Introduction:

The comparatively simple rasa theory of the Ma.Sै. becomes the subject matter of fine analysis and recondite discussion in the later writers. The different darsanika views have entered into this discussion and made it complicated. These different views have been given by Abhinavagupta padacarya in his commentary on the rasasutra because he gives his own subtle theory. The same subject has been touched by him in this commentary on Dhvanyaloka. Before we come to this later development, it will be appropriate to study the treatment of rasa as given by writers on poetics earlier than Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta.

In the earlier Alamkarikas such as Bhamaha, Danandin etc., we do not come across any adequate discussion on rasa-realisation. It seems, these earlier writers on poetics had their own notion of kavya or poetry as word and sense taken together in general. All that rendered charm to poetry was termed 'alambakara'. Bhamaha calls it 'vakrokti in general (II.85)(1). Danandin also takes the term alambakara in a wider sense and applies it to anything that may render charm to poetry. (II.1)(2). Vamanasa, at I.1.2, takes the term alambakara in a wider sense and defines it as 'Saundarya'or'charm' in general(3). Thus, whatever is a source of charm in poetry, is broadly termed alambakara by the earlier writers on poetics. These writers must not have been unaware of the theory of rasa as propounded by Bharata as can be seen from the definition of mahakavya. It seems that they tried to approach this problem of rasa, and its position in poetry, by taking it as alambkara, which was recognised as a source of beauty in poetry.
This might explain the appearance of the whole group of alamkāras such as rasavat, preyas, urjasvi, etc. Thus, it may prove interesting to study the treatment of these alamkāras by the earlier writers, in order to trace their attitude towards the problem of rasa in poetry.

_BHĀMAHA:_

We will begin with Bhāmaha. He treats of preyas, rasavat, urjasvi and samāhi-ta in the third pariccheda of his Kāvyālamkāra. Rasavat is defined at III.6 as that which clearly manifests the rasas such as S'rīmāra and the like. Bhāmaha also mentions rasa at some other places but seems to take the word rasa in the general sense of kāvyarasa and not in any technical sense of the term. Preyas for him is what Vidura said to Kṛṣṇa when he came to his home, viz., that “O Govinda, the pleasure that I derive to-day from your coming to my house will arise, in course of time, only when you arrive again.” It should be noted that Bhāmaha has not defined preyas, samāhita and urjasvi. The illustrations cited throw some light on the treatment of rasa by him.

In later writers on alamkāra, we find that rati or love with reference to God, preceptor, king etc., does not give rise to rasa, but only makes for Bhāvadhwani. But for Bhāmaha, as we have seen, it is an alamkāra, as in case of preyas. So, for Bhāmaha, bhāva depicted in a poem takes the form of either preyas or that of urjasvi. Urjasvi is also not defined but only illustrated at III.7 as, the serpent discharged with the arrow by Kāma towards Arjuna, when it came back, was rejected by Kāma with the words, “O S'кая, does ks Kāma aim twice?” This speech of Kāma displays a lofty emotion of valour or S'aurya, not developed to be the capacity of rasa or sentiment, and therefore, not rasavat, in which, rasa is to be shown clearly i.e. spaṣṭa. Thus, the other two viz. preyas and urjasvi are concerned only with the exhibition of bhāvas alone. Samāhita is treated at III.10 as, “Samāhita is illustrated in Rājamitra, when kṣatriya ladies were going to appease Paras'urāma, Nārada appeared before them.” Here, Bhāmaha refers to a situation wherein the kṣatriya ladies, being terrified by the wrath of Paras'urāma, who was out to kill their husbands, were making an effort.
effort to appease him. Nārada arrives and helps them in their cause. Thus, the whole incident has some reference to the quelling of the emotion of anger. In later ālāṃkārikas, the element of chance occurrence on the part of Nārada is given greater importance, and it makes for the figure of speech called samādhi. The element of the quelling of emotion seems to have been ignored.

The above discussion makes it clear that Bhāma is not unfamiliar with the idea of rasa in general, though, he nowhere gives us a treatment of the discussion of rasa in poetry. He subsumes the fact of rasa, under what may be termed as 'emotion-based ālāṃkāra'. (9) Thus we see that the fact of rasa is here treated under the general category of ālāṃkāra. We however, find that Bhāma, while describing mahākāvya, probably drawing upon from the Na.Ś.'s, refers to the five Sandhis (pañcabhiṣa sandhibhīryuktaṁ), and also to all the rasas (rasais'ca sakalaiḥ prthak I.20;21) as characterising a mahākāvya. So, even though he has not incorporated or adopted discussions on rasa as found in the Na.Ś.'s, he is definite in his view that as in the case of a nāṭaka, the body of a mahākāvya also consists of five sandhis and is pervaded by all the rasas. As to nāṭaka (I.24) he has referred to other works, obviously those on dramaturgy. It may also be noted that the anibaddha or muktaka type of poetry is characterised by 'Vakrokti' and 'svabhāvokti'—which are at the root of other aḷāṃkāraś. It will therefore appear that for Bhāma, aḷāṃkāra based upon vakrokti and svabhāvokti is something which characterises a muktaka, while rasa is a characteristic of a mahākāvya. Rasa as an aḷāṃkāra, as observed above, would find place even in a muktaka.

DANDIN

Dandin also, from the theoretical point of view, seems to hold an identical position with reference to the topic of rasa. He also tries to incorporate rasa, bhāva, etc., under such figures as rasavat, prayas, etc. (10)

But, as compared to Bhāma, Dandin seems to have given more importance to rasa. This is seen in his treatment of the figures such as rasavat, prayas, etc. (11). Dandin treats of these figures at II.280-291. He talks of Śrūṇāra at II.
281, of raudra at II.282, and of vīra at II.284. Karuna is illustrated at II.286. Bibhatsa, ĥāya, vādīmau Adbhuta and Bhayanaka are illustrated in II.286, 289, 290 and 291, respectively. Abhimava in his Abh. (pp.272. Vol.I N.G.S. G.O.S, Ed.II), while explaining the causal view of rasa held by Lollata, says that earlier writers such as Dandin also held a similar view. (12). The commentators try to read a fully worked out rasa theory in Dandin. (13). But as to the theoretic position in kavya, Dandin says at II.287. that thus, kārunya which is enhanced, is taken as alamkāra. (14). Thus, even for Dandin, rasa is only an alamkāra in poetry. (15).

Preyas is defined as, 'priyatarākhyā' at II.275. Preyas is felicitous expression and rasavat happens where rasa abounds. Urjasvi is where pride dominates or that which has appropriate excellence. (16). From the illustrations cited by Dandin, it becomes clear that for him, preyas occurs in case of the suggestion of some bhāvas. (17). In the same way, urjasvi exhibits the bhāva of 'garva' or pride. Both preyas and urjasvi exhibit a bhāva as a kavyas' obhākara-dharma, i.e. alamkāra which serves to render charm to poetry. Rasavat, on the other hand, as seen above, exhibits fully developed rasa in form of an alamkāra. (18).

Dandin, like Bhāmaha, while describing the characteristics of a mahākavya says that a mahākavya should be full of rasas and bhāvas (rasabhāvanirantaram), and should also have well-defined sandhis. He also, like Bhāmaha, refers to other works for a description of drama.

VAMANA:-

Vamana does not treat these alamkāras. He, however, has tried to incorporate rasa in his own way in the arthaguna called kānti, which is defined at III.2.15 (19). It should be noted that Vamana seems to make an advance over his predecessors in subsuming rasa under guṇa which, for him, forms the essentials of poetry-nitya dharmah as compared to alamkāras which are accidental or impermanent- i.e. anitya, a distinction which does not seem to have been made by Bhāmaha and Dandin.
Udbhaṭa treats of the topic as below. In the fourth varga of his Kāvyā-śāstra, he mentions these figures in the first kārikā. He defines prayasvat as: "Poetry which is composed so as to contain the indications of bhāvas like rati, by means of anubhāvas and the like, is said to contain prayas. The suggestion of these bhāvas such as rati and others, would lead us to rasavat. So, Vivṛṭikāra says that here, rati or love is to be taken only with reference to God, king, etc. In case of rati or love with reference to the beloved, it is rasavat. (20)

Rasavat is defined at IV.3. as, 'that in which the development of sentiments such as Śrīmāra and the like, is clearly shown, and in which are included (the indicators such as), a verbal statement of the sentiment, the sthāya, the Sāsthāra, the vibhāvas and abhinaya. (21). Īrjasvi (IV.5) is, "the delineation of sentiments (rasas) and feelings (bhāvas), which hurt the sense of propriety in their depiction, or which are expressed in passion, anger, etc. (22). This is entirely a novel explanation of Īrjasvi, not to be seen either in Bhāmaha, or Daṇḍin. Again, the use of the terms such as, 'kāmakrodhrādiḥkāraṇāt' probably suggests that 'rasa' according to Udbhaṭa is caused by factors such as kāma or sex desire, krodha or (erotic-feeling) anger, etc. Abhinava, as seen above, tried to read the causal view of Lollāta in Daṇḍin.

Here also, probably we may read the same with greater confidence. Samāhita is defined at IV.7 as, "the description of the quelling of sentiments (rasa), feelings (bhāva), or their semblances (ābhāsas), quite unmixed with accessories (such as anubhāva). (23).

Thus it appears that Udbhaṭa treats of rasa as a part of alamkāra. But he has made a greater advance in discussing rasa eventhough as an alamkāra as can be seen in the definitions of prayasvat and the like. He mentions terms such as anubhāva and abhiṣeka refers to the 'Svās'abhāvocatva' of rasa. Thus, probably he is the first amongst the earlier writers to have incorporated Bharata's theory. He also adds one more aspect of rasa theory viz. that whether rasa can be Svās'abhāvocya i.e. expressed by its own name or not. For him, rasa
can be expressed, by its own proper name, a position, generally controverted by authors like Anandavardhana, Abhinavagupta and others.

**RUDRATA:**

When we come to Rudrata we find a still greater advance in the incorporation of ideas pertaining to rasa. The first point to be noted is that he does not include rasavat, prayas, furjasvi etc. in the enumeration of alambāras. He, however, in I.4 characterises kavya by the word 'sarasm'. Whether this is for Rudrata, a general characteristic of kavya or merely as in Bhāmaha and Dandin a characteristic of a mahākavya is not quite clear because the kavya to which he refers is one which a mahākavi is supposed to compose. In the later adhyāyas viz. XII to XVI, we find the subject of rasa discussed along with the discussions on the nāyakas, Nāyikās etc. In fact, this section incorporates the relevant material of the Nā.Ś'a. His justification for bringing in this topic of rasa is as follows. He says that poetry should incorporate rasas because those who have an aesthetic bent of mind are frightened by the dry teachings of the Ś'astraś. They can learn wisdom about the four ideals of life from poetry which is full of rasas(XII.1.2)(24). Namisādu says that rasas are not considered while dealing with the figures of sense, because poetry has word and sense for its body and vakrokti, vāstava etc. as literary embellishments, while rasas are like beauty, the natural quality (sahajān gnāh), and therefore are excluded. (25)

Thus, as noted earlier, rasas are treated by Rudrata with reference to kavyaphala or the object of poetry as derived by the connoisseurs. He then directly proceeds with the enumeration of rasas, viz. S'rigāra, vibhuvā, bhayānaka, adbhuta, īśya, raundra, s'ānta and prayāṇ(XII.3.). At XII.4. he says that rasas are so termed because they are relished as such-rasanādrasatvamēśām-. Namisādu says that the acāryas such as Bharata have called S'rigāraśāti to be rasas, because the sthāyibhāvas are so relished. Thus, it seems that Rudrata here treats of rasa-nispatī as seen in Bharata and tries to correlate it with the sahrdaya who relishes rasa as a kavyaphala. Then he gives two varieties of S'rigāra viz. sembhoga and vipralambha and proceeds with the different types of nāyakas and his companions. From verses XII.16 onwards, he describes the
different types of nāyikās. The XIIIth adhyāya is devoted to a description of s'ṛṅgāra and the XIVth to the vipralaṃbha. In the XVth adhyāya he describes vīra, bibhatsa, bhānaka, adbhuta, hāsya, raudra, s'anta and preyān. Then he gives a verse about the rītis that are appropriate to different rasas. The last adhyāya is devoted to the different types of prabandhas.

It should be noted that, as seen above in the light of the remarks of Namisādhu, Rudrata is inclined to take rasa as 'sahaja guṇa' or natural quality of kāvya or poetry, as against alaṅkāra which is an external ornament. Vāmana was the first to say that guṇas are the permanent qualities of kāvya, as against alaṅkāra which is an 'ānitya dharma' or impermanent quality. Vāmana incorporated rasa under kānti guṇa which formed one of essentials as compared to mere alaṅkāra, which forms the external element in kāvya. Thus we see that the tendency to make rasa as something essential as compared to mere alaṅkāra (in its narrower connotation), first originated in Vāmana, and then was carried on further in Rudrata.

Moreover, Rudrata talks of preyas as a separate rasa at XV.17. Rati or love with reference to a friend gives rise to this rasa. Thus, what in Bhāmaha, Daṅgin and Udbhāta appears as an alaṅkāra called preyas, appears in Rudrata as an independent rasa.

Rudrata, in the last chapter of his work treats of the various types of prabandhas or literary compositions. He says that the four objects of life should be treated in prabandhas mixed with rasas—(samyak tān abhiṣādyat rasas-asaṃsīrān prabandheṣu). Then he refers to the maximum varieties of prabandhas in poetry, viz. (mahā)kāvya, kathā, ākhyāyikā, etc. These are of two kinds—(i) imagined by the poet amī or (ii) based upon tradition. They may be (mahat) long, or short. (XVI.2-) He describes the longer variety in verse 5. Those are the great poems in which all the four objects of life are depicted at length, and in which all the rasas are also depicted. While the smaller poems are those in which only one of the objects of life is depicted. As to rasas, all of them are not expected in them, while one rasa is completely depicted (XVI.56). It may be karuṇārasa or vipralaṃbha (i.e. pravāsa s'ṛṅgāra) or prathamānurāgam (XVI.34).
We have seen above that in the alamkārikas earlier than Anandavardhana, rasa is depicted as one of the alamkāra and gunas, which, so to say, in their view, is a prominent characteristic of poetry. These authors, however, are not unfamiliar with the nātyarasas, discussed in the Nā. S'ā. As we have seen, they bring them in while defining the mahākāvyas and by implication also in kathās and ākhāyikās. Thus, it would appear that for these authors, rasas and bhāvas have their proper place in the prabandha kāvyas, great or small. We may note here the well-known lines about the muktakas of Amaru, wherein it is said that each verse of his is equal to a hundred prabandhas, implying thereby that one verse of Amaru has as much rasa as can be found in hundred prabandhas.

Anandavardhana:-

With Anandavardhana, we enter into a new era of sanskrit poetics. He seems to have fully realised the importance of rasa both in drama and poetry, and tries to give rasa a prominent place while incorporating it in his general scheme of vyākhyāna. For him, the soul of poetry is dhvani or the suggested sense which is derived through the function of word, called vyākhyāna.

This dhvani or the principally suggested sense, is three-fold according to Ananda, viz. Vastudhvani, or the suggestion of a matter of fact or idea, alamkāradhvani, or the suggestion of a figure and rasadhvani or the suggestion of sentiment. This rasadhvani is virtually regarded as the highest type of dhvani by Ananda. For him, rasa is never svas'abdavacya i.e. expressed through its own proper name, but is always suggested through vibhāva, anubhāva and vyabhicārins. Thus Ananda seems to have achieved a great point while harmonising the concepts of rasa as seen in dramaturgy and that of vyākhyāna in poetry. Abhinava has elaborated the point in his Abh. as well as Locana.

Conclusion:-

Thus we have seen that the earlier ālamkārikas such as Bhāṣā, Dandin etc. do not totally ignore the fact of rasa. But they try to incorporate it under alamkāra, a source of charm to poetry. Dandin is more elaborate in his treatment. Udbhata also seems to be better informed about the concept of rasa.
and its position in kāvya. He is probably the first to take rasa as svas'abda-vācyā i.e. expressed by its own name. But one point is clear that for all these, the ultimate 'alāṃkārya'is kāvya itself, and rasa, bhāva, etc., are only alāṃkāras, in the wider sense of the term as 'kāvyas'obhābakadharma'.

In Vāmana and Rudrāṭa we noticed a new trend to incorporate rasa, bhāva, etc. under guna, the essential or eternal quality of kāvya(nityadharma). Rudrāṭa also speaks of several rasas, in fact only bhāva for him can be rasa. Ānandavardhana with his theory of dhvani and vyākhyā gives a new orientation to the whole theme. Abhinavagupta, as we will see later on, elaborates the position taken by Ānanda and himself in his Locana and Abh. We will consider his views on rasa realisation later on.

**FOOT-NOTES**

1 Bhāmaha. II.86 इति सत्तं बहुविधभिन्नावर्तमानं विभाषयति।
    यतोपयोक्ति कविता कार्योकलारोऽन्य किता।

2 Dṇḍin. II.1 काव्याशैलीकारान प्रभावितः कार्यकारान छल्लाति।

3 Vāmana. I.1-2. लालित्यकल्लारः।

4 Bhāmaha. III.6. रसबुद्धिस्वतित्वुपस्तुरा दिलसे यथा।
    दैविक समागमवस्फोकरिण्यति चिन्तिते॥

Bhāmaha does not choose to go into any detailed treatment of Rasa. At I.21, he says that the Mahakavya should be युक्तं लोकस्वर्षम-वेन संसर्ग सकलें: पुराणः। At V.3, he says: स्वादु काव्यारसोमिर्मिः शास्त्रमयुक- युक्ते। Probably, herein the word 'Rasa(सैनी kāvyarasa) is not to be taken in a technical sense.

5 Bhāmaha. III.5. प्रेमो गृहागतं कृपणमवाचींविरुद्धुलो यथा।
    जय यथा यम गोविन्द जाता त्याय गृहागते।
    दानेष्यन्तरः भ्रमरीतिस्वाक्षरान्तत्त्वः॥
    This has been quoted by Dṇḍin also. Appayya Dīkṣita takes it as an example of Ananvaya Dhvani.

6 Bhāmaha. III.7 : उँचसि कृषि साधा रमय पापाय पुनरावृत्ति॥
    चित्र संस्कृति सिंह किन्नरस्तेल्यत्विरपालः॥
Dandin does not seem to take rasa in any technical sense, but only in the general sense of 'kāvyarasa' alone, in all these occurrences. Hemacandra says the same when he says:

अंजिनः तुग्रास्ममावार्जी अग्राम्यामस्थिि तुसवसः। नागणिकिंचि

also agrees to this. He says (MS. 189). वान्नावस्म ed._वान्नावस्म_

नुग्रास्ममावार्जी अग्राम्यातु वससः। हत्यापृतो वैस्य वैद्या। At III. 149.

pati as again गिर्यारसः is explained by Tarunavacasa/साजुल्लम only. At I. 62 also, Rasa 'does not carry any technical connotation. I. 62 reads-

कार्यं भाषायःकार्यं भाषायः नित्यभाषायः।

तवार्थाप्राप्तेऽभाषा कार्यं भाषायः ॥

Dandin also expects like Bhāmaha, the Mahākāvyya to depict, without exception, Rasa and Bhāva. (see I. 81 अंजिनः तुग्रास्ममावार्जी अग्राम्यामस्थिि तुसवसः।) तब्रास्ममावार्जी and हद्यामसः take 'Rasa' and
'Bhāva' here in their technical sense. But we may take this, with Dr. De in the general sense of 'Kāvyarasa'.

12. अभिव्यक्ति, मा, (m.272, Vol. I. Ns.-) चिरंजीवो चायस्य फलः। तसा हि दृष्टिना स्वार्थकारस्तर्कः। परा यिः। रति: बुधारमाता सता हुपकाख्यायस्य। हतित(कायायस्य ii.281) अवास्थापयत कौरेज कोपे राधानाथस्य गतः। (ii.283) हत्याधिच।

13. तकुण says at ii.281: तथिं रसम्। हुपकाख्यायस्य विभावानुभावव्यवहारः। चारियोऽनेम हत्यः।

The हृदयगम्य adds -रत्नाधिपतिः: एव न्यायी मावः यौज्यादिना वाकार्यानु-पाथानेन अनुभवमाने: हर्षिरुतिस्मितिकोलमुद्गमिति: यमिकारितम: समृद्धयमानः कृष्णन-न्तरां वृहदाराध्या लभे। तेन अन्विन्योऽनेन रसम्।

रागाचार्यं रेडी also follows तकुण: 'He says that herein, वास्तवः is the' विमावः 'her sweet words, smile etc. are the अहुब्धवास और हस्तां, विस्मयः etc. are the Vyabhicārabhāvas. The स्थायिमावः called रति is enhanced to the state of वृहदाराध्याः।

14. दृष्टिना II.287: हतिकायायस्मृतमः। कार्य्याः स्थितमः।

15. Dr. De observes:(pp 212 Sanskrit Poetics)-"But the Rasa in these figures is subordinate to the expressed figure itself to which it serves as a means of embellishment. (कल्याणस्मृतमः।) in other words, the Rasa is developed not for its own sake, but as increasing the beauty of expression'. I fail to agree with this.

By कल्याणस्मृतमः 'what Dandin means is that here Karuna Rasa becomes the अलंकार of काव्यः. The term अलंकार is to be taken, as noted above, in its wider sense of a काव्यशास्त्रकारः. For, otherwise, we fail to trace any other कल्याणः in these illustrations, to which the particular rasa can be subordinated. Again, Dandin calls Rasavat to be that which is'rasapes'ala'ı.e. that which causes delight due to Rasa(ii.275).

16. दृष्टिना II.275: प्रेमः। लगवानां रसविन्यासमु। उपित्सुः यद्राकारः युक्तलक्षणः। काल्याणः।

17. तकुण says तश्चेतुपलित्वातिविषयः प्रेमिकप्रकाः। प्रेमः।
Some modern commentators such as Reddi seem to overread things when they observe that Rasavat, Preyas and Urajsvi are grouped together because all of them form the varieties of what is called कलेकसमचारी. It is doubtful whether Dandin could be held to be conscious of the classification of Dhvani as above.

वासना III.11.16: दीपार्श्वले कालीतु।

विवृतिकार-रतिरिह देवगुलुपा दिविष्यया मृक्को वाण्तविण्यायान्। तु रति: पूर्णने रतिकल्लीकारों कलितु॥

उद्भव IV.11.1: रससुवर्त्ततस्पथ्यां गाराधिर्पादनम्।

त्वक्तन्त्या सिस्चारितविशालणायस्यम॥

22. IV.5: अनौंचिल्यावाणों कामजोशाविवाहारणात।

भावानां च रहस्यानां च बन्ध उज्जस्य कथ्यते॥

उद्भव IV.7: रसभावाचानार्थे: प्रकाशन्वम्।

अस्वामिनि: तृणधर्मे वटात्साहित्यम॥

24. जशु काश्यकृ चं अस्वास्थानामाणमातीतः

भुरु मुदु तथा नीतिभूपले हि नस्त्विनि अस्वामिनि॥ उद्भव IV.8।

25. अस्वास्थानामाणमातीतः हस्तरसाः अर्थः अर्थः

किं अर्थार्थ: उत्तमानेन अवस्थम स्थित राज्याने स्थिताः हि अर्थः

कारकाः कारकाः कारकाः कारकाः कारकाः कारकाः।

रसांस्य आर्थिकां अनुस्मृतां अपेक्षा: गुणाः स्निश्चलः अवश्यमाहारमः॥