



International Journal of Sanskrit Research

अनन्ता

ISSN: 2394-7519

IJSR 2017; 3(4): 196-200

© 2017 IJSR

www.anantaajournal.com

Received: 02-05-2017

Accepted: 03-06-2017

Dr. Sourabodhi Bhattacharyya
Assistant Professor of Sanskrit,
Galsi Mahavidyalaya, Galsi,
West Bengal, India

Ālaṃkārika concept of *doṣa*: A critical study (From Bharata to Vāmana)

Dr. Sourabodhi Bhattacharyya

Introduction

Poetics asserts an outstandingly basic position in Sanskrit composing. Rājas' ekhara sees it as the seventh aṅga of Veda ^[1]. Despite the way that the Ālaṃkāras'āstras is so named, beside alaṃkāra, kāvya and kavi, the utility, cause, sway, guṇas, doṣas, rīti, rasa thus on of kāvya in like manner come shockingly near Ālaṃkāras'āstras. Unmistakable analysts have dealt with the diverse subjects of Sanskrit poetics and have insisted their gift time to time. Some of those poeticians treat certain part of the speculation, while others deal with the entire space in amazing purpose of interest. Starting from Bharata who flourished in about the second century B.C. up to the eighteenth century A.D., researchers like Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, Vāmana, Udbhata, Rudrata, Ānandavardhana, Rājas' ekhara, Abhinavagupta, Mammata, Vis'vanātha, Jagannātha and others have made Ālaṃkāras'āstras of different volumes and sorts in their individual ages. Each of the Ālaṃkārikas has been found to have a couple dissensions with others in esteem of their considerations and nature of theory.

In the Ālaṃkāras'āstras a basic spot is given to the treatment of poetic blemishes (kāvyadoṣas). All the unmistakable Ālaṃkārikas beginning from Bharata have dealt with the nature and sorts of defects which are absolutely to be evaded in the academic pieces since they destroy the jazzy perfection of verse. Doṣas, are, thusly, suitably described as the explanations behind diminution (apakarṣa) of kāvya ^[2]. The nonattendance of doṣa is considered by Bhoja the essential condition which makes an expression fit to be called kāvya ^[3]. Among the four poetical relations of s'abda and artha the first is the evading of doṣas (doṣahāna). Essentially subsequent to taking due thought to avoid all defects a craftsman can consider emblishing his talk with excellences. Complementing on the evading of doṣas in kāvya, Bhāmaha states that nobody is welcomed by sacrosanct writings to create verse under sensitivity or coercion or discipline, however to be a terrible craftsman is declared by the sagacious to pass itself ^[4]. Likewise, Daṇḍin watches that one should not make even an irrelevant defect in a verse as a decent looking body may realize contempt by uprightness of a singular tainted spot ^[5]. Indeed, even the poeticians like Mammata explicitly and others like Vis'vanātha and Jagannātha obviously advocate the release of blemishes in the implications of kāvya.

Bharata's view towards *kāvyadoṣa*

In his Nāṭya-S'āstra, Bharata, the father of Indian Dramaturgy has talked about in subtle element the proper different methods of expression, beat, style, and metrical courses of action that improve the rasa of a work alongside a framework of *doṣas*. Bharata's central concern being dramaturgy and the methods to be utilized in the creation of show for stage execution he manages different ways and methods of expressions, which include excellence, power and pride to, the discourse ^[6]. As damaged expressions detracts from the excellence of verbal and formal parts of poetry, he, subsequently, has observed flaws which are to be stayed away from by the dramatists. He has given a point by point record of the thirty-six "*kāvya lakṣaṇās*" or unmistakable components that loan magnificence to a lovely work Bharata is specific that every single graceful creation both capable of being heard and noticeable trust have in any

Correspondence

Dr. Sourabodhi Bhattacharyya
Assistant Professor of Sanskrit,
Galsi Mahavidyalaya, Galsi,
West Bengal, India

event a portion of the thirty six *lakṣaṇās* and as they add magnificence to the abstract piece, they ought to be utilized by the dramatists with due regard for the rasa presented.

The literary imperfections demolish the tasteful relish of a work, so Bharata has instituted the term "*kāvya-doṣās*" to portray them. As the idyllic benefits advance the tasteful impact of a work Bharata has named them as "*kāvya-guṇās*." It is intriguing to note that Bharata has offered priority to the *kāvya-doṣās* over the *kāvya-guṇās* and says that the guṇas are none other than alternate extremes of *doṣas* -*guṇā viparyayādeṣām*^[7]. The way that he has specified the *doṣas* in front of the guṇas is a sign, that he considers evasion of *doṣas* as the initial step while in transit to the acknowledgment of rasa. Bharata enumerates ten poetic blemishes^[8]: 1. *gudhārtha* (circumlocution) 2. *arthāntara* (superfluous expression) 3. *arthahīna* (devoid of meaning) 4. *bhinnārtha* (defective significance) 5. *ekārtha* (tautology) 6. *abhiplūtārtha* (elliptical expression) 7. *nyāyādapeta* (logical lapse) 8. *viṣama* (unevenness of metre) 9. *visandhi* (hiatus) 10. *s'abdacyuta* (grammatical impurity). Bharata characterizes all these *doṣas* that are intricately clarified and delineated by Abhinavagupta in his commentary on Nāṭya-S'āstra called 'Abhinavabhāratī'. Bharata underlines on the shirking of *doṣas* or literary imperfections since *doṣa*, as the very name demonstrates, has a deflecting impact on verse as it defaces its magnificence. Abhinavagupta, the renowned analyst of Nāṭya S'āstra demands the nonappearance of *doṣas* than on the nearness of *guṇas* and *alamkāras* advancing his perspective regarding Bharata's *doṣas*: '*etad-doṣa-vihīnam s'rutisukham dīpta-rasam ca yadi bhavati tāvatā guṇāntarairalamkārais'ca hīnamapi kāvyam lakṣaṇayogāvhyabhicāritiyuktam*'^[9].

As Bharata was the most seasoned mastermind on graceful benefits and negative marks his thought was not clear in regards to the *s'abda-doṣas* and *artha-doṣas* as isolated divisions however his meaning of *visandhi* has in its perspective *s'abdas* more than *arthas*. It has gotten to be basic for the later researchers to follow the development of these ideas which took clearer and more consistent shape bit by bit in the later stages. Moreover the ten *doṣas* are not called *rasadoṣas* however, as we have seen, they are eventually identified with Rasa. It is additionally be noticed that According to Bharata, literary flaws are the idyllic elements, which corrupt graceful excellence all around. Then again, they are just called *kāvya doṣas*. This shows the simple way of poetics in the period of Bharata; and that is the reason we don't meet here with a nitty gritty treatment of *anaucitya*, the central impediment of Rasa, which was exceedingly explained later by *Dhvanikāra* and others.

Bhāmaha's view towards *doṣas*

On exchange about *doṣas*, Bhāmaha the creator of *Kāvyaalamkāra*, not just takes after Bharata in number of *kāvya-doṣa*, but adds more *kāvya-doṣa* to the rundown. Likewise he restricted to the announcement of Bharata, that literary flaws or poetic blemishes are the wonderful substances, which corrupt beautiful magnificence generally. Bhāmaha states that in specific situations, some literary flaws additionally upgrade wonderful impact and along these lines these imperfections don't generally deface graceful excellence. At the end of the day, a *doṣa* may once in a while likewise turn into a *guṇa* on the off chance that it helps in the acknowledgment of the slant.

Bhāmaha, has examined in point of interest the idea of *guṇas* and *doṣas* that oversee a scholarly synthesis. He respects the nearness of *doṣas* as an indication of *anaucitya*. For the most

part Bhāmaha has said two arrangements of graceful deformities in the first and fourth section containing ten *doṣas* of his *Kāvyaalamkāra* separately^[10]. While talking about general qualities of verse Bhāmaha said first arrangement of *doṣas* in a connection. These are as follows: 1. *neyārtha* (far-fetchedness). 2. *kliṣṭa* (obstruction of the sense). 3. *anyārtha* (disappearance of the sense). 4. *avācaka* (inexpressiveness). 5. *gūḍha-s'abdābhidhana* (hidden meaning). 6. *ayuktimat* (improper). 7. *s'ruti-duṣṭa* (offensive to the ear). 8. *artha-duṣṭa* (implicity indecent). 9. *kalpanā-duṣṭa* (difficult conception). 10. *s'ruti-kaṣṭa* (unmelodious).

The announcement which instantly precedes the list of these *doṣas* is: '*vaktrābhidheya's'abdoktirīṣṭā vācāmālanṅkṛtiḥ*'^[11]. "A shrewd or guileful presentation of significance and words is attractive in ideals of their constituting different methods of expression." Then he continues to give the rundown of *doṣas*, *neyārtha* and so forth. On the off chance that our understanding of the later slokas is to be with regards to the past comments of Bhāmaha, we might need to say that these *doṣas* speak to flaws in sly locution which in its turn has been portrayed as the substance of adornment in verse. No and each characteristic in the turn of expression will gain the status of adornment. Expressions too outlandish ought to be stayed away from carefully. Specifically, *neyārtha* and others are the vertible pitfalls which an artist ought to prepare for. Consequently, it will be seen, Bhāmaha's first rundown of *doṣas* might be more apropos portrayed as *vakroktidoṣas* than *kāvya-doṣas*.

Guarding Upamā an over the top measure of crucial portion in his arrangement of *Alamkāras* Bhāmaha notice seven Upamā-doṣas in the second segment of his *Kāvyaalamkāra*. Bhāmaha as per the assessment of Medhāvīn, presents seven Upamā-doṣas, viz., (i) *hīnatva* (deficiency) (ii) *asambhava* (impossibility) (iii) *lingabheda* (disparity of gender) (iv) *vacanabheda* (disparity of number) (v) *viparyaya* (contrariety) (vi) *upamānādhikāta* (redundancy in upamāna) and (vii) *asādṛśya* (dissimilarity)^[12].

The faults discussed by Bhāmaha in his second list are eleven viz., (i) *apārtha* (absence of collecting meaning) (ii) *vyārtha* (with conflicting statement) (iii) *ekārtha* (tautology) (iv) *sasams'aya* (ambiguity) (v) *apakrama* (reversal of order of statement) (vi) *sabdahīna* (ungrammatical) (vii) *yatibhraṣṭa* (deviation from the rules of metrical pause) (viii) *bhinnavṛtta* (fault in metre) (ix) *visandhi* (disjunction of euphonic combination), (x) *desa-kala-kala-loka-nyayagama-virodhi* (alien to place, time etc.) and (xi) *pratiṅghatvādihīna*^[13]. These constitute the *doṣas* second to none in any *kāvya*, as indicated by Bhāmaha. While the primary rundown of *doṣas* concerns *vakrokti*, the internal nature or substance of verse, the second specifies just such deformities as are pretty much outside.

From above dialogue we can say that Bhāmaha's perspective towards *kāvya-doṣa* was more adaptable than his forerunner Bharata. He is not just offers significance to the linguistic precision and stylish values of the word and sense in verse additionally attempts to center the light on the prerequisite of intelligent exactness. Bhāmaha demands staying away from lovely flaws which he clarifies finally. This demonstrates his inclination and request for flawlessness in the craft of graceful structure. In spite of the fact that generally tolerant of the perspectives of others, he just can't acknowledge idyllic flaws without getting bothered, for the writers ought not create broken pieces. For this matter he in a roundabout way berates even Kalidasa for rational does not endorse of a cloud turning into a courier^[14]. This doesn't make him blind towards

wonderful magnificence which may coincidentally be created through the organization of the supposed idyllic flaw too. On occasion the specific setting transforms a defective organization into a wondrous thing and Bhāmaha with all his strictness, is interested in this.

*sannives'avis'eṣāttu duruktamapi s'obhate/
nīlam palās'amābaddhamantarāle srajāmiv//
kiñcidās'rayasaundaryāddhatte s'obhāmasādhvapi/
kāntāvilocananyastam mālimasamivāñjanam//*^[15]

Maybe this later on made ready to the hypothesis of perpetual and impermanent idyllic flaws considered much painstakingly by later *Dhvani-scholars*.

Daṇḍin's view on kāvyadoṣa

Before entering in the subtle elements examination on Daṇḍin's perspective towards the concept of literary flaws (kāvyadoṣa) we ought to take care of the primary part of Kāvyaḍars'a.

*tadalpamapi nopekṣyam kāvyē duṣṭam kathañcana /
syād vapuḥ sundaramapi s'vitraikena durbhagam//*^[16]

It implies that even a slight defectis beyond any doubt to deface the impact of verse generally as a solitary infected spot is adequate to render a great looking body appalling and subsequently it ought not be persevered. He says, "A word very much utilized is proclaimed by the insightful to be the desire satisfying cow; the same not well utilized, however announce the client's cow-like nature"^[17].

Daṇḍin notice, after Bhāmaha, ten blemishes or *doṣas* of artistic arrangement, yet he characterizes them distinctively by and large. They are in name and substance indistinguishable with Bhāmaha's first rundown of *doṣas* noted above, with the main special case of the eleventh flaw of deficient rationale, which is perceived by Bhāmaha yet overwhelmingly dismisses Daṇḍin as a shortcoming hard to judge and unrewarding to examine. In any case, even with reference to this flaw, Daṇḍin concurs with Bhāmaha in the identification of its six subdivisions. With respect to Bhāmaha's second rundown of flaws, which concern the internal pith of verse they would compare all in all to the *doṣa* (or rather the inverse of *guṇa*) which Daṇḍin notice as being truant in the *vaidarbha mārga* and as for the most part describing the inverse *gauḍa mārga*. We have noticed that some of these *guṇa* viparyayas are explicitly named by Daṇḍin. They are (i) the opposite of *s'leṣa*, called *s'ithila* (ii) the opposite of *prasāda*, called *vyutpanna* (iii) the opposite of *samatā*, called *vaiṣamya* (iv) the opposite of *sukumārātā*, called *dīpta* (v) the opposite of *kānti*, called *atyukti* (vi) the opposite of *artha-vyakti*, called *neyatva* (vii) the opposite of *mādhurya* (unnamed)^[18]. These structure seven issues as against ten of Bhāmaha, yet Daṇḍin talks about the excellences *udāratva*, *samādhī* (and presumably *ojas*) as having no contrary energies (or comparing deficiencies), in as much they are regular to both the *margas*. Daṇḍin does not consistently manage *Upamā doṣas*.

In any case, Daṇḍin does not go into the inquiry initially raised by Bharata regarding whether the *doṣas* in poetics are sure elements or insignificant nullifications of *guṇas*. It is clear from Daṇḍin's treatment however, that he specifies in ch. iv the outside issues clearly as positive substances, after the way of Bhāmaha; while the key issues are taken as nullifications of a portion of the *guṇas* of the *vaidarbha*

mārga and thus as positive qualities of the *gauḍa mārga*. He endeavors to keep away from contention by making utilization of the qualification of the two inverse sorts of style, making the supposed *guṇas* the attributes of the *vaidarbha mārga* and a portion of the purported *doṣas* the attributes of the *gauḍa mārga*.

In the conclusion, Daṇḍin opines that the paradigm which chooses whether there are *doṣas* or not in a specific connection is none other than the essence of the refined. On the off chance that they affront the essence of the refined, then alone would they be able to be named as *doṣas*, not otherwise.

*na liṅgavacane bhinne na hīnādhikāṭāpi vā /
upamādūṣanāyālam yatrodvego na dhīmatām //*^[19]

He likewise gives occasions when they go about as impediments of wonderful impact and comments that under such circumstances they should be shunned. The reason, he says, abandons saying.

*idrṣam varjyate sadbhiḥ kāranam tatra cintyatām /
guṇadoṣavicārāya svayameva manṣibhi //*^[20]

Therefore however Daṇḍin has attempted to enhance Bhāmaha, he stays basically a devotee of his, he doesn't wander upon unique treatment of the subject of literary imperfections either with reference to their inclination or number. In any case, he looks over the entire thing from an alternate viewpoint. In an outcome he adheres to the conventional number of the ten *doṣas* and dislikes to go astray from it.

Concept of kāvyā doṣa, according to Vāmana

Vāmana is the following huge Ālaṅkārika to Daṇḍin who prospered in the middle of the eighth and the ninth century A.D. He composed his KāvyaĀlaṅkāra in the Sutra style and has given own discourse to the Sūtras called Vṛtti. In his 'KāvyaĀlaṅkārasūtravṛtti', Vāmana treated the subject poetics more experimentally than Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha. As the method for touching base at wonderful excellence, as Vāmana would like to think, is the evasion of *doṣas* and the usage of *guṇas* and *alaṅkāras*, Vāmana, similar to his forerunners, sets down at the beginning that verse must be free from *doṣas*^[21].

Doṣahāna picks up priority over that of *guṇādāna* in accomplishing the lovely impact. The *Kamadhenu* finds a defense for this-*lṣṭānuvartanātkuryātpṛaṅṣṭānīvartanamiti nītyā guṇālaṅkāradānātpurvaṁ doṣahānameva kavinaḥ kartavyamiti sūcayitum doṣahānasya prathamato nirdeśah kṛtaḥ* watches *doṣas* as-*'gunaviparyayātmano doṣah'*^[22].

'Deformities are those components whose qualities are inverse to those of the *guṇas*'. Interestingly Vāmana has explicitly set at nothing the power of Bharata and stated an opposite postulation. The positive components in beautiful piece are *guṇas* and not the *doṣas* which are simply nullifications of *guṇas*. He keeps up that flaws reduce the magnificence of verse while perfection upgrades it. Vāmana is the main author who demonstrates contrasts among the *doṣas of pada* (word), *padārtha* (which means of the word), *vākya* (sentence) and *vākyaārtha* (which means of the sentence). In like manner, in the seventh section of his work, Vāmana isolates the *doṣas* into four general gatherings to be specific, *pada-doṣas*, *padārtha-doṣas*, *vākya-doṣas* and *vākyaārtha-doṣas*. Further he sub-isolates all these four gatherings of *doṣas* as taking after : *pada-doṣas*^[23] -(i). *asādhu* (grammatically wrong), (ii). *kaṣṭha*

(unmelodious), (iii). grāmya (vulgar), (iv). aprafīta (unknown) and (v). anarthaka (meaningless). padārtha-doṣas ^[24] - (i). anyārtha (deviated from the conventional meaning), (ii). neyārtha (far0-fetched sense), (iii). guḍhārtha (hidden meaning), (iv). as'līla (having obscene meaning) and (v). kliṣṭa (obstruction of the sense). vākya-doṣas ^[25] - (i). bhinnavṛtta (deficiency in metre), (ii).yatibhraṣṭa (defective in caesura) and (iii) visandhi (unharmonious junctions). vākya-rtha-doṣas ^[26]- (i). vyartha (self contradictory), (ii). ekārtha (tautology), (iii). sandigdha (dubious), (iv). ayukta (improper statement), (v). apakrama (non-sequent) and (vi). loka-vidyā-viruddha (alien to popular and scientific concepts).

Obviously even Vāmana is as conscientious as his precursors in sticking to the customary number of ten while his pada and padārtha doṣas from one perspective and his vākya and vākya-rtha doṣas on the other are precisely ten, neither more nor less.

An examination of Vāmana's index of doṣas with that of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin demonstrates to us that he has not added anything new to the current number of doṣas. His inventiveness comprises in his redistribution of them on certain essential standards and that is all that can be said amazingly. Despite the fact that hypothetically Vāmana takes after his forerunners in his treatment of doṣas, he for all intents and purposes copies their number.

kāvya doṣa, according to Rudrata and Udbhata

In this setting, reference can be made to other two treatises composed on the Alamkāra hypothesis, to be specific "Kāvyaalamkārasārasaṅgraha" of Udbhata and "Kāvyaalamkāra" of Rudrata. These two Ālamkārikas i.e. Udbhata and Rudrata were the supporters of Bhāmaha who thrived in the eighth and the ninth century A.D. individually.

An imperative components of Rudrata's treatment is that he takes after Bharata in holding that guṇas are contraries of doṣas as against the perspective of his quick ancestor Vāmana. Henceforth guṇas, accordingly, don't get at his hands any investigative composition. his alleged guṇas are all nullifications of faults. In the identification of doṣas additionally Rudrata takes after a rule, somewhat unique in relation to that of Vāmana. Taking s'abda and artha as the two components of verse he says doṣas in two arrangement: - (i) s'abda doṣas or defect of words and (ii) artha doṣas or defect of sense. The first series includes eleven faults, viz (a) pada doṣas - (i) asamartha (incapable of expressing the sense), (ii) apraparafīta (unintelligible), (iii) visandhi (ugliness of sandhi), (iv) viparīta-kalpanā (having opposite or hindered conception), (v) grāmya (vulgar), and (vi) des'ya (slang). Three vākya-doṣas (i) samkārna (confused), (ii) garbhita (parenthical) and (iii) gatārtha (unnecessary repetition of a stated matter). The second series comprehends (besides four Upamā doṣas) nine artha doṣas, viz., (i) apahetu (bad reason), (ii) aprafīta (having an unusual sense), (iii) nirāgama (statement against scripture), (iv) bādhatya (contradictory), (v) asambaddha (irrelevant), (vi) grāmya (vulgarity), (vii) virasa (incompatible sentiment), (viii) tadvān (explicit statement of an implicit), (ix) atimātra (enormity of exaggeration). Some of these doṣas like 'tadvān', are, it must be noted, determined strikingly by Rudrata.

Aside from these different Dosas, Rudrata likewise says four Upamā doṣas in the eleventh section of his work. Those are - (i) sāmānya-s'abda-bheda, (ii) vaiṣamya, (iii) asambhava, and (iv) aprasiddhi. All these Dosas expressed by Rudrata are intricately talked about and represented by Namisādhu,

analyst of Rudrata's Kāvyaalamkāra. It is likewise be noticed that Bhāmaha said seven Upama doṣa. Like Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, Rudrata trusts that with change of conditions doṣas get to be guṇas.

Udbhata additionally composed the 'Bhāmaha-vivaraṇa' which was an analysis on Bhāmaha's Kāvyaalamkāra, however the work is not found in the present abstract world. We can not discover Udbhata's perspectives on different beautiful angles from any essential source. Subsequently, basing on various optional sources, it can be said that Udbhata holds no real qualification amongst guṇa and alamkāra and respects that them two grant magnificence to verse.

The above exchange focuses to the way that the idea of poetic blemishes instituted for first time in the thought about the most punctual Ālamkārika Bharat as a theoretical hypothesis, and increased conspicuous shape in the long traverse of time in pre Dhvani school. What's more, it regarded as a detailed topic of Sanskrit poetics at the coming Dhvani school through pens of countless. Also, it turned into an unavoidable point of Sanskrit poetics.

References

1. upakaratattvavāda alamkāra: saptamamaangamiti yāyāvarīyaḥ/ (Kāvyaamīmānsā : ch II)
2. rasāpakarṣakā doṣaḥ (Sāhitya Darpaṇa : ch.VII,1)
3. prathamam doṣajñānameva vidheyam yataḥ kamanīyarūpādi samṛpadupetamapi vapuḥ kuṣṭhabindunaikenāpi daurbhāgyamanubhavati (S'ṛngāra Prakāś'a : Vol-II, ch-IX)
4. nā kavitvamadharmāya vyādhye daṇḍanāya vā/ kukavitvam punaḥ sākṣānmṛtimāhurmanīṣiṇaḥ// (Kāvyaalamkāra: I.12)
5. tadalpamapi nopekṣyam kāvyē duṣṭam kathañcana/ syād vapuḥ sundaramapi s'vitraikena durbhagaḥ // (Kāvyaadars'a:1.7)
6. vāci yantrastu kartavyo nātyascaiṣā tanuḥ smṛtā/ aṅganapathyasattvāni vākya-rtham vyañjayanti hi// (Nātya-S'āstra : Vol. II, ch.XIV.2)
7. Ibid, ch. XVI,96
8. guḍārthamarthāntaramarthahīnam bhinnārthamekārthamabhiplūtārtham/nyāyādapetaḥ viṣamam visandhi s'abdacyutam vai das'a kāvyadoṣaḥ// (Ibid.ch. XVI.88)
9. Abhinava Bhāratī on Nātya S'āstra. XVI, 83(K.M.edn.), p-312 of the Ms. In possession of Dr. S.K.De.
10. neyārthamkliṣṭamanyarthamavācakamay uktimat/guḍhas'abdābhidhānam ca kavayo na prayujyate//and s'rutidūṣṭarthaduṣṭe ca kalpanādūṣṭamityapi/ s'rutikaṣṭam tathavahurvācan doṣān caturvidham.// (Kāvyaalamkāra : I.37, I.47)
11. Ibid.I.36
12. hīnatāsambhava līnga vacobheda viparyaya/ upamānādhikatvan ca tenasādr's'yatapi ca// (Kāvyaalamkāra : ch.II.,39)
13. Ibid. ch.IV.1-2
14. for detail, see- http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/20989/7/07_chapter%201.pdf
15. Ibid. ch. I.,54-55
16. Kāvyaadars'a : ch.I.,7
17. gaugauḥ kāmādughā samyak prayuktā smaryate budhaiḥ / duṣprayuktā punargotvam prayoktuḥ saiva s'amsati // (Ibid. ch.I.,6)
18. for details, see-History of Sanskrit Poetics vol-I,2nd edn,p-87

19. Ibid ch.II.,51
20. Ibid ch.II.,56
21. “kāvyamgrāhyamalāmkārāt.saundaryamalāmkārah. sa doṣagunālāmkārahānādānābhyām”. (Kāvyaṅgrāhyamalāmkārah. sa doṣagunālāmkārahānādānābhyām. I.i.1-3)
22. Ibid.ch.II.i., 1.
23. duṣṭam padamasādhu kaṣṭam grāmyamapratītamānarthakam ca (Ibid.ch.II.i., 4).
24. anyaneyaguḍhārthās lilakliṣṭāni ca (Ibid.ch.II.i.,11).
25. bhinnavṛttatibhraṣṭavisandhīni vākyāni. (Ibid.ch.II.ii., 1).
26. vyarthaikārthasandigdhayuktāpakramaloka-vidyāvīruddhāni ca (Ibid.ch.II.ii., 9).
27. Parashar Sadhana. Kāvyaṅgrāhyamalāmkārah of Rājaśekhara: original text in Sanskrit and translation with explanatory notes, D.K. Printworld, 2000.
28. Roer Dr. E. Sāhitya Darpaṇa or Mirror of Composition, Treatise on Literary Criticism, (Bibliotheca Indica; Collection of Oriental Works), Calcutta, 1851.
29. Raghavan V. Bhoja S’ṛṅgāra Prakāś’a, Punarvasu, Madras, 1963.
30. Josyer GR. Maharaja Bhoja Raja’s S’ṛṅgāra Prakāś’a, The Great tenth century work on Sanskrit and Prakrit Rhetoric, Second Vol Prakashas 9 to 14, Mysore, 1963.
31. Sarma Batuknath. Kāvyaṅgrāhyamalāmkārah, 2nd edn.: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sanstha, Varanasi, 1981.
32. Sarma Raman Kumar. Kāvyaṅgrāhyamalāmkārah, 1st edn.: Vidyanidhi Prakashan, Delhi, 1994.
33. Sastry Naganatha PV. Kāvyaṅgrāhyamalāmkārah of Bhamaha, Motilal Banarsidass Publ. 1970.
34. Mishra Acharya Ramchandra. Kāvyaṅgrāhyamalāmkārah, 2nd edn: Chowkhamba Vidyabhavan, Varanasi, 1995.
35. Joshi Kanhaiyalal. Nāṭya-S’āstra of Bharata, 2nd edn. Vol. I, II. Parimal Publication, Delhi, 1988.
36. Joshi Kanhaiyalal. Nāṭya-S’āstra of Bharata 3rd edn. Vol. III Parimal Publication, Delhi, 1994.
37. Basu. Anil Ch., Kāvyaṅgrāhyamalāmkārah, 1st edn. Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Calcutta, 1977.
38. Choudhury Satyadev. Kāvyaṅgrāhyamalāmkārah (of Rudrata): Vasudev Prakasan, Delhi, 1965.
39. De SK. History of Sanskrit Poetics, 2nd rev edition, Firma KLM, Calcutta, 1960.
40. Venkat Rao D. Cultures of Memory in South Asia: Orality, Literacy and the Problem of Inheritance (Volume 6 of Sophia Studies in Cross-cultural Philosophy of Traditions and Cultures), Springer Science & Business, 2014.
41. Dr. Krishnamoorthy K. Essays in Sanskrit Criticism: Karnataka University publication, 1964.
42. Jha Bechan. Concept of poetic blemishes in Sanskrit poetics, Chowkhamba Amaravharati Prakashan, Varanasi, India, 1965.
43. Chari VK. Sanskrit Criticism: Motilal Banarsidass, 1993.
44. Banerji Sures Chandra. A Companion to Sanskrit Literature, Motilal Banarsidass Publ. 1989.
45. Kane PV. History of Sanskrit Poetics, Motilal Banarsidass Publ. 1971.
46. De Sushil Kumar. Sanskrit Poetics as a Study of Aesthetic, University of California Press, 1963.