



ORNAMENT OF HUMAN AND RHETORIC OF LITERATURE MAY NOT BE
COMPARED WITH EACH OTHER

SUDIP CHAKRAVORTTI

Research Scholar,
Rabindra Bharati University
Kolkata

In Sanskrit poetics, we get various types of meanings for the word, अलंकार। But, here the consultation is restricted only within the arena of figure of speech. The main mentionable definitions of अलंकार as given by the rhetoricians are follows –

- The word, अलंकार refers to ornaments.
- In derivative procedure, the meaning is (अलम् – कृ + घञ्) अलंकारोति इति अलंकारः – i.e. अलंकार helps to decorate or to adorn the poetry. This notion is supported by भरतः। In नाट्यशास्त्रे he has opined that – “अलंकारैर्गुणैश्च बहुभिः समन्वितकृतम्। भूषणैरिव विशारदैस्सूक्ष्ममिति स्मृतम्।” (17.6)
- According to काव्यालंकार by वामन – “सौन्दर्यमलंकारः” - beauty is अलंकार। Again he says - “काव्यं वाचमलंकारात्” and in वृत्ति he also comments that “अलंकारैरलंकारः। करणवृत्त्याया पुनरलंकारशब्दः अयनुपमादिषु वर्तते।”
- In काव्यादर्शे दण्डिन् says, “काव्यशैभाकरान् धर्मान् अलंकारान् प्रचक्षते। (kāvyaśāstra – 2 / 1)” – those things which decorate the poetry are called अलंकार। The same kind of speech is available in Agnipurāṇa (342/ 17).
- अलंकार means one kind of book where poetical features are consulted i.e. अलंकारशास्त्रं। We can here accept the remark of कामधेनु which is – “यः अयमलंकारः काव्यग्रहणहेतुत्वेन उपन्यस्यते, तदुपकारत्वात्। शास्त्रमपि अलंकारानाम्ना व्यवदिश्यते इति शास्त्रस्य अलंकारत्वेन प्रसिद्धिः प्रतिष्ठिता स्यात्।”
- A special categorical part of the poetics which earnestly supports the अलंकार as a special poetical school which is अलंकार school inside अलंकारशास्त्रं।

To make a conclusion about the diversified meaning of अलंकार we can recall the speeches of कुन्तक who clearly says that – “अलंकारशब्दः शरीरस्य शोभातिशयकारितत्वात् मुख्यतया वाटकादिषु वर्तते, तत्कारित्वसामान्यात् उपचारात् उपमादिषु, तद्देव य तत्सदृशेषु गुणादिषु, तथैव च तदभिधायिनी बन्धे।” The present matter is about the ornament of human and rhetoric of poetry. So, the consultation is now going to enter into the comparison between these two and the supporting points of comparison are to be taken from the speeches of the renowned rhetoricians of Sanskrit Poetics. The conclusion is based on the practical analysis.



मीमंसे gives a happy analogy by saying that the face of a beloved woman, though lovely, does not look radiant without ornaments — “न कान्तमपि निर्भूषं विभ्रान्ति वलिताननम्” (1 / 13). अलंकार is, according to him, indispensable for a composition to merit the designation of कव्यम्। मीमंसे is the earliest exponent or the founder of the अलंकार school of Sanskrit Poetics. Moreover, he ignores the आत्मा (soul) of poetry of which later rhetoricians make so much: - because अलंकार is nothing but outward element like ornaments to human beings. Here, figures of speech or अलंकार is compared with the ornament of a female. Such kind of treatment is partially correct but not justified.

The comment of Kuntaka in respect of the ornament of human is — “अलंकारशब्दः शोभातिशयकारितत्वात् मुख्यतया कटकादिषु वर्तते।” He defines अलंकार or rhetoric of poem as — “तत्कारित्वसामान्यत्वात् उपचारात् उपमादिषु”. So, he compares rhetoric with the ornament. Is it justified?

In Dhvanyāloka Ānandavardhana also says — “अङ्गाभितास्त्यलङ्कारा मन्तव्याः कटकादिवत्” (2 / 7). Like other Sanskrit rhetoricians, Ānandavardhana also supports the falsified view point that — rhetoric or अलंकार of literature is compared with the ornament or अलंकार of a human. But how is it possible?

Same kind of treatment is being done by Mammata-bhaṭṭa. In his Kāvya-prakāśa we see the verse —

“उपकुर्वन्ति तं सन्तं ये अङ्गद्वारेण जातुयित्।

हारादिखट्वलंकारास्ते अनुप्रासेपलादयः।।” (8 / 2)

Sāhityadrapaṅkṣā, Viśvanātha has the opinion that —

“शब्दार्थयोरस्थिरा ये धर्माः शोभातिशयिनः।

रसादीनुपकुर्वन्तः अलंकारास्ते अङ्गदादिखत्।।” (10 / 1)

In this way, we can give many other references from the speeches of Sanskrit rhetoricians to show their views regarding the comparison between ornament and rhetoric. Their speeches make it clear to us that they always support the identical comparison between ornament and rhetoric. They only think about the common quality of these two which is the enhancing power of beautification. But, they have forgotten to consider the root differences which are lying under these two.

Similarity is — both ornament and rhetoric help in enriching the beauty. Dissimilarity is — the ornament like gold may be replaced easily from the body and the replacing of ornament does not destruct the human body at all. Whereas after replacement of any kind of poetic rhetoric, the body of the poetry cannot be able maintain its existence. A chart is given to show the comparison between ornament and rhetoric.



Sl. No	Subject	Ornament of Woman		Ornament of Poetry		Remarks
		Ornament	Human Body	Rhetoric	Body of Poem	
1	Structural Element	Metal or any other thing which has adorning power	Flesh & blood and other elements	Word & Meaning	Word & Meaning	Structural element is different for ornament & human body but is same for rhetoric & poem
2	Replacement	Replacement ornament from human body is very easy or simple task	Replacement ornament from human body is	Replacement rhetoric from the body of the poem is not easy and in most cases is impossible task for the sake of the poem	Replacement rhetoric from the body of the poem is not easy and in most cases is impossible task for the sake of the poem	
3	In case of replacement or destruction of ornament / rhetoric	Ornament replaced or destroyed	Human body is not affected at all and remains alive	Rhetoric replaced or destroyed	Poem also faces destruction	Ornament does not directly related to human body but rhetoric is directly related to the structure of the poem
4	Decay or loss	Causing decay or loss of the ornament occurs with the passage of time	Causing decay or loss of the ornament occurs	Causing decay or loss of rhetoric does not happen and it stays with the poem for ever		
5	Activity	Being placed outside of the body, ornament enhances the physical beauty artificially and does not affect natural beauty of human body	Being placed outside of the body, ornament enhances the physical beauty artificially and does not affect natural beauty of human body	Rhetoric stays with the body of the poem but is not placed from the outside. This beautification is natural in respect of the structure of the poem.		Sometimes artificial use of Alankara may hamper lucidity of the poem and it comes from the poem itself not outside
6	Similarity	Enriches the beauty of the human body	Enriches the beauty of the human body	Enriches the beauty of the poem		Ornament & alankara perform the task of beautification
7	Category of beauty	Beauty is of two kinds — natural beauty of the body and the artificial beauty of the ornament comes together	Beauty is of two kinds — natural beauty of the body and the artificial beauty of the ornament comes together	Beauty is of one kind which comes due to the collaboration of word and meaning and it is natural beauty of the poem		Ornamental beauty is planned from outside but, rhetorical beauty is the latent power



Thus we can conclude that ornament and rhetoric are not identical and ornament may not be compared with rhetoric. Most of our Sanskrit rhetoricians think अलंकार as outward element like ornament. But, if we think deeply it appears that अलंकार is not an outward element, but is the structural element. Kāvya (literature) is the body which is made by word and meaning and word and meaning are the base of अलंकार। Word and meaning are like the structural parts of the body of the Kāvya (literature). Therefore rhetoric and ornament are quite different.

References :

1. Kane, P.V. *History of Sanskrit Poetics*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarashidas Publishers Private Limited, 2002.
2. Chattopadhyay, Chinmoyee (Ed.). *Kāvyaśāstra*. Kolkata: Paschimanga Rajya Pustak Parshat, 1995.
3. Bandyopadhyaya Sureshchandra (Ed.). *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Kolkata: Nabaptra Prakashan, 1389 (Bengali Era).
4. Acharya Ramananda (Ed.). *Kāvyaśāstra*. Kolkata: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1998.