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CONCLUSION: CONTRIBUTION OF RÜPA GOSVÄMIN TO SANSKRIT POETICS

In the traditional theory, Bhakti is explained as Devādīviṣayārati which can never reach the level of a rasa. It will be only a bhāva. But the excellent poetry of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa depicting the emotion of bhakti and the lyrical poems in the regional languages (which were just sprouting around the term of the first millenium) like the religious poetry of the Padas of Ālavāra in Tamil language, of the devotional poems in Gujarātī, Marāṭhī, Hindi, Bengālī, Asāmī etc. in fact, the entire Indian literature were the unavoidable literature examples very much before the eyes of RG. The intense experiences of the bhakti were also seen in the example of the life of Caitanya Mahā Prabhu. Even his philosophical theory of Acintyabhedabheda provided a proper a philosophical background. All these evidences literary, experiential and philosophical led RG to propound a theory wherein even Devādīviṣayā rati (or at least Kṛṣṇaśrayā rati) could be seen as developing into a rasa called Bhakti. Hence RG propounded the theory in his two works—BRAS & UNM.

We should, first take a loser look at the changes that RG has effected in the existing traditional structure of Rasa—theory in the BRAS. These changes will, in fact, have to be considered as his contribution to the Sanskrit poetics.

The BRAS is divided into four division ie. Pūrva—'eastern', Dakṣiṇa—'southern', Pāścima—'western' and Uttara—'northern'. We can see that this division signifies the order of Pradakṣiṇa—'circumambulation' and indicates by implication the great devotion. That RG has for Kṛṣṇa and his bhakti. Each of
the divisions is further classified into sub-divisions called *Laharis*—'waves', thus justifying the title of the work as Ocean of the Nectar of Devotional Sentiment.

The broad design of the entire work can be viewed in this way. In the first section RG gives us the general characteristics of the *Bhakti-rasa*; in the second he describes the constituents of *Bhakti-rasa* i.e. the *Vibhāvas*, the *Anubhāvas*, the *Sāttvikabhāvas*, the *Vyabhicāribhāvas* and the *Sthāyibhāva* of the *Bhakti-rasa*; in the third, he explains the five major types of *Bhakti-rasa*, i.e. the *Śānta*, the *Pṛita* (dāsya), the *Pr̄yān* (sakhyā), the *Vatsala*—(vātsalya) and the *Madhura*—(*Śringāra*/*Ujjvala*); and in the last section he recounts the minor or subordinate *rasas* seven, other than *Śringāra*, without *Śānta*—as well as sundry topics like the *rasas* in agreement and opposition, or *rasābhāsa* etc. The whole ground design of the work aims at giving a self-complete exposition of the newly propounded *Bhakti-rasa* in all its relevant and important aspects.

In the first (eastern) division, we have four *laharis*; the first *lahari* describes devotion in its general nature (*Sāmānya-bhakti*) and in other three divisions the author propounds the three major kinds of devotion—the *Sādhanabhakti*, the *Bhāvabhakti* and the *Premābhakti*. The theoretical material seems to draw from the well-known traditional *bhakti*-scriptures like *Nārada-bhakti Sūtra*, *śāndiliya bhakti-sutras*, *Nārada Pañcarātra* and so on; whereas, for the illustrative part of the work, the author draws upon the vast devotional literature like the *Purāṇas*, the *Gītā*, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Bhāgavata*, the *Gītā-govinda*, the *Līlāśūka* and so on. These works will of course, continue to be his sources of illustrations not only in the first section but throughout this work.
In the second or the southern division having five *lahāris* he has propounded the constituents of the *Bhakti-rasa* theory mainly on the basis of Bharatas *rasa* theory. But, it appears that he also is conversant with and occasionally draws upon his predecessors in poetics like *Dhvanyāloka Daśarupaka, Rasārṇava–Sudhākara*, even sometimes *Sāhitya–darpana* etc.

In the first *lahāri*, he treats the element of *Vibhāvas*. He mainly follows the opinion of Bharata and divides the excitants in two: *Ālambana*—the substantial and *Uddīpana*—‘the enhancing’. The first and foremost *Ālambana* is Lord Kṛṣṇa Himself. Here, Kṛṣṇa is presented as the Supremes in—the Highest Godhead His form, qualities, age. The devotees could be the sages and saints, or His subordinates, or His friends, or His elders or His beloved and queens.

In the second *lahāri*, he deals with the *anubhāvas*—‘consequents’. Consequents are not any more different from those in other ancient works. However, their division into *Śīrṣa*—‘cold’ and *Kṣepana*—‘casting/throwing’ is RG's original thinking trying to enter closely into the nature of the consequent.

The third *lahāri* deals with *Sāttvika–bhāvas*—‘involuntary emotions’ which are signified in three ways: *Snigdha*—‘soft’, *Digdha*—‘smeared’, and *Rūkṣa*—‘harsh’ of these first is of two types *Mukhya*—‘principal or direct’ and *Gauṇa*—‘secondary or indirect’. Here the direct involuntary would be understood in relation with Kṛṣṇa Himself.

The second, the *digdha*, occurs when these *bhāvas* (principal & secondary) are secondary and arise from indirect relation with Kṛṣṇa i.e. with some relatives of Kṛṣṇa or with His, possessions.
When there is no real *rati* for Kṛṣṇa but one exhibits such signs as tears etc. only casually, listening to the stories and legends of Lord Kṛṣṇa, such involuntary emotions are called *Rūkṣa*; these, however, arise very rarely in a person. This discussion and division of *Sattvikabhāvas* is original and the basis of this division is the extent of intimacy of the bhāvaka with Kṛṣṇa and/or His possessions either with *bhakti* or without *bhakti*.

RG also treats the scientific process of the rising of involuntary emotions in the heart/mind. The author says that these involuntary emotions express themselves on the body of the connoisseurs. The intense *citta*—‘mind’ becoming *sattva* immerses itself in the *Prāṇa*—‘the vital air’ and the *Prāṇa* experiencing *Vikāra*—‘disturbance’ creates agitation in the body. Then these *stambha* etc. appear into the body of the devotees. When the vital air takes shelter into earth, water, luster (*tejas*), and sky, then there respectively arise stupor, trears, sweat and change of colour as well as loss of consciousness. When *Prāṇa* resides in its own place, its three-fold intensity i.e. *Mandatva*—‘slowness’, *Madhyatva*—‘middle’ and *Tīrātva*—‘strong intensity’ gives rise respectively to the involuntary emotions of horripilation, trembling and break of voice gradually. These involuntary emotions create disturbance both internally and externally, hence they are called both emotions as well as consequent.

Afterwards the author describes the same eight involuntary—emotions stupor, perspiration etc.—as given by Bharatamuni.

Thereafter, dealing with the process of the involuntary emotions, the author shows that the agitation of soul and body depends upon the degree/intensity (less or more) of truth/existence. All the involuntary, also, by
reason of the intensity of the aesthetic fact presented before the bhāvakas, get developed upto various levels of intensity and are presented in four ways: 1) Dhūmāyita-‘smouldering’, 2) Jvalīta-‘flaming’, 3) Dīpta-‘burning’ and 4) Uddīpta-‘brightly burning’. All these involuntary when are greatly flared up and intensified attain to the state of the Mahābhāva, and when five or six of them reach the highest pitch (simultaneously ?), then they are called Sūddīpta.

The author says, the intensity of these involuntary emotions is also expressed in these three characteristics.

1) It may extend up to a long time,
2) It may pervade many limbs (except in eyes and voice), &
3) It may attain climax by it own nature.

In the end of the lahari the author treats with the apparent semblance of involuntary, which are of four types: 1) Ratyābhāsa, 2) Sattvābhāsa, 3) Niḥsattva and 4) Pratīpa. Each former is superior to the latter, which implies that Ratyābhāsa bhāva is superior to all.

RG refers to this aspect of the sāttvika bhāvas only for the reason of knowledge and proper distinction between the real and the apparent.

In the next lahari, while dealing with the vyabhicārī-bhāvas, he first seems to add to the number given by Bharatamuni. But then he again apologetically retraces his advancement. For example, he mentions a few vyabhicārī-bhāvas over and above the traditional thirty-three given by Bharatamuni, but again says they are not counted separately as they are already included in the traditional list. But one great quality of BRAS is that it enters into the analysis of the process of these components. For example,
he gives the fourfold analysis of involuntary emotions—Dhumāyita, Jvalita etc. and shows the aspect of their intensity. He also refers to the fourfold ābhāsa of this Sattvikābhāvs such as Ratyābhāsa-bhāva, Sattvābhāsabhāva, Nihsattva and Pratīpa. In the same way he refers to the way in which vyabhicārī bhāvas inter-relate among themselves, such as Iṣya, arising out of asūya and giving rise to nirveda. He separates the six transients, trāsa etc., which are not connected with rāti. He also classifies them as Svatantra and Paratantra and again Paratantra as vara & avara. These minute observations on the nature of and in the process of these bhāvas are observed for the first time by RG and can be considered as his significant contribution to the Sanskrit poetics.

In the fifth laharī RG discusses the permanent mood of Bhakti-rasa. In the enumeration of the transient moods he has followed the views of ancients writers. Here, he discusses the topic of the permanent emotions. He divides them Principal and subordinate. Where the principal permanent mood divided in two categories, Svartha & Parartha. Of these the latter one is of five types—Suddha, Priti, Sakhya, Vatsalya and Priyata/Madhurā rati; he further presents the suddha rati as threefold—Śāmānyā, Svacchā and Śanti. The other three—Priti, Sakhya and Vatsalya are each again twofold: Kevala and Samkula.

Afterwards RG treats the subordinate types of permanent moods of bhakti. These permanent moods are seven in the number (barring of course, the rati which is already treated above) which are described mainly after the Natya-Sāstra. But he points out that even among all the seven, the presence of devotion or Kṛṣṇa rati is essential because Kṛṣṇa-rati is the Atyantika sthāyi in all the
devotees and without it all other emotions will fall meaningless. Here RG also points out an exception of this general theory, that Kṛṣṇa cannot be the determinant in *Bibhatsa rasa*, the permanent emotion of which the *Jugupsa* desire to avoid is not possible in the case of *Kṛṣṇa-rati*.

Thereafter, the author enumerates some problems and characteristics of *bhakti rasa*. He follows the views of ancient munis and accepts the forty-nine emotions and says that these arise out of the threefold qualities of *Sattva*, *Rajas* & *Tamas* and are either pleasant or painful. If pleasant, they will be cool, if painful, they will be hot. However, this Kṛṣṇa *rati* being full of *Paramānanda*, will always be warm. Secondly he points out that Kṛṣṇa and His beloved persons are the cause of *rati*.

Even in the case of the mental states of the *Bhāvakas* when they are enjoying the *Bhakti-rasa*, RG has to contribute a correction (or an addition). Where ancient writers like *Anandavardhana* or *Dhananjaya* etc., have given three or four types of states of mind viz. *Vikāsa*-‘cheerfulness’, *Vistāra*-‘exaltation’, *Kṣobha*-‘agitation’, and *Vikṣepa*-‘perturbation’. RG adds the fifth one *Purti*-‘fulfilment’, because it represents the sentiment of quietist devotion, the first type of the major sentiment.

In the third section, RG has deals in five *laharīs* respectively with the five major types of *Bhakti rasa*: the *Śānta* (or *Śudha*), the *Priti* (or *Dāsya*, the *Preyān* (or *Sakhyā*), the *Vātsalya*, and the *Madhura* (or *Priyātā*). The *Śīngāra* was already considered in the tradition *Rasarāja* and *Śānta* was given the highest status of *Prakṛti* (of all other rasas) by Abhinavagupta. RG’s new scheme of
Bhakti rasa not only places Bhakti as the highest rasa, it also includes and gives (perhaps) a proper place to both these in his larger scheme of Bhakti rasa.

RG's treatment of Śanta rasa is also thoroughly original. His dividing Śanta into parokṣa and sāksāt, and the Śanta bhaktas into Ātmārāma and Tapasagana is original. Even its enhancing excitants and consequents—are each divided into two categories: Sadhāraṇa & Asādhāraṇa, even the permanent mood of rati also into samā & śāndṛa etc., shows how closely he has looked into and analyzed the examples of Śanta rasa. A similarly close analysis is also given of the Priñta-bhakti or Dāsyu-bhakti which could arise due to either sambhrama or gaurava and in four types of subordinates viz. Ādhikṛta, Āśrīta (again of three types saraṇagāta etc.), Pārīsada & Anuga, from two-fold permanent moods of priñti and ādra and can reveal itself in three levels of intensity called prema & rāga (either in the form of viyoga or yoga, this latter leading to the threefold results of siddhi, tuṣṭi or sthiti) and so on. Similar cause of analysis can also be observed in his treatment of the third type of bhakti rasa, the Preyān, wherein friends are classified first on the basis of their residence (city or vraja), then on the basis of their relative age oldern, younger, equal, assistant, then of their types–dear ones, gods, sages; then of age child, boy, adolescent–and so on. The permanent mood here also is two fold sakṣya-rati & viśrambha. Even in the fourth type of Vatsala rati, this closely searching eye of an analyst critic can be discerned. Here, quite surprisingly, he comes up with a very unusual involuntary, state (not mentioned in BRAS.II.iii, where he actually discusses the sāttvika-bhāvas: stāṇya-srāva, where in the breasts of mothers would begin to flow at an over-whelming emotion of love for Kṛṣṇa. The supremacy of the last
type of Bhakti can be surmised from the fact that a whole work is distinctly dedicated to the analysis and exposition of the Madhura bhakti.

In the fourth section also, this analytical eye is seen here and there: in the analysis of Dānavīra, in the Viṣayālambana of Karuṇa-bhakti as well as of Raudra bhakti, in the three types of Krodha–rati (i.e. kopa, manyu & roṣa) as well as of bhaya rati, in two types of Jugupsā, in the observation that Kṛṣṇa cannot be ālambana of Bibhatsa–rasa and so on. Whereas he has followed the rules of depicting friendly or antagonistic rasas as given by Anandavaradhana in the eighth lahari, in the ninth he is again seen entering into a rather close analysis of the three types of the rasābhāsa–‘semblance of sentiment’, the best of which he calls Uparasa. He defines and details rasābhāsa of the five types of the Bhakti–rasa, and shows his preference for Saguna–bhakti in the three types of Śānta–uparasa fully in accordance with the theory of Acintyabhedābheda, where incarnate Brahman i.e. Kṛṣṇa is considered superior to the quality–less brahman; strangely however, he is broadminded enough to note a view that one hero showing affection for many heroes would constitute a Madhura–uparasa. Even his discussion of Anurasā and Uparasa conforms to the closely analytical nature of his exposition of the Bhakti rasa.

Though it appears that his effort has not been taken seriously by latter theoreticians of Sanskrit poetics, yet it is an important theory worth–studying in details. The very fact that he is propounding a theory for the acceptance of Bhakti as rasa and there too, as an all–important and all–comprehensive central rasa itself is his greatest contribution to the Sanskrit poetics. As seen above, the need to propound such a theory was very much there, the literary, theoretical
and philosophical background was already prepared, only it need someone to strike the chord. And RG struck the chord. He had to make adjustments and some marginal changes in the existing structure and details of the traditional rasa theory. What changes in the details had he to make and how for he has succeeded in the efforts needed to be examined into details. Such a study was a long-felt desideratum and the present study endeavors to fulfill.