CHAPTER-3

SUPREMACY OF ONE RASA :
BACKGROUND
IN
SANSKRIT POETICS
Indian Poetics has recognised eight primary sentiments which are latent in man. They are Rati 'love', Hāsa 'laughter', Śoka 'sorrow', Krodha 'anger', Utsāha 'high-spiritedness', Bhaya 'fear', Jugupsā 'disgust', and Vismaya 'wonder'. As these are fundamental and relatively long-lasting, they are called as the Sthāyibhāvas. A Sthāyibhāva needs some stimulus for its arousal. The stimuli or the Vibhāvas that give rise to a Sthāyin are of two kinds: Ālambana which would be in the form of a person or a thing with reference to which a Sthāyin arises, and the Uddipana or the attendant circumstance which would enhance the excited Sthāyin. Apart from these, there are some passing moods which are called Saṅcāribhāvas or Vyabhicāribhāvas. They are thirty-three in number—innerveda—'dis interestedness' etc. A Sthāyin is expressed through some physical gestures or emotional reactions which are technically called the Anubhāvas. When these are artistically represented either through a drama or through a poem they excite the Sthāyin in a Sahṛdaya. He enjoys his own Sthāyin in a state of impersonalised subjectivity. Thus a Sthāyibhāva, transformed into a state of aesthetic enjoyment will be called Rasa. Thus, the will be eight rasas from eight Sthayibhāvas. Bharata has given the following Sūtra.

\[\text{सिंहासनं भिन्नान्त्रं भिन्नान्त्रं भिन्नान्त्रं} \]

\[\text{(नाट्य शास्त्र नृ.२.३२)}\]
'Rasa issues out from the association of stimulus, emotional reaction and passing moods'. Of the eight rasas, Śṛṅgāra (developed out of rati) is condeved as the best, the rasarāja. However, Bharata's Rasa-scheme is not adequate to cover all human emotions. It is necessary to hold the cases of non-sexual love like that between parents and children, elders and youngsters, as different from the traditional Śṛṅgāra. Daṇḍin is of the opinion that Preyas is very closely connected to Śṛṅgāra but different in the sense that Pṛiti is the Sthāyin of the former whereas Rati is the Sthāyin of the latter. In his treatment, of Pṛiti appears to be identical with Bhakti, as his illustrations of Pṛiti refer to Bhakti only.

Daṇḍin comments:

भक्तिमात्राराध्य: सुप्रीति ततो हृदा:।
प्रतिप्रकाशनं तद्भ प्रेयं इत्यवगम्यताम्।

Daṇḍin does not consider Bhakti as a Rasa but keeps it outside the purview of his Rasa-scheme as he treats the cases of all eight Rasas under the head of Rasavadāikāra.

Ānandavardhana keeps silent on this issue. Abhinavagupāṭa refer to earlier Poeticians who claim that Bhakti and Śraddhā are different Rasas; he himself includes them under Sānta by making them accessories of Sānta:

---

2 भक्तिमात्राराध्य: सुप्रीति ततो हृदा:। (Daṇḍin, Kāvyādarsa.11.275)
3 अथ यामम गोविन्द एक्षो। etc.
4 Ibid., II, 277
5 Ibid., II, 279
6 इत्यद्वर्तमात्र रसविभा स्यूती गिराम्। Ibid, II.292 see for details, Ibid, 280–292
7 Before Ānandavardhana, Rudrāṭa has treated Preyān as a Rasa but he relates it only with friendship : स्नेहप्रकृतिः प्रेयान्। (Kāvyādarsa, २९)
Mammaţa is the first Ālaṅkārika to refer directly to Bhakti. But he dismisses the status of Rasa to Bhakti and accepts it only as a Vyabhicāribhāva or passing mood:

रतिवेदवदिविषया व्यभिचारी तथाभिभिन्नत् ।  
भाव: प्रोक्त:------------------------ ||

The commentators of Mammaţa like Govinda Thakkura and Nāgoji Bhatţa, naturally support his view by stating that the love towards god etc., can not rise to the level of a Sthāyibhāva

तेनानुभूताया अनुभवादिविषयपुष्पायाश्च न रसलम् ।

Hemacandra, the author of Kavyamānasana, is of the opinion that all the sentiments like Sneha, Bhakti etc., are the varieties of rati and are nourished as Bhāvas only:

सेवोभिभयमत्वत्स्य हि रत्ने विषया: ।  
तुल्येऽ: या परस्परं रति: स सेवो ।
नित्यसर्वं उत्तमेरति: प्रसत्कं: सैव भक्ति पदवाच्चा ।  
उत्तमस्य अनुसम्यवं रति: वास्तवम् ।
एवमादी च विषये भावसैव, आस्वाद्यतात् ।

Appayya Dikṣita, (17th century) upholds the view of Daṇḍin and observes that the thirty three transitory moods like Nirveda etc and the love expressed towards gods, elders, children etc., fall under the province of Bhāva only, and the instances where such a Bhāva is subordinated to something else come under

---

8 Abhinavabhārati, as quoted in V Raghuvan. Number of Rasas, P.110  
9 काव्यप्रकाश, I, 12 cd.  
10 Kavyaprabha P.126. But it should be noted that mammeta reads the removal of auspicious things (मिलात्तत्तल) as one of the purpose of poetry. Ibid 1.2
Jagannatha observes that Bhakti is nothing but Rati or love towards Godhead and it cannot rise to the level of a rasa:

Thus the major theorists in Sanskrit Poetics, are of the opinion that Bhakti was not a Rasa on par with other traditionally accepted Rasas. However, these theorists did recognize the importance of Bhakti; for, some of them like Ānandavardhana, Appayya Dīkṣita etc., were devotees them and Abhinavagupta was a mystic too. The logic behind the dismissal of Bhakti is somewhat feeble and unconvincing. As Dr. Raghavan says:

'This is not commendable attitude. If it is said that friendship is only a variety of Rati, can we call the Rasa in the association of Rāma and Sugrīva, Śṛṅgāra? If brotherly attachment again is brought under Rati, is the Rasa in the association of Rāma and Bharata or Rāma and Lākṣāmaṇa, Śṛṅgāra? Literature is too full of these types of attachment.'

Karuṇā-Synthesis: Bhavabhuti:

There are some writers who propose (or seem to propose) a theory in which not eight but only on of them is considered as the principal or original
**rasa** and all other **rasas** as arising out of (and also merging back in) that principal **rasa**. Prof. V. Rāgavan calls such a view as the theory of **Rasa-synthesis**. He says '**Rasa-synthesis** means a reducing of all **rasas** to the nature of one, formulation of one as **Prakṛti** and the rest as its **Vikṛti**.'

There are at least four such cases before RG which deserve some consideration here.

First among these is Bhavabhūti. He is said to propound the theory of **Karuna-synthesis**. The tradition of considering **Karuna** as an important **rasa** is very old. The first **Kavya** in Sanskrit, the ādikāvyya, i.e. the **Rāmāyaṇa**, arose out of a sense of pity16. **Rasesu karuno rasah** is a well-known anonymous saying. Again, it is said: **Kāruṇyam Bhavabhutir eva tanute**17. 'Only Bhavabhuti is the past master in creating the pathetic (**Karuna**) sentiment in which **api grāva rodity api dalati vajrasya ṣṛdayam** i.e. stones weep and the heart of thunderbolt becomes shattered18. Even the heroine **Sīta** in his **Uttara-rāma-caritam** is called the sentiment of **Karuna** incarnate i.e. karuṇasya mūrtir athavā ṣaririnī19. In the end of the third act of his play **Uttara-rāma-carita**, the characters of Vāsantī and Tamasā say:

\[
\text{एको रसः करुण एव निमित्तभेदः-द्वित्ते: पृथकःगृहिनिवास्थवते विवर्तनं} \]
\[
\text{आवर्तबुद्धितर्कःमयाचिन्तकारः-नम्भो यथा, सलिलभेव हि तत्समस्तम्} \]

The verse has a **vedāntic** background as seen from the words like **nimitta-** ‘cause/motive’, **vivarta-** ‘turning/revolving/changing’, **vikāra-** ‘agitation of mind’,
etc. Bhavabhuti here appears to propose a theory that \textit{Karuna} is the only all important \textit{rasa} and all other \textit{rasas} are only its transformations. Just as the single element of water takes various forms like whirlpool, bubbles, waves etc., Similarly it is \textit{Karuna} that takes different forms due to various \textit{nimittas}. Karuna is the \textit{prakṛti}, other \textit{rasas} are its \textit{vikṛtis}. Though this statement is very appropriate in the context in which it appears, yet it is rather too much to say that Bhavabhuti appears to propound here a theory of \textit{Karuna}-synthesis as some scholars claim. Virarāghava himself seems to be the first supporter (or the propounder? we do not know) of such an interpretation. He says:

\begin{quote}
इदमत्र कवयेमतम्-यथापि श्रृङ्खला एक एव रस इति श्रृङ्खलप्रकाशकाराकारमितम्,
तथापि प्राणयदृश्वयम्-रागिविरामिः-साधारणमात् कहण एक एव रसम्।
अन्ये तु तद्विकृतम्: इति।
\end{quote}

\(^{19}\) Virarāghava com. P–99

\textbf{Sānta–Synthesis : Abhinavagupta:}

Next we have Abhinava Gupta advocating a \textit{Sānta–synthesis}. Actually, Bharata propounded only eight \textit{rasas}:

\begin{quote}
श्रुगारहास्य करणा रौध्रवीरभयानका:।
बीमतस्बाहुतवैव अष्टोत्तरतवे रसम्: स्मृत्ताः।
\end{quote}

This is confirmed by Kālidāsa in his \textit{Vikramorvaśiyam}. Act I in the verse:

\begin{quote}
मूनिमा भतीन यः: प्रयोगो भवतीव्यक्तसतःसाधयो नियुक्त:।
\end{quote}

\(^{23}\) etc.

But it is likely that there was a tradition which included \textit{Sānta} as the ninth \textit{Rasa}.

\textit{Bhāvapraśakāśana} says:

\begin{quote}
उत्पतिस्तु रसानां या पुरा वासुकिनोविता।
नारदस्तोयेन तैरेशा प्रकारान्तरकल्पिता।
\end{quote}

\(^{21}\) Virarāghava com P–99

\(^{22}\) N S V.I.15

\(^{23}\) Vikramor Vaśiyam–Act.I, verse
and in the same context:

रजस्तमोविहिनानासु सत्यावस्थात् सचित्तः ।
मनागस्मृत्युवाह्यतां शान्तो रस इत्तीतः || न.भा.प्रा., p. 48

Vasuki was perhaps the first to accept Śānta rasa. Even Kohala is mentioned to discuss the sthāyī of ānata. Dharmasuri, author of Sāhityaratnākara, says:

कोहलस्तु उत्साहो वा निर्वेदो वा शमो वा अस्त स्वाधीनुष्ठानः।

Rāghavan shows the text of Natyaśāstra containing the elements of Śantarasa, in the verse:

क्रियादर्श: क्रिया क्रियादर्श: क्रिया शम: || न.स. वि, 108 (I first line)

dूःखातानां श्रमातानां शोकातानां तपस्विनाम् || न.स. वि, 114 (I first line)

Udbhata, probably the first commentator of Bharata, recognizes Śānta and speaks of nine rasas. Rāghavan feels that he could be the person to have made alterations in the text of Nātya Śāstra which in its revised form accommodates Śānta rasa and runs as follows:

श्रृंगारहस्यकरण: रूद्रवीरसमयानकाः ||

There are authors like Asvaghoṣa and king Harṣavardhana who wrote works depicting Śānta as their principal rasa. Theoretically also authors like Udbhata, Rudraṭa, Ānanda vardhana, and even perhaps Taутa and Nāyaka have

---

24 Bhāva prakāśana—p.47
25 Bhāva prakāśana—p.48
26 Vide D. T. Tātacārya J.O.R., Vol.v,p,29
27 N.S.I.108 (I st line)
28 N.S.-I.114 (I st line)
29 N.S.-I.
supported the case of Śanta. It is, however, Abhinava, who finally propounds. Śanta as the most important rasa is the Prakṛti of all.

The revised text of NS it self says:

भावा विकारः रत्नाः: शान्तस्तु प्रकृतिमभः ||
विकारः प्रकृतेजीति: पुनर्लीव लीयते ||
स्वं स्वं निमित्तमासां शान्तायां: प्रवत्ति ||
पुनर्निमित्तायां च शान्ते एवोपलोक्यते ||

Abhinava has strongly put forward the case of Śanta-rasa hence, the theory of Śanta-synthesis is ascribed to him. He dismissed the claims of Nirveda or Śama or Utsāha and proposes Ātman as the sthāyi of Śanta. He concludes:

tविद्वात्सवधापवेश तत्त्वायं शमः: ||

He again says: all rasas, in the state of their relish, will be like Śanta.

Aharīkāra–Śṛṅgāra : Bhoja

Bhoja comes with in fifty years of Abhinawa and taking his idea from the latter, he propounds a theory which is generally called Śṛṅgāra-synthesis. The term Śṛṅgāra however is used in a very special philosophico-spiritual sense. In this theory Bhoja appears to adopt a monistic as well as pluralistic approach simultaneously.

The theory seems to develop from the following verse of Dandin in which he has defined the rasa-based Alamkaras. The verse is:

प्रेरःप्रियतराह्याय रसवदुरस्वेशालम् ||
उज्ज्वलि: स्माहाकां बुद्धिकृतिाष च तत्त वच्यम् ||

30 N.S Vi.86–87
31 N.S. P–331
Bhoja, in the first place, endorses the view that sentiment also are *Alaṅkāras* and says *Preyah*, *Rasavad* and *Uṛjasvi* become sentiments when they are *yuktotkara*-‘heightened’, otherwise they remain merely qualities called *preyah*, *Bhāvikatva* and *Aurjitya*. The sentiment called *Preyah*, *Rasavad* and *Uṛjasvi* are a higher type of *Alaṅkāras* because they are related to *Bhāvas*. Though them Bhoja propounds his own concept of the three-level *rasa*.

According to Bhoja, then the first state of *rasa* is *Rūḍhāṁkāra* this is the basic or fundamental stage of *rasa*. *Rasa* in this state is of the form of *Aharīkāra* or *Abhimāna*-Ego/Pride and is present in every soul as a result of its experiences of past lives. This *Abhimāna* which is self-consciousness can also be looked upon as *Śṛṅgāra*-‘self-love’, in a highly philosophical sense. In Bhoja’s own words:

\[
\text{रसोऽभिमानोऽञ्जकारः ब्रजार इति गीयते ।}
\text{योक्षर्थः तत्स्मात्त्यात काव्य कम्लीवल्लभुते ॥}
\text{विशिष्टाकृतजन्मायं जन्मित्रामंत्रात्मसु ।}
\text{आलससम्ममुनोपूरेर्को हेतुः प्रकाशाते ॥}^4
\]

This *Abhimāna*-Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra develops into *Māna*-‘dignity or self-respect or consciousness’, it is the ‘I’, the ego which is at the root of, is the most primary cause of all experience as their 'experience', This stage is also called *Parākoti*.

The second stage, *Madhyama-vasthā*-‘middle stage’, occurs when this one basic *Ahaṁkāra rasa* manifests itself as *Abhimāna*-‘self-assertion’,
'consciousness of the self', revealed in attaching itself to describes to several outward objects with which it comes in to contact. The one basic rasa thus manifests itself in multiplicity of forms. All the eight rasas described by Bharata’s or the twelve given by Bhoja:

श्रृंगार–वीर–कहण–रौद्राङ्ग–भयानकः ||
वीमलस–हास्य–प्रेयासः शान्तोदासीत्रता रसाः ||

or even all the forty-nine moods (including transitory moods and involuntary emotions) can develop to the state of rasa in this stage. In fact even when fully developed to the state at sentiment, in this stage, they will be called emotions only.

अलम्बनविभावेयः स्वेभ्यः समुत्तिनायम् ||
रसो रस्याविद्येण भाव इत्याभिषेयते ||

Thus in this stage, the several emotions which have arisen out of the our Aharīkāra, are attended by their respective emotions etc. and develop to the state of climax, yet really speaking they are emotions only, they can be called sentiment only in secondary sense, because the real sentiment is only one the Aharīkāra rasa and it is a only when Aharīkāra is present as Abhimāna, as the experiences, that the different sentiments can be relished. (In the terminology of Abhinava, Ātmā–‘soul’, is neither viśesata ullikhila nor atyantatiraskṛta.37

The third and final stage also called uttarā koṭi occurs when all the several emotions having reached their individual climax, then become transformed into one unitary rasa which should now be called Preman. The

35 स.कन्न.5.१६४
36 स.कन्न.5.२६
37 अभिनव भारती (NS. I P. 273)
climax of individuals emotions themselves is only *Preman*. The emotions which were several in the second stage now reach their highest intensity, and are synthesized into the one sentiment which is *Preman*. Dr. *Rāghavān* has described the entire process of this sentiment very well in these words: Thus *ahaṁkāra* or *abhimāna* of the first stage becomes *abhimāna* for various outward objects and become the manifold emotions of *rati* etc. and those emotions themselves develop into respective *rasas* and culminate in *preman*-'love' though which they again pass into the first fundamental sentiment of *ahaṁkāra.*

Thus in the first and final stages. In the *parā* and the *uttara koṭiś*, the sentiment is only one. "We are there in a monistic *Pāramārthika* stage' (ibid). Only in middle stage, the *Vyāvahārika* stage, pluralism of sentiment finds place. Again in the third stage the several manifestations of the emotions of the middle stage return to the original one sentiment. The several *Vikṛtis*, as it were, return to their *Prakṛti*. 'This third stage is therefore only the involution of the evolved'. (ibid)

It is to be noted here that in identifying the sentiment with *Śṛṅgāra* on the one hand *Ahaṁkāra-Abhimān* on the other, *Bhoja* is actually admitting two sense of *Śṛṅgāra*, one at the 'Vyāvahārika' stage where it is the *Prakāśa-yuktā* state of *rati* and another in the spiritual-philosophical sense of *Abhimān*-souls attachment toward outward objects. Prof. K.C. Pandeya brings out this second connotation of *Śṛṅgāra* clearly the word *Śṛṅgāra* is used by *Bhoja* in the *Śṛṅgāra prakāśa* in the context of his theory that *Śṛṅgāra* is the only sentiment, not in the ordinary sense of the word as an aesthetic configuration, the central fact of

---

38 भूगार प्रकाश-प-410
which is love, but in the sense of self-feeling of a particular type, which is due to the pure religious dead of those in whom the quality of Sattva predominates and arises from or is strengthened by the residual traces of the experience of the part birth and takes a man to the highest cultural level \( \text{(yena śṛṅgam ucchrayo riyate.}^{39} \, \text{(Śūra. P.420)} \) (Indian Aesthetics I. P. 198) So for as this aspect of the theory is concerned the influence of the Sāṁkhyā school of though is to obvious. In the Sāṁkhyā system, it is the Ahaṁkāra which makes all worldly experiences of pleasure and pain possible for the Puruṣa. Similarly, it is the Ahaṁkāra of the sahṛdaya bhāvaka which makes all the rasa-relish possible for him. A slight divergences may be noted here. In the Darśana the experiences can be either pleasurable or painful, where as in a Kavya, all experiences—even those of pathetic will ultimately transform into preman only.

**Adbhūta-Synthesis : Viśveśvara:**

There are some other views of rasa-synthesis which however have not been given much importance. Viśvanātha Kavirāja, the author of Sāhityadarpana, has noticed one such view of Adbhuta-synthesis which he ascribes to some Narāyana who obviously must have been his predecessor. In the context of Adbhuta rasa, Viśvantha says: 

\[
\text{Tadāha Dharmadattaḥ svagranthe}
\]

\[
\text{रसे सारस्थमत्कारः सर्वनायनन्तुमूत्ते}
\]

\[
\text{तद्यमत्कार सारस्तात। सर्वनायनहतो रस ॥ ॥ ”}
\]

It may be noted that this tradition of Adbhuta-synthesis seeme to have gone some way. There is one work camatkāra-candrika (cc) of one

---

39 Śūra. P.420 Indian Aesthetics I.P. 198
40 S.D.under III-3
Visvesvarakavicandra (Pub. Andhra Uni, Press, Waltair, 1969, ed. Dr. P. Sriramamurti) Who was a protege of the famous king Singabhupala (related 1386–1412 A.D.), author of Rasārṇavasudhākara. Visvesvara defines camatkāra as camatkārastu viduśāmananda parivāhakṛta.⁴¹ (CC.I.6) and Kāvya as Śabdārthau sa camatkārau kāvyam. He says: camatkāra can reside in all the seven elements of a poem:


gunaṁ rītiṁ rastā vṛttiṁ pātāṁ śaṅyāmalaṁkāritaṁ
satā tānaṁ camatkāraṁ bruvatē budaḥ...

gunaṁ dīnaṁ vaakṣyāmokṣkāṁ śaṅdṛṣṭyaṁyogataṁ. ¶"⁴³CC.I.6–7

The entire treatise elaborates in eight chapters (called vilāsa) this element of camatkāra—wander—ful achievement/astonishment:

Some sort of continuation of this view can be seen in jagannathas Rasagangādhara. He defines Kāvya as ramaṇīyārthapratiptādakaḥ śabdaḥ kāvyam and ramaṇīyatā as lokottarāḥ lādajanaṁkāṭāna gocarā and ultimately svaviśiṣṭa janakavaccadekapratipāda—katāsangārṇa camatkāraktvam kāvayatvam.⁴³

One Hariprasāda, author of Kāvyaloka (written 1729 A.D.) also defines Kāvya thus:

विशिष्टवन्द्रपत्व काव्या कालम् कमत्तकत:।
उपसिद्धिम् प्रतिभा नाग्रोपपादित्म।॥७

It is in the light and context of these efforts that we now propose to examine RG’s theory of Bhakti as the only and the highest of Rasas as propounded mainly in his BRAS.

⁴¹ Camatkāra Candrikā, I–6
⁴² Camatkāra Candrikā, I–6–7
⁴³ Rasagaṅgādhara
⁴⁴ Kāvyaloka (quoted in intro, to cc, p.xxx vii)