i>	Unknown			+8
18	<i>Māyāpuṣpaka</i>	Unknown			B ³ +10
19	<i>Kṛtyārāvaṇa</i>	Meṇṭha			B+10
20	<i>Chalitārāma</i>	Unknown			B+10
21	<i>Puṣpadūṣitaka</i>	Brahmayāśaswamin	2		U
22	<i>Rāmābhyudaya</i>	Yaśovarmman			+8
23	<i>Pratimāniruddha</i>	Vasunāga			U
24	<i>Abhijñānājānaki</i>	Unknown	3		U
25	<i>Hanuman-nāṭaka</i> or <i>Mahānāṭaka</i>	Hanumān	2		+10
26	<i>Mṛcchakatika</i>	Sūdraka	1		+1

	Work	Author	No. of verses	No. of context	Period
IV	Mahākāvya				
1	<i>Raghuvamśa</i>	Kālidāsa	48		R
2	<i>Kumārasambhava</i>	''	20		R
3	<i>Śīsupālavadha</i>	Māgha	7		+ 7
4	<i>Kirātārjunīya</i>	Bhāravi	14		+ 5
5	<i>Gauḍavaho</i>	Vākpatirāja	3		+ 8
6	<i>Harivijaya</i>	Sarvasena	1		+ 4
7	<i>Hayagrīvavadha</i>	Meṅṭha			U
8	<i>Rāmacarita</i>	Abhinanda			+ 9
V	Khaṇḍakāvya				
1	<i>Meghadūta</i>	Kālidāsa	5		R
VI	Prose works				
1	<i>Kādambarī</i>	Bāṇabhaṭṭa		1	+7
2	<i>Harṣacarita</i>	''		5	+7
3	<i>Tantrākyāyika (Pañcatantra)</i>	Viṣṇuśarma	1		+3
VII	Epics				
1	<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	Vālmīki		1	R ⁴
2	<i>Mahābhārata</i>	Bādarāyaṇa	1		R ⁵
	Unknown Sanskrit verses		113		
	Unknown Prākṛt verses		14		
	Incomplete verses		5		
	Stray verses		20		
Total -46 works			335		
			verses		

1 Roughly between -1 to +5

2 Unknown

3 Before

4 Roughly below -500

5 Roughly +5

CONCLUSION

In the realm of Sanskrit poetics, the text *Vakroktijīvitā* and its author Kuntaka have a prominent place. Though Kuntaka had neither any recent followers nor a strong commentator in Sanskrit poetics, his contribution to Sanskrit poetics cannot be dispensed off. His theory of *vakrokti* has gained relevance in modern times. Kuntaka is considered as a practical literary critic among Sanskrit rhetoricians. The opinion of F.R. Leavis found in '*The aesthetics of new criticism*' that the function of literary criticism is to define modern sensibility and to help in preserving it in a world of spiritual bankruptcy. T.S Eliot says that the aim of a critic is to realize the aim of an artist, which is completely different from the real world. Ransom opines that the duty of a critic is to understand the ontological maneuvers of a poet. A poem or any other poetic composition is an expression of temperament which is realized by the critic only if he possesses the same temperament. The duty of a critic is to elucidate and analyze the sensible imagination achieved by the poet through his poetic skill. This means that a critic should bring forth the ontology of a poem in a wide sense. According to T.S Eliot, criticism is a highly complex activity and chief tools of a critic are comparison and analysis. Critics have deep concern with human values. They always appreciate the compositions that possess moral values. At the same time they vehemently criticize the impropriety found in the composition because which may adversely affect the society and at the same time lessen the value of the poets. These things make literary criticism relevant in the social arena.

When Kuntaka's contribution is evaluated from the standards of modern criticism, he has his own features. A critic, in modern sense, is one who approaches all literary genres unbiasedly. He is not influenced by the greatness of the author, instead he is concerned with the literary text. The critic objectively analyzes the merits of the literary works and relishes their essence. He is also an adept in expressing his analysis and appreciation of literary works. Kuntaka is seen to fulfill these qualities of a literary critic. He is seen to approach Sanskrit literary works without any preconceptions. Works of all poets, both renowned and less-known poets feature in his criticism. He also takes up both major and minor works of all poets. It is only the literary merits that attract Kuntaka's attention. Kuntaka has his own uniqueness when compared with other Sanskrit rhetoricians. Most of the Sanskrit rhetoricians compose their own verses to illustrate various literary concepts. Only a few of them, quote examples from literary works. Vāmana, Ānandavardhana, Mahimabhaṭṭa and Mammaṭa are seen to quote verses from both Sanskrit and Prakrit literary works. They are also seen to cite *muktakas* which are now seen in various compilations of *subhāṣitas* (anthologies). Kuntaka is seen to cite examples from numerous literary works. He has given numerous examples from various literary works to substantiate his arguments. This reveals his immense scholarship of Sanskrit and Prakrit literatures.

Certain contributions of Kuntaka make him unique in the history of Sanskrit poetics. One of them is his choice of illustrations, which is highly representative. Kuntaka tries to explain how an example is suitable for a particular context and tries to evaluate the selected work as

a whole. Sanskrit rhetoricians did not try to evaluate the literary works completely. Ānandavardhana is surely an exception to this general feature. He tried to establish the dominant sentiment of *Ramāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* respectively as *karuṇa* and *śānta* in his text *Dhvanyāloka*. Kuntaka has taken up various texts for complete analysis while discussing the last varieties of figurativeness. The compositional figurativeness itself shown in works like *Abhijñāśākuntala* and *Kirātārjunīya* reveals that Kuntaka tries to evaluate the Sanskrit literary texts very intensely and completely. Moreover he also suggests some possible alternations to particular contexts without considering the stature of its author. These things make Kuntaka unique in the history of Sanskrit poetics.

The aptness of the title of a literary critic given to Kuntaka is obvious while going through the wide variety of citations he has taken from various literary sources and his complete evaluation of some compositions. It is well known that his last two varieties of figurativeness like contextual and compositional are helpful to assess the complete evaluation of a work. The highlight of Kuntaka is his unbiased nature in his citations. He cites the works of numerous famous poets at the same time novice too. Lots of rare works like *Abhijñānajanaki*, *Udāttarāghava* etc. were cited by him. Kuntaka would not have chosen these examples mechanically; it is to his credit that he has not blindly borrowed the examples cited by earlier rhetoricians. He has independently made those choices. Use of different and beautiful literary verses in the poetic text will surely lessen the boredom while reading it and at the time it also pleases the sensitive readers.

It is notable that uniqueness of Kuntaka is mainly due to three reasons. One of them is his boldness in criticizing the master poets. Another one is his boldness in breaking the theory of early rhetoricians with apt explanation and the suggestion of a new one in its place by replacing the old one. Yet another reason is his propriety in making plausible innovative changes in certain situations like ‘*vidhimapivipannādbhutavidhim*’ in *Mālatīmādhava* etc. These emendations made by Kuntaka have already been appreciated by the scholars. They reveal his literary taste.

Anthologies are the storehouse of scattered verses of various poets. Knowledge about some rare poets and their meaningful verses would be in the oblivion if some rhetoricians like Kuntaka would not have cited them. In anthologies numerous verses were ascribed to some famous poets also. But it is unfortunate that the original texts did not possess any of the verses found in anthologies. For instance, Peterson’s edition of *Subhāṣitāvalī* have some verses ascribed to Aśvaghoṣa, but none of his works now contain the same verses. Either these are the *muktakas* written by the same poets or there must have been numerous poets of the same name. The anthologies possess some verses of women poets like Indulekhā, Vijjā or Vijjakā etc. The rare verses in the famous poetical text must have been the inspiration for the compiler of the anthologies for compiling them.

The keen evaluation of some verses in *Vakroktijīvita* from its original source will also help to assess his emendation skill for giving more charm to the verse. Such emendations are found largely in anthologies. Among the verses of anthologies cited by Kuntaka, the

compilation availed before him are *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* and *Gāthāsaptasatī*. The beautiful emendation or variant readings in the verses cited by Kuntaka in *Vakroktijīvita* and the verses found in the available compilation of the text *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* are given in the chapter named Kuntaka's assessment of verses cited in *śatakas* and anthologies. Kuntaka cites three verses from *Gāthāsaptasatī*, among them two are as same as in the available texts like *Gāthāsaptasatī* edited by Bhatta Sri Mathuranath Sastry, and *The prākṛt Gāthāsaptasatī* edited by Radhagovinda Basak. But another verse cited as taken from *Gāthāsaptasatī* is not found in these texts. Some version of *Gāthāsaptasatī* available at the time of Kuntaka may have this verse. The verse is as follows: - *anyadlaṭabhatvamanyaiva ca kāpivarttanacchāyā/śyāmā sāmānyaprajāpaterekhaiva ca nabhavati*// Gradually in new editions, it may have been lost due to some reasons like scribal error, loss of manuscripts etc. The relevance of citations will be more explicit in such situations because that particular verse was still preserved only through such citations. Thus the attempt taken by the rhetoricians to preserve few rare verses that completely would be in oblivion is really significant.

Though Kuntaka cites numerous verses from the works of Kālidāsa, it is notable that he does not use his compositional figurativeness in the works of the master poet except through the suggestion of the excellent choice of title of *Abhijñānaśākuntala*. The other works cited for explaining compositional figurativeness are *Veṅṅīsamhāra*, *Kirātārjunīya*, *Śīsupālavadhā*, *Uttararāmacarita*, *Nāgānanda*, *Mudrārākṣasa* and *Tāpasavatsarāja*. Moreover Kuntaka does

not cite any verse from *Mālavikāgnimitra* and *Ṛtusamhāra*. Kuntaka goes through the popular works of Kālidāsa like *Raghuvamśa*, *Kumārasambhava*, *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, *Meghadūta* to bring forth both his excellence and drawbacks. At the same time Kuntaka cites excellent verses from large number of some lost works. It reveals the unbiased nature of Kuntaka.

Kuntaka brings forth the poetic excellence of Kālidāsa through the depiction of the hunting episode of Daśratha. Here for protecting Daśratha from his sin of killing an ascetic boy in his hunting, the master poet opines that even sometimes due to bad luck good people also go astray. Thus Kālidāsa very convincingly saved Daśratha's image instead of saying that he mistakenly killed a young blind ascetic boy. Such astounding poetic skill of Kālidāsa brilliantly paved the way for absolving Daśratha of his sins. Here Daśratha says that the curse fallen on him is like a blessing because of his childlessness. This is one of the beautiful incidents cited by Kuntaka to reveal the poetic beauty of Kālidāsa. At the same time Kuntaka boldly criticizes Kālidāsa indicating the faults found in *Raghuvamśa* and *Kumārasambhava*. In *Raghuvamśa* Kuntaka criticizes Kālidāsa because of the depiction of Rāma's remembrance of the bad deed of Kaikeyī even after his victory. He again points out the impropriety in the words of Dilīpa. In *Kumārasambhava*, humiliating words showered by Cupid towards Indra is considered as highly improper. Here Kālidāsa would have included such a depiction so as to show that even the great personalities also have such weakness at times. But according to Kuntaka, a great poet should always be especially conscious in the depiction of ideal characters.

Moreover Kuntaka's criticism of *Śiśupālavadha* is also praiseworthy. Māgha gave lengthy description of the city of Dvārakā when Kṛṣṇa commences his journey towards Indraprastha. But Kuntaka points out that such long description of Dvārakā is really improper. The bold opinion presented by Kuntaka is highly remarkable because such a long description contribute, nothing for the further development of the story. Māgha developed this portion through seven hundred sixty six verses in ten cantos, which was mentioned in *Māhābhārata* only through few verses. Kuntaka again signifies that the straight forward title given to this *mahākāvya* is charmless.

Kuntaka's analysis of Sanskrit dramas is also praiseworthy. In *Veṅīsamhāra*, Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa depicts the amours between Duryodhana and Bhānumatī while going a great war outside. Kuntaka criticizes such impropriety of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa. According to Kuntaka in such a crucial time the presence of Duryodhana in the harem and a single word with deep passion to her wife is also improper. If so there is no need to say impropriety in explaining the amours. Moreover Kuntaka also points out the impropriety of suspecting the fidelity of his wife without properly understanding her mind. Such observations of Kuntaka reveal his keen literary taste.

Another striking observation of Kuntaka is in the drama *Nāgānanda*. Here the ideal hero Jīmūtavāhana offers his own body and saves a serpent named Śaṅkacūda from Garuḍa. Jīmūtavāhana did so because once he happened to hear the lament of a serpent that today is the turn of her son to be the prey of Garuḍa. Then Garuḍa begins to eat Śaṅkacūda without realizing that this is not a serpent. Garuḍa beomes

full of remorse when he comes to realize that the prey he started to eat was a great Vidyādhara prince. Afterwards Garuḍa takes a vow of non-violence. Through this Jīmūtavāhana not only saves a single serpent but also the whole race of serpent. It is doubtless that pointing out such incidents Kuntaka would like to uphold the importance of moral values. Here the self-sacrifice of Jīmūtavāhana is noteworthy.

Indication of impropriety in the words of Sītā in *Bālarāmāyaṇa* also shows that Kuntaka never tolerates improper behavior from an ideal character. Kuntaka also appreciates the authors of *Mudrārākṣasa* and *Tāpasavatsarāja* for their depiction of new way of political strategy in their work to delight the readers. Kuntaka's such bold attempt of criticism and beautiful observations on the compositions of master poets also help to attain a unique position in Sanskrit literature. A poet can easily influence the people of both the higher and lower classes of a society. So a responsible poet should be aloof from poetic blemishes.

The verses cited in a poetic text can make the composition attractive and at the same time awful. In some early poetic texts the distinctness is only due to the different examples cited for various situations. In most of the poetic texts, the verses cited are of the poet's own compositions or sometimes it may be the eulogy of their patron. By selecting appealing verses Kuntaka has done his job perfectly.

Among the five *mahākāvyas*, Kuntaka cites four except *Naiṣadha* because of its later origin. He did not cite any verses from the famous *mahākāvyas* like *Buddhacarita* and *Saundarananda* of Aśvaghoṣa. He has also avoided some other *mahākāvyas* like *Bhaṭṭikāvya* of Bhaṭṭi, *Setubandha* of Pravarasena etc. It is well

known that there are some great resemblances between the works of Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa. Kuntaka may also have a firm belief about the genuineness of Kālidāsa like most of the other Sanskrit poets. This may be the reason for the avoidance of the works of Aśvaghoṣa.

Another notable fact is that he did not cite any verse from the plays of Bhāsa. At least *Svapnavāsavadatta* and *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* were must have been available at the time of Kuntaka. Still there is no exact reason why Kuntaka rejected these famous plays of Bhāsa. This may also point towards the real authorship of Bhāsa's plays. It is well known that a group of scholars opine that those plays were composed by the *cākyars* of Kerala for dramatic presentation at a later age.

Another notable fact is that names of certain cantos of some dramas have same name with some rare works cited by Kuntaka. For instance the name of tenth canto of *Bālarāmāyaṇa* is *Rāghavānanda*. It is also interesting to note that both the dramas like *Tāpasavatsarāja* and *Udāttarāghava* were written by the same author named Anaṅgahaṣamātrrāja. There is also a work named *Udārarāghava* cited some rhetoricians. This may sometime confuse with *Udāttarāghava*. But it is only Kuntaka who cites *Udāttarāghava* in his work. Kuntaka discusses about fifty literary compositions either citing few verses from them or sometimes just touching the name of a work. Among them he cites approximately three hundred and thirty five verses. In them ninety four verses are taken from the great poet Kālidāsa including forty eight from *Raghuvamśa*.

Kuntaka elaborates the qualities that each style possesses. But this elaboration seems to create certain difficulties. The vague distinction between the qualities at times seems blurred to the readers. Some of the traits found in one quality is said to be found in another quality too. Thus the line of demarcation of qualities is seen to overlap over each other. For instance, the use of uncompounded words is a feature of both perspicuity and sweetness in the tender style.

Moreover in several occasions he says that the beauty of this figurativeness can be imagined by the sensible readers without giving any apt explanation. In certain situations it is easy to assess as he said but sometimes it creates difficulties. This reluctance for further explanation may be due to either the familiarity of the situation or its recurrence in earlier poetic texts. It is also unfortunate that Kuntaka has no followers as Ānandavardhana etc.

Kuntaka seems to present numerous sub-divisions for the varieties of figurativeness. These divisions often create confusions. For instance, the difference between the sub-divisions of contextual and compositional figurativeness is found to be vague. Kuntaka makes such a distinction because he would like to show how a context helps the whole work through contextual and an overall assessment through compositional figurativeness. The ultimate aim of both the figurativeness is the complete evaluation of the text. The proposal of ideas like these two figurativeness are highly appreciable, but their distinction needs to be more vivid. Among the rhetoricians it is only Kuntaka who had done such an attempt to evaluate the whole compositions. The objection is only in the divisions given in those varieties.

The text *Vakroktijīvita* of Krishnamoorthy has shown the reference of the verse ‘*ko’yambhrāntiprakārastavapavanapadam lokapādāhatīnām*’ etc. as an anthology named *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Vallabhadeva. But it is notable that the 95th verse of *Bhallaṭaśataka* has the same verse. The date of *Bhallaṭaśataka* (8th or 9th century C.E) is much earlier than the *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Vallabhadeva (15th century C.E). So doubtlessly this verse can be assigned to the text *Bhallaṭaśataka*. Krishnamoorthy has pointed out the 60th and 83rd verses of *Bhallaṭaśataka* as cited by Kuntaka and then it is not clear how this verse went unnoticed. Here the emendation is seen only in a single word of the last line ‘*kenopāyenasādhyo*’ as seen in the *Bhallaṭaśataka*. Kuntaka amends it as ‘*kenopāyenasahyo*’. In this verse the word ‘*kenopāyenasahyo*’ is pertinent because ‘how the wind itself tolerates the dirtiness created by the dust’ is appropriate. Thus in this verse either the change made by Kuntaka or the scribe is really appreciable.

In the first *unmeṣa* Kuntaka compares a verse of Bharavi with a verse of an unknown poet, which is discussed in the chapter named Kuntaka’s estimation of *mahākāvya*s. The verse starts with *kramādekadvitriprabhṛtiparipāṭīḥ prakāṭayan* etc. The same verse is in the anthology named *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* of Śrīdharaḍāsa with a little change in the beginning as *asāveka* instead of *kramādeka* and is ascribed to Rājaśekhara. But the available text of Rājaśekhara does not have this verse. This makes one assume that either this is his stray verse or it was written by some other Rājaśekhara. These are some new facts found as new from the available text of *Vakroktijīvita*.

Apart from other rhetoricians the name of compositions availed only through Kuntaka are *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya* and *Abhijñānājānaki*. Kuntaka touched almost all branches in Sanskrit literature like dramas, anthologies, *mahākavya*'s, Prakrit works like *Gauḍavaho*, *Gāthāsaptasatī* etc. He has also cited prose works like *Kādambarī* and *Pañcatantra*, *ākhyāyikas*, like *Harṣacaritā*, epics like *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Mahābhārata*. The keen analysis of the text *Vakroktijīvita* again reveals that Kuntaka has the deep knowledge of grammar. Kuntaka also cites large number of verses from few poetic texts too. This reveals Kuntaka's all-round proficiency in the realm of Sanskrit and Prakrit literature.

A true critic uses literary theories to evaluate a literary text and provides personal point of view, ideas and their own conclusion about style and structure of a particular text and its author etc. Kuntaka used his six types of figurativeness to assess the literary texts and provides plausible emendations, modifications and criticisms by always keeping ethical values. Criticism does not simply evaluate literary works. It should also contribute to the betterment of the society. A critic can approach literature from different perspectives. He can interpret the literature through historical approach by understanding the time and culture in which the work was written. Biographical approach helps to investigate the life of an author using primary texts like letters, diaries and other documents that reveal the experience and feelings that led to the creation of a literature. Sociological criticism focuses on the relation between literature and society. Writers can sometimes affirm and criticize the values of the society in which they live. Philosophical approach involves the evaluation of a text and its moral content. It also

deals with how a work reflects the human experience in the world. Literature can generate good effect as well as bad effect in the society. Kuntaka, as a critic, has upheld moral values in his evaluation of literary works. His observations while explaining the contextual figurativeness in *Veṇīsamhāra*, *Nāgānanda* and his criticism of *Raghuvamśa* and *Kumārasambhava* reveal his affiliation to the traditional values of the society.

Kuntaka, in spite of the absence of any strong followers, still stand as a prominent figure in the line of Sanskrit rhetoricians. His originality and individuality evident in his criticism of Sanskrit literary works makes him an important thinker in the history of Sanskrit poetics. Acquaintance with various genres of literature is surely a desirable trait of a critic. Kuntaka's acquaintance with a large number of literary works both in Sanskrit and Prakrit equips him with a strong tool in the evaluation of literary works. His attempt to etch out a new path different from the established *dhvani* theory shows his boldness in the field of literary criticism. The new theory of *vakrokti* indeed became an asset to Sanskrit poetics which is proved by the recent studies on the same concept. His critical observations have actually helped in revealing the minute aspects of poetic beauty latent in literary works. Other rhetoricians have also unreservedly opened up the improprieties found in major literary works. Rhetoricians like Mammaṭa seem to point out blemishes in major literary works just for the sake of illustrating the definitions of poetic blemishes. This trend was criticized by later thinkers. But Kuntaka's observations were generally approved by the world of connoisseurs. Practical analysis of beauty of poetry is properly

analyzed by Kuntaka. This trait really makes Kuntaka a worthy critic. Kuntaka's scholarship combined with his critical acumen and aesthetic sensibility make him an irreplaceable critic in Sanskrit poetics.

From these the features of Kuntaka can sum up as:-

1. His choice of illustrative verses from various Sanskrit literatures is highly representative.
2. His attempt of complete evaluation of a text unlike other rhetoricians is also remarkable.
3. So his criticism took into its fold both the criticism of individual verses as well as complete literary works unlike other rhetoricians, whom composed verses themselves to illustrate the poetic concepts.
4. Unbiased approach while choosing instances, criticizing the author and also at the time of suggesting alteration.
5. Kuntaka's criticism towards the master poets is a reminder to the budding poets that they should take utmost care in their compositions. Even master poets are also not free from poetic blemishes then what about novice poets.
6. By the analysis of the dramas like *Veṅīsamhāra* and *Nāgānanda* it is revealed that Kuntaka would like to uphold the importance of moral values.
7. His strong criticism and upholding of moral messages prove that he was highly committed to the society.

8. Thus the title given to him by K. Krishnamoorthy as ‘practical literary critic’ is indisputable. He is the only critic who provides literary criticism in its wide sense among the rhetoricians of the history of Sanskrit poetics.
9. Discussion of wide variety of literature proves his all round proficiency in Sanskrit literature.
10. His grammatical skill is explicit through lexical and grammatical figurativeness.
11. The compositions availed only through Kuntaka are *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya* and *Abhijñānājānaki*.
12. Acceptance of Kuntaka’s opinion by the world of connoisseurs.
13. His critical observations have actually helped in revealing the minute aspects of poetic beauty latent in literary works.
14. He had used six types of figurativeness for evaluating different literary genre. These six varieties help to assess a text from phoneme to a text as a whole in a beautiful way. He is the only Sanskrit critic who tries to evaluate a complete text using his own theories.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

English

- Barlingay, S.S. *A Modern Introduction to Indian Aesthetic Theory-The Developments From Bharata to Jagannātha*. D.K Print World Pvt.Ltd., New Delhi, 2007.
- Bhattacharya, P.C. *Meghadūta of Kālidāsa*, Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Calcutta, 1981.
- Bhattacharya, Narendra Nath. *History of Indian Erotic Literature*. Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd. 1975.
- Cardona, George. *Pāṇini, His work and its tradition*. Vol.I, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1997.
- Chakrabarti, Tarapada. *Indian Aesthetic and Science of Language*. Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Calcutta, 1971.
- Chakravarty Shrutidhara. *Pāṇinīan influence on Sanskrit Poetics*. Pratibha Prakashan, Delhi, 2008.
- Chandravasu, Srisa. *The Siddhāntakaumudi of Baṭṭoji Dīkṣita*. Vol.I.
- Dasgupta, S.N and De, S.K. *History of Sanskrit Literature*. Sri Sibenralal Kanjilal, 1962.
- De, S.K. *Aspects of Sanskrit Literature*. Firma KLM P.Ltd., Calcutta, 1976.

..... *History of Sanskrit Poetics*. Firma KLM P.Ltd., Calcutta, 1976.

Dwivedi, R.C. (Ed.). *Principles of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers P.Ltd., Delhi, 1969.

Dwivedi Rewa Prasad, (Ed.). *The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa*. Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1993.

Giri, Kalipada. *Concept of poetry an Indian approach*. Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Calcutta, 1975.

Har, Saktipada. *Bhāravi and Kirātārjunīyam, a critical study*. Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Calcutta, 1983.

J.N Bhattacharya Nilanjana Sarkar, (Ed.). *Encycnlopaedic Dictionary Of Sanskrit Literature*. Vol-4, Global Vision Publishing House, 2004.

Kane, P.V. *History of Sanskrit Poetics*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1971.

Keith, A.B. *A History of Sanskrit Literature*. Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1973.

..... *The Sanskrit Drama in its Origin, Development Theory and Practice*. Oxford University Press, London, 1924.

..... *The Sanskrit Drama in its Origin, Development Theory and Practice*. Motilal Banarssidass, Delhi, 1992.

Krishnamoorthy, K. *Essays in Sanskrit criticism*. Karnataka University, Dharwar, 1974.

- (Critical Ed.). *Dhvanyaloka* of Anandavardhana, Karnataka University, Dharwar, 1974.
- *Kālidāsa*. Motilal Banarssidass, Delhi, 1982.
- Krishnamachariyar, M. *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*. Motilal Banarssidass, Delhi, 1937.
- Kulkarni, V.M. *More Studies In Sanskrit Sāhitya-Śāstra*. Bhogilal Leherchand Institute of Indology, Patan, 1983.
- *More Studies In Sanskrit Sāhitya-Śāstra*. Saraswati Pustak Bhandar, Ahmedabad, 1993.
- Macdonell, A.A. *A History of Sanskrit Literature*. Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1972.
- Mahamahopadhyaya Jha Ganganatha. *Kāvya prakāśa of Mammata with English Translation*. Bharatiya Vidhya Prakashan, Delhi, 2005.
- Mirashi, V.V. *Bhavabhūti*. Motilal Banarssidass, Delhi, 1974.
- Misra, P.K. *Sanskrit Poetics*. Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi, 1988.
- Mishra, Kameshwar Nath. ‘*Saraswatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa of Bhoja*’, Vol-1 and 2 Chaukhambha Publishers, Varanasi, Second Edition, 2004.
- Nandargikar, Gopal Raghunath, *The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa*. Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi.
- Patnaik, J.N. *The Aesthetics of New Criticism*. Intellectual Publishing house, New Delhi, 1982.

- Radhagovinda Basak (Ed.andTrans.). *The Prākṛt Gāthā Saptaśatī*.
Compiled by Sāthavāhana King Hāla. The Asiatic Society,
Kolkata, 1971.
- Raghavan, V. *Studies on Some Concepts of Alamkāraśāstra*. The Adayar
Library and Research Centre, 1942.
- *Some Old Lost Rāma Plays*. Annamalai University,
Annamalanagar, 1961.
- Raja, C. Kunhan. *Amarusataka*. Dr. C. Kunhan Raja Centenary
Celebration Committee, Thrissur, 1997.
- Rajendran, C. Dr. *A Study of Mahimabhaṭṭa's Vyaktiviveka*. Published
by Dr. C Rajendran, 1991.
- *Sign and structure, Indological essays*. Published by the
author, 2001.
- *Kuntaka*. Sahitya Academi, New Delhi, 2011.
- Ramachandra, Ragini. *Indian literary Criticism-An Enquiry in to its
Vitality and Continuity*. Reliance Publishing house, New Delhi.
- Sankaran, A. *Some Aspects of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit or The
Theories of Rasa and Dhvani*. Oriental Books Reprint
Corporation, New Delhi.
- Sastri, Gaurinath. *A Concise History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*.
Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1974.

- Sastri, R.P. (Ed.). *Mālatīmādhava*. Global vision Publishing house, Delhi, 2004.
- Seturaman, V.S. (Ed.). *Indian Aesthetic an Introduction*. Macmillan India Limited, Madras, 1992.
- Sing, Amal Dhari. *Kālidāsa A Critical Study*. Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi, 1976.
- Srinivasan, K.S. *The Ethos of Indian Literature, A Study Of Its Romantic Tradition*. Chanakya Publication, Delhi, 1985.
- Stein, M.A. (Ed.). *Kalhana's Rājatarāṅgiṇī or chronicle of the kings of Kashmir*. Vol.1. Sanskrit text with critical notes, Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, Delhi, 1892.
- (Ed.). *Kalhana's Rājatarāṅgiṇī, A chronicle of the kings of Kashmir*. Translated with an Introduction, commentary and appendices, Vol.1. Motilal Banarsidass publishers private limited, Delhi, 1900.
- Sternbach, Ludwik. *Unknown Verses Attributed To Kṣemendra*. Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad, Lucknow, 1979.
- Tripathi, Brahmananda, *Vyaktiviveka of Rājānaka Mahimabhata*, The Chaukhamba Surabharati Prakashan, Varanasi, 2005.
- Unni, N.P. *Megasandēśa*. Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi, 1987.
- Upadhyaya, Ramji. *Sanskrit and prākṛt mahākāvya*. Sanskrit Parishad, University, Saugar, 1992.

Vasudevan, T. *A Study of Stylistics in Sanskrit Poetics with special references to Kuntaka*, part I and II. Publication Division, University of Calicut, 2002.

Warder, A.K. *Indian Kāvya Literature*, Vol.1. Motilal Banarssidass, Delhi, 1972.

..... *Indian Kāvya Literature*, Vol.2. Motilal Banarssidass, Delhi, 1974.

..... *Indian Kāvya Literature*, Vol.3. Motilal Banarssidass, Delhi, 1977.

..... *Indian Kāvya Literature*, Vol.4. Motilal Banarssidass, Delhi, 1983.

..... *Indian Kāvya Literature*, Vol.5. Motilal Banarssidass, Delhi, 1988.

Winternitz, M. *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol.III. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1963.

Malayalam

Acyutanunni Cāttanātt. *Vakrokti-jīvitam*(trans). Vallattol Vidyāpīṭham, Sukapuram, 2009.

Balachandran, Indira. *Kalidasa Vykhari*. Kerala Bhasha Institute, Trivandrum, 2000.

Abhayadev. (trans). *Ramakatha* of Fr.Kamil Bulcke, Kerala Sahitya Academi, Trissur.

- Koyithatta, N. (trans). *Soorya Sathakam of Mayura Mahakavi*. Vidyarambham Publishers.
- Krishnan Nair, Poojappura. *Vakroktikairali*. Kerala Bhasha Institute, Trivandrum, 2003.
- Kunjunni Raja, K. *Bhashadarsanavum Charithravum*, Kerala Bhasha Institute, Trivandrum, 2000.
- Menon, M.S. (collected by), *Pourasthya sahithya Darsanam*, Poorna Publication, Calicut, 1980.
- *Kavi Kavitha Sahridayan*, Kerala Sahithyasamithi, Calicut, 1985.
- Marar Kuttikrishnan. *Raghuvamsam*. Marar Sahitya Prakasam, Kozhikode, 1949.
- Nair, M.P. Sankunni. *Chatravum Chamaravum*. The Mathrubhumi Printing and Publishing Co. Ltd., Calicut, 1988.
- Naushad, S. *Vakroti Sowndarya Darshanam*. Melinda Books, Trivandrum, 2003.
- Paniker, K. Ayyappa. *Indian Sahithya Sidhantam*. Kerala Bhasha Institute, Trivandrum, 1999.
- Prayar Prabhakaran. *Bharatiya Sahitya Sastra Patanangal*. Kerala Sahitya Academi, Trissur, 1999.
- Rajendran, C. *Tharatamyia Kavyasasthram*. Kerala Bhasha Institute, Trivandrum, 2000.

Ramakumar, V. *Mahābhāratam*. Siso publishers, Trivandrum, 1997.

Thomas, K.M. *Mundasseriyum Malayala Niroopanavum*, Citical Study,
Current Books, Trissur, 1994.

Unithiri, N.V.P. *Vakrokthi Kavyajeevitham*. Kerala Bhasha Institute,
Trivandrum, 2001.

..... *Samskritha Sahithya Vimarsanam*. Kerala Bhasha Institute,
Trivandrum, 1990.

..... *Kalidasakrithikal: Oru Padanam*. Mathrubhumi Books,
2013.

Sanskrit

Ācārya śrīnivāsa śarmā. *Kirātārjunīyam*. Bharatiya Vidya Prakasan,
Varanasi, 2013.

Banerji, Sures Chandra. (Critical Ed). *Sadukti-Karṇāmṛta of Śrīdharadāsa*. Firma K.L Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, 1965.

Basak, Radhagovinda. (Ed). *The prākṛt Gāthāsaptaśatī*, The Asiatic
society, Kolkata, 1971.

Jhā, Bechana. (Ed). *Kāvyaḷankārasūtra of Ācārya Vāmana*,
Chaukhamba Sanskrit Sansthan, Varanasi, Fifth Edition, 1991.

Jha, Badainath and Jha, Madan Mohan (Ed.). *Rasagaṅgādhara of Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha*, Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi,
Second Edition-2012.

- Jha, Ramachandra (Ed.). *Raghuvamśamahākāvyaṃ of Mahakavikalidas*,
Krishnadas Academy, Varanasi, 1983.
- Dādhīca, Sivadutta M.M.Pt (Ed) *Śīsupālavadhā of Māgha*.
Chowkhamba Krishnadas Academy, Varanasi.
- Devadhar, C.R. *Vikramorvaśīya of Kālidāsa*, Motilal Banarsidass
Publishers P.Ltd., Delhi, 1966.
- *Works of Kālidāsa*, Edited with an exhaustive introduction,
critical and explanatory notes and English translation, Vol-II,
Motilal Banarsidass Publishers P.Ltd., Delhi, 1984.
- Devīdatt śarma and indradatt uniyāl (Ed.). *Tāpasavatsarāja of Śrī
Anangahaṛṣa*. Sāhitya Bhaṇḍār, 1868.
- Dwivedi, M.M. Rewāprasāda. *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa by Bhojarāja*. Vol.I and
Vol.II, Indira Gandhi National Centre For The Arts, New Delhi
and Kālidāsasamsthāna, Varanasi, 2007.
- Dwivedi, R.C. *Alaṅkārasarvasva-Saṅgīvinī*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi,
1965.
- Ganguli Kisari Mohan. *The Mahābhārata*, Vol.II. Munshiram
Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi, 1970.
- Jagannath Pathak , Acharya. *Dhvanyaloka of Śrī
Anandavardhanacharya*. Chowkhamba Vidyabhavan, Varanasi.
- Kale, M.R. *The Abhijñānaśākuntalam of Kālidāsa*. Motilal Banarsidass
Publishers P.Ltd. Delhi, 1969.

- Kale, M.R. *Veṅīsamhāra of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa*. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers P.Ltd. Delhi, 1936.
- *Mudrārāshasa of Viśākadatta*. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers P.Ltd. Delhi.
- *Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa*. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers P.Ltd. Delhi, 1981.
- *The Megadūta of Kālidāsa*. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers P.Ltd. Delhi, 1974.
- *The Uttarakāmarita of Bhavabhūti*. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers P.Ltd. Delhi.
- Krishnamoorthy, K. *The Vakrokti-jīvita of Kuntaka*. Critically edited with variants, Introduction and English translation, Karnatak University, Dharwad, 1977.
- Kulkarni, V.M. *Bhoja And The Haravijaya of Sarvasena*. Saraswati Pustak Bhandar, Ahmedabad, 1991.
- Lal Tripathi, Chote. (Ed.). *Rāmacarita-Mahākāvyaṃ of Mahākavi Abhinand*. Bharatiya avidya Sansthan, Varanasi (republishing 2004).
- Misra Jagadīsha, PT. (Ed.). *Hanumannātaka of Śrī Hanumāna*. The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1967.
- Misra, Kameshwar Nath. *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇam of Bhoja*. Chaukhamba Orientalia, Varanasi, 1882.

- Mishra, Ramachandra Acharya. *Samskratasāhityetihāsa*. Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi, 2003.
- Mishra, Ramachandra Acharya. *Kāvyaadarśa of Mahākavi Daṇḍī*. Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi, Fourth Edition 1991.
- Miśra, Srī Rāmacandra Acārya. *Mahāvīracarita of Mahākavi Srī Bhavabhūti*. Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi, 2005.
- Nagar, R.S. (Ed.). *Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharatamuni*, vol-1-4, Parimal Publications, Delhi, 1983.
- Nandargikar, Gopal Raghunath. *The Meghadūta of Kālidāsa*. Bharatiya Book Corporation, Delhi, 1979.
- Peterson, Petor. (Ed.). *Śārṅgadara Paddhati*. Combiled by Śārṅgadara, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, Delhi, 1987.
- Rai, Ganga Sagar. *Bālarāmāyaṇa of Rājaśekhara* with Hindi translation. Chaukhamba Surabharati Prakashan, Varanasi, 1984.
- (Ed.). *Malatīmādhava of Mahākavi Bhavabhūti*. Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, Varanasi, 2002.
- Sastry, Bhaṭṭasrimathuranath. *Gāthāsaptaśati*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- Sastry, Naganatha, P.V. *Kāvyaālaṅkāra of Bhāmaha*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, Second edition-1970.
- Sharma, Dipak Kumar. *Suṃtātīlaka of Kṣemendra*. Text with Sanskrit Commentary and English Translation, New Bharatiya Book Corporation, Delhi, 2007.

- Sharma, Yogeawaradatt. *Ācārya Daṇḍhi-Kāvyaḍarśa*, Nag Publishers, Delhi, 1999.
- Shastri, Bābūlal Shukla. *Viddhaśālabhañjikā-nātikā of Mahākavi Rājaśekhara*. Chaukhambha Orientalia, Varanasi, 1976.
- Shastri, Haragovinda. *Kāvyaśālikārasūtra of Ācārya Vāmana*. Chowkhamba Surabhārati Prakashan, Varanasi.
- Srihemacandraviracitam *Kāvyaśānuśāsana*, Chawkhamba Vidyābhavan, Vārāṇasi.
- Sukla, Pandit Rāmadeva. *Kāvyaśālikāra* of Rudrata. Chowkhamba Vidyabhavan, Varanasi.
- Sukthankar, S. (Critical Edn). *The Mahābhārata*, Vol. VI. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, poona, 1940.
- Sukthankar, S. (Critical Edn). *The Mahābhārata*, Vol. III. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, poona, 1942.
- Suru, N.G. (Ed.). *Gauḍavaho by Vākpatirāja*. Prakrit Text Society, Ahmedabad, 1975.
- Sūdraka, Isvaradatta, Vararuci, and Śyāmilaka. *Caturbhāṇi*. (Ed.). M.R. Kavi and S.K.R. Śāstri. Published by D.G. Śarma and Krishana, Bakerganj, Patna.
- Tripathi, Ramashankar. (Ed.). *Uttararāmacharita of Mahakavi Bhavabhuti*, Krishnadas Academy, Varanasi, 1996.
- Upreti, T.C. (Ed.). *Nāṭyadarpaṇa of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra*. Parimal Publications Delhi, 2012.

Vallabhadeva, *Subhāṣitāvaliḥ*. (Ed.). Peter Peterson, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1961.

Vidyākara, *Subhāṣitaratnakośa*. (Ed.). D.D. Kosambi and V.V. Gokhale, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1957.

Vyas Bhalashankar, D. *Kuvalayānanda of Appayadīkṣita*, Chowkhamba Vidyabhavan, Varanasi.

Hindi

Acarya hariram. *Mahākavi hāl aur gāhāsattasai*. Śaraṇ book ḍipo, Jaypur, 1982.

Saraswati, Swami Jagadishwaranand. *Bhartṛhariśatakam*. Subodh Publications.

Sarma Devichandra and Sarma Ranjit. *Samskṛt Sāhitya Kā Śāstriya Itihās*. Jnan Prakasan, Meerut.

Tripathi, Shri Ramakant. *Sūryaśatakam of Śrī Mayūra Bhaṭṭa*. Chowkhamba Vidyābhavan, Varanasi, 1996.

Kausik Devdutt, *Samskṛta Kāvyaśāstr Mem Vyāvahārik Samīkṣa*. Bharatiya Vidya Prakasan, Delhi, 1981.

Kulasresht, Sushama, *Brihatrayi: ek tulanatmak adhyayan*. Eastern book linkers, Delhi, 1983.

Journals

Ācāryaḥ bābulālaḥ mīnā. Bhāraveḥ bahuñjatā. Visva samskṛtam 50.4, December 2013, pp.33-42.

Archanakumaridube. *Vakrokti vaibhavam*. Visva samskr̥tam 42/1-2, March-June2005.

Sobha, P. *Kālidāsasya racanāvaibhavam*. Visva samskr̥tam 42/3-4, September-December 2005.

Suman Kumar jhā. *Kirātārjunīya mahākāvye kirātārjunayoryuddha-sandarbhā vaiśiṣṭyam*. Sāgarika 42/3-4.

Suśrī Anitha Bamsala. *Svātantryottara samskr̥ta traimāsika patrikāsu vakrokteḥ vimarśaḥ*, Visva samskr̥tam 48/3-4, September-December 2011.

Narayanan, P.V. *Political Philosophy of Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa*. Dhīmahī, VoI-3, January 2012.

Nivāsaśarmā Yaṭvalli. *Māghasya Sarvaśāstraviduṣyam*. Visva samskr̥tam 50.2, June 2013.pp.59-65.

Rajendran, C. *Kālidāsa-an assessment by Kuntaka*. Pratyabhijñā, Vol. II, Issue. 1-2, Jan-Dec 2015.pp.63-69.

Articles

De, S.K, *A Reference to the Mahānāṭaka*. Jhā Commemoration Volume, Poona Oriental Series No.39, Oriental Book agency, Poona, 1937.

Krishnan Kutty, K.P. *Deviansum Vakroktiyum*. Vijñānakairali, Kerala Bhasha Institute, April 5, 2014.

Motayil Sibū, *Vakrokti-Navamānaṅgal*. Paurastya Sahitya Siddhantāṅgal Prasaktiyum Prayogavum. Vidvan P.G. Nair Smārāga gaveṣaṇa

kendram, Malayala Vibhāgam, U.C. College Aluva, Book7/
Issue1/Feb-2015.

Prasad Parameshwar, *Kālidāsa- his Scientific interpretation of certain physical phenomena*. Government Oriental series, Class B No:7, K.B Pathak Commemoration Volume. Bhandarkar Oriental Research institute, Poona, 1934.

Shanbhag, D.N. *Variant Readings of Kālidāsa's verses in Kuntaka's Vakroktijīvita*. Centenary Commemoration Volume, Vol.XVI. Oriental Research Institute, Mysore,1992. pp-20-24.

Shuba, K.S. *Vakroktisiddhāntavum putukavitayude viśakalanavum*. Paurastya Sahitya Siddhantagal Prasaktiyum Prayogavum. Vidvan P.G. Nair Smāraga gaveṣaṇakndram, Malayala Vibhāgam, U.C. College Aluva, Book7/Issue1/Feb-2015.

APPENDIX-I

SOME LOST PLAYS MENTIONED BY KUNTAKA

In two varieties of compositional figurativeness Kuntaka has just mentioned the title of few works without citing any verses or contexts. Thus his evaluation of these works is impossible. Available information about these dramas is discussed below. Definition given for one of the varieties of compositional figurativeness is as follows:-

*apyekakakṣayā baddhāḥ kāvyabaddhāḥ kavīśvaraiḥ/
puṣṇantyanarghāmanyonyavailakṣaṇyena vakratām//¹*

“Even when great poets compose different literary works based on an identical theme, they are each seen to possess infinite individual beauty, each possessing distinctness from the others.”²

Composition of various literary pieces based on an identical theme is common in the literary world. Among them some poets write in their own style without deviating from the original source. Some poets add some new concepts in it to relish the readers. For this instance Kuntaka cites few unique literary pieces written based on *Rāmāyaṇa*. They are *Rāmābhyudaya*, *Udāttarāghava*, *Vīracarita*, *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*, *Māyāpuṣpaka* etc. Here Kuntaka just cites the names of these texts for showing the uniqueness of the texts though they are written based on same source. This is enough to understand the positive attitude of Kuntaka towards these compositions. Available information of these compositions is given below.

1. *Rāmābhyudaya*

Rāmābhyudaya is written by Yaśovarman of the 8th century C.E. It is believed that the author Yaśovarman of this play is the King of Kanauj mentioned in *Gauḍavaho* of Vākpatirāja. In *Gauḍavaho* the story ends by the victory of Lalidāditya muktāpīḍa over Yaśovarman. In *Rājataranṅinī*, Kalhaṇa says that after his failure the king Yaśovarman become dependent and flatterer of Lalidāditya. Kalhaṇa gives a verse which denotes that Yaśovarman was himself a poet.

*kavirvākpatirājaśrībhavabhūtyādisevitaḥ/
jītau yayau yaśovarmā tadguṇastudivanditām//³*

This is a drama of six acts. This is one of widely cited dramas by some rhetoricians among the lost Rāma plays. Some citations from the works like *Dhvanyāloka*, *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, *Daśarūpakāvaloka*, *Sāhityadarpaṇa* etc. helps to trace out some essential information about this play. The theme of this play starts from Rāma's sojourn in Pañchavaṭī till his coronation. In this drama the poet does not make any deviation from the original source. But it is surmise that Yaśovarman rejected the portion of *Vālivadha* from his drama but not entirely. Reference of one or two sentence of the speech of Vālin is in the *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa*. Absence of Rāma's deceitful killing of Vālin is one of the speciality of this drama.

2. *Vīracarita*

It is already said that *Vīracarita* is a unique literary piece written based on *Rāmāyaṇa*. It is interesting to note that all the names of the work cited for this particular variety of compositional figurativeness are

dramas. So *Vīracarita* must be a drama. Undoubtedly all these works depict different sentiments and all the incidents described in them possess unique charm in spite of being taken from the same source. Here Kuntaka opines that the uniqueness of each composition reveals the creative genius of the authors of these works. Kuntaka's suggestion of the title of a work without citing any verse makes it difficult to identify the works. In *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* the author says that the sudden end of a sentiment while it is flowing well is improper. An instance taken for it is from the drama *Vīracarita*. The word fight between Rāma and Paraśurāma, which was enriched by the heroic sentiment, was interrupted by the words of Rāma that '*kañkaṇamocanāya gacchāmi*'.⁴ In the second act of *Mahāvīracarita* the word fight between them was interrupted by *kañcukī* by saying '*devyaḥ kañkaṇamocanāya militā rājan varaḥ preṣyatām*'.⁵

Moreover in the first *viveka* of *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* the author says that for making Rāma an ideal hero, Bhavabhūti brilliantly avoids deceitful killing of Vālin in *Vīracarita*. Undoubtedly this prompt to think that title given as *Vīracarita* is none other than *Mahāvīracarita* of Bhavabhūti.

3. *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*

The largely cited drama next to *Rāmābhyudaya* among the lost Rāma plays is *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*. The citations of this drama are in the works like *Abhinavabhāratī*, *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, *Sāhityadarpaṇa* etc. The author of *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* conjectured as Meṇṭha. It is believed that it was written either before or in the beginning of the 8th century C.E. According to the opinion of Subandu there are five types of *nāṭaka*,

they are *pūrṇa* (complete), *praśānta* (tranquil), *bāsvara* (brilliant), *laḷita* (sportive) and *samgraha* (entire). Here the *pūrṇa* satisfies all the *sandhis* like *mukha* etc. Most probably it is equal to the normal types of dramas. *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* is a drama known through only some minute incidental references and also from some rhetorical texts. It is interesting to note that Subandu considered it as an example of *pūrṇa* type of *nāṭaka*.

Kṛtyārāvaṇa means ‘*Rāvaṇa and witch*’. Kuntaka also appreciates the name of this play for the selection of the significant title because Rāvaṇ’s witchcraft is the main theme that leads the story. It deals with the story of *Rāmāyaṇa* from the abduction of Sītā up to the victory of Rāma in seven acts. The author of this drama has made numerous innovations in it. In this drama Śūrpaṇaka separates Sītā from Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa in the forest by disguising as Gautamī. Moreover while the abduction of Sītā, she is in the midst of some hermits. Then Sītā decides to go along Rāvaṇa for the protection of the life of hermits. The poet planned a unique idea in making Sītā more noble by depicting herself as taking such shocking suffering. Another innovation made by the dramatist is that Rāma is an eyewitness of the abduction of Sītā. In original story Rāma knows after some times to some extent from Jaṭāyus. The innovations of this drama are considerable.

4. *Māyāpuṣpaka*

There is only a little information about this play of an unknown authorship. Three verses find in *Abhinavabhāratī* and one in *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* are the only source material to understand this drama. From one of the verse it is clear that the author of this drama gave

personification to *Brahmaśāpa*. Here the dramatist says that the reason of the breakdown of coronation, the exile, and the death of Daśaratha due to the separation of his son is because of the curse of the blind Brahmin. This is found in the original story. The innovation of the dramatists is his unique depiction of the personified form of the *Brahmaśāpa*. Thus the *Brahmaśāpa* is none other than the curse of the old Brahmin. Kuntaka here cites this drama to show the uniqueness of this drama from its original source. He again mentions this drama as an instance of a significant title, which gives an idea of fundamental theme. In the title the word *māyā* means illusion and *puṣpaka* signifies the flying chariot of Kubera. But from the available quotations it is impossible to find out the significance of the illusory chariot in this play. Kuntaka citation of it for denoting significance of title makes sure that in this drama the illusory chariot plays a major role.

Kuntaka cites them for showing uniqueness of dramas though they were written based on an identical theme. It is explicit that poets of these dramas beautifully included innovations and emission of blemishes from them. So Kuntaka's selection of them as a unique piece of literary compositions written based on an identical theme is really praiseworthy. He cites *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* and *Māyāpuṣpaka* also for showing the significance of the title which brings forth the pivot motif. Kuntaka cites some other dramas also along with *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* and *Māyāpuṣpaka* to denote the significance of title. The definition given for this particular variety of compositional figurativeness is as follows:-

*āstāṃ vastuṣu vaidagdhī kāvye kāmapi vakratām/
pradhānasamvidhānāṅkanāmnāpi kurute kavīḥ*⁶

“Even if we let alone the artistic skill of the poet in devising original incidents or episodes, we find that he can display his unique art even in designating his main plot with a very significant title.”⁷

As pointed out earlier Kuntaka does not prefer the simple and straight forward titles of works such as *Hayagrīvavadha*, *Śísupālavadha*, *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*, *Rāmānanda* and *Rāmacarita*. According to him such titles contribute nothing to the whole work. He opines that the unique title of a work plays a significant role in contributing the charm to the work as a whole. It should be related to the pivotal incident discussed in the plot. The examples given for such beautiful titles are *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, *Mudrārākṣasa*, *Pratimāniruddha*, *Māyāpuṣpaka*, *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*, *Chalitarāma* and *Puṣpadūṣitaka*. Some of them are well known compositions. The works like *Māyāpuṣpaka* and *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* were already discussed. So the lost works remained among them are *Rāmānanda*, *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*, *Chalitarāma*, *Pratimāniruddha* and *Puṣpadūṣitaka*. Available information of these compositions is given below.

5. *Rāmānanda* and *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*

Kuntaka cites the name of these two plays also for showing the impropriety of straight forward titles. In *Rasārṇavasudhākara* Siṅgabhūpāla cites two verses from *Rāmānanda*, the work of an unknown author. Bhoja and Rājaśekhara also cite the same verses without mentioning these are from *Rāmānanda*. So date of *Rāmānanda* is assigned before 9th century C.E. The *Uttararāmacarita* has the verses of it with some variant readings. But the unimportance of the verses in

Uttararāmacarita makes it clear that it is from some other source. There is no more information of this drama except two or three verses.

One of the compositions cites by Kuntaka related to *Mahābhārata* is *Pāṇḍavābhyudaya*. There is not any available information about this work. Only the title helps to conjecture its relation with *Mahābhārata*. Kuntaka does not cite any verses from them, he just cites name of these two works to indicate the absence of beauty in the straight forward titles.

6. *Chalitarāma*

Kuntaka cites the name of this play for indicating the beauty of the title. It is a six act Rāma play of an unknown author. It describes the story of Rāma from his coronation up to the acceptance of Sītā. In this drama two spies of a demon disguise as Kaikeyī and Mantharā and deceives Rāma by giving false news about the character of Sītā. This makes the author to give the title as *Chalitarāma* means *Deceived Rāma*. The citations of it is seen in the works like *Daśarūpakāvaloka*, *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* etc. From the available citations a small portion of the story of this drama is surmise as follows. It is well known that in *Uttararāmacarita*, there was a fight between the army of Candraketu and Lava in the name of *Aśvamedha* horse. In this drama Lava has been caught in the fight by Lakṣmaṇa and brings him Ayodhyā as a captive. There by seeing his mother's golden statue, he says like this in wonder, 'ayekathamiyamambā rājadvāramāgatā, kathamiyam kāñcanamayī' etc. Then everyone came to realize that Sītā is alive and he is the son of her. Because of the unavailability of the complete drama the presence of Kuśa at the time of fight, and the story after realising Lava etc. are

unknown. From this a little information about the author's influence of *Uttararāmacarita* is explicit. But it is noteworthy that the poet does not blindly follows Bhavabhūti but also make plausible innovations in it.

7. *Pratimāniruddha*

Kuntaka does not give any more detail of this play except its name. He just cites the name of it for indicating the beauty of the title. But from the brief reference of Mammaṭa and Abhinavagupta etc. it is conjectured that it is a drama of one Vasunāga, son of Bhīma or Bhīmadeva. *Pratimāniruddha* is the only known work of Vasunāga though it is lost. It is based on the story of Kṛṣṇa's grandson Aniruddha with Uṣā, daughter of a demon king named Bāṇa. Actually heroine Uṣā was the daughter of Hara and Gaurī but came to be known as the daughter of Bāṇa. The implication of this story is in the *Harivamśa*. The story in *Harivamśa* is as follows; Uṣā had a dream of Aniruddha and identify him with the help of her friend Citralekha through her paintings. Citralekha brings Aniruddha in his sleep and then Bāṇa imprisons the lovers. Then a great war took place between Bāṇa and Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa defeat Bāṇa but did not kill him by the will of Hara. Aniruddha become free by the help of Lord Kṛṣṇa and went to Dwārakā along with Uṣā. Because of the unavailability of this text, it is not clear what the title Statue Aniruddha indicates. May be it is some innovation bring forth by the author.

¹ K. Krishnamoorthy, *Vakroktijīvitā of Kuntaka*, p.282.

² *ibid*,p.576.

³ Vishnu Bandhu (E.d). *Rājatarāṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa*, part-I,p.131.

⁴ T.C Upreti (Ed.). *Nāṭyadarpaṇa of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra*, p.54.

⁵ Acārya Śrī Rāmacandra Miśra (Ed.). *Mahāvīracarita of Mahākavi Śrī Bhavabhūti*, p.103.

⁶ *ibid*,p.281.

⁷ *ibid*,p.575.

APPENDIX –II
SOME OTHER MAHĀKĀVYAS MENTIONED
BY KUNTAKA

Kuntaka has given elaborate discussion of various *mahākāvya*s of Sanskrit literature. At the same time he just cites the name of two *mahākāvya*s like *Rāmacarita* and *Hayagrīvavadha* for showing lack of beauty in straight forward titles given to a composition. Kuntaka's assessment of these texts is impossible as he does not cite any verses from it. Thus brief information of these *mahākāvya*s is given as appendix.

Rāmacarita

There are numerous poems entitled *Rāmacarita* composed by different poets. Among them one work is of Abhinanda of 9th century C.E, another one is of Kashinatha of unknown date and yet another one is written by Sandhyakaranandin of 11th century C.E. Thus it can be assumed that Kuntaka has most probably mentioned about the *Rāmacarita* of Abhinanda because Kuntaka might have been familiar with this work which was composed before him.

Rāmacarita of Abhinanda is a *mahākāvya* in 36 cantos written based on the story of *Rāmāyaṇa*. It is believed that it was written in the 9th Century C.E by the inspiration of a King named Harivarṣa of the *gauḍīyapāla* dynasty. The story starts from the dwelling of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa in the mountain named Prasaravaṇa at the time of rainy

season and ends with the slaying of the demons Kumbhanikumbha. It is notable that in the form of *pariśiṣṭa*, four more cantos of *Rāmacarita* are also available. It is not sure whether they are also written by Abhinanda or not. Style of writing and use of *vaidarbhi rīti*, *prasāda guṇa* etc. gives a hint that the first *pariśiṣṭa* may have been written by Abhinanda. The first three *pariśiṣṭas* discuss about *makarākṣaparikṣayaḥ*, the fighting skill of Indrajit and then his decline. The final *pariśiṣṭa* ends with the death of Rāvaṇa. There is a verse which reveals that Abhinanda was considered as a *mahākavi* in the series of *mahākavīs* next to Kālidāsa.

*kaviramarah kaviracalah kavī kālidāsābhinandau ca/
anye kavayah kapayah cāpalamātram param dadhati//¹*

The anthologies like *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* and *Subhāṣitaratnakośa* cite few verses of Abhinanda. As in the case of the confusion related to the name of *Rāmacarita*, the name Abhinanda produces some confusions because there have been several persons bearing the same name. Abhinanda, the author of *Rāmacarita* is the son of one Satānanda. There is also another Abhinanda, the author of *Kādambarīkathāsāra*. It is believed that the latter one belongs to Kashmir and he himself describes as the son of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa.

Hayagrīvavadha

Information about *Hayagrīvavadha* and its author Menṭha is available only through some scattered verses availed from some texts like *Rājataranṅinī* of Kalhaṇa, *Suvṛttatilaka* of Kṣemendra, *Sarasvatīkanṭhābharaṇa* of Bhoja, *Bālarāmāyaṇa* of Rājaśekhara etc.

This makes one assume that *Hayagrīvavadha* was written before 10th Century C.E. Some of its verses are also available in the anthologies like *Sūktimuktāvalī* of Jalhaṇa, *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Vallabhadeva, *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* of Srīdharadāsa etc. *Rājatararaṅgiṇī* informs that the patron of Meṅṭha was Mātr̥gupta of Kashmir.²

Suvṛttatilaka of Kṣemendra is a text on Sanskrit prosody. It is divided in to three chapters known as *vinyāsas*. The first *vinyāsa* entitled *vṛttāvacaya* contains thirty eight *kārikas*. The second one named *guṇadoṣapradarśanaḥ* discusses about the merits and demerits of various metres. Here Kṣemendra opines that a little carelessness in the use of metres is improper and it will adversely affect the poetic delight. The third *vinyāsa* named *vṛttavinīyoga* contains forty *kārikas*. In this work he cites some examples of his own and also from other compositions. In the third *vinyāsa*, Kṣemendra says that:-

*ārambhe sargabandhasya kathāvistarasaṅgrāhe/
śamopadeśavṛttānte santaḥ śamsantyanuṣṭubham//³*

The metre *anuṣṭubh* is prescribed by the prosodists to start with a *mahākāvya*, to begin the description of a topic and also in the context of introducing a theme suggestive of the mood of indifference.⁴

Then as an example to the use of *anuṣṭubh* in the beginning of the *mahākāvya*, Kṣemendra cites the first verse of *Hayagrīvavadha*.

*āsīddaityo hayagrīvaḥ suhr̥dveśmasu yasya tāḥ/
prathayanti balam bāhvoḥ sitacchatrasmitāḥ śriyaḥ//⁵*

There was a demon named Hayagrīva, the power of his hands manifest through the wealth of white smile with the charm of the white umbrella, found in the house of his friends. The same verse is also cited by Bhoja in the second *pariccheda* of *Sarasvatīkanṭhābharaṇa* at the time of discussing the divisions of prose. There is also a verse of *Hayagrīvavadha* in *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, where Rājaśekhara boasts about himself. Moreover he considers Meṇṭha after Vālmīki, this reveals the acceptability of the poet Meṇṭha.

*babhūva valmīkabhavaḥ kaviḥ purā tataḥ prapete bhuvi bhartṛmeṇṭhatām/
sthitaḥ punaryo bhavabhūtirekhayā sa varttate samprati rājaśekharaḥ//⁶*

Earlier there was a poet named Vālmīki and he later reached this world as Bhartṛmeṇṭha. Again he becomes well known in the name of Bhavabhūti, now he exists in the name of Rājaśekhara. An anonymous verse of *Sūktimiktāvalī* says about meṇṭha that:-

*vakrokyā meṇṭharājasya vahantyāsṛṇirūpatām/
āviddhā iva dhunvanti mūrdhānam kavikuñjarāḥ//⁷*

These are some scattered verses which gives information about Meṇṭha and *Hayagrīvavadha*. This *mahākāvya* is written by Meṇṭha or Bhartṛmeṇṭha. The title *Hayagrīvavadha* means the ‘slaying of *Hayagrīva*’. Meṇṭha wrote this by taking the scattered information from *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* like *Agnipurāṇa* and *Padmapurāṇa* etc. The verses in it are not lyrical in nature. They just provide proper and best examples for figures of speech like *utprekṣā*, *vakrokti* etc. There is no certainty about the date of this work. But a Malayalam scholar named M.P Śaṅkuṇṇi Nair, who is also well versed in Sanskrit, in his work

titled as *Chatravum Cāmaravum* mentions that it was written between the time of Kālidāsa and Daṇḍin. He also says that the works written after Kālidāsa like *Ratnāharaṇa*, *Aśmakavamśa*, *Hayagrīvavadha* etc. were lost. He also adds that a copy of *Hayagrīvavadha* availed from Kerala is in a north Indian manuscript collection. He again comments that poets like Meṇṭha, Sarvasena and Kālidāsa seems to have largely influenced by the critics like Kuntaka and Ānandavardhana.

Hayagrīva is a mythical character found in the epics. The story related to Hayagrīva found in the epics is as follows. It is believed that the story happened at the time of end of the sixth *manu* named *Cākṣuṣa*. At that time the world was on the rise of distort. Meanwhile Hayagrīva stole the Veda from Brahman, who was in sleep. The person who is going to inaugurate the seventh cycle was Vaivasvata. While lord Viṣṇu was in the incarnation of fish, the fish was caught by Vaivasvata. He protected the fish until it grew and he left it in to the sea. The fish foretold him about the impending flood that will wipe out the corrupted world completely and warned him to build a ship to flee. Vaivasvata was to get on it with the seven sages. He also secured all the seeds to restart the world after flood. Following the storm heavy rain fall leashed the earth. The great fish appeared at the time of flood and he protected the ship of Manu from the strong waves by taking it in his horn. Then somehow they reached the mountains of Himālaya. Manu inaugurated the new cycle of society. First of all he produced a daughter through Vedic practice. The whole dynasties that exist today emerged from Manu and his daughter. At the time of such complete destruction of

the world, Hayagrīva conquered heaven by defeating the King Indra. Brahma realized the condition of heaven after awakening from his sleep and entrusted Viṣṇu to liberate the heaven from Hayagrīva. At last the great fish pierced his horn in to the chest of the demon Hayagrīva. He then bestowed the Veda back to Brahman. In this way this epic ends with the optimistic way by the victory of good over the evil.

It is familiar that in most of the *kāvya*s the poet highlights the greatness of the hero. Deviating from this usual custom, in this epic the poet depicts the power of the evil demon Hayagrīva. And at the end by killing such great evil Hayagrīva, the poet brings forth the greatness of lord Viṣṇu, who was in the form of the incarnation of the great fish. Thus the poet's indirect depiction of the strength of the hero should surely delight the readers. Moreover the appreciation he has got from some famous poets and rhetoricians also strengthens the significance of this work. There are also some other works that have their titles related to the name of antagonists. Some of them are *Śisupālavadha*, *Rāvaṇavadha* etc.

¹ Chote Lal Tripathi, *Ramacharita-mahākāvya*m of mahākavi Abhinanda, p.3.

² *hayagrīvavadham meṇṭastagre darśayannavam/
āsamāpti tato nāpatsādhvasādhviti vā vacaḥ//
atha grathayithu tasminpustakam prastute nyadhāt/
lāvaṇyaniryāṇabhiyā tadadhaḥ svarṇabhājanam//
antarajñatayā tasya tādrśyā kṛtasatkṛtiḥ/
bhartrmeṇṭaḥ kavirmene punaruktam śriyorpaṇam//
sa mātrguptasvāmyākhyam nirmame madhusūdanam/
kālenādatta yadvāmānmmaḥ svasurasadmane//*

“When Meṇṭha showed before the king his new (poem called) *Hayagrīvavadha* (‘the death of *Hayagrīva*’), he did not get any word of approval or dissent from the king until he had completed it. Then when he set about to bind the volume, he (Mātr̥gupta) placed below it a golden dish, lest its flavor might escape. Honoured by such appreciation on the part of that (king), the poet Bhartṛmeṇṭha thought the rich reward superfluous. He built a (shrine of) Madhusūdana (Viṣṇu) called Mātr̥guptasvāmin, whose villages were in the course of time appropriated by Mamma for his own temple.”²

³ Dipak Kumar Sharma, *Suvṛttatilaka of Kṣemendra*, p.67.

⁴ *ibid*,p.68.

⁵ *ibid*,p.67.

⁶ Ganga sagar Rai, *Bālarāmāyaṇa* of Rājasekhara, p.7.

⁷ *idem*.