CHAPTER - III

RITI, ALANKĀRA AND DHVANI - Other Schools

We have taken note of three powers of word i.e. indication or Abhidhā, implication or Lakshanā and the intention or Vyanjana which otherwise known as Tatparya or the meaning intended by the speaker. Baring Abhidhā or indicative sense which is open and literal and principal or Mukhyārthā and comes first to the mind, when this principal meaning implies some contradiction or leaves something unclear or fails to satisfy some queries raised with regard to the tenebility of principal meaning that Lakshanā or implication is resorted to or projected.

Lakshanā or implication assumes two forms (1) Suddha or Pure, (2) Gauni or subordinate. Suddha or Pure, implication again assumes two forms (1) Upādāna Lakshanā and (2) Lakshanā-Lakshanā. Upādāna Lakshanā is that in which the literal or principal meaning is not set aside or thwarted but retained along with the meaning projected which helps clearing the principal meaning left uncleared i.e. Helmets entered the house. In this case helmets means persons wearing helmets.

In Lakshanā-Lakshanā, contrary to this, the primary meaning is thwarted and rejected while another meaning is projected e.g. 'There is a hut on the Ganges' obviously hut cannot be on
the flow of a river like Ganges it must, therefore, be rejected
and substituted by 'on the bank of the river Ganges' which is
acceptable.

The cases where though two objects are different, they
have similarity in some respects due to which the characteristics
of one are transferred on the other e.g. this boy is a lion. This
means the boy is so brave as can be entitled with the characteristics
of a lion. Such cases fall within the field of Gauni Lakshanā or
subordinate implication and not pure implication.

Mukul Bhatt has raised controversy with regard to this
classification of indicative, implicative and intentional meanings
and has included them all under indicating meanings or Abhidha 2
but Mammata has refuted this view of Mukul Bhatt. He has again
divided pure and subordinate Lakshanā into two forms each one
of them is Saropa or super-imposition and the second is Sadhya-
vasāna or intro-susception Lakshanā. This is of six types. Vishwa-
ñath has expanded the list into sixteen types 3.

From implication to intention:

The first initial classification of implication or Lakshanā
is (1) that which is based upon Rudhi or tradition and another
(2) which is based upon intention.

Here even Hemachandrāchārya follows Mammata, Abhinava-
gupta and Ānandvardhana verbatim and hence this means that their
views have been unanimously accepted except in case of Mukul Bhatt who differs from them and hence we have taken note of the difference.

Mammata has mentioned three pre-requisites of an implication. They are (1) Mukhyārthabādh or where the primary meaning is untenable, (2) Tadyoga or the relation of primary meaning with some other distant sense on which easy transition can be made, (3) Rudhi or Prayojana or the intention i.e. the meaning intended to be conveyed by the employer.

Transition to Dhvani:

It is significant to note that for establishing and proving their theory of Dhvani or Vyanjana both Mammata and Ānandavardhana go back to the etymological meaning of a word and take full assistance of the theories expounded by the school of Grammarians and there is nothing wrong in it, as the first and foremost meaning of a word is determined by grammer which contains rules governing our use of language. Mammata analyses word "Dhvani" as 'sabdā’, kāvyakāelē amśam ātma: abhinām eśāt, ' means that which explicates meaning. Grammarians called all words Dhvani in a broader sense because it is the words that we use that suggest the meanings which are eternal forms of Sphota. Thus a word is a Dhvani of the Sphota. When we use Gau, Gau is a Dhvani of the Sphotarupa Go. Dhvani, therefore, is the Vyanjaka of the Sphota which is Vyangya. Therefore, it is Vyanjaka of the Sphota
which is Vyanyya. This is the view of Mammata while Hemachandra considers Dhvani as Vyanyya. The term Dhvani was later on taken over by Aestheticians who, mainly follow the school of Grammarians on all vital issues and styled it as the pair of word and sense which is capable of suggesting a sense that outshines the sense expressed by the words literally. Mammata uses term Dhvani for both: Shabda as well as Artha – the word as well as meaning.

This suggested sense is found only in literary compositions like poetics and presupposes the sympathetic as well as imaginative response of the reader, who is termed Sahradya. Mammata's explanation of the term Dhvani is considered weightiest because he is regarded as staunch supporter as well as authorised spokesman of Dhvani theory established by Anandvardhan in Dhvanyaloka and strengthened by Abhinavagupta by his Lochana commentary.

**Dhvani as the soul of poetry:**

According to Anandvardhana and Dhvani-theorists, Dhvani or poetic suggestion is the soul of poetry or poetic composition and it is revealed to a sympathetic enjoyer of poetic composition by an entirely distinct power of a word called suggestion or Vyanjana. Dhvani is always Vyanjana or suggestion distinct from Vachya or literal as well as metaphorical or the implication.

Dhvanyaloka of Anandvardhana criticizes three different schools of ancient aestheticians who were reluctant to admit Dhvani as the soul of poetry. They are (1) Abhavavadins or negationists
who are ignorant of the true nature of Dhvani as they believe only in the expressive power of words i.e. Vachyartha or literal sense only. (2) Lakshanavadin or the followers of Metaphorical school who are troubled constantly by the doubts concerning the existence of Dhvani as the most important aspect of poetry, and (3) Anirdeshyaavadins who suffer from an inability to define Dhvani in a logical way, though they accept that there is such a thing as Dhvani. Despite the opposition from these theorists, gradually more and more aesthetic thinkers veered round the concept of Dhvani and finally accepted the status of Dhvani as the Atma or the soul of poetry.

The Nature and Types of Dhvani:

Dhvanyaloka of Anandvardhan and Lochan commentary on it by Abhinavagupta both explain the genesis of (1) the word Dhvani, (2) the sense of Dhvani, and (3) the power called Dhvani. There is divergence of views with regard to the nature of suggestion. Abhinavagupta has dealt with five such views and according to Vimarsini, a commentary by Jayaratha on Ruyyaka's Alankarasarvasva, there were twelve rival schools that opposed the theory of Dhvani or suggestion. But most of these rival theorists' views centred around the expressed sense or at best around Vachyartha and Lakshyartha - indicating and implication - so they are bracketed together and called Vachyarthavadins.

In the second Karikā of Dhvanyaloka, we have a two fold division of word (1) Vachya or literal, and (2) Pratiyamana
or suggested. The Vāchya or literal meaning is Prasiddha or Laukika and ordinarily known while Pratiyamana is Alaukika or extraordinary and known only to some Sahradaya. This extraordinary sense called Pratiyamana is a 'suggested sense' and is entirely different from the literal or Vāchya sense and constitutes quintessence of poetic composition. As per the true beauty of this suggested sense, we are told that it is like the supple grace that pervades the entire being of a lovely damsel which over and above the ornaments and make up as well as the symmetry of form of that damsel.

The captivating charm of a work of art is not equal to the adornments of word and sense of excellances but is, in fact, much more than these beautifying elements and is different from the beauty of the external elements. It is the beauty of the entire work and not of parts or external ornaments of it.

Suggestion or Dhvani is, thus, the soul of a poetic composition, is independent of and supreme among such other elements like Alankāra, Guna, Riti, Vritti and Sanghatana or structure. Mere absence of Dosas or flaws or presence of Guna and Alankāra does not constitute the essence of a poetic composition. It is the Pratiyamana sense, distinct from all other senses that gives life to a poetic composition. It is like Lāvanya in a damsel. It is because of the pervading influence of this Pratiyamana sense that endows a poetic work on eternal value and immortal creativity. Works of great masters like Vyāsa, Vālmiki, Kālidāsa and others are ever anew because of their Pratiyamana sense.
Types of Dhvani or Suggestion:

Vyangya sense, Pratiyamana sense or power of suggestibility is of three types basically. They are (1) Vastudhvani, (2) Alankāradhvani, and (3) Rasadhvani. These three have again their sub-types. Of these three varieties, Vastudhvani refers to the subject-matter of poetic composition; Alankāradhvani refers to the embellishments. Both these can be conveyed through the expressive power of a word but the last and the most important among them viz. Rasadhvani can never be expressed as it is always and invariably suggested. Abhinavagupta has divided Dhvani into Laukika or ordinary and Alaukika or extraordinary and has subsumed Vastudhvani and Alankāradhvani under the former or Laukika. He has regarded Rasadhvani as the best type and has subsumed under Alaukika or extraordinary. This last is beyond the expressive power of words and can only be enjoyed through proper representation of the aesthetic stimuli.

Abhinavagupta has explained the classification and division of Dhvani and said that it is applicable to Šabda, Artha and Vyāpara both severally as well as collectively. In Kāvyā, it is used collectively and can mean (1) the suggestive word, (2) the suggestive primary meaning or vāchyārtha, (3) the suggested sense or Vyangya, (4) the process of suggestion or Vritti, and (5) the whole poem or Dhvanikāvya. This shows that the way he uses the term is far more development over Dhvani as was used by Gramma-
rians. According to Grammarians, Sphota is Dhvani which is expressed through sound which is eternal and indivisible significant word.

Following Grammarians, the literary critics developed the conception. Especially the Dhvani school of literary critics apply the term Dhvani to Vāchakasabdās and Vāchyārtha or indicative words and the meaning they express which again jointly, and severally suggest the implicative meaning or Pratiyamanārtha. Abhinavagupta comprehends all the four elements - the word, the meaning, the process and the intention - within the connotation of the term Dhvani. Āndavardhan explicitly states that suggestion is the unidirectional communication of a sense other than the expressed by both the expressed sense and the expression when Vyāngya is pre-eminent.

Śabdī and Ārthī Vyānjana:

According to Dhani theorists, a word can be merely Vačaka or literal or merely Lakshanika or implicative but it can never be only Vyānjaka or intentional. In other words, Vyāngyārtha or suggestion can never be revealed by a word without at the same time expressing a Vāchyārtha or literal sense and conveying a Lakshyārtha or implication. This again means that suggestion or Vyānjana must be accompanied by either Abhidhā or indication or Lakshana (implication).
The Sabdi Vyanjana or literal suggestion is either Abhidhāmula based on literal sense or Lakshanāmula based on implication. Vyangya sense or suggestion is in addition to either the literal or the implicative sense. In the case of suggestion, we have to assume two powers possessed by a word simultaneously i.e. Vyanjana and Abhidhā or Vyanjana and Lakshanā. In either case we should not mean that Abhidhā or Lakshanā is the cause of Vyanjana. It is only a Sahkarin or accessory. The motive or Prayojana is apprehended by Vyanjana or intentionality. In a gross example 'there is a hut on the Ganges' (Gāngayām Ghoṣaḥ) the primary meaning is not tenable as there cannot be a hut on the flow of a river like the Ganges and we have to resort to Lakshanā and mean that 'there is a hut on the banks of the Ganges'. This again does not convey the sense of coolness, holiness etc. which can only be conveyed if we resort to Vyanjana or intentional aspect of the whole sentence. The word the Ganges carries the meaning 'Banks' by Lakshanā and 'coolness and holiness' by Vyanjana.

Dhvani in nutshell as Hemachandracharya has put it, is entirely different from the principal meaning - Mukhyārtha, secondary meaning or Gaunārtha and implied meaning or Lakshyārtha. It is different from all other senses. This is a variety of Pratyāyamana sense which represents fourth stage of language as Abhinavagupta explains it. This is neither expressed nor indicated or implied but experienced or felt by or revealed to the appreciative,
sympathetic and responsive reader. Pratiyamana means Svasamvedanasiddhata self-realisationness. This felt nature of the suggested sense is brought out very well in Dhvanyāloka by Anandvardhana. It is like Lavanya or 'nectar of joy'.

Abhinavagupta divides the suggested sense into (1) Laukika or ordinary, (2) Alaukika or extraordinary. He subsumes vastudhvani and Alankāradhvani under ordinary or laukika and retains Rasadhvani under extraordinary or Alaukika.

Reduction of Riti, Alankāra to Dhvani:

While following Anandvardhana, Mammata and Abhinavagupta, we can say that Dhvani concept being elastic as well as dynamic revives ancient tradition upheld by Bhamah, Dandi, Vāman and Udbhata of subsuming the metaphorical and implied or indicated sense under Mukhyārtha or principal one. Dhvani concept towers them all and subsumes under it emotive sense, structure, texture, aesthetic experience, embellishments as well as organic form of imaginative beauty. It makes break with referential speech or expressed sense completely and represents the emotive or literary aspect of language at its best. The term Dhvani comprehends within it the ideas of emotion, structure, texture, unified character of the aesthetic experience, organic form as well as the imaginative beauty of the literary medium consisting in 'ambiguity', 'ambivalence', 'implication' complexity and richness, many-sidedness,
irony, paradox, tension, conflict, contriety and even gestures. The Dhvani concept of Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta absorbed and assimilated the concept of Rasa so marvelously conceived and established by Bharat in his Natyashashtra. This meaning which is unique and exclusive to poetic composition alone, is characterised as the essence of poetry. It has its parallels in fine arts like music, dance, drama, architecture etc. The theory is so formulated that it can assimilate the essence of all the traditional aesthetic categories while emphasizing 'Rasa'.

The pre-eminent role of Dhvani in poetry assumes the realisation of the fact that there is unique aesthetic formation of poetical or aesthetic expression called suggestion, which is totally different from the two well known processes known as direct and indirect expression. This is the height of Dhvani theory. In the words of Anandvardhana, the word has, as it were, realized itself or its meaning and has risen above the word and its meaning both.

Once this is realized that suggested meaning is the real poetic meaning, it becomes clear that in all instances of Dhvani or suggestion, the Vyangyārtha is always more important and beautiful than the Vāchyārtha as well as Lakshyārtha. This again implies that even in case of Vastudhvani where a bare idea is suggested, the beauty of the Vāchyārtha or literal sense is outshone by the beauty of the Vyangyārtha or the meaning intended for it is the
central aim of poetic composition to delight the reader by the all-surpassing suggestion. Hemachandra following Mammata and Anandavardhana classifies Dhvani into three types: Vastu or ideas or the content, Alankara or suggestive figurative shades and Rasadi or sentiments and this threefold sense or Dhvani is the soul of poetry.

The first Vastudhvani suggests bare idea or matter of fact subject different from explicit meaning and this is also the characteristic of other two types viz. Alankara and Rasadi type.

Thus Vastudhvani completely differs from the explicit or expressed sense.

Hemachandra employs the term Adi to hint at the other senses such as Gauna or secondary and Lakshya or implied. He points out that sometimes, the expressed sense of the nature of a positive proposal but the suggested sense is of the nature of a prohibition. Anandavardhana too points out that though the Vastu or subject matter is suggested by the inner power of the explicit statement or the expressed sense, still the expressed sense is never intended and it is distinct from the sense suggested. Thus, in all cases of Dhvani, the suggested sense, be it Vastu or subject-matter of Alankara or figure, or Rasa, is quite different from the expressed sense. Though Vastu and Alankara are always conveyed by the Vyangya, Vyangya is always conveyed by suggestion and neither by indication or implication.
Refutation of Tatparya theory:

Since no comprehension of a sense is possible without Sanketa (conjunction) being there, a word can convey a sense only if Sanketa or conjunction of the word with actual situation or object exists. This reminds us of Mammata's definition of Vāchak Sābda or significant word and Sanketa is of one type only because it cannot be placed on a word to yield a special meaning for fear of the fault of endlessness and infringement of the rule. The connection of general word meanings in a sentence comes about owing to expectancy (Akānksā), compatibility (Yogyatā) and Proximity (Sannidhi). This is the view of Abhihitavanavādins.

Abhihitavanavādins hold that the Tatparya or purport-sense also belongs to the word when the senses of words in a sentence are combined together due to the force of expectancy, compatibility and proximity. The purport sense, which possesses a special form, and which though not the sense of the different words used in a sentence, represents the sense of the whole sentence. This is the view of those who maintain that connection arises between senses after they are expressed by the different words in a sentence. They maintain 'Vāchya eva Vākyartha' - the expressed sense is the sentence sense. They hold the view that words express connected meaning. They are Anoitabhidhānvādins. Abhinavagupta has arranged all the four in the following order: (1) Abhidhā or literal, (2) Tatparya or purport, (3) Lakshanā
or implication, and (4) Vyanjana or intentional. Thus according to him Vyanjana or intentionality is the fourth power or Vritti.

Thus Tatparya or purport belongs not to individual words as Abhidha, Lakshanā or Vyanjana do but to the sentence as a whole. Its purpose is to convey the connection (Anvaya) between the meanings of the different words in a sentence. This connected meaning is styled as Tatparyarthā.

The followers of Abhihitānvayavāda hold that in a sentence, the different words first convey their respective individual senses and then a connection between them arises giving rise to a sentence-meaning or import of the sentence as a whole. According to them, every word has a generic (Samānyya) meaning which it expresses independently. This may be called Vākyarthā and it is learnt from Viddhāvyavahāra or behaviour of the elders and Kosa or dictionary. When several words are combined to make a sentence, the senses are modified in some way to accommodate others. These together give rise to a sense which is the sense of the sentence as a whole. This is accomplished by Tatparya Vṛtti which operates owing to the force of expectancy, compatibility and proximity (Syntax, Semantax and Pragmatics). Abhihitānvaya view is upheld by the followers of Kumārilabhatta, a great Mīmāṃsaka, as also by the followers of Nyāyavaisesika school.
Another school of Mimamsakas led by Prabhakara hold the view known as Anvitabhidhanavada which oppose the view mentioned above. According to Anvitabhidhanavadin, words in a sentence express connected meaning and hence, there is no need for assuming a Samanya or generic sense over and above ordinary sense of a word. The meaning of words are understood as connected (Anvita) and hence no separate entity like Tatparyarthvritti is called for.

Arthi Vyanjana: Suggestibility of meaning:

The process of suggestion has been defined as that power of conveying a sense which is aided by the sensitive reader's refined sensibility, rendered pure by the apprehension of meaning born of the powers of indication and implication - Abhidha and Lakshana. Any one of these three senses viz. Vachya or literal, Lakshya or implied and Vyanga or intentional or all of these three in their turn, suggest some inner sense when either the speaker is some peculiar person, or the subject on hand has some speciality or the intonation of the sentence uttered is peculiar, or the expressed sense is peculiar or the person associated with the speaker is peculiar or the context, place, time, gestures and others have some peculiarity about them. In all such cases there is definitely a suggested sense. The suggested sense, in its turn, proceeds sometimes from Vachyartho or literal meaning, at other times from Lakshyartho or the meaning implied and sometimes from Vyanyartho.
or the meaning intended. All these varieties have been illustrated by Mammata following Anandvardhana and Hemachandra both.

All meanings and suggestion:

It is surprising to note that Mammata in the second Ullasa of Kāvyaprabhāśa states the nature of word and sense and then declares in Kārikā that suggestiveness is admitted as belonging to all senses\(^8\). This means that not only the word is suggestive but the three-fold sense - the expressed or indicative, the implied as well as intentional - also is suggestive. This can also be taken to mean that senses, in addition to being expressed implied and suggested are further suggestive i.e. they suggest something else over and above these three.

Arthivyanjanā or meaning dependent upon sense or suggestion occurs in those cases of suggestion where the special conditions which give rise to Sabdivyanjanā of Abhidhāmula type or Lakshanāmula type exist. Out of these two Lakshanāmula must be Prayojanavali or with purpose and Abhidhāmula must pre-suppose ambiguity of words. Arthivyanjanā occurs when there is suggestion but which is devoid of purpose and ambiguity of words. In order that these senses become suggestive the presence of certain peculiar circumstances is required. These circumstances are, that operation of the three-fold sense, which owing to the peculiary of the speaker, the person addressed, the modulation of intonation of voice (Kaku).
the sentence-meaning, the proximity of another person, the occasion, 
the place, the time etc. become the cause of the apprehension of 
another sense in the case of persons gifted with creative imagina-
tion. The main point to be conveyed by all these is that Vāchya-ṛtha 
or literal meaning can be understood by all, Lakshya-ṛtha by some 
thoughtful but Vyanga-ṛtha requires a distinct Pratibha or imagina-
tive, creative ability.

Suggestiveness of word as well as sense:

The question naturally arises that when in a speech 
or linguistic discourse the purpose is carried out jointly by the 
word and sense, why they are conceived here as distinct as we 
have seen the suggestiveness based on word and the same based 
on meaning or sense? For all practical purposes, they are found 
connected so it looks, prima facie, unreasonable to make word and 
sense, the basis of two divisions of Vyanjana viz., Shabdivyanjana 
and Arthivyanjana.

Such a criticism has been replied by Mammata. He 
says "since the word is suggestive when accompanied by the other 
sense, the other sense also is there considered to be suggestive 
due to its cooperation with that word in conveying the suggested 
sense". In other words, a word is said to be suggestive when 
it is Arthantaryak or having another meaning also. In Abhidhamula 
Vyanjana or suggestion based upon literal sense which carries more 
than one meanings. So also in Lakshanāmula Vyanjana or suggestion
based by implication when it is accompanied by another sense. But in such cases we must remember that the other sense possessed by a word is cooperative since it is the principal sense which is suggestive. In अर्थवियन्यान, the अर्थ or meaning is suggestive and word or साध्वा is a help-mate or cooperative.

In fact वियन्यान or suggestibility belongs to both the word as well as meaning but in शब्दवियन्यान the word is principally suggestive and meaning is cooperative while in अर्थवियन्यान, the अर्थ or meaning is principal while the word is cooperative. With a view to make sure, whether the suggestion proceeds from the word or from its expressed sense, in certain circumstances, we can examine the sense conveyed by changing or substituting another word bearing the same sense. If it be found that suggestion remains unaffected even when we substitute the synonymous word, then it is regarded as based upon the अर्थ or meaning whereas if the slightest change in the word alters or affects व्यांग्यार्थ or suggestion, then it is said to have been based on साध्वा.

साध्वासाक्तिमुला, we have seen is two-fold: of अलंकार or of वस्तु - the ornaments or the subject-matter. If ornament or अलंकार is principally represented by the word, it is अलंकारगतासाध्वासाक्तिमुलाद्वानि or suggestion based on ornaments or figure and if subject-matter is principally represented by the word, then it is वस्तुगतासाध्वासाक्तिमुलाद्वानि.
Slesa and Vyanjana:

The question how Sabdivyanjana differs from Ślesha because both of them are based upon ambiguity of words used carrying more than one sense, the indiscriminate use of Vyanjana will eliminate the scope of Ślesa to this question. Dhvanikār's reply is "It is true that in Sabdasaktimula as also in Ślesa, we have the apprehension of more than one sense, but in Sabdasaktimula we have also the apprehension of an unexpressed poetic figure or Alankāra as some definite relation like Sadrsya or analogy etc., obtains between Vachya or literal and Vyangya or suggested senses. In Ślesa no such relation obtains. This is the essential difference between the two. In Ślesa, two or more senses are apprehended but the unexpressed relation that connects two distinct meanings is not present.

Division of Arthasaktimulavyanjana:

The division of Arthasaktimulavyanjana is made on the strength of the variety of suggestion involved. Prima facie there are two divisions based upon (1) Vastu, and (2) Alankāra and hence there are four varieties depending upon whether Vastu or subject matter is emphasized or Alankāra or figure is emphasized.

1. Vastudhvani in which the Vastu or subject-matter is suggested by Vastu.
2. Vastudhvani in which the Vastu is suggested by Alankāra or figure.

3. Alankāradhvani in which suggestion is suggested by Vastu or subject-matter.

4. Alankāradhvani in which suggestion is suggested by figure.

Mammata has classified Arthasaktimūla into twelve varieties. He has divided them, first, into three varieties (1) Svatahsambhavi i.e. one in which the whole sense is natural, (2) Kavi Praudhokīsiddha i.e. one that is created or established by virtue of Poet's words full of lofty imagination, and (3) Kavini-baddhavaktrapraudhoktimatranispannasarirah i.e. one created by the words full of lofty imagination of the speaker or character conceived by the poet.

Hemachandra criticizing Mammata says that his classification is ill-conceived and unreasonable and hence the above three-fold classification should be rejected, for even a natural idea does not appear to be charming without the grand utterances of poet. Therefore Kavipraudhokti or the lofty imagination of a poet is enough to produce a charming suggestion whether in an idea or in a figure of speech. Poets' imagination is, therefore, an essential prerequisite for any beautiful piece of literature.

Poetic imagination - Pratibha:

Following Ānandvardhan and Abhinavagupta and fully grasping the above exposition of Arthasakti or meaning power of
words, we may note here that ultimately, it is the Poetic imagination variously termed as Pratibhā by Abhinavagupta that abides over all forms of poetic expression of composition. It is this element which makes even a matter of fact or real object otherwise unattractive, full of charm and beauty. In the words of Abhinavagupta, "the words of the great poets are indeed inexhaustible sources of poetic wealth" and "a mere spot on the part of a mighty genius produces such a result as is undreamt of or unheard of, whereas a great effort by another fails to produce even an iota of a fruit". Indeed the mere flutter of the hair of the quarter-elephant is sufficient to cause an earthquake, while the poor bee may shatter itself to pieces by falling from great height but succeeds not in shaking a creeper!"

Rasadhvani is always suggested never expressed:

Rasadhvani forms a distinct type of Dhvani which is always suggested and never expressed. It is never dependent upon Vachya or literal meaning nor upon Lakshya or implied sense but is always Vyangya or suggested. Poetry which portraits Rasas and Bhāvas, Rasabhāsa and Bhāvabhāsa, Bhāvasānti, Bhāvodaya, Bhāvasthiti, Bhāvasandhi and Bhāvasahalata - nine in all - provide very good examples of Arthaśāktimūlavyangya and hence it explicitly acknowledges "Rasadischa" as a poetic principle. It is central and cardinal principle. Rasa, Bhāva etc. are always suggested or Vyangya for they can never condescend to the level of Vāchyaṛtha
or literal sense. In other words, whereas in Vastudhvani and Alankaradhvani, the Vachya sense or the Lakshya sense plays its part, in Rasadhvani, Vachya or literal sense is totally neglected or discarded. Rasadhvani is always suggested. This is so especially in all cases of words, sentences as well as a whole poem or a poetic composition. This in turn shows that Rasa is supreme in poetic composition.

Rasadhvani or suggestion of an emotional state or emotion or mood always surpasses everything that is explicit or matter of fact. It is this variety alone that is of supreme importance. Suggestion or Dhvani in the form of Rasa is a matter of realization and there is no emotion that can become detectable without the sole means of suggestion for Rasa is never denoted by words, but is always developed or portrayed by means of a proper presentation of Vibhāvas or determinants, Anubhāvas or ensuants and Vyabhichāribhāvas or the accessories or the fleeting emotions of that particular Rasa. In a poem, we have a poetic description and in a drama, an aesthetic representation of the Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhichāribhāvas leading upto Rasa. This rasa is a matter of experience and not a mere statement. It is impossible, in fact, to experience Rasas like Vira, Shringār etc., in a composition which is totally devoid of the delineation of their respective Vibhāvas etc. though there is always mention of Vira, Shringāra etc. Thus both by Anvaya or the method of agreement and Vyatireka or the
method of difference - positive and negative concommitance - the conclusion is inescapable that Rasa is portrayed not by its proper name but by development through the representation of the appropriate Vibhavasamagri or esthetic situation. A word of caution is necessary. It should not be supposed, as is done very often, that these Vibhavas etc. generate Rasa like so many causes, they only suggest Rasa.
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