A close reading of the two texts, the Dhvanyäloka and the Vakroktijivita, led me to take up their comparative study, since it appeared to me that the two theories were complementary to each other, in many respects. While Anandavardhana's book deals with the theoretical and philosophic discussions on poetry along with their practical implications, Kuntaka gives at length practical applications of the poetic theories of earlier rhetoricians, including that of Anandavardhana. These two complementary theories are close to the standards of modern literary criticism which can be applied to any literature.

The critical study of the Vakroktijivita, as a whole, is not done by any modern scholar and a comparative study of Anandavardhana and Kuntaka has never been done; hence the attempt is made here to study them comparatively. A brief survey of the scholarly work up to date is given below.

A number of modern scholars like Dr. A. Sankaran, Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, etc., have worked on the Dhvani
theory in detail historically and critically. But Kuntaka is not yet critically dealt with by anybody. Dr. De, who has edited the text of the Vakroktijivita for the first time, in the introduction gives the history of the principle of Vakrokti before Kuntaka and just summarises the contents of the Vakroktijivita, with a remark: —

"Bhāmaha's Vakrokti, however, found an exponent in Kuntaka who develops its implications fully in his Vakrokti-jivita and builds a unique theory of poetics on its basis. He adopts Bhāmaha's idea of Vakrokti as the distinguishing characteristic of all poetic figures (alāṃkāra-sāmānyalakṣana) and employs it to denote selection of words and turning of ideas which are peculiar to poetry and which are abhorrent of matter-of-fact speech. But he analyses all poetic speech from this standpoint and elaborately develops what is only hinted at by Bhāmaha."

(P. xxv).

This remark does less than justice to the influence of Ānandavardhana on Kuntaka, an influence perhaps stronger than that of Bhāmaha. Bhāmaha never goes into the details of the implications of Vakrokti as fully worked out by Kuntaka.

Dr. A. B. Keith says; —
The intention here is not to indicate the caste of a person but to praise his knowledge. Upacāra-t'hāla takes place when there is dharmavikalpā in understanding abhidhā as in,

"मन्त्राः प्राधान्याः" means

"समक्षस्य पुस्तकाः पीयाः"

and does not mean that the cots weep.

Udvyatākara, in his Nyāyavārttika says that—
mukhyavrtha-vyatikrama, deviation from the primary meaning, does not involve pravojana-vyatikrama or sacrifice of main intent. It is just superimposition or upacāra like

"मन्त्राः प्राधान्याः" well known in ordinary speech (loka-prasiddha).

Vācaspatimis'ra in 'Nyāyavārttika-tātparvātīka' says that usage of words is of two kinds, primary and secondary. Primary (abhidhā) is constant and by exception it becomes secondary (bhākta).

"तत्समाधिः प्रधानः औषधीविशिष्टः तत्सम पुरुषदवालोऱ्यावनो भवति॥ p. 351, Chaukhamba ed.)

He gives exactly the same example—"मन्त्राः प्राधान्याः"—where the expressed meaning is incompatible, so we have to resort to the secondary meaning. The word used in a secondary sense must always be well known.
"More fortunate is Kuntaka, probably a contemporary of Abhinavagupta, whose Vakroktijivita is an effort to present in a new and improved form the idea vaguely present to Bhamaha and those who laid stress on figures as the essential feature of poetry. He insisted that Vakrokti, crooked or figurative speech, is the life of poetry, distinguishing it from science and any merely ordinary or natural mode of expressing facts of any sort." ('A History of Sanskrit Literature', p. 392).

With this remark he summarises Kuntaka in two paragraphs but does not deal critically with his text. Here also the major influence of Anandavardhana is ignored and an undue importance is attached to Kuntaka's idea of alankāra. It cannot be forgotten that Kuntaka has only one chapter on alankāra as such, while more than 2 of the book is devoted to a consideration of Vakrokti as a principle underlying not only particular figures but also poetic language itself.

Dr. S. N. Dasgupta also does not add much about Kuntaka when he says; —

"His (Kuntaka's) work is divided into four chapters and it consists of kārikās and their interpretations with examples. He held a theory that Vakrokti was the soul of poetry but even in Bhamaha we
find that certain alaṅkāras were not regarded as alaṅkāras as there was no vakrokti in them. Vakrokti as the essence of kavya literature is not a discovery or invention of Kuntaka, but it was he who gave it a finished form. (History of Sanskrit Literature' by S. N. Dasgupta and S. K. Des. Pp. 548-549).

Then Dr. Dasgupta summarises Sābdārtha-Sāhītya of Kuntaka and vakrokti as its alaṅkāra in two paras.

Dr. Kane remarks about the Dhvanyāloka; —

"The Dhvanyāloka is an epoch-making work in the history of Alāṅkāra Literature. It occupies the same position in the Alāṅkārasāstra as Panini's sūtras in grammar and the Vedāntasūtras in Vedānta." ('History of Sanskrit Poetics', p. 161).

He summarises the contents of the Vakroktijīvita and says; —

"The Vakroktijīvita is a work of great value and deserves to be rescued from the oblivion into which it has fallen. Whatever one may think of his central theory that Vakrokti is the soul of poetry and of the somewhat quaint nomenclature adopted by the author, the work shows originality, great literary acumen and is full of charming ideas." (P. 234).

Dr. V. Raghavan in 'Some Concepts of the Alāṅkārasāstra' refers Kuntaka's views about Svabhāyokti, mārga, etc. In his thesis 'Bhoja's
Sūnggarapakṣa's he deals with Sāhitya of Kuntaka and compares Bhoja's concept of dhvani with Anandavardhana's dhvani theory and the Vakrokti of Bhoja with the Vakrokti theory of Kuntaka with a remark.

"There are many points of similarity between Bhoja and Kuntaka, two great writers of the post-Anandavardhana period, who accepted Dhvani and Rasa with all their supremacy, but took up the old concept of Alankāra and Vakrokti and elaborated systems out of them. But there is a good deal of difference also between the two writers." (P.12).

Thus though Dr. Raghavan has studied Kuntaka critically from a few points of view, he has not covered the whole portion of the Vakroktiţivita.

To remove some misconceptions about the value of Kuntaka's work and to vindicate his thought in comparison with that of Anandavardhana, whose value is undoubted, is the primary consideration behind this thesis. It is considered at least by some scholars that Kuntaka is a system-builder unlike the mere rhetoricians of the early schools. His system stands on an equal footing with that of Anandavardhana himself. Dr. A. Sankaran says;

"Though Kuntaka belongs to a different school of critical thought, he fully recognises the individuality of dhvani (suggestion and suggested element) in poetry and also its construction to aesthetic pleasure." ('Some Aspects of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit', ch. IX).
"Kuntaka re-established the principles of the older schools by adapting them to the current tendencies of critical thought and giving them a new garb." (Ch. IX).

Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, in his doctoral thesis, 'The Dhvanyāloka And Its Critics', mentions that the varieties of Vākrapā include the varieties of dhvani, and remarks:

"He (Kuntaka) is not a slavish follower of either the ancient Alankāra-school or the new Dhvani-school; at the same time he is also not an unsparing critic of either school. Kuntaka, therefore, may be regarded as an eclectic writer who incorporates into his work the merits of both the schools. But whereas his criticism of the ancients is more pointed and frequent, it may be said that he hardly criticizes the Dhvani theory and he is second to none in his admiration for Anandavardhana since he always quotes from the latter with approval." (pp. 316-317).

Thus the detail study of the Dhvanyāloka is done by many scholars and the historical study of Kuntaka, or the critical study of some of the portion of Kuntaka also is done by modern scholars. But the detail study of Kuntaka's text separately is not done so far; and I hope this is the first attempt to study in detail the texts of Anandavardhana and Kuntaka comparatively, and assess their value in the
course of the historical development of thought in Indian Poetics. Their value to modern critical thought is also indicated occasionally. This study embraces in its perview a full presentation and discussion of the theory and practice of the most basic canons in Sanskrit Literary Criticism namely, Bhakti, Alänkåra-Alänkårya, Råti-Guna, Rasa, and Dvåani-Vakrokti. I hope and trust that this study of mine may serve, in however, small a measure, towards the extension of existing knowledge in the field of Alänkårasåstra.

I am grateful to the U.G.C. for giving me the chance to conduct research on this topic. I have tried to refer, as far as possible, to all the important books and articles related to my field and even some of the latest articles in learned periodicals. I am greatly indebted to my guide, Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, for his able guidance which helped me to complete my study within the appointed time. I am thankful to the authorities of the Bhandarkar Institute, Poona; and the Royal Asiatic Society Library, Bombay, for kindly allowing me to consult manuscripts, books and periodicals.