Chapter III

The Stylistics of Deviance in Kuntaka's *Vakroktijivita*

Kuntaka lays down briefly that his object in writing a fresh treatise on poetics, when many others exist already in the field, is "to establish the idea of strikingness which causes extraordinary charm in poetry."[1] The phrase, "strikingness," characterizing the concept of vakrokti is the central principle of his poetic theory. For vakrokti, which he maintains is essential to poetry, is taken as a kind of *victra abhidha* (striking denotation) so that the vakra-bhava (obliquity) underlying it becomes synonymous with *vaicitrya* (strikingness).

The *vakrata* includes a strikingness of expression which is different from the one found in the established mode of speech in the *sastras,* and scientific treatises. It is, therefore, a deviation from the general usage of language. Kuntaka explains vakrokti as an idea expressed with a view to attaining strikingness of poetic effect.

Referring to the conventional view that the alliance of the word and its sense constitutes poetry, Kuntaka lays down the special qualifications of this alliance in the use of the figure of "vakrokti." He does not agree with Dandin that a mere word or idea may be charming; what really makes the alliance poetic, according to him, is the srikingness of vakrokti.

Kuntaka, however, did not put enough emphasis on rasa (aesthetic element) and bhava (emotion) as elements of poetry. Although he admits the

necessity of rasa, he regards its delineation apparently as a special way of realizing obliquity in a composition. He seems to agree with Ānandavardhana that it is not the mere matter but the beauty imparted to it by the continuous development of rasa which makes poetry alive. He, however, remarks that rasa could be comprehended only as an element of vakrokti.

Unlike Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, he did not give rasa the status of a mere figure of speech. By his time Ānandavardhana had already worked out the importance of rasa and indicated its position as an essential element in poetry. So Kuntaka had to assign a more definite place to rasa in his poetic theory than merely placing it as a figure of speech.

While discussing the notion of vakyā-vakrata (sentential obliquity) in which the svabhāva (nature) of an object forms the theme, Kuntaka gives directions as to how sentient objects can be described and made attractive through the proper development of the sentiments. He recognizes the importance of rasa in poetry and allows it to be a constitutive element in the two kinds of style, the sukumāra (delicate or soft style) and the vicitra (striking style). Kuntaka belongs to that group of authors after Ānandavardhana's time who does not deny the concept of dhvani but tries to explain it in terms of vakrokti.

Although the concept of vakrokti is usually associated with Kuntaka,it has had a long tradition in Indian aesthetic theory.The theory of vakrokti shows a remarkable divergence of conception and treatment, developed in the works of Bhāmaha, Kuntaka, Abhinavagupta, Bhoja, Rudraṭa and Mammaṭa. Vakrokti literally means indirect speech. In the wider sense, it means strikingness or

deviance in expression. Deviation can be of different kinds, but the most effective deviation is vakrokti.

Vakrokti is the basis of poetic language. The theory of vakrokti has emerged as a viable theory of the language of poetry. As poetry is a linguistic organization, vakrokti or obliquity is considered to be the most constitutive element of the poetic language.

Though the concept of vakrokti has been in use for a long time in ancient time by Subandhu, Amaru and Bāṇa, a detailed treatment of it is made in Bhāmaha's work. Bhāmaha mentions it as a figure of speech. Bhāmaha owes his use of the concept to Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra,* where Bharata refers to vakrokti in the context of defining lakṣaṇās (secondary meaning). Bharata devotes four chapters to what he calls *vācika-abhinaya* (linguistic representation) where he discusses in detail diction, rules on the use of language, modes of address and intonation, and styles. He emphasizes lakṣaṇās and their significance in poetry. He also refers to obliquity as secondary meaning, which has similar properties to those of vakrokti. Lakṣaṇā, according to Bharata, is the essence of all poetic figures and lends strikingness to poetry.

Lakṣaṇās are a set of beautifying factors and are also called vibhūsanas. Abhinavagupta defines lakṣaṇās as those beautiful elements: "which impart such pleasing turns by the poetic expression and look different from the ordinary."[2] Lakṣaṇās, which look like alaṁkāras or mere turn of expressions, are in fact manifestations of strikingness of speech and benefactors of figures of speech.

Bharata regards other poetic elements subordinate to lakṣaṇās. Lakṣaṇās are endowed with a natural grace and originate from the poet's imagination and make poetry more acceptable even other embellishments. Their presence adds to the charm of the figures.

Abhinavagupta compares the different stages in the production of poetry to those in building a house. Lakṣaṇās are like the construction of walls; the use of alaṁkāras is like adorning the walls with paintings. Alaṁkāras exist apart from what the object of presentation is; they are like a garland in poetry which is apart from the body but serves to beautify it. Lakṣaṇās are, on the other hand, beautiful characteristics of the body itself.

Abhinavagupta's analysis reveals that Bharata's lakṣaṇās are akin to what Bhāmaha designates as vakrokti. P.C. Lahiri quotes S.P. Bhattacharya who remarked that Bharata's lakṣaṇās are " much more than a poetic element like guṇa and alaṁkāra," and that they "might well be taken as an elastic poetic principle" which, like Kuntaka's *vakrokti* , includes within its scope, other poetic elemtents."[3]

Abhinavagupta, too, is of the view that there is no distinction between lakṣaṇās and vakrokti.It seems reasonable to believe that the vakrokti of Bhāmaha was foreshadowed in Bharata's lakṣaṇās.

Abhinavagupta equates obliquity with a "consummate composition" which is a generic quality found in all figures. He remarks :

> There is, in fact, the strikingness in words and meanings and it consists in their transgressing the ordinary. This very quality characterises poetic figures, and it is a heightened form of expression that distinguishes poetic speech from the

matter-of-fact speech of everyday life. *Atisayokti* is found in all figures.[4]

The concept of vakrokti has had a "chequered career" in Indian poetics. It has had conspicuous ups and downs. Even some modern scholars have considered vakrokti to be one of the "byways" of Sanskrit criticism which could be connected and linked up with the highways of literary criticism like rasa and dhvani. The theory of vakrokti has long been neglected since the time of Kuntaka.

Kuntaka had given vakrokti the most elaborate treatment. He deals with it in the very detailed way, delineating its nature, types and significance in poetry.

He has given vakrokti a full fledged theory of poetic expression. To him, vakrokti is synonymous with poetry (kāvya) itself. Both inadequate expression and expression devoid of idea are, according to him, of no use. He calls a beautiful expression without a beautiful idea "dead" *(mṛtakalpa)* and a beautiful idea expressed in not an equally beautiful form as "diseased" (vyādhibhuta). He defines poetry in three ways: poetry is the poet's achievement; poetry consists in ornamentation; poetry is the mingling of sound and sense, which is established in a composition embodying the poetic activity of a deviational character. The third definition of poetry is a logical development of the other two.

According to Kuntaka, poetry is an alliance of word and its meaning. He remarks:

> Poetry is a coalescence of sound and sense which is established in a composition embodying the poetic activity of a deviational character, and which delights those who know the true nature of poetry.[5]

Explaining his theoretical position he further remarks:

> Both words and meanings are to be embellished and their embellishment lies in their obliqueness. *Vakrokti* is an ingenious utterance peculiar to poetry and is distinct from popular usage. It is a clever turn of speech, witty and startling in effect.[6]

But this alliance of sound and sense must have the speciality of being characterized by vakratā or vaicitrya (obliquity). Daṇḍin had maintained that poetry is embellished words communicating the desired meaning. Kuntaka disagrees with Daṇḍin that mere word however charming it may be, or mere idea conveyed by it, does not constitute poetry; what makes them poetic is the presence of the striking quality of obliquity.

The role of the poet in poetic expression is very important because it is the poet's act of imagination that gives the expression its desired obliquity. By recognizing the significance of the poet's imagination in poetic creation, Kuntaka has established the theory of vakrokti on a firm aesthetic footing.

According to Kuntaka, obliquity is an essential factor in poetry which depends upon the individual power of the poet. It helps poetry to impart an unspeakable delight to the connoisseur because it distinguishes poetry from

matter-of-fact speech. Kuntaka believes that poetry becomes lively in association with vakrokti.

Vakrokti is a functional element of poetry (Kavi-Vyāpāra-Vakratā). It is also recognized as the embellishment (alaṁkṛti) of the word and its meaning, the physical constituents to poetry. Kuntaka says that an unembellished poetry can hardly be conceived. He believes that poetic delectableness causes an elevation of spirit; he thinks that whatever renders poetry charming must be recognized as vakrokti.

Bhoja has also discussed vakrokti in his works. He used the term in three different senses: the poetic expression in general; the figure of speech beginning with upama (simile); and one of the varieties of the verbal figure called vākovākya. Bhoja does not use vakrokti in its large sense frequently. There is, however, some similarity between Bhoja's and Kuntaka's concepts of vakrokti. Bhoja defines poetry as opposed to non-oblique language used in scientific treatise and other common discourses.

Bhoja thus defines poetry in terms of vakrokti. He designates vakrokti as an extraordinary, rounded expression (visistā- bhaṇiti). At times he seems to be working out a reconciliation between *dhvani* and *vakrokti*. While assigning to dhvani a supreme position in poetry, he at the same time emphasizes the significance of vakrokti without which, he feels, poetry will be a mere speech.

Though Kuntaka's concept of vakrokti was not endorsed by later writers, his views regarding strikingness as the central characteristic of the language of poetry were widely accepted. Ruyyaka, for example, regarded a poetic figure as

a particular form of speech. Commenting on the figure anumāna (inference), he affirmed that it cannot be distinguished from the logician's inference unless there is a particular strikingness depending on the sense.[7] Mammaṭa also believes that the charm of expression can come out of figures even where there is no rasa. He goes to the extent of maintaining that a figure is nothing else than strikingness itself. To him a hyperbolical expression constitutes the main ingredient of poetry.[8] The views of Panditarāja Jagannātha are clearer still. He too looks upon a figure as a specialized expression and holds strkingness to be the generic trait of all figures. This strikingness, he says, results from the charm brought about by the poet's imagination.[9]

Strikingness serves as the essence for all poetic expression. The element of wonder that results from strikingness is an invariable part of poetic enjoyment. The idea regarding strikingness of poetic expression has kept on appearing variously in Indian poetics. It emerged in the form of Bharata's "lakṣaṇā," Vāmana's "bandha-gumpha," Ānandavardhana's "bandhacchāyā" and "uktivaicitrya" and Rājaśekhara's "bhaṇiti-vaicitrya." These ideas were present in these writers in a disorganised form, but it was left to Kuntaka to treat them in a systematic and comprehensive way.

Kuntaka, however, is fully convinced that it is the expressional deviation or strikingness that is the most important element, which is responsible for the effectiveness and charm in poetry. In his prologue to *Karpuramañjari* Rajāśekhara also maintains that neither the idea, nor the word, but the manner of expressing the idea in words that makes poetry worth reading. Kuntaka is even more categorical. He cannot imagine a position in which poetry can be seen dissociated from its figures. He has variously affirmed the essentiality of

poetic obliquity. A strikingness in speech, he maintains, imparts an excellent charm even to an object which is stale and tasteless.

Oblique speech, for Kuntaka, is the general principle underlying all figures of speech. The comprehensiveness of Kuntaka's concept of vakrokti can be measured from an analysis of his treatment of the "sukumāra marg" (brilliant style). To him, vakrokti is the only embellishment possible to the word and its meaning. Both the word and meaning are adorned and their adornment consists in the poetic process known as vakrokti. He, thus comments :

> Word and meaning have their distinct existence in poetry and come to be adorned by something different from themselves. The fact is that the very process of poetic utterance is constituted by oblique turns assumed by words and meanings. The poetic process itself in this sense, is the real ornamentation and is extremely delighting.[10]

Kuntaka never thought of poetry in a purely formalistic, mechanical way and in terms of its drab technicalities. He remarks:

> Just as the excellence of a painting transcends the beauty of various shades and colours on the canvas, the poet's art far excels the beauty of individual elements such as words, meanings, attributes and figures.[11]

His conception of vakrokti may not have been developed from Manoratha's verse where vakrokti means only an excellent arrangement of words. He probably took cue from Avantisundari, but developed and established the concept in a profoundly fresh way.

However, his theory has been occasionally subjected to criticism. His theory of poetry, Lahiri says,"lacks precision. Kuntaka has spared no pains to form a definite and unique theory of poetry... but his theory has remained indefinite to his readers." Lahiri attributes this indefiniteness to Kuntaka's comprehensiveness, "grandiloquent expressions and large generalization." [12] S.P. Bhattacharya believes that Kuntaka possessed "the state of a genuine critic but not the dash of a genius." [13] Vijayavardhana criticises Kuntaka's theory of poetry as "far-fetched and unrealistic" and "rather strained," which "tried to explain poetry mainly from the formal point of view. [14]

Most of these commentators, however, tend to forget Kuntaka's objectives and look at his theory from a rather narrow point of view. Despite these criticisms, Kuntaka has been hailed as "one of the rare original minds of later Indian poetics who attempted to account for poetry in terms of the essentially non-literal character."[15] His sturdy independence prompted him to formulate a new theory of poetics without adhering to the teachings of the orthodox scholars. Krishnamoorthy comments on the value of Kuntaka's theory:

> Whoever understands Kuntaka's varkrokti narrowly to mean an oblique trope, as understood by say Rudrata, would be doing a gross injustice to his freshness of thought... "vakrokti" of Kuntaka is a synonym for the principle of beauty underlying the poetic language as such.[16]

Poetry, says Kuntaka, is the activity of the poet, which produces transcendental delight in responsive readers. He devotes nearly the whole of his *Vakroktijīvita,* with the exception of the introductory portion of his first

chapter, to the definition, classification and illustration of six varieties of vakrokti. These varieties operate at six levels of poetic expression: phonetic; lexical; grammatical; sentential; contextual, and the composition as a whole. Taken together they represent, in fact inter-linked categories characterising the nature of speech. Kuntaka elaborates:

> Obliquity is of six types each with a number of sub-divisions, each subdivision striking the reader by a subtle nuance of poetry. The six types are: obliquity in the arrangement of syllables; obliquity in the base forms of substantives; obliquity in the whole sentence admitting of a thousand varieties, including a whole lot of figure; obliquity in parts or incidents; obliquity in the entire composition, which may be spontaneous or studied, both transmitting beauty and delight. [17]

The second chapter of his book takes up for detailed consideration the first three varieties of vakrokti. The third chapter deals with vākyāvakratā and the fourth prakaraṇavakraktā and prabandhavakratā. Thus the entire book deals within a comprehensive manner the ubiquitous presence of vakrokti in poetic language.

Kuntaka has recognized in the arrangement of syllables of phonetic obliquity the first variety of vakrokti. He seems to regard phonemes as the foremost basis of analysis of poetry. This type of vakrokti, which relies upon the arrangements of consonants, is known as alliteration. This type includes, besides the use of alliteration, also the more subtle sound effects produced by the free and irregular repetition of similar or identical phonemes at varying intervals. Kuntaka remarks:

> Sometimes alliteration without any interval too, employed artistically by the poet, contributes to high poetic charm because of variation in vowels, when alliteration is effected without extra effort, when it is adorned with syllables which are not harsh, when it becomes appealing by discontinuance of earlier sound repetitions and by new choices for reiteration.[18]

These effects are of great importance in determining the precise nature of attributes and styles based on them. Kuntaka is, however, fully aware of the limitations of this kind of obliquity. Alliteration, he holds, should never violate propriety and should be in consonance with the feelings conveyed. Moreover, they should be very carefully chosen and should not be tarnished by unattractive phonemes. The poets can make their work more beautiful by the repetition of novel phonemes. And finally, lucidity should always be maintained.

The second type, lexical obliquity, comprises all effects based on the choice and use of words. This can have various forms. When a word in common usage, Kuntaka writes, is used so as to include an attribution of associative meanings other than the primary meaning, we have an example of lexical obliquity.

Another instance of lexical obliquity is the use of synonyms in an artistic way. Usage has conferred certain properties and associations on words, and synonyms have different shades of meaning and distinct associations. The most important kind of this variety of obliquity is due to transference (upacāra) when a word is used in a secondary sense to refer to an object with which it is not directly associated. Kuntaka comments thus:

> When the stated and the implied, though apparently far removed from each other, have a common attribute, however slight, which lends itself to hyperbolic treatment and adds charm and delight to figures of speech like metaphor, we have obliquity of metaphorical expression.[19]

This variety also includes such devices as speaking of an abstract phenomenon as it was some material which could be handled as if it is animate.

Another important sub-variety of this kind of vakrokti is called obliquity of usage. Kuntaka thus remarks on this:

> When a conventional denotation of words inheres connotation of even improbable meanings or includes exaggeration of an attribute in the poet's attempt to express extrordinary derision or supreme exaltation of the object, we have obliquity in the infinitude of usage. [20]

Obliqiuty of epithet is yet another sub-variety of lexical obliquity. "If the excellence of an epithet," Kuntaka says, "heightens the beauty of a verb or substantive, we have obliquity of epithet." [21]

Kuntaka is fully conscious of poetic beauty arising out of these components. He has also dealt with certain other sub-varieties of lexical obliquity. Obliquity of concealment (Saṃvṛti) operates when the subject of description is screened by the use of pronouns and so on for achieving excellence of expression. This is associated with the poet's keenness to convey the infinite speciality of the object being described. Obliquity in the use of affixes adds to the beauty of decorum in the subject described by making for a striking originality in a composition. The other sub-varieties which Kuntaka mentioned are: obliquity in adverbial, "root activity" (bhāva) and gender. There is

one more sub-variety of this kind, the one pertaining to the speciality of verbs, which can be realized in five forms:

> Obliquity of verbal forms is seen when there is cohesion of the subject with the verbs, when another subject attains excellence in relation to the same verb, when the adverbials go to qualify it, when metaphorical superimposition heightens the beauty of the verb form and when the direct object, though concealed, gets charmingly communicated.[22]

In a poetic composition, Kuntaka adds, the poet is also guided by considerations of special tense, case, number, person, preposition, particles, and so on. He discusses these various sources in his treatment of obliquity in the inflectional forms of substantives. This variety of obliquity may also be called grammatical obliquity. It includes all possibilities of grammatical construction of an expression. Ānandavardhana has included most of these sub-varieties in his treatment of dhvani.

Kuntaka concludes his discussion by maintaining that "when several forms of literary turns occur together in such a way as to enhance the beauty of one another, they produce artistic charm reminiscent of myriad-faced beauty." [23] The poetic speech, to him, is a creeper, with words as leaves, which give striking beauty to expression while enriching our feelings and rasas.

The next variety of vakrokti operates at the level of sentence. Kuntaka says:

> Obliquity of sentence is distinct from the richness of beauty born of attributes and figures in so far as they relate to artistic words and content expressed in varied styles. In

> fact, expressiveness of the sentence form should be regarded as the essence of this beauty. Just as the excellence of a painting transcends the beauty of various shades and colours on canvas, the poet's art far excels the beauty of individual elements such as word, meaning, attributes and embellishments.[24]

Obliquity in sentence has a thousand varieties including the whole range of figures of speech. Kuntaka follows the list of figures given by Bhāmaha but revises it by redefining the figures to lend greater precision to his analysis.

Kuntaka, unlike Bhāmaha, distinguishes figures from subject matter. But he accepts only eighteen figures. He remarks that the other figures, which he does not include, are either not different from the figures listed or lack aesthetic charm. A sentence, for him, is nothing but an assemblage of many beautifying elements. Comparing the strikingness of a sentence with that of a charming woman, he remarks:

> A good poet's oblique speech appeals to one's heart even like one's beloved. Both the beloved and poetic speech share common features, i.e., striking graceful qualities, alluring charm of word usage or foot-steps, elegant but sparse ornaments, tasteful sentiment, tender-heartedness and elegance of expression.[25]

He also discusses obliquity of subject matter. He says: "When the subject matter is described in a way conducive to beauty by virtue of its own infinite natural charm and by means of exclusively artistic expresions, we have an example of creative beauty relating to content."[26] Content which is beautiful serves an integral purpose in a poetic composition. The subject matter may be

"natural" (sahaja) or "imposed" (āhārya) by the poet. When the subject-matter, Kuntaka implies, is naturally beautiful, it does not have to be heavily embellished.

The senence is no longer regarded as the largest unit of linguistic analysis. The concept of "discourse" has opened up possibilities of the analysis of a text from a wider-than-sentence perspective. It is remarkable that Kuntaka does not finish off his analysis at the level of sentence but deals with obliquity in terms of the context and the entire composition. When the intended object is capable of maintaining a sense of unpredictability and is "the product of the unique, boundless poetic skill underlying it, we have the obliquity of episode or incident."[27]

Kuntaka also describes ten sub-varieties of the obliquity of episode. If the results are excellent, he does not care for the rules. He says, "It should not be vitiated by an excessive craze for observing rules even when they (*chandhas*) are inopportune, provided the episode reveals a unique charm of originality." So what he values most in the use of episodes is an organic unity. He goes on to say:

> An organic unity which strikingly underlies various incidents described in different parts of the work leading to intended end, each bound to the other by a relationship of mutual assistance, reveals the essence of creative originality which is most delectable in the case of rare poetic geniuses who are endowed with the gift of an extraordinary creative imagination.[28]

The last variety he discusses is the obliquity of composition itself. This type of vakrokti, he claims, has the beauty of the combined effect of the other five varieties. At this point Kuntaka's text is fragmentary. He describes seven main sub-varieties of the obliquity of the entire composition.

According to him, the poet may change the rasa of the source story to make his work delightful; he may make only one part of the original story the subject matter of his work. The very title of the work may possess strikingness indicating the tilt being given to it; an abbreviated story may be expanded or an extensive one cut short by the author. Finally, the whole work of the author may be oblique, giving instructions and telling new ways of success. Even if poets use an identical theme for their literary works, they use it so differently that each work has its own inherent beauty.

Kuntaka's treatment of the six varieties of vakrokti along with their sub-varieties is very detailed and impressive. Krishnamoorthy comments on this aspect thus: "Kuntaka had tried to widen the application of the idea of vakrokti so as to include all types of *camatkāra* in poetry. And his classification of several varieties of *vakrokti* was no doubt ingenious but hardly serviceable."[29]

Kuntaka tried to establish the supremacy of vakrokti in poetry as Ānandavardhana did for dhvani. His classification is more scientific than Ānandavardhana's: beginning with the minimal unit of sound, i.e., phonemes, he goes on to describe vakrokti at the level of a composite, extensive unit of discourse, i.e., *māhākāvya*. In his efforts to make his classification comprehensive, he equates some of the varieties of vakrokti with those of

dhvani. Some of Kuntaka's contemporaries believed that Kuntaka's theory of vakrokti was nothing other than the theory of dhvani in disguise.

Kuntaka, as Warder points out, was "no doubt inspired by Bhartṛhari's similar conception of language as indivisible utterances or sentences, grammatical analysis being only abstraction and not a discovery of real roots, suffixes etc."[30]

II

The two kinds of poetry which Tillyard discusses are "direct" and "oblique" poetry. The concept of oblique poetry has not been clearly formulated by Western scholars, nor have they applied it to critical practice, as has been done by the Indian poeticians. Aristotle was the first Western scholar to accept the full significance of obliquity in poetry. He regards metaphor as the greatest thing in poetry, the "mark of genius." As he says, "It is one thing that cannot be learnt from others; and it is also a sign of genius, since good metaphor implies an intuitive perception of the similarity in dissimilarity."[31]

In the Graeco-Roman tradition no critic has been so seriously concerned with obliquity as Longinus. According to Longinus, "The effect of elevated language upon an audience is not persuasion but transport."[32] He explains in detail the structure of speech and all the devices that lead to the sublime. He remarks:

> The sublime consists in a certain loftiness and consummateness of language, and it is by this and this only that the greatest poets and prose writers have won pre-eminence and lasting fame.[33]

He goes on to say that in poetry "we look for something transcending the human, the extraordinary, the great and the beautiful."[34] Crocé designates artistic beauty in poetry as a "verbal paradox." To him "the aesthetic fact... is form, and nothing but form." He remarks:

> Language is a perpetual creation. What has been linguistically expressed in not repeated, save by reproduction of what has already been reproduced. The ever-new impressions give rise to continuous changes of sound and meaning, that is, to ever-new expressions. To seek the model language is to seek the immobility of motion. [35]

There is a remarkable similarity between vakrokti and some of the tenets of Russian Formalism and New Criticism. The New Critics consider the arrangement or form of a poem as the most important matter, to them form is the basis of the intensity of poetry. They equate form with meaning; the aesthetics of organicism has been a major preoccupation with them. According to Cleanth Brooks, "The most critical discoveries of our time--perhaps if not a discovery but merely a recovery-- is that the parts of a poem have an organic relation to each other."[36]

The New Critics analysed poems in terms of opposites like texture / structure, extension / intention etc, and this critical practice is determined by the "principle of variety in unity or the reconciliation of the opposites." The analysis takes into account the technical principles of ambiguity, polysemy, paradox and irony and such other features. Vakrokti is thus analogous to these concepts of New Criticism.

William Empson used the term "ambiguity" to refer to words and sentences with secondary meanings. His *Seven Types of Ambiguity* is instrumental in highlighting the importance of this trope implying the dynamics of poetic meaning. Wimsatt and Brooks refer to Empson's book as having "brought home to a whole generation of readers the fact of the many-sidedness of language."[37] It is the ambiguity that enables the poet to meet the double demand made of the language of poetry. Empson's treatment of ambiguity is similar to I.A.Richards'. The poet, according to Richards, has to make inexpressibly complex adjustment and hence his ambiguity:

> The natural generality and vagueness of all reference which is not made specific by the aid of space and time is of great importance for the understanding of the senses in which poetry may be said to be true.[38]

Richards talks of "the state-of order-disorder within our lexical structural would-be system called poetry."[39] "Poetry with insides," Richards continues, "gives most pleasure when only generally...understood."[40] Richards sees ambiguity as nothing abnormal. He equates the study of poetry with the study of the modes of language, characterized by "the ambiguities and confusions that are overt or latent."[41] He also points out that ambiguity, which exists everywhere, is in particular "the indispensable means of most of our important utterance — especially in poetry and religion.[42]

The poetic language occasions multiple interpretations. In *The Meaning of Meaning* Richards calls poetry the supreme form of emotive language. The language of poetry, as against the non-poetic language, is "fluid."

He goes on to explain this fluidity:

> There is an important use of words... (in poetry) which does not freeze its meanings but leaves them fluid, which does not fix an assertorial clip upon them in the way that scientific prose and factual discourse must. It leaves them to move about and relate themselves in various ways to one another.[43]

It is this "fluidity" of meaning that gives abiding charm to poetry. Ambiguity, in the sense of multiple implications,is a natural, subtle and effective instrument for poetry and dramatic purposes. On this account, poetic language means all it says and suggests even what is does not say.

Ransom points out that the concreteness of poetry does not prevent it from becoming ambiguous. If the artist has an observant mind his compositions are likely to be rich and suggestive. The distinguishing feature of poetry is ambiguity which does not only mean having a double meaning. Therefore, devices like pun do not constitute ambiguity, because there is no scope for "puzzlement" here. The kind of ambiguity that Empson talks of originates from extensions of meaning from either a single word or juxtaposition of words; ambiguity is always bound up with figure and imagery.

The seven types of ambiguity mentioned by Empson are types of "logical disorder" in order of increasing distance from simple statement and logical exposition. These seven types are kinds in which

> a detail is effective in several ways at once; two or more alternative meanings are fully resolved into one; two apparently unconnected meanings are given simulaneously; alternative meanings combine to make a complicated state

> of mind in the author; a fortunate confusion is present which owes its inception to the author's discovering his idea in the act of writing or not holding it all in his mind at once, what is said is contradictory or irrelevant and the reader is forced to invent interpretations; and full contradiction is in operation marking a division in the author's mind.[44]

Brooks defines poetry in terms of structure. This structure is for more internal than the metrical pattern or the sequence of images; it is "a structure of meanings, evaluations, and interpretation," and the principle of unity which informs it seems to be one of "balancing and harmonising connotations, attitudes and meanings."[45] Such a structure involves irony and paradox. The "prose-sense "fails to represent the inner, essential or real structure of the poem.

"Irony," according to Brooks, is "the kind of qualification which the various elements in a content receive from the context." It is the "recognition of incongruities."[46] Brooks' irony, in other words, refers to a poetic device which involves "the less extreme kinds of modification of a word by its context."[47]

Brooks' concepts of "irony" and "paradox" are interlinked. He thinks poetry in terms of paradox, which is structural. He regards paradox as "a device for contrasting the conventional views of a situation, or the limited and special view of it such as those taken in practical and scientific discourse, with a more inclusive view."[48] He believes that almost all great poems ensure the presence of irony and paradox. He maintains that "paradox is the language appropriate and inevitable to poetry" and that poetry is different from the scientist's

language which is "purged of every trace of paradox." He further remarks in his essay "The Language of Paradox" that, "...the paradox springs from the very nature of the poet's language."[49] Even a "simple and straightforward poet is forced into paradoxes by the nature of his instrument."[50] The poets consciously employ paradox to gain compression and precision. The method, says Brooks, "is an extension of the normal language of poetry, [and] not a perversion of it."[51]

Brooks has been criticized for his critical monism. While acknowledging his "valuable contributions," Crane criticizes Brooks for presenting a theory which has a "fundamental error" in it:

> ...he has begun to theorize about poetry at the wrong end — starting not with concrete poetic wholes of various kinds, the parts of which with their possible interrelationships, can be inferred as consequences from inductively established principles, but rather with one only of the several internal causes of poems, and the cause which they have most common with all other literary productions, namely, their linguistic matter: here he begins, and here also he ends. The choice is regrettable, since it prevents him from dealing adequately with poetic works in terms of the sufficient or distinguishing causes of their production and nature....[52]

Despite frequent occurrences of the terms "irony" and "paradox" in his works, Brooks himself admits that perhaps they are inadequate and misleading."[53]

Allen Tate describes poetry in terms of tension. The poet, according to him, "has an immediate responsibility . . . for the vitality of language"; his task is the preservation of "the integrity, the purity, and the reality of language."[54] The

poet has an edge over the scientist, for his inner field of experience is denied to the latter, and he has the resources of figurative language at his disposal.[55] Tate believes that a poet is known by his language and not by his subject matter: "For in the long run, whatever the poets 'philosophy', however wide may be the extension of his meaning . . . by his language shall you know him; the quality of his language is the valid limit of what he has to say."[56] The quality of a poem can be determined by its total effect, to examine which one has its configuration of meaning. "The meaning of poetry," says Tate, " is the 'tension', the full organized body of all the extension and intension that we can find in it."[57] "Extension," as logicians use the word, stands for denotation, and "intention," for connotation. In the ordinary or logical use of the term, the two are of inverse relationship. A poem is a verbal structure which in some peculiar way has both a wide "extension" and a deep "intention." All good poetry, Tate maintains, is "a unity of all the meanings from the furthest extremes of intention and extension," and the recognition of these meaning is "the gift of experience."[58]

These views have a striking parallel with those of Kuntaka's. Kuntaka defines literature at one point as the mutual tension, or rivalry of word and meaning. His is a theory of poetic tension of general validity, in which tension is compatible with basic harmony, as is evident from his definition of literature as the coexistence of sound and sense. Kuntaka, however,extends his concept from the poetic moment to the poetic continuum. The parity of sound and meaning, the notion of a "jealousy" between them, and the sub-ordination of the two to the total poetic expression are the most important features of the concept of tension in poetry.

Another concept that bears obvious resemblances to vakrokti is Blackmur's theory of language as "gesture." "When the language of words fail," Blackmur writes,"we resort to the language of gesture."[59] The language cannot be put to its highest use without incorporating within it some such quality of gesture. He further observes,

> Nor can we master language purposefully without re-mastering gesture within it. Gesture in language is the outward and dramatic play of inward and imaged meaning. It is that play of meaningfulness among words which cannot be defined in the formulas in the dictionary... gesture is that meaningfulness which is moving, in every sense of that word: what moves the words and what moves us.[60]

Gesture, Blackmur claims, is of great structural importance in poetry. It is "native" to language, without which language would get dry and petrified. It comes before language, but when it goes with language, the language is animated by it. Blackmur regards gesture as " what objectively joins the perceptions of the different senses together, heightening them into a single sensation."[61]

Blackmur's concept of "gesture" can be placed alongside the Indian concepts of dhvani and vakrokti. Blackmur draws a distinction between the "language of silence," understood by processes of mystical or intuitive knowing, and the "rational" language.

He, however, believes that "technique" should not be confined to the linguistic arrangement in a poem, but involves the other possibilities of

language for its illumination ranging from structure and tropes to sources and influences. He dislikes poetry that is unintelligible. He says:

> True meaning... can only exist where some contact, however remote, is preserved between the language, forms, or symbols in which it is given and something concrete, individual, or sensual which inspired it, and the degree in which the meaning is seized will depend on the degree in which the particular concreteness is realized.[62]

But the New Critics' approach to the poetic language is too circumscribed and prescriptive compared to the dynamics of vakrokti. Their assumptions, as Wimsatt points out, "have been developing in a way that makes it now difficult to speak well of poetry." [63] It is significant to note that Blackmur himself admits that the skills developed for the analysis of texts has resulted in "critical insularity."

Kuntaka has discussed six varieties of vakrokti, operating at six levels of poetic expression: phonetic, lexical, grammatical, sentential, contextual and the composition as a whole. These varieties of vakrokti can be placed beside eight kinds of deviations mentioned by Leech: lexical, grammatical, phonological, graphological, semantic, dialectical, registral, and historical deviation. In a way, Kuntaka's theory pointed toward the direction subsequent literary criticism had to take. Kuntaka regards the poet's intuition as the source of obliquity, thus giving the theory of vakrokti a human character.

Tillyard uses the word "rhythm" in a wide sense to cover all the effects that the sounds of words command. Rhythm is a powerful means of obliquity.

Shelley's poem *To a Skylark,* Tillyard says, is an excellent example of rhythmical obliquity. The poem is not a fanciful elaboration of the skylark's song but an expression of the poet's instinctive belief in progress and achievement. The variety of rhythm in the poem suggests the elasticity of the poet's feeling. Experience proves how thoroughly the rhythm is the poem.

Another source of obliquity is symbolism. One can hardly deny the effectiveness of symbols in the poetic expression. Tillyard uses the term "symbolism" in a rather narrow sense. To him, it implies the use of certain objects as constantly significant, not subservient to other objects. It also implies the author's deliberate intention to give the objects a symbolic meaning. But Tillyard accepts symbolism as a minor form of poetical obliquity; he becomes somewhat sceptical of certain fixed symbols as they tend to become either "aridly mechanical" or "fraudulently suggestive."

Allusion, like symbolism, is regarded as a minor means of obliquity. By allusion, Tillyard means a reference, conscious or unconscious, to a passage in literature, its main function being to thicken the meaning of certain details. Allusions are helpful in attaining economy of words. They connect a poet to the tradition, and once the continuity has been established, they take on a general function. They also help the poet manipulate the "tone" of the poem.

Obliquity in a poetic composition may lend some obscurity to style, but eventually it provides density to the poetic expression. As an expressive system, poetry, particularly modern poetry, embraces all forms of obliquity as expression of deeper thought.

Oblique poetry finds expression in what has been called the "complex style." It has been pointed out that the Metaphysical style of the seventeeth century English literature, the style of Browning and the difficult style of the modern poets like Hopkins are different realizations of this "complex style."

This style is marked by an unusually powerful expressiveness. Those who write in this style always attempt to say things fresh and are not afraid of boldly experimenting with new forms of expression, new tricks of style or using old techniques in new ways. The Metaphysical poets, led by John Donne, shocked their contemporaries and successors by their daring innovation in language use.

Browning's is a well-known case of a poet writing obscure poetry. The sources of his poetry are his subtle and unusual themes, his varied, unfamiliar and learned allusions and illustrations, his extremely abrupt and sometimes carefree manner of putting things, all of which were part of his new technique of writing poetry. He found the conventional notion of writing inadequate and incapable of transferring his thoughts and feelings on to the dead and silent page.

Quite a few modern poets produced what could be accepted as the best specimens of oblique style. Hopkins poetic experiments in "sprung rhythm" and "inscape" are unconventional and striking. Hopkins thought that the one aim of poetry is to grasp and express the individuality of everything in the world. An attempt to capture "inscape" in poetry will mean precision and distinctiveness in language. This would explain many apparent difficulties or "oddities" in Hopkins' vocabulary and syntax. The directness and urgency which he wishes to communicate along with his concentrated fierceness obliged him to wrench syntax, and frequently to use inversions, omissions and ellipsis. He did not use

the rules of grammar, for the rules limited the possibilities of language as a medium of poetry. He was aware that his poetry may appear obscure or difficult, but had to explain to his friends that he was obscure not because he wanted to be obscure but because he could not help being obscure while striving to say quickly, minutely, powerfully and authentically what he wanted to say. It is the peculiar mode of apprehension that forces Hopkins to take recourse to the distinctive mode of saying things.

Poetry is found to be obscure when there is a breakdown in the flow of communication between the poet and his readers. But when a poet's mind is working under some kind of intense pressure, the resulting poetry gets obscure because he is raising language to a new power. "In such moments," remarks John Press, "the poet rises and falls through different levels of consciousness, leaping enormous gaps between discontinuous orders of experience, like a desperate climber... ."[64]

Writing on "pure poetry," as he calls it, Valéry, the French symbolist says:

> Every time words show a certain deviation from the most direct, that is, the most insensible expression of thought, every time deviations foreshadow, as it were, a world of relationships distinct from the purely practical world, we conceive more or less precisely, the possibility of enlarging this exceptional domain,... which, when developed and used, constitutes poetry in so far as it is an effect of art.[65]

Valéry is not aware of the danger of such a poetry. He particularly draws our attention to the "complicated and artificial" nature of the art of our age, which becomes more mysterious, narrower, more inaccessible to the people.

Mallarmé has justified obsurity in poetry even more strongly:

> Obsurity is a dangerous thing, regardless of whether it results from the reader's inadequacy or from the poet's. But if you avoid the work it involves, you are cheating.... There must always be an enigma in poetry. The purpose of literature — the only purpose — is to evoke things.[66]

Ambiguity arises in poetry from the poet's employment of language in a particular way to reveal several layers of meaning. Words, as Bhartṛhari says, are capable of yielding multiple meanings, even unintended ones, by force of context. Empson uses the term "ambiguity" to connote various layers of meaning in poetry. He remarks:

> An ambiguity, in ordinary speech, means something very pronounced and as a rule witty or deceitful. I propose to use the word in an extended sense, and shall think relevant to my subject any verbal nuance, however slight, which gives room for alternative reactions to the same piece of language.[67]

Empson's classification of ambiguities is based on their communicative effects and their contribution to the textual structure. Many of the ambiguities he deals with involve factors that cannot easily be evaluated linguistically. These levels include: levels of ability in comprehension; degrees of sensitivity and ingenuity; awareness of historical background; allegory; allusion; etymology; sound symbolism; and the poet's intentions.

Sanskrit critics have given an impressive classification of "ambiguity" on the basis of comparison (*sadharmya)*, exaggeration (*atiśaya*), dissimilarity

(*vaiṣamya*), appropriateness (*aucitya*), obliqueness (*vakrokti*), and wonder (*camatkāra*). Empson's seven types of ambiguity roughly correspond to paronomasia, irony, chime, conceit, transitional similies, repudiation of the idea, antithesis and paradox.

Wheelwright has employed a more significant term, i.e., "plurisignation," to indicate the richness of meaning in poetry.[68] Ambiguity can be interpreted in more than one way in a sentence. Most ambiguities are, however, automatically resolved by verbal context or by the situation in general in which communication takes place.

The phenomenon of multiple meanings, whether accidental or intentional, is not always a negative feature of language use. As Weinreich suggests, it is doubtful whether "an absolute distinction between true ambiguity and mere indefiniteness of reference can be maintained."[69] And it is this "indefiniteness of reference" that makes oblique poetry.

Linguistic and stylistic techniques have proved useful in the analysis of the verbal structure of poetry. As Culler points out:

> ... linguists [have] provided a number of concepts which could be used elleptically or metaphorically in discussing literary works... the use of such terms may help one to identify relations of various kinds, both actual and virtual, within a single level or between levels, which are responsible for the production of meaning.[70]

The foremost among these concepts, Culler says, is the Saussurean dichotomy of langue and parole, which he regards as the basis of distinction on which

modern linguistics rests. It would be worthwhile to consider the Indian theory of vakrokti in relation to Saussure's langue-parole distinction and Chomsky's treatment of "competence" and "performance."

The Indian thinking on poetry is largely centered around language. *"Vāk"* has been accepted as the very base of the Indian thought. Poetry has been considered in India primarily in terms of linguistic organisation. The Sanskrit poetics gives due consideration to linguistic aspects while dealing with various elements of literary composition. A close examination of the various aspects of Indian poetics will make it clear that Indian authorities on poetics never separated linguistics from poetics. While dealing with literary problems they also dealt with many intricate problems pertaining to linguistic behaviour. The Indian theory of stylistics made particular efforts to discover the general principles of poetic language.

The system built by Indian scholars is somewhat similar to that of generative grammar. It emphasizes at every point that the linguistic approach is the only approach which can help determine the patterns of beauty in literature.

Ānandavardhana explored the nature of poetic meaning, and unfolded the function of words in poetic discourse. If classification, characterisation and meaning of relevant facts are accepted as the main objectives of science, then Ānandavardhana's poetics must be said to have a scientific basis.

The linguistic orientation of Sanskrit poetics can be seen in alaṁkāra and vastu dhvani. The basis of alaṁkāra dhvani and vastu dhvani is essentially linguistic. Also, blemishes (doṣas) are mostly classified on a linguistic basis.

The general approach of Sanskrit poetics has been relatively objective in building a science of literature. S.K. De, however, takes this approch to be no better than that of textbooks and manuals. He attacks the Sanskrit poetics by saying that it ignores the poetic personality in the work of art and does not "satisfactorily explain as to why the work of one poet differs in character and quality from that of another poet, or why even two works of the same poet are not the same in these respects." He goes on to argue:

> Sanskrit poetics purportedly engaged in solving the poetic riddle, delighted, rather in the pleasure of abstracted thought and formula calculation. Its method is suitable for the study of botany or zoology, but affords hardly any assistance for the understanding of aesthetic facts or principles. While it has an intuitive realization of the true nature of poetry, it allowed its intellectual prepossession to confine itself to the formulation of pedagogic expedients or normative abstractions. It is like studying the index of a book than the book itself.[71]

Though the Sanskrit critics were meticulously involved in "pedagogic expedients," as De argues, I would not completely agree with him that the Sanskrit critics were much concerned with "abstracted thought." What the Sanskrit critics have said about the nature of poetic langauge, the significance of suggestion as a semantic function, autonomy of literature, the nature of aesthetic perception, emotionality are all relevant for the modern scholars today. A comparative study would reveal that the Indian poetic tradition shares with the modern Western critical theories a central and practical interest in the way poetry should be analysed. It is only that Indian critics do not use Indian theories to analyse and evaluate modern literary text.

Kuntaka's and the Russian Formalists' approaches to the nature of poetic language have a striking similarity. Both were concerned with the basic problem of literariness in literature and strove to look into it in their own way by excluding non-literary agents. The point of departure between the two, however, is that Shlovsky, in the process of locating and understanding literariness of literature, demystified literature, in the process also de-mystifying the creator/ writer. In the Indian scenario this question did not arise because Indian writers never assumed any threat for literature and never felt the need to leave their biographical trace behind unlike the Westerners.

Kuntaka and the Formalists agreed on the fundamental principle of poetics lying in the distinction between poetic language and everyday language. This distinction could be seen in the opposition between *svabhāvokti* (statement) and *vakrokti* (obliquity), between the language of familiarization and that of defamiliarization. *Svabhāvokti* (scientific treatise), imparts knowledge and information, it removes ignorance but does not enhance perception, which is the work of poetic language. Similarly, Shklovsky believes that poetic language glorifies and enhances perception, whereas scientific language enhances recognition. However, Kuntaka's discussion of vakrokti and his views on language are more comprehensive than Shklovsky's concept of defamiliarization. Kuntaka's vakrokti anticipated the problem of literariness much before the Russian formalist theory.

Notes :

[1] Kuntaka, *Vakroktijīvita,* trans. K. Krishnamoorthy (Dharwad : Karanataka University, 1977) I.2, 288.

[2] Abhinavagupta, *Abhinavabhārati,* ed. Ramakrishna Kavi (Poona: Bhandrarkar Oriental Institute, 1956). i-iv.

[3] P. C. Lahiri, *Concept of Rīti and Guṇa in Sanskrit Poetics* (Delhi: V.K. Publishing House, 1987)17.

[4] Abhinavagupta iv.

[5] Kuntaka I.7 292.

[6] Kuntaka I.8 300.

[7] Ruyyaka, *Alaṁkārasarvasva,* ed. Girijaprasad Dvivedi (Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1939) 148-49.

[8] Mammaṭa, *Kāvyaprakāśa,* ed. Sivaprasad Bhattacharya (Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1961) 301.

[9] Jagannātha, *Rasagaṅgādhara,* ed. Badrinath Jha and M.M.Jha (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1955) 203.

[10] Kuntaka I.10 306-307.

[11] Kuntaka III.4 419.

[12] P.C. Lahiri 147.

[13] S.P. Bhattacharya, *Studies in Indian Poetics* (Calcutta: Firma KLM Pvt. Ltd., 1964) 116.

[14] G.Vijayavardhana, *Outlines of Sanskrit Poetics* (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1970) 131,135.

[15] Lahiri 148.

[16] K. Krishnamoorthy, *Studies in Indian Aesthetics and Criticism* (Mysore: D.V.K. Murthy, 1979) 190-91.

[17] Kuntaka I.18-21 389-92.

[18] Kuntaka II-4 365.

[19] Kuntaka II.13-14 381.

[20] Kuntaka II.8-9 369-370.

[21] Kuntaka II.10 373.

[22] Kuntaka II 24-25 395.

[23] Kuntaka II.34 408.

[24] Kuntaka III. 3-4 419.

[25] Kuntaka III.64 535.

[26] Kuntaka III.1 411.

[27] Kuntaka IV.2 537.

[28] Kuntaka IV.15 566.

[29] K. Krishnamoorthy, *Dhvanyāloka and Its Critics* (Mysore: Kavyalaya Pub., 1966) 306.

[30] A.K. Warder, *Indian Kāvya Literature. vol. I* (Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass, 1972) 106.

[31] Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. Ingram Bywater in *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon (New York: Random House, 1941) 1459a.

[32] Longinus, *On the Sublime*, ed. T.S.Dorsch (London: Penguin, 1969)100.

[33] Longinus 100.

[34] Longinus 148.

[35] Benetto Croce, *Aesthetic* (London: Oxford UP, 1922) 253.

[36] Cleanth Brooks and R.P. Warren, *Understanding Poetry* (New York: Henry Holt, 1938) 71.

[37] W.K. Wimsatt and Cleanth Brooks, *Literary Criticism: A Short History* (London: Routledge, 1957) 638.

[38] I.A. Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1948) 160.

[39] I.A. Richards, "The Future of Poetry," *The Screens and Other Poems* (New York: Norton, 1960) 126.

[40] I.A. Richards, *Coleridge on Imagination* (London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962) 214.

[41] I.A. Richards *Coleridge on Imagination* 232.

[42] I.A. Richards *The Philoshphy of Rhetoric* (London: Oxford UP, 1936) 40.

[43] I.A. Richards, *Speculative Instruments* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955) 148.

[44] William Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (London: Penguin, 1947) v-vi.

[45] Cleanth Brooks , *The Well-Wrought Urn* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1947) 178-79.

[46] Cleanth Brooks 191.

[47] Brooks and Warren 587.

[48] Cleanth Brooks 230.

[49] Cleanth Brooks 8.

[50] Cleanth Brooks 9.

[51] Cleanth Brooks 10.

[52] R.S. Crane, "The Critical Monism of Cleanth Brooks," in *Critics and Criticism,* ed. R. S. Crane (Toronto: Univ of Tornoto Press, 1953) 105.

[53] Cleanth Brooks 179.

[54] Allen Tate, *The Man of Letters in the Modern World* (New York: Harcourt, 1955) 11,20.

[55] Allen Tate 35.

[56] Allen Tate 73.

[57] Allen Tate 71.

[58] Allen Tate 70.

[59] R.P. Blackmur, *Language as Gesture* (New York: Columbia UP, 1954) 3.

[60] R.P. Blackmur, 6.

[61] R.P. Blackmur, 16-17.

[62] R.P. Blackmur, 396-97.

[63] W.K. Wimsatt, *The Verbal Icon* (New York: University of Kentucky Press, 1954) 276.

[64] John Press, *The Chequerd Shade* (London: Oxford UP, 1963)191.

[65] Paul Valéry, *The Art of Poetry* (London: Routledge, 1958) 184-85.

[66] Stephene Mallarmé, *Mallarmé: Selected Prose Poems, Essays and Letters*, trans. Bradford Cook (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1956) 21-22.

[67] William Empson 19.

[68] Philip Wheelwright, *The Burning Fountain* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1954) 101.

[69] U.Weinreich, "Explorations in Semantic Theory," in *Current Trends in Linguistics. vol.III*, ed. T.A.Sebok (The Hague: Mouton, 1966) 411-12.

[70] Jonathan Culler, *Structuralist Poetics* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975)8.

[71] S.K. De, *Sanskrit Poetics as a Study of Aesthetic* (Bombay: Oxford UP, 1963) 78-79.