

Vol.no. XCIV(no.4)
Oct–Dec 2019

The Vedic Path
**Quarterly Journal of Vedic
Indological & Scientific Research**

Peer-reviewed Research Journal

ISSN 0970-1443

Registration no. 29063/76

indexed at

www.worldcat.org

Guide to Indian Periodical Literature

**Originally published as *The Vedic Magazine*
form 1906 to 1935
and thereafter as *The Vedic Path***

Editor: Prof. Shrawan K Sharma

www.thevedicpath.in

thevedicpath@gkv.ac.in

+91-9412074666

Quarterly Journal of English
Gurukula Kangri Vishwavidyalaya
Haridwar, Uttarakhand, India

Functional Philosophy of the *Dhvani* Theory

Shrawan K Sharma

Professor of English

Gurukula Kangri Vishwavidyalaya, Haridwar 249 404(UK)

email: drshrawan@gmail.com

Abstract

Ānandavardhana perceived that what gave shape and meaning to word was *dhvani* (suggestion). He was trying to say that meaning in a composition was revealed through *dhvani*. This was the main consideration which prompted Ānandavardhana to interpret the earlier theories of rasa (sentiment), *alañkāra* (figures), *rīti* (phrasal organization) and *guṇa* (quality) which were concerned with the empirical and external comprehension of *kāvya* (literature) and also the earlier *śabdaśakti* (semantic powers) *abhidhāśakti*, (the primary or denotative power) and *lakṣṇāśakti* (the secondary) which were concerned with the denotative meaning and connotative or indicated meaning). He found these theories and semantic powers inadequate to form the final meaning of *kāvya* (a literary composition) and so he propounded the theory of *dhvani* (suggestion) in his treatise *Dhvanyāloka* (9thc). The present paper aims at demonstrating the working of *dhvani* in literature with illustrations from English literature in order to answer the questions raised above.

Keywords : *dhvani*, *alañkāra*, *rasa*, *rīti*, *abhidhā*, *lakṣṇā*, *vyañjanā*, *vācyārtha*, *vyañgyārtha*.

Before Ānandavardhana's *dhvani* theory, there were three important literary theories—the *rasa* theory, the *alañkāra* theory and the *rīti* theory. The *rasa* theory was propounded by Bharata (2nd century B.C.) in his treatise *Nāṭyaśāstra*, based on empirical aspects of *Nāṭya* (drama) in his *Nāṭyaśāstra* saying: “*vibhāvanu-bhāvavyabhicārisamīyoga-drasanicpattiḥ*” (the savouring of the sentiment is possible through the combination or integration of *vibhāva* (causes and determinants of the rise of a sentiment), *anubhāva* (the visible effects or gestures) and *vyabhicāribhāva* (transitory emotion). According to him, each of us is fitted with a built-in structure of *sthāyībhāvas* (basic mental states or basic sentiments) which are the modified forms of basic drives or instincts as a result of centuries of evolutionary process of humanization and social living. These *sthāyībhāvas*, which are chiefly eight in number, are heightened to *rasadaūā* (a relishable state) by the poet so that we have one *rasa* corresponding to each of them. Thereafter, Bhāmaha (6th Century) in his *Kāvyaālañkāra*, defining *kāvya* (literature) as *śabdārttau sahitau kāvyam* (togetherness of word and meaning is literature) considered *alañkāra* (figure) as the most essential element of *kāvya*. Udbhata (8th—9th century) in his treatise *Kāvyaālañkāra-sāra-saṅgraha* was delineated *rasas* in relation to *alañkāras*. Similarly, Vāmana (8th—9th century) in his *Kāvyaālañkāra* focused on *viśiṣṭa padracanā* (a particular arrangement of words and phrase) in his *rīti* theory, considering *rīti* (phrasal organization) as the benefactor of *rasas* and *bhāvas*. Thus all these aestheticians were concerned with the empirical and external comprehension of *kavya*.

At the level of meaning it was generally agreed before Ānandavardhana that words had sort of semantic powers, *abhidhāśakti*, (the primary or denotative power) and

lakṣṇāśakti, *guṇavṛtti*, *bhakti*, *upcāra*, (the secondary or connotative or indicated power). The school of ritualists founded by Kumarila held that there existed a third power, *tātparyāśakti* which furnished a final meaning. Ānandavardhana dropping *tātparyāśakti* added *vyañjanāśakti* or *vyañjakatva* (suggestive power) to furnish a final meaning. Thus in his theory he accepted three power of words *abhidhāśakti*, *lakṣṇāśakti*, and *vyañjanāśakti* or *vyañjakatva*. He explained them by talking of two kind of usages of language: the language of *kāvya* and the language outside *kāvya*. The first is referential or conventional and the second is metaphorical or implicit. At the level of meaning, these two usages are not very far from each other. The first is *vācyārtha* the second is *lakṣyārtha* or *bhākta*. The third meaning is *vyañjanā* which is a contextual meaning, not solely dependent on words. According to him, this *vyañjanā* is latent in both *abhidhā* and *lakṣṇā*. He defined *vyañjanā* or *dhvani* as a contextual meaning, not solely dependent on words. Jaganntha adds here that meaning does not come always from words alone. There are other factors where they are ascertained. In case of words having more than one sense these factors play an important role in conveying the intended sense (*Rasagaṅgādhara* 147). Bhartṛhari enumerates categorically these factors:

saṁyoga (association), *viprayoga* (separation), *sāhacarya* (concomitant), *virodhita* (opposition), *artha* (purpose), *prakaraṇa* (context), *liṅga* (symbol), *sannidhi* (proximity,) *sāmarthyā* (capability), *aucitya* (propriety), *deśa* (place), *kāla* (time), *vyakti* (person), *svara* (intonation).

Vākyapadiya II, 317-318.

It is because of these factors, *vyañjanā* or *dhvani* may arouse a negative meaning when the statement in conventional language is positive or vice-versa. It may give rise to meaning, which is neither positive nor negative when the statement is clearly positive or negative. It also may give rise to a meaning quite different from that which the statement has for the addressed. Now the statement is meant for not the one, to whom it is addressed, but for the other with the person addressed. Thus nature of *vyañjanā* or *dhvani* is unique. There is an analogy of human body in order to understand the nature of *vyañjanā*. Human body has three aspects— *rūpa* (complexion), *saundarya* (form) and *lāvaṇya* (charm). *Rūpa* is complexion seen by eyes and it does not depend on ornaments. *Saundarya* stands for physique of a person, or parts of the body. And *lāvaṇya* is the consequence of *rūpa* and *saundarya* and depends on them but it is without them. The relation between them is also that of the lamp and its light. In order to get light, one takes the lamp, the wick, the fuel, and the match-box. Although the light is the consequence of the lamp, the wick, the fuel, and the match-box and so depends on them, yet it is away from them. Thus, *dhvani* is the power of revelation as of a lamp which reveals the object upon which it casts its light. Similarly, in order to arrive at the *vyañgyārtha*, the *sahṛdaya* approaches the *vācyārtha* (*Dhvanyāloka* I. 9).

Accepting *vyañjanā* as key to furnish the final meaning in *kāvya*, he built a new structure of literary theory on the foundation of thought of his predecessors Bharata, Bhāmaha, Udabhata and Vāmana and propounded the *dhvani* theory in his *Dhvanyāloka*, as a theory of suggested meaning in *kāvya*. The thesis of Ānandavardhana's theory is that *dhvani* is the quintessence of *kāvya* and *rasa* is the quintessence of *dhvani*. What is then *dhvani*? *Dhvani* is an exclusively poetic

feature concerned with exploiting the beauty of every element in the medium of language like *alañkāra*, *guṇa* and *rīti* to serve the ultimate artistic end of *rasa*. The beauty of *vācyārtha* and *lakṣyārtha* is an external aspect of poetic beauty. The internal beauty or soul is the *vyañgyārtha* or *dhvani* which was not explained by the earlier aestheticians. He modified the concept of *rasa* by saying that *rasa* is not stated. It is expressed due to the power of *vyañjanā*. Similarly, his concept of *ālañkāra* is also suggested and *guṇas* enhance charm. He gives a detailed account of *saṅgātana* (phrasal organization) which also suggest *rasas*. Thus *pāñcālī*, *vaidarbhī* and *gaudi* suggest different *rasas*.

Ānandavardhana calls “this power *dhvani* when in its purest form, that is, when it predominates over the other semantic powers in the sentence” (*The Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana with the Locana of Abhinavagupta* 15). He further says that “*dhvani* is that type of *kāvya* where the *vācyārtha* (primary or conventional meaning) loses its independent entity and suggests meaning i.e. *vyañgyārtha*. Here the *vācyārtha* being secondary enhances the *vyañgyārtha*. This type of *kāvya* is *uttama* (the first grade). This’s why, Ānandavardhana, considers *dhvani* to be the soul of literature, “*kāvyaśyātmā dhvanirīti*”(D.A. I,1.).

Ānandavardhana perceives that meaning in *kāvya* is revealed through *dhvani*. He explains it by saying that *dhvani* is a hint or an echo of something which it reveals to *sahṛdaya* at a particular moment of his consciousness during his interaction with *kāvya*. From there Ānandavardhana goes on to explain that the meaning which is revealed to the *sahṛdaya*, is according to his capacity yet a meaning to be revealed in the poem is different from its literal meaning as it contains *dhvani* or echo of poet’s experience of higher reality. No

doubt, each word or figure or image comes into being with a poet's perception of higher reality underlying them yet they are not part but fruits of the central experience of the poet. The relationship between the *vācyārtha* and the *vaṅgyārtha*, in fact, becomes what Ānandvardhana calls *sādhyasādhana-bhāva* (content revealing itself through the form).

Let us illustrate how *dhvani* works in *kāvya*. For this purpose a very famous statement of Antony in *Julius Caesar* has been taken:

ANTONIO: (to Romans)

They (Brutus, Cassius and other conspirators) are honorable men and Brutus is an honorable man.

Julius Caesar

Julius Caesar has been murdered. Brutus, Cassius and others hatched a conspiracy of his murder. It is the same Brutus who was a close and intimate friend of Caesar. They misguided the people and won their confidence. Antony, a friend of Caesar, is addressing the hostile audience. He intends to expose Brutus. So in the beginning he does not speak against Brutus but later when he has the mob on his side, he changes his tune. He made the statement "Brutus is an honorable man" The primary meaning of "Brutus is an honorable man" is: Brutus commands respect. He is a genuine person, a respectable person. Obviously, this meaning is inapplicable. So a secondary meaning is drawn: Brutus is not an honorable man. But this alone is not the purpose of using the word "honorable" Shakespeare could very well use the expression: "Brutus is not an honorable man" or "He is a dishonorable man" The preference for using that particular expression implies that the writer meant something more. Antony does not have intention to convey primary

meaning. The statement suggests not only dishonor but also the ungratefulness and treachery which are associated with Brutus. This tertiary or suggested meaning is brought out by the power of *vyañjanā*, which is identical with *dhvani*.

There is another example of *dhvani* taken from the same play:

BRUTUS: Get me a taper in my study, Lucius
When it is lighted, come and call me here.

LUCIUS: After sometime enters)
The taper burneth in your closet, sir
Searching the window for a flint.

Brutus sends his servant Lucius to light a candle in his room and then paces around his garden contemplating the conspiracy against Caesar. After sometime Lucius tells him: "The taper burneth in your closet, sir / Searching the window for a flint". Although the statement has intention of conveying primary meaning i.e., "the candle is burning in the study", yet it says something more suggestively. It suggests the sick condition of Brutus's sick heart in which there is conflict over the issue of hatching a conspiracy of Caesar's murder. Here *vācyārtha* the burning of taper is intentional and bears a concealed intention to show Brutus's sick heart. It is a reminder of the conspiracy that Brutus is hatching against Caesar. It also shows the conflict in Brutus over the issue of hatching a conspiracy of Caesar's murder.

In the first illustration, *abhidhā* is inapplicable. Rather it is *lakṣṇā* that is applicable but its *vācya* is not intended to be spoken. Here *vyañgyārtha* (suggested meaning) is brought out by *lakṣṇāmūladhvani*. In the second illustration, *abhidhā* is applicable. It is intended to be spoken but extends to something further. Here *vyañgyārtha* is brought out by *abhidhāmūladhvani*.

On the basis of such illustrations as given above, Ānandavardhana's typology of *dhvani* given in his *Dhvanyāloka* can be understood. Broadly, *dhvani* falls into two kinds: *avivakṣitavācya* (unintended expressed sense) and *vivakṣitānyaparavācya* (intended expressed sense but extending to something further).

Avivakṣitavācya is *lakṣṇāmūladhvani* because it depends on *sahakārīvarga* (the group conditions) like *sāmpīya sambandh* (mutual closeness), *sādrsya* (similarity), *samvāya* (association), *vaiparitya* (contrast), *kriyāyoga* (attribution) that bring *lakṣaṇā* into play. These conditions are *mukhyārthabādha* (suppression of meaning). Abinavagupta identifies *sahakārīvarga* as the agents which cause the shifting of the sense. Ānandavardhana divides *avivakṣitavācya* into two types: *arthāntarasamkramita* (partially expressed) and *atyantatiraskṛta* (completely set aside).

In *arthāntarasamkramita*, *vācyārtha* is not intended to be spoken partially. It remains in the background or subordinate position. It is transformed in the other meaning or shifted to something else. In it *pada* and *vākya* (sentence) play important role. Abhinavagupta holds that *samkramitavācya* is like the thread of a necklace, which is unnoticed property-possessor. Shelley's poem *Adonais* is an example of *arthāntarasamkramitavācya*. The poem is an elegy on the death of Keats. Keats was a handsome youth, a great poet. He was attacked by critics unreasonably and finally died in his youth. He lived on his sufferings caused by the attacks of critics. He has become immortal as his spirit and name echo through the ages in the form of poetry. These qualities cannot be conveyed by means of denotative function of words. Even if these qualities are conveyed by denotation one by one, they will not be had in one single act of cognition, they will

not be the source of a wondrous aesthetic experience and hence they will not give rise to great beauty. These qualities of Keats have been suggested through Adonais (Adonis). In Greek mythology, Adonis is a handsome youth who was loved by Aphrodite, the goddess of love and who was killed by a wild boar during a hunt. Aphrodite pleaded with the gods of the underworld, that Adonis could be released from death. According to the myth, he was allowed to live in the world but for half the year only. Adonis thus came to be associated with the cycle of the seasons and was worshipped as a god of fertility. Thus the point in using the name, Adonais here is to suggest the life of Keats. No doubt, the life of Keats has assumed countless forms but due to suggestion, their separateness is not clearly perceived. In this way they have become the source of a strikingly beautiful aesthetic pleasure that is analogous to the flavor of a wonderful drink or a cake where the individual ingredients cannot be separately tasted but yet add to the flavor of the final product.

In *atyantatiraskṛta*, *vācyārtha* is transformed in the other meaning or shifted to something else. In it the *vācyārtha* is completely lost or entirely set aside. In it also *pada* and *vākya* (sentence) play important role. The following is an example of *atyantatiraskṛta* from *Macbeth*

I have given suck, and know how tender it is
to love the babe that milks me—
I would, while it was smiling in my face,
Have plucked my nipple from his boneless gums,
And dashed the brains out, had I so sworn as you
Have done to this.

Macbeth Act 1sc 7

When Macbeth backs out on his promise to kill Duncan, she criticizing Macbeth tries hard to sound ruthless.

She says: “I have given suck, and know how tender it is/to love the babe that milks me—:” these are the words of Lady Macbeth describing her emotional bonding between her as a mother and her baby at the time of feeding. Then all of a sudden there is a change in her expression from love to ruthlessness when she says that [I] “plucked my nipple from his boneless gums,/And dashed the brains out” Lady Macbeth does not mean at all that she would dash her baby down, but that she could do it, if she would. Here the primary meaning is set aside. The expression is in the secondary sense of being a representation, a sense occasioned by the act of ruthlessness with her own baby.

As far as *vivakṣitānyaparavācya* is concerned, it is called so because here *vācyārtha* is *vivakṣita* (intended to be spoken). It is also called *abhīdhāmūladhvani*. It imparts meaning in two ways: *aslakṣyakrama-vyaṅgya* (non-sequential suggestion) and *saṅlakṣyakramavyaṅgya* (sequential suggestion). *Aslakṣyakramavyaṅgya* is *rasadhvani* and *saṅlakṣyakramavyaṅgya* has *vastudhvani* and *alaṅkāradhvani*.

As has already been referred to, *asaṅlakṣyakramavyaṅgya* is *rasadhvani*. Ānandavardhana was the first Indian critic to state that a *rasa* cannot be directly expressed. *Rasadhvani* takes place where the *vyaṅgyārtha* is produced without apparent sequence. In it first the *vācyārtha* is perceived, then after a momentary interval, the *vyaṅgyārtha* drawn on us. Although, there is an order (*karma*) in it yet the process of transition from the *vācyārtha* to the *vyaṅgyārtha* is so quick that it is not clearly discernible. It is called *rasadhvani* (suggestion of *rasa*). It is that suggestive power which floods the mind with a host of ideas, not always clearly definable, which are necessary for such completion

of the aesthetic image as is necessary for suggesting *sthāyībhāva* at a high pitch and bringing about complete self-forgetfulness in the hearer in which the aesthetic experience consists. It is also suggested by phonetic sound, lexis, sentence, case, number, gender, indeclinable, particle.

Abhinavagupta explains *rasadhvani* by giving an example of the beauty of a girl which can be discussed but cannot be pinpointed as it lies elsewhere. That's why, the appreciation of her different parts gives a sense of pleasure. They may lead to the appreciation of higher reality but not its revelation because they are offshoots of the process of codification of higher reality and not its direct comprehension. The parts which lead to the main stream are *laukik* (worldly) and therefore, their manifestation is classified as *sañlakṣyakram* or traceable by the mind of the *sahr̥daya* while the manifestation of *alakṣyakram* or *rasadhvani* is like *sahr̥daya*'s coming face to face with poet's universalised apocalyptic vision and is therefore instant and overwhelming. This is a realm of *vidyā* where all logic dissolves into revelation. This high state of aesthetic sublimation is arrived at by the extraordinary or the latent power of the world *vyañjanā*.

Abhinavagupta also goes into the detail of this "instant process" as he points out first the *sahr̥daya* receives the impact of *vācya* then his mind tends to universalise his experience to draw general conclusions, then his self enters the universalised experience which is parallel to poet's universalised experience. This sublimation of the *sahr̥daya* can be caused through *vyañjanā* when it reveals *alaukika dhvani* or the *sahr̥daya* is able to grasp it. At this moment a single word, a sentence or the impact of the entire composition may link him with the higher reality and lift him to the consummate level of poetic experience or *mahārasa*.

Here D.G. Rossetti's "The Blessed Damozel" is an example of *rasadhvani* (suggestion based on aesthetic sentiments) .

There will I ask of Christ, the Lord
Thus much for him and me :
Only to live as once on earth
With Love –only to be,
And then a while for ever now.”
“*I saw her smile*
And then she cast her arms along
The golden barriers
And laid her head between her hands ,
And wept. *I heard her tears*”

This poem is an example of *rasadhvani* (suggestion based on aesthetic sentiment). The poem evokes an image of two lovers—one in Heaven and another on the earth—who desire to meet each other. It so happens that the blessed damsel, who is in the heaven, imagines to reunite with her lover on the earth and smiles in this oblivious state. But next moment she realizes the fact reunion with her lover is impossible and so weeps. The lover who sees her smiling initially, now hears her tears. Hearing the sound of the tear-drops as they fell on the ground suggests a poignancy to the whole situation. The *sthāyībhāva* of love is in the state where it is mutually shared. This *sthāyībhāva*, by means of the combination of *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and *vyabhicāribhāvas* has reached a point where it can be aesthetically enjoyed. Here it is to mention that although there is a sequence, it is not perceptible.

Let us have an example of *rasadhvani* (*karuṇa-rasadhvani*) which has been taken from Matthew Arnold's *Rustom and Sohrab*:

Gazed, and gazed, and stood
 Speechless; and then uttered one sharp cry:
 “O boy, thy father!”

Rustom and Sohrab

In the poem Sohrab, being fatally hurt by Rustom, says to him that his father would take revenge and suddenly Rustom discovers through a token on Sohrab’s body that he is his son and utters “O boy, thy father!”. The utterance suggests a poignancy to the whole situation. *Āeoka*, the *sthāyībhāva* of *karuṇarasa*, is aroused by means of the combination of *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and *vyabhicāribhāvas* and within no time it reaches a point where it can be aesthetically enjoyed.

The second type of *vivakṣitānyaparavācya* is *saṅlakṣya-kramavyaṅgya* or *kramadyotita* or *anuraṇanopamavyaṅgya* (sequential suggestion) i.e when the process of transition from the *vācyārtha* to the *vyāṅgyārtha* is clearly noticeable. It is of two kinds: *vastudhvani* (suggestion of idea) and *alaṅkāradhvani* (suggestion of figure). *vastudhvani* is aroused from the power of meaning while *alaṅkāradhvani* from both the power of meaning and the power of word. It is noteworthy here that the ideas suggested by *vastudhvani* and *alaṅkāradhvani* somehow admit expression in conventional language but those aroused by *rasa* can never be so expressed. *Rasa* is always *vyāṅgyārtha*, unlike *vastu* and *alaṅkāradhvani* which may be *vācyārtha* and *vyāṅgyārtha*.

Vastu dhvani is that power of meaning, which operates to arouse the suggested idea, which refers to all that goes by the name of *vibhāva* and *anubhāva*. This is discernible in Macbeth when King Duncan unaware of the suggestive reality addresses Macbeth as his ‘worthiest cousin’:

O worthiest cousin!
 The sin of my ingratitude even now
 Was heavy on me ; thou art so far before ,
 That swiftest wing of recompense is slow
 To overtake thee.

Macbeth ActI, Sc.iv, 14-18

Duncan here is unaware of the suggestive reality of his ‘worthiest cousin’ who is nobody but his unpurged butcher and whose invitation, he’s misapprehending as ‘banquet’ is nothing but his murderer and death personified by the hands of his ‘peerless kinsman’ i.e. Macbeth who’s worthiest in the eyes of Duncan while he’s unworthiest for the reader. Here again *dhvani* is strongly at work and it continues in the speeches of King Duncan. How suggestive is Duncan’s comment on the treachery of Cawdor:

There’s no art
 To find the mind’s construction in the face:
 He was a gentleman on whom I built
 An absolute trust.

Macbeth Act I, Sc. iv, 12-15

Here the *vācyārtha* expresses how King Duncan has been deceived by the innocent face of Thane of Cawdor, who at the time of his death was full of repentance and remorse. Here *vyañgyārtha* is a comment on Macbeth who with his concealed “mind’s construction” is going to be the greatest traitor as he shall murder King Duncan. It gives rise to a meaning quite different from that which the statement has for the addressed. Now the statement is meant for not the one, to whom it is addressed, but for the other with the person addressed.

vastudhvani has been divided into two kinds:

a) *Kavipraudhaukti mātra siddha* (suggestion of inventive fancy): It is born of the poet's inventive fancy. It happens to be a mere figment of poetic imagination. It is very effective as the word *praudha*, formed of two *pra* (extremely) and *udhaḥ* (carried out), shows. An expression is called *praudha* when it is appropriate to the matter to be conveyed. The following is an example from Keats's "Ode on Grecian Urn":

Heard melodies are sweet but those unheard
Are sweeter; therefore, ye soft pipes, play on;

At the surface level these lines can be considered paradoxical or self-contradictory as there are no unheard melodies which can be sweeter. No doubt, the couplet is a figment of poetic imagination and the *vācyārtha* is intended to be spoken but it suggests the life of art and imagination. It also suggests the transcendental or divine world which can be perceived through imaginary senses. No denotative meaning could have done this justice, the way "unheard melodies" does. It gives rise to a positive meaning, while *vācyārtha* is neither positive nor negative.

b) *Svataḥ sām̐bhavī* (suggestion of the possibility of fact) : It is grounded in material possibilities. It is based on a certain sanction of realism. It suggests in a manner which cannot be altogether falsified. The delineation might have its other dimension in real life. The following lines from Keats's *The Eve of St. Agnes* is an example of *svataḥ sām̐bhavī vastudhvani*:

But to her heart her heart was voluble
Paining with eloquence her balmy sides
As though a tongueless nightingale should swell
Her throat in vain, and die, heart-stifled in her dell.

The Eve of St. Agnes

In this stanza the poet describes the helplessness of Madeline, who as per tradition of keeping fast silently on the eve of St. Agnes (i.e. 21st January) was required to observe complete silence. Although Madeline was compelled to not to utter a syllable, yet her heart was speaking fluently unto itself and she is feeling acute pain in her smooth sides because of not being able to give vent to her feelings. How could a heart be holding a converse with itself? That is the obvious difficulty, arising after grasping the primary meaning, the *vacyartha*. That necessitates a probe into the poet's suggested import. In that state of enforced reticence, the charmed damsel is having a debate in the inmost recesses of heart. This debate is concerned with misgivings such as these: Will she be at all granted the flattering vision of her lover in her sleep. Will he measure up to her expectations? Will she further able to control his possible errant fancies? Will not the vision be suddenly disrupted? These and a host of other kindred misgivings are agitating the young virgin's soul. Resultantly her soft sides have started paining intensely in commensuration with the briskness of the train of quickly succeeding thoughts and feelings. She now reminds the poet of the tongueless nightingale which swells her throat to give expression to her pain and suffering.

The poet imagines the tongueless nightingale (*aprastuta*) in the helplessness of Madeline (*prastuta*). It is an example of *svataḥ sām̐bhavī dhvani*, inasmuch as conditions, attaching to Madeline, are within the orbit of material possibilities: “But to her heart her heart was voluble” and that was “Paining with eloquence her balmy sides”—mute endurance of internal torments often creates pain in the sides—all such happenings take place in the practical world. The suggested import, the *dhvanyārtha*, is the deep agitation,

rather consternation, caused in the damsel's heart, and that creates the charm.

As far as the *alañkāra dhvani* is concerned, it is that power of meaning or word, the suggested idea aroused by which, is an *alañkāra*. This idea, though may have been presented in some other context as occupying a subordinate position as an embellishment to the meaning of a sentence, is presented here, not as an embellishment of something else, but independently, though still recognized as such. Defining the *alañkāradhvani* Ānandavardhana observes "Only that is admitted as *alañkāradhvani* whose employment is rendered possible just by the emotional suffusion of the writer and which does not require any other extra effort on his part. It can be understood with the help of the following example:

Lit up are the quarters with your lustrous eyes
And your face looks charming with a smile upon it
And still, o darling, if the ocean does not swell,
Obviously it is a mass of inertness.

Though the idea of moon face is not directly stated, it is clearly suggested. It is only when the metaphor that the lady's face is identical with something beautiful (like moon etc) is understood, the passage becomes meaningful. Here thus we have *rūpakālañkāradhvani*.

Shelley's poem, "To A Skylark" suggests *viśmayā-
lañkāradhvani*:

Higher still and higher
From the earth thou springest
Like a cloud of fire;
The blue deep thou wingest,
And singing still dost soar, and soaring ever singest.

What thou art we know not;
 What is most like thee?
 From rainbow clouds there flow not
 Drops so bright to see
 As from thy presence showers a rain of melody.

Like a high-born maiden
 In a palace-tower, ...
 Like a Poet hidden
 In the light of thought, ...

Like a glow-worm golden
 In a dell of dew,
 Like a rose embower'd
 In its own green leaves, ...

In the poem Shelley uses many *alañkāras* with a view to bringing his idea home. Personification occurs when the poet addresses the bird as if it were a human being. Then the poet uses metaphors to describe the days light such as “arrows of the sun”. There are alliterations line expressions like “pale purple even”, “of that silver sphere” or “Till the world is wrought”. The poem also abounds in Shelley’s use of similes like “like a cloud of fire”, “like an unbodied joy”, “Like a glow-worm golden” or “Like a rose embower’d” to capture the joy and beauty of the bird and its song. All these *vāṣyālañkāras* (expressed figures) throughout the poem are suggestive of another *alañkāra* i.e. *vismayālañkāra*. The qualities of skylark expressed by the *vācyālañkāras* are unique. This confirmed when he says:”What thou art we know not” .

For, only an *alañkāra* which is conveyed by *ṣabdaṣakti* (the semantic power) is intended by the writer to form an instance of *dhvani*. If two ideas are manifest (simultaneously)

as a result of *ṣabdaśakti*, we have an instance of *ṣleśa* (double entendre).

The opening lines of Keats’s poem “Sleep and Poetry” are worth quoting in this regard :

What is more gentle than a wind in summer?
 What is more soothing than the pretty hummer
 That stays one moment in an open flower
 And buzzes cheerily from bower to bower?
 What is more tranquil than a musk-rose blowing
 In a green island, far from all men’s knowing?
 More healthful than the leafiness of dales?
 More secret than a nest of nightingales?
 More serene than Cordelia’s countenance?
 More full of visions than a high romance?
 What, but thee, sleep.

Keats’s “Sleep and Poetry”

In this example, an extra meaning is conveyed by *ṣabdaśakti* and in order that two meanings might not appear as entirely disconnected, we will have to postulate the relation of the standard of comparison and the object compared as existing between the two. Thus *ṣleśa* we see here is not grounded on words only as it is the case when it happens to be *alañkāravācya* (the expressed figure). But it is an *alañkāra* suggested by the special *dhvani* based on *ṣabdaśakti*.

The functional philosophy of underlying *vastudhvani*, *alañkāradhvani* and *rasadhvani* is based on the five elements of *kāvya*: two *vācya* elements— *vācyavastu* and *vācyālañkāra*, and three *vyañga* elements— *vyañga vastu*, *vyañga alañkāra*, *vyañga rasādi*. Here *vācya vastu* and *vācyālañkāra* elements, which are essential in *kāvya*, are one and the same as they belong to the same functional order. But if the two orders are interposed i.e. *vācyālañkāra* and *vyañga vastu*, then critical

opinion required. If the beauty of *vyañga vastu* is subsidiary to the beauty of *vācya*, then it will be regarded as *alañkāra*. This pattern is known as *gunībhūta-vyañga*, where there the suggested element is *alañkāras*. In the same way, if the beauty of *vyañga rasādi* is subsidiary to the beauty of *vācya*, it will again be regarded as *rasavadālañkāra*. And when the *vyañga vastu* or *vyañga alañkāra* or *vyañga rasādi* are not subsidiary to *vācya*, then they become the highest state of *dhvani*. It is important to note that *rasa* has dual role, depending upon the intention of the writer. If *rasa* is principal, it is called *dhvani* and if it is subsidiary, it loses its claim of being *dhvani* and is called *rasavadālañkāra*. Another important thing to remember is what is suggested in *alañkāradhvani* is also *vastu*, but this *vastu* is due to *praudhokti* and so in order to distinguish this *vastu*, it is called *alañkāradhvani*.

Thus Ānandavardhana built a new structure of literary theory on the foundation of thought of his predecessors Bharata, Bhāmaha, Udabhata and Vāmana and propounded the *dhvani* theory. He modified the concept of *rasa* by saying that *rasa* is not stated, rather it is *vyañga*. Similarly, the concepts of *vastu* and *alañkāra*, though they may be *vācyārtha*, but they are *vyañgārtha* also. He also gave a detailed account of *saṅgatanā* (phrasal organization) which also suggest *rasas*. His superstructure was built on the argument that, by animating words with a life of their own, the poet suggests to us things that speech is not calculated to express. The relationship between the *vācyārtha* and the *vyañgārtha* in fact becomes what Ānandavardhana would call *sādhyasādhanabhāva* (content revealing itself through the form).

Works Cited

Ballantyne, J R & Mitra, Pramada Dasa Trans. *The Mirror of Composition* (Vishwanath's *Sāhityadarpaṇa*). Varanasi: Motilal Banarsi Das ,1956.

Ghosh, Manmohan. *Bharata: The Nāṭyaśāstra, A Treatise on Hindu Dramaturgy and Histrionics*. Calcutta: The Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1950.

Jagannath. *Rasagaṅgādhara*. Bombay: N S Press, 1947.

Jha. Ganganath *The Kāvyaṅkārasūtra of Vāmana* . Delhi: Satguru Publicatios, Indian Books Centre, 1990

Krishnamoorthy, K. *The Dhvanyāloka and Its Critics*. Mysore, 1968.

... . *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana*. Dharwad: Karnataka University 1974..

... . *Vakroktijīvitam* of Kuntaka. Dharwar: Karnataka University 1977.

Pandey K.C. *Comparative Aesthetics I : Indian Aesthetics*. Varanasi, 1959

Sasty, Naganatha. *Bhāmaha: The Kāvyaṅkāra*. Delhi: Motilal Banarasi dass, 1970.

The Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana with the Locan of Abhinavagupta ed. & trans. Ingalls, Daniel H.H. trans.et.al. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harward University Press, 1990.

Upreti, Thaneshwar Chandra Mammaṭa. *Kāvya Prakāśa*. Delhi: Parimal Publications, 2003.