

CHAPTER V

THEORY OF ANUMĀNA

IN

SANSKRIT POETICS

CHAPTER V

THEORY OF ANUMĀNA IN SANSKRIT POETICS

The Nyāya theory of Anumāna (inference) exerts its profound influence on the Rasa and Dhvani theory of Sanskrit poetics. A great classic like VV of Mahimābhaṭṭa is based on the Anumāna theory. Almost all the eminent poetics have more or less dealt with Anumāna in their works. Therefore, an analytical exposition of the theory of Anumāna with its relation to some poetic theories is attempted in this chapter.

V.1 Anumāna as a Pramāna

Anumāna is an important means of valid knowledge. Except the materialistic Cārvāka almost all the Indian Philosophical systems accept Anumāna as a source of valid knowledge (pramāna) for the cognition of such objects which are not cognised by means of Pratyakṣa (perception). But, unlike other schools of philosophy, the Nyāya school accepts four pramānas¹ and gives highest emphasis on Anumāna and distinguishes it from other pramānas in its detailed treatment which has not been so thoroughly and systematically dealt with by any other school. The treatment of Anumāna forms the most important topic in the Nyāya, especially Navya-Nyāya system of logic.

Anumāna as its etymological sense (also literally) indicates is 'after-proof'. It is after-proof in the sense that it uses the knowledge derived from perception (pratyakṣa) or verbal testimony (śabda) and helps the mind to march on further and add to its knowledge. Since Anumāna consists in making an assertion about an object on the strength of the knowledge of the hetu which is invariably connected with sādhya, the word Anumāna literally means the cognition which follows from other knowledge. Here, the prefix 'anu' means 'after' and 'māna' means the means of knowledge. From this literal meaning it follows that the perceptual knowledge of the hetu gives rise to the inferential knowledge. One can infer the existence of fire, for example, after perceiving the smoke which has got an uninterrupted connection with the surface of the mountain. The knowledge of invariable concomitance (vyāpti) is the key to having inferential knowledge. This knowledge of vyāpti is not possible without the help of direct perception. Vyāpti is a relation of invariable concomitance between hetu and sādhya. The knowledge of the sādhya as related to the subject of inference (pakṣa) depends on the previous knowledge of the hetu as related to the subject and at the same time as invariably related to the sādhya. One can infer fire on the mountain by virtue of the fact that one perceives smoke on it and has observed it as invariably accompanied by fire. In both the cases the necessity of perception cannot be denied.

Anumāna, according to the Naiyāyikas, is the most important cause of anumiti (inferred knowledge), or cognition or judgement)². It represents the process by which this cognition is obtained. In the instance of inferred knowledge, the mountain is fiery because of smoke (parvato vahnimān dhūmavattvāt), the conclusion that 'the mountain is fiery' is the anumiti³ and the process by which it is produced consisting of pakṣadharmatā (existence of probans in subject) and vyāpti (invariable concomitance) is anumāna i.e. parvato vahnimān dhūmavattvāt. Anumiti differs from pratyakṣa in giving the valid knowledge of a thing that it is not in direct contact with the senses. In the instance of fire on the mountain, senses of a person do not come in contact with the fire at all, as they do in direct perception. In the whole process of inference, one sees only the smoke on the mountain, and to that extent, his senses come in contact with that object. Inferred knowledge (anumiti) depends upon two things - pakṣadharmatā and vyāpti⁴. Firstly, one must see the smoke on the mountain. This is technically called pakṣadharmatā⁵. Secondly, it is necessary that one must have the knowledge of the relation of fire and smoke (i.e. wherever there is smoke there is fire) from the past experience. This is technically called vyāpti⁶. In the process of Anumāna, one brings the past experience to bear upon the present case of the smoke on the mountain. This is technically called parāmarśa.⁷

Anumāna is of two kinds : svārtha (inference for oneself) and parārtha (inference for others).⁸ Svārthānumāna causes one's own inferential experience. Parārthānumāna is the syllogistic expression which consists of five members and which a person employs after inferring for himself fire from smoke, with a view to enabling another person to have likewise the same kind of inferential cognition.⁹ Parārthānumāna consists in the use of a regular five membered Sanskrit syllogism termed Nyāya. The five members are as follows:

1. Pratijñā parvato vahnimān dhūmavattvāt
2. Hetu dhūmavattvāt
3. Udāharana yo yo dhūmavān sa sa vahnimān yathā mahānasah
4. Upanaya tasmāt tathā
5. Nigamanam tathā cāyam

The validity of an inference depends on the validity of its constituent propositions. If any of the constituent propositions is fallacious, the whole inference will be vitiated.

This is in essence, the Nyāya theory of Anumāna. With this outline of the Anumāna theory in view an attempt is made here to explore how Sanskrit poeticians have employed this Anumāna theory in the analysis of poetic theory of Rasa and Dhvani.

V.2 Theory of Rasa and Anumāna

The theory of Rasa constitutes one of the most important features of Sanskrit poetics. According to Bharata the main object of a drama is Rasa. Ālankārikas believe Bharata to be the earliest exponent of Rasa theory and so they try to find his support for their views on Rasa.

The theory of Rasa realisation is based on the Rasasūtra of Bharata i.e. vibhāvārabhāvavyabhicārisaṃyogāt rasanispattih.¹⁰ Thus sūtra has been differently interpreted by different scholars-commentators on the basis of different interpretations. Important questions pertaining to Rasa that were posed and answered in different ways were about the locus of Rasa, the nature of Rasa, the process of its realisation and kinds of Rasa. This gave rise to different theories viz., Utpattivāda of Lollaṭa, Anumitivāda of Śaṅkuka, Bhuktivāda of Bhaṭṭanāyaka and Abhivyaktivāda of Abhinavagupta as available in his Abhinavabhāratī. The knowledge of these theories is gained only through the Abh of Abhinavagupta and some later writers like Mammaṭa and Hemacandra.

In the history of Sanskrit poetics Śaṅkuka as a prominent exponent of Bharata's Rasa theory occupies an important place. He, under the influence of Nyāya philosophy, makes a novel and unique attempt to interpret the sūtra on

the basis of the Naiyāyikas' theory of Anumāna. He distinguishes himself from other rhetoricians by his Anumitivāda. After Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa, Śaṅkuka took up the problem of Rasa and criticised Lollaṭa's view. His own original work is lost. But it has been possible to reconstruct his view on the basis of the brief quotations in the work of Abhinavagupta, which is more or less abridged and copied by Mammaṭa and Hemacandra. Since Śaṅkuka makes an attempt to refute the Rasa theory of Lollaṭa and then propounds his Anumitivāda; it is, necessary here to present Lollaṭa's view also in order to understand Śaṅkuka's stand, his counter arguments and to make a critical appraisal of his view point.

V.3 Lollaṭa's Theory of Rasa

Bhaṭṭalollaṭa appears to be the first writer to attempt a psychological analysis of Rasa. According to Abhinavagupta he interprets the Rasasūtra of Bharata as follows:¹¹

The birth of Rasa takes place out of the combination of the permanent mental state - implicit in the sūtra - with the determinants etc. More precisely, the determinants are the cause of the birth of the feeling, which constitutes the permanent state of mind. The consequents intended by Bharata are not, obviously, those which arise from the rasas - for they cannot be considered as causes of rasa - but the consequents of the states of mind only. Even if the

transitory states of mind, in so far as they are feelings, cannot accompany simultaneously the permanent mental state, still, according to Bharata, this is not absent, but remains in a state of latent impression. In the example too, some flavourings appear in a latent state, like the permanent state, and others in a emergent state, like the transitory states. Rasa, therefore, is simply a permanent state, intensified by the determinants, the consequents, etc.; but, had it not been intensified, it is only a permanent state. This state is present both in the person reproduced and in the reproducing actor, by virtue of the power of realisation (anusandhāna).

V.4 Śaṅkuka's Refutation

Śaṅkuka gives the following arguments against the view of Lollaṭa¹² :

1. Sthāyibhāva (permanent mental state) cannot be Rasa because without Vibhāvas it cannot be known. Vibhāvādi are līngas (logical reasons) by means of which the knowledge of sthāyibhāva is acquired.
2. If it is accepted that without vibhāvas, sthāyibhāva can be known by means of Śabda (verbal testimony), then, Rasa cannot be pratyakṣa. For, śabdajñāna is only a parokṣajñāna.
3. Bharata, therefore, has not expounded the sthāyibhāva first and Rasa afterwards. If the permanent mental states

exist before the Rasa why does Bharata explain Rasa first and thereafter the sthāyibhāvas.

4. If Rasa is nothing more than an intensified permanent mental state then Bharata need not have defined the determinants twice: once in connection with the non-intensified state (NS, VII) and once again in connection with it in its intensified state (NS, VI). It is illogical to explain the causes of the same thing twice.

5. If Rasa happens to be an intensified feeling, the problem of gradation will arise. An intensity admits of many degrees, similarly, there ought to be numberless grades in the realisation of Rasa.

6. If it is argued that only when the utmost intensity is reached, Rasa is realised, then, there would not be six varieties of hāsyarasa.

7. Bharata explains the ten stages of Śṛṅgārarasa. If each of them would have different grades as per their intensity there would be an infinite number of mental states and of rasas.

8. We see that what happens is just the contrary, in the sense that sorrow (soka) is at first intense, and is seen to grow weaker with time and that in the feelings of anger (krodha), heroism (utsāha) and delight (rati) a diminution is met with when the indignation (amarṣa) firmness (sthairya) and sexual enjoyment (sevā)¹³ are absent.

Śaṅkuka then explains the rasasūtra in the following way:¹⁴

The actor(naṭa) with his long training and constant practice represents the causes, the effects and the associating causes, (which are technically called vibhāvas, abubhāvas and vyābhicāribhāvas respectively) so skillfully that they, though artificial, are considered by the spectators as the real ones. The linga i.e. vibhāvas etc., lead the spectators to infer the sthāyibhāvas like rati etc., existing in the naṭa. But as a matter of fact they are not present in the naṭa, because he is imitating the original sthāyibhāvas of the real characters like Rāma. As this is the imitation of the original sthāyibhāvas this is given a different name 'rasa'. The realisation of the spectators is of a very distinct kind. The spectators take the naṭa as Rāma, the original character, on the analogy of the knowledge of a citraturaga (the painted horse). It cannot be called yathārthajñāna (valid knowledge), because naṭa is different from the character, say, Rāma. It is not mithyājñāna because there is no another jñāna to negate it like 'this is not Rāma'. It is not samsayajñāna because there are no two alternatives (koṭis) in the cognition such as 'is this Rāma or not'. In the absence of the similar jñāna as 'he is like Rāma' it cannot be called sādrśyajñāna also. Therefore, this jñāna about naṭa as 'this is Rāma' is quite peculiar, and different from all the other forms of jñāna like pramā, mithyā, samsaya and sādrśya. This kind of jñāna is the result of the naṭa's skill in the four kinds of abhinaya.

It may be argued that the knowledge of Rasa is not valid as it is negated by the subsequent knowledge. According to the rule invalid knowledge is defined as tadabhāvavati tatprakārako 'nubhavo 'yathārtha (to perceive a thing when it does not exist is bhrama). In the present case the Rāmatva which is not in the naṭa is ascribed to him; and in such a case how can a bhrama produce the real effect? This question is answered by Saṅkuka by saying that even a bhrama can produce an effect. He quotes the kārika of Dharmakīrti's PV "Seeing a gem and a light from a distance a man misunderstands both of them as manis." ¹⁵ Thus, his jñāna is only a bhrama. But when he approaches, then, he is able to get maṇi. Therefore even a bhrama can produce a real effect. This jñāna is further proved to be bhrama also because in Nāṭya only the artificial imitation of kāraṇas, kāryas and sahakāris are brought into use and these are given new names vibhāva, anubhāva and vyābhicāribhāva. Ālambanavibhāva and Uddipnavibhāvas can be present by reciting appropriate verses. The anubhāvas and vyābhicāri bhāvas also can be represented by the naṭa with the help of the trainings etc. But a sthāyibhāva can never be presented because it cannot be expressed by merely using such words like rati, hāsa etc., being beyond the scope of abhidhā. It can only be imitated. The imitation by naṭa helps the spectators to infer the sthāyibhāva in naṭa. Only the sthāyibhāva like rati, which are imitated are called by the rhetoricians with the names like śṛṅgārarasa. In other

words, rasa is the inferential knowledge of the imitation of sthāyibhāva like Rati. But, unlike other inferences, this anumiti is the source of pleasure, because in this, the things inferred are beautiful. In this respect it is quite unique. Since the spectators infer Rasa, it is to be understood as resting in naṭa. Though the sthāyins are not in the naṭa, the sāmājika have the inference of them - as there is no bādhakajñāna. This is in fact not the inference of actual but only the so called sthāyibhāva which is the imitation of the original one. Therefore, ultimately the imitation of the sthāyibhāva is understood as the Rasa.

The above analysis gives rise to the following points: The process of the vahnyanumāna as described by the Naiyāyikas is different from the Rasānumāna because of the following reasons:

1. Rasa, the object of inference is unique in nature and is different from the other worldly objects of inference.
2. In the other cases of Anumāna, both the sādhya and the sādhana which become the object of perception and of which relation is perceived, become the object of inference. For example: in the case of the vahnyanumāna, sādhya i.e., vahni and hetu i.e. dhūma are perceived in a kitchen and the person who has frequently observed their invariable relation in a kitchen or in many places is able to infer the presence of fire by looking at the smoke. But in the

case of Rasa, it never can become the object of perception. Hence the relation existing between kāranarūpa-vibhāvādi and kāryarūpa-rasa is never perceived.

3. Vibhāvādi are kāraṇas for the intensification of the sthāyibhāva (in Rāma). But for the spectators they are lingas.

4. The realisation of Rasa which is the fruit of Anumāna is unique and cannot be compared with any other anumiti, the knowledge obtained by inference.

Searching for the root of Śaṅkuka's theory of the Rasānumāna one realises that for Śaṅkuka rasa is a kind of knowledge (jñāna). Since Rasa is a jñāna a sādhana to obtain the knowledge of Rasa is called for (technically called pramāna). The pramāṇas such as pratyakṣa, Upamāna, Śabda and others are not capable of producing the knowledge of Rasa. Therefore Anumāna is the only means which helps one in obtaining the knowledge of Rasa. The knowledge of Rasa is not possible by Pratyakṣa as there is no direct connection between respective indriya and Rasa. Pratyakṣa is defined as indriyārtha sannikarṣajanya jñāna. Upamāna is also not capable of giving the knowledge of Rasa because the sādrśyajñāna is essential for Upamāna as gośadrśo gavayaḥ. Since there is no object similar to Rasa, Upamāna does not obtain. Rasajñāna cannot be obtained by Śabda pramāna also because the knowledge of Rasa cannot be obtained by the statements of a trustworthy person (āptavākyaṃ śabdaḥ).

No other pramānas such as Arthāpatti, Anupalabdhi, Sambhāva Aitihya produce the knowledge of Rasa. Ultimately it is the Anumāna pramāna which only can account for the knowledge of Rasa. So Rasānubhiti is one type of anumiti. It seems that Śaṅkuka follows the well-known Nyāya method of parīśesa¹⁶ as given in the NBh. on the strength of which he develops his theory of Anumāna.

Śaṅkuka is well aware of the fact that the Rasānumiti is not like the vahnīyānumiti. That is why he says Rasajhāna is different from the four types of jhānas and explains it by the illustration of citraturaga. He also points out that even if the rasānumiti is different from the vahnīyānumiti it still leads to arthakriyā. He quotes a verse from Dharmakīrti's PV to that effect. All these go to prove that Śaṅkuka had a deep knowledge of the Nyāyaśāstra and the influence of which perhaps motivated him to develop the theory of Rasānumāna.

V.5 Bhaṭṭa Tauta's Criticism

Bhaṭṭa Tauta (10th century A.D.), teacher of Abhinavagupta criticises the Anumitivāda of Śaṅkuka.¹⁷ He poses the question: does Śaṅkuka's Anumitivāda propound Rasa as an imitation of sthāyibhāva based on (1) the experience of the spectators or (2) that of the actors or (3) the nature of Rasa or (4) the strength of the statement of

Bharata himself.

(1) Śaṅkuka's anumitivāda cannot be based on the experience of the spectators. Imitation (anukarāṇa) is possible only of the things which are already perceived by a means of cognition (pramāṇa). For example, in case of a person drinking milk and saying 'Thus did so-and-so, drink the wine', the action of milk-drinking reproduces action of wine-drinking. But it will be realised as imitation only when the spectator has himself directly observed the imitated person drinking wine. But nothing is found in the naṭa, which may be said to be the imitation of something else. His body, his artificial face, horripilation, faltering voice and the movement of limbs etc., cannot be the imitation of sthāyibhāva like rati. The Anubhāvas appearing outwardly cannot be identical with the sthāyibhāva, which is beyond the perception of others. They, being insentient, being perceived by different organs of sense and having different substrata cannot be called imitation. Moreover, consciousness of imitation presupposes perception of both the original and of its imitation (made by the actor). But nobody (either the spectator or the actor) has ever perceived the rati of Rāma (character). Hence, the possibility that the actor is imitating Rāma is excluded.

If it is the feeling of the actor which is realised as the imitation of the rati of Rāma which as perceived by

the spectators is considered as Śṛṅgāra Rasa; still one has to consider in what form and in what manner it is cognised. If the cognition (pratīti) of the feeling of the nāṭa is similar to that of the ordinary feeling, which consists of causes, such as women etc., when the feeling of the actor would be perceived in the form of rati. Therefore, the idea of the imitation of rati is not sound.

Further, the determinants etc., are real in the character but in the actors they are unreal. If that is the case, are they perceived as artificial by the spectators? And if they are perceived as artificial, the cognition of rati is not possible. If one says that for this reason what is cognised is not rati but the imitation of rati, then it would be possible only for a man of dull wits.

When the cognition of the līṅga (logical reason) e.g. smoke, is erroneous, the inference based upon it will be invalid. Though the vapour appears as smoke, if it is cognised as smoke, the inference of fire from it will not be valid.

Even if the actor himself is not enraged, still he is seen as such, the resemblance is due to contraction of eyebrows etc., Hence, he is like someone who is enraged. But the spectators willingly suspend their awareness of

this resemblance between the actor and the character. As a result of which they are immersed in a certain state of consciousness of the actor. Therefore, the idea that what appears on the stage is an imitation of something is not valid.

Further, the knowledge of the spectator i.e. 'This is Rāma' is not correct. For, this perception is devoid of every doubt, and it is not stultified later by some subsequent cognition which would invalidate it (bādhaka). Then, why should one not consider it as true cognition? And, if it is stultified, why it is not a false cognition? In fact though the invalidating cognition does not appear, it will always be a false cognition. Thus Śaṅkuka's contention, that this is "an experience wherein, it being devoid of any contradictory idea, one cannot distinguish any error", is untrue. Furthermore, in other actor also, the spectators have the perception 'This is Rāma', hence the cognition of Rāma is only in its most universal aspect.

The statement that 'the determinants can be recognised through the power of poetry' is also not true. For, the actor does not have the perception 'This Sītā is the woman I love', If it is argued that, this is how the determinants are made perceptible to the spectators then in this way the permanent state will be made perceptible on a better way. Since it is predominant, spectators experience it as 'That man(is) in this (feeling)'.
 :

Therefore it is wrong to say that from the point of view of spectators, Rasā is an imitation of the permanent mental state.

(2) From the point of view of actor, it is not valid, for, the actor while performing the drama does not have the notion, 'I am imitating Rāma or his feelings' The word anukarāna can be explained in two ways - one, the production of actions similar to those of someone and two, temporally after-product. If we take the first meaning, then naṭa has never seen Rāma. Hence it is not possible. If the second meaning is taken, then such imitation would extend to all the activities even of the ordinary life.

If it is said that the actor does not imitate a particular being (niyata) and has only this notion, 'I am imitating the sorrow (śoka) of some noble person (uttamaprakṛti); then the question arises : by what he is imitating? Certainly it cannot be done by sorrow, since it is absent in the actor. It also cannot be done by the tears etc., because tears are insentient, while sorrow, being mental state, is sentient.

If it is argued that naṭa is imitating the consequent (anubhāvas) of the person, who also wept in the manner he does, then naṭa also intervenes in his act of imitation and the relation of anukārya-anukartā no longer exists. Besides the actor does not have the awareness that he is imitating.

The actor's performance takes place only through three causes: his skill in art, his memory of his own determinants, and the consent of his art aroused by the state of generality of the mental states and in this virtue, he displays the consequents (anubhavas) and reads the dramatic text with suitable intonations (kāku). He is conscious of this only and not of imitation.

(3) Nor can it be said that there is an imitation from the point of view of the nature of things (vastuvṛtta) for, it is impossible that a thing of which one is not conscious has a real nature.

(4) Even Bharata has never said that Rasa is the imitation of a permanent mental state. Such a statement was never made by him even indirectly or by a means of an indication. On the contrary the various sub-divisions of women's dance, various music and the dhruva song described by Bharata indicate exactly the opposite. The expression of Bharata i.e. 'Drama is an imitation of all the forms of existence in the seven islands' can have also other explanations. And if it were an imitation, then there would be no difference between it and the imitation of the attire, walk etc., of the beloved one.

V.6 Mahimabhāṭṭa's View

Mahimabhāṭṭa has a rightful place in the context of Anumitivāda among the various theories of rasanispatti.

According to him, Rasa is Anumeya.¹⁸ The permanent mental states of love, sorrow etc., belonging to the characters delineated in a kāvya are inferred through the cognition of the vibhāvas, anubhāvas and the vyābhicāribhāvas described in the kāvya. It is the inexplicable magic of poetry that the inferred sthāyibhāva leads to the exquisite pleasure of rumination whereas in ordinary life the inferred sthāyibhāvas as belonging to others do not lead to any such pleasure. Thus, the instances cited by Ānandavardhana for Rasadhvani like the description of Pārvatī's entrance with floral decoration of the spring season and the reactions caused by that in Śiva, described in the canto III of Kumārasambhava can be included in Anumāna.

V.7 Viśvanātha's Refutation

Viśvanātha points out a defect in Mahimābhāṭṭa's stance, that is, Rasa is Anumeya. He poses the question as what exactly Rasa is in the Anumāna theorist concept. Is it the cognition of love etc., as existing in the characters like Rāma inferred from the cognised vibhāvādi depicted in poetry? Or is it the self-manifesting bliss enjoyed by the aesthete on aesthetically contemplating the dramatic performance? If former is accepted then it is different from that of dhvani theorist. If the second alternative is accepted, then it is evidently clear that the proposed hetu is fallacious on account of the lack of the knowledge of invariable concomitance between Rasa and the vibhāvādi.¹⁹

Hence there cannot be any inference.

Moreover, the mere knowledge derived through the reasoning "wherever there is the express statement or dramatic presentation of such and such vibhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas, there is the origin of the rasas like Śṛṅgāra, is also not taken as rasa by the dhvani theorists. Thus the hetus which are adduced by Mahimabhaṭṭa for the realisation of rasa cause the inference of something else viz., the mere cognition of the presence of a particular mental state in the dramatic character. But they cannot explain the aesthetic bliss that is rasa. Hence it is actually hetvābhāsa in so far as it establishes something other than what is sought to be established.

V.8 Theory of Dhvani and Anumāna

Ānandavardhana in his DhA.²⁰ refers to the question as known from the Locana, whether Dhvani can be included in Anumāna. He presents the Anumāna theory as a pūrvapakṣa view perhaps keeping in mind the Naiyāyikas. The argument is that - the suggested meaning being the speakers purport can be understood through inference. Hence, vyāṅgya-vyāñjakabhāva is liṅgalingibhāva. The so called suggestiveness of sound is none other than a liṅga. This pūrvapakṣa argument is refuted by saying that the suggested meaning cannot be inferred. The knowledge which arises on hearing

an uttered sound has two aspects - 1. the intention of the speaker (tātparya) and 2. the actual meaning (vācyārtha). The former consists in the desire to reveal the form of the sound and to convey some special idea through the sound. These two desires can be inferred from the utterance of the sound. But the expressed and the non-expressed ideas of a sentence fall within the purview of the meaning to be described. These meanings are not inferred. Secondly, there may be differences of opinion regarding the nature of the suggested meaning among the listeners. But no such difference is possible on the case of the inferential meaning which is a definite form of cognition arrived at from a given hetu.

If one argues that since the validity of the suggested meaning is ascertained through inference it can be treated as inferred, this is unsound, since, for the same reason the expressed meaning, when verified through inferential methods, should have to be regarded as inferred, which, however, is not the case. It is regarded as the expressed meaning itself, being originally cognised through the denotative power of the word.²¹

Thus, Ānandavardhana makes passing reference to the Naiyāyika theory of Anumāna. He makes a definite attempt to refute the view of Naiyāyikas who attempt to reject the suggested meaning. This becomes clear from the rejoinder of Jayantabhaṭṭa, a Naiyāyika of great repute.

V.9 Jayantabhaṭṭa's Criticism

It was not at all necessary for Jayantabhaṭṭa to refer to and refute a theory of literary criticism, but Ānandavardhana's action seems to have inspired a reaction in Jayantabhaṭṭa, who is drawn to refute the dhvani theory in his Nyāya text only because Ānandavardhana has discussed and refuted the Naiyāyika theory of Anumāna.

Jayantabhaṭṭa examines the dhvani theory in his NM while discussing the problem whether Arthāpatti is an independent Prāmāṇa. He thinks that the newly reached theory of dhvani does not deserve any serious notice at all.²² He laughs at the very idea that poets propose to solve the problems concerning words and their import, which have eluded satisfactory solution at the hands of the most learned logicians.²³ He ridicules Ānandavardhana as a 'paṇḍitammanya' a man who makes a pretence of scholarship which he does not possess.²⁴

He notes the first two instances of Vāstudhvani cited by Ānandavardhana, and remarks that the fact can be explained more satisfactorily by regarding the so-called suggested meaning as being conveyed by the primary function of words with the assistance of other prāmāṇas, particularly anumāna. Jayanta's criticism has been hedged in between his refutations of the views of Mīmāṃsakas on Arthāpatti and Abhāva. According to him dhvani occupies almost the same

place as that of Arthāpatti and therefore the criticism levelled against the latter will, in his opinion, apply mutatis mutandis in regard to dhvani too. Just as Arthāpatti is nothing more than a kind of inference dhvani also is another kind of inference only. He kills two birds with one stone by positing that words with their well-known functions are enough to explain all meanings, arrived at through some pramāna or another. The variety in meaning is due, in other words, to the variety of the pramānas that assist in the grasping of the meaning and not due to the variety of functions (vyāpāra) of a word.

V.10 Mahimabhaṭṭa's Criticism

Mahimabhaṭṭa's VV stands foremost among the works criticising the Dhvani theory. He attempted to demonstrate elaborately how all varieties of Dhvani can be included in Anumāna. In the third chapter of the VV he cites about thirty examples quoted in the Dhā and shows how they can be explained away by Anumāna. Some of them are analysed as follows:

1. Vastumātradhvani

भ्रम धार्मिक विश्वस्तः स शुनकौड्य मारितस्तेन ।
गौदानदीकच्छलताकुञ्जवासिना वृत्तसिंहैर्न ॥

These words are spoken by the heroine to a mendicant who wanders in the forest to gather flowers. She explicitly bids him to wander as he pleases. The meaning actually

intended here is the prohibition of wandering. This meaning according to Ānandavardhana, is conveyed through suggestion; while Mahimabhaṭṭa shows that it is inferred.²⁵ It can be explained as:

2. Arthāntarasamkramitavācya

तदा जायन्ते गुणाः यदा ते सहृदयैर्गृह्यन्ते ।
रविकिरणानुगृहीतानि भवन्ति कमलानि कमलानि ॥

Mahimabhaṭṭa points out that the word kamalāni (lotuses) is used twice in two different senses. The first word refers to the lotuses in their general capacity and the second to the particular aspect characterised by qualities like excessive charm and perfume caused by the contact with the rays of the sun. These particular qualities are inferred as existing in the lotuses because of the identification of the general with the particular.²⁶ It cannot be objected that the identification between the same objects is illogical, because there the identification is between the same things characterised by different aspects.

3. Atyantatiraskṛtavācya

रविसंक्रान्तसौभाग्यस्तपारावृतमण्डलः ।
निःश्वासान्ध इवादर्शश्चन्द्रमा न प्रकाशते ॥

Here the explicit statement that the mirror is blind, being actually incompatible causes the inference of the dimness of the mirror. Blindness can be the characteristic of only a living being; hence we infer that all that is intended is that mirror is just like the eye covered by the vapour of

exhalation.²⁷

4. Śabdāsaktimūlādhvani

अत्रान्तरे कुसुमसमययुगमुपसंहारंनुदजृम्भत श्रीमाभिधानः
फुल्लमल्लिकाधवरावृहासो महाकालः'

Here, apart from the contextual meaning referring to the advent of the summer season, we cognise a non-contextual meaning referring to Śiva. Mahimabhaṭṭa maintains that it is because the figure Samāsokti originating due to the greater suitability of the epithets to the Mahākāla (Śiva) serves as the cause for the second meaning of that word.²⁸ As a result it is able to denote the non-contextual meaning i.e. Śiva in addition to the contextual meaning, the great season (Mahā kālah). The word mahākāla by itself cannot give both the contextual and the non-contextual meanings alike by Abhidhā and it is the association of roaring laughter (aṭṭahāsa) and the destruction of yuga with mahākāla that is responsible for the cognition of a non-contextual meaning. Thus we cognise this meaning also: "In the meanwhile yawned terrible Lord Śiva with a boisterous laughter white like full-blown jasmines", apart from the contextual meaning: "By that time, the great season called summer concluding the twin months of flowering season burst forth whitemess of full-blown flowers rendering the turrets beautiful". Its Anumānavākya can be possible in the following two ways:

- (a) प्रकृतं महाकालपदं महाकालदेवताविशेषप्रतिपादनपरम्, युगसंहार-
वृहासबोधकपदसमभिव्याहृतत्वात्,
(b) महाकालो नाम देवविशेषः अत्रत्यमहाकालपदप्रतिपाद्यः,
युगसंहारावृहाससम्बन्धित्वात् ।

Mahimabhaṭṭa insists that some hint should be given by the poet as to the presence of the non-contextual meaning for its cognition. Accordingly he denies the presence of the additional meaning in places wherein no such hint is given. For example:

दत्तानन्दाः प्रीजानां समुचितसमयाक्लिष्टसृष्टैः पयैभिः
पूर्वा विप्रकीर्णा दिशि दिशि विरमन्त्यह्नि संहारभाजः ।

दीप्तांशौ दीर्घदुःखप्रभवभवभयौदन्वदुत्तारनावौ

गावौ वः पावनानां परमपरिमिता प्रीतिमुत्पादयन्तु ॥ (V.V.P. 478)

Here, there is nothing to warrant the presence of the non-contextual meaning pertaining to cow and hence no cognition of that meaning is possible here. The homonymous word gauḥ itself cannot denote the non-contextual meaning because in that case, there would be no reason why it cannot denote other non-contextual meanings like vajra as well. It cannot be argued that due to the suitability of epithets to cow, only that main meaning is selected from among the several non-contextual meanings; there is nothing to show that a second meaning other than the contextual is intended by these epithets. If we take the word gauḥ to be the determining factor of their non-contextual meaning, it will involve the defect of mutual reliance (anyonyāśraya)²⁹. The cognition of the non-contextual meaning of the epithets will itself have to be caused by means of the word gauḥ. It cannot be argued that both the homonymous viśeṣaṇas and viśeṣya operating jointly cause the cognition of the non-

contextual meaning; they have no capacity to produce meaning independently without the involvement of the reader's cognitive power. Moreover, if the word were the cause of the cognition of the contextual and the non-contextual meanings alike, it could do so automatically and simultaneously. In that case there would be no sequence in their cognition. Thus Mahima shows that the homonymous words themselves are not capable of giving forth the non-contextual meaning without some hint. In the absence of any such hint there can be no cognition of the non-contextual meaning.

5. Arthaśaktimūladhvani

Mahimabhaṭṭa explains that in case of Arthaśaktimūladhvani the cognition of the suggested meaning from the expressed meaning is like their invariable concomitance. Thus in the verse:

एवं वादिनि देवर्षे पार्श्वे पितुरधौमुखी ।
कीलाकमरूपत्राणि गणयामास पार्वती ॥

the expressed meaning consisting of Pārvatī's counting the petals of the lotus causes the inference of the bashfulness of Pārvatī because of the mutual connection between them.³⁰

V.11 The Suggestive Elements in Mahimabhaṭṭa's Perspective

Anandavardhana regards all elements of poetry, beginning from mere letters (varṇas) to the whole composition (prabandha) as capable of suggestion (vyañjaka). Mahimabhaṭṭa examines

this view from his own standpoint. According to him, varṇas and saṁghaṭanā do not have the natural power to evoke Rasa directly. They are related to the Rasa only through the expressed meaning.³¹ Mahima maintains that the Rasas shine forth more vividly when they are inferred from the expressed meaning given forth by sound adorned with the appropriate varṇas and saṁghaṭanā. The varṇas and saṁghaṭanā are actually the attributes of sound which gives forth the expressed meaning, which in its turn is the cause of Rasa just as dry leaves cause fire which is the cause of smoke. The relation of varṇas and saṁghaṭanā with the concerned Rasa is grasped through experience. It is our ordinary experience that people use style and sound devoid of huge compounds when affected by emotions like love and grief. When angry or excited, they employ harsh sounds and complex style. This experience serves the basis of the inference of the appropriate Rasa from varṇas and saṁghaṭanā.³²

As to the suggestiveness of words and sentences, Mahimabhaṭṭa points out that they are directly responsible for the cognition of the expressed meaning from which Rasa is inferred. They become the cause of the cognition of another meaning because of either metaphorical usage (upacāra) or factors like the context (prakaraṇasāmagrī).³³ The word rāmeṇa in रामेण प्रियजीवितेन तु कृतं प्रेम्णः प्रियेणीचिन्तम् । is the example where a word becomes responsible for the inference of Rāma's qualities like bravery etc., otherwise

the use of 'maya' in place of 'Rāma' could have served the purpose.

Mahimabhaṭṭa concludes VV with the observation that the gist of his arguments is that all the elements considered to be responsible for Abhivyakti by the Dhvani theorists are accepted by him as the causes responsible for inference.³⁴

V.12 Anumāna and Mahimabhaṭṭa's Theory of Language

Mahimabhaṭṭa critically examines the problem of meaning and analyses the concepts like Abhidhā, Lakṣanā, Vyañjanā and Tātparyasakti as well as Prāmaṇas like Upamāna and Arthāpatti.

The most interesting feature of this theory of language is that he considers all linguistic expressions as the forms of inference. One resorts to language to bring forth some desired effect in the hearer. This effect may be either some positive action or abstention from action. It is the result of yathārthajñāna and ayathārthajñāna. In Mahima's view language by its very nature is pragmatic, having definite aims in its operation. It is through creative conviction of the validity of the communicated fact that a hearer can be persuaded to act in accordance with the speaker's wishes. In other words, linguistic usage always involves the establishment of some fact logically and convincingly leading the hearer to the comprehension of the validity of

that fact. The hearer can be convinced of the validity of a proposition only when he understands the logic in it and this demonstration of logic is done through language.

Mahimabhaṭṭa distinguishes between descriptive sentences which do not establish anything new and substantive sentences establishing new facts. In other cases the meaning of the sentence becomes descriptive as in the case of the statement:

अस्त्युत्तरस्यां दिशि देवतात्मा हिमालयो नाम नगाधिराजः ।
'there is a mountain called Himālaya in the north'.

Substantiation of new facts involves the presentation of the fact to be established (sādhya) as the means of establishing that fact (sādhana). The sādhya and sādhana portions of a sentence are constituted respectively by the subjective and predicative elements of the sentence. In other words, the known facts become sādhana in establishing the sādhya of unknown facts. The process involved in the comprehension of the theme of an argument is inference undergoing in the mind of the hearer when he cognises a verbal statement.

Ordinary inference is possible only when there is the knowledge of the invariable concomitance (vyāptijñāna) of the sādhya and sādhana. In the inference of fire on the hill, on seeing smoke, one is prompted by the knowledge of the invariable concomitance between the fire and the smoke grasped by the hearer from his frequent observations in the places like kitchen. The same procedure is followed in the understanding of the arguments couched in ordinary language,

which can be grasped from three sources of valid knowledge. They are 1. Loka 2. Veda and 3. Ādhyātma. Among the three, the first two constitute verbal knowledge and the last one is perception. First of all Bharata has referred to these three pramāṇas. Abhinavagupta explains the term Lokapramāṇa means pratyakṣa, Anumāna, Āgama etc. whereas, as Ruyyaka points out, this list significantly omits Anumāna. The omission, Ruyyaka explains, is due to the fact that Anumāna is the end served by these pramāṇas.³⁵

Mahimabhaṭṭa deals with sādhyasādhanabhāva of a language at two different levels. (1) The substantiation of one fact by another at expressed level. (2) The substantiation of a fact by means of the expressed facts, at the unexpressed level. It is the second type that comprises Anumāna wherein Mahima includes all varieties of Dhvani. Though both types of substantiation involve sādhyasādhanabhāva, the former is essentially different from the latter in one important respect. The first type, comprising explicit sādhyasādhanabhāva, causes the cognition of no new idea save the logical relationship between directly stated sādhya and sādhana. On the other hand, the second type caused the cognition of the unexpressed sādhya from the expressed sādhana. Ruyyaka cites the parallel to kāvyaḥetu and Arthāntaranyāsa of Udbhaṭa to illustrate the point.³⁶ Anumāna is like kāvyaḥetu where something unexpressed is cognised. The explicit sādhyasādhanabhāva is like Arthāntaranyāsa where one

expressed idea is substantiated by means of another expressed idea.³⁷ All instances of Dhvani, in Mahima's view, consist of sādhyasāadhanabhāva between the expressed and the unexpressed meanings, i.e. of the second type.

Mahima divides the whole meaning-complex of language into vācya and anumeya.³⁸ He is of the view that the relationship between word and meaning is conventional. Sound can denote a meaning only when there is a convention assigning that specific meaning to it. Hence, he rejects the view that sound can ever denote a meaning not having a conventional relation with it.

V. 13 Critics of Anumāna Theory

1. Mammata

Mammata in his KP makes an attempt to show the defects in Mahimabhaṭṭa's theory of Anumāna.³⁹ He presents the pūrvapakṣa view as follows:

The suggested meaning without having any relation with the expressed meaning cannot be cognised. If it happens, anything could be suggested by any word without any restriction. So one has to accept that the suggested meaning has some relation with the expressed meaning. Since relation exists between the two there can be no suggestiveness in the absence of that relation existing between the suggested and the suggestor. The relation is such that the suggestor is never

concomitant with the contrary of suggested. The suggestor also subsists in the suggested meaning. Thus the suggestor fulfills three essential conditions of a hetu required in Anumāna viz., pakṣasattva, sapakṣasattva and vipakṣasattva. The knowledge of the suggested meaning becomes inferential in nature. For example in 'bhrama dhārmika' etc., the traveller is advised to move in the wilderness because of the death of the dog. But it leads to the inference that godāvaritīra is not a safe place because of the presence of the lion. The nature of inference is :

गोदावरीतीर भीरुभ्रमणयौष्यम्, दृप्तसिंहवत्त्वात्, यन्नेवं
तन्नेवं यथा प्रमोदघानम् ।

Thus presenting the pūrvapakṣa view Mammaṭa shows the three defects of Anaikāntikatva, Viruddhatva and Asiddhatva of hetu in the given example.

The first defect is that the hetu is Anaikāntika which is explained as savyābhicāra in the Nyāyaśāstra. It is so named because it does not possess only one end only or it tends to prove not only one thing but also its opposite. Thus Anaikāntika means inconclusive. Mammaṭa says that the mere apprehension of something frightening is not an adequate reason for abstaining from wandering since people are seen wandering through dangerous places when they are obeying the command of their elders or are impelled by love. Thus the hetu is Anaikāntika by nature.

Secondly, the hetu suffers from Viruddhatva which is defined in the Nyāyaśāstra as that which is invariably comcomitant with the absence of the sādhya. In the given example the mendicant's aversion to the dog may not be due to his fear but because of its impure nature. Hence it does not prove that he would be afraid of the lion. If he is a hero, the presence of the lion may prove just the contrary.

Thirdly, the defect of Asiddha also occurs in the given example as it does not establish the sādhya correctly. The presence of lion on Godavari's bank itself is not a documented fact. It is conveyed through the verbal statement of a woman in love. Thus the validity of the hetu itself being not established, the whole process of inference built upon it loses certainty required in a normal process of an inference.

Mammaṭa again demonstrates the same thing with the help of another verse 'niśśesacyutacandanam' etc. In this verse Anumāna theorists cannot explain the cognition of the suggested meaning from the expressed meaning. The signs seen on the messenger's body cannot conclusively prove that she has returned after enjoying dalliance. The very same signs can warrant the conclusion that she has taken bath. Nor can the term 'adhama' establish the bad conduct of the hero since the wickedness of hero is not a fact established through valid means. Thus, Mammaṭa establishes that the indefiniteness of the suggested meaning proves the difference between Anumāna and Vyañjanā.

3. Vidyādhara

Following Ruyyaka, Vidyādhara (1285-1325 A.D.) in his Ekāvali rejects the Anumāna theory of Mahimabhaṭṭa.⁴⁰ He repeats the arguments of Ruyyaka but adds Anupalabdhi as vyāptiprayojaka which is not found in the treatment of Ruyyaka in his AS. Anupalabdhi cannot prove dhvani for it can prove only that sādhya which consists of an absence of something as the absence of a jar can be proved from Anupalabdhi. The fact, that 'there is no jar here' can be proved from the perception that it is not cognised here. Since, had it been here it would have been cognised. If Mahimabhaṭṭa attempts to prove dhvanyabhāva from Anupalabdhi, the hetu which is vitiated leads to the fallacy called Asiddha. When the cognition of dhvani is evident, its non-cognition cannot be proved. Nor can dhvanyābhāva be proved from the non-cognition of words and their sense. The non-cognition of a jar cannot prove the absence of a pillar. Therefore, the non-cognition of words and their senses cannot prove the absence of dhvani. Thus Anupalabdhi cannot establish the vyāpti between the sādhya and the sādhana, dhvani and śabdārtha.

4. Vidyānātha

Vidyānātha (1325 A.D.) in the Pratāparudrīyayaśobhūṣana while dealing with Mahimabhaṭṭa's Anumāna theory maintains that Arthaśaktimūladhvani cannot be included in Anumāna.⁴¹ There

There is no vyāpti between suggestive elements and the suggested meaning, because the intended meaning is cognised from words qualified by the poet's intention. Different meanings are cognised from the same words due to the difference in the implications of the poems. This is not compatible with Anumāna which requires the cognition of the same meaning from the same expression.

5. Viśvanātha

Viśvanātha (1383A.D.) in his SD repeats the arguments of Mammata with regard to the problem of the inclusion of vastudhvani and alankāradhvani in Anumāna. The hetu in the example like 'bhrama dharmika' etc., is not ~~free~~ from the defects like Aniakāntika and Asiddha. Apart from this he further points out some other difficulties with regard to the Anumāna theory. Referring to the verse 'niśsesacyuta-candanam' etc., he raises the question as to who is the inferer? or who does infer that the messenger made love to the hero? There would not be any problem if it is maintained that the implied meaning is inferred by the messenger herself or by other people present there. But the Anumāna theorists maintain that it is the sahrdaya who infers this meaning. This is unsound since the same verse may give a different meaning in a another context. Thus the vyāpti between the literal and the suggested meaning is not possible.⁴² It may be argued that the literal meaning

qualified by background features like the speakers mood can give rise to specific suggested meaning only. But there is no way of comprehending the vyāpti in such a specific form modified by contextual features. Further, Viśvanātha argues that as the subject matter presented in poetry originates from the poet's pratibhā it is essentially different from logical propositions.⁴³ The hetu depicted in poetry having defects like sandigdhatva and Asiddhatva may fail to satisfy the technical requirements of the hetu in a logical syllogism.

5. Kavi Karnapura

Kavi Karnapura (1505A.D.) in Alaṅkāra-kaustubha (II kirana) in connection with the discussion of vyañjanā deals with the Anumāna theory of Mahimabhaṭṭa and rejects it.⁴⁴ Vyañjanā cannot be identical with inference. For, the relation between the suggestor and the suggested is not the same as that of the hetu and the sādhyā in the case of Anumāna of fire from smoke. The relation existing between the suggester and the suggested is of the nature of manifestor and manifested like the lamp and the jar. While in the case of vahnayanumāna the relation existing between dhūma and vahni is sāhacarya. Secondly, in the vahnayanumāna of Naiyāyikas the knowledge of hetu produces arthakriyā (a sense of action). On the basis of arthakriyā, anumāna is known to be valid one. Thirdly, there should be presence of the hetu in pakṣa otherwise the anumāna is not possible.

All these conditions are not there in case of vyañjanā. So the anumiti of the suggested meaning is not possible. Vyañjanā also does not depend on any kind of vyāpti and therefore it can convey the suggested meaning in all circumstances.

Anumāna is a major topic of Nyāya philosophy and it deals with a very fundamental aspect of epistemology. Experience of rasa or realisation of dhvani is also an important type of cognition and as such it also moves on the fringe of the epistemological problem. Thus, the chain of Anumāna to substitute the vyañjanā (and dhvani) is a very serious one, and has constituted a major theory in Indian aesthetics, a major opposition to the Rasa-Dhvani theories, and an important exposition in the VV of Mahima. Aesthetic experience as a kind of cognition has claimed an important portion in the earlier poeticians like Bhāmaha etc, a major theory of rasanumiti propounded by Śaṅkuka, and a major perhaps the most serious criticism of the Dhvani theory. The graveness of this particular objection to Rasa and Dhvani has been recognised by all the major and minor poeticians beginning from Abhinava and upto Appaya and Jagannatha and even after who, while adhered to the Rasa and Dhvani views of Ānandavardhana, Abhinava, Mammata, could not afford to neglect it and always mentioned it and strove to answer it out. Each successive writer trying to add an argument or two of his own. This shows that this

important part of Nyāyaśāstra, the anumānaicāra has not only constituted a major source of fear to the poetic theories but also has influenced the poetical thought and sharpened the wits of the Indian literary thinkers. It has proved to be a very important aspect of the Naiyāyika influence on Sanskrit poetics.

1. प्रत्यक्षानुमानोपमानशब्दाः प्रमाणानि । Nys., I.1.3
2. अनुमितिकरणं अनुमानम् । Ts., P.25
3. तज्जस्यं पर्वतो वह्निमान् इति ज्ञानमनुमितिः । ibid.
4. अनुमानस्य द्वे अङ्गौ व्याप्तिः पक्षधर्मता च । TB, P.33.
5. व्याप्यस्य पर्वतादिवृत्तित्वं पक्षधर्मता । Ts, P. 25
6. यत्र यत्र धूमस्तत्राग्निरिति साहचर्यनियमो व्याप्तिः ।
7. व्याप्तिविशिष्टपक्षधर्मताज्ञानं परामर्शः । ibid ^{ibid.}
8. तच्चानुमानं द्विविधम् । स्वार्थं परार्थं चेति । TB. P.25.
9. यत्तु कश्चित् स्वयं धूमाद्यग्निमनुमाय परं बोधयितुं
पञ्चावयववाक्यं प्रयुङ्क्ते तत् परार्थानुमानम् । TB., P. 26.
10. NS., ch. VI, P. 226.
11. Gnoli, R. The Aesthetic Experience According to Abhinavagupta, PP. 25-26.
Translation is taken from the above.
12. ABh., PP. 266-7.
13. As Translated by Gnoli, op.cit, p. 29.
14. ABh., PP. 266-7.

15. PV. II. 56.
16. विशेषाभावसङ्कृतसामान्यहेतुकानुमानम् ;
प्रसक्तस्य प्रतिषेधेन्यत्राप्रसङ्गात्परिशिष्यमाणे
संप्रत्ययः । Nyāyakośa, P. 484.
17. ABh, २३३
18. यापि विभावादिभ्यो रसादीनां प्रतीतिः सानुमान
एवांतर्भावमर्हतीति । 'विभावानुभावव्यभिचारि
प्रतीतिर्हि रसादिप्रतीतेः साधनमिष्यते । ते
हि रसादीनां भावानां कारणकार्यसङ्कारिभूता-
स्तानमुपापयन्त एव रसादीन् निष्पादयन्ति ।
त एव हि प्रतीयमाना आस्वादपदवीं गताः
सन्तो रसा इत्युच्यन्ते । इत्यवश्यम्भावो
तत्प्रतीतिक्रमः । VV. P. 477.
19. तत्र प्रष्टव्यम् किं शब्दाभिनयसमर्पितविभावा-
दिप्रत्ययानुमितरसादिगतशगादिज्ञानमैव
रसत्वैनाभिमतं भवतः, तद्भावनया भावुकैर्भाव्यमानः-
स्वप्रकाशानन्दे वा ? आद्ये न विवादः ।
किन्तु रसादिगतशगादिज्ञानं रससत्त्वा नौच्यते
स्माभिः इत्येव विशेषः । द्वितीयस्तु

व्याप्तिगृहणाभावाद्धेतोराभासतयाऽसिद्ध एव ।

SD. P. 163.

20. व्यञ्जकत्वं शब्दानां गमकत्वं तच्च लिङ्गत्वमतश्च
व्यङ्ग्यप्रतीतिर्लिङ्गि प्रतीतिरेवेति लिङ्गलिङ्गिभाव
एव तेषां व्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकभावो नापरः कश्चित् ।

DHA. III. 33. P. 216.

21. Locana, p. 254.

22. अथवा नैदृशी चर्चा कविभिः सृष्ट शोभते ।
विद्वांसोऽपि विमुह्यन्ति वाक्यार्थगृहनेऽध्वनि ॥
NM. P. 45

23. तदलमनया गौष्ठ्या विद्वज्ज्जोचितया चिरं ।
परमगृहनस्तर्कज्ञानामभूमिरयं नयः ॥
NM. P. 45

24. एतेन शब्दसामर्थ्यमहिम्ना सोऽपि वारितः ।
यमन्यः पण्डितमन्यः प्रपैदे कश्चन ध्वनिम् ॥
विधेर्निषेधावगतिर्विधिबुद्धिर्निषेधतः ।

भम धम्मिअ वीसन्थो मास्म पान्थ गृहं विश ॥

NM. P. 45.

25. तेनानुमेय एव भ्रमणस्य निषेधो न व्यङ्ग्य
इत्यवस्येयं यथा नात्र शीतस्पर्शोऽनैश्चित्तः
शीतस्पर्शस्य । VV. P. 465.

26. एवञ्चास्याध्यनुमानान्तर्भाव एवावगन्तव्यः।
VV. P. 476.
27. तस्य चानुमानान्तर्भावः समर्थित एव प्राक्।
28. इत्यत्र त्वन्तरैकः प्रकारो न सम्भवतीति
कुतोऽर्थांतरप्रतीतिः। VV. P. 476.
29. Ibid. P. 479.
30. Ibid. P. 489.
31. Ibid. P. 499.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid. P. 501.
34. तदेवं ध्वनेरनुमानान्तर्भावाभ्युपगमः श्रेयानिति।
Ibid. P. 510
35. Ruyyaka, Com. on VV. प्रमाणं च त्रिधा लोक-
वेदाध्यात्मस्वप्त्वेन ----- अनुमानमत्र न
गणितं तस्योपकार्यत्वेन प्रसिद्धत्वात्। P. 501.
36. ततश्चौद्धटकाव्यहैतुन्यायेनानुमानं व्यवस्थितम्,
अर्थांतरन्यासन्यायेन तूपपादनम्। Ibid., P. 49.
37. VV., P. 57-8.
38. अर्थाऽपि द्विविधौ वाच्योऽनुमेयश्च। Ibid. P. 47.
39. KP., P. 255(-).

40. यत् पुनरनुमानतो नातिरिच्यते ध्यनिरित्याचष्ट-
महिमभट्टस्तदपि पलाकायमानम् प्रकृतौ
ध्वनिः साध्यसामान्यं शब्दार्थौ च साधनसामान्यं
तत्र च ध्वनैरनुपलब्धिर्वा शब्दार्थयोस्तादात्म्यं
वा तदुत्पत्तिर्वा साधिका । Ekaivali, p. 32.

41. Pratāparudraśāstrabhāṣanam, p. 33

42. ननु वक्रग्रथवस्थासङ्कृतत्वेन विशैल्यो हेतु-
रिति न वाच्यम् एवंविधव्याप्त्यनुसंधानस्याभावात् ।
SD., p. 168.

43. Ibid

44. AlamkāraKaustubha, p. 27.

ES

२०२