Rasavat and allied Alāṅkāras wherein Rasa, Bhāva etc., are included, were first formulated and explained by Bhāmaha. Earlier to him the concept of Rasa, Bhāva, etc., had already crystalised in the Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata. A Rasasūtra was formulated by Bharata as:

"Vibhāvānubhāvavyabhisāmyogādṛasanasātrapatiḥ"\(^{39}\)

Bharata explains the concept of Sthāyibhāvas and Saṅcāribhāvas and presents details of Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas. The three accessories of Rasa, viz., Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhisāmyogādṛasanasātrapatiḥ are mentioned in the Rasasūtra as giving rise to the experience of Rasa. He speaks of eight Rasas, viz., Śrṅgāra, Hāsyā, Karuṇa, Vīra, Raudra, Bhayānaka, Bībhatā and Adbhuta pertaining to the dramas.\(^{40}\) He has emphasized the importance of the delineation of Rasa in dramas by saying that Guṇās, Alāṅkāras Laksāṇas etc., should be employed with reference to Rasas in a drama.

It is with this background that Bharata and other Alāṅkārikas of the pre-dhvanī period speak of Rasa, Bhāva,
etc., making them suitable to fit in their scheme of poetic theories. Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin advocate the importance of Alāṅkāra in poetry, although the latter has contributed to the Mārga or Rīti theory. In their scheme of poetic theory Rasa, Bhāva, etc., have become certain Alāṅkāras like Rasavat, Preyas, Urjasvin, etc. Vāmana who propounds Rīti-Guṇa theory has included the concept of Rasa, etc., in the Artha-guṇa called Kānti-

"Dīptarasatvāṁ kāntiḥ ī\"41

Later, Udbhaṭa has contributed very interesting points regarding Rasavat and allied Alāṅkāras and has also spoken of Śāntarasa for the first time. Rudraṭa the last important writer belonging to this period has spoken about Rasas in detail, with Preyān as the tenth Rasa. However Rudraṭa has not separately dealt with Rasavat and allied Alāṅkāras. A study of Rasavat and allied Alāṅkāras according to these writers is made in the present chapter commencing with Bhāmaha.
RASAVAT AND ALLIED ALANKĀRAS ACCORDING TO BHĀMAHA

Right from the time of Bhāmaha's Kāvyālaṅkāra, the Rasavat and allied Alāṅkāras have been recognised and explained. It is seen in the treatment of these Alāṅkāras that Bhāmaha has introduced all the ideas of Rasa, Bhāva, Rasābhāsa, Bhavabhāsa, etc., within the purview of the four Alāṅkāras, Rasavat, Preyas, Urjasvin and Samāhita. Inspite of the fact that Bharata showed his inclination to establish Rasa as the central element of drama he did not make it explicit whether Rasa could be equally important in other literary types like Mahākāvyya, Kathā, Akhyāyikā, etc. It cannot, however be said that Bharata was not in favour of giving importance to Rasa in poetry in general. For the first time it is found in Bhāmaha's Kāvyālaṅkāra that Rasa, Bhāva, etc., must be delineated in Mahākāvyya, Kathā, Akhyāyikā, etc. Yet he does not accord a place which was due to Rasa, Bhāva etc., in poetry. In his theory of Alāṅkāra he laid emphasis on Alāṅkāras as the prime source and substance of charm. In his conception of Alāṅkāras we find a communion of the ideas of what embellishes (Alāṅkāra) and what is embellished (Alāṅkārya) both the source and substance of charm. It is in this light that we should consider the treatment of Rasavat and allied
Alaṅkāras by Bhāmaha as a pioneering attempt which has inspired and influenced later writers until the time of Ānandavardhana who gave a new orientation to the concept of Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras.

1. Rasavadalaṅkāra:

The Rasavadalaṅkāra is one of a small group of Alaṅkāras, generally recognised by the older writers of Sanskrit Poetics. Some of these Alaṅkāras are differently explained, but they all relate to emotional states.

The Rasavadalaṅkāra is a delightful figure of speech. Judging by the way in which it is introduced by Bhāmaha, the reputed early Alaṅkārika, it is clear that it had gained recognition long before him. He says that Rasavat, Preyas, Īrjasvin and others were mentioned as figures of speech by the wise:

"Preyo rasavad ūrjasvi paryāyoktaṁ samāhitaṁ ī
Bhāvikatvaṁ ca njaguralaṅkāram sumedhasaṁ Ṛ"42

However, the credit for attempting a succinct definition of Rasavadalaṅkāra goes to Bhāmaha. He defines it as 'that figure where the erotic and other sentiments are clearly manifest.'
‘Rasavaddarśitaspaṣṭaśṛṅgārārādīrasaṁ yathā’

He illustrates it with the following example:

‘Devi samāgamat dharmamaskariṇyatirohitā’

“The goddess (Parvati) met the ascetic (Śiva in disguise who revealed his real form), with her complexion becoming externally red.”

Here, through the word ‘atirohitā’ given as a ‘viśeṣaṇa’ of devi there is a clear presentation of the ‘Anubhāva’ which further suggests a ‘Vyabhicāribhāva’ in the form of bashfulness manifesting Šṛṅgārarasa. This amounts to Rasavadalaṅkāra according to Bhāmaha.

It is felt that the example given by Bhāmaha is extremely vague and meaningless. It is also noted that Udbhāta’s commentary – ‘Bhāmahavivarana’ is not extent on the concerned passage. And some scholars have attempted the interpretation of this illustration of Rasavat given by Bhāmaha. For instance, S.Ramachandra Rao has translated it as “The queen openly met the mendicant”. Obviously the word ‘atirohitā’ has been taken in the sense of ‘a tirohitā’ i.e., ‘not covered’. And the term ‘dharma-maskarin’ means the mendicant. Naganatha Shastry has
translated the passage as “The Devī receptacle of dharma arrived unobstructed”. Here, ‘dharmamaskariniyatirohitā’ has been split as ‘dharmamaskarini atirohitā (na tirohitā)’.\textsuperscript{47} Devendranath Sharma refers to the view of Śrīśaila Tātācārya’s Sanskrit Vṛttī of Bhāmaha’s Kāvyālaṅkāra wherein ‘dharmamaskarini’ is taken as locative singular of ‘dharmamaskarin’ and interpreted as referring to Śiva in disguise. There is a suggestion that ‘atirohitā’ should be read as ‘atirohite’ meaning thereby ‘prakāṭite sati’. The whole statement would mean, according to Tātācārya, that the devī(Parvati) had the meeting with Śiva when he revealed his real form casting off the disguise.\textsuperscript{48} Devendranath Sharma himself translates the statement into Hindi in a different way. It amounts to saying “The female ascetic who revealed herself came in the form of devī.\textsuperscript{49}

In the light of the above observations it appears that the interpretation of the example does not bring out any point congenial to the spirit of the definition of Rasavadalaṅkāra by Bhāmaha. But the interpretation given above by me sets aside all doubts about the example. The context that is suggested by Tātācārya is quite sound although his interpretation of the line is not acceptable. (For further details see f.n.45)
S. Ramachandra Rao observes: "Upon a careful analysis of the definition, it becomes clear that the figure is constituted of three elements: first, sentiments are to be depicted; second, there should be clarity in presentation; and third, there must be the element of delight. It is obvious further that Bhamaha has in mind the depiction of any of the sentiments and not of any particular one.\(^50\)

One can see that Bhamaha assigns a definite place for Rasavadalanka. He uses this figure to show that even sentiments can become Alankaras and that they have a special place in the Alankara scheme. He is very emphatic also in pointing out that there is always an underlying principle of all Alankaras called Vakrokti or charming way of poetic communication.\(^51\) It naturally follows that he takes the figure Rasavat in consonance with his idea of Vakrokti as its underlying principle.

2. Preyo'lankara:

Bhamaha has not given any definition of Preyo'lankara, but he only illustrates it with a stanza. He might have thought that the word 'Preyas' itself is self explanatory and it further hints the intended nature of the figure. The expressions intended to please the hearers are
termed Cātu (Sweet flattery) in Sanskrit. He gives the following verse as its example:

'Adya yā mama govinda jāta tvayi ɡ̣r̥hāgate ।

Kalenaiṣa bhavetprītīstavaivāgamanāt punah ॥ ॥52

Vidura addressed Lord Kṛṣṇa who had come to his house: "O Govinda, the happiness that I now enjoy by your arrival to my house, may I have it again in future by another visit of yours."

Here Vidura's devotion and love for Lord Kṛṣṇa is revealed in his words that the joy he experienced from Lord Kṛṣṇa's visit was unique. Jagannātha Pañḍita in his 'Rasagangādhara' (N.S.P.edn P.276) criticises and declares that Sadṛṣya-pratīti is the dominating factor here, than the Ananvaya.

Although Bhāmaha has not given a regular definition of Preyo'laṅkāra it is clear from the example that by Preyas he means agreeable and pleasing speech charged with a feeling of devotion or affection. This example given by Bhāmaha gives a clue to later writers to give a suitable definition of that Alaṅkāra.
The above illustration can be compared with the description found in Udyogaparvan of the Mahābhārata. The verse 'Adya yā mama' is not exactly found in the Mahābhārata. Belvalkar in his notes to Kāvyādārśa (Sanskrit, Part II, Page-29) says on the authority of Premacandra (the commentator) that a verse similar to this is found in the Udyogaparvan of the Mahābhārata. He quotes it as follows:

'Yā prītiḥ puṇḍarīkākṣa tavāgamanakāraṇāt !
Sā kimākhyāyate tubhyamantarātmāsi dehinām II'

However, in P.C.Roy’s edition of the Mahābhārata, Udyogaparvan, chapter 88, verse 24, the following is the reading of the verse:

'Yā me prītiḥ puṣkarākṣa tvadvarṇana samudbhvā !
Sā kimākhyāyate ' etc.

The same is repeated as the last verse of chapter 91 (Page 27) of the same edition.

3. Urjasvin Alankāra :

As regards this figure also, Bhāmaha has not given a regular definition. He has given an illustration of it as given below:
Urjasvin is like this - "The Sarpastra which came back for using it against Arjuna again was discarded by Karṇa saying ‘Salya, would Karṇa discharge arrow twice?’"

It is clear from this instance that Karṇa was not in favour of using the arrow for the second time. It manifests the deep rooted pride on the part of Karṇa as regards his prowess. From this it appears that according to Bhāmaha this figure is related only with the expression of pride and egoism. Or it consists in proud and spirited words. The conception of this Alaṅkāra gets a definite shape in the hands of Udbhata. And Kuntaka has given an analysis of the example of Urjasvin given by Bhāmaha, although he does not accept Bhāmaha’s conception of this Alaṅkāra. This will be discussed in a subsequent chapter. (Ch.IV)

4. Samāhita Alaṅkāra :

Bhāmaha does not define this figure but only illustrates it as follows:
The figure Samāhita is thus (illustrated in the work) Rājamitra. \(^5\) Nārada appeared before the Kṣatriya damsels who went along to associate themselves with Paraśurāma. This illustration of Samāhita is drawn from the work called 'Rājamitra'. It describes how Nārada appeared before the Kṣatriya damsels when they were going towards Paraśurāma to appease him.

It is to be noted here that Paraśurāma had taken an oath that he would destroy the entire clan of Kṣatriyas. In this context the Kṣatriya-damsels were going towards him with the intention of appeasing him. The Kṣatriya-damsels were full of misgivings about the success of their errand. They were worried as to how they could appease Paraśurāma. It was at this moment the appearance of Nārada before them was a pleasant surprise. They expected that Nārada would advise them the proper way of appeasing Paraśurāma. Thus Samāhita according to Bhāmaha consists in the arising of a favourable atmosphere when one is not in sight of any solution to the problem.

It is clear from this that Bhāmaha's conception of Samāhita does not involve Rasa, Bhāva, etc. It is only from
the time of Udbhata that this Alankara comes into the fold of those Alankaras which have the subservience of Rasa, Bhava, etc.

However, Mukunda Madhava Sharma conjectures that the example of Samahita given by Bhamaha consists of Bhavaprasama. "In the example, which only refers to the situation where we may have a case of Samahita, we get the word 'prasakti', meaning pacification; and this may refer to the prasama of some 'Bhava'. He further observes:

"It may be opined that Bhamaha here actually desires a Bhavaprasama, on the strength of the assumption that Udbhata says explicitly only what is implicit in Bhamaha; for, Bhamaha's influence over Udbhata in respect of this group of Alankaras is very clear from a comparison of the definitions of Rasavat given by both of them."56

This figure Samahita as illustrated by Bhamaha is regarded by later Alankarikas by the name 'Samadhi'. The same is true with regard to the conception of Samahita in Danchin's Kavyadarsha. He defines the figure as:

"Kiícidārabhamāñasya kāryāṃ daivavaśāt punah !
Tatsādhanasampattirā tadāhuḥ samāhitam II"57
It is illustrated by the following verse:

"Mānamasyā nirākartum pādayorṇe patiśyataḥ I
Upakārāya distyaitadudīrṇaṁ ghangarjitam II"58

The definition and the example given above show that Daṇḍin like Bhāmaha does not include any idea of Rasa, Bhāva, etc., in the conception of Samāhita. Hence, until the time of Udbhāta this Alaṅkāra does not come into the fold of Rasavat group of Alaṅkāras.

(B)

Daṇḍin's Exposition of Rasavat and Allied Alaṅkāras

Leaving out Samāhita from the fold of Rasavat group Daṇḍin has accepted all the other three Alaṅkāras, viz., Rasavat, Preyas and Īrjasvin. He brings out the excellence of this group of Alaṅkāras:

"Preyāḥ priyatārākhyānaṁ rasavadrasapeśalam I
Īrjasvi rūdhāhaṅkāraṁ yuktotkarśaṁ ca tatraṁ II"59
The Rasavat which is relishable with sentiment, the Preyas which consists in agreeable and pleasant speech and the Urjasivn which depicts egoism are all characterised by excellence. An account of each of these Alankāras is given here.

1. Rasavadalankara :

The figure consists in exalted expression made charming by the sentiments which are the ripened forms of Sthāyibhāvas in union with other elements such as Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicāribhāvas.

The definition of Rasavadalaṅkāra in the words of Daṇḍin is very simple, direct and compressed. The inadequacies found in the definition of Rasavadalaṅkāra given by Bhāmaha are removed by Daṇḍin. He defines Rasavat as "that which is delectable because of the presence of sentiment"

'Rasavadrasapesalām'²⁶⁰

Daṇḍin's definition focuses the attention of the reader on the essential element in the figure Rasavat, namely, the pronounced presence of a sentiment.
Dandin has illustrated Rasavadalankara with eight instances. Following Bharata, Dandin has accepted eight Rasas, namely, Srngara, Raudra, Vira, Karuna, Bihatsa, Hasya, Adbhuta and Bhayana. Accordingly he has illustrated this Alankara with stanzas manifesting these eight Rasas.

(i) The first illustration manifests Srngararasa:

"Mretiti pretya sahgantum yayā me maranāṁ matam I
Saisā tanvī mayā labdha katham atraiva janmani II"

A jubilant Vatsaraja (Udayana) exclaims after seeing his beloved Vasavadatta: "Thinking her to be dead, I decided to end my life and rejoin her; but how is it the same beauty is before me even in this birth!"

Here, the heroine Vasavadatta is the Alambana-vibhava; the situation which presents the heroine as alive is the Uddipana-vibhava. This statement itself is the Anubhava. Autsukya, Vismaya, etc., which are suggested here are the Vyabhicaribhavas. With the combination of
these, the Sthāyin 'Rati' comes to the experience of the Sahṛdayas. This is Sṛṅgāraraṇa.

Realising that a word of explanation is necessary for Rasavat, Dāndin says that in the stanza the latent emotion (Sthāyibhāva) of love (Rati) by reason of the intensity of manifestation, has developed into the erotic sentiment. (Sṛṅgāra):

"Prāk prītirdarśita seyam ratiḥ sṛṅgārataṁ gataḥ !
Rūpabṛhulyayogena tadidam rasavadvacah \(^{64}\)

In this stanza the term 'Rūpabṛhulyayogena' is very significant. In the Preyas 'Rati' with regard to the gods, etc., is manifested. Whereas in the Rasavat 'Rati' related to 'Rūpa', i.e., Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicāribhāvas is developed into the erotic sentiment (Sṛṅgāra). Thus the word 'Rūpabṛhulyayogena' distinguishes Rasavat from Preyas.\(^{65}\)

(ii) The second example of Rasavat brings out the manifestation of Raudrarasa. It is thus:

"Nīgrhya keśevōkṛṣṭa kṛṣṇā yenāgrato mama !
Soyam duḥśāsanah pāpo labdah kiṁ jivati kṣaṇam \(^{66}\)
"He who had in my very presence, dragged Draupadī by the hair, that same sinner-Duḥśāsana has been secured by me. Can he live now for another moment?"

"Here Bhīma's wrath mounting to the highest point as he sights the enemy, is developed into the Raudrarasa, is accordingly is an instance of Rasavadalaṅkāra.⁶⁷

Here, the enemy is the Alambanavibhāva; the dragging of Draupadī by the hair is the Uddīpanavibhāva; Garva (pride), etc., which are suggested here are the Vyabhicāribhāvas. The Sthāyibhāva Krodha is developed by the above elements and it manifests as Raudrarasa.

(iii) The next example illustrates the manifestation of Vīrarasa:

"Ajītvā sārṇavāmurvīmanistvā vividhairmakhaiḥ 1

Adatvā cārthamarthibhyo bhaveyam pārthivah katham u"⁴⁷

"Before I conquer the earth together with oceans, before I perform various sacrifices and before I give away wealth to the seekers how can I become a king?"

"Here, the king's firmness or fortitude assuming a pre-eminent form, becomes the sentiment called Vīra and s
accordingly able to establish the Rasavat nature of these expression."^6^9

Here, the enemies to be conquered in the battle, the religious merit in performance of sacrifices, the seekers in giving gifts are the Ālaṁbanavibhāvas. The sight of the enemies, etc., are Uddīpanavibhāvas. This speech itself is the Anubhāva. The quest for the help, etc., are Vyabhicāribhāvas. These elements manifest the Viṁraṣa.

It is significant to note here that in the above example of Rasavadalaṇakāra involving Viṁraṣa, Daṇḍin has implied three varieties, namely, Yuddhabhīra, Dharmabhīra and Daṇavīra. One can also think of the inclusion of Dayāvīra in Daṇavīra itself, because compassion is the driving force of Daṇa. Thus the possibility of classifying Viṁra into four varieties is indicated here. This indication is taken up by later writers in classifying Viṁra into four kinds as Yuddhabhīra, Dharmabhīra, Dayāvīra and Daṇavīra.\(^7^0\)

(iv) The fourth example is the one which shows the manifestation of Karuṇarasa :

"Yasyāḥ kusumaśayyāpi komalāngyā rujākarī /
Sādhīṣādeva kaṭhaṁ deva hutaśanavatīṁ citāṁ ||"^7^1
"My Queen! this your delicate body is pained even on a flower-bed; how do you repose upon the burning funeral pyre?"

Here, the sorrow being roused is regarded as the sentiment of Karuṇa. This is also Rasavat according to Daṇḍin. Here, the term 'tanvi' who is dead is the Ālaṁbanavibhāva; the rememberance once of kusumaśaṇyā (flower-bed), etc., are Uddīpanavibhāvas. The above pathetic speech is the Anubhāva; 'cinta' etc., which are suggested here by 'kathā' are the Vyabhicāribhāvas. These elements bring out Karuṇarasa.

(v) The following is an example of the Rasavat involving Bibhatsa:

"Pāyaṁ pāyaṁ tavārīnāṁ śoṇitaṁ pāṇisaṁpuṭaiḥ I
Kaunapāḥ saha nṛtyanti kabandhairantrabhūṣaṇaiḥ II"12

"Having repeatedly drunk the blood of your enemies with palms held together, the ghosts decked with entrails are dancing in the company of the trunks of the dead enemies"

Here, the blood-drinking demons who are decked with entrails are the Ālaṁbanavibhāva; with drinking of blood,
the adornment with entrails, etc., are *Uddīpanavibhāvas*; this statement itself is the *Anubhāva*; *Moha*, etc., which are suggested by these words are *Vyabhicāribhāvas*. The *Sthāyibhāva Jugupsā* nurtured with the combination of these, mainfests *Bibhatsarasa*.

(vi) The following stanza is given as an illustration of *Hāsya*:

"Idamamlānaṁānāyāṁ lagnāṁ stanapate tava I

Cādyatāmuttariyena navām nakhapadaṁ sakhi II"\(^{73}\)

"O friend, let this fresh nail-mark imprinted upon your breast, be covered up by your upper garment, you beeing the one whose pride is unabated."

These are the joking words of a friend addressed to the heroine who pretended pride towards her lover in the presence of her friends, but had dalliance with him in secret. Here, the heroine who pretended pride is the *Ālaṁbanavibhāva*; the nail-marks on her breasts are the *Uddīpanavibhāva*; the statement of the friend itself is the *Anubhāva*; *Cāpalya*, etc., suggested by these words are the *Vyabhicāribhāvas*. The *Sthāyibhāva Hāsa* is fully manifested as *Hāsyarasa* by the combination of the above accessories of *Rasa*. 
(vii) *Adbhutarasa* is illustrated by the following stanza:

"Aṃśukāṇī pravālāṇi puṣpaṃ hārādibhūṣaṇam ।
Śākhāsca mandirāanyakām citraṁ nandanaśākhīnām ॥" ⁷⁴

"Strange are the trees of the Nandana garden— their very sprouts serve as garments, their flowers as wreaths and other ornaments, and their branches as mansions!"

Here, the trees of the heavenly Nandana garden are the Ālambanavibhāva; the sprouts serving as garments, etc. are the Uddīpanavibhāva; exclamations like 'Citram!', etc., are the Anubhāva; 'Sambharama' 'Harṣa', etc., are the Vyabhicāribhāvas suggested here. The Sthāyibhāva Vismaya is developed by the combination of the above accessories, into the Adbhutarasa.

(viii) The last and the eighth one is the Bhayānakarasa, which is illustrated by the following stanza:

"Idam maghonah kulīṣam dhārāsannihitānalam ।
Smarāṇam yasya daityastrīgarbhāpatyā kalpate ॥" ⁷⁵
"This is Indra’s thunder bolt with fire residing in its blade, the very memory of which causes-abortion of demonesses."

Here, the thunder bolt of Indra is the Ālāmbanavibhāva; the fire residing in its blade is the Uddīpana vibhāva; the statement about the abortion of demonesses is the Anubhāva; shivering, etc., suggested by these words are the Vyabhicāribhāvas. With the combination of these the Sthāyibhāva Bhaya is fully developed into the Bhayānakarasa.

Thus having explained the Rasavadalaṅkāra with the examples of eight Rasa, Daṇḍin says:

"Vācyasyagrāmyatāyonirmādurye darśito rasaḥ 1
Iha tvastarasāyattā rasavattā smṛtā girām II"76

According to Daṇḍin, the charm of poetry exhibited in the quality called sweetness (Mādurya)77 springs from the non-vulgarity of the expressed sense. Here, in the context of Rasavadalaṅkāra the instilling of the speech by the eight sentiments is regarded as the essence of the figure.
The above account of the manifestation of eight sentiments makes it clear that Daṇḍin has considered *Rasa* as the content of *Rasavadalaṅkāra*. Although he has included all about *Rasas* in *Rasavadalaṅkāra*, he has shown his awareness of the importance of *Rasa* in a poetic composition as a whole. This is clear from what he says in connection with the *Mahākāvya*. It is said that the *Mahākāvya* should be *Rasabhāvanirantara*.78

Daṇḍin fully expounds the most striking characteristics of each of the eight *Rasas* of Bharata and gives excellent verses in illustration. The very propriety of these verses exhibits clearly his keen perception of that element in poetry, i.e., *Rasa* which appeals most to the heart or which moves and entrances the reader.

The examples given by Daṇḍin reveal the fact that he considers what is later recognised as *Rasa* itself as *Rasavadalaṅkāra*. The rhetoricians of post-dhvani period may consider the examples given here for *Rasavadalaṅkāra*, probably excepting the example of *Bībhatṣa*, as the instances of *Rasa-dhvani*. According to them these are not the examples for *Ālaṅkāra*. This will be discussed under the conception of *Rasavadalaṅkāra* according to Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka. The example of *Bībhatṣarasa* is one in which
the Rasa is subscivient to Rājaviśayaka rati and hence can be considered as an instance of Rasavadalahkāra according to Ānandavardhana.

2. Preyo'laṅkāra :

Dandaṅin defines Preyas as the expression of sweet and exalted compliments born of devotion and causing pleasure (prīti).

"Preyah priyataraṅkhyānam"9

It approximates to the idea of the Bhāva of the Rasa-dhvanivādins which consists in the suggestion of Devādiviśayaka Rati.80 The pleasurable sensation may be felt either both by the addresser and the addressee or by the former only. For example :

"Adya yā mama govinda jātā tvayi gṛhāgate /
Kālenaṅgā bhavitprītiśtavaivāgamanāt punah H"81

"The pleasure, O Govinda, that has been mine today by your coming to my house, let the same pleasure be mine again in time by your arrival again."

This is the speech of Vidura. None else could be expected to have such self confidence. Hari, who is ever to
be propitiated by devotion alone, became well pleased at it. The pleasurable sensation of both the addressee (Vaktā) and the addressee (Boddhavya) is felt here. The example illustrates the prīti of Vidura for Śrīkṛṣṇa and also of Śrīkṛṣṇa for Vidura. These words of Vidura for Śrīkṛṣṇa are justified because he would have not received such solace from any one else. That is why Śrīkṛṣṇa who is adored through devotion was very much pleased. Same is the example of Preyas given by Bhāmaha. Thus Daṇḍin has presented only a modified version of Bhāmaha’s Preyas.

The verse seems to be an adaption of the last verse in the 92nd Adhyāya of the Udyogaparvan. It is difficult to ascertain whether the adaptation was the work of Bhāmaha where it occurs as an example or of Daṇḍin or of unknown predecessor of both.

In this context Daṇḍin has put forth another example for Preyas where the pleasurable sensation is felt by the speaker only —

"Somaḥ sūryo marudbhūmirvyoma hotānalo jalam I
Iti rūpāṇyatikramya tvām drastum deva ke vayam II"

"What power have we, O Lord, to see you with our eyes; you who remain transcending the forms of
manifestation like Soma, Sūrya, Marut, Bhūmi, Vyoma, Hotṛ, Agni and Jala."

This exhibition of pleasure on the part of king Rājavarman, after he had visualized the god, is what can be regarded as the Preyas. The example illustrates the prīti on the part of the speaker alone.

Daṇḍin distinguishes prīti from rati, though he implies some proximity between the two. Taruṇavācaspati the commentator, defines prīti as affection with reference to gods, preceptors and elders. Prīti thus comprehends all aspects of non-sexual love. Daṇḍin's example refers only to one aspect, viz., devotion to gods. This leads Dr. V. Raghavan to think that Daṇḍin's Preyas is equivalent to 'bhakti' which is synonymous with 'prīti'. It is obvious from the example given by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin that the feeling of adoration of Vidura for Lord Kṛṣṇa, which may also be called devotion, is the subject of Preyo'laṅkāra. The second example given by Daṇḍin all the more supports the view that devotion is the subject of this Alaṅkāra.

But Daṇḍin's definition certainly does not set the limit. Hence it is not fair to restrict the scope of his Preyas on the basis of his example which are, of course, of limited range. It may be noted here that Rudrata mentions
Sneha (by which he means 'love of friendship') as the dominant emotion of Preyas which he stamps as Rasa.\(^8^5\)

Prīti is the dominant emotion of Preyas and Daṇḍin would have it, while Rati (love) is the Sthāyibhāva of the erotic sentiment. Daṇḍin treats Preyas independent of Rasavat, perhaps because the latter in tradition did not comprehend the former within its scope.

Daṇḍin's conception of this figure is comparable to Bharata's lakṣana,'priyavacanas.'\(^8^6\) In later theory it was conceived as subordinate form of Bhāva,'\(^8^7\) just as the figure Rasavat was considered to be the secondary of Rasa. Thus from the narrow signification of prīti in early theorists, the figure received a wider conception of emotions in general, including those Sthāvins as well as the Vyabhicārins in later writers. Inspiration for the change, seems to have come from the exposition of the figures, Preyas, Rasavat and Urjasvin in Udbhata.\(^8^8\) Bhoja, on the other hand, invents on the model of the figure, a Guna of the name and relates it to flattery (cātuki)\(^8^5\) in which sense Preyas lived long in later Rhetorics. Besides, the figure develops into new Rasa in Rudraṭa,\(^9^0\) perhaps on the suggestion of Daṇḍin's correlating it with the sentiment of love.
3. Urjasvin Alankāra:

Urjasvin is the exalted expression of pride or vigour. It is what displays egoism. Daṇḍin defines it as:

'Urjasvi rūdhānakāram' \(^9\)

The example given by Daṇḍin for Urjasvin is:

"Apakartā'hamasmiti hṛdi te mā sma bhūdbhayam !
Vimukheṣu na me khaḍgaḥ prahartum jātu vāṅcati II" \(^9\)

"Yes, I am your enemy; but you don't entertain on that ground any fear in your heart; my sword never at all wishes to strike those that have shown their back in the battle field."

With these words a certain warrior full of pride allowed an enemy hemmed in battle-field to depart. Here, the pride of the warrior is manifested. This and such other instances are to be regarded as the Urjasvin Alankāra.

The same is the conception if Urjasvin given by Bhāmaha. In Udbhāta, however we notice a change. He relates the figure with sentiments and feelings arising from impropriety; \(^93\) and consequently in later theory the subordinate aspect of Rasābhāsas and Bhāvabhāsas was
regarded as the sphere of this figure. Bhoja takes its unexalted form as the Aurjitya guna, while he develops a new Rasa named Uddhata on the suggestion of Dan\'dins definition of this figure.

4. Sam\'hit\'ala\'nk\'ara :

It is already observed at the end of Bh\'amaha's section that Sam\'hita does not come into the fold of Rasavat group before the time of Udbhata. Dan\'dins definition of this Ala\'nk\'ara is already quoted there. Now his definition and example of Sam\'hita are explained.

Sam\'hita is the coincidence of an act with another and accomplishment of the act is shown by chance. Dan\'din defines it as:

"Ki\'ncid\'rabham\'nasya k\'aryam daivava\'s\'at punah \nTats\'\'adhana\'sam\'appattiry\'\' tad\'\'ahu\'\' sam\'hita\'\m\'am \"\n
"When an act already undertaken by an agent is being done by chance through attainment of another cause capable of accomplishing it, then the figure is called Sam\'hita.\"
The figure is instanced in the following verse:

"Mānamsāyāḥ mirākartum pādayorme patiśyataḥ!
Upakārāya diṣṭaitadudīrṇam ghanagarjām u"

"While with a view to pacifying her angry-pride I was about to prostrate myself at her feet, fortunately there arose, to favour me, this roaring of the clouds."

A lover was about to fall at the feet of his beloved full of pride, in order to pacify her anger. Just then the thunder arose. This frightened the lady who apparently gave up her anger and threw herself into her lover’s arms. Thus the roaring of clouds, which arrived accidentally, helped the lover and made his task easy. Hence, the stanza is an example of Samāhita.

Here, the effect, i.e., ‘quelling of anger’, which is being produced by the cause, i.e., ‘falling at her feet’, is easily accomplished by the sudden operation of another cause, i.e., ‘the roaring of the clouds.’

In Sanskrit erotic poetry ‘Māna’ has a special meaning, which is thus explained:

‘Strīṇamīrṣyākṛtah kopo māno’nīṣaṅgini priye!’
Vamana, due to his peculiar view point, puts forth quite a new exposition of this figure. He defines it as conversion, by mistake, of the object of comparision into the original thereof. Udbhata on the other hand, totally discarding the earlier conception, links it up with the allaying of sentiments and emotions, and his theory wins general acceptance in the later writers. To accommodate Daṇḍin's conception of this figure, a separate figure named 'Samādhi' was introduced in later theory. It is almost the same as 'Samādhi' of later Alāṅkārikas.

It is thus clear that Daṇḍin clarifies the opinion of Bhāmaha on Rasavadalaṅkāra and other Alāṅkāras of its group and amplifies all his statements. Nor does he forget to mention the relationship of Rasavat and the synthetic concept of Vakrokti which he has accepted like Bhāmaha. For Daṇḍin, all literature stood divided into two varieties: Svabhāvokti and Vakrokti. It is but natural, therefore, that he too brings the Rasavat and other figures under the category called Vikrokti.
RASAVAT AND ALLIED ALAṆKĀRAS IN UDBHAṬA

Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras get some additional points in Udbhaṭ's 'Kāvyālaṅkāraraśaṅgraha'. Though the advocates of primacy of alaṅkāras in poetry have recognised the importance of Rasa, yet they have not treated it independently and have included it in the Alaṅkāra. Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhaṭa designated Rasa as Rasavadalaṅkāra, Bhāva as Preyo'laṅkāra. Udbhaṭa has termed Rasābhāsa and Bhāvabhāsa as Urjasvin Alaṅkāra and Bhavaśānti as Samāhitālaṅkāra. Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin too have dealt with Urjasvin and Samāhita alaṅkāras, but they have established their relation with Rasa in a far-fetched manner. While dealing with this subject Daṇḍin was inspired by Bhāmaha, and Udbhaṭa by both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. Yet the definition given by Udbhaṭa present the subject in a very clear and vivid manner.

1. Rasavadalaṅkāra:

Udbhaṭa states that in Rasavat there must be a clear portrayal of any of the nine sentiments and that these sentiments must be made manifest by the specification of the sentiments (Rasas) by actually naming
them and their *Sthāyibhāvas* (*Svāsabda*), depiction of *Saṅcāribhāvas*, *Vibhāvas* and *Abhinaya* (*Anubhāvas*).

"Rasavad *darśitaspaṭaṇṇgārādi rasodayam I
Svāsabdāsthayisaṅcārivibhāvābhīnayāspadam II\(^1\)"

To illustrate this figure he has given the following three verses:

"Iti bhāvayatāstasyā samastān pārvatīgūṇān I
Sambhṛtānalpasanākalpaḥ kandarpah prabhala'bhavat II\(^2\)
Svidyatā'pi sa gātrena babhāra pulakotkarm I
Kadamkakalikākośakesarapракaropamam II
Kṣaṇamauṣtukyagarbhiṇyā cintāniścalayā kṣaṇam I
Kṣaṇam pramodalasayā dṛśā'syā'syāmabhūṣyata II\(^3\)"

"The effect of Cupid along with all its emotions became strong in him (Lord Śiva) who thought of all the virtues of Pārvatī. His perspiring body bore the horripulation which was like the pollen in the shell of the *Kadaṁba* flower. His face became adorned with his eyes which for a moment became full of curiosity. Steady due to anxiety for a moment and languid with joy for another moment."
Pratihārendurāja, the commentator, pointing out the svāsabdokti of all the five elements, viz., Vibhāva, etc., has observed that in the above verses the Sthāyibhāva 'Rati' (love), the Sañcāribhāvas Autsukya, Cintā and Promoda, and the Anubhāvas Sveda and Pulaka, along with the two Vibhāvas, viz., Pārvati and her spouse Lord Śiva, have been stated by Svāsabda. And thus the definition of Rasavadalaṅkāra as presented by Udbhāta is fully applicable to the above verse.

From these statements of Udbhāta and Pratihārendurāja it may be construed that in the time of Udbhāta the Svāsabdokti of Vibhāva, etc., had been probably accepted in the examples of Rasavadalaṅkāra.

Thus Udbhāta, adopting the phraseology of Bhāmaha, has also pointed to the five constituents of Rasa. Out of these five, Sthāyin, Sañcārin and Vibhāva are recognised by the Rasa school; Abhinaya is synonymous with the four types of acting as accepted by Bharata. The fifth factor is 'Svāsabda'. According to the commentary of Pratihārendurāja it means Svāsabdavācyatā (the communicability by their own term) of the 'Sañcāribhāvas' like curiosity, Sthāyibhāvas like love and Rasas like Śṛṅgāra, etc., Udbhāta himself in his illustration of Rasavadalaṅkārahahas employed words 'Kandarpa' (rati).
indicating Sthāyībhāva; Austsukya, Cintā as well as Pramoda (hilarity) indicating Sañcāribhāva.

What is noteworthy here is that Udbhaṭa mentions nine sentiments as against the eight counted by his predecessor, Dainḍin, the ninth being Sānta for the first time. It is also curious that he insists upon naming the Rasa, their Sthāyībhāvas and their accessiores, Vibhāvas, etc., an idea hotly contested and rejected by later rhetoricians. It is again to be observed that Udbhaṭa refers to two things by the term Rasavat, viz., (1) the figure where the sentiments occur in the manner specified, and (2) a composition (Kāvaya) in general where sentiments are portrayed. He considers in such a composition, the presence of sentiment as an Alāṅkāra. Udbhaṭa goes out of the way to point out that in the figure Rasavat the sentiments portrayed should be in conformity with what is said in the authoritative texts, in consonance with what happens in the world and in keeping with propriety.

It was Udbhaṭa, who while presenting the definition of Rasavadānapāra for the first time in the history of Indian Poetries, used the word ‘Svasabdā’ meaning thereby that the Rasas, Śṛṅgāra, etc., the Sthāyībhāvas, Sañcāribhāvas, Vibhāvas and
Abhinaya (Anubhāva) in all their varieties are to be stated by their own names. Udbhāta's opinion is that all the Bhāvas are expressed by their own technical terms i.e. they are Svāsbda-vācyā. So the word 'Rati' expressed in a stanza, describes the Sthāyibhāva Rati.

After Udbhāta, Ānandavardhana, Mammaṭa, Viśvanātha and others have referred to the above topic (Svāsbdavācyatā) as a Rasadoṣa. In them the conception of Rasavat gets totally changed. This will be made clear in the next chapters.

2. Preyo'laṅkāra:

The definition of Preyo'laṅkāra given by Udbhāta is as follows:

'Ratyādikānāṁ bhāvānāṁ anubhāvādi sūcanaṁ! 
Yatkāvyaṁ bdhyate sadbhistat preyasvat udāhṛtam

"That poem which has the portrayal of the Bhāvas such as 'Rati' through the Anubhāvas, etc., is called the Preyasvat." The Bhāvas are of three kinds as Sthāyibhāvas, Vyabhicāribhāvas and Sātvikabhāvas. The Sthāyibhāvas are nine, viz., Rati and others. Nirveda and others are the thirty-three Vyabhicāribhāvas. Stambha and others are the
eight सत्विकाभवास. Thus the delineation of the abovvee fifty भवास through the अनुभवास of four kinds as अंगिका, वृक्का, सात्विका and अहर्या constitutes the अलाहक्षा called प्रेयास according to उद्भाता. As regards the सथयिभवास it may be noted that they become रसास when delineated fully through the presentation of विभवास and others. When they are not fully developed but indicated by अनुभवास, they are called भवास only. As regards रति in particular it may be noted that it remains a भवा only when it refers to gods, preceptors, kings and the like. But when it refers to the beloved it can be रसावत itself according उद्भाता.

This point is made clear by the विवर्त्तिकार (Rājānaka Tilaka) when he says:

'Raṭirīha devagurunśpādi viṣayaḥ gṛahyate /
Kāntāviṣayāyaḥ stuteḥ sūcane rasavadalaṅkāra vakṣyate /'

It may be noted here that भामहा and दांडिन considered the feeling of adoration or devotion as the subject of the प्रेyo'लाङ्का, as evident from the examples given by them. उद्भाता, on the other hand, connected this with the सथयिभवास, etc., portrayed through अनुभवास, etc. भामहा and दांडिन had in their mind the conception of प्रेyo as pleasing expression charged with devotion. The
underlying element is *Priti* in this *Alaṅkāra*. Udbhata extended the scope of this *Alaṅkāra* to cover all the *Bhāva*s. In the example of this *Alaṅkāra* he has described the love of an affectionate mother for her child.

‘Iyam ca sutavātsalyat nirviśeṣā spṛhāvatī /

Ullāpayitumārabdhā kṛtvemāṁ krodā atmanāḥ ॥ १०९

“This mother (Pārvatī) feeling extremely emotional on account of affection for the young one of a deer, began to chant rhymes, taking it on her lap.”

Here, ‘Rati’ of the form of *Vātsalya* is manifested. The young one of a deer is the *Ālambanavibhāva*. *Vātsalya* is heightened by the contact of ‘*Autsukya*’ as the *Saṃcāribhāva*. The action of taking the young one on the lap is the *Āṅgikānubhāva* and the chanting of rhymes, etc., are the *Vācikanubhāvas*. These manifest the *Vātsalya* of Pārvatī towards the young one of a deer.

From the example of Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhata we can know that *Preyas* is related to affection towards children besides adoration and devotion towards gods and elders. Such being the case, in the examples given by Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhata, we can trace the source of the *Snehabhāva* which has been mentioned by Rudraṭa and Bhoja.
in their discussion on the Rasa called Preyaṇ. It may be observed here that Bhāmaha and others placed Rati pertaining to a beloved under Rasavadalaṅkāra and the other emotions such as affection, devotion and adoration, under Preyas. As is clear from Udbhāṭa's definition of Preyas all other Bhāvas can be included in this Alaṅkāra.

3. Urjasvin Alāṅkāra:

In Rasavat we are concerned with Rasa; in Preyas with Sthāvyabhāvas, Vyabhicāribhāvas and Sāttvikabhāvas. Now in Urjasvin we have to deal with Rasābhāsa and Bhāvabhāsa according to Udbhāṭa. Abhāsa means 'Anaucityena pravṛttiḥ' here. Any sentiment or feeling that is developed without propriety is called Rasābhāsa or Bhāvabhāsa. The delineation of such a Rasābhāsa or Bhāvabhāsa constitutes the basis of the figure Urjasvin.

It may be observed here that from the illustrations of Urjasvin given by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, it appears that this Alāṅkāra is related only with the expression of pride and egoism, but not with any impropriety related to Rasa or Bhāva. The definition by Daṇḍin as Urjasvi rudhāhaṅkaram does not indicate either Rasābhāsa or Bhāvabhāsa, but Udbhāṭa has made the nature of
Urjasvin as involving Rasābhāsa or Bhāvabhāsa, both in his definition and illustration.

Udbhata defines this Alāhkāra to be a description in which the passions have transgressed the proper bounds and have become improper. Such improper Bhāvas and Rasas when delineated bring about the Alāhkāra called Urjasvin:

"Anaucityapraṇṛttanāṁ kāmakrodhādikāraṇāt ī
Bhāvanāṁ ca rasānāṁ ca bandha īrjasvi kathya ī ī110

The following is an example of Urjasvin:

"Tathā kamośya vaṇīdh e yathā hima-gīreh sutām ī
Saṅgrahītum pravṛtṛte haṭhenā'pāsyasatpatham ī ī111

"The tempo of Śiva's lust rose so high that he, disregarding all the canons of good conduct, rushed to take hold of Pārvati by force".

The passion of Hara was heightened to such a degree that he abandoned the righteous path and began to act improperly. This constitutes Rasābhāsa forming the content of Urjasvin.

Udbhata's conception of Rasābhāsa and Bhāvabhāsa is similar to that presented by the Dhvanivādins. The
only difference is that Udbhata regards Rasābhāsa and Bhāvabhāsa, whether predominant or subordinate, as Īrjasvin Alaṅkāra, while they regard them as Rasādidhvani when predominant and regard them, when subordinate, as Alaṅkāra. From this it appears that during Udbhata’s time the form of this Alaṅkāra had undergone a change from the form it had in the times of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin.112

4. Samāhitālaṅkāra :

The definition of Samāhitālaṅkāra given by Udbhata is as follows:

"Rasabhavatadābhāsavṛtteḥ prāsamabandhanam I

Anyānubhāvaniḥśunyarūpaṁ yattatsamāhitam II"113

"The allayment of the Rasa, Bhāva, Rasābhāsa and Bhāvabhāsa without the comprehension of Anubhāvas of any other Rasa, Bhāva, Rasābhāsa and Bhāvabhāsa, constitutes the Samāhitālaṅkāra."

The allayment of Rasa, Bhāva, etc., is the quiescence of the same Rasa, Bhāva, etc. When such an allayment of Rasa, Bhāva, etc., is portrayed, and no other Rasa, Bhāva, Rasābhāsa or Bhāvabhāsa is sought to be
introduced with the abatement of the previous one then it gives rise to the figure *Samāhita*.

To illustrate this figure Udbhata has given the following two verses:

"Atha kāntām draśām dṛṣṭvā vibhramācca bhramāṁ bhruvoḥ /
Prasannaṁ mukharāgam ca romāṇcasvedasāṅkulum II

Smarajvarapradīptāni sarvaṅgāni samādhadhat /
Upāsarpat girisutām girīśaḥ svastipūrvakam II"\(^{114}\)

Here, the abatement of Hara's desire is described. He allayed all the marks of previous passion on his body and then approached Parvati. The appeasing of passion indicated by the covering up of the indications (Anubhāvas) of passion in all the limbs of the Lord, constitutes *Samāhita*.

"Samādadhanni jē rupevastāpayan................."
Atra bhagavatā sṛṅgārasya ye'nuḥbāvāḥ kāntādrśtyādayāḥ
teṣāmavahitthena ṛkārapraccādanātmakena bhāvena
tirodhānām vihitam / Yaduktāṁ svastipūrvakamiti /\(^{115}\)

The main difference here too between Udbhata and
the Dhvanivādins is the same which has been referred to above in the description of Urjasvin and Preyas Alṅkāras.

Samāhita means Samādhi, i.e. cessation of an emotion. The difference between these two words is only in their suffixes. That is why the Samāhitālaṅkāra as explained by Bhāmahe and Daṇḍin has given a clue to the Alṅkāra called Samādhi as presented by Mammaṭa. Udbhata's view on Samāhita is not in consonance with that of Bhāmahe and Daṇḍin. He has grafted the idea of Rasādiśānti in the formulation of this Alṅkāra. The idea of predominance or otherwise of Rasādiśānti does not make its appearance in Udbhata. Even that concept which will be later called as Bhāvaśāntidhvani of Dhvanivādins is also a case of Samāhitālaṅkāra according to Udbhata.

The Problem of Udāttālaṅkāra:

A variety of Udāttālaṅkāra is brought into discussion vis-a-vis Rasavadalaṅkāra. This is done by Pratihārendurāja while commenting on the second variety of Udātta presented by Udbhata. According to Udbhata the first variety of Udātta represents "Vṛddhimadvastu" and the second variety "Mahatmanāṁ caritam" rendered subordinate to the main content of the poem:
"Udāttamṛddhimadvastu caritam ca mahātmanāṁ I
Upalakṣaṇatāṁ prāptaṁ netivṛttatvamāgaṁataṁ II"\(^{118}\)

The following is an example given by Udbhata for the second variety of Udāttālāṅkāra:

"Tasyādikrodapīnaṁsaṁigharṣepī punaḥ punaḥ I
Niśkampasya sthitavato himādrer bhavati sutā II"\(^{119}\)

Here, the prowess of Viṣṇu as Ādīvarāha is described. Although the Varāha repeatedly butts against the Himavān the latter successfully resists it. This description has the portrayal of Viśarasa in it. But the Rasa is not predominant in the stanza. It is only subordinate to the purpose of indicating the sublime constancy and steadfastness of Himavān.

As regards this second variety introduced by "Caritam ca mahātmanāṁ", and its example, Pratihārendurāja anticipates an objection that Rasavadalaṅkāra peeps into this variety of Udāttā on the ground that Sṛngāra and other Rasas would be involved in describing the great deeds of the magnanimous persons. He answers this objection by saying that there is no occasion for Rasavadalaṅkāra here because the great actions of the magnanimous persons are
rendered subordinate to the main content of the poem. Here the deeds of the great is not the main import because it is rendered subordinate to another content. It is only in such occasions where Rasas are known as the main import that there is the culmination of the stanza (Vākya) in Rasa experience. Then alone the Sthāyībhāva being nourished comes to be relished as Rasa. This is the province of Rasavadalaṃkāra according to Udbhāta. Therefore there is no transgression of Rasavadalaṃkāra into the province of the second variety of Udātta.\textsuperscript{120}

According to Udbhāta, only Rasavadalaṃkāra shows the full development of Rasa which is prominent in a stanza, while other Alāṅkāras deal with Bhāva.

Prof. M.Hiriyanna in his article, 'The Problem of the Rasavadalaṃkāra' says:

"It should be added that this fact that a Rasa may subserve another suggested element of poetry was not a new discovery of Ānandavardhana or by any other later thinker. For, Udbhāta (if not, some other early writer also) admits what he calls Udattālaṃkāra, one of whose two varieties is based upon a recognition of that very fact. The Rasa element is present in it; and yet it is distinguished by him from the Rasavadalaṃkāra, because that element is not of first importance there."\textsuperscript{121}
Commenting on the statement of Prof. Hiriyanna, Dr. Hemalata B. Deshpande observes:

"Ānandavardhana has not simply borrowed Uدبhaṭa's Udattālaṅkāra and changed its name into Rasavadalaṅkāra, but has added something of his own in his new scheme of Rasavadalaṅkāra."\(^{122}\)

Thus it is Uدبhaṭa who thinks of a possibility of the existence of Rasas in a subordinate manner in the content of Udattālaṅkāra. The existence of the Rasas like Vīra, Adbhuta, and others within the scope of Udattā, is clear from the example of Uدبhaṭa quoted above.

Hence, it may be noted that in the conception of the second variety of Udattā, Uدبhaṭa has indicated the subordination of Rasa to the main content of a stanza. Ānandavardhana has possibly taken this clue and formulated the concept of Rasavadalaṅkāra as a case of subordinating Rasa, Bhāva, and the like to the Vākyārtha. The concept of Rasavadalaṅkāra as formulated by Uدبhaṭa and his predecessors is a case of predominant Rasa, which is Rasadhvani according to Ānandavardhana.
RASAVAT ETC. ARE NOT ALAṆKĀRAS ACCORDING TO VĀMANA AND RUDRAṬA

Vāmana does not define the figure Rasavat as an Alahkāra. He includes the element of Rasa under the quality of sense, called Kānti. This is clear from the definition of the Arthāguna Kānti:

"Dīptarasaṭvatam kāntih /"

"Dīptā rasāḥ srīṅgārādayo yasya sa dīptarasaṭha / Tasya bhāvaḥ dīptarasaṭvatam kāntih /"123

He illustrates it with reference to the most important of the Rasas, viz., Srīṅgāra, by a verse from the Amaruśataka:

"Preyān sāyamapākṛtaḥ saśapatham pādānataḥ kāntayā
Dvitrāṇyeva paḍāni vāsabhavanāt yāvanna yāntyunmanaḥ /
Tāvat pratyata pāṇisampuṭalasannivitamām dhṛto
Dāvitvaiva kṛtapraṇāmakamaho premṇo vicitrā gatiḥ ||123"

He asks the reader to select instances of Kānti where other Rasas illumine poetry:
Vāmana’s Arthaguṇa Kānti corresponds to figures like Rasavat of the Alāṅkāra system. For this reason Vāmana does not define the Rasavat as a figure. Vāmana’s view is that Aupamya is the underlying element of all poetic figures. This has deterred him from defining Rasavat, as a poetic figure. He attempts to include Rasa in one of the essential (Nitya) characteristics of poetry, viz., in the Arthaguṇa Kānti, which happens to be one of the aspects of Riti, the soul of poetry. Hence, it is clear that this certainly marks an advance upon the treatment of Rasas by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin who consider Rasa as Rasavadalaṅkāra.

**Samāhita**:

Vāmana gives Samāhita altogether a new shape. He defines it as:

"Yatsaḍrśyam tatsaṭampattih samāhitam !"126

Samāhita consists in obtaining that object the resemblance of which is found in something else.
He illustrates it by the verse:

"Tanvi meghajalārdra valkalatayā dhautādharevāśrubhīḥ
Sunyevābharaṇāiḥ svakālavirahādviśrānta puspodgamaḥ
Cintāmohamivāsthita madhulihāṁ sabdairvinā lakṣyate
Caṇḍī māmavadhūya pādapatitam jātānutāpeva sā h||127"

“That slender one, and the tender leaves wetted by the clouds her lower lip washed by her tears; not decked with blossom, as it is past its time of flowering; it is she with her ornaments cast aside; since the bees are not humming to it, she has been silent in anxious thoughts. So it is that irascible one, who having spurned me now seems to be stung with remorse.”

Vāmana remarks—

‘Atra purūravaso latāyāmurvaśyāḥ sādṛṣyam gṝhataḥ
saiva latorvaśī sampanneti !’

In the illustration given above the resemblance of Urvasī is witnessed by Pururavas in a creeper. The same creeper where he finds the resemblance of his beloved Urvaśī transforms into Urvaśī herself.

Obviously this conception of Samāhita differs from that of Udbhāṭa who includes the idea of Rasādīśāntī
in it. Nor does it correspond to the idea of Samāhita as defined by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. According to Vāmana, Samāhita Alāṅkāra is meant to be the obtainment of the desired thing out of a similar thing and not the indication of good omens, as explained by Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin. Vāmana defines only the Alāṅkāras based on similarity or Aupamya. This may be the reason why he defined only the Samāhita Alāṅkāra and not the other Alāṅkāras in the group of Rasavadādi Alāṅkāras. The Samāhita of Vāmana is based on Sādṛṣṭya which turns a similar thing into the very object desired by a person.

Rudraṭa occupies a position different from his earlier rhetoricians. On the one hand, he is influencenced by the Alāṅkāra school, and on the other, he bears the impress of Rasa school. He has not given any place to the Rasavat and allied Alāṅkāras in his work. Recognising the importance of Rasa in poetry he has discussed it in four chapters (XII-XV) of his work, 'Kāvyālāṅkāra'.

Like Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, Rudraṭa too has accepted Rasa as an essential element in poetry. He has for the first time pointed towards the use of Ritis like Vaidarbhī, and others and Vṛttis like Madhurā, Lalitā, and others in accordance with particular Rasa. He has dealt with the classification of heroes and heroines under
Sṛṅgārarasa, and has also clearly declared the supremacy of the Sṛṅgārarasa. He has drawn a definite line of demarcation between Kāvya and Śāstra on the basis of Rasa. He has also stressed on the proper use of the Rasa. He observes that the use of Rasa other than befitting the context or extreme use of even an appropriate Rasa constitutes a flaw called Virasatā.

Rudrata recognised nine Rasas and has added a tenth, the Preyān to the list. The Preyān Rasa of Rudrata is probably suggested by the poetic figure Preyas admitted by Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhata. His definition of Preyān corresponds partially to that of 'Bhāvadhvani' developed later, wherein Sneha (a kind of Rājādiviśayaka rati) is included.

It is to be noted that Rudrata has defined and illustrated a figure called Bhāva. Two examples of Bhāva given by Rudrata are quoted in the Kāvyaprakāśa, and in the Locana. Abhinavagupta distinctly refers to Rudrata's Bhāvālaṅkāra as a case in which the vyaṅgya sense is subordinate. But this Alaṅkāra has nothing to do with Rasa, Bhāva, etc.

Rudrata's Bhāvālaṅkāra is novel and noteworthy. He gives two types of Bhāvālaṅkāra; one of them includes
Ānandavardhana’s Gunibhūtavyāṅgya kāvyā and another his Vastudhvani. The ‘Bhāva’ of a speaker is suggested in this Alñkāra. Here the word ‘Bhāva’ appears to mean Abhiprāya, the speaker’s hidden intention and is not the same as Bhāva which results in Rasa.

It is interesting to note that Ruyyaka, in his review of Rudraṭa’s opinion on Bhāvaḷaṅkāra, states that Rudraṭa admits the three kinds of suggestion mentioned by the Dhvani theorists. He says that Rudraṭa implies Vastu-dhvani in the figure Bhāva; Alañkāra-dhvani in Rūpaka, etc.; Rasa-dhvani in Rasavat and Preyas. But it is rightly pointed out by S.K. De that “Excepting what is stated with regard to Vastu-dhvani being traceable in Rudraṭa’s ‘Bhāva’, the remark does not apply. Rudraṭa does not mention, define or otherwise deal with the figure Rasavat, Preyas, etc.”137