CHAPTER-V

RASAVAT AND ALLIED ALAṆKĀRAS IN THE POST-DHVANI PERIOD.

The history of Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras with all their details, is traced up to Kuntaka in the last three chapters. In the present chapter it is proposed to deal with the same Alaṅkāras according to the writers from Bhoja to Jaganātha, who are considered to belong to 'post-dhvani' period. They generally fall in line with Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta in the treatment of Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras. Although Bhoja shows his leaning towards the earlier rhetoricians in treating Rasa, Bhāva, etc., as Alaṅkāras coming under Rasokti, Mammaṭa ardently follows Ānadhavardhana and also Abhinavagupta, in his conception of these 'Alaṅkāras.' He deals with these Alaṅkāras under one of the varieties of Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya-kāvyā called 'Aparāṅgavyaṅgya.' Ruyyka and other writers follow mainly Mammaṭa. Hemacandra, the author of 'Kāvyānuśāsana', Jayadheva, the author of 'Candrāloka,' Vidyādharā, the author of 'Ekāvalī' Vidyānātha, the author of 'Pratāparudrayaśobūṣaṇa' do not add much to what is already stated by Mammaṭa. Viśvanātha discusses these Alaṅkāras on the same line as Mammaṭa does but contributes his points in his discussion on the status of these Alaṅkāras.
Appyya Dīkṣita deals with these Alāṅkāras in his 'Kuvalayānanda'. Jagannātha Paṇḍita discusses these Alāṅkāras incidentally under the concept of Rasādīdhvani in the available portion of his 'Rasagaṅgādhara'. The contribution of some of these writers is highlighted in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

(A)

BHOJA'S INCLUSION OF RASAVAT, ETC., IN RASOKTI

Though Anandavardhana gave a new conception of Rasādyalaṅkāra and accommodated it within the framework of his Dhavni theory, there were still writers who clung to the early views expressed on it. One such writer was Bhoja, who like Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Udbhata considered all the elements of poetic expression as 'Alāṅkāra', or 'promoters of beauty.' He therefore held Rasa as forming Rasavadalaṅkāra, because he was of the view that sentiment also was a beautifying factor of expression. He called Rasavadalaṅkāra as Rasokti or poetic expression having an emotive content and distinguished it from Svabhāvokti and Vakrokti.

Indeed, the only advance which Bhoja registered about Rasavadalaṅkāra was to bring it under Rasokti instead of placing it under Vakrokti as Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin had
earlier done. Nor did he see the necessity for maintaining the three figures, Rasavat, Preyas and Urjasvin separately; he brought the last two under the first.

For Bhāmaha, the whole field of poetic expression was Vakrokti; Daṇḍin separated the Svabhāvokti and thus had the two spheres in the realm of poetic expression. To both these writers Rasa was still under Alaṅkāra and Vakrokti. Although in his overall synthesis, Bhoja kept Bhāmaha's equation of poetic expression with Alaṅkāra, yet he made the further rational trifurcation of poetic expression, into Svabhāvokti, Vakrokti and Rasokti, thus separating Rasas from the second sphere. In this scheme, naturally, all cases of Rasa would be called Rasokti. And the term Rasavat means the same thing and has no other special significance because of the suffix 'Vat'. Like Kuntaka, Bhoja too felt that the suffix should be properly explained. Strictly speaking the possessive sense or the comparative sense (that Kuntaka adopts: 'Tena tulyam', etc.) does not apply, but both of them could be by courtesy explained as applicable. But the speciality of Bhoja's explanation is that, instead of 'Matup' or 'Vat' according to 'Tena tulyam' or 'Tatra tasyeva' he takes the 'Vat' in Rasavat according to the Sūtra 'Tadarham' (V.i.117).
In Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, the word Rasavat did mean the expression or Alahkāra having Rasa. The case is similar to the names of some other Alahkāras like Sasandeha, Bhrāntimān, etc. Bhoja explains the word thus: The suffix can be a 'Matvarthīya', possessive suffix, or the comparative 'Vat' which is used according to the Sūtras 'Tena tulyāṁ kriyā ced vatih', and Tatra tasyeva. The Matvarthīya (possessive) is strictly inexplicable, because Rasas pertain to sentient beings and not to inanimate Kāvyā or poetry; but it can be explained in a way. Bhoja says that poetry can be called Rasavat, since it enamates from Rasa, i.e., it is the expression of characters who have Rasa. The case of 'Vat' in the second sense also seems to be apparently inexplicable. For, the Kāvyā is not comparable with Rasa nor is there anything in Kāvyā which is like something which Rasa has.

'Rasāḥ iva, rasasyeva vā / Na ca rasaistulyāṁ vartate /'

But even this can be explained. Bhoja says that this 'Vat' is used according to the Sūtra 'Tadarham'. That which is capable of conveying the Rasa of Rāma, etc., is Rasavat.

"Rasavato rāmāderyadvacanam, tadrasavatvāt rasavat / Rasān pratipādayituṁ yadarhati tadrasavat /

212
Bhoja calls Rasa as Rasavadalāṅkāra or Rasokti one of the three departments of poetic expression, the other two departments being Svabhāvokti and Vakrokti. He applies the name Alaṅkāra to Rasa because he follows Daṇḍin’s definition of Alaṅkāra as any element that beautifies poetry, ‘Kāvyāśobhākaradhamama’. It would thus seem that Bhoja makes Rasa also ‘Vācyāśobhākara’. But it cannot be forgotten that he makes Rasa the chief element and subordinates both Guṇa and Alaṅkāra (and in the latter Rītis, Vṛttis, etc., are included) to it as the factors contributing to its appeal. As a follower of the ancient view-point of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, Bhoja does not feel that the supremacy of Rasa is anyway affected by holding it as an Alaṅkāra.

In accordance with his allegiance to Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin (to the latter in a large measure), Bhoja considers the Rasas as Rasavadalāṅkāra or Rasokti, expression dominated by Rasa, Rasa-pradhāna. He definitely explains Rasokti as the expression or Vākya in which Rasa is portrayed through the conditions developing it namely, Vibhāva, Anubhāva and Vyabhicāribhāva:

"Vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicārisaṁyogāttu rasaniśpattau rasoktiriti"
Thus **Rasokti** is the expression in which the interplay of Vibhāvas, etc., calling forth Rasa is depicted. That is- what Ānandavardhana and his followers would call a case of Rasa, Bhoja would call it a case of Rasokti. Bhoja gives the same illustration of Daṇḍin for the eight Rasavadalāṅkāras and explains them according to Daṇḍin. These constitute the third Varga of Bhoja’s Alaṅkāra named Raskotī.

There is difference between Bhoja’s position and the position of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin; and Bhoja’s position is a distinct advance. In Bhāmaha we had the state of affairs in which, under the concept of Vakroktī the two other concepts of Svabhāvokti and Rasavadalāṅkāra were included. Daṇḍin separated Svabhāvokti from Vakroktī since it involved least deviation from the existing nature of things. He divided the realm of poetic expression into Vakroktī and Svabhāvokti. Daṇḍin still had the Rasas under Vakroktī. This was felt to be illogical, for if the delineation of Rasa can be clubbed together with another, it can with propriety be linked with Svabhāvokti and not Vakroktī. For while Svabhāvokti described the nature of things as they were, Rasokti depicted the nature of emotions as they were. Hence, Bhoja released the Rasa from the purview of Vakroktī. Bhoja therefore has given three Uktis: Svabhāvokti, Vakroktī and Rasokti.
To prove that Rasas also are Alāṅkāras Bhoja quotes the verse of Daṇḍin 'Preyah priyatarākhyaṇam' etc., He includes Preyas and Urjasvin into his Preyān and Udāttā Rasas and brings them under Rasavat. Thus he does not have the three separately.

Bhoja exploits this verse of Daṇḍin for establishing his new found Ahaṃkāra theory of Rasa having three phases. He forces a meaning upon the expression. 'Yuktotsarṣam ca tat trayam' and says that the three, Preyas, Rasavat and Urjasvin become Rasas and Alāṅkāras when they are 'Yuktotsarṣa' (heightened to the level of Rasa or superior) and when they are not 'Yuktotsarṣa', they are the Guṇas called Preyas, Bhāvikatva and Aurjitya.215

Samāhitalaṅkāra :

Following Daṇḍin Bhoja in his 'Sarasvatīkanṭhābharapa' defines and explains the figure Samāhita in six varieties:

"Kāryārāmbhe sahāyāptīrdaiṅdvādaivaṅkteha yā I

Ākasmikī buddhipūrvopbhayī vā tatsamāhitam II"216

Bhoja distinguishes between different varieties of the figure Samāhita according as the Sahāyāpti is
daivakṛtā or adaivakṛtā, and according further as each of these is ākasmikī or buddhīpurvā. He gives Dandins example of Samāhita as ākasmikī daivakṛtā sahāyāptih:

"Mānamasyāḥ nirākartum pādayorme patiśyataḥ I
Upakārāya diṣṭyedamudīraṇaṁ ghanagarjitam II"²¹⁷

He remarks -

"Atra mānanirākaraṇopakrame kālotpannasyākasmikā-ghanagarjitasya mānavidhvamse sahakāritvat ākasmikīyaṁ daivakṛtā sahāyasaṃpattih I"

Here also, in this conception of Samāhita of Bhoja, there is no connection of Rasa, Bhāva, etc.

(B)

MAMMAṬA'S TREATMENT OF RASAVAT, ETC., UNDER GUṆĪBHŪṬAVYAṄGYA

Mammaṭa and others have not placed Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras in Citrakāvya along with Upamā, etc., but included them in the Aparāṅga variety of Guṇībhūṭavyaṅgya, a variety of poetry which is superior to
Citrakāvya. Thus they have indirectly recognised them as of higher order than Upamā, etc. Mammaṭa did not regard Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras as figures but brought them under the class of poetry containing subordinated suggestion.

Following Ānandavardhana, Mammaṭa, after explaining and illustrating the varieties of the second type of Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya called ‘Aparāṅga’ observes:

'Ete ca rasavadādayo'laṅkārāḥ

In Aparāṅga the term ‘Apara’ refers to Rasādi and the principal meaning of a sentence. The term ‘Aṅga’ refers to the Rasādi and the Anuraṇana type of suggestion. Thus, ‘Aparāṅga’ is that wherein the Rasādi or Anuraṇana type of suggestion becomes subservient to Rasādi and the principal sense of a sentence:

"Aparasya rasāderavācyasya vā vākyārthībhūtasyāṅgam
rasādi anuraṇanarūpaṁ vā "

For Example :-

1. Subservience of Rasa to Rasa (Rasavat):

"Ayam sa raśanotkarṣi pīnasatnavimardanaḥ /
Nābhūyurujaghasparṣi nīvīvisraṁsaḥ karaḥ "$
"This is that hand which (at the time of copulation) pulled the girdle, pressed the well-developed breasts, touched wistfully the nave, thighs and hips and loosened the knot."

Here, the erotic (love in union) is subservient to the pathetic (Karuna). So it is Guṇibhūtavyaṅgya. This is the utterance of the wives of king Bhūriśravas on beholding his hand cut off from his body in the Mahābhārata war. Here the principal sentiment is Karuṇa to which Śṛṅgāra is subordinate. From the point of view of the Śṛṅgāraśa, which occupies a subordinate position, the verse is an instance of Rasavadalaṅkāra.

The commentators of Mammaṭa clearly bring out the views of Mammaṭa on Rasavat. They say that "in the stanza 'Ayam sa raśanotkarṣī' where the wives of the king Bhūriśravas lament, the primary import is the sentiment of pathos. Its secondary is the remembered element of the erotic. The stanza is called Rasavat because it registers an association with the main sentiment, Karuṇa, and that the termination 'matup' brings out this sense. The auxiliary sentiment of the erotic here is intended to support the main sentiment and therefore, it is like a sentiment as indicated by the termination 'vat' which indicates comparison. The chief
idea seems to be that there is not the element of 'sole absorption' (vigalitavedyāntaratva) in the subordinate sentiment to become a real sentiment. The very fact that it plays a secondary role (aṅga) deprives it of the nature of being a real sentiment. The real sentiment in the poem therefore is pathos."221

Rasavat is two-fold. In the above verse it is subservience of Rasa to Rasa illustrated. Mummaṭa gives another example where Rasa is subservient to Bhāva:

"Kailāsālayaphālalocanarucā
vivarthitālaktaka vyaktīḥ
Pādanakhadyutirgiribhuvah
sā vah sadā trāyatām I
Spardhābandhasamīddhayevā
sudṛḍhāṁ rudhā yayā netrayoh
Kāntiḥ kokanadānuṅkārasarasā
sadyaḥ samutsāryate II"222

"May that splendour of the foot-nails of Pārvatī, which has its red paint shine by the light of the eye on the fore-head of Śiva (who has fallen upon her feet in order to please her), protect you for ever! By this splendour, kindled by emulation, as it were, is speedily dispelled the luster, steadily developed and petty like the red
lotus, of the eyes (of Pārvatī whose eyes have developed redness due to extreme anger).

Here Rasa (erotic-love in union) is subservient to the Bhāva (the poet’s devotion to the goddess Pārvatī). Hence, it is also a Guṇībhūtavyāṅgya.

According to Mammata Bhakti is not a Rasa. The Sthāyibhāva ‘Rati’ itself when related to gods, etc, will be called Bhakti. In the previous example, a Rasa is subservient to another Rasa, whereas here it is subservient to a Bhāva (Sthāyibhāva).

2.Bhāva subservient to Bhāva (Preyas) :

"Atyuccāḥ paritaḥ sphuranti
girayaḥ sphārāstathābhyodayaḥ-
Stānetāṇapi vibhratī kimapi
na klāntāsi tubhyām namah 1
Āścaryena muhurmuhuḥ

stutimiti prastauṁ yāvad bhuva-
Stāvad bibhradimāṁ smṛtastava

bhūjo vācastomudṛtaḥ II"²²³

"All round there rise lofty mountains and vast oceans, you bear all these, yet you don’t feel any fatigue;
all respects to you. While, with a sense of wonder I was thus repeatedly singing the glories of earth, I was reminded of your arm, O king, which bears it (i.e. which bears the burden of earth), thereupon my mouth was sealed."

Here the Bhāva in relation to earth, namely, loving admiration is accessory to the Bhāva of loyalty for the king. Therefore it can be called Preyas.

3. A Rasābhāsa and Bhāvābhāsa subservient to Bhāva (Urjasvin):

Bandhikṛtya nṛpa dvigām

mṛgadṛṣṭastāḥ pāsyatām preyaśaṁ

Śliṣyanti praṇamanti lānti

paritaścumbanti te sainikāḥ 

Asmākaṁ sukttaidṛṣṭonipatito-

syaucityavārāmnidhe

Vidhvastā vipado'khilāstaditi

taiḥ pratyarthibhiḥ stūyate II"224

"O king, your soldiers having captured the deer-eyed wives of your enemies, embrace them, court them (kneel down to please them), carry them all round and kiss them,
under the very nose of their husbands and yet you are praised by those same enemies thus: O ocean of propriety, it is on account of good fortune that you have come before our eyes and our misfortunes have been destroyed."

Here the Rasābhāsa of the erotic type, appearing in the solidiers and the Bhāvabhāsa in the form of veneration for the king, on the part of his enemies, implied in the first half and second half of the stanza respectively, are subservient to the poet's Bhava of admiration for the king. We can trace the Urjasvin Alāṅkāra here.

4. Bhāvaśānti subservient to Bhāva (Samāhita):

"Aviralakaravālakampanair-
bhrukūṭitarjanagarjanairmuhuh 1

Dadṛṣe tava vairiṇāṁ madaḥ

sa gataḥ kvāpi tavekṣaṇe kṣanāt II”225

"The pride of your enemies which repeatedly manifested itself in the continuous brandishing of swords, in frowns, in threats and in shouts of defiance, has instantly vanished at your sight."
Here the allayment of the Bhāva in the form of pride is subservient to the poets Bhāva in the form of admiration for the king. Thus it is an example of Samāhita.

5. Bhāvodaya subservient to Bhāva (Bhāvodayālaṅkāra) :

This figure occurs when a Bhāva is described as occurring or as being in the process of evolution and not when the Bhāva is completely evolved. Here the word 'udaya' means 'the condition of being in process of evolution.' In this variety, the charm of the suggested sense consists in the rising or emergence of a Bhāva. Mammaṭa gives the following verse as its example:

"Sākaṁ kuraṅgakāḍśā madhupānalīlāṁ
kartum suḥṛdbhirapi vairiṇi te pravṛtte I
Anyābhidhāyī tava nāma vibho gṛhitāṁ
kenāpi tatra viṣamāmakarodavasthāṁ II"²²⁶

"O Lord, even when your enemy was engaged in the festivity of drinking in the company of the deer-eyed damsel and his friends, your name mentioned by some one, though in a different sense, made the situation tense."
Here, the rise of the fear is subservient to the poet’s Bhāva in the form of admiration for the king. Hence, it is a case of Bhāvodayālahāṅkāra.

6. Bhāvasandhi subservient to Bhāva (Bhāvasandhyālahāṅkāra):

Bhāvasandhi is a conjunction of two emotions. It is a figure in which two Bhāvas opposed to each other are described as competing with each other. In this variety, the charm lies in the relish of the two simultaneously co-existing Bhāvas which are equally prominent (Ekakālameva tulyakakṣayorāsvādaḥ). These two Bhāvas may be conflicting with each other, thus indicating how the heart is being tossed up in two different directions.

For example:

"Asodhā tatkalollasad asahabhāvasya tapasaḥ
Kathānāṁ visrambhēsvathā ca rasikāḥ śailaduhitūḥ
Pramodāṁ vo diśyāt kapatavātuveśāpanayane
Tvarāśaithilyābhīyāṁ yugapad abhiyuktāḥ smanaharaṁ II"\(^{22}\)

"Impatient at then enfeebling state of Parvati’s penance and also delighted at her confident intimations of love, Śiva was seized simultaneously by both haste and
languor in removing the apparel of disguised Brahmacharin. May he, the destroyer of Cupid, bestow happiness on you."

Here is the co-existence of excitement (udvega) and steadiness (dhrti) which is subservient to the poet's Bhava in the form of devotion towards Lord Siva. Hence, it is Bhavodayalaṅkāra.

7. Bhavasabalata subservient to Bhava (Bhavasabalatalaṅkāra):

Bhavasabalata is mixture of various emotions. It is a figure of speech in which many Bhavas are represented as each succeeding one taking the place of each preceding one. This variety illustrates the complex of human experience when various, i.e., more than two emotions which are equally powerful, take possession of the heart.

The example is:

"Paṣyet kaścit cala capala re kā tvarāham kumari
Hastālambaṁ vitara hahahā vyutkramaḥ kvāsi yāsi !
Itthāṁ prthvīparivṛṣṭha bhavadvīśo'raṇyavṛṭteḥ
Kanyā kaścit phalakīsalayāṁ nyādadānābhidatta H"228

"Oh, somebody might see us, move away, O impetuous one; what is the hurry? I am a maiden. Offer me the support
of your arms. Alas! Alas! this transgression of propriety!
Where are you? Where are you going, O monarch of the
earth? - thus the daughter of your forest-dwelling enemy
speaks to somebody while plucking fruits and sprouts."

Manikyacandra suggesting the context of this verse
says that these are the words of a virgin to a wanderer in
the forest who wants carnal pleasure with her (or who
wants union with her).

Here, there is the commixture of the feelings of
Apprehension or Misgiving ('Somebody might see us'), Envy
('Move away'), Recollection ('I am a virgin'), Fatigue
('Offer me the support of your arms'), Depression ('Ah, Ah'),
Determination ('What a perverted order of things') and
Longing ('Where are you going?') - which is subordinate to
the poet's admiration for the king.

Thus after explaining and illustrating the
varieties of the second type of Guṇībhūtavyāṅga called
'Aparāṅgavyāṅga', Mammaṭa observes: These are the Rasavat
and other figures:

'Ete ca rasavadādayo'laṅkārāḥ 1'229

This is said with reference to the assertion-'these
will be exemplified under subordinated suggestion."\textsuperscript{230}

These - (1) Rasa, (2) Bhāva, (3) Rasābhāsa and Bhāvabhāsa (4) Bhāvaśānti (5) Bhāvodaya (6) Bhāvasandi and (7) Bhāvaśabalatā- as subordinate to another Rasa or Bhāva or any other Vākyārtha are what are known as the figures of the speech called -

(1) Rasavat, (2) Preyas, (3) Īrjasvin, (4) Samāhita, (5) Bhāvodaya (6) Bhāvasandhi, and (7) Bhāvaśabalatā respectively.

Mammata further observes that although Bhāvodaya, Bhāvasandhi and Bhāvaśabalatā are not spoken of as figures by anybody so far, yet they are dealt with here with the anticipation that someone in future might describe them as such:

"Yadyapi bhāvodayabhāvasandhibhāvaśabalatavāni nālaṅkāratāyā uktāni tathāpi kaścit bruṣyādityevamuktam"\textsuperscript{231}

This is the hint which the later writers like Ruuyaka and others have taken up and dealt with all these as Alankaras on the lines on which Mammata explained them.
RUYYAKA ON RASAVAT AND ALLIED ALĀṆKĀRAS

Rayyaka clearly reveals the influence of the Alāṅkāra school on his treatment of poetry and its conception. This fact is quite evident from the name of his work, 'Alāṅkārasarvasva'. He shows his knowledge of Rasa when he discusses the difference between Bhāvika Alāṅkāra on the one hand and Svabhāvokti and Rasavat on the other. He, then, gives an account of the four Alāṅkāras based on Rasa, Bhāva, Rasābhāsa and Bhāvābhāsa being subordinate.

The first Sūtra given by Ruyyaka for Rasavat and allied Alāṅkārs is as follows:

"Rasabhāvatadābhāsatatprāṣamānām nibandhe rasavat-preyaurjasvisamāhitānī" 232

It means that when there is the delineation of Rasa, Bhāva, Rasābhāsa, Bhāvābhāsa and Bhāvapraśama, there arise respectively the Rasavat, Preyas, Urjasvin and Samāhitā Alāṅkāras.

Having given a Sūtra for the four Alāṅkārs, Ruyyaka explains them in the Vṛttī one by one.
According to Ruyyaka Rasavat is that in the description of which the Rasa element is present:

"Raso vidyate yatra nibandhane vyāpāratmanī tadrasavat"\(^{233}\)

Among the later followers of the Dhvani school, a slight shift is to be seen in Ruyyaka. In his 'Alaṅkārasarvasva', Ruyyaka adopts Anandavardhan's view of Rasavat and after discussing the old and the new conceptions of Rasavat cites the verse 'Kim hāsyena', etc.,\(^{234}\) as an illustration which can be explained according to both the old and the new conceptions.

What is to be noted in Rayyaka's explanation of this verse, on the new view of Rasavat, is that the Vākyārtha is Karuṇarasa and the Āṅgarasa functioning as Alaukikāra is Vipralambha śṛṅgāra. According to Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta, Karuṇa is the Āṅgarasa, which becomes the Alaṅkāra. That there was however an earlier writer who spoke of Vipralambharasa to be here clear, for Kuntaka takes some pains to refute the Vipralambharasa- theory here. Kuntaka stating the Pūrvapakṣa, says that Karuṇa is the Vākyārtha and Vipralambha of the variety of Pravāsa figures as its Āṅga:
Rayyaka follows this interpretation. Anyhow Rayyaka streamlines the new Rasavat theory as one Rasa being Āṅga of another Rasa. Of Rayyaka's commentators, Jayaratha reconciles the two interpretations.

"Atra yadyapi rājavīṣayāyā rateraṅggitvāt karuṇo'pi tadaṅgameve, tasya śṛṅgārāpekṣaya (i.e. Vipralāmbhaśṛṅgārāpekṣaya) angitvamārityaivamuktam" 236

Śobhākara in his 'Alaṅkāraratnākara', states the view according to Ruuyaka's pariśkāra:

Rasānām rasādin prati aṅgatve rasavadalaṅkāraḥ ! Tataśca rasādin prati rasādināmaṅgatve rasavadādayo'laṅkāraḥ "237

The outcome of this Pariśkāra is that Cātu and devotional verses need not any longer be searched for becoming illustrations of Rasavat; in pure Rasa-poetry, any case of two Rasas, one Āṅgin and another Āṅga, as in 'Ayam sa raśanotkarṣi', provides a case of Rasavadalaṅkāra, the Āṅga-rasa being the embellishment.
To correlate this with another approach or topic of the study of Rasa and Dhvani, this is one type of \( \text{G} \)unibh\( \text{H} \)utavya\( \text{N} \)gya, where one Rasa is An\( \text{G} \)a of another. \( \AA \)nandavardhana himself says this under Gu\( \text{N} \)ibh\( \text{H} \)utavya\( \text{N} \)gya (in Udyota III.35) and gives there the analogy of the king following his servant whose marriage is being celebrated:

\[
\text{"Ras\( \text{A} \)dir\( \text{U} \)pavya\( \text{N} \)gyasya gu\( \text{N} \)ibh\( \text{H} \)ave rasavadalah\( \text{K} \)\( \text{A} \)ro dar\( \text{S} \)ita\( \text{H} \) Tatra te\( \text{S} \)\( \text{M} \)\( \text{A} \)dhik\( \text{A} \)rikav\( \text{A} \)cy\( \text{A} \)pek\( \text{S} \)a\( \text{Y} \)a gu\( \text{N} \)ibh\( \text{H} \)\( \text{A} \)vo viv\( \text{A} \)hapra\( \text{V} \)\( \text{R} \)ttabh\( \text{R} \)ty\( \text{N} \)uy\( \text{Y} \)a\( \text{Y} \)ir\( \text{R} \)javat}\]
\]

And following him, Mamma\( \text{T} \), after explaining and illustrating the varieties of the second type of Gu\( \text{N} \)ibh\( \text{H} \)utavya\( \text{N} \)gya called 'Apar\( \text{A} \)nga' which is the one relevent here, observes:

\[
\text{'E} \text{te ca rasava} \text{d} \text{ad} \text{a} \text{dayo'la} \text{h} \text{ka} \text{rah}'}
\]

At the end of his paper on 'The Problem of the Rasavadala\( \text{N} \)k\( \text{A} \)ra' M.Hiriyanna drew attention to the Ala\( \text{N} \)k\( \text{A} \)ra called Ud\( \text{A} \)tta in Udbh\( \text{A} \)ta and pointed out how its second variety already indicated the line and paved the way so to say for \( \AA \)nandavardhana's idea of Rasavadala\( \text{N} \)k\( \text{A} \)ra. Mamma\( \text{T} \) indirectly mentions the identity of the second Ud\( \text{A} \)tta with a case of Rasa being A\( \text{N} \)ga (X.29). Ruyyaka faces straight this situation of overalping of the second Ud\( \text{A} \)tta and Rasavadala\( \text{N} \)k\( \text{A} \)ra and says:
"Yanmate (i.e. Ānadavardhanamate) tvāṅgabhūtarasādīvīṣaye rasavadādyalakahāraḥ anyatra rasādīdhvaninā vyāpatatvāt, tatra dvitiyodāttālāṅkārasya viṣayo nāvaśīṣyate, tadviṣayasya rasavadādinā vyāpatatvāt !" ²⁴¹

2. Preyo'laṅkāra:

A description which is pleasing is Preys :

'Priyataram preyo nibandhanameva draṣṭāvyām !'

The illustration given for Preyas is :

"Gāḍhālīṅganavāmanikṛta kucaprodbhinnaromodgama
Sāndrasneharasātirekavigalat śrīmannataṁbāṁbarā !
Mā mā mānada māti māmalamiti kṣāmākṣārollāpinī
Suptā kim nu mṛṭā nu kim manasi līna vilīnā nu kim m" ²⁴²

Here the joy of a heroine (Saṅcāribhāva) is delineated. It is subservient to the erotic sentiment (Sambhogaśāṅgāra). Hence, it is a Preyo’laṅkāra.

Ruyyaka gives another example for Preyas -

'Tadvakṛtrāṁṛtapāṇadhurlalitayā ²⁴³ etc.,
where a Vyabhicāribhāva 'Cinta' is subordinate to the sentiment of love-in-separation (Vipralambaḥṣēṅgāra).

While explaining the figure Preyas, Ruyyaka says that it is the same as Bhāvālaṅkāra:

'Eṣa eva ca bhāvālaṅkāraḥ !'

This is because there is in it the description of the existence of Bhāva.

3. Urjasvin Alaṅkāra

Urjasvin is that in which there is strength. Here the association with strength is due to the delineation of something which arises from impropriety:

"Urjo balāṁ vidyate yatra, tadapi nibandhanameva|
Anaucityapraṅvatavādatra balayogah "244

Ruyyaka gives the following stanza as its example:

Dūrākaiṣaṅamohamantra iva me tannāmni yāte śṛtiṁ
Cetaḥ kālaḵalāmapi prakurute nāvasthitim tāṁ vinā !
Etairākulisayā vikṣatataraiṣraṅgairanaṅgāturaḥ
Sampadyate kada tadāptisukhāṁ mityetanna vedmi sphaṭam "245
Here, Vipralambhaśrīṅgāra in the form of Raśāna's desire for Śītā and the Vyabhīcāribhāva 'Autsukya' are delineated in an improper manner (Anaucityena pravṛttiḥ devyāḥ Śītāyā avigayatvat). So by force (balat) Rasa has been made subservient. Hence it is Urjāsvīn. The Vyabhīcāribhāva 'Autsukya' (anxiety) is also delineated in an improper manner.

4. Samābhitaṇaṅkāra:

Samāhita means the removal or pacification:

'Samāhitaḥ pariḥāraḥ

The following is the example:

"Aksnoḥ sphaṭāśrukaluṣo’慕容ā nilīnah
Lāntam ca sārdhamadharas puraṇam bhrukuṭyā I
Bhāvāntarasya tava caṇḍi gato’pi roṣo
Nodgāḍhavāsanatayā prasaram dadāti

Here is the description of pacification of anger (Kopa), a Vyabhīcāribhāva, which is rendered subordinate to the other Bhāva (Bhāvāntara). Thus it is a Samāhita.

Ruyyaka considers Bhāvodaya, Bhāvasandhi and Bhāvalabalatā as separate Alaṅkāras from Rasavadāḍi Alaṅkāras:
"Bhāvodayasandhiśabalaṭāśca prthagalahkārāḥ"

5. Bhāvodayālānkāra:

When Bhāvodaya becomes subordinate to something else the figure is Bhāvodaya:

'Bhāvasyoktarūpasyodaya, udgamaṃvasthā '

Ruyyaka illustrates it with the following verse:

"Ekasminśayane vipakṣaramanāṇī nāmagrahe mugdhaya
Sadyaḥ kopaparigrahaglapitaya cāṭūni kuvannapi /
Āvegādavadhīritaḥ priyamastūṣṇīṁ sthitastatkṣaṇāṃ
Mābhūtsuptā ivetyamandavalitagrīvam punarvīkṣitāḥ
"

"At the utterance of the name of rival beloved, the pretty one, lying on the same bed (with her lover), suddenly turns her back in anger and feels distressed; not withstanding the sweet honeyings she treats the lover with disrespect in her excitement. However, on his keeping quiet at that moment, she turns her neck suddenly and looks at him, lest he should fall asleep."

Here, the rising of the longing (Vyabhicāribhāva) in the heart of the heroine is suggested by the Anubhāva.
i.e., her looking at the hero. Here, the Vyabhicāribhāva 'Autsukya' being subservient to erotic sentiment (Śrīṅgāra) is to be regarded as an Ālāṅkāra called Bhāvodaya.

6. Bhāvasandhya Ālāṅkāra:

Ruyyaka defines it as -

Sandhiḥ dvayorviruddhayoh spardhiḥbhāvenopanibandhah

and gives the following example:

"Vāmena nārinayanāśrudhārām

kṛpaṇadhārāmatha dakṣiṇena !

Utpuṅsayannekatarah karena

kartavyamūḍhah subhaṭo bahūva ṭū" 252

Here, there is the conjunction of Sneha (love or Sthayin of Śrīṅgāra) and Ranotsāha (eagerness for war- a Saṅcāribhāva). This Bhāvasandhi is found subordinate to Moha, another Bhāva. Hence, it is an Ālāṅkāra called Bhāvasandhi.
Ruyyaka defines it as:

'Sabalata bahūnām pūrvapūrvopamardenopanibandhah I'  

and illustrates it by the following verse:

"Kvākāryam ṣaṣalakṣmaṇah kva ca
   kulāṁ bhūyo'pi dṛṣyeta sā
Doṣāṇāṁ praśamāya me śrutamaho
   kopo'pi kāntaṁ mukham I
Kīṁ vakṣyantyapakalmaśāḥ kṛtadhiyāḥ
   svapne'pi sā durlabhā
Cetaḥ svāsthyaamupehi kaḥ khalu
   yuvā dhanyo'dharam pāsyati II"  

"How improper is this action and how (pure) is the lunar race! - Would she come in my sight again! My learning is meant to prevent the evil! - Oh, what a pretty face even in anger! What would the sinless wise men say? She is rare even in dream. O heart, keep poise, - who is that blessed youth who will kiss her?"
Here is the Bhāvaśabalatā of the deliberation, longing, judgement, recollection, misgiving, wretchedness, steadiness and anxiety. Thus it becomes an Alāṅkāra called Bhāvaśabalatā.

It must be remarked that ancient authority is not unanimous in defining these figures (i.e., Rasavat and allied Alāṅkāras). The Samāhita of Daṇḍin (and Bhāmaha also) is quite different from that of Udbhaṭa; moreover Bhāvodaya, Bhāvasandhi and Bhāvaśabalatā are not defined by Udbhaṭa, Bhāmaha or Daṇḍin and Ruuyaka is the first rhetorician in the post-dhavni period who has defined these three figures and included Rasavaddi Alāṅkāras in the Alāṅkāravarga.

(D)

THE STATUS OF RASAVAT, ETC., ACCORDING TO VIŚVANĀTHA

Viśvanātha, the author of 'Sāhityadarpaṇa', deals with Rasavat and allied Alāṅkāras in the chapter on Alāṅkāras. According to him when Rasa or Bhāva, or Rasābhāsa and Bhāvābhāsa, or Bhāvasānti are reduced to a subordinate condition (Guṇībhūta), they become Alāṅkāras and are
respectively termed Rasavat, Preyas, Urjasvin and Samāhita.

"Rasabhāvau tadābhāsau bhāvasya praśamastathā

Guṇībhūtatvamāyānte yadalāṅkṛtayastadā ।

Rasavatpreya Urjasya samāhitamiti kramāt ॥"\(^{255}\)

The term ‘Guṇībhūta’ to him means ‘Subordination of Rasa, etc., as factors contributing to charm’ to the main import of the sentence:

‘Guṇībhūtatvam rasāntarādīnām utkarṣādāyakatvena aṅgatvam ।’ \(^{256}\)

1. Rasavadalāṅkāra :

It sometimes so happens that the principal Rasa is one, while another Rasa serves to add to its charm and is, therefore, subordinate to it. When this is the case, the figure is Rasavat, which is so called because there is in it the association of another Rasa.

‘Rasayogādrasavadalāṅkārah ।’

Viśvanātha cites by way of example the same stanza which is quoted by Mammata :
Viśvanātha points out that in this verse the subordinated Śṛṅgārarasa heightens the appeal of the principal Karuṇarasa. According to him the process is as follows: The subordinated Śṛṅgārarasa, which itself is Upakṛta (helped) by words and senses that manifest it, embellishes the words and senses manifesting the Karuṇarasa.258 In short, in this context Śṛṅgārarasa has played the role of an Alaṅkāra and it is termed as Rasavadalaṅkāra.

These are the words of the wives of king Bhūrīśravas, who fell in battle, at the sight of his hand. This verse forms part of the lamentations of the women. Here, the principal Rasa is Karuṇa and the subordinated Rasa is Śṛṅgāra. The description of the amorous movements of the hand, that are remembered by the women, heightens the main Rasa (viz. Karuṇa), because the recollection of those movements is an excitant (Uddīpanavibhāva) of Karuṇa (the loss of the women appears greater when it is seen what the hand had been to them). Thus love being not the principal Rasa intended, but only subordinate (as heightening the main Rasa, Karuṇa) the figure is Rasavat.
Visvanātha defines Preyas as -

"Prakṛṣṭapriyavātpreyah /"

The figure Preyas is so called, because of its being favourite of the best (of critics), or because of its causing great pleasure. (Prakṛṣṭānāṁ priyāṁ tasya bhāvaḥ, or praviṣṭāṁ priyāṁ yasmin tasya bhāvaḥ prakṛṣṭapriyatvām tasmāt).

The figure Preyas occurs when a Bhāva becomes subordinate to something else. Visvanātha gives his own verse as an example:

"Āmīlitālasavivartitatārakākṣīṁ
matkāṇṭhabandhanadaraślathabāhuvallīṁ /
Prasvedavārikāṇikācitagaṇḍabimibāṁ
saṁsmṛitya tāmanisāmeti na sāntimantaḥ II"259

"As I remember ever and anon the fair one with her eyes half-closed, in which the pupils were languid and motionless, with her soft creeper-like arms which are gently loosened as they clasped my neck, with her round cheeks
which are suffused with perspiration, my heart does not obtain tranquility."

Here the first three lines depict Sambhogasriṅgāra which is subordinate to Vyabhicāribhāva called Smaraṇa. The Vyabhicāribhāva itself is subordinate to Vipralambaṅgāra, because the topic of description is the state of the separated lover who remembers his past experience of love.

3. Urjasvin Alāṅkāra:

When Rasābhāsa and Bhāvabhāsa become subordinate to something else, there is Urjasvin. The figure is called so because in it there is 'Urjas', i.e., impetuosity or force, in so far as there is improper procedure:

'Urjo balaṁ, anaucityapraṇvṛttau tadatrāṣṭityūrjasvī !'

An example of Urjasvin is:

"Vane'khalakalāsaktāḥ pariḥṛtya nijastriyaḥ !

Tadvairivanitāvṛṇde pulindāḥ kurvate ratim "260
"The savages of the forests, now betaking themselves to all the charming arts—singing, dancing, etc.—enjoy the company of the ladies of your enemies, having abandoned their own consorts."

Here the principal content is 'Rati' having for its object the king. It (Rājaviśayaka rati) is a Bhāva and not Rasa according to the definition 'Ratirdevādiviṣayā, etc.' This Bhāva is helped by the description of the love of the savages for the royal ladies. This is Śrṅgārābhāsa (and not Śrṅgāra), because there is impropriety (Aaucitya) in the love as it is adulterous. As Śrṅgārābhāsa is here subordinated to a Bhāva, the figure is Urjasvin. The same holds good in the case of Urjasvin based upon Bhāvābhāsa.

4. Samāhitālaṅkāra :

Samāhita means 'giving up or quelling' of emotion,

'Samāhitaṁ pariḥaraḥ !'

The figure Samāhita occurs when Bhāvapraśama becomes subordinated to something else. Viśvanātha gives the example—'Aviralakaravāla, etc'.

In this stanza the quelling of the emotion of pride existing in the enemies is subordinated to the emotion
of love for the king, which is the principal.

Bhāvodaya, Bhāvasandhi and Bhāvasabalata:

These are called the Alāṅkāras by their own names, i.e., Bhāvodayālaṅkāra, etc.

'Bhāvasya codaya sandhau miśratve ca tadākhyakah' ²⁶²

When Bhāvodaya, Bhāvasandhi and Bhāvasabalata are subordinated to something else, they are Alāṅkāras called Bhāvodaya, Bhāvasandhi and Bhāvasabalata respectively. Viśvanātha does not expressly say that Bhāvodaya, etc., must be subordinated in order to constitute the figure Bhāvodaya, etc., but that qualification necessarily follows from the treatment of the four figures Rasavat, etc.

Bhavodayalnkarā: When a Bhāvodaya becomes subordinated to something else the figure is Bhāvodaya.

An example is:

"Madhupānapravṛttāste suhṛdbhīḥ saha vairiṇāḥ I
Sruttā kuto'pi tvannāma lebhire viṣamāṁ daśām II" ²⁶³
"Busy, as they were in their drinking festivity in the company of their friends, those foemen of yours were reduced to a miserable condition, having somehow heard your name."

Here the principal Bhāva is of love (admiration) for the king. The Bhāva of terror that is described as arising is subordinate to this main Bhāva.

*Bhavasandhyalaṅkāra:*

The figure Bhāvasandhi occurs when Bhāvasandhi is subordinate to something else.

For example:

"Janmāntarīnaramaṇasyāṅgaḥ saṅgasamutsukā ।
Salaḷjā cāntike sakhyāḥ pāṭu naḥ pārvatī sadā ॥²⁶₄
dhānām
dhānām
dhānām
dhānām

"Longing for union with him who was her lord in her former birth, but modestly seated by the side of her female friend—may Pārvatī ever protect us."

Here the Bhāva in the form of devotion towards Pārvatī, is the main content. The conjunction of two Bhāvas, longing and bashfulness is subordinate to this main content.
Bhavaśabalatalaṅkāra:

When many Bhavas are represented as successively taking the place of each preceding one, there is Bhavaśabalatā.

'Sabalatā tu kālabhedena nirantaratayā pūrvapūrvopamardinām (āsvādaḥ) I' [Pradeepa.p.110. (Nir.)]

The figure occurs when Bhavaśabalatā is represented as subordinate. The example given by Viśvanātha for Bhavaśabalatā is the same stanza as cited by Mammaṭa for illustrating this figure, i.e.,

'Paśyet kaścit cala capala, etc.'

There is nothing new in Viśvanātha's explanation of this verse.

Though Viśvanātha has put forth the illustration of 'Aparāṅga' parallel to those of Mammaṭa, yet he has dealt with Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras under Citrakāvya along with the Alaṅkāras like Upamā, Rūpaka, etc. In this way he has equated them, though indirectly, with the latter. The discussion put forth by him deserves elucidation, which is set forth here below:
There can possibly be four alternatives in regard to the position of Rasavat, etc., as Alāṅkāras:

a) Rasavat, etc., are not Alāṅkāras,

b) Rasavat, etc., should be recognised as Alāṅkāras only secondarily,

c) Rasavat, etc., may be recognised as Alāṅkāras principally,

d) Rasavat, etc., are Alāṅkāras similar to Upamā, etc.

Of these Viśvanātha attributes the first three to some unknown writers, while he has put forth the fourth as his own view:

a) Alāṅkāras are those which heighten the Rasa, etc., by embellishing the form of words and senses. But Rasa, etc., being upakārya (that which is helped) by words and senses should properly be called Alāṅkāryas. Therefore Rasa, etc., cannot be called Alāṅkāras.

b) Rasavat, etc., should be accepted as Alāṅkāras secondarily, because Aṅga-rasa, etc., does aid the Aṅgin-rasa, etc.
c) If the chief aim of the Alāṅkāras is to subserve the Rasa, the Rasavat, etc., only should be called Alāṅkāras. To designate, Ěūpaṁā, Rūpaka, etc., by this name would be as meaningless as to call hump of flesh attached to the goat’s throat as its nipple.

Viśvanātha does not exclude Rasavat and other allied Alāṅkāras from the list of Alāṅkāras; nor does he recognise them as secondary Alāṅkāras; nor does he admit them as the Alāṅkāras primarily. He equates them with other Alāṅkāras like Ěūpaṁā, etc. He argues that the value of an Alāṅkāra does not depend only on its being contributory to the Rasa. This is done even by the Vācaka, etc.,—a word, a syllable, a sentence, a sense, etc., but they are not called Alāṅkāras. As a matter of fact, the value of an Alāṅkāra lies in its aiding the Rasa through its contributing charm to the word and meaning. This view applies as much to the Rasavadaḷaṅkāra as to the Ěūpaṁā, etc. The Āṅga-rasa, etc., strengthened by their own suggestive word and sense, supplement the Āṅgin-rasa by embellishing the suggestive word and sense of the Āṅgin-rasa. They never do it without embellishing the word and sense.

It is rightly observed by S.D. Choudhary:

"Viśvanātha's attempt to apply the definition of Alāṅkāra on Rasavat and other allied Alāṅkāras is of course
laudable, but a closer study would reveal that these Alaṅkāras are more significant than Alaṅkāras like Upamā, etc. In the illustrations of these Alaṅkāras, one of the Rasa. Bhāva, etc., by reducing itself to the secondary position, contributes to the principal Rasa, Bhāva, etc., by adorning its words and senses. On the other hand in the illustrations of Upamā, etc., such a question does not arise. Thus the Rasavat and the other allied Alaṅkāras are superior to the Alaṅkāras like Upamā, etc. It would be, therefore, more logical and cogent to accept them as a variety of ‘Guṇībhūtavyāṅgya’ as Mammaṭa has done and not to place them under ‘Citrakāvya’ as Viśvanātha does.”

At the end of his treatment of Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras, Viśvanātha says:

“Evam ca yacca kaiściduktaṁ - ‘rasādīnāmaḥgītvaye
rasavadādyalaṅkāraḥ / Aṅgatve tu dvitīyodāttałaṅkāraḥ
 tadapi parāstam /”

“Similarly the dictum of some that the figures Rasavat, etc., occur when Rasa, etc., are principal and that when the latter are subordinate, the figure is Udātta (of the second variety, aṅgabhūtamahāpuruṣacaritavarṇanam) is not correct.”
Some writers on Rhetorics denied the existence of Dhvani in poetry. They said that wherever Rasa, etc., are principal, there is Rasavadalaṅkāra; where Rasa, etc., are subordinate there is the second variety of Udātta. These views are not correct, for the simple reason that words also will then have to be called Udāttālaṅkāra, because they also are subordinate to the principal Rasa (just as Udātta is said to be constituted by Rasa, etc., being subordinate).

(E)

APPAYYA DĪKŚITA ON RASAVAT, ETC.

In the entire range of Sanskrit Poetics, the figures belonging to the group of Rasavat, bear a long and chequered history. Rhetoricians differ widely among themselves on the propriety of recognising these as poetic figures at all. Some rhetoricians are of the opinion that Rasa or the state of poetic experience constitutes the soul of poetic art; hence, it is not proper to relegate it to the status of an embellishment. Some rhetoricians point out that the prominent emotional mood might rightfully constitute the essence of a poetic art, but a subservient emotion remains an embellishment, going to beautify the sentiment of paramount importance. Jayadeva the author of 'Candrāloka'
hesitates to recognise the figures belonging to this group as proper poetic figures, but Appayya Dīkṣita the author of 'Kuvalayānanda' lends his whole-hearted support to these, and asserts that these figures have every right to demand recognition as principles of embellishment.

Appayya Dīkṣita at the end of his work 'Kuvalayānanda', after having defined and illustrated one hundred Alaṅkāras, deals with Rasavat and allied Alaṅkāras. He says:

"Rasabhāvatadābhāsa bhāvaśāntiniśivandhanah
Catvāro rasavatpreyaurjasvi ca samāhitam ā
Bhāvasya codayah sandhiḥ śabalatvamiti trayah
------------------------ alaṅkārānvidurbudhāḥ //272"

He does not give separate definitions of these Alaṅkārasa. His explanation of the examples shows that he follows Mammaṭa.

1. Rasavadalaṅkāra :

Appayya Dīkṣita gives the following example for Rasavat:
In this stanza one learns of sage Agastya who, 'in one sip drank the entire waters of the ocean and saw the divine fish and tortoise - both incarnations of Lord Viṣṇu.' Here the marvellous sentiment plays a secondary role to support the mood (emotion) of devotion towards the sage.

It is relevant to note in this connection that the author of 'Alaṅkāracandrikā', a commentary on 'Kuvalayānanda' had the Rasavat in his mind while framing a correct definition of a figure of speech. He showed in his definition that certain suggested elements could also become figures of speech and hence introduced a phrase to include a few varieties of Vyaṅga under Alaṅkāra while he excluded all other Vyaṅga-elements generally.

Appayya Dīkṣita has given another example for Rasavat, i.e. 'Ayam sa raṣaṇotkarṣī, etc.', which is already cited in 'Kāvyaprakāśa' of Mammaṭa and 'Sāhityadarpaṇa' of Viśvanātha.
2. Preyo'laṅkāra :

The following stanza illustrates the figure Preyas:

"Kadā vāraṇāsyāmamarataṭīnirodhasi vasan
Vasānaḥ kaupīnanām śirasi nidadhāno'nijaliputam !
Aye gourīnātha tripurahara śāmbho trinayana !
Prasīdetyākrosannimiśamīva nesāmi divasān "275

Here, Śāntarasa is suggested and the Vyabhicāribhāva 'cintā' is also suggested through the word 'kadā' (when that day will come?). This Vyabhicāribhāva 'Cintā' is auxiliary to Śāntarasa. Hence, there is Preyas here. Appayya Dīkṣita says that this Preyo'laṅkāra itself is called Bhāvālaṅkāra.

He also gives another example ('Atyuccāḥ paritaḥ, etc.') for Preyas wherein Vasumatīviṣayaka ratibhāva is subservient to the Rājaviṣayaka ratibhāva. This is already cited by Mammaṭa in his 'Kāvyaprakāśa'.276
Here, the intention of the poet is to praise the heroism (brahma) of the king, who has given shelter to the poet. The king has conquered all his enemies and all the queens of the enemies are wandering in the forest with fear. Here poet’s admiration for the king is predominant. The Kiratas (forest hunters) becoming mad (mudha) after looking at the beauty of the foe-women is Rasabhasa here. So here is the semblance of erotic sentiment (Sringerabhasa). This is subservient to the loyalty (admiration) for the king. Hence, it is Urjasvin Alankara.

4. SamahitaAlankaara :

"Paşıyāmade kimiyaṁ prapadyata iti
sthairyaṁ mayālaṁbitaṁ
Kim māṁ nālapatītyayaṁ khalu
śaṭṭhaṁ kopastayāpyāśritaṁ /
Ityanyonyairvilakṣadṛṣṭicature
tasminnavastāntare
Savyājaṁ hasitaṁ mayā dhṛtiharo
muktastu bāṣpastayaṁ "278
Here is the allayment of the anger (Sañcāribhāva) of the heroine. This allayment of Bhāva (Bhāvaśānti) is subservient to the erotic sentiment (which is Aṅgīn) in the stanza. Hence, it is a Samāhitālankaṭa.

5 Bhāvodayālankaṭa:

"Tadadya viśramya dayāluredhi me
Dināṁ ninīkṣāmi bhavadvilokīṁ ā!
Adarśī pādenā vilikhya patriṇā
Tavaiva rūpeṇa samaḥ sa matpriyāḥ ā"²⁷⁹

Here, the 'Autsukya' of Damayatī for Nala is manifested. This arising of Atsyukyabhāva is subservient to the love (erotic sentiment) of Damayanti for Nala. So here is Bhāvodayālankaṭa.

6. Bhavasandhyaalankaṭa:

"Ekābhūt kusumāyudheṣudhiriva pravyakta puṇkhāvalī
Jetumahāṅgalpālikeve pulakairanyā kapolasthalī ā!
Lolākṣīṁ kṣaṇamātrabhāvivirahā klesāsahāṁ paśyato
Drāgākarṇayataśca vira! bhavataḥ prauḍhāhavādaṁ baram ā"²⁸⁰
Here, the poet is praising the heroism of the king (who has given shelter to him.) The king is filled with love for the heroine on the one side and eagerness for war on the other. Thus there is the admixture (Sandhi) of 'Rati' and 'Autsukya' (Bhāvas) which is subservient to the poet's admiration for the king.

7. Bhāvasabalalāṅkāra:

This is illustrated by the stanza, 'Kvākāryam, etc.', already quoted and explained by Ruuyaka in his 'Alaṅkārasarvasva'.

There is nothing new in the illustrations of Rasavadalaṅkāra given by Appayya Dīkṣita.

(F)

JAGANNĀTHA PAṆḌITA ON RASAVAT

Jagannātha Paṇḍita, a reputed author on Poeties makes a few ripe observations on the figure Rasavat, though he did not attempt a detailed discussion of it in his 'Rasagaṅgādhara'. His definition of a figure of speech gave him ample scope to think of Rasavat as an Alāṅkāra:
To him a figure of speech was one 'that is charming and yet plays an auxiliary role.' Such a definition, naturally gave him scope to treat a sentiment as a decorative (Alaṅkāra). Reflecting on an important aspect of the figure Rasavat, Jagannātha Panḍita says that it is but natural for a passing mood (Vyabhicāri bhāva) like Krodha (anger) to be in association with the heroic sentiment (Virarasa), for the mood of enthusiasm (Utsāha) to be with the furious sentiment and for the mood of mirth (Hāsa) to be with the erotic sentiment; but to form the real figure of Rasavat, even these passing moods should be strengthened by excitants (Vibhāvas), ensuants (Anubhāvas), etc., so that they may be in their full form to support the main purport of the stanza. He says:

"Evaṁ ca vīraraśa-pradhāne krodho raudre cotsāhaḥ śṛṅgāre hāso vyabhicāri bhavati, nāntariyakaśca I Yadā tu pradhānaparipoṣārtham so'pi bahuvibhāvajāḥ kriyate tadā tu rasālankara ityādi bodhyam 1"283

All this may be summed up by saying that in his view the subsidiary element in Rasavat could not be either a passing mood, or a permanent mood, but it must be a full-fledged sentiment (Rasa):
Various are the views expressed, in the formation of the word 'Rasavat'. Some think that the figure is so called because of the association of Rasa with it; some others think that it is an ornament having Rasa in it; some think that it is similar to Rasa and some others feel that it is capable of expressing Rasa. The most convincing explanation comes from the hand of Jagannātha Paṇḍita, who calls it 'Rasālaṅkara' and says that it is called so on the analogy of the maxim of the 'Brāhmin-monk' (Brāhmaṇaśramaṇa-nyāya):

śramaṇa is Buddhist monk and therefore not a Brāhmin, and yet, though now a Buddhist, he was formerly a Brāhmin. Similarly, in the expression 'Rasālaṅkāra', it is an Alaṅkāra now, but formerly it was a Rasa. It is like another expression 'Alaṅkāradhivyani' which means that a poetic piece now is suggested and that before it became a suggestion it was an Alaṅkāra or decorative.