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CHAPTER - II

RASA : ITS SIGNIFICANCE, ILLUSTRATION AND DESCRIPTION

II.0   The primacy of rasa

II.0.1 Rasa in the ancient scriptures

The precedence in point of consideration, however, goes to the most ancient scriptures, the Vedas which are the earliest literary monuments of Indian culture. They are the quarries to which every precious gem in learning is or is tried to be, traced. This fact accounts for the attempts of some rhetoricians to discover the concepts of rasa adumbrated in the Upaniṣads, the concluding portions of the Vedas. In the Rgveda the word, rasa is found occurring in senses of water, soma juice, cow's milk, and flavour. The Atharvaveda extends the sense to the sap of grain and the taste, the latter becoming very common. In the Upaniṣads rasa stands for essence or quintessence and self-luminous consciousness though the sense of taste is at places conveyed. Ayurvedic science recognizes the six rasas, which, however, are the props to support its whole superstructure. The Raṣāyanaśāstra moves round the pivot of rasa. Mercury, which is called rasa, plays here a very important part. In the above two contexts rasa denotes
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mostly some concrete objects as liquids etc. and thus remains on a physical plane. The knowledge of *rasa* and the concrete objects denoted by it in the Indian medical system do cater to the weal, welfare and happiness of the living organism, yet human beings feel highly delighted with the abstract pleasure which is super physical. In the *Śaivadarśana* (mercury) is also called the semen of Lord Śiva,\(^\text{10}\) though physical yet it raises here in a way *rasa* from the physical to the super-physical plane, as it gets connected as the vital element with Śiva. According to this Darśana this very *rasa* in the Tai.Up. is called the ultimate reality on the attainment of which one becomes all bliss.\(^\text{11}\) In the world, however, it is equated in a sense akin to the above with the aesthetic pleasure which is the life of literature. It retains its superphysical plane at this level also. The aesthetic pleasure is experienced at the recital of a literary work, prose or poetry, or at the representation of a dramatic work. The manifestation of this delightful experience, on the practical side, is seen either in sudden activities and movements, rapt attention etc of the readers and the spectators during the recital and the representation, or in the verbal expressions and statements made at their completion. *Rasa* in the above context plainly stands for delightful and pleasurable experience relating to emotions which were as true, powerful and vehement before as they are now or as they will ever remain. Consequently any concept evolved on them as the basis will safely and unscathingly bear the verdict of time, if not in nomenclature, then assuredly in contents. The Sanskrit poeticians, rhetoricians and dramaturgists fully realised this latter aspect of *rasa* in their work.

---


II.0.2 *Rasa* is the soul of poetry

The ancient theorists regard *rasa* or the aesthetic emotion as the very soul of the poetry. *Rasa* is an emotion excited by artistic circumstances or situations. It only means that no emotion is raised to the status of *rasa* unless it is aesthetically excited. The grief expressed at the death of a child does not endow a person with *karuṇarasa*. It becomes *karuṇarasa* only when a talented poet describes it through artistic skill.

Indian Ācāryas have said the *sarvart rasamayaṁ jagat* that is, the whole universe is sweetend by *rasa*. In other words they have identified *rasa* with *brahmaṁ sarvam brahmamayaṁ jagat*. Ācārya Abhinavagupta, the celebrated aesthetes, hold that the poetry and the drama both are identical as far as the *rasa* experience is concerned. The constant consciousness in supreme happiness i.e. of *rasa*. The *rasa* school deals *rasas* preferably eight. The stream beginning from Bharata’s *NS*, developed by the commentators beginning from Mātrgupta or Śaraṅgadeva, was further strengthened by the original contributions of Ānandavardhana, Dhanaṅjaya, Mammaṭa, Viśvanātha and Bhānudatta.

The word *rasa*, or aesthetic emotions, has a general and a technical meaning. In the first sense *rasa* means taste while in the second sense it means the well known primary dominant emotions such as शृङ्ग, हस्य, करुण, रॉट, वीर, अनुदत, भयानक, and दीर्घमल्ल. History of Indian literature records that pathos in the heart of a poet was transformed into poetry. Saddest thoughts of a poet move his mind in forms of the sweetest songs. The *Rā*. of Vālmiki stands a testimony to this fact. Moved by the sorrow of the lamenting female bird, Vālmiki uttered the first śloka, शोकः शोकतवामागताः. Taking clame from him the later poets profusely used the pathos in their works and attained fame in the world of poetry.
All kāvyā should carry rasa in the same way as dramas and the best epics and lyrics. The occasions producing emotions vibhāva and the expression of emotion by the characters anubhāva must be harmoniously created agreeably to the rasa, so that the effect of the work is not spoiled. Likewise the style, modes, vṛtīs and figures of speech and incidental descriptive passages, must all harmonise with the rasa. In any kāvyā though various other rasas should be drawn in subordinate positions, just as there should be one main ‘objective’ kāvyā. The preceptors of Indian aesthetics consider joy or emotional experience of beauty as the beauty or joy is found from kāvyā in two shapes. These are (i) Style of composition and (ii) the presence of excellent suggested sense or suggestion.12 The embellishments, guṇas, rītis etc. are included under the first one and sentiment is included under the second one, when the embellishments etc. are responsible for external beautification, rasa is fully internal and is the soul of poetry. The scholars of dhvani school all hold rasa as the cause of delight in kāvyā. So the relishing rasa in a kāvyā is the principal duty of a poet. Locanakāra has rightly said that "rasavamdhaḥ eva mukhyah kavi vyāpūra viṣayah". So the element rasa should not at all be ignored in the kāvyas.13 Then what it may be? Rasa primarily means ‘taste’ or flavour or savour or relish but metaphorically it means the emotional experience of joy or beauty in poetry or drama.14 Rasa or sentiments is of nine kinds according to SD. These are गृहार, हास्य, करुण, त्रेत, वीर, भयानक, वीभत्स, अद्दृत, and शान्त. Out of the nine sentiments Rā. consists of all the sentiments. Among these karunārasa is the anigirasa and all others are anigarasā to it.

II.0.3 Rasa in Sanskrit learning

Rasa in the field of Sanskrit learning has a very wide
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scope. Various are its connotations in different sciences. The sense, there attached to it in each differs according to the context. Use of rasa, however, goes to the most ancient scriptures, those Vedas, which are the earliest literary monuments of Indian culture. Rasa is used for water, milk, juice, essence, something tasteful etc.\textsuperscript{15} Rasa makes the literary work enjoyable "rasyati iti rasaḥ". According to the Šṛti, rasa is the supreme brahman, "raso vai sa".\textsuperscript{16} According to Bharata, a literary work is incomplete without sentiment.\textsuperscript{17} Also Viśvanātha says "a sentence having a sentiment is known as kāvyā."\textsuperscript{18} Besides, rasa is use under various meaning in Vedas, Upaniṣads etc.-

\begin{itemize}
  \item a) pusnāmi causdhiḥ sarvāḥ somabhutvā rasātmanakah.\textsuperscript{19}
  \item b) janme rasasya vā vṛdhé.\textsuperscript{20}
  \item c) According to Kāmaśāstra the meaning of rasa is ratiḥ and kāmaśaktiḥ, "raso rati prītbhāvo rāgo vogoḥ samāptitirrati paryāyaḥ".\textsuperscript{21}
\end{itemize}

So Sanskrit in general in nourished by the sentiment.

II.0.4 The derivation of rasa

Rasa is derived from the ṛras which occurs in the pāṇinīya dhātupātha and is explained as having the senses of 'to make sound' 'to taste' and 'to be oily' (rasa śabde (bhvādi), and rasa āsvādanasnehanayoḥ (cūrāḍī).

The root ṛras has thus three different meanings. In the first sense it is associated with the river rasa according to Yāska
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The word *rasa* is used as a name of a particular river or sometimes a river in general. One may say that here too the word may be connected to the sense of being liquid. *Rasa* in the sense of something liquid is associated with many things like juice or the sap of plants or the milk of the cow or the virile semen of the body etc. In fact we find lexicons giving all these various meanings. Amara for example says:

\[ rūpaṁ śabdo gandharasaspars'āccaviśayā amī. \] (line 291), and also \[ śṛṅgārādu više vīrye guṇe rāge drave rasaḥ. \] (line 2789) and also the six-fold tastes (line 295)

Hemacandra adds the following senses:

\[ gṛhe, dhātāu i.e. humours of the body, pārade i.e. mercury, premṇi, bhāve, ātmani, \] and also in the sense of sukha.

Thus the word *rasa* has a very interesting semantic history. We are here interested in finding out how the physical sense of the word gets transmuted into the experience of aesthetic plesure or the flavour of a sentiment of emotion.

**II.0.5 Rasa, its origin**

The *Agni-purāṇa*, unlike any other writer, tries to trace *rasa* to the "Supreme Reality", the very embodiment of *ānanda* from which proceed *ahaṅkāra* and *abhimāna* and the latter gives rise to *rati* from which various other sentiments take rise. From it proceed *rāga taiksṇa, avaṣṭambha* and *saṅkoca*. These respectively give rise to गृह, रौद्र, वीर and वीभत्त्स. These four become the basic sentiments. They, in their turn, give rise to, other sentiments e.g. गृह, produces हाम्स्ह, कर्ण, रौद्र, वीर, produces अहंकार, and वीभत्स produces

---

22. "rasa and dhvani", in Sanskrit poetics by Dr. Tapasvi S. Nandi, p. 191-92
Bharata in his *NS*\(^{24}\) refers to these four basic sentiments and the remaining four taking their rise from them. Thus, in *Agnipurāṇa* propounds the theory that there are four basic sentiments from which proceed the remaining four sentiments, as also the sentiment *sānta*. An effort is made by some scholars to taken this theory of the origin of *rasa* to that propounded by *Bhoja*.\(^{25}\) According to *Bhoja*,\(^{26}\) the supreme egoism or self-consciousness, which when developed and realised in the absence of all impediments, through the *vibhāvas, anubhāvas* and the *vyabhicāribhāvas* represented in action or poetry, becoming blissful state of mind, constitutes *rasa*. Emotions, love, mirth etc. are born of the person possessed of self consciousness, and never is it that these emotions are transformed into the delectable *rasas*. They only add lustre and beauty to *srngāra*, like the rays of light to fire.

**II.0.6 Rasa in *kāvyā* and drama**

The *Agnipurāṇa* like Bhoja associates *rasa* with both dramatic composition and *kāvyā* as such. The *purāṇa* states that dramatic spee without *rasa* is not charming like wealth without renunciation and if a poet were *śṛngāri*, his poetic composition would be saturated with *rasa*.\(^{27}\) The origin of *rasa* is assigned to *vibhāvas*, and the reciprocity of the suggestion between *rasa* and *bhāva* is stressed. The later hair-splitting about the *rasanispati* is not even hinted in the *purāṇa*.

**II.1.0 Number of *rasas***

**II.1.1 Opinions of different ācāryas:**

The earliest and most orthodox mention in Bharata of eight

---

23. 339, 7-8.
24. *NS*-VI, P-99
25. Rasarnavasudhākara.1923, Pp-54077
26. Śṛṇ. vol, Pp-2,246.
27. 329/9, 11.
sthāyibhāvas and the resulting eight rasas corresponding to them, of which शाला, वीर, पैर, and वीभत्स are the main leading four others, हास्य, अन्तत, करण, and प्रभावण. Daṇḍin accepts the classification, but udbhata adds२८ शान्त as the ninth rasa, although Bharata२९ neither defines it nor mentions its corresponding vibhāva. Rudraṭa is singular in postulating a tenth rasa, called preyas, which is accepted by Bhoja, with the addition of two new rasas, udāṭṭa, as well as śānta. Rudrabhaṭṭa admits nine rasas in poetry; so do Hemacandra. The Agnipurāṇa in the same way mentions nine rasas (and eight sthāyibhāvas) but follows Bharata in regarding four as principal and lays special stress on the śṛṅgāra. Ānandavardhana admits śānta (Pp. 138-238). Those later authors who accept the ninth rasas, the quietistic, necessarily postulate nirveda, arising out of the knowledge of reality (tattvajñāna), as its sthāyibhāva, which is called by some authorities śāma, or respose resulting from freedom from mental excitement२०. The vaisnava writers (especially kavikanapūra add dāsya, sakhyā, vātsalya, premaṇ and bhakti).३१

II.1.2 Opinion of daśarūpaka kāra

The author of the Daśarūpaka, however, contends that there can be no such sthāyibhāva as nirveda or śāma, for the development of that state (if it is at all possible to destroy utterly love, hatred and other human feelings) would tend to the absence of all moods; and in the drama, the object of which is to delineate and inspire passion, it is inadmissible. Others again hold that the

28. If the verse is genuinely Udvatā's ses above p.114 fn 15- on the śānta rasa in Bharata and Dhanaṇjaya see S.K. De. Some problems pp. 139-41. On the number and nomenclature of rasas generally see V.Raghavan, Number of Rasas, Adyar 1940.
29. The śānta texts in Bharata, available in certain recensions, are interpolations, see Raghavan, op.cit.p.15f. Kalidāsa knew only eight rasa, Vikramorvaśiya ii.18, where Muni Bharat is also mentioned.
30. This sentiment is also closely related to the sentiment of disgust; for it arises from an aversion to wordly things.
31. See S.K.De, vaisnava faith and movement, P-145
quietistic rasa does exist, as it is experienced by those who have
tained that blissful state, but it has no sthāyībhāva in dramatic
composition; for nirvēda being the cessation of all worldly activity,
or śama being freedom from all mental excitement, it is not fit to
be represented. Hence Māmāta takes eight rasas in the drama
(p-98) and nine in poetry (p-117). Bhoja, in accordance with the
views of the school which lays special emphasis on the śṛṅgāra,
accepts only one rasa, the erotic, in his śṛṅgāraprakāśa, and
although he mentions as many as ten rasas in his sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa, including the śānta and the preyas, he
appears to devote almost exclusive attention to the śṛṅgāra in his
treatment of the rasas in this work. The views about the
admissibility of the śānta are discussed by the author of the Ekāvalī
(Pp-967) who maintains that Bharata has mentioned nirvēda as a
vyabhicārībhāvas; and this fact is interpreted as indicating that the
sage meant it both as a sthāyībhāva and as a vyabhicārībhāva; but
Hemacandra (p-81) anticipates and rejects this quibble of verbal
interpretation, through agreeing in the general proposition as to
the admissibility of the śānta as the ninth rasa.

II.1.3 Opinion of darpanakāra

Viśvanātha primarily admits eight orthodox rasas (III.p-160) but adds the ninth śānta in deference to the views of these
authorities, and a tenth rasa; called vātsalya or parental affection,
subscribing apparently to Vaiṣṇava ideas.32 He quotes a verse to
explain that the mood, called by the great sages the quietistic, which
has among all sentiments, tranquility (śama) as its basis, is that
state in which there is neither pain nor pleasure, nor hatred, nor

32. Bhanudatta counts (rasa-tarangini) māyā under the rasas, Rudrāta mentioned
preyas (friendship), which rasa is accepted by Bhoja. Some writers add śraddhā (along
with bhakti see Bhanudatta, op-cit, P-56, 11.25f singabhupāla admits only eight
rasas, but his treatment is from the stand point of dramaturgy.)
affection, nor any desire. But the question arises how can the quietistic, being of the nature described, arising only in a state of emancipation wherein there is an absence of all feelings like the accessories etc., be relishable enjoyment. To this objection Viśvanātha replies that the quietistic is a rasa because in that state the soul is not completely absorbed in the Divine, so that the presence of feelings, like the accessories etc. in it not incompatible. As for the statement that there is an absence of even pleasure in it, it is not contradictory, for it refers only to worldly pleasure.

II.1.4 Opinion of Jagannātha and others

Jagannātha, the latest writer on the subject, advocates nine rasas and maintains (Pp-29-30) that like an other rasas, the śānta is capable of being represented and appreciated by the audience. Since the clever performance of the actor, representing such a state of mind, free from disturbance and not affected by passion or desire, is found in actual experience, if their state of mind, exhibited by their silent and rupt attention, which ought to settle the question. The representation of absolute indifference or the actor’s power of representing it is not the point in issue; it is the capacity of the spectator who actually feels the sentiment. Jagannātha also adds that even those, who do not admit this rasa in the drama, should accept it in poetry from the fact that poems like the Mbh. have for principal theme the delineation of śāntarasa, which is thus established by universal experience (akhilalokānubhavasiddhatvāt). Nāgėśa remarks on this that the śāntarasa should also be admitted in the drama on this ground, in as much as the prabodhacandrodāya

33. na yatā duḥkhāṁ na sukham na cintā, na dveśa-rāgau na ca kaicī icchā/rasāḥ sa śāntaḥ kathito munindraiḥ, sarveṣu bhavesu śāma-pradhānah, cited also in Das
34. ityevam-rāpasya śántasya mokṣavasthāyā evātma-svarūpāpatti lakṣānāvām prādurbhūtātvā tatra saṅcāryadāhinā ahāvāt kathāṁ rasathvām.
35. yas cāsmin sukhaḥbhāvo 'pyaktas tasya vaisayika-sukha-paratvān na virodhaḥ.
is universally acknowledged as a drama (P-30).

II.2.0 Constituents of *rasa*

II.2.1 *Rasa*, the aesthetic object

*Rasa*, the aesthetic object, is essentially a product of dramatic art and is not to be found in the creation of nature. It is not pure unity, but unity in multiplicity. The unifying factor in the multiplicity is a basic state of mind (*sthāyibhāva*) which binds together in an organic whole (i) the emotive situation in human setting, consisting of the physical cause of the basic mental state (*vibhāva*) (ii) the mimetic changes, which are inspired by the aroused basic mental state and as such are indicative of the internal state (*anubhāva*) and (iii) the transient emotious (*vyabhicāribhāva*).

The basic mental state is the central and the most important phase of this configuration. The rest are simply necessary accompaniments, very much like the paraphernalia it is the king, who is the centre of attraction to the spectator, so is the basic mental state to the audience. Therefore, when it is stated that the basic mental state is the aesthetic object (*sthāyi bhāvo rasah smṛtah*) the implication is not that other constituents of the aesthetic configuration do not figure in the consciousness, but simply that they appear as subordinate.

For a clear understanding of the essential nature of *rasa* it is necessary to grasp the full implication of the technical terms.

II.2.2 *Vibhāva*

*Vibhāva* stands for the emotive situation, which is presented on the stage and which in actual life would be responsible for the emotion, which is shown by the hero, but the relation between situation and emotion is not that of cause and effect.

36. A.Bh., Vol-I.292
Reason for this has already been started in the preceding section. The reason is that of a medium to a state of mind, as in the case of mystic medium and the experience, which is got through it.

We often see a child riding a stick and enjoying a horse-ride as it were. He shows most of the physical signs and motions of a rider of horse. He tightens bridle, whips and makes it gallop. The question, that arises i.e. “Is horse the cause of the experience of horse-ride” How can it be so in its absence? The experience, therefore, is due to medium, through which the child works himself up so as to experience horse ride. Just the same is the case with the situation, presented on the stage. It is only a medium, through which the actor works himself up to a certain emotional pitch and consequently shows the signs, which are natural to an emotion.

Thus, 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 arouses emotion in a manner quite different from that, in which emotion arises in actual life. Emotion always has an objective reference. It can arise only in the presence of an external stimulus. As everything exists only in some place and at a certain time, spatial and temporal factors are distinguished from the object as such. Accordingly vibhāva is represented to have two aspects

i) ālambana, the object, which is primarily responsible for the arousal of emotion, on which emotion depends for its very being and which is its mainstay: and

ii) uddīpana, the environment, the entire surrounding, which enhances the emotive effect of the focal point, the object

37. D.R., 97
38. A.Bh., Vol-I, 285
which primarily stimulates emotion.

If we recall to our minds the scene from the *Abhijñāna Śākuntalam*, in which love in *Dusyanta* is represented to arise for the first time, the distinction between two aspects of *vibhāva* will become clear. *Dusyanta* is in the neighbourhood of Kanva's hermitage. He sees Śakuntalā, accompanied by her two friends, watering the plants of hermitage garden. She asks one of her friends to loosen the breast cover of bark, which she complains has been too tightly tied by the other. The other immediately retorts in a befitting manner: “Why do you find fault with me, when the fault lies, not with me, but with your rising youth?” Here Śakuntalā, who has been brought to focus by the aforesaid talk and becomes the object of love of *Dusyanta*, is the *ālambanavibhāva* and the entire forest scene with beautiful hermitage garden at its centre and pleasant breeze, gentle sunshine and the sweet companions, which offset her beauty and make it more bewitching, are *uddīpanavibhāva*.

**II.2.3 Anubhāva**

All the physical changes, which are consequent on the rise of an emotion and are in actual life looked upon as the effects of emotion, are called *anubhāvas*, to distinguish them from the physical effects of emotion which arise in real life. They are called *anubhāvas*, because they communicate the basic emotion to the characters, present on the stage, or make known the nature of emotion in the hero, as also because they make the spectator experience an identical emotion (*anubhāvayati*).

The physical changes and movements, which follow the rise of an emotion, are of two kinds (i) Voluntary and (ii) Involuntary. There are some movements and changes, which are definitely willed by the person in emotion, which are willful
expressions of emotion, such as the movement of eyes and eyebrows, which spring from the intention of the person, swayed by emotion to communicate it to others. But there are other changes and movements, which automatically follow the rise of emotion, such as change of colour, horripilation, blush etc. The voluntary physical changes are called sāttvikabhāvas. The former can be produced by an effort of will even though the emotion, with which they are supposed to be casually connected, may not be present in the heart. They, therefore, are not the infallible signs of emotion. But the latter can take place only when the emotion, of which they are recognized to be the effects, is actually present in heart. They are the infallible signs of emotion. They are eight in number. They are included in the list of forty-nine bhāvas, admitted by Bharata.

In regard to the presentation of vibhāva and simple anubhāvas, Bharata does not give any instruction; nor does he define them. He simply says that in representing them one has to be faithful to what is found in actual life and, therefore, they have to be learnt from the same source.

Fortynine bhāvas, however, including (i) eight sāttvikabhāvas, which are nothing more than anubhāvas, but are classed separately, because they are involuntary and, therefore, are unmistakable reflexions of inner emotive state; (ii) Thirty-three transient emotions (iii) eight persisting emotions are dealt with exhaustively, because of their special utility in giving rise to rasa. Let us, therefore, state clearly the meaning and function of bhāva.

II.2.4 Bhāva

The word bhāva in dramaturgy is used in the sense of

39. NS. 95
40. NS. 80
41. A.Bh., Vol-I, 343
mental state only, which, as we have shown in the preceding section, is of fortynine types. And although the word bhāva is used at the ends of compounds, standing for situation and mimetic changes (vibhāva and anubhāva), yet they can not be put under bhāva, because Bharata has used this word in a technical sense and has definitely fixed the number of bhāvas.

The mental states are called bhāvas for two reasons.

i) because they bring rasa into being, make rasa on accomplished fact, by means of three types of acting (vācika, āṅgika and sāttvika) and

ii) because they pervade, intensely affect, the minds of the spectators.42

The first meaning is applicable to the word when it is used with a view to instructing the dramatist or the actor. The second meaning is implied when the word is used to explain how the mental states, called bhāvas, after the spectator. The idea may be elaborated as follows: There are two recognized meanings of bhāva in Sanskrit.

i) One that causes something to be bhāvanā and

ii) One that affects (vāsanā). In both the cases it has causal sense.

Thus, bhāvas (mental states), present in the actor, when represented by means of three types of acting, bring into being, produce, rasa (relish or relishability) in the stage presentation. Similarly bhāvas present in the dramatist, when represented in appropriate language, expressive of various physical movements and changes, in which they find natural expression, produce rasa. In these cases bhāva is used in the first sense of one that causes

42. A.Bh., Vol-I, 347
something to be. But if we take *bhāva* in the second sense of pervading, we have to confine ourselves to the spectator’s point of view. We know that a sweetsmelling thing, which are in contact with it. It is due to substantial pervasion by musk that cloth, in which it is put, acquires the fragrance of musk. This process, by which a thing, which has no strong perceptible smell of its own, acquires the smell of another, is know as *bhāva* or *bhāvana*. Thus, the mental status are called *bhāvas* from the point of view of the spectator, because they pervade the mind of spectator exactly as does musk the cloth, with which it is in contact.

**II.2.5 Vyabhicāribhāva**

*Vyabhicāribhavās* are transient emotions. They are so called, because they come as it were face to face with the spectator in the course of *rasa* of various kinds. In spite of the fact that they are mental states, they appear as it were embodied, when they are acted out by means of various types of acting in a befitting situation. They are called *vyabhicārins* for another reason also. That is, they bring the different *rasas* as if it were face to face with the spectator. For, when a transient mental state is acted out in a befitting manner in a befitting situation, there remains no doubt about the basic mental state, from which the transient one springs. The presentation of basic mental state in terms of the transient emotion and involuntary and voluntary physical changes in an appropriate situation, raises the *sthāyin* from being a mere matter of inference and brings it as it were directly before the spectator. For, inference is inference only so long as it is drawn from the perception of anyone of the three.

(i) cause
(ii) effect and

---

43. A.Bh., Vol-I, 345
44. A.Bh., Vol-I, 356-7
(iii) invariable concomitant.

But when all the three are distinctly present and perceived, the inference ceases to be inference and borders on direct perception in so far as the element of doubt, which is ordinarily associated with it, disappears, because of the multiplicity of evidence. It may be pointed out here that the word "brings" (nayati) is used in the present context, not in its literal, but only in conventional sense, just as in the case of the statement "sun brings the day".

II.2.6 Sthāyibhāva

The reason why an emotive state of mind is called sthāyin (persisting or basic) may be stated as follows-

Drama presents a complete section. And completeness of action consists in its having five stages:

1) fixing upon an objective
2) effort to realise it
3) reversal
4) overcoming of opposition, and
5) achievement of the objective.

But action in its physical aspect springs from a definite state of mind, which is aroused by a particular situation in which the agent finds himself. It is necessary that the state of mind should persist through all the stages of action. For, otherwise action should end abruptly at any one of the intermediate stages and will remain incomplete. It is also natural that with the change in situation and reversal in fortune or favourable turn in the course of events, other mental state arise, but they can have no independent being; nor can they rise in isolation from and unaffected by the original and basic or persisting mental state, which was responsible for fixing upon the objective. In fact other mental state arise simply because the basic mental states is there. They are like waves, which rise
There are eight basic mental states. Their appropriate situations, the mimetic changes in which they find expressions, and the accompanying transient mental states are given in full detail in the 7th chapter of Bhatar’s NS. Unfortunately Abhinavagupta’s commentary on it seems to be irrecoverably lost.

II.3.0 Rasa and Its illustration

II.3.1 Śṛṅgāra

The basic emotion of śṛṅgāra is rati. The ālamanavibhāvas are the hero and the heroine. Rati owes its origin to men and women and relates to the fulness of youth. The moon, youth, solitude etc., are the uddipanavibhāvas. The side long glance, twisting of the limbs, knitting of the brows etc., are the anubhāvas. Sloth, disgust etc. are the vyabhicāribhāvas. The sentiment śṛṅgāra is developed from the combination of these factors. There are two kinds of erotic sentiments viz., saṁbhoga and vipralambha. The former is counted as one, because of the endless variety of its manifestations in the form of mutual glances, kissing, embraces and so forth karṇapūra describes it as follows:

“adyah parasparāvalokanādharāūpāne cumbanakha-daśanakṣatā diprabhūta prabhedopyeka eva gaṇyate”.

Rati is the sthāyin of vipralambha and is considered as an aspect of śṛṅgāra. According to traditional conception, there are four forms of vipralambha, viz., purvarāga, māna, pravāsa and karuṇa. But Mammaṭa accepts five forms, adding śāpa to the list. Karṇapūra follows Mammaṭa and illustrates five forms, but he points out that śāpa applies only to human beings. Those who

45. Alankāra-kaustubha of Kavi Karṇapūra, p. 154
46. aparastvabhilāsavrāhīryā pravāsaśāpa hetuka iti paṇcadhā loke eva śāpatuh:-tenaśaukikaścatuvidaḥ, Ibid., p.-154
accepts karuṇa as the forth form of vipralāṁbhā include śāpa in pravāsa. Like other rhetoricians Karnapura also describes ten states of pūrvarāga viz. अभिलाप, चित्तन, स्मृति, गुणकिर्त्तन, उद्घा, प्रलाप in the absence of the person addressed, उभाद, व्याणि, जड़ता, मण्ड, and विरह is of three kinds: past, present and future. The third form of vipralāṁbhā is īrsyā. He says that it is nothing but māna which results from the rejection of the lover by the heroine in anger. The ways of preman are by nature subtle and crooked. He mentions it as follows: a "premnah kunṭilagāṇītvāt kopo yaḥ kāraṇam vinā". He also quotes a verse from Rasārnavasudhākara:

nandinām ca vadhūnām ca bhujagānām ca sarvadā
premnāmapi gatirvakra kāraṇam tatra nesyate.

Among the two types of māna, īrsyāsaṁbhūta is the result of jealousy or envy. But praṇayasaṁbhūta is exhibited to express more love. Dhanaṅjaya does not recognise karuṇavipralāṁbhā.

He accepts māna and pravāsa including īrsyā as separation caused by Jealousy. Bhoja, Singabhupāla and Viśvanātha are of opinion that karuṇa is a separate variety of vipralāṁbhā. Karnapūra follows them. He says that pūrvarāga springs from love taking possession of the hearts of lovers at sight or by hearing prior to their union.

svapnādvā śravanādvāpi citrādervā vilokanāt
śākṣādā kasmikādvāpi darśanāddurlabhe janē /
prākttāno ratirudbhūtā samprāpteḥ purvamevasā
pākadvayāntare pūrvarāgatām pratipadyate //

Rūpagosvāmin distinguishes seven stages in course of

love, viz., प्रेम, सेह, मान, प्रणय, रग, अनुरग, भाव, or महाभाव. 53

47. Alamkārakaustubha of Kavikarnapūra, p. 154
48. DR-IV, 50-51
49. Sarasvatikantābharana V.623
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p.214
Singabhūpāla however speaks of प्रेम, स्नेह, मान, प्रणय, रण and अनुराग omitting भाव, or महाभाव as a stage of rati.\(^5^4\) Karnapūra state that love attains perfection in महाभाव through the stages भाव, प्रूढ़रण, रण, अनुराग, प्रणय, प्रेम स्नेह. Singabhūpāla says that रण is of three varieties, कासुब्हराग, निलीरा ग मानीश्वराग.\(^5^5\) Karnapūra adds one type as हरिद्रा.\(^5^6\)

**II.3.2. Hāsyā**

Laughter (हस्या) is the basic mental state of hāsyā. The transitory state are, weariness, exhaustion, unsteadiness, stupor and so forth. Bharata gives six varieties of hāsyā expression. Smita, hasita, vihasita, upahasita, apahasita and atihasita. But Karnapūra reduces the number to three, viz., smita, hāsa, prahāsa. He also points out that smita is employed by higher characters, hāsa by middling characters and prahāsa by lower characters. Karnapūra defines the three types of hāsa as follows:

\[
\text{adharoṣṭhaśphūratayā śykaṇyoreva visphurata}
\]
\[
\text{alaksitadvijam dhīrā uttamānāṁ smitaṁ viduḥ}
\]
\[
\text{vikasaddaśanadyoto gaṇḍābhoge prafullata}
\]
\[
\text{kičikīkāla kaṇṭharavo yatra hāsaḥ sa madhyamah}
\]
\[
\text{sadharmah sāsrutāṁrākṣah sputaghora kaṭuśvanaḥ}
\]
\[
\text{vyāttānano vyaktudantāḥ prahāsogṛmya ucyaṭe.}\(^5^7\)

Smita is described as a smile in which glances are charming and the teeth concealed. In hāsa, the teeth are slightly visible and some sweet sound is also produced. In prahāsa there is laughter in which eyes become watery, shoulders shake violently,

\(^5^4\) Rasarṇabhasudhākara II. P.107.
\(^5^5\) Ibid. p.107
\(^5^6\) Nailaḥ sa esa kathito na kadacidghrasati śobhate tyartham kausumbh, sa hi viditaḥ sthitva paiti prāsobhata pūrvam manṛṣṭāḥ sa hi yah kila napaityevatisobhate jaśram hāridrah sa tu bodhyo yatapi na ca śobhate yastu. Alamkarakaustubha of Kavikarnapūra, p.166.
\(^5^7\) Ibid, p.143
teeth become clearly visible and loud sounds are produced. The rhetoricians are of opinion that hāsya is of two kinds, atmastha and parastha. But Karṇapūra ignores this point. He is of opinion that subjectivity and objectivity apply not to hāsya alone, but to many other sentiments (bahuniṣṭa).

II.3.3 Karuṇa

The mental state of śoka or sorrow creates the sentiment of karuṇa. Sighting, weeping, paralysis, lamentation and the like are its consequents. The transitory states are indolence, depression, sickness, agitation, despair, stupor and so forth. Karṇapūra is of opinion that it exists only in the sāmājika: ayantu sāmājikagatā eva, nānukāryagataḥ parokṣo'pi.58

II.3.4 Raudra

It is krodha the mental state that develop into the sentiment of raudra. Sweating, sanguineous face, trenor, frowning etc. are its consequents. The transitory states are indignation, intoxication, arrogance, envy, cruelty and the like. It exists in the original hero as well as in the audience, as shown by Karṇapūra.

II.3.5 Vīra

The sentiment of vīra develops from utsāha when presented by means of relevant vibhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas. Benevolence, combat, liberality, etc are its anubhāvas. Arrogance, dreadfulness, indignation, etc, are its vyabhicāribhāvas. Like other rhetoricians, Karṇapūra also says that it is of four types according to its source, viz. yuddha, dāna, dayā and dharma. The heroes are therefore called yuddhavīra, dānavīra, dayāvīra and dharmavīra. He is of opinion that its sthāyin exists in the anukārya (original hero) as well as in the sāmājika (audience).

58. Alamkārakaustūhā of Kavikarnapūra. p-141
II.3.6 Bhayānaka

_Bhayānaka_ relates to the dominate state of _bhaya_. Trembling of all the limbs, sweating, purched lips, and fainting are its consequents. Fright, destruction, agitation, depression etc. are its trabsitory states. Karṇapūra believes that it exits in _sāmājika_ only.

II.3.7 Bibhatsa

_Bīvasta_ develops when _jugupsā_ is suggested in the appropriate way. The consequents are the contraction of nose, mouth and so on. Agitation, sickness, weakness, depression and the like are its transitory states. Karṇapūra is of opinion that it exits in the audience alone.

II.3.8 Adbhuta

_Adbhuta_ relates to the dominant state of _vismaya_. Exclamations of surprise, weeping, trembling, sweating etc. are its consequents. The transitory states are flurry, unsteadiness, joy, contentment, etc.

II.3.9 Śānta

_Nirveda_ transmutes into _śānta_ when manifested by means of suitable determinants, consequents and transitory states. To be free from addiction to pleasures of sense is its consequents. Assurance, contentment, recollection etc. are its transitory states. Certain rhetoricians are of the opinion that _śama_ is the _sthāyibhāva_ of _śāntarasa_. Karṇapūra considers _nirveda_ itself as its _sthāyin_. He refutes the view that _śānta_ is not a sentiment and asserts that it has to be considered as a _rasa_ because it displays _camatkāra_. He believes that where there is _camatkāra_ there exists _rasa_ also.
II.3.10 Vātsalya

Mamakāra or self interest is the basic mental state of vātsalya. Embracing is its consequent. The transitory states are joy, complacency and so on. It exists in the audience. Haripāladeva, author of Sangītatsudhākara accepts vātsalya as rasa and gives priti as its sthāyin. The Vaiśṇava writers consider it as a sentiment.

II.3.11 Prema

It is cittadrava, the mental state, that develops into the sentiment of prema. Assurance, impatience etc. are its transitory states. It exists in the real hero as well as in the audience. Kṛṇapūra considers preman as love supreme which holds within it every other rasa. Some rhetoricians think that śṛṅgāra is the rasa in the love between Radhā and Kṛṣṇa. They therefore treat preman as the aṅga of that śṛṅgāra. But Kṛṇapūra states that preman is the aṅgina and śṛṅgāra is its aṅga.59

II.3.12 Bhakti

Cetoraśjakatva or the power of moving the heart, i.e., rati develops into bhakti. When manifested by means of suitable determinants, consequents and transitory states. Melting of the heart (hṛdayadrava) and the like are its consequents. Self disparagement, depression etc. are its transitory states. It exists in the real hero as well as in the audience.

In the illustration of these sentiments Kṛṇapūra accepts kṛṣṇa as the vibhāva. He is of opinion that kṛṣṇa is the source of all rasas. Karnapūra records:

“śṛṅgāro rādhikāyām sakhiṣu sakarunah
ksvedadagdhesvaghāhe rbhibhatsī tasya gārbhe

59. Ibid, p. 151
II.4.0 Description of different types of rasas

अथ रसस्य भेदानाहः

शृङ्गार हास्य कसृषीवीर भावानकाः।
वीभासोज्जृहृत्य इत्यद्वीर रसाः: शान्त सत्या मतः। ॥ २६२

"Now Bharata states the divisions of “flavour”. “The 'erotic' (शृङ्गार), the ‘comic’ (हास्य), the ‘pathetic’ (कसृषी), the ‘furious’ (कसृषीवीर), the ‘heroic’ (हीरी), the ‘terrible’ (भावानक), the ‘disgustful’ (वीभास), and the marvellous (हृदय): these-eight are “flavours”, and so is the “quietistic” (शान्त) held to be by some. Of these, the “erotic” is first to be discussed.

शृङ्गारः

शृङ्ग हि मन्योभेदमर्द दागामनेतुतकः।
उत्तम प्रकृतिणाः रसः: शृङ्गार इत्यते। ॥ २८३ ॥
परोंदा वर्जिष्ठवा तु: वेषेऽथ चानुरगीणीम्।
आलम्बनं नाविकं: स्तुर्दिक्षिणाधाशच नाविकं:। ॥ २८४॥
चन्द्रन्वदनरोलान्वसत: स्वादिक्षतान: ।
शृङ्गविक्षेपक्षाकदियत्युभावः: प्रकृतितिः। ॥ २८५॥
लक्ष्मी म्नामाणलत्युभुवा: अनुभिविचारिणः।
स्थायिभावो रतिः: रामावर्णोऽयः विषुद्वैवतः।। ॥ २८६॥

तद्देवदानाहः

विप्रलम्भोपः संभोगेऽय: द्विधाविघ्योमतः।
सं च पूर्णाग्निन्यवास करणात्मकचतुर्ध्रा स्यात्।। ॥ २८७॥

60. Ibid, p. 151
II.4.1 Erotic sentiment

**Definition:** by *śṛṅga* literally ‘horn’ which sprouts from the head of a bull as a plant does from the earth is meant the budding of love; and by the word *śṛṅgāra* from ‘śṛṅgam ṛchchhati’, it has the horn for its cause is meant that ‘Flavour’ generally most manifest in the noblest natures, which has for its condition the coming on or existence there of for one devoid of that sentiment can not enjoy.

II.4.2 Āsraya

In this case let the substantial ingredients be the heroines, excluding another's wife, and a courtezan if not honestly enamoured, and the heros, the ‘impartial’. The moon, sandalwood ointment, the hum of bees, are held to be ‘enhancers’. Motions of the eyebrows, and side glances, are found as its symptoms. For example:

"Perceiving that the house was empty"
Here a husband of the just mentioned description, and a
girl of the just mentioned description, are the two “substantial
excitants, the empty house is an enhancing ‘exitant’, the kissing is
an ensuant, the bashfulness and the mirth are ‘accessories’, the
condition of love, developed by all these in a man of taste, assumes
the nature of what we call the ‘erotic’ flavor.

पूर्वराग : दशकामदशा

1. अगिलाप (longing) 2. चित्ता (thoughtfulness) 3. स्मृति (reminiscence) 4. गुणक्षण (qualities of
the love-one) 5. उदेश्य (anxiety) 6. संप्रलाप (discourse) 7. उम्मद (confusion of mind) 8. व्याधि (sickness) 9. जड़ता (stupefaction) 10. मृति (death)

प्रणayan manabjñopaya:

1. साम (conciliation) 2. भेद (division) 3. दान (presentations)

कृतिरुत्तम: प्रवास-दशकामदशा:

1. असौभ्रव (squalor of the person) 2. सन्ताप (fever) 3. पाण्डुता (paleness)
II.4.3 Accessories

Its ‘accessories may be any except ‘sternness’, ‘death’ indolence, and ‘disgust’. Here the ‘permanent’ condition is love’ and according to the fancy of the mythologists it is black-coloured, and its deity is Viṣṇu who in his incarnation as the amorous Kṛṣṇa was remarkable for the darkness of his colour.

II.4.4 Division

Erotic flavor is held to be of two kinds, viz, 'separation' (विप्रलंब) and 'union' (सम्प्रोग) where excessive love does not attain the beloved object, (the hero or the heroine) this is ‘separation’.

II.4.5 Sub-division of vipralambha

And let this love in separation be of four kinds, consisting of 1. affection arising before the parties meet’ (पुरवराग), 2. ‘indignation’ (मान), 3. the being abroad’ (प्रवास), and the ‘sorrow’(करुण) of one who has no hope of a re-union which yet is destined to take place.

A) Pūrvarāga

While the parties are strangers to one another, is the peculiar condition which belongs, before they have attained their wishes, to two persons mutually enamoured through having heard
of or seen one another. And here the hearing may be from the mouth of a messenger or a bard, or a female friend, and the seeing may be by magic or in a picture, or face to face, or in a dream.

**B) Daśadaśā of pūrvarāga**

In such a case the following ten are the conditions of love, viz., अभिलाष, विला, स्मृति, गुणकथन (the mentioning, the qualities of the loved one, anxiety), गुणकथन, उदेवा, and (discourse) संप्रलाप, Where the person addressed is not, confusion of उम्माद, व्याधि, जड़ता and मृति of मरण.

**Different opinion**

There another opinion on the condition of love. (1) fondness on exchanging glances. (2) union of minds, (3) thoughtfulness, (4) sleeplessness (5) growing thin, (6) neglect of all objects, (7) abandonment of shame, (8) distraction, (9) insensibility, and (10) death.

**Divisions:- pūrvarāga is of three kinds**

(1) मान indigo, (2) प्राव safflower and (3) करुण madder. That fondness which makes no great show, and which yet when it has come into the mind, does not depart, they call the indigo love, the indigo being a colour that will well stand washing; such was the love of Rāma and Sītā. They call that the safflower love which shines but departs like the dye of safflower which fades in the washing. They call that the madder love which does not depart, and which does shine.

**Māna:** Next of māna, the second of the conditions of the separation of lovers. Indignation means anger. But this is of two kinds, 1) arising from fondness or 2) from jealousy. Let that anger be ‘indignation from fondness, which, without any cause, through the capricious way-wardness of affection takes place in the case
of two, even when there is very great love between them. "Of two" i.e. of the hero and of the heroine of each of these is the ‘indignation arising from fondness’ to be described.

**An exceptional case, where zest is thus only added to love in union**

But when this distance of behaviour through indignation cannot be kept up by the lady until conciliation, then the case is one, not of a species of separation but of a condition called jealousy which may be an accessory and enhancer of love in union.

**Where there is ground for jealousy**

When the husband's attachment to some other loved one is seen, or inferred, or heard of, thus lady’s fury in jealousy is manifested. They are of three kinds, in as much as it may result from (1) behaviour on starting out of sleep, or (2) signs of dalliance, or (3) blurting out the name of the loved one in the hearing of the jealous one.

**Means of removing māna**

साम, (conciliation) भेद, (division) दान, (presents) नवि, (submission) उपेक्षा, (disregard) स्वान्त, (change of humour) such are the six expedients which the husband should employ in succession for the removal māna. ‘conciliation’ is affectionate language, ‘division’ is the gaining over of her female friend to the offender’s side, ‘presents’ should be of ornaments or the like, on some pretext, ‘submission’ means falling at her feet. But when ‘conciliation’ and these others have failed, then let there be ‘disregard’- i.e. neglect. By a ‘change of humour’ the indignation’s being put to flight by some sudden terror or joy, etc.
The being abroad (pravāsa)

Being abroad means being in a different country, in consequence of business, or a curse launched by some deity, or a confusion in the midst of which one of the lovers is separated from the other. In this case what takes place is filthiness of person and clothing, a head with a single braid into which all the locks are gathered as a sign of mourning, sighs, sobs, weepings, fallings on the grounds etc. There may be असौहस्य (squalor of the person), सन्ताप (fever), पाणुता (paleness), दुर्बलता (emaciation), अचौथि (distaste for everything), अघीरता (languor), अनालम्बनता (desolateness), तन्मयता (being absorbed in the thought of her), उमाद (frenzy), मूच्छा (insensibility). Such, in their order, are to be understood to be the ten conditions of love in this case of separation. ‘Squalor’ is the being beset with fifth, but ‘fever’ is the sickness of separation, ‘Distaste for everything is indifference towards thing, Languor’ is disinclination for everything, and what is called “desolateness” is the vacancy of the mind, ”The being absorbed in her’-i.e. she appears everywhere, both without and within, in the heart of the lover, in the beauty of the flower, in the brightness of the moon, etc.

Among these three kinds of exile, let that which is ‘in consequence of business’ be of three kinds, viz. future, present and past. This threefold character belongs to that which is in consequence of business, because this is preceded by an understanding that the exile is to take place, where as in the case of a curse or of one’s being unexpectedly snatched away, there is not room for contemplating the separation as some thing future.

Karuna (the sorrow)

One who has no hope of a reunion which yet is destined to take place.

Either of two young lovers being dead, and being yet to
be regained though some supernatural interposition, when the one
left behind is sorrowful, then let it be called the ‘separation of tender
sadness’. But if the lost one be not regaineable, or regaineable only
after transmigration in another body, the flavor is called the pathetic.

II.4.6 “Love of union”; described

There is said to be ‘love in union’ where two lovers, mutually enamored are engaged in looking on one another, touching
one another for instance- “perceiving that the house was empty”
this “love in union” is, by the learned, asserted to be one only,
because, in consequence of its many varieties of kissing, embracing,
It would be impossible that they should be separately reckoned.
As accessories in regard to this, let there be the six seasons with
their several persuasive to loving fondness, the moon and the sun,
and so too their settings, gambols in the water, rambles in groves,
the morning, draughts of nectar, the night, anointments and
adornments, and what ever is pure and fair. And to the same effect,
Bharata declares, “whatever in the world is pure, and fair, and bright
and slightly, all such suits with the erotic”. As has been declared
“Not without previous separation does the union of lovers prosper
for, it is after cloths or the like have been soaped that their colour
increases the more”.

II.4.7 Śrṅgāra in the words of Bharata

यत्किंचिंहको शूचि मेघं दर्शनीयं व तत्किंचार्णादानीयंते। NŚ, 9. 45 (vṛtti)

“Whatever is sacred, pure, placid and worth-seeing can
be compared to śrṅgāra”.

According to Rudraṭa

सर्व रसोभ्यः श्रुतारस्य प्राधान्यं प्रकटिपुरुषां अनुसरति रसां रस्ततामस्य नान्यं: सकलमिदमोऽनन्यः ्णमामाबलव्यम्
तद्वितिः बिरचनीयं: सम्प्रेय ग्राम्यन्द भवति बिरसभेवन्ति हीन हि काव्यम्। K.A. (Rudraṭa), 14.38
"No other rasa is capable of producing that bliss of pleasure which the śṛṅgārārasa does. This sentiment permeates all human beings, and more than that even flora and fauna. The poetry in its absence is of an inferior order. Therefore it demands special effort on the part of the poet". And in the words of Ānandavardhana: स्रृंगार एव मधुरः परः, प्रह्वादनो रसः: I DL (2.7) "Of all the rasas, śṛṅgārārasa alone is the sweetest and the most exhilarating". As mentioned above śṛṅgārārasa has been exalted above all other rasas indirectly. There was probably a group of ācāryas who not only wanted to confer the name rasa on śṛṅgāra exclusively, but also held it to be the basis of all other rasas; vira, karuṇa etc. Relying on the available records, the views of Bhojarāja and the author of Agnipurāṇa can be put forth as an authoritative evidence.

II.4.8 Śṛṅgāra as depicted by Bhoja

Bhoja has reserved the name rasa for śṛṅgāra exclusively and does not designate the nine other viṇa, karuṇa, etc.- as rasa'. 61 He holds śṛṅgāra synonyms of self and ego ahaṅkāra and abhimāna respectively. 62 The terms ahaṅkāra and abhimāna used by Bhoja do not mean false pride or arrogance, but is indicative of an innate attachment of man to one’s own self. Because of this very ego and self attachment, he begins to expand his personality. When a lovely damsel casts glances on a man, this happening awakens an emotion of self consciousness, self confidence and self attachment into his mind, and plunges him headlong into bliss. That is verily the state of ahaṅkāra (śṛṅgāra), in which he feels an ecstatic thrill, regards himself as fortunate, gratified and object of sweet and tender love'.

61. शृंगारविशेषं कल्ण्डन्तुस्तैः भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति
62. सोभीमनोहारकः स्रृंगार इत्सेवते I Sarasvati Kanthabharana, p.5
(Bravo, Bravo, homage to me that I have been looked at languidly by this dame, whose waving eyes imitate those of a frightened fawn). This ego may be called as *rasa*. According to Bhoja, *rasa* is the (realization of) pleasing self-consciousness, in the midst of emotions like pleasure and pain, etc. which favours a particular mood.\(^63\) *ahaṅkāra* is alternatively called *śṛṅgāra* as it elevates the reader or spectator to the *śṛṅgāra* of bliss. Bhoja is, therefore, in favour of calling *ahaṅkāra* or its synonym *śṛṅgāra* only by the name of *rasa*\(^64\) and not the other so called *rasas*.\(^65\)

In order to understand this aspect, it is necessary to throw

---

63. For Example:
- *śṛṅgāra* (Sr. Pra. p. 466)

64. For Example:
- *śṛṅgāra* (Sr. Pra. p. 466)

65. This primary faculty called *ahaṅkāra* is not available to every body. That is attained by righteous persons by virtue of the pious actions and the experiences of their previous births as well as this birth. This alone is the precious possession of man’s soul and is the source of all his noble qualities. That person alone is entitled to be called a *sahādaya*, or *sāmājika* in whom this faculty of *ahaṅkāra* wakes up. He alone is called *rasika* (the recepient of pleasure) who happens to possess *ahaṅkāra* or *śṛṅgāra*, other wise he will be called *nirasa* (one devoid of susceptibility). An *ahaṅkāra* (egoist), say, a *śṛṅgāri* (erotic), poet or *sāmājika* alone can make the world pleasant and receive poetic pleasure. The emotions *rāti*, *hāsa*, *utsāha*, etc. rise only in the egoist or an erotic individual and not in one who has no ego, no eros and no susceptibility.

There fore it is not reasonable to agree with Bharata that *rasa* results from *rāti*, it is more logical to attribute the emergence of *rāti*, etc. to a particular variety of ego in the soul, called *śṛṅgārarasa*.

### a.
- *śṛṅgārarasa*

### b.
- *śṛṅgāra* (Sr. Pra. p. 466)

### c.
- *śṛṅgāra* (Sr. Pra. p. 466)

It may be noted here that the word *śṛṅgārin* of the author of Agnipurāṇa is alsoexpressive of *rasika* and not that of *ratipriya*, i.e fond of love.
light on the views of Bhoja regarding to the bhāva rati, hāsa etc., the mutual relationship between ahaṅkāra or śṛṅgāra, rati, etc. and also the number of rasas; Bhoja does not agree with Bharata in calling the rati etc. eight bhāvas as sthāyibhāvas, thirty three bhāvas like nirveda etc. as saṅcāribhāvas and the eight bhāvas stambha etc. as sāttvikabhāvas. According to him all the 49 (8+33+8) bhāvas may be sthāyibhāvas or saṅcāribhāvas depending on their circumstances and the situations, and all of them be called sattvika in as much as they spring form sattva, that is the mind.  

All the above bhāvas originate from ahaṅkāra, and they themselves together constitute ahaṅkāra itself in the same way as flames arise from fire and together constitute fire itself. Ahaṅkāra is as if an emperor and bhāvas his nobles, who seated round him add to is majesty. Bhoja holds that all the above-49 bhāvas and not only the so called eight sthāyibhāvas as maintained by Bharata and others permeated by ahaṅkāra reach their perfection with the help of the vibhāva, etc. and become capable of giving poetic pleasure to the sahrdaya. These are termed as ‘rasa’ by courtesy. In fact, they are primarily bhāvas for two reasons, firstly, they do not answer to the above quoted definition of rasa advanced by Bhoja (मनोनुकूलकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�ुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकुकु�
Bhoja accepts only one rasa ‘ahāṅkāra’ (srṅgāra). He says further that if the importing of pleasure by bhāvas (rati, etc.) is to be called ‘rasa’ metaphorically, then all the bhāvas may be called rasa metaphorically, then all the bhāvas may be called rasa because of their capacity to impart pleasure, and their number would be fortynine. Bhoja has divided rasa into three categories.

i) deep rootedness of ahāṅkāra in man (rūḍhāhaṅkāratū),

ii) to assign the name rasa to the super-excellence (parāprakārasatā) of the 49 bhāvas metaphorically, and

iii) the development of the bhāva rati, hāsa, utsāha, etc. into preman. Bhoja has called the third category as preman rasa also.

Substance

The substances of the above discussion is that in the opinion of Bhoja all the 49 bhāvas arise from man’s ego, when described or dramatized with the help of vibhāva, etc. in a piece of poetry or drama, awaken and re-inforce the ego of the sahaḍaya’. In this view the word ahāṅkāra is a synonym of both rasa and...
śṛṅgāra. Holding rasa to be a synonym of ahaṅkāra, he has analysed the human mind. According to Br. Up.’s statement ‘आत्मन्त्र स्वयं निः स्वभवित, ‘ the emotions like affection, sorrow, derision, ardour, anger, aversion, wonder, fear, stoicism, etc., displayed by man towards other beings, are in fact meant for self-gratification only. The word ahaṅkāra or abhimāna used in the technical sense by Bhoja indicates this very gratification and self-love. The ahaṅkāra is at once the source of rati, etc., and the accumulation of them. The supreme aim of poetry is only to evoke and gratify this ahaṅkāra. The above-said novel concept is undoubtedly on unprecedented contribution of Bhoja in the field of poetics and in that of Psychology too. The rasa of Bharata was indicative of ‘transcendental delight’, but in the view of Bhoja शुक्लविभिन्न: रस:, has been presented as the basic cause of rasa, (poetic delight) The pleasure of theory of Bhoja is maintaining which is carried forward from Bharata. But on the basis of the following etymology; श्रुत रीते गमनेते बैन इति श्रुताः; (by which climax is attained is called śṛṅgāra) to accept śṛṅgāra as a synonym of ‘ahaṅkāra’ or rasa. Would be misleading, because it disregards the traditional meaning of śṛṅgāra, (श्रुत कुच्छति इति श्रुताः:) which is the elevation of rati. In fact this etymology is due to an inclination towards a particular notion.

Bhoja was under the spell of a group of the अच्युतस, who believed ‘śṛṅgāra’ to be the basis and pivot of the rāsas (bhāvas). He therefore on the one hand, through this etymology, accepted the word śṛṅgāra as an equivalent of rasa in the broad sense, and on the other declared it to be the basis of all the rāsas holding it to be synonym of preman. In his view rati alone is the vital element of the so called rāsas, śṛṅgāra, hāsyā, etc. agreed to by Bharata and other अच्युतस. For instance, an amorously inclined man is regarded as being love-minded, and a man full of ardor for battle

71. Every thing is dear to us for the gratifications of our ownself. Br. Up. 2.4.5.
as war minded. Similarly, an individual filled with the emotions of anger, humor, etc., is thought to be anger loving and humor loving respectively. Obviously the śṛṅgāra has been given such a broad base on the strength of prejudice prevalent among a group of ācāryas with a view to raise it to the position of the fountain head of all the bhāvas. Similarly, an individual filled with the emotions of anger, humour, etc., is thought to be anger loving and humour loving respectively. Obviously the śṛṅgāra has been given such a broad base on the strength of prejudice prevalent among the group of ācārya with a view to raise it to the position of the fountain head of all the bhāva. Similarly, an ācārya partial to vīrārasa, may conjure up the persons like ratyutsāhi, ranotsāhi, amarsotsāhi, parihāsotsāhi etc.

And then, taking śṛṅgāra to be a synonym of all the four-śṛṅgāra, ahāṅkāra, rasa and preman though is suggestive of a novel view on the part of Bhoja, yet it shows prejudice as noted above. In fact, all this notion creates confusion. Bhoja has accepted three categories of ahāṅkāra or rasa.

a) the deep-rootedness of ego in man (rūḍhāhaṅkāratā).
b) metaporical designation of all the 49 emotions love, etc. as sentiment.
c) Incorporation of the śṛṅgārarasa as held by Bharata and others on śṛṅgāra.

He has in this way, no doubt, managed to include in the above categories, as far as possible, the entire material presented by other ācāryas by maintaining that the singular instinct of ahāṅkāra is the root of all these elements. But there is nothing specially novel in the first two categories except the principle of ahāṅkāra.

In the first category the idea of deep rootedness is analogous to the vāsanā of Bharata and other ācāryas. In the second
category Bhoja has accepted that there is "पूर्विकर्म-सम्बन्ध" between the bhavas and abhimāna (rasa). But we come across this type of relationship in Bharata also when he points out a time lag between the act of chawing (carvanya vyakti) and the relished pleasure (āsvāda). In this second category Bhoja has termed the 'prakāraśa' of the saṅcāribhavas and sātāvīkahavas metaphorically as rasa, but even this concept of his is not absolutely orginal, as Bharata and others have principally admitted the pleasure caused by the saṅcāribhavas, but for the sake of clarity they have termed it 'bhava' instead of 'rasa'. Now let us take the third category in which all the rasas are subsumed in preman. But, as shown above, it is indicative of group prejudice. Once the view of Bhoja is conceded, the classification of any subject-matter of any śāstra would be uncessenary.

**Sum up**

1. Ahaṅkāra may, no doubt, be admitted as the origin of all our feelings, i.e., an element which is made up of all the emotions, and when it reaches its acme, it may be termed 'rasa'.

2. On the etymology श्रोगरास, the word śṛṅgāra may be accepted as the synonym of 'rasa' and 'ahaṅkāra' though by implication.

3. But we are not prepared to follow Bhoja in accepting śṛṅgāra as the synonym of preman, and consequently to regard śṛṅgāra as the base of all the rasas (bhavas), and thus to bring all of them within its orbit. In the end it may be pointed out that Bhoja has made no attempt to establish the supremacy or excellence of the śṛṅgārarasa over other rasas.

**II.4.9 Agnipurāṇa**

The view of Agnipurāṇa is almost similar to those of Bhoja. Delight is as old as is supreme soul. The experience of
delight is called *rasa* or *caiatnya camatkāra*. The development of the *rasa* or *camatkāra* is called *ahaṅkāra*. *Ahaṅkāra* gives rise to *abhimāna*, and the latter to *rati*. This *rati* when associated with the *vyabhicāribhāvas*, etc. is called *śṛṅgāra*, and the *rasas* like *hāsyā*, *karuṇā*, *bhayānaka*, etc. strengthened by their respective *sthāyibhāvas* are the variants of the *rati* or *śṛṅgāra*. Although like Bharata, accepting *śṛṅgāra*, *raudra*, *vīra*, and *adbhuta* as the four basic *rasas*, the author of Agnipurāṇa attributes their origin to *rati* only. *Rati* has four forms: *rāga*, *taiksānyā*, *avastambha*, and *saṅkoca*. These give rise to the above four *rasas* *śṛṅgāra*, *raudra*, etc., respectively and from these form arise the *hāsyā*, *karuṇā*, *adbhuta* and *bhayānaka* respectively. It may be noted that Bhoja treats *ahaṅkāra*, *abhimāna* and *śṛṅgāra* as synonyms, and yet he accepts that *śṛṅgāra* is originated from *abhimāna* though indirectly and remotely. But according to the author of Agnipurāṇa, *ahaṅkāra* gives birth to *abhimāna* *abhimāna* to *rati* and from *rati* are originated all the *rasas* like *śṛṅgāra*, *hāsyā*, etc. There is yet another difference between the views of these two *acāryas*. According to Bhoja *śṛṅgāra* in its broad sense is synonym of ‘*rasa*’, but the author of Agnipurāṇa admits it to be a principal variety of the *rasa*, whose other varieties are *hāsyā*, *karuṇā*, etc. of course, Bhoja regards *rati* as the source of all the *rasas*, yet he puts forward a third category of the *rasa* *śṛṅgāra* in the form of *preman*.

**II.4.10 Conclusion**

The conclusion is that with a little difference in the method of elaboration, both Bhoja and the author Agnipurāṇa accept *śṛṅgāra* alone as source of all the *rasas*. Though the Sanskrit *ācāryas*

---

73. Ibid
74. Sr.Pra., p. 513.

Though *śṛṅgāra* originalis from *ahaṅkāra* yet he calls its synonym.
have not explicitly called श्रीगारा as the rasarāja, yet they have accepted it as the best of the rasas. The view of Bharata, Rudraṭa and Ānandavardhanas in this regard have been quoted above as an evidence. The different view point of Bhoja and the author of Agnipurāṇa, though not wholly appealing and satisfying, do lead to the acceptance of the supremacy of the श्रीगाररासा indirectly. The succeeding acāryas have advanced a few more reasons to substantiate the supremacy of the श्रीगारा and there are some other reasons too which may by put forward here’.

Hemachandra, Vidyādhara, Rā.G. and other acāryas have assigned the top positon to the श्रीगाररासा 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’.75 Viśvanātha claims universality of श्रीगार रासा on the ground that it is the only rāsa with which all the sañcārībhāvas sexpecting ferocity, mortality and indolence and all the sthāyībhāva barring revulsion are connected.76 In fact, in the ultimate analysis, even ferocity, mortality, indolence and revulsion are related to श्रीगारा in one way or the other Sāradātanaya votes for the association of all the sañcārībhāvas with the श्रीगाररासा. Not only sthāyībhāvas and sañcārībhāvas, but also the largest number of anubhāvas and sāttvikaśhāvas exist dominantly in the two varieties of श्रीगाररासा, sambhoga and vipralambha.77 Again, this rāsa is connected with so many other aspects like;

i) the five divisions of the vipralambha-श्रीगारा, पुर्वरागा, māna, pravūṣa and śāpa, karuṇa.

ii) the twelve stages of kāma such as caksuprīti etc. and too

75. तबकामय सकलं-वाजि-सुलभतायत्तत्तितत्त्विन्द्रांगस्मिन सर्वत्र तत् हर्यतेति पूर्व ब्रजन: (Kāvyanuśāsana, p-81, Ekāvali, p-99, ND, P-163.
76. तत्क्रियाय-विश्वासात्स्व-स्वितिहितारिण: (SD, 3-186.
77. समग्रवर्गनागराः: ब्रजसे वृहत्तस्वति Bhāvaprakāśa
other stages of kāma such as abhilāsa etc.\textsuperscript{78}

iii) the elaborate classification of nāyaka and nāyikā and their companions dūri, sakhi, etc. under the ālambanavibhāva.\textsuperscript{79}

iv) the sattvaja alamkāras, of the nāyikās, such as bhāva, hāva, helā etc.\textsuperscript{80}

In this way, the wide range of the subject proves the universality and the excellence of the śṛṅgārarasa of all the rasas. Besides, this is the only rasa where both the ālambanas i.e., āśraya and the viṣaya incite each other. In other words, the pair of ālambanas in other rasas are mutually hostile or indifferent, but in this rasa they are very intimately attached to each other. Further, sauhārdra, bhakti, kārpanya, all these so called rasas accepted by different ācāryas from time to time get merged in the extensiveness of the śṛṅgārarasa.\textsuperscript{81} In view of the above it can categorically be stated that:

1. Of all the rasas the śṛṅgārarasa is the most excellent. The basis for such superlative epithet is its all comprehensive nature and its universal appeal.

2. The view of Bhoja that śṛṅgāra is the synonym of rasa, and that other rasas are only the variety of śṛṅgārarasa, and in this account, the notion that śṛṅgāra is the pre-eminent rasa of all the rasas may not be taken as wholly acceptable.

3. Many thinkers may be inclined to regard the śṛṅgārarasa as the supreme rasa on the ground that all the rasas originate from it, but this view would be very difficult to sustain in its

\textsuperscript{78} vide Pratīparudrayaśobhāsana, p-194, S.D.-3-190.
\textsuperscript{79} vide S.D., 3rd ch.
\textsuperscript{80} Rasamanjarī (the whole book)
\textsuperscript{81} Rasatarangini, 6.2. (Vr.)
entirety, all that can be accepted is that although all other rasas are certainly related to it, some by virtue of compatibility, and others through incompatibility, yet they do not originate from it.

II.5.0 Hāsyarasa

The literary work of a writer aims at the production of particular kind of pleasure in the hearts of the sympathetic readers. Among the eight varieties of rasas, the H.R. is the particular one which can be relished without the śṛṅgārarasa while witnessing a spectacle of the H.R. nobody thinks that it is the imitation of the śṛṅgārarasa and hence a case of H.R. A well dressed strong and cautious person suddenly slipping on the road furnishes the instances.

Hāsyarasa comes in the 2nd of the enumeration. sthāyibhāva of H.R. is hāsa. The other bhāvas are enumerated as per the description of Viśvanātha in S.D chapter III. According to him the definitions of H.R. is:- 

अथ हास्यः -

विकृताकारवाचेष चेष्टेदः कुहकाव्येत्||
हास्यो हासस्थायिभावः क्रेतः प्रमथैवतः || २१४||
विकृताकारवा-कचेष्ट यमालोक्य हसेजनः |
तपारातान्य प्राहुस्तवतयोधिनेन मतम् || २१५||
अनुभावोष्खितंक्रोच वदन स्मृतातदवः |
नित्यालक्ष्यिश्चाभिष्कराप्रत स्मृतिभिअराप्यः || २१६||
च्येदानं मित्तहसितं मथानं विहसितावहसिते च ।
नीचानामहसितं तथातिहसितं तदेय यत्नेऽवेदः || २१७||
इष्ठधिकसिन्यनं स्मितं स्माचत्तरदित्यत्तथम् |
विभिन्नकृत्यविधिं तत्र हसितं कथितं सुः || २१८||
मधुरस्तवं विहसितं सार्वविशेषः कःमवहसितं तथ ।
अपहसितं सार्वावशं विक्षिप्तः (च) भवत्वत्न हसितम् || २१९||
II.5.1 The ‘comic’ described

The ‘comic’ in which the ‘permanent condition’ is ‘mirth’, and which according to the fancy of the mythologists, is white-coloured, and has the attendants of Śiva as its presiding deities, may arise from the fun of distorted shapes, towards, dresses, gestures what ever a person laughs at, when he beholds it distorted in respect of form, speech, or gesture, this they can the, ‘substantial’ element of the 'comic'. The gestures there un to pertaining are held to be the ‘enhancers’. Among its ‘ensurants’ are closing of the eyes, smiling of the countenance, and the ‘accessories may be drowsiness, indolence, dissembling.

Different characters show their sense of the ridiculous

When under the influence of the ‘comic’ the best kind of persons slightly smile or else smile, the middling sort laugh, or laugh aloud, the baser sort roar with laughter, or are convulsed with laughter, such are the six kinds of mirthful expressions. Let a ‘slight
smile' (smitci) have the eyes opened and the lip quivering by the learned, among these varieties of mirthful expression, that is called a ‘smile’ (hasita) where the teeth are some what shown, a ‘laugh’ (vihasita) is attended by a soft-sound, loud ‘laughter’ (avahasita) is that which is attended by shakings of the head and shoulders, a roar of laughter (apahasita) has the eyes filled with tears, a ‘convulsion of laughter’ (atihasita) is that where the limbs lose all control.

II.5.2 Various creatures

From the above mentioned definition of H.R., we can easily know about the various creatures of H.R. Hāsyā arises due to disfigured appearance, discordant speech, distored activities and deformed figure. The permanent emotions sthāyibhāvas of H.R. is hāsa. Its colour is white and the deity of H.R. is pramathagana. The ālambananavibhāva in H.R. are the imitators, the jugglers etc. imitating others activities of distorted and deformed faces which compel spectators to laugh loudly. Here the uddīpanavibhāvas in H.R. are the peculiar activities of the speaker of humours words which naturally arise the laughable situations. When the sthāyibhāva has fixed upon the ālambana and is excited by the uddīpanavibhāva and is nourished by the vyabhicaribhāva, there appear naturally some outward signs to show this process. This is called the anubhāvas. External manifestations as movement of the eye, closing of the eyes some times, expanse of the face are counted as the anubhāvas in the H.R. The saṅcāribhāvas are thus the transitory emotions having no permanent character. They arise and help the sthāyibhāvas to attain their fully matured stage. The factors like nidrā, ālasya, abahitthā etc. are the vyabhicāribhāvas in the H.R.

II.5.3 Division

The H.R. is at first divided into the ātmastha and the
parastha. Bharata defines the first as when the character laughs by himself and the second as when he makes others laugh. Abhinava agrees to the definition of the first and explains the second as that when the character seeing others laughing laughs by himself without seeing the vibhāvas etc. And he says that even those who have seen the vibhāvas but have not laughed being of grave and serious nature do laugh when they see others laughing. Hasya is divided into sex kinds. (i) the smita (ii) the hasita (iii) the vihasita (iv) the upahasita (v) the apahasita (vi) the atihasita. The first and second have reference to the character of high status, the third and the fourth to those of middle status and the fifth and the sixth to low characters. Some recognize only three kinds instead of the above six. For instance, the hasita is mixed with the smita. A.G leaves this view aside as he says it will occupy a wide space. Each kind is, limited to the vibhāvas in each of when the hāsyā reaches a particular stage of sublimation. The hāsyā of which the hāsa is the sthāyibhāva may be said to reach the six stages but they are reached only in the appropriate vibhāvas

II.5.4 different opinions

Bharata gives six varieties also, ranging from a smile to a roar, according to the nature of man who are gentle, boisterous and so on. Kavikarṇapūra reduced the number to three. Bharata himself speaks of a broad three fold classification of laughter according to the nature of man as uttama, madhyama or adhama viz, refined or unrefined. Further Bharata has recognized that laughter has two varieties, laughing with and laughing at viz, svagata and paragata.

Each kind of hāsyā has its own definite characteristics. In case of smitahāsyā, there is little expanse of eyes and lips are moving little inwardly. In case of hasita, there is a little appearance of teeth and in case of vihasitahāsyā one can laugh with the
movement of head and shoulder, *apahasita* is one in which at the time of laughing the water naturally comes to the eyes. But in case of *atihasita* there are the movement of foot, shoulder, hands etc.

**II.5.5 Aesthetic experience of laughter**

Aesthetic experience of the emotion of laughter is essentially the same as that of the laughter at the empirical level. It is due to the presentation of a distorted imitation of another's dress, ornament, language etc. such as do not fit in with time, place, age, manner etc. It is of two kinds

i) self centered (*atmastha*)

ii) centered in another (*parastha*)

On this point there is difference of opinion. An earlier authority maintained that it is said to be self-centered when a person's laughter is excited by the ridiculous dress, ornament etc., which he himself is putting on; e.g. the jester laughs at his own ridiculous dress, appearance and demeanour. It is said to be centered in another when another is made to laugh by it, e.g., the jester makes the heroine laugh by his dress etc. This view is not justifiable, because according to this, *hāsyā* of both types refers to the same ridiculous dress etc., which belongs to one's own self or another and as such serve as stimulant of the laughter. But if the opponent were to say that he speaks of *hāsyā* as centered in another in as much as the sight of laughing man excites laughter in another then he may as well speak of the *karuna*, the basic emotion of which is grief, and other similar *rasas* are of two kinds. For grief in the master causes grief in the servants also. A.G, therefore, holds that the basis of division of *hāsyā* into two kinds is as follows:

The laughter is a contagious emotion in as much as its expressions arouse identical emotion in others, exactly as the sight of a person, enjoying a delicious fruit, produces saliva in the mouth
of the beholder. Thus, it happens that when we see another person laughing at something we ourselves start laughing, though we do not see the cause of laughter ourselves. Thus, ātmasthāhāsya means the experience of the emotion of laughter due to the perception of an object that is ridiculous. And parasthāhāsya means the experience of the emotion of laughter because of the sight of expression of laughter as an emotion in another, without seeing the ridiculous object that is the stimulant of it.

II.6.0 अथ करुणः:

इष्टाभावानिष्टानि: करुणाः रसो भवेत् ।
धीरः कषोहत्वाणिं कथितो मयदेवसः ॥ २२२ ॥
शोकोज्ज्वल भाविभावः: स्वाच्छोच्छमालामवं मतम् ।
तस्य दाहाववास्या भोवदूर्विपण पूनः ॥ २२३ ॥
अनुभवा देवनन्दभूपागतांनिदितादयः ।
वैवर्ण्यःचुभास्वानि: स्वास्तमप्रलस्तीचः ॥ २२४ ॥
निविदेशामप्लावाध्यामितास्मृतिश्रामः ।
विषय जड्ठोमदवविनादिवयाविभिवारिणः ॥ २२५ ॥

स्त्रय करुण विप्रलभादृ भेदमाहः:-

शोकश्वाभित्या भिक्षो विप्रलभादवं रसः ।
विप्रलभे रति: स्थायी पूनः संभोगहेतुकः ॥ २२६ ॥

II.6.1 The pathetic described (209)

Let that rasa be called ‘pathetic’ which arises from the advent of what is unpleasant, or from the advent of what is unpleasant, or from the loss of what is loved. By the learned it is mythologically spoken of as dove-coloured, while its presiding deity is the god of death. Let sorrow be here the permanent mood (206) what is held to be the essential excitant is the object sorrowed for. Let the ‘enhances be such things as when this the dead body of the loved one- is being burnt. It “ensurants” are the caursing
one's destiny, falling on the ground, wailing, changes of colour, sighs, and sobs, stupefaction and raving. Its “accessories” are indifference to all worldly objects, fainting, epilepsy, sickness, debility, reminiscences, weariness, distress, insensibility, madness, anxiety, etc.

The “object sorrowed for” is a deceased relative, or the like (For example- in Rāghavavilāsa “How unsuited are this they lovely form and the cultivation of matted locks in the forest! Is not fate’s coupling the two as inappropriate as a cutting of the Acacia-flower with a sword). For here we have Daśaratha blaming destiny, he being pained with the sorrow produced by Rāma’s having to dwell in the woods when he was so much better qualified to adorn a palace. In like manner examples might be adduced where ther is separation from relatives, loss of wealth,. But the full development of the “pathetic” is to be seen in the Mbh., in the section entitled the striparvan.

II.6.2 The difference of real pathetic- from separation of tender sadness’(224)

This rasa the “pathetic differs from the ‘separation’ of those who are destined to be reunited, through its having sorrow as its, “permanent mood”. In the ‘separation’, the permanent mood’ or ground work of the sentiment, is 'desire', this being occasioned by the hope of enjoying reunion.

II.6.3 Karuṇa and other rasa

A sahrdaya derives pleasure not only from the rasas – śṛṅgāra, hāsyā, etc., but also from the rasas –karuṇa, bhayānaka, etc. This is a statement which from a practical and logical point of view appears to be paradoxical and fallacious . Therefore several acāryas term rasa as sukhadukhātmaka, i.e., causing both pain and pleasure. Of these Rā.G, the authors of N.D are most prominent,
because they have provided the maximum material on the subject. Their statement in this connection is “सुखेद्र खत्म्को सः?” (N.D.3.7.) Clarifying this maxim they have observed that while five rasas-श्रीगुरा, हस्या, विरा, अधभुता and सांता provide pleasure, the other four rasas- करुणा, राउद्रा, भयानका and बिभत्सा cause painful feelings. The rasas of the first group are indisputably delightful, but these आचर्यास do not accept the second group of rasas as such. They have offered four arguments in this connection.

1. The like rasas, karuṇa, bhayānaka, etc. lead the suhrdaya to some indescribable state of agony. The spectators are perturbed by them. But does anybody feel perturbed during moments of pleasure? Is there anyone who enjoys such scenes on the stage as the abduction of Sītā, undraping and seizure of Draupadi by her hair, the servitable of hariścandra under a cāndāla, the death of Rohitāśva, etc.

2. The second argument is that the worldly affairs and conduct are realistically presented in poetry and drama. Poets describe the worldly pleasure in the pleasing way, and sorrows in the painful way. The pathetic condition of those, whose life is being enacted, e.g., Rāma and Sītā separated from each other, would undoubtedly be painful. Therefore if their poetic and dramatic representation be admitted as delightful, it follows that imitation would not be real, as it would be contrary to the realities of the practical world.

82. (1) the erotic, (2) the humour, (3) the heroic (4) the marvellous and (5) the quietistic respectively.
83. (1) the pathetic, (2) the furious, (3) the terrible, (4) the disgustful respectively.
84. भगवन्को बीमासः करुणो राउद्रो सत्तायामात्र अनावश्यकपूर्णमण्यस्ति। अतएव भगवन्कांदिमि उद्भवते समाजः। न नाय सुखायादाय उद्भो गद्ये। N.D., p. 291
85. Ibid, Page-291-292
86. (४) करुणस्तु सुखेद्र-खत्मक- संसारार्थनुष्ठेण रामानिर्विशेषं निवचनं सुख-दुःखात्मक- रामानुष्ठितमेव गृहान्ति।
(५) सन्तोषानुष्ठितार्थं वस्तु: च। परिवर्तनानुष्ठितकाव्यवनाशव्यक्तम्ब तापदुःखात्मकः। एव। यदि चावशुकलेः सुखात्मकः स्पृहा, न समायं अनुशस्त्रं स्वायं विशेषतेन भयानादृ प्रवर्तिति। Ibid, p. 291-92
3. Those, who hold rasa to be fundamentally pleasing, may plead that just as the description or dramatisation of the touching scenes before the persons in sorrow comforts and soothes them, similarly the rasas like karuṇa and bhayaṅaka are pleasing and not painful. But Ra.G observe that in fact on such occasions too the pleasure which the afflicted persons appear to get is basically a painful experience, because that individual does not experience pleasure from the pleasant contexts (like other persons), but feels uncomfortable and distressed. Therefore to accept the fact that he derives pleasure from the sorrowful contexts is nothing but an illusion. Thus rasas karuṇa, etc. are painful. 87

4. Though the rasas karuṇa, etc. are ‘radically painful, yet if the spectators, receive supreme delight from them, it is because of the skilful acting of the actor, the brilliant composition of the poet and also the beautiful setting of the stage. 88

In this statement, they mean, that the pleasure which we get from reading the graphic and touching description of a poet, or by seeing the beautiful and captivating acting of an actor inspires us to read or witness them again and again. Thus the longing to undergo that delightful experience provides pleasure to the sahrdaya even when he reads a poem of witnesses a drama full of horror and pathos, other wise these rasas are basically painful. In support of this statement they give an illustration. Just as the brave man gets wonder struck at the skill of his foe while the latter strikes at him, 89 in the same way the spectator too gets delightfully struck by the skill of a poet or that of an actor. Now let this be examined.

87. येअवरूपताः-विनाश-दुःखवादः करुणो वर्णनात्मकीप्रवृत्तियो ज्ञाते सुखवादः: श्रीरानि परमाभिर्। दुःखवादः एव। दुःखी हि दुःखवादायु सुखभिन्नस्ते। प्रमोदादिः-वाच्या हु तामात्तै करुणादृशः दुःखात्मनाः एव। इति। Ibid, p. 292
88. यदृपुनर्मिव प्रमोदादिः प्रमोदादिः हु अवरूपताः-विनाश-दुःखवादायु सुखवादायु। प्रमोदादिः-वाच्यात्। सुकृतभिन्नस्ते। प्रमोदादिः। इति। Ibid, p. 291
89. विस्मयस्वते हि शिखर्षे दक्षिणारूपं प्रहारुऽक्षालस्ते वैरणा शौचिताः-मातमिः। Ibid, p. 291
all these arguments. The first one has been advanced with reference to the mental perturbance of the *sahrdaya*, and the second keeping in view of organic thirty between the worldly dealings and the poetic composition. The third argument is connected with the worldly sympathy and consolation, and the fourth one takes into account the external beauty of poetry as well as skillful performance of the actor and also the stage-craft.

Obviously, all the four arguments are based on the erroneous conception that there is absolutely no difference between worldly activities and a work of poetry. That is why in the first argument a *sahrdaya* has been supposed to be as distress and disturbed by the *rasas karuna, bhayānaka*, etc, as a worldly man in ordinary life is supposed to be frightened or woe beg gone. But in fact the worldly emotions of love and grief, etc. always differ from their counterparts in poetry. The worldly emotions are confined to a particulars space, time and individual, while those in poetry do not suffer from any such limitations.

Similarly, in the second argument on the strength of this very concept the events of ordinary life have been thought to be similar to those described in poetry. But this is inadmissible, because both are different for many reasons. One striking difference between the two is that unlike the events of the world, in poetry reality alone is not depicted, it is necessarily mixed with the element of imagination of the poet. Therefore to say that the pleasure and pain of the *sahrdaya* are the same as those of the *anukārya* (one whose role is imitated in action) is basically wrong. Now let us take the third argument. There is a marked difference between the grief of a mother, who is her real life is bereaved of her son and that of the *sahrdaya*, who witnessing the performance of such an event on the stage or reading in la *kāvya*, becomes sad. In the former case, various situations are possible such as the softening of the
sorrow by consolation, its intensification, or its total disappearance at some calm and settled moments. But in the case of the sahṛdaya the question of such situations does not arise, as he is no way related to the events other than depicted in poetry, during these moments he is not a sahṛdaya, but is a worldly individual.

The forth argument, no doubt, contains truth but only unilateral. The brilliance of the poetic composition and especially that of acting no doubt bewitches the sahṛdaya. This statement may be corroborated by a converse example that how a most pathetic and heart-rending scene, because of the inefficient performance of an actor, produce, ridicule instead of pathos. Thus the brilliance born of the actor’s skill and poet’s gift can not be denied, but this brilliance only intensifies the already existing effect on the sahṛdaya and is not its generative cause. For instance, it intensifies the emotion of love of the sahṛdaya in the Śr.R., the emotion of grief in the K.R., and so on. In addition, this brilliance born of skill produces a feeling of admiration and wonder in the spectator for the genius of the poet as well as the actor. But this feeling of admiration should not be held to account for the realisation of pleasure in the rasas karuṇa, bhayānaka, etc. This feeling of admiration is on the worldly plane, so it can produce worldly pleasure and not the poetic delectation. Rā.G were not the first to hold the view that rasas karuṇa bhayānaka, etc., are both pleasing and painful. Some definite statements to this effect are available even prior to them.

a) 
चेन वृत्तायारि सुखदुःखजननशक्तियुक्त ।
विपयसामायिन वाहीत्रो सुखदुःखस्थवारो रसः ॥
(some unknown ācārya, vide, A.Bh., Pt.I, Page-278)
b) 
रसस्य सुखदुःखात्मकत्वात् तद्भव्य लक्षणन्तरं उपविष्टते,
अतएव तद्भव्यजनक्त्वम् । (Rasakalikā, vide No.of R. Page-115)
c) 
रसा हि सुखदुःखरूपः । (Śr.Pra.,Page-369)
Though it is not clear from the statements whether the said acāryas held all the rasas both as pleasing and painful, or some of them pleasing and others painful, yet the probability is that they would have, like Rā.G, accepted the rasas śṛṅgāra, hāsya, etc., as pleasing, and the rasas, karuṇa, bhayānaka, etc., as painful. Beside these statements Vāmana has quoted in the name of certain acārya a verse which clearly shows that he himself and probably some others acāryas too believed in the existence of both pleasure and pain in the K.R.

(Kāvyālatāṅkāra-sūtravṛtti, 3.1.9 (Vṛ.)

But from this statement one cannot get clear indication that in K.R. whether pleasure precedes pain or vice versa. It appears, however, that they accepted precedence of pain over pleasure. In other words the sahṛdaya, though experiencing worldly pain, does ultimately enjoy the delectation of poetry. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī (17th C.A.D.) was probably the first to explain this conception in an original way. His conclusion is that pleasure is experienced from all the rasas, though its degree varies from rasa to rasa. The main reason for this is that the predominance of the sattvāguna is the principal factor of pleasure, and it does never so happens that in any rasa the rajoguna and the tamoguna are completely subdued, and the sattvāguna becomes perfectly manifest, the former two are always present to some extent.91

No doubt it is difficult to determine the measure in which they exist in a particular rasa, but they do exist. Therefore all the

90. Experience tells that as in the pathetic dramas there happens an overlapping of pain and pleasure, in the same way, such state also happens in the case of ojas and prasāda gunas.

91. सत्त्वगुणोऽसुखस्वतत्वादि सवायं भावानं सुखसपूर्वापि रजस्तम्भोऽश्चस्मणांति तातापवक्षवाद्यवाद्। अतो न सत्त्व रजस्तम्भेः तुम्मुक्तवाचः॥ Number of rasas, p. 156.
rasas, the mixture, rather overlapping, of pleasure and pain is determined by the proportion in which the two gunas referred to above exist. Thus the following four alternative views are before us:

a) All the rasas are pleasing

b) All the rasas are both pleasing and painful.

c) The rasas like śṛṅgara, hāsyā are pleasing, but the karuṇa, bhayānaka are painful.

d) The śṛṅgara, hāsyā, etc. are pleasing, but karuṇa, bhayānaka etc., are both pleasing and painful.

In fact the analogy between the beverage and the rasas, karuṇa, etc., is not appropriate, because there may be sequence in the admixture of ingredients, sweet, sour, bitter, etc., in the preparation of the beverage, but there is no such sequence in its taste. But in the poetry or drama dealing with karuṇarasā there fore exist a sequence between the grief (worldly pain) and the poetic pleasure. The gap of time however is so short that it is not possible to assert with certainty any time-lag between the pain and pleasure.

What ever be the case, this quotation of Ra.G. is sufficient to make us believe that they accepted the fourth view that the rasas, karuṇa, bhayānaka, etc., are both pleasing and painful, i.e. at first painful and then pleasing immediately afterwards. If that be their view, it can certainly be explained. But if they hold these rasas to be absolutely painful, it would not only be opposed to the principles

92. Just as a beverage (prepared with the sweet, sour and bitter ingredients) becomes all the more delicious because of its pungent taste, similarly in the rasas, karuṇa, etc. the mixture or overlapping of pleasure and pain makes the poetry all the more pleasant.

93. 'शतिन्द्रक-पवशत-मेदन-ज्यांवेन'
of rehetorics (and psychology too), but will be contrary to practice and thus wholly in acceptable. A single argument, presented by Viśvanātha that the rasas, karuṇa, etc., are pleasing because the sahṛdayas long and look forward to witness such dramas, is enough to annihilate the view-point of Rā.G.

\begin{quote}
करणादाबिपि रसे जायते वत्तम भुक्तम्।
सचेतसामसुरभवः प्राणं तत्व केवलम्।
किं च तेषु यदा दुःखः, न कोष्ठि स्वातंद्रमुखः॥९४ S.D. 3.4.5.
\end{quote}

No keen reader of ND will be prepared to admit after the perusal of their entire text that the philosophers and thinkers of the caliber of Rā.G. held that the rasas like karuṇa, etc., are purely painful. They may have accepted these to be so, though only in the initial stage, but ultimately they would have accepted these as pleasing ones. This view can be explained in several ways and from several points of view.

1. All the sthāyibhāvas like rati, śoka, etc., in all the rasas like śṛṅgāra, karuṇa, etc., are experienced as mere worldly pleasure and pain until they are perfectly matured or made manifest in the form of rasa by the combination of vibhāva, etc., For instance, in an erotic play if a spectator gets reminiscent of his own beloved, or in a pathetic play if he is reminded of his own dead son, his emotion of love and grief respectively will be an experience of worldly pleasure or pain only. That person, even while sitting in the auditorium, is, for the moment, not a sahṛdaya but a worldly individual only. But the moment, in which that individual rises above the self, is the moment of his aesthetic pleasure. The worldly pleasure born of love, and also the worldly pain born of grief, become the precursors of this ultimate state of rasa.

94. If the sahṛdayas experience pleasure in the rasas like karuṇa, etc., it is the only proof the these rasa are capable of producing poetic delectation; if in these there were pain, then no one would turn a look towards them.
2. The worldly cause, effect and accessory are called *vibhāva, anubhāva* and *saṅcāribhāva* respectively in poetry, because they now transcend from the worldly to the super worldly plane. As long as the emotions, grief, fear etc., are related to worldly cause, effect and accessory, even in the auditorium itself, they are no doubt painful, but when give associated with *vibhāva*, etc., they convert into the *rasa* like *karuṇa, bhayānaka*, etc., which give always transcendental pleasure.

3. The Indian poetics has a powerful means in the doctrine of *sādhārāṇi karaṇa* to prove the *rasas, karuṇa, bhayānaka*, etc., are always pleasing at the time of their maturity.

By virtue of it the *sahādaya* descends from; the particular to the common emotional ground, i.e. his grief or fear do not remain bound to a particular place and time. He is free from all kinds of infatuations and privations. Consequently the character in poetry or play loses his individuality and thus appears to be a common person. For example, Rāma and Sītā turn into an ordinary man and woman, respectively, and the automatic result of all this is that the *sahādaya* is freed from his individual feelings and relationships. Therefore in such situations it can not be accepted that the *sahādaya* experiences worldly pleasure in the case of Śrī.R., etc., and worldly pain in the case of K.R., etc., This situation gives us transcendental pleasure in both the cases.

---

95. an excitant, an ensuant and an accessory.
96. K.P.,4.27,28.
97. *sādhārāṇi karaṇa* means turning of a particular into general.
98. ‘असाधारणस्य साधारणकरणं इति साधारणीकरणं ’
99. Bhāṣyakāra, p. 470
100. Ā.Bh., p. 464,465
101. Rāmāyaṇa, 4.40 (Vr.)
II.6.4 To sum up

1. Every *sthayībhāva* gives worldly pleasure or pain in its immature stage, but when mature, it turns into transcendental pleasure.

2. In the *rasas, karuṇa, bhayānaka*, etc., the spectator, no doubt, at some particular moments, experiences pain born of grief and fear, etc., but that pain is worldly only, exactly in the same way as the enjoys, at some particular moments, the worldly pleasure of love and humour, etc., in the *rasas, śṛṅgāra, hāsyā*, etc. But this sort of pain or pleasure precedes the state of *rasa*.

3. a) This worldly pain or pleasure, however, is not at all indispensable, because it is not always experiences it. Some (though their number be small) may not do so,

   b) Nor this worldly pain or pleasure in an accessory means to the acquisition of the ultimate transcendental pleasure

   c) Of course this pain or pleasure can prove an effective impetus to the experience of transcendental pleasure in the case of immensely sensitive hearts.

4. a) It is true that in life the grief, love, etc., cause worldly pain and pleasure, but in poetry and drama both these types of emotions when combined with *vibhāva*, etc., give the *sahṛdaya* transcendental pleasure.¹⁰²

   b) Consequently, the *rasas, karuṇa, bhayānaka*, etc., are not painful, they too are as pleasing as the *rasas, śṛṅgāra, hāsyā*, etc.

---

¹⁰². लोकिक-शोकहर्षित-कारणेष्यो लोकिकहर्षितो जायते हृदि लोक एव प्रतिनिधिः।
काले पुत्रं: सत्वस्योजीविविभाविभ्य: सुविभव जायते हृदि || *S.D.- 3.7. (Vr)*
II.7.0 Rudra and Vīra

The 'furious' described

The 'furious' in which anger is the 'permanent mood' is according to the mythologists, re-coloured, and has Rudra as its presiding deity. Its 'essential excitant' is on enemy, and his behaviour is regarded as its 'enhancer'. Its liveliness may be enhanced by excitant \( \text{उधिया विभावे विभिन्न विभिन्न विभिन्न} \). Its 'ensuants' are kitting of the brows, biting of the lips, swelling of the arms, threatenings gestures, telling of one’s achievements, and brandishing of weapons, so also reviling, and angry looks. Let \( \text{उधिया विभावे विभिन्न विभिन्न विभिन्न} \) sternness, flurry, horripilation, perspiration, trembling, intoxication, delirium, impatience, be its (व्यभिचारिन्य) ‘accessory’ moods. For example- hear Aśvatthamā in the Veṇīsamhāra. “By which so ever unmannerly beasts of men among you, armed as you are, this heavy sin of Droṇas murder was perpetrated or approved or witnessed, I shall make a sacrifice to all the quarters of heaven with the blood, fat and flesh of them, though they include Bhīma and Arjuna with
Kṛṣṇas the foe of naraḥ”. He states the difference of this form the martial ‘heroic’

And it is the redness of the face and eyes that difference this, the ‘furious’, from the martial ‘heroic’ which is to be next described.

अथ बीरः:

उत्तमप्रकृतिवीर उत्साहस्थायिभावकः।
महेन्द्रदेवतो हेमच्छोदयं समुवाहतः॥ २३२॥
आलम्बनभावास्तु विजेत्वावदयो मता॥
विजेत्वाविदेषायात्स्योद्धीपनरुपिणः॥
अनुभावास्तु तत् स्तुः सहायनेष्णादयः॥ २३३॥
संवारणास्तु धृतिमितवस्यमुद्धितकरोमादा।
स च दानधर्मदैत्यया च समन्वितरक्षचुर्धा स्यात्॥ २३४॥
स च वीरो दानवीरो धर्मवीरो युद्धवीरो दयावीरस्येति चतुर्विधः॥

II.7.2 The heroic described

The ‘heroic’, which belongs to the noblest men, has energy as its ‘permanent mood’. It is stated by the mythologists to be yellow-coloured, and to have the great Indra as its presiding deity. But its ‘essential excitants’ are held to be persons that are to be conquered. Its ‘enhancers’ are the behaviour of the persons to be conquered. But let its ‘ensuants’ be the seeking for allies. But its ‘accessories’ are firmness, resolution, pride, reminiscences, reasonings, and horripilation. And it may be of four kinds, as being conversant about liberality, or duty or war or benevolence.

The heroic divided

It is of four kinds :- दानवीर, धर्मवीर, युद्धवीर, दयावीर.
दानवीर- For example Paraśurāma, whose liberality is spoken of as follows:

“His liberality extended to the giving away, without any affection, of the earth girdled by the seven seas”. Here the permanent mood, Paraśurāma’s energy in dispensing, attains to being the दानवीर. The flavour in question being excited by the ‘essential excitants’ the brahmanical recipients, and my such ‘enhancing excitants’ as the goodness and determination of the benefactor and exhibiting as ‘ensuant’ on it the relinquishment of one’s whole possessions; and being brought to its highest development by such ‘accessories’ as cheerfulness in the parting with all one’s possessions, firmness.

युधिष्ठिर- For example- Yudhishthira- who speaks as follows:- “My kingdom, and my wealth, and my body, and those who are my wife, my brothers, and my children, and whatever in this world I am possessed of, all this is ever ready to be sacrificed to my duty”.

रामचन्द्र- For example- the illustrious Rāmacandra whose ambassador, Aṅgada the son of Vālī thus speaks: “O Rāvaṇa lord of Ceylon, let Sītā the daughter of Janaka be restored. Rāma himself begs this. What confusion of thy wits is this? Be think thee of propriety. Even up today nothing is lost to thee in Ceylon, but count not on further forbearance. If thou will not do thus, this arrow of mine already stained with the neck-blood of thy friends Khara, and Duṣaṇa and Trīśirās, once let it make friends with the bow-string that joins it, will forbear no further”.

दयावीर- For example- Jimūtavāhana who outshining prometheus thus addresses a hungry vulture which has stopped eating him.

“The blood still circulated by the valves of my veins, and there is still flesh on my body; I do not see that thou art yet satiated; why then, O bird, hast thou desisted from havouring”? 
II.7.3 *Raudra* vs. *vīrarasa* (furious vs. heroic)

According to Bharata, the author of the *NS*, the *rasas*—śṛṅgāra, raudra, vīra and bibhatsa—are the fundamental *rasas* and hāsyā, karuṇā, adbhuta and bhayānaka originate from them respectively. Sometime afterwards two more *rasas*—śānta and vātsalya—were added to the list, and the number of *rasas* increased from four to nine or ten. The question, why the *rasas* hāsyā, karuṇā, etc. were accepted as originating from śṛṅgāra, raudra, etc., can be explained to a certain extent psychologically. There is ‘cause and effect relationship between the pairs of *rasas* śṛṅgāra and hāsyā, raudra and karuṇā, vīra and adbhuta, and bibhatsa and bhayānaka. Therefore there can be no objection against admitting the above position.

While considering the difference among the four original *rasas*, we notice that there is distinct difference between the śṛṅgāra and bibhatsa, the former is related to love, while the latter is based on repulsion. But it looks a little inappropriate that raudra and the vīrarasas—which are related to almost similar emotions have been listed among the original *rasas*. Either of these could have been easily regarded as the original *rasa*, and the other one its offshoot. But Bharata has not done so. Therefore a natural question arises: what is the difference between the two that has led the ācārya to regard both of them as fundamental *rasas* and thus to add one more *rasa* to the list of original *rasas*. Here an attempt is made to answer this question.

103. श्रीनादि बनेद्व हास्यो राजेश्वर कलौनो रस: | बीरन्धौजात्वसूतिनाथिनि भक्तसन्म भयानक: *NS* 6.40
Viśvanātha, the author of *S.D.*, pointing to the similarity between *raudra* and *vīra*, said that in both these *rasas*, the *śīlpanavibhāva* is the enemy, and the *uddipanavibhāva* is his gestures and postures. The *anubhāvas* too in both these *rasas* are the same, e.g., picking up of the weapons, challenging the enemy, twitching of the eyebrows, reddening of the eyes and face, roaring and threatening, etc. The *saṅcāribhāvas* too, patience, endurance, pride, argumentation, furiousness, etc., are the same.

In spite of the above similarity, the *sthāyibhāva* of *raudra* is *krodha*, while that of *vīra* is *utsāha*. Here the question arises why either *utsāha* or *krodha* be not accepted as the *sthāyibhāva* of both the *rasas*, and the other be included in it, and consequently, out of the two, only one rasa may be accepted *raudra* or *vīra*, and the other one be included in it.

*Krodha in utsāha*: Let us consider the first alternative that *krodha* may be incorporated in *utsāha*. In any verse dealing with *vīrārāsa* we are bound to come across the words expressing anger, as it is necessarily present in the heart of the warrior on the battle field. In fact the warrior, at first, feels anger towards his enemy and then is assailed with the fervent feeling to annihilate him. Let us take one example in Hindi language:

\[\text{धर्मवीर वांच वांच खोप, राज जय जय जय महर्षी} \]

\[\text{वरो भुज जय जय जय महर्षी} \]

Jayadrathavadha (J.V. (M.Sh-G.))

---

104. (a) *Raudra*- आलम्बनविभावतः *S.D.* 3.227

*bīrā*- आलम्बनविभावतः विजेत्यासो मः | *Ibid*, 3.233

(b) *Raudra*-यच्योद्ध्रवेन मतम् | *Ibid*, 3.22

*bīrā*- विजेत्यातिरः। *Ibid*, 3.233

105. Arjuna says, “I solemnly swear that if I do not will Jayadratha tomorrow before, I shall burn myself to death”. 
I Arjuna say, "I solemnly swear that if I do not kill Jayadratha tomorrow before sun-set, I shall burn myself to death." Arjuna feels dynamic zeal to fight the enemy only after his fit of anger towards him. Similarly in the example of V.R. quoted by Viśvanāth:-

भो लकेिक्कर, दीयतां जनकजा, राम: स्वयं याचले, बोियं ते महतिविभमः, स्मर नयं, नादायि क्रिष्टिदृत्य गतम् ।

नैवें चेतृ खर-दूषण-त्रिशिरसा कण्ठासुना परिलः: पत्री नैष सहिष्यते मम प्रतुर्ज्ञानं-बन्धुकृत: \[106\] S.D., 3.234 (vr)

वेचि देह दास सुअम, होि दास दूः मन्द ।

रखििहृं, निज बच सत्य करी, अभिमानी हरिचद \[107\]

If this position is admitted, the krodha should be accepted as the sthāyibhāva of both the rasas, and consequently the utsāha be included into the krodha and the vīra into the raudra. But in case utsāha is included into krodha, its importance and position would be lowered down. It would also be dethroned from its position of being a sthāyibhāva by arguing that it is not related only to the V.R., but to all the other rasas, and thus it would be taken to be just a saṁcāribhāva and not a sthāyibhāva. The definition of utsāha is:- कायवरभिषु संस्कमः स्वयंनुसाह उच्चते \[106\] S.D. 3.178 i.e. utsāha is needed at the commencement of every sort of work. For example, a person afraid of a lion needs utsāha to flee. Lakṣmana too must have been filled with utsāha to under harsh and sarcastic words at seeing the

106. (Rāmacandra’s message to Rāvana though Angada, “O Lord of Laṅkā, give me back the daughter of Janaka. Look! Rāma himself is asking for it. What has camouflaged your kind? Learn the ways of conduct. Nothing has yet been lost. Otherwise, my arrow, which is already stained with the blood of Kharā, Dūṣaṇa and Triśīras, will not tolerate anything, if it becomes the friend of the string of the bows i.e., it is stretched on the bow").

Rāma challenges Rāvana only after he is overpowered with a feeling of fury and anger. Not only in the examples of yuddhabhāva, even in the example of dānabhāva quoted below there is an under tone of anger in the words of the munificent Hariścandra.

107. I, am egoist Harīścandra, would prove true to my word, even if I have to sell off my wife and son and have to under go servility.
dreadful axe of Parśurāma. Not only this, Duṣyanta must have felt utsāha to court Śakuntalā after being bewitched by her beauty. Even the bereaved father needs a particular kind of utsāha to lament and cry over the death of his dear son.

Thus the presence of utsāha can be admitted in all the rasas. That is why many ācāryas, rejecting it as only the sthāyibhāva of V.R., and accepting it as a saṅcāribhāva, have stressed upon its need or presence in all the rasas. Therefore the emotion utsāha, which is needed in one form or the other for all the rasas should not be elevated to the position of sthāyibhāva or V.R. It should be considered as the saṅcāribhāva. And then, accepting krodha as the sthāyibhāva of both the rasas, the V.R. should be included into Ra.R. Even if we do not include V.R. into raudra, at least vīra can be accepted as a variety or part of raudra.

Now we come to the second alternative of the issue that Ra.R can be included into V.R. A strong argument can be presented to support this view that it is krodha which precedes utsāha to combat. krodha in cause, while utsāha to combat is its effect. Between cause and effect it is always effect that is regarded of greater importance. As it is anger (i.e. cause) that culminates into a heroic deed (i.e. effect), there should be no hitch to include Ru.R. into V.R. Or if we like, accepting the raudra as the penultimate stage of vīra, we can call it a variety or part of the V.R.

II.7.4 Argument for both the rasas as one

But the arguments presented to accept both the rasas as one are very weak and unconvincing. In fact these two are separate rasas. No doubt Viśvanātha has pointed out similarity between the two, but he has hinted at their dissimilarity to. He has clearly mentioned that the colour of the Ra.R. is red, while that of the vīra

108. उस्तह-विस्तयी स्वरेषुपुष्पविविधायिणी 1 (Sāṅgītaraṇākara)
is golden, the deity of the *raudra* is Rudra, while that of the *vīra* is Mahendra. It can be argued that this difference regarding colour and deity is merely based upon *kavi-paramparā* or *śāstra-paramparā*, and such traditions are not always regarded as a strong proof to accept any issue. But even if we disregard this, the difference between the two *rasas* is quite distinct.

II.7.5 The difference between the two *rasas*

1. The *sthāyibhāva* of *raudra* is *krodha* and it remains stationary in this *rasa*; it does not lead to *utsāha* for fighting. The *sthāyibhāva* of *vīra* is *utsāha*. In *V.R.* also *krodha* does crop up, but it does not remains stationary, and ultimately or an inspiring factor for *utsāha* which is a supported or an inspired phenomena. In short, *krodha* is a means, while *utsāha* is an end. Thus *krodha* is at secondary position, while *utsāha* at primary. Therefore the *sthāyibhāva* of *vīra* is *utsāha* and not *krodha*. In fact even the *sthāyibhāvas* in certain circumstances turn into *sañcāribhāvas*. Here *krodha* is only *sañcāribhāva*, therefore it can be called *amarśasañcāribhāva*.

2. Even if it be admitted that *utsāha* is necessary for every *rasa*, yet according to the maxim ‘प्राध्यानेन व्यवहैशः भवनि’ (the things are named on the basis of their main quality), in every *rasa* its *sthāyibhāva* is primary, and *utsāha* serves only as its *sañcāribhāva*, as in the case of *V.R.* the *sthāyibhāva* is *utsāha* while *krodha* stands only as its *sañcāribhāva*. There is world of difference between the *krodha* that works as *sthāyibhāva* of *Ra.R.* and that which works as *sañcāribhāva* of *V.R.* While in *raudra* the *krodha* is beastly, in *vīra* it is emotional. In the moments of beastly anger, the person loses selfcontrol and is besides himself, while in the emotional anger, the brave person is full of enthusiasm; he retains his courage, bravery and the power to distinguish between foul and fair.
3. In Ra.R. the person, in a fit of anger, loses his temper even over the weak and the incapable persons, but in V.R. the brave person shows his utsāha to fight only towards those who are either equally powerful or superior to him in strength. Similarly there is a vast difference between both the sthāyibhāvas krodha and utsāha.

II.7.6 Difference between krodhas and utsāha

1. Krodha is said to be born of rajoguna, while utsāha to be that of sattvaguna. That is why, while in anger one loses his balance, but in zeal and enthusiasm he retains it.

2. The angry person is imbued with the feeling of retaliation, while the brave is not.

3. The angry person, in the moments of anger especially at the knowledge of the superior power of his opponent, suffers from a feeling of fear, but the brave person, even in the most disastrous moments, would not.

4. The angry person stoops down to injustice while the brave never.

5. The angry person indulges in acrobatics or in boasting, but the brave would not. He does display his bravery, but not beyond his capacity.

The face and eyes of both the persons angry and brave do become red because of krodha or utsāha, but there is lot of difference between the two. The red eyes of the angry person show that he is besides himself, and therefore will try to harm his adversary, and if it is not possible, he will try to harm his children or his property or something, he will, at least out of disgust, beat his forehead and scratch his face. On the other hand, the red eyes

109. तिर्य स्तात्तल्ल भगवद्गीता-3.37
of the brave person testify to his seriousness and discretion, his firm determination to meet the enemy. The brave will neither harm the children or the property of his enemy, nor will he scratch his face out of disgust. The redness is present in both the cases, but the reason as well as the result are different. Perhaps Viśvanātha too by his statement रक्तस्पर्शनेत्रला चास्य भेदिनी वुढ़िविरा: (S.D. 3.231) meant this. The difference between the redness on the faces of the two is that as the face of the furious person turns red, his mouth begins to foam, while the face of the brave shines with a glow in his true colour.

II.7.7 Accepting amarśa as the sthāyibhāva of both the rasas

The above analysis clearly shows that both these rasas are different from each other and one can not be included into another. Yet there are certain ācāryas, who accepting amarśa as the sthāyibhāva of both the rasas, are in favour of identifying the two. The definition of amarśa as given by Viśvanātha is as follows:

निन्दक्षेपा पक्षादेशस्याधिकारिनिविन्दितः
नेत्रायमिश्रःकम्प-भूषणलोचननादि-कृत् (S.D. 3.156)

(The amarśa is the determination of a purpose caused out of censure, false accusation, insult, etc., and leading to the redness of eyes, shaking of the head, knitting of the eyebrows, rebuking and snubbing, etc.)

But, as it has been said above, amarśa too is a form of anger. It may be the sañcāribaḥvas of both the rasa, but not their sthāyibhāva. As a matter of fact amarśa even as sañcāribaḥvā does not strengthen V.R. as much as it does Ra.R.. Defamation, accusation and censure may cause anger, but they alone would not be enough to create utsāha. For example, the apathy and

110. It is the redness of the face and eyes that differentiates it (raudrarasa) from the yuddhavīraraśa.
indifference shown by Śakuntalā towards Durvāsās caused anger in the latter, because he thought that she had insulted him, but it did not produce utsāha in him to combat with her. Similarly in the Harṣacarita of Bāṇa, the defamatory words and the mocking laughter of Sarasvatī, the daughter of Brahman, caused anger in Durvāsās, who out of amarśa said: ॐ (O ye pedantic girl! dare you laugh at me?)

The amarśa in these words too indicates krodha and not utsāha in the minds of the sage. The illustration of amarśa as given by Viśvanātha will further clear the point.

In Janakapuri at the occasion of the ‘Sītā-svayamvara’, when the sages asked Pārśurāma to remain calm after Rāma had broken the bow of Lord Śiva, he says, “I shall pay amends for disobeying you-worth of all honour as you are; but still will not belie my great vow of taking arms (against the kṣatriyas)” In the statement of Pārśurāma there is a feeling of anger towards Rāma and Lākṣmaṇa, and not that of utsāha for fighting against them. Therefore amarśa can never be the sthāyībhāva of V.R. Amarsa caused by defamation, accusation or censure may inspire or cause utsāha, but it is only a means or a cause and not the end or effect itself.

II.7.8 Conclusion

1. The raudra and the V.R. are two entirely different rasas.

2. They can not be included into each other, because krodha, the sthāyībhāva of Ra.R. cannot be that of V.R. Similarly utsāha, the sthāyībhāva of V.R. cannot be that of Ra.R. They can serve only as sañcārībhāva in the other rasa.
3. Accepting amarsa as the sthayibhava of both the rasas and thus identifying them is also untenable, because amarsa works only as sañcāribhava in both the rasas, though its scope or role is much greater in the Ra.R. than in the V.R.

II.8.0 Bhayānakarasa (BR.) (The terrible)

अथ भयानकः:-
भयानकीयं भयस्थायिन्यं भूतात्मिकं।
खीरीचलक्षकृति: कृष्णो मोक्षस्वरूपः। ॥ २३५ ॥
यम्मातुल्लतो भीती स्तद्विक्रमनि मतम्।
चेष्टा घोरतीर्थस्य भट्टरबीयः पुनः। ॥ २३६ ॥
अनुभवोत्त्वं वैन्याग्रंहनदवस्वं भाषणम्।
प्रलयस्वेतोमाथकंभितक्षणवकादयः। ॥ २३७ ॥
ज्वल्पमेवसंगीतमोहसंस्मातिनिदिनतः।
शारावस्मारस्मानिन्यमृत्युवधा व्यभिचारिण:। ॥ २३८ ॥

II.8.1 The terrible described

The ‘Terrible’ has fear for its permanent mood and time for its presiding deity. It belongs to women and mean persons, and is regarded under a mystical or mythological aspect by the learned as being black-coloured. In this case that is regarded as the “essential excitant” by which the fear is produced. Again, let the ‘enhancers’ be its fierce gestures. The ‘ensuants’, in this case are charges of colour and speaking with a stammering tone, fainting, perspiration, horripilation, trembling, looking in every direction. Its ‘accessories are aversion, agitation, bewilderment, terror, debility, prostravion, doubt, epilepsy, confusion, death etc.

For example: “The eunuchs fled, having abandoned shame, because of their not being reckoned among men, the dwarf, in terror, ensconces himself within the loose and wide trousers of the chamberlain, the mountaineers, the guardians of the bounds, acted in a style accordant with their name, while the hump-backs,
fearing that they may be seen by the monkey who has occasioned all this alarm, covering down, slink quietly off”.

II.8.2 Object responsible for B.R

Fear is ordinarily aroused by the sight of terrible objects such as demons etc., in women, children and persons of low type only. Occasionally, however, it may arise in persons of higher type, but then that is due to teacher or king. Yaugandharāyana, for instance, is represented to be afraid of king Udayana. Such fear is not inconsistent with their greatness. Very often fear and excitement in others are responsible for the arousal of fear in those who see them in those mood

II.9.0 Bibhatsa (Disgustful)

The disgustful described

The *rasa* is called the “disgustful” where the ‘permanent mood is aversion. It is alleged by the mythologists to be blue-coloured and to have Mahākāla (an awful form of Śiva) as its presiding deity. Stinking flesh and fiber and fat, are regarded as its

111. A.Bh., Vol-I 327
‘substantial excitant’. In the same, the presence of worms are instanced as the ‘enhancers’. Spitting, averting of the face, closing of the eyes are regarded as ‘ensuants’ in this case, and in like manner, let the ‘accessories’ be bewilderment, epilepsy, agitation, sickness, death etc.

For example- Mālati Mādhava Act V- “Having first torn and stripped off the skin, then having devoured the swollen and violently stinking lumps of flesh that were readily to be got from such parts of the mass as the shoulders, buttocks, and back, casting his eyes within the skeleton, and with his teeth displayed, the beggarly ghost is eating it his ease, from the skeleton placed in his lip, what flesh remains upon the bones or is to be found at the joints”.

II.9.2 Causes of the bibhatsarasa

Rasa experience of bibhatsa is due to the sight of loathsome things, presented on the stage or hearing there of. The disgust is due to various causes, subjective objective or both. It may arise because of the dislike for an object that the cultural peculiarity of the man generates. Thus, brähmanas have natural disgust for garlic, because of their spiritual culture. An object, though generally recognized to be pleasant, is disliked on account of inequilibrium in the three humours. Thus milk is disgusting to a man suffering from phlegmatic disorder. An object, though good in itself, becomes disgusting, because of its being dirty or because of its having been enjoyed to satiation. Dialogue between Vasāgandhā and Rudhirapriyā in the Veṇīsaṁhāra is a famous illustration of bibhatsa. Bibhatsa implies the simultaneous rise of bhayaṁaka, because of the identity of the situation.112

112. A.Bh., Vol.-1, 299
II.9.3 Bibhatsa in relation to mokśa

Bibhatsa is recognized to be of two types only by those who ignore the implication of the word dvitiyakaḥ in Bharata’s text. According to them, it is of two types: (i) pure and (ii) impure.

When the feeling of disgust is aroused by the presentation of such objects as blood, intestine etc, which agitate the mind (kṣobhanatvat), we have pure bibhatsa. But when disgust is aroused by the presentation of foul smelling excrement etc., which trouble the mind or make it shrink, we have impure bibhatsa.

But, according to the teachers of AG, it is of three types-

i) which agitates the mind (kṣobhana)

ii) which troubles the mind or makes it shrink (udvegī) and

iii) which is pure.

They assert that the second is rare and that the word dvitiyakaḥ is used in connection with the second type to indicate its rareness. It does not mean that bibhatsa is of two kinds.

They hold that loathsome object may be presented in such a way as may lead to the realization of variety of human wishes through contemplation on them and so help in the attainment of the highest human objective, the final emancipation. Such a presentation of bibhatsa as leads to the attainment of such an objective, is, according to them, pure (suddha)\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{113} A. Bh., Vol. I, 332
II.10.0  *Adbhutarasa (marvellous)*

प्राद्यातः:-
ाभदु: विप्रमयस्या विभावो गन्धविवेब्वत: || २४२ ||
पीतवर्णो वा स्वतु लोकाति गमातामवनं मतम्।
गुणानां तत्तद्यम भवेतुद्विपरं पुनः || २४३ ||
स्वाभाव: स्वपनं रोमाशा-शंदास्वस्तसंश्च।
तथा नेत्रविकासाद्य अनुभवः: प्रक्रीतिता: || २४४ ||
बितकविविश्वस्तसाधिति हर्षाद्य व्यभिचारिण:।

II.10.1  The marvellous described

The “marvellous” has wonder or surprise as its “permanent mood”, and a *gandharva* as its presiding deity. It is alleged by the mythologists to be gold-coloured. Its ‘essential excitant’ is held to be any supernatural thing. Then again let the greatness of the qualities of that super natural thing. When again let the greatness of the qualities of that supernatural thing be the ‘enhancers’ of the sentiment. Stupefaction, perspiration, horripilation, stammering speech, agitation, and so too wide opening of the eyes, and the like, are said to be its ‘ensuants’. Its ‘accessories’ are ‘debate’, flurry, confusion, joy etc. For example: Listen to Laksmana in the *Viracarita* of Bhavabhuti, Act-I. “The sound of the clang raised by the breaking of the bow-staff of the moon-crested Śiva, which (bow) had got into his (Rāma’s) arms or literally arm-staffs as a drum for proclaiming the boy play of my elder brother reverberating with its force condensed in the belly of the receptacle of Brahmā’s the halves of which, violently shaken, have collapsed as a box so that the sound can’t get out, ha! how!-does it not even yet subside”?

The emotion of *adbhutarasa* is wonder that is due to the perception of what is looked upon as impossible at the empirical level. (A.Bh. Vol.-I, 330) It is necessarily to be presented in the closing scene of the highest type of drama. In the last scene of the
Uttararāmacaritam, according to Bhavabhūti’s own statement, we find it presented in the very first act of the Ratnāvali, where in the extraordinary beauty of king Udayana makes Sāgarikā take the king to be cupid and inspires wonder in her. It seems to have much in common with the conception of “sublime”.

II.10.2 Constituents

The sthāyībhāva i.e. dominant mood of abhutarasa is vismaya. Its ālambanavibhāva is some thing astonishing, and its uddīpanavibhāva is the description of that thing, such as the portrayal of its colour, size, shape, dimensions etc. Its sāttvikabhāvas are perspiration, trembling, choking of the voice, etc. Its sañcāribhāvas are uneasiness, exultation, reasoning, frightening, etc. Thus the process of the manifestation of the abhutarasa is the same as that of the other rasas. Certain acāryas, however, have given more importance to this rasa and have proclaimed that it is the basis of all the other rasas. The statements of Rā.G (12th C.A.D.), Dharmadatta (12th –13th C.A.D.) and Nārāyaṇa (13th-14th C.A.D.) are worth mentioning in this respect.

II.10.3 Opinion according to Guṇacandra

Rā.G have shed light on the importance and position of the abhutarasa as follows; “In one of the varieties of rūpaka called nāṭtaka there should; be one rasa as dominant and other rasas subordinate. It should end in abhutarasa”. एक्सिसमुः अन्यात्तस्म अहातात्तस्म.

Expounding the compound word ‘abhutantam’, the acāryas say that towards the end of the drama, i.e., in the nirvahanasandhi, there should be abhutarasa. ‘अधुत एव सोयने निवृत्तये ख्र’. Explaining it further, it is said that in a drama, on the other hand, a beautiful damsel, or an empire and or a conquest of the enemy is acquired by the nāyaka, the chief character, through the rasas śṛṅgāra vīra, raudra etc., and on the other such things are
not acquired by the *pratināyaka*, i.e. the rival of the here, inspite of his best efforts depicted through *karuṇa*, *bhayaṅaka* and *bibhatsarasas*. But the drama should end with the acquisition of some thing to be acquired through the *adbhutarasa*, some thing that is almost impossible to achieve. In fact every action must have some result, if the drama is not based on the concept of acquiring some thing wonderful at the end, all the labour of the dramatist is invain.\textsuperscript{114} It means that the dominant *rasa* may be any, but the *nirvahana*, i.e. the fruit (the result achieved in the act) connected with that *rasa* should be intermingled with the element of wonder. By ‘wonder’ he means such an acquisition, which on the one hand is impossible to achieve in ordinary circumstances.

For which the hero has to struggle in a way different from normal routine, or has to face great obstacles, and on the other, it is unusual, super worldly and difficult to be obtained by the ordinary people, though for which there is deep longing in every heart. For example, in day-to-day life, an acquisition of a lady through marriage has no element of wonder, such an ordinary event, therefore, cannot be the proper theme for a drama. The love affair between Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā, however, can be the subject of the drama, because on the one hand, in such events we find behaviour not found in our ordinary life, and on the other, every *sahṛdaya* has a longing to get such a wonderfully beautiful damsel like Śakuntalā. The same applies to the event of “Prthvīrāja-Saṅjuktā-marriage”. It has an element of wonder because of the unusual behaviour of Saṅjuktā at the assembly of the kings who had come to seek her hand in marriage, and therefore, it is a proper theme for a drama. Similarly, for the dramas of *vīrārasa* quite

\textsuperscript{114} एकाक्षरसागराद्वारा भक्ति को श्रीमान्। अन्तः एवं रत्नोऽनन्तर निर्वहनेन यथा। यत: कुशी-वीरः रूपम्। सीतानां-पश्चिमलां-शहुमतः। समयति। करण-प्रयासक-वीराधिकरे। तत्ततित्रुति। इत्यदया व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति। वही प्रत्ययोऽसाब्दमपराभवति। अतः व व्रतम्योऽसाब्दमपराभवति।
unusual events are desirable. For example, Nepolean’s utterance ‘I went, I saw, and I conquered’ can be the basis of a drama only when either the enemy is shown fleeing cowardly, or it is depicted that his blood-thirsty sword could not quench its thirst because of the deserted city of his enemy. Still more effective is the event of battle between Rāma and Rāvana, in which Rāma invaded Lanka, completely annihilated Rāvana, his army and his warriors and thus get Sītā free. The above-noted statement of Rā.G can be summed up in the following words:

a) in the events noted above, śṛṅgāra or vīra would in doubtely be accepted as the predominant rasa,

b) if other rasas like hāsya, raudra etc., are mixed there respectively, they would be accepted as aṅgarasas, as they only assist the aṅgīrāsa in its fun manifestation,

c) but in both the cases whether the dominant rasa may be assisted by other so-called subordinate rasas\(^{115}\) or not, the kāvyacamatkāra of this rasa is due to adbhutarasa.

Most probably inspired by some such ideas, Dharmadatta in his following statement has accepted the omnipresence of the adbhutarasa in each and every piece of poetry.

रसे सार: चमत्कारः सर्वावज्ञन्यनुभूते |
तच्चमत्कार-सारत्वे सर्वावज्ञन्यनुभूते रस: \(^{116}\) S.D.33

And on the some basis Nārāyaṇa (the great grand father of (Viśvanātha) had declared that the adbhutarasa was the only rasa

\(^{115}\) So-called in the sense that such rasas technically termed as bhāvas and not rasas.
\(^{116}\) The essence in rasa is camatkāra, which is, felt everywhere in poetry, for this very reason the existence of adbhutarasa has been accepted in every poetic piece.
Undoubtedly \textit{camatkāra} is the essence of \textit{rasa}. Viśvanātha has called it synonym of ‘surprise’, which causes the expansion of the heart of the \textit{sahṛdaya}; \textit{camatkāra}: चमकावः सिवितातार्करूपी विमयावपर्याय {S.D.3.3 (Vr.)} and this \textit{camatkāra} may be, by stretching its meaning, accepted as synonym of ‘\textit{adbhuta}’, and this very \textit{adbhuta} is an inevitable element in all the \textit{rasas} because \textit{rasa} can not become manifest without it. While accepting all this,

i) We can not, like Rā.G, call this ‘\textit{adbhutatattva}’by the name of ‘\textit{adbhutarasa}’,

ii) Nor like Nārāyaṇa, can it be regarded as the only \textit{rasa}, because \textit{adbhutatattva} is only a means to the attainment of the poetic pleasure and not the end itself, the end indeed is the other \textit{rasa}-erotic, etc. Not only this, even where the \textit{adbhutarasa} is the end, the \textit{adbhutatattva} must inevitably be present as a means. We can illustrate this by the following passage from the drama ‘Rāmābhyaudaya’ in which the fire-god enters with Sītā in his lap

\begin{quote}

\textbf{Verse from Rāmābhyaudaya:}

\textit{This verse is an illustration of \textit{adbhutarasa}. Its permanent emotion is \textit{vismaya}, the fire-god seating Sītā on his lap is \textit{vibhāva}, his external form is \textit{uddīpanvibhāva} and the pitiable condition, distress, curiosity, sorrow and instability, etc., are the \textit{saṅcāribhāvas}.}

\end{quote}

117. The poet Nārāyaṇa, therefore, has declared \textit{adbhutarasa} to be the only \textit{rasa}.

118. The fire-god, making a canopy of thick smoke by its hands of flames touching the sky, wearing demand on its breast and shrouded with dear-skin, removing the sad shadow encircling the lovely looking Sītā sitting in his lap and thus defeating the purpose of death, its appearing.
The permanent emotion vismaya comb lined with vibhāva, etc is being manifested in the form of adbhutarasa. The process of such manifestation of the adbhutarasa is exactly the same as in the case of the other rasas. As regards the presence of the adbhuta element, it is present in the adbhutarasa also; as it remains in all other.

II.10.4 Conclusion

i) The 'adbhutatattva’ should not be given the name ‘adbhutarasa’, as has been done by Ra.G,

ii) Nor it should be accepted, according to Viśvanātha, as synonym of the ‘vismaya’, because here it creates also impression that it stands for a sthāyīvibhāva, named vismaya’

iii) To remove this ambiguity, therefore, it should be named camatkāra as has been done by Dharmadatta.

Consequently: 1) Adbhutarasa is a rasa like all other rasas. 2) In all the rasas, including adbhutarasa, it is not the adbhutarasa but the adbhutatattva that is present, and it should be called, for the sake of clarity, camatkāra and not adbhuta.

II.11.0 The quietistic

अथ शान्तः:-

शान्त: शास्त्रेऽविभाव उतम प्रकृतिर्मितः ॥ २४५ ॥
कुन्देन्दुनृद्धरचायः श्रीनारायणेतरः।
अनिवत्तवादिनाःशैवसुनिसारता तु वा ॥ २४६ ॥
परमत्वर्कप्य वा तथालभन्नमिष्ठे ॥
पुण्यावेश्यहरिक्षेत्रिधरमवन्यादृः ॥ २४७ ॥
महापुष्पस्तत्त्वात्स्मोपस्पन्नपिणः।
रोमावत्तानभावात्तथा स्युतिभिर्भारिणः ॥ २४८ ॥
निनेदर्वर्णस्मरणतिभुतद्वादृः।
अस्य दयावीरादेः सकाशादेभेदमाह-
The 'quietistic’ described

The ‘quisetic’ has quietism as its ‘permanent mood’, and is esteemed the mood of the very best of men. Its beauty is fair as jessamine and as the moon, and the adorable Nārāyaṇa is its presiding deity. Its ‘essential excitant’ is the emptiness or vanity of all things by reason of their not being lasting, or else it is the form of the Supreme spirit,- i.e. God- the only entity in the opinion of the quietist. Its ‘enhancer’s consist of holy hermitages, sacred places, places of pilgrimage, pleasant groves, and the like,-the society of great men. And let its ‘ensuants’ be horripilation, and in like manner let its ‘accessories’ be self-disparagement, joy, remembrance, resolve, and kindness towards all beings.

The fullness of this rasa is to be seen in the Mbh.

II.11.2 The quietistic not identical with the heroic-in-mercy

The ‘heroic-in-mercy’ or the like (heroic in religion, devotional love) is not the same with this rasa, as the latter is of a nature without egotism. In the heroic-mercy and the like, such, for example, as Jimūtavāhana, we do not find or extinction of egotism, in as much as in the middle of the drama Nāgānanda, where of he is the hero, has love for Malayavati and in the end, his acquiring the sole monarchy of the Vidyādharas are observed. The quietistic, however, consisting only in the extinction of egotism in everyway, is not to be included there in (in the heroic-in-mercy). Hence, in the Nāgānanda the quietistics being the principal sentiment is confuted.
II. 11.3 An objection stated against the quitistic’s being a flavour

(Some one may ask)—(That in which there is neither pain, nor pleasure, nor thought, nor hatred, nor affection, nor any desire— is called by the chief sages the quietistic flavour, which has, among the all sentiments, quietism for its principal mood). How can the quietistic being of the nature described in; the preceding couplet, arising only in the state of emancipation (which is defined to be the attainment of the real nature the soul) and where in there is an absence of the accessories be a flavour? To this it is replied as follows:

The quietistic a flavour while the soul is only about to be emancipated. As that quietism only, which exists in the state where in the mind is joined to land disjoined from the soul (or, in other words, when the human soul is not completely absorbed in the Divine) attains to the nature of flavour, the presence in it of accessories also is not hindered.

As for the declaration of the absence, there in, even of pleasure, it refers only to worldly pleasure, and consequently there is no contradiction. For it is asserted. The bliss of quietism supreme over heavenly as well as earthly pleasures. The earthly pleasures of sense and the great pleasure in heaven; these are not worth the sixteenth part of the bliss springing from the quelling of all desires”.

When the heroic in-mercy becomes the quietistic: The heroic in mercy, are entitled to be included here in (i.e. in the quitistic flavour) if the attain to a state devoid of egotism in everyday.

II. 11.4 The nature of aesthetic experience of śāntarasa

Just as the white string, whereon gems of different kinds
are loosely and thinly strung, shines in and through them, so does
the pure self through the basic mental states such as \textit{rati} and \textit{utsāha},
which affect it.\textsuperscript{119} The aesthetic experience of \textit{sānta} consists in the
experience of the self as free from; the entire set of painful
experiences which are due to the external expectations, and
therefore, is blissful state of identity with the universal. It is the
experience of self in lone of the stages on the way to perfect self-
realisation. Such a state of self, when presented either on the stage
or in poetry and, therefore, universalized, is responsible for the
arousal of a mental condition, which brings the transcendental bliss.
Two main controversial points have been raised regarding \textit{ŚR}:

1. Which should be accepted as its \textit{sthāyibhāva}?
2. Can this \textit{rasa} be a proper subject for drama as it is in poetry?

\textbf{II.11.5 The \textit{sthāyibhāva} of \textit{sāntarasa}}

Whether \textit{nirveda} or \textit{sāma} be accepted as the \textit{sthāyibhāva}
of \textit{ŚR} is a point that demands consideration. The famous \textit{ācārya}
Mammatā has placed \textit{nirveda} both in the list of \textit{sthāyibhāvas} and
\textit{sañcāribhāvas}. This \textit{bhāva} is acceptable to him as both \textit{sthāyi}
and \textit{sañcāri} of \textit{ŚR}. But no clear line of demarcation can be drawn
between \textit{nirveda} as \textit{sthāyibhāva} and \textit{nirveda} as \textit{sañcāribhāva}, as
he has not defined this \textit{bhāva}. After some time this demarcation
was done though indirectly by Rā.G. indirectly because he has put
\textit{sāma} as the \textit{sthāyibhāva}. According to him:

1. \textit{Sāma} is absence of desires.\textsuperscript{120}

2. The \textit{sāma} which denotes the equilibrium of mind, keeps
the people away from desire, fury, greed, ego, illusion and
attachment towards worldly affairs, is the \textit{sthāyibhāva} of \textit{ŚR}.\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{119} A.Bh.,Vol.,341.
\textsuperscript{120} ft:\textit{Śrīmad Bhāratīya Mārthanda,} p. 33
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid, p. 317
3. This *rasa* originates by contemplating over the cycle of births and teach through fear and detachment and by intensive study of the scriptures that deal with god and nature, virtue and sin and serve as means to attend salvation.\(^{122}\)

On the other hand, *nirveda* accrues from the knowledge of truth and detachment caused by the afflictions due to poverty, disease, insult, jealousy, delusion, rage, punishment, separation from dearness, etc.\(^{123}\) The above statements of Rā.G. mean that, āśama is genuine and permanent detachment caused by afflictions due to poverty, bereavement, etc. Therefore āśama is the *sthāyibhāva* of Ś.R, while *nirveda* is its *saṅcāribhāva*. Both these *ācāryas*, clearly rejecting the opinion of Mammaṭa in this context, have expressed that to call one and the same *bhāva*, i.e., *nirveda* both as *sthāyī* and *saṅcari* is a contradiction in itself.\(^{124}\)

But truly speaking there is no difference between the opinion of Mammaṭa on the one hand and of these two *ācāryas* on the other, which is clear from the well-known example of Ś.R given by Mammaṭa:

\begin{quote}
अहि वा हरे वा कृṣुपशायने वा दुष्पदि वा।
मणि वा लोके वा बलवति रिपी वा सुहदि वा।
तुषे वा शैंपने वा मम समुदशि यत्नि दिवसः।
क्वचित् पुण्यरण्ये शिव शिव शिवेति प्रलम्भः।
K.P., 4.44 (verse)
\end{quote}

[Be it a serpent or a garland of flowers round by neck, be it a bed of roses or a stone... I, possessed of equanimity, pass my days, uttering ‘Śiva, Śiva’.]

It is quite evident that here the *sthāyibhāva nirveda* denotes

122. N.D., 3.20 (*Vṛ. also*)
123. Ibid, 3.28 (*śūra* (*Vṛ.183*)
124. *ममयतु व्यभिचारिक्षण प्रस्तुतादि विवेदयम् शान्तससि प्रति स्वाधिताः प्रतिकृतूल विभिन्नादिपरिप्रहः*; *इत्यदुत्त तमो ग्रहं प्रति व्यभिचारिताः\(^{c}\), *बुधवः* *स्वयंनिशोधने प्रतिच्छिन्नः* *प्रतिष्ठा किंतु* *Ibid*, p. 332
detachment caused by freedom from worldly affairs and not by worldly afflictions, though of course the latter would be called only sañcāribhāva and not sthāyibhāva. The commendations of Mammaṭa also had understood his viewpoint and clearly state that:

स्थायी स्वाद विषयेतेष्व तत्त्वज्ञानाद भवेद वदि ।
इद्यामित्व विषयोगाति कृतस्तु व्यभिचार्यसै॥ K.P.(B.B), p. 116

[This nirveda would be called sthāyibhāva only when it is caused by the knowledge of truth, while it would be called sañcāribhāva if produced by the ill falling upon our dear ones and separation].

However, by keeping nirveda and sama on separate footing, Ra.G. have contributed to the clarity of the subject, and perhaps taking hint either from their work or from some other work, Viśvanātha, propounding similar view, has accepted the separate entity of sama and nirveda.125

11.11.6 Conclusion

In conclusion we may say that:

a) Sama should be accepted as the sthāyibhāva of Ś.R and nirveda its sañcāribhāva according to the occasion.

b) That piece of poetry, where only nirveda is dealt with, would be called the example of śanta-bhāvadhvani and not that of ŚR.

11.11.7 Śantarasa: The proper subject of drama or not?

(a) Dhanañjaya, the author of Daśarūpaka of Dhanika, the commentator of this treatise has presented more material than other ācāryas upon this topic. Dhanañjaya has hinted that the sthāyibhāva

125. S.D., 3.142,175,245
śama along with other eight sthāyībhāvas has been accepted by some ācāryas, but it will not be matured (to the level of rasa) in the dramas: शाम्भ मनोकथातः प्राणुः प्रूढ़किरिपेशु वैतत्स्यः। D.R., 4.35. It indicates that even if śānta (whose sthāyībhāva is śama) be accepted as the ninth rasa, it can be, of course the subject of poetry, i.e., prabandha and muktaka kavyas but not that of drama. Commenting upon the above statement, Dhanika has said that:

i) Śama cannot be the sthāyībhāva in a drama as it cannot contribute to its stability, because it is nothing but a mental state in which all the actions dissolve altogether. It means that in the state of śama, a character in drama becomes so absorbed in himself and contemplative that any action becomes beyond his capacity to be performed on the stage.¹²⁶

ii) Advocating the view that it can be a subject of poetry, he says that as in poetry the subtlest topics can be presented in words, Ś.R too can be made a subject of poetic treatment.¹²⁷

But in fact Dhanika himself does not agree in principle that the Ś.R be used predominantly in poetry and also in drama. His view in this regard is as follows: The subject of Ś.R is free from all concern about worldly pain and pleasure, aversion and affection, etc. It is, therefore the subject of self-realization in which a person is detached from the world, and is thus beyond the scope of both poetry and drama. This view is supported by sṛuti when it, by employing the words ‘neti, neti’, i.e., not this, has declared such a theme indescribable. In fact, the enjoyment of Ś.R is beyond those

¹²⁶ Win DR., 4.35 (Vṛ.)
¹²⁷ Wiibii-ftqikcjnfwnf?) i DR., 4.44 (Vṛ.)
persons who are aesthetically disposed to worldly objects. If Š.R is dealt with in poetry, drama, etc., it is only by courtesy.¹²⁸ In this very context Dhanika has advanced three points for rejecting the Š.R.

1. Some śācāryas, though accepting this rasa in theory, do not deem it to be the proper subject for both poetry and drama, and in support of this view-point they quote the authority of Bharata who has enumerated and defined the vibhāvas, etc., of eight rasas and not of this rasa.

2. Other śācāryas, though they accept the sthāyibhāva śāma and the Š.R, yet are in favour of merging it with the bibhatsarasa or virarasa in the following way:-

a) The feeling of aversion towards the world is an inevitable constituent of the Š.R, hence it can be merged with bibhatsarasa.

b) The sthāyibhāva śāma ultimately culminates in the realization of the supreme or salvation. In other words, śāma is the means and this realization is the end. If all such means towards this end, among which śāma occupies a prominent position, he accepted as a sthāyibhāva utsāha, the Š.R can be merged into virarasa.

3. Other śācāryas totally deny the existence of śāma or nirveda so much so that they do not accept it even in

¹²⁸ शायलो हि यदि तत्ततः
न देषु धन्यः, न सुखः, न हिंसा न हेर्मांगो न च काचिनिदिनः।
रससु शायल: कण्ठिनो मुन्ननि: सरसु भावेन्दु शम प्रभानः।।
इत्यवत्त्वन: तद्व तथो मोहावसायमेवोक्षकस्मस्कृयतिनिकल्क्याम् प्रदुभायत तस्य च स्वतेनाधिकतीनित्यः। तथाहि-तूतिपि स
एव नेति वेति इत्यऽध्योक्षतनामा न च वेषभूतवं शायलस्य सहिद्या: स्वाधिकित: सति: तदुक्तवी शायलस्याहवायो निरक्षितः।।
D.R., 4.45 (vr.)
common dealings. The reason for this is that the state of sama is possible only when the couple of opposite emotions such as love and aversion, etc., are completely annihilated, but no worldly being has found it possible to attain to such a state of mind right from the beginning of the creation down today, nor is there any possibility of it in future. Thus the sthāyibhāva sama or nirveda do not exist at all, and therefore the presence of ŠR is altogether out of question.129

We may conclude from the above statements that:

i) Dhanika accepts ŠR to be the subject of poetry and drama only be courtesy.

ii) Some acāryas like Dhanañjaya accept it as a rasa in theory, but do not deem it a proper subject for poetry and drama.

iii) Some acāryas, while, recognizing ŠR, are in favour of merging it either in bibhatsa or in virarasa.

iv) Some acāryas have rejected it in too.

(b) In this connection we may quote kulapati, an acārya of the rūti-period of the history of Hindi literature, who, thought recognizing this rasa in poetry, has rejected it in drama on the following two different grounds:

1. A drama has multifarious episodes, while poetry has one single subject.

2. A sahṛdaya, apathetic to the world, does feel no desire

129. (a) तत्र कैविदात्: नास्त्येव शालो तत्, तत्यावचेष्य विभववाच्च प्रतिपदातादश्यायणात्।
(b) अनये हृ वृहत्तत्त्वाभ्यां कर्षयति-असाधि-वात-वायुहाद्रवयतम-हेर्मीर्षेतुमशक्तिश्च।
(c) अनये हृ वृहीबधाताहि अनर्थावं कर्षयति। एवं वदनः: शममि नेन्द्रिति। D.R., 4.35 (Vr.)
to witness the drama apprehending best any of the episodes may disturb his equanimity, while he feels no such fear from poetry.

Therefore Š. R should not be used in drama, while there is no bar to its use in poetry.\(^{130}\) The argument, which kulapati advances in regard to the non-acceptance of Š. R in drama holds good in case of poetry also. No poem even when dealing with Š. R primarily, The argument, which kulapati advances in regard to the non-acceptance of Š. R in drama, holds good in case of poetry also. No poem even when dealing with Š. R primarily, can afford to be single themed from the beginning to the end. Such a piece will turn into a didactic piece and not remain poetry. Therefore a poem based on the Š. R is as likely to disturb equanimity if really it does as a drama. It is, however, true that a sahādaya receives impression from a drama much more quickly than from poetry.

Now let us consider the second argument. It is also misconceived. As a matter of fact, in a successful play (and in a poem too) the consummation of the principal rasa is effected with such a vehement force and heart-bewitching device that the other episodes become automatically suppressed and dim, and thus by contrast make the main rasa all the more brilliant. For instance, when in a drama (or poetry) the sthāyibhāva utsāha matures into vīrarasa, the effect of the cowardly activities of the low characters figuring before totally disappears, and by contrast, it makes the spectator, be he a brave or even a coward person, glow with enthusiasm and consequently all the more strengthens his sthāyibhāva utsāha. Similarly, when the sthāyibhāva śama or nirveda matures in a drama or poetry, the effect of the descriptions producing worldly infatuation is absolutely eliminated. This also strengthens the sthāyibhāva śama. If this be the state of a common
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130. Rasa-rahasya, 3.92 (Vr.)
spectator, it will be all the more intense in the case of one
instinctively permeated by nirveda. Therefore it is not logical to
reject the Š.R as a subject of drama on this ground too.

It may be further questioned as to how many saints are
there in the world who are keen to witness play dominated by Š.R.
It would be easy to answer this question if we take certain parallel
eamples. There are few persons, who in spite of their chivalrous
spirit, have no taste for seeing a play or listening to poem full of
virarasa, and correspondingly there are several dispassionate
persons who have taste for other rasas, but have no liking for
śṛṅgāra. On this logic, these two rasas should also be dislodged
from the position of rasa.131 As a matter of fact, a play and a poem
are meant for the saḥṛdāyas who need not be either saintly or
otherwise.

In this context one more objection can also be raised, how
many persons will there be in the world, who have genuine taste
for Š.R. But firstly, this objection can be raised even against a poem
dominated by Š.R for which kulapati has accepted its use. Secondly,
the rejection of Š.R on the basis of this objection would deprive
the society of sublime feelings like nirveda and tranquility resulting
there from. And thirdly, to reject a particular rasa in literature
simply because of the small number of persons interested in it is
nothing but an injustice to that rasa.

(c) Two objections of Dhanika against the acceptance of
Š.R remain to be answered the inability of this rasa to be stated as
a drama and also described in a piece of poetry. The reason behind
both these objections is the same, i.e., all activities subside in the
śama. AG also has stated this view through an antagonist: नैहि
वेदाम्बुप्रम: प्रयोगोम् । 132 i.e., the cessation of actions is incapable of being

---

131. तत्त्वं बीतांगद्यां बुःसारेन न स्ताप्यः इति सेवजः ससाह्यव्यताम् इति । DL., (See N.of R., p. 24)
performed. Of course, the culmination of nirveda in which all the feelings and emotions disappear is incapable of being staged or described, but this does not apply only to nirveda, but to all other sthāyibhāvas, rati, hūsa, etc. That is why the stying of the copulation (culmination of rati), the murder (culmination of krodha), etc., are prohibited. Similarly the culmination of nirveda disassociation from pleasure and pain, etc. is incapable of being either staged or described. Yet it is easily possible in a play to describe or poetry the following vibhāvas, anubhāvas and sañcāribhāvas of Š.R as it is possible in the case of other rasas like śāṅgāra, hāsya, etc.

i) vibhāvas: The causes which show that this world is transitory, false and full of illusions and therefore to be shunned.

ii) anubhāvas: The progressively intensifying struggle of such saintly and meditative individuals as Buddha who on account of their nirveda being evoked, long to be liberated from these bondages.

iii) sañcāribhāvas: Such as anxiety, or delight in the hearts of people like Buddha.

Most probably prompted by these very ideas Namisādhū, a commentator of kavyālārikāra by Rudraṭa, had to point out to the existence of vibhāva, etc., in the Š.R, and give the following rejoinder to the abhāva-vādin, i.e., who does not believe in the existence of Š.R, .It is illogical not to accept Š.R, because the emotions, etc., are present here also.133

Therefore, in our opinion, sama though being radically indescribable, may reasonably be accepted as an appropriate subject of both poetry and drama. Dhananañjaya himself in this context has

133. कृतिगुम्भजलारिकाम् नेत्रेषु। जयद्वारे। भवतिकर्मणामप्रतिविधामतिवाद्वा। K.A.(Ru) Commentary p. 166
mentioned four different means for the realization of sama: hilarity (muditā), amity (maitrī), pity (karunā) and apathy (upeksā), and Dhanika has connected them with these moods respectively: evolution (vikāsa), expansion (vistāra), agitation (kṣobha) and distraction (vikṣepa).

By establishing this connection both these acāryas seek to convey that the mental and internal tendencies evotion, etc. are present in every individual, but in whom so ever they culminate in the above physical and external form hilarity, etc. that individual becomes sānta. Now this sama being externally expressed in the form of hilarity, amity, etc., can be a subject of poetry and drama. In fact this states of sama is in a way different from other sthāyibhāvas. According to the theory of rhetorics (as well as of psychology) the sthāyibhāvas, rati, hāsa etc. and the saṅcārībhāvas nirveda, glāmi, etc. exist instinctively in every individual, but they can not be the subject of either poetry or drama unless they are externally manifested in one form or the other. Precisely the same principle holds good in the case of sama. Therefore like other rasas the sānta too can be a theme both of poetry and drama. And if the culmination of sama, i.e., the realization of one’s ownself cannot be a subject of poetry and drama: ‘गामप्रकृतिनिवार्यं’, then the same can be true of other sthāyibhāvas, rati, hāsa, etc. Their extreme form too has been declared as a taboo for poetry.

In conclusion we may say that Ś.R can be as good a subject for both poetry and drama as any other rasa.

II.12.0 Vātsalyarasa (parental affection)

अथ मुनीन्द्रसांमतो वत्सलः-
स्वुपुं चबलकारितया वसलं च नसं विदुः ।
स्थायी वसलता स्मेह: पुरुष द्राक्षमानम मलम् ॥ २५१ ॥

134. Dhanañjaya: गामप्रकृतिनिवार्यं गुर्जरवेदस्तवलय। Dhanika: अध्यायं गद्यार्थमयो मुदित।-पै-कल्पचारिं-विलक्षणं: तत्र च। विश्वास-विचार-कोम्य-विकृति-रूपार्थिकत वसलकौश शास्त्रसाहित्यम निर्णयित।; D.R., 4.45 (vr)
II.12.1 The flavour of ‘parental affection’ described

From its evident charmingness they consider parental affection also as a flavour. Its permanent condition is parental affection, and a son, are considered its essential excitants. The enhancing excitant are their action, barning, heroism, benevolence. embraces, touching their body, kissing their head, gazing at them, erection of the hair of the body, tears of the joy and others are declared to be the ensuants. Apprehension of evil, delight, pride are considered the accessories. Its (the flavour’s) colour is shining like the interior of a lotus and the Mothers of the world are its deity. The following is an example: “That child heightened the joy of the father as it uttered what its nurse first spoke, as it walked clinging to her finger, and as it stooped being taught to bow down”.

II.13.0 Prema (Love)

It is cittadrava, the mental state, that develops into the sentiment of prema. Assurance, impatience etc., are its transitory states. It exists on the real hero as well as in the audience.

II.13.1 According to Karṇapūra

Karṇapūra considers preman as love supreme, which had within it every other rasa. Some rhetoricians think that śṛṅgāra is the rasa in the love between Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. They therefore treat preman as the origin of the śṛṅgāra. But Karṇapūra states preman is the aṅgin and śṛṅgāra is its aṅga.135

135. keśācinnmate śrīrādherēṣaśaḥ śṛṅgāra eva rasah tanmate pietadudāhāranāni śṛṅgāro pgo premo iṅgam, angasya pikvacydrikttata vayantu prema/iṅgi śṛṅgāro iṅgamiti viṣe saḥ, Alarikāra Kaustubha of kavikarpāra, p. 149.
II.14.0 Bhakti

The hints of the bhaktirasa are to be found as early as Bhāmaha in the preyas alāṅkāra which Dāndin also accepts. But the bhakti as a separate rasa received no recognition as it was included in the bhāva, the immature rasa stage of the rati. There were some efforts at its implicit acceptance as rasa and not merely as the bhāva, but the attitude of strict adherence to the traditional position rendered the above efforts useless.

II.14.1 The opinion of Paṇḍitarāja

All the is finally illustrated in the Rasagaṅgādhara where in Paṇḍitarāja raises the problem by pointing out the bhakti as rasa and giving his verdict to the effect that all kinds of the rati except the rati between man and woman are to be included in the bhāva with the staunch advocates of the bhakti, however, it held its supremacy. It was regarded not only as one of the recognized rasa but the only rasa: all other rasas were to be included in it. The bhakti synthesis received its advocacy in two schools, viz, the Chaitanya school of the Bengal Vaiṣṇavism and the Advaitavādin as Madhūsudana Sarasvatī.

II.15.0 The concept of rasa and scholars

Rasa had absorbed the attention of the great scholars in Sanskrit poetics for its scientific stand and utmost necessity in poetry and drama. To trace its origin it is noticed that at first it occurs in Bharata’s N.Ś. in its technical sense. Prior to it rasa has been used in the sense of water, juice etc. ordinarily. But coming to Bharata it is observed that in N.Ś. it has been very scientifically described. Again some traditional verses are found, Rājaśekhara also informs us that Nandikesvara was the author of rasa and

137. By- Dandin, Kāvyādarśa, Govt. Oriental series class A No. 4, B.O.R.I., 1938.
Bharata described *rupakas*. So it appears that prior to Bharata there was some work upon *rasa* but is lost to us. As the name indicates, in *N.Ś.* Bharata deals with drama vividly and within two chapters *rasa*, *bhāva* etc. are described. So *rasa* is found here in the context of drama. For this reason S.K. De says “The idea of *rasa* apart from any theory thereon, was naturally not unknown to old writers and Bharata’s treatment would indicate that some system of *rasa* however undeveloped or even a *rasa* school, particularly in connexion with drama must have been existence in his time.”

II.15.1 Importance attached by Bharata

Bharata attached much importance to *rasa* because in his opinion without *rasa* there comes no meaning. He describes the evolution of *rasa* as “*vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicāri-samyogād rasa-nispattiḥ*.” He takes *bhāvas* as important elements in realizing *rasa*, because the sense of poetry is brought into existence through them by the three kinds of representation i.e., through words, gestures and internal feelings. He treats *vibhāvas* for the sake of clear knowledge (*vibhāvo vijñānarthāh*) or which make the permanent mood excited. Then *anubhāvas* are those by which the permanent mood is made to be felt, (*anubhuyate*) *vyabhicāribhāvas* strengthen it or only at this stage *rasa* is enjoyed. The *sthāyibhāvas* are called so, because they are not overcome by favourable or unfavourable *bhāvas* and stay permanently in the mind. These are eight in number like *rati, hāsa, krodha, utsāha, bhaya, jugupsā, vismaya* and *soka*, which become *śṛṅgāra, hāsy, raudra, vīra, bhayānaka, bibhatsa, adbhuta* and *karuṇa* respectively when combined with their *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and *saṅcāribhāvas*. Bharata does not give any definite number of *vibhāvas* and *anubhāvas* as they can be known from the observation of the
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behaviour of the people. *Vyabhicāris* are produced in the mind in a floating manner and are accessory emotional states. Then to clarify it Bharata gives the example of a beverage. As one taste a beverage through the combination of various seasoned articles, so the permanent mood reinforced (*upagata*) by various *bhāvas* attains the state of *rasa*. But the words like *sāmyoga* and *nispatti* in the *rasa* formula of Bharata we are so much ambiguous that different theories were put forward for its proper explanation. But before going to discuss it one should see how *rasa* was treated at the hands of Bhāmaha etc., who were the followers of *alaṁkāra* school.

II.15.2 **Rasa according to Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin**

To Bhāmaha word and sense only constitute poetry (*sabdārthau-sahitau-kavyam*) and the description of *rasa* comes in the context of the figure of speech called *rasavat*. According to him “*rasavat* should manifest the *rasa* clearly”.\(^{140}\) Again he is of the opinion that a *mahākāvya* must separately depict all the *rasas*. The technical words like *vibhāvas* etc., which were very famous later on ware not found. So it can be concluded that though Bhāmaha had some idea about *rasa*. Still he ignored it and included in some poetic figure. But coming to Daṇḍin we see that some importance is attached to *rasa*. Here it has not been included in some poetic figure but in an important excellence (*guna*) of the diction called *mādhurya*. According to him *rasa* stays in words and in the objects (*vastu*) of this *mādhurya* *guna*.\(^{141}\) Also in the description of the figures like *rasavat, preyas* and *urjasvin* we get names of *rasas* like *śṛṅgāra, raudra, vīra* and *karuṇa*. Describing the figure *rasavat* he says that *rati* has become *śṛṅgāra*.\(^{142}\) So we can say that he was well aware of the *rasa* theory but like Bhāmaha, could not give nay importance and included in some excellence.

\(^{140}\) *rasavad darśitaspaśtaśṛṅgārādi rasam yathā, K.A., III.6.*
\(^{141}\) *madhurāni rasavad vaci vastunyāpi rasasthitā, K.D., 1.51.*
\(^{142}\) *rati śṛṅgāratām gatā, Ibid., 11.281.*
Vāmana falls in the same line with his predecessors. He includes *rasa* in one of the *gunas* called *kānti*. But an important thing he does, as for the first time he enquires about the soul of poetry, which is *ṛiti* to him. According to him in the *guna* called *kānti*, *rasa* should be prominently present.\(^{143}\)

II. 15.3 **According to Udbhāta**

Udbhāta describes *rasavat* as where *rasas* are developed through *sva-śabda, sthāyin, saṅcārin, vibhāva* and *anubhāva*\(^{144}\) so it can be said that he had some idea of *rasa* theory but might be in an unscientific form. Anyway here also *rasa* is sub-ordinate to the figure *rasavat*. But Rudrāta is the important writer of this phase who does not include *rasa* etc. in *alāṅkāras*. Even he devotes four out of his sixteen chapters of his *kavyālāṅkāra* for the description of *rasa*. In the first and second chapter of his work, we find the description of *Ś.R* and also in the third chapter other *rasas* are described. But like Bhāmaha he takes word and sense as poetry. Also more emphasis has been given to *alāṅkāras* than *rasa* etc. He though describes *rasa* etc. still is silent about its theoretical aspect. So he can be placed in between the *alāṅkāra* and *rasa* school.

II. 15.4 **Rasa school**

The *rasa* school deals *rasa* preferably eight. The stream beginning from Bharata’s *NŚ*, developed by the commentators beginning from Mātrgupta or Śāraṅgadeva, was farther strengthened by the original contributions of Ānandavardhana, Dhanañjaya, Mammta, Viśvanātha and Bhānudatta.

143. *dīptarasatvam kāntih kāvyālāṅkārasūtra*, III.2.15.
144. *kāvyālāṅkārarasārasamgraha* IV, 13.
II.15.5  

View of Kuntaka

In this way when rasa was regarded as an important element in poetry, different scholars tried to incorporate it into their own system. Kuntaka thinks vakroki is the soul of poetry. He takes vakroki as the charming modes of expression and is different from ordinary speeches. So this imparts some strikingness to words and senses.\textsuperscript{145} This vakratā is of six varieties. They are (1) varṇavakratā, (2) pādapūrvvārdhavakratā, (3) vākya vakratā, (4) pādauttarārdhavakratā, (5) prakaraṇavakratā and (6) prabandhavakratā. He includes all the alaṅkāra under varṇavakratā and dhvani under rudhi and upacāravakratā, which are varieties of pādapūrvvārdha vakratā. In vastu and prabandhavakratā he includes rasa. But he emphasizes rasa very much. He says that the works of the first rate poets are full of rasa and they do not rest upon mere stories.\textsuperscript{146} In this way he thinks the above six kinds of vakratās used by the poet gives aesthetic delight to the man of taste.

II.15.6  

Opinion of Bhoja

An important scholar Bhoja who in his two works namely sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa and śṛṅgāraprakāśa gives a different view regarding rasa. He does not admit any other rasa than śṛṅgāra. He thinks three kotis or stages of rasa namely parā, madhyamā and uttarā. He takes rasa as explained by earlier alaṅkārikas as in madhyamāvasthā and are only bhāvas, but secondarily called rasas. The first stage is rudhāhaṅkāratā and the last is the preman rasa, which comprehends all rasas. He thinks all the forty nine bhāvas originate from ahaṅkāra and themselves are ahaṅkāras as flames and fire. According to him rasa is only one, that is śṛṅgāra which is also ahaṅkāra. Again if rati etc. are to be called as giving pleasure

\textsuperscript{145} V.J., 1.7.
\textsuperscript{146} nirantararasodgāragarbhasandarbhanirvarāb / giram kavīnāṁ janti na kathāmātramāśritāḥ // V.J., IV.11.
secondarily then all the forty nine bhāvas may be called rasa because they give pleasure.


According to Bhoja ahaṅkāra is the root of all the forty nine bhāvas. When by vibhāvas etc. these are described or dramatized then they awake this ahaṅkāra of the man of taste and it gives him aesthetic delight. Śṛṅgāra is one quality of this ahaṅkāra. Bhoja takes ahaṅkāra as basic element of rasa and also thinks śṛṅgāra as equal with it. In this way rasa explained by Bhoja which mainly centers round ahaṅkāra and śṛṅgāra is very much peculiar and important in Sanskrit poetics.

Dhanaṅjaya and Dhanika have little difference with AG etc. regarding rasa. According to them when by vibhāva, anubhāva, sāttvikabhāva and vyabhācāribhāvas the sthāyibhāva is made relishable then there is rasa.147 But the difference is that where AG etc. think rasa can be enjoyed by the power of suggestion Dhanaṅjaya and Dhanika think this power as purport (tātparya). According to them as the primary purpose of poetry is to give pleasure then the power of purport after giving this only ceases. The author of D.R. think the bhāvyabhāvaka relation between vibhāvas etc. and rasa. Again he thinks though joy is the same in all the rasas, still due to the contact of different vibhāvas there are four kinds of mental feeling like vikāsa in śṛṅgāra and hāṣya, vistāra in vīra nad adbhuta, kṣobha in bībhatsa and bhayānaka and vikṣepa

147. vibhāvairanubhāvaiśca sāttvikānibhāvaiśca
śṛṅgāraṁ sthāyibhāvakam
śṛṅgāraṁ rasaṁ svadate
śṛṅgāraṁ rasaṁ svadate // D.R. IV.1.
in raudra and karuṇa. But AG thinks it is one. Mahimabhaṭṭa’s concept of rasa is the same with AG but according to him it can be comprehended through anumāṇa. Then we find Jagannātha who thinks that the consciousness free from obstruction (āvaraṇa) is rasa. Vibhāvas etc. remove this obstruction from the consciousness.

II.15.7 Conclusion

In this way rasa first propounded by Bharata was brought into prominence by Anandavardhana and AG. As the earlier poeticians like Bhāmaha etc. were concerned with the body of poetry so they could not think rasa to be important. But after AG a new trend began in Sanskrit poetics where rasa acquired prominence and even same scholars tried to incorporate it into their own systems. However, the theory of Ānandavardhana and AG over shadowed all and more or less the later writers had to admit it. In this way the concept of rasa has been enumerated by different authors in Sanskrit poetics.