CHAPTER - III

RASĀDYALAṄKĀRAS ACCORDING TO ĀNANDAVARDHANA AND ABHINAVAGUPTA

It is seen in the previous chapter how Bhāmaha, Dandin and Udbhata regard the instances of Rasa, Bhāva, etc., as Rasavat and allied Alāṅkāras even when they are predominant, viewed from the angle of the Dhvanivādins. It is Ānandavardhana who establishes Dhvani as the soul (Ātman) of poetry and accommodates the concepts of Alāṅkāra, Guṇa, etc., within the perview of Rasādidhavani. In this context he examines and reshapes the concept of Rasādyalaṅkāra by clearly distinguishing it from Rasādidhavani. His contribution is further elucidated and elaborated by Abhinavagupta in his Locana. In the present chapter the contributions of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta to the concept of Rasādyalaṅkāra are studied. To begin with the contribution of Ānandavardhana is highlighted as it is the basis for Abhinavagupta's elucidations.

(A)

ĀNANDAVARDHANA ON RASĀDYALAṄKĀRAS

The task of correctly and clearly defining Rasavat and allied Alāṅkāras is ably carried out by Ānandavardhana, the propounder of Dhvani theory in Indian Poetics. In his
Dhvanyāloka a work dealing with the theory of Dhvani in poetry, he gives a new turn to the concept of Rasādyalaṅkāra by distinguishing it from Rasādidhvani.

He says: “If the main purport of a poem is something else, and if Rasa, etc., are secondary to it, then these Rasa, etc., become only figures.”

“Pradhāne’nyatra vākyārte yatrāṅgāṁ tu rasādayaḥ / Kāvye tasmin alaṅkāro rasādiriti me matiḥ” 138

This definition has three elements: firstly, there is reference to a main purport in a poem (Aṅgin); secondly, there is the suggestion of sentiments, etc., thirdly, the sentiments, etc., are said to be secondary (Aṅga). In such cases, where Rasa, etc., are auxiliary to the Vākyārtha, Ānandavardhana declares that they become figures like Rasavat, Preyas, Urjasvin, etc:

“Yadyapi rasavadalaṅkārasyaṁyairdarśito viṣayastathāpi tasmin kāvye pradhānatayaṁ anyo artho vākyārthībhūtastasya ca aṅgabhūtā ye rasādayaste rasāderalṅkārasya viṣyā iti māmakīnaḥ pakṣaḥ” 139

“Although others have explained the scope of Figurative Sentiment (in quite a different way), still it is
It is the view of Ānandavardhana that only such sentiments, etc., as become auxiliaries to the main purport of the sentence, are to be regarded as figures. For instance, one can easily see how in hymns of praise, sentiments, etc., appear as auxiliaries though they are generally regarded as instances of the figure called Preyas:

"Tadyathā cātuṣu preyālaṅkārasya vākyārthatve'pi rasādayo'āṅgabhūtā dṛṣṭyante i"\textsuperscript{140}

Though both Rasa and Alaṅkāra were very familiar concepts long before Ānandavardhana, there had been no scientific or systematic distinction drawn between them. Thus Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin could regard Rasas in poetry as forming an Alaṅkāra, viz., Rasavat. Contrariwise, Daṇḍin could assert that Alaṅkāras called forth Rasa in poetic content.\textsuperscript{141} Ānandavardhana thinks that this reveals only absence of precise thinking about the soul of poetry. In his own deeper analysis which penetrates into Dhvani, both Rasa and Alaṅkāra acquire precise connotations. They become names of two clearly distinct levels of beauty in poetry.
Rasavat as Śuddha and Saṅkīrṇa:

Having given the definition of Rasavat, Ānandavardhana divides the figure into two kinds: The pure (Śuddha) and the mixed (Saṅkīrṇa). He gives the following examples to illustrate the first variety where the wives of a vanquished king see their husbands in a dream and at the end lament thus:

"Kīm hāsyena na me prayāsyasi punah prāptaścirāddarśanaṁ
Keyāṁ niśkarunā pravāsarucitā kenāsi dūrikṛtaṁ !
Svapnāteṣviti te vadan priyatamavāsaktakaṅṭhagraho
Buddhvā roditi riktabāhuvalyayastārāṁ ripustrījanaṁ II\(^{142}\)"

"Of what use is it to joke with me? You have returned after a long time and you will not leave me again; cruel one, why is this desire for travel? - In this way, the wives of your enemy speak in dreams clasping the necks of their beloved husbands, but on becoming awake they see their bare arms and loudly lament."

The stanza is intended to be in praise of a kind of extraordinary valour. So Cātu or sweet flattery is the main subject-matter here. There is also a 'pure' delineation of the pathetic sentiment in the lament of the ladies. The
latter is not of primary importance and is there only to nourish the main purport. Hence, it is a case of Rasavadalāṅkāra of the 'pure' variety. Here, in the pure variety the subsidiary sentiment of pathos is not associated either with another sentiment or figure.

\[ \text{Suddha iti-rasāntareṇāṅgabhūtena alaṅkārāntareṇa na mīśraḥ} \]

Dr. K. Krishnamoorthy observes here -

"In this verse (‘kimāḥāsyena....’ ect.,) a lady in her dream encounters her smiling husband. 'Since I know how cunning you are, I shall keep you chained in my arms; you shall not go,' says she. 'Ruthless,' etc., refer to his faults for which he is lovingly rebuked. Her innocence is implied. As all this is the result of a dream, it disappears as soon as the lady wakes up. In this verse the lament of the widowed queens of the enemy, who meet their beloved only in a dream, is pathetic no doubt. But the pathos is made subordinate to the valour of the king which is eulogised. Hence, Karuṇārasa is said to be an Alaṅkāra here." 

\[ \text{"Ityatra karuṇārasasya sūddhasya aṅgabhāvī} \]

\[ \text{sphuṭameva rasavadalāṅkāratvam} \]
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To illustrate the second variety of Rasavat, Anandavardhana cites the example where the fire of the arrow of Śiva is depicted as playing the role of a lover:

"Kṣipto hastāvalagnah prasabhamabhihato'-
pyādadāno'mśukāntaṁ

Gṛhṇan keśeṣvapāṣaścaraṇanipatito
nekṣitaḥ saṁabhrameṇa Ṭ
Āliṅganyo'vadhūtaśtripurayuvatibhiḥ
sāśrunetropalābhiḥ

Kāmivardrāparādhaḥ sa dahatu duritaṁ
śāmbhavo vaḥ śaṛāgniḥ Ṭ"¹⁴⁶

"May the fire of Śiva's arrow burn our sins, an arrow which behaved like a lover whose guilt is just discovered; though shaken off by the tearful wives of Tripura, it clung to their hands; though beaten back, it seized the hems of their garments; though forcibly pushed aside from their braids, it fell at their feet and though pushed back, it embraced them."

In this stanza, the main import is the valour of God Śiva. There is also the delineation of Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra arising out of jealousy in the behaviour of the ladies of Tripura. Here, the sentiment is mixed with the
figure Śleṣa for the words used refer both to the fire and to the lover.¹⁴⁷ The Rasa mixed with Śleṣa is subordinate to the praise of Śivas’s valour which forms the main subject of description. Hence, it is an instance of Saṅkīrṇa Rasavada-laṅkāra.

It is to be noted that the Karuṇarasa is also portrayed in the picture of the women shedding copious tears. In the circumstances, it would be regarded a flaw on the part of the poet to describe contradictory sentiments such as Śṛṅgāra and Karuṇa simultaneously.¹⁴⁸ But since both of them here are only subordinate to the main subject of the praise of Śivas valour, the flaw is avoided. Whenever Rasa happens to be the chief content of a poem, it can never be an Alaṅkāra. For, Alaṅkāra means a ‘beautifier’. And how can Rasa (which is the soul) become a beautifier of itself? It can be called an Alaṅkāra only when it acts as a beautifier of something else as in the above example. When Rasa itself happens to be predominant, it is Dhani-kāvya, and the figure of speech like Upamā will serve to beautify it.

"Yatra hi rasasya vākyaṛthībhāvah tatra kathamalaṅkāratrvam? Alaṅkāro hi cārutvahetuḥ prasiddhaḥ; na tvasau ātmaiva ātmanāḥ cārutvahetuḥ!"¹⁴⁹
"But in instances where sentiment itself happens to be main purport how can it ever be a figure? It is well known that a figure is (nothing but) an enhancer of charm. It is indeed impossible that a thing can become an enhancer of its own charm."

**CETANA AND ACETANA OBJECTS IN THE CONTEXT OF RASAVAT**

Apart from defining correctly and illustrating clearly the figure Rasavat, Ānandavardhana gets the credit for refuting the view that the content of Rasavat should always be the behaviour of sentient objects (centana) and that the insentient (acetana) have no place in it. He argues that if this view is accepted, then the figure of speech like simile go without any scope, for the simple reason that all of them deal with insentient objects:

"Yadi tu cetanānāṁ vākyārthībhāvo rasādyālaṁkārasya viṣaya ityucyate tarhi upamādīnāṁ pravīralaviṣyatā nirviṣayatā abhihitā syāt "¹⁵⁰

"If one were to assert that the treatment of sentient subjects alone serves to exemplify Figurative Sentiment, it would mean that figure like the simile would either be left with very little scope or no scope at all."
To the question as to what should be done in the case of an instance of Rasavat dealing with the behaviour of insentient objects, his answer is that in such cases, the behaviour of the sentients should be superimposed on the insentients.

"Yasmād acetanavastuvṛtte vākyārthībhūte punah cetanavastuvṛttāntayojanayā yathākathāṅcid bhavitavyam"

"For even when the theme happens to be the behaviour of an insentiment object, the behaviour of a sentient object also will in one way or another be superimposed upon it."

Ānandavardhana cites here two verses from Act IV of the Vikramorvaśīyām, which will make the point clear. The first describing the river in terms of Urvaśī supposed to have turned into that form:

"The rippling wave is her arching brow; the fluttering line of birds her griddle; drawing along its foam, which is as it were her garments loosened through anger, it flows meanderingly, avoiding the many obstacles in the way, like my beloved who stumbles along as she remembers my faults; so surely that irascible one has been transformed into this river."
And the second describing the creeper in similar terms:

"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."¹⁵³

In these examples, the poet ascribes the features and movements of Urvaśī to insentient objects like the river and the creeper and appeals to the readers due to their emotional flavour.

Here, in the words of Narayana Pillai:

"In both these instances Kālidasa describes inanimate objects. By his poetic genius they have been rendered into objects, the description of which affords every scope for the play of emotion. The poet's mind is full of emotion and he projects his mind on these inanimate objects with the result that he finds live feelings and human behaviour in them. That is why the Sanskrit rhetoricians say that in case the poet's mind is charged with emotion, all the objects he describes
would get suffused with sentiment and in case the poet is void of emotion, his objects too will fail to rouse any emotion."  

A third illustration is also given describing the withering of creeper-bowers on the bank of the Yamuna, which were once the witnesses of the love of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā and other Gopis.  

In instances like these, although insentient objects figure as the primary subject in the expressions, there is the association of the activity of sentient beings. If, then, it is contended that where there is the association of sentient beings, there is Rasavadalaṅkāra, simile and other figures would be left without any scope or with only very little scope. For, there is, really speaking, no such theme of non-sentient objects, where, ultimately, there is no linking with the theme of sentient beings, with the former serving as the Vibhāva of the latter. Therefore according to Ānandavardhana’s theory, Rasas become Alaṅkāra where they are employed as a subordinate element (Aṅga); and the Rasa, Bhāva, etc., which are predominant (Aṅgin) are Alaṅkārya constitute Rasādīdhvani, the soul of poetry, as distinguished from Rasādyalaṅkāra.
S. Ramachandra Rao has rightly observed:

"Thus in discussing the figure Rasavat Ānandavardhana has made two important contributions. One is to have evolved in connection with the Rasavat, the principle of Āṅgāṅgībhāva or the main and subsidiary relationship by which he excludes the sphere of Rasavat from that of Dhvani or suggestion. Where sentiments and moods are the main import, he classifies such instances under suggestion and where they play a secondary role, they are classified as figures of speech. The other is to have shown that the scope of Rasavadalaṅkāra is unristricted and that it can have both sentient and insentient as its content."  

(B)

ABHINAVAGUPTA'S COMMENT ON RASĀDYALĀṅKĀRA

Firstly Abhinayagupta has elucidated the example of Rasavadalaṅkāra given by Ānandavardhana in its Śuddha as well as Saṅkīrṇa forms. Thus commenting on the verse "Kim hāsyena" etc., given as an example of Śuddha Rasavadalaṅkāra, he says that the Sthāyībhāva Śoka when roused by the disappearing of the dream turns out to be Karuṇārasa when it comes to be experienced. Since it becomes auxiliary to the celebration of the royal mightiness, it is only a figure,
viz, Rasavadalaṅkāra. Its poetic charm is unquestionable, specially when compared with a prosaic statement like "your foes were killed by you." The charm of the verse owes itself to the pathos. Things like 'face' may get embellished by 'moon', etc. In other words, similies, etc., become instrumental in bringing out the beauty of natural things. In the same way, a Vastu or a Rasa when aided by another Rasa becomes beautiful. Hence, there is no discrepancy in a Rasa becoming an Alaṅkāra any more than a Vastu becoming one. The question as to what beauty does a Rasa add to a natural sense, may be met with a counter-querry as to what beauty does a simile bring in. If the answer is that 'a simile compares', then the parallel reply is "Rasa sweetens the natural sense." There is no room then for a specious objection like 'what does Rasa embellish among the Vibhāvas, etc.' It is settled definitely that Prastuta artha (the valour of the king) itself is the Alaṅkārya; not Vibhāvas etc.

Thus Abhinavagupta has explained the exact way in which the subordinate element of sentiment in Rasavat brings about the charm in a stanza. Taking the example given for illustrating the 'pure' variety of Rasavadalaṅkāra, namely, 'kiṁ hāsyena' etc., he points out that the sentiment of pathos contributes to the charm of the main purport which is the valour of the victorious monarch. This idea is made
beautiful by the delineation of the pathetic sentiment. In the explanation of Abhinavagupta, the word 'sundari bhūtah', occurs. This is formed out of the termination 'cvi' which brings out the idea that the sense that was not beautiful before, is made beautiful now.

"Na hi tvayā hatā iti yādṛganaśāṅkṛtōyām vākyārthaḥ 
 tādṛgayaṁ, api tu sundarībhūtah Ātra arthasaundaryām ca 
 karuṇarasakṛtaṁ eva āṁ" 158

He is thus of the opinion that the main import of the poem is rendered charming by the sentiment of pathos.

Next as regards the example of Saṅkīrṇa Rasavadalaṅkāra, viz, "Kṣipto hastāvalagnaḥ", etc., Abhinavagupta shows how it is not an example of the Śuddha variety. He says that Rasa which is auxiliary here is supported by a figure of speech. Hence, it is not pure. As regards the Doṣa (describing contradictory sentiments such as Srūgāra and Karuṇa simultaneously) anticipated by Ānandavardhana, he says that although the verse contains pathos, the text does not speak of it in preference to Vipralaṁbha; because pathos does not bring beauty in the context. Only jealousy going with Vipralaṁbha adds charm as an Alaṅkara. But it is an auxiliary; not the purport of the sentence. Had it been the purport, even a shadow of Karuṇa...
which is a sentiment hostile to Sṛṅgāra could not have been brought in. Vipralāmbha being a form of Sṛṅgāra has hope or expectation of reunion for its basis; whereas Karuṇa a form of grief (Śoka) is founded on hopelessness. Hence, the two are incompatible. But that incompatibility is not to be considered because both are subordinate to the main purport.

**DEFENCE OF RĀSAVADALANKĀRA**

Abhinavagupta, in the defence of Rasavat, asks 'what, pray, is the contradiction involved in saying that a sentiment too can become a decorative like any other matter (Vastu)?'

'Ṛṣasyāpi vastunā ivālaṅkāratve ko virodhaḥ ī'

The figure Rasavat occurs wherever the sentiments embellish the words and senses of the principal import of a stanza.

'Ṛsaṇāpi vastu vā rasāntaram vā upaskṛtaṃ sundaram bhāti ī'

He argues that whatever role figures like simile, etc., play in beautifying a composition, a similar role is played by the Rasavadalankaṇa. And he clinches the argument.
by saying that it is the experience of a Sahrdaya that the sentiments in a Rasavat beautify other sentiments in a stanza and that the name Rasavadaľāṅkāra given to it is most appropriate:

'Rasenāpi tarhi sarasīkriyate so’rtha iti svasaṁvedyam etat /' 161

ON PREYAS AND OTHER ALĀṆKĀRAS

Ānandavardhana gives examples only of Rasavadaľāṅkāra but Abhinavagupta, in his Locana, gives examples of Bhāvālaṅkāra, Bhāvābhāsālaṅkāra, etc.

Abhinavagupta, while commenting on the statement of Ānandavardhana, viz.,

'Tadyathā cātuṣu preyo’laṅkārasya vākyārthathvæpi rasādayo’ñgabhūtaḥ dṛśyanste /'

says that in the opinion of Bhāmaha pleasing statements (cātuṣu) constitutes Preyo’laṅkāra and that when Preyas is the main purport of the sentence Rasa, etc., can be subordinate to it according to Ānandavardhana. In such instances where Pṛiti towards the preceptor, god, king, etc., there is Preyo’laṅkāra according to Bhāmaha. In that case Preyas has to be regarded as Alaṅkārya in the instances of Rasavadaľāṅkāra such as “Kim hāsyena na me prayāsyasi”, etc.
Having referred to the view of Bhāma, Abhinavagupta comments that it is not proper to consider an Alāṅkāra as the main purport of the sentence. Otherwise the Alāṅkāra can be taken as the main purport of the sentence in the sense that it is predominant as the source of poetic charm:

"Bhāmahābhiprayena cātuṣu preyo’laṅkārasya vākyārthōtvepi rasādayo’ṅgabhūtā dṛṣṭyante itidamekāṃ vākyam / Bhāmahena hi gurudevanātiputra viṣayaprītivānānam preyo’laṅkāra ityuktam / Tatra preyanalaṅkāro alāṅkaraṇīya ihoktaḥ / Na tvalaṅkārasya vākyārthatvam yuktam / Yadi vā vākyārthatvām pradhānatvam / Camatkārakāriteti yāvat /" ¹⁶²

Abhinavagupta also refers to the opinion of Udbhata and others who follow him, according to whom the pleasing statements constitute Preyas when they are main purport of the sentence. In the opinion of Udbhata, Bhāvālaṅkāra itself is the Preyas. Therefore what is said about Rasavadalaṅkāra also applies to Preyas and other Alāṅkāras. Whatever that is referred to by Rasavat or Preyas represent all the Alāṅkāras of that group:

"Udbhata mātānusārīnastu bhaṅktvā vyācakṣate / cātuṣu cātuviṣaye vākyārthatve cāṭūnām vākyārthatve / preyo’laṅkārasyaapi viṣaya iti pūrveṇa sambhandhaḥ /"
With this preamble Abhinavagupta paves the way for explaining other Alāṅkāras of the group. Thus we find in his Locana the illustrations of Bhāva and other Alāṅkāras

1. Example of Bhāvālaṅkāra:

"Tava Śatapatramṛdūmāratalalāścaraṇa-
ścalakalahaṁsanūpukaladhvaninā mukharah |
Mahiṣāsurasya kirasī prasabham nihitah
kanakamahāmahidhragurutām kathamaṁba gatah ||"¹⁶⁴

"O mother, how is it that your foot which is as soft as the lotus, which is red and which is endowed with the pleasing noice of the anklets resembling the moving swans, has become as heavy as a great mountain, when it is stamped forcibly on the head of Mahiṣāsura?"

Here, the eulogy of the goddess is the main purport of the sentence. The feelings such as Vitarka, Vismaya, etc., which are suggested subserve the main purport by
contributing charm to it. This is the instance of Bhāvālaṅkāra.

2. Examples of Rasābhāsālaṅkāra:

"Samastaguṇasaṃpadāḥ samamalaṅkriyaṇām guṇai-rbhavanti yadi bhūṣaṇām tava tathāpi no sābhase।
Śivaṁ hṛdayavallabhaṁ yadi yathā yathā raṇjayeh
tadeva nanu vāṇī te bhavati sarvalokottaram॥" 165

"O Goddess of Speech, although you are endowed with all excellences and adornments, you do not look really adorned. But when you please Śiva as your beloved then alone you will excell all the worlds."

Here, in the statement, ‘Śivaṁ hṛdayavallabhaṁ yathā yathā raṇjayeh’ there is the suggestion of Śṛṅgārābhāsa with Śleṣa. This is rendered subordinate to the purpose of contributing charm to the praise of Śiva which is the main purport of the sentence. The import is that Goddess of Speech attains greatness when she is employed in the praise of Śiva.
3. Example of Bhāvabhāsālaṅkāra:

"Sa pātṛ vo yasya hatāvāsēṣa-
ṣṭattulyavaranājanaraṁjiteṣu I

Lāvanyayukeśvapi vitrasanti
daiṭyāḥ svakāntānayanotplaleṣu II”¹⁶⁶

"May he, the God, protect you. The demons who remained when others were killed by him are afraid of seeing the dark lotuses in the form of the eyes of their beloveds that are charged with collyrium resembling your complexion."

This is the praise of God Viṣṇu who is the destroyer of demons. What is suggested here is the Bhāva in the form of fear (Trāśa) which is unbecoming of the demons who are of ferocious (Raudra) temperament. This is only produced by the power of the God. Thus it is an instance of Bhāvabhāsa. This is rendered subordinate to the main purport of the stanza in the form of the praise of Viṣṇu. Hence, it is an example of Bhāvabhāsālaṅkāra.

Thus Abhinavagupta has clearly shown how Rasa, Bhāva, Rasābhāsa and Bhāvabhāsa can become subordinate to the main purport of the sentence. He further indicates that in the same manner Bhāvapraśama also can be subordinate to
the purport of the sentence. Thus he has paved the way for the later writers like Mammaṭa and others to consider them as Alaṅkāras involving the subordination of Rasa, Bhāva, etc.

It may be noted here that Bhāvālaṅkāra is the same as Preyas according to Udbhaṭa. Rasabhāsa and Bhāvabhāsa as Alaṅkāras are already found in the concept of Urjṣṭvin of Udbhaṭa. Similarly allayment (Sānti) of Rasa, etc., are already found in the concept of Samāhita of Udbhaṭa. In the conception of these Alaṅkāras, Udbhaṭa has not made any descrimination between the predominance or subordination of Rasa, Bhāva etc. Only in the case of second variety of Udāṭta he has revealed the idea of subordinating Rasa, Bhāva etc. But Abhinavagupta has given these Alaṅkāras clearly as the cases of the subordination of Rasa, Bhāva, etc. This is in consonance with the conception of Anandavardhana's Rasādyalaṅkāra. In this aspect Abhinavagupta foreshadows the treatement of Rasa, Bhāva, etc., as the Alaṅkāras by later writers.

An objection can be raised how Rasādi, which really is Alaṅkārya, can become Alaṅkāra? Alaṅkāra is the means of decoration; how then the Alaṅkārya itself be the Alaṅkāra? It cannot be decorated by itself. Anandavardhana is aware of this objection and replies that the Rasādi here are subordinate and not predominant as in Rasadhvani. When they
are subordinate and beautifying something else, which is Vākyārtha, they can be called Alaṅkāras or Cārūtvahetu on the analogy of other figures of speech like Upamā. Therefore, poetry containing Rasavadādi-alāṅkāras is classed under Guṇībhūtavyaṅga-kāvyā like other figures of speech because the suggested Vākyārtha is rendered more striking by the peculiar use of these Rasas playing a role of Alaṅkāras.

Abhinavagupta explains this point more clearly. The emotional states (Cittavṛttis) are real soul (Ātman) of poetry and hence Rasādi-dhvani is real Alaṅkārya and the Alaṅkāras, invariably associated with body, decorate if used properly, the Alaṅkārya itself.