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1. Introduction

Śobhākareśvaramitra (sometimes called Śobhākaramitra), a Kashmirian Sanskrit rhetorician who lived between the middle of the 12th century and the former part of the 13th century, discussed the aesthetic beauty of two rhetorical figures – *anumāna* and *hetu* – in his *Alaṃkāraratnākara* (AlRat). He not only redefined the two figures, but also made a new systemization of them in comparison to earlier authors of Sanskrit rhetorical literature in Kashmir, such as Mammaṭa (ca. 1050–1100) and Ruuyaka (ca. 1125–1175). However, Śobhākaramitra’s thought on *anumāna* and *hetu* has not been fully elaborated by previous studies, such as Rao 1992 and so on. In this paper, I will focus on Śobhākaramitra’s expounding of the two figures and reveal how he thought they convey poetical beauty.

2. Śobhākaramitra on *anumāna*

The figure of *anumāna* is usually translated as “poetical inference.” The attribute “poetical” shows its difference from a logical inference. In general, it refers to the process of stating a thing to be proven (*sādhyā*) and its proof (*sādhana*), which results in the understanding of the former one. Ruuyaka and Mammaṭa both argued that in this figure, the proof should contain the property of *trairūpya: paksadharmatā, anvāya* and *vyatireka.* This idea was borrowed from the Indian logicians who insisted on this prerequisite of a good inferential proof. In the context of the AlRat, one also needs to apply this property.

Śobhākaramitra defined *anumāna* as that kind of rhetorical figure in which one understands by oneself, from its proof, an object which is not yet understood by means of explicit verbal expression or by means of implicit expression. To simplify, I only present one of Śobhākaramitra’s examples.
Example 1:

\[ \text{mugdhākṣi nūnam adhunā tvadapāṅgakelivātāyane vasati kāmukalokapālaḥ} \]
\[ \text{karnāvatamsakusumesu nibaddhavāsaḥ sevāparo}\]
\[ 6) \text{yad iha ṣaṭpadagāyano} \]
\[ 7) \text{yam} \]

O girl with innocent gaze! Surely now the directional guardian [in the form of Love-god] lives in the amusement window/the direction of wind (i.e. horizon) that is the outer corner of your eyes; for the bee-singer is frequenting the perfume/garment attached to the flowers that are your ear ornaments.

In this example, the reason is expressed literally by the word \text{yad}, so this is a case of explicit expression of proof. The thing to be proven is the existence of the Love-god in the corner of the girl’s eyes, and its proof is the perception of the existence of a bee-singer as an attendant near the girl’s ear.\text{8)}

Although Šobhākaramitra admitted that there are cases of “pure” poetical inference, i.e. the expressions in one stanza contain no figurative application, he re-analyzed one of Ruyyaka’s examples of poetical inference as containing another rhetorical figure, while the latter insisted on it being an example of “pure” type.\text{9)}

3. Šobhākaramitra on hetu

The rhetorical figure of hetu can be translated as “poetical reason.” Šobhākaramitra defined it as an inferential mark (liṅga) which causes others to understand something that is not known to them.\text{10)} In other words, hetu should take the form of an inference for the sake of others (parārthānumāna), while in the cases of anumāna there should be an inference for the sake of oneself (svārthānumāna). This is a new division of the two figures in comparison to that made by Ruyyaka, because the latter divided the two figures according to the condition whether there is new information in one stanza or not.\text{11)}

Now let us consider the following example of hetu given by Šobhākaramitra:

Example 2:

\[ \text{ayi pramatte sicayaṃ gṛhāṇety uktāpi sakhyā na viveda kācit} \]
\[ \text{magnā hi sā tatra rasāntarāle yatrāntarāṅgo bhagavān anāṅgah} \]

Even though her friend told her, “Alas negligent lady! Hold on to your garment,” a certain lady was unaware, since she was sunk in the midst of rasa where the adorable Love-god [lives].

In this example, with regard to the result of the unawareness of the heroine, the state of being immersed into the rasa is the inferential mark. The word \text{hi} indicates that this is a
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4. The difference between the rhetorical figure of anumāna and hetu

Although anumāna and hetu are both rhetorical figures based on reasoning, they can be distinguished from each other on several aspects. As has been mentioned above, the new contribution of Śobhākaramitra to their distinction is that he analyzed the two figures according to the distinction of svārthānumāna and parārthānumāna. The property of trairūpya in the proof was also maintained by him. Besides these, he also listed other prerequisites for the two figures. In the case of anumāna, there can be suggesting words, such as “I know” (jāne) or “surely” (nūnam), which inform the reader that there is an inference for the sake of oneself; while in the case of hetu, the mention of the person addressed is optional, and the form of the inferential mark is either explicit or implicit.

5. Why do poetical inference and poetical reason convey aesthetic beauty?

The key point that makes a good example of anumāna or hetu is that in a stanza, there is a special strikingness (vicchittiviśeṣa) expressed by the vocabulary of the poet. If a stanza containing “poetical inference” lacks this strikingness, then it will be similar to a logical inference which does not convey any aesthetic beauty. Another point is that the proof and the inferential mark should not take ablative endings, otherwise they just express a fact and do not convey any wonderfulness. Śobhākaramitra also gave us a counter-example:

prajānāṃ vinayādhānād rakṣanād bharanād api
sa pitā pitaras tāsām kevalāṃ janmahetavaḥ

He is a [real] father by giving guidance to his subjects/descendants, by protecting them and by supporting them. [Ordinary] fathers are merely the causes of their birth.

If this counter-example were a case of hetu, then the result, i.e. giving guidance, protecting and supporting the subjects/descendants, would be inferential marks. But they all take the ablative ending, so they lack elegance. Therefore, this stanza is not a case of hetu.
6. Conclusion

Śobhākaramitra’s division of the rhetorical figures of *anumāṇa* and *hetu* focused on the difference between the inference for the sake of oneself and the inference for the sake of others. This new viewpoint is a development of the theory of earlier authors of Sanskrit rhetoric, and it shows the growing influence of Indian logic on aesthetics.

Notes

1) For the date of the three authors, see De 1976; Kane 1971; Rao 1992, 4. 2) See Jenner 1968, 264–265; Gerow 1971, 108. 3) Cf. KP p. 270 and AlSar pp. 172–173. 4) See Katsura 1985. 5) See AlRat p. 133, 23–24. 6) The printed edition reads *kusumopaniṇībaddha* instead of *kusumesu nibaddha*. This latter reading is a conjecture based on manuscripts. 7) *vātāyana* means window, and punningly a cardinal direction. *lokapāla* is appropriate for direction. 8) See AlRat p. 134, 10–11: *atra gyanasevārūpakāryadarśanāt sevanīyakāmukalokapālavasthitih kāranarāpānumīyate*. The current reading is a conjecture according to manuscripts. The printed edition reads *gīyanasevakād rūpakādyadarśanāt*. 9) See AlSar p. 173, 10–16; AlRat p. 135, 16–21. 10) AlRat p. 135, 23: *pareṇānavagatasya vastunaḥ pratipādakam ganakarūpaṁ liṅgaṁ hetuḥ*. 11) See AlSar pp. 171–172; pp. 173–174. 12) See AlRat p. 137, 10–14.
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AlRat See Rao 1992.

AlSar *Alaṃkāra-sarvasva of Ruyyaka with Sañjīvanī Commentary of Vidyācakravartin: Text and Study*. Ed. V Raghavan. Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas, 1965.
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