

LANGUAGE OF LITERATURE AND THE FIGURATIVE MODE IN INDIAN (SANSKRIT) POETICS

Rinu

Assistant Professor
Department of English & Foreign Languages
Central University of Haryana,
Haryana, India

Abstract

A literary work is a linguistic construct with a special use of language. This language is highly innovative and creative and represents the most delightful and unique expression of human soul. Here it is noteworthy that this language of literature is not without figurative mode. They can be understood in a proper way in the light of the poet's function. The poet makes the language creative by the proper use of figures. They are assimilative aspects of the artistic or creative expression. They enhance the beauty of each other and strengthen the meaning of the literary composition. Hence, a literary activity requires assiduous use of linguistic elements to express the sense or sensibility of language. This paper aims at making a statement of the creative use of language of literature and the figurative mode conceived in Indian aesthetic thinking and focuses on how Indian aestheticians like Bharata, Bhāmaha, Vāmanaāa, Ānandavardhana, Kuntaka and Ksemendra unfold the role of language of literature and figurative mode in enabling the writer to transform his basic concept into an effective and meaningful message and the reader to understand it.

Keywords: *Kāvya-puruṣa, Kāvya, Śabda, Artha, Rasa, Alamkāra, Rīti, Dhvani, Vakrokti, Aucitya*

A literary work is a linguistic construct with a special use of language. This language is highly innovative and creative and represents the most delightful and unique expression of human soul. It is this language which enables poet/writer to transform his basic concept into an effective and meaningful message. This very language enables the reader also to understand meaning which is an inescapable notion because it is not something simple or simply determined. Here it is noteworthy that the language of literature is not without figurative mode. They can be understood in a proper way in the light of the poet's function. The poet makes the language creative by the proper use of figures. They are assimilative aspects of the artistic or creative expression. They enhance the beauty of each other and strengthen the meaning of the literary composition. Hence, a literary activity requires assiduous use of linguistic elements to express the sense or sensibility of language. When composing a piece of literature, one may need to be concerned with the phonological, morphological, syntactical, semantic and other

components of a language and also all extra-linguistic matters like rhetoric, plot, characterization, setting, theme, motif, and imagery. This paper aims at making a statement of the creative use of language of literature and the figurative mode conceived in Indian aesthetic thinking. This paper focuses on how Indian aestheticians like Bharata, Bhāmaha, Vāmana, Ānandavardhana, Kuntaka and Ksemendra unfold the role of language of literature and figurative mode in enabling the writer to transform his basic concept into an effective and meaningful message and the reader to understand it.

As referred to earlier, the paper focuses on Indian thinking, but in order to strengthen the approach, I begin with Plato who considers art as divine food for human beings. Coomaraswamy puts it in the following way: “For, to state the Platonic doctrine in more familiar words, it is written, that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God...that bread which came down from heaven” that is to say, not by mere utilities but by those “divine realities” and “casual beauty” with which the wholesome work of art are informed...” (22). Coomaraswamy explains it in his discussion on a figure of speech or a figure of thought, by making a synthesis of the creative use of language and the figurative mode. In order to have a detailed account of the language of literature as discussed in Indian poetics, it would be in the fitness of things to begin with Rajashekhara’s metaphorical presentation of *kāvyaपुरuṣa* (a literary composition) as summarized by Prof. Sharma. He says “In his text *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* the disciples of Bṛhaspati is shown asking him, “Who is this *kāvyaपुरuṣa*?” Bṛhaspati informs about *Kāvyaपुरuṣa* as the son of Sarasvatī. *Śabdārtha* (Words and meanings) form his body. Sanskrit is the mouth. Here Sanskrit does not mean Sanskrit language but a *pranjal bhāṣā* (the creative use of language by the poet). *Prākṛt* (dialects) are the limbs or arms, *apabhraṃśa* (tribal or folk) legs; *piśāci* (languages of illiterate) feet and *miśrit* (mixture of all languages) large bosom.”(Sharma 161) His speech is elevated. Metrical composition is the pores, questions and quizzes the forms of discourse, figures of speech the ornaments. *Kāvyaपुरuṣa* transcends time and is linked with past, present and future because of the creative use of language. It is again because this a reader, while studying this *kāvyaपुरuṣa*, feels thrilled, transported, at varying intervals. This experience involves two things: the first is beauty caused by the creative use of language, known as aesthetic beauty and the second is pleasure caused by the beauty known as aesthetic pleasure which is experienced by the reader. This aesthetic experience may be *rasagatasaundarya* (experience caused by rasa) *alaṃkāragatasaundarya* (experience caused by figures), *rītigatasaundarya* (experience caused by diction), *dhvanigatasaundarya* (experience caused by suggestive meaning), *vakroktigatasaundarya* (experience caused by oblique expression) and *aucityagatasaundarya* (experience caused by propriety). Indian aestheticians have examined the language of *Kāvyaपुरuṣa* from the standpoints of *rasa* (aesthetic sentiment), *alaṃkāra* (figures), *rīti* (diction), *dhvani* (suggestion), *vakrokti* (oblique expression) and *aucitya* (propriety).

Bharata’s *rasa siddhānta* (theory of aesthetic experience) propounded in his *Nāṭyaśāstra* is based on the harmonious and creative use of language-- both verbal and non-verbal—which makes the expression a highest kind of *kāvya*. Bharata mentions four kinds of language— *āṅgika* (voluntary non-verbal expression) to depict emotions/feelings of a character being played by the actor, *vācika* (verbal expression) to express emotions/feelings, tone, diction, pitch of a particular character, *āhārya* (costume and stage expression) to enhance expression, *sāttvika* (involuntary non-verbal expression) to express the deepest emotions of a character. It also includes four kinds of *vṛttis* (styles)-*bharativṛtti* (verbal style) which gives a prominent place to speeches, *sāttvati* (grand style) which focusses on words and gestures, *kaisiki* (graceful

style) which focuses on costumes and *arabhata* (energetic style) in which dominates the violent actions. The basic concept of *rasa* formulated by Bharata in his *rasasūtra*, ‘*vibhāvanubhāvavyābhicārisamyogādrasaniṣpattiḥ*’ is also based on the creative use of language. Here the emotional experience is generated by the very four kinds of language divided into two categories—verbal and non-verbal. They are meant for *vibhāvas* (causes and determinants of the rise of an emotion) which are *ālamban* (supporting causes, usually the hero or the heroine or such objects) and *uddīpan* (features or circumstances that accentuate the feelings of *ālamban* (hero or heroine), *anubhāva* (gestures expressive of what is going on in the heart or the mind of main characters, like casting a terrified glance, heaving a sigh or involuntarily shedding a tear) and *vyābhicāribhāvās* (transitory emotions which go along with and consequently reinforce prevailing mood or emotional disposition). Through the conjunction of the language of *vibhāvanubhāvavyābhicāri* the poet activates, with some kind of empathetic induction, the propensity of *sthāyībhāvās* (basic sentiments) in the reader and the movement it is consummated, the *sahr̥daya* (sensitive reader) experiences an afflatus or transport which is designed as *rasa* (aesthetic sentiment). The pronouncements of Bharata regarding the use of language—verbal and non-verbal-- are figure in all the modern literary theories of the west, though not as comprehensive as made by him.

In the process of *rasa* experience, it is the creative use of language that turns the *sahr̥daya* (reader/spectator) from *laukik* (worldly) into *alaukik* (supra-human) and hence now he experiences aesthetic pleasure even in weeping. At this juncture of the language, the *sahr̥daya* is neither subjective, nor objective, nor neutral. He transcends the world but does not enter into a divine a world. Here *citta* (mind) has two states: *dīpti* (state of luminosity) and *pighalanā* (state of liquefaction). The former state arouses the *rasa* (aesthetic sentiment) of *bhayānaka* the terrible), *vīra* (the heroic), *hāsya* (the comic) etc. while the latter arouses *karuṇa rasa* (sentiment of pathos), *sṛṅgāra rasa* (erotic sentiment) etc. It is noteworthy here that *citta* (mind) is like sealing wax which gets melted in the company of heat and finally turns into a liquid form. Now *rajas* (mode of passion) and *tamas* (mode of dullness) are also liquefied and so *citta* (mind) experiences universal rhythm followed by *rasa*. Now *citta* (mind) transcends the worldly limits. It is *rajas* (mode of passion) and *tamas* (mode of dullness) that makes *citta* (mind) have different experiences of life. They limit the realization of *citta* (mind) but the moment these *guṇas* (modes) are melted, the limitations of *citta* (mind) are removed and we have *rasa* (aesthetic sentiment). The liquefaction of *citta* (mind) takes place after *rajas* (mode of passion) and *tamas* (mode of dullness) get subdued for the time being, affording scope for the *sattva* (mode of goodness) to inundate the inner consciousness.

The *kāvya* is expressed through the medium of language which has evolved from very old conventions accepted for the smooth world affairs: ‘*vyavahārya lokasya pragittham samayah kṛtaḥ.*’ Bhāmaha describes the sound aspect of the word as well as emphasizes on the meaning aspect of the word in the following statements: “the poem which lacks meaningfulness, well-turned expression, decency, logicity and intelligibility is bad *kāvya*, however musical it may be. (*apustrarthamavakrokti prasannamrju komalam/ bhinnam geyamivedam tu kevalam srutipesalam*)” (Sastry 11)

Bhāmaha defines *kāvya* as ‘*śabdārthau sāhitau kāvyam*’ (togetherness of word and meaning). Here it is not to be taken as a mere insipid statement but it should be possessed of some charm created by the figures of speech. According to him, *alamkāra* is the most essential element of *kāvya* and it consists in the striking manner of putting a striking idea in equally striking words. Thus *kāvya* should be possessed of some charm created by the figures of speech.

In *Kāvyaśāstra* Bhāmaha makes a shift from the grammatical purity of words to brilliance of meaning. Bhāmaha opines that in literature the subjects and the language are the same, but the word structures are different, unusual, uncommon, striking and are hence pleasing. That shows the beauty of *kāvya* lies in the uncommonness of expression. According to him “the locus of literariness is in the figures of speech, in the mode of figurative expression, in the grammatical accuracy and pleasantness of sound (euphony)” (Kapoor 16).

The *rīti siddhānta* (theory of style) of Vāmana, propounded in his *Kāvyaśāstrasūtra* based on three types of phrasal organization, is the creative use of language. He divides this organization in three ways. The first is *asamās* (the phrasal organization, devoid of compounds). It has *mādhurya* (sweetness- melody). Here *guṇa* which generates special delight by liquefying the reader’s psyche is *mādhurya* (sweetness and melody). It is experienced more and more in compositions delineating the *sambhog śrangār*, the *karuna*, the *vipralambha* and *śānta rasa*. It consists of the repetition of phonemes which imparts melodious music. The second is *madhyama-samāsa* (phrasal organization, made up of small compounds). It pervades the entire mind of the reader immediately even as fire catches the dry fuel. It is called *prasād*. Phrases which are easily understandable produce this excellence. It well accords with different *rasās* which are helped in their arousal due to it. The last type of *rīti* is *dīrgha-samāsa* (the phrasal organization made up of long compounds). It has *ojas* (elegance and emotionality) which excites and inflames the psyche, expanding it. It attains prominence in the delineation of *vīra*, *bībhatsa* and *raudra*. It is generated by a combination of plosive sounds, semi vowels and hard consonants and long compounds.

Dhvani theory of Ānandavardhan which focuses on meaning is based on the creative use of language. It is this very *dhvani* which is an analysis of the suggestive potentiality of the language of literature and acts at various levels of meaning based on *śabdaśakti* (word powers). Ānandavardhana talks of three levels of meaning or three *śabdaśakti*: *vācyārtha* or *abhidhā* (primary or conventional meaning), *lakṣaṇā* (metaphorical meaning or indication) and *vyanjanā* (suggestion). It is worth noting here that in *kāvya* (a literary composition) *abhidhā* and *lakṣaṇā* are the ways and provide jumping-off ground to convey an entirely new meaning what we call *vyanjanā* (suggestion) which is the end of the essence of *kāvya*. In *Dhvanyāloka*, Ānandavardhana puts this in the following way: “*yatrārthaḥśabdau vātamarthamupasarjanīkṛtsvārthau, vyañkataḥkāvya viśeṣaḥ sa dhvanirīti sūrbhiḥ kathitaḥ*” (“That kind of *kāvya* (a literary composition), wherein the (conventional) meaning renders itself secondary and suggests the (intended or) implied meaning, is designated by the learned as *dhvani* or suggested *Kāvya*”(Krishnamoorthy 19). Here *abhidhā* and *lakṣaṇa* being the ways have a number of varieties of *dhvani* that reflect the creative nature of suggestion and the subject of poetic art. He holds that *dhvani* (the suggestive meaning) is indicated by a) composition b) phoneme c) word d) sentence e) construction f) case termination g) personal termination h) number i) affix j) compound. It is enlightening to see how the *ācāryās* of *dhvani* theory discuss the powers of words and the modes of expression. The powers of words explain an epistemological process, taking place in the referent, the image and the symbol.

Vakrokti theory of Kuntaka also holds that *kāvya* is a play of the creative use of language. Kuntaka says that *vakrokti* consists in the delightful union of word and meaning which is characterized by the infusion of unique poetic art which is capable of affording pleasure to the *sahrdaya*. Kuntaka considers *vakrokti* as the single most aspect of *kāvya*: “Both these are the ‘adorned’. Their adornment consists in the poetic process known as ‘artistic turn of speech’” (Krishnamoorthy 39). He holds that that unique expression which alone can fully convey the

poets' intended meaning out of a hundred alternatives before him is to be regarded as 'word'. Similarly, that alone which possesses such refreshing natural beauty as to draw the appreciation of delighted readers is to be reckoned as meaning.

According to him, *vakrokti* operates at six levels: The first is *varṇa-vinyāsa-vakratā* (phonetic obliquity or obliquity in arrangement of phonemes or consonants or syllables). It works at the level of phoneme when similar or identical phonemes or consonants are repeated at varying intervals, when consonants or phonemes are arranged without any interval, when new consonants or phonemes are employed and when stops are combined with their homorganic nasals. It also includes alliteration and chime. The second type of *vakratā* is *pada-pūrvārdha-vakratā* (lexical obliquity). It is found in the base forms of substantives. Its sub-varieties are *rūḍhi-vaicitraya-vakratā* (obliquity of usage), *pariyāya-vakratā* (obliquity of synonym), *upacāra-vakratā* (obliquity of transference), *viśeṣana-vakratā* (obliquity of adjective), *saṃvrti-vakratā* (obliquity of concealment), *vṛtti-vakratā* (obliquity of indeclinable), *kṛyā-vaicitra vakratā* (obliquity of verb). The third type of *vakratā* is *pada-parārdha-vakratā* (grammatical obliquity or obliquity in the inflectional forms of substantives) i.e. tense, case, case, number, person, voice, affix and particle and accordingly they are called *kāla-vaicitrya-vakratā* (obliquity of tense), *kāraka-vakratā* (obliquity of case) *saṃkhyā-vakratā* (obliquity of number) *puruṣa-vakratā* (obliquity of person), *upagraha-vakratā* (obliquity of voice), *upasarga-vakratā* (obliquity of affix), *nipāta-vakratā* (obliquity of particle). The fourth type of *vakratā* is *vākya-vakratā* (sentential obliquity) or obliquity in a whole sentence admitting of a thousand varieties, including a whole lot of figures. It has mainly two sub-varieties: *sahajā-vakratā* (natural obliquity) and *ahāryavakratā* (imposed obliquity). The fifth type of *vakratā* is *prakaraṇa -vakratā* (episodic obliquity or obliquity in parts or episodes or incidents). It has *bhāvapūrnasthitivakratā* (obliquity of emotional state), *utapādyalāvanyavakratā* (obliquity of modified source story), *prakaraṇaupakārya-upakārahāvavakratā* (obliquity of episodic relationship), *viśiṣṭhaprakaraṇavakratā* (obliquity of particular event and episode), *aṅgīrasaṇiṣyandanikaṣavakratā* (obliquity of dominant *rasa*), *apradhānaprasaṅga* (obliquity of secondary episode), *prakaraṇāntaravakratā* (device of play within play), *sandhiviniveśavakratā* (obliquity of juncture). The last type of *vakratā* is *prabandha-vakratā* (compositional obliquity or obliquity in the entire composition). Its sub-varieties are *rasāntara-vakratā* (obliquity of changing the *rasa*), *samāpana-vakratā* (obliquity of winding up the story), *kathā-viccheda-vakratā* (obliquity of intending end), *anuṣāṅgika-phal-vakratā* (obliquity of contingent objective), *nāmakaraṇa-vakratā* (obliquity of title), *tulya-kathā-vakratā* (obliquity of identical story). Thus the *vakrokti* theory works at the creative use of language at six levels: phonetic, lexical, grammatical, sentential, episodic or contextual and composition as a whole.

The *aucitya theory* propounded by Ksemendra upholds the same view as has been already conceived by other *Indian aestheticians*. The *aucitya* theory says that *kāvya* is a placing together of different parts of language which are mutually agreeable or in harmony. It again says that it is the linguistic creativity that binds the parts of a piece of literature together. He enumerates twenty seven constituents of the language of literature, calling them proprieties in the use of poetic language. Broadly they can be classified into seven categories: *bhāṣāaucitya* (propriety of language), *guṇaucitya* (propriety of verbal organization), *alamkāraucitya* (propriety of poetic figure), *vyākaraṇaucitya* (propriety of grammar), *rasaucitya* (propriety of *rasa*), *kāvya-pratibhāucitya* (propriety of creative genius).

Here all the categories explicitly pronounce that *kāvya* is the creative use of language. Each of these first five categories includes the various constituents of language in them.

Bhāṣāaucitya (propriety of language) has *pādaucitya* (propriety of word and phrase). *Vākyaucitya* (propriety of sentence) has *prabandhārthaucitya* (propriety of meaning in narrative). *Guṇaucitya* (propriety of verbal organization) bears *prasād* (perspicuity or simplicity), *mādhurya* (sweetness, melody) has *ojas* (elegance or emotionality). *Alamkāraucitya* (propriety of poetic figure) includes all proper use of figures of speech. *Vyākaraṇaucitya* (propriety of grammar) like Kuntaka's *pada-parārdha-vakratā* (grammatical obliquity) acts at inflectional level of substantives i.e. tense, case, case, number, person, voice, affix and particle and accordingly they are called *kāla-vaicitrayaucitya* (propriety of tense), *kārakaucitya* (propriety of case), *sāmkhyaucitya* (propriety of number), *puruṣaucitya* (propriety of person), *upagrahaucitya* (propriety of voice), *upasargaucitya* (propriety of prefix) and *nipātaucitya* (propriety of particle). *Samskṛti-aucitya* (propriety of culture) is impregnated with *deśaucitya* (propriety of place or language with reference to the place), *kulaucitya* (propriety of family or language with reference to status of the character), *vrataucitya* (propriety of custom or language on different occasions with reference to the prevailing customs and practices). Even the last category of *aucitya*, *kāvya-pratibhāucitya* (propriety of creative genius) focuses upon the creative use of language. It deals with *tattvaucitya* (propriety of truth), *sattvaucitya* (propriety of goodness), *abhiprāyaucitya* (propriety of purpose), *svabhāvaucitya* (propriety of nature), *sarasamgrahaucitya* (propriety of essence), *pratibhāucitya* (propriety of talent), *awasthāucitya* (propriety of age), *vicāraucitya* (propriety of thought), *nāmaucitya* (propriety of title), *āśirvādaucitya* (propriety of benediction).

As far as the figurative mode (which Indian aestheticians conceive as *alamkāra*) is concerned, it is not separate from the language of literature; rather it is an integral part of the language of literature composed of *sabda* and *artha*. Bharata holds that *alamkāras* are embellishments of *kāvya* (a literary composition), causing beauty pertaining to both sound and sense. In this regard he mentions three *arthalamkāras* viz. *upama*, *rupaka* and *deepak* along with one *sabdalamkāras* viz. *yamaka*.

Recapitulating the idea of as conceived by Bharata, Bhāmaha elevated it to the level of the full-fledged theory in his *Kāvya-ālamkāra*. According to Bhāmaha, *alamkāra* is the most essential element of *kāvya* and it consists in the striking words and *kāvya* should be possessed of some charm created by the *alamkāra*. Bhāmaha, in his turn, took a holistic view of the matter, highlighting the value in *kāvya* of both kinds of figures: '*arthalamkāra*' as well as '*sabdalamkāra*'. This is so because *kāvya* implies essentially the togetherness of words and their sense '*sabdarthausahitaukāvyam*', in the absence of this togetherness *kāvya* cannot flourish.

According to him figurativeness lies in *vakrokti* (oblique expression) whether the *alamkāra* is of word or of sense '*vakrābhidheyaśabdotiriṭāvācāmalamkārti*'. He also holds that *vakrokti* lies in *atisyokti* what the West calls "hyperbole", a kind of exaggeration. This shows that poeticality of *kāvya* lies in some kind of exaggeration; it is exaggeration that makes a statement poetic. Hence, he advises the poets:

saiśāsarvaivavakroktiranyarthovibhaktaye
yatnosyamkavinākāryaḥkoalamkāroanayavinā (85)

[This very figure called "Atisyokti" is in point of fact nothing but indirect speech. The meaning of *kāvya* (a literary composition) derives its charm from

this. The poet should try to cultivate it; which “*alamkāra*” is without it?]
(Sastry49)

If the real task of the poet is to make indirect speeches, the importance that Bhāmaha attaches to *alamkāras* becomes self-evident. Undoubtedly *kāvya* just cannot be conceived of without exaggeration and thus without *alamkāras*. The next aesthetician who belongs to *alamkāra* school is Acarya Dandin. In his *Kāvyaadarśa*, he defines *alamkāra* as attributes, which conduce to creation of *kāvya*'s luster. He includes *gunas* (excellences) also in his concept of *alamkāra*. The question of how to make *kāvya* look as appealing as possible receives the greatest attention of Dandin who believes that it is ornaments that lend real charm to the human body and the ornaments of the lady or *kāvya* are called *alamkāra*. He, naturally, therefore, declares: “*kāvyaśobhākārānadharmānalāmākārānprakṣate* [Features that cause the beauty of *kāvya* are called *alamkāra* (figures of speech)]” (*kāvyaadarśa* I.1). By the word “*sobha*” Dandin means aesthetic excellence achieved by *kāvya* and that is attained primarily by *alamkāra*.

Acārya Udbhata, the renowned commentator of Bhāmaha's treatise, has used Bhāmaha's *Kāvyaālamākāra* for his purpose rather profusely but he manages to be independent and original. For example, Udbhata does not recognize the *alamkāra* ‘*upamarupka*’ and ‘*utpreksavayava*’ that Bhāmaha has clearly recognized. The great “alamkarin” that he is, he invents new *alamkāra* like *punruktivadabhasa*, *sankr*, *kāvyaing*, *drastant* and *chekanuparasa*. Although Bhāmaha and Dandin both have discussed *alamkāra* like *praye*, *ujasvi*, *smahita* etc., neither has been able to clarify their characteristics clearly but Udbhata explains these *alamkāra* lucidly and precisely. He is the first to discuss ‘*kāvyaavrttis*’ like ‘*parusa*’, ‘*komala*’ and ‘*upanagarika*’ as the varieties of the *alamkāra* ‘*anuparasa*’ which the West calls ‘alliteration’. His division of *alamkāra* is quite scientific. He has classified them into six heads in his *Kāvyaālamākāra-sarasangraha*.

Acārya Vāmana, the author of *kāvyaalamkārautravratti* discusses *kāvya laksna* (the signs of *kāvya*) the relationship between *kāvya* and *alamkāra* and the purpose of *kāvya*. The whole work is based on the function of *alamkāra*. It has been put as ‘*kāvyaighaamalankarat*’ i.e. *Kāvya* becomes admirable and acceptable on account of its association with *alamkāra*. Here the word ‘*alamkāra*’ does not really mean “figures of speech” but rather “beauty” in a very wide sense.

Clearly, the sense of the word ‘*alamkāra*’ does not mean ‘figures of speech’ in its usual sense conveyed by the English expression ‘figures of speech’; the word has rather to be taken in its broader sense of beauty. And beauty resides not only in the ornaments that a human form wears but also in the inner qualities that underlie that form.

Vāmana is probably the first aesthetician who proposes an aesthetically oriented approach to *kāvya* and declared rather boldly: ‘*saundrayalamkāra*’ i.e. Figures of speech are the quintessence of beauty. The treatment of the question of what constitutes *kāvya*, as given in Vāmana's *Kāvyaālamākārasutra* puts *ālamākāra* as ‘*kāvyaśobhāyamaalankārasaktyoshbdaarthiyovattatte*’ i.e. Words and their meanings refined by figures of speech constitute *kāvya*. Rudrata, the author of *Kāvyaālamākāra* does not ignore the fact that *ālamākāras* characterise the internal quality of *kāvya*. His division of *alamkāra* is also very scientific. He broadly divided *ālamākāras* into two categories: *sabdalamkāra* (verbal figures) and *arthalamkāra* (semantic figures). With the emergence of the *Dhvani siddhanta*, the *alamkāra* along with *gunas* (excellences) were given a subservient status considering them to be merely external factors of poetic fascination. Acarya Ānandavardhana

holds in *alamkāras* are those elements which, depending upon word and meaning, minister to the generation of poetic charm, being external embellishments; the central element is *Dhvani* which is the soul of *kāvya*. Mammata recognizes *alamkāras* as the external and not inherent attributes of *kāvya* because *kāvya* can manage to be without them, though their presence is sure to enhance the beauty of *kāvya*. Ruyyaka, the author of *Kāvyaalamkārasarvasva* is famous for his scientific classification of *alamkāra*. He divides all figures of speech into five groups on the basis of the following five features: 1: *samya* (similarity), 2: *virodha* (antithesis), 3: *srnkhlā* (interconnectedness forming a string), 4: *nyaya* (logic) and 5: *gudarthapratiti* (perception of inner meaning). In the above-mentioned categories, he discusses six *sabdalamkāras* (verbal figures) and seventy-five *arthalamkāras* (semantic figures) in his *Alamkārasarvas* which have five new *alamkāras*. The significance of Ruyyaka lies in the fact that he very studiously classifies the *alamkāras* as *sādrsyamulaka* or based on resemblance; *virodhagarbha* or pregnant with contrast; *srnkhalabadha* or Stringed ones; *tarkanyāmulaka* or based on logical syllogisms; *vākyanyāyamulaka* (based on the logic of the sentence); *lokanyāyamulaka* or based on public logic; *gudhartha-pratitimulaka* or based on feelings..

Jayadeva, the author of *Candrāloka* also belongs to this *alamkāra* school of criticism. In his view, *alamkāras* are the soul of *kāvya* (a literary composition) for without them no composition could ever be called a poem at all. Here, he is attacking Mammata who had opined in *Kāvyaaprakāśa* that a poem could be with or without *alamkāra* i.e. *kāvya* could exist even without *alamkāra*. In the considered view of Mammata, *kāvya* is nothing but words and meaning which are devoid of all defects and are full of *alamkāra* (figures) generally but sometimes existing even in the absence of the latter (i.e. figures of speech). Jayadeva finds this ‘sutra’ of Mammata unacceptable; in his view, it is travesty of facts: how can *kāvya* (a literary composition) exist without *alamkāra*, for it is the *alamkāra* which go to make words and meanings assume the character of *kāvya*; without figurativeness accruing to words and meanings, no sensible man can conceive of the existence of *kāvya* just as nobody can conceive of unburning fire. Since the existence of fire without its nature to burn is unthinkable, the existence of *kāvya* in the absence of the *alamkāra* is impossible.

To conclude, it can be clearly said that Indian literary theories-- *rasa* (aesthetic experience), *alamkāra* (poetic figure), *rīti* (diction), *dhvani* (suggestion), *vakrokti* (oblique expression) and *aucitya* (propriety) have conspicuous pronouncements regarding language of literature and the figurative mode. It is worth noting that the western aestheticians also hold that, when composing a literary composition, one may need to be concerned with the phonological, morphological, syntactical, semantic and other components of a language and also all extra-linguistic matters like plot, characterization, setting, theme, motif, and imagery. The Indian aestheticians treat the components of language and the figurative mode under *rasagatasaundarya*, *alamkāragatasaundarya*, *rītigatasaundarya*, *dhvanigatasaundarya*, *vakroktigatasaundarya* and *aucityagatasaundarya* considering indispensable aspects of *Kāvyaपुरuषा*. Treating linguistic phenomenon in literature, they hold that a certain figurativeness is the most indistinguishable characteristic of the language of literature. They show that language of literature and the figurative mode embody a significant aspect of human experience in the stylized linguistic form.

Works Cited:

- Bharata. *The Nāṭyaśāstra, A Treatise on Hindu Dramaturgy and Histrionics*. Ed. Manmohan Ghosh. Varansi: Chowkhamba Press, 2007. Print.
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda K. *Figures of Speech or Figures of Thought*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 2011. Print.
- Jha, Ganganath. ed. and trans. *The Kāvyaśāstra of Vamana*. Delhi: Satguru Publications, 1990. Print.
- Kapoor, Kapil. *Literary Theory: Indian Conceptual Framework*. New Delhi: East-West Press, 1998. Print.
- Krishnamoorthy, K. *New Bearings of Indian Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ahmedabad: B.J. Institute of Learning & Research, 1982. Print.
- Mammaṭa. *Kāvya Prakāśa*. Ed. Thaneshwar Chandra Upreti. Delhi: Parimal Publications, 2003. Print.
- Sastry, P.V. Naganatha, ed. and trans. *Kāvyaśāstra of Bhāmaha*. 2nd ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1991. Print.
- Sharma, Shrawan K. “Aesthetic Pleasure in Indian Critical Tradition.” *Asian Journal of Literature, Culture and Society*. 3.2. (2009):109-119. Print.
- . “The Soul of Literature: A Holistic View of Indian Poetics”. *The Vedic Path*. XC.3-4 (2015):161-191. Print.
- Warder, A.K. *Indian Kavya Literature: Literary Criticism*. Vol.1. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2009. Print.