

When poetry is ripe: An overview of the theory of *kāvyaṣāka*

Alessandro Battistini
Sapienza – Università di Roma

This paper will offer a complete review and translation of the passages dealing with *kāvyaṣāka*, the ‘ripeness of poetry’, throughout the whole history of Sanskrit poetics. The origin of the idea most probably lies in an impressionistic comparison between poetry and fruit, the same idea that underlies the notion of the *rasa* ‘sap/aesthetic experience’. Indeed, the vividness of the image is even more striking than for *rasa*, and the juxtaposition of *kāvya* and juicy items has aroused the theoretic fancy of many *ālaṃkārikas*.

In fact, although it does not enjoy a prominent position amongst critical devices, *ṣāka* and its varieties are mentioned and discussed in all major works on poetics.¹ Using a chronological viewpoint to follow the development of the concept, we start from some episodic remarks to arrive at the more complex classifications offered by Puranic systematists, only to end again with a simplified categorization. This theoretic insight is followed by a brief review of the practical application of the theory of *kāvyaṣāka*, presenting excerpts from classical literature in which well-known works and authors are compared to fruits.

The Sanskrit texts of the translated passages are given in the Appendix at the end of the paper, in the order they appear.

1. *Ṣāka in theory*

1.1 *Bhāmaha, Kāvyaālaṃkāra 5.62*

Bhāmaha is the first author to compare poetry to fruit, although he does not explicitly mention *ṣāka*. The rationale of the simile is evident: pedantic poetry is like a disgusting fruit. His judgment points to the realm of *artha*: indeed the passage comes from the chapter devoted to poetic defects springing from logi-

1. So far, the only contribution explicitly devoted to the topic of *kāvyaṣāka* is Dwivedi 1974.

cal fallacies. There is no trace of a developed set of maturations as in later writers, only an isolated image. *Rasa(vat)* is still an *alaṃkāra*, and the sour *kapittha*, ‘wood apple’,² will remain as the symbol of bad poetry up to Bhoja and Rājasēkhara.

Poetry which even in the presence of *rasa* is unpleasant (*ahr̥dyam*), unclever (*apeśālam*) and not easily analysable (*asunirbhedam*) according to some is like an unripe wood apple (*kapittham āmam*) (...).

1.2 *Vāmana*, *Kāvyaḷaṃkārasūtravṛtti* 1.3.15; 3.2.15

Vāmana refers to *pāka* twice, with different implications. When he deals with deliberation (*avekṣaṇa*), one of the aids for poetry (*kāvyaṅga*), he quotes two *śloka*s centred on ripeness: the focus is on sound (*śabda*). This formulation will be the basis for all subsequent speculations, not only on *pāka*, but also on the cognate idea of *śayyā*, ‘repose’. Ripe poetry is the one in which words have found their definitive arrangement and cannot stand synonyms:

As long as the mind hesitates there is insertion and deletion (*ādihānoddharaṇe*).
When the stability of a word is fixed, alas! Eloquence is accomplished.
When words abandon the capacity of being substituted (*parivṛttisahīṣṇutām*),
experts in the disposition of words call it ripeness of words (*śabdapākam*).
(*Kāvyaḷaṃkārasūtravṛtti* 1.3.15)

The second occurrence comes from the section on qualities of meaning (*arthaguṇa*), under the heading *kānti*, ‘brilliance’. The three stanzas provide a first, neat subdivision of *pākas*. Here, *pāka* is the overall taste bestowed on a composition by *guṇas* or by their absence:

The complete blooming of qualities (*guṇasphuṭatvasākalyam*) is called ripeness of poetry (*kāvyaḷapāka*),
and it is compared to the full maturation (*pariṇāmena*) of Mango (*cūṭasya*);
having the quality of difficult matter (*kliṣṭavastuguṇam*), and being based on
the refinement of nouns and verbs (*suptūṇisamskārasāram*),
poetry has the ripeness of Eggplant (*vṛntākapākam*) and therefore people
dislike it.
Something whose meaning is devoid of the ten *guṇas* is useless:
the sentence ‘ten pomegranates, etc.’ is not fit for using.
(*Kāvyaḷaṃkārasūtravṛtti* 3.2.15)

2. *Feronia limonia*. Botanical identifications follow Khare 2007. I have personally tasted all the fruits mentioned in this paper during a pleasant tour of Pondicherry’s bazaars with Miss Iona MacGregor.

The allusion to the proverbial nonsense ‘ten pomegranates, six cakes, basin, goat-skin, lump of flesh, a petticoat, this of a maiden, of a swordsmith’s son, father, dropping’ (*daśa dāḍimāni śaḍ apūpāḥ kuṇḍam ajājinam palalapinḍaḥ adharorukam etat kumāryāḥ sphaiyakṛtasya pitā pratiśinaḥ*) discloses a game of cross references between early *ālamkārikas* and grammatical literature.³ The same nonsense is employed by Patañjali in *Mahābhāṣya* 1.2.2 when he discusses *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 1.2.45, a *sūtra* dealing precisely with the ‘meaning’ of words. The authors of *Kāśikāvṛtti*, commenting on this *sūtra*, give the word *kapittha* as an example of *prātipadika*. Without jumping to any conclusions, the recurrence of names of fruits (pomegranates, wood apple) within the same passage certainly deserves mention.

1.3 *Rājaśekhara*, *Kāvyaṁimāmsā* 5

Rājaśekhara devotes the 5th chapter of his work to the investigation of *kāvyaṁpāka*. His main contributions are the lucid discussion of previous positions and the abundant enumeration of fruits with their maturities. He rejects *pāka* as the definitive stability of words and follows his wife *Avantisundarī* in seeing ripeness as something very similar to poetic propriety (*aucitya*). A quotation from *Vāmana* on *vaidarbhī rīti* somehow links *pāka* to this poetic style. Unfortunately, examples for each *pāka* are not given, nor are we offered any hint as to how they can effectively be distinguished. Were it not for the existing internal hierarchy, we would be inclined to read the passage simply as a lush *enumeratio chaotica*.

Thanks to continuous exercise (*abhyāśavaśataḥ*), the expression (*vākyam*) of a good poet reaches ripeness (*pākam*). The *Ācāryas* ask: ‘What then is this ripeness?’. *Maṅgala*⁴ answers: ‘It is the maturation (*pariṇāmah*)’. The *Ācāryas* ask ‘Again, what is this maturation?’. *Maṅgala*: ‘It is the proficiency which consists in the intimacy with verbs and nouns (*supāṁ tiriṇāṁ ca śravaḥ*)’.⁵ The *Ācāryas* say: ‘That is the felicity of expression (*sausābdyam*). Ripeness is the stability in the disposition of words (*padaniveśaniṣkampatā*)’.

It is said: ‘As long as the mind hesitates (...)’. [*Vāmana*, *Kāvyaṁlamkārasūtravṛtti* 1.3.15].

The *Vāmanīyas* say: ‘The conclusion of the stability of words comes also from the inserting and inserting again. Therefore ripeness is the aversion of words for substitution (*parivṛttivāimukhyam*)’. They say: ‘When words abandon (...)’. [*Vāmana*, *Kāvyaṁlamkārasūtravṛtti* 1.3.15].

3. For the influence of grammatical thought on *Bhāmaha* and *Vāmana* see *Chakravarty* 1984 and 1993.

4. On the figure of *Maṅgala* see *Krishnamoorthy* 1971.

5. Cf. *supra* *Vāmana*, *Kāvyaṁlamkārasūtravṛtti* 3.2.15.

Avantisundarī remarks: ‘Again this lack of creativity (*aśaktiḥ*) is not *pāka*’. Because for one and a single matter, there is more than one reading which is ripe for great poets. Therefore, ripeness is the composition in which expressions (*sūkti*), meaning (*artha*), and sound (*śabda*) are appropriate for *rasa*.⁶ It is said:

According to me the ripeness of expression
is the right fastening of sound and meaning
suffused with qualities, ornaments, styles, expressions,
by which the connoisseurs attain pleasure.

This is said:

Being the speaker, being the meaning, being the sound, being the *rasa*
there is still not that by which the nectar of poetry flows.

[Vāmana, *Kāvyaślokaśāstrānubandha* 1.2.11]

The Yāyavāriya says: ‘Thanks to its being inferred through the result, *pāka* is in the dominion of denotation (*abhidhāviśayaḥ*) and can also be expressed through different words. And now it is subject to usage if the agreement of the connoisseurs is sanctioned there’.

And this is ninefold for the community of poets who exercise themselves in poetry.

Among these, not sweet at the beginning and at the end is Neem (*picumanda*); not sweet at the beginning but middling in the ripening is Jujube (*badara*); not sweet in the beginning but sweet in the ripening is Grape (*mṛdvikā*); middling at the beginning but not sweet at the end is Eggplant (*vātāka*); middle at the beginning and at the end is Tamarind (*tintīḍika*); middling at the beginning and sweet at the end is Mango (*sahakāra*); delicious at the beginning and not sweet at the end is the Betel nut (*kramukā*); delicious at the beginning and middle at the end is Cucumber (*trapusa*); sweet at the beginning and at the end is Coconut (*nālikera*). Among these the first *pākas* in the three triads must be rejected. It is better not to be a poet than to be a bad poet. Bad poetry is indeed death with breath. The middle ones [in the triads] must be refined. Indeed, refinement enhances the quality of everything. Even impure gold becomes pure gold when heated in fire. The others are acceptable. What is naturally pure needs no refinement. A touchstone has no power compared to the brilliance of a pearl. Again a work of unstable ripeness is traditionally considered the ripeness of the wood apple (*kapittha*). Good speech is obtained just as edible grain is obtained through threshing straw.

At the same time poetry ripens in nine different ways for one who exerts himself,

The clever should divide it according to the rule of insertion and rejection.

This threefold classification has been shown for the students’ sake,
nevertheless in the three worlds there are many more varieties.

6. This brings *pāka* very close to the more developed concept of propriety (*aucitya*), for which see *Dhvanyāloka* 3.10-14 *vṛtti* and *Aucityavicāracarcā*.

1.4 Bhoja, Sarasvatikaṅṭhābharaṇa with Ratneśvara's comm. 1.77

Bhoja and the commentator Ratneśvara cast a new light on *pāka*. They treat the topic under the heading *prauḍhi* 'maturation', belonging to the category of *vākyaguṇas*. Together with the usual recollection of previous argumentations, their main contribution is the illustration of a practical criterion to distinguish different *pākas*, based on the phonetic texture of single stanzas. The *Sarasvatikaṅṭhābharaṇa* agrees with Vāmana on seeing *pāka* as (a consequence of) *avekṣaṇa*: results (and *pākas*) vary according to the nature of the words immutably chosen by the poet. A point of disagreement is the *vārtākapāka*'s place: for Vāmana, it characterizes 'bookish' poetry, while for Bhoja, the very same expertise in lexical subtleties constitutes the *guṇa* of felicity of expression (*suśābdatā*). The existence of *arthapākas* as opposed to these *śābdapākas* is stated at the end of the passage, but the topic is not fully developed. Indeed, it will be more adequately discussed by Vidyādhara and Vidyānātha.

Now the author defines the quality of the expression characterized by a supreme pitch:

[Bhoja:] A mature ripeness (*prauḍhaḥ parīpākaḥ*) of poetic diction goes by the name maturity (*prauḍhī*).

As:

He uprooted the earth; he crushed the enemy's chest; he ate the fortune of king Balin all at the same time.

What has been done by this young hero in the span of one life time, could not have been accomplished by the Ancient Man in three lives.⁷

Here the ripeness of expression is called maturity: this maturation of Coconut, of Grapes, and so on which is obtained by practice through a pleasant composition, adding or removing words like the *grāmya*, etc. [as '*abhyuddhṛta*'] or also from the words *prakṛtistha*, *komala* and *kāthora*⁸ or *nāgara*, *upanāgara* and *grāmya*. And so, this sentence is called the ripeness of Coconut. In the same way the ripening of Mango and Grape also remain to be explained.

[Ratneśvara:] This ripeness of poetic diction is called maturity. Ripeness is the impossibility to substitute words with synonyms (*pariyāyaparivartāsahatvam*). As he said: 'When words abandon (...)' [Vāmana, *Kāvyaśāstrakārasūtravṛtti* 1.3.15]. 'Mature': accomplished at the beginning and at the conclusion. And this can be of three types: Coconut, Mango, and Grapes. That is to say: the ripe coconut is hard in its skin, it has its soft core hidden in the coir and is much harder in the shell. In the same way, a composition can be hard in one's mouth, but immediately after, it is full of sweetness, and then harder; therefore the *nālikerapāka* is said to be quite hard. That is to say, in the first *pāda* of the mentioned example, the four syl-

7. Attributed by Jalhaṇa's *Sūktimuktāvalī* to Cittapa.

8. The terms refer to the classification of words according to their phonic texture (normal, sweet, harsh) or to their social context of use (urban, common, and vulgar).

lables ‘*abhyuddhṛta*’ are hard at the beginning, the six syllables ‘*vasumatī dalī*’ are soft, the four letters ‘*taṃ rīpūrāḥī*’ are harder because of *anusvāra*, *repha*, and the long vowel. Also here ‘*taṃ*’ through a sweet disposition strengthens the similarity with that part of the shell which is tender: this according to our elders. Thus in the three *pādas* starting with the second, the similarity with the coconut fruit must be inferred, because of the four, six and four syllables.

He [i.e. Bhoja] said how this ripeness then arises: ‘here’, ‘by practice’, that is, it is obtained through exercise. ‘Exercise is the frequentation under the guidance of those who know how to make and compose poetry’ [Mammaṭa, *Kāvya prakāśa* 1.3 *vṛtti*]. He said how that particular *pāka* arises: ‘through a pleasant composition’, through the sweetness in the combination. And also how that happens: ‘adding or removing’. Adding is inserting in the composition and removing is deleting. Then it is said, adding or removing what: ‘words’ like *abhyuddhṛta*, etc. intentionally taken one by one. And then it is said from what: ‘*prakṛtistha*, etc.’. Therefore this is the meaning: this really must be chosen among *prakṛtistha* words and so on, which on account of the charm of the composition does not allow the substitution with synonyms.

This is the convention: another word may exist, but for the connoisseurs it does not. This is the kind of an accomplished composition, how could it be otherwise? A word synonym inserted somewhere else in the composition is not pleasant in the same way.

And therefore this is a quality of expression (*vākyaguṇa*). And the harshness arises from conjunct consonants or long vowels. As in the present example ‘*rīpūrā*’, etc., someone [i.e. Vāmana] has said that *vārtākapāka* is characterized by the proficiency in using nouns and verbs. But this is really the *guṇa* defined as felicity of expression. ‘In the same way’. As the Grape has a soft skin at the beginning, and inside contains some hardness on account of its two, three, four kernels, in this way some compositions are indeed soft at the beginning and at the end and hard in the middle. ‘Ripeness of grapes’ is the name given to what has a slightly hard nature made up only of conjuncts and long vowels. Such as:

Are the young leaves of these creepers, cared for by the water you sprinkle, continuous?

The leaves are similar to your lips, red though long bereft of red lac.
[*Kumārasambhava* 5.34]

And also as:

The trembling eyes bear the face whose musk *tilaka* was washed off by the
teardrops of the fickle eyes,
as if the *mṛga* mark of the moon had gone away.⁹

For this very reason it has been said by the author of the *Kavikalpalatā*¹⁰ and by others that there is no fourth *nīlakapīthapāka*, ‘blue wood apple’s ripeness’. And as the mature mango fruit is sweet at the beginning, but in the kernel it is hard, so another composition starting from the beginning is soft and in the middle it is harder: this is called *sahakārapāka*. And again as:

9. Anonymous. I read *vahatī*, which gives a better sense.

10. An unidentified work not to be confounded with the *Kavikalpalatā* by Deveśvara.

O *kamalinī*, morning is your friend! *Kumudinī*, you will rejoice the next moonrise!

Blessed night, you are gone, darkness is dispelled! – *rathāṅga* birds say aloud shaking their wings.¹¹

And also here in this example the hardness must be recognized as double. These here are the only three pure *pākas*. But there are many more born from contamination. Those are indeed *arthapākas* and will be analysed differently in the fifth chapter.

The 5th *pariccheda*, which has come to us with no commentary, places *pākas* amongst the features of *rasa*: they are laconically defined as varieties of love (*premabhaktayaḥ*) and divided into ripeness of grapes, coconuts and mangoes (*Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharāṇa* 5.125). The passages in *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* dealing with *pāka* (mainly in chapter 36, the last one in the work) are too fragmentary to be taken into account here.

1.5 Agni Purāṇa 345.22cd-23

The *Agni Purāṇa* places *pākas* among *ubhayaguṇa*, that is, amongst qualities of both sound and meaning. The passage adds nothing to our understanding of *pākas*, and is, moreover, invalidated by the typical Puranic carelessness. The question of the dependence of the *Purāṇa* on Bhoja or vice versa is of no interest here: whether Bhoja has expanded the clumsy Puranic views, or the *Agni Purāṇa* has imperfectly summarized the learned king makes no difference whatsoever.¹²

A certain high maturity (*uccaiḥ parinatīḥ*) goes by the name ripeness.

It is fourfold [!], according to the distinction between grape (*mṛdvikā*), coconut (*nārikela*) and mango (*ambu*). The ripeness of grapes is sweetness in at the beginning and in at the end.

1.6. Vidyādhara, Ekāvalī with Mallinātha's comm. 1.12

Vidyādhara treats *pāka* in the first section of his work, while discussing the causes of poetry, namely *abhyāsa*. His contribution is nothing else more than an almost literal reprise of previous literature. As often happens, the most interesting insights come from the commentator, Mallinātha, who conciliates *pāka* with *śayyā* and provides an example of his own to illustrate the theory. The whole passage is much indebted to Rājaśekhara.

11. Anonymous.

12. For a discussion in merit, see the *Introduction to Agni Purāṇa*, 120-28.

[Vidyādhara:] The expression of poets who exercise incessantly (*anavaratam abhyasyatām*) reaches ripeness (*pākam*). And *pāka* is the conjunction of sound and sense appropriate for *rasa* (*rasocitaśabdārthanibandhanam*) [cf. supra Avantisundarī quoted by Rājaśekhara]. Others say: ‘*pāka* is the proficiency in words (*padavyutpattiḥ*) flowing from the ambrosia of what has been heard (*śravaṇasudhā*)’ [cf. Maṅgala quoted by Rājaśekhara]. And others again say: ‘*pāka* is the aversion of words for substitution’ [cf. the Vāmanīyas quoted by Rājaśekhara].

[Mallinātha:] *Rasas* are *śṛṅgāra*, etc. That use of words capable to express them, given their distinction between soft and haughty etc., through the appropriate stitching of sound and meaning (*ucitaśabdārthagumphanā*) becomes a shower of ambrosia for the ears. Therefore *pāka* is the blossoming of words appropriate for the savouring of *rasas* (*rasāsvādocitaśabdaniṣpattiḥ*) and can be obtained through practice. The meaning is that exercise is fruitful. And this *pāka* is famous in the compositions of Kālidāsa and others. Another opinion is: ‘The aversion of words for substitution’, it which is the impossibility of being exchanged. And that is also called also mutual repose (*maitrīśayyā*). As in my *śloka* describing the moonrise:

Because of the touch of the rays of the moon,
all the beings, from the lump of grass, are portrayed by the shiny night as
having a peaceful soul.

If we insert other words here, such as *kṣapā* instead of the words *niśā*, etc., reciprocal mutuality would be broken (*parasparamaitrībhaṅgaḥ*).

1.7 Vidyānātha, Pratāparudrīya with Kumārasvāmin’s comm 2.35-36

After the Puranic exploit, the situation returns to simplicity with Vidyānātha. He reserves a prominent place for *pāka* among the main constituents of *kāvya*, along with *śabda*, *artha*, *guṇas*, *rītiś*, etc. For this rhetorician, *pāka* is concerned with *artha*, and is defined as the basically twofold savouring of *rasa* (*rasāsvādaprabhedāḥ*) (*Pratāparudrīya* 2.5ab). The emphasis is on the simplicity of the meaning, and both the *pākas* are illustrated with examples marked respectively by clarity or obscurity. The ambiguity between *rasa* as juice / as an aesthetic experience reaches here its apex here.

Ripeness is the depth of meaning (*arthagambhīrīmā*), pleasant in two different ways: grape and coconut, with clear differences.

Grape has the *rasa*/juice bursting inside and outside.

(*Pratāparudrīya* 2.35-36ab)

And this is glossed by the commentator Kumārasvāmin as: ‘It bursts inside and outside because is savoured at the very moment of reading (*pāṭhasamaye*)’.

On the other hand, the ripeness of coconut ‘has the rising of the juice hidden inside (*antargūḍharasodayaḥ*, 2.36cd)’. The commentator explains: ‘The meaning is not grasped quickly because it relies on a detailed explanation (*vyākhyānasāpekṣatvāt*)’.

The *asunirbhedam* of Bhāmaha resounds here (see *supra*). The difference lies in the fact that Vidyānātha admits ‘difficult’ poetry as well.

Kumārasvāmin sums up and admits the possibility of additional *pākas*:¹³

drākṣāpāka and *nārikelapāka* fall in into one or the other category according to the slow or quick grasping of the meaning (*arthasya drutavilambitapratītyoh*). Because there is another variety of understanding, a middle one, consequentially other *pākas*, such as banana and mango, etc. (*kadalīrasālādī*) can consequentially be imagined.

2. Pāka in practice

In the following passages, taken from *maṅgalācaraṇas* and *prasastis* of *kāvya*s, single pieces of poetic art are judged (sometimes in a biased way) under in the light of *kāvya*pāka.¹⁴ Given the ingenuity of the comparison between poetry and fruit, a theoretic background may not be necessarily be implied.

2.1 Mallinātha, Ghaṇṭāpatha commentary on Bhāravi’s Kirātārjunīya, maṅgalācaraṇa 6

The voice of Bhāravi is similar to a coconut (*nārikelaphalasaṅgmitam*): it can be cracked open with a single stroke, and the connoisseurs may agreeably savour agreeably its pulp (*sāram*) rich in sources of juice/aesthetic sentiment (*rasagarbhanirbharam*).

Mallinātha’s pointed opinion has a counterpart in the popular *subhāṣita*:

The simile is proper to Kālidāsa,
and pregnancy of sense (*arthagauravam*) to Bhāravi,
to Daṇḍin is grace in wording,
and in Māgha all the three qualities are present.
(*Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra* 37.63)

2.2 Sūryapaṇḍita, Rāmakṛṣṇavilomakāvya, maṅgalācaraṇa 7

A less apt statement is made by Sūrya, premising a boasting remark to his *Rāmakṛṣṇavilomakāvya* palindrome. Indeed, the judgment is hardly fitting for a composition belonging to the *citrakāvya* genre, which by definition is abstruse and difficult (cf. also the synonym *duṣkara*).

13. Vidyānātha admits the ripeness of dates (*madhukṣīra*) as well.

14. *Pāka* as a hermeneutic tool has crossed the border of Sanskrit literature: Rao 1995, 38 discusses the parodistic attack on a contemporary Telugu poet as being ‘as ripe as a stone’.

The versification (*chandoktī*) does not contain monosyllabic words (*ekākṣarānī*),
 nor unusual words (*aprasiddhābhīdhānakam*);
 grammatical solecisms (*vyākaraṇakliṣṭam*) are absent:
 here there is only the ripeness of Grapes (*drākṣāpāko*).

2.3 *Jayadeva, Gītagovinda 12.31*

The last stanza comes from the closing part of Jayadeva's poem. In this bold *praśamsā*, Gītagovinda is said to encompass all possible delicacies. Although the verse is positively a late interpolation it still deserves mention, because almost all the sweet items of in the stanza have already been mentioned by previous theorists. So, even if the author did not have in mind a precise reference to the theory of *kāvya-pāka* (which is very likely, given the conventional character of the *praśastī*), the learned reader would have certainly recalled for sure some passages in *alaṃkāra* literature.

O sweet wine (*sādhvī mādhvīka*), no one cares of for you! Sugar (*śarkare*), you are bitter! Who will look at you, grape (*drākṣe*)? Ambrosia (*amṛta*), you are mortal! Milk (*kṣīra*), you taste like water! O mango (*mākaṇḍā*), weep! And you, lover's lips, do not try to compare, therefore go! As for the essence of love, the clever words of Jayadeva arouse the sentiment just too well.

Appendix Sanskrit texts

I. Pāka in theory

I.1 *Bhāmaha*, Kāvyaḷamkāra 5.62

*ahṛdyam asunirbhedaṃ rasavattve ʔpy apeśalam /
kāvyam kapittham āmaṃ yat keṣāṃcit tādṛśam yathā //*

I.2 *Vāmana*, Kāvyaḷamkārasūtravṛtti 1.3.15; 3.2.15

*ādhānoddharaṇe tāvad yāvad dolāyate maṇaḥ /
padasya sthāpīte sthāīrye hanta siddhā sarasvatī //
yatpadāni tyajanty eva parivṛttisahiṣṇutām /
taṃ śabdanyāsaniṣṇātāḥ śabdapākam pracakṣate // 1.3.15 vṛtti //
gunasphuṭatvasākalyam kāvyapākam pracakṣate /
cūtasya pariṇāmena sa cāyam upamīyate //
suptīnsaṃskārasāraṃ yat klīṣṭavastuguṇam bhavet /
kāvyam vṛntākapākam syāj jugupsante janās tataḥ //
guṇānām daśatāmukto yasyārthas tad apārthakam /
dāḍimāni daśetyādi na vicāraḥsamam vacaḥ // 3.2.15 vṛtti //*

I.3 *Rājasekhara*, Kāvyaṃīmāṃsā 5

*abhyāsavaśataḥ sukaveḥ vākyam pākam āyāti / ‘kaḥ punar ayam pākah?’ ity
ācāryāḥ / ‘pariṇāmah’ ity maṅgalaḥ / ‘kaḥ punar ayam pariṇāmah’ ity ācāryāḥ /
‘supāṃ tinām ca śraṇaḥ saiṣā vyutpattiḥ’ ity maṅgalaḥ / ‘sauśabdyam etat /
padaniveśaniṣkampatā pākah’ ity ācāryāḥ / tad āhuḥ – ‘āvāpoddharaṇe tāvad
yāvad dolāyate maṇaḥ / padānām sthāpīte sthāīrye hanta siddhā sarasvatī //
‘āgrahapariṅrahād api padasthāīryaparyavasāyas tasmāt padānām
parivṛttivaimukhyaṃ pākah’ ity vāmanīyāḥ / tad āhuḥ – ‘yatpadāni tyajanty eva
parivṛttisahiṣṇutām / taṃ śabdanyāsaniṣṇātāḥ śabdapākam pracakṣate //’ ‘īyam
asāktir na punaḥ pākah’ ity avantīsunḍarī / yad ekasmin vastuni mahākavīnām
aneko ʔpi pāṭhaḥ paripākavān bhavati / tasmād*

rasocitaśabdārthasūktinibandhanaḥ pākaḥ / yad āha –
‘guṇālaṅkārarītyuktiśabdārthagrahanakramaḥ / svadate sudhiyāṃ yena
vākyapākaḥ sa mām prati //’ tad uktam – ‘satī vaktari saty arthe śabde satī rase
sati / astī tan na vinā yena parisoravati vāṅmadhu //’ ‘kāryānumeyatayā
yattacchabdanivedyaḥ paraṃ pāko ’bhīdhāviśayaḥ / tatsahrdayaprasiddhisiddha
eva vyavahārāṅgam asau’ iti yāyāvarīyaḥ / sa ca kavigrāmasya kāvyam
abhyasyato navadhā bhavati / tatrādyantayor asvādu picumandapākam, ādāv
asvādu pariṇāme madhyamaṃ badarapākam, ādāv asvādu pariṇāme svādu
mṛdvīkāpākam, ādau madhyamam ante cāsvādu vārttākāpākam, ādyantayor
madhyamaṃ tintīḍlikāpākam, ādau madhyamam ante svādu sahakārapākam,
ādāv uttamam ante cāsvādu kramukāpākam, ādāv uttamam ante madhyamaṃ
trapusapākam, ādyantayor svādu nālikerapākam iti / teṣāṃ triṣv api trikeṣu
pākāḥ prathame tyājīyāḥ / varamakavir na punaḥ kukaviḥ syāt / kukavitā hi
socchvāsaṃ maraṇam / madhyamāḥ saṃskāryāḥ / saṃskāro hi sarvasya guṇam
utkarṣayati / dvādaśavarṇam api suvarṇam pāvakaḥ pākena hemībhavati / śeṣā
grāhyāḥ / svabhāvasūddham hi na saṃskāram apekṣate / na muktāmaṇeḥ
śānastāratāyai prabhavati / anavasthitapākam punaḥ kapitthapākam āmananti /
tatra palāladhūnanena annakaṇalābhavat subhāṣitalābhaḥ /
samyag abhyasyataḥ kāvyam navadhā paripacyate /
hānopādānasūtreṇa vibhajet tad dhi buddhimān //
ayam atraiva śīṣyāṇāṃ darśitas trividho vidhiḥ /
kintu vividham apy etat trijagaty asya varttate //

1.4 Bhoja, Sarasvatīkaṅṭhābharāṇa with Ratneśvara’s comm. 1.77

samprati prakarṣakāṣṭhālakṣaṇaṃ vākyasya guṇaṃ lakṣayati –
[Bhoja:] ukteḥ prauḍhaḥ parīpākaḥ procyate prauḍhisamjñayā / yathā –
‘abhyuddhṛtā vasumatī dalitaṃ ripūrah kṣiptakramaṃ kavalitā balirājalakṣmīḥ /
atraikajanmani kṛtaṃ yad anena yūnā janmatraye tad akarot puruṣaḥ purāṇaḥ //’
atra prakṛtisthakomalakaṭhorebhyo nāgaropanāgaragrāmyebhyo vā
padebhyo ’bhyuddhṛtādīnāṃ grāmyādīnāṃ ubhayeṣāṃ vā padānām
āvāpodvāpābhyāṃ sanniveśacārutvena yo ’yam ābhyāsiko nālikerapāko
mṛdvīkāpāka ityādir vākyaparīpākaḥ sā prauḍhir ity ucyate / tathā caitad vākyam
nālikerapāka ity ucyate / evaṃ sahakāramṛdvīkāpāke apy udāharaṇīye iti //
[Ratneśvara:] ukter iti / ukter vākyasyāyam pākaḥ sā prauḍhiḥ / śabdānām
pariyāparivārtasahatvaṃ pākaḥ / yad āha – ‘yatpadāni tyājyanty eva
parivṛttisahiṣṇutām / taṃ śabdanyāyaniṣṇātāḥ śabdapākam pracakṣate //’ iti /
prauḍha iti / upakramopasamhārayor nirvyūḍhaḥ sa cāyam
nālikerasahakāramṛdvīkopalakṣaṇais trividho gīyate / tad yathā –
nālikeraphalaṃ pakvaṃ tvaci kaṭhinaṃ śīrāsv avivṛtakomalaprāyam
kapālikāyāṃ kaṭhinataraṃ tathā kaścīt saṃdarbho mukhe kaṭhinas
tadanantaraṃ mṛduprāyas tataḥ kaṭhinataro nālikerapāka ity ucyate / tathā hi –
prakṛtodāharaṇe prathamapāde ’bhyuddhṛteti varṇacatuṣṭayam ārambhe

kaṭhinam 'vasumatī dali' iti varṇaṣaṭkaṃ komalam 'tam ripūrah' ity
 anusvārarephadīrghair akṣaracatuṣṭayam kaṭhinataram / atrāpi tam iti
 mṛduprāyaniveśena komalakapālikāmukhabhāgasārūpyam draḍhayatīty
 asmadārādhyāḥ / evaṃ dvitīyādīpādatraye catuṣkaṣaṭkacatuṣkair
 nālikeraphalasāmyam unneyam / katham punar evaṃvidhaḥ pākāḥ
 sambhavatīty ata āha – atreti / abhyāsenā nirvṛtta ābhyāsikaḥ / kāvyam kartuṃ
 vicārayitum ca ye jānanti tadupadeśena karaṇe yojane ca paunaḥpunyena
 pravṛttir abhyāsaḥ / [Mammaṭa, Kāvyaṭprakāśa 1.3 vṛtti] asāv api katham
 pākavīśeṣo bhavatīty ata āha – sanniveśacārutveneti / sanniveśo racanā tasyām
 cārutvam / tad api katham ity ata āha – āvāpodvāpābhyām iti /
 saṃdarbhānupraveśanam āvāpaḥ / tataḥ samuddharaṇam udvāpaḥ / keṣām ity
 ata uktam – padānām iti / uddhṛtānām iti buddhyā pṛthak kṛtānām / kebhya ity
 ata uktam – prakṛtiśhādītyādi / tenāyam arthaḥ / prakṛtiśhādīpadato 'py etad
 evoddhartavyam yad ghatanāsauṣṭhavana paryāyaparivartanam na saḥate /
 bhavati hi sahrdayānām evaṃ anyat padam nāstīti vyavahārah / so 'yam
 racanāsiddhivīśeṣaḥ katham anyathā tajjātīyam eva padam anyatra saṃdarbhe
 niveśitam na tathā svadate / ata evāsau vākyaguṇaḥ / kāṭhinyam ca saṃyogair
 dīrghair vā svarair bhavati / yathātraivodāharaṇe ripūra ityādau /
 sūptīnyuṭpatīlakṣaṇas tu vārtākāpākāḥ kaiścid uktaḥ, sa tu
 suśābdatālakṣaṇaguṇa eva / evam iti / yathā drākṣāphalam tvaca ārabhya
 komalam antarā dvitricaturāsthīsaṃpādītam kiṃcīt kāṭhinyam evaṃ kaścīt
 saṃdarbham upakramopasaṃhārayoḥ komala eva madhye kaṭhina eva /
 saṃyogadīrghasvaramātrakṛtamanākkāṭhorabhāvo mṛdvīkāpāka ity ucyate /
 yathā – 'ayi tvadāvarjtaḥ saṃbhṛtam pravālam āsām anubandhi vīrudhām /
 cirojjhitāktakapāṭalena te tulām yad ārohati dantavāsasā //'

[Kumārasambhava 5.34] yathā ca –

'anavaratanayanajalavanipatanaparipītahariṇamadatilakam / vadanam
 apayātamaṅgamadaśāsīkīraṇam vahanti loladṛśaḥ //’ ata eva
 kavikalpalatākārādibhir ukto nīlakapitthapākaścaturtho nāsti /
 yadvac ca pariṇatam saḥakāraphalam ārambhād eva komalam aṣṭhani tu
 kaṭhoraprāyam evam aparāḥ saṃdarbho mukhād ārabhya mṛdur antare
 kaṭhinatarāḥ saḥakārapāka ity ucyate / yathā / – 'kamalini kuśalam te
 suprabhātam rathāṅgāḥ kumudīni punar indāv udgate tvaṃ ramethāḥ / sakhi
 rajani gatāsi tvaṃ tamo jīrṇam uccair iti taralitapakṣāḥ pakṣiṇo vyāharanti //'
 atraivodāharaṇe 'pi dvidhā kaṭhoratvam avaseyam / te 'mī traya eva
 śuddhapākāḥ / vyatikarajanmānas tu bhūyāmsaḥ / eta evārthapākāḥ pañcame
 prakārāntareṇa pratīpādayīsyante //

1.5 Agni Purāṇa 345.22cd-23

uccaiḥ pariṇatīḥ kāpī pāka ity abhidhīyate // 22cd //
 mṛdvīkānārikelāmrāpākabhedāc caturvīdhaḥ /
 ādāv ante ca saurasyaṃ mṛdvīkāpāka eva saḥ // 23 //

I.6 *Vidyādhara, Ekāvalī with Mallinātha's comm. I.12*

[Vidyādhara:] *anavaratam abhyasyatām eva kavīnām vākyaṇi pākam āsādayanti / pākas tu rasocitaśabdārthanibandhanam / śravaṇasudhāsyandīni padavyutpattiḥ pāka ity anye /*

[Mallinātha:] *rasāḥ śrīṅgārādayaḥ / teṣāṃ mṛdūddhatādibhedabhinnatvād ucitaśabdārthagumphanāt tadvyāñjanasamarthā satī sā padavṛttiḥ kaṛṇāmṛtavarṣiṇī bhavati / ato rasāsvādocitaśabdanīṣpattiḥ pākāḥ sa cābhyāsasādhyā iti saphalo 'bhyāsa ityārthaḥ / ayaṃ ca pākāḥ kālidāsādiprabandheṣu prasiddha eva / matāntaram āha / padānām iti / parivṛttivaimukhyaṃ vinimayāsahiṣṇutvam / etad eva maitrīśayeti cākhyāyate / yathāsmadīyaśloke candrodayavarṇane – 'nīśākarakarasparśān nīśayā nirvṛtātmana / amī stambhādayo bhāvā vyajyante rajyamānayā // ' atra nīśādīpadasthāne kṣapādīpadāntaraprakṣepe padānām parasparamaitrībhaṅgaḥ /*

I.7 *Vidyānātha, Pratāparudrīya with Kumārasvāmin's comm. 2.35-36*

[Vidyānātha:]

arthagambhīrimā pākāḥ sa dvidhā hrdayaṅgamaḥ / drākṣāpāko nārikelapākaś ca prasphuṭāntarau // 2.35 // drākṣāpākāḥ sa kathito bahir antaḥ sphuradrasaḥ / 2.36ab /

[Kumārasvāmin:] *pāṭhasamaye 'py āsvādyamānatvād antar bahiś ca sphuraṇaṃ draṣṭavyam (...) evaṃ vyākhyānasāpekṣatvān na drutam arthapratītir ity arthaḥ / drākṣāpākanārikelapākāv arthasya drutavilambitapratītyoḥ parāṃ koṭim ārūḍhau / atas tadantarālavartinyā madhyapratīter anekavidhatvāt tadanusāreṇa kadālīrasālādīpākāḥ svayam ūhyā ity āha /*

2. *Pāka in practice*2.1 *Mallinātha, Ghaṇṭāpatha commentary on Bhāravi's Kirātārjunīya, maṅgalācaraṇa 6*

nārikelaphalasaṃmitaṃ vaco bhāraveḥ sapadi tad vibhajyate / svādayantu rasagarbhanīrbharaṃ sāram asya rasikā yathēpsitam //

[*Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra 37.63*]

upamā kālidāsasya bhāraver arthagauravam / daṇḍīnaḥ padalālītyaṃ māghe santi trayo guṇāḥ //

2.2 *Sūryapaṇḍita, Rāmakṛṣṇavilomakāvya, maṅgalācaraṇa 7*

naikākṣarāṇi chandoktir nāprasiddhābhīdhānakam / naiva vyākaraṇakliṣṭaṃ drākṣāpāko 'tra kevalam //

2.3 Jayadeva, Gītagovinda 12.31

*sādhvī mādhvīka cintā na bhavati bhavataḥ śarkare karkaśāsī drākṣe drakṣyanti
ke tvām amṛta mṛtam asi kṣīra nīraṃ rasas te /
mākanda kranda kāntādhara dhara na tulāṃ gaccha yacchanti bhāvaṃ yāvac
chṛṅgārasāraṃ śubham iva jayadevasya vaidagdhyavācaḥ //*

References

Texts and translations

- Agni Purāṇa* = *The Alaṃkara-section of the Agni Purāṇa*, ed. and transl. into English by Suresh Mohan Bhattacharyya, Firma KLM Private Ltd, Calcutta 1976.
- Ekāvalī* = *Ekāvalī of Vidyādhara, with the Tarāla Commentary by Mallinātha*, ed. by Kamalāśaṅkara Prāṇasaṅkara Trivedī, Bombay Sanskrit Series 63, Government Central Book Depot, Bombay 1903.
- Kāvyaḷaṃkāra* = *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra of Bhāmaha*, ed. by P. V. Naganatha Sastry, Wallace Printing House, Tanjore 1927 (Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1970²).
- Kāvyaḷaṃkārasūtravṛtti* = *The Kāvyaḷaṃkāra Sūtras of Vāmana, with His Own Vṛtti*, ed. by Mahāmahopādhyāya Pt. Durgāprasāda, Kāśināth Paṇḍurang Parab, rev. by Wāsudev Laxman Shāstrī Paṇśīkar, KM 15, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay 1926.
- Kāvyaḷamīmāṃsā* = *Kāvyaḷamīmāṃsā of Rājaśekhara*, ed. by C. D. Dalal, Pt. R. Anantkrishna Shastry, GOS 1, Oriental Institute, Baroda 1934³.
- Kīrātārjunīya* = *The Kīrātārjunīyam of Bhāravi (Cantos I-III), with Mallinātha's Commentary*, ed. and transl. into English and Hindi by M. R. Kale, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1966⁴.
- Pratāparudrīya* = *Pratāparudrīya of Vidyānātha, with the Commentary Ratnāpaṇa of Kumārasvāmin*, ed. by C. Sankara Rama Sastri, Bālamano-ramā Series 3, Sri Balamanorama Press, Madras (Mylapore) 1950³.
- Rāmakṛṣṇavilomakāvya* = *Rāmakṛṣṇavilomakāvya of Daivajña Śrī Sūrya Paṇḍita, with an Auto-Commentary*, ed. with the *Marmaparakāśikā* Hindi commentary and introduction by Kāmesvara Nātha Miśra, Haridas Sanskrit Series 288, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi 1970.
- Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa* = *The Sarasvatī Kaṇṭhābharaṇa by Dhāreśvara Bhojajadeva, with Commentaries of Rāmsiṃha (I-III) and Jagaddhara (IV)*, ed. by Pt. Kedārnāth Śarmā, Wāsudev Laxman Śāstrī Paṇśīkar, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay 1934².
- Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra* = *Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra*, Enlarged and re-edited by Nārāyaṇa Rāma Ācārya 'Kāvyaṭūrtha', Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay 1952⁸.

Secondary sources

- Chakravarty 1984 = S. Chakravarty, *Influence of Grammar on Vāmana's Kāvyaḷamkārasūtravṛtti*, «Rtam» 16-18 (1984–1986), 535-39.
- Chakravarty 1993 = S. Chakravarty, *The Impact of Grammar on Bhāmaha's Kāvyaḷamkāra*, in *Studies in Indology and Musicology. Dr. P. N. Kawthekar Felicitation Volume*, ed. by Sushma Kulshreshtha, J. P. Sinha, Pratibha Prakashan, Delhi 1993.
- Dwivedi 1974 = R. C. Dwivedi, *The Theory of Kāvyaḷapāka with Special Reference to the Kāvyaḷamīmāṃsā*, «Vishvashvaranand Indological Journal» 12 (1974), 106-19.
- Khare 2007 = C. P. Khare (ed.), *Indian Medicinal Plants. An Illustrated Dictionary*, Springer, Berlin–Heidelberg 2007.
- Krishnamoorthy 1971 = K. Krishnamoorthy, *Maṅgala, a Neglected Name in Sanskrit Poetics*, «Journal of the Oriental Institute of Baroda» 20, 3 (1971), 247-55.
- Rao 1995 = V. Narayana Rao, *Coconut and Honey. Sanskrit and Telugu in Medieval Andhra*, «Social Scientist» 23 (1995), 24-40.

