Chapter III

Jagannatha's Conception of Rasa

Origin and development of the concept.

The doctrine of rasa is an outstanding contribution towards Aesthetics and has been acknowledged as the guiding-principle in Indian literary criticism. Indian tradition connects the name of Valmiki with the conception of rasa. He is universally recognised not only as the discoverer of new metrical forms but of rasa also. We have no knowledge about any critic existing in the pre-Valmiki age. But there must have been a systematic study of rasa in pre-Valmiki period since he has recognised the nine rasas of Bharata in the Ramayana (Bala Kanda, Ch. IV, 9). However, rasa has been accepted as the most essential principle of poetry since Adikavi Valmiki's times, though theoretical speculations on its varieties and multiplicity, on its proper aesthetic representation etc. began a bit late.

Bharata is universally accepted as the oldest exponent of the rasa-theory. He attaches highest importance to rasa in poetry and similarly holds the view that no dramatic representation is possible without the suggestion of rasa.¹ So in the sixth chapter of his Nātyasāstra, he enunciates his famous rasa-sūtra - 'tatra vibhāvāmubhayabhicārisamyogād rasanispattīḥ'. This sūtra has become Mona Lisa's smile in the history of Sanskrit criticism.

¹ 'na hi rasādrte kascidarthah pravartate' (Nātyasāstra VI).
Many later writers have given various interpretations of the sūtra on the basis of various systems of Indian philosophy. But the Nātyasāstra was composed with an eye to the dramatic representation and so rasa was not the principal theme of Bharata. He dealt with rasa only in relation with the dramatic art with which he was mainly concerned. So Rājasēkhara on the basis of some current traditions said that Bharata was the original exponent of drama and Nandikeswara was that of rasa-doctrine.2 There is ground to believe that during Bharata's times, the dramaturgic rasa school was fully established and Bharata borrowed and worked it up into his system. In the Nātyasāstra, there are many verses cited as anuvāmsya in the sixth and seventh chapters. Dr P. V. Kane3 believes that these were composed by unknown scholars and were handed down from father to son or from teacher to pupil, and Bharata incorporated them in the Nātyasāstra. A great controversy centred round his well-known rasa-sūtra and different commentators like Lollata, Sankuka, Bhattanāyaka and Abhinavagupta offered different interpretations. Ancient writers discussed the rasa-sūtra in relation with the dramatic literature. They also did not take rasa as the central point of their discussion, nor the relation of rasa to poetry was systematically dealt by them. It is, however, Ānandavardhana who brought out the importance of rasa in poetry in his epoch-making work Dhvanyāloka. He extended the rasa-theory to the province of poetry which was restricted to drama only. He not only mentioned the name of Bharata but also

2. 'rupakādiniṛupanī m Bharataḥ; rasādhiārikāṃ nandikeswarah' - Kāvyamāmāsa I.
3. History of Sanskrit Poetics, p.17.
considered both drama and poetry as one variety in relation to rasa (cf. 'stacca rasādī tatparyena kāvyanibandhānām bharatādavapi suprasiddhāmeva', Dhv. Vṛtti on 3.32). He also maintains that the chief centre of appeal in poetry is rasa or aesthetic sentiment. He writes - vṛttayo hi rasāditatparyena samāvesi-tāh kamapi nātyasya kāvyasya ca ochāyāmahahanti/ rasādayo hi dvayaorapi tayorjīvabhūtāh/ Dhv. Vṛtti on 3/33). Thus Ānandavardhana accepts the dramaturgic rasa-theory of Bharata as applicable to poetry and attaches highest importance to rasa thereby declaring it as the very life of poetry. To speak in the word of Dr Krisnamoorthy - 'Rasa, in short, endows eternity of interest and charm to subjects otherwise limited and circumscribed. Even like trees in spring, well-known themes put on a charm and splendour altogether new and fresh, when they are associated with rasa. That is why Ānandavardhana appeals to the poets never to become indifferent to consideration of rasa while writing their works.'

Though Ānandavardhana is the first to deal systematically the relation of rasa to poetry in general, other ancient writers on poetics like Bhamaha, Dandin and Vamana also have appreciated the importance of rasa in poetry. Dandin in his Kāvyādarsa 1.18 says that a mahākāvya should be abounding in rasas and bhāvas. But as he is an exponent of alamkāra theory, he holds that it is literary embellishments which impart pleasantness to the expressed idea. He treats rasas in connection with the figure rasavat and

according to him rasa is an álāṁkāra only. Bhamaha also adopted the rasa-sūtra of Bharata in his definition of Mahākāvyya and he stated that it should contain separately the various rasas. This led Dr Krisnamoorthy to conjecture that Bhamaha and Dandin had before them the great Epics of Vyāsa and Vālmiki and their definitions of poetry were in accordance with these two Epics.

Vamana was an upholder of riti theory. He considered rasa not as an álāṁkāra but as a guna namely Kānti which is defined by him Kāvyālāṁkāra-sūtra-vṛtti thus –

'dīptarasatvāṁ kāntih'

He also was aware of dramaturgic rasa theory of Bharata. For he attached highest importance to ten rūpākās among the Kāvyas. These writers were influenced by the rasa theory of Bharata but they considered drama as a separate class of composition and so they did not deal with them. It was, however, Rudrata who made a departure from his predecessors in treating rasa in his Kāvyālāṁkāra. Although he was an advocate of álāṁkāra school, he was influenced by the rasa school and felt the necessity of dealing with rasa separately. Dr De considers Rudrata as a supporter of álāṁkāra school on the basis of the statement of Ruyyaka – 'rudradenaḥ bhāvalāṁkāraḥ dvidhaivoktaḥ/ rūpakādīpakāpahmutitulyayogitā- danbupamalamkāro vācyopaskarakatvena uktah/ rasavatpreyaUrjsvipra- vārtaurasabhāvādivācyasobhaśhetutvenktah/ utpreksā tu svayameva pratiyamāna kathitā/ tadiḥtham tribidhamaṇi pratiyamanamaṇiḥkarat- ayākhyapitameva/ (Alāṁkāraśarvasvaṃ, ed. by Kumari S. S. Janaki, p.8).

8. 'sandarvesu dasarupakam sreyah' – Kāvyālāṁkāra-sūtra-vṛtti 1.2.30.
It must be admitted that Rudrata's treatment of rasa opens new path for the later theorists. In fact it is he who paved the way for Dhvanikara to deal with rasa in his Dhvanyāloka.

In the eleventh century, Abhinavagupta the great Kasmirian philosopher and rhetorician wrote his Abhinavabhārati and while interpreting Bharata's dramaturgic rasa-sūtra, declares that the dramaturgic and Kāvya-rasa is virtually one and the same. In his Abhinavabhārati, he writes - na natye eva rasāḥ, kāvyeyi, nātyā-yamana eva rasāḥ/ kāvyartha bīṣaye hiṣ prayāksalpasamvedanodaye rasodaye ityupadhyayāḥ/ (Abhinavabhārati, ed. by Dr Nagendra, p.504). In support of his own statement Abhinava quotes his teacher Bhaṭṭatātā. From this, it is evident that even before Abhinavagupta, writers on Alamkārasāstra discussed the doctrine of rasa and its applicability to poetry. They came to the conclusion that Kāvyarasa and nātyarasa were virtually one. Later on we get several works expounding the theory of rasa after the Nātyasāstra, the most important of which are Śṛngāraprakāśa, Daśārupaka, Śṛngāra-tālaka, Bhāvaprakāsa, etc.

**Bharata's Rasasūtra**

Bharata's famous rasa formula in the Nātyasāstra is the corner stone on which Indian aesthetic theory is based. According to this formula, 'rasa presents itself to our experience when

10. Hindi Abhinavabhārati, Dr Nagendra, p.504.

11. vibhāvamubhāvavyabhicārisamjogāt rasanispattih (Nātyasāstra VI).
vibhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas combine. The word 'saṁ-
yoga' in the sūtra has given rise to a great deal of controversy about the nature of its interpretation. However without entering into controversy, it can be said that Bharata himself took the word 'saṁyoga' in the sense of combinations and according to him rasa results from bhāvas and not vice versa (cf. s drsyate hi bhāvebhyo rasānāmabhinirvṛttih, na tu rasēbhyo bhāvānabhinirvṛtyr-vṛttirītī. Hindi Abhinavabhāratī Dr Nagendra, p. 510).

The term 'rasa' primarily means taste or relish. Bharata applies the term in the field of dramatic criticism. So rasa, according to him, is aesthetic relish. It is a complex process where the whole range of psycho-physical responses of a man are involved. It is an organic unity where the vibhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas combine to rouse sthāyibhāvas and connoisseurs relish an aesthetic pleasure which is called rasa. Bharata attempts to bring out this conception by some worldly instances. He says that rasa is so called because it is an aesthetic enjoyment. 'Just as persons who partake of food prepared with many condiments (such as jaggery, curds, cardamom, camphor, marica) taste many flavours and feel pleasure and delight, so spectators relish sthāyibhāvas suggested by various bhāvas, acting, recitation etc. and enjoy delight and therefore, are called natyarasas.'

This above quoted Bharata's rasa-sutra is the foundation on which different theories on rasa are based and it is admitted by all

12. Dr Krisnamoorthy, Essays in Sanskrit Criticism, p. 65.
13. Vide, Nāṭyasāstra ed. by Dr Nagendra, p. 497.
14. MM. P. V. Kane, History of Sanskrit Poetics, p. 362.
There are eight basic mental states. They lie dormant in the minds of connoisseurs who go to see a theatrical performance or to read a poem. When proper stimuli in the form of dance, music and words in case of a dramatic show and music of words in reading poetry, activates these basic mental states, they in turn lead to sentiments which are consciously savoured by people of taste. These sentiments are called 'sthāyī' because they exist prior to the aesthetic situation as an abiding but latent reality in our mental background. That is why some modern writers have translated them as 'permanent mood' or 'basic mental states'. Bharata assigns reasons why they are called 'sthāyī' in the following lines -

'yathā narendro vahujanaparivaropī sa eva nama labhyate nānyaś sumahānapi puruseṇ tathā vibhānubhāvāvyabhicāriparivṛtah sthāyī bhavo rasa nama labhyate. bhavati cātra sūkṣmā -

yatha naraṇām nṛpatiḥ sīsyānām ca yathāguruh/ evam hi sarvabhāvānām bhavah sthāyī mahāniha/ (Nātyasāstra, G.O.S. ed VIII, pp.350-51).

Bharata enumerates eight sthāyibhāvas namely, rati (love), hasya (laughter), sōka (sorrow), krodha (anger), utsāha (enthusiasm), bhaya (fear), jugupsā (repugnance) and vismaya (wonder). Other
critics have added a ninth one - nirveda too. Krisma Chaitanya in his Sanskrit Poetics (p.4), has shown how the eight sthāyibhāvas of Bharata correspond to six passions of Descartes. According to him, they are admiration, love, hate, desire, joy and sorrow. Others are derivatives of these.

Vibhāvas - Vibhāvas are the medium through which the permanent moods like rati, hāsa, etc. are reused to a relishable condition. They are, however, not in the relation of cause and effect with the permanent moods (sthāyibhāvas). When they are presented on the stage, they can stimulate the sthāyibhāvas. So Dr K. C. Pandey¹⁵ rightly considers the vibhāvas as dramatic situations. They are not the cause but are the mediums through which emotions are expressed by the actor and experienced by the spectator. The vibhāvas are related to the sthāyibhāva in the same way as 'letters' of a word are related to its 'meaning'. The relationship between the two is not causal or causational; but expression-al. According to Bharata also, vibhāvas are the focus of cognition. They render the permanent moods capable of being sensed through three kinds of representations that is, words, bodily behaviour and emotional display. There are two types of vibhāvas - ālaṁbana vibhāva and uddīpana vibhāva. The ālaṁbana vibhāva is the basic stimulus which is primarily responsible for the arousal of emotion. It is on them that emotions depend for their very existence. The uddīpana vibhāva is the enhancing stimulus; they are so called

because they encourage the intensity of permanent moods. The environment or the surrounding stimulating emotion will fall in the category of vibhāvas. Thus in case of erotic sentiment the lady or the heroine will be an ālambana vibhāva and spring season, moon-rise or garden etc. the uddīpana vibhāvas.

Amubhāva - Amubhāvas are the results of the excitations or are the psycho-physical reactions on the spectator. They are indicative of the emotions in the hero or heroine in a dramatic presentation. The perception of the excitation is transferred from the characters to the spectators by sympathetic induction. They are called amubhāvas because they cause the spectators experience the basic emotion of the hero or the heroine presented on the stage by different devices of communication. According to Dananjaya they are the external manifestations of the basic emotion working within. So they are the products of permanent moods produced in the hero or heroine in the development of a dramatic situations. Jagannātha Panditarāja treats these amubhāvas as effects of the permanent moods. He derives the word thus - 'anu pāścādbhāva utpattiryesām/ amubhāvayantītī va vyutpat-
patteh' (Rasagangādhara, p.39). So in Panditarāja's view the amubhāvas are the after-effects of the permanent mood expressed on the stage; they help to arouse in us rati or other bhāvas existing in objects of experience. Thus, amubhāvas are the voluntary expression; they are nothing but the psycho-physical changes on

account of the rise of emotion. They belong to that class of voluntary expression which can be produced by an effort of will. But there are some other kind of changes in excitement which are brought out automatically without any effort of will. They are involuntary expressions and Bharata calls them sāttvikabhāvas. In case of these bhāvas also, the mind is bound to be affected. Bharata admits eight sāttvikabhāvas in his Nātyasāstra.¹⁷

Vyabhicāribhāva - Vyabhicāribhāva is a functional nomenclature. They are that class of feelings which are transitory in nature. They are called such because they are susceptible to any other permanent dispositions. 'As they can move along freely with any other strong emotion, they are otherwise termed as sancarībhāvas as well.'¹⁸ According to the Daśarūpaka, vyabhicāribhāvas are like the waves of the ocean which rise above and go down in the process of developing of bhāva.¹⁹ Although they are mental states, they may be acted out in befitting manner in a befitting situation and then the audience or reader would feel their occurrence. Bharata enumerates thirty three vyabhicāribhāvas and almost all later canonists follow Bharata in this respect. But Panditarāja sees that there are many such other mental states or feelings not included in Bharata's list. So he does not rule out the possibility of new additions in the list of Bharata.²⁰

¹⁸. Dr S. N. Sastri, Laws and Practice of Sanskrit Drama, p.244.
¹⁹. Daśarūpaka 4/7.
Jagannātha's theory of rasa

Jagannātha's theory of rasa is the most important topic in his Rasagangādhara. As he is the last interpreter of Bharata's rasa-sūtra, his theory has a value of its own. Before giving his own theory of rasa, Jagannātha furnishes the succinct summary of the views of his predecessors like Abhinavagupta, Mammata, Bhatta Lollata, Bhattanāyaka and Shri Sankuka. He, however, is greatly influenced by Abhinavagupta and his own new appears to be an exact paraphrase of Abhinava's commentary on Bharata's famous rasa-sūtra. In his Rasagangādhara Panditarāja enumerates eleven interpretations. Of these eleven, we do not know the source of seven views. Pandit Madan Mohon Jha in his introduction of Hindi Rasagangādhara (p. 29) conjectures that these views on rasa-realization are invented by Panditarāja himself. We shall examine here these views and shall try to assess the contributions made by our author in aesthetics. As he was a strong supporter of Abhinavagupta, we shall first have a glance over the view of Abhinavagupta as interpreted by Panditarāja.

Rasa, according to Abhinavagupta is nothing but the basic mental state universalised and relished by the Sahrdaya. The basic mental states remain in latent form in the minds (hearts) of the sāmājikas; at the time of relish they are revived. Thus in poetry, vibhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas are depicted through beautiful and faultless diction, or in a drama they are depicted through various kinds of abhinayas, and through this depiction sthāyibhāva is suggested. Though, of course, Sita or any other heroine is the subject of the permanent mood rati;
glances etc. are its effects and bashfulness, eagerness etc., are auxiliaries and all these are related to some 'specific' or 'personal' connection and still by them, basic mental states cannot be aroused. These are to be impersonalised or universalised or generalised in the mind of the samajika by virtue of the power of suggestion. Then it is relished by the inner self of the responsive critic and this is called rasa.

Quoting Mammata, 21 Jagannātha says that sthāyibhāva manifested by vibhāva and other is rasa. What is meant by the term 'vyaktah' in the definition is the object of suggestion too which is again nothing but the removal of the curtain from Cit or Chaitanya. Just as a light, its cover or curtain being lifted up, illumines itself and other object around it, so also the self, when its veil of ignorance is removed, reveals itself and sthāyibhāvas together with vibhāvas, anubhāvas etc. Now permanent moods like rati and others are mental properties and so there is obstruction of their being revealed by Ātma-chaitanya. But, how can the vibhāvas, anubhāvas be revealed by eternal consciousness? In anticipation of such a question Jagannātha states that vibhāvas, anubhāvas are presented to the mind; they appear as mental properties and like unreal objects seen in dreams, they too become self-luminious. The taste of these vibhāvas, anubhāvas etc. lead to the removal of the cover of obstruction which is veil of ignorance, from the eternal consciousness. This removal of the veil of ignorance is the realisation of rasa, which is always in our

consciousness but we can realise it because of the veil. Permanent moods are not produced in the mind of āmājika, nor to do they perish. They are always therein, so rasas also cannot be produced, nor they perish. They are so called by laksanā. Clarifying this point, Panditarāja says that, though letters are eternal, the organs of the mouth, which are instrumental in pronouncing them are non-eternal; this characteristic of the organs by which letters are uttered is ascribed upon the letters also. As Pandit Badrijnath Jha rightly observes - 'yathā vaiyākaraṇādimaḥ utpanno gakārah', 'vinasto gakārah' ityādipratītigocarayorutpatti-vināśa-yornityesu varnese vatuteśasambhavāt tadvijnakakanthaīalvādīvyā-pāreṣu ca sambhavadaropakah tathaiva rasaśisu nityesu utpanno rasah 'vinasto rasah' ityādipratītigocarayorutpattibinaśayo-rasadibyan-jikāyam vibhādādicarvanāyām vidyāmanayosārṣyaśayabhūtesu rasa-dīsvaropa ityārthah' (Hindi Rasagangādhara, Part I, pp.92-93).

Jagannātha Panditarāja interpretes the rasa-theory of Abhinavagupta in the light of the Vedanta theory of the Advaita school of Sankara. In this view, there is no necessity of assuming a bhāvana vyāpāra and even without the assumption of such a function rasa is interpreted as being suggested. Thus by reading a poem, the reader with poetic susceptibility first understands the meanings of words and then, there is the cognition of the vibhāva, amubhāva and vyabhicāribhava. Again the sympathetic reader is highly influenced by those vibhāvas, amubhāvas etc. by their carvanā and by the operation of suggestion, his feelings in consciousness is liberated from any involvement of ego. It becomes impersonal and detached and in such a supreme moment the mind
with the permanent moods being freed from the veil of ignorance, attains the state of supreme bliss. This state of the mind is identical with the self-consciousness. In other words, the sahrdaya is totally merged in pure bliss or ananda. The state of his mind can be well-compared with that of Yogin in savikalpa samadhi when in his consciousness supreme bliss prevails alone.

Our intellect is essentially below 'chaitanya'. It has pleasure as its property but no permanent bliss. Transcendental bliss is chaitanya itself. When chaitanya is made reflected in a medium of intellectual mood, the latter appears to be conscious and blissful. Such a perfect reflection cannot be caught by an ordinary intellect. When the intellect is purged of all impurities arising from rajas and tamas and preponderates in sattva element, then it would be the fit medium for catching the reflection of transcendental consciousness-cum-bliss.

Giving Abhinavagupta's view on rasa, Jagannatha tries to come to a conclusive view: Caitanya (transcendental consciousness) itself with its veil of ignorance removed and further circumscribed by permanent mood such as emotion of rati etc., is rasa. Emotions are adjuncts to transcendental consciousness unveiled. They are directly revealed in the process of unveiling of the consciousness and in this process there is a mysterious experience of transcendental consciousness as tinged by emotion. This experience is unique; it is a class by itself. In order to substantiate his view he recites some Upanisadic sentences. There are other sentences which seem to contradict his view. He reconciles this conflicting passage of the Upanisad and establishes his
view on solid ground. Then he distinguishes his view from that of the great aesthetician Abhinavagupta. He maintains that rasa, according to Abhinavagupta is the permanent emotions like rati etc., illumined by transcendental consciousness unveiled of ignorance. But whether rasa is attribute of self or substantive, it is always self-luminous and eternal. When we judge the realisation of rasa from the view point of the permanent moods like rati etc., then it can be shown that rasa is non-eternal and itarabhāsyā (revealed by others). In association with Īkaitanya, it is eternal and self-luminous. The removal of the veil from chaitanya leads to carvana or relish of rasa. This experience is something uncommon. It is different from the experience of the Supreme Soul in religious meditation. The aesthetic pleasure is characterised by laukika vibhāva, amubhāva etc. and is possible through the power of suggestion. But the spiritual joy is pure joy and is possible through śravana, manana and nividhyāsama. To quote Dr Nagendra - 'Whereas spiritual joy is an absolute experience of the supreme self, aesthetic pleasure has a material basis invariably. This material basis is extremely refined; it is an impersonal or universalised pleasure no doubt, yet it is there, because the impersonal or universalised experience also is, in the ultimate analysis, a material experience and not a spiritual experience like a yāgic experience or the experience of religious meditation. It is a state of sublimation, a liberated state of the psyche, but it does not transcend the psyche.'

22. 'The Nature of Aesthetic Experience' in 'Indian Aesthetics and Art Activity', p.77.
According to Bhatta Lollata, when vibhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas are described by the poet or staged vividly by mimic and they co-operate together and in their conjunction, rasa is produced. Thus according to him, the dominant emotion like rati etc. is produced by ālambana vibhāvas like Rama, Sita, etc., is enkindled by uddīpana vibhāvas like gardens, breeze, moon light and others and is revealed and heightened by anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas respectively. In this way sthāyibhāvas being produced by vibhāvas and fostered by vyabhicāribhāvas become a matter of experience and this is relished as rasa. Though according to this view, the relation between the vibhāva and sthāyibhāva is that of the produced and producer and the relation between the sthāyibhāva and vyabhicāribhāva is that of the cherished and cherisher, still production or utpatti is the central point here and without it, neither pratīti of rasa nor its nourishment is possible. So this view is known as utpattivāda. The abiding emotions like rati etc. when carried to maturity by vibhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas produce rasa. It primarily belongs to the hero like Rama; but it is attributed to the actor who imitates the action of the hero by various kinds of acting. This imitation by the actor becomes a source of pleasure for the audience who realise rasa through jñānalakṣanā. Manikyachandra, therefore, rightly concludes the view of Bhatta Lollata thus:

23. Dr Suryananda Swami, in his article 'Abhinavaguptapādapratipāditam Rasavivecanam' in the 'Principles of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit', p.248.
24. Dr N. N. Chaudhury, Kāvyatattvasamākṣā, p.175.
vibhāvairjanitomubhāvaih pratitīṁ nito vyabhicārivirūpacito mukhy-
ayā vr̥ttyamukārye tadrupatansandhanandanukartaryapi pratīyamānāh
sthāyi bhavo rasa iti/ vibhāvanubhāvavyabhicārisamjogasthāyi pari-
pūsto rasatām yatīti tātparyām (Kāvyaprakāśa, p.41). But this
view of Lollata is not tenable at all. True character of aesthetic
experience cannot be supported by this theory. Moreover, vibhāvas
as Mammatā holds, cannot be efficient cause of rasa. For, we
know that in nimittakāraṇa, an action remains even after the effi-
cient cause is destroyed. But on the other hand, there cannot be
realisation of rasa if there are no vibhavas and anubhavas. So
vibhavas and anubhavas cannot be the efficient cause of rasa. They
also cannot be regarded as communicative mark (jñāpaka-kāraṇa) for
a communicative mark is possible only when the thing communicated
exists there. But, as a matter of fact, rasa does not exist be-
fore; it is suggested by vibhāvas and others and then it is enjoyed
by the people having poetic taste. Another objection to this
theory is that it fails to explain how rasa produced in the actor
can arise in the mind of the spectator.

Sankuksa's view

Propounding the theory of rasānumītī, Shrī Sankuka holds
that rasa is not produced but it is a matter of inference. The
clever actor by his skilful acting imitates the character and exhi-
bits vibhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas by his instruction,
proficiency and practice. From these, the spectator is led to
infer that dominant mood which exists in the actor. Although vi-
bhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas are artificial, they produce
an illusion of reality and are supposed to belong to the hero whom
the actor personates. From this the spectator relishes the perma-
nent emotions like rati, hasa etc. by the process of inference.
This inferred basic mental state, because it is simply and imita-
tion of a real basic mental state of real hero, such as Rama, and
because it is associated with the enchanting situation, adds to
itself a peculiar charm and develops into an enjoyable condition
of the spectator's mind. It is called Rasa because of its enjoy-
ability. This interpretation of Bharata's famous rasa-sūtra by
Shrī Saṅkuka is after the Nyāya Philosophy and is also an 'anumī-
tivāda'.

But this theory is also defective like the previous one.
Vividness, immediacy and intensity of aesthetic experience cannot
be explained by this theory. It does not consider that the perma-
nent moods which are relished as rasa, are there in the samajikas.
But how can samajikas experience aesthetic pleasure if rasa is not
produced in their own hearts? Again inferred perception or cogni-
tion of an object cannot produce the same charm, the same aesthetic
pleasure as direct perception can.26

Bhaṭṭanāyaka's view on rasa

Bhaṭṭanāyaka rejects the theories of rasotpatti and rasānu-
miti of Lollata and Saṅkuka respectively which are based on the
assumption that permanent moods exist in the actor or in the origi-
nal character whom the actor personates and not in the spectator.

26. Krisna Chaitanya, Sanskrit Poetics, p.27.
A spectator or a reader cannot relish rasa if it is not personal at all, nor it is possible to cognise it as related to his individuality; for, Sakuntalā and others cannot be the vibhāvas for the spectator. Again without generating agents no realisation of rasa can take place. It also cannot be said that Sakuntala should be taken as a beloved (kanta) in a general sense of the term. A kānta (beloved) can be vibhāva in erotic sentiment only when there is definite proof to show that there is no social or psychological barrier in mutual relationship with her. Otherwise sisters and other relations also should be vibhāvas, which is objectionable in the eye of social decorum. Besides, it is not possible for the ordinary reader or the spectator to identify himself with the hero like Dusyanta. No sensible person can consider himself to be the hero like Dusyanta who was a king and was possessed of extra-ordinary virtues, while he himself is a 'little man' of street. Again the realisation of rasa is not possible from mere words alone. Mere information of the hero and the heroine from a conversation will not be source of relishing at all. Nor it is possible mentally, for, there is a gulf of difference between the realisation of rasa and the cognition of the vibhavas and others brought by memory or contemplation. The cognition of emotion does not occur due to recollection, for, he did not feel such vibhavas. So the views of Bhaṭṭa Dollāta and Sāṅkuka are not tenable.

Rejecting these former two theories, Bhattanayāka expound the theory of Rasa-bhukti. According to this view, poetic language has its powers - abhidhā, bhāvakatva and bhojakatva. The
Vibhāvas and anubhāvas are conveyed by abhidhā. Bhāvakatva removes the individual characteristics of the vibhāvas which are obstacles on the path of the realisation of rasa. In other words, vibhāvas like Sakuntalā and Sītā become free from all their individual relationships like space, time, age and other conditions and are presented as lovely women (kāntās). She represents not an individuality but an universal 'form' of female beauty. Then the sahrdaya finds no scope for cognising Sakuntalā as āgamyā or unreachable. Thus universalising the aesthetic objects, the power bhāvakatva becomes ineffectual and then by virtue of the third power namely bhojakatva, the two guṇas - rajas and tamas become completely suppressed in the mind of the sāmājikas and the third guṇa satva is rendered more prominent. In that serene state, the mind is not touched by any conflicting thoughts and the self with its blissful consciousness enjoys the sthāyībhāva like rati etc. This is called rasa. This enjoyment on account of its touch with subject (bisaya) is akin to the bliss of realising the Supreme Self but not identical with it. Actually Bhāttamāyaka's view differs from that of Abhinavagupta on the point that it admits another power namely bhavakatva. Bhoga of Nāyak is parallel to suggestion or vyānijāna of Abhinavagupta.

As stated above, Panditarāja elucidates eleven views on rasa in total. Of them, four views have been examined already. But he also mentions two views - first is that of the navyas and the second belonging to another school of neo-aesthetics. The actual source of these two views are not known to us. Nor any rhetorician has tried to find out their origin. However, we propose to give the summary of these two views.
The View of the Navyas

In poetry and drama vibhāvas, anubhāvas etc. are expressed by the poet and the actor respectively and by the operation of vyanjanā, Dusyanta's love for Sakuntalā is suggested. Then, due to the predominance of defective discrimination, the sāmājika forgets his own identity and vicariously considers himself to be the hero like Dusyanta which is an illusion like idea of silver in 'shukti'. As a result of this illusion, there arises in him 'anirvacaniya' love for Sakuntalā. Then this love culminates in an impersonal experience and this experience is called rasa-experience. According to this view the rasa-experience is a creation of illusion like the creation of sukti-rajata. So it is the result of a defective discrimination. When that defect will be removed, there would not be any rasa-pratīti. The pleasure that one derives from rasa-pratīti is a transcendental one and so, this experience is a blissful condition. It is also vyangā because the sthāyībhāvas like rati and others are conveyed through vyanjanā. In the realisation of erotic sentiment, when Dusyanta's love for Sakuntalā is depicted, the sāmājika identifies himself with Dusyanta and the personal nature of Dusyanta is totally shrouded and as such the love that the sāmājika enjoys is anirvacaniya. The reader or the audience neither enjoys Dusyanta's love nor he considers himself as Dusyanta. On the other hand, by cutting its relationship with individual Dusyanta, a different type of love is produced which is enjoyed by the reader and the audience. Unless a defect is assumed at the very root of the realisation of rasa, no explanation can be offered how the personal nature of
Dusyanta is shrouded in the depiction of his love for Sakuntalā. If however a defect is presupposed, it can well-explain the fact how the reader can identify himself with Dusyanta. Thus, due to the defective discrimination, the reader or the audience as the case may be, solely identifies himself with the hero like Dusyanta, the heroine, like Sakuntalā, is also presented in his mind in her universalised form.

Now the point at issue is how will the tragedy be relishable? If the actor or a spectator realises rasa after the identification of his own self with that of the hero, then the sorrow of the hero should also touch the mind of the sāmājika as well. It cannot be said that one experiences pain in real situation only, but there is no pain in an imaginary tragedy. The aesthetic experience of tragic emotions too is a pleasant one. Even the shedding of tears at the experience of tragic emotion is caused by pleasure and not by pain. So the devotees shed tears hearing the description of God though there is no touch of slightest pain. Similarly experiencing the tragic sentiment where the reader identifies himself with the tragic character Dasaratha, who suffers from the grief of separation from his son is a pleasant one. In fact, poetry has a supermundane action where even the unpleasant things like grief, sorrow, etc. produce transcendental pleasure. This is something extra-ordinary. It is a specific and unique pleasure different from all sorts or pleasure, material as well as spiritual. It is also produced by contemplation of the meanings of poetry. Thus ultimately rasa-experience depends upon the action of poetry (kāvyavyāpāra).
This theory is based on a bold assumption which is not founded upon facts. Universal impersonal illusory experience cannot be equated with aesthetic experience, since illusory experience is always subjective and personal and so it is a private property. Aesthetic experience is impersonal and transcends the narrow circle of ego. It is experienced by all spectators with poetic sensibility simultaneously. The magical power of some of our inner organs has been assumed like a sex-machine to solve all problems concerning aesthetic experience. It proves nothing but assumes everything. This so called explanation of the navyas is nothing but a masked assumption.

The view of another school of neo-aesthetics

Stating the view of another school of neo-aesthetics, Jagannātha maintains that the advocates of this school recognise neither the power of vyanjanā nor any anirvacanīya love etc., but they hold that the sāmājika while reading poetry or witnessing a dramatic show, identifies himself with the hero like Duṣyanta and others due to the predominance of defective discrimination as accepted by the navyas. Then by the feeling of oneness with Duṣyanta and others, which results from the contemplation of the purport of poetry, he considers himself as Duṣyanta having love for Śakuntalā (Duṣyanto‘haṁ śakuntalā-vaśyakaratiṁān). This kind of apprehension of the transcendental rati in the mind of the sāmājika itself is rasa. Although such kind of attitude is possible in dream also, this does not originate from the contemplation of kāvyārtha and so there is not any aesthetic pleasure. In
actual sense-perception, there must be the object of knowledge with which our sense-organ must come in contact with; but the realisation of rasa is an illusion and so there may not be rati or other permanent emotions in the sāmājika. Just as in illusion, a rope is mistaken to be a snake, though in reality, there is no snake, in rasa-apprehension also, the sāmājika identifies himself with Dusyanta who loves Sakuntalā, due to illusion. Though this direct attitude of the mind demands contact with the objective world, it is illusory in nature and does not demand any external object. It is the emotion like rati and others which are experienced by the aesthetic and hence, secondarily, rasa is also said to be experienced (cf. rativisayakatvāt āsvadasya rasāvisayakat- ravyabahārah odanam pacatītivat aupacārikah – Kāvyatattva-Samik-sā, p.209).

This theory is also unsatisfactory. It restates the view of the navyas in an amended form. So the criticism which is generally levelled against the view of the navyas is applicable to this view too. Dr N. N. Chaudhury rightly observes – 'asminnapi mate svasmin dusyantabhedabodhasya ratimatvaparakara- bodhasya ca bhrāntatvena prāguktaduṣaṇajātām asmadupadarsitām vajralepāyate/ sarvathā rasasya vibhramātmakatve sarahdayanāṁ tatvapaksapātināṁ kāvyanātyānusilane pravṛttirasāddheya bhavati/ ata idam mata-dvayam nāsmākam cetasya camatkāramabiskaroti' – Kāvyatattva-Samik-sā, p.209).

In addition to these views, Jagannātha records another five views on rasa (Rasagangādhara, p.34). In these views, there
has been a confusion with regard to the exact nature of rasa. So they do not stand the critical examination. The last three views again are quite contradictory to Bharata's rasa-sūtra and so they may be outright rejected. Vibhāvas are actually some objects and individuals; they cannot be rasa. Similarly anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas themselves are not rasa. Rasa is suggested by vibhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas jointly and not singly. Dr N. N. Chaudhury has rightly remarked that though under special circumstances rasa is suggested by vibhāva, anubhāva or vyabhicāribhāva separately, the remaining two also should be present in the background. 27

Though the source of these absurd views are not known to us, it can be assumed that there prevailed object confusion about the nature of rasa. Dr Raghavan 28 quotes such contradictory views from the Locana and has remarked thus - 'That some considered the drama itself as Rasa, some others vibhavas alone as Rasa, still others the Anubhavas alone as Rasa, another set of writers, all these but together as Rasa' is recorded by Abhinavagupta in his Locana and at a very late time, by Jagannātha Pandita, such object confusion there prevailed. 29 Though there is divergence of opinion regarding rasa, all the scholars admit that the aesthetic experience is essentially pleasurable, it is a state of bliss, a state of self-fulfilment. Realisation of rasa is a pleasurable state and the taste of this supreme delight is the ramaniyatā of

29. ibid., p.448.
The number of Rasa

The number of rasa is a controversial problem in the history of Sanskrit Criticism. This controversy about the types of rasa is due to the difference of opinion regarding the admission of Säsnta in the list. From the ancient times, rasa has been accepted to be eight. Bharata in his Nātya-Sāstra speaks of eight rasas and accordingly gives eight sthāyibhāvas. Poet Kālidāsa who is acknowledged as the great master-mind of India mentions eight rasas only. Dandin, another ancient rhetorician accepts eight rasas only (cf. 'ihā tvastārasayattā rasavatta smṛtā girām' - Kavyadāsṛa, II,298). Bhāmaha, of course, did not give any prominence to rasa in his Kavyālāmkāra. He included rasa in the alāmkāras. But it can be presumed that he was aware of eight rasas only. It was, however, Udvata who spoke of nine rasas in clear term mentioning Sānta also in the list. Mammata said that Sānta was the ninth rasa having nirveda as its sthāyibhāva. Abhinavagupta accepts nine types of rasa and assigns reasons why Sānta also should be included in the list of rasa. He cites instances showing Bharata's awareness of Sānta, but his arguments are based not upon Bharata's reference but upon his silence and they explain why Bharata was silent about it.

30. Vikramorvasiyam II,18.
31. Dr De, Some Problems of Sanskrit Poetics, p.139.
problem of Śānta rasa has been exhaustively treated by modern scholars like Dr Raghavan and Dr De. Any further discussion will be mere repetition. We however propose here to give a summary of Jagannātha's discussion on Śānta rasa.

Jagannātha's view on Śānta rasa

Like Abhinavagupta, Jagannātha Panditarāja admits nine rasas — Sṛngāra, Karuṇa, Śānta, Raudra, Vīra, Adbhuta, Hāsya, Bhayānaka and Vibhatsa. This admission of nine rasa by Panditarāja reminds us the statement of Udbhata who recognised Śānta as a rasa for the first time. There were others who, though, accepted Śānta as a rasa in poetry, ruled out the possibility of its depiction in a drama. Their contention is that in the actor, there is no āsama and therefore, he cannot depict Śānta rasa. But this argument is not tenable. For, rasa is not produced through the character or the actor. It is the mind of the spectator having tranquility or 'nirveda' as one basic mental state, which relishes Śānta rasa. It also cannot be said that the actor lacks the basic mental trait of tranquility and as such he cannot depict Śānta rasa on the stage. For, in that case, there will be no theoretical ground to suppose that an actor can represent Bhayānaka rasa too. Though actually there is no wrath, fear etc. in the actor, he can cleverly show himself to be angry. Similar will be the case in the representation of Śānta rasa also. Another argument against

32. Vide, 'The number of Rasas; Dr De's article 'The Santa Rasa in the Natya Sastra and Dasarupaka' in his book 'Some problems of Sanskrit Poetics'.
admission of Śānta rasa is that the very atmosphere of dramatic representation with its songs, music and make-up etc. is rather antagonistic to the development of a mood of śāma or Nirveda (tranquility) and so the śāmājika cannot relish it. Pāṇḍitarāja meets this argument by the statement that those who accept Śānta as a rasa, do not consider music and orchestra as antagonistic to Śānta rasa. These accessories like orchestra, music etc., instead of being obstruction in the manifestation of Śanta rasa are helpful in producing it. Dr N. N. Chaudhury has rightly remarked that the sage Nārada preached the transitory nature of this world with sweet tunes of his lute and Śrī Chaitanya sang the glory of the Lord Krisna in accompaniment of the beating of the drums etc. It is, therefore, futile to consider orchestra, music etc. as antagonistic to tranquility and impediment in the development of santa rasa.

Again there are writers who hold that any thought connected with mundane associations is contrary to the manifestation of Santa rasa. The ālambanavibhāva of Śānta rasa like ephemeral nature of the world and its uddīpanavibhāva, like the hearing of the Purānas, the company of the seers and the sight of hermitage and the places of pilgrims etc., are essential for the manifestation of the queistic sentiment, and such thoughts which have mundane associations will be antagonistic to the depiction of Śānta rasa. But their standpoint is also not tenable. Quoting from the Sangītaratnakara, Jagannātha establishes Śānta as a rasa

refuting the argument of those who deny it the status of rasa on
the above ground.

Some of the writers, however, admit Sānta as a rasa in
Sravya Kāvya (poetry) but they do not admit as a rasa in a drama
(cf. 'nanu sāntarasasya anavineryatvāt yadyapi nātye'nupraveso
nāsti, tathāpi suṣkṛttādīdivastūnām sarveṣāmapi sābdapratipādyay
-tayā vidyāmānātvat kāvyavisayam naṃbāryate', Daśarūpaka, Avaloka,
p.98). So they accept the Mahābhārata as a Kāvya having Sānta
rasa as dominant sentiment. But they do not admit it in the sphe-
re of drama. The argument of this class of canonists is baseless.
As Dr Raghavan rightly remarks, 'To grant it in Kāvya and to deny
it in Nāṭya is as clumsy a compromise as the one which grants it
inherent Rasatva and denies it in the conventional vogue as a
Rasa. Kāvya is, in essence, only drama and this Abhinava has em-
phasised in his Abhinavabharati. If it is possible to develope it
as the theme of a Kavya, equally is it possible to handle it as
the motif of a drama.'34 So Mammas-bhāṭṭa35 though first accep-
ted only eight rasas, had to admit later on Sānta as the ninth
one ('Nirvedasthayibhavo'sti sāntopī navamo rasaḥ' - 4/35).

**Jagannātha’s illustration of Rasas**

Having established Sānta as a rasa Jagannātha Panditarāja
enumerates the vibhāva, anubhāva and vyabhicāribhāva of each of
them. Then he illustrates each of them citing his own illustration.

---

34. Number of Rasas, p.48.
35. Kāvya Prakāsa, 4.29.
First he takes up the Srngāra rasa. Srngāra is of two types —
Sambhoga (love in union) and Vipralambha (love in separation).
Sambhoga-Srṅgāra is that sentiment of love between the lover and
the beloved when they are united together. The Vipralambha-
Srṅgāra again is that sentiment of love existing between loving
couple when they are separated from each other. But the union of
the couple does not signify their co-existence or juxta-position.
There may not be Sambhoga-Srṅgāra in the same bed if either of
them suffers from jealosy, indifference and other perverse atti-
tude. Again, even if the lover and the beloved remain in sepa-
rate places, there may not be separation. For, in that case, co-
existence of the two lovers in the same place suffering from the
perverseness of attitude may not result in feeling of separation.
So samjoga (union) and vyōga (separation) are the two attitudes
of the mind. When they emotionally think that they are united,
then that sentiment of love will be Sambhoga-Srṅgāra. If, on the
other hand, they consider themselves to be separated the senti-
ment will be a Vipralambha-Srṅgāra. Panditarāja cites the verse
'sayita savidhe' etc. as an illustration of Sambhoga-Srṅgāra
which we have discussed already. Vipralambha-Srṅgāra is illus-
trated by the verse —

väcomāngalikih prayānasamaye jalpatyanalpājane
   kelimandiramāgatatoyananamkuhe vinyastavakrāmbuje/
   niḥsacaaglapīdharoparipatadvāspārdavaksoruhā
   vālā lolośilecanā śiva śiva pranemāmalokayate/

'While other people uttered volumes of auspicious words,
the fickle-eyed girl with her lotus-like face placed at the window
of the pleasure-house and her breasts being wet with tears falling
This verse describes the separation of a departing husband from a young lady. While other kinsmen speak much at the hour of departure, the young lady looks at her beloved through the window. She heaves sighs and sheds tears. The intolerable nature of her separation is suggested by the repetition of the word 'siva' and unfathomable mental agony is expressed by her eager-looks, heaving of sighs and shedding of tears. So this is an instance of vipralambha-srṅgāra. Here the nāyaka is the ālambana-vībhāva, breaths and tears of the nāyikā are anubhāvas and grief, anxieties etc. are vyābhicāribhāvas. Through the combination of these three, Sambhoga-śrṅgāra has been suggested.

Vipralambha-śrṅgāra is classified into five divisions by ancients like Mammāta and other (vide, aparastu abhināsavire-hersāpravāśaśāpaḥ-hetuka iti pāncavidhāḥ - Kāvyā Prakāśa, p.128). They are prāvāsa (exile), abhilāsa (desire), viraha (separation), irṣā (jealousy) and sāpa (curse). But Jagannātha rejects this classification on the ground that the difference among them is not very glaring and they are actually various shades of the same mood.

Karunarasa

Karunarasa is illustrated by the following verse:

apahāya sakalalvandhavacintāmudvāsya gurukulapranayam/
ḥā tanaya vinayasālin kathamiva paralekpathikobhūh//
'O my son, leaving all your friends and banishing your love for your gurukula, you have become a traveller on the path leading to the other world.'

The verse under discussion gives a pathetic description of the death of the son of the speaker. Here the dead son is the alambanavibhava; the sight of the friends at the time of death is the uddipana-vibhava, the pitious cry is the anubhava and mental uneasiness, restlessness etc. are vyabhicaribhavas. All these combined together have suggested Karunarasa.

Santarasa

Jagannatha cites the following verse to illustrate Santarasa -

malay-nilakalakutayo-ramanikuntala-bhogi bhogayoh/
svapacatmabhubornirantara, mamajata paramatmani sthitih/

'I have no knowledge of distinction between the Malaya wind and Kalakuta, between woman's lock of hair and the hood of serpent and between Candala and Self-born one and my existence has merged in Paramatman.'

Here the transitory phenomenal world is the alambanavibhava, the feeling of equality in all objects is the anubhava and knowledge etc. are vyabhicaribhavas. The combination of these leads to the suggestion of Karunarasa which has soka as its permanent mood. Though the verse suffers from the fallacy of bhagna-prakrama, still the speaker has lost the knowledge of distinction
between the good and the bad and to signify that dosa itself has become a guna here.

Raudrarasa

Raudra-rasa is illustrated by the verse -

navocchaitajauvanasfuradaswarvagarvajvare
madiyagurukārmukāma galitasāddhvasaṁ vrscati/
ayām patatu nīdayām dalitadrptabhūbdrgata-
skhaladrudhiraghasmaro mama pāraśvadho bhairavah/

'Let this fearful axe of mine, which drank the blood oozing from the vain kings killed in the battle, fall upon him who is highly proud of his blooming youth and who broke the bow of my guru without any fear.'

This is the speech of Bhārgava (Parasurāma) whose penance was disturbed by the breaking of Siva's bow by Ramchandra who was known to him. Here, the name of Ram who is the ālambanavibhāva is not mentioned because of his being a gurudrohi or through excessive anger. The breaking of the weapon fearlessly as inferred from the sound is uddipana vibhāva; harsh and rough speech is the amabhāva. Pride and arrogance etc., are sancāribhāvas. All these combined together lead to the suggestion raudra-rasa. The very diction of the verse has been able to cherish excessiveness of anger.
Virarasa

Jagannatha classifies víra-rasa into four varieties on the basis of four-fold division of utsāha, the permanent mood of víra rasa. These are dānavíra, dayāvíra, yuddha-víra and dharmávíra. To illustrate dānavíra, the following verse is cited -

kiyadidamadhikam me yaddvijārthayitre
kavacamaramaniyam kundale cārpayāmi/
akarunamavākṛtya drākkṛpanena nīrya -
dvahalarudhiradhāram maulimā-vedayāmi/

'I have given the anklet and the two ear-rings to the Brahmin who is coming as a supplicant to me. What is with me? I can dedicate even my head cutting it immediately by the sword with flood of blood emitting from it.'

This a speech of Karna to the members of his royal court, who were astonished at his charity and were even ready to give his own amulet and the two ear-rings to Indra who was under the guise of a Brahmin. Indra is here ālambana vibhāva, his prayers and entreaties are uddīpana vibhāvas, Karna's readiness to give even the holy amulet and other things as something insignificant is anubhāva. The pride implied by the arthāntarasamkramitavācydvāvani from the word 'mama' and his reminiscence of his illustrious parents who were no more, are sancāribhāvas. These have suggested munificent heroism (Dānaviratva). The diction (vrtti) here is quite apt; it has been illustrative of the modesty and self-respect of the speaker and as such, it creates 'camatkṛti' in the mind of the reader.
Jagannātha Panditarāja illustrates the remaining types of vīra-rasa with suitable examples. Then he discusses the classification of heroic-sentiment into four-fold type in accordance with the view of the ancients. He remarks in this connection that such a four-fold classification of the vīra-rasa is an arbitrary tradition.36 For, vīra-rasa, like Śṛṅgāra-rasa can admit of many divisions. As for instance, in the verse cited as an illustration of yuddha-vīra ('sapadi vilayametu etc., RG, p.49), if the last word 'dhammāt' is altered by 'sākyāt' it will be an instance of Satyavīra. If it is argued that satya (truthfulness) is included in dharma (righteousness) and so satyavīra has been included in the dhammavīra, then the separate category of daya-vīra as independent of dharma-vīra has no justification; for, dāna and dayā are also the two features of dharma. Dr S. N. Sastri very aptly observes that if Satyavīra is to be included in dharma-vīra, it would not be valid in logic and experience both, because such an all-inclusive notion of dharma is an omnibus feature and secondly the relish of the emotional expression with a specific characteristic cannot be enjoyed in its generic terms.37 So, if all these varieties are recognised, other classification of it like Pandityavīra, Ksemavīra and Vala-vīra also will have to be recognised.

Adbhutarasa

Adbhuta-rasa is illustrated by this verse -

36. S. N. Sastri, Laws And Practice of Sanskrit Drama, p.281.
37. Laws And Practice of Sanskrit Drama, p.281.
earaearajaga^alasadanam badanam tava/
galadgaganagambhiryamviksami hrtacetanā//
'I become unconscious while I see your face as deep as the sky
and abode of the movable and the immovable worlds.'

This is the speech of Yasodā when sometimes she saw the
mouth of her son Vāsudeva. Here the face of Krīṣna is the ālam-
banavibhāva, the sight of the whole universe in the mouth of Lord
is the uddīpama-vibhāva, Yasodā's falling unconscious, horripil-
lation, throbbing of eyes etc. are anubhavas and fear etc. are
vyabhicarībhavas. Through the combination of all these, adbhuta-
rasa is suggested.

Jagannātha here, rules out the possibility of suggestion
of Yasodā's love for Krīṣna, though it exists there. Even if it
is suggested, in no case wonder and awe that she felt seeing the
whole universe in his mouth, will be subordinate to the love.
Yasodā's feeling of devotion by the thought that 'he is illustri-
ous person', will not be opposed by her idea that 'this is my
son'. So, wonder, the permanent mood of adbhutarasa will not be
subordinated to the feeling of devotion here.

Hāsya-rasa

śūrītāpādaśairvihite nibandhe nirūpitā mutanajuktiresā/
angām gavām pūrvamahe pavitraṁ na vā katham rāsavadharmat
patnyā//

'In an article written by my revered father, this new reason has
been given - if the front part of the body of a cow is pure and
sacred why, then, is that of a female ass not so?

Here in this verse, the son of the logician is the ālambana-vibhāva, his statement without slightest doubt is uddīpana-vibhāva, the showing of his teeth etc., are anubhāvas and his mental anxieties etc., are vyabhicāribhāvas. These contribute in the manifestation of hāsya-rasa.

Bhayānaka-rasa

Jagannātha cites the following verse as an example of Bhayānaka-rasa -

śvēnāmambarataladupāgatam Susyadānanabilo vilokayan/
kampamānatanurākuleksanaḥ spanditum nahi Sasāka īāvaka/

'Seeing the hawk coming down from the sky, the lavaka (a bird) had its face turned pale, its body began to tremble and looks turned anxious; it could not move.'

Here the hawk is the ālambana-vibhāva, its quick flight below is the uddīpana-vibhāva, the paleness of its face is anubhāva and its mental anxiety etc. are the vyabhicāribhāvas and through them Bhayānaka-rasa is suggested.

Bibhatsarasa

This is illustrated by the following verse -

nakhairbidāritānām sabānam pyoṣanitaḥ/ ananesvanulimpanti hṛṣṭā betālayositah/
'The gay betala women besmear their faces with the blood of the corpses with intestines completely dislocated and torn off by their nails.'

Here the corpses are the ālambana-vibhāvas, tearing of the intestines etc., are uddīpana-vibhāvas, the horripilation, closing of eyes caused by ecstacy are anubhavas; eagerness etc. are vyabhicaribhavas; here Bibhatsa-rasa has been suggested.

**Jagannātha on Bhakti-rasa**

In the beginning the attention of traditional literary critics was not drawn towards the Bhakti-rasa and so, they seem to be silent to mention it at all. Abhinavagupta, the great Kashmirian philosopher and rhetorian included devotion to god in bhavas like smrti, mati, dhṛti and utsāha. Following him, Mammata-bhatta also said that love and other feelings towards god were known as a bhava only (cf. ratirdevadivīṣayā vyabhicari tathānjugi-tāh/ bhāvah proktah/ Kāvya Prakāśa IV.35). But the credit of raising bhakti to the status of a rasa goes to the Bengal Vaisnava alamkārikas. It is they who have introduced into Sanskrit literary criticism 'the most bewitching and maddening essence, that has immediately sublimated it from a mundane literary discussion to a sublime eulogy of the Supreme Bliss.'

Before the advent of the Bengal Vaisnava Mahājana, the great Mahārastrian scholar Vopadeva in the thirteenth century wrote his famous Vaisnava treatise

---

'Muktāphala' and there he defines Bhaktirasa as a kind of aesthetic experience that one derives by the process of hearing, singing, meditating on the names and deeds of Lord Visnu or of Vaisnabhaktas as given Vyāsa and others (cf. vyāsādivirvarṇitasya visnoavrūpaṁ bhaktānāṁ vā charitasya navarasatmākasya śravanadīna janitascamatkaro bhaktirasah, Quoted by Dr Sudhir Das Gupta in his Kāvyāloka, p.338). From this Dr Das Gupta concludes that the credit of bringing the philosophy of aesthetic experience to the highest level of devotion should go to the Vaisnava scholars like Bopadeva and other from south. But this remark of Dr Das Gupta is not justified. Actually the novel application of the orthodox Rasa-theory to the doctrine of Bhakti was done by Rūpa Goswamin in his epoch-making works, Bhakti-rasāmrta Sindhu and Ujjalanilamani. He was followed by a galaxy of Vaisnava stalwarts like Jīva Goswāmin, Kavi Karnāpūra, Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja and others who not only championed the cause of Bhakti-rasa but also declared it as the Principal-rasa - Rasārāt. Madhusudan Saraswati, the great Advaitic Philosopher of Bengal also advocated Bhakti-rasa in his Bhakti-rasāyana and declared that the Bhakti-rasa was the real rasa on account of its being a state of supreme bliss and other rasas were inferior to it. There is a great difference between Bhakti and other rasas like Sṛngara etc., as there is difference between the sun and the glow-worm.

(cf. Paripurnarasa kṣudraraśebhyo bhagabadratiḥ/ khadyotebhyo evadityaprabhva balabattarā//

Bhaktirasāyana II.77-78)

Jagannātha Pānditarāja makes a departure from the traditional Alamkārikas in accepting the line of Bengal Vaiśnava Alamkārikas when he raises the problem of Bhakti-rasa and virtually he seems to advocate it though ultimately he does not. He holds the view that nobody can deny the experience of Bhakti-rasa having the Supreme God-head as the ālambana-vibhāva manifested through the enthralling horripilation and flow of tears and nourished by joy and others while listening to the narration of Purāṇas like Bhāgavata and others. The devotion to God here is the permanent mood. This cannot be included in Sāntarasa as attachment (amurtā) and detachment (vairāgya) are contradictory. But advocating strongly for the case of Bhakti as rasa, in the end he apprehends certain difficulties and fearing that such a concession may lead to a theoretical chaos, he prefers to abide by the authority of Bharata. It has been said by traditional rhetoricians that Bhakti is nothing but rati to God and this is a mere bhāva only, so it cannot be a rasa. Somebody may argue that Bhāgavat rati should be taken as a permanent emotion and love for a woman be taken as a bhāva only, as there is no criterion to distinguish one from the other. Pānditarāja replies that this conception is not based on satisfactory ground. Because the proper elaboration of rasa, bhāva etc. are done according to the dictum of Bharata. Others have no authority to dislodge it. In absence of such an authority in this respect, somebody will propose the love for a son as a sthāyībhāva, and jugupsā and soka also would fall under the category of vyabhicāribhāvas. The whole system of Bharata will then have to be overhauled and this is far from desirable. Bharata alone is the guide and authority
to decide which Bhava is sthayin and which vyabhicarin. Thus Jagannatha Panditaraja following the tradition of alamkara-sastra accepts nine rasas and rejects the claim of Bhakti as a separate rasa. As Dr Raghunath Sharma rightly remarks, 'It is really a pity that inspite of strong advocacy for rasa hood of Bhakti, Panditaraja declares his slavery to the tradition and expresses his inability in classifying Bhakti as a rasa. This is a clear blot on the traditional literary system.'

An assessment of Jagannatha's treatment of rasa

Jagannatha Panditaraja occupies a prominent place in the development of the Rasa-theory. He being the last of the Sanskrit theorists, his treatment of rasa is important from the viewpoint of the development of the Rasa-theory from Bharata down to his own times. He is perhaps the last theorist who attempts to give it a definite and coherent basis, though he did not, of course, hold rasa as the soul of poetry, as Viswanatha of the fourteenth century did. Still in his treatment, rasa occupies a prominent position in poetry. His definition of poetry as 'words bringing charming idea into an expression' led him to think that only such an expression gives charming idea which is capable of giving transcendental joy. In the end, he admits that 'Rasa is felt as that which is invariably connected with the
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highest joy and partaking of beauty in the world.43 He gives an elaborate treatment of the rasa-theory and to clarify his stand on the doctrine of rasa, he states eight views on it. Some of these views are the classical interpretation of Bharata's famous Rasa-sūtra by Lollata, Shri Sānkuka Bhattanāyaka and Abhinavagupta; the source of the other views are not known to us. Thus we see that he tried to be as such elaborate and all comprehensive as was possible in his times. He is a 'grand synthesizer' of the all past traditions on this topic and tries his best not to leave any gap or incongruity in his theory. His powerful mind is able to parade the whole of the continuous process starting with Bharata and culminating in himself as its zenith.

Jagannātha's interpretation of rāsa is the crowning success in his Rasagangādhara. He is faithful to the traditional view on the topic as given by Abhinavagupta and Ānandavardhana. To give a more rational and firm ground, he includes rāsa in asam-lakṣa-vyāngadhvani as has been done by Mammata. His exposition of Abhinava's interpretation of rāsa is an important contribution to the history of Sanskrit Criticism. In stating the view, he gives it a new colour in the light of Vedānta Philosophy. Dr Pandey in his Indian Aesthetics (p.139) remarks that what Jagannātha Panditaraja attributes as Abhinavagupta's view of aesthetic experience is not the actual fact. According to Dr Pandey, Abhinavagupta does not hold the view that the aesthetic experience is the experience of the sthāyin, related to the self (cit) as the
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attribute of itself. Most probably the mind of the learned Doctor missed the point due to over-sight. Jagannātha has replaced the metaphysical basis of Abhinavagupta's aesthetics by the metaphysics of Advaita school and made corresponding changes which is suitable to his new metaphysical foundation. He interpretes 'abhībyakti' in the sense of blissful suggestion which lifts the vibhavas etc. above common level and rasa-nispatti is the illumination of blissful self delimited by sthāyibhavas. Thus Panditaraṇāja's view on Rasa does not differ from that of Abhinavagupta which is identical with carvāna or realisation freed from obstacles. 'Actually it is nothing more than the presentation of in Vedantic form and nomenclature of the factors at work in removing the obstacles (vighnāpasāraka) in the conscious emergence (samvit-ti) of rasa postulated by the great Abhinavagupta'. 44 So the greatness of our Panditaraṇāja lies in the fact that while he is faithful to Abhinavagupta acknowledging vāsanās, described by the great Easmirian philosopher, he admits on the basis of Vedānta philosophy, the state of soul covered by the veil of ignorance. In support of his view, Jagannātha quotes from the Upaniṣad and maintains that inner chaitanya with rati and other sthāyibhavas and free from any avarana or curtain is felt as rasa. Thus Panditaraṇāja's treatment of rasa cannot be original in all respects. While he remains faithful to Abhinavagupta and Mammata, he gives the Rasa-theory a firm and philosophical basis. This is by no means is less original than propounding a new theory in literary criticism.
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His exposition of the eight conflicting views of predecessors on rasa evidences the clarity of his thinking and the power of his logic. It does not suffer from any fallacy of definition - too wide (ativyapti) or too narrow (avyāpti). His application of Nyāya method of argument provided enough safeguard against any logical slip in his theory. Jagannātha's novelty of treatment raises the exposition of rasa-theory to a very high level, though he had nothing to add newly to that conception after being fixed by Dhvanikāra. As a matter of fact, the view of Dhvani school as stated by Mammaṭa, became inspite of many attempts on improvement in details, a kind of fixed cannon for all time to come.  

On the whole Panditarāja's treatment of rasa gives this doctrine a coherent and synthetic philosophical basis within the limits of its fixed form laid down by ancient authority. His treatment of the concept with apt illustrations from his own pen gives us an idea how the doctrine was developed within its limits of the cannonical form starting with Bharata with an eye to both drama and poetry. Ignoring none, not evening the nameless, and showing catholicity towards all theorists of past at the same time adhering to philosophical discipline of Vedanta and logical discipline of Nyāya, Jagannātha has reviewed as precisely as possible, the different interpretation of rasa-sūtra along with different types of rasa. Such a grand synthesis of past views and superdevelopment of a theory is possible only through an encyclopaedic genius like Jagannātha Panditarāja and that is why after
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Abhinavagupta, he must be given the second place in the history of Sanskrit literary criticism for his critical acumen and all-comprehensive and lucid treatment of the subject on such a grand scale. Whatever is significant concerning 'rasa', has come in his discussion. His Rasagangādhara is significantly a landmark in the history of Sanskrit poetics.