CHAPTER IV

R.A.S.A.

Rasa is given a very important position in the theory of dhvani because it is intimately connected with dhvani. Rasadhvani primarily is the soul of poetry, as vastadhvani and alankaradhvani all lead ultimately to rasadhvani. Kuntaka includes rasa, like all other concepts, in his different types of vaksatā. Before coming to the detailed treatment of rasa in these two theories, namely, the dhvani and the vakmuktī, we will take a historical survey of the concept of rasa before Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka's time.

The term 'rasa' is found in the Upanisads to mean 'juice', 'honey', 'milk', 'flavour' etc. As there are śārasas in the pākasāstra, so in the same way, the theory of navarasa has been introduced into the kāvvasāstra. As the total taste-effect produced by different condiments in a drink is more delightful and enjoyable than and completely different from each of those condiments taken separately, so too the complete and finished effect in the rasa-form brought about by the bhāvas is very delightful and it differs from the bhāvas themselves,
These bhāvas are laukika, that is to say, found in the world but the rasa is alaukika and not found in worldly pain and pleasure. Kāyavāsa is enjoyed only by critics (sehrdayas).

The earliest known exponent of the theory of rasa is Bharata. It is evident that before Bharata the theory of rasa was quite developed as he often quotes his predecessors. Rājastekhoro refers to Nandikesvara as the founder of the rasa theory, and according to Kāraṇamātra, the earliest formulator of rasa as the soul of poetry is S'auddhodani. All these earlier manuscripts are lost unfortunately and as a consequence we have to depend on Bharata as the father of Alankārasṭra.

Bharata speaks about nātvarasa as taken from the Atharvaveda.¹

"सनानाथजयादि।"

(०.०. १. ७).

In the sixth and seventh chapter of his Nātvasṭra Bharata explains rasa and bhāva in detail. He

---

1. Perhaps the magic incantations and imprecations involving fixed emotions like hate, anger, jealousy, heroism etc. evident in the Atharvnic poetry provide the genesis for the theory developed by Bharata.
enumerates eight-rasas, s'ānta, hāsya, karuna, renāra, vīra, bhavānaka, bibhalsa and adbhuta. There is a controversy among scholars about the number of rasas accepted by Bharata, whether he accepted or not the ninth, the s'ānta rasa. Among the four recensions of the Nāṭya-
śāstra, only one, i.e. Gaekwad's edition alone contains a portion on this rasa at the end of the sixth chapter. None of the three versions contains this portion.

Abhinavaśruta comments, —

"दे पुनःविरसति तत्र द्वितीय तन्त्रम् हन्ताःपद्धमामिति यति।"  (A Bh P 332, R.K Kavi's edn)

So he was aware of this controversial problem about s'ānta-rasa. Abhinavaśruta admits the s'āntaraasa, tattvājāna being its sthāvībhūvé and Lord Buddha its deity. He treats the s'āntarasa in detail in his commentary, Abhinavabhārati, taking the example of the Nāgānanda.

He gives vībhāvādī for s'ānta.

"तस्य न दे पुनःविरसति तत्र द्वितीय तन्त्रम् हन्ताःपद्धमामिति यति। मोदालोपितासाथ्यो गुणमया, निर्बंधितस्यस्तीतिधुत्यादयो अभिव्यक्तिष्ठितयो भवज्ञानालयान्।"  (A Bh P 340)

Bharata describes abhinivasas relating only to eight rasas and some great poets like Kālidāsa who follow Bharata are aware of only eight rasas.² So it seems

² "मुलिना- भरतन- दे प्रयोगा भवानिस्प्रायाये नियुक्त। अन्ति कान्ताया महति महता हुमना। नवल-वालप्रण।"  
- Vikramorvas'īya, II, 8.
Bharata does not admit the ninth rasa, i.e., sānta in drama. Dr. De says,—

"It is held, therefore, that the objections to the sāntarasa are not valid. A sānta play is bound to appeal to persons of devoted mind; but that does not disprove that it is capable of being depicted and relished, while it is not true to say that men are eternally slaves to rāga and dveśa. There has been a continuous stream of literature which depicts sānta as a Rasa."

Many scholars have discussed the problem in detail and there is no necessity to go into details. There are three groups among modern scholars regarding the acceptance of the sāntarasa. Some accept it in drama as well as in poetry; others accept it in poetry alone and still others reject it completely. The Sanskrit rhetoricians also are divided in similar three groups regarding the sānta-rasa.

We can conclude from Bharata's text that he does not admit sānta-rasa in drama as it cannot be enacted on the stage. Therefore he admits in acting only rāga and his treatise is related only to dramaturgy. He does not mention sāntarasa though he would have accepted it in poetry. According to Dr. Hargravan, the

3. 'Some Problems of Sanskrit Poetics' - p. 14?.
Buddhists and the Jains were probably responsible for making s'anta the ninth Rasa.

Bharata explains the eight rasas, their sthāvībhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicārins; the colour and the deity of each rasa. Out of the forty-nine bhāvas he mentions, eight are the sthāvībhāvas or basic emotions present in every human being, eight are the mental conditions or sāttvika bhāvas and the rest thirty-three are transitory or momentary feelings which are noticed occasionally and are called as vyabhicāribhāvas (or saṁcāri-bhāvas).

Bharata gives the resa-sūtra,

\[ \text{विद्याज्ञानुकुण्डज्ञायिन्यार्थान्तः प्रसङ्गविनिविषयः} \]

Rasa is produced by the combination of all these types of bhāvas. This maṇḍatta theory of Bharata led many theoricrians to formulate their own theory of rasa. Abhinavagupta quotes three interpreters of Bharata's theory. Their original books are lost and only through the Abhinavabhāratī we can get their resa-theories.

Bhatta Lollate is a Mīmāṃsaka, according to whom Bharata's 'maṇḍatta' means 'uttvati'. Rasa is in the zero on the stage. He imitates correctly the personalities described by the poet, and the spectators cannot distinguish the original personality from the imitator.
due to the imitator's skill in acting, and thus the spectators enjoy rasa. Rasa is produced in the actor on the stage according to this theory.

S'ankuka is a Naiyāyika who does not accept the uttṛcātī-vāda of Lollata and puts forth his anuvrtti-vāda. 'Nisūrtti', according to him, is 'anuvrtti'. He explains his theory by the analogy of a painted horse (citra-taracana-nvāya). Seeing the painting we infer that it is a horse, we cannot deny it to be a horse nor can we accept it as a living horse. In the same way we infer the existence of rasa in the actor. It is not produced in the actor but his imitation makes one to infer rasa of the original character as represented by him.

Bhattaśāyaka is a follower of Ānā śa doctrine. His theory shows the three gradual steps of the development of rasa, viz. abhidhiśa, bhāvanā and bhogikarana. Abhidhiśa is vihāvādi or a medium of expression bhāvanā is poet's intention (or kavīceta ṣātva) and bhogikarana is the enjoyment of rasa for which only a saṁrđeva is fit to set that Supreme Delight which is similar to Brahmānand. Bhattaśāyaka, for the first time, brings the prime plot of sadhārenīkarana (or universalisation) to explain how the rasas are enjoyed as alocike. Pāyārasas are completely far from the feelings of day to day life. If
rasas were laukika. then those like Karuna, raudra and others would not have delighted the spectators. Even srunga depicted on the stage would have made spectators ashamed of themselves if sadhārani karana were not there. They are neither spectator's own emotions nor are they produced or inferred in actors. In such cases a critic cannot enjoy rasa because it is not at all related to him. Thus Bhālatānvaka criticises earlier theories of rasa and establishes his own theory on the principle of sadhārani karana. By this principle the character on the stage is universalised and in general the sthāvībhāvas enacted by an actor are enjoyed as rasa by spectators.

Abhinava puraṇa accepts this principle of sadhārani karana through which the uncommon acts like crossing the ocean etc. are enjoyed by the spectators and all the rasas become sukha-pradhāna.

"ततः सर्वदेशीय शुभप्रधानां द्विमतिकयान्तर्विररेत्युः
धनस्य आचार्यानान्दोदर्तव्यातः। तथा हि पुनः
धनशोकमित्यकारिणी उद्धोलकम्यस्तुधिन्तरसातायान्तरस्यते \\n(शुभरस्य)। आंशिकानिरस्ततत्ततः हृदयमपि लते पुनः चापेतुकु स्वयं
पात्यव्याप्तस्य क्रांतिवीर्यक्तं कुणोषीति वद्भिरस्यभि
वन्देरत्नस्य च्यरिस्थानम्।"

(C A Bh P 282)
The sthāyibhāvas are the instincts (vāscā) present in every man in a varying degree.

The universalisation means, a spectator does not feel that the bhāvas enacted on the stage are of a particular character, say for instance of Rāma, but he, the spectator, takes them in general, as emotions of a man or those of a woman. His instincts are stimulated when he witnesses the enacted bhāvas and he experiences delight. To get this joy, a spectator or a reader has to become one with the actor or the poet (tanmāyibhāvana). Thus according to Abhinavagupta rasa is sāmaikā and not nataśata. He follows Ānandavardhana and says that rasas are suggested by vibhāvādi and they are never expressed. His theory is called abhiyuktāvīdā.

Bharata relates rasa with dramatic representation. The four kinds of abhinaya enables spectators to enjoy rasa. He says,—

Abhinavagupta calls rasa the very theme of nāṭya. He defines drama as,—
Rasa is the most important feature in drama. One single rasa runs like a thread right through in a dramatic representation.

Bharata gives the analogy of pānaka to explain rasa produced by the combination of different bhāvas. Abhinavagupta comments on it,

Thus bhāvas and rasas are inseparable. There can be no rasa without bhāva and bhāva cannot be bereft of rasa. The relation between them is of a seed and a tree.
Ahhinavaganta brings this out more clearly when he says,—

The seed of rasa is in poet's mind and the fruit thereof is the delight experienced by the spectators.

Rasas are so termed because they are to be enjoyed (केवादाविवर्तत) and bhāvas are so termed because through words, gestures and the representation of the temperament, they infuse (bhāvaṃvati) the meaning of the play into the spectators. When the meaning of bhāvas goes deep into the heart, the cittavṛttis are roused in mind and spread all over the body like a dry wood catching fire.
The sthāvībhāvas are more important than the rest of the bhāvas because these sthāvībhāvas when mature (paripusta) through vibhāvādi become rasas to be enjoyed by sakrāvās.

A sthāvībhāva is like a king, and other bhāvas like his attendants. Abhinavagupta treats bhāvas as cittavṛtti-viśeṣa.

So according to Abhinavagupta, uddipana vibhāvas and outer actions (bāhyā anubhāvas) do not deserve the name bhāva. By bhāva he means cittavṛtti-viśeṣa.

Bharata states four original rasas and the other four, he says, emanated from these original four rasas.

(N.S. VI, 39 Gaekwad’s ed.)
Bharata treats in detail the sthāvibhāvas, vibhāvas, anuvibhāvas and vidhi vibhāvas of these rasas. In fact, there is only one rasa as the aesthetic pleasure is one, as Abhinavagupta says,

"पुल युल तावत्पराभिधियो रसः शुस्यास्तानियवे
तवेन तस्मात् प्रात्मातिती। तस्मैव पुनःगिरिन्त्वशिष्याः
विभागः।"

Dr. Kane, following Abhinavagupta, remarks,—

"The Aesthetic pleasure or delight is one (rasa is really one); but as in the case of speech, where senses are derived from sentences and sentences are split up into words and letters, so they (earlier rhetoricians) held that the pleasurable feeling or effect could be distinguished as of eight sorts."

Abhinavagupta shows the inter-relation of all the rasas.

4. 'The History of Sanskrit Poetics' - p. 359
Thus the four purusārthas Abhinavagupta relates with the nine rasas. He rejects other rasas like sneha, anura, bhakti etc. as they can be included in other bhāvas like rati, hāsa etc.

But the fact is that when a bhāva gains maturity with the help of other bhāvas it reaches the stage of a rasa, and Abhinavagupta admits vyābhi-cārībhāvas and sāttvika-bhāvas as cittavṛtti-vis'esa. When these cittavṛtti-

5. Hemacandra in the Kāvyaṇaśāsana (ch. II, section II) copies this section of Abhinavagupta word to word.
vis’esas are supported by other bhāvas, they can reach the stage of rasa. So there can be as many rasas as the number of bhāvas. As a consequence of this, the number of rasas cannot be limited to eight or nine. In general we can accept these eight or nine rasas as major as explained by Bharata and Abhinavagupta.

Bharata, like abhinavagupta, relates all other concepts to rasa though he discusses it only in two chapters of his big treatise on dramaturgy. Abhinavagupta’s commentary, named Abhinavabhārati, is very important to understand well the theory of Bharata. He follows Anandavardhana and refers to important commentators of Bharata.

Many great poets and dramatists refer to Bharata’s theory of rasa in their works. As we have seen, Valliśāsa accepts Bharata’s eight rasas. In the Malayāvagīśa, he praises the dramatic art in the following words —

"देवानामिदमाधुर्यम् भुनया कालं कलुं गाुःकरण—
कर्तृकंद्रमुमालखालवातिकं स्वादै लिखक्ति क्रिया
हेमाखोऽवमात्र भक्तयादित नानासं प्रह्वते
साधुं भिलकरुचिनिध्य नरथपदेक समाराधनम्।"

(C M II, 4)

Bhavabhūti gives the greatest importance to kārūna rasa when he says,—

"जो रसा कारूण एक।"

(C U R C III, 48)
Even the stones weep and the hard metal like vajra (or diamond) also melts by karupa rasa. He seems to say that it lies at the base of all the other rasas also.  

Further, Vyasa says in the S'is'upālavadha that a poet, who knows rasa and bhāva properly, should use both the śūnas, ojas and prasāda. Vallabha has commented on the words rasa and bhāva used by Vyasa, —

"सभालाग्नाक्योगिणीगोत्वान्। भव बहु रसा भवाते नि́वयं रसेऽवेच तीया बोभका न य भवस्थेषु।"

Elsewhere Vyasa says that all the bhāves lead to artha, i.e. rasa.

"अर्थाद्भविते भवं स्वाक्षरिते यथा स्नेत्रयौ भुजाङ्कस्तथा नेतुभेषिष्ठ।" (II, 89).

Dr. Santosh Kumari Sharma deals with the rasa in the Haravijaya of Rājānaka Rātnākara. The main sentiment

6. Rasa is given importance even in kathā as Bāna says —

"सुभुमलकालापविकांसकोमलां करोति भव हाय अन्लापिक्यं रसेऽवेच तीया बोभका बोभकास्मयमुपागान्ता भवा गन्यानन्तिन्त्यान्"।

Kādambarī, Introductory verses, No. 8

of this epic is heroism; but the poet is also master equally of s'rnagāra rasa. The following beautiful stanza proves his skill in depicting s'rnagāra rasa, particularly

\[
\text{रूपरसीकम् दृष्टिपालवतीलाम्}
\text{अन्तर्विक्ष्मन्तराध्यलोकात्मी गीतभाना।}
\text{प्रेमका बीलोकथितुमस्मालविदेशं दकु}
\text{रम्भोजनत्रिकिनीमोक्षनम्।}
\]  
\(\text{रा. V. XII, 29}\).

Dr. Sharma remarks on the stanza quoted above,—

"Our poet does not approve of a love of fickle nature. To him, love is a sacrifice. The Haravijaya depicts that sort of love which is eternal, and in which two devoted souls are interwoven with each other from the mental as well as from the physical point of view. It is that sort of meeting in which separation is beyond the imagination, and, if, unfortunately, separation happens to come, it is merely a physical separation and has nothing to mar the true love of a lover, for, the departed one has the picture of the consort drawn on the heart to view whenever desired."

Ratnakara, following Bharata, relates kais'iki vṛtti, which is full of music and dance, to s'rnagāra rasa in the stanza,—

\[
\text{नेपच्ये भम्ंमनोरं कृतस्या}
\text{शुक्लारं वितरस्माचिन्तियं कालौ।}
\text{फान्तर प्रस्मदमुदारस्वत्तलेख्यं}
\text{रम्भोजनसरलनुत मात्रीकः।}
\]  
\(\text{रा. V. XVII, 79}\).
Thus we notice that many dramatists and poets followed Bharata's rasa theory in their works, each in his own way.

Bharāhīa gives less importance to rasa in the kāvya-lankāra. He stresses more on vakrokti, the basic principle of all the alankāras. He includes rasa of Bharata in his rasavat alankāra.

Dandin follows Bharāhīa when he defines this figure of speech as,

But he does not stop there itself. He shows awareness of the fact that sthāvyibhāvas themselves, when supported by vibhāva, anubhāva, and ṛvabhācāribhāvas, become rasas. So he says,

Dandin also is aware of only eight rasas of Bharata. He shows the development of all the eight sthāvyibhāvas into eight rasas under his rasavat alankāra and says,

According to Dandin rasa can be included in śūbhārta guna also, which is free from vulgarity. There are both,
vag-rosa and vastu-rosa in mādhura gana, hence scholars are intoxicated by this gana as bees are by honey.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{तथा वस्तु रसायनः} & \text{ वस्तु रसायनः स्थायिनः।} \\
\text{येन सुधि नवीनता स्थिरना सधस्य नवस्थिता॥} \\
\end{align*}
\]
(C.K. I. 51)

There is only sūrtyanuprāsa, pleasing to the ears, in mādhura gana. Dandin takes rasa in a broad sense of sweetness of artha when he says,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{काम नवेच्याकरो रसमयं विविधकृता} \\
\text{तथौप्रयासयशस्यावलं भार वहले भुवस्य॥} \\
\end{align*}
\]
(C.K. I. 62)

Kṛṣṇaśvāma or vulgarity mars the beauty of artha which is rasa. Therefore the statement,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{कामं नवेच्याकरो मधु रसमयं कथये।} \\
\text{वायू विभिन्नमेव निर्देशी।} \\
\end{align*}
\]
(C.I. 63)

becomes very vulgar, and the statement,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{कामं नवेच्याकरो मधु रसमयं कथये।} \\
\text{तथौ विभिन्नाय विद्वेश्या।} \\
\end{align*}
\]
(C.I. 54)

is overflowing with rasa as it is devoid of any grāmyata.

Thus Dandin deals with rasa objectively.

Vāhana includes rasa in his arttacara kānti. He defines kānti as,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{दीपरस्तवं कान्तिः।} [K A 3 V 3 2 15]
\end{align*}
\]
and comments on it,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{श्रीपत्ररसं: श्रुतिरादिकं वस्त्य क श्रीपत्र।} \\
\text{तयं भावं श्रीपत्ररसं कान्तिः।} \\
\end{align*}
\]
So when *rasa* is prominent in a composition, it is *artha*guna kānti.

Udbhata, following Bhāṣaṇa and Dandā, includes *rasa* in the *rasavāda alankāra*. As we have seen, while dealing with *rasavāda alankāra* (ch. II, section III of this thesis), that *rasa* in *svaś'aha* (according to Dabhaṇa) and his *svaś'aha* (theory of *rasa* is criticised by later rhetoricians. Udbhata accepts nine *rasas*, s'ānta being the ninth and remarks that these nine *rasas* belong to drama, —

Udbhata includes *bhāva* under the figure of speech *praves bhāvabhāsa* and *rasābhāsa* under *saśāhita alankāra*, and includes *anucita rasā* and *bhāva* in the *pravesin*. *kāvyā* is *alankāra* and *bhāva* are *alankāras* according to Udbhata. His commentator, *Praśāntanandarāja*, shows awareness of *rasa* to be the soul of poetry and says, —

Abhinavagupta criticises these earlier authors who include *kāvyarāsas* in *gunas* or *alankāras*. —

अन्येण वृत्तिः अन्येण च गुणानि कारणानि विशिष्टानि
कृतेत सन्तविषयं मयं वृत्तेऽपि अन्यं
Poetry is primarily dramatic, so the rules for nātyarasa are applicable to kāvya-rasa also. In drama rasa is very important as Bharata says—

"यत्र हि रसायते कथितं शवलये" ।

Therefore in poetry also it is important as it is the very life of poetry and cannot be included in any māra or alankāra.

Rudrata is the first rhetorician to dedicate one whole chapter to rasa in his kāvya-lāntaka. No doubt he gives primary importance to alanprāras. He is nevertheless aware of the importance of rasa in poetry. According to him, rasa is the element that distinguishes poetry from dry discussions of stāstra. Rasa-lānya is an easy way to understand the four purusartha. This view of Rudrata is followed by later rhetoricians like
Kammata when they distinguish poetry from śāstra, and compare the lessons learnt by reading kāvya with those imparted by a beloved in sweet words. Rudrata says, —


Nāsa kāvya kriyate, arṣyaśāstraḥ sākhyanumāṇaḥ, ननु शतु च नौरसेवये तत्तत्त्विति शास्त्राभं।

Kāmśāstraḥ yateśaśāstraḥ sākhyanumāṇam, ननु शतु च नौरसेवये तत्तत्त्विति शास्त्राभं।

According to Kāmśādu, rasas are gunas like 'saundarya'. Saundarya is 'beauty' so he may be taking rasa as 'beauty' of poetry.

Rudrata accepts nine rasas and adds the tenth of his own, called 'preyāṇ'. According to him stāna and prayāṇ can be enjoyed as rasas because they are delightful like Dandin's madhurya-ṣūna; therefore whatever brūka, if extremely delightful, can be called rasa.
Among all the rasas, Rudrata gives importance to s'rneśa rasa and says that without s'rneśa rasa, poetry is nirasa or non-delightful.

Bhoja, however, thinks that s'rneśa alone is one rasa which manifests itself in various forms known by different names.

Rudrata connects rītis with rasas. For s'rneśa rasa he prefers vaidarbi and pāncālī rītis and maññāra and laññī vṛttis.

He divides s'rneśa into saṃbhosa and vipralambha and again vipralambha into praccāhama and prakāča. He gives four types of vipralambha-s'rneśa, viz. prāthama-nurāga-vipralambha, māna-vipralambha, pravāsa-vipralambha and karupa-vipralambha. He describes the ten states of love through which a separated person goes.
ālambana-vibhāva of s'ringāra rasa. It seems according to Rudrata, rasa is dependent on the hero and the heroine, their different moods and levels. So the practical procedure of Rudrata seems to indicate that he takes rasa as vastucara.

Rudrabhatṭa, at the beginning of his work, ‘s'ringāratilaka’ states that Bharata and others have discussed rasa in connection with drama but his is the attempt to apply it to poetry.

Poetry bereft of rasa is described by him as,—

Poetry must possess rasa as its constant theme. He accepts nine rasas and in his Maṅgala-s’laka Rudrabhatṭa brings them out very beautifully describing Lord S’iva as possessing all the nine rasas.
Following Rudrata, he gives importance to s'ringara rasa. In this Rudrabhatta gives a one-sided development of rasa, because if s'ringara is the rasa-raja, other rasas like bibhatsa cannot get their proper place in poetry. Under sambhara-s'ringara Rudrabhatta describes various types of heroes and heroines. In his treatise of vipralambha-s'ringara also he follows Rudrata. Thus all the rhetoricians before Anandavardhana deal with rasa objectively as vastudharma.

A sehrdaya enjoys the rasa but rasa is released outside in nātya or kāvyā as such, is the theory dear to all the ancient commentators of Bharata and actually accepted by all poets like Vallidāca and Bhavabhūti. While in Ananda-vardhana’s theory rasa is released or the first time in the mind of rasika. In the theory of Kuntaka, which follows the ancient’s rasa is manifested in s'abha and in artha only of poetry or drama. Ananda-vardhana has no other go except to relate these two by the concept of vyāmanā-vyāpāra; but for Kuntaka it is unnecessary because without discussing whether it is bhakti or vyānā or aukikā-abhidhā, he can easily say that it is the unique function of the creative mind.
It is pratibhārvapara and nothing more. This is an easy
way of avoiding all controversy about the need for
postulating a new vyāsāra. Thus dhvani and vakrokti
become interchangeable terms in relation to rasa. The
word vakrokti was never used in such a comprehensive
significance as to include all the aspects of the creative
mind, including even dhvani, before Kuntaka’s time.
Kuntaka’s originality lies in thus investing an old word
with the widest significance. Let us discuss now the
detailed treatment of rasa in the texts of Ānandavardhana
and Kuntaka.

Ānandavardhana treats rasadhvani under asamālāsyā-
krasa-yyangya-dhvani, which comes under vyakṣitānyapara-
vācyadhvani based on abhidhā. The sequence between
vācy and yyangya is unnoticeable in asamākṣa-krasa-
yyangya-dhvani under which are included rasa, bhāvo,
rasaḥbhāsa, bhāvabhāsa, bhāras'anti etc. Rasadhvani is
distinguished from the Rasavat alankāra on the basis of
prādhānya and aprādhānya of rasa. When the rasa is
primarily important in the intention of the poet as
felt by the critic, and alankāras and gūnas are sub-
ordinate to it, it is called rasadhvani. We have seen
how rasādi become subordinate in rasavadādi alankāras
in ch. II, section III of this thesis. For the first
time rasa is given such a high position in poetry in
"The insistence on the emotional aspect of language is, in fact, one of the signal contributions of the dhvani school to the science of semantics."

Abhinavagupta supports Anandavardhana's rasadhvani theory by observing that without rasadhvani poetry cannot exist. "Even a slight touch of rasa brings very much charm to poetry."

Abhinavagupta gives the examples of bhārādhyāsas to show that suggested bhāvas also make poetry very beautiful. The objection is raised, why vibhāvas and anubhāvas are not called dhvani; and Abhinavagupta replies that they are svas'abdayēva and cannot be enjoyed like rasa and bhāva. The word vibhāva has no meaning without rasa.

Vibhāva is closely related to rasa. It has two aspects, the vyañjake aspect towards rasa and vācya aspect towards words. Vibhāva cannot be called laukika.

kārana because it is alaukika found only in an imagined situation and not in reality. Dr. Pandey explains vibhāva as, —

"The word "vibhāva" stands for the dramatic situation, which is not the cause but only a medium, through which emotion arises in the actor. But emotion in the spectator is due to identification with the hero. Vibhāva is so called, because it arises emotion in a manner quite different from that in which emotion arises in actual life." 9

Every vastu acquires a new power in relation to rasa and this power is called vyanārā. And such capacity of the vastu to become a stimulus of rasa is known as vibbāvāya. Every vastu is a vastu and nothing more in laukika vyanārā; but in kāvya, a vastu will never be a mere vastu. It will also be a vibhāva. Thus whenever Ānandavardhana speaks of rasa and refers to vibhāvas, we may take it to mean only vastus characterised in terms of rasa exclusive to poetry. So if we interpret Kuntaka when he talks of rasa as a vastu, as mere only rasopākāraka-vastu, or what Ānandavardhana would call vibhāvo. But there is a great gulf between the two theories of rasa though the terminologies appear at first sight to be not much opposed. While vastu can

never be alankārya in the system of Ānandavardhana, in
Kuntaka's broader usage vastu itself is nothing but
alankārya.

Vibhāvaśāhāsa leads to rasabhāva, for example,
Rāvana's rati towards Śīla. Abhinavagupta defines
rasadhvani as,

```
स्त्रायंश्चालितस्योद्योगादित्वात: सत्वान्तिपादिक्यान
अभिबंधनाति यज्ञशरीरिः प्रसुस्यत्साहित्याभिधानक: प्रतीपन्तु?
(śocana, Dv. va. I , 377)
```

Abhinavagupta discusses the theories of Lolata.
S'ankuśa and Bhattānāyaka, of rasa and proves that rasa
can be found also in poetry as in drama. In drama we
get rasa by lokadharmī and nātyadharmī as part of the
actor's art; and in poetry we get rasa by svabhāvakā
and vakrokti as found in the poetic art. This rasa being
alaukika is only suggested, suggestion being the unique
art function. In the realm of poetry, words and meanings
alone are the material of art. These acquire the capacity
of vibhavādi by forceful or sweet diction.

Abhinavagupta refutes the bhāvakātya theory of Bhatta-
ānāyaka to defend Ānandavardhana's pratīyamāna theory; but
he accepts Bhattanāyaka's sādhārārikarana.
Rasa is so important for Anandavardhana that he re-establishes all the other poetic concepts in the light of rasa. The alankāras and sūnas, which do not add the beauty of rasa by overpowering it, and which add beauty to rasa being subordinate to it, are admissible to rasa-dhvani. Too much fascination for alankāras leads to rasabhāna, which is a blunder in poetry. Even great poets sometimes are tempted to show their skill in using alankāras in chains and Ānandavardhana criticises this.

He gives beautiful examples like, —

कुपोष्ट जलाशी करतलानीर्द्धन मृदिता
तिरिको मिन्द्रायम्बृत्तद्धोद तपस्यः।

सुधुः वर्षको वडसतत्तथ्यानालाक्षसतिनिमी
प्रियो मनुजालितानिर्मणस्तरस्ये न पुः कथम्।

(p. 482)

Here iryā-vipralambha-s'ṛṇāra rasa is the main theme of the stanza. The alankāras, s'lesa, vyatireka etc. flow automatically with rasa adding beauty to it. This is a beautiful example of rasa-dhvani.

Ānandavardhana proves that rasa is different from vācyārtha though based on it. He criticises Udbhata's svasa'abdayāva theory of rasa, saying that only the words like s'ṛṇāra and karma do not help to enjoy rasa (rasā-svāda) without vīthāvādi. Abhinavagupta defines rasa very beautifully in this connection,
Only a sahrdaya whose cittavritti or vāsanās are stimulated by the sthāvibhavas, described through vibha-vādi in poetry, can enjoy rasadhvani, which primarily is the soul of poetry. Abhinavagupta defines a sahrdaya as,

"येषा काव्यानुग्रहोपायायमराज्ञिश्चिमुद्रे मनोभुजे
वर्जिनीययमयस्मिनयोग्यं तेऽथ स्थव्रयस्वादसाशि: सहस्त्रया."  

(Locana, Dhv Vol I, p 62)

By constant study of poetry the critics achieve the power of becoming one with the poet's feelings and they can enjoy them as their own. This is called emotional collaboration. Abhinavagupta does not accept rasa in

10. Collingwood says, "The audience which the artist thus feels as collaborating with himself may be a large one or a small one, but is never absent." - 'The Principles of Art'. P. 315.
the actor but if a poet or an actor becomes a saarsdaya, he can enjoy rasa as a critic. As Prof. Hiriyanan says,—

"Rasa experience is the outcome more of reconstruction than of remembrance." 11

Ardayasya or tanavibhavana is necessary to enjoy rasa.

Abhinavagupta criticises Bhattanayaka for showing bhayana rasa in the example of vastudvani, viz.

'Bhrama dharmika ---'. For the mendicant it may be the bhayana rasa but for a reader it can be just a baasa of compassion or pity. The same arrow used by Bhattanayaka against Anandavardhana is used by Abhinavagupta against Bhattanayaka himself. Condemning vastudvani, Bhattanayaka indirectly has accepted the rasadhvan of Anandavardhana. Technically Bhattanayaka is correct in showing rasa in the examples of vastudvani. But Abhinavagupta is a wonderful defender of Anandavardhana. He says that it is not a flaw to have rasa in vastudvani. In every piece of poetry there will be presence of sphuta or asphuta rasa. In 'Bhrama dharmika ---' Abhinavagupta does not accept bhayana rasa. He says that it is s'rusa rasa because a desire for dalliance is suggested. In fact, rasa is defined as alaukika and this is laukika.

actually found in ordinary life. This sort of rasa is abnormal and found only in unchaste ladies. So this cannot be the example of fully developed rasadhvani. Only the cleverness of these unchaste ladies is more interesting in these stanzas than any emotion; hence it is rather rasābhāsa than the real rasa.

The soul of poetry is the suggested sense, which primarily is rasa according to Anandavardhana when he says,

"कायस्यात्मा स प्रायः प्रत्येकत्था -साधिकैः पुरोः
कृत्यादिकेत्तिवसीमोगतया -शास्त्र: " (विद्व. I, 5)

The sorrowful laments of a separated bird took the form of a beautiful stanza full of karuna rasa. This suggested karuna rasa is called kavyātman, which is known only by critics who know the principle of poetry; i.e. who are real connoisseurs.

Poetry, full of suggested rasa, can be produced only by great poets. Abhinavagupta clarifies Anandavardhana's view why rasa alone is called kavyātman, when there are vastudhvani and alankāradhvani. Vastudhvani and alankāradhvani always lead to rasa, therefore, in general, rasa itself can be called as the soul of poetry. Abhinavagupta discusses about the sthāyībhāva s'oka, which took
the form of a stanza having karuna rasa. The grief (or S'oka) is not the personal grief but it is general impersonal and universalised form of rasa. The S'oka of the bird aroused Valmiki's citravrtti imaginatively or ideally and he could enjoy karuna rasa. Rasa can be suggested even through a word, a part of a word, sentence, style or a whole prabandha. The parts of words like upasarga, nirata etc. being forceful suggest rasa and if they are removed from the stanza, the whole beauty of the stanza is lost. In words also we find rasa, for example in the stanza,

"उल्कामिनीः मन्योपरिवर्त्तीलः शुक्लान्ति
ते लेचने मलिनेशा विमुखे स्विपन्ने
गृहरहि सकियात्या सत्त्वेव दस्या
धुमाविचित्रे दर्दने न वैज्ञेलामिनी"
(CHV vol II, p 70-)

The word 'te' suggests the whole rasa. Different rasas and bhavas are combined in the king's expression, 'those eyes'. Actually the word 'those' (i.e. eyes) relates to śrṣnāra rasa which leads to karuna rasa in the above quoted stanza.

We have discussed the relation between rasa and sanchatana (ch. III of this thesis). Ānandavardhana discusses rasa in the whole prabandha where one rasa is
prominent and the plot (or itivṛtti) is beautiful with proper vibhāvadā and other factors of beauty like alankāras, sandhīs etc. which are vācaka. According to Anandavardhana, the plot of a composition is the body of poetry, leading to the soul which is rasa. There must be propriety in using all the beautifying factors in itivṛtti, because it should not harm the main rasa of the composition. Aucitva should be maintained in different bhāvas according to different characters and situations. Aucitva gets a very important place in rasa as it is governed by it. Impropriety in rasa is a grave mistake and Anandavardhana treats all the poetic concepts in the light of rasa, hence aucitva governs all the poetic factors.

Anandavardhana shows aucitva in Kalidāsa’s Kumārasambhava in the description of love stories of the Great God Siva and the Goddess Pārvatī, who are the parents of the world. Therefore their sambhoga-vaṃsa, like that of ordinary human beings, becomes vulgar. So there must be propriety in describing the famous historical characters or deities as the main characters in a composition. For the concept of aucitva Anandavardhana follows Bharata’s foot-steps and always refers to him with respect while expanding the concept of aucitva in rasa. For ucita rasa kathā-sāra also should be ucita.
The plot should not hinder the flow of rasa. Every incident should lead to the main rasa. Anandavardhana points out the example of the conversation of a vulture in the Mahabharata, leading to the main rasa, i.e. sānta.

The opposite rasas of the main rasa should be avoided by a great poet. Detailed descriptions of unwanted things, unnecessary exposition of rasa; suppression of rasa when actually it should be exposed and repetition of the same rasa, though fully developed, lead to anaucitya of rasa and it is rasabhanga. The opposite rasas like sānta and s'ṛngāra; s'ṛngāra andraudra should not come one after the other in one and the same character. They can come close only when some other compromising rasa is coming in between them as a bridge to connect the two opposite poles. In the Nāgānana, both sānta and s'ṛngāra rasas are there, but they are connected with the adbhuta element; therefore it is not a fault to bring these opposite rasas together. An opposite rasa can be described in a villain or in/other character but not in the hero to mar the main rasa. In a prabandha there will be many subordinate rasas and one will be the main which is fully developed throughout the whole composition. The precaution should be taken that
the subordinate rasas should not develop with the main rasa to compete with it. If at all two opposite rasas are found in one character, one of the two rasas should be the main and the other subordinate to it.

Anandavardhana accepts śāntarasa, tṛṣṇāksayasyakha being its etbhībhāva. The relation of rasa and the plot of a composition is like that of gura and ṣaṁjñi. Vibhāvādī themselves are not rasas, just they help the ṣaṁjñi, i.e. rasa.

Anandavardhana shows rasa even in grobhātavyajravākāvyā, but the itivṛtta or vṛṣṭvārtha there is more charming than the vyapāra rasa. Even an inanimate object, if human feelings and sentiments are attributed to it, becomes very beautiful and as good as the first-rate poetry on account of this association of rasa. If a poet himself is full of rasa, the whole world of poetry will be sarasa by the power of his imagination. If the poet is interested in mere itivṛtta, the whole composition will be dry (nirasa).

According to Anandavardhana, all the incidents in the Mahābhārata lead for salvation because sānta is the main rasa of the Mahābhārata. The main rasa of the Rāmāyana is karuna, showing separation of loving paœ.
Thus according to Anandavardhana there can be no poetry without rasa. Rasa is not found in the vāstu (or śāttvika). There can be no rasa without acūtva. Acūtita rasa leads to rasabhāsya and it is a major flaw though can be overcome by the poet's intuition. The śūrvita must be, 

"सति तापितत्तथानुबहावः" (Chh., vithī on I, 2) leading to the main rasa.

The elaborate discussion of Anandavardhana is not only philosophical but also practical. He understood the spirit of Bharata's concept of rasa and established it in poesy as the very artha or the substance of it. According to Anandavardhana, both a poet and a reader must be equally talented to enjoy rasa. Abhinavagupta discusses rasa mainly as sabhāvyabhāva. Anyway the credit of popularising the rasa theory of Anandavardhana goes to Abhinavagupta. He is a strong defender of Anandavardhana and to support rasa as pratiyamana and a one-faced function, he criticises Bhattanayaka's bhāvana-vyāpārā and the three-faced function of rasa. His commentary is the soit to see the light of the dhvani theory of Anandavardhana.

12. Mānīkycanira shows a high regard for Abhinavagupta in his commentary on the Kavyapaktas'a, and says, 

"स्वादयन्तु रास नर्त्याद्यत्त्वानुभावः 'न यथाप्रत्यात्म अथवाः "

सति तापितत्तथानुबहावः हि त्योऽन्तः"
According to Anandavardhana, rasa is mainly anukramayakramavangya, like s'ataptra-patra-suci-bhadana-nyáva but it can be samalakṣa-krama-yyanyaga also when s'o' haeva are suggested and through them the rasa is grasped. In such cases, the sequence between the bhavas and the rasa is clearly seen. In, the suggested bhavas like 'loka', 'autsyka' lead to the enjoyment of s'rnga rasa.

Thus for Anandavardhana rasa is everything and poetry without rasa does not deserve to be called kávya, rather it can be called mere aitiyrtta.

For Kuntaka rasa is a vastu and hence alankára. Beauty or vakrata is added to vastu which is rasa, so it becomes delightful and enjoyable. Rasa is objective in Kuntaka’s treatment so it gets less importance. It is subjective in Anandavardhana’s theory so it is very important. Kuntaka’s objective and practical theory of rasa leads him to criticise Anandavardhana’s twofold function of rasa, in rasadhvani as the alankára and in rasavat alankára as an alankára. According to Anandavardhana rasa is not found in the aitiyrtta and Kuntaka’s
opinion is that *rasa* is found in the situation itself.

In Kuntaka's way of understanding, *rasa* and *svabhāva* both are *vastu* and they are beautified by *kavipratikā* which shines forth in the composition. When the intuition helps for the full development of *rasa* or the minute observation of *svabhāva*, it gives delight to the *rasikas*.

For example on the below quoted stanza,

```
śāntasvaṁ pushyanuṇḍitaṁ, kumārasya avikāryata, 
śāntasvaṁ pravāhanavaśa, kumārasya pravāhanavaśa.
```

Kuntaka comments,—

```
'तामस्यमोक्षादेभितानुसारी भुवनी, अतोप्पः शाश्वताय यात्,' 
शब्दवर्णविद्वांसुवृत्ति-कस्मकर्तमा सोहनतया 
कल्पवेदविज्ञानकाव्य-कस्मकर्तमा सोहनतया.

13. Dr. R.W. Wells says, "In each culture the critics justify the outlook known to them and define that technique as the best which most fully realises the native ideas. But it is the technique that is clearly stated rather than the outlook as the aesthetics of Aristotle or Cicero, of Bharata or Lagaranāndana, clearly shows." *Classical Drama of India.* - London 1963. p 48

Thus Kuntaka's theory deals with the technique of poetry and not with the philosophical outlook like the theory of Amśavardhana.
The delicate heart of the great sage Valmiki is the main theme of the stanza. The full development of karupa rasa is seen in the beauty of the delicacy of Valmiki's heart, which is full of compassion seeing the pitiful condition of Sītā. In this example, due to Valmiki's soft heartiness the karupa rasa has become more beautiful. Sahāyatan is essential to enjoy rasas.

A beautiful vācyārtha, pleasing to the critics, helps the flow of rasa by becoming subordinate to it and also beautifies svabhāva. He takes the example from Nārāyaṇa's Balarāma to show that if vācyā is not beautiful, it neither helps rasa nor svabhāva. The stanza is,

```
सदा पुरोपारसर्वकाल्य भन्धिण्यन्ति
सीता अवाच जीवनमणि पशि जलवानि,
गलत्यमयं कियदित्यमकृद भुवना,
शामाणु तुलनात्मकोरमेव।''
```

The word 'asakt' is not proper here and spoils the vācyārtha of the stanza. Every moment Sītā asks Rāma, how far they have to go still; and bearing this few repeatedly, several times, tears came to Rāma's eyes for the first time. The slightest mistake of using the word 'asakt' spoils the beauty and the vācyārtha does not attract the
critics because it does not help the dignified character of Sītā acr it develops the rasa fully.

While defining sûhitya, Kuntaka says that both s'abda and artha, competing with each other in beauty, possess rasa. His kāraka-vakratā shows the attributed rasa to the inanimate objects. Rasa is developed in case of these inanimate objects as it is developed in animate beings. Even Kuntaka's mārgas contain rasa. The sukumāra māra is full of rasa on account of its delicacy and charm. In the vicitra māra rasa and bhāva are delightful due to their strikingness. Thus the rasa in the sukumāra māra is due to svabhāvavarnana and in the vicitra māra it is due to vakratā.

The uddīpana vibhāvas, on account of their minute description, become subordinate to rasas. Akaabana vibhāvas like gods and sandharvas, possessing the supernatural element of cetanatva and being full of rasa, delight equally the minds of the rasikas.

CV P III
The inanimate vibhāras can have svabhāvatis'āya helping the main rasa; and super-natural beings can have extra-ordinary development of rasa.

Saubhāgya guṇa which is the excellence of the whole poetic composition, possesses all the beautifying factors, delights the reader on account of its alaukikatva and sarasata.

Kuntaka includes rasa in his varieties of vakrata, especially in vākyavakrata. In vis' esana vakrata, due to appropriate adjectives, rasa reaches its highest level of enjoyment. In lingavakrata, beauty is brought by rasādi. The feminine gender is mostly preferred to give the emotional touch. The alankāras like rūpaka become sarasa due to upacāravakrata. Rasa, svabhāva and alankāra are described properly in vākyavakrata.

Under vākyavakrata he cites the examples to show bhāva and rasa. Kuntaka accepts propriety of bhāvas in the development of rasas.
Following Anandavardhana, Kuntaka shows rāsa in a part of a word, i.e. in unasāra, nipāta etc., in his treatment of pada-vakratu. In a line—

"तैदहें तू कस्म भावप्यति है सा हा देखि धीरा भवां"

The nipāta 'tu' reveals the delicacy of Sītā and her inability to bear the pangs of separation, which rāsa is bearing at the advent of the rainy season. It is possible only for Rāwa as he has become hard-hearted.

The nipāta 'tu' suggests all the possibilities of Sītā's worst condition on account of the separation. It helps the vipralambha-sūrdha to become more striking to the heart of a reader.

Thus Kuntaka includes rāsa in the varieties of vakratu, considering rāsa as a vastu (or itivyrtta). Beauty (or vaicitrva) is added to rāsa found in a situation and it becomes extremely delightful and pleasing to the minds of the critics.

Following Anandavardhana, Kuntaka says that aṅkāras like rūpaka etc. should be used with propriety. The aṅkāras should not spoil the beauty of rāsa or the
delicacy of natural description.
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The aucitya should be observed to retain the beauty of rasa. All the three vastu-prakāras, viz. rasa, svabhāva and alankāra become alaukika due to the skill of the poet. Kuntaka always gives equal importance to rasa and svabhāva but under ākṣa-vakrā he has added alankāra also in vastuprakāra. Vastu, according to Kuntaka always is alankāra.

Kavi-kaus'ala (or the skill of the poet) alone helps the development of rasa through proper vibhāvādi. He quotes a stanza possessing vīra rasa and comments on it,—

Kavi-kaus'ala (or the skill of the poet) alone helps the development of rasa through proper vibhāvādi. He quotes a stanza possessing vīra rasa and comments on it,—

There are two kinds of cetasā-varagā-visāva. In the first category, gods and human beings are included.
This category is very important for the *rasa-paripusa*. In the second category, birds and beasts are included. For the full development of *rasa* the first category is preferred than that of the second by great poets.

Kuntaka cites examples to show *rasa-paripusa* in human beings. He quotes some stanzas from the fourth act of the *vikramorvasīva* to show the highest level of the development of *vipralambha-s'rnasa* rasa. He quotes some stanzas from the *Tāpasavatsarīja* to show karuna rasa. Kuntaka further says that like *mukhya-cetana*, *amukhya-cetana* or *acetana-visavya* also becomes attractive by the attribution of *rasa*. So Kuntaka divides *rasa* into three categories:— (1) *Mukhya-cetana-visaya*, (2) *Amukhya-cetana-visavya* and (3) *Acetana-visaya*. We will take the examples of all the three kinds of *rasa-pariposa*.

The lamentations of king Udavana, for Vāsavadatta develop karuna rasa, through proper vibhāvānuḥhāvṛs, to its top-most level. Udavana sees the young-one of a deer searching for Vāsavadatta and his sorrow increases. This is
an example of karuna rasa of mukhya-cetana-visaya.

In mukhya-cetana-visaya, minor living beings are described. For example,

\[ \text{सुरांकुटिले यन्त्रुंगं प्रकटीकर्ते सनातनिहानारहातदशं तैरेष आत कन्यं अस्यं} \]

The notes of a male cuckoo are helping the rasa, sambhara-s'ra'ra. Rasa is thus developed through minor animate beings like birds, beasts, etc. Now we will take an example of cetana-visaya, which develops rasa.

\[ \text{इमस्सुमुक्तिप्रायत्नात्यति निपतितसिद्धान्तष्ठम संस्थापण सिद्धांतमन्त्रोत्सप्पन्ते} \]

The inanimate things as the breezes coming from the mountain Malaya, the blossoms of mango-trees, suggest the advent of the Spring. Their descriptions help for the development of vipralambha-s'ra'ra. Thus inanimate objects also can give rasasvada, if animation is attributed to them.

According to Kuntaka, svabhava-pradhana vastu or rasapradhama vastu is always alankarya and can never be called an alankara. There can be no poetry without vastu and vastu itself cannot be the means of decoration. We
have seen how Kuntaka criticises Anandavardhana's definition of rasavat alankāra, for making rasa subordinate. For Kuntaka, rasa can never be subordinate to anything; it is always alankāra. Rasa is always present in a good poetic composition and karipretibbha adds beauty to it to make rasa relishable. When rasa is beautiful only due to arthālankāras, and if the alankāra is removed, the rasa looses its charm, it is called rasavat alankāra by Kuntaka. Alankāra adds an extra-ordinary beauty to rasa in the rasavat alankāra.

Thus Kuntaka treats rasa objectively as a kavya-vastu. According to Anandavardhana, rasa alone brings beauty to a poetic composition, and without rasa a composition is not fit to be called poetry. According to Kuntaka, rasa is not subjective and beauty is added to it. So the alankāras, which make rasa more attractive, are important. Alankāra is a starting point to get rasa and without alankāra one cannot get rasa according to Kuntaka. Anandavardhana discusses rasa mainly as āsvāda, from the critic's point of view. The delight got by the critics, by kāvyarasa, is subjective and supreme, hence Anandavardhana's discussion becomes idealistic. Kuntaka treats rasa from the point of view of a poet as his book is meant to train the poets, so the rasa is discussed
objectively as a vāstu. Both the ways of explaining rasa are convincing. Anandavardhana's theoretical discussion is helped by the practical application of Kuntaka. Thus the two theories are complementary to each other.

Later rhetoricians like Mamsata and Ruyraka follow Anandavardhana's rasadhyeni theory. Bhoja has one fundamental (prakrti) rasa, sārūrya, and a number of bhāyas, all capable of becoming rases themselves, though the same rasa is applicable to them only through upacāra. The theory of rasa, according to Bhoja, is discussed in detail by Dr. Raghavan in his thesis, 'Bhoja's S'ṛngāra-prakāśa'. Bhoja divides the whole of literature into rasokti, vakrokti and svabhavokti and says that among the three, the rasokti is important in all the types of literature. He defines rasokti like the rasa-sūtra of Bharata.

"सिंगहोत्सवभवन्यविद्यानिः स्वातन्त्र्यं नरसानीकृतितपतिः"

(CS P vol II, p 372, Dr Raghavan's edn)

In the Sṛngāraprakāśa he defines rasa as,—

"सुभाषितं अस्त्रवस्त्र आचार्यम् शुद्ध भविष्यति रसम्"

14. Following Bhoja, Visves'vara says in the Comatkaracandrika,—

"स्यं जनवीरां श्वाभिषेकेन रसायनिकृप्ति विषयते।"

(Bhoja's S'ṛngāra-prakāśa—V Raghavan, p 417)
Rasa is Self or "go according to Bhoja. Many rhetoricians, following Bhoja, emphasise s'rngāra rasa. S. Choudhary remarks,—

"Hemacandra, Vidyādara, Rāmacandra-Gunacandra etc. have assigned the top position to the s'rngāra rasa on the ground that its influence is not confined to human race only, but is common to all the species, and is very familiar and pleasing to all without exception." 15

Rāmacandra and Gunacandra propound a theory that kārma rasa is painful and rasas like bibbatsa and bhayānaka are repulsive. They take rasas to mean the worldly pleasure and pain. Rasa, according to Rāmacandra and Gunacandra, primarily relates to the actual human life and secondarily to the spectators or readers.

"सन्तता तुमास्ताक्षरात्। नृपतिहृदयो अस्वकर्मोऽवस्थणम् कदाचैं निमोऽवस्थणम्॥"

Dr. K. H. Trivedi comments on this view,—

"This view of Rāmacandra may very well be compared with that of Lollata who also believes that Rasa originally resides in Rāma and others and being superimposed on the actor it gives delight to the spectators." 16

15. 'S'rngāra-Pasarāja' - Essays on Indian Poetica.
Saradatena follows Bhoja. Visvanatha, following Anandavardhana says,—

There can be no poetry without rasa. Rasa is the soul of poetry; but for the practical application of rasa, he follows the objective treatment of Kuntaka. He discusses rasa according to characters (or nayaka-nayika-bheda). It is the case with many later rhetoricians that they follow Anandavardhana’s theory and for the practical application, they prefer Kuntaka’s treatment of rasa as a vastu.

Jayannatha includes rasadhvam in the first category of poetry, i.e. uttamottama kavva. None of these writers add anything new to the theory of rasa in poetry, already established forcefully by Anandavardhana, and given practical objective turn by Kuntaka. Mostly they follow one or the other of the predecessors.

Some novelty is found in the Ujvalanilamani of Rupacovin. He gives the highest place to ujvala-s’rugsra, madhur’ rati being its sthavibhava. He describes love-sports of Radha and Krishna. His s’rugsra rasa is meant only for divine characters and not for any ordinary hero and heroine.

Prabhakarabhatta in his Rasapradina, refutes...
Narayana’s theory that Adbhuta is the underlying basis of all the rasas. The Adbhuta element cannot be found in rasas like karnna, according to Prabhākaraabhata. So adbhara is a different rasa having vismaya as its sthayabhava.

Thus rasa is discussed both subjectively and objectively in Sanskrit Poetics. From the point of view of an aesthete, it is subjective and if the creative experience of a poet is considered it is objective. Ananda-vardhana and Kuntaka both can be justified, each in his own way.

---XXX---

17. Vistvesvara also says in the Garattārasaandria that on account of canmatkara we get joy from all the poetic factors.

- And, "मल्लकरस्वु लिङ्गमानन्दपरमेवाहू "

"गुण शीति रसं दूति पारं श्रवामुदार्ततिमि
सप्तताति -मल्लकरकारण शुचः वृधा."
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