

SŁAWOMIR CIEŚLIKOWSKI

Łódź

ON SOME CORRESPONDENCES BETWEEN THE SANSKRIT  
AND EUROPEAN THEORY OF LITERATURE

## INTRODUCTION

The importance of the Sanskrit theory of Word and the literary text far exceeds the limits of its time, space and direct thematic scope. The almost two thousand-year-old history of the Sanskrit theory of literature begins with the still preserved work of Bharata. However, taking into consideration the first presentations known to us—dealing either with general problems such as those of the word, the sentence and their nature or with more particular details, as some tropes—at least another thousand years should be added to this period.

Besides: the achievements of the literary theory in India are strongly connected with other disciplines, first of all with logic and linguistics; they refer not only to Sanskrit and old related languages but also to other natural languages thus suggesting a comparative and synthetic approach.

Since the present paper will have to include a considerable number of banal statements and observations very commonly known in the Hindu and European culture it seems worth-while to insert the author's own opinions into the whole presentation arranged according to the divisions typical of the *alaṃkāraśāstra*<sup>1</sup> focussing the main attention on the formal ways of formulating those problems which are usually<sup>2</sup> treated as parallel

<sup>1</sup> Being chronological this division is not typical of Hindu tradition. A problem appears of whether the Sanskrit literary theories should be given the name of the study of tropes and figures (*alaṃkāra* means a figure, trope) or another name, for example, *kāvyaśāstra*—a term closer to the notion of literary theory. Being most generally accepted, the former term seems more justified. However, taking into consideration European terminology we would use "literary theory" rather than "rhetoric", "stylistics" etc., first of all because almost every Hindu author of *alaṃkāraśāstra* dealt with more than one discipline of literary theory. Besides, such partial treatment would be pejorative as well as humorous to the same extent as the application of the term "grammarian" to the achievement of Pāṇini, Bopp, Baudouin de Courtenay, or Chomsky.

<sup>2</sup> Even in the works of contemporary Hindu theoreticians and historians of literature.



to European theories, although it seems that noticing parallels does not exhaust the whole problem.

## 1. SOME HISTORY

The centuries long lack of interest of the Hindus in the systematics of their history is generally known. Chinese and European scholars dealt with those problems earlier and more precisely and thoroughly than the Hindus themselves, although many important problems have not been solved such as the problem of dating not only the authors of poetics but even significant historical facts. One may mention here the controversy concerning the dates of Kaniška's reign, a ruler of the Kushan dynasty<sup>3</sup> who ruled over a territory larger than France, G.F.R., G.D.R., Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria and Switzerland together. Some authors place this dynasty between 30 A.D. and  $\pm 220$  A.D.; for others the dates of Kaniška's reign oscillate between 58 B.C. and 288 A.D. Nowadays he is placed either in 78 A.D. or in 144 A.D. In the light of such divergencies the difference of five year oscillations concerning the dates of birth and death of Buddha and Jina<sup>4</sup> seems really very slight.

### A

a) More significant divergencies appear in the dating of literary texts and determining the dates of birth and death of the authors of *alaṃkāraśāstra*. For instance, the dates of Bharata's life oscillate for four centuries—between the 2nd c. B.C. and the 2nd c. A.D. This example being particularly striking, still divergencies mounting up to two centuries, not to mention one century, are quite frequent.

The widely developed comparative studies, extremely precise in determining the sequences of events, are only relatively useful in the case of basic doubts concerning the dates of facts which constitute the final reference.

b) It is not surprising then, that the first entirely theoretical texts, associated with the 5th—8th c. A.D. are still waiting to be arranged into a sequence and placed in precise time. According to the Hindu tradition the first work was that by Bhāmaha<sup>5</sup>. Attempts at dating, however,

<sup>3</sup> The Kushan dynasty (or two dynasties?) embraces the reign of at least seven kings: two Kadphises (grandfather and grandson), Vajēška, Kañiška, Huviška and Va-  
śiška.

<sup>4</sup> It is enough to compare *The Oxford History of India* or *The Wonder That Was India* by A. L. Basham with *A Survey of Indian History* by K. M. Pannikar or with the works of Mrs. J. Auboyer, not to mention various papers on more detailed aspects, as particular persons, dynasties or countries.

<sup>5</sup> As far as its significance and influence are concerned, Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* equals the poetics and rhetoric of Aristotle.



show that he lived later than Kālidāsa but certainly earlier than Vāmana and Dhavanikāra from the 8th c.<sup>6</sup> The most convincing dating places Bhāmaha in the 7th c. This, however, presents further difficulty since Daṇḍin is another candidate. The Hindu tradition places him after Bhāmaha, yet according to the most convincing arguments he belonged to the 6th c. A.D.<sup>7</sup> The information concerning Bhāmaha's text complicates the matter even more since it appears that some quotations from his work do not exist in the preserved text. Still another complication is caused by the doubts of whether Daṇḍin's text is, and, in the case it is, to what an extent, a discussion with Bhāmaha's opinions on *hetu*.<sup>8</sup> The above controversies, doubts, and discussions may make it completely impossible to define a period of a writer's life. We might presume that all the disputants are wrong but we might just as well presume that they are right, for instance, as far as the details are concerned, and that their conclusions are too far-fetched when confronted with their premises. Such view is supported by the reading and analysis of *Kāvyaadarśa* and *Kāvyaalāmkāra*. The author of the present paper considers extreme dating an exaggeration. We should thus limit ourselves to accept in most cases the 6th and 7th c. Besides, it is known that Bhāmaha, a Buddhist, lived in Kashmir, that Daṇḍin, a Shivaite, wrote on the court of the Pallaves in Kāñci (near modern Madras). A third supposition usually omitted

<sup>6</sup> It is not certain whether he was a teacher of Ānandavardhana or a fictitious person created by him. Kālidāsa also presents problems: it has been generally accepted that he lived in the second half of the 5th c. A. D. but for some Hindu authors he was a contemporary of king Vikramāditya, but not the great ruler of the Gupta dynasty who lived at the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th c. but the one whose reign marked a new era in India, the so-called Vikrama era which began in 56 or 58 B. C. However, the same name belonged to a small ruler from the 2nd c. A. D. at whose court Kālidāsa might have lived.

<sup>7</sup> Recently A. K. Warden and E. N. Tiomkin in well documented papers have supported the idea of Bhāmaha being the first one. According to P. V. Kane Daṇḍin was the first, although Kane places him in the 7th c. A. D. Other attempts at clarifying this problem by suggesting that some authors had later namesakes seem not very convincing; argumentation that Daṇḍin argues with his predecessor Bhāmaha seems reasonable, but, on the other hand, a further part of Bhāmaha's text seems to be an answer to Daṇḍin.

<sup>8</sup> One of the five components of the Hindu syllogism is called a cause: *hetu*. The same name refers to one of the tropes which differs from the component of the syllogism in a way analogous to that in which the European equivocation in logic differs from that in poetics—in logic it is an error, in poetry and poetics—a trope of rather positive character. E. N. Tiomkin's *Mirovozerenie Bhamahi* is written from the point of view of the analysis of Book V of Bhāmaha's treatise; the author compares it with Book IV of the Madras edition of Daṇḍin's treatise (Book III, ed. O. Böhtlingk). Daṇḍin's corresponding fragment shows that the fragment of the last Book might have been an answer to Book V of Bhāmaha's treatise. Tiomkin, however, does not take into consideration Book II of *The Mirror of Poetry* where a fragment dealing with the *hetu* trope (II 235–259) seems to have provoked Bhāmaha's discussion.



yet no less probable, might suggest that both the authors were more or less contemporary. This would explain the anonymous discussion between them as well as the differences in the applied logical systems. It also seems that Bhāmaha's work, though begun a bit earlier than that of Daṇḍin was finished after the completion of the third book but before that of the fourth book of *Kāvyaḍarśa*.<sup>9</sup> In this way the question of whether both the writers lived in the 6th or in the 7th c. A.D. would remain unsolved, but such an answer requires quite new, substantial arguments.

c) Beginning with the 9th c. the dating is more certain, the oscillations smaller, and from the 12th c. on we can even talk of a relatively strong exactness of dates. The total number of 150 authors of treatises on literary theory can be grouped as follows: 7th—4th c. B.C.—the beginnings; 2nd c. B.C.—2nd c. A.D.—Bharata; 6th—11th c. A.D.—founders of main schools and their oldest commentators (the latest dating—Kuntaka); 12th—15th c. A.D. (from Hemacandra to Jayadeva and Viśvanātha)—the main flourishing; and from the 18th c. till Appayyadīkṣita—an output most strongly resembling the baroque-rococo continuation and completion of earlier systems.<sup>10</sup> We must then stress the following facts: the first authors to appear are Hindu—Yāska and Pāṇini, i.e. linguists who also considered many elements of literary theory. The period of Pāṇini is at

<sup>9</sup> None of the arguments—beginning with those of O. Böhtlingk and H. Jacobi—refers to the generally respected custom, formulated *expressis verbis* by Rājaśekhara, according to which a discussion by name with living authors was considered improper. One might only argue anonymously with their ideas. We should also consider that it is not very probable that both the works were written “at once,” within a short time; they were rather being written during a longer period. Such assumption is additionally supported by the compositional precision of particular Books and their fragments and by the poetic precision of exemplifications. So, those books might have been being written during many years. We could thus presume that the author of the *alaṃkāra* theory wrote the basic part of this concept earlier while the author of the *mārga* theory (i.e. Daṇḍin) wrote afterwards his first part as well as changed his second part on the *alaṃkāras*; Bhāmaha's Book V might have been an answer to this; this answer, in turn, was commented upon in the last Book (Book IV in the Madras edition) of Daṇḍin's work. A detailed analysis of both the texts with respect to this problem would by far exceed the limits of a footnote and the scope of the present paper. The conclusion that neither Bhāmaha nor Daṇḍin was absolutely first seems easy. It would also justify the (probably only apparently) unsolvable, a century old, controversy among the scholars.

<sup>10</sup> Such division follows, in fact, the chronology given by the main historians of Hindu literature and its theory, as, for instance: S. K. De, *Studies in the History of Sanskrit Poetics*, 1925 and 1960; P. V. Kane, *The History of Sanskrit Poetics*, 1923 and 1961. The author of the present paper has prepared a synchronic table of the most important authors of Hindu studies in literary theory showing their approximate dates confronted with the authors of the most important European concepts as well as with the basic dates of the political and cultural history of India and Europe. The limited length of the article as well as the small size of its pages make it impossible to include this table here—hence this short information is at least inserted within the text.



the same time the Golden Age of Greek culture. Thus such representatives of Greek rhetoric as Koraks and Teisias are his contemporaries, while Aristotle and Isocrates are younger. Next, between the extreme dates of Bharata the lives of Horace, Cicero and Quintilian can be placed. The greatest flourishing of the Greek and Latin poetics and rhetoric takes place during those centuries when in India no mention of new treatises on literary theory is to be found. Not earlier than after the fall of the Western Empire and the decline of the Roman culture in Western Europe the Byzantine rhetoric and poetics flourish and all the main schools of literary theory are founded in India.

## B

a) The first European and Hindu correspondences should be mentioned here. The first to suggest a solution to this problem was A. Gawroński and later, independantly of Gawroński, S. Konov<sup>11</sup> who did it with respect to the theatre and its theory, that is, also with respect to Bharata. To put it shortly: the development of poetics within both the cultures was independent. Finding an influence of the Greek and Bactrian fine arts on the art of Gandhara is not an argument sufficient to prove that European rhetoric influenced Hindu literary theory to the same extent as the influence of wandering Hindu philosophers on the Pythagoreans and Diogenes<sup>12</sup> does not inform us about the Hindu influence on the Greek and Roman linguistics and literary theory.

The development of trade between Europe and India which lasted from the early hellenistic period till the Early Middle Ages might justify the ascertainment of mutual influences; however, it was during that very time that the fundamental divergencies were formed, and the reading of the main treatises points to two completely independent lines of literary theory heritage within the two cultures. Thus, the concept of RASA and DHVANI found no resonance and evoked no emotion in Europe and, similarly, the theory of MIMESIS not only found no imitation in India, but even when Śāṅkuka mentioned the theory of imitation the most eminent Hindu literary theoreticians and philosophers immediately proved that neither the literary work itself nor the process going on in the reader during its reception, and, analogously for the the-

<sup>11</sup> A. Gawroński: *The Origin of the Indian Drama and the Question of Greek Influence*, 1916 (a MS the full text of which was published in 1946 as *Początki dramatu indyjskiego a sprawa wpływów greckich*); *Quelques observations sur le rôle du temps et du lieu dans le théâtre indien*, [in:] *Księga pamiątkowa ku czci O. Balcera*, vol. I, 1925; S. Konov, *Das indische Drama*, 1920; A. B. Keith, *The Sanskrit Drama in Its Origin, Development, Theory and Practice*, 1924.

<sup>12</sup> According to the Pythagorean concept mimesis was understood as expressing emotions.



atre—neither what was happening to the actor nor what was going on in the actor—was or could ever be an imitation.

The independence of the developments within stylistics and the theory of tropes would be more difficult to prove if not for the fact that in each of the two cultures slightly different problems were raised, particularly in stylistics, and slightly different aspects were stressed. In India, unlike Europe, we notice the characteristic connection between the MĀRGA-RĪTI and the RASA theory and, on the other hand, the search for the essence (SPHOTA) of the word and sentence by means of sound.

The problem of the theory of tropes and figures is also obvious: it is here that we can most clearly see the transformations of earlier native achievements of both cultures, the characteristic poetic images going back to the earliest great works: to the *Vedas* and to the centuries older *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

Continuing this concise review we must also note the striking contrast between the poor European Middle Ages and the richness of contemporary Hindu theories; later, in the 15th—18th c. we see a relative balance in this respect, and finally, during the last three hundred years a great flourishing of literary theory concepts in Europe contrasts with relatively poor achievements in India.

b) India did not try to discover the West. Its interest was directed to the East, the North and the South. This is documented not by political invasion but by the flow of the rivers of culture. Buddhism moved to the North—it invaded Tibet, reached China and Japan. Hinduism flowed to the South—through Sri Lanka, Burma, Cambodia, Siam it reached as far as Indonesia. Both religions were accompanied by art. Sculpture and temples in the above countries illustrated the content of the Jātakas and Rāmāyana.

India did not try to discover the West. It was the West that was discovering India. From the West there came the Aryans, the Persians, the Greeks. From the West—the Arabs, the Portuguese, the French, and the English.

The renaissance of the ancient culture in Europe saw also the beginnings as well as the hurricane-like development of political expansion.

For Western Europe the age of the Enlightenment was the age of gradual conquering of India; for the whole Europe—the vogue for everything Oriental: Turkish coffee, Persian carpets, Bengal lights, Chinese tea and Japanese gardens.

The age of conquering India was the age of fascination with Indian riches and Chinese etiquette. And with philosophy. First of all with philosophy—its uniqueness, mysticism and mystery. It was the age of the Enlightenment and the realization that: *ex Oriente lux*. At this very time, through language and linguistics, Europe became aware of its links with India.



In the rationalistic 18th c., thanks to such great scholars and translators as Jones, Colebrooke, and later Bopp and others, Europe became prepared for the Goethean raptures over Shakuntala, for the Romantic enchantment with the Orient.

## 2. RASA

### A

a) It is generally known that the Hindu authors of classical treatises on literary theory were not interested in the search for the essence of beauty. They were aware that literary works were artificial and arbitrary; they also realized the power of the word. Already Bharata, who, we may presume on the basis of *Nāṭyaśāstra*, was not the first one, was conscious of the subjectivity of aesthetic experience and he distinguished between sentiments, emotions and other feelings which could, for the sake of clarity, be called direct emotions and indirect ones arising in the readers, that is, aesthetic experiences. His famous quotation:

vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicārisamyogād rasa niṣpattih

[stimuli, congruent behavioural features and ancillary emotional reactions — combined together evoke the RASA]

was responsible for the majority of Hindu authors concentrating upon the ways of appealing to the reader and spectator by means of a work of art. To use, for the sake of simplification, more or less corresponding modern terminology, the RASA refers to and analyzes the literary work — reader relation while the DHVANI theory deals with the means of conveying the writer's intentions. And although during the first period of the emergence of literary theory treatises the problem of the RASA was not always in the very center of interest,<sup>13</sup> from Abhinavagupta on almost every eminent theoretician tried to contribute to the RASA developing, specifying and complementing it. And even if representatives of different schools would sometimes disagree — still Hindu poetics remained till the 18th c. with the RASA theory which chose art (poetry and theatre) as a uniquely specific sphere of human behaviour which was neither a reflection of subjective experience nor an objective presentation, but a means of evoking sentiments, etc.

<sup>13</sup> For instance, Dandin treats the RASA as a factor enabling the formation of a poetic figure which he calls *rasavat*; giving priority to VAKROKTI Kuntaka questions the RASA maintaining that it is totally included in his theory which is a better means of accounting for the appeal of poetry. For Ānandavardhana the RASA was fundamental for poetry although not to such an extent as the DHVANI — the soul of poetry.



b) It has been certified that the word RASA (literal meaning—taste) has existed for at least thirty hundred years. It can be already found in the *Vedas*, for instance, in some hymns of Atharvaveda<sup>14</sup> where it signifies the life-giving juice of plants. Later, through texts on physiology, i.e., the medical and culinary art, RASA comes to denote the sense of taste both in the literal (palate) and figurative meaning. However, theoretical texts only very slightly refer to the physiological meanings<sup>15</sup> which might serve as examples of applying the idea of taste to aesthetic experiences. It should be noted here that RASA as taste—aesthetic experience—was in India understood in a slightly different way than in Europe where it was generally interpreted after Schücking as the aesthetic education. It referred not to one's intellectual capacity but to emotional elements of quite specific intellectualized character. We might say that it did not mean an intellectually fully satisfying response to intellectual stimuli but an intellectually processed emotional response to emotional stimuli.<sup>16</sup>

c) Presenting the RASA theory we must first stress that aesthetic experience can take place only as a result of a material cause. Such material cause is provided by a work of art being received (read, heard, seen) at a given moment.<sup>17</sup>

A literary work consists of a number of letters and sounds arranged into words and sentences understood by the reader. The text appeals to the reader in two ways: as a complex of stimuli (*vibhāva*)—for the eye and for the ear (letters and sounds) and as a number of images provoked by the figurative meaning (*anubhāva*) of received words and sentences. The received images do not refer directly to the reader<sup>18</sup> but they stir in him some past but still inherent experiences (*bhāva*). The experiences thus stirred enter the reader's consciousness encountering a conscious concept of the meaning contained in the literary text. Both complexes

<sup>14</sup> For example;

AV. III. 31. 10: udāyusā samāyusodoṣadhīnām rasena...

III. 13. 5 : tīvro rasa maghūpreāmaramāgama...

X. 8. 44: akāmo ghīro amrtah svayambhū rasena...

<sup>15</sup> Two texts could be quoted here: Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* and Rājaśekhara's *Kāvyamīmāṃsa*.

<sup>16</sup> Constituting the most specific feature of Hindu literary theory the RASA has been studied by many European scholars as well as by contemporary Hindu writers who have produced many thorough works enabling European readers to get acquainted with this concept. For example, in French: S. C. Mukerjee, *Le RASA, essai sur l'Esthétique Indienne*, 1926; in English it would be impossible to mention even the main ones, such as the already mentioned S. K. De or K. Chaitanya with his comparative study *Sanskrit Poetics*, 1965.

<sup>17</sup> Whether it also being remembered and imagined—is another problem.

<sup>18</sup> It is the problem of the psychic association mechanisms in bringing out meanings hidden in the subconsciousness. It is worth mentioning here that the basis of C. G. Jung's psychology is a specific mixture of Freud's and Hindu concepts.



of experiences (the reader's own and the "text's") are first differently oriented (towards the reader's experience and towards that of the lyrical character), which results in some weakening of their impact. At the same moment both of them as if merge into one whole of generalized, supra-personal character. Devoid of the sharpness of individual orientation they are easier to assimilate the richness of corresponding sound and rhythm values as well as the richness of imagery; in this way they are transformed into aesthetic experience which, in the case of really great literature, may become particularly intensified and pass into aesthetic rapture (*camatkāra*).

Such is, in the light of the RASA the origin of aesthetic experience which, in this sense, would be only a vessel, a form to be filled by different values. We must admit here that the ability to perceive in the RASA one form for various contents can only fill one with admiration for the deep insight of the early Hindu scholars. With the same admiration we approach their ability to distinguish a comparatively small number of primary values which can fill the vessel of aesthetic experience. It is even more astonishing that, thanks to a peculiar analytical procedure, the Hindu theoreticians of literature and theatre distinguished several primary tastes<sup>19</sup> each of them being "capable of filling up the work" while others, if present, served only as a complement "breaking down" the primary taste. Very important, though not essential, for the present considerations, is such systematization of all kinds of aesthetic sensations which, by respecting either opposite or secondary pairs of sensations makes structuralization of the main values possible. Including here the so-called accompanying sensations (*vyabhicāribhāva*)—33 are usually mentioned—we might receive a list of categories much richer than that by Volkelt, although not exceeding the framework of several Standard (primary) aesthetic categories. Leaving aside the discussion concerning the number of these categories<sup>20</sup> and taking into consideration the most popular order, derivation (→) and opposition (↔) we could suggest the following "Standard" of primary sensations (*bhāva*) and their corresponding aesthetic experiences (*rasa*):

<sup>19</sup> It seems that the Sanskrit names of primary sensations cannot be always translated univocally; the scope of many terms is slightly broader than that of their European equivalents. Thus: *rati*—love, *hasa*—joy, but also irony, gaiety, merriment; *krodha*—anger, fury; *utsāha*—courage, but also strength, power, heroism; *bhaya*—fear, terror, awe; *jugupsā*—disgust, but also horror, abomination; *vismaya*—wonder, but also amazement, fascination, enchantment; *śoka*—pity, but also grief, sadness, sorrow.

<sup>20</sup> Besides the already mentioned authors see also: M. Lindenau, *Rasa Lehre*, 1913; V. Raghavan, *The Number of Rasa*, 1940; K. Krishnamoorthy, *Rasa as a Canon of Literary Criticism*, 1959; M. K. Byrski, "Smak" *Brahmy i "smak" Buddhy*, "Studia Filozoficzne", 1970.







Poetry was made accessible by translations, for instance, of *Shakuntala*, whose English version appeared in 1789, the German one in 1791. The fascination with the Orient and the discovery of "Oriental wisdom" was reflected in the violently growing interest of scholars who were followed by a considerable part of intellectual élite in Great Britain, Germany, Poland, France, and later also in other European countries. This interest concerned first of all what seemed most essential: the value of emotions, the search for all that was oldest and preserved in its most primitive form, i.e., folklore, search for what people would believe in, that is, for everything mysterious and marvellous. It is enough to mention here A. W. Schlegel's lectures, Goethe's words and some earlier, also Oriental, sources of the concepts of human nature.

It seems to us that, except for orientalists,<sup>22</sup> too few scholars dealt with the problem of Hindu inspiration of Romanticism as reflected in the works of Europe's greatest writers,<sup>23</sup> and seen also in the influence of, for instance, *Pañcatantra* on European fables. The transmitters of a broadly understood Indianism were the English and the Germans. Separated from India by a great physical distance the Germans found, in their own peculiar way, spiritual affinities with India: first, they accepted the closest linguistic relation, calling, erroneously, Indo-European languages—Indo-German languages. Next, they found relations between the old German religious beliefs and some Hindu beliefs. Having established the sense of affinity with India they started systematic research crowned by magnificent results.<sup>24</sup> The British were in a slightly different situation: having conquered and incorporated India they were closer physically. The commercial, military and political contacts between India and Great Britain were intermingled, in the lives of scholars and writers, with cultural contacts, so that beginning with the works of Whitney we can talk of mutual penetration of cultural phenomena of these two countries. This penetration grew much stronger as soon as Hindu scholars started to write in English—first in India, and next in Great Britain. Such situation

<sup>22</sup> Cf. J. Tuczyński, *Indianizm w romantyzmie polskim*, also Bibliography, [in:] *Wschód w literaturze polskiej*, ed. J. Rejchman, 1970.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. J. W. Goethe's *Faust*, works by J. Słowacki (*Kordian*), A. Mickiewicz, C. K. Norwid. See also Tuczyński, *op. cit.*; *Wschód...*

<sup>24</sup> A few names should suffice to show the great achievements of the 19th century: Schlegel brothers, one of whom was a lecturer on Sanskrit, the other—a lecturer on, among other subjects, the culture and fine arts of India; F. Rückert—not only an excellent poet and translator of Hindu literature (*Atharvaveda*, *Jayadeva*) but also an expert on Oriental poetics—Persian (to which he devoted a comprehensive work) and Hindu. Next, O. Böhtlingk, W. Stenzler, R. Pischel, G. Bühler, H. Jacobi. We could also mention many other linguists, philosophers, aestheticians, and authors of many concepts which owed much to the just mentioned works by Hindu literary theoreticians. Max Müller should be discussed separately not only because of his great contribution to the world Hindu studies, but also because, living in Great Britain and writing in English, he belongs to the English as well as German culture.



made it more difficult to study the influence of Hindu culture on the English speaking writers and scholars—citizens of the Empire and the United States—the more so that they would often unconsciously assimilate what was only an anglicized import from India.<sup>25</sup>

In earlier periods, that is, until the end of the 18th c. Poland, thanks to her power and political role, had close diplomatic and commercial contacts with the Eastern neighbours of the Ottoman Empire. This was reflected in the customs and, to a smaller extent, in culture. For instance, *Bhagavadgītā* was translated into Polish as early as in the 16th c.<sup>26</sup> In the 19th c. Poland, partitioned between the Russian, Prussian and Austrian Empires, had to share her knowledge of India with the invaders. Yet, in spite of many limitations and political obstacles not only information of the language (Sanskrit grammar in 1828) but also of literature and philosophy<sup>27</sup> as well as of many European achievements was brought to Poland.

b) The situation in other countries was similar. The knowledge about the Orient, including India, grew greater and greater throughout the whole 19th c., and it culminated in a second strong wave at the end of the century. Europe already knew in original versions as well as in translations (not only English, German, Polish or French) works by Hindu linguists: Pāṇini, Patañjali, Bhartrihari; it also knew the *Vedas* and the two great epics, works by Kālidāsa and Śudraka; translations of theoretical works by Bharata, Daṇḍin and Ānandavardhana were already available. It was then that Polish orientalists and literary historians, although producing rather a small number of works concerning Hindu culture, represented mature orientation in fundamental problems. During the last quarter of the 19th c. and the beginning of the 20th c. Poland was also overflowed by translations, commentaries, and, finally, creative research on various problems of the Hindu culture. The violent interest in India, manifested, among others, in publications, coincided with a new trend in European literature. It was initiated in a few countries by a small group of people headed by the famous Przybyszewski and Strindberg. This trend, created by the young generation, and referred to as Young Germany, Young Poland, and Young Scandinavia was characterized by a turn back to ideas which dominated over Europe half

---

<sup>25</sup> Tracing Hindu inspirations in Romantic literature written in English would certainly be easier in the case of early Romantics when the sense of affinity was not so strong. But making clear distinction between the English and the Hindu element in the theory of art of the second half of the 19th c. and in the 20th c. seems more and more difficult if not absolutely impossible (cf. Kipling, Pound or Eliot with respect to the RASA-DHVANI theory).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. S. Grochowski, whose life is placed between 1540—1612.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Tuczyński, *op. cit.*



a century earlier. In Polish literature it was first of all a turn to the priority of emotion and mood, specific "psychologism", fascination with folklore and its beliefs, fascination with the Orient, the Hindu culture playing probably the most important role here. At the end of the century literary theoreticians and writers left numerous proofs of not only fascination, but also deep knowledge of Hindu theory of literature. Dealing still with Polish literature which can serve as a very typical exemplification, we may mention many such eminent writers of that period as Kasprowicz, Tetmajer, Miciński and Lange whose works betray a nonaccidental acquaintance with Hindu culture<sup>28</sup> and even make use of some tropes characteristic of Hindu poetics.<sup>29</sup> Besides, the structure of their lyrical works suggests the RASA theory as the best possible approach to their interpretation. While the problem of whether the Polish, English and probably even the German writers did this consciously or not is a subject for further research, the observation that there were evident traces of inspiration seems almost indisputable.

The above considerations should not lead one to the conclusion that too much importance is attached to the so-called "influences" of Hindu theory of literature. The problem is much more subtle and delicate. We might probably presume that its essence is to be looked for in the general atmosphere of the fascination<sup>30</sup> with all that was creative and new to many European writers and their cultural milieu. To support definitely or abolish the idea of such influences would require thorough research far exceeding the limits of the present paper which, by stressing this most interesting period-theme parallel, aims only at drawing attention to the correspondence which provides rich material for comparative theoretical studies.

---

<sup>28</sup> That Lange knew Sanskrit can be seen on the basis of oral information which the author of the present paper received from S. F. Michalski—an eminent indianist, Lange's contemporary; also from: F. Machalski, *Orientalizm A. Langego*, 1937; E. Donebach: *Hinduskie chwytły u Langego*, [in:] *Papers of the Indianistic Section of the Polish Philology Students' Research Circle*, 1976; *Przy okazji pewnego listu Antoniego Langego*, „Sprawozdania Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego”, 1976. See also: M. Smurzyński, *Wstęp do rozważań nad indianizmem w twórczości Młodej Polski*; D. Kadyńska, *Z zagadnień indianizmu u T. Micińskiego*; M. Skawińska, I. Zajac, *Rzeczywistość jawy, snu i nieistnienia jako pojęcia indyjskie w twórczości Bolesława Leśmiana*; A. Kostowska, J. Lewkowski, *Pojęcie nirwany w poezji Młodej Polski*; K. Kwiatkowska, A. Strąg, J. Suliga, *Interpretacja symboliki hinduskiej w wierszu Leśmiana „Dżananda”*—all the above papers were presented in 1974 during The International Session of Polish Philology Students and published as cited *Papers...* See also: A. Strąg, M. Pychyńska, *Interpretacja wiersza Leśmiana „Przed świtem”*, „Sprawozdania Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego”, 1976, vol. 9.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Donebach, *op. cit.*; S. Cieślowski, *A proposito del tropo dipaka*, *Resistencia* 1972.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. J. Reyman, *Peleryna, ciupaga, znak tajemny*, 1971, p. 76.



## 3. DHVANI

## A

a) The DHVANI theory is a specific development and completion of earlier concepts whose authors looked for the essence of poetry in various elements of a poem. Thus, some would find it in the *alamkāras* i.e., first of all in the tropes and figures constituting specific poetic imagery; others — in good style or, finally, in the reader's aesthetic experience, that is, beyond the text, although on its basis. The theorists of the DHVANI did not deny the achievements of particular schools and theories, but, in searching for the essence of poetry, they shifted the main stress onto what was inexpressible — onto what was, by means of any method or theory, indirectly suggested to the reader.

The authors of theoretical treatises defined many ways of indirect expression. Not going into details we might mention various metaphorical and litotetic expressions, directed understatements, ambiguities, allusions. We should also briefly mention that all utterances were classified into ordinary epic description — which expressed its meaning directly (typical of scientific writing rather than literature) and a "bent" (oblique) way of expression (*vakratā*) which was typical of all works of art and was even treated as the very essence of poetry (*vakrokti*). This concept, however, was not accepted in the form presented in Kuntaka's treatise. Later theoreticians either denied it or neglected, making use, however, of other theoretical achievements of the author of *Vakroktijīva*.

b) The definitely leading school was that of Dhvanikāra (the 8th c. A.D.) and Ānandavardhana (the 9th c. A.D.). Their concept included the opinion of Bharata and his followers that the essence of poetry is its ability and readiness to lead the reader to aesthetic experience; both of them also accepted<sup>31</sup> the role of imagery and style as the sources of aesthetic experience, maintaining, however, that most important is the power of a literary work to arouse aesthetic experiences by means of suggested sensations. Thus, the reader's aesthetic experience was treated as a resonance of a work of art.

The word resonance,<sup>32</sup> used sometimes by Hindu linguists to denote letters (sounds) or words displaying the essence of a word (or sentence), in theory of literature referred to the ability of a word to suggest meaning

<sup>31</sup> This was confirmed two hundred years after Dhvanikāra by a great philosopher, literary theoretician, mystic and poet — Abhinavagupta.

<sup>32</sup> The word "resonance" — DHVANI — was given various meanings in European languages — from the literal "sound" or "overtone" through "word" and "hint" to "concept", "meaning", "idea".



(sense) that was behind it, by overshadowing or underlining the specific meaning (sense) of another word.<sup>33</sup>

The theorists of the DHVANI distinguished in poetry two senses: the directly expressed sense and the indirectly expressed sense, each of them having its own characteristic power of being suggestive. The indirect sense is also of two kinds—the first one is contained in the figurative meaning, the imagery of poetic language being its source; the second—the unexpressed sense exists behind the directly uttered words and behind the imagery created by words: “apart from images arising directly from the poet’s words, such thoughts are awakened that couldn’t be expressed directly.” The stirring of those thoughts—is the DHVANI.<sup>34</sup>

c) The structuralist tendencies of the authors of the DHVANI can be seen in the specific division into categories and in the relations between particular kinds of suggestions. In a literary work they distinguish two senses: the expressed sense and the suggested sense.

The suggested sense is conveyed to the reader (or made to resonate) thanks to a given figure of speech (*alamkāra*) by means of a suggested poetic image (ALAMKARA-DHVANI); thanks to the style (RĪTI) by means of meaning suggested by a description (VASTU-DHVANI); and finally, thanks to a mood (*rasa*) which is not expressed directly but suggested (RASA-DHVANI).

In each of the three *means of conveying* the suggested sense we can

<sup>33</sup> It would be unjust for Dhvanikāra and Ānandavardhana’s predecessors not to notice their role in the development of the concept of DHVANI. Not only logicians and linguists dealt with the problem of the resonance. About ten eminent literary theoreticians earlier than the authors of the DHVANI were able to notice that words could be used indirectly, that is, they could suggest a meaning different than that expressed directly. Yet neither the existence of partial theories before the 9th c. nor Dhvanikāra and Ānandavardhana’s acquaintance with them throw sufficient light on this very concept. According to Ānanda himself, features of the previous theories form the “body of poetry” its “soul” being the resonance to produce what the whole poem is meant to be.

<sup>34</sup> Let us quote here the most popular exemplification of the expressed and the suggested sense of the phrase *gāṅgayam ghoṣa* which, although not usual in Sanskrit, can be, according to K. Chaitanya, easily understood by a European reader. The phrase means “a hamlet on the Ganges” (Gāṅga, the river Ganges is feminine; the ending-*ayam* is the ending of the Locative case Singular; one of the many meanings of *ghoṣa*—for instance, cry, news, alarm—is a hamlet, a shepherds’ settlement.) Thus the phrase “a hamlet on the Ganges” can be understood a) in the expressed sense, which evokes the image of the Ganges with a hamlet (perhaps on pales) *over* it; in other European languages it would mean a hamlet floating *on* the river or immersed *in* the river; b) in the figurative sense (kind of elipsis) “Ganges” means the ground along the river, that is, the bank of the Ganges, which in fact produces the image of a hamlet built “on the bank of the Ganges”; c) in the suggested sense this phrase should be understood as “a hamlet washed by the holy and purifying river.” The “bank” could be easily omitted here since the really important idea is that of the Ganges as a holy and purifying river and the hamlet—purified by being washed by its waters.



distinguish a *situation* in which the suggested sense imposes itself spontaneously and simultaneously with the expressed sense (that is, it is as if independent of the expressed sense) or a situation in which the suggested sense can be grasped by the reader only after grasping the expressed sense.

In both these situations three *possibilities* may occur: 1) when the suggested sense completely overshadows the expressed sense, so that the latter "vanishes"; 2) when both the senses exist side by side (constituting thus poetic ambiguity); 3) when the suggested sense is subordinated to the expressed sense.<sup>35</sup>

The most frequent cases of the *kinds of relations* between the expressed and suggested senses are: the relation of negation and the relation of direction. The latter kind of relation displays a very characteristic feature of Hindu systems of literary theory: a shift from formal structures to more particular cases the great number of which guarantees the system its open quality.

Unfortunately, the scope of the present paper does not allow us to present all the interesting transformations within the DHVANI theory, the most subtle discussions, ideological and logical aspects, processes leading to the conviction that the main (and for some theoreticians—the only) means of evoking in the reader a response to the unexpressed meaning is the RASA-DHVANI.<sup>36</sup>

## B

Similarly to India, Europe had to wait for more than two thousand years for the final formulation of the concept of a sense obliquely expressed. Since the end of the 19th c. these problems have been, if not in the very center of the critics' interest, at least not far from it.<sup>37</sup> Accepting the Romantic cult of emotion and "mood" both the writers and the critics were faced by the question of how to present it, express, convey or even impose on the reader. They were thus striving to translate emotions into words but without vulgar directness and impoverishing "plain words."

<sup>35</sup> It is worth noticing here that in the case when the suggested sense is subordinated to the expressed sense we cannot in fact refer to the *dhvani*, but only to the meaning and implied meaning.

<sup>36</sup> We should refer here to the rich and written in many European languages literature concerning these problems. Besides the already quoted works of S. K. De, K. Chaitanya, P. V. Kane, A. B. Keith, we should also mention: A. Sankaran, P. S. Naidu (India), L. Renou (France), R. Gnoli (Italy), W. Ruben (Germany), P. Grincer, Alichanova (USSR) not to mention European translations of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta's treatises.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. M. Podraza-Kwiatkowska, *Symbolizm i symbolika w poezji Młodej Polski*, 1975, with a rich bibliography in the text and the footnotes; W. Tatarkiewicz, *Dzieje sześciu pojęć: sztuka, piękno, forma, twórczość, odtwórczość, przeżycie estetyczne*, 1975.



All these attempts were reflected in the concepts of Dilthey, Spranger as well as their friends, students and followers. We find them in the concept of Mallarmé, who considered allusion and symbol primary in poetry. Taken from the reader's point of view they lead to the *Einfühlungsgefühl* concepts and their consequences; taken from the author's point of view — to the principles of using indirect expression and the attempts at conveying the most subtle and tenuous "vibrations of the soul," "evanescent moments," "moods evaporating at a breeze" and revelations of the "naked soul." The literature of that period abounded in works that were rather short but with many facets and of particularly strong impact. Here we could mention the "Young Poland" group of writers who, making use of the many possibilities provided by the Polish language,<sup>38</sup> used, besides word-formation, all possible means of conveying various shades of meaning. They were particularly keen on using strange words and Sanskrit names which, by being unfamiliar and mysterious (for instance, nirvana, Buddha, Aśoka, Jananda), served as signals of values inexpressible so far. This observation again draws our attention to the above-mentioned theme-time parallels between the transfer of Hindu culture performed by means of translations and the new romantic and symbolist literature in Poland, whose origins were looked for in Goethe's writing and which exploded violently after the Polish "sober" positivism.<sup>39</sup> It was in that period of symbolism that Europe accepted indirect expression as the fundamental feature of poetry, particular stress being put on allegory, metaphor, symbol and myth. At that very time Mallarmé and S. George underlined the importance of suggesting, by means of words, values which could find no adequate formulation. At that very time Ignacy Matuszewski,<sup>40</sup> a Polish critic and literary historian, formulated the principle of "wrapping personal emotions in the veil of symbolism to give a sensuous analogy to the inner state of the soul," which corresponded to the then popular concepts of innocence which could introduce "things unexpressed by words." It does not seem to be a coincidence only that A. Lange,<sup>41</sup> an eminent Polish poet, translator and polyglot,

<sup>38</sup> Probably the greatest, from among the European languages, number of diminutival suffixes, forms expressing frequency, bringing different connotations, which, combined with a great number of prefixes, allowed the writers to express most subtle shades of meaning.

<sup>39</sup> Conditioned by the historical and political situation Polish positivism was a period of muffling and veiling the attempts to regain independence after the brutally suppressed rising of 1863; a period of giving up the romantic ideas of active strife and a period of a comparative freedom as far as the influence of foreign cultural trends (theory of art included) was concerned.

<sup>40</sup> I. Matuszewski was acquainted with Hindu literature, see: *O dramacie indyjskim*, [in:] *Swoi i obcy*, 1903.

<sup>41</sup> A. Lange was, at the same time, a translator, popularizer, and editor of Polish translations of Sanskrit literature.



formulated statements in which the word was treated as *res sacra*—an approach so strongly flavouring of the Hindu tradition. We cannot be surprised either by the concepts of “creation through word” clashing with the mimetic concepts and following not only from those by F. T. Vischer but also from translations and commentaries of the Sanskrit works on literary theory.<sup>42</sup> Thus we may say that European theory of literature entered the 20th c. not only with its own achievements but also with the Hindu theories of RASA and DHVANI, which, though not always quite consciously, were being gradually assimilated into it. The output of Rabindranath Tagore—a great writer of India, soon a Nobel Prize winner—was a strong stimulant intensifying and quickening this process.

#### 4. ALAMKĀRA AND RĪTI

When the RASA and the DHVANI came to Europe, they merged, in fact, into one theory, which was due to the fact that in India they had existed side by side for a thousand of years and in this very form were transmitted by the early as well as by the contemporary Hindu and European theoreticians and critics. We may also presume that an equally important reason for these two theories merging into one in European consciousness was the fact that the Romantic concept of the priority of emotion and its expression (analogous to RASA) was followed by the concept of suggested and not directly expressed meaning (analogous to DHVANI). Such treatment of the RASA-DHVANI was characteristic of the Expressionist movement, whose writers and theorists were often the originators of Neo-Romanticism or people connected in some way with the Orient, particularly with India<sup>43</sup>. European literary Expressionism was characterized by a more frequent use of certain tropes and figures of speech among which the hyperbole, exclamation, repetition, accumulation and, for different reasons, elipsis and anacoluthon were firmly rooted in the theory of this movement. Used in Europe for more than two thousand years these tropes and figures were now given new theoretical background and slightly different functions. Their principles,

<sup>42</sup> Ānandavardhana was translated by H. Jacobi in 1902/3; Yāska and Pāṇini in 1875, 1887. In 1880 Pischel translated and edited the text by Vāmana and Rudraṭa; in 1875 Viśvanātha's text was published in English, in 1898 Bharata's text appeared in Paris, Dandīn's in Leipzig. In the same year appeared an English version of Maṃmaṭa's text.

<sup>43</sup> In Poland, for instance, S. Przybyszewski supervised the “Zdrój” magazine and the Expressionist movement. Features significant for literary expressionism were found in the works of such writers of the Young Poland as T. Mięński, S. Wyspiański, J. Kasprówicz, later B. Leśmian, S. I. Witkiewicz (Witkacy), and others. One of the theorists of Polish Expressionism was S. Stasiak—an indianist, professor in Lvov and later in Great Britain. See also *Wschód...*



place and functions in the system of poetics were, in spite of many similarities, different from those of analogous tropes and figures in Hindu treatises.

#### A. ALAMKĀRA

a) The first theoretical comments on tropes and figures of speech in India are some centuries older than the corresponding earliest European comments. They can be found in linguistic works by Yāska, in his famous *Nirukta*, and by Pāṇini. The first systematic approaches to tropes and figures as elements of a comprehensive theory can be found, besides Bharata's text, in the two oldest texts on literary theory mentioned earlier in this paper—by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, whose concept of tropes is structuralized but not so formalized as that in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭhādhyaya*.

The problem of tropes and figures (*alamkāra* means an embellishment, a trope) occupies much space in Hindu treatises on literary theory, regardless of the fact whether the tropes and figures are treated as the "soul", "embellishment" or "body" of poetry. The main division is three-fold: figures of speech (*śabda*), figures of sense (*artha*), and other figures (*ubhaya*). A clear differentiation between the figures of speech and the figures of sense were presented by Maṃmaṭa: if the substitution of one element of a figure by its synonym or analogy does not result in significant change of meaning—we are confronted with a figure of speech; if a significant change of meaning takes place—a figure of sense.

The number of tropes and figures in Hindu poetics has always been considerable, but it has always depended on the ways of systematization and the degree of generalization. Leaving aside particular variations the number of tropes ranges from 30 tropes that cannot be further reduced to over one hundred. The main list is constituted by the following tropes: metaphor (*rūpaka*), comparison-analogy (*upamā*), "reproof"—litotetic trope (*ākṣepa*), cause (*hetu*), illuminator (*dīpaka*), pun (*śleṣa*), hyperbole (*atiśayokti*) and others, depending on the individual and general tendencies of theory of literature or, at least, of poetics. In each of the systems a particular position was occupied by repetitions of sounds (rhyme and alliteration included), repetition of sense (for instance, synonyms), accumulation, all kinds of exclamations (for instance, salutations—*aśis*).<sup>44</sup>

b) Yet the enumeration, analysis of particular tropes and figures and even the documentation of differences and similarities between the Hindu and the European approach<sup>45</sup> do not seem as important as the

<sup>44</sup> No rash conclusions should be jumped at on the basis of the importance attached to the above tropes and figures in India and Europe. The problem of this correspondence should still become a subject of detailed historical and philological research.

<sup>45</sup> This has not been sufficiently proved so far although H. Jacobi, I. Nobel, V. Raghavan, S. Bhattacharya, S. K. De, K. Chaitanya, B. Jha and many others managed to confront many aspects of these approaches. See: I. Nobel, *Beiträge*



specific character of Hindu theoretical systems. It consisted in forming not only a special poetic "language" but also its characteristic "grammar", that is, the division of words into "species", "actions" and "features"<sup>46</sup> and forming by means of them "families of meaning" embracing words which, though differing in their origin and shape had a common feature (for instance, the quality of being blue, the ability to gallop, etc.). The result of this categorization was the division into concordant words (belonging to the same category) and disconcordant words (belonging to different categories). Another principle of this "grammar" was that of putting together words to create poetic images by means of juxtaposition 1) by prediction (using disconcordant words) or 2) by negation (using concordant words, but denying their relations) or 3) by narrowing or broadening the scope of one of the two words as well as by 4) directing the reader's attention towards both the words simultaneously or towards one of them: strengthening it by, for instance, exaggeration or weakening the other word by, for instance, understatement.<sup>47</sup>

In this way we obtain some kind of structural lattices of open character, whose scope, when compared to analogous lattices of European poetics, represents a slight shift. We may presume that the apparent similarity in the treatment of many tropes and figures resulted in a comparatively weak interest of European critics in this field of the Hindu theory of literature. At the same time the difficulty in grasping all the subtleties of this theory hindered the translators (with very few exceptions) in using the numerous possibilities of expression while adapting Sanskrit texts to European languages. As a result, this field of the Hindu theory of literature as well as the next one—stylistics—has neither been exhaustively studied nor sufficiently exploited.

#### B. RITI

a) The problem of style and theoretical stylistics is one of the most controversial problems in European theory of literature.<sup>48</sup> This resulted, in a considerable degree, from the ambiguities of the term as well

zur älteren Geschichte des Alamkāraśāstra, „Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft,” 1912, No. 13; H. Jacobi, *Über Begriff und Wesen der poetischen Figuren der Indischen Poetik*, 1908. The above Hindu writers wrote in English but published in India. Besides the papers by S. Cieślowski (the work on *dipaka* included) the following Polish works could be mentioned here: D. Kadyńska, *Dwa tropy poetyckie: porównanie i podobieństwo*; J. Krakowiak-Ślósarska, *O metaforze*; M. Smurzyński, *Akszepa jako chwyt litotetyczny. Ironia*—all the three papers in „Sprawozdania Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego”, 1976, vol. 9.

<sup>46</sup> *Jāti*, *kriyā*, *guṇa* do not correspond exactly to the noun, the verb and the adjective; though similar, their scopes are slightly different than those of the corresponding grammatical terms. For example, action (*kriyā*) embraces not only verbs and participles but also the gerund.

<sup>47</sup> See, for instance, *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* by Rājashekhara.

<sup>48</sup> See the great number of problems and aspects presented in: S. Skwarczyńska, *Wstęp do nauki o literaturze*, vol. II, 1954.



as from other causes which were rather unknown to the majority of Hindu literary theoreticians. It seems that the differences between the Hindu and the European approach to style form obstacles in arousing interest in the problems formulated by the MĀRGA-RĪTĪ theorists. From the historical point of view we must again go back to the 6th—7th c., that is, to Dandīn and a bit later, to Vāmana, whose term *rīti* was generally accepted in India as referring to a specific group of theoretical problems. The scope of the present paper does not leave space for the discussion of the differences in the treatment of tropes and figures by these two writers, that is, for finding out which figures and to what a degree belong to the study of style and which, exceeding its limits, belong to the study of tropes and figures. We must also leave out the very interesting discussion of the relation between the means of expressing and suggesting aesthetic experience and the problems of style. For the sake of the present paper it is sufficient to mention the opinions on style of the first and main writers in this field.

b) Dandīn begins by presenting two problems. The first one concerns the differentiation of literary works according to their genres: poetry and prose.<sup>49</sup> To these he adds a mixture of these two forms (*miśra*) referring, however, to phenomena exceeding the limits of literary theory—theatrical phenomena. The second problem—a complex one to be discussed later—is the problem of national languages. Dandīn represents the opinion that, according to some hierarchy of languages and genres, epic poetry should be written in Sanskrit, other (“worse”?) genres in Prakrits, others—in Apabhramśa, while those containing dialogues may be written in several languages.<sup>50</sup> The above mentioned problem of languages probably corresponds most closely to the European differentiation of jargons and dialects, it being significant that only such jargons and dialects count here whose literature is far above the level of “regional” or “folk” literature. Formulating this problem in European terminology we might say that each dialect has its own peculiar “stylistic” features. The first criterion of differentiating stylistic problems is surprising for a European scholar since it refers mainly to the sounds of words (*śabda guṇa*, according to Vāmana).<sup>51</sup> The following aspects are significant

<sup>49</sup> Vāmana distinguishes: poetry—*oratio vineta* (*nibaddha*) and prose—*oratio recta* (*anibaddha*). On the problems of literary genres in the Hindu theory of literature see also: S. F. Michalski, *Zagadnienia rodzajów literackich w literaturze i poetyce indyjskiej*, ZRL, 1959 vol. 1/2; Materials for the Dictionary of Literary Genres, *ibid.*, entries by: S. F. Michalski, H. Willman-Grabowska, S. Pobożniak.

<sup>50</sup> Here Dandīn disposes of the problems considered significant: “the person in which works are written is not a sufficient criterion of differentiating” (genres and styles).

<sup>51</sup> Vāmana’s *śabda guṇa* as well as Dandīn’s five features of style concern the sound values of words, for instance, the compactness and uniformity of a word, the degree of smoothness in the pronunciation of consonants, the regularity in using sharp or soft sounds, stressing a word by means of heavy sounds, etc.



here: the guttural, voiced, voiceless, etc., qualities of consonants, the open, low, high, etc. tone of vowels and semi-vowels, the joining of syllables from the point of view of their being harmonious, strong, dramatic, onomatopoeic, etc., etc.—all this is to serve as a means of evoking certain aesthetic experiences (RASA) through the emotive values of sounds.<sup>52</sup>

The second criterion refers to the meaning (*artha guṇa*, according to Vāmana). The following factors are significant here: maturity of concept (read: subordinating the whole work to one concept), legibility of sense, lucidity of meaning (lucidity and directness—according to T. Kotarbiński), logical continuity of expression or joining apparently loose statements into higher meaningful units, as well as descriptive qualities and absence of vulgarity. Vāmana took his concept of RĪTI (style) from Bharata and Daṇḍin. He generalized the features of linguistic expression distinguishing in each of them the sound and sense aspect, showed the principles of joining words and presented a methodical discussion of all these features. Thus, the Hindu theory of literature was given a systematized, though too short, presentation of those aspects of the problems of the literary expression which even nowadays face the European specialist on style with many difficulties. This was achieved thanks to a procedure analogous to that of Daṇḍin in the case of tropes (the metaphor included). When compared with the European concept of style<sup>53</sup> the Hindu theorists came close to elegant simplicity by limiting their works to very few problems, while the remaining ones, usually included in the European stylistics, were discussed by them within particular theories (concepts) as referring to aesthetic experience, literary suggestion or the use of tropes.

In spite of all its interesting ideas and achievements the concept of RĪTI did not attain in India the significance which it deserved. Although it was not neglected during the whole development of the Hindu theory of literature, i.e., till the end of the 18th c., and although the high methodical level of its presentation was to a considerable degree followed by later authors, still, in the course of history it was, on the one hand, overshadowed by the RASA and the DHVANI concepts, on the other hand, it had not managed to establish itself firmly enough being created in too bright a light of the theory of tropes.<sup>54</sup>

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

All the above considerations aimed neither at showing the influence of Hindu literature on European concepts during the last two hundred years nor at presenting analogies which originated quite independently

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaḍarśa*, I, 52.

<sup>53</sup> The origin of the Sanskrit *mārga* and *rīti* is quite different from that of the European "style"; hence, the completely different associations connected with this problem: *mārga* (from: *mārg*—to achieve) means (the proper) way, method; *rīti*—a line, current, mode.

<sup>54</sup> See De, *op. cit.*



of one another. The comparative significance of the presented problems consists first of all in the inspirations, most subtle and most difficult to trace, as well as in the independent processes of forming concepts in each culture, which later were corrected through reciprocal translations and commentaries revealing the achievements on both sides.

One of the directions of the development of linguistics may serve as a good example here: thanks to his acquaintance with Sanskrit and its grammar Bopp laid foundations of the European comparative linguistics, which had also been done by Hindu grammarians for a group of Prakrits. Having exhausted the first resources of information and having formed several concepts, European linguists would from time to time go back to Pāṇini, Patañjali, Bhartrihari and other Hindu linguists, recently finding in their works new messages. "Pāṇini should be recognized as the first structuralist in the theory of linguistics" says N. Chomsky<sup>55</sup> in the fifties. And he means not only the degree of formalizing the observations on language, but also the method of generalizing, the character of which was, we would almost daresay, generative. The psychological aspect of language, the problem of meaningful units connected not only with the phonemes and morphemes, which in fact refers to psycholinguistics—all these are phenomena "derived" from the SPHOTA and the DHVANI.

Our next example concerns directly the theory of literature: there appeared in Poland a book on the fantastic fiction of horror<sup>56</sup>—a dissertation interesting, valuable and stimulating, particularly as far as the concept of the RASA is concerned. The bibliography of this dissertation mentions a book written in English by D. P. Varma<sup>57</sup>—a Hindu literary theoretician. This fact, and we would like to stress it particularly strongly, should not lead one to the simple conclusion that Varma's book "exerted an influence" on that by Wydmuch. Wydmuch's book is itself saturated with the atmosphere of terror and horror. We have no reason to presume that its author was, to a smaller or greater extent, following D. P. Varma's book. There is, however, sufficient reason to notice that Wydmuch's book is a resonance (DHVANI) to Varma's ideas concerning the RASA of terror and horror in his book on the Gothic novel. We should add here: a book which is more than interesting.

Thus it seems that a better acquaintance with the texts of Hindu theory of literature, a greater number of works concerning these texts, and a conscious drawing upon this tradition, i.e., a transition from "that" through "how" and "by what way" to the prospective "where from"

<sup>55</sup> This information is not precise being only remembered from: N. Chomsky, G. A. Muller, *Introduction to the Formal Analysis of Natural Languages*, [in:] *Handbook of Mathematical Psychology*, vol. II, 1963.

<sup>56</sup> M. Wydmuch, *Gra ze strachem. Fantastyka grozy*, 1975.

<sup>57</sup> D. P. Varma, *The Gothic Flame. Being a History of the Gothic Novel in England. Its Origins, Efflorescence, Desintegration and Residuary Influences*, 1957.



and "from whom" would be the most fruitful approach for many a European investigator of literary theory and the most proper and deserved homage paid to the old Sanskrit theoreticians.

## O PEWNYCH ODPOWIEDNIOŚCIACH SANSKRYCKIEJ I EUROPEJSKIEJ TEORII LITERATURY

### Streszczenie

W szeroko rozumianym tle historycznym początkowej niezależności, a w dwu ostatnich stuleciach pewnej odpowiedniości, przedstawiono koncepcje interpretacyjne dotyczące trzech różnych spraw dyskusyjnych:

1. Pierwsza dotyczy względnego datowania dwu najwcześniejszych ze znanych nam dzieł teoretycznoliterackich w Indiach. Zawężając daty bezwzględne życia Dandina i Bhamahy do VI i VII w. n. e. (a niewykluczone, iż do przelomu obu wieków) autor opowiada się za współczesnością obu, co — tłumacząc bezimienną między nimi dyskusję — byłoby jednocześnie zgodne z pewnym honorowanym na ogół zwyczajem, wyrażonym *expressis verbis* przez Rājasekhara, iż za nieprzystojne uważa się dyskutowanie imienne z żyjącymi autorami; należy dyskutować nie z nimi, ale z ich poglądami.

Jednocześnie na podstawie kompozycyjnej precyzji *Kāvyaadarśi* Dandina i *Kāvya-lamkāry* Bhamahy i trafności w doborze i układaniu przykładów, co mogłoby świadczyć nie o „jednorazowym”, ale raczej dłużej trwającym powstawaniu obu dzieł — oraz na podstawie rodzajów wypowiedzi o tropie zwanym *hetu* (przyczyna) i tak samo nazywanym elemencie sylogizmu indyjskiego autor przedstawia następujący obraz ewentualnego kształtowania się obu dzieł, zgodny przecież z indyjską tradycją: Bhamaha stworzył podstawową część swojej teorii wcześniej; Dandin swoje dwie pierwsze części napisał zapewne po nim, w tym o *hetu* jako o tropie; na to odpowiedzią być mogła część księgi V traktatu Bhamahy. A tę dopiero skomentował znowu Dandin w swej ostatniej księdze (IV wg recenzji madraskiej).

2. Druga dotyczy indyjskich paraleli z zasadniczymi dla europejskiego romantyzmu poglądami. W tym głównie idzie o priorytet uczuć i nastrojów, doznań (przeżyć) estetycznych i koncepcję RASA, co historycznie zbiega się z poznanymi w Europie niewiele wcześniej indyjskimi poglądami dotyczącymi języka i językoznawstwa, filozofii, literatury i teorii sztuki, przekazywanymi przede wszystkim przez takich teoretyków i twórców romantyzmu, jak np. bracia Schległowie, Schelling, Goethe, podobnie zresztą pod koniec wieku, w czasie mody na Indie, Schopenhauera itd.; liczne ślady indyjskich poglądów widoczne są w dziełach tak teoretyków sztuki, jak i twórców angielskich, francuskich, niemieckich czy polskich.

3. Ostatnia sprawa dotyczy analogicznych paraleli czasowo-tematycznych między poznaniem w Europie koncepcji DHVANI a symbolizmem z rozmaitymi formami „mowy nie wprost” w Europie przełomu XIX i XX w. (np. S. Mallarmé, S. George) oraz ekspresjonizmem z jego specyficznym wykorzystywaniem niektórych tropów i figur; przy czym nie bez znaczenia wydaje się, iż liczni twórcy i teoretycy tych czasów byli do tego stopnia zainteresowani Indiami, że studiowali sanskryt, tłumaczyli utwory literackie, poetykę (niech dla przykładu wystarczą w Niemczech F. Rükert, w Polsce A. Lange, w Wielkiej Brytanii Kipling, Eliot); albo odwracając sprawę: bywało, że tzw. zawodowi indyjniści byli jednocześnie uznanymi teoretykami sztuki (jak dla romantyzmu bracia Schległowie, tak np. w Polsce dla ekspresjonizmu — S. Stasiak, prof. Uniwersytetu Jana Kazimierza, piszący w „Zdroju”).



W sumie: autorowi uwag o odpowiedniościach wydaje się słuszne, by w nauce o literaturze europejskiej przejść od enigmatycznych wskazań, że „pewien orientalizm daje się zaobserwować, poprzez „jak” i „którędy” do rzeczowego już „skąd” i „od kogo”, ew. „kto”; co — daleko od tzw. „wpływologii” — mogłoby być wielorako owocone, szczególnie zaś dla indyjskich teoretyków literatury byłoby ich przypomnieniem i właściwym (tj. bez ukrywania) wykorzystaniem ich twórczości.

*Sławomir Cieślukowski*