One of the great prasthānas of Sanskrit Poetics is what we might call 'Dhvani', particularly rasa-dhvani, Prasthāna. It is therefore natural that the topics of Vyañjanē-dhvani and rasa should have been discussed by many modern scholars. However, as far as my knowledge goes, no one has discussed in detail, the origin and development of these two topics and their inter-relation in a connected form. It has been my humble attempt to do this work in the present thesis.

In Dhvanyāloka, we find the dhvani theory in its fully developed form. At Dhv.I.2 we are told (1) that the 'artha' or sense which is the soul of poetry, is of two kinds viz., vācyā or expressed and pratiyamāna or implied. It is this pratiyamāna artha which is regarded as the soul of poetry (Dhv.I.5)(2), though Abhinava would allow this honour to that pratiyamāna sense alone which conveys rasa. (3). In Dhv.I.7., we are told (4) that this pratiyamāna sense is not understood merely by the knowledge of grammar or logic, but it is known only ṃana by those who know the essence of poetry. Thus, Dhv. indicates a verbal process in poetry which is only grasped by the aesthetics of poetry. So, what one has to find out in great poetry is this 'Vyañjyārtha' or the suggested sense, and the word that is capable of shedding light on it. When in a poem, this verbal process of vyañjanē predominatnantly engages the mind, it is called 'dhvani' or 'dhvanikāvyā' by the sūris or sages. Ānanda says that the soul of poetry is dhvani (kāvyasyātmē dhvaniḥ-Dhv.I.1). Here dhvani is a synonym of vyañjyārtha. But he also says (Dhv.I.13) and Mammata follows him, that a poem in which dhvani predominates is called dhvanikāvyā (kāvyavis'ēṣaḥ sa dhvaniriti sūribhiḥ kathitaḥ) (Dhv.I.13). Here dhvani is a characteristic of a poem which is classified by Mammata as uttama-idamuttamam atis'ayini vyañjyē vācyat dhvanirbuñjdhaili kathitaḥ(K.P.I.). Thus in one sense, dhvani is a characteristic of a poem in which vyañjyārtha predominates.

From Dhv.I.1, we have to infer that Ānandavardhana does not regard himself to be the first to promulgate this theory. As we learn from the
introducing portion of the Dhv., this theory was a subject of great controversy amongst the learned critics of Sanskrit poetry. The very first verse informs us that though the wise have ordained that the soul of poetry is dhvani, still, some say that there is nothing like dhvani, while others say that it is something secondary in a poem, and still others maintain that the essence of dhvani is something beyond words (Dhv.I.i). (5).

Unfortunately however, we do not find any work earlier that Dhv., which treats of dhvani in this fashion. So, I have attempted in this thesis to find out, if possible, the earlier background of this theory,

The theorists of poetry or writers on poetics in Sanskrit were primarily, as it should be, concerned with the nature and functions of poetry. Poetry, however, is an art which uses human speech as its medium. Therefore, these writers thought it proper to concern themselves with word and whatever it conveys, i.e., the various meanings, particularly the emotive suggestions in contrast with its direct or scientific meaning. In other words, they considered what is called a modern logic, the scientific and the emotive uses of language (Sunsane stebbing. Introduction of Logic). This has led to the theory of abhidhā, lakṣanā and vyāñjanā in Sanskrit poetics.

According to Ānand, there are three types of dhvani viz. vastudhvani, alaṁkāradhvani and rasadhvani. But vastu and x alaṁkāra dhvanis can also be conveyed by abhidhā. Rasadhvani, however, is exclusively conveyed by vyāñjanā. This vyāñjanā and rasa become intimately correlated. It appears that all the emphasis laid upon vyāñjanā is mainly for the purpose of rasa-convayance. In this way these two topics viz. vyāñjanā and rasa become, so to say, parts of a single theory. So, investigation (or inquiry into) in one topic remains incomplete with an investigation in the other topic. So, in the second part of my thesis, I have tried to study the origin and development of the concepts of rasa and the various theories advanced for its conveyance by different theorists (Part/III).

In the first part (Chs. I-IV) I have started with the references of dhvani and vyāñjanā in the Vedic literature including the
If panisads, starting with Rgveda. After that I proceed to Nirukta, Rk-prātis'ākhya, Astādhyāyī of Pāṇini and Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali.

It may be noted that we fail to come across the words 'vyanjana, 'pratīyamāna' as such in the Rv. The word dhvani also does not occur in the Rv. We will see, however, that we do come across different forms of the root Vdhvan in Hv. and also of the word 'dhvani' in Av. But these occur in the usual sense of 'sound' and do not have the technical sense of dhvani as seen in Sanskrit Poetics.

However, we do come across different forms of the root Vāj, and Vi+Vāj, such as ajyate, ajyase, ajyamān, vya jyate, vyanjate, etc. A careful study of the different occurrences of Vāj in its various grammatical forms shows that it seems to carry principally the meaning viz. (i) 'to anoint', with a view to embellish; the second stage being that of embellishment proper; and (ii) 'to shine'. Its use with the prefix 'vi' is in the sense of 'to shine forth', 'to glitter', etc. The idea seems to be to enhance the glitter of something by the application of some ingredient, the stages being first anointing and then the consequential embellishment and the general meaning of adding zest to a thing, and this adding zest, by means of revealing the hidden meaning of a thing. Moreover, the survey of the occurrences of vi+Vāj in the Vedas shows two connected meanings, viz. to bring out something hidden, or the application or enhancement of something, to brighten, to embellish, to decorate, to adorn, to display. I have similarly studied all such occurrences of Vāj, Vi+Vāj, Vāhvan and dhvani in the Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta, Pāṇini and Patañjali.

The Nighaṇṭu does not contain Vāj and Vi+Vāj in any grammatical form. There are certain occurrences of Vāj in the Nirukta, but this is only by way of explaining the Vedic mantras quoted therein, and we fail to come across any new shades of meaning other than those already found in the Vedas. Nor do we find any occurrences of Vāhvan or the word dhvani in earlier the Nighaṇṭu or the Nirukta. However, at 7.15 in the Nirukta, we have 'vyanjanaśtram' in the sense of 'more indication'. Vyanjana here means an indicator. This seems to be the earliest occurrence of 'vyanjana' in the sense of 'indication'. Similarly, in Ch.I. (Nirukta), Yāska cites the opinion of Gṛṣya who holds that upasargas
are not meaningful by themselves but they serve to suggest or indicate the
relation of nāma and ākhyāyata with a particular meaning. Says Gargya:

nirāobbhaṁ karmapasamyogadyotakāṁ upasargāṁ arthāṁ nīrāhah. nīmākhyāyastu
karmopasamyogadyotakāṁ bhavanti. Thus, it seems, Yaska comes very near to the
power of dyotana or suggestion. We know that in the kāvyas'āstra the word
dyotana is used as an equivalent of vyanjana. Thus these early occurrences of
the VākJ and vi+VākJ and vyanjana foreshadow the later technical use in
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In the Pāṇinī also, there is no mention of vyaṅjana or Spūta or dhvani as such. We
come across 'vyaṅjana' in the technical sense of a consonant. But at Pā. II. i,
34-vyaṅjanaupasikte, the explanation given is: 'Dadhā upasikte dādhikem'.
Thus vyanjana is anything that is used to enhance the relish of the main or
principal object of eating. We come across the same use of the term vyanjana
in the Mātyas'āstra, wherein Bharata cites the analogy of Šāḍavādirasa (Mā.
S'a. Ch. VI). This can have an important bearing on the vyaṅjana-vāda of the
ālamkārikas. In Patañjali also, we do come across occurrences of different
forms of VākJ and vi+VākJ and also Spūta and dhvani. But the term dhvani
occurs in the sense of sound only. The word vyaṅjana by itself is missing
even here. At VIII.1.70, in the Mahābāhāgya it is observed, 'Vyaṅjye anta anena iti
vyaṅjana'. Thus vyaṅjana is that which reveals or manifests or brings
something into light. This sense of prākāśana is noteworthy, especially
from the point of view of the vyaṅjana-vāda.

I have also studied the occurrences of VākJ and vi+VākJ in works of
eyearly poets such as Āśvaghoṣa, Mahādēsa and also Bhāsa, the supposed author
of the thirteen Trivendram plays. Literary criticism follows literature. So,
I have tried to note certain important occurrences in these poets, which
could have inspired the Sanskrit poeticians in the formation of the theory
of vyaṅjana and dhvani. For example, Pā Ca. IV. 84 reads:

'upeṇamamido mā kāyaṁ saunāravvyajjakaṁ tvayi'. Herein a vakya is said to
Similarly in Kalidasa's Meghaduta (pūrva, 29) we have:

"Saubhāgyam te subhaga viraḥvasthayā vyānjayantī. This is the description of the river Nirvindhyā. As Mallinātha explains, the nāyakaṁyikābhāva is clearly suggested here. Moreover, Kumāra VII. 91 reads:

tān sandhīṣu vyānjī tāvatibhedam
rasāntareṣu pratiḥṛdayam... etc.

This has a clear reference to the concepts of vyānjana and rasa. Instances can be multiplied. One fact emerges out of this, and it is that the Ālampārikas might have found much in this to draw upon.

Ānandavardhana and Mammata make it clear that the original inspiration for the theory of vyānjana comes from the Sphota-doctrine of the grammarians (6). So, I have tried to investigate this relationship. I have based my suty on the original works such as the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali and the Vākyapādiya of Bhartṛhari, etc. as well as the exposition of Sphota in the works of scholars like P. C. Chakravarty and Gaurinath Shastri. I have tried to draw as many as nine important points to justify the statement of Ānanda and Mammata that the Sphota doctrine is their original source of inspiration for the dhvani-theory (ch. 4)(sandhe sūtra).

As vyānjana is one of the s'abdavṛtti, and as a general discussion on s'abdavṛttis forms an important part, particularly in later Sanskrit Poetics, I have thought it proper to discuss these topics also in detail (chs. VI -XII, Sec. XI, Part I).

In these chapters, I have not only discussed the nature and scope of different s'abdavṛttis, but also the recognition of these by different schools of thought such as the Vaiṭkaraṇas, Mīmāṁsakas, Vaiṣṇavas, etc. I have also discussed the topics of word and its import, and word and its relation with meaning. In these chapters, I have consulted the original works; yet I am particularly indebted to the works of P. C. Chakravarty and Prof. Devasthali.
In Ch. 3 (Part I), I have tried to study the exact recognition of different s'abdavrttis in the works of early poeticians such as Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, etc. It should be noted, however, that in the works of these authors, we do not come across a systematic discussion of the nature and scope of the s'abdavṛttis, as is seen in the works of later authors on alamkāras such as Kāmata, Hemacandra, Vis'vanātha etc. However, we meet with passages which go to show that the authors were familiar with the ideas of functions of word. Bhāmaha has discussed the nature of word and has tried to refute the Sphoṭavāda. Bhāmaha's familiarity with the functions other than vyañjana is quite apparent as shown by me in the thesis (Ch. 3, ES). As to his familiarity with vyañjana, we may say that vyañjana does not occupy the same place as abhidhā in his mind, i.e., he does not seem to have known vyañjana as a separate vṛtti. He, however, uses different forms of viśvañj with the later meaning of vyañjana at different places. As in Bhāmaha, so also in Daṇḍin, we do not come across any mention of vyañjana as such by name. However, we come across different forms of root viśvañj in the sense of 'to suggest'. We also come across the term 'pratiyate' meaning 'is implied'. We come across clear references to laksana or gaunī. Vāmana very often refers to bhakti, laksana, or gaunārtha and upaśāra. But he also does not mention vyañjana by name. He seems to touch vyañjana only indirectly.

In Udātha there are some direct and indirect references to the different vṛttis including 'avagamana' (kāvyālamkāra, Udātha). The meaning of 'avagamana' is very near to vyañjana.

In Rudrata, we come across direct and indirect references to abhidhā and laksanā and also indirect references to vyañjana. Thus we see that in these early authors from Bhāmaha to Rudrata, we do find references in their works which go to indicate that the idea of vyañjana was not absent in their minds, though we cannot say that they have clearly visualised it, much less defined it. It should be noted however, that the charm that comes out of vyañjana is recognised by these earlier authors in different alamkāras such as peryāyokta,
The exponents of dhvani school like Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Ruyyaka and Jagannātha say that the earlier writers such as Bhamaha, Dandin, etc., though without clearly defining dhvani, had subsumed it under various guṇas and alamkāras. An element of implicit sense can be seen in the treatment of different guṇas and alamkāras in the earlier authors, but I have, however, found no explicit recognition of dhvani as observed by Ānanda, Abhinava, etc. So, my submission is that even if an element of implicit sense in different alamkāras and guṇas treated by the early poeticists, and thus even if vyanjana is seen subsumed under this, it should not be taken as a proof that the theory of vyanjana or dhvani was clearly recognised by Bhamaha, Dandin, etc.

After thus far studying the problem of the origin and development of the concept of vyanjana-dhvani, I have attempted a study of the origin and development of the concept of rasa in Part II of my thesis which covers Chs. VI-IX. I have already referred to the probability that the importance attached to vyanjana and dhvani in Sanskrit poetics is more or less due to its being the sole conveyor of rasa.

I have studied the occurrences of rasa in the Vedas and the Upaniṣads and in the Nirukta and the Bhaddevatā. I have also studied the occurrences of rasa in the works of both Pāṇini and Patañjali. Then I have studied the occurrences of the word rasa in different senses in the works of early poets such as Vṛṣabhāsya, Bhasa and Kalidāsa, and then I have noted the view of Bharata. (ch. VIII)

After this, I have studied the approach of the early ālāmkarikas such as Bhamaha, Dandin, etc., to the problem of rasa. The method of approach is similar to that in case of dhvani and vyanjana in Part I.

In the course of my study, I have tried to indicate as many as nine interesting points with reference to the use of the word rasa in various senses in the Rv. We find the word rasa in the Vedas, not only as signifying something liquid but we also find the qualities of joy-giving, tastefulness,
exhilaration, being the essence of the Vedas, etc. Thus rasa in the Vedas becomes an object of relish, a joy-giving essence, etc.

The Naśaśā (Ch. I. 17) says that the fact of rasa in Nāṭya is derived from the fāya Av. Abhinava tries to explain this in a rather obscure way. But I have tried to explain this in a different way. It should be noted however, that though the word rasa occurs at several places in the Av., we have no clear case of the later meaning of nāṭyarasa or kāvya-rasa in it. From another point of view, we may say that several hymns of the Av. taken by themselves are impressive love lyrics, their ritualistic application notwithstanding. The number of such hymns is about thirty. I have tried to suggest that the attempt to correlate nāṭyarasa or kāvya-rasa to Av. is not justifiable from this point of view.

In the Upanisads however, we see that the word rasa occurs also in the sense of essence of the universe and the Taittirīya U. identifies atman with rasa-raso vai saḥ. In the Chandogya, rasa is a synthetic product of many ingredients. In the Nirukta and the Brhaddevata I have not found anything useful for my purpose.

Thus, the different ideas associated with the word rasa in the Vedas and the Upanisads have implicit in them the idea of aesthetic taste as well and the term rasa might have been used in the sense of aesthetic taste also as may be seen in the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali (Ch. VII). In Ch. VII, I have tried to study the occurrences of ṛgas, or the word rasa in the works of Pāṇini and Patañjali. In the dhatupātha ṛgas is seen in the sense 'to make sound', 'liquification', and 'to taste'. In Pā. V. 2. 95- 'rasādibhyas'ca, the meaning of rasa according to Pāṇini is not clear. The Mahābhāṣya seems to suggest that the meaning here is different and illustrates it by using the expression 'rasiko naṭah', in which the aesthetic sense of rasa is quite clear. The Kas'īkā here explains that the matup suffix is ordinarily to be used in respect of the qualities grasped by senses, but in case of 'rasiko naṭah' or 'rūpinī apsarasaḥ', the idea is to
suggest not merely the rasa or rūpa apprehended by sense-organs, but sentiment or emotion and beauty respectively. The Tattvabodhini on the Śiddhānta-kaumudi makes this all the more clear when it says—rasikāṁ ityatāru ṛasaṁ s'abdṛvo gṛhyate na tu ṛasaṁgrāhyo guṇoḥ (pp. 305, NS. Ed. '53). From this we have to assume that this aesthetic sense of rasa might have been well established in usage, otherwise Patañjali could not have used the illustration of 'rasiko nāṭaḥ'.

Then, I have studied the occurrences of 'rasa' or ṛas in the works of early poets such as Āśvaghoṣa, Bhāsa and Kālidāsa. I have tried to suggest, quoting illustrations, that it is precisely such clear instances as explained in Ch. XVII, in the works of literary masters that might have been the original source of inspiration for theorists to formulate the rasa theories.

Ch. XVII clearly explains the views of Bharata as seen in M. S. In ch. 16 of M. S., dealing with the concepts of laksana, guṇa, dosa, and alamkāra, it is stated (vs. 113-114) that the guṇas and the alamkāras have Ṛ to be used in poetry in consonance with the delineation of different rasas. Here, it may be noted, rasa is visualised in connection with poetry, in addition to nāṭya.

Ch. XIX studies the ideas of rasa as seen in the works of early poeticians such as Bhāma, Daṇḍin etc. I have observed that the earlier alamkārikas such as Bhāma, Daṇḍin etc. do not totally ignore the fact of rasa. But they try to incorporate it under alamkāra, a source of charm in poetry. Daṇḍin is more elaborate in his treatment than Bhāma. Udbhāta also seems to be better informed about the concept of rasa and is probably the first to take rasa as svasaabdavāya. One point is clear that in all these authors the ultimate 'alamkāra' seems to be kāvya itself; rasa being only an alamkāra, a kāvya's obhākaradharma.

In Vāmana and Rudrāta, we notice a new trend of incorporating rasa, bhāva, etc. under guṇa, the essential or eternal quality of kāvya (nityadharma). For Rudrāta the number of rasas is not just eight or nine. In fact all the bhava-samabhava-sam-bhāvāndbhāva.
bhāvas can be enhanced to the capacity of rasa. Ānandvardhana, with his theory of vyāšjana and dhvani gives a new orientation to the entire theme of rasa. Abhinava elaborates the position.

Thus far I have traced the two streams of thought, one pertaining to s'abdaafrttis, with particular reference to vyāshjana and dhvani, and the other pertaining to the origin and development of the concept of rasa and other cognate ideas. In the Dhv. we find these two currents meeting and merging with each other and bringing forth an integrated theory of rasa and dhvani.

So, in Part III of my thesis, comprising chapters, I have studied the theory of rasa and dhvani from the point of view of its development. This includes topics such as 'dhvani and rasa in Ānandavardhana', 'classification of poetry', 'the pūrvapakṣa against vyāshjana in Ānanda', 'some anti-dhvani theorists', 'dhvani in Abhinavagupta', 'rasa experience as in Lollāta, S'ākhuka, etc.', 'rasa-realisation in Abhinava', and 'some other writers on rasa such as Dhanaviṣaya, Dānāśika, Bhoja, Nātyadarpanākāra, Nāmāta, Hemacandraga, Vis'vanātha and Jagannātha.

'Rasa and Dhvani in Ānanda' forms the subject of this chapter. This is done in a novel and all-composing fashion. Ānanda does not discard the other elements of poetry such as alamkāra, gūpa, etc., mentioned by early authors such as Bhamaha and the like. Another point worth noting is that here we come to understand how the rasa-theory which originated with rūpakas or with nāṭya became generally a topic for all varieties of poetry. We have seen that Bhamaha, Daṇḍin and others clearly emphasise the element of rasa in the mahākāvyas and kathās, the two important varieties of prabandha kāvyā. But Ānanda makes the importance of rasa more comprehensive or universal in all the varieties of poetry of which prabandha is only one. Thus we may say that as far as our knowledge goes, it is in Ānanda that we find the element of rasa becoming the soul of all poetry, a thing which Vis'vanātha in his famous utterance vis'raṣṭāmakaṃ kāvyam, makes more explicit. It may be remarked that the concept of rasa was extended even to non-literary arts such as painting,
sculpture, music and dance. (See Vis'udharmottara purYa.)

Chh. describes the three-fold classification of poetry by Anandavardhana. He however refrains from calling it uttama, madhyama and avara or citra. In ch. I have discussed how Ananda refutes the purvapakS against vyanjana in the Dhv. In doing so he refutes the abhavavādins first and clearly distinguishes between vyanjana and abhidyā, vyanjana and tātparya, vyanjana and lakṣaṇa and vyanjana and anumāna. He also refutes the Naiyāyikas.

While starting the exposition of dhvani as expounded in Dhv., we raised the question of the earlier writers who did not accept dhvani and against whose views Ananda was trying to establish his theory. We noted that we have not been able to discover specific works or authors who hold views opposed to the dhvani theory. Consequently, we relied upon Dhv. and Locana for those views. We do, however, find works posterior to Dhv. in which carry on their polemics against the dhvani theory. In order to complete the discussion on dhvani I have also taken up a critical consideration of these works also.

Among these works, we come across the AVM of Mukulabhāṭṭa, VJ of Kuntaka, BR. of Dhanañjaya with Avaloka of Dhanika, VJ.V. of Mahima Bhāṭṭa and Sr.Pra. of Bhōja.

Mukula seems to incorporate implicit sense under lakṣaṇa which is only a part of abhidhā for him. For Kuntaka, vakrokti is vicitṛ abhidhā. He subsumes implicit sense partly under abhidhā and partly under lakṣaṇa. Kuntaka has also given much importance to rasa. I have tried to evaluate his position critically. Kuntaka, with his theory of vakrokti or a striking mode of speech differing from the transcending the ordinary everyday mode of speaking about a thing, and such that it charms by the skill of the poet, seems to comprehend all the sources of charm in poetry, beginning with alamkāra and ending with dhvani and rasa. For him, even dyotaka and vyañjaka words, on account of their quality of the ability to give
meaning-expressive of meaning, metaphorically. Thus broadly speaking, Kuntaka may be termed an antarbhūvavādīn and a bhaktivādīn to a certain extent.

In the fourth prakāśā of the Dīr., the authors touch the problem of rasāmabhūti or the experience of sentiment in poetry. Dhanika's elaborate commentary brings out their views clearly. They accept the fact of rasādī but they fail to accept the proposition that rasādīs are conveyed by vyañjana. They accept bhāvyabhāvaka relation between rasādīs and kāvyā. They are of the opinion that the vyañjya or suggestion of the dhvanivādīs can be explained with the help of tātparya s'akti or purport alone. Vis'vanātha in his SD. tries to refute the tātparyavādīs. It seems, however, that the controversy lies in name only.

Māhimabhāṭṭa has pointed out as many as ten blemishes in the definition of dhvani as given by Ānanda. I have tried to evaluate his arguments critically and have shown that some of the faults as pointed out by him are of a formal nature, while others may be taken as a fundamental nature and so bearing upon his theory of kāvyānumīti. It may be noted that he has this much justification in his view that the indirect thoughts and feelings arising out of the direct meaning can be psychologically regarded as of an inferential nature. This however, is in no sense a logical amūmāna or inference and even Māhīma laughs at those who want kāvyānumīti to be tūkānumīti!

As for Bhōja, the authors of S.K.A. and S'p.Pra., Dr. De seems to suggest that he (i.e. Bhōja) does not accept the dhvani theory of Ānanda. Dr. Raghvān tries to refute him. But, it may be noted that, in the S.K.A. and S'p.Pra., there are alamkāras and guṇas which embody vyañjana. This however, does not make him a vyañjanāvādīn, though, as Dr. Raghvān suggests, Bhōja can be taken as an antarbhāvavādīn.

A critical review of the opponents of the dhvani school shows that they are not opposed to pratiyamānatā or implied sense as a source of charm in poetry. The difference, however, arises as to how this implication
there in poetry. The difference, however, arises as to how this implication is grasped. Ananda regards this as one of the functions of word, but this function is not, according to him, fulfilled by either abhidhā or laksanā. He therefore posits a third function of word viz. vyāñjanā. His opponents see no necessity of adding a third function of word because the implied sense can be grasped by the inferential processes of thought, and by meanings, yielded through abhidhā and laksanā. So far them, to accept vyāñjanā would lead to what is called gaureva doṣa. Thus the question resolves itself into the acceptance or non-acceptance of this additional function of word. Modern logicians who discuss the function of language do accept what they call the emotive use of language in addition to its scientific function. The various emotive associations that a word has, become, so to say, prominent in poetic language. But if one considers the psychological process of the emotive function, one has to agree that they are of an inferential type. In fact, as Mamata says, those who experience and enjoy rasa have to be keen in the inference of sthāyin-(loke prameśādhitiḥ sthāyeyamantaḥ bhyaśapātavatām...etc."K.P.IV.26). Thus it is not impossible to reconcile both the opposing views.

In the next chapter (i.e. Ch. XTVI), I have considered the views of Abhinavagupta on dhvani. Abhinavagupta follows the Dhv.in his theories on dhvani and rasa. His two important works on this subject are his commentary on Dhv. known as Locana and his commentary on the Na. S. of Bharata, known as Nāṭyavedavivṛti or Abhinavabharati. The merit of his work lies in clear elaboration and at times subtle explanation and original insights to a certain extent. He was a great philosopher of the pratīyabhijnā School.

As Locana and the Abh. are com.m.s, much of their content is naturally the same as that of Dhv. and Na. S. For the same reason, much of their treatment is bound to be piece-meal. In the discussion of the contents of Dhv. and Na. S., I have, as far as possible, confined myself to the works themselves. Here, while considering Abhinava's Com.m.s, I have noted the points which have been clarified, elaborated and sometimes improved upon
by him. In the treatment of these points some repetition has been unavoidable though I have tried to avoid it as far as possible. As noted just now, the treatment of various topics in these commentaries, particularly in Locana, is piece-meal, and so, in order to give a coherent and critical account, I have brought together passages bearing on the same topic and tried to give a connected account (Chs. XXVII and XXVIII).

In Chs. XXVII and XXVIII, I have tried to discuss the views on rasa-experience as explained by Lollaṭa, Śeṅkuka, BhāṭṭaHāyaka and Abhinavagupta. The views of the former i.e. Lollaṭa, Śeṅkuka and BhāṭṭaHāyaka, are put forth by me as clearly and precisely on the basis of the presentation of their views by Abhinavagupta. In doing this, I have not only consulted the original sources but I have fully utilised the excellent work of Gnoli and Dr. K.C. Pandey.

Different Scholars have tried to correlate the views of these ācāryas such as Bhāṭṭa Lollaṭa, Śeṅkuka, etc. with different schools of thought. I have tried to show that excepting Abhinavagupta, nothing definite can be stated with reference to the rest. As nirvīgā samvīt and cāmākāra are central to the concept of Rasa in Abhinava’s theory, I have tried to explain these terms in the light of pratyabhijñā philosophy. (Ch.-XXVII)

In Chs. XXVIII, XXIX, and XXX, I have tried to record the views of some other writers on rasa. This covers the works of Bhānākṛtya and Dhanika, Bhoja and Rāmchandra and Guṇacandra, and also Mammaṭa, Hemacandra, Vis’vanātha and Jagannātha. I have taken up Bhānākṛtya, Dhanika, Bhoja and the authors of ND together because they have something novel, something different from the kashmirian tradition to record, while Mammaṭa, Hemacandra, Vis’vanātha and Jagannātha follow the lead of Abhinavagupta. I have tried to put this in a critical way though of course, as for Bhoja, my thanks are due to the excellent work of Dr. Raghvan. The last chapter gives the résumé.

In the résumés I have tried to correlate the conclusions reached in different chapters and present a connected account of the theory of vyeṣṭi-chvāni-rasa. I have tried to make clear how Abhinava has incorporated...
in his theory the views of his opponents. I have also shown how the concept of rasa developed from its form of category of aesthetic experience to the stature of the higher spiritual experiences of the bhaktas.

As mentioned in the beginning of this statement, dhvani-vyanjanam and rasa are much discussed subjects by modern writers on Sanskrit Poetics. It will be therefore, presumptuous on my part to say that I have discovered something absolutely new. However I humbly submit that the following points worked out in detail in this thesis are, as far as my knowledge goes, new in treatment and interpretation.

(i) The sort of detailed discussion of the occurrences of Vāṇj, Vi+Vāṇj, Vāhnvan and dhvani in the Vedas, Nirukta, Rk. Prāṇa, Aṣṭādhyāyī and Mahābhāsya, and the literary works of early poets such as As'vaghoṣa, Bhāsa and Kālidāsa is attempted for the first time and this (Ch. III) I humbly submit, is one part of my contribution to knowledge.

(ii) I have tried to explain the relationship between the theory of Sphoṭa and the theory of dhvani, in Ch. II (see, Part- I) by advancing as many as nine important points.

(iii) In Ch. VI, I have tried to discuss the recognition of different s'abda-vṛttis in the works of early ālamkārikas such as Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin etc.

(iv) In Ch. VI. I have tried to discuss the recognition of pratiyamāna sense in the works of early poeticians such as Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin etc.

(v) In Ch. VII. I have tried to point out nine interesting points with reference to 'rasa' as seen in the Vedas. The investigation, so far as I know, is in much greater detail as compared to earlier efforts by different scholars.

Then,

(vi) In Ch. VII I have tried to study the occurrences of Vṛṣas and rasa in the works of Pāṇini and Patañjali. In the Mahābhāsya, I feel I have pointed out for the first time, that we come across an expression viz. 'rasikā ṇaṭah' which clearly suggests that rasa in its aesthetic sense was known to Patañjali and must have been in vogue much earlier. (Ch. VII).
(vii) In ch. VII I have tried to suggest how actual practice in the literary works such as those of As'vaghoṣa, Bhasha etc., might have influenced the theorists to formulate their theories of rasa. (ch. VII)

(viii) In ch. XIV, I have tried to put the views of Bharata in a precise and clear way, and have also suggested that Bharata also thought of rasa with reference to poetry-kavya-as well, and not with reference to nāṭya alone.

(ix) In ch. XIX, I have attempted an investigation into the treatment of rasa by Bhamaha, Dandin, etc.

(x) In ch. XX, I have tried to put the ideas on rasa and dhvani as found in the Dhv. of Anandavardhana. I have tried to present the whole matter in a critical and comprehensive way and have tried to evaluate the arguments for and against vyañjanā critically.

(xi) In a similar way, I have tried to present the ideas of some anti-dhvani theorists (ch. XXI) in a critical and comprehensive way.

(xii) Chs. XXII and XXIII present the views of Abhinava on dhvani in a coherent way. Whatever is found in the form of a piece-meal treatment is taken up by me and arranged in a connected way so as to evolve a distinct pattern.

I have also attempted to present as clear and precise an account as possible of the views of Lollāṭa, S'ānikaka, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and Abhinavagupta in chs. XIX, XXIII, XXIV, and tried to see whether these can be correlated to some 'darsana'.

(xiii) In chs. XXV, XXVI and XXVII, I have tried to present the views of some other important writers on rasa, such as Dhanaśīyā, Dhanika, Bhoja, Rāmacandra and Gunacandra, Mamata, Ramaśrī, Visvanātha and Jagannātha. I have tried to give a critical account of these authors.

All this, I humbly claim is my contribution to knowledge. ✓
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