

Maṅgalaśloka of Dhvanyāloka

Dr. Anandakrishnan Kunholathillath

Associate Professor, Department of Sanskrit, KMM Govt. Women's College, Kannur, Kerala
(Affiliated to Kannur University)

Abstract

The *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana is a milestone in the history of Sanskrit poetics. In this work, he establishes that *dhvani* (suggestion) is the soul of poetry, and defines it in a systematic and scientific manner. Following Indian tradition, Ānandavardhana begins the *Dhvanyāloka* with a *maṅgalaśloka* (auspicious verse). In the *Locana*, the commentary on the *Dhvanyāloka*, written by Abhinavagupta, it is said that this auspicious verse is very significant in that it illuminates different types of *dhvani*. In the later commentaries and studies on the *Dhvanyāloka*, it is this very perspective of Abhinavagupta that is seen to have been followed. However, this research paper discusses the significance of choosing such an auspicious verse wherein Ānandavardhana glorifies the claws of Narasiṃha in the context of the connection between the story of the *Narasimhāvatāra* and the subject matter of *Dhvanyāloka*. Here, various dimensions related to poetic appreciation — such as *kāvyaśarīra* (the body of poetry), *kāvyaātmā* (the soul of poetry), *vyañjanāvyāpāra*, and *sahṛdaya* (the sensitive reader) — are discussed in connection with the mythological narrative.

Keywords: *Maṅgalaśloka*, *Dhvanyāloka*, Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, *Dhvani*, *Vyañjanāvyāpāra*, *Sahṛdaya*, *Rasa*.

Introduction

Indian poetics, known as *kāvyaśāstra* in Sanskrit, addresses the scientific and philosophical dimensions of language in literature. As K. Krishnamoorthy observes, “the whole field of Indian poetics may be regarded as one continued attempt to unravel the mystery of the beauty of poetic language”.¹ The various schools of Indian poetics have examined the creative use of language from diverse perspectives, seeking to understand both the experience of the artist during the act of composition and the aesthetic response evoked in the *sahṛdaya* (the sensitive reader) during the process of appreciation. Despite methodological differences, all schools of Indian poetics converge on the notion that the primary objective of *kāvya* is the evocation of *rasa* in *sahṛdaya*.

Modern scholarship classifies Indian aesthetic theory into eight schools, viz., *rasa*,

¹ *Studies in Indian Aesthetics and Criticism*, p. 22.

alankāra, *guṇa*, *rīti*, *dhvani*, *vakrokti*, *anumāna* and *aucitya*. The foundations of Indian aesthetics were laid by Bharata (c. 200 BCE) in *Nāṭyaśāstra*, where the theory of *rasa* was first systematically articulated. Subsequent developments include the *alankāra* tradition represented by Bhāmaha (c. 7th century CE), *guṇa* by Daṇḍin (c. 7th–8th century CE) and *rīti* theory advanced by Vāmana (8th–9th century CE). A decisive shift in Indian poetics occurs with Ānandavardhana (9th century CE), the Kashmiri critic who propounded the *dhvani* (suggestion) theory and identified it as the *kāvyaātmā* (soul of poetry). His seminal work, *Dhvanyāloka*, is widely regarded as an epoch-making work in the history of Sanskrit poetics for its systematic formulation of *dhvani* as the central organizing principle of poetic meaning. In this work, Ānandavardhana extends Bharata's theory of *rasa*, originally developed in the context of drama, to *kāvya* and called it *dhvani*. As later critics such as Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja (17th century CE) acknowledges in *Rasagaṅgādhara*, *Dhvanyāloka* settled the principles to be followed in poetics.¹

As Sivakumara Swamy pointed out, there was no full-fledged approach to analysis of literature developed prior to Ānandavardhana where poetic analysis was limited to certain factors like charm (*alankāra*, *guṇa*) and manners of composition (*mārga* or *rīti*). The standard topics of poetics, without a central binding principle, were lacking proper orientation and purpose. It was Ānandavardhana who established *dhvani* or suggestive element in poetry, especially *rasadhvani* as the central principle of charm in poetry or as the soul of poetry.² Thus, Ānandavardhana stands as the first thinker to systematically articulate the primacy of *rasa* in *kāvya* through the doctrine of *dhvani*.

Maṅgalaśloka of Dhvanyāloka

It is an ancient tradition in India that authors begin their work with a *maṅgalācaraṇa* or an auspicious invocation. Patanjali (c.2nd century BCE) highlights the significance of *maṅgalācaraṇa* in his work the *Mahābhāṣya*.³ There has been strong belief that for successful completion of any work undertaken by an author, it should begin with *maṅgalācaraṇa*. Following the Indian tradition, Ānandavardhana opens his treatise *Dhvanyāloka* with *maṅgalācaraṇa*, wherein he glorifies the claws of Narasiṃha (man-lion incarnation of Lord Viṣṇu). The *maṅgalaśloka* is as follows.

svecchākesariṇah svacchasvacchāyāyāsītendavah |

trāyantām vo madhuripoh prapannārticchido nakhāh ||

Of Madhu's foe

¹ *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, p.161.

² *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana*, Ed. Dr. M. Sivakumara Swamy, pp.1-2.

³ *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā of Bhartṛhari*, Fascicule IV, Āhnika I, Ed. Johannes Bronkhorst, p. 21.

incarnate as a lion by his will,
may the claws, which put the moon to shame
in purity and shape,
by cutting off his devotees' distress
grant you protection.¹

Abhinavagupta on *Maṅgalaśloka*

As Abhinavagupta (11th century CE) observes in his *Locana*, the celebrated commentary on *Dhvanyāloka*, the opening *maṅgalaśloka* is highly significant in propounding the *Dhvani* theory. The expression “*trāyantām vaḥ*” may be interpreted as “may the claws of Lord Madhuripu (Viṣṇu in his Narasiṃha incarnation) protect you” and refers specifically to the commentators and students of the work. This “protection” is not merely physical or devotional; rather, it signifies the help rendered for attaining the desired object by removing all the obstacles that may come in the way of proper understanding of the text. The verse suggests *utsāha* (energy or enthusiasm) of the Lord, which is the *sthāyibhāva* (permanent emotion) underlying *vīrarasa* (the heroic sentiment) and thereby illustrates *rasadhvani*. The heroic act of Madhuripu, who assumes incarnations of his own volition (*svecchākeśariṇaḥ*) and remains steadfast in protecting his devotees without reliance on external instruments, but solely through the extraordinary power of his claws as agents of protection, gives rise to multiple instances of *vastudhvani*. The Lord's profound compassion in alleviating the suffering of the afflicted is conveyed through the expression *prapannārticchidaḥ*. Further, the phrase *svacchasvacchāyāyāsītendavaḥ* suggests the image of a waning or distressed crescent moon. The descriptive epithets applied to the claws, such as *prapannārticchidaḥ* and *svacchasvacchāyāyāsītendavaḥ*, function as additional instances of *vastudhvani*. The superiority of the claws—both in brilliance and in their capacity to alleviate suffering—over the afflicted crescent moon illustrates *vyatirekadhvani* (suggestion through contrast). Moreover, *utprekṣādhvani* is present in the implied notion that the moon suffers distress because it is now overshadowed by the greater splendor of the claws, which attract the admiration previously directed toward the it. *Apahnutidhvani* (suggestion through denial or concealment) is also discernible, as the moon appears to withdraw from its former status, as though people no longer revere it, being captivated instead by the brilliance of the claws. Thus, the verse exemplifies multiple forms of *alankāradhvani* also.

¹ *The Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana with the Locana of Abhinavagupta*, Ed. Daniel H.H. Ingalls, p.43.

Abhinavagupta concludes his analysis by emphasizing the appropriateness of this *maṅgalaśloka* to the subject matter of the *Dhvanyāloka*, as it effectively illustrates all three major types of *dhvani* viz.. *rasadhvani*, *vastudhvani*, and *alāṅkāradhvani*.¹

From this interpretation, it may be inferred that Ānandavardhana selected this verse in order to demonstrate the various forms of *dhvani*. However, it remains to be considered whether the abundance of instances of *dhvani* alone prompted Ānandavardhana to select this *maṅgalaśloka* for *Dhvanyāloka*.

It has been an accepted tradition among authors to begin their works with a *maṅgalaśloka* that is appropriate to the subject under discussion. Mammaṭa Bhaṭṭa (11th century CE), at the opening of the *Kāvyaaprakāśa*, explicitly states that the author invokes the most suitable deity to remove obstacles: *granthārambhe vighnavighātāya samucita iṣṭa-devatā parāmrśyate*.² Bharata begins the *Nāṭyaśāstra* with invocations to Brahmā, the creator of Nāṭyaveda and Śiva, the god of dance,³ while Vāgbhaṭa (c. 6th century CE) opens the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdaya*, one of the basic texts of Āyurveda, with a salutation to the unique and rare physician.⁴ It is also customary to invoke either the deity as a whole or the deity's feet. For instance, in the play *Karṇabhāra*, written by Bhāsa (c. 4th century BCE), and depicting the Kurukṣetra War, invokes Lord Mahāviṣṇu, who assumed the form of the mighty Narasiṃha, in the *maṅgalaśloka*.⁵ Appayya Dīkṣita (16th century CE) commences *Kuvalayānanda* by saluting the feet of Gaurī.⁶

In contrast, Ānandavardhana invokes neither the deity in its entirety nor the feet but specifically the claws of the deity Narasiṃha, praying, “May the claws that cut asunder the afflictions of the devotees protect you”. This distinctive choice of a specific limb of *iṣṭadevatā* reflects adherence to the principle of *aucitya* (propriety). This is not incidental but is closely aligned with both the narrative context of the verse and the thematic concerns of the text more than the multitude of instances of *dhvani* illuminated therein. This connection becomes clearer when one considers the central objective of the *Dhvanyāloka*.

The Concept of *Dhvani*

Ānandavardhana's primary aim was to establish that *dhvani* constitutes the very soul (*ātman*) of poetry (*kāvya*). Although this idea gained wide acceptance among scholars,

¹ *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana*, Ed. Dr. M. Sivakumara Swamy, pp. 27-28.

² *Kāvyaaprakāśa* with English Translation, Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha, p.1.

³ *Nāṭyaśāstra*, I.1.

⁴ *Aṣṭāṅgahrdaya*, *Sūtrasthāna*, I.1.

⁵ *Karṇabhāra*, I.1

⁶ *Kuvalayānanda* I.1.

Ānandavardhana was the first to define *dhvani* systematically. His definition, articulated in the thirteenth *kārikā*, may be regarded as the conceptual core of the work. According to this formulation, that form of poetry in which the *śabda* (word) and *artha* (literal meaning) renders their meaning sub-ordinate (unimportant or insignificant) and suggests *vyaṅgyārtha* (the intended or implied meaning), is termed ‘*dhvani*’ or ‘suggestive poetry’ by the learned people. Thus, while *śabda* and *artha* constitutes the body of poetry, (*śabdārthaśarīram tāvat kāvyam*)¹, *dhvani* functions as the soul of poetry.

The symbolic significance of the *maṅgalaśloka* may now be more fully appreciated once we understand the *Purāṇakathā* behind the *maṅgalaśloka*. Just as the claws of Narasiṃha serve as powerful instruments that overcome external obstacles and reveal a deeper purpose, so too do *śabda* and *artha* yield their prominence to allow the emergence of *dhvani*. The invocation is therefore not merely ornamental but conceptually integral to both the Puranic narrative and the theoretical framework of the *Dhvanyāloka*.

Puranic Narrative (*Purāṇakathā*)

The story of Narasiṃha is narrated in detail in several Puranic texts, notably the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (c.3-4 CE)², one of the relatively earlier *Purāṇas*, recounts how Lord Viṣṇu assumes the Narasiṃha incarnation to slay Hiranyakaśipu, the father of Prahlāda, in order to protect his devoted follower.³ The *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, while narrating the same episode, situates it within the broader theological framework of the story of Jaya and Vijaya, thereby foregrounding the concept of *mokṣa* (liberation). Although the precise date of composition of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* remains uncertain, according to some scholars the limits to its dating are 500-1000 AD.⁴ According to T. Hopkins, the most likely time for the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* to have been written is probably between 850 and 900 AD.⁵ D. Dennis Hudson and Edwin Bryant argue for a "Gupta-period" date for the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* based on the sculptural program of the Vaikuṇṭha Perumāl Temple (c. 770 CE) , its narrative content, and the iconographic evidence that the text was fully composed and circulating well before the temple was built⁶. If so, it is plausible that Ānandavardhana was familiar with this text.

¹ *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana*, Ed. Dr. M. Sivakumara Swamy, p.30.

² *The Cultural Heritage of India*, Vol. II, p.257.

³ *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, Book I, Ch.20.

⁴ *The Advaitic Theism of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, p.6.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Hudson, D. Dennis, *The Śrīmad Bhāgavata Purāṇa in Stone: The Text as an Eighth-Century Temple and Its*

Implications, *Journal of Vaiṣṇava Studies*, vol. 3, no. 3, 1995, pp. 137–182.

According to this narrative in *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, Jaya and Vijaya were the devoted gatekeepers of Vaikuṇṭha, the eternal abode of Lord Viṣṇu. On one occasion, they inadvertently obstructed the entry of the Sanatkumāras—eternal sages who retained a childlike form—when the latter sought to visit Lord Viṣṇu. Offended by this act, the sages cursed them to be born in the mortal world and thereby be separated from the Lord. The sages also told them that after three births Jaya and Vijaya can return to Vaikuntha.¹

In their first birth, they were born as Hiraṇyākṣa and Hiraṇyakaśipu, the sons of sage Kaśyapa and Diti. Hiraṇyākṣa was slain by Viṣṇu in his Varāha (boar) incarnation when he attempted to submerge the earth in the cosmic ocean. Hiraṇyakaśipu, driven by vengeance, undertook severe penance to obtain a boon from Brahmā that would render him virtually invincible. He requested that he not be killed by man or beast, during day or night, indoors or outdoors, on earth or in the sky, by any weapon, or by any divine or mortal being. Having secured this boon, he proclaimed himself supreme and demanded universal worship.

However, his son Prahlāda remained an unwavering devotee of Viṣṇu from an early age and refused to acknowledge his father's authority. Enraged, Hiraṇyakaśipu subjected Prahlāda to numerous attempts on his life, all of which proved futile. Finally, in a moment of frustration, he challenged Prahlāda by asking whether Viṣṇu was present in a nearby pillar. When Prahlāda affirmed this, Hiraṇyakaśipu struck the pillar, from which Viṣṇu emerged in the form of Narasiṃha—neither man nor beast. At twilight (neither day nor night), Narasiṃha dragged Hiraṇyakaśipu to the threshold (neither indoors nor outdoors), placed him on his lap (neither earth nor sky), and slew him with his claws (not a weapon), thereby circumventing the conditions of the boon.

In earlier commentaries and studies on the *Dhvanyāloka*, the claws of Narasiṃha are generally interpreted as a powerful instrument or weapon employed for the protection of the afflicted. However, the suggestive richness of the verse allows for a deeper and more nuanced interpretation in connection with *vyañjanāvyāpara*—the power of suggestion.

Power of *Vyañjana*

In *kāvya*, the distinctive relationship between *śabda* (word) and *artha* (meaning) is termed *vyāpāra* (semantic operation). Sanskrit rhetoricians traditionally recognize three types of *śabdavyāpāras*: *abhidhā*, *lakṣaṇā*, and *vyañjanā*. *Abhidhā* denotes the primary or conventional meaning of a word—its direct, dictionary sense. *Lakṣaṇā* (indication) refers to the secondary meaning that arises when the primary meaning is either inappropriate or untenable in a given context; in such cases, a related meaning is inferred

¹ *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* VII.1.35.

on the basis of contextual necessity or convention. The true essence of *kāvya* cannot be fully grasped through *abhidhā* and *lakṣaṇā* alone. In the works of accomplished poets, there exists a dimension beyond the literal, viz., the *pratīyamāna* (implied) meaning, which is qualitatively distinct from the explicit sense conveyed by the combination of word and meaning¹. This suggested meaning operates at a higher level of aesthetic appreciation and emerges from the totality of the poetic composition rather than from its isolated components. The manifestation of this implied meaning is made possible only through *vyañjanāvyāpāra*. It is the suggestive power of language inherent in all the elements that constitute poetry. It enables the apprehension of a meaning that transcends both the *vācya* (primary) and *lakṣya* (secondary) senses. Aesthetic appreciation typically begins with the comprehension of meaning through *abhidhā* and *lakṣaṇā*, and is subsequently deepened by the imaginative engagement of the *sahṛdaya* and then through the operation of *vyañjanā*, this process culminates in the realization *rasa*, true aesthetic essence of poetry. As such, *vyañjanā* assumes primacy over the other *śabdavyāpāras* and is rightly regarded as the defining principle of poetic expression.

Based on the principle of *vyañjanā* or suggestion, Ānandavardhana classifies poetry into three. They are:

- i. *Dhvanikāvya*²– In this type of poetry, the words and their literal meanings occupy a subordinate position to the suggested sense which is charming and reigns supreme in realization of *rasa*. It is also called *uttamakāvya*.
- ii. *Guṇībhūtavyāṅgya*³– That type of poetry wherein suggested sense has some charm but is subordinated to the expressed sense is called *madhyamakāvya*. This is poetry of the second rate.
- iii. *Citrakāvya*⁴– It is that type of poetry wherein there is no suggested sense, however charming the expressed sense may be. This is poetry of the inferior type and cannot be considered as good poetry. It is called *adhamakāvya*.

The importance given to the element of suggestion determines the quality of poetry and among these, the highest type of *kāvya* is *dhvanikāvya*.

Interpretation of Maṅgalaśloka: Original Perspective

In the story, Narasimha destroyed the body of Hiranyakaśipu and the latter's soul was liberated and gave distressed Prahlāda the eternal bliss. Here the agent for liberating the

¹ *Dhvanyāloka*, I.4.

² *Ibid.*, I.13.

³ *Ibid.*, III.34.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III.41.

soul of Hiranyakaśipu by destroying his body is the claws of Narasimha. Likewise, in *kāvya*, the *śabda* and *artha* which constitutes the body of *kāvya* becomes unimportant and *dhvani*, which is the soul of *kāvya* becomes illuminated and thus the woes of the *sahṛdaya* get destroyed. Here the agent for illumination of *dhvani* is *vyañjanāvyāpāra*. The action of the claws, which destroys the body of Hiranyakaśipu while simultaneously granting liberation to his soul and bliss to Prahlāda, may be read as a symbolic parallel to the operation of *vyañjanāvyāpāra* in poetry. Just as the claws alone suffice to accomplish the destruction of Hiranyakaśipu and the liberation of the deeper purpose, so too does *vyañjanāvyāpāra* suffice to reveal the essence of *kāvya*. This process closely parallels the action of Narasimha's claws, which destroy the corporeal form of Hiranyakaśipu while enabling the liberation of his essential being.

In Kavya, no external instrument is required beyond the *vyañjanāvyāpāra* in order to illuminate the soul of *kāvya*, viz., *dhvani*. The imagery of the claws thus functions as a metaphor for the efficacy and autonomy of *vyañjanā* also. Their decisive force symbolically parallels the capacity of suggestion to penetrate beyond literal meaning and disclose the deeper aesthetic truth of poetry. This theoretical framework hence illuminates the symbolic significance of the *maṅgalaśloka* in the *Dhvanyāloka*.

At the same time, it must be noted that the body of *kāvya* is not entirely dispensable. Just as Hiranyakaśipu's embodied existence is necessary for the eventual realization of liberation, *śabda* and *artha* are indispensable as the initial vehicles of meaning. However, when confined to the literal level, they may act as obstacles that prevent the *sahṛdaya* from realizing the deeper aesthetic experience of *rasa*. Only through the operation of *vyañjanā* can this limitation be overcome, allowing the *sahṛdaya* to apprehend the suggested meaning and attain aesthetic fulfillment.

The revelation of *dhvani* is thus contingent upon the preparedness of the *sahṛdaya*. Abhinavagupta gives *sahṛdayalakṣaṇa* as follows. "The word *sahṛdaya* denotes persons who are capable of identifying with the subject matter, as the mirror of their hearts has been polished by the constant study and practice of poetry, and who respond to it sympathetically in their own hearts".¹ The experience of *rasa* arises when the aesthetic elements resonate within such a cultivated consciousness, pervading it as fire permeates dry wood.² Furthermore, although Prahlāda is not explicitly mentioned in the *maṅgalaśloka*, he may be implicitly understood as representing the *sahṛdaya*. Just as Prahlāda attains divine grace through unwavering devotion, the *sahṛdaya* attains aesthetic realization through sustained engagement with poetry. The qualities of

¹ *The Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana with the Locana of Abhinavagupta*, Ed. Daniel H.H. Ingalls, p.70.

² *Ibid.*

the *sahrdaya*—sensitivity, receptivity, and refined perception—may thus be compared to Prahlāda’s devotion and spiritual insight.

At first glance, it may appear that Prahlāda, who receives divine protection and ultimate bliss, is the true beneficiary of the Narasiṃha episode. However, from a deeper theological perspective, it is Hiraṇyakaśipu who attains liberation and thereby progresses toward ultimate union with the divine. A similar paradox may be observed in the realm of poetics. While it seems that the *sahrdaya* achieves fulfillment through the experience of *dhvani*, it is, in fact, the *kāvya* itself that attains its highest status. When the literal structure of poetry is transcended and the suggested meaning is revealed, the poem is elevated to the level of *dhvanikāvya*, or *uttamakāvya* (the highest form of poetry). It is for this reason that the works of poets such as Kālidāsa have endured across centuries, owing to their profound suggestive power.

Finally, just as Viṣṇu assumes the Narasiṃha incarnation spontaneously, out of his own will, to protect his devotee, the realization of *dhvani* in poetry is not externally imposed but arises organically within the consciousness of the *sahrdaya*. The destruction of Hiraṇyakaśipu’s body by the claws, while preserving the soul, parallels the operation of *vyañjanā*, which transcends the literal structure of poetry without negating its foundational role. In both cases, the apparent destruction is, in fact, a means of revelation and fulfillment.

Although Abhinavagupta identifies multiple figures of speech (*alaṅkāras*) in his commentary on the *maṅgalaśloka*, the dominant figure operative in this interpretive framework is *rūpaka* (metaphor). As defined by Bhāmaha-

upamānena yattattvamupameyasya rūpyate

*guṇānām samatām dṛṣtvā rūpakam nāma tadviduh.*¹

Rūpaka arises when the characteristics of one entity (*upamāna*) are directly superimposed upon another (*upameya*) based on a perceived similarity of qualities. In the present context, the claws of Narasiṃha may be understood as metaphorically representing *vyañjanāvypāra*, the agency that removes the suffering of the *sahrdaya* and enables the experience of *rasa*. Here *rūpakalaṅkāra* is illuminated.

Conclusion

Ānandavardhana, a devotee of Viṣṇu with a philosophical orientation, sought to move beyond earlier traditions that privileged figures of speech, and instead to

¹ *Kāvyālaṅkāra of Bhāmaha*, II.21

establish *dhvani*—enabled by *vyañjanā*—as an independent and central principle of poetic theory. His invocation of the claws of Narasiṃha, rather than the deity in entirety, is therefore deliberate. The *maṅgalaśloka* not only invokes divine protection or offers an initial glimpse of the aesthetic charm associated with *dhvani*, but also encapsulates the fundamental theoretical claim of the *Dhvanyāloka* that the very soul (*ātman*) of poetry resides in suggestion, realized through the power of *vyañjanā*. The study could establish the inextricable connection between the subject of the *Dhvanyāloka* and the Puranic story of Narasiṃha behind *maṅgalaśloka*. As the preceding discussion indicates, a deeper analysis of the *maṅgalaśloka* reveals that it adheres to the principle of propriety (*aucitya*), presenting a fully coherent and contextually appropriate poetic image that aligns seamlessly with the subject matter of the treatise.

Bibliography

1. *Aṣṭāṅga Hṛdayam of Srīmadvāgbhaṭa*, Ed. Dr. Brahmanand Tripathi, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, Delhi, 2014.
2. *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana*, Ed. Dr. M. Sivakumara Swami, Chethan Books, Bangalore-104, 2010.
3. *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana*, Ed. Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy, Karnatak University, Dharwar, 1974.
4. *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana with the Locana of Abhinavagupta*, Ed. Daniel H. H. Ingalls, London, 1990.
5. *Karṇabhāram (Karna's Burden) of Bhāsa*, Ed. Dr. Sudhakar Malaviya, Chaukhambha Orientalia, Varanasi, 1975.
6. *Kāvyaaprakāśa of Mammaṭa with English Translation*, Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha, Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Varanasi, 1967.
7. *Kāvyaālankāra of Bhāmaha*, Ed. C. Sankara Rama Sastri M.A., B.E., The Sri Balamanorama Press, Mylapore, Madras, 1956.
8. *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā of Bhartṛhari*, Fascicule IV, Āhnika I, Ed. Johannes Bronkhorst, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1987.
9. *Natyashastra of Bharatamuni*, Ed. Madhusudan Shastri M.A, Banaras Hindu University, 1971.
10. *The Bhāgavata- Purāṇa (Part III)*, Eds. J.L Shastri and G.V Tagare, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, Delhi, 2003.
11. *The Kuvalayananda of Appayya Dikshita*, Ed. T. K. Ramachandra Aiyar, R.S. Vadhyar and Sons, Kalpathi, Palghat, 1978.
12. *Viṣṇumahāpurāṇam of Mahārṣi Vedavyāsa*, Ed. Pt. Thaneshachandra Upreti, Parimal Publications, Delhi, 2003.
13. Kane, P.V, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi,



- 2002.
14. Krishnamoorthy, K, *Studies in Indian Aesthetics and Criticism*, D.V.K. Murthy, Mysore, 1979.
 15. *The Cultural Heritage of India*, Eds. S.K De et al., Vol. II, The Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, Calcutta, 1975.
 16. *Journal of Vaisṇava Studies*, vol. 3, no. 3, USA,1995