CONCLUSION

In the foregoing chapters an attempt is made to give the history and development of Rasavat and allied Alāṅkāras in Sanskrit Poetics. The rhetoricians of the early period, Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhaṭa deal with Rasa, Bhāva, etc., as Alāṅkāras. Rasavat, Preyas and Urjasvin are the three Alāṅkāras belonging to this category in the treatment of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. Udbhaṭa accepts these three Alāṅkāras and adds Samāhita to this group by modifying its conception to include Bhāvaśānti, etc., in it, although this Alāṅkāra does not have anything about Rasa, Bhāva, etc., in the treatment of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. Two writers belonging to the early period namely Vāmana and Rudraṭa do not deal with these Alāṅkāras. Vāmana includes all ideas of Rasa in the Arthagūṇa called Kānti. The Bhāvaśāṅkāra of Rudraṭa has nothing to do with Bhāva, etc.

From the time of Ānandavardhana, Rasavat and allied Alāṅkāras receive a new conception with a view to distinguishing them from Rasādīdhvani. It is said that they are the cases of subordination of Rasa, Bhāva, etc. Abhinavagupta relates this conception of Rasavat, etc., with Rasavat, Preyas, Urjasvin and Samāhita of the early
period and elucidates the examples of Rasavat given by Ānandavardhana. Kuntaka who belongs to this period gives altogether a new conception of Rasavat and regards the Alaṅkāras Upama, Rūpaka, etc., which are as appealing as Rasa in certain contexts, as cases of Rasavadalaṅkāra. Preyas and other Alaṅkāras are not admitted by him as Alaṅkāras at all. Bhoja on the other hand includes Rasa, Bhāva, etc., as certain Alaṅkāras coming under the Rasokti group.

Mammatā who follows Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta distingshes Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras from Rasādīdhvani and illustrates them as certain varieties of the second type of Guṇībhūtavyaṅga called Aparāṅgayaṅga. Besides Rasavat, Peryas, Īrjasvin and Samāhita, he mentions and illustrates Bhāvodaya, Bhāvasandhi and Bhāvāsabalata as Alaṅkāras under the same condition. Later writers like Ruyyaka, Viśvanātha and otehrs accept all the seven Alaṅkāras of this group and illustrate them.

Thus we can see the change in the nature of Rasavadalaṅkāra in three different periods. From Bhāmaha’s time to Ānandavardhana’s time, it was similar to Bharata’s Nāṭyarasa. Ānadavardhana changed its nature completely to make it Kāvyarasa, distinguishing Rasavat from Bharata’s
Nāṭyarasa, which is the soul of poetry and is called Rasadhvani by Ānandavardhana. Kuntaka took the boldest step in denying it as an Alāṅkāra and proving its importance as an Alāṅkārya. But Kuntaka's theory of Rasavat is completely neglected by later writers and Ānandavardhana's theory is followed mostly as seen in the history of Sanskrit Poetics.

The Alāṅkāravadins have conceded the superiority of Rasa even though they have called Rasa, etc., as Rasavad-Alāṅkāra, etc. Therefore it is certain that Rasavat and other allied Alāṅkāras must have been, in their opinion superior to other Alāṅkāras like Upamā, etc.

Further, Kuntaka has in plain words declared the supremacy of Rasavadalaṅkāra by calling it the life (jīvita) of all other Alāṅkāras. Upholding his idea of Rasavadalaṅkāra, Kuntaka says that this poetic figure is the best ornament of poetry, which will surely draw the attention of the learned critics.

The Rasadhvanivādins, Mammaṭa, etc., have not placed Rasavadalaṅkāra, etc., in Citrakāvyā along with Upamā, etc., but included them in Aparāṅga, one of the variety of Guṇībhūtavyaṅga. Thus they have indirectly recognised them of higher order than Upamā, etc. Though Viśvanātha has put forth the illustrations of Aparāṅga parallel to those of
Mammaṭa, yet he has dealt with the Rasavat and other allied Alāṅkāras under Citrakāvya along with the Alāṅkāras like Upamā, Rūpaka, etc. In this way he has equated them, though indirectly, with the latter. Thus we can identify the comparative excellence of Rasavat and other allied Alāṅkaras.

In the light of the above the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. With the entire material on Rasa and Bhāva along with the details of the accessories of Rasa, the Sthāyibhāvas and kinds of Rasa in Bharata’s Nāṭyarasa before them, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin apply it to poetry in general making it a part and parcel of their theory of Alāṅkāra in regarding Rasa, Bhāva, etc., as Rasavat and other Alāṅkaras. Udbhata follows the same trend and contributes the concept of Samāhita to this group. It is clear from the treatment of these Alāṅkaras by these writers that they consider Rasa, Bhāva, etc., as Alāṅkaras without taking into account whether they are predominant or subordinate to anything else. Only with regard to the second variety of Udāṭta Udbhata has referred to the idea of subordinating Rasa, etc., to the main content. As formulated by Pratīhārendurāja and
further elucidated by Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta and Kuntaka, the opinion of early writers has been that Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras are the cases of Rasa, Bhāva, etc., being predominant, while the second variety of Udātta has been a case of Rasa, Bhāva, etc., being subordinate.

2. The attempt on the part of Ānandavardhana is to dislodge the above position of the early rhetoricians (Ālaṅkārikas) regarding Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras. By way of distinguishing them from Rasādidhvani Ānandavardhana prescribes that Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras should have the subordination of Rasa, etc., to the main purport of the sentence. This new conception of Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras has been accepted by all the later followers of the Dhvani school such as Mammaṭa, Ruyyaka and Viśvanātha. The result of this conception is the removal of confusion between Rasavat and other Alaṅkāras on the one hand and Rasadhvani, Bhāvadhvani, etc., on the other.

It is, however, necessary to make one observation with regard to the above conception of Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras. It is clear from the above that Rasavat, etc., come under Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya type
called Aparāṅgavyaṅga. This Aparāṅgavyaṅga is of two types as Vācyāṅgavyaṅga and Vyaṅgavyaṅga. Under the second type we have instances of one Rasa being predominant and the other Rasa being subordinate. The well-known example given by Mammaṭa and others is -

'Ayam sa raśanotkarṣi, etc.'

Here Karuṇa is Aṅgirasa (predominant) while Śīṅghāra is Aṅgarasa (subordinate). From the point of view of the Aṅgarasa it is regarded as an instance of Rasavadālāṅkaṇa. Then from the point of view of Aṅgirasa, it should be considered as an instance of Rasadhvani with 'Rati' supported by Smarana, etc., as contributing to its appeal. As some later writer have put it the argument is -

"Aṅgarasāpekṣayā yadyapi guñībhūtavyaṅgayatvam rasavadālāṅkāratvam ca tathāpi aṅgirasāpekṣayā tasya rasadhvanitvam anivāryameva."

In the case of instances where Rasa, Bhāva, etc., are rendered subordinate to the Vācyārtha, Rasavat and other Alāṅkāras will have a distinct status. Thus in the process of extending the scope of Rasavat and other Alāṅkāras on the basis of what Ānandavardhana has said, the later writers have
given a double status to the instances of these *Alaṅkāras*.

3. Kuntaka is categorical in saying that *Rasavat* and other *Alaṅkāras* as explained by Bhāmaha and others are not *Alaṅkāras* at all, but *Alaṅkāryas*. This is another instance of revealing the defect in the approach of Bhāmaha and others regarding *Rasavat* and allied *Alaṅkāras*. But his view that *Rasa*, etc., cannot be regarded as subordinate is not convincing in the light of Ānandavardhana's conception of *Rasaḍyalaṅkāra*. Further his conception of *Rasaḍalaṅkāra*, though original, leads us to further confusion on the issue. If *Upamā*, *Rūpaka*, etc., are to be regarded as *Rasaḍalaṅkāras* under certain contexts, then the concept of *Rasaḍalaṅkāra* falls into an uncertain ground. In this conception any *Alaṅkāra* that is distinctly recognised as *Upamā*, *Rūpaka*, etc., has to be considered as *Rasavat* when one feels that it is as appealing as *Rasa*. It is difficult to decide when a certain *Alaṅkāra* is *Rasavat* and when it is that *Alaṅkāra* proper. In affect Kuntaka also gives a double status for *Upamā*, etc., as *Rasaḍalaṅkāras* and as those *Alaṅkāras* proper.
4. As regards the conception of *Rasavat* and allied *Alaṅkāras* in the post-dhvani period it may be observed that the writers have given illustrations of the seven *Alaṅkāras* of this group. Following the trend concretised in Mammaṭa later writers regard them as certain varieties of *Aparāṅgavyaṅgya* and treat them separately in their *Alaṅkāra* chapters. Some writers like Hemacandra illustrate them, like Mammaṭa, in their *Gunībhūtayaṅgya* sections.