CHAPTER III

RASA AND ITS VARIETIES

Rasa which is most important factor in poetry has been dealt at length by Mammaṭa. Following Ānandavardhanācārya he has placed it under Asaṃlakṣyakrama. After describing the nature of Rasa and giving Bharatamuni’s Rasaśūtra, Mammaṭa has given explanations of Bhaṭṭa Lollāta, Sṛisāṅkuka, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and Abhinavagupta. It is at this point that the commentators have interpreted differently the same Kārīkas. They have explicitly put forth their alliance with particular view, without caring what the view of Mammaṭa was.

After defining eight varieties of Rasa and their basic feelings he has given subordinate emotions (Vyabhicāri-bhāva) and Bhāvas (Emotions). Mammaṭa has also included Sānta as ninth. Rasa, of which Nirveda (self-disparagement) has been given as basic feeling (Sthāyibhāva). He then defines Bhāvabhāsa and Rasabhāsa. Of subordinate emotions there are (1) Allayment ‘Sānti’ (2) Manifestation ‘Udaya’ (3) Mixture ‘Samdhi’ (4) Variegation ‘Sabalata’. In the end some other factors of minor importance are also discussed.

Various Explanations of Rasa Śūtra

Before giving their views about the Rasa theory itself the commentators have explained the terms Vibhāva, Anubhāva etc. which have been used in Bharatamuni’s Rasaśūtra.
Manikyacandra, the earliest amongst the commentators, who describes the text of Mammapa in its historical setting, gives his own definitions of Vibhava etc. He has then made a powerful attack on Lolla's theory on Rasa. He argues that firstly it is wrong to say that the Saivyoga of Sthayi with Vibhava etc. becomes Rasa because then the Bharata Muni should have defined Sthayibhavas first, but he has defined Rasa first. Because if we accept the cause and Action theory then cause must exist first, and be defined first. Moreover, if Rasa had been the accumulation; then there would not have been Hasya Rasa's six-fold division 'Athopacayam praptā eva Rasaucyate tahri Smita, Hasita, Vihasitādyah sadbhedā Hasya Rasasya Na syuh'. He has argued further that it is the basic feeling which becomes Rasa and not the accumulation of Vibhavas etc. 'Pragavastho Bhavah Sthāyi Rasi Bhavati Na tu Kramena-opci ta'. More so he adds that the Rasa is not a pre-existence of emotions, but it is otherwise 'Tasmānna Bhavapūrvavatvam Rasasyāpitutadviparyaya eva'. He points out one more defect in the 'Anukartrtva' theory of Bhaṭṭa Lolla, i.e. that if it is agreed that the sentiment generated in the personated character is secondarily
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recognized in personating actor then it is altogether impossi-
ble, because then the 'Alaukiktā' or Transcendentalness of
Rasa is not possible. Mānîkyacandra has declared emphatically
'Nānukāryago Rasa',¹ because one cannot follow the emotions
of other people, 'Para cittaVyātīnamalakyamāṇatvenānukātu-
masakyatvāt'.²

He has also given various arguments to refute the
claim of those who assert, that Rasa is Anukaraṇa and is
inferred. This in fact is the view point of Śrīsaṅkukasa. It
may however be pointed out that Mammaṭa's text no where has
used the word 'Anukarṇa'. Mānîkyacandra has interpreted
'Sāmājikānām carvyamaṇa Rasa' as 'Mukhya Ramādyānugatassa-tha-
yyānukarṇanarūpavātvedeva ca nāmanteṇa vyap disto Rasa'.³ It
is on this base that he has given a lengthy criticism of
'Anukarṇa'. However, he has emphatically stated that
Inference of Rasa is not possible because it is against
common experience, ⁴ 'Tatranumāntvamanabhāva viruddham'.
The reason for this is 'Vigallta Vedyāntratvena'. He adds
that if we accept that Rasa is produced from Inference then
it does not seem to be real.

He seems to be less harsh towards Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's
view. He supports him when he says that the realization

¹Samketa, p. 42.
²Ibid.,
³Ibid., p. 43.
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of Rasa is not possible in aloofness. He has put-forth his own arguments for this. Firstly, the emotions of gods and goddesses cannot be enjoyed by the ordinary human beings, because those are uncommon, 'Kāntāditvam sadharanam vāsanā vikāsaheturbhaviṣyatīti eṣedevā varpanādau tadapi katham'.

And with words also there cannot be production of Rasa because that will also mean like real sexual enjoyment of the pair. He further supports Bhaṭṭanāyaka by saying that the acceptance of Bhāvakatva vyapara is appropriate, because it helps in differentiating between poetry and drama, 'Yadi hyabhidhā vyāpārantarabhiṁi bhāvakatva vyāparo nāgī kriyate tadā sastrebhyah kāvyanāṭiyayoh kimantram syāt'. But he does not agree to Bhāṭṭa Nāyaka's Bhojakatvavyapara. His argument is that after generation and expression there is no need of third 'Vyāpara', because the eternal Rasa comes to existence then 'Kim co tpatyabhivyakti dvānaṁabhīyupagame nityo vā sanvā Rasa iti na tṛtyā gatiḥ'. Moreover, there is no need of Bhojakatva when suggestion or Vyānapā is already accepted by others 'Na rasopi pratītireva bhogikāṁ vyāparah kāvyasya rasa viṣayo vyānapā rūpo nāmāntareṇa pariḥ smṛtah'.

1Samketa, p. 46.
2Ibid., p. 46. 'Sabdāderapi tatpratitau na rasotpattihpratyaksadiva nāyakamithuna pratītaiu'.
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during Māṇikyacandra's time there was vast difference amongst poeticians about what to be regarded as Rasa. Some of his contemporaries regarded 'Vibhāvas' as Rasa and others Anubhāvas and so on; this has been admitted by Māṇikyacandra himself.

But he has given his outright support to Abhinavagupta's point of view, that the basic feeling or 'Sthāyibhāva itself becomes Rasa, when it is generalised by the force of Vibhāva, Anubhāva, etc. He has further clarified this stand that it is 'Sthāyi' which when reaches carvāṇata is called Rasa. He has also cleared all objections on Carvāṇa, which cannot be termed as invalid proof because it is not agreed or given by any other person; but on the other hand it is there and is felt by every one and is self-existent. ' Svym tu nāpramāṇikīśvasamvedanasiddhatvāt' and because it is manifested by Vibhāva etc. non-worldly cause so it is transcendental and unique in nature.

His support for Abhinavagupta reaches its top when we find a comparison of all the theories given in verse, which concludes giving highest place to Abhinavagupta's theory. He ends the verse thus 'Sarvasvam hirasasyātra guptapādā hi janate' meaning that Abhinavagupta is the only person who knows all about Rasa.

1Saṃketa, p. 49.
2Ibid., p. 51. 'Jnanāntrebheyo vilakṣṇaiva'.
3Ibid., p. 52.
Chronologically next commentator is Sridhara the writer of Kāvyaprakāśa Viveka. His commentary on this portion of the text can be regarded as best. He has first of all defined the technical terms used in Bharatamuni’s Rasasūtra. His definition of Sthāyibhāva is that the Vasana which is enjoyed is Sthāyibhāva meaning thereby that when Vasana reaches the stage of enjoyment it is called ‘Sthāyibhāva’. He has quoted Bharatamuni to support his stand. Bhāvas or Emotions according to him are those which make Rasa manifest ‘Bhavayatīti Bhāvah’. He has also refuted the claim of those who say that Syngāra is the only Rasa. The reason for this is that then we cannot know the emotions ‘Bhāvānava-bodhāt’. Moreover the basic emotion of permanent feeling is in the character not in the poetry. He has also given the definitions of Vibhāva, Anubhāva, etc. He has profusely quoted from Bharatamuni’s Nāṭyaśāstra to support his definitions. It is interesting to note that he has simply explained the wordings of various poeticians who have given their explanations of Bharata’s Rasasūtra. No comments have been given on them. However, towards the end of the explanation he has summed up each of them. His summing up of Bhaṭṭa Lollatā’s view is that the sanyoga of Vibhāvādi is of three kinds because of their cause and resultant

1 Kavya Pr. Viveka, p. 62. ‘Yadvāsanā-āsvādapa-dvamavagāhamaṇanuvartate sa sthāyi’.
2 Ibid., p. 65. ‘Kathamekaiva cittavyātistatra’.
3 Ibid., p. 66. ‘Ata eva nippattirapi tridhaiva pakṣeyābhikhyeyā’. 
relation etc., so the manifestation of Rasa is also threefold. It is manifested in 'Anukārya' and nourished by permanent emotion (Sthāyibhāva) and 'Aṇipuṣṭa' is 'Sthāyi'. Similarly he has summed up Śrīsāṅkuka's point of view like this\(^1\) *Sa cānumīyamānah siddharūpa vyaṅgādi Vailaksīnyena Sādhityānumāte*. But while dealing with Abhinavagupta's theory of Rasa he has given beautiful explanation of the manifestation of Rasa. He feels that according to Abhinavagupta Rasa is suggested or Vyaṅga and Vibhāva etc. are suggestive and they are connected with 'Sthāyi' with 'Vyaṅga-vyanjakabhāva'. He adds that it is the permanent emotion which is manifested into Rasa 'Sthāyyeva yogyatātra Rasibhavatityucyate' and that Rasa is neither manifested in Anukārya and nor it itself is 'Anukaratṛ'\(^3\) because then there will be no charm in it.

Śrīdharma feels that Vāṃśa is the basic thing for enjoyment of Rasa. Without it enjoyment of Rasa is not possible, \(^4\) 'Nirvāsanaasya carvaṇa nāasti, tadevaṃ vāsanaa-vbhāseva carvayitṛtvam' and that very, which resides there in the mind of a man from time immemorial is manifested into Rasa by Vibhāvas etc.

\(^{1}\) Kav. Pr. Viveka, p. 68.
\(^{2}\) Ibid., p. 69.
\(^{3}\) Ibid., p. 69.
\(^{4}\) Ibid., p. 70.
He also describes two kinds of suggestiveness \(^1\) (Vyanjanam) one that is settled minutely in the cause 'Ekam tāvat karaṇe sūksma tayavsthitasya'. The second is 'Dvitiyāntāpāya pratitiśāpeksopāya pratitiṟūpam' and it is with the second that the manifestation of the Rasa is possible. He supports Mammatā in his assertion that Rasa is not 'Kārya'\(^2\) or resultant. He has own arguments to put forth. He says that if we accept Rasa as resultant then its co-existence with Vibhāva etc. is not possible because the cause must have pre-existence with resultant. But the case here, is opposite.

Then he has given a lengthy explanation of 'Cit' and 'Caitya' to explain the enjoyment of Rasa.

Candrāsa has also given his own definitions of 'Ālambana' and 'Uddipana'. 'Ālambana' according to him is 'Viṣayikriyanta' i.e. which are made the subject those are called 'Ālambanas' and which arise the emotions are 'Uddipana', 'Udabodhyanti Uddipayanti'. He attacks the explanation of Bharatmuni's Rasasūtra by Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa. He says that the spectator cannot be charmed by the emotion which is originally produced in the character personated and does not belong at all to the reader or the spectator. This would mean the loss of 'Rasyamanata'. Hence this view is incorrect.

\(^{1}\) Kav. Pr. Viveka, p. 70.
\(^{2}\) Ibid., p. 71.
"Atra... 

... tatra sarvatra Rasa iti nāmātrameva na tu  

Rasyamanatā praṇatvamānyupeesāyacamāyampakṣah'.

He has also forcefully attacked the 'Inference theory' of Śrīśāṅkuka. He says that if Rasa is known by Inference then there will be no charm in it, and charm is the real essence of Rasa. He raises one more objection that is, if it is said that if 'Sukha' or happiness is there after the Inference of Rasa then the Rasa will become a cause of the 'Resultant' i.e. 'Sukha'. But it has been clearly asserted by all poeticians that Rasa is neither cause nor resultant, 'Tatrādyo dūṣīgye Dvitiye tu ko ayaṁ Raso yasya kāryam sukhamīti prāśānāniskṛti'. So this explanation according to him is also defective.

He has also not spared Bhāṭṭanāyaka. He feels that Bhāṭṭanāyaka is 'Dhvanidarsana vidvesā' i.e. a man who is against the philosophy of Dhvani. He attacks his plea that Rati etc. become the subject of Bhoga by generalization. He argues that it is not possible that way, because Rasa does not exist as 'Anukārya' in 'Anukarti', and also cannot be enjoyed when it is far away from the spectator. Moreover by generalization the enjoyment of Rasa is not obvious, because then there will be 'Arasyamanatā'.

1 Dipiīka, p. 98.
2 Ibid., p. 101.
3 Ibid., p. 101.
Govinda Thakkura has given his own definitions of 'Vibhāvas' etc. with a little more explanation than other commentators. He has also enumerated eight effects or 'Kāryāṇi'. He has defined with originality the word 'Vyaktah' in the Kārikā. According to him it means Carvaṇā. This clearly shows that on the question of Rasa he is more 'Rasavādin' than 'Dhvanivādin'. He has clearly said that 'Sthāyī' or permanent emotion mixed with 'Vibhāva' etc. and made a subject of enjoyment of 'Carvaṇā', is Rasa. Very clearly he goes on to add that 'Sthāyī' or permanent emotion by itself cannot be called Rasa, it is so only when it mixes with 'Vibhāva' etc. and then the enjoyment from it is just like the 'Supreme' Bliss' or 'Brahma'. Also before embarking upon the task of analysis of the view of other poeticians he has clearly stated that Rasa cannot be said as 'Kārya' or effect produced by some cause. He has also quoted the definition of 'Sthāyī-bhāva' in a couplet.

He has bitterly criticized the explanation of Bharata's Rasasūtra by Bhatta Lalātā. He says that the arguments of Bhatta Lalātā are such; as cannot be considered good at all. First of all according to the theory of Lollata the Rasa is not there in spectator (Sāmājika), because that would mean
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1 Pradīpa, pp. 89-90.
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lack of charm. Moreover mere knowledge of Rasa cannot produce any charm and its knowledge cannot be derived from words alone, because that would mean the existence of charm in the worldly love affairs. It also cannot be attributed to knowledge. There is no proof for doing so.

Govinda Thakkura has beautifully done away with the Inference theory of Śri Saṅkuka with a single sentence. Unlike others he has not heaped many arguments at this stage. Thakkura's argument is that the knowledge which is not derived directly is bereft of any charm, hence the knowledge derived from Inference would be without any charm. Moreover, there is no proof that the knowledge derived from Inference would produce any charm.

Bhaṭṭanāyaka's theory of Rasa is also not acceptable to Govinda Thakkura. According to him the two processes of 'Bhāvakatva' and generalization or generalized presentation, are unwarrantable. Moreover, the 'Bhogatva' is purely a mental process and hence the enjoyment of the Rasa by the soul is not there. Moreover, this process of manifestation of Rasa leads us to 'Abhīvyakti pakṣa'. Govinda Thakkura, however, has given his unstinted support to Abhinavagupta.

Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa the grammarian commentator has mainly followed the track trodden by Govinda Thakkura. He has hardly
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1Pradīpa, p. 94.
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put forth his own views even on this important topic. Exceptions however are there. Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa defines 'Sthāyi' as something remaining subtly in the mind in the form of 'Vāsanā'. He has defined Rasa as 'Sākṣībhāṣyoratyādi Rasa iti' but it is only when the permanent emotion mixes with Vibhāva etc. in which there is always a part of bliss. On Śrīsaṅkuka's Rasa theory of Inference, his objection is that manifestation of Rasa is even there if the Inference of the hero is not accepted by the reader or the spectator. On Bhaṭṭanāyaka's theory of attribution of two processes he says that both the processes namely Bhāvanā and 'Sādharṇī-karaṇa' or generalization are useless because the feeling like Erotic are firstly experienced by the hero and then subsequently by the reader or the spectator. Hence there is no need of attribution of two processes as have been given by Bhaṭṭanāyaka.

Śrīvidyācakravartin the writer of the commentary, Sampradāyaprakāśini has given a rather simple and catching definitions of Vibhāva etc. According to him the simple causes or the helping causes for the generation of different kinds of worldly emotions are called Vibhāvas etc., in the
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1Uddyota, p. 89.
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literature. But it is to be noted that it is only with the help of Guṇas and Alamkāras in poetry and acting in drama that such feelings or emotions are manifested into Rasa. In the explanation of Bharatamuni's Rasasūtra by Bhaṭṭa Lollatā, he has enumerated three kinds of connection between 'Vibhāvas' etc. and the Rasa. With Sthāyi it has 'Janya-Janaka' or cause and effect relation. With 'Anubhāva' it has 'Gamya-gamaka' or Indicative and intended relation and with Vyabhicāri it has Poṣya-poṣakabhāva'. But all these relationships are useless because these do not go anyway to explain the emotion that arises in the mind of the spectator. The commentator, however, offers no comments on the theory of Bhaṭṭa Lollatā. The habit of 'Routine Formality' can be seen in this context where the commentator has not made any effort to put forth his views but has only explained the words of Mammata. However, the lengthy explanation of Abhinavagupta's view shows his inclination towards this school of thinking. A further proof of this is the words which he uses before starting to comment on this viewpoint. The words give the most exalted position to Abhinavagupta. One more noteworthy point is that he has given his own example in verse to show the generalization of Vibhavas etc.
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1Sampradāyaprakāśini, p. 105.
2Ibid., p. 112.
3Ibid., p. 113.
The writer of the commentary Sahityacudāmaṇi, Bhāṭṭa-gopāla starts his commentary on Rasa portion with his bold assertion that the permanent emotion 'Sthāyi' made 'Vyakta' by 'Vibhāvās' etc. is Rasa; which is neither a thing made known or something generated. On the basis of 'Vibhāvās' etc. the commentator has differentiated the poetry from Drama. According to him where there is only theoretical depiction of the 'Vibhāvās' etc. it is poetry but where these are depicted practically it is Drama. He has also given the definitions of Vibhvāva, Sthāyibhava and Anubhava etc. He has given very short and precise explanations of the viewpoint of Poeticians on Bharata Muni's Rasasūtra. He offers no comments on Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa, he sharply criticizes Srisankuka. He says that the Rasa enjoyment according to this theory comes under no regulation because the enjoyment is said to be in a non-aligned position; which is altogether impossible. He has supported Abhinavagupta's viewpoint.

Bhimasena the writer of the commentary Sudhāṣāgara has given lengthy explanations of the Earlier Rhetoricians explanation of Bharata Muni's Rasasūtra. But his criticism is word to word copy of Govinda Ṭhakkura. This is there when he criticizes Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa, Bhaṭṭanāyaka and Srisankuka. His definitions of Vibhāva etc. are also more or less the
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1Sahityacudāmaṇi, p.
2Ibid., p.
3Sudhāṣāgara, pp. 103-237.
the same of Govinda Thakkura.

Siddhicandra Gani as usual has criticized Mambata bitterly as far as Rasa is concerned. He explains the experience of 'Parmananda' or 'Superjoy' of Rasa in the light of what he calls Vedantinaya. Here he seems to follow Jagannatha. But the view of the navinas he states as follows 'Tadapekṣayā kāminikuṇḍakalasā sparśacandananahulepanā-dineva nāṭyadarsana kāvya śravaṇābhyaṁ sukha viśeṣo jāyte sa eva tu Rasa iti navīnāh'. This view puts the aesthetic pleasure on par with ordinary sensual pleasure. Consistently with this view of Navinas, Siddhicandra Gani has recognized only four Rasas - viz. Śṛngāra, Hāsya, Vīra and Adbhuta. He further refutes the claim of Karuna, Raudra etc., as Rasas. Siddhicandra Gani does not reduce the number of Rasas on the basis of the original and the derived, he does it on the very principle of Rasa. He accepts the view that 'Sukha' is principle of Rasa and that on that principle there could be only four Rasas. He makes use of the arguments of those who regard Rasa as 'Sukha-dukhātmaka', in showing that Karuṇa etc. are 'Dukhātmaka' and then following the principle that Rasa by definition is Sukhātmaka, rejects Karuṇa etc. as Rasas. It has not been possible to find out the Navinas who hold this view. Certainly Jagannatha does not do so.

1Kav. Pr. Khaṇḍana, p. 16.
2Ibid.
3Ibid., p. 21.
Manikyacandra\(^1\) is clearly for the 'all pleasureess' or 'sukhātmakata' of the Rasas. Not only this much, he goes on to assert clearly that all Rasas are 'Ānandarūpa' and not the least there is anything like 'Uparānjakatā' in the Rasas. According to him Hāsyatā is of three kinds 'Smita', 'Hasita', 'Apahasita'.\(^2\) He has also given separate definitions of all these three kinds. Vīra also is of three kinds according to Manikyacandra. These three kinds are 'Dharma', 'Dāna' and 'Yuddha'. He has accepted the number of Rasas as nine; Sānta has been accepted as the ninth Rasa with Nirveda as its 'Sthāyibhāva'.\(^3\)

Śrīvidyācakravartin has also accepted the number of Rasas as nine and has shown in the analization of one example, how all the pre-requisites of a Rasa are found in the verse.\(^4\) The types of 'Bhāva' are same as accepted by Māmaṭa.

Bhattacharōla also accepts Sānta as Rasa and Nirveda as its Sthāyibhāva. He includes Dāvīra etc. under Sānta. He even quotes a verse which means that all Rasas generate from Sānta and at the stage of degeneration they again assimilate with Sānta.\(^5\) He quotes four verses of his own as
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\(^1\) Samketa, p. 50.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 60.
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 65.
\(^4\) Sampradayaprakāśinī, p. 140.
\(^5\) Sāhityaśuṣṭāmaṇī, p. 140. 'Sva sva nimittamāsādyā santadutpadyate Rasah, Punarnimitattāpāye tatraiva pratiyate'.
examples of Santa Rasa. He, however, has pointed out that some people accept 'Sama' as the 'Sthāyibhava' of 'Santa' Rasa. Anandavardhanacārya also accepts sama as the basic feeling of Santa.

Śrīdhara also supports Mammaṭa on the question of Santa Rasa. He has forcefully met the objection that Santa has not been enumerated amongst Rasas by Bharatamuni. He adds that Dayāvīra etc., are in fact the other names of Santa Rasa.

Govinda Thakkura though accepts Santa as ninth Rasa but he differs from Mammaṭa on the question of its Sthāyibhava. According to him 'Sama' is its basic feeling while 'Nirveda' is 'Vyabhicāri'.¹ But Nāgojībhāṭṭa differs from him to declare Nirveda as Sthāyibhava of Santa.² Bhimasena accepts 'Sama' as the Sthāyibhava of Santa Rasa. Mahesvara and Vāmana accept Nirveda as Sthāyibhava of Santa. Siddhicandra's view about the number of Rasas has already been shown.

Conclusion

Mammaṭa has mentioned four different explanations of Rasasūtra of Bharatamuni. Most of the commentators accept the explanation of Abhinavagupta as most appropriate. But

¹Pradīpa, p. 125. 'Tasmācchamo-āśya-Sthāyī'.
²Uddyota, p. 125.
the real moot point is whether the aesthetic pleasure is like any other pleasure of life or its character is different? The so called navīnas headed by Siddhicandra Gaṇī take this experience on par with the ordinary sensual pleasures which he says is as pleasing as the sight of beautiful woman. But most of other commentators take the enjoyment of Rasa as Transcendental.

There have been varying definitions of Vibhāvas etc., but ultimately all point to the righteousness of Mammaṭa's view. The process of manifestation of Rasa has also been described differently. Candīḍāsa, Maheśvara and Siddhicandra Gaṇī toe the one line while others follow a different path.

The number of Rasas as nine has also not been accepted unanimously. There have been views, agreeing to only four Rasas and some to more than nine. Śānta's capability of inclusion in Rasa category is also mooted, but the real difference is on the point of 'Sthāyibhāva'. Govinda, Bhīmasena and others accept Śama as the basic feeling of Śānta. Others namely Śrīdharā, Bhattachopāla etc. accept Nirveda as its Sthāyi. The first group follows Anandavardhanācārya while the other follows Mammaṭa. There have been some other minor points like the sub-varieties of Rasas which have been debated.