

***Anumiti Vāda, Vyaktiviveka and Anumiti* concept in Sinhala Literary Criticism**

H.W. Biresh Indika Sampath

Abstract

This article is a study on the *Anumiti Vāda* (the theory of inferential cognition), which is rarely discussed in Sanskrit literary criticism, *Vyaktiviveka* by *Mahimabhaṭṭa*, the main text of *Anumiti Vāda*, and the usage of *Anumiti* (inferential cognition) in Sinhala literary criticism. The research problem is to find the importance of *Anumiti Vāda* among other critical theories of Sanskrit, and its reflection on Sinhala literature. This study focuses on *Anumiti Vāda* and is based on primary and secondary resources under the qualitative research methodology. Sanskrit critical books such as *Vyaktiviveka*, *Dhvanyāloka*, etc., as well as Sinhala critical books such as *Siyabasalakara*, and theoretical books on *Anumāna* (inference) such as *Bhāṣārātna* written by *Tarkavagīṣa Bhaṭṭācārya* and *Tarkasaṃgraha* by *Annamibhaṭṭa* have been studied as the primary resources for this research. The books and articles by post scholars relevant to this concept were used as the secondary data. The data analysis methods were text analysis and comparative discussion. The origin and the evolution of *Anumiti Vāda*, the usages of the *Anumiti* concept in Sanskrit literary criticism, the *Anumiti* concept of *Mahimabhaṭṭa*, *Vyaktiviveka*, the main text of *Anumiti* by *Mahimabhaṭṭa*, the limitations and the capacity of *Vyaktiviveka*, the idea of the Sinhala critic *Hemapaḷa Vijayavardhana*, about

that theory, and the history of the usage of *Anumiti* in Sinhala literary criticism will be discussed in this article. *Anumithi* is a concept that identifies the meaning of some idea by the *Anumāna* (inference). Having rejected the theory of the meaning of suggestion (*Dhvani*), *Mahimabhaṭṭa* has introduced different methods identical to his, under the analysis of his theory, as alternatives to the poetic elements of the previous critics.

Key words: *Anumiti*, *Mahimabhaṭṭa*, *Vyaktiviveka*, *Siyabaslakara*

Introduction

This monograph mainly discusses the theory of *Anumiti* (inferential cognition) presented by *Mahimabhaṭṭa* in his *Vyaktiviveka*, written in the 11th century. All the Sanskrit critical theories are combined one by one because of the relationship of all concepts. *Rasa* and *Alaṅkāra* are the two oldest critical theories. *Dhvani* and *Aucitya* are the evolutions of the *Rasa Vāda*, and *Guṇa-Rīti* and *Vakrokti* are the evolutions of *Alaṅkāra Vāda*. Therefore, there are six critical theories of Sanskrit. If *Guṇa* and *Rīti* considered as two theories, that number would be increased to seven. According to some critics, there are eight Sanskrit critical theories, and the reason for that is the inclusion of the *Anumiti* theory.

However, *Anumiti* differs from the other six or seven critical theories, and it seems like an external and unexpected theory. It is an adaptation of a theory related to Indian philosophy and logic for literary criticism. *Mahimabhaṭṭa*, the critic of *Anumiti*, tried only to reject *Dhvani Vāda*, the theory of suggestion, using the new theory he introduced to literary criticism. Only the importance of *Anumiti Vāda* is the greatness of the arguments of *Mahimabhaṭṭa*; if not that, *Vyaktiviveka* may have been an unfamous and useless text.

The central concept of *Anumiti* is the knowledge that recognizes some other knowledge. Because of the universal combination of those

two things, the meaning of the unknown can be understood by the recognized thing. Therefore, *Anumāna* is the sign or mark about an object with a particular character, which helps to identify the character of a thing. *Mahimabhaṭṭa*, having rejected the *Dhvani Vāda*, has introduced this theory for literary criticism. He has adapted the critical theories and concepts of previous critics as the relevant theories of his theory, and sometimes, he has used his methodology to present those theories.

Methodology

The main objective of this research paper, which is presented under the topic of ‘*Anumiti Vāda, Vyaktiviveka and Anumiti concept in Sinhala Literary Criticism*’ is to discuss *Anumiti Vāda* (the theory of inferential cognition) founded by *Mahimabhaṭṭa* in his *Vyaktiviveka* written in the 11th century. Because of the rareness of the discussions on that concept in Sanskrit literary criticism, it is a basic need in this field of study. The other objectives are to survey the origination, different usages, and evolution of that theory and examine the usage in classical Sinhala literary criticism.

The research problem of this study is to survey the identity of *Anumiti*, among other critical theories of Sanskrit, and to examine its reflection in Sinhala literary criticism. This research is based on primary and secondary data using qualitative research methodology. Text analysis and comparative discussion are used as data analysis methods.

The order of this monograph is the introduction, methodology, and literature review of the study, the different usages of the *Anumiti* (inferential cognition) concept of Sanskrit literary criticism, introduction to the *Anumiti* concept, the importance of *Mahimabhaṭṭa* and his *Anumiti* theory, the capacity, limitation, and weaknesses of *Mahimabhaṭṭa*’s theory, the ideas of modern Sinhala critic

Vijayavardhana which relevant to that, the usage of *Anumiti* as a critical theory by the *Siyabaslakara* author, and the conclusion.

Literature Review

This study is original, very first-time research, and there is no previous research on this topic. However, there are some relevant details in separate resources. This research, which is implemented using qualitative research methods, is based on primary and secondary data. Introductory critical texts written in Sanskrit and Sinhala languages and English translations are the primary resources of this study, and the articles written by post-critics in academic journals are secondary resources. Those resources were studied as hard copies or internet resources of recognized sites. All the resources of this study can be divided into three categories.

- a. resources based on the *Anumiti Vāda*
- b. resources based on the *Anumiti* concept
- c. resources based on Sinhala literary criticism

The edition of *Vyaktiviveka* by *T. Gaṇapatiśāstrī* in 1909 is the leading primary resource of this study, and other relevant Sanskrit critical books, including *Dhvanyāloka* by *Ānandavardhana* and Sinhala classical books such as *Siyabaslakara* are also primary resources of this. The edition and the translation of *Dhvanyāloka* by K. Krishnamoorthy (1982) and *Siyabaslakara* edition by the three monks *Lelvala Sirinivāsa*, *Bentara Dhammasena* and *Hāgoda Dhamminda* (1948) mainly used for this research.

Furthermore, other philosophical and logical books such as *Bhāṣāratna* by *Tarkavagīṣa Bhaṭṭācārya* and *Tarkasaṃgraha* by *Annambhāṭṭa* were important as the primary resources. The *Bhāṣāratna* edition of *Kallpada Tarkacharyya* (1996) and the English translation by the *Tarkasaṃgraha* by *V. N. Jha* (2010) were studied for the understanding of the basic theory of *Anumāna*. Books and journal

articles relevant to those concepts, written by modern critics, were followed as secondary resources. “*Mahimabhaṭṭa’s Analysis of Poetic Flaws*” written by Lawrence McCrea (2004), “*Revisiting the Definition of Anumiti*” written by Arka Pratim Mukhoty (2023), “*The ‘Vyakti-Viveka’ of Mahima-Bhatta*” written by M. T. Narasimhiengar (1908), and “*Nature of Anumāna and Anumiti as discussed in Bhāṣāratna of Kanda Tarkavāgīṣa*” written by Devalina Saikia (2024), were studied as critical articles in Academic journals for this study.

For examining the *Anumiti* theory in modern Sinhala literary criticism, three books “*Sanskṛta Kāvya Vicāraye Mūladharma*” (1967), “*Outline of Sanskrit Poetics*” (1970), and “*Kāvya Vicāra Gaveṣaṇa*” (1968) written by Hemapāla Vijayavardhana mainly were important in this study. He has allocated only two paragraphs to discuss *Anumiti Vāda* in his book “*Sanskṛta Kāvya Vicāraye Mūladharma*” and its English translation, “*Outline of Sanskrit poetics*,” because of the consideration of irrelevancy in the primary critical way of Sanskrit. In his book “*Kāvya Vicāra Gaveṣaṇa*,” he presented a basic idea about the *Siyabaslakara* author's knowledge of *Anumiti*.

The different usages of *Anumiti*

The foundation of the *Anumiti* (inferential cognition) is the guessing of the opinion that follows some other knowledge or well-known information, and it is a different theory from *Dhvani Vāda*, the theory of suggestion. The critic who tried to apply *Anumiti* as a literary theory is *Mahimabhaṭṭa*, the author of the book *Vyaktiviveka* in the 11th century.

However, that concept has been discussed differently in the previous and post resources. The critic of *Rasa Saṅkuka* has also introduced an *Anumiti* concept (Theory of Inference of Rasa), which differs from the theory of *Mahimabhaṭṭa*. However, the central concept, *Anumana* (Inference), is similar.

Saṅkuka considered the sentiments as a logical inference process. When an actor portrays a character, the audience assumes that the actor and the main character are the same. It is the actor's responsibility to mimic the emotions of human existence, including the determining moods (*Vibhāva*) and consequent states (*Anubhāva*).

Sentiments are a mirror of the actor's mimesis, according to *Śaṅkuka*. Many critics of *Alaṅkāra*, such as *Ruyyaka*, *Hemacandra*, *Mammaṭa*, *Bhoja*, *Vāgbhaṭa*, *Jayadeva*, and *Viśvanātha* have explained *Anumāna* as a poetic figure. However, *Mahimabhaṭṭa*'s theory differs from those critics, and he has explained *Anumāna* as a critical theory based on meaning as an alternative idea of the meaning of suggestion (*Dhvani*) of the critics of *Dhvani*.

Introduction to *Anumiti* concept

The previous grammarians, the Buddhist and Jain philosophers¹, and the post-critics such as *Kanada Tarkavagīṣa Bhaṭṭācārya*, the writer of the book *Bhāṣāratna* in the 16th century have discussed that concepts *Anumāna* and *Anumiti*, but not as a critical theory of literature, only as a theory of the meaning of the language².

The meaning of the *Anumāna* is the knowledge that understands some other knowledge. Because of the universal combination of those two things, the meaning of the unknown can be understood by the known thing. Therefore, *Anumāna* is the sign or mark about a thing with a particular character, which helps to know the character of a thing. The combination of fire and smoke is a simple example, and

1. Sathischandra Chatterjee, “*Nyāya theory of Knowledge, a critical study of some problems of logic and metaphysics*”, (Delhi, Bharatīya kalā prakāśan, 1950), P.234
2. Devalina Saikia, “*Nature of Anumāna and Anumiti as discussed in Bhāṣāratna of Kanda Tarkavagīṣa*”, International Journal of Sanskrit Research, (ed) Devesh Kumar Mishra and others (India, 2024), 10(4): 287-292, available at <<https://www.anantaajournal.com/archives/?year=2024&vol=10&issue=4&part=E&ArticleId=2458>>

fire is sometimes apprehended through inference due to its connection with smoke. *Anumiti* (Inferential cognition) is the derivation of the *Anumāna* (Inference).

Many religious, philosophical, and critical traditions have different ideas about *Anumāna*. The *Nyāya* system states that knowledge of an item is obtained by applying knowledge of a *liṅga* or sign linked to the inferred object through a universal relationship known as *vyāpti* rather than by direct observation. *Vaiśeṣikas* believe that *Anumāna* knowledge comes from seeing a symbol or *liṅga*. Buddhists believe it starts with the idea that one item is inextricably linked to another. On the other hand, the Jains believe that it is a way to know an unseen thing by seeing a sign and remembering its constant concomitance with the object.

In *Tarkasaṃgraha*, *Annambhaṭṭa* in the 17th century defines inferential cognition (*Anumiti*) as that cognition which results from *parāmarśa*. In his commentary on *Tarkasaṃgraha*, namely *Tarkasaṃgraha-dīpikā*, *Annambhaṭṭa* shows an over-coverage of the *Tarkasaṃgraha* definition of *Anumiti* in ‘perception after doubt.’ And then, in *Tarkasaṃgraha-dīpikā*, he moves on to remove the over-coverage by qualifying the definition (of *Anumiti*) with *pakṣatā*³.

According to the *Nyāya* school of Indian philosophy, founded by *Maharṣi Gautama* in the second century, *Anumāna* (Inference) is one of the fourfold theories of *Pramāṇa*, and those are Perception (*Pratyakṣa*), Inference (*Anumāna*), Comparison (*Upamāna*), and Testimony (*Śabda*). That school is named ‘*Pramāṇa-Śāstra*’ and is important in the philosophical world. According to *Nyāya*, knowledge reveals both the subject and the object, which are distinct. Knowledge or cognition is defined as apprehension or consciousness. In his ‘*Nyāyasūtra*,’ *Maharṣi Gautama* says that perfection is attained by correctly knowing the true nature of sixteen categories. *Pramāṇa* is

3. Arka Pratim Mukhoty, “*Revisiting the Definition of Anumiti*”, *Journal of the Indian Council of Philosophical Research* 40 (2):173-182 (2023) available at <Arka Pratim Mukhoty, *Revisiting the Definition of Anumiti* - PhilPapers>

the primary and significant of these sixteen categories⁴. *Anavambhaṭṭa* has explained '*Pramāṇa*' as the uncommon cause (*karaṇa*) of valid knowledge (*prama*)⁵.

Knowledge may be valid or invalid by Indian philosophy. Valid knowledge is called *Prama*, an object's correct apprehension, and the source of valid knowledge is called *Pramāṇa*. Invalid knowledge is known as *Aprama*. *Nyāya* maintains the theory of correspondence and the combination of *Prama* and *Pramāṇa*, which *Naiyayikas* explains as follows.

<i>Prama</i>	-	<i>Pramāṇa</i>
<i>Pratyakṣa</i>	-	<i>Pratyakṣa</i>
<i>Anumiti</i>	-	<i>Anumāna</i>
<i>Upamiti</i>	-	<i>Upamāna</i>
<i>Śabda</i>	-	<i>Śabda</i>

Anumāna, according to *Gautama's* '*Nyayasutra*,' is the second of the four *pramāṇas*, which in turn is grouped as the first of the sixteen categories. *Annambhaṭṭa* states in his *Tarkasamgraha* that *Anumāna* (Inference) is the instrumental cause of *Anumiti* (The inferential knowledge). The word *Anumāna* is the combination of the two words '*anu*' and '*māna*'. Because '*Anu*' means 'after' and '*māna*' is the knowledge, the literal meaning of *Anumāna* is the knowledge (*māna*) which stems from after (*anu*) another knowledge. *Annambhaṭṭa* says that *Anumāna* was the cause of *Anumiti* in his '*Tarkasamgraha*'⁶.

4. Puja Ghosh, '*Nyaya Theory of Pramana*', RESEARCH REVIEW International Journal of Multidisciplinary 2021; 6(2):04-06 ISSN: 2455-3085 (Online), Available at <PhPramaNyayaTheoryPramanaGhosh.pdf>
5. "*Pramayah karanam pramanam*" (Annambhatta –*Tarkasamgraha* –sutra 39)available at < E0201113032.pdf> Bhaskar Jha, "*A critical study about the Nyaya theory of prama and pramanas*", IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume 20, Issue 11, Vol. I (Nov. 2015) PP 30-32 e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p- ISSN: 2279-0845. www.iosrjournals.org
6. "*Anumiti-karanam-anumāṇam*." Puja Ghosh, '*Nyaya Theory of Pramana*', RESEARCHREVIEW International Journal of Multidisciplinary 2021; 6(2):04-06 ISSN: 2455-3085 (Online), available at <PhPramaNyayaTheoryPramanaGhosh.pdf>

Anumāna has been divided into three types by *Gautama* as *Pūrvavat*, *Śeṣavat* and *Sāmānyatodṛṣṭa*. The first two are based on causation, and the last is on mere co-existence. *Pūrvavat* inference is the inferring of the unperceived effect from a perceived cause, and *Śeṣavat* is inferring the unperceived cause from a perceived effect. *Sāmānyatodṛṣṭa* inference is the inference which is based not on causation but on uniformity of co-existence.

Annambhaṭṭa has accepted two types as *Svārthānumāna* and *Parārthānumāna* of *Anumāna*. *Svārthānumāna* is a psychological process, and the formal statements of the members of inference are not required in it, but *Parārthānumāna* is a syllogism. It must be presented in language and must be done to convince others of it. *Kevalānvayi*, *Kēvalavyatirēkī* and *anvayavyatirekī* inference is another classification of inference, and it is based on the nature of *vyāpti*.

***Mahimabhaṭṭa* and his *Anumiti* theory**

The theory of *Anumiti* has been developed as a critical theory of literature by *Mahimabhaṭṭa* in the 11th century. His book *Vyaktiviveka* is important in Sanskrit literary criticism because of the introduction of a new theory as an alternative to all contemporary theories. Although his book and the theory are not very famous in Sanskrit literary criticism, critics such as *Mammaṭa-Bhaṭṭa* have cited him. According to his book *Vyaktiviveka*, his name was ‘*Rājānaka Mahimaka*⁷,’ and the term *Rājānaka*, which is used by critics such as *Ānandavardhana*, *Kuntaka*, *Mammaṭa*, and *Ruyyaka*, means that the citizenship of *Kāśmir*. The author of *Vyaktiviveka* introduces himself as *Mahima*, and his real name may be *Mahima* or *Mahimaka*. However, he was famous in the field as *Mahima Bhaṭṭa* or *Vyakti Vivek karu*.

7. आधातुं व्युत्पत्तीर्णपूतृणां चेमयोगभाजां नः ।
सत्सु प्रचतिमयानां भीमस्वामतिगुणस्य तनयानाम् ॥
श्रीधर्यसखाङ्गभुवा महाकवेः ज्ञामनस्य शषियेण ।
व्यक्तविविको वदिधे राजानकरमाहमकेनायम् ॥

M. T. Narasimhiengar, “The ‘*Vyakti-Viveka*’ of *Mahima-Bhaṭṭa*” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 1908, 63–71. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25210531>.

Searching for the authors cited by *Mahima Bhaṭṭa* and other critics who cited him is one way to define his period. He has cited the creative and critical works of the previous writers such as *Kālidasa* (*Śākuntala*, *Raghuvamśa*, *Vikramorvaśīya*, *Kumārasambhava*), *Bhāravi* (*Kirātārjunīya*), *Srī Harṣa* (*Nāgānanda*), *Bharṭṭrikari* (*Vākyapadīya*), *Māgha* (*Śisupāla-vadha*), *Rājaśekhara* (*Bāla-Rāmāyaṇa*), *Bhavabhūti* (*Uttara-Rāmacarita*, *Mālatī-mādhava*), *Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa* (*Venī saṃhāra*), *Ratnākara* (*Haravijaya*), *Anandavardhana* (*Dhvanyāloka*), *Bhaṭṭa-Nāyaka* (*Hṛidaya-darpaṇa*, Commentary on the *Nāṭyaśāstra*), *Abhinavagupta* (*Dhvanyāloka-locana*) and post critics such as *Mammaṭa* (*Kāvya-prakāśa*), *Ruyyaka* (*Alaṅkārasarvasva*), *Hemacandra* (*Kāvyaṇūsāsana*) have cited him. The period of the previous critics he cited is earlier than 1000 AD, and the post-critics who cited his book are in the 11th century or later; therefore, his period can be considered the 11th century⁸.

In his poetic work *Vyaktiviveka*, *Mahimbhaṭṭa* constitutes one of the important responses among the works that critique the *Dhvani* theoretical teaching put out by the *Dhvanyāloka*. *Mahimbhaṭṭa* most likely composed this *Vyaktiviveka* two centuries after *Ānandavardhana's* *Dhvanyāloka*, during a time when Sanskrit poetics was broadly embracing *Ānandavardhana's* poetical theory. *Mahimbhaṭṭa* wrote his work to understand every *Dhvani* theory notion during the *Anumāna* process. *Mahimbhaṭṭa* critiques the *Dhvani* doctrine and applies his theory *Anumāna*; even *Bhaṭṭanāyaka* is known as a logician who analyses the epistemological dimensions of *Dhvani* theory, objections to the *Dhvani* theory's epistemological components, expressing a concern primarily about the reader's comprehension of the recommended *Rasa* through poetry⁹.

Bhaṭṭanāyaka, however, acknowledged that the essence of poetry is the implied meaning of *Ānandavardhana*, particularly *Rasa*. In his

8. Arthor A, Macdonell, “*History of Sanskrit Literature*” (New York; D. Appleton and company, 1900), P. 434

9. *Vyaktiviveka of Mahimbhaṭṭa [Part 11]*, available at <<https://www.wisdomlib.org/hinduism/essay/kavyamimamsa-of-rajasekhara-study/d/doc628269.html>>

Nyāyamañjarī, another renowned logician, *Jayantabhaṭṭa*, explores the topic of *Arthāpatti* being an autonomous *Pramāṇa* and looks at the consequences of *Dhvani*. He thus acknowledged *Dhvani* in *Anumāna* as well as *Arthāpatti*. The significance of the proposed meaning of *Ānandavardhana* is not disputed by *Mahimbhaṭṭa*¹⁰. Nonetheless, his method was to show how *Anumāna* might incorporate all *Dhvani* verities. By examining numerous instances from *Dhvanyāloka*, *Mahimbhaṭṭa* demonstrates that the declared sense does not imply the unexpressed.

In this way, the acceptance of the poetic scheme of *Ānandavardhana* by *Mahimbhaṭṭa* can be understood. In the discussion of the sentiments, he mainly tries to focus on his novel speculations of *Anaucitya* as the supplement of *Rasa*. The *Anumāna* theory of *Mahimbhaṭṭa* does not receive proper recognition in the later *Ālaṃkārikas*.

In the opening stanza of *Vyaktiviveka*, the one aim of the author is to establish his opinion that *Dhvani* (Meaning of suggestion) falls under the head of *Anumāna* (Inference) is presented¹¹. As a great logician, he wanted to criticize other schools' grammatical and rhetorical theories¹². His main objective was to explain and supplement the *Dhvanyāloka* of *Ānandavardhana* in his way¹³.

Vyaktiviveka is a three-chaptered book, and the chapters have been named "*vimarśas*." The first is the definition of *Dhvani*, and the

10. काव्यस्यात्मनि संज्ञानिरिसादरूपे न कस्यचिद्वि वमितिः।
संज्ञायां सा यतः केवलमेषाऽपि व्यक्त्ययोगतोऽस्य कुतः॥२६॥
T. Ganapatiśāstri, (ed.) "*Vyaktivivekah*" (India: Rājākīya Mudraṇa
Yantrālaya, 1909), 1.26, available at<[https://ia600501.us.archive.org/31/items/
Vyaktiviveka/vyaktiviveka.pdf](https://ia600501.us.archive.org/31/items/Vyaktiviveka/vyaktiviveka.pdf)>
11. अनुमानेऽन्तर्भावं सर्वस्यैव ध्वनेः प्रकाशयतिम्।
व्यक्तविविक्तं कुरुते प्रणम्य महिमा परां वाचम्॥१॥ (*Vyaktiviveka*, 1.1), Ibid.
12. युक्तोऽयमात्मसदृशान् प्रतर्ति मे प्रयत्नो नास्त्येव तज्जगति सर्वमनोहरं यत् ।
केचज्जिज्वलन्तर्ति वक्सन्त्यपरे नमिलन्त्यन्ये यदभ्युदयभाजि जगत्प्रदीपे॥२॥
(*Vyaktiviveka*, 1.2), Ibid.
13. इह सम्प्रतपित्ततोऽन्यथा वा ध्वनकिरस्य वचोवचिचनं नः।
नयितं यशसे प्रपत्स्यते यन्महतां संस्तव एव गौरवाय॥३॥ (*Vyaktiviveka*, 1.3), Ibid.

second is the impropriety of words in conveying *Dhvani*. The third one is the impropriety of the threats of the various modes of *Dhvani*. In the third chapter, *Mahimabhāṭṭa* critically examined the inner essence of expressions, citing passages from different writers. The author longs for readers' indulgence, and there is much evidence for that¹⁴. As the common way of later rhetoricians, he mainly uses the prose style, but at the end of each discussion, he summarizes his opinion in a few verses.

In the final stanza, the author shows he is careless about the kind of reception the educated public would give his work. He merely wants to be remembered by them, whether as a target of mockery or as someone who has developed an entirely novel theory that makes academics happy¹⁵.

It is crucial to look at *Vyaktiviveka*'s core ideas. According to the author's theory, *Dhvani* is the same as *Vyañjaka*, which is the suggestive sense of a word or the word itself. *Vyakti* (suggestion) is sufficiently attributed to *Vyañjaka* if *Vyañjakatva* (suggestiveness) is granted. Since *Vastu*, *Alankāra*, and *Rasādi* are merely derivative meanings of *Vyañgya*, *Vyakti* is not acquired in these cases. *Vyakti* manifests the desire to be expressed, which manifests alongside what manifests it (just as a vessel in a dark room becomes apparent alongside the light that illuminates it). It is only after the *Vācyārtha* (literal sense) that *Vastu* and *Alankāra* are understood. Furthermore, *Rasādi* strikes aesthetes only after *Vibhāvādi* (the cause of *Rasādi*) strikes them, not simultaneously. Due to its briefness, this gap between *Vibhāvādi* and *Rasādi* comprehension is imperceptible to our senses. *Rasādidhvani* is considered '*Asaṃlakshyakramavyaṅgya*,' which means the suggested

14. प्रतपिय बुद्ध्यपेचो प्रायस्सङ्कोचवसितरी कर्तुः ।
तेन न बहुभाषित्वं वदिवद्भरिसूचित्व्यं नः ॥

Narasimhiengar, M. T. "The '*Vyakti-Viveka*' of *Mahima-Bhatta*." Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1908, 63–71. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25210531>.

15. अन्धेरनुलखितिपूरवमदि बुरवाणो नूनं स्मृतेर्वषियतां वदुषामुपेयाम् ।

हासककारणगवेषणया नवार्थ-तत्त्ववावमर्शपरतिषसमोहयावा ॥, Ibid, P. 71

sense is so close to the suggestive sense that the sequence is not discernible. As previously stated, *Vyakti* cannot be attained in all types of *Vastu*. According to *Mahimabhaṭṭa*, the two senses (*Vācya* primary and *Vyaṅgya* suggested) are sequential and have a relationship of premise and conclusion. The process involves inference (*Anumāna*).

Artha is therefore not a *Vyañjaka* but only a ground of conclusion. It is quite unlikely that should be regarded as indicative of anything because it enters the mind before its meaning is even understood (*Vyañjaka*). Furthermore, the secondary sense, shore (*Taṭha*), which can only be deduced from the literal sense, cannot be revealed by a word like at, whose meaning is exhausted with its literal connotation, flood, etcetera. Given this, claiming that the word can convey "chilliness" (*Śaitya*) and other meanings is pointless. However, because of their literal meanings, these words can quickly become sources of inference. Additionally, letters and word combinations connected to words that convey their primary senses (*Vācakah*) may indicate inference (*Anumāpaka*) through this connection. Therefore, the author aims to establish the *Anumāna* technique and disprove the *Dhvani* school of thought¹⁶.

The author of *Vyakthi Veveka* has adopted the *Dhvani* theory to realize his central concept of inference (*Anumāna*). The interpretation of *Dhvani* in *Dhvanyāloka* is "that kind of poetry, wherein the (conventional) meaning renders itself secondary or the (conventional) word renders it is meaning secondary and suggests the (intended or) implied meaning, is designated by the learned as *Dhvani* or 'Suggestive Poetry.'¹⁷" *Mahimabhaṭṭa* uses this definition to conform to the definition of an *Anumāna* in the first *Vimarśa* of his book. He

16. T. Gaṇapatiśāstri, (ed.) "*Vyaktivivekah*" (India: Rājakīya Mudraṇa Yantrālaya, 1909), Preface, P.1-2, available at <<https://ia600501.us.archive.org/31/items/Vyaktiviveka/vyaktiviveka.pdf>>

17. यत्प्रार्थः शब्दो वा तमर्थमुपसर्जनीकृतस्वार्थो ।
व्यक्तः काव्यवशिषः स ध्वानरतिः सूरभिः कथ्यति ॥१३॥
K. Krishnamoorthy (ed.), "*Ānandavardhana Dhvnyāloka*" (Delhi, Montilal Banārsidass, 1982), 1.13, P.19

says that it is expressed or inferred from it where the meaning reveals a difference of meaning from somewhere in relation, which is called poetic inference¹⁸.

Sections from *Dvanyāloka* are quoted and critically examined in the second, which also notices *Śabdānaucitya* (word inappropriateness) in extenso. In the third, it is demonstrated that the *Dhvani* examples are suitable for an *Anumāna* since they include the components necessary for the latter. According to *Dhvaniśāstra*, the book primarily demonstrates that *Anumāna* encompasses all *Dhvani* types. Because *Mahimabhaṭṭa* has a great deal of regard for *Dhvanikāra*'s knowledge, he is competitive with him and wants to overshadow his reputation. *Mahimabhaṭṭa* created the *Anumāna* school and provided a thorough treatment of the inappropriateness of *Śabda* in his priceless work consisting of three *Vimarsās*, while *Dhvanikāra* discussed a novel line of argument on *Dhvaniprasthāna* and focused on the inappropriateness of *Artha* in his work in three *Udyotas*.

"Our analysis of the words of the sound-maker, whether by assumption here or otherwise, will certainly lead to fame, for the praise of the great is the only honor."¹⁹

Mahimabhaṭṭa wanted to reject *Dhvani*'s concepts and establish inference concepts through his arguments. He did not want to reject it using the ideas of other critics who rejected *Dhvani*'s theory. Therefore, he has not paid much attention to previous and contemporary resources of other critics who unaccepted the *Dhvani*²⁰. Like *Dhvani*, other

18. वाच्यस्तदनुमति वा यत्प्रार्थोऽस्थान्तरं प्रकाशयति
सम्बन्धतः कुतश्चति सा काव्यानुमतिरित्युक्ता"॥,
Vyaktiviveka, P.22, available at <[https://sa.wikisource.org/wiki/wiki/व्यक्तविविक्ः_\(राजानकपुय्यककृतव्याख्यासहतिः\)](https://sa.wikisource.org/wiki/wiki/व्यक्तविविक्ः_(राजानकपुय्यककृतव्याख्यासहतिः))>
19. इह सम्प्रतपित्तितोऽन्यथा वा ध्वनकिरस्य वचोवचिनं नः।
नयितं यशसे प्रपत्तस्यते यन्महतां संस्तव एव गौरवाय॥३॥, *Vyaktiviveka*, 2.31.3,
(P.01), available at <[https://sa.wikisource.org/wiki/wiki/व्यक्तविविक्ः_\(राजानकपुय्यककृतव्याख्यासहतिः\)](https://sa.wikisource.org/wiki/wiki/व्यक्तविविक्ः_(राजानकपुय्यककृतव्याख्यासहतिः))>
20. T. Ganapatiśāstri, (ed.) "*Vyaktivivekah*" (India: Rājākīya Mudraṇa Yantrālaya), Preface, P.04, available at <<https://ia600501.us.archive.org/31/items/Vyaktiviveka/vyaktiviveka.pdf>>

critical theories, such as *Vakrokti* (The Crooked Speech), have been criticized for his ambitions to establish the concept of inference²¹.

Although the *Anumāna* theory has been so successfully established after a severe attack on *Dhvanikara* by a wealth of argumentative reasoning yet, on account of the paucity of writers following his lead and the multitude of writers who have followed the opposite school, it has not received such liberal treatment at the hands of successive poets and rhetoricians as the other theory (*Dhvani*). Thus, rhetoricians like the learned *Mammaṭa* and others uphold the *Dhvani* theory with avidity and treat the *Anumāna* theory with unmerited contempt. On the other hand, owing to the wealth of comparisons instituted regarding the demerits and merits of other writers, they closely follow the path traced out by the great *Mahimabhaṭṭa*.

The first chapter of *Vyaktiviveka* discusses *Ānandavardhana*'s definition of *Dhvani*, and the third examines his examples of *Dhvani*, showing in each case the inferential process by which the allegedly "suggested" meaning is understood. The second chapter, which comprises more than half of the entire *Vyaktiviveka*, elaborates on several varieties of poetic flaws. After the second chapter, *Mahimabhaṭṭa* says, referring to the entire discussion of poetic flaws, "enough of this extensive treatment of matters unrelated to the topic at hand."²²

In the second chapter, *Mahimabhaṭṭa*'s only objective is to name the proof that *Ānandavardhana* named the suggestion as nothing but inference. However, his argument is unacceptable, as only a few of the many types of aesthetic defects dealt with by *Mahimabhaṭṭa* are

21. काव्यकाञ्चनकषाश्रममाननि कुन्तकेन नजिकाव्यलक्ष्मणि यस्य सर्वनखिवदुत्तदति श्लोक एष स नदिशति मया॥ , *Vyaktiviveka* (P. 58) यत् पुनः शब्दार्थौ सहितौ तेन ध्वनविदेशार्प वक्रोक्तस्त्रिनुमा न क्रमि॥ *Vyaktiviveka*, (P. 28), available at <[https://sa.wikisource.org/wiki/wiki/व्यक्तविवेकः_\(राजानकसुयुक्तकृतव्याख्यासहितः\)](https://sa.wikisource.org/wiki/wiki/व्यक्तविवेकः_(राजानकसुयुक्तकृतव्याख्यासहितः))>

22 *Vyaktiviveka*, P.462, Lawrence McCrea. "*Mahimabhaṭṭa's Analysis of Poetic Flaws.*" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 124, no. 1 (2004): 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4132155>.

found in *Ānandavardhana's* verse²³. The vast preponderance of what is discussed in the second chapter has no bearing on the critique of this verse. However, his main argument is based on demonstrating that poetic language is not fundamentally different from other language varieties.

According to *Mahimabhaṭṭa*, *rasa* is not a highly necessary element to be presented in poetry or one generally found in the best poems as an essential and fundamental goal of all the poems²⁴. *Dosa* is the poetic flaws regarded as either intrinsic or extrinsic that damage the aesthetic pleasure of the poems either directly or indirectly²⁵. Because the objective of all poetic languages is to generate *rasa* as successfully as probable, any element of a poem that limits or impairs in any way the ability of the poem to convey *rasa* will be regarded as a flaw to be avoided by the poet.

There are two main types of poetic defects, according to *Mahimabhaṭṭa*, and those are intrinsic (*antarāṅga*) and extrinsic (*bahirāṅga*). *Antarāṅga* is the defects that directly impair the intended *rasa*, and the unsuitability of the States of the sentiments are examples. *Mahimabhaṭṭa* explained those defects in detail, presenting examples and theories from previous writers. The second type of defects explained by *Mahimabhaṭṭa* are grammatical or semantic features that obscure the intended meaning and thereby indirectly impede the communication of *rasa*. Those *Dosās* have been analyzed in the second chapter of *Vyaktiviveka*. For this discussion, *Mahimabhaṭṭa's* following the grammatical and *Mīmāṃsaka* books, excluding the critical books, is a remarkable thing.

Extrinsic flaws *Mahimabhaṭṭa* presented are mainly fivefold, and those are *Vidheyāvimarśa* (non-consideration of what is predicated), *Prakramabheda* (breaking of an initial pattern), *Kramabheda* (breaking of sequence), *Paunaruktya* (redundancy) and *Vācyāvacana*

23. *Vyaktiviveka*, P. 179

24. *Vyaktiviveka*, P. 101, 142

25. *Vyaktiviveka*, P. 182

(not stating what should be stated). He has widely explained those aesthetic flaws considering many critics and their theories²⁶.

Furthermore, *Mahimabhaṭṭa* has discussed the punning and the expressive power of words in his book. In discussing *vācva*-vacant, he has noted the poetic flaws produced by improperly constructed puns (*Śleṣa*). Using more than one possible meaning is not enough to create a viable pun (*Śleṣa*); there are many further conditions. In this discussion, his main argument assumes that poetic language must play by the same rules as the usages of general language. Therefore, even poetry based on puns is not exempt from the everyday needs of sentential coherence.

“Ānandavardhana and Mahimabhaṭṭa are in agreement regarding the nature of the figure Śleṣa both argue that wherever this figure occurs there will be some verbal cue that prompts the search for a double meaning, and that both meanings conveyed by such an expression will be directly expressed. It is regarding the possibility of double entendre in the absence of such a verbal cue that they differ. For Ānandavardhana, a set of sounds capable of bearing more than one meaning, used without such an explicit verbal cue, once they have expressed a single, contextually relevant meaning, will suggest, rather than directly express, a second meaning a case of Śabdaśaktimūla dhvani; for Mahimabhaṭṭa, there will be only a failed attempt to compose the figure śleṣa. Mahimabhaṭṭa attempts to show that, by the standards he has articulated in his analysis of śleṣa, examples of what Ānandavardhana calls śabdaśaktimūla dhvani cannot effectively and coherently convey a double meaning at all.”²⁷

26. For more details, Lawrence McCrea. *“Mahimabhaṭṭa’s Analysis of Poetic Flaws”* Journal of the American Oriental Society 124, no. 1 (2004): 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4132155>, P. 80-88

27. Ibid, P. 89, 90

As an attack on *Śabdaśaktimūla Dhvani*, in contrast to *Ānandavardhana* and others who argued that implied or unstated meanings are conveyed by one or more "powers" (*Śaktis*) of words apart from their capacity of direct expression, *Mahimabhaṭṭa* contends that words have one and only one expressive power that of denotation or direct expression (*Abhidhā*). The suggested meaning is a meaning that can be understood only after the understanding of its directly expressed meaning. If direct expression, figurative expression, and suggestion are the functions of words, all the meanings would be generated simultaneously when the words themselves were heard. Therefore, *Dhvani* is a useless interpretation, and the meanings may lead to understanding further, unstated meanings only through inference, according to *Mahimabhaṭṭa*²⁸.

Mahimabhaṭṭa bases his central argument on inference, stating that knowledge of anything not directly perceived can only be arrived at through an invariable connection with what is perceived. According to him, perception and inference are only two means of knowledge. By the definition of *Mahimabhaṭṭa*, poetry is a language intended to convey a particular emotional state (*Rasa*).

Ideas of *Vijayavardhana* and ‘*Anumenen ena aruta*’ of *Siyabaslakara*

Sri Lankan critics have not widely discussed the *Anumiti* theory of *Mahimabhaṭṭa*. *Hemapala Vijayavardhana*, the great Sinhala critic for the comparative of Sanskrit literary theories, has explained it negatively, and he has allocated only two paragraphs for it in his book ‘*Outlines of Sanskrit Poetics*’.

“The Anumiti school could be exempted from treatment as a separate school. The main idea behind Anumiti vāda was to deny the existence of Dhvani by maintaining that it was redundant to postulate a separate function of words to arrive at the suggested sense, as inference is the

28. *Vyaktiviveka*, P. 81-83

process through which it is arrived at. This concept did not play any part of great importance in the evolution of the Sanskrit theory of poetry. The idea was put forth by an ingenious writer, hostile to the Dhvani theory, but gathered no support, and did not develop into a separate school.²⁹

“Another theorist belonging to the 11th century who attempted to controvert the progressive dhvani theory was Mahimabhatta whose work is known by the name Vyaktiviveka. Herein his attempt was to establish that there was no separate function called dhvani in poetry; and what dhvani-theorists postulated as the novel function of suggestion was none other than the logical process of inference. He strove to build a critique of poetry based on this concept of logical inference and took great pains to prove that what the dhvani-theorists considered as cases of suggestion were mere instances of inference. He showed that this was a function not confined to poetry alone. This theory of Mahimabhatta is sometimes known in Sanskrit as Anumitivāda. However, as this was not a comprehensive critique of poetry but merely an attempt to nullify the dhvani theory this does not merit recognition as a separate school of Sanskrit poetics. In his thesis Mahimabhatta gained no support from any subsequent author and in itself it was not capable of overriding the dhvani theory. However, Vyaktiviveka remains a monument to its author's aggressive logical argument.³⁰

However, Vijayavardhana has discussed the influence of *Anumiti* on the oldest Sinhala critics. Although the *Siyabaslakara*, which King Sena I wrote in the 9th century of the Anurādhapura era,

29. G. Vijevaradhana, “*Outline of Sanskrit poetics*”, (Varanasi-1: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1970), p. 06.

30. Ibid, P. 19

was a translation of Kāvyaḍarśa, which Sanskrit critic *Daṇḍin* wrote in the 7th century, the author has added new concepts relevant to *Guṇa-Rīti* and the difference of the levels of the meanings, by other external resources. In the stanzas from 400 to 402 of the third chapter of *Siyabasalakara*, the author has explained two meaning levels, **Penena Arut** (the denotation) and **At belen ena Arut** (the connotation)³¹ with examples. He said that *At belen ena Arut* was the inferential meaning, and it was like something, like a pot, seen by the lamp's light.

“*Vena vena duṭṭu sadin - baṇḍanev pahanin penena*
Dænenanumenenarutata - ath belenenarut viyat”³²

The term ‘*Anumenenarutata*’ (*Anumenen ena aruta*) of this stanza means the meaning of inference. Because ‘*anumenen*’ means ‘by *Anumāna*,’ ‘*ena*’ means ‘coming from,’ and ‘*aruta*’ means ‘meaning’ (*Artha*), the meaning of the Sinhala term ‘*Anumenenarutata*’ is the meaning coming from the inference. In the stanza 402, *Siyabsalakara* is an example to clarify those two meanings as ‘*Thumul siruræthi mē - dahaval bata no budi*’ (This fat person does not eat in the daytime). He explains that the fasting of that man in the daytime is the *Penena Aruta* (the denotation), and his eating at night is the *At belen ena Arut* (the connotation)³³.

Although some critics have accepted that two meaning levels the *Vācyārtha* (the verble meaning) and the *Vyaṅgyārtha* (the meaning of suggestion) of the *Dhvani Vāda*, however, in the conclusion of the journal Article of the *University of Ceylon Reviews* written by *Hemapala Vijayavardhana*³⁴ those two levels of the meaning of the *Siyabasalakara* is not a reflection of the *Dhvani* concept but an

31. **Penenat at belen - ena arutudu sadath deka Yam sada savanatehi heta - hænnṅenu penenata nam vē** *Lelvala Siriniwasa Thero, Benthara Dhammasena Thero and Heagoda Dhamminda Thero, “Siyabasalakara Vivaraṇaya”* (Colombo: M.D. Guṇasena, 1948), (3.400), P.209
32. ***Siyabasalakara Vivaraṇaya***, (3.401), P.210
33. **Thumul siruræthi mē - dahaval bata no budi yatha, Dahaval nokanu penenata - Rea bith belen ena arut**, *Siyabasalakara Vivaraṇaya*, (3.402), P.210
34. G.H. Wijewardhena, “*Kāvya Vicāra Gaveṣaṇa*” (Colombo: Nikan Limited, 1968), P. 170

explanation of *Anumiti* the inferential cognition which older than *Dvani Vāda*. Sometimes, *Anumiti* can achieve the meanings of unclear terms. According to the critics of *Anumiti Vāda*, some meanings are conjectural, like the “eating in the night” (the *At belen ena Arut*) in the previous explanation of stanza 402 of *Siyabaslakara*.

The example about the fat person who does not eat during the day times of Stanza 402 of *Siyabaslakara* is another similar example for the explanations about the twofold meaning levels, and *Mammaṭa* who wrote the *Kāvyaaprakāśa* in the 12th century has used an example like this for the same signification³⁵. “*Phino Devadatto divā na Bunkte*” or “*Devadatta* who has a fat body does not sleep in the day times” is an example of the *Kāvyaaprakāśa*. The sleeplessness of the *Devadatta* during the day is the verbal meaning of this illustration, and his sleep at night is its hidden meaning. Because the *Kāvyaaprakāśa* writer did not have an opportunity to read the Sinhala text *Siyabaslakara*, this example is considerable as another typical example earlier than both authors. Therefore, as an extension of the ideas of *Vijayavardhana*, the usage of *Anumiti* as a critical theory in Sinhala can be considered as an old concept than *Mahimabhaṭṭa* the founder of *Anumiti Vāda* in the 11th century.

Conclusion

This monograph is based on the *Anumiti* theory (inferential cognition) of *Mahimabhaṭṭa* in the 11th century and his book *Vyaktiviveka*, the main text for that theory. Sanskrit critics have different interpretations of *Anumiti*. *Śaṅkuka* has introduced *Anumiti* as a sub-theory of *Rasa Vāda*, and critics of *Alaṃkāra*, such as *Ruyyaka*, *Hemacandra*, *Mammaṭa*, *Bhoja*, *Vāgbhaṭa*, *Jayadeva*, and *Viśvanātha* have explained it as a poetic figure. However, *Mahimabhaṭṭa*'s theory differs from those critics, and he has explained *Anumāna* as a critical theory based on the meaning as an alternative idea of the meaning of suggestion (*Dhvani*) of the critics of *Dhvani*. The main concepts of *Anumāna*, the old theory relevant to Indian philosophy and logic, were

35. *Kāvya Vicāra Gaveṣaṇa*, P. 164

discussed at the start of this article, and the concepts of *Mahimabhaṭṭa* were intensely discussed. Although *Anumiti* is one of the eight critical theories of Sanskrit literary criticism, it differs from the other seven theories and seems like an external and unexpected theory. Mainly, *Anumiti*'s theory of *Mahimabhaṭṭa* is an introduction to the new theory as the ambitions of the rejection of *Dhvani Vāda* of *Ānandavardhana*. Post-critics have not paid enough attention to discussing this theory because of the unimportance of that theory as a critical theory of literature. Although all the critics have considered *Mahimabhaṭṭa* as the first critic who used *Anumiti* as a theory for literary criticism, the author of *Siyabaslakara* can be identified as the first critic who used that concept for literary criticism as the extension of the ideas of *Hemapala Vijayavardhana*.

References

- Arthor A, Macdonell. **“History of Sanskrit Literature”**, New York; D. Appleton and company, 1900.
- Chatterjee, Sathischandra. **“Nyāya theory of Knowledge, a critical study of some problems of logic and metaphysics”**, Delhi, Bharatīya kalā prakāśan, 1950.
- Gaṇapatiśāstri, T. (ed.) **“Vyaktivivekah”**, India: Rājākīya Mudraṇa Yantrālaya, 1909. available at <<https://ia600501.us.archive.org/31/items/Vyaktiviveka/vyaktiviveka.pdf>>
- Ghosh, Puja. **“Nyaya Theory of Pramana”**, Research Review International Journal of Multidisciplinary 2021; 6(2):04-06 ISSN: 2455-3085 (Online), Available at <[PhPramaNyaya TheoryPramanaGhosh.pdf](#)>
- Hadgopoulos, Demetrius John. **“A Note on Inferring and Perceiving: (Anumiti and Samśayottara-Pratyakṣa).”** Journal of Indian Philosophy 12, no. 1 (1984): 67–71. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23444189>.
- Jha, Bhaskar. **“A critical study about the Nyaya theory of prama and pramanas”**, IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume 20, Issue 11, Ver. I (Nov. 2015) PP 30-32 e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845. www.iosrjournals.org
- Jha, V. N. **“Tarkasangraha of Annambhaṭṭa”** (English translation with notes), Kerala, Chinmaya International Foundation Shodha Sansthan, 2010, available at <<https://ia801307.us.archive.org/15/items/TarkasangrahaOfAnnambhattaVNJha/Tarkasangraha%20Of%20Annambhatta%20-%20V%20N%20Jha.pdf>>

- Krishnamoorthy, K. (ed.), *“Ānandavardhana Dhvnyāloka”*, Delhi, Montilal Banārsidass, 1982.
- McCrea, Lawrence. *“Mahimabhaṭṭa’s Analysis of Poetic Flaws.”* Journal of the American Oriental Society 124, no. 1 (2004): 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4132155>.
- Mukhoty, Arka Pratim. *“Revisiting the Definition of Anumiti”*, Journal of the Indian Council of Philosophical Research 40 (2):173-182 (2023) <Arka Pratim Mukhoty, Revisiting the Definition of Anumiti - PhilPapers>
- Narasimhiengar, M. T. *“The ‘Vyakti-Viveka’ of Mahima-Bhaṭṭa.”* Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1908, 63–71. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25210531>.
- Saikia, Devalina. *“Nature of Anumāna and Anumiti as discussed in Bhāṣārātna of Kanda Tarkavāgīśa”*, International Journal of Sanskrit Research, (ed) Devesh Kumar Mishra and others (India, 2024), 10(4): 287-292, Available at <<https://www.anantaajournal.com/archives/?year=2024&vol=10&issue=4&part=E&ArticleId=2458>>
- Senanayaka, G.S.B. *“Dhvanyāloka Vivaraṇaya”*, Colombo: M.D. Guṇasena, 1969.
- Sirinivāsa Thero, Lelvala, Bentara Dhammasena Thero and Hāegoda Dhamminda Thero, *“Siyabaslakara Vivaraṇaya”*, Colombo: M.D. Guṇasena, 1948.
- Tarkacharyya, Kallpada. (ed.), *“Bhāṣārātnam of Kaṇḍa Tarkavāgīśa”*, Calcutta: The Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat, 1996, available at <https://archive.org/details/bhasharatnakanadatarkavagesaed.kalipadatarkacharya_202003_696_m/page/n5/mode/2up?view=theater>
- Vijayavardhana, G. *“Outline of Sanskrit poetics”*, Varanasi-1: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1970.
- Vijayavardhana, G.H. *“Kāvya Vicāra Gaveṣaṇa”*, Colombo: Nikan Limited, 1968.
- Vijayavardhana, G. H, *“Sanskṛuta Kāvya Vicāraye Mūladharma”*, Colombo: M.D. Guṇasena, 1967.
- Vyaktiviveka of Mahimabhaṭṭa* [Part 11], available at <<https://www.wisdomlib.org/hinduism/essay/kavyamimamsa-of-rajasekhara-study/d/doc628269.html>>