DHVANI AND VAKROKTI VARIETIES

- A Comparison.

Dhvani is primarily suggestion of poetic or aesthetic sense over and above expressed and indicated senses. In the chapter on 'Bhakti' we have seen how dhvani is different from bhakti. Anandavardhana shows that there is difference between vacvartha (expressed sense) and vyavvartha also. Following Vamana, who divides artha into ryahta and suksma; suksma further divided into bhayva and vasaniva. Anandavardhana also divides the poetic sense into vacva and prativamana. Vamana's bhavva-artha, which he defines as, 'the meaning which is grasped quickly (s'Ichra-nirupaniva-samvah)' is Anandavardhana's vacvartha; and Vamana's vasaniva-artha which he defines as, 'the meaning which is grasped after such concentration (ekograt-prakarsa-samyah)' is Anandavardhana's prativamana.

Anandavardhana admits that the earlier rhetoricians were aware of suggestion in poetry but they did not explain it completely. or included it under alankaras like
samāsokti, vyājastuti, aprastutaprav'asena, etc.

Tondavardhana compares pratīyamanērtha with the grace of a young, beautiful lady. The grace (lāvanra) of a lady is different from outer decorations; similarly the suggested sense, which is found in the works of great poets and grasped and enjoyed only by sensitive critics, is different from expressed sense which is already explained by earlier rhetoricians. Vācyārtha becomes the means for vyāngvārtha/see a lamp/to behold an object in the dark. L. Benou shows seven points of difference between the expressed and the suggested meaning in his article, 'The Dhvani in Sanskrit Poetics'. 1 The seven points are:

1) Difference of Nature — If expressed sense is affirmative, suggested sense can be negative.

2) Difference of Time — Expressed sense is grasped immediately, suggested sense is understood after understanding the expressed sense.

3) Difference of Linguistic Means — Expressed sense is perceived by words, suggested sense may reside in a part of a word, or even in the style.

4) **Difference of Mode of Apprehension** — Expressed sense results from the rules of Grammar, suggested sense can originate from the context or from external elements.

5) **Difference of Effect** — Expressed sense brings a cognitiv percept, pure and simple, suggested sense creates a joyful feeling of surprise, at least in the soul of cultivated people.

6) **Difference of Number** — Expressed sense is one at a time, but suggested sense can be multiple according to circumstance.

7) **Difference in the Person Addressed** — Expressed sense may be addressed to the husband, while suggested sense to the lover.

Poetic words suggesting beautiful sense must be equally beautiful, according to Anandavardhana. He defines the body of poetry as:

Prativarana or suggested sense is threefold leading to:

1) Suggestion of idea (vastu-dhvani).
2) Suggestion of figure of speech (alankara-dhvani).
3) Suggestion of sentiment (rasa-dhvani).

There are innumerable varieties of vastu-dhvani, i.e.
positive vācyārtha suggesting negative sense; negative vācyārtha suggesting positive meaning; positive or negative vācyārtha suggesting neither positive nor negative meaning; and permutations and combinations of these. For example in the stanza:

श्रुति बस्मवत्कर्ष्या भवन्तु निःश्रास्तरे पद्मेनाय
भा नम्बारे तथा विना दक्षिणाभिस्मृत्य आनेषते

(CDN Locana, vol I, p 134)

The expressed meaning is, 'you go'; but the suggested meaning is neither positive nor negative. The beloved does not want her lover to go to her co-wife nor does she want him to be in her company, against his will. Her taunting remark suggests that he has greatly offended her.

Abhinavagupta shows difference between vastudhvaṇi and abhidhā, laksana and tātparya. Vastudhvaṇi is not abhidhā because the expressed and the suggested meanings are opposed to each other in vastudhvaṇi. Suggested idea (vastudhvaṇi) is different from indicated sense (laksana) as there is no hindrance in understanding the expressed sense in vastudhvaṇi. Tātparya cannot be negative if the vācyārtha is positive, therefore, tātparya also cannot be identified with vastudhvaṇi of Mandavardhana.
When one expressed alankāra suggests another alankāra, it is called alankāra-dhvani. Anandavardhana says that Udbhata has shown suggestion in few arthālankāras; but his intention is to show prātiyamānātā in all the arthālankāras. Both vācya and vyangya alankāras should be equally beautiful in alankāra-dhvani. If they are not charming they cannot be called dhvani. The figure of speech dipaka, though upamā is suggested in it, is not called upamālankāra-dhvani. The reason is that we cannot decide whether the poet imagined dipaka alankāra with the intention of upamā-dhvani or dipaka alankāra. Both the possibilities are there so it is inclusive in dhvani. Only the prādhvāya can distinguish vācya-alankāra from the vyangya-alankāra. To take an example of alankāra-dhvani,

It is a beautiful rūpaka-dhvani-kāvyā. The lovely face of a maid is identified with the Moon. The ocean is called a lifeless heap because it is not rising up seeing the moon-like face of a lady. A real rasika alone can enjoy such extra-ordinary beauty. Here the figure of speech sīlāsa.
is váçya, helping the vyangya alankāra, rūpaka, becoming subordinate to it.

Both vastudhvani and alankāradhvani lead to rasadhvani. There can be no poetry without a touch of human or attributed emotion. The sembhogā-s'raśā found in vastudhvani is due to asati-carita and hence does not get a very high position. Rasadhvani is found in both, samlaksya-krama-vyangya-dhvani and asamlaksya-krama-vyangya-dhvani. In the asamlaksya-krama-vyangya-dhvani, rasa is suggested by expressed vibhāva, amabhāva and vyabhicārina, though the sequence between váçya and vyangya is not noticed. In samlaksya-krama-vyangya-dhvani, the directly suggested sense leads on at the next stage to a further suggestion of rasa. It is also called arthes'aksi-udbhava-dhvani. The expressed words become subordinate to the suggested sense which further suggests rasa. For example in the stanza from the Kumārasambhava.

"पञ्चायां प्रदेवानि पाठि विन्दुरधोमुखि नीलामलभागाः गणयामास्य पार्ती ॥" ।
(Dhv Vol I, p 558)

The words expressing the counting of the petals of a play-lotus are subordinate to the suggested vyabhicāribhāva, namely, lajiśā and autsukya. These vyabhicāribhāvas further lead to s'raśā rasa, as they are the intima-
tions of rati in Parvati's mind.

Now let us take an example of asaṣṭaṇa-krama-vyanja-dhvanī, where through expressed vibhāvādi, we perceive suggested rasa immediately without knowing the sequence between vācyārtha and vyāngvārtha.

The bashfulness of the lady on account of the presence of elders, the throbbing of her heart due to the repressed anger and her sorrowful glance with tears in her eyes, are expressed anubhāvas which suggest pravāsa-vipralambha-s'rañga-rasa. The rasa-pratiti here is immediate through expressed vibhāvānumbhāvas.

Thus Anandavardhana proves that the threefold pratīva-mūnārtha is different from the vācyārtha. Similarly he shows the difference between dhvani and tātparya, and dhvani and anumāna. Dhvani is not tātparya because there is no padārtha-vākyārtha-nvāya between vācyā and vyanjā. It is ghata-prāṇi-nvāya between vācyā and vyanjā. The vyanjākātya, both of expressed as well as unexpressed meaningless words, as of musical notes, is proved by experience.
Dhvani is not even anumāna as vācyārtha need not be invariably concomitant with vyāngya. The linea-lingi-nvāya is different from vācyā-vyāngya-nvāya.

At the outset of his book, Anandavardhana states five anti-dhvani schools. One of these schools does not admit the existence of dhvani apart from alankāra, guru, ērtti and rīti. Dhvani can be included in one of these concepts according to this school. The other school rejects dhvani completely. According to this school, there cannot be any such concept as dhvani which is different from all well known factors of poetic beauty, which are explained by earlier rhetoricians. Such a new concept cannot please the minds of the critics. The third school is of antar-bhāvavādin. This school includes dhvani under alankāras. There are several ways of figurative expressions, so one need not be too much proud if he invents one more novel way of expression. Manoratha, a poet and a contemporary of Anandavardhana, ridicules the dhvāri theory in the stanza,

"वास्मिनमा करतु विषयन मन्दपिहादि सालइक्षुः ।
अनुपलब्धाचिताः न पैल वचनोऽन्तेकितिन्यथे यतर्
काव्यं नव ध्वनिं समन्वितांि मित्रं अः स्मार्याऽः ।
ते विद्यमान विद्याधिति किं लुक्तिनां गुः स्वर्णं ध्वनेऽः"

( Dhv Vol I, P 47)
It proves that before Anandavardhana, the vakrakta or alankāra school of Bhāsā was predominant. Most of the poets were following the objective view and naturally the vastu or poetic theme was given more importance. To establish his subjective theory of rasadhvani, Anandavardhana had to face a strong wave of opposition from various schools of thought, existing in his time. The fourth school is the bhākta school, which includes dhvani in bhakti. The fifth school is of anākhyaśārddāna, who say that the nature of dhvani is inexplicable.

Anandavardhana refutes all the five schools of thought of abhāvārādāna, antābhāvārādāna and anākhyaśārddāna. He shows how dhvani is different and more delightful than all the earlier poetic concepts which become subordinate to dhvani in Anandavardhana's theory. Dhvani cannot be included in any of these concepts. Dhvani neither can be included in bhakti nor can be identified with it as their nature and scope differ.

To show that dhvani is not inexplicable, Anandavardhana defines and classifies dhvani and thus establishes his dhvani theory successfully facing all the oppositions. He defines dhvani as,—

"यज्ञाय: शिंदे वा तम्रधसुप्रस्तुरनिषादस्यत्सरयः।
व्यवहारं कार्यक्षेपं से ध्यानिषीदि सुरसिद्धि: काथितः॥

(Dhv Kāśika, I, 13)"
S'abda and artha become subordinate to the suggested sense and such a special class of poetry alone is called dhvani-kāvya.

Anandavardhana classifies dhvani under two broad heads:

1) Dhvani based on laksāra, i.e. avivakṣita-vācya-dhvani, and

2) Dhvani based on abhijñā, i.e. vivakṣānta-para-vācya-dhvani.

In avivakṣita-vācya-dhvani the expressed sense is unbelievable and so we have to resort to the secondary meaning which leads to the suggested sense. For example, —

"वेष तद्वद्वांश्च वेष स्वरूपिणिः श्रियुतिः
त्यात् अनुमोदनां इत्येकतिः सौवर्णम्"
(Dhv Vol I, p 233)

The expressed sense that these three persons choose the earth bearing golden flowers, is not proper. We have to resort to laksāra, which suggests that these people get plenty of riches.

In vivakṣānta-para-vācya-dhvani, the expressed meaning suggests some other, very delightful meaning. To illustrate, —

"विद्याधरि क्षणं नाम विषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽविषयोऽवि
Apparently the person is talking about a parrot, but the way he speaks suggests his own love for his beloved and his hidden intent to kiss her red lips.

These two types of dhvani are further subdivided.

Avivaksita-vācya-dhvani is subdivided into two parts:
1) Arthāntara-sankramita-vācya-dhvani, and
2) Atvanta-tiraskṛta-vācya-dhvani.

In arthāntara-sankramita-vācya-dhvani the plan meaning is almost submerged in another associate meaning.

In the stanza,

The word 'Rāma' does not mean only 'Dāśarathī Rāma' but suggests some of his extra-ordinary merits like courage, tolerance and hard-heartedness to bear the separation from his beloved at the advent of the rainy season.
In atyanta-tirnākṛta-vācya-dhvani, the expressed meaning of a word is completely dropped to get the suggested meaning. For example,

"रात्रिसंक्षेपानवाचस्तुवाचारणवृत्तिः |
नित्यमाण्डू व्यासदर्षं तो निद्राते॥" (CDW vol I, p 85)

Here blindness is attributed to a mirror. The blindness of a mirror means its inability to reflect, and not actual blindness. The suggested sense is that, in winter the moon is not very clearly and brightly visible. It is hidden behind the cloudy mask.

Vivakṣātānta-paravācya-dhvani also is twofold:

1) āsaṃlakṣya-kram-vyanva-dhvani, and
2) Samaṃlakṣya-kram-vyanva-dhvani.

Rasa, bhūva, rasādhāśa, bhavādhasa, bhavasānti etc. come under āsaṃlakṣya-kram-vyanva-dhvani. Then they are suggested primarily in poetry, they are called the soul of dhvani. If rasa, bhūva, etc. are not primarily suggested, they become slankāras like rasavat. The sequence between vācya and vyanva is not visible in āsaṃlakṣya-kram-vyanva-dhvani. Rasadhvani, which primarily is the soul of poetry, according to Āṇandaśādhana, and bhavadhvani etc. are suggested through the expressed sense. The expressed sense directly leads to the experience of
suggested rasa, bhāva etc. In the stanza,

The suggested vyabhiçāribhāva 'vitarka' is more beautiful than expressed vipralambha s'īrṣāra. So it is bhāvadhvani, and the krama between vācya and vyangya is not noticed here.

In sa resumed-krama-vyangva-dhvani the sequence between vācya and vyangya is visible. Following Abhinavagupta, quoting Bhartrhari's kārika,

Dr. A. Sankaran says, —

He quotes Abhinavagupta, —

2. 'Some Aspects of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit or The Theories of Rasa and Dhvani.'
The samyoga and vibhāra does not refer to the stick of the drum here. It means the contact and separation of prākṛta and vaikṛta varnas which manifest sphote. According to Dr. Sankaran,—

"These last sounds that strike the ear are called dhvani."

But every varna or sound is vyāḍā and is called invāni by Bhartrhari. In sound of the bell all the dhvani are heard but their krama is not seen.

Samlakṣya-krama-vyāngya-dhvani, which is like śūnya-sabda-akti-kuṭṭha, is subdivided into:

1) S'abdas'aktimūla,
2) Arthas'aktimūla, and
3) Udbhayas'aktimūla.

When a figure of speech is suggested by the power of expressed sense, it is called s'abda-s'akti-kuṭṭha-samāna-rūpa-samlakṣya-krama-vyāngya-dhvani. It is different from s'lesa. In s'lesa both the meanings are expressed, and in s'abdas'aktimūla-dhvani the figure of speech is suggested through the power of expressed words, which are equally beautiful. For example,—

"अज्ञातस्मातः अनुवादस्मातः पुराणप्रथमसंहिताम्"
Here the comparison between the advent of the hammer and Lord S'iva is suggested through the power of expression. So it is upamā-alankāra-dhvani. When the suggested alankāra also is expressed, it is not s'abdas'aktimāla-dhvani. It is the expressed figure of speech like vakrokti, according to Anandavardhana.

Anandavardhana cites many illustrations to show various suggested figures of speech. In arthas'akti-mūla-dhvani, by sequence between vācyā and vyanāya, rasa or bhāva is suggested as in 'Evaṁ-vādini-devargā', like rasa and bhāva, alankāra and vastu also can be suggested by the power of expressed sense. The suggested sense originated by arthas'akti is divided into prāṇkhoṭi-māṭra-nispanna and svatāh-sambhāvi. Prāṇhokti-māṭra-nispanna can be twofold: --

1) Kaveh-prāṇhokti, and
2) Kavinibādhasva-vaktuh-prāṇhokti.

When the poet himself is the imaginative speaker suggesting other meaning, it is called kavi-prāṇhokti-nispanna-arthas'akti-mūla-dhvani. To illustrate, --

"अज्ञाति कृत्तिकाति न तावदर्शं युगलिततां युगलिततां
अभिनवसगरमुस्तावनिश्चौपर्णिज्ञाननिश्चौपर्णिज्ञान
तरान्।"

(Ločana, Dhv Vol I, p 578)
The Spring only aims the arrows of the Cupid but does not shoot them. This suggests that the desires of lovers to unite increases day by day in the Spring-season. The example of kannibaddha-vaktr-dandhokta is, 'Sūkhavini kva na nama', where the speaker will not be the poet himself but the character created by the poet.

Svatah-sambhavi is a subject which can possibly occur as well in outside-nature and which does not owe its existence exclusively to the imaginative activity on the part of the poet. The stanza, 'Evaś-vādini devasaś' is the example of this type of dhvani.

The above classification of dhvani is based on vyangva. Anandavardhana classifies dhvani on the basis of vyāñjaka also. Dhvani can be found in a word, in parts of a word, in the style or in the whole poetic composition. This classification of dhvani found in varna, pada, vākya etc. is dependent on the classification of sphone into varna, pada, etc., as we have seen in the first chapter of this work. We also have seen that Anandavardhana's whole theory of dhvani is based on the akhanda-sphone-vāda of grammarians. He shows high regards for vaivākārana when he says,—

"परि निविधताल: नगरीकार: कस: खालकार: विविधानिता..."
In the first kārīkā of the Dhvanyāloka, Ānandavardhana says that the scholars have defined dhvani as the soul of poetry. But the theory was not respected much due to the strong opposition to it. Therefore Ānandavardhana strongly defends the dhvani theory refuting all the oppositions mentioned by him in the first kārīkā, and explains clearly the nature and scope of dhvani. By the term 'vaiyakaranaiḥ' in the first kārīkā, he means 'vaiyakarana-naiḥ'. The last kārīkā of the Dhvanyāloka makes it clear when he says;—

"सत्यायत्त्वन्तन्त्रमीर्चन्त्युक्तम्
भावस्य पारिप्रेक्ष्यया मदाक्षीः
तद् व्याख्यात्मकहि उदयीः
शास्त्रविधिनि इति प्रथितात्मिकाः"

The theory of dhvani was already existing in the minds of people. But it was neglected. Hence Ānandavardhana re-established it, Locana comments on the above quoted kārīkā, —

"रसे साहित्येन अक्ते लोकोपासिद्धै 'सम्भविता-
प्रत्ययचतुर्वचनिः प्रवर्तितैः स य 'सम्भवतःसत्यां नाम"
Thus according to Abhinavagupta, Bhartrhari himself was the author of the dhrvani-theory. Bhartrhari applied it to language and Anandavardhana applies it to poetry. In language, a unit of dhrvanis suggests the whole meaning by sphota; in poetry, one meaning suggests another meaning. The principle of suggestion is the same in both, language and poetry. Due to suggestion, poetry becomes beautiful, or else it is mere vārtta or report.

The commentary Bā lapriya comments on the Locana, —

अभिनवगुप्ते कुलनिर्माणः घलयुतस्य अनुभावगानम्।
अस्य भाववर्ते अथावर्त्ती गुणसुद्धारितम्।

Thus Anandavardhana's theory of dhvani is completely inspired by the dhvani theory of Bhartrhari.

Anandavardhana shows the power of suggestion of a word and a sentence in avivakṣita-vācā-dhvani of both the types, arthāntara-sankramita and atvānta-tirāskṛta.
In "भिन्ने मठ मधुरणा भसने नायका नामात"

*the word 'madhuranā' suggests a high degree of beauty.*

It is atyanta-tiraskṛta because beautiful features of a lady cannot be sweet like sweet-meat. Similarly a word can be suggestive in arthāntara-sankramita-vācya-dhvani also. We will see the suggestivity of a sentence in arthāntara-sankramita-vācya-dhvani.

**द्विजस्वामिनि: कैलासपी कैलासपी प्रथात्मकानुपरिणामं |**

**कैलासपी कैलासपी कैलासपी विज्ञानानुपरिणामं अक्षमः** [DHV p. 674]

Here amṛta and visa mean sukha and dūhkha, thus the meaning of a sentence is transformed by vākyā-vidyājātṛta.

A word and a sentence can be suggestive in both the varieties and their sub-varieties of vīvaksitādvyapara-vācya-dhvani. For example,

"तुलोद्धिकमथाप्रवृद्धि धरणीयार्याधुनिः (लिंगशून्य)"

By shādīprakṛti the whole sentence suggests another meaning which is more delightful. In the stanza

"सापीजल ठीसिदन्ततुलोद्धिकमथाप्रवृद्धिः वानाजलालकुमुळी मुल्ले परिपर्वतेः (लिंगशून्य)"

The word 'tulitalakamukhi' suggests the beauty of her daughter-in-law and her son's attachment to her. He has lost his strength due to love-sports with her and is incapable of hunting elephants and tigers. The one word
suggests the whole meaning by arthasa'kta. Therefore it
is the illustration of padayvya'jakata of svatah-samkhyi-
arthasa'kta-udbhava-vivekantyaparavṛtya-duvan.

An objection is raised how dhvani, which is a sāvya-
vis'esea, can shine forth through pada. Anandavardhana
replies that it is possible because then pada are not
vācaka but they are vṛṣṭiḥaka in such examples, where
dhvani is illuminated through words or parts of words.

Asmlakṣya-krama-vyavga-dhvani, i.e. sesādi also
can be suggested through varna, pada, vākya, saṅghaṇa
and prayāṇa.3

Anandavardhana gives illustrations to show that even
suhantas, tinantas, saṁsāras etc. suggest alaksya-krama-
vyavga-dhvani.

In the following stanz a all these vṛṣṭiḥaka are found,
suggesting different shades of bhāvas.

3. See ch. iv for more details.
There is vacana and subanta vyañjaka in the word aravah. The plural 'aravah' suggests Rāvana's answer. The taddhita tāpasa and nipaṭa api in tatrāpyasau tāpasa suggest the impossibility that an ascetic can kill the whole army of demons. The tīpata 'nubant' in the second line suggests the wrong cānasārtha followed by an ascetic. In the second half of the stanza we find kṛṣṇanta, taddhita, samāsa and upasarga, suggesting Rāvana's anger at its highest. Rāvana is upbraiding Meghanāda, Kumbhakarna and also his own mighty arms that could conquer the heaven several times. Thus the parts of the words suggest rasa and similarly rasa is suggested by a word, a sentence, the style and a whole composition. Arthavyañjaka also is found in prakāraṇa as in the Grūḍhro-ṃōṛya-samvāda in the Mahābhārata.

Thus dhvani is classified through vyavaye and through vyāñjaka. About the varieties of Dhyani, Dr. Krishna-noothry remarks,—

"No one can deny the fact that all works of literature are not of uniform excellence but admit of varying degrees of excellence. The earlier concepts of ilankāra, sūna etc. is not help in the least in detecting these degrees of excellence. With the principle of Dhyani it is not so; for Dhyani is not a watertight thing, not admitting of varieties. The ways of suggestion are as manifold as they are mysterious." 4

4. 'Essays in Sanskrit Literary Criticism', p. 107
Anandavardhana has classified the whole field of poetry from the standpoint of dhvani. The classification is threefold:

1) Dhvani-kāvya;
2) Cunībhūtavyangya-kāvya; and
3) Citra-kāvya.

Dhvani-kāvya is the best type of poetry where primarily rasādī is suggested. The suggested element is pradhāna in dhvanikāvya. Vastudhvani and alankāradhvani also come under dhvanikāvya, the first-rate poetry. We have dealt with dhvanikāvya in detail with illustrations while classifying dhvani. Hence, then, we will turn to Cunībhūtavyangya-kāvya.

In Cunībhūtavyangya-kāvya, vācya or expressed sense is more beautiful than vyangya or suggested sense. Hence vācya is pradhāna and vyangya is apradhāna in this type of poetry. For example, —

```
"अलव्यापैन्नुरपरम इि केहयमजा
यज्ञोपलापी शाश्वाना सहु सप्रस्वाते।
उन्मत्ततिः हीरसकुम्भात्ति — न बहं
यज्ञपरे कुदिल्कापूर्णानवस्यः॥"
```

(DHV vol II, p 1125)

The lady described in the above stanza is a full incarnation of Beauty. A youth desirous of her beauty, describes
her beautiful features. The description of her features is suggested. Expressly the lover describes the ocean of grace (lāvenya). The expressed rūreka alankāra is more beautiful than the suggested appreciation of her beauty by her lover, and his desire for her. Here by atvanta-tiraskṛta-vācyas we get the suggested meaning which is subordinate to the expressed sense. Tīvalaśitānva- saravācya-dhvani also, where vācya is not dropped to get vyaneyva, can be sunībhūta-vyango-kāvyam. In "नन्द तजन्मि महामया" the expressed Nature-description is more charming than the suggested vippadambha-s'raukāra-rasa. In this stanza the expressed sense is not dropped to get the suggested rasa.

When suggestion is expressed in words, it is called the second-rate poetry. In the following stanza, —

"संकेतत्वाहमनसं निंद्र ताल्ला लिदैथया।
हेतृणीक्षितकियां कीलापदं निमीलितम्।"
(Dhv vol. I, p. 565)
the closing of the play-lotus suggests the sun-set Its suggestion is expressed in the words "संकेतत्वाहमनसं निंद्र ताल्ला।"
So it is not dhvanikāvyam, but sunībhūtavyango-kāvyam.

When suggested rasa becomes subordinate, it is rasavat alankāra. All the arthālankāras possess vyanja- kētyam. Then vyango element in alankāras is primary or
pradhāna, it is alankāra-ihvani, the best kāvya. The vācya is pradhāna and more beautiful than vya-kāvya, it is gunabhūtavānva-kāvya. Though Ānandavardhana calls it a second-rate poetry, he admits that it is equally delightful. There are infinite ways of figurative expressions dependent on intuition. All of them are pleasing in their own way and they are followed by great poets. Dhyani, which is the kavyālāma, is the main stream of poetry and gunabhūtavānva is a sub-stream of poetry. A poetic composition without a tōn of suggestion, primary or subordinate, is not called poetry at all strictly speaking, according to Ānandavardhana.

The intonation (or kāku), which conveys a meaning different from the expressed sense, is included in gunabhūtavānva-kāvya by Ānandavardhana. The suggested meaning is derived by a peculiar ironical way of expression. Thus intonation is completely dependent on abhidha which is more beautiful. Plenty of illustrations of kāku are found in Bhattatārāvāna's Veṣaṃāra. No other dramatist can compete with Bhattatārāvāna in using kāku so beautifully. Very few rhetoricians have dealt in detail about kāku. Three authors throw a flood of light on the nature of intonation.

5. Prof. V. M. Kulkarni says, "Bṛhatā is the first rhetorician who treats of intonation in detail."
There is no rasa in Nītikathā but it is included in the second-rate literature because of its suggested advice. The kathā itself is more attractive than its suggested tātparya of nīti. One must be careful in distinguishing pradhanāna and apradhanāna of vaca and vyanja to understand the difference between dhvanikāva, sunibhūtvavagra-kāva and alankāra. Otherwise the famous alankāras will be mistaken for either of them. He illustrates a stanza from Dharmakīrti’s Pramāṇaviniścaya. ⁶

for the guidance of actors. Rājas’ekhara for the first time arrives at the classifications of intonation with suitable illustrations. Abhinavagupta’s work is, no doubt, a commentary on Nāṭyasūtra but his brilliant exposition of intonation, its nature, its etymology, its varieties and its subject matter is marked by freshness of approach and originality.”—’The Treatment of Intonation (kākū) in Sanskrit Poetics. – J.O.R.I. Baroda, vol. XVI, part I, p. 33.

⁶ Anandavardhana has written a commentary on Dharmottara, a commentary on the Pramāṇaviniścaya.

⁷ Kremendra in the Anvityavīcārācāra quotes this to show arthaśucitva in the word ‘tanvi’.
Anandavardhana does not admit this to be the example of vyājastruti because it is not clear whether the person praising the beauty is the lover of the lady or a third person. It is sprastuta-prasantasa because it reveals the laments of a great matchless person, who is creating jealousy in his enemies by his achievements, and is unable to find another fit person who can understand and appreciate him.

Thus the alankāras have threefold position in the theory of dhvani. Alankāras may be vācya, may be samībhūtavanga or may be dhvani. Once the dhvani theory is accepted, particular alankāras in a stanza will be decided easily and clearly.

The distinction is dependent on the prādhānya and aprādhānya of dhvani.

The third class of poetry is of citra-kārya. This type is not pleasing. It lacks rasādi and suggestion. It is twofold:

1) S'abdacitra like duskara-vamaka-pravasa etc.
2) Arthacitra having arthālankāras without a touch of suggestion or intention to illumines any rasa.
It is called citra because it can remotely become vibhāva for rasādi as there can be no poetry which does not stimulate any cittavṛtti. Every object in the world is a vibhāva of one or the other rasa, and poetry cannot exist without vastu. When a poet is interested more in a play of words or glittering expressions, he pays very little attention to rasa or bhāva. So citrakāvya is said to be udaya bereft of rasa, because the main intention of the poet is not to compose a sarasa-kāvya. When the poet intends to depict rasa, it becomes dhvanikāvya. Ānandavardhana says, —

'खूब कविता तैलकरण कार्यलोग रसमये राजतह हा एक तैलरागचालनीस अभिवृत्त-तल्ला,'

and — 'अपारे यथार्थस्थारे कंठिका: प्रसारिता, यथार्थमेव स्वच्छते लिखिबे पापित्तिना।'

Thus Ānandavardhana classifies poetry from the standpoint of Dhvani. 8

Kuntaka’s vakrokti is an artistic expression far away from ordinary speech or scientific language. The

---

8. For further details see 'Ānandavardhana’s classification of poetry from the standpoint of Dhvani' by Dr. K. Krishnsmoorthy — The Poona Orientalists, vol. xliii. pp 67-78
use of vakrokti or artistic expression reveals the skill of the poet. The whole beauty of poetry lies in vakra-
abhidhā. Hence the vakrokti is called the life of poetry.

A Kashmirian poet, Ratanākara, contemporary of Ananda-
vardhana, has composed fifty stanzas called 'Vakrokti-
pañcāśikā'. He shows the skilful crooked way of con-
versation between Śīva and Pārvatī. For example, —

"अलखार्कारात्मका वचनो मयात्मका वचनो नयेचे, कशी द्व्ययो
पुष्पविनियोकांना शुद्ध पुनरायुक्त असक्तांको नाम्य यत्तौ
मै भुजाधवियां मयादितांते व्याप्तिकर्थे भूत काण्यं
दिशादिर्युलिताः भूतातितिन्ते शूरी षवं, सम्पदः॥"

Dr. Kane says;—

"The vakrokti is really an off-shoot of the alankara school." (pp 368 - 369)

Kuntaka takes the idea of vakrokti, the general principle underlying all the alankāras, from Bhamāha and develops his own theory of vakrokti following the Dhvani theory of Anandavardhana. Dandin also divides the whole literature into vakrokti and svabhāvokti. 9 By the time of Sudrārab, vakrokti lost its importance and became a mere svabhālankāra. Anandavardhana calls vakrokti a vācrā-

9. According to G. T. Deshpande, Lokadharā and Nityadharā in drama are svabhāvokti and vakrokti respectively in poetry. He follows Abhinavagupta. — See 'Bhāratiya Sahityasāstra', in Marathi, p 33
Abhinavagupta calls vakrokti the best type of sanatraka.

"वक्रोक्तिकलिप्त शमश्चतना।"

Anyway Kuntaka re-established the old principle of vakrokti, put forth by Bhāmaha, in his own novel way. Kuntaka widened the scope of vakrokti from mere 'alankāra-sāmānya' to 'kavya-îjīvita'. Vakrokti distinguishes poetry from śāstra and ordinary speech as it is exclusively found in poetry and could have no opposition with dhvani. Dr. Kuppuswami Shastri in his article, 'Alankāra-śāstra and its Bearings on the Creative Aspect of Poetry' says,

"The different theories meet on common ground when they say: 'भास्माळधकोददसमेत् काव्यसभा' but diverge on कव्या-वासुधकोददसमेत् अभासिते '11"

Kuntaka divides vakrokti into six main parts.

10. Dr. K. N. Datewale calls vakrokti as 'Manipulation' in his 'Kusavrata', p. 209.
1) Varna-vinyāsa-vakrata
2) Pada-purvārdha-vakrata
3) Pada-parārdha-vakrata
4) Vākya-vakrata
5) Prakaraṇa-vakrata; and
6) Prabhanda-vakrata

When varnas or letters are repeated over and over again, and bring pleasure to the sense of hearing in the recitation of poetry, it is called Varna-vinyāsa-vakrata. This is known as anuprāśa or yamaka by earlier rhetoricians. Sometimes just one letter is repeated, at others two or more as in—

\[
\text{र भंगे वोकहलितकोषदेशिलोक देवलोकयोग्यम्} \\
\text{अन्नवर्ताला करस्मलाकारमेव} \\
\text{वेदलोकको विस्तरनात्र शुद्धेन्द्रनार्मदानायम} \\
\text{मेनामधलिनीनामनवर्तामक्यमर्यादाकिं समीरा।} \\
\text{(V J. P 172)}
\]

Many letters are repeated in the stanza quoted above. They produce a pleasant jingling sound when recited. When the anuprāśikas are repeated, poetry sounds more pleasing. These letters may be soft or forceful according to poetic excellences and the style connected with them. Repetition of the words is called yamaka and some appropriate yamakas are found in the Vasanta-varnana in the Raghuvamsa.
The pada-pūrvārdha or prātipadika-vakrata includes the beauty of sup, tin etc. It has many varieties:—

a) Rūdhi-vaicitrya-vakrata — When some extra-ordinary quality is attributed to some well-known character, it brings novelty to the expression; and this is termed as rūdhi-vakrata. Kuntaka quotes the stanza, "Snigdha-s'yaśā" which Āṇanda-varāhāna has quoted for arthātara-sankramita-vācya-dhāvani, and says that the word 'Rāma' implies his extra-ordinary attributes like courage, tolerance etc. Kuntaka admits that Āṇanda-varāhāna has already explained the vyangva-vyaṅkaka-bhāva in these examples, and says,—

"एवं एवं कार्यवैद्यैवक्रातः प्रतिस्थापनंरूपं अदृश्य स्वेतमय्यावरोधे। रुपमं अनहो विश्वेते।" (V J P 201)

Rūdhi-vaicitrya-vakrata is twofold:—
1) The poet describing his own prosperity or diversity and
2) The speaker being the character created by the poet's imagination.

b) Paryāya-vakrata — Among many synonyms when a fit word, bringing effective beauty, is chosen it is called paryāya-vakrata. E.G.

"वामं कुक्कलकालिकोच्यं मुनि श्रीमोक्तरामस्वातः। सप्तं कामस्पर्शं पुर्वं विपुलभोगं नित्तम्भस्योऽस्य।।
सहायेऽरूपं विद्युतयात्विनं गणेशादिभूत्यमानं वुझ। पायाद्व: प्रथमं वपु: स्मरिषोऽधिभवलक्ष्यताः।।" (V J 1.69)
There are several synonyms for Śiva but 'Śmara-riphu' is the most appropriate name here. He is the enemy of Cupid as he has burnt him once. Inspite of this he is eternally united with his dear wife. It is surprising to his attendants. The word 'Śmara-riphu' brings all the beauty to the stanza. Kuntaka includes pratīvayāna alankāra under nandyava-vakratā.

e) Upacāra-vakratā — In upacāra-vakratā human activities are attributed to inanimate things. Beautiful (saarasā) alankāras like rūpaka etc. are at the basis of this vakratā. In,

'गमन ो मनसयं धार्मचलितारुलिनकी -ि च वनानि
लिसहराधारुसुपका तुराति नीता आर्ये नित्राः ॥
'\textit{mattatva}' and 'nirahankaratva' are attributed to the inanimate objects like clouds and rays of the moon.

Ānandavardhāna cites this example for atyanta-virākṛta-vācyā-dhvani.

Kuntaka distinguishes rūpaka-mūla-upacāra-vakratā from simple upacāra-vakratā on the basis of Pratīvayā- mānata. In ordinary upacāra-vakratā abheda between upamāna and upamāna is suggested by attribution; while in rūpaka-mūla-upacāra, by a slight similarity abheda is expressed.
The adjectives of the lady have vivified the stanza. If they are removed there remains no beauty at all. *Rasa, vipralamba-s'raśa*, also is revealed through these adjectives. *Vis'esana* brings beauty to the threefold vastu, viz. *rasa*, *svabhāva* and *alankāra*.

Kuntaka quotes the example, 'Vrīḍāyogāt-natavadanavā' to show the beauty of *krīvāvis'esana*. The *krīvā-vis'esana* 'cakita-harini-hāri' brings extra-ordinary beauty to the word 'netra-trībhāgak'. *Nandavardhana* quotes this stanza to show *dāvati* in *padāvayeva*.

e) **Samvrti-vakrata** — When the nature of vastu is inexpressible, some sarvanāma like 'kimapi' is used instead of an exact expression. This sarvanāma suggests inner feelings or extra-ordinary vastu, thus bringing more charm to poetry. For example, —

"निष्क्रियनिशिक्तज्ञो भद्रमणसामया
नायिकायनि न-च स्त्राणि निरतामानि।"
It is suggested that the joy of listening to such words can be understood only by experience.

f) **Vṛtti-vaicitrya-vakrātā** — A word can become more pleasant by *samāsā* or *taddhita* affixes as in, —

"वाट्टेन्न समु नु हर।" (S.V. p. 76)

The *avaya* 'pāndima' is more beautiful than 'pāndita', 'pāndutva' or 'pāndubhāva'.

g) **Bhāva-vaicitrya-vakrātā** — When well-known roots of words are used in a novel way it is called *bhāva-vaicitrya-vakrātā*.

h) **Linea-vaicitrya-vakrātā** — When different genders, especially the feminine gender, is used to bring out delicacy and charm, it is called *linea-vaicitrya-vakrātā*. For example, —

"पदमा पत्थ पुरस्ताबिम्।" (S.V. p. 77)

Here instead of 'tatah' or 'tatah' the word 'taśi' is used as *Kuntaka* says, —

"नामे वर्णस्त्रीति पेशालम्।" (S.V. p. 77)

i) **Kriyā-vaicitrya-vakrātā** — When beauty lies in a verb, it is called *kriyā-vaicitrya-vakrātā*. *Kuntaka*
quotes Anandavardhana's Mangalas'loka, in which Abhinavagupta shows the threefold dhvani.

... ... ...

Nails are well-known for hurting but here they are destroying the difficulties. This contrary operation (viruddha-kriya) is indeed beautiful. Similarly in, 

... ... ...

the verb 'dhvanananti' is more beautiful than 'jalepati' or 'vadanti'.

3) Padaparārđha or Pratvya-vakrata — This variety of vakrata includes the beauty of tense, case, number, person etc.

a) Kāla-Vaiṣeṣitra-vakrata — When the use of past or future tense in description becomes pleasing due to propriety, it is called kāla-vaiṣeṣitra-vakrata. To illustrate, —

... ... ...

A lover, who is afraid of the future separation from his beloved, due to the rainy season, is speaking here. The description of the fast approaching rainy season as closing the pathas of desires, adds beauty by kāla-vaiṣeṣitra.
b) **Kāraka-vakrātā** — In **kāraka-vakrātā** animation is attributed to inanimate things and the inanimate objects act like human beings for the development of rasa. F.g.

> स्तनाक कर्ता नरें अपमान अलास्यालेक्ष्याकार टंकाय, पहुँच वरदी असल; पहुँच अभ्यास।
> शारदोत्सवमाधुरु, पतलसी च भूपलसी करतुके ना जानीभास्तस्या। क इति है विकारत्वालिकरः।

The human actions are attributed to the flow of tears, the sweet voice and the forehead, to develop the **vipralambha-s'ṛngāra**. This **vakrātā** is somewhat similar to **unacara-vakrātā**.

c) **Sankhyā-vakrātā** — Poets use plural for singular or dual to bring vācitrīya in poetry. Sometimes two words having different numbers are brought together.

In, "वर्णेन तत्त्वान्वैः अनुभुकर ठालसक श्वेत कृतः।"

'वेस (vāsan)' is used for 'I (ahās) suggesting tātasththa (objective attitude). In,

"पुरुषोदयस्यानां नयने वाणी सनातानः।"

Duals and plurals are brought together. (CV J. P. 278)

d) **Purusā-vakrātā** — In the place of the first or the second person, the third person is used in **purusā-vakrātā**. For example,
The third person 'evam janah' is used for the first person 'aham' as a euphemism.

e) **Upagraha-vakrata** — If *parasaipada* or *atmanasipada* is used with propriety to bring beauty, it is called **upagraha-vakrata**. As in,

> ताक्ष्यायनमेवापि भूमिकू राशिः मुद्रायुपेक्षा
> लघुपत्तित्वात् विचारी विचित्रौ वियुज्याति
> नागार्जुनात्मकोसात् दस्यस्य नात्र
> प्रातिप्रेयानन्तननविकृतिक्षिताति॥॥८३॥ (V J p 283)

The eyes of the female deer remind king *Dasa* of his own beloveds and the beautiful movements of their eyes. He is unable to kill them because of this remembrance; even he holds back the arrow set to the bow. The *atmanasipada* 'vibhida' beautifully suggests how of its own accord the thumb-grip became loose.

f) **Pratyaya-vakrata** — Beauty is brought into poetry by the use of comparative and superlative degrees and it is called **pratyaya-vakrata**. To cite an example,

> रूपीनां वस्तुनि देवन भूमिकू भागु तत्त्वा गिरा कृत्य
> निमित्तु प्रभुवैश्यत्तरिषार्थि व भागु अन्य ना भागु।
> वान्रेकां वान्रिता ताक्तवै वान्रितवै वान्रितात्
> विकृतात्सुप्रथामीति यमन्योनिश्चितरक्षम॥॥३॥

(C V J, p 284)
Vande-laya: The comparative degree in the critic's exhibits beauty; it praises the ability to understand both kavirṣṭi and Brahmaśrīti.

g) Pada-vakra: A novel beauty is found in words when upasaras and nipātas illuminate rasa. It:

> "नुसस्य युस्मिण्डाधरायां परिप्रेक्ष्यार्थवैविभाग भवति नूसस्य साहित्यार्थायां प्रत्यक्षास्य प्रमपायमविन्यास स चुपितानुसार!"

The nipāta 'tu' and upasara 'prati' etc. add beauty to the words of Duṣyanta, regretting his inability to kiss Sākuntāla.

When several varieties of pada-vakra are found together, they bring extra-ordinary beauty to poetry as a portrait with the combination of many pleasing colours. Just as the bees would ingale themselves with the honey, so do the rasibās relish such poetic compositions to the full.

4) Vakva-vakra: There are infinite varieties of vakva-vakra as the whole field of alankāra falls under it. There is no limit to the imagination of poets; hence vakva-vakra is vast and limitless. It is different from vara and pada-vakra. E.g.

> "उपस्थितां शुचिमिशाय अस्मिनं
कर्णं नयं साधितस्मि प्रसन्नां।"

> "अधिकृष्टानि दशिवर्णं वर्णं कर्माणि
अज्जाय सम्प्रसादे कुम्भां ब्रह्माणि"
The figure of speech here is kavyali̇ca (or poetic reason). Karuna rasa is developed throughout the stanza. Kuntaka includes rasa also under vākyavakrata. He classifies rasa and bhāva into three categories as --

1) belonging to mukhya-cetana like gods, semi-gods, men etc.; (2) belonging to amukhya-cetana like animals, birds etc.; and (3) belonging to inanimate objects (acetana).

Kuntaka connects vākyavakrata with kavipratibha (or kavikus'ala) as it includes kavyanārca, containing the beauty of guṇas and alankāras. Particularly alankāras require abhīva kavi-kus'ala and abhyāsa along with pratibha. Vākyavakrata is like a painted wall having a combination of several beautiful colours decorating the wall. Kuntaka discusses several alankāras under vākyavakrata and shows pratīyamānatā in some alankāras.

5) Prakārana-vakrata -- When a famous incident is changed or something is added to it to heighten a character or develop the rasa, it is called prakārana-vakrata. For example, in the Rāmāyana Sītā sends Laksmana to protect Rāma, when she hears the laments.
of Rāma, who has gone in pursuit of the demon Mārīcā. The very idea of Lakṣmaṇa's help to Rāma is degrading the position of the hero; so in the 'udāttarāṣṭava' the dramatist has changed the incident a little bit. In the drama, Lakṣmaṇa has gone in pursuit of Mārīcā and Sītā sends Rāma to protect Lakṣmaṇa thinking that he is in danger.

Sometimes the original plot is altered in view of the propriety and beauty. In the Śākuntala, the curse of Durvāsas, the forgetfulness of Dugvantā and the role played by the royal-signet ring etc. change the epic story completely. Natural descriptions like Vasanta-varnana, the very apex of the development of the main rasa - as Pururavas's madness in the fourth act of the Vikramorvasīya - also come under prakārana-vakrata. Co-incidents and sub-plots auxiliary to the main plot and the proper and beautiful use of sandhis etc. also are included under prakārana-vakrata.

6) Prabandha-vakrata — The result of all the five types of vakrata is seen in katha or nātaka and it is called prabandha-vakrata. Its intention is to instruct in a sweet manner.

In 'Tamasavatsarāj' king Udayana is described as a dhīra-lalita type of hero; but the main intention of the
dramatist is to show how a fit minister can save the king from all difficulties and disasters.

In *prabandha-vakrata* the main *rasa* of the play or of the prose-romance is different from the main *rasa* of the original source. The main *rasa* of the *Mahabharata* is *s'anta* but the main *rasa* of *S'akuntala* is *s'ringa* and that of *S'is'upalaavadha* *v'ira*.

The dry facts of history can become the theme of an epic or a drama. Minor incidents in a big epic like the *Ramayana* can become the plot of full-fledged poems. Though many poets write on the same theme, it does not become monotonous, provided it contains some novelty and beauty. At the end of a play or an epic many achievements fall to the credit of the hero. All the changes come under *prabandha-vakrata*.

Kuntaka's classification of *vakrata* is substantially based on *Anandavardhana*’s classification of *dhyani*. Following the grammarians *Anandavardhana* divides *dhyani* in *varna*, *pada*, *v'akva* etc., and following *Anandavardhana* Kuntaka divides *vakrata* in the same way. Therefore *vyan'akata* of *varna*, *pada*, *padavavara* like *krdanta*, *taddhita*, *sam'asa*, *upasarga*, *nipata* etc. are Kuntaka’s varieties of *padapurb'dha-vakrata* and *padapardhada-
vakratā like, vṛtti-vakratā, vīśësara-vakratā, sārvēva-vakratā, bhāva-vakratā, kāroka-vakratā, upagraha-vakratā, padā-vakratā, containing the beauty of upasargas and nipātas etc. Ānandavardhana's twofold avivaksita-vācya-dhvani namely arthāntara-sankramita-vācya-dhvani and ātranta-tirāskṛta-vācya-dhvani is Kuntaka's rūdhi-vaiścitrīya-vakrata and upacāra-vakrata respectively. Kuntaka's pariśva-vakrata with a touch of pleasant alankāras is Ānandavardhana's s'abdas'aktimūla-vedadhvani or vākya-dhvani if the whole sentence is suggestive. Both are included in pariśva-vakrata by Kuntaka. He quotes the same examples as cited by Ānandavardhana for vākya-dhvani of s'abdas'akti:

1) "नूनुमहयुंगमुपपन्तन्न्यपुष्ठमहिला धवलगुट्ठासा व्यजूमन्तर गृहभविक्षणा महाकाव्यां.।"

(C.V. J. P. 212)

and 2) "वर्चस विनमर भवसस्य धरणीधविक्षणायांगुड़ा

तव शेषः।" (C.V. J. P. 213)

Kuntaka's vākya-vakrata is wider than Ānandavardhana's vākya-dhvani. Vākya-vrûṣṭrakṛtya is concerned only with a sentence but vākya-vakrata covers the whole portion of alankāra. It includes mārgas, ārupas, alankāras and also rasa. The vākya-vakrata is related to kavya-pratibbha and āhārya-kaus'ala and it includes Ānanda-
vardhana's bhāva-dhvani, rasā-dhvani, alankāra-dhvani and gunībhūtayyangya-kāvya. Prakārata-vakratā and Prabandha-vakratā is similar to prabandha-dhvani of saalaka-sa-krasa-vyanaga and asalaka-sa-krasa-vyanaga.

Anandavardhana's citrakāvya is Kuntaka's varna-vinyasa-vakratā. Kuntaka quotes many examples quoted by Anandavardhana and points out some beauty which Anandavardhana points out. The only difference is that Anandavardhana mentions them as a type of dhvani and Kuntaka mentions them as a variety of vakrata.12

Thus the whole field of dhvani, as also the whole field of alankāras and anasa, is accepted and included under vakrata by Kuntaka. The classification of vakrata is broader than the classification of dhvani. Some weak points of Anandavardhana, as for example, to give rasa the subordinate position in the rasavat alankāra or classifying gunībhūta-vyanaga-kāvya as second-rate poetry, are removed by Kuntaka, giving them primary importance. Anandavardhana is not very convincing in distinguishing the dhvani-kāvya from gunībhūtayyangya-kāvya, according

12. A detailed chart of these is provided at the end of this work. The similar stanzas quoted by Anandavardhana and Kuntaka also are listed.
to Kuntaka. He reveals the beauty of गृहिष्ठस्यायन्यकाव्यa and argues that it is equally beautiful and deserves to be called the best type of poetry. According to Kuntaka, low type of poetry cannot be called poetry at all, and there are no grades in beauty. Poets charge the world by their imagination to give pleasure, and when poetry no more conveys the sense of pleasure, it is mere report or scientific discussion or an ordinary talk.

Kuntaka's theory of vakrokti, though broad and all-pervading, did not become very popular as he lacked followers. Later on vakrokti became a mere alankāra of शब्द or अर्थa in Sanskrit Poetics. The credit of the popularity of ध्वनि theory goes to the लोकपक्षa Abhinavagupta and the followers of ध्वनि theory like नागाजा, रायराक्ष, जातपरिनाथa etc.

Bhoja takes vakrokti in the sense of बैज्ञा and दार्शन. Vakrokti is the general principle underlying all the alankāras Bhoja divides the whole literature into स्वभूवक्तिः, vakrokti and rasokti. Vakrokti is a poetic beauty, according to him. So he says;

"वद्वक्र कच्चा शाक्ते आदि च च तया यथा तत्तत्
वक्रे यद्वर्णोर्करो तत्र अव्याक्तिः गुणे ॥
"CS 3 p c 10 vi"

Elsewhere he calls vakrokti as an alankāra.
Dhvani is a variety of tātparya for Bhoja when he says,—

"तत्पर्येत्रो वचनि अनित्यं भावे" १३

(सं प प्र १)

He calls dhvani as the s'abhastra gāmbhirva. Bhoja follows Bhūmaha, Dandin and Vāmana, in bringing everything under alankāra or guna. १३

Bhattanāyaka does not accept Ānandavardhana's view that rasa is enjoyed through dhvani. He criticises Ānandavardhana's argument about dhvani as a third function,—

"अन्नित्यसामाशये योजिते योजारे अक्षाराशये।
तस्य सिद्धं प्रश्ने स्वरूपन्तथं शतन न संपत्ती।" । (Locana, vol. I, p. ६५)

Poetry is a single unit and abhidhā includes laksāna. Bhāvakāśa is the main vyāpāra found in poetry and shoikātā is found in relation to the critics. Vāya-vyāpāra is a single vyāpāra with three functions (tryams'ān kūra-vyāpāraḥ).

If dhvani has the only function of vyājāna, a dhvani-kāvyā may be a fragment of poetry and not the whole.

Abhinavagupta is an able defender of Ānandavardhana. He argues that Bhattanāyaka has explained the three functions for the enjoyment of rasa and rasa is the soul of

13. For details of comparison between Bhoja and Kuntaka, and Bhoja and Ānandavardhana, see Dr. Raghavan's 'Bhoja's Śrīprāga-prākāśa'. pp. ११४ - १३१ & १३८ - १८३
Poetry. Poetry is not meant to advise or to derive knowledge. Its main purpose is to produce Supreme Delight.

If Bhatanayaka is thinking *vestu-dhvani* and *alankāra-dhvani* as a fragment of poetry, he cannot think the same of *rasa-dhvani*. If he thinks *rasa-dhvani* as a *kāvya*: it goes against his own theory of threefold function of *kāvya*. Moreover, *vestu-dhvani* and *alankāra-dhvani* ultimately lead to *rasa-dhvani*. Therefore *dhvani* cannot be dismissed as a fragment of poetry.

Mahimabhatta has written a complete book to include *dhvani* in *anumāna*.

*Artha* is only twofold according to him, expressed (*vācya*) and inferred (*anumāya*). *Vācya* is the conventional expressed sense and *anumāya* includes the threefold *dhvani*.
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Mahimabhattra includes everything under *anumāna*. Even about *rasa* he remarks,—

>aśāsri bīkṣaṣṭādītrāṇe rसāदिनां श्रतिनिः सन्नाम एषानि सम्भवत इत्यतः (४ ४१७ मिश्र 's edn)

He points out many mistakes of *Anandavarāṇa* in *Jayavṛtti-loka*. He finds faults even in the definition of *śvānī*.

Mahimabhattra criticises *Anandavarāṇa*'s *sugīthā*-vyānīya-kāvyā.

>यदि आच्छ गुणीश्रुतव्यययः पीर्यदि वाक्ता।
>सकुणिरानिनी नास्रि व्यस पिनारी वानरी।
>न हि कामात्मावृत्तमय ध्यानात्मा समवर।
>तेन निर्मातवित्समय स्पृष्टरूपे अथवा भा।

(ch. 1., 96, 37).

Mahimabhattra does not accept Kuntaka's *vakrokti* as the life of poetry. He quotes the *kārīkā,*

>शास्त्राधीनी उपविवाहितसारानिनी।
>नाथे अवविवहितो आध्य तत्तलिमाधानिगा।

from the *vakroktivādā* and comments,—

>तत्त्वाधिना शास्त्राधीनसास्त्रविकारविवाहान्तरसकारं
>यहेपूर्वो नाथां नाम शास्त्राधीनसास्त्रविकारान्तरसकारं
>आपूर्वानां अन्तरसकारान' सन्मात्रानिन्न।
>तत्त्वाधिनानात्तलिमाधानिगा। तत्त्वाधिनानात्तलिमाधानिगा।
>शाश्वात्त्वेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशेवाशे
Atmaram S'astri summarises the earlier views in his article, 'Sāhityas'astre Tātparyavṛttih', —

Sāhityāstreasantah kṛvyena vā tātparyavruttir-śevādaṁ. 

Bhattacharāyaḥ kṛvyena vā tātparyavruttir-śevādaṁ. 

Dhvanī is the touch-stone of poetry according to him.

Most of the literary commentators after Anandavardhana show the threefold dhvani in the work on which they are commenting. For example, Rājehavabhatta shows dhvani in the stanzas of Sākuntala and Tripurārṇi points out the examples of rasadhvani in the Sūlakīnīdevī.

A stanza, praising Anandavardhana, is found in the Sūktimuktāvalī of Jalhana.

Thus Anandavardhana's dhvani theory was upheld by most of the later rhetoricians and Kuntaka was neglected by them. There is a close similarity, as we have seen in this chapter, between the two theories, dhvani and rakrakta. Their approach to find out the poetic beauty is similar though the medium is different. Both the theories finally
are related to kavi-pratibha. Ānandavardhana reaches pratibha through rasa which is suggested, and Kuntaka through poetic expression (vaṣṭi-dhyāna-bhangī-bhāpita). While Ānandavardhana's dhyāni postulates an important principle underlying rasa, Kuntaka completely ignores it and he himself adopting Bharata's terminology of rasa in its literal aspect. One cannot say, therefore, that Kuntaka has any contribution to make to the aesthetic philosophy of rasa. What is lost in aesthetic philosophy is more than made up by his gift for practical analysis. T. Venkatacarya aptly says,

"Kuntaka's is an indispensable work and is a great contribution in the field of literature of Sanskrit Poetics."