

The Philosophical Significance of Dhvani: Ontology, Epistemology, and Aesthetic Consciousness in Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana

Akash Sadanand Naik Salgaonkar¹, Dr Walter Menezes²

¹ GSRF Doctoral Research Fellow, School of Sanskrit, Philosophy, and Indic Studies, Goa University, India, & Assistant Professor, DCT's Dhempe College (Autonomous), Miramar, Goa – India, Orcid Id: 0009-00071-5964-9671

² Assistant Professor & Programme Director in Philosophy, School of Sanskrit, Philosophy, and Indic Studies, Goa University, India, Orcid Id: 0000-0003-2306-0666

Abstract:

The theory of *dhvani* (suggestion), as articulated by Ānandavardhana in the *Dhvanyāloka*, marks a decisive philosophical transformation in Indian aesthetics and linguistic theory. This paper argues that *dhvani* is not merely a poetic device, but a comprehensive philosophical framework that redefines the ontology of meaning, expands epistemology, and establishes aesthetic experience (*rasa*) as a mode of knowledge. By introducing *dhvani* as a third semantic function beyond *abbidhā* (literal) and *lakṣaṇā* (indicative), Ānandavardhana shifts the understanding of language from a referential system to an experiential medium. Drawing on primary textual evidence from the *Dhvanyāloka* and contemporary scholarship, this article demonstrates how *dhvani* anticipates modern semantic, phenomenological, and reader-response theories while remaining firmly rooted in Indian philosophical traditions. The paper ultimately positions *dhvani* and argues for its relevance as a foundational contributory theory to the global philosophy of language and aesthetics.

KEYWORDS: *Dhvani*, *Vyañjanā*, *Rasa*, *dhvanyārtha*, Indian Aesthetics.

1. INTRODUCTION

The theory of *dhvani* emerged in classical Indian poetics as a new way of thinking about meaning in language and art. Ānandavardhana famously said, “*kāvyaśyātma dhvaniḥ*” (Ānandavardhana, 1956, p. 01), the soul of poetry is suggestion. This is not just a literary point but a philosophical one about how meaning works (Kulkarni, 2018, p. 321). Before Ānandavardhana, Sanskrit poetics focused on form, employing systems such as *alaṅkāra*, known as figures of speech, *riti*, the style of writing, and *guṇa*, the qualities or virtues of writing. These models carefully analysed the surface of poetry but did not explore the experience it creates. Ānandavardhana shifted attention from structure to experience, creating a new direction in literary theory (Samani & Santhanam, 2024, p. 6291). This shift is philosophical, not just a change of method. It alters how language is seen: from simply representing things in a literal sense to suggesting them. The literal meaning of words is necessary but not enough for a deeper poetic and aesthetic experience. Meaning unfolds in layers, and suggestion, *dhvani*, is central to this process. Singh points out that meaning is more than the sum of words. It comes alive through context and resonance (Singh, 2022, p. 233). This paper seeks to elaborate on the philosophical significance of *dhvani* by examining its ontological, epistemological, and aesthetic dimensions. Specifically, it argues that *dhvani* represents a comprehensive theory of meaning that transcends linguistic literalism and, in doing so, establishes aesthetic experience as a mode of knowledge. The

theory of *dhvani*, developed by Ānandavardhana in the ninth century, constitutes one of the most profound contributions to Indian philosophical aesthetics. In his seminal text, *Dhvanyāloka*, he inaugurates a radical rethinking of poetic meaning. The assertion that the essence (*ātman*) of poetry lies not in its literal expression but in its suggestive power. This assertion, encapsulated in the well-known dictum *kāvīyasyātmā dhvaniḥ*, that the soul of poetry is *dhvani*, without it it's not poetry at all! This marks a decisive departure from earlier traditions that privileged *śabda* (word) and *artha* (meaning) as sufficient determinants of poetic excellence (Kulkarni, 2018, p. 321). Sophisticated approaches towards language and aesthetics existed prior to Ānandavardhana, but they remained primarily concerned with the external or formal aspects of poetry and literature. With Ānandavardhana's intervention, the focus shifts inward, toward the experiential and affective dimensions of meaning. As Kulkarni observes, this shift redirected literary criticism “from the outer part of poetry to the internal part of poetry” (Kulkarni, 2018, p. 321). This paper aims to demonstrate that *dhvani* is philosophically significant not merely as a literary concept but as a comprehensive theory of meaning, cognition, and aesthetic experience.

2. Ontological Reconfiguration of Meaning Through *Dhvani*

At the heart of *dhvani* theory lies a fundamental reconfiguration of the ontology of meaning. Classical Indian semantics had recognised two primary modes of signification: *abhidhā*¹, referring to the direct literal understanding of a word, and *lakṣaṇā*², which signals the secondary or indicated meaning arising when the primary sense is untenable. In contrast, Ānandavardhana introduces a third mode: *dhvani* or *vyañjanā*³. *Dhvani* is the suggestion, and *dhvaniyārtha* is the suggested, the suggested meaning achieved through *dhvani* is *dhvaniyārtha*. This accounts for meanings not directly stated, nor merely implied, but rather suggested in a subtle, aesthetically charged manner (Devy, 2024). Sharma describes this triadic structure simply. He notes that *vyañjanā* creates *vyañgyārtha*, or suggested meaning, which goes beyond the primary and secondary levels (Sharma, 2022, p. 203). This third level transforms meaning by offering an experiential, not just a propositional, dimension. “Ānandavardhana introduced a new paradigm: the idea that suggestive meaning, or *dhvani*, was the true essence of poetic expression” (I, 2023). In *Dhvanyāloka* (Uddyota II), Ānandavardhana distinguishes between *vācya*, the expressed literal meaning, and *vyañgya*, the nuanced suggested meaning, arguing that the latter constitutes the true poetic essence (Ānandavardhana, 1972, pp. 165–170). The literal meaning functions as a vehicle, but the suggested meaning carries the aesthetic force. “*Dhvani* is a theory of meaning and symbolisms, and this principle leads to poetry of suggestion being accepted as the highest kind of poetry” (I, 2023). This hierarchical relation implies that meaning is not static but dynamic, unfolding through layers that culminate in aesthetic realisation. Singh reinforces this ontological hierarchy by describing *śabda* and *vācyārtha* as the “body” of poetry, and suggestion as its “soul” (Singh, 2022, p. 234). The body-soul metaphor is philosophically significant. It suggests that literal meaning is necessary but not sufficient; it must be animated by suggestion to achieve aesthetic vitality. Thus, *dhvani* transforms the ontology of meaning; what was once a referential structure becomes a layered, experiential process. “Ānandavardhana argues for a new linguistic capacity, suggestion (*dhvani* or *vyañjanā*),

¹ *Abhidhā* refers to primary literal meaning of the word, the direct meaning conveyed by a word in its conventional usage.

² *Lakṣaṇā* denotes secondary meaning known as the indicative meaning, which is inferred, because of the error in the literal meaning, therefore the indicative meaning is only arising when the literal sense is contextually inappropriate.

³ *Dhvani/vyañjanā* is the power of suggestion, enabling meanings that are neither directly stated nor logically inferred.

which he believes accounts for important phenomena not included within existing theories of secondary meaning” (Keating, 2016). Meaning now extends beyond what is said, reaching into the realms of what is suggested and felt. In this reconfiguration lies Ānandavardhana’s most radical contribution. To clarify: traditional semantic theories in Indian philosophy identified two principal functions of language, *abhidhā*, which conveys primary or literal meaning, and *lakṣaṇā*, which conveys secondary or indicated meaning when the primary sense is inadequate. By introducing a third function, *dhvani* or *vyāñjanā*, Ānandavardhana accounts for meanings neither directly stated nor merely implied, but suggested in a subtle and aesthetically charged manner. “Ānandavardhana integrates both the internal and external factors of literature and distinguishes between two kinds of meaning, the explicit and the implicit, and attempts to estimate the worth of literature by giving preference to the implicit rather than the explicit, claiming that implicit meaning is the true essence of literature and is called *dhvani*” (Singh, 2022, p. 234). Sharma explains: “The third word-power is known as *vyāñjanā* and the meaning obtained therefrom is called *vyangyārtha* or *pratīyamānārtha*” (Sharma, 2022, p. 203). This meaning does not rank below the first two. It is the most important, because it holds poetry’s aesthetic core. In the *Dhvanyāloka*, Ānandavardhana also says the literal meaning is often just a carrier for the suggested meaning. For example, in Uddyota II, he sets out the difference between *vācya*, the literally stated meaning and *vyāñgya*, the nuanced suggestion that suggests the suggested meaning (*dhvanyārtha*) is the real heart of poetry (Ānandavardhana, 1972, pp. 165-170). Meaning is not limited to words. It extends into lived experience. Singh reinforces this point by noting that while *śabda* and *vācyārtha* form the “body” of poetry, its essence lies in suggestion: “the essence of *rasa*⁴ can be perceived only through suggestion (*vyāñjanā*)” (Singh, 2022, p. 234). The body–soul analogy underscores the clear ontological hierarchy between literal and suggested meaning. *Dhvani* turns the idea of meaning from something fixed to a process that grows. Meaning reaches beyond words by unfolding through suggestion and experience (Singh, 2022, pp. 233-237).

3. Epistemological Expansion: Aesthetic Cognition Through *Dhvani* as Knowledge

The introduction of *dhvani* or *vyāñjanā* marks a key shift in Indian linguistic epistemology. Recognising suggestion as a form of meaning in its own right, Ānandavardhana validates aesthetic cognition as knowledge. This questions the dominance of inferential and logical models in epistemology (Keating, 2016). Kulkarni emphasises that Ānandavardhana’s theory introduces “a third potency of language” that operates beyond literal and secondary meanings (Kulkarni, 2018, p. 321). This potency does not work through deduction or inference but through intuition. The meaning is seen all at once, often as a sudden insight that cannot be broken down further. This view resonates with Bhartṛhari’s concept of *sphoṭa*⁵, which posits that meaning arises as an instantaneous flash (*pratibhā*). “*Sphoṭa* entails a kind of mental perception which is described as a moment of recognition, an instantaneous flash (*pratibhā*), whereby the hearer is made conscious, through hearing sounds, of the latent meaning unit already present in his consciousness” (Theodorou, 1995). Singh notes that the logical derivation of meaning from individual words is often inadequate (Singh, 2022, p. 233). Similarly, Prabhu observes that the meaning of an utterance often differs from the meanings of its constituent parts (Prabhu, 2013, p. 25).

⁴ *Rasa* is source of the aesthetic essence of bliss or *ānanda* experienced by the sensitive reader, transcending individualistic abysmal mundane emotions.

⁵ Bhartṛhari’s *sphoṭa* theory posits that meaning arises as a holistic flash rather than sequential accumulation.

Dhvani extends this insight into the aesthetic domain. It acknowledges that poetic meaning cannot be reduced to propositional content but must be experienced as a unified whole. This anticipates phenomenological approaches, which emphasise lived experience over analytical abstraction. “The essence of a poem, in this view, is not just the emotion it overtly expresses, but the emotions it subtly suggests through its rhythm, sound, and interplay of its words” (Timalsina, 2007, p. 134). In this framework, aesthetic experience is not merely pleasurable but cognitive. It reveals truths that cannot be articulated through literal language. “Ānandavardhana argued that the highest aesthetic power of poetry lies not in what is explicitly stated, but in what is evoked implicitly” (I, 2023). Thus, *dhvani* establishes a form of knowledge that is experiential, intuitive, and affective. The introduction of *dhvani* or *vyañjanā* also has profound epistemological implications. By positing suggestion as a distinct mode of meaning, Ānandavardhana legitimises aesthetic experience as a form of knowledge. This challenges the dominance of logical and inferential models of cognition (Raghavan, 2022, p. 14) because the linguistic and literary thinkers that came before Ānandavardhana always tried to downplay the role of *dhvani* and reduce it to inference “Mahimabhatta proposed that the process of poetic suggestion, *dhvani*, be included in the larger process of inference *anumāna*” (Raghavan, 2022, p. 15). Kulkarni emphasises that Ānandavardhana “postulates a third potency of language... beyond its literal meaning” (Kulkarni, 2018, p. 321). This potency operates not through logical deduction but through intuitive and emotive apprehension. Meaning is grasped holistically, often in a moment of emotive insight rather than through sequential analysis. This view resonates with Bhartr̥hari’s theory of *śpota*, which posits that meaning arises as an instantaneous flash, *pratibhā*. Singh notes that “the logical interpretation of sentence-meaning based on individual word meanings is often fallacious” (Singh, 2022, p. 233). Similarly, Prabhu observes that “the meaning of the whole utterance is different from what the individual words indicate” (Prabhu, 2013, p. 25). *Dhvani* extends this holistic epistemology into the aesthetic domain. “Ānandavardhana highlighted the need to consider the entire utterance as an important unitary linguistic symbol” (Singh, 2022, pp. 233-237). It acknowledges that poetic meaning cannot be reduced to propositional content but must be experienced as a unified whole. This anticipates modern phenomenological approaches, which emphasise lived experience over analytical abstraction.

4. Rasa and the Metaphysics of Aesthetic Experience

The culmination of *dhvani* is in *ānanda*, which is found through *rasa-dhvani*, where suggested meaning produces aesthetic experience. “*Rasa*, *dhvani* and *rasa-dhvani* are the major critical terms in Sanskrit poetics that developed during the post-Vedic classical period” (Sukla, 2016, p. 15). Ānandavardhana argues that while *rasa* may be conveyed through literal meaning, it becomes dominant only when it is suggested (Ānandavardhana, 1972, pp. 165-167). This distinction is crucial. It implies that *rasa* is not a property of language but an emergent experience of the *dhvanyārtha*, the suggestive meaning. Sinha describes this process as one in which aesthetic pleasure arises through suggestion and is realised by the *sahṛdaya*⁶, the sensitive reader (Sinha, 2024, p. 01). The reader does not merely decode meaning but participates in the entire process of realisation and the realisation itself. Philosophically, this suggests that aesthetic experience is ontological. It transforms individual emotion into universalised feeling. *Rasa* is not subjective but shared, transcending personal boundaries. In this sense, *dhvani* bridges language and being,

⁶ *Sahṛdaya* refers to the cultivated philosopher and an emotive reader capable of appreciating aesthetic experience through suggestion.

revealing a deeper layer of reality through aesthetic experience (Sukla, 2016, pp. 13-18). The highest manifestation of *dhvani* is *rasa-dhvani*, where the suggested meaning culminates in the aesthetic experience of *ānanda*. *Rasa* is not merely an emotion but a universalised aesthetic experience that transcends individual subjectivity. Sinha describes this process as one in which aesthetic pleasure “springs from... suggestiveness” and is realised by the *sahṛdaya*, the sensitive reader (Sinha, 2024, p. 02). This universalisation of emotion has metaphysical implications. It transforms personal feeling into a shared mode of being. That is why *dhvani* is the key, “*dhvani* is a key idea in Indian aesthetics. Abhinavagupta, a century later, added important elements to the theory of *dhvani*, through his ideas of *camatkara*, rapture, and *alaukika*, other-worldly” (Amaladass, 1984, p. 66). In this sense, *dhvani* functions as a bridge between language and ontology, revealing a deeper layer of reality through aesthetic experience.

5. Dhvani and the Fluidity of Meaning

One of the most radical implications of *dhvani* is its challenge to fixed semantic boundaries. In *avivakṣitavācya-dhvani*⁷, the literal meaning is intentionally disregarded, allowing new meanings to emerge (Sreenath, 2017, pp. 817-836). Sreenath argues that this form of *dhvani* enables signifiers to escape conventional semantic constraints and acquire new significations (Sreenath, 2017, p. 818). This destabilisation of meaning anticipates modern theories of linguistic indeterminacy (Timalsina, 2007, p. 134). However, unlike post-structuralism, *dhvani* does not lead to relativism. Instead, it grounds semantic fluidity in aesthetic coherence. Meaning is not arbitrary but guided by *rasa* and contextual resonance. “Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta intermedialise this experience by extending it to a reader of poetry. They argue that *rasa* is also generated by a linguistic potency called *dhvani*” (Sukla, 2016, pp. 13-18). One of the most philosophically radical aspects of *dhvani* is its capacity to transcend conventional meaning. In the category of *avivakṣitavācya-dhvani*, the literal meaning is deliberately set aside, allowing the suggested meaning to emerge independently. “Ānandavardhana’s significant contributions include incorporating emotions and other associative meanings into language meaning, expanding conceptions of primary and secondary meaning” (Singh, 2022, p. 235). Sreenath argues that this form of *dhvani* “opens up a signifier to new significations that are not conventionally associated with it” (Sreenath, 2017, p. 818). This challenges the fixed relationship between signifier and signified, allowing language to become a site of creative transformation. “*Dhvani*, however, is a more specifically linguistic issue and *vyāñjanā* a more broadly metaphysical term” (Singh, 2022, p. 236). Such a view anticipates modern post-structuralist theories, particularly the idea that meaning is not fixed but constantly deferred and reconstituted. However, unlike post-structuralism, *dhvani* grounds this instability in aesthetic experience rather than linguistic indeterminacy (McCrea, 2022, pp. 1-24).

Dhvani theory assigns a central role to the reader. The *sahṛdaya* is not a passive recipient but an active participant in meaning-making. Sinha emphasises that the suggestion stimulates the *sahṛdaya* and produces aesthetic delight (Sinha, 2024, p. 1). “*Dhvani*, however, is a more specifically linguistic issue and *vyāñjanā* a more broadly metaphysical term.” This anticipates reader-response theory but differs in its emphasis on shared sensibility. The *sahṛdaya* is trained to perceive suggestion and experience *rasa*. Interpretation is not subjective but grounded in aesthetic competence. *Dhvani* theory emphasises the role of the reader. The *sahṛdaya*, or sensitive reader, is not a passive recipient of meaning but an active

⁷ *Avivakṣitavācya-dhvani* refers to a type of suggestion where literal meaning exists but is not intended. Therefore, of no relevance.

participant in its realisation. Sinha notes that the suggestion “stimulates the *sahr̥daya*” and produces aesthetic delight (Sinha, 2024, p. 08). This emphasis on reader participation anticipates modern reader-response theory. However, *dhvani* differs in that it assumes a shared aesthetic sensibility rather than subjective interpretation. “He also asserted that the overall meaning of an utterance may differ from the meaning of the individual words” (Singh, 2022, p. 237). The *sahr̥daya* is trained to perceive suggestion and experience *rasa*. Thus, meaning is not located solely in the text or the author, but emerges through the interaction between the text and the reader (Singh, 2022, p. 7).

6. CONCLUSION

Dhvani represents a comprehensive philosophical framework that redefines language, meaning, and aesthetic experience. By introducing suggestion as a fundamental mode of signification, Ānandavardhana expands the ontology of meaning, legitimises aesthetic cognition, and establishes *rasa* as a universal mode of experience. Its relevance extends beyond Indian poetics, offering insights into global philosophical debates on language and meaning. *Dhvani* stands as a testament to the depth and sophistication of classical Indian thought (Chakrabarti, 2011). “Ānandavardhana’s significant contributions include incorporating emotions and other associative meanings into linguistic meaning and expanding conceptions of primary and secondary meaning” (Singh, 2022, p. 235). The philosophical significance of *dhvani* lies in its ability to fundamentally transform our understanding of language, meaning, and aesthetic experience. “Dhvani, or 'meaning-without-saying, is a central concept in Sanskrit literary theory, emphasising the suggestive power of language to evoke deeper meanings beyond the literal” (Hudson, 2013, p. 51). It moves beyond the confines of literal expression and challenges the assumption that meaning is fully contained within words or directly accessible through logical interpretation. Instead, *dhvani* reveals that meaning unfolds in layers and that the deepest and most meaningful dimensions of expression are often those that are not explicitly stated but subtly suggested. In doing so, it redefines language as a dynamic medium that transcends its own structural limits and can evoke experiences that cannot be reduced to propositional content. “Ānandavardhana’s theory of *dhvani*... anticipates many modern philosophical developments while remaining deeply rooted in Indian intellectual traditions” (Chari, 1977, p. 391). At a deeper level, *dhvani* introduces a shift from a purely representational view of language to an experiential one. Language is no longer treated merely as a tool for conveying information, but as a medium through which reality is aesthetically disclosed. This shift carries profound philosophical implications, as it recognises that human understanding is not limited to rational or analytical cognition but includes intuitive and affective modes of knowing. The experience of suggested meaning, arising through *dhvani*, demonstrates that knowledge can emerge from sensitivity, imagination, and emotional attunement rather than from formal reasoning alone. “Everyday patterns of speech (*vyavahāra*) are taken as a starting point for theorising in epistemology as in other areas of philosophy” (Chakrabarti, 2011). *Dhvani* also expands the ontology of meaning by using the everyday language and establishing a hierarchy of meaning in which suggested meaning surpasses literal meaning in significance. This does not negate the importance of the literal; rather, it situates it as a necessary foundation for deeper layers of meaning to emerge. In this sense, meaning is not static or fixed but relational and evolving, shaped by context, perception, and the reader’s responsiveness. The recognition that meaning is not exhausted by what is directly expressed opens up a

more fluid and expansive understanding of communication, one that accommodates ambiguity, resonance, and multiplicity.

Furthermore, *dhvani* underscores the central role of the reader or perceiver in the realisation of meaning. The aesthetic experience it produces is not inherent in the text alone but arises through an interaction between the text and a receptive consciousness. This highlights the participatory nature of understanding and affirms that meaning is co-created rather than passively received. Such a view anticipates modern hermeneutic insights while grounding interpretation in a shared aesthetic sensibility rather than subjective arbitrariness. Perhaps most importantly, *dhvani* establishes a profound connection between language and aesthetic experience as *ānanda* through the concept of *rasa*. In this framework, the suggested meaning culminates in an experience that transcends individual subjectivity and becomes universal. This transformation of personal emotion into a shared aesthetic state suggests that *dhvani* is not merely a linguistic phenomenon but a mode of accessing a deeper dimension of human experience. It reveals that art and literature are not simply forms of representation but avenues for encountering a more refined and universal mode of being. In its entirety, *dhvani* offers a comprehensive philosophical vision in which language, meaning, and experience are intricately interwoven. It challenges reductive models of meaning, expands the scope of knowledge, and elevates aesthetic experience to a central place within philosophical inquiry. By doing so, it stands as one of the most sophisticated and enduring contributions of Indian thought to the global understanding of language and consciousness. The philosophical significance of *dhvani* lies in its comprehensive reconfiguration of language, meaning, and aesthetic experience. By introducing suggestion as a fundamental mode of signification, Ānandavardhana expands the ontology of meaning beyond literal expression, legitimises aesthetic cognition as a form of knowledge, and establishes *rasa* as a universal mode of experience. *Dhvani* anticipates many modern philosophical developments while remaining deeply rooted in Indian intellectual traditions. It stands as a testament to the sophistication of classical Indian aesthetics and its enduring relevance to contemporary philosophical discourse (Chari, 1977, pp. 391-399).

REFERENCES:

1. Amaladass, A. (1984). *Philosophical Implications of Dhvani: Experience of Symbol Language in Indian Aesthetics*. Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien.
2. Amaladass, A. (1994). *Dhvanyāloka concordance* (A. Amaladass, Trans.). Sri Satguru Publications.
3. Ānandavardhana. (1956). *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana*. India: K.L. Mukhopadhyay.
4. Ānandavardhana. (1972). *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana: Uddyota 2* (S. Kumar, Trans.; 1st ed.). India: KLM.
5. Bronner, Y. (Ed.). (2023). *A Lasting Vision: Dandin's Mirror in the World of Asian Letters*. Oxford University Press.
6. Chakrabarti, K. K. (2011, 3 3). *Epistemology in Classical Indian Philosophy*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Archive.
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2025/entries/epistemology-india/>
7. Chari, V. K. (1977). The Indian Theory of Suggestion (Dhvani). *Philosophy East and West*, 27, 391–399. 10.2307/1397981
8. Devy, G. N. (2002). Indian Literary Criticism: Theory and Interpretation. *Orient Longman*, 31–40.

- Devy, G. N. (2024, 2 29). *Anandavardhana: Dhvani - Structure of Poetic Meaning*. Literary Sphere. <https://www.literarysphere.com/2025/05/anandavardhana-dhvani-structure-of.html>
- Hudson, E. T. (2013). Meaning-Without-Saying: The Implicit Literary Theory of the Mahābhārata. In *Disorienting Dharma: Ethics and the Aesthetics of Suffering in the Mahabharata* (pp. 50–73). OUP USA. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199860760.003.0001>
- I, P. (2023). *Dhvani: The Soul of Indian Poetic Expression*. Philosophy Institute. <https://philosophy.institute/aesthetics/dhvani-soul-indian-poetic-expression/>
- I, P. (2023). *The Scope of Rasa in Art: Beyond Emotional Aesthetics*. Philosophy Institute. <https://philosophy.institute/aesthetics/rasa-in-art-beyond-emotion-aesthetics>
- Keating, M. (2016, 11 26). *The Literal-Nonliteral Distinction in Classical Indian Philosophy*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2021/entries/literal-nonliteral-india/>
- Kulkarni, D. S. (2018). Dhvanyaloka by Anandavardhana: A critical reading. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 5(3), 320–322. <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.jetir.org/papers/JETIR1803326.pdf>
- McCrea, D. L. (2022). Meaning and Appearance: The (Re)turn of the Real in Indian Aesthetics. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 50(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-021-09315-0>
- Prabhu, V. (2013). Form of Life as Transcendental Dhvani Meaning. *KEMANUSIAAN*, 20(1), 23–32. <https://ejournal.usm.my/kajh/article/view/3097>
- Raghavan, A. (2022). Logical inference and poetic suggestion. A look at the first chapter of the Vyaktiviveka by Mahimabhaṭṭa. In the *Lunch lecture with Aneesh Raghavan* (pp. 14–15). French Institute of Pondicherry. <https://stb.univie.ac.at/en/news-events/detail/news/logical-inference-and-poetic-suggestion-a-look-at-the-first-chapter-of-the-vyaktiviveka-by-mahimabh/>
- Samani, N., & Santhanam, L. (2024). The Concept of Guṇa in Sanskrit Poetics. *ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*, 5(6), 3380–3388. <https://www.granthaalayahpublication.org/Arts-Journal/ShodhKosh/article/view/6291>
- Sharma, B. (2022, 2). Dhvani theory: Understanding the meaning of a literary composition. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 10(2), 202–210. <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://ijcr.org/papers/IJCRT2202147.pdf>
- Singh, A. (2022). Dhvani Theory in Indian Aesthetics. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 7(3), 233–237. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.73.34>
- Singh, A. (2022, 6). Anandavardhana's Theory of Dhvani: An Introduction. *EPR A International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 8(6), 6–9. <https://eprajournals.com/IJMR/article/7071>
- Singh, A. (2022, 6). Dhvani theory in Indian aesthetics. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 7(3), 233–237. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijels.73.34>
- Sinha, S. (2024). Unveiling the unspoken: A critical study of dhvani in Indian aesthetics. *Journal of South Asian Exchanges*, 1(2), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.21659/jsae/v1n2/v1n202>
- Sreenath, V. S. (2017, 6 29). Avivakṣitavācya-dhvani and the Deterritorialization of Signifier: A Liberating Experience for Language, Author and Reader. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 45, 817–836. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-017-9322-6>
- Sukla, A. C. (2016). Indian Intercultural Poetics: The Sanskrit Rasa-Dhvani Theory. *Cultura International Journal of Philosophy of Culture and Axiology*, 13(2), 13–18. https://doi.org/10.3726/b10729_13

- Theodorou, S. (1995). *Bhartrihari*. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <https://iep.utm.edu/bhartrihari/>
- Timalsina, S. (2007). Metaphor, Rasa, and Dhvani: Suggested Meaning in Tantric Esotericism. *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion*, 19(12), 134–162. 10.1163/157006807X224404