To explain the Vedic Mantras like, we have to adopt the secondary sense (bhakti). Sāṅkara-bhāṣya on the sūtra given above, explains this in detail.

The word anna is used in a secondary sense. It does not mean that a person who performs sacrifice will drink Soma in sacrifice as gods drink. It just means that, he enjoys all happiness in this world and thereafter. The word anna is used in the sense of upabhoga-hetu. The happiness enjoyed by gods in heaven will be obtained by him. Eating here does not mean actually

1. Brahmasūtra 3. 1. 7.
boring and swallowing. In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, it is said:

\[\text{The actions like biting, eating, etc., are not done by gods.} \]

Those who are ignorant as bhaktaḥ are only performing the rituals of sacrifice but not collecting any knowledge. Bhāsyakāra concludes:

\[\text{who are ignorant as bhaktaḥ are only performing the rituals of sacrifice but not collecting any knowledge. Bhāsyakāra concludes:} \]

It is indicated that a sacrificer gets all the joys and happiness. This view of Bhāsyakāra is summed up in the commentary 'Bhāmati' by Vācaspatimis'ra.

Aggam Mātārī says that these actions like eating etc. are gaṇaps and not mukhyas.

Anandagiri, in his commentary 'Nyāyanirṇaya', says that this secondary meaning is explained to avoid the misunderstanding (vaivartītha) of the actions like sacrifice mentioned in the Vedas.

Both the schools of PūrvaMāṇḍūkya deal with vākyārtha and while discussing vākyārtha, they have some place for laksārtha.

According to the Abhihitānyavavādīns, the recollection of the padārthas associated with one another become the cause of the vākyārthaṇāna, on the strength of the three accessories - Ākāṅkṣā, Yogavātā and Asatti (or Sāmbādhi). The Anvītabhidhānāvādīns say that the words themselves convey the anvītapaḍārthas, viz. their
meaning and their mutual relation, so that the padārthas conveyed by pada do not convey the vākvartha, i.e., there is no abhīhitānva. And they raise the objection that if padārthas are recollected, a separate s'akti for each word will be required; but for anvita padārthas only one s'akti is sufficient to give the meaning of a sentence. For this objection the Abhīhitānvaavādins reply that, the separate s'akti is not necessary for every padārtha because the anvaya, the relation between one padartha and another, is conveyed by laksanā and not by abhidhā. The incompatibility will not be there in Vedic sentences like ordinary speech (lokavākyā) but the secondary power is applicable to the anvaya because the words convey only their meanings by the power of abhidhā and the mutual relation must be understood only by laksanā. It cannot be argued that the words which bear out the intention of conveying their meanings and their relation, convey both by abhidhā s'akti.

S'abara, to explain the kṛtakapravogas of poets, has stated laksanā as a s'abavārā. He quotes a sample passage of poetry under the sūtra:—

"उत्तपत्ति यावनाः श्रुतस्मात्कलिनितलानाः"

[१००१२४]
the stanza; —

"The sweet voiced swans (or geese) today moving amidst clusters of blue lotuses appear as if dancing with their bodies covered with blue silk."

"This has been cited as an instance of human composition based on experience as against the Veda which enjoys things which are beyond the scope of experience for which reason the latter is to be treated as 'apauruṣeya'." 4

The source of the stanza cited by Śāhara cannot be traced. Probably the stanza is taken from Mahābhārata.

The question of laksanā is explained by Prabhakara under this stanza and very well summed up by his commentator Śālikanātha. Prabhakara does not agree that the anvaya of the words is conveyed by laksanā, because the words themselves are anvita. So he says, laksanā is found in kavivarnana. Śālikanātha in 'Pañcikā' says;

4. Translation with explanation taken from 'Citations in Ś'abarabhasya' by D.V. Garge.

Laksana is understood after the tātparyārtha of a sentence is realised and it is not itself responsible for the anvaya which is prior to tātparyārtha.

Pārthasārathī, in his 'Nyāratanamāla', discusses the problem of laksana in detail. He quotes the same stanza quoted in the Sīhārabhāṣya but he reads the second line differently;

'सन्तोषेऽचिस्वर वर्णनं मानिषीति सारसः' 6

He quotes this to show the 'arthavisa-varṇanarūpa' of poets. So all kavyākyas involving varṇanā are bhakti or laksana. He says that together with arthavisa-varṇanā, we find here anvaya also which is perceived by laksana.

6. The rhythm of the anustubh is better preserved in this reading.
But according to the Anvitabhidhānāvādins the arthavā of a sentence is conveyed by ākāṅka, yogya and śīruṇḍhi found in words and not by laksāṇa. Pārthasarathi's reply to the Anvita-bhidhānāvādins' ūrey śūnyā objection states, how by saṅkhyā the indicated meaning is conveyed in the statement "गत्रयतियोग" is that, by the word Gangā only the bank of the river Gangā is known and by the anuvāya the words gosāi is known. So the laksāṇa is perceived by śāntikā. He asks the Anvitabhidhānāvādins that, if all the words in a sentence are indicative, how the knowledge of anuvāya can be there? Thus he proves to be a follower of the Bhaṭṭa school of māṃśa. Thus the problem of laksāṇa is discussed both in Purvamīmāṃsā and Uttarāmīmāṃsā.

The knowledge of Supreme Being by meditation (or tapas) is called yoga by bhakti according to Patañjali. He recognises four conditions for laksāṇa, viz. tatātthya (location), tādāśārya (quality), tat-sāprapta (proximity) and tat-sāhācārya (association).
Three more conditions for laksana are added by Gautama in his Nyāyasūtra while discussing the relation between abhidha and laksana. He says; 

"सहिष्चरणः र्यानाः सन्धिः सन्धिकर्तृकः सन्धिकर्तृकतरः भानविधि योगावशनाधिपतिः योजा जनयति। "

Secondary meaning is known by location, purpose, behaviour, measure, weighing, proximity, and inherent connection as in,

"मद्या: कौशली। कर्त्यं कर्त्यानी। यथा रात्रा आधुनिकतः। नूतनिकतेन नूतनिकतेन नूतनिकतेन।"

respectively. Gautama, while discussing c'hala, deliberate misunderstanding, discusses upacara-c'hala based on arthapratisedha, a hindrance in understanding the expressed sense. He discusses vak-c'hala, samanya-c'hala and upacara-c'hala. The vak-c'hala is based on punning, for example,

"नावलस्य गोध यथा भानवकः।" (सू.१२.१२)

can mean that Mapavaka is having a new rug or it can also mean that Mapavaka is having nine rugs. Samanya-c'hala occurs when something is uttered with some intention as in,

"अष्टो वचन्नमश्च सत्तौपि विवर्धारः परवर्षमलः।" (सू.१२.१३)
It is known that the Naiyāvikas are always interested in rūdhā s'abtrapravāsa while poetry is interested only in pravojanavati laksanā. According to the Naiyāvikas poetry cannot be created without rūdhī.

Jayantabhaṭṭa in his Nyāyamañjari, while discussing as upacāra-c'hhala, distinguishes mukhavṛtti, gaunavṛtti and laksanā of a word. In the upacāra-c'hhala there is mukhavrthabaddha either by gaunivṛtti or by laksanā. For gaunivṛtti he gives the example, "gaunaivṛtti", and for laksanā he gives the example, "gaunāivṛtti". Here the word 'gaun' indicates dullness of the cowherd, so it is gauna-pravāsa. Due to his dullness a cowherd boy is called as a bull.

Laksanā is a secondary meaning which is conveyed after the expressed sense. The statement "gaunaivṛtti" conveys the expressed meaning, 'a hamlet on the Ganges'. But there is hindrance in understanding...
this expressed sense because a hamlet cannot exist on the current of the river, so there is mukhyārthabhave and therefore we have to resort to laksanā or secondary sense. "मक्खवर्थवासी" a hamlet on the bank of the Ganges. Jayantabhatta refers to both, laksanā and gaunīvṛtti, by a common term bhakti.

हुरुदयार्थिक का भक्तामपनागाम्या यत्र जाश्वित।
फलेदलोकिन्तु व्याख्यार्थ अनानाली तस्येकैमतीतालम्बी।
कुयार्थिपे यथा भावन्ति सरोक्ष्ये
आययं महोदाय यथा तत्र अवक्षुण्णे न लोपः।
तेन प्रभावीयं शक्तुदुत्तालालेष्यां
रप्पे अवक्ष्यं स्वादं नृत्यं प्रभावम्॥

Here he refers bhakti only to aśabdārtha and not to the whole vākyārtha. The whole vākyārtha is changed by one upacarita word as in "मक्खवर्थवासी" the word kroṣṭanti is not bhākta word but the word mūroṣḥ is bhākta which indicates maṅgaṣṭhāḥ and changes the meaning of the sentence. The nirūdha words like lavoṣa, kuṣṭula etc. also are the examples of padāgata laksanā. Prof. Atmaram Sastri shows that the school of Jaimini believes that

8. 'Sahityas'āstre Tātparyavṛtih', Sanvīd, 15th Feb. 1966, p. 73.
laksanā resides in vākya and not in s'abda. He quotes
Kumārila bhaṭṭa,

"वाक्यार्थोऽक्षयमाणे हि स्थिर्निति व स्थिरिति।"

and also Parāśara bhaṭṭa:

"तत्त्वनानां बाक्यं न पदानां शास्त्रं- नामाध्यक्षिणाः अनायति तथाकालिनया। पदस्तिः प्रभाषितं पदार्थं तत्त्वतेऽपः आपीति प्रभाषितमेति।"

The school of Prabhākara believes that vākārtha is known by tātparyavṛtti and denies laksanā. Anyway laksanā may be both, either padapata or vākavṛtta.

While commenting on abhidhā, which is Is'vasaṅketa, the commentary Nyāyabodhini discusses the question of laksanā. According to tārkikas only abhidhā is Is'vasaṅketa and not laksanā because it is only lokaprajñā.

The Nyāyabodhini says:

"शाल्यमुक्तको अक्षणा । तस्रा द्विवृत गौणी शुद्धा
कैलाः। गौणी नाम आक्षेपावस्थाः अक्षणा । तथा
किंतू वाक्यस्वात्मक इत्यादी साध्वप्रकट्य सिंहासनस्य
विशेषेऽक्षणा । गौणा शाल्यिस्वार्त आक्षेपक्षणा,
आक्षेपक्षणा अवस्था स्वात्मकक्षणा वैती।" (P. 87, pt. G. Shasta's edn.)

This he is dividing laksanā in gaunī and s'uddhā. Gaunī
is based on similarity as in ‘मीन्हे भागत:’ Sūddhā is threelfold. Jahallaksana is based on samīpya as in ‘गानरां चोपि:’ Ajahallaksana is seen in the example like कादेभ्यां तत्तिर्स्थितम् where by the word kāka all dadhyapaghātakas like kākabidālādi are indicated. Jahada jahallaksana is vyaktimātrabodha-pravacika. According to the vedantins tat tvam asi is the example of this type which indicates sarvijñāna and Brahman alone (vyaktimātra) is indicated by it.

Thus we find that laksana is common to stātras and to our ordinary way of talking and not exclusive to poetry. Later on it became a poetic concept. It is a secondary power of words to explain the Vedic Mantras, poetic imaginative descriptions, the riddles in the associations of learned scholars and ordinary speech where nirudha words or other laksanika words are used. The Laghmāraṅga of Nāgas'abhaṭṭa shows that all artha-vāda in the Veda is only laksanā.

‘समुदाय ना (स्त्रोता) अन्तर्भाषिकः। अति एता
अर्थविद्याव्यात्तः श्रावस्यो अर्थाशास्त्रीयः।’ 7

Among rhetoricians Bhāmaha is a first stātrin who

---

discusses about pada and vyākya in his Kavyalāhkāra. According to him pada is the collection of syllables, which are modified by suffixes and affixes and convey the meaning. The group of such words (padas), which are related to one another, is a sentence (vyākya). He criticises the sphotavāda\(^\text{11}\) of the grammarians and says that we should not believe in them because they take s'abda as Brahman which is Kāṭastha and Nitya. According to Bhāmaha the artha is just known by sanketa. The s'abda is not nāramārthika but it is pratvakṣa or anuvita. Bhāmaha is a perfect logician. He criticises the Apohavāda\(^\text{12}\) of the Buddhists. According to him a word does not suggest both the positive and the negative meaning. To express the negative meaning, we must look for another word. The word 'cow' suggests only the presence of a cow and not its absence. The aim or phala of a word is to convey the relevant meaning and there cannot be two phalas for one s'abda.

11. Kavyalāhkāra VI 11-12.
12. Ibid VI 16-19.
For Bhāmaha poetry is the combination of beautiful s'abda and artha. And this beautiful factor is alaṅkāra of s'abda and artha. Naturally he includes bhakti in one of the alaṅkāras, namely rūpaka. The lakṣanā or bhakti found in s'āstra is different from that of poetry. In poetry it is beautiful and not like विनियो भावना। The poetic use of lakṣanā is rūpaka. The upamāna, due to the similarity of qualities, is superimposed or the upameya.

According to Dandin, the poetic beauty is better explained by sūpa. He includes bhakti in samādhīsūpa making it wider. Here he is talking of lakṣanā as arthasūpa which turns grāmya or vulgar words also into a beautiful composition.

The functions of the eyes, namely nimīlana and unnimīlana, are superimposed on a lotus for sādākṣa and vikāsa in order to explain the implicit softness and sweetness of a flower to a face. In poetry, by gaṃpavṛtti, the words like 'vomiting', 'spitting', bring more charm though in ordinary speech they become vulgar. Dandīn calls this samādhīgūpa, which is based on bhakti, as kāvyasārvasva. So everywhere there is bhakti in poetry.

The whole host of poets trace the track of samādhīgūpa in a poetic language or bhakti in s'āstraic language.

While discussing the alaṅkāras like hetu, sūkṣma, lekha, Dandīn again says that they are beautiful due to gaṃpavṛtti.

Thus saundaryā is clearly brought into intimate relation with bhakti by Dandīn.

Vāmana’s vakrokti-alaṅkāra is based on sādṛṣ'ya-lakṣaṇa. He defines it; —

His vakrokti is similar to Dandin's samādhiopana. He says in vyātti on the above kārīka:

> "Asthānādīdārā mārtyānaṁ kārya-vā śāsthiṁśvinī<yā<

His amāśāyanāṁ bhārṇam anāśāyaśāṇā paścītāṁ समस्यानां।

He quotes another example,

> "st̄hū kā bhāntaravamūrtapulakāda tuṣṭe mārtiṁśvinī
daśāgaṇe dhātva-va kṛṣṭaśrāṇāṁ parīṇatamālakād/-śāntam।"

and comments on it;

> "Indra-saṁghaśeṣa samācaraṁ samācaraṁ।"

Again while dealing with s'abda-suddhi he says that in a single sentence many metaphorical words should not be used. This kind of procedure becomes defective.

> "Asthānādīdārā।

He gives the words dvirepha, rodara etc. as lākṣaṇika and says that well known nirūda words like these can be used but not unfamiliar words like dvika for kāka. If they are used, the construction suffers from the fallacy apārtha. Vāmana is aware of two kinds of lākṣaṇa. One

15. Kāvyālaṅkārasūtravṛtti, 4. 3. 8.
16. Ibid VI, 15, 16.
which is beautiful i.e. atis'ayavati or pravojansavati lakṣanā found in poetry, and the other nirūḍha lakṣanā, just borrowed from loka or ordinary way of talking. Pratibhāgocarā lakṣanā is vakrokti which makes poetry sublime and beautiful but the excess of nirūḍha words spoils poetry and it becomes a poetic fallacy. Vasana follows the tradition of Bhamaha. For Bhāmaha vakrokti is the underlying base of all the alaṅkāras. So Vāmana's vakrokti shows the difference between bhakti in poetry and bhakti in sāstra.

Udbhaṭa clearly states that the rūpaka is based on supavṛtti;

There is incompatibility (s'abdārthaśabdhaviraha) in expressed sense, and the supavṛtti or secondary power is adopted to understand the superimposition (rūpaka).

Pratīhārenduṛā, the commentator of Udbhaṭa, comments on the example; —

This is a samastavisavarūpaka. The wateriness is attributed to the moon-light. The moon is the pot; the stars are the flowers fallen into the water of the moon-light, which is sprinkled over the foreyard of the wide sky, in turns by the daughters of the Lady Night.

Rudrata deals with s'abda and vākya in detail. He defines s'abda as,

"रन्यां नमुदयः"

and classifies it in:

1. Nāma;
2. Ākhyāta;
3. Nipāta;
4. Upasarga; and
5. Karmapravacanīva.

These words are related to each other in a sentence to give the total meaning. He gives the attributes of a sentence:

"अन्तुलाधिक्त्वञ्जनननमुक्तमुक्तार्थसिद्ध-सामरथम्
क्षेत्रसमर्थनं महामूलबिल्यं प्रकृतकात्॥" 18

So the abhidhāvākya, according to Rudrata, must possess all these excellences.

We can bring bhakti under Rudrata's rūpakālaṃkāra, particularly samastavisavarūpaka, where the human activities are attributed to inanimate objects; and the parivṛtti alaṅkāra, where by upacāra one thing is taken and another thing is given in exchange by each

other at one and the same time. The example for the samastaviṣṇavarūpaka is,

where the human activity of smiling is attributed to the lotus creepers. The lotuses are called their faces; and their pollen, their teeth. This example of Rudraṭa is similar to the example of Dandin's samādhiguna.

The illustration given for parivṛtti is;—

In this example the simultaneous exchange is seen, the one thing is given and another thing is taken. Giving dars'ana the prāṇas are taken and stealing the mind the pain is given. So there is 'give and take' in metaphorical sense to suggest the rise of love in hero's heart for the heroine, who at first sight attracts him.

Thus all these rhetoricians before Anandavarādhana recognised bhakti as a principle of Beauty in Poetics.

At the very outset of his book Anandavarādhana anticipates the fear that the bhāktavādīs perhaps may regard his dhvani similar to their bhakti and they might include dhvani under bhakti. He wants to show

the difference between his principle of dhvani and bhakti, already discussed by different philosophical schools.
He admits that this amukhyavrtti or secondary power had touched the fringes of dhvani but dhvani itself was not explained by anybody.

"अभिधानां तत्वान्वीत तद्विषयमुद्धिं दर्शयितं तत्समावेशोऽभिधात्" (Dhvanijaloka, Vol. I p. 55 - R.S. Taipredi's edn)

Anandavardhana's concept of dhvani is different from that of abhidha and laksana which are already explained by sāstras. Anandavardhana is aware of abhidha and laksana but he does not stop with two vyāpāras. He goes one step ahead to show the third vyāpāra, which not only is over and above these two vyāpāras but also exists simultaneously with them. Dhvani does not come without abhidha or laksana and there is no poetry without dhvani. The expressed word and sense become subordinate to the suggested meaning in dhvanikavya. Abhidha and laksana are the means to get the vyānicvārtha. The expressed sense is a torch to illumine the suggested meaning.

The classification of dhvani in avyakṣitavārya-dhvani and vivakṣitāvyaparavārya-dhvani clearly show that dhvani is based either on abhidha or on laksana. The reason of this classification given by Abhinavagupta in
his Locana is that, the three vyāpāras, namely abhidhā, laksanā and tātparya are famous and the fourth vyāpāra is vyānyanā which is based on these three, but it is beyond them and not the same. Though these three vyāpāras are explained by different philosophical schools, Anandavardhana's dhvani is not explained by anybody. It is anusmīlitapūrva and discovered for the first time by Anandavardhana as the soul of poetry.

According to the Mīmāṃsakas the vyānāvārtha can be called another vācyārtha. Anandavardhana refutes the view saying that the two vyāpāras, abhidhā and vyānānā are different; similarly laksanā and vyānānā also are two different vyāpāras. The padārtha-vākyārtha-nī ṣa also is not applicable to vācyva and vyānāva because according to scholars the padārtha-pratīti is false. Moreover the padārtha-vākyārtha-nī ṣa is like pot and its material cause. When the pot is ready, its material is not seen separately; similarly when we get vācyārtha, there is no separate knowledge of padārthas. The ṛṣya-vyānāva-nī ṣa is different from this padārtha-vākyārtha-nī ṣa because the vācyārtha is not abandoned to get the vyānāvārtha. There is ghata-pradīpa-nī ṣa, that is to say, when we get ghata-pratīti, the lamp is not assent. Thus in a single sentence we can see both vācyārtha and
vyavārtha, yet it is not a fallacy because one of them is predominant and the other is subordinate to it.

Anandavardhana's dhvani is based on the sphotavāda of the Grammarians. According to the sphotavāda we grasp the meaning of a word by s'abdaphota. The s'abda communicating the meaning is different from the sound which is produced and heard. The sound, which is called dhvani, is merely instrumental or vyaniaka in the manifestation of an internal voice which is called sphota.20 Kāyata explains this as,—

The s'abda is Brahman according to the Grammarians and it is constant; the changes do occur in dhvani but due to these changes or vikrta-dhvanis the sphotāsman is not affected.

(Ločana, p 274, Ohv Vol I)

20. "आयोगाभागाया करणेवर्जनयते।\\
स स्नेता शारदा, शारदेन्योऽभिध्यःश्रद्धोऽरुप्तसः।।
(Ločana, p 270, Vol I)
The sphota is divided into eight parts:

1. Varnasphota;  
2. Padasphota;  
3. Vākyasphota;  
4. Akhandasphota;  
5. Akhandavākyasphota;  
6. Varnajātisphota;  
7. Padajātisphota; and  
8. Vākyajātisphota.

The real sphota, according to Bhartrhari, is the fifth one i.e. the Akhandavākyasphota which is one and indivisible. The sphota is divided into varna and pada just for the sake of analysis. The dhvanis are important because there is no vākyasphota without dhvani, which is varna or pada, and the knowledge of dhvani and sphota is not separate. It is simultaneous like prakāśa and stambha. One dhvani cannot manifest sphota, in case the other dhvanis will be useless; one group of dhvanis also does not manifest sphota because there can be no group of them; for, a dhvani disappears when it is produced.

Not every dhvani manifests sphota but all dhvanis are necessary for the sphota which is manifested by the last dhvani. It is as if a student were to repeat a verse over and over again to commit it to memory. The earlier repetitions are not wasted but help the last one when the student repeats it correctly.21 Dhvani, though anītya,

21. "यथानुशास्त्र: सोचे का भौतिक-मुपगन्धाति । । आत्मत्वा न व गुणः गृह्यति निर्माते॥"
is upāya or means for the sphota, which is nitya. There is vyāgya-vyañjaka-bhāva between sphota and nāda or dhvani. The dhvani of the Grammarians manifests sphota and hence the term dhvani is used for suggestive poetry. The dhvani of the Grammarians suggests sphota and the same suggestive capacity is possessed by the dhvani of Anandavardhana. So what Anandavardhana terms as dhvani is vācvaśṛtha for the Grammarians. But Anandavardhana's dhvani is above vācvaśṛtha and laksyaśṛtha based on vyañjaka-svādśa, and vācvaśṛtha and laksyaśṛtha become subordinate to vyāgyaśṛtha. Anandavardhana divides his dhvani in varnagata, pada-gata, vākyagata etc. on the basis of the division of sphota into varna, pada etc.

Anandavardhana thought it necessary to examine fully the principle of bhakti to show the difference between his dhvani and bhakti. Dhvani and bhakti are not identical because the nature and scope of dhvani is different from that of bhakti.

"भव्यत्वो विभवति नैव तत्त्वं सर्वभ७दादृध्ये द्वात्रिजि।" 22

Dhvani is not defined by laksana because the definition suffers from both the fallacies of being too wide.

22. Dhvanyāloka, I. 14.
(ativyāpti) and of being too narrow (avyāpti).

Suggestion (dhvani) is different from indication (bhakti) because dhvani suggests another meaning than vācyārtha though based on vācyārtha. Bhakti is metupecaśra or secondary meaning. Anandavaradhana gives illustrations to show the secondary usage of the words like, 'vadati', 'nattih punaruttam', 'ātīto', 'anubhavati', etc. and remarks that such words cannot be called dhvani. 

In rūdhimāta lakṣanā there is no trace of dhvani. The words like lavanva, kusāla etc. are used figuratively to convey the meanings which are different from their derivative meanings. There is only upacāra in these words and we can never expect any suggestion in them. Hence it is wrong to say that where there is bhakti there is dhvani, and consequently the definition suffers from the logical fallacy of ativyāpti (Too Wide). Moreover lakṣanā is amukhyavrtti and the pravojana or phala is different from this saunavṛptā in the word.

In the statement, "सिताप्वनात्वदि" सिताप्वनात्वदि is the phala to a hearer and a speaker. It is not derived by laksanā. When there is mukhyarthabādaḥ, there is laksanā but there is no laksyarthabādaḥ to understand the pravojana and therefore it is due to vyāṇjana. Poetry is interested in special pravojana which is aesthetic and different from the pravojana in ordinary life. The antarbhēvavādīne, who don't know this aesthetic pravojana of poetry, said dhvani identical to bhakti. But it is a fact that dhvani is found exclusively in poetry and not in s'āstrāe like bhakti.

Bhakti cannot define dhvani because bhakti is completely based on expression or abhiddhāvāpaḥ as Abhinānavagupta calls it.

(Dev. vol I, Locana, p 309)

whereas dhvani is solely based on vyāṇjakaṭva of words found only in poetry. Vastudhvani, which is found in common talk, does not rise higher in the division of dhvani; alankāradhvani is higher than vastudhvani and rasadhvani is the highest.

Anandavardhana shows another logical fallacy of avyāpti in identifying bhakti with dhvani. We shows that the classification of dhvani is so vast and bhakti is just a part of it. We can find bhakti only in one
class of dhvani i.e. avivaksitavacva-dhvani which is based on laksana. But there is no scope for bhakti in vivaksitavacvara-vacva-dhvani. Anandavardhana discusses the problem scientifically in detail to show how the scope and nature of dhvani is different from the scope and nature of bhakti.

Laksana is not a principal verbal function. Always it follows abhidha. But it is not the case with vrddhana which is the principal verbal function. The three-fold dhvani i.e., vastudhvani, alankara-dhvani and rasadhvani, never appears as subordinate function of words. Canaavrtti is subordinate to the expressed sense but dhvani is different even from expressed sense, though it is always accompanied by it. In,

"परंतु वात्स्यायन तवं देव प्राणं प्रियंकराः सुखोपुरुषो ते वीराकुमारं गणयामादि पारिष्ठिति।"

the expressed sense is not at all dropped in order to understand the suggested sense of 'लाला-हर्षादि'.

The nature of dhvani is different from that of bhakti. Dhvani is threefold, viz. vastudhvani, alankara-dhvani and rasadhvani. Tasad di prati can never be said as subordinate function and the same is the case with vastudhvani and alankara-dhvani. Though the avivaksitavacva-dhvani is based on bhakti, it is not the same as
bhakti because it suggests something more than laksana. Laksana here helps to understand the suggested sense which is pradhana and the indicated meaning itself becomes apradhana or subordinate to the suggested sense. Thus the two vyaparae of a word namely laksana and vyarnana are different by nature and scope, and therefore dhvani cannot be identical with bhakti though bhakti can be an upaleksana of one dhvaniprabheda.25

Abhinavagupta in his Locana deals with this topic more elaborately than Anandavardhana. He asks the Bhaktavadin whether they consider the non-difference between Suggestion and Indication to mean.

1) Tadatma or tadrupa of bhakti and dhvani; or
2) Bhakti to be the vyavartaka-dharma of dhvani just as prthivitva is the vyavartaka-dharma of prthivi or parthiva-dravya; or
3) Bhakti to be upaleksana of dhvani.

All the three points are explained by Anandavardhana and the Locana follows him discussing them in more detail. Both bhakti and dhvani possess different

25. "स्याचेव द्विनिर्भेदस्या का तु मयात्मार्थम्। अक्षणौ थिये, कृते नाथ नवयासैतिर्वेन नृ, १२।" Dhvanyaloka, I. 19.
properties, their nature and scope differs and the identity suffers from the two fallacies of *stuvāpti* and *uvvāpti* as discussed above. The scope of *laksana* is very limited. It resides only in a word or in a sentence but *dhvani* resides in a word, in word's parts in a sentence, in sense and in the style of a poet.

_Abhinavagupta_ shows one more difference that the *pravojana* is not valued very much in _bhakti_. _Bhakti_ is mere *upacāra_; so it cannot be called *dhvani*.

"वहें यथा प्रयोजनं सदैव नादतांम्यं तत्त से लिङ्गाच्यां रूपां यत्र भूलता पय श्रवणं गायिता, भक्ति-पूज्यारस्त्रापि को लज्जन्यापार"

_LOCANA on DHV KARUKA I. 13_

According to _Abhivdvaragupta_ nirūdha _laksana_ is just like _abhidha_.

He refers _laksana_ as _amukhyārtha_ or _agnipavāpa_ but admits that the fivefold _laksana_ has occupied a very broad scope in the common way of talking. He explains the five kinds of _laksana_ as;

\[\text{अभिवाच्चक्षुन विन्यासंत्वस्त्वस्त्व नीत्रेकश्चक्षु महोकिः-} \\
\text{ध्यो भूमशब्दः कै स्माने यस्मादी कृत्या तदन्} \\
\text{भूमशब्देन यस्य संयोगः सम्बन्धः शस्पदक्षयः-} \\
\text{स्त्यार्थस्तोऽं त्रादेभरि ध्रुवशब्देन अस्यते।}
\]

26. "निमाट: ज्ञानः, *काशित्यामृत्योदिनिविचारनात्*

(CP 301)
The fivefold laksāna has occupied the whole world but it is inadequate to explain poetry because poetry is different from the outer world.

Abhinavagupta explains in detail how rasa is suggested and never indicated. The description of viśuśāśkritas in poetry are mukhyārtha and not saukhya. Rasa is slaukika, it is enjoyed when suggested through vibhāvadī. It is alakṣaśakrama. Therefore there is no chance for laksāna which always follows abhidhā (abhidhā-pucchhahbhūta) and hence the krama between abhidhā and laksāna is seen clearly. While commenting on the examples of vastudhvani, 'Bhama Dhammī' etc. Abhinavagupta refutes to admit it as the example of vicārla-laksāna.

27. Locana on Kārikā I. 18.
He argues that there is no mukhavartabada in the verse 'Bhama Dhamra' when the negative (niscdhataaka) vastu is suggested. Same is the case with alankaraadhvani also. When an alankara is suggested, the expressed alankara is not dropped or there is no hindrance in understanding it. So the threefold dhvani, found in poetry, is different from the fivefold laksana.

Following Anandavaradhana, Abhinavagupta admits that the earlier rhetoricians touched the fringes of dhvani but they did not define or explain it.

'अभिधानस्य शक्तिश्चेष्ट स्त्रीर्यां आद्यां अभिज्ञातो वर्णाक्षे शक्तिज्ञानाभावीधानमाभिधानयापारो मुख्यं गुणवृत्तिः इति। नामनोदै यथा 'साहस्याभस्त्रणा कर्किता,' वल्लो मनान्तो शूष्ट्रा इति। तैताबद्ध धार्मिकगुहोपिताः व्यक्तिकीर्तिकारस्तु एवस्मातिकारक प्रकृतिशक्तु - अज्ञातस्तवसमाप्तिवेक्षः न कृतान्त्रत्वोपपदताः - अस्थवत् अभिज्ञानार्थते च यथायुतज्ञवात् - गृहस्योपदोषिमात्रेऽति।' (Dhv vol I, hancana, p 57, Tirtha's edn)

All these earlier rhetoricians recognised only two powers namely abhidha and laksara, and though they were aware of some suggestiveness in poetry, they included it in alankares like aprastuta-pras'amsa, vyaso'kta etc.
Badrata included dhvani in his bhāvālakāra. So the nature of dhvani was just like an unbroken coconut before. Anandavarihāna's detailed treatment of this concept as the soul of poetry.

According to Kuntaka, vakrokti is the very life of poetry. He follows Bhamaha, for whom the vakrokti is the underlying base of all the alankāras. The old school of Alankāra is revived again by Kuntaka, proving vakrokti to be the all-pervading concept. Vakrokti is not a mere alankāra but is the principle of Beauty underlying all the poetic concepts; in consequence all the poetic concepts are included under one or the other variety of this broad concept of vakrokti. There is no poetry without this vakrokti or strikingness. Poetry is the combination of beautiful words conveying beautiful meaning-cum strikingness or vakrokti. Vakrokti is sāstrostroki-bhāngi-bhaniti or a beautiful mode of expression. It is different from s'āstroki and lokoki, and found exclusively in poetry giving joy to the minds of critics.

Kuntaka includes bhakti as a poetic concept, in his rudhivaicitrva-vakrata, which is based on dharmādhyāropa. He defines it as, —

"यत अन्तर्देशस्त्राधिकारिक्षार्पणस्च।
The uncommon or lokottara attribute is superimposed on a well known person in rūdhivaicitrya-vakrata as in the illustration,

"Rama's crime whoever!" (P 197 v J)

the word 'Pama' indicates 'the capacity of tolerating deep sorrow' (dukkhasahismita) of Pama which is uncommon to all; or in,

"Rama's etc. - - - - such. Connect: 1'' (V J p 67)

the word 'Pama' indicates extraordinary valour (lokottara-sūrya) Kuntaka's upacāra-vakrata is similar to Dandin's smādiśguna. Kuntaka defines it as,

"Yatamaścit śvarunā śrutiśvamābhāvadhāyaṁ - śarāṇaṁ -
śīnādhamayupachāta(CV J. P 70 - Dr. Nangenda's edn)

When an inanimate thing is talked as an animate thing, the upacāra vakrata or striking superimposition takes place

23. Vakroktijīvita of Kuntaka. II, 8, 9 - Dr. Nangenda's edn

* "Kuntaka understands upacāra as the cause of sāregā lakṣaṇa based upon sādīśya. He thinks that upacāra
Thus Kuntaka includes bhakti in these two varieties of vakrata, viz. rûdhivai citra-vakrata and upacâra-vakrata.

Like bhakti Kuntaka includes dhvani also in his all-pervading vakrokti. The example cited for rûdhivai citra-vakrata, i.e. "नारूद स्निग्ध शरीर तके 1", is cited by Anandavardhana for his arthântarasankrama-vâcya-dhvani which is based on laksâna. Hence a great Sanskrit scholar like Dr. S. K. De, following Vidyâdharâ remarks that Kuntaka is a Bhaktavadin who includes dhvani under bhakti. To quote him,—

"The Yakroktijîvita-kâra, therefore, may be classed (together with Bhamaha, Dandin, Pâdbhata and Vâmana) among those who hold


29. तूनेन यजु फुस्ककैन अवक्तावलोकिता कानीश-सिद्धि अत्यास्वय-विद्याधराः एकावली, I. p. 51, Trivedi's ed
that dhvani or suggestion is bhakta; (according to the classification of the Dhvanikar) and Anandavardhana) or, in other words, among those who maintain that the suggested sense is not the essence of poetry but is only a secondary element. 20

It is not correct to say that Kuntaka brings the whole of dhvani of Anandavardhana under upacara-vakrata which is based on anuvriti. In fact, he brings only laksemaulada-dhvani of Anandavardhana under rudhivaicitrva-vakrata and upacara-vakrata. In rudhivaicitrva-vakrata he takes the example of Anandavardhana, which he has cited for arthamanta-sankramita-vacya-dhvani, i.e., 'नवक्षेत्रवे वाक्या बध्यता' and comments that Anandavardhana has shown the vyakhyanka-bhava clearly here so my pains are saved to show this to be different from vacyarthata. So Kuntaka includes only laksemaulada-dhvani i.e. avivaksita-vacya-dhvani under his upacara-vakrata and rudhivaicitrva-vakrata which are based on bhakti.

In other places, apart from laksemaulada-dhvani, he recognises vivaksitavaparavacya-dhvani too which is based on abhidha or denotation. He is also aware of the three varieties of dhvani, viz. vastudhvani, alankara-dhvani and rasadhvani. While discussing about parvarya-

vakrata he remarks,

"पुष्प पुष्प च शब्दशास्त्रितमूलोनुसारानन्दप्रबोध" ।

(V J p 211)

Speaking about vicitra-marga he uses the term pratiyamena-mana in the sense Anandavardhana has used it :-

"शतीमाननातमयं यत्र वाक्यार्थिक्यं नित्यतं।

वाक्यवाचकत्वात मयाविन्यात्त्वतर्थ प्रस्तावितः।"

and comments on it :-

"अध्यनोन्तरार्थिनार्थिलस्य शतीमानार्थस्वरूपायेऽन्

भास्नायः मुपांश्च वाक्यवाचकत्वायमय्यार्थार्थार्थ प्रकरणते।"

(V J p 40)

He uses the word 'vyaneva', but he includes this 'pratiyamena-vyavahara also in his broad vakrokti theory. Thus he can be termed as antarbhava-vadin but not abhavavadin.

"यत्र अध्यनोन्तरार्थिनार्थियमेष गम्भीरतया विषयवीर्यमेयो न वर्षुना कुस्मविद्यायेयस्य विवेधयते। कथा शुक्लया नाश्चाचाचाचाचाचाचाचाचार्थम्।

शाश्वतोक्ष्यितायम् । तद्विद्यायेयस्य तद्विद्यार्थः

नुस्तादस्य वाक्यमूलस्थापितो विवेधयते। शब्देशे

शाब्रेत्वेत्र शाश्वतोक्ष्यितार्थावलम्बनसमथिष्ठित्तस्य विवेधयते।

एव, प्रतीतिमानं अथोऽथो अव्यवहर्ता–

वाक्यशास्त्रायस्मरे सुलोच्यामेष विवेधयते।"

(V J p 128)
According to *Kuntaka* the term 'uktī' itself appears something very broad to include all the possible functions that a language can have; so with *abhidhā* all other functions like *laksanā, vyāhāra* etc. are included in his *vskrokti*, or the striking expression.

Dr. A. Sankaran in his article 31 says,——

"*Kuntaka* fully recognises the individuality of *Dhvani* in poetry and its contribution to aesthetic pleasure. He agrees with the threefold classification of *Dhvani*, i.e. *Vastu, Alankara, and Pasa*.

Another learned scholar, Prof. S. *Yupparanjaya Cestri*, 32 refutes Dr. S. K. De's opinion that *Kuntaka* is a *Bhākta-vādin*.

"Dr. De is misled by the ambiguity of the term Bhākta and confounds this word as sometimes used in the sense of 'an element of secondary importance' with the same word which is used by Anandavardhana in the sense of 'something associated with the secondary significative power called laksanā or gunavrtti'. Lālān bhaktivaśa does not take several forms as Dr. De imagines."


Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy gives the reason why modern scholars like Dr. Be think Kuntaka as a bhāktaśādīn.

"The staunch followers of Ānandavardhana like Vidyādharma and Jayaratha had branded Kuntaka as a bhāktaśādīn and that is the reason which has misled modern scholars." 33

So it is clear that Kuntaka is not a bhāktaśādīn. He includes both bhākta and dhvani in his vakrekti and he does not mean dhvani to be laksanā or bhākta.

Among the followers of Ānandavardhana, Mammata deals with bhākta in detail. He recognises six kinds of laksanā, viz.

1) S'uddha laksanā. 2) Gaunī laksanā.
3) Upādāna laksanā. 4) Laksana laksanā.
5) Sāropā laksanā. 6) Sādhyavasāna laksanā.

He defines and illustrates them in the second chapter of his 'Kāvyā-Prakāśa'. According to him laksanā is superimposition, —

"अर्थवर्ण अन्तर्गितां विद्यते " (II, 9)

Mucaka,34 comments on the example given by Mammata to

33. 'Some critics of Ānandavardhana's theory of Dhvani', Indian Culture, B.N. Barua commemoration volume.
34. Commentary on Kāvyaprakāśa called Kāvyaprakāśa-sanketa by Mucaka, ch. II.
show the *laksyārtha* and the *vyangyārtha*. The example is:

\[ \text{कथा कर्त्तव्यमार्थाः समायोद्भवति} \]

The *laksyārtha* in the stanza is, 'you have behaved inmically, loving my lover', and the *vyangyārtha* is her guilt due to love passion. Rucaka shows *viperīta laksāna* due to obstruction in understanding the expressed sense. This *viperīta laksārtha* suggests another meaning i.e. *vyangyārtha*.

An objection is raised here that, if there is *mukhyārthebādha* in this stanza due to the style of speaking, we can find the same in 'Bhama Dharmia' also, and it will be the case of *viperīta laksāna* instead of *vastu-dhvanī*. The possibility of mistaking *laksita-laksāna* or *viperīta-laksāna* for Dhvanī comes here because it is a common talk. Rucaka replies, the objection,

\[ \text{तत्ततः इत्यऽक्षयमहाक्ष्यते} \]

35. This *āguraṇa* is a special kind of suggestion. *Jagannātha* uses this word to mean the suggestion.
To justify his view, he quotes the lines often quoted by Vyāsāsakas:

"क्षेत्रे वाच्यस्य स्वाभाविक कार्यलय स्वाभाविक प्रकृति अस्त्रालेख स्वादुगमनं मिमाम्य ॥"

When we get the meaning by hindrance in understanding the primary meaning, it is called laksana; but when there is a hindrance after understanding the primary meaning, it is athidha only and not laksana at all.

Vidyācakravartī, in his commentary Sañjīvanī on Rûṣyaka's 'Alankāra Sarvasva' says that laksanādhyādhvani always is s'abdes'aktimāla and vastorūpa. So the field of laksana in the classification of dhvani is very limited. The vastu according to Vidyācakravartī is all that explains jāti, kriva or puna of an object.

"यो हि सन्ध्यामृतः सः निर्युक्ते शब्दस्वरूपात: नस्तुपश्च स्वाभाविक अयोग्यगुणेऽर्थामः पद्यभावोल्लक्षणं अधिनेवं दक्षिणं कथयते" 36

sense when he says — "र्थस्वरूपायोजययोजाध्यायस्य स्ववृष्टिमयायोजाध्यायस्य अनित्यस्वरूपाययोजाध्याय।" The commentaries also give the meaning of devarana as dhvānana or sućara. — Rasagangadhara, p. 543 k.r. edn.

As Mahimabhatta so he includes dhvani in his theory of Anumāṇa, he includes bhakti also therein.

There is no arthāntarapralīti by sunaṛti. So it is just inference called by the name bhakti. He does not deny bhakti as a s'abivesyāpāra but the phala according to him is Anumāṇa or inference.

A real Viṃśaṅkara is Makulabhātta, who is called Viṃśaṅka-sūramaha and being a staunch follower of Brahmā-vāda of classical Viṃśaṅka he refutes dhvani theory and includes it in bhakti in his Abhinavārtaśtrā. He admits only two vyākaraṇa, abhidhē and laksana and defines them;

शब्दव्याकरणेऽवस्तं प्रतीतिस्तवं भवेत ताँ मूलविगतेव अधविवेगयस्य पुनःविगतेयः भावावच्च भ्रमित्वा "38

38. Abhinavārtaśtrā, I. I.
So laksana is inferred from abhidha, i.e. it is artha-vaseya according to Nukulabhata. He gives the example for nirudha laksana,

which is the example given by Anandavarda for arthanta-sankramita-vacya-dhvani. Mukula comments on it.—

If the words are taken individually the theory of Mukula-bhatta becomes justifiable. But his bhaktavada can explain only laksanamula-dhvani. Anandavardhana’s devaṇi is meant to explain rasa mainly; so Anandavardhana draws the lines of vācvartha and laksvartha, beyond which comes rasa, suggested by vibhaṇa, etc.

On गम्भीर विद्वान भवे भरे Mukula comments,—

"अन्य त्यो रामचक्क्राची वासारिच्च्चर्चिनिः ब्रह्ममातिः परेसणत्वात् यथंतरतामुनेश्वरामुपात् तस्मादिविधिविशिष्टं अव्यवहितस्वूरतम्। भव्यभाष्मेतिरुप्यास्यायं व्यथार्थां कथाप्रेषितवत्त्वात् एवं गुणाः योप यथादानां अव्युत्कृष्टाः।"
He includes both *avivaksa-vacca-dhvan* and *vivaksa-nyparavacca-dhvan* in *laksana*. He shows sadra'ya and *viperita-laksana* in *avivaksa-vacca-dhvan* and *upapena-laksana* in *vivaksa-nyparavacca-vacca-dhvan*.

By the term 'sadra'ya' here he intends to include *Ananda-vardhana* and the followers of the *dhvani* theory.

Fukulabatta's *laksana* is sixfold and it includes all *sama-griti* like *vakra*. He has changed the general theory of *laksana*. His division of *laksana* is based on the division of *dhvani*. It is a special theory of *laksana* based on the theory of *dhvani* to dismiss the *dhvani* theory.

All the prakaranādi-sāmagnī of dhvani, according to Yukula, is lakṣaṇā-sehodara. He includes vastudhvani, alabhāra-dhvani and rasadhvani in varkṛtyanibandha-laksanā, vācya-nibandhanā-laksanā and vācya-nibandha-laksanā respectively. In,

the vastu 'pracchanna-surata or secret dalliance' is suggested. So according to the dhvani theory it is the example of vastu-dhvani. According to Yukula it is varkṛtyanibandha-laksanā because, if it is a chaste and speaking thus, there is no dhvani at all. Whereas, offering an excuse of unchaste lady is bringing water, so it is apūra and hence there is an impelment in understanding the primary meaning, so by viparīta-varbandha the meaning, pracchanna-surata, is known and hence it is viparīta-laksanā.

In another example,

...
there is *alankāra-dhvani* according to the dhvani theory. This is the praise of a king or *prapaticātu*. His identity with Vāsudeva is imagined. Hence there is the figure of speech *rupaka* suggested by *prapaticātu*, which is the primary meaning. *Mukula* says that it is *laksana* combined with *gaunopacāra* with superimposition (अन्वयवयानविधिमयः अन्वयवयानविदीकायः). This superimposition or *rupaka* is *upacāra* and hence it is *vākvanibhandhag-laksana*.

Vastudhvani and *alankāra-dhvani* can be explained by this new theory of *Mukulabhatta* because they are found in ordinary talk also, so there is some scope for *laksana* in those two varieties of dhvani; but *laksana* cannot explain rasadhvani since it is *alankīka* and not found in ordinary talk. It is exclusively found in poetry and only sahrdavas can feel it, for others it is just a *vastu* and no *rasa*. For rasadhvani *Mukula* has not chosen his example from *Dhvanivālaka* but he has cleverly selected his own example to dismiss rasadhvani.

The example given by him is,—

"दुधरस भदनेष्वलो दिशि दिशि व्याप्तमालै भाषयः
दहुनारायणः शशास्त्रमात्रायं नहोत्तरः कोड़ेलियः।
उच्चुक्स्तनामारुपरामित्वं शतर्कब्रह्मचर्यः
श्रेष्ठर्मा शरिर भाषरमप्रम मथमैः परशुग्रुरयो दुधरसः।"
Here the spring, the moon-light, the cooing of cuckoo, etc. are *uddīpana vibhāvas* of *rati*, so it is *s'rnēra-rasadhvani*. According to Mukulā, *s'rnēra*, etc., are the subject of *vācyanibandhana-laksana*. Here on the five things, like an arrow of the cupid, the spring, etc., the fieriness is superimposed, and so we get *vipralambha-s'rnēra* as the total meaning or *vākvartha*. Therefore, it is *vācyanibandhana-upādāna-laksana*.

Thus he shows that *laksana* includes *kshola-mohdvani* and proudly says,—

> "जसामानंगाविमाहितं नु खननः सतदधोन्निनतयोप-पारितस्य वितक्त इति देशमुनिविध्यविमौलितानिश्चक्तामः पमः विदितः कुशाशीया वुद्ध्या विनिपणियिष्ठः"

He shows that the scope of *laksana* is as wide as *Dvani*; hence to include *Dvani* in *Bhakti* is not *śīvānti*; and it is not *avyānti* also because, *śīvānti-laksana* like 'lipta' is found in *artha-māna-vanakrama-vāya-dvani*. He shows that in nature also there is no difference between *Dvani* and *Bhakti*. *Laksana* like *śuddha-nāma* is based on *artha* and not on *s'abda*. In *गुप्तवा बोधः* we get the *laksvartha* 'मुरूले बोधः' by the meaning
”सबूतत्वासः चौः” and not by the mere word ‘the Canga’.
So the indication is based on both the word and the meaning like suggestion. The hindrance to primary meaning is perceived by artha itself and not by s'abja alone.

There are only two vrāparas of word and only two arthas, mukhya (primary) and amukhya (secondary), and there is no third type of artha. The primary meaning is sbbha admitted by all the philosophers. So the secondary meaning is vyahana and when one admits amukhya as laksana, there is no scope for vyahana. The s'abja samacanda—

or phala comes with laksartha itself because, no word can be used without any laksartha and īśāna ādasana will not have any charm in poetry. It is not possible for all to use s'abja words easily—

 rinsana. āṣavāna āsyāntākṣaraśāntādibhadhānātāt

śrīyate s'abjāntā śāntāntātā śāntāntātātā śāntāntātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātātातः

Puruṣa tries to refute this view of Mukula saying that there is no scope for prayōjana in lakṣartha and the prayōjana is known only by laksartha.
Though laksana is taken very broadly, it can explain as vastu, alakara and some other but can never do justice to the depth of emotional sensing, which is the very essence of poetry. lekara may explain emotional situations but never vastu which is experienced only by sahrdayas.

Kuatala's concept of kavyaniti is broader than mere abhidha and laksana. So he does not commit the same mistakes of including vastu in anakti as sukula has done. While Anandavaradha takes pains to establish the unique function of language in poetry, Kuatala is interested in giving it as one of the several aspects of the creative process hence the difference. Varadharaj is more philosophically convincing, while Kuatala is more practically helpful to the literary critic. The two views are not opposed but supplementary to each other.

---xix---

40. Satketa on Kavynprakas'a, ch. II.
41. A learned French scholar, Hené cails laksana as 'semantic superimposition' by which poetry is characterized precisely. -- The Enigma in the Ancient Literature of India - Diogenes, Nov. 1960
* For details see pp. 81-82, 101, 137, 143, 182-84, 186, 300.