

JAINA CONTRIBUTION TO INDIAN POETICS

I. In the histories of Sanskrit Poetics available today, though some Jaina authors are referred to in passing, we have neither a full survey of all the works nor an objective assesment of them taken as a whole. Even in exhaustive surveys like that of Krishnamachariar, the major works on poetics by ancient Jaina authors in languages other than Sanskrit are not to be found. The object of this paper is to give a brief outline of the Jaina contribution to the development of literary theories in India, taking into consideration some of the major works in Sanskrit as well as in old Kannada.

Jinasena's *Mahāpurāṇa* (9th Century A.D.) records in unmistakable terms the tradition of the Jainas that *Alaṅkāra-sāstra* or science of poetics, including topics like *alaṅkāras*, two *mārgas* and ten *guṇas*, was revealed by the *Ādi Tīrthaṅkara* himself for the benefit of humanity :

Upamādīnalaṅkāraṅ sanmārgadvayavistaram |
Daśaprāṇānalaṅkārasaṅgraha vibhur abhyadhāt ||

(XVI. 115)

It is again in this *Mahāpurāṇa* that we get for the first time an illuminating explanation of the word '*vāṅmaya*'. Jinasena says that the three disciplines, viz., grammar, prosody and poetics collectively form *vāṅmaya* :

Padavidyāmadhicchandovicitiṃ vāgalaṅkṛtim |
Trayīsamuditāmetāṃ tadvido vāṅmayaṃ viduḥ ||

(Ibid. XVI, 111).

As Dr. Raghavan has pointed out, the first clear enumeration of nine *kāvya-rasas* including *praśānta* and substituting *vṛīḍanaka* for *bhayānaka* is to be had in one of the of the very ancient Jaina *āgamas* viz., *Anuyogadvāra-sūtra* (Āgamodaya Samiti Series Ed. P. 134) :—

Ṇava kavvarasā paṇṇattā, taṃ jahā—
Vīro siṅgāro abbhūo a roddo a hoi boddhavvo |
Velaṅṅō bībhaccho hāso kaluṇo pasanto a ||

(*The Number of Rasas*, Second Ed. p. 158).

It has been estimated that this canonical *sūtra* cannot be later than the 5th century A.D. Possibly it is much older. In the Jaina poetic tradition as recorded by several old Kannada poets like Raṅṅa (10th century A.D.), Jinendra has only one *rasa* and that is *sānta*.

“ *Ninage rasamonde śāntame jinendra* ”

(*Ajita-tīrthaṅkara-purāṇa-tilaka, Jina-stuti*).

While praising Sarasvatī, the same poet states figuratively that her ornaments are not sixteen, but thirty-six, alluding to the thirty-six *lakṣaṇas*, as against sixteen *saṃskāras* :—

Padinā rallaṅkriyāracane

Mūvattāru nerpaṭṭavu / ... (op. cit.).

The doctrine of *lakṣaṇas* seen in Bharata was thus kept alive in the Jaina tradition, though it went out of vogue in later Sanskrit poetics.

The Jaina religion naturally gave the highest importance to tranquility or *praśānta* as the highest value in spiritual life. The same was imported openly into the field of poetics too; so openly that the Jainas went even to the extent of branding even secular poets like Kālidāsa as *kukavis* because of their excessive devotion for *śṅgāra*. Jinasena, uses all his wits in rewriting Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* in such a way that each line of Kālidāsa breathing the spirit of *vipralambha-śṅgāra* is transformed to yield the *sānta* significance with the help of two or three more new lines added to each line by Jinasena himself. It is the famous *Pārsvābhyudaya*. In this *Kāvya* we have the out-and-out declaration that ' *kāvya-dharma* ' i.e. *Kavisamaya* has forced *kukavis* like Kālidāsa to regard *śṅgāra* as *satya* though it is *asatya* in fact :—

Syād vā satyaṃ kukaviracitaṃ kāvya-dharmānurodhāt
Saty apy evaṃ sakalam uditam jāghatīty eva yasmāt |
Sabhrūbhaṅgprahitanayanaiḥ kāmīlakṣyeshv amoghais-
tasyārambhaś caturavanitāvibhramair eva siddhaḥ | |

(*Pārsvābhyudaya, III. 11*).

This presents a new attitude towards poetry as such and gives for the first time an unqualified importance to religious instruction as the foremost concern of poetry. Although Bhāmaha and other

Hindu theorists had allowed some room for ethical instruction incidentally in poetry, the general Hindu attitude is represented by the clear-cut statement in the *Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa* :

Dharmārthakāmamokṣāṇām

Śāstraṁ syād upadeśakam |

Tad eva kāvyam ity uktam

Copadesam vinā kṛtam || (Ch. XV. 1-2).

The dividing line between *śāstra* and *kāvya* was thus none other than *upadeśa* or ethical instruction. The Hindu theorists stood for secular poetry, while the Jainā theorists, like the Buddhists, pleaded strongly for a new tradition of religious and ethical poetry. In practice too, we find that almost all the Jaina literature in Sanskrit, Prakrit and old Kannada, is more religious than secular. This new tradition of pure religious classical literature left its strong influence on later development of vernacular literatures.

II. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Nṛpatunga (9th century A.D.) is credited with the authorship of the first work on poetics in old Kannada, the *Kavirājamārga*. The work is more or less a free adaptation of Bhāmaha's *Kāvyalaṅkāra* and, much more, of Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*. But it begins with *Jinastuti* and has some unique ideas, not found in Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. His definition of poetry, for instance, takes us beyond the words of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin to the *bhāva* of the poet on the one hand and to the *viśeṣa* of *śabdās* as well as *alaṅkāras* relating to *arthavyakti*.

Kavibhāvakṛtāneka —

pravibhāgaviviktasūktamārgam kāvyam |

saviśeṣaśabdaracanam

vividhārthavyaktivartitālaṅkāram ||

What is still more interesting is his treatment of *mārgas* and their *guṇas* in relation to particular *rasas*, a fact not found either in Bhāmaha or Daṇḍin. More surprising is his nomenclature of the pathetic sentiment as *karuṇarasa* in place of the usual *karuṇarasa*. Nṛpatunga realises for the first time that *mārgas* are dependent on *rasa*. There is no clue in the book that he had read Rudraṭa or

Ānandavardhana. Hence all the more reason that Nṛpatunga should get the credit for this progressive doctrine :

*Bagedu m̄rgadvitayamaṁ gatigalaṁ
Praguṇa-guṇagaṇodayarkaḷ vitarkadiṁ |
Sogayisuvantu vacanaracaneyiṁ
Negaḷdire berasi peḷge rasaviśeṣadoḷ || (II. 98).*

*Vīraraṣaṁ sphuṭoktiyinudāratamaṁ karuṇārasaṁ m̄ḍū—
ccāraṇeyindamaobhutarasaṁ nibiḍoktiḡaḷindamalte sṛ—
ṅgārasaṁ samantu sukumārataroktiḡaḷiṁ prasannagam—
bhīrataroktiyiṁ prakāṣamakke rasaṁ satataṁ
praśāntamuṁ. (II. 99).*

*utsavadinde hāsyarasaṁ madhuroktiḡaḷindamalte bī—
bhatsarasaṁtaraṁ śithilabandhanadiṁ satataṁ bhayānako—
dyatsurasaṁ karaṁ viṣamabandhanadiṁ nṛpatungadeva-mā
rgotsavamūrjitoktiḡaḷinakkati-raudrarasaṁ rasāvaham.
(II. 100).*

‘ After considering carefully the procedure of the two *mārgas*, the poet should so compose his work that it will give the impression of beauty to learned critics. And he should select each of them in tune with particular *rasas* as indicated below.

The *guṇas* of *sphuṭatā* and *udāratā* are appropriate for *vīraraṣa*, *M̄ḍutā* suits *karuṇārasa* most, and compactness (*sleṣa*) is best for *adbhuta*, *sukumārata* is suited for *śṅgāra*; *praśāda* and *gāmbhīrya* go well with the delineation of *praśānta*.

Utsava is the occasion for the *hāsyarasa* wherein *Madhurokti* preponderates; *śithilabandha* favours *bībhatsarasa*; *viṣamabandha* is helpful in *bhayānaka*. *Ūrjitokti* is best suited for *raudrarasa*’.

We cannot dismiss his *karuṇārasa* as a scribal variation of *karuṇārasa*. For, the example cited by him describes the *virahotkaṇṭhā* of the heroine and the hero is called upon to show pity on her (III. 191). The *sthāyibhāva* involved here is *karuṇā* or *dayā* (pity) as against *śoka* or suffering.

An even more intriguing tenet of Nṛpatunga is his reference to *dhvani* as an *alaṅkāra* and his description of it as 'based on *śabda* though defective in *artha*'. His illustration of it is as follows: "A pair of *animiṣas* (fish) is shining in the lotus. What a wonder!" The original is as follows:—

Dhvaniyembudalaṅkāraṁ

Dhvaniyisugum śabdadinamarthade dāṣyaṁ |

Nenevudidanintu kamalado—

ḷaṇimiṣayugamoppi torpuḍintidu codyaṁ || (III. 208).

This reference is of unique interest to scholars because it shows an awareness of *dhvani* as a poetical concept in far off Karnatak even before the *Dhvanyalōka* reached that remote province from Kashmir. It provides an uncontestable proof to the fact that *dhvani* was *samāmnātaparva* among literary theorists even before Ānandavardhana. Of course his idea of it is too hazy and mistaken to be considered seriously.

III. The next old Kannada theorists is also a Jaina. He is Nāgavarma II, the author of the *Kāvyāvalokana* (Circa, 11th Century A.D.). Though he expressly acknowledges his indebtedness to Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Vāmana and Rudraṭa, he has some new points of his own to add. His definition of poetry and idea of *śabda* and *artha* are unique:—

Ire śabdārthaṅgaḷ ta—

Tparateyinadu kāvyamadaroḷucitaikārthān |

Taravāci śabdamaṅgala—

Sarupamahlādakāriyappudarthum ||

None of the early Sanskrit, theorists explain the nature of *śāhitya*, the unique relation of *śabda* and *artha* in poetry. Nāgavarma explains for the first time that it is *tatparatā* or exclusive aesthetic concern. Regarding the nature of *śabda*, again unique to poetry, none of the early Sanskrit theorists tell us anything important, including Rudraṭa who is the model for Nāgavarma. They just mention that it should be meaningful, and without defects besides possessing excellences. The principle underlying the avoidance of defects or the inclusion of excellences goes unexplained. But Nāgavarma rightly points out that *aucitya* or propriety is the underlying principle of all literary usage of words. He regards

artha again in aesthetic terms by characterising it as *āhlādakāri* in so many words. His addition that *artha* is *avabhāsarūpa* hints at his new philosophy of poetry comparable with the theory of *vaiyākaraṇas* that *pratibhā* is *vākyārtha*. (The word 'arthāntara' in the verse cited above does not mean 'another meaning'; it means 'one single meaning' like the word 'śabdāntara' used in his definition of śabdāsleṣa). There is absolutely no trace of Nāgavarma's familiarity with Navya *ālankārikas*. Hence his ideas become doubly important. He does not refer to *dhvani*.

Another outstanding contribution of Nāgavarma to Indian poetics is his characterisation of *rīti* as the *śarīra* or body of poetry and *rasa* as the *Jīva* or its life-breath. He adds significantly that though there may be no *ālankāras*, so highly praised by the learned, the infusion of *rītis* and profusion of *rasas* will make a composition very enjoyable :

Rīti vinātavastukṛtigoppuva mai rasabhāvavṛtti-ni—
Rnītivye jīvamantadarinanyitanappa kavīśvaram budha |
Vrātamoraldu biccaḷisi naccuvalaṅkṛti kūdadirdodaṁ
Rītiyoḷonde peḷvudu rasam biḷe bandhurakāvyabandhamam ||

This is indeed a new synthesis brought about for the first time between *rīti* and *rasa* even in the absence of a knowledge of *dhvani*.

IV. We might now turn to Jaina writers on Sanskrit poetics. These have been discussed in detail by modern scholars and do not therefore need any introduction. The first place among these is reserved for Hemachandra, whose *Kāvyañuśāsana* with his own commentary is noteworthy for more reasons than one. Though modelled after the *Kāvyaṅprakāśana*, his brilliant text-book covers all the topics of poetics thoroughly. This is the first book to include dramatic theory in its purview and sets and example to later writers like Viśvanātha and Vidyānātha. Hemachandra has also often quoted *in extenso* from old works which are now lost, like Bhaṭṭatauta's *Kāvyaakautuka* and Lollaṭa's commentary on *Nātyaśāstra*. Sometimes he gives reference to sources not available to us elsewhere. For example, the verse *Lāvanyadraviṇavyayo...* is cited by Ānandavardhana as a most likely composition of Dharmakīrti. Even Abhinavagupta does not explain in his *Locana* regarding the exact work of Dharmakīrti in question. But Hema-

chandra tells us that it is from the concluding portion of *vinīścayavṛtti* by Dharmakīrti :—

Tathā cāyaṃ vinīścayavṛtityante

Dharmakīrtyaścāryasya śloka iti prasiddhiḥ |

(VI. under *Anyokti*).

In his treatment of *alaṅkāras* as well as *dhvani*, he often cites new examples not found in Mammaṭa and Ānandavardhana.

The next Jaina writer deserving our notice is Vāgbhata I. (12th century A.D.). He follows in the main the older tradition of poetics, and brings about a synthesis like Nāgavarma between all the well known concepts viz., *guṇa*, *alaṅkāra*, *rīti* and *rasa*. His whole book is written in verse like the *Kāvyaḍarsa* and often the first line of his *śloka* forms the definition and the second line, its illustration. It was so famous as a convenient text-book that Mallinātha in his commentary over *Raghuvamśa* etc., has often referred to him. One speciality of the book is, however, the lengthy treatment of *kavisikṣā*.

Vāgbhata II hailing from Mewar (also 12th century A.D.) has also called his work by the name *Kāvyanuśāśana*. But this work is a very short one when compared with Hemachandra's. It deals at length with *kavisamayās* and *kavisikṣā* exercises. One most interesting feature of the book is his illustrations for *Kāvya-doṣas* which are taken from popular *Mahākavis*. e.g. “*dilīpa iti rājenduv induh kṣīranidhāv iva*” (*Raghuvamśa*) illustrates the defect *punarukta* “*mātsaryamutsārya vicārya kāryam...*” (Bhartṛhari) illustrates *sandigdha*. He is aware of Ānandavardhana and refers to him for details about *dhvani*; yet he brings under *paryāyokta* all the varieties of *vastudhvani*. He even gives examples, not found in any other work, on *dhvani*. Its brevity is its chief merit.

The *Kāvya-kalpalatāvṛtti* by Arisimha (14th century A.D.) is a work out-and-out on *kavisikṣā*, dealing with Sanskrit poetic composition as a mechanical craft which could be taught. Its four chapters are devoted to the topics of *Chandassiddhi*, *śabadasiddhi*, *ślesasiddhi* and *arthasiddhi*. We get interesting details here of the tuition offered: e.g., (1) practice of *Indravajrā* metre with one syllable—

Kākā kakakā kakakā kakākā

Kīkī kikīkī kikīkī kikīkī |

Kūkū kukūkū kukūkū kukūkū

Kaṁkaṁ kakaṁkaṁ kakakaṁ kakaṁkaṁ | | (I. 2)

(2) a specimen of *samasyāpurāṇa* :—

Kastūrī jāyate kasmāt
Ko hanti karīṇām kulām |
Kim kuryāt kataro yuddhe
Mṛgāt śimhaḥ palāyate ||

The *Alaṅkāra-mahodadhī* of Maladhāri Narendraprabha, produced in the court of Vastupāla, is a comprehensive text-book on all aspects of Sanskrit poetics with copious standard illustrations. He sometimes adds to the varieties of well known concepts. For example, he gives for the first time the following new sub-varieties of *vr̥tṭyanuprāsa* :—*Karṇāṭī*, *Kauntalī*, *Kauṅgi*, *Kauṅkaṇī*, *Vāna-vāsikā*, *Trāvaṇī*, *Māthurī*, *Mātsī* and *Māgadhī*.

The *Nātyadarpaṇa* by Ramachandra and Guṇachandra is a standard work on dramaturgy. It gives a novel view of *rasa* that it is *sukha-duḥkhātmaka* and controverts the usual thesis that all *rasa* including *karuṇa* is *ānandātmaka*.

The *Alaṅkāracintāmaṇi* by Ajitasena is a late work from an author hailing from South Kanara district of the present Mysore State. It is influenced very much by the *Pratāparudrīya* of Vidyānātha. Like the *Pratāparudrīya*, all its examples are in praise of Bharata cakravartī. It abounds in details relating to *citra-kāvya* varieties.

For further Jaina writers on Sanskrit poetics, I should refer the interested scholars to a very informative article in Hindi by Pandit Amrutlal Shastri on Jaina Alankara Sahitya published in the Acharya Bhikshu Smṛiti Grantha, Jaina Shvetambara Terapanthi Mahasabha, Calcutta, 1961, Vol. pp. 199 ff.

V. It will be seen even from the above brief survey how the Jaina contribution to Indian poetics is substantial, qualitatively as well as quantitatively. They have not merely given compilations of earlier material. They have added their own thoughts also. It is mainly in this field that the Jaina contribution has succeeded in transcending the narrow boundaries of religion and becoming the common property of Indians at large.

Department of Sanskrit,
 Karnatak University,
 Dharwar.

K. Krishnamoorthy