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RASA THEORY AND RĀMĀYĀṆA: IT’S EVOLUTION AND DEVELOPMENT (FROM BHARATA TO VIŚVANĀTHA)

III.0 Introduction

At the threshold of the development of the theory of *rasa* stands Vālmīki, the father of classical Sanskrit poetry, an incident in whose life, related in the second chapter of the *Rā*. B.K., explains the origin of the *śloka* metre in Sanskrit and reveals the earliest germs of the concept of *rasa* according to the later writers. The incident runs thus:- When once Vālmīki went out into the forest in search of sacrificial wood and grass, he met a happy pair of *krauṇca* birds twittering with joy on the branch of a tree, one of whom was suddenly shot dead with an arrow by a hunter; and when the merciful sage witnessed the innocent male bird, that was killed, writhing on the ground in his own blood, and the helpless female, bereaved of her loving mate, and being vaguely conscious of the untold sufferings that she would have to undergo without him, sending forth a shriek of terror and agony, his heart was touched with a deep feeling of pity for her grief, and the intense pathos of the situation that filled his heart flowed out to find expression in the shape of that exquisite and melodious *śloka* मा निषाद......... ¹ etc. Vālmīki was struck with wonder and joy at this first involuntary emanation of measured poetry and through deep introspection and analysis of the state of his mind at the time of its utterance, he discovered for this mastery a solution which he gave out to his pupils in these words “शोकार्त्तम्य प्रकृति मे श्लोको भवतु नान्यथा”(B.K.-II, 18)”That

¹. B.K., II, 14 & 15

शोकार्त्तम्य प्रकृति मे श्लोको भवतु नान्यथा।
भा भशं भश्चः भश्चः भश्चः समायः;
चं तत्समायं श्लोकं भवतु नान्यथा।
which proceeded from me who was over powered by pathos shall be nothing but poetry or rhythmic expression'.

This statement understood in the light of the above krauṇca incident is rightly regarded by Ānandavardhana as revealing the critic in Vālmīki, and as containing in embryo the theory of rasa fully developed later. The wallowing of the surviving female to which the sage was witness were transported from the sphere of his perceptual experience to that of his imagination and presented there as विभाव and अनुभाव that stirred up his instinct of pathos to its depth and developed it to that climax, when he reached a still mental condition with an intense feeling of pathos, in which his personality was lost, resulting in his having only a sense of joy; and this pleasant feeling of pathos that over powered him translated itself spontaneously into the form of the sloka मा निधात,........ etc. The sage surely meant something like the above when enigmatically said 'from my intense feeling of pathos shall proceed nothing but rhythmic expression'.

At one stroke Vālmīki is both a poet and a critic. He is the former, as he is able to imagine vividly and intensely for the situations, the characters and the searching’s of their hearts, and express that feeling in the form of excellent poetry. He is the latter also for he fully realizes that it is this feeling, arising out of his complete imaginative sympathy with the characters and incidents that transformed itself into rhythmic expression. The function of the poet and the critic is identical in their understanding and feeling for the characters, their emotions etc. The poet is superior to the critic, for he possesses the creative genius and the expressive power which furnish the critic poetry that forces him to have the same understanding and feeling as the poet, the critic falls short of the poet, for he seeks poetry to aid his imagination to think and feel with the poet. The poet is valued to the extent to which his poetry evokes in the critic understanding and sense of bliss. The critic is
judged by the degree of understanding and joy that he has from a study of poetry. Vālmīki is a poet and critic. From the few hints that he throws out and from the poetry of the Rā., distinguished by the simplicity of style, naturality of imagery and vividness of description, which tend towards the full development of rasa, it is possible to make out that to Vālmīki, spontaneous expression emanating from one when overpowered by an intense feeling of pathos constitutes poetry, or the state of poetic inspiration is a climax of emotion when it, the emotion, finds a spontaneous outlet in rhythmic expression Milton’s ‘unpremeditated song’ is this same spontaneous rhythmic expression.

It may here be pointed out that the views set forth above, being based on the second chapter of the B.K., could not be maintained as Vālmīki’s without coming into conflict with the conclusions of historical research and philology which show that only Books II-VI form the genuine portions of the work originally written by Vālmīki. Against this we urge that, although much of the first book including the second chapter is a later addition, the second chapter contains a genuine record of the tradition handed down from Vālmīki, and early poets like Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti bear ample testimony to the authenticity of the tradition that the krauṇḍa incident in the life of Vālmīki was the occasion for the spontaneous enunciations of poetry and also for the origin of the sloka miler in Sanskrit² and U.Rā.³. Ānandavardhana fully believing in this tradition looks upon Vālmīki as the father of the theory of

2. Rā. XIV-70
tātpyāḥcaukṣūṣṭितानुसारी कवि: कुरोदकाराणाय यातः।
निपट विद्वानविद्वानीन्द्रा:; स्तोत्रकथयावर गयम शोकः।। See Mallinatha on this.

R-2 आत्रेयी-अथ स जगामिषान्ता चाध्यायिनवान्तं नैन्तवादानुपतः।
नुमाचारैणामः स्रीवान्तक्वांवविहेणन वचनानां ददर्श।
आकाशप्रकाशाताभयं वचनमूल्यो तदस्त वरिणातात्मैवदृशत।
"मा निषाद..." कन्तेलाभाबवार्त० नृतसतलसद्यं मवताः।
आत्रेयी-तेत्र हि पुनः सर्वत्र नैन्तवादातनुजविन्दुक्तस्मुरुषाणां भाषावान् भूतवान्।
पद्धतिसिद्धदृश च वागानानि प्रभृति। तदस्तृति रामचरितम्।
अव्याहत्योविशयिष्यते ते च यशु: प्रतिभाः, आदिः। कवितिः।” इत्यत्तवान्ततिः।। अथ स भाषानां... एमाग्यं प्रणिन।
rasa, although he twists the view to suit his own comprehensive theory of dhvani. It is further gratifying to wrote that Prof. Macdonell is quite willing to grant the probable historicity of the above tradition.

III.0.1 Rasa theory of Bharata

The different stages in the development of the theory of rasa, after the few suggestions that have been thrown out by Vālmiki, are absolutely lost to us until the doctrine emerges in a concrete shape, fully developed in all its varied ramifications in the NS of Bharata. This big work of thirtyseven chapters, purporting to deal with the art of histrionics, treats of a variety of kindred arts and sciences ancillary to it and among them are poetry, literary criticism, criticism, dramaturgy etc.

The theory of rasa is an earnest attempt to indicate the ‘character of the emotional effect of the drama’ or it successfully explains the rise and nature of the ‘aesthetic pleasure’ that a responsive audience experiences while witnessing the skilful enactment of a play. It was definitely formulated in its varied aspects for the first time by Bharata in his NS. It was briefly stated by him in that well-known aphorism.

Vibhāvas are certain causes or mainsprings of emotions like love etc. like the spring season, pleasure garden, fragrance, moonlight etc. anubhāvas are the visible effects or the consequents of the searching are of the hearts of the heroes. They are quickly

4. DL, P-26. 1.5
5. Hist. of Skt. Lit. P-317
moving eyebrows, side long glances etc. vyabhicāribhāvas are transitory or evanescent emotions that tend only to develop the main sentiment, such as anxiety anger etc. the path of love is never smooth. Through a harmonious blending and representation of appropriate vibhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas, there arises in the audience a certain climax of emotion, invariably accompanied by a thrill and a sense of joy, and this is rasa or aesthetic pleasure. To take a concrete instance skilled actors represent Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā. There first meet in the pleasant, beautiful groves of the hermitage vibhāva. Each struck with the rapturous beauty of the other, casts eager, longing looks. At forced parting Śakuntalā finds an excuse to steal a glance at her lover anubhāva. In their extreme difference and anxiety they pine away, one for the other vyabhicāribhāva. Happily Śakuntalā’s mate helps her in declaring her love through a letter, Duṣyanta hastens to present himself and there is union of the lovers. When all these are represented aided by poetry, music and other histrionic devices, which Bharata calls nātyadharmi the deep seated instinctive impression of love (sthāyibhāva) is kindled in the mind of the audience and developed to that climax, when through complete imaginative sympathy with the situation, the audience forgets all differences of person, time and place, and this climax of emotion reveals itself in a sort of blissful consciousness. This bliss is rasa.

Classification

After sitting this theory, Bhrata classifies the rasas into eight in accordance with the eight dominant emotional moods, which, when developed, transform themselves into the rasa. They are 1) śṛṅgāra, 2) hāsya, 3) karuṇa, 4) raudra, 5) vīra, 6) bhayānaka, 7) bibhatsa, and 8) abhuta. He further enumerates thirtythree vyabhicāribhāvas and eight sūttvikabhāvas, which are only external indication of emotion. He suggests the appropriate
vibhāvas, anubhāvas and vyabhicāribhāvas that tend most to the development of the particular rasaś.

In addition to its enunciation, the author elaborates on the various contributory factors that promote the realization of rasa. All of them are brought under abhinaya or action, which is fourfold. 1) āṅgika, 2) vācika, 3) āhārya, 4) sāttvika. These are respectively action through the limbs of the body, speech dress and certain outward expressions of emotion. Numerous divisions are given under each head and the relevancy of each kind of action in the promotion of the different rasaś is indicated then and there. In the endeavour to treat all arts as subordinate and ancillary to histrionics, Bharata brings poetry and literary criticism under vacikābhinaṇa. He deals fully with the ideas of poetics style and diction prevalent during his time. In chapter XV he defines and illustrates the different metres that lend sweetness to dramatic style. In the next he deals with the alaṁkāras or poetic embellishments, which according to him are only four, the same ten traditional gunas or qualities of style and ten doṣas or faults of style, which have to be avoided. Dramatic technique is treated fully in chapters XVIII and XIX and the four vṛttis, kaiśikī etc., in the twentieth. Music and its use in kindling up the particular emotions are dealt with at great length in the last chapters of the work.

Though Bharata does not recognize the individuality of the science of literary criticism, he gives it indeed a prominent place in his scheme of histrionics. The conceptions of guṇa, alaṁkāra vṛtti etc. hear ample testimony to the high literary sense and the spirit of critical inquiry into the distinguishing characteristics of poetic style in the learned men of his age. The evolution of the

\[6. \quad (NŚ. \text{Chapter VI \\& VII})
7. \quad (NŚ. \text{Chapter VIII. 9})\]
theory of *rasa*, which is a successful analysis of the process of the realization of pleasure in poetry and which enabled later critics to formulate an excellent theory of poetry based on it, fully testifies to the genius of Bharata, and poetics itself appears in the *NS* to have long outgrown its hascent stage and bids fair to assert its independence. Being the earliest systematic exponent of the science, in addition to being at the head of the *rasa school*, Bharata may justly claim the little of the father of Sanskrit literary criticism.

**III.0.2 Rasa theory of Ānandavardhana**

Ānandavardhana, the author of the *Dhvanyāloka* and the vṛtti there on, became famous as the greatest exponent of the *dhvani* school which according to his own admission had its origin centuries before him. The theory of *dhvani* was based on the *sphoṭavāda* of grammarians who hold that the *sphoṭa* is the permanent capacity of words to signify their imports and is manifested by the expressions of the experiences of the previous ones. The formulation of the doctrine of *sphoṭa* was made on order to determine the significative seat of a word and the *ālāṃkārikas* concerned themselves first with this grammatico-philosophical problem about the relation of a word to its connotation in order to get support, strong and confirmatory, for their theory. According to this school the best poetry is not only that which suggests *rasa* but also others, such as, the statement of some fact or imaginative element and poetic figures. This redounds to the credit of this school as it enunciated a definition of poetry which was much more comprehensive than that of the *rasa* school. But even then *rasa* held the predominant position, considered and declared as it was the soul of poetry unlike previous writers who allowed *rasa* to

---

8. Sankaran (some aspects of literary criticism in Sanskrit, p. 50, 60, Pub, by the University of Madras, 1929).
9. DL.-1.1
10. DL.-1.5 (vṛtti)
come in only through the back door, *rasa* become the principal and the unifying factor. The *gunas*, *alamkāras* and *ritis* which were severally established as the life of poetic compositions by preceding writers, who had scarcely troubled them selves with or were highly prejudiced against, working out and establishing, *rasa* as the ulterior aesthetic principle, had to do service to *rasa*. They were all harnessed to beautify the soul, *rasa*, and it was enjoined that the poet should be very careful in the rasadhvani as objects already seen when touched with *rasa* appear quite new as the trees in the month of *Caitra*. The *alamkāras* and the *gunas* are dependent entities and therefore, adorn the principal element, which is *rasa*. As *dhvani* had a much wider scope, there naturally come in some points of difference between Bharata and Ānandavardhana in the process of the realization of *rasa*. According to the former the factors as *vibhāvas* etc. whether expressed a suggested by words created pleasure in the minds of spectators where as the letters attributed the pleasure in the minds of the readers or the spectators to; the suggestion of words. More over, the function of poetry was to suggest *rasas* or *alamkāras* or *vastus* as applied to both poems and dramas according ask to Ānandavardhana where as Bharata called the best poetry that which suggested *rasa* only through the representation of *vibhāvas* etc. but in spite of this difference Ānandavardhana put a special premium over *rasa* as has already been said. He recognized both the aspects, objective (as residing in the *kāvyā*) and subjective (as enjoyed in them selves by *sahādayas*) of *rasa*. His preference to *rasadhvani* is confirmed by his recognising the ŠR as the principal one in the *Mbh.* He also recognised the *rasābhāsa*, the *bhāvabhāsa*, their *praśama* etc., topics connected with *rasa*.

11. Ibid, II 6 and III 6
12. Ibid, IV, 4
13. Ibid, I, 7
15. Ibid, II, 3
Rasa though accepted as the soul of a literary piece, was put on a par with the statement of fact and poetic figure, all the three suggested by words and comprised under the dhvani. This was not liked by certain critics who became famous as the opponents of the dhvani doctrine. Pratihārendurāja said in his commentary. The laghuṛtti, to the kavyālāmārkārasārasanīgraṇa, that ask the three kinds of the suggested sense could very well be brought under the head of alāmārkāras like paryāyokta, śleṣa, rasavād etc., But he accepted rasa as the soul of poetry. He clears up Uddbhata’s position in this respect. He says, "As to what is said before (in this work) that rasas constitute alāmārkāras, such as rasavād etc., is said in a condition when this discrimination about the real nature of rasas was not meant (by the author)".

III.0.3 Abhinavagupta's exposition of the rasa theory

It is the source of the latter theories, of rasa setforth by Lollatta Śaṅkuka Bhaṭṭanāyaka and AG. Unfortunately the commentaries or books in which the views of the first three commentators or thinkers appeared have been irretrievably lost and one have to depend entirely on AG’s presentation of their views in his Locana and ABh, the two famous commentaries on DL and NS respectively. In Lollatta’s view the permanent emotions itself, when intensified or developed by the vibhāvas etc., becomes the rasa. Its locus is first of all the hero of the play. The rasa is subsequently attributed to the actor who plays the role of the character (by imitating him in form, dress and action). Śaṅkuka, however, refutes this view and interprets the manifestation of rasa as a process of inference. The permanent emotion is inferred to exist in the actor

17. तम्मालमतामि नूँ दूरोपतिनी मदनविन समम्बंजु ब्रोषमितलामि NS-Vol-1, p.278
It however, may be pointed out that AG himself says elsewhere “Dāśitaścāmākaraṇāvādaḥ”-ABh. on VI-33.
playing the role of the character, though not really present in him, by means of the *anubhāvas*, skillfully exhibited in this acting. This permanent emotion thus inferred, is but a reflex *anukāra* of the real permanent emotion of the character in the drama, and because it is a reflex, it is called by a different name, viz., *rasa*. The emotion by their very nature is endowed with exquisite beauty and are, therefore, a source of charm and pleasure when inferred. Bhaṭṭānāyaka denies that *rasa* is produced or that it is perceived or that it is suggested. He ascribes to a play (or a poem) three powers or functions, *abhidhā*, *bhāvanā* or *bhāvakatva* and *bhojakatva* or *bhoga*. *Abidhā* deals with what is expressed, *bhāvanā* relates to the *rasa* and *bhojakatva* to the audience. It is Bhaṭṭānāyaka who for the first time compares the enjoyment of *rasa* with the enjoyment of bliss arising out of meditation on the absolute. The power of *abhidhā* is universally accepted. But the other two powers (ascribed to a play or poem) have no legitimate foundation.

After presenting these different views and refueling them AG sets out to enunciate his own views. At the outset, however, he frankly speaks of “the ladders of thought constructed by earlier writers” and acknowledges his indebtedness to his predecessors. Further he observes,” Therefore I have not found fault with the theories of other goodmen. I have only refined on them”). In the course of his exposition of the nature of *rasa* he is prepared to accept the view of *upacaya* of the permanent emotion as *rasa*, advocated by Lollāṭa, or of *anukāra* of the permanent emotion as *rasa*, adopted by Śaṅkuka, or the view of *viṣayasāmagrī* (having potency to create pleasure or pain) as *rasa* held by the *saṅkhya*...
with certain qualifications.\(^{19}\)

A careful analysis of AG’s exposition of the *rasa* theory reveals the following aspects or characteristics.

i) An ordinary emotion is individual and immediately personal. *rasa* is generic and depersonalised. It is shared by all *sahādyas* and it has essentially no personal significance. A permanent emotion, only when it is universalised and when it lends itself to aesthetic enjoyment (*rasanā, carvanā, āsvāda*), becomes *rasa*.\(^{20}\)

ii) The perceptions of *rasa* is in a class by itself *alaukika*, totally different form or beyond ordinary everyday experience. The experience of *rasa* is “not really of this world. It is beyond our concepts of time and space. It only takes place in the realm of literature, and never in real life”. It consists exclusively in knowledge, which is not comparable to any other kind of knowledge.\(^{21}\)

iii) *Rasa* is always suggested *abhivyakta*. It can never be expressed-described in words *vācyā* even in a dream.\(^{22}\)

iv) The essence of *rasa* consists exclusively in aesthetic pleasure or relish. The state of aesthetic relish is a form of

---

19. अलोकितसविविधसम्बन्धनात्मक्रृत्याणायोगतं नीतोपिष्क्येत्तेकसरं नूत विकस्यम्बाय: तत्कालिक्य एव नूत
चर्मातिनिर्मकालात्मकर्मधार्मिकत्व एव तस:, Ibid, p. 284

20. लोकिकत्वावस्थुपूर्णम् का सरस । तेनलोकिकत्वावस्था लोकावात: स्मृतिनामात्मकसंबद्धत्वार्थ मेवः एव । Ibid, p. 284
and, नाट्यतः एव सा न लोक इत्यादः काय्य नाट्यमेव । Ibid, p. 291
and, रना च ओपकैविक किन्तु ओपानायेऽयो लोकिकस्थिति विलक्षणेऽयो । Ibid, p. 285

21. वस्तु व्यक्तिः न स्मार्दनाव्ययो न लोकिकस्थितिः ्सस्तः । Locana (Bped 1940), p. 51

22. चर्मातिनिर्मकालात्मकर्मधार्मिकत्वार्थ मेवः एव नूत विकस्यम्बायः तत्कालिक्य एव नूत
रचनातिनिर्मकालात्मकर्मधार्मिकत्वार्थ मेवः एव तस:। Ibid, p. 284
and, नाट्यस्तः एव सा न लोक इत्यादः काय्य नाट्यमेव । Ibid, p. 291
and, रना च ओपकैविक किन्तु ओपानायेऽयो लोकिकस्थिति विलक्षणेऽयो । Ibid, p. 285

अस्मातृं स्मार्दनाव्ययाः न लोकिकस्थितिः ्सस्तः । Locana (Bped 1940), p. 51

अन्यानं सर्वदेशस्मार्दनाव्ययाः ्सस्तः । Locana (Bped 1940), p. 51
consciousness (sāṁvedana) free from obstacles, i.e. worldly preoccupations, etc. As rasa consists of tasting one’s own form of consciousness it is essentially or predominantly pleasurable. However on account of the matters (or emotions such as bhaya, jugupsā, krodha, śoka) presented there is a slight touch of bitterness or painfulness.\(^{23}\)

**v)** Rasa is not an objective ‘thing’ in the real world. For it exists only during the period of aesthetic experience (carvana) and does not persist for any time after the aesthetic experience is over. It is a private and personal experience. It is an inner happening invisible to a person other than the second connoisseur. This does not mean its reality is improvable (aprāmāṇika). It is ‘svasaṁvedanasiddha’ (Its only proof was one’s own inward experience itself).\(^{24}\)

**(vi)** Rasāsvāda is akin to parabrahmāsvāda through there is considerable difference between the two experiences. In both cases there is a sense of complete response of having reached the goal beyond which there is nothing to be accomplished, and thus both the experiences are alaukika. AG himself distinguishes between the transcendental joy characteristic of aesthetic experience and the bliss that comes from the contemplation of or the meditation on the Supreme Being by the Yogi.\(^{25}\)

\(^{23}\) Read the following passage from the Abhinavabharati (p. 285) and, from the Locana (p. 508 (Bped, Banaras, 1940))}

\(^{24}\) It is, however, interesting that AG condemns this rasāsvāda as very inferior to the bliss that comes from finding repose in God. (AG himself distinguishes between the transcendental joy characteristic of aesthetic experience and the bliss that comes from the contemplation of or the meditation on the Supreme Being.)

\(^{25}\) Read the following passage from the Abhinavabharati (p. 285) and, from the Locana (p. 508 (Bped, Banaras, 1940))
sahrdaya perceives the vibhāvas etc. not in an indifferent manner (tātasthyena) but by being overcome by sensitivity (sahrdayatva or hṛdayasatṁvāda). He sympathises with the original character and to a large degree he even identifies (tanmayibhāvanā or tadatmya) with the character and the situations depicted etc. He however does not identify himself with the original character completely. He no doubt undergoes the emotions “He is pleased when the character is pleased, he is in sorrow when the character is in sorrow, he is angry when anger (krodha) is being presented and afraid when bhaya is presented” but he maintains certain distance. But before the identification of the spectator with the original character, and the events and things portrayed in the drama, takes place they all are generalised or contemplated universally, i.e. they become independent of any relation with particular individual time and place. In the theatre, we live in the time or space neither of the original characters nor of the actors. We are outside both time and space, which characterise the world we know it is a different order of reality.

AG is indebted to various predecessors for the different aspects of his concept of rasa. He is indebted to Ānandavardhana as regards the idea that rasa is always and ever suggested and never expressed described in words to Śaṅkuka as regards, the idea that the perception of rasa does not fall within the recognized categories of knowledge (and is thus alaukika, in a class by itself) and that the reality of rasa is not improvable because it is actually felt (sva-saṁvedanasiddh) to Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka as regards the idea of sādhāraṇikarana, and the comparison of rasa with parābrahmāsvāda, and the concept that rasa is by its very nature pleasurable”. AG’s contribution to the rasa theory lies mainly in his great emphasis on the alaukikutva of rasa, and the pleasurable nature of all rasas and the generalisation of the sensitive reader’s
own emotion. He will also be remembered for having coined new
critical terms like sahrdaya, hidayasamivada, svatmanupraveshā, 
tanmanyabhava or, carvanā camatkāra, alaukika, and so forth. These
terms are frequently used in books on literary criticism after the
twelveth century.

Many post-AG writers including Mammaṭa, Hemacandra, 
Viśvanātha and Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha accept AG’s view without
any hesitation. It may, however, be stated, in passing, that the
authors of ND and of kāvya prakāsakhandaṇa severely criticise AG
for his view that the rasas are pleasurable.

III.0.4 Rasa theory of Mammaṭa

Mammaṭa, did not catch up hints and suggestions from
the previous writers to expound any new theory of his own but
brought about a harmonious fusion of their theories assigning
therein proper places to different constituents. His attitude to rasa,
therefore, has nothing novel in it. He recognises rasa as an
important element in poetry. This recognition remains implicit at
some places where as at others it becomes explicit. In his very first
verse of the voluminous kavyaprakasā he accepts that rasas import
charm and delectableness to poetry, thus making it full of nothing
but delight. In the definition of poetry of which he accepts three
kinds and makes no explicit inclusion of rasa in it. The admission
of the Chitra kāvyā admitted by Anandavardhana, too, as a division
of poetry would also, according to Viśvanātha, show that rasa
did not form an essential element. Yet the explicit injunction as to
the presence of the guṇa in and the absence of the doṣa from, it
would imply the importance of rasa, explained as the former two
concepts are in direct connection with the latter one. The absence
of the mention of the word, rasa, from the definition of poetry may

27. vibhāvānubhāvena vyaktāḥ saṅcāriṇāḥ tathā/
rasatāmeti ratyādih sthāyāḥ bhāvah sacetasāṃ// SD.III.1
be justified due to the concept of *rasa* being an established fact in poetics and hence understood by implication in such important cases, but the three kinds of suggested sense, viz., the *vastu*, the *alamkūra* and *rasa* appear rather inconsistent as *rasadhavani* has been mentioned as one of the kinds and, therefore, it cannot cover all the cases. The irregularities as appearing here as well as at other places are reconciled if this idea is kept in view that Mammaṭa’s task was that of compiling, and if some inconsistencies creep in they should be made light of in considerations of the bigger problems where in he could effect reconciliation. He considered the *guṇas*, the *ritis*, the *doṣas* and the *alamkūras* in their relation to *rasa*. He also considered the different *rasas* in relation to one another, and after having given his view on *rasa* he gave it a detailed consideration. He agrees with AG in his view of *rasa*.

Since he has quoted the view of AG and his predecessor and his opinion appear to be a significant view on the theory of *rasa*.

### III.0.5 *Rasa* theory of Viśvanātha

It is already discussed that the early writers on Sanskrit poetics like Bhāmaha etc. were concerned only with word and sense. Ānandavardhan and AG emphasised the importance of *rasa* in poetry. But Ānandavardhana advocates *dhvani* theory. Though he realises the utmost necessity of *rasa* din poetry still he could not come out openly to say *rasa* as the soul of poetry. But influenced by him Viśvanātha completes the task by saying that *rasa* only is the soul of poetry. To establish it he opens the first chapter of *SD*. with the criticism of the definition of poetry, given by authors like Mammaṭa, Ānandavardhana, Vāmaha, Mahimabhaṭṭa etc. After this he gives his own definition of poetry.

---

28. *parasya na parasyeti mameti na mameti ca/
tadasvāde vibhāsvāde h paricchedo no vidyate// SD. III.12.*
In the third chapter of *SD* Viśvanātha elaborately describes *rasa, bhāva*, etc. Here *vibhāvas* etc. deity, colours are also described. In the very first verse of this chapter we see that Viśvanātha first of all defines the evolution of *rasa*. According to him the *sthāyibhāvas* of the connoisseur being manifested by *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and *saṁcāribhāvas*, take the form of *rasa*. Further he explains it by giving the example of milk and curd. As milk changes into curd, in the same way the permanent moods change into *rasa*. So it is clear that according to Viśvanātha only the form changes here but not a brand new thing is created. It is not manifested like jar by lamp because then *rasa* will be a *pūrvasiddha*. Then explaining the permanent moods he says that these mental states can’t be concealed by the favourable or unfavourable states of mind. These are the base of different *rasas* and stay up to the end. Those are of eight varieties like *rati, hāsa, krodha, soka, uṣāha, bhāva, jugupsā* and *vismaya*. Again he includes *šāma* within it and the number is nine.

*Vibhāvas* are those by which the permanent states are awakened. For example seeing a beautiful woman in a garden awakens the *rati* of a man. So woman and garden are the causes of awakening of the *rati* of the man. When these causes are placed in poetry and drama are known as *vibhāvas*. They are of two types like *ālambana* and *uddīpana*. *Anubhāva* is the external manifestations of the awakened permanent states like glances, movements of limbs etc. In the ordinary world they are effects but in poetry and drama they are called as *anubhāvas*. *Vyabhicāribhāvas* give enrichment or take the permanent state into relish at this stage. These are like the water bubbles which are seen and unseen sometime also. So when the permanent states like *rati* etc. are manifested by the above *vibhāvas* etc. become *śṛgūra, hāsyā*,

29. rasodbodhe vibhāvādyah kāraṇānyeva te maṝḥ SD.III.14.
raudra, karuṇa, vīra, bhayānaka, bibhatas, adbhuta. Also from śāma śānta is manifested. Again he enumerates vātsalyarasa with permanent state vatsalatā in giving honour to the sage Bharata. Now a question may arise as for example rati of Rāma was awakened by Śitā originally. But can it awaken rati of the man of taste? To this Viśvanātha answers that this is only possible by the power of generalisation sādhāranikṛti. By this power the man of taste makes himself identified with Rāma and Hanumāna etc. So the acts like crossing the ocean etc. do not appear impossible to him though it is beyond his capacity. The permanent states like rati etc. appear in a general form. Otherwise if he feels it personally then shyness etc. will be felt. So Viśvanātha says that in the realisation of rasa the vibhāvas etc. and the permanent states do not appear as belonging to somebody or not. Again they does not appear as belong to the connoisseur or not to himself.\textsuperscript{30} In this way all the particularities of the permanent states and vibhāvas etc. are divested and they all appear in a general form. This is only possible by the power of generalisation. Though vibhāva, anubhāva, and vyabhicāribhāvas are called causes, effects and accessories still at the time of the enjoyment of rasa they are felt as one.\textsuperscript{31} To clarify it he gives the example of a beverage. We can get different taste of the ingredients like peeper, sweet etc. before the preparation of it, but when it is fully prepared we do not get any individual taste but a combined one. In the same way vibhāvas etc. are felt as one in the realisation of rasa.\textsuperscript{32}

According to Viśvanātha there is no difference between rasa and svāda. But in the saying ‘rasah svādyate’ we find the difference is kālpānīka. It is just like the saying’ rice is cooked’. But we know that after cooking it becomes rice only. In this regard

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid, III.15.
\textsuperscript{31} na jayate tadāsvādo vinā ratyādivāsanānādy SD. III.8
\textsuperscript{32} tasmādaśālaukikāh satyān vedyāh sāhdayi rayāni SD.,II.26.
it appears that Viśvanātha has taken this idea from AG.

Then coming to the taste of pathetic sentiment we see that Viśvanātha emphasises the pleasure in it but not pain. He says that there is pleasure experienced by the man of taste in this sentiment. His feelings are the proof regarding this. Then to clarify it he says that if there is pain in this sentiment then no one will be attracted towards it and so the great works like Rā. etc. whose main sentiment is pathos will be useless. So to solve the above problem he says that in ordinary life we may get pain from its causes etc. but when these are presented in poetry and drama they became extraordinary vibhāva, anubhāva and saṅcaribhāva. But here pleasure is experienced and not pain. As some people even shed tears in seeing a drama or reading a poetry, it is only due to their kindness to the characters. But all people do not enjoy poetry and drama Viśvanātha thinks that some inclination vasanā is necessary for this. These are of two types i.e. of this birth and previous one. For this reason grammarians etc. do not enjoy rasa as they have no inclination of this birth. without the inclination of the previous birth the man of the taste even can't enjoy it.

Coming to process as how rasa is enjoyed Viśvanātha opines that at this time the quality of sattva prevails over rajas and tamas because without perfect clamness of mind rasa can never be enjoyed. This predominence of sattva comes through the extraordinary sense of poetry which makes one absorbed in that. There is no separate feelings of vibhāvas etc. Again it is a self-illumined knowledge (svaprakāśa) as it does not become an object of any kind of knowledge. Also at the time of the enjoyment of rasa one feels nothing except it. So it is a knowledge of itself (vedyāntarasparśasūnye). Regarding the power by which this extraordinary rasa is enjoyed Viśvanātha says that this power is

33. vṛttinām visrānterabhi dhiātparyalaksanākhyānām/
    angikārya turyā vṛttirvode rasādāntām|| SD. VI
vyāñjana. Abhidhā, lakṣanā and tātparya power can't bring rasa into realisation. So after the cessation the above powers a fourth power arises named vyāñjana by which rasa is enjoyed.\(^{34}\) Then defining svārubpa of rasa Viśvanātha says that it is an extraordinary thing, because it does not come under any category of things of the world. First of all it is not an effect because it has no existence without vibhāvas etc., which are causes. In the ordinary world cause and effect do not stay together always. It is not an eternal (nitya) thing because before and after the reflection of vibhāvas etc. rasa ceases to exist. It is not an undeliberative knowledge (nirvikalpaka). In this type of knowledge there is no name, form etc. are known of the object. But the experience of rasa proves that it is an extreme delight. But it is not also a deliberative (savikalpaka) knowledge. It is because we can't express it through any words like jar, pot etc. It is not pratyakṣa as there is no expressive word. It is not parokṣa as we enjoy it through our senses. So in this way by differentiating rasa from the worldly objects he at last says that for this reason it has been designed as alaukika and only realised by the man of the taste.\(^{35}\)

As Viśvanātha admits the abhivyakti of rasa so he refutes the theory put forth by Lollaṭa, Śaṅkuka etc. He is of the opinion that rasa can't stay in the original characters. If so then rasa will be limited i.e. there is no relation of the man of the taste to it. Again pain will be received from pathetic sentiment ordinarily. The awakening of love between them will be rati but can't be śṛṅgāra. Then he refuses the theory of Śaṅkuka. According to Viśvanātha an actor takes the form of Rāma etc. and behaves like them only after effective training and practice. He only can help the man of taste to enjoy rasa and can't enjoy rasa. But if it be said that he enjoys rasa disproduced within him, he can't be called an actor

\(^{34}\) nispattya carvanasyāsyā nispattirupacarataḥ/ SD. III.27.
\(^{35}\) sancārinah pradhāntāni devādiviśayā ratiḥ/ Ibid.III.260.
but is a connoisseur. Explaining the word *nispatti* in the *rasa-sūtra* of Bharata. Viśvanātha says that here *rasa* is not produced but only its relish (*carvaṇā*) is produced. We see that *carvaṇā* does not stay always. So it can be said that it is produced. But as there is no difference between *rasa* and *carvaṇā*, so *carvaṇā* can’t be called produced but secondarily said so. As *carvaṇā* can be called produced only secondarily, so *rasa* can be called produced secondarily. Viśvanātha describes all the *rasas* in a vivid manner with their colour, nature, duty etc. Then we get the description of opposite sentiments. Then regarding *bhāva* Viśvanātha says that when we see the prominent manifestation accessory states, slightly agitated permanent mood and love directed towards gods etc. there is *bhāva*. But as there is relish or we enjoy it so it can be taken to the sphere of *rasa*. As in the marriage of a servant the master or even king appears secondary in the same way sometimes the accessory states become prominent and then is *bhāva*.

Regarding *rasābhāsa* and *bhāvabhāsa* Viśvanātha opines that when *rasa* and *bhāva* stay with impropriety then it become the semblance of *rasa* and *bhāva*. Impropriety is the deviation from the rules as laid down by authors like Bharata. For instance if love is between appropriate hero and heroine then is *śṛṇgāra*. But when love is directed towards the wife of the preceptor, king etc. then is semblance of *rasa*. In this way semblance depends upon propriety.

In this way having described his theory he makes all the elements subsidiary to *rasa*. According to him faults are those, which are *rasa* and it may occur in words and its parts sentences, meaning and in *rasa*. *Guṇas* are the qualities of *rasa* like heroism of the soul. *Rūtis* make this *rasa* enjoyable. The *alāṁkāra* are like the ornament in the body. Viśvanātha thinks *rasa* as the only important element in poetry. According to him *rasa* can only be

enjoyed by the power of *vyanjana*. In the fifth chapter of *SD.* he rejects the view of Mahimabhaṭṭa who says that *rasa* can be inferred. In this way we see the *rasa* theory has been described in the *SD.* of Viśvanātha. As he has been influenced AG has influenced him so to him *rasa* only appears as the only important element in poetry. Other aspect like *alamkāra* etc. are subsidiary to *rasa* and help to manifest this. Here one get a very exhaustive description of *rasa* with all its accessories. So likewise Viśvanātha having given the definition of poetry as *vākyam rasātmakaṁ kavyam* in the third chapter of *SD.* establishes *rasa* further.

**III.1.0 The opinion of above authors on *rasa* theory referring to Rā./Rāmakathā**

**III.1.1 Dhvanyāloka**

*DL* quotes the *Rā./Rāmakathā* in following contexts.

काव्यस्यात्मा स एवार्थस्तथा चालिके: पुरा।
ब्रोजविविविवियोगोल्ल: शोक: शलोकत्वमाणम्: || व्हन्यालोकः-१.५

विविधवाच्यवाच्यकथाचरण: राजश: चालिक: काव्यस्य स एकर्ष: सारभूत: । तथा चालिकविविविविविविवियोगोल्ल: शोक एव: शलोकत्वय: परिणत:।३७ शोको हि
करणस्याविभावः । प्रतीयमानस्य चालिकेदददर्तीौपि सर्वावस्येऽनेवोपकल्पः, प्राधान्यादुः।

That meaning alone is the soul of poetry, and so it was that, of yours the sorrow of the Vālmiki at the separation of the curlews couple took the form of a distich. That meaning by alone happens to be the quintessence of poetry whose outward charm is secured by the combination of varied and uncommon explicit meaning, expressions and art of arrangement. That is why the sorrow of the first poet, on hearing the wail of the he-curlew afflicted with separation from its close mate, transformed itself into a distich. Sorrow indeed is the abiding emotion, which is at the

37. "तथा निष्ठान प्रतिद्वंद्वयातः न्ययमान: शशित्वति समा:
ब्रोजविविविविवियोगोल्ल: शोकमाहिलः"
basis of the sentiment of pathos. As already explained, it is only of the nature of the implicit. Though one can discern other sub-species of the implicit, they can all be understood by the synecdoche of sentiments and emotions since these happen to be the most important representatives of the rest.

**Kārikā 5-** This is one of the most crucial kārikās in the text and bristles with problems of interpretation and text reading. Anandavardhana here is citing the testimony of the famous epic poet, Vālmiki, in support of his main thesis that rasadhvani is the soul of poetry. The wording of the kārikā reminds us not only of the Rā. (B.K-ii, 15) but also of the Raghuvamśa (XIV.70). Both these passages make one think that the sorrow of the sage Vālmiki at the sight of the tragic end of one of the mating birds found a spontaneous expression in metrical form, viz., मा निषाद...... etc. The wording of the vṛtti on the kārikā does not conclusively show whether the śoka in question is originally of Vālmiki or of the surviving bird. However, the additional clarification offered in the vṛtti that śoka indeed is the sthāyibhāva of karuṇarasa raises certain fundamental issues. Is he by chance trying to distinguish between empirical sorrow (located in the bird) from impersonal sorrow produced in the witnessing sage? Another problem posed here is whether the specific sloka viz. मा निषाद...... is the form taken by Vālmiki’s śoka or whether it refers to the whole epic. In the vṛtti on IV.5 the author openly states in so many words that the sage has ‘woven’ (आमृति:) this karuṇarasa into the Rā. as a predominant content.

Some manuscripts (vide. NSP edition) construe the reference in question to be मा निषाद...... and quote it in the body of the vṛtti. But in view of other considerations noted above as well as its absence in other manuscripts, our edition has relegated it to the footnote. Even if, it were held as a genuine part of the text, it
would have to be understood as containing the essence of the Rā. as a whole in order to do justice to the express statement of Ānandavardhana in the fourth uddyota, besides the clear implications of the present kārikā.

The purpose of the present kārikā is to find a poet’s testimony for the thesis that vyāngyārtha alone is the soul of poetry. rasa happens to be the most important element in vyāngyārtha. Vālmiki’s ascertain (शोक: स्तोत्रास्तमण्डल:) in the Rā. should yield the meaning—“karunarasa has been transformed by me into the form of the epic-poem,” if it is to be relevant in this discussion. Hence the word soka should mean karunarasa and soka should mean Rā. though it involves some stretching. The vṛtti has clearly indicated this by the expression शोको हि करुणस्थायिभावः. There is a likelihood of our mistaking the personal sorrow to be the sthāyibhāva and to think that this sthāyibhāva is different from karunarasa. But the truth is that, like the other technical terms in viz, vibhāva and anubhāva, bhāva too, whether vyabhicāri or sthāyi is applicable only in the realm of artistic representation and does not connote its empirical counter part. Further, there is no separate entity like rasa other than sthāyibhāva. Rasa is only the name given to the sthāyibhāva at the point when it yields aesthetic delight.

AG has taken great pains to bring out this implication of Ānandavardhana. He even goes to the extent of construing the third quarter in the kārikā in a very oblique way:- शोकस्थायिभावकरणात्: = शोकस्थ साहत्त्वचव्यंसमहिमाः……उद्भुद:.. And adds that the sage has no personal sorrow like the surviving bird. The sight of the bird’s sorrow excites his aesthetic contemplation of universal sorrow. (शोकस्थायिभावकरणात्) which spontaneously overflows in metrical form. The nature of the sage’s creative experience is one of pure aesthetic delight. It has been very difficult for this editor to fix the reading of the vṛtti on this kārikā. Most of the manuscripts consulted give the reading
The editors of the NSP edition indicate that only one manuscript gives निहत for निहत. But the reading of BP as well as of KSRI is निहतमहत्री indicating there by that the Kerala manuscript traditions is unanimous regarding this reading. P.V.Kane holds positively that the former Kashmiri reading adopted in this test is more genuine of the two (History of Sanskrit poetics, PP. 364-365, footnotes No. 1). But further studies of this editor show that the Kerala reading was perhaps known to Orissa scholars as early as candidasa, as the following extract from his काव्यप्रकाशदीपिका will show:-

......सहचरवध्याकुलकौश्लाक्तिफलितदीशीयोकोदबुद्धविवेदनविनिर्गतानानिरसतत्व परिणामसूत्विनितकाव्यप्रतिफलनात्मकसहद्वहुद्वानन्द.....(S.P. Bhattacharya’s edition, Varanasi, 1964, Page-357).

Obviously, this is a paraphrase of the relevant Locana passage. The word वथ here possibly alludes to विह or else it is a paraphrase of निहत. A more positive evidence in favour of the reading निहत is provided in the testimonial of the earliest reference to this vṛtti passage by Rājaśekhara in his kāvyamānārāśī निषादनिहतसहचरीके ् क्रोऽयुवान्द...... (GOS Edition Baroda, 1934, Page-7)

These extracts raise further issues. Was the bird, which was shot a male or a female? Both Ānandavardhana and Rājaśekhara assert it to be the female. This is diametrically opposed to the statement in the Rā. Long before Kuppuswamy Shastri, Candīdāsa quoted above had tried to emend the text of “क्रोऽइक्रोऽल” into क्रोऽइक्रोऽल, सहचरविह into सहचरवथ (सहचरविह Kuppuswami Shastri). But these are in our opinion pointless. A similar ingenious attempt by G.H.Bhatta (J.O.I, Baroda, Vol.IX, Pt.2, PP.148-151) to explain the compound as referring to the male birds death is noted and negative effectively by Kane. His logic is this, “Supposing that निहत is the correct reading, we expect सहचरी विहकात्र-निहत क्रोऽल, as he must have
been killed before he was shot” (LoC. cit.). The attempts of both Kuppuswamy Shastri (upalocana) and G.H. Bhatta involve a very forced and far-fetched dissolving of the compound to yield the sense of the male as the bird shot down. This is hardly permissible in the uniformly straightforward style of the vṛtti. The reading सत्रिहितहजरोविशिष्ट offers an easy meaning if we understand विशिष्ट itself to mean ultimate parting due to death of the female bird in intimate embrace of the male.

As indicated above, the verse मा निषाद... may be taken to represent the essence of the Rā. as a whole symbolically. If Rāma and Sītā are understood by the mating birds Rāvaṇa represents the hunter who brings pain to Sītā, the female bird. Such a symbolic interpretation has been suggested even by Paṭābhirāma Shastry in his notes on BP, besides P.V. Kane). On the other hand, if a literal meaning alone were to be understood from the verse, it would be difficult to illustrate even karunarasa therein. For, the verse is more an imprecation or curse hurled on the hunter by the sage in anger, and lees an embodiment of sorrow or pity at the suffering bird.

(Notes by K.Krishnamoorthy Ānandabardhana DL text with English translation)

This is quoted from Mahānāṭaka, V.7. (JRAS, 1898, P-296)

The word Rāma in this example carries the suggestive force mentioned. The word does not merely denote an individual
with that proper name but conveys the sense of a person endowed with various qualities by the force of suggestion.

This is quoted from Rā III, XVI-13.

This is a description of winter by Rāma, when at Paṅcavaṭī. Several qualities like unusual haziness, futility, etc. justify the figurative use of ‘blind’ in the verse. The moon’s ineptitude for illumining objects is what is suggested. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka misses the point when he asserts that the use of the word झः rules out any Lakṣaṇa. For झः in the verse indicates the similarity obtaining between the moon and a mirror, not between the moon and the blind. The word ‘blind’ qualifies only the mirror. To repeat the word झः in the second content may be good mīmāṃsā, but it is bad criticism (of Locana). It should be noted that all the examples given under kārikā-I are of individual words only, since that is the specialty of the type called अर्थान्तरसंक्रमितवाच्य. But the next kārikā refers to the other type called विविधतान्तरसंक्रमितवाच्य which relates to the content of a verse or a passage as a whole. The major category of rasa comes under this. The suggested figures of speech also represent another aspect.

The other figures will come (spontaneously) swarming at the beck and call of a poet concentrated upon sentiment and gifted with (a rich) imagination and will compete with one another for
their first preference at his hands, though outwardly they might appear to involve great labour on his part. We may cite as instances the description of the vexed Sītā at the sight of the severed head of māyā-Rāma in the poem Setubandha.

Though words involving the relation of suggested suggester are possible in various ways, the poet desirous of securing novel poetic themes should be most intent upon one of them only viz., suggestion of sentiments, etc. So long as the poet exercises underlected concentration regarding the suggested contents viz., sentiment, emotion, its semblance, and the suggesters previously explained, viz., letter, word, sentence, and texture, and the work as a whole, the poets entire work will become strikingly novel. That is why in epics like the Rā. and the Mbh., the subjects of ‘battle’ etc. appear quite new through they are described again and again.

In a work as a whole the delineation of a single sentiment as the predominant one will endow not only novelty of content but also abundance of charm. If one should ask for examples, we would say in reply that the Rā. is itself one example and that the Mbh. is another. Into the Rā. indeed, the first poet himself has incorporated the sentiment of pathos as is clear by his own declaration “Sorrow has taken the turn of a stanza”. It has in fact been kept up as predominant till the very end of the work in view of his concluding the work at the point of the eternal loss of Sītā

38. VR-1.1.40
If one would reckon at least a single person besides Vālmīki as endowed with poetic genius, there is no escaping the principle that poetic themes are inexhaustible. DL utilizes śloka’s from Rā/Rāmakathā on the context of dhvani, rasa, guna and alarnākāras. The Rāma’s life from among any Rāmakathā/Rā. are utilized by the author because the contexts are popularly known and could be comprehended.

III.1.2 Kāvya prakāśa

Kāvyaprakāśa quotes the Rāmakatha on following context.

अन्तरेद्वादी फणिपापादधनविधि: शक्ति भवेद्वङ्गे गांव्र बक्षिसि तावद्वे हस्तमता द्रोणादित्रत्राहतः।
देवमानन्दिन्द्रोदन्त तक्ष्ममण्डलीकान्तरं प्राप्तिः: केनाचयृ मूणाक्षि राक्षसपत: कुला च रण्डाश्च।।
K.P.Chapter, /5/

(quoted from वाल्लामाभाषण of राज्येश्वर X20 गो.का.प्र. P-811) अग्र केनाप्रेयोगशासिसम्मलानानुपरिक धवनि

(Here the suggestion of the speaker himself lies in the term 'by some one’ where the suggestive reverberation is based upon the force of the meaning (and this is too ‘obvious’))

अर्थत्ये प्रकटीकृतपि न फलप्राप्ति: प्रभो प्रत्युतः
दुहुमन्द दशारथिर्बिषेलचरितो युक्तस्तथा कन्याया।
उतकर्ष च परस्य मानसश्लोको विसंसंस चात्रनः
श्रीरं च जनगतितदिर्गामुखो देव: कर्थं मृण्यते।। K.P.Ch. VII

quoted from महाविचरित II-9 श्री.का.प. 138, गो.का.प्र. P-244.

अथ (अर्थदोषानु) (Defects of sense enumerated) Example of the
incomplete)

अत्र स्वरत्नम् ‘अपेक्षितम्’ इत्याकाशिति।
ननि परस्योच्चनेन संबन्धो योग्यः।

Here the intended ascertain is ‘How can you bear the idea of giving up the jewel among women’; and in as much as the passage as the term ‘strīratnam’ only, it is, to that extent, incomplete”.

अप्राकृतस्य चरितातिशयेश्च दृढः-
रघुदुःस्याभास्य तथापि नास्था।
कोषेष वीरशिशुक्राकृतिप्रमेयसः-
सीन्द्र्यसरसमुदायम्: पदार्थः।

२३३ || K.P.Ch.VII

(quoted from महावीरचरितम् of भवयुति II-39 गो.का.प्र. P-121, सू.र.भा. 360/28)

अत्र ‘अपहरतसि’ इत्यपहतस्य विधिवर्च्छ: तथापित्यस्य द्वितीयवाक्यवत्तेन वोपोऽः अत्र दोषः-
(अनभिविधवाच्च) ( omission of a necessary statement) ( that of which the meaning has to be quested out नेपालान्य)

It is essential that there should be a finite verb in the preceding sentences, without which there would not be two distinct sentences.

अतिकस्लतः तपः परासिनिमसप्तःगमदेवतः
सत्सांगिनिता च वीरभसोत्तरालस्य मां कर्ष्टः।
वैदेहीपिरार्ध्य एष च मुहुण्ठत्विधममातीत्यन्
आनन्दी हरीविन्दनेंदुसिनिरनिन्ध्यो िमुनपायन्तः।

५२ || K.P.Ch.IV

quoted from महावीरचरित-भवयुति II-16, गो.का.प्र., P-95

भावस्या शास्त्रिर्दश: सचिष्ठ: शाल्तता तथा अनुवेगहर्ष्यो: भावसंविधः (conjunction of emotion) भावसंविधः

Here we have the ‘conjuncture’ of flurry and joy
Where an impossible relation of things constitutes the similitude, it is illustration

Here the (impossible) statement made leads on to the simile that—"a description of a solar dynasty by my intelligence would be just like the crossing of the ocean by a raft"

(quoted from "Hanumatnataka" XI.2, श्री.का.प., 4.26, गोक्रा.प., P-82, व.सु.आ., 2283; सु.र.भा., 361/49)

रस स्वरूपमाह-वीरस्य (here is the heroic sentiment).

(quoted from बालरामनायण of राजशेखर II-37, P-42, क्रोनिकलीविवादः-कुलिक, 1-66, म.व.वि., P-234, गो.का.प., Pp-202,296)

"201"—Defects occurring in parts of words पदांशांत्वदोषः: अद्र विजेय इति कृत्य प्रत्ययः कालप्रत्ययचार्यवाचकः॥

230—Want of intended connection अपवसत्योगमः इत्यदि भार्यवस्य निदायां ताल्पर्यम, कृतवेदित परशी सा प्रतीतिः। ‘कृतवेदत्’ इति तु पाठे मतयोगो भवति।
Here the word ‘Bhāvanipati’ literally meaning the husband of Bhava’s wife (Bhavani meaning the ‘wife of Bhava’ another name for Śiva) has the repugnant signification that the Goddess had a husband other than Śiva, the God spoken of.

In as much as the fault have lies in the order of the words being reversed, the defect is attributed to the sentence, not to the meaning of the sentence.
The above verse comes under varieties of excellences (गुणाना भेदः):

द्वितीयार्थतःतत्त्वाचकरोपप्रथमार्थ यथा-
मणीरूपचरणपालं गन्धः भूः सदभाः
सिन्धुसिन्धुचन्द्रमूर्तिनीर्घर् भूत: कः 
तत्दिति जनकपुरी लोचनेषुपुरुषः.
पद्धि पद्धिकथयुपितविशिष्ठता शिस्तिता च || २२६ || K.P., Ch-VII

(quoted from वालसामायण of राजसेन भार्य VI.36, गो.का.प्र., P-214)

अन्तर्यंतरीक्षलक्षकम् दोषम् (Isolation, in the second half of a slokas of as expressive word required in the first half)

The construction here is ‘bhuh sadarbhā-’(the ground is covered with shoots) tat (therefore) gamyatāṁ (walk with soft tread etc.), and the term ‘tat’ which is required in the first half of the verse has been placed in the second half, with which it has no syntactical connection.

(quoted from हनुमनस्नाय भाषा VIII, श्री.का.प., 4.89, गो.का.प्र., P-182) अन्तर्यंतरीक्षलक्षकम् (दोषम्) (non-discrimination of the predicate) अविष्कृतः:
प्राप्तन्यनानिरेत्री विषेषायाः यत्र तत्।

The meaning being that 'the greatness had turned out to be false, in as much as I have to make an effort to guard my city'. In this manner there is a logical connection between the assertion of falsity and the subsequent statement, in the other case the two statements stand separately a) 'my heads have false greatness' and b) 'I have to guard the city', and there is no logical connection between the two.
We have an example of 'undesirable second meaning, i.e. where the words have an implication repugnant to the context. Here the sentiment desired to be described is that of disgust, and repugnant to this is the erotic sentiment which is implied by the words used.

(quoted from Śrutkṣems of Kālidāsa XI-20, g.ṛ.ā.p. P-232) अद्य अमतः पराधेम लोष्म् (undesirable second intention) अद प्रकृति रसे विद्वद्ध प्रश्नायस्य व्यज्ञकोयप्रेषः।

The passion of the heroic is suggested here.

(quoted from Gā.-Jī. 1.43, 11.30, bh.स.क.आ., P-341) अत्र ध्वनि (सर्वनामप्रतिद्विवचननाम) (suggestion of the pronouns, substantives and numbers). The passion of the heroic is suggested here.

(quoted from DL of Ānandavardhana II, g.ṛ.ā.p., P-131, DL, II.I, PP.61-62) अत्र गुड़मेवः ध्वनि: (commixture of dubiousness)
life from among any Rāmakathā are utilised by the author because the contexts are popularly known and could be comprehended.

III.1.3 *Sāhityadarpana*

SD quotes Rāmakathā on following context.

चतुर्विंशति प्रासिक हाव्यम् ‘रामदिवंत्रज्ञतयं न रावणार्दत्वं इत्यादि’ S.D.Ch.I-
kārikā-2, P-4 काव्यफलानि रिरुपानि वस्तुतो दानाहामि।

One ought to do as Rāma and the like not as Rāvana and the like”

न्यायार्थ व्ययेचि मे यदायलर्मायसी तामसः
सौयस्वै निहितं रामसकुलं जीत्वहो रावणः।
प्रियतंखर्तं गृहितवता किं कुमम्भकर्मन वा
स्वर्गायतिका विलुप्ति तृषोमूहः: किमेभि पुँजः। || S.D., Ch.I-kārikā-2, p-7

quoted from (हुनभानां) दोषस्वरूपमः अस्य रत्नकस्य विधियासियमो दोषहततवा
काव्यत्बं न स्यात् काव्यस्वरूपतिर्पनाबत्रसरेः सवर्णिः प्रमाणवचननाम दर्शनाहामि तव “तदोऽसै’
इत्याविकायंकारोगतकाव्यस्वरूपस्य प्रकाशितात्तिहिषप्तैर्दर्शनाहः! ||

निग्रहयात्तकान्तितिमायतो वेदुद्वलका चना:
वाताः श्रीकरिण: पशोदसुहदामानदक्षेका: कलमः।
कामं सन्तु दृढः कठोरहर्षो रामोदिष्य सर्व सहे
वैदेही तु कथं भविष्यति हहा हा देवी धीरा भव। || ३१ || S.D., द्वितीय परिच्छेद, p-54

quoted from (हुनभानां) इतरयन्त्रविशिष्टं (लक्षणान्दिनां) निरुपणं वस्तुतो
नैयायिकानामिः दर्शनाहाम्। वधायत्र कार्यसंयो भेदास्त्रत तत्र महाकाव्येवत्तनकाशतयतवा
लक्षणान्दिन्युप्तवदनय त्वार्तवस्तका एव ||

अत्रात्यन्त:खसिष्णुप्ये रामे धर्मिणि लक्ष्ये तत्वेवातिशयः फलम्।
लक्षणामुनिलितवाच्य्यनिरसिस्वरूपमम्
अनुपस्पन्ततमाहः
तथा रामायणदीनां भविता दु:खहेतुता- S.D. तत्तिय परिच्छेदः, kārikā-5, p-83
करमप्रसादु:खहेतुते कहरस्यप्राधानारामायणदु:खहेतुता प्रसति: स्यात् (करणादीनां
Aagarusa in Vālmiki's Rāmāyana 248

quoted from रघुवरसंहिता (रसस्वरूपम्) व्यविचारिणः: (मरणम्)

quoted from “वालरामायणे” रसस्वरूपम् (व्यविचारिणः) (श्रम)

quoted from उत्तरारणामितरत्र

quoted from Uttarārāmacarita

गुणभूतव्यवस्था भेदनिरपेक्षन काव्यभेदी

अन्तः ध्यात्माभिषेकवृद्धियोक्ष्यकाव्यभेद

प्रतीपादन सुप्रतीतमेव
अत्रौत्स्वरायसंदिवसकालमयोऽराजविश्वासतत्वावज्जित:।
रामो पुनिनः निषयम् कानन मगानानामविवाहसुगो- ।
संद्रत्वय भरतेन राजप्रसिद्धिमेतः मात्रा सहेवोन्नीतम्।
तौ सुग्रीवविभीषणमावः नातीप्रपातसनात।
प्रक्षिप्ताः दनकंधाध्रुववम् व्यवस्था: समस्ता ह्विन:।
|| S.D. पं चितन्त, p-281

quoted from विश्वामारायस्य (पूर्ववर्त्तं वसु इतिवृतम्) काव्यस्य दृश्यश्रव्यभेदी- ।

लोकस्वर्गः भएवो सुचिर स्थितित ।
रामेण लोकपरिवारभावायुलन ।
निवासिताः जन्मदायिः गर्भपुत्री ।
सीताः वनस्य परिक्रियाः लक्षमणोऽधमः।
|| S.D. पं चितन्त, p-286

quoted from कुन्दमालायमुः प्रस्तावना भेदः: प्रयोगान्तिशाय:।

अत्र नृप्ययोगार्ध स्वप्रभादानाभिवृत्ता सुत्रावर्णे।
‘सीताः वनस्य परिक्रियाः लक्षमणोऽधमः’ इति।
सीतास्वरूपः: प्रेमसंज्ञा निषाण्वः स्वप्रयोगमन्तिशायान एव।
प्रयोगः: प्रयोजितः।

स हत्वा वापिस वीरस्तन्ते सिद्धिर्योऽविकल्पः।
धातोः: स्थान इवादेः सुंदरस्य संयोजित्यवद् ।।
‘स वः: शशिकलामौलिस्तालमायोप कल्यात्तामः।
‘तामिन्दुसुपदसुकोऽहदि चित्तायामः।’ || S.D. साम्प चितन्त, p-393

quoted from (विश्वनास्य) दौष्ट स्वरूपः वालये दुःश्रव्यादिनां कीर्तनम्।

‘कपोले जानक्या: करिकलवदत्त्वुद्विसुविषि।
समसत्त्वकोरोगास्मागुलकं वक्तव्यमलम्।
मुः: पश्यव्यवहर्जरोंवस्त्रावलतकतः
जदातुग्रामिः: इर्दवित्त खुर्णं परिवृङ्कः।’ || S.D. साम्प: पर्चित्त, p-446

(quoted from जयदेवस्य प्रसादाधवः) (दोषवस्तर) विक्रुद्धः। समावेशाय: सिद्धान्ताय:।
राजवायस्यालाभन्मिमित्त वायुमुद्यन सः।।
अभिकृष्ठः महत्त्वते कृष्णमेततिस्त्रिनोऽधि:। || S.D. द्वाम: पर्चित्त, p-524

"quoted from रघुवंशः" (अलंकार) स्पदभेदाक्षरामम्।
The 

The 

SD utilises slokas from Rāmakatha/Rā. in the context of rasa, kavyafalāni, doṣ, laksanaḥ, sāṃskāraḥ, vṛttiṇāḥ, and alaṅkāra. The Rāma’s life from among any Rāmakathā are utilised by the author because the contexts are popularly known and could be comprehended.

III.1.4 Theory of rasa applied to the Rā.

The Rā. is truely a kāvya in its main purpose, its form and contents. It abounds in elaborate description and flight of fancy.

39. बालकाण्ड 2-15 is the famous verse मा निवाद…. मोहितम् 2-18 is शोकारङ्गतः भवतु नायिका; 40-41 शामिलितस्त्रूपिनिः पाठि गौति महारिणा। दौकुर्याभारणादुःशः शोकः स्लोकस्त्रूपिनिः। Thus the बालकाण्ड states the origin of the classical Sanskrit sloka and also contains the germs of the rasa theory. The सुम्बुशा (०४-०३) (स्लोकस्त्रूपिनितः शोकः) echoes the words of the बालकाण्ड and so does भाष्यालोकः 1.5, p.31, ‘काव्यस्त्रूपिनिः स एकारङ्गम् च वायुम्: पुषु। प्राचीनत्वतियात्रात्रेकोऽस्मिन्: शोकः स्लोकस्त्रूपिनिः।’ (P-32) quoted the verse ‘मा निवाद……’; For example, the highly poetical description of the sea (समन्तिर्गते कृपान्त्वतान्तियात्रेकोऽस्मिन्) in the बालकाण्ड (4-115), the imaginative description of the sky in सुम्बुशा (५७-१-४) and the elaborate स्पृहा in अपेक्षाकाण्ड (६९-२८), may be referred to in this connection. The दशरथ (१.६८) advises the authors of dramas to draw upon the समाययन and the तृस्तत्व for their plots.
May be applied the theory of *rasa* to the *ādikāvya* viz., *Rā*. It is narrated in the B.K that the sage Vālmīki saw a hunter killing one out of a pair of amours *krauṇca* birds. The parting of the loving pair by violent means, the fall and death of the female bird are the *vibhāvas* of *karunarasa* and the lamentation and piercing cry of anguish uttered by the surviving male partner are the *anubhāvas* of *karuna* these powerful of moved the dormant mood of sympathy and pathos in Vālmīki’s heart, for a moment it beat in union with the sorrow of the bird (तममिथाव) and there was on overflow of that powerful feeling in the form of the measured verse ‘मा जिततां त्वममः: शापवी: समा:’. It should not be thought that the sage was plunged into *shōk* in the popular sense. The word शोक in *सुकुंश*–*XIV. 70 and DL quoted above earlier is used in the dramatic sense (viz. as the *sthāyibhāva*).

40. The words of the “DL. काव्यम स एवार्थः सार्वभ: संरूपततङ्गशीविनोखरतावृक्षन्तजितः शोकः एव सकृतमण्या परीमा:” (p. 32) and of the लोपन कोऽइःनियोगेष्वत् वाक्यरीवीर्यानन्तराणारतिः (स.817) create a serious difficulty. All editions of the *सूर्यभेद* make the hunter kill the male bird and it is the female that laments. The DL And लोपन had, it is clear, a reading before them which made the female die by the arrow. Not only so, the काव्यभा of *राज़ेश्वर* (P-7) reads निनाहनिन्ततङ्गशीविने खुशुवुगः करणोदयाः गिरा क्रांत्यन्तराणारतिः and supports the above interpretation of the DL given by me (P.V.Kane in his H.S.P). The late M.M.Prof. Kuppuswami in his उपस्थोदन on कौण्डी explains, ‘निन्तत: सहवशीविनकारः क्रोधः:’ But this is not satisfactory. The word in DL is संरूपततं and not निन्ततः besides the लोपन has “सहवशीननान्” supposing that निन्ततिः is the correct reading, we expect शहवश: विरह कान्त निन्ता क्रोध: as he must have been कार्तभ: before he was shot when the male gave out a cry in the pangs of death. Why should the क्रोध male be विरहकारात after being निन्ता? Further, the verse is indicative of राम’s life. When शीत was carried away by राम, she was as if dead to him and it is राम that laments (as भवमुलिः says अपि राम रणिति about राम’s condition). So क्रोध: corresponds with शीतपराप्य and क्रोधक्रांत्य with राम’s lamentations. And the काव्यभा is quite clear. Recently Prof. G.H.Bhatta (in J.O.I.Baroda, Vol.-IX Part 2, PP.148-151) contributes a paper on; this episode and prefers to read निनाहनिन्ततङ्गशीविनोखरतावृक्षन्तजितः in DL. And explains the composition in a peculiar way viz. निनाहनिन्ततङ्गशीविनोखरतावृक्षन्तजितः निन्ततात: कार्त: स चार्थी क्रोधक्रांत्य: क्रांत्यन्तराणारतिः. This is a strange way of dissolving the compound. This interpretation gives a topsy-turvy order. The क्रोध: must have been first कार्त: and then killed and so we except सहवशीविनकारलिखित Ed. Prof. Bhatta connects the *आक्रान्त* with the *रामकी*. The straightforward and usual construction would be to connect *आक्रान्त* with *क्रोध* that immediately proceeds. The reference he makes to proceeding verses does not impress me. When once the theory was espoused that it was the male that was killed, then suitable verses could have been easily interpolated.
The sage was not occupied with his own sorrow felt for the poor bride, but with the whole objective episode that stirred his heart and that led to the outburst (viz. मा निषाद प्र.). The situation as idealized by the sage’s vision due to his sensitive nature and imagination gave rise to the poetic outburst, when the poet is completely full of the \textit{alukika} experience of an emotional idealized situation, then poetry gushes out from him, as the \textit{Locana} P-32 puts it (सावत्त्वूणौ न चैतन तात्वात्त्वविविध). Not every reader of a poem can appreciate or experience the emotional appeal of that poem. The reader must possess sufficient mental equipment and visualize in his own mind the situation as expressed by the poet. AG. quoted from Bhatatata from the \textit{Locana} at P-220 above (नामक करे: श्रेष्ठ: समानोत्तमवर्तित). The poet cannot communicate to every reader the emotional situation depicted in the \textit{sahādaya} an emotional state similar to what he depicts in the poem. There must be a close correspondence between the poet’s imposes conveyed by his choice of words and possible impulses in the reader.

\textbf{III.2.0} \textit{Aṅgirasa} and \textit{aṅgarasa} in \textit{Rā}.

\textbf{III.2.1} The selection of the \textit{aṅgirasa} and \textit{aṅgarasa} in \textit{kāvya} literature

\textit{Rā}. is the river of \textit{rasa}. The \textit{rasas} like \textit{śṛṅgāra}, \textit{vīra} and \textit{karuṇa} etc. are portrayed present in a masterly way. \textit{Adikāvi} exhibits his skill in depicting all the \textit{rasas}. Among all the \textit{rasas}, which is to be termed as principal sentiment is a matter of discussion. It is because “though there is a convention that more than one sentiment should find a place in entire works of literature, one of them alone should be made principal by the poet who aims at greatness in his work”.

\begin{verse}
प्रसिद्धेऽविष्णुप्रमाणान्त नानात्मविनिवर्तने ।
एको रसोद्भवकर्तव्यस्तोष्यमुन्यक्षर्मिच्छला ॥४१
\end{verse}
Though in fact the convention is that, in epics etc. as well as in dramas etc., several sentiments should be delineated with either equal importance to each or differing importance the better procedure is that a poet who is intent upon adoring his work with abundant beauty should make it a rule to attach principal importance to only one intended sentiment amongst them.

When several rasas are delineated in a work the rasa which happens to be intended as primary is called स्थायीर्ण and other passing sentiments are called स्वार्थिनी

बहुतं सम्बन्धतानां रूपं वस्त्र भवेद्व बहुः।
स मनन्नो रसः स्थायी शेरण्य संचारिणो मताः।

The question of main (अधि) and subordinate (अन्त) sentiments has been most beautifully discussed in the DL from verse 17 to verse 31 of 101 ुद्योग. It has been pointed out by K.K.Raju in his paper "Ānandavardhana and Aesthetics" that Ānandavardhana was the first to legislate on this question of the unity of sentiment. K.Krishnamurty appears to agree with Raju’s conclusion. Unfortunately this part of this unique and original work has not received the attention of thoughtful writers on poetics leading them on to expand the ideas first promulgated by Ānandavardhana. Probably this was because he mentions them in a manner suggesting that all this is incidental to the study of dhvani: On dhvani several writers have published papers, tracts and books but very little work seems to have been done on this aspect of the unity of sentiments and the āṅga-āṅgībhāva, the question of ancillary sentiments and their relation to the main. This presumptuous attempt is to fill the gap left by the great masters in the field of poetics.

There are two aspects here relating to the āṅga-āṅgībhāva which require a more detailed consideration. One is that the rule

42. DL- p. 397
provides for other sentiments being dealt with in subordination to the main one the question is will that not too cause this undesirable eddying? The truth is that once the main sthāyibhāva is roused and activated by the proper atmosphere and gestures included in the list of agencies vibhāvas, anubhāvas, and vyabhicārībhāvas, the poet bringing up other sentiments in an ancillary manner will not affect the sthāyibhāva now in an activated and dominating stage. In fact good playwrights can actually make the lesser sentiments subserve the reinforce the main sentiment. They do this of course primarily by permitting only cognate rāsas to enter the play and by sketching them slightly; they do not develop them to their full range with admirable artistic they make them just subserve their needs, no more.

The second aspect involves the concept of opposed sentiments. The sanskrit dramaturgist recognises four pairs of mutually opposed sentiments as given in this verse.

श्रुत्वा वीभतससि तथा वीरभयानको ।
राष्राषुती तथा हास्यकरुणी चैरिणी मिथ: ॥ śṛṅgāratilaka, III, 35

Love is naturally opposed to disgust, heroism to fear, and humour to pathos: perhaps not so natural is the pair of opposites, anger, and wonder. Tranquility quite naturally does not figure in this. Now if a play write develops to a roughly equal degree both the opposites in any of these warring pairs, he is sure to churn up opposing sthāvis in the spectators with quite inartistic results. Hence a good play wright will take up for slight delineation only those ancillary rāsas which do not work against the main sentiment. And where he finds it necessary to deal with an opposed sentiment, he is restrained by a maxim not to over develop it.

अविशेषी विशेषी वा स्मोरििनि स्फानते ।
परितोष न नेतव्य: तथा स्वादवियोधिता ॥ DL, III, 24
By observing artistic restraint good play writers can, where the need arises, take up one or more of the other sentiments and sketch them slightly, just enough to serve their purpose but not to that degree where it will work against the ruling sentiment and submerge it. It is relevant here to discuss the different view points of different ācāryas for determining the main sentiment.

III.2.2 Determination of aṅgāraṇa in the kāvyā literature

Ācāryas are differed from each other regarding the number of rasas. It is considered from 8 to 11. To consider śanta, vātsalya and bhakti under rasa category is still in controversy.

Although each rasa is आर्तकार्य the importance of every rasa should be considered equally. Several ācāryas attach more importance to one rasa in comparison to the other. Among them some accepted śṛṅgāra as the main sentiment. Some consider vīra, karaṇa or śanta as the main sentiment. In the verse DR , it has been laid down that only one sentiment should rule over a play, that should either be love or the heroic.

एको संस्त्रीकर्तव्यः: वीरः: ब्रह्मारि एव वा।
अष्टमन्ये रसः: सर्वेच बल्लतिविवहणेणुपतः। DR, III, 33

In straggling loosely constructed plays fashioned more on the kāvyā pattern like Murāri’s Anargharāghava and Rajaśekhara’s Bālarāmāyaṇa there are several sentiments developed with result that they can scarcely be classed among plays and we shall therefore leave them out of count in this consideration. In most of the plays that have survived the flood of time, we find the sentiment of love, usually, love-in-separation, adopted as the ruling sentiment, this is the case in all the three plays of Kālidāsa and in the Mūlatimūḍhava of Bhavabhūti. The heroic sentiment dominates Bhavabhūti. The heroic sentiment dominates Bhavabhūti’s Mahāvīrācarita and Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa’s Venīśamhāra. Bhavabhūti’s claim that he regards pathos as the only sentiment of which the other are mere variants
and that pathos is the dominant rasa of his Uttararāmacarita. Generally the epics attach importance on those rasas which are supported the different eminent ācāryas. Śrīkāra श्रीकार वीर शान्तानामेकोेंजीस इत्यते अग्राणि सवेदिनि रसादुः

According to Ānandavardhana the aṅgirasa is while considering the main and subordinate sentiments it is important to study whether it is original and any other rasa is originated from it. The original rasa is called main sentiment and the originated rasa is called subsidiary rasa. Ācārya Bharata gives his opinion regarding the above matter. According to him śṛṅgāra, raudra, vīra and bibhatsa are the creators of hāsya, kruṇa, adbhuta and bhayānaka respectively.

It is evident that the rasas like śṛṅgāra, raudra, vīra and bibhatsa are primary rasas and hāsya, kruṇa, adbhuta and bhayānaka are subsidiary. The corner stone of the analysis is चित्तृति. At the time of relish of rasa according to the situation of चित्तृति the main and subordinate rasas are determined. Four stages of चित्तृति are accepted (1) विकास (2) विस्तार (3) क्षेप (4) विक्षेप. At the realisation of rasa like श्रीकार, वीर, वीभत्स, रौद्र, the experience of विकास, विस्तार, क्षेप and विक्षेप come respectively. Hence the above four rasas should be considered as primary sentiments. According to Dhananājaya rest of the four rasas are originated from the above rasas.
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Amongst all the rasas Śr.R occupies a significant position. Some poets here accepted śṛṅgāra and vīra as the main sentiment in most of the mahākāvya and nāṭaka’s but for the most part raudra and bibhatsa do not constitute the main sentiment. Karuṇarasa occupies as primary sentiment in most of the kāvya. Scholars are of opinion that Mbh. the great epic is based on ŚR:

Ānandavardhan points out that the rasa of the great epic Mbh. is śānta. Ācārya as mentioned below have considered main sentiment as one and have established that other sentiments are created within the main sentiment. On the above context it is noteworthy to go through the opinions of four ācāryas.

According to ācārya Bhoja śṛṅgāra has occupied primary position among all the rasas. It is considered as the creator of all other rasas. Poetry becomes colourful because of śṛṅgāra, The form of śṛṅgāra is like अभिमान and अह्वार.

रसोदभिमानोध्वारः शृङ्गार इति गीयते ।
योद्धर्षस्तम्यान्त् काव्यं क्रमीयत्वमस्तुते ॥ ॥

Bharata the 1st pioneer of rasasiddhānta has highlighted the importance of Śr.R. According to him.

यत् किविज्ञाते शुचि मेघं दर्सनीयं वा तच्छल्लारर्थप्रभावते ॥

Śṛṅgāra symbolises anything that is beautiful, pious, best and bright in nature. The sthāyibhāva of śṛṅgāra is रति. Not only in man but also in beast the sentiment of love is present. It is also recognised as rasarāja due to its broadness. The importance of
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śṛṅgāra lies in the fact that ācārya have discussed at greater length the concept of Śr. in comparison to other rāsas.

विश्वनाथः:

Viśvanātha in his SD. has mentioned the name of his forefather Nārāyaṇa and there by established the importance of adbhutarasa. Establishing the primacy of adbhutarasa Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍit said “सर्वत्राभ्यं सलो” i.e. adbhuta is primary and the only rasa. Viśvanātha, following the line of thinking of his predecessor Dharmadatta, said that:

रसे मारतमत्तकः सर्वत्राभ्यं भूपते,
तत्रतत्त्वं मारते सर्वत्राभ्यं भूपते रसः।
तस्मादभूतमेवै कृती नारायणो रसः।५१

Although ācārya Viśvanāth has mentioned about the importance of adbhutarasa he has not accepted it as primary sentiment. While Darpanakāra gives the definition of mahākāvya he accepted śṛṅgāra or vīra as primary sentiment.

एक एवं भवेदसी श्रुतार वीर एवं वा।५२

No kāvya has been written considering adbhutarasa as अजीरस.

अभिनवगुप्त

AG has accepted ŚR as original rasa and determined its importance. He opines thus:

स्वं स्वं निमित्तमात्राद शान्ताद भावः प्रवृत्ते।
पुनिनिमित्तपथे च शान्त एवोपलीपते॥५३

AG’s finding is that the relation of ŚR lies with mokṣa,
the ultimate aim of human life, because every kavya is considered as अलैकिक and ब्रह्मावाद and श्र प्रेक्षा depicts it. So श्र should be considered as the primary rasa.

पहाकवि भवभूति

According to Bhavabhūti karuna is the only rasa and depending upon it different rasas are depicted.

एको रस: करूण एव निमित्त भेदाद्
भिन्न: पृथक। पृथ्विवाश्रयं विवर्त्तन्।
आवर्तबुद्धुदत्तमभ्रष्टन विबाहान्।
आभो यथा सतिरतिमेव ही तत्तमस्तम्।।54

Pathos is described as the quality of power in literature, music, speech and other expressive forms of evoking of pity or compassion.55 Bhavabhūti was so much fascinated by pathos that he went to the extent of declaring pathos or karunarasa as the only rasa, other rasas being its distortions.

III.2.3 Aṅgīrasa of the Rā.

Vālmiki has beautifully depicted almost as the rasas in different contexts of the Rā. But regarding the अंगीरस it is a controversial point. Ancient śāryas and great poets like Kālidāsa, Bhababhūti have highlighted the importance of karunarasa either directly or indirectly. Scholars of Rāmaliterature have accepted the Rā. as a heroic mahākāvyā. They have advanced the following reasons for the same.

1. U.K is an interpolation (प्रक्षेत्र). Hence basing upon U.K the primafacie of karunarasa can not be accepted.

2. The context of krauñchvadha is doubtful and depending upon the above incident the karunarasa cannot be accepted

54. Uttararāmacarita- 3/47
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as the main rasa.

3. The heroic characters of Rāma and others and the incidents like Rāvaṇavadha point to the heroic rasa as the main sentiment.

4. It is mentioned in B.K that at the beginning this mahākāvya is named as “पौलस्यवध” So the main rasa of Rā. should be heroic.

5. Scholars of Indian mahākāvya’s are of the opinion that basing upon yuga and environment, Rā. and Mbh. represent vīrayuga.

6. A Historical facts for the most part demonstrate the fact that the primary rasa of Rā. is heroic.

Rabindranāth Tāgore has accepted ŚR as the aṅgīrasa of Rā. ‘समायण में बाहुवल को नहीं, जिगीष्ठा को नहीं, रात्रिगृह को नहीं, केवल शान्त (रसास्पद) गृहस्थ धर्म को ही, कर्म के अनुसार से अभिव्यक्त कर महान शैव वीर के ऊपर प्रतिष्ठित किया है’56 Here Tāgore has not determined ŚR as the main sentiment according to śāstra, but he was laid stress on the moral peace after reading the entire mahākāvya. Scholars are of the opinion that bhaktirasa also constitutes main sentiment of Rā. In this context K.R.Śāstri’s opinion deserves mention “We are in the Rā. in a region where the karuṇarasa reigns supreme and is finally transcended and etheralised into ŚR and bhaktirasa”.57

In this way ‘καρυγνα vīr, sānta or bhakti comes within purview of aṅgīrasa of Rā. Now it is important to justify the real primary sentiment of Rā. among all the above four sentiments. Sānta or bhaktirasa cannot be accepted as the aṅgīrasa of Rā. There is no sufficient ground in favour of ŚR or bhaktirasa. Vālmiki himself also has not identified it. Secondly, till the age of Rā. the ŚR or
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bhaktirasa has not recognised. Under these circumstances these rasas cannot be called as anigirasa. Yet Vālmiki has successfully depicted the atmosphere of ŚR along with the concept of bhaktirasa hither and thither in the Rā. Śr. R cannot be taken as anigirasa of Rā because it is not a creation of a luxurious poet, rather it is a description of the pious character of Rāma by tranquil natured’ see Vālmiki’. The arguments given in the favour of vīrarasa can not be accepted because of the following reasons.

1. It is a controversial fact that the U.K of the Rā. is an interpolation (प्रत्यय). All scholars are not prepared to accept it as interpolation. So basing on the above point it cannot be said that karuna rasas is not the primary sentiment of the Rā.

2. The context of kraunca vadha cannot be said as doubtful because there is no sufficient ground for it. Ācāryas like Ānandavardhana have considered the context of kraunca vadha as authentic.

3. Basing upon the heroic deeds of Rāma and other characters, vīrarasa cannot be said as heroic because their heroic deeds have been intermingled with karuṇa.

4. Historical facts are not adequate and sufficient to prove vīrarasa as the main sentiment.

5. It is true that at times Rāma in of pangs of separation was provoked for a war but the root of this utsūha was karuṇa.

The real aim of Rāma was to set free Sītā from Rāvaṇa and to rescue the earth from the torture of demons. At the time of determination of primary rasa it is also important to see the opinion of poet as inner-evidence. (अन्तःसाध्य)

Vālmiki accepted karuṇa as his stream of inspiration. The
incident which moved Vālmīki and led to the first utterance of rhethiric poetry, outside the Veda, was a parable of the creative process. When he went into the forest to gather material for his sacrificial purpose and for a refreshing bath in the Tamasā river, he noticed a pair of krauṇīcha birds disporting themselves on the branch of la tree. Suddenly the male bird was brought down by a hunter’s arrow fell to the ground dead, weltering in its own blood and the female bird uttered a cry of anguish. A spontaneous utterance wells up from the poet’s heart, condemning the crime and cursing the hunter.

Maharṣi himself told to his disciples

And the heartfelt ṣoka of maharṣi turned into śloka.

This is also the opinion of other ācāryas and learned critics. Ānandavardhana has accepted karunārasa as aṅgīrasa of the Rā. Analysing the theory of ‘dhvani' he said-

Explaining the above verse he writes "तथा चादिकवे वाल्मीकिनिःिःहचतचाविरकवातक्रोऽयद् ज्ञातैः शोकं एवं श्लोकोलम् परिणतः." In DR Dhanika
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in his footnote establishing the सुखात्मकता of karuṇarasa accepted that the Rā. is based on karuṇarasa. 

Viśvanāth establishing karuṇarasa as pleasurable has accepting it as the principal rasa of Rā. According to him if pathetic will be considered as painful then such composition as the Rā. would be causes of pain instead of giving delight to every man of taste.

کارुणावापि से जायें यस्मेव सुखम्,
समेतसामेतुभवः प्रमाणं तत्र केवलम्।
किंतु तेषु यदा दुःखं न कोष्ठपि स्वातमसुखः
तथा रामायादीनां भविता दुःखेतुला।

Great poet Kālidāsa has also accepted śoka as the source of encouragement. He has acknowledged karuṇarasa as the principal rasa of Rā.

निषद विद्यापिन्न दर्शनस्यः स्तोकलमापन्ति यस्य शोकः।

Dramatist Bhababhūti considers treatment of pathos as a central concern of the Vālmikī and the concept of karuṇa has inspired and stimulated him to write the great drama “Uttararāmacaritam”. K.R.Śāstri accepts that Rā. is based on karuṇarasa. “The other rasas are found in the poem, yet its dominant rasa is karuṇarasa.” The rasa which starts from the beginning extended upto the end and all other rasas support it, can be depicted as primary sentiment. Karuṇarasa fulfills all the requirements of the above fact and can be said as the principal sentiment of the Rā. Here the other rasas like vīra, śṛṅgāra etc. are intermingled with karuṇa. On the one hand the characters of Rā.
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are the embodiment of heroism and on the other hand there are intermingled with karuṇa. Scholars of Ra. always visualise the empire of karuṇa. Karuṇa is the original thought of the poet.

At the time of Ra. there was no particular theory according to śāstra for determination of principal rasa. Afterwards at the time of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti the principal rasa like śṛṅgāra, karuṇa etc. gradually came into lime light. Another reason for this is that Vālmīki did not want to bind himself by any rules rather he wanted to mention rasa and alamkāra etc. according to context in a free hand style. When the question arises as to what is the principal sentiment of Ra., it appears that the poet has not made any specific difference between karuṇa and other viñarasas etc. by which one can say confidently that karuṇa is the main sentiment of the Ra. However, judged from both inner and outer evidence we can say that karuṇarasa is the principal rasa of this mahākavya.

III.2.4 Enumeration of karuṇarasa in different kāṇḍas of Ra.

Rasa and literature are inextricably intertwined. “Rasasiddhanta” is considered as the corner stone of Indian literature. Bharata, the founder of NS is considered as the pioneer of “Rasasiddhanta”. Prior to it Rajaśekhara has mentioned the name of Nandikeśvara in connection with the “Rasasiddhanta”. But literature on this count is not available. According to Bharata, rasa is the quintessence of poetry. In fact there is no element in drama, which is not related in one way or the other following Bharata’s concept. Except Bharata other eminent śāstraśāstrīs have also acknowledged the importance of rasa. According to Viśvanātha poetry is vākṣyam rśatvamkāavya, DL. says that rasa is the very life of

---
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literature and rasa is the soul of poetry. For Kuntaka, kavya is

It would be quite natural that the primary element of kavyas i.e. rasa is ever present in the Rā. Rāmāyaṇa itself bears ample testimony to its presence. Scholars are of the opinion that the Rā. is the epic of rasa. Basing upon different contexts of V.R various dramas and kavyas are composed attaching supreme importance to rasa.

अत्तीरस of V.R

Most of the Indian scholars and foreign critics have accepted karunarasa as the atīraṇa of VR and other rasas are its antarāṇa. The above statement is also endorsed by Ānandavardhana. “समाएणि हि कल्पणा: स्वयमातिकविना सुत्रितः” In the Rā. it is said that it originated from when the merciful sage Vālmiki witnessed the innocent male bird, that was killed, weltering on the ground in his own blood, and the helpless female, bereaved of her loving mate, and being vaguely conscious of the untold sufferings that she would have to undergo without him, his heart was touched with a deep feeling of pity for her grief. The intense pathos of the situation that filled his heart flowed out to find expression in the shape of that exquisite and melodious sloka

“मा निषाद प्रतिष्ठां ल्यमाम: शाश्वती: समा:।
यत्रौषधिमुद्वन्दनेवक्ष्यादधि: काममोहितम्॥”
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The above verse is considered as the स्वाभाविक of karunārasa. Hence, there is no gainsaying the fact that the beginning of Rā. is based, for the more part, upon karunārasa. The conclusion of Rā. as drawn by Vālmīki is also based upon separation, and there is no chance for reunion. Hence it can be said the end of Rā. is also based upon karunārasa. Excluding above all facts the entire Rā. is overshadowed by karunārasa. The other rasas like वीर, श्रुतार etc. which figure in the middle have enhanced the karunārasa and seen as अन्तरस.  

Karunārasa occupies a vital place in most of the contexts of Rā. especially in Ay.K. and U.K. Here karunārasa has reached its zenith. Besides this the context of karunārasa has also occurred on different kāṇḍas, like Ar.K., Kiś.K., Yu.K., S.K. etc. The specialty of Vālmīki is that he has also successfully described the शोक of the other प्रतिनिधिक. All the above context come within the purview of karunārasa because of the intensity of शोक.  

Mentioned below are some of the verses of Rā. exhibiting karunārasa.

**Karunārasa as depicted in Ay.K.**

The whole of Ay.K. is permeated with karunārasa. In this kāṇḍa the unexpected exile of Rāma is the most pathetic incident, which begins with the boons asked by Kaikeyi. On hearing the cruel request of Kaikeyī Daśaratha overwhelmed with grief, falls on the ground, unconscious. Then regaining consciousness, he felt tormented (once more) by (the memory of) Kaikeyī’s words. “Distressed and uneasy as a deer at the sight of a lioness and seated on the bare floor he began to sign like a highly venomous serpent fixed to a charmed spot through magic spells. Uttering the remark “Oh, what a pity!” the indignant king fell into a swoon one more,

---

78. मित्र, नेषनाल-साल्मीकिं और कालिदास की काव्यकला, पृथ्वी-२३२
79. Ibid, p-233
80. V.R.-2.11.26-27

नव पद च व्यथिष्ठ दण्डकालाध्ययनस्यतः: ॥

सिद्धान्तस्य धर्मश्री रामी भवेतु तस्मादः: ।

भरतो भास्तास्य वीरान्यावप्यर्थक्ष|

---
his mind infatuated with grief.81

Here the grief, anxiety and enrage of Daśaratha have been vividly depicted and the above things are enhanced through the unjustified and unrighteousness boons of Kaikeyī. The stream of śoka has been flowing onwards, when Rāma appeared, king Daśaratha was seated on a sofa with Kaikeyī. He looked quite miserable and sad Rāma was greatly alarmed at this condition of the king. He thought the piteous condition of Daśaratha due to bodily distemper or mental anguish.82 The lamentation of the ladies of the harem as a result of the frustration of Rāma’s coronation is a vivid description of karuṇārasa. The love and affection of Rāma towards them entails the uddīpana of the karuṇārasa.83

Vālmīki has also vividly depicted the untold pathetic condition of Kauśalyā. Hearing the unpalatable news Kauśalyā fainted on the ground like a tree fallen by an axe and shone like a goddess fallen form heaven.84 Seeing his mother, who did not deserve suffering, fallen unconscious like a banana tree, Śrī-Rāma for his part lifted her up.85 Kauśalyā who was unable to bear the intense suffering, wailed a lot and said her sacred observances and gifts as well as courses of self discipline are of no use.86 Before retire to the woods in obedience to the command of his father Rāma entered to the consort of the emperor. As the king saw Rama from a distance coming towards him with raised palms, instantly rose from his seat and tried to embrace him, but he fainted on the ground.

81. Ibid, 2.12.4-6.
82. Ibid, 2-18,13
83. Ibid, 2.20.1-6.
84. Ibid, 2.45.1-2
85. Ibid, 2.45
86. Ibid, 2.20.32

शांतिकोश सारस्वत सरस्वती परमार्थ पद्मनाथ के ।
प्रभात महाशाह देवी वाल्मीकि दिवेशभुजा ॥
The separation of Rāma very often pained Daśaratha. Rāma said to his father to take care of his magnanimous mother Kauśalyā. Daśaratha hearing the words of Rāma and seeing his dressed like a hermit lost his senses in sorrow and after some time when he had regarded his power of speech, he began to lament bitterly. Here the *sthañyibhāva śoka* which resides in the heart of Daśaratha in enriched by *sañcāribhāva* through *ślaṇi, niśeṣa, and viśeṣa* etc. The citizens of *Ayodhyā* all loved Rāma dearly, and they did not cease to follow Rāma even when Daśaratha desisted. They ran after his car overwhelming with grief.

In this context the poet depicted sympathy for Rāma’s exile through animal, bird, tree etc. all animals and in-animate things. The nature seems sympathetic for Rāma. The river Tamasā came to view as though retarding the progress of Rāma.

Perhaps Kālidāsa in his *Abhijñānaśākuntalam* depicts *karunarasa* at the time of sending Śakuntalā to her in-laws house. He has been influenced by *VR* to a remarkable extent. After Rāmas banishment, in the context of Daśaratha’s death the poet Vālmiki

---

87. *Ibid*, 2.20.33
89. *V.R.*, 2.34-17
90. *Ibid*, 2.42.4-30
91. *Ibid*, 2.45.32
92. *Abhijñānaśākuntalam*"
vividly depicts karunarasa. After Rāma’s entering into woods, Daśaratha’s narrating the incident of munikumāravadha and the lamentation of his parents to Kausalyā make the pathetic sentiment reaching its zenith. The ascetic couple had cursed the king that he too would meet his death in his agony of separation from his son.93 Saying so, the said emperor spoke weeping again to his wife (Kausalyā) that he could no longer see her with his eyes and his memory too is fading.94 What can be more painful than the fact for Daśaratha was that at the end of his life he could not behold Rāma.

When the emperor did not wake up even though roused by means of panegyrics sung by bards, accompanied by musical instruments played upon for the same purpose, the ladies of the gynoeciums conclude by other means that the king is dead and soon after commences the loud wail of Kausalyā, Sumitrā and other queens.96 The sufferings of Bharata originated from the banishment of Rāma constitute the ālambanavibhāva of soka. In the grief of Bharata the death of his father and separation of mother cause a great loss mixed with भूत्यश्चन्द-चेतना.97 Hence the grief of Bharata has been expressed through लामि. Such grief mixed with लामि of Bharata was expressed highly in front of Kausalyā.98 Because he wanted to eradicate the accusation caused by his

93. V.R.2.64.54
94. Ibid, 2-64.65
95. Ibid-2.64.66-67
96. Ibid-2.65-19-29
97. पारि, जानियते- पारि यथार्थम् रामायण और रामचरितमाला-सीतदर्य विधान का तुलनात्मक अध्ययन, पृष्ठ-२२३
98. V.R. 2.75
mother Kaikeyi.

Such ṣoka of Bharata became enhanced reaching Citrakūṭa. Seeing Rāma, he stumbled down even on an ground, his eyes getting bedimmed with tears at the sight of their ascetic garb. He could not speak further, his throat choked with tears. 99

The ṣoka of Bharata, beggaring description creates sympathy in every sahṛdaya's heart. After Bharata's returning to Ayodhyā the stream of karuṇa appears to be all the more increasing. 100

**Karuṇarasa in U.K.**

In the Rā. karuṇarasa has reached its zenith through the abandonment of Sitā by Rāma. He, because of fear of public opinion had to abandon Sitā, which caused him mental agony after wards. The poet has vividly described the grief of Rāma and has expressed it before his brothers.

वामपूर्णि े नयने दृष्ट्रा रामस्य धीमत: ।
हतरोभ यथा पद्मि मुखं चौद्व च तत्स्य ते ॥ 101

Valmiki depicts the karuṇarasa through the sāttvikabhāvas (eyes full of tears, face like a withered lotus) of Rāma. In this context Rāma himself is the ālambanavibhāva of his ṣoka. When Lakṣmana by the order of Rāma left Sitā in the forest the wailing of Sitā made the environment very pathetic. Sitā hearing the dreadful words of Lakṣmana fell on the ground in utter despondency. She swooned away as if for a moment 102 and then with tears filled in her eyes, spoke to Lakṣmana that God has created her for suffering.

---

99. 2.99.39 वामपूर्णि च नयने दृष्ट्रा रामस्य धीमत: ।
100. V.R.-2.114.2-28
101. Ibid, 7.44.15-16,7.45.3-27
102. Ibid, 7.44.16
The pathetic wailing of Sītā touches the every heart of sahṛdaya. The poet casually described the event of Sītā’s entering into the lap of earth-goddess. The request of Sītā for shelter to mother earth has only glorified the element of chastity in her. Hence the poet has not depicted Sītā as surrounded by grief. But after Sītā’s entering into nether world karuṇarasa has been depicted in a natural way. Rāma becomes enveloped by grief at Sītā’s depature, weeping long and shedding tears in profusion. Such grief of Rāma becomes description. Rāma requested mother earth to return him Sītā. Following separation from Sītā grief stricken Rāma was expressed his anger towards earth. Here the वर्षाब is has been intermingled with karuṇarasa. Thus Ay.K. and U.K. of Rā. maintain the acme of the sentiment of pathos. Besides this karuṇarasa also figures in different kāṇḍas.

**Karuṇarasa in Y.K.**

Rāma laments over the precarious condition of Lakṣmaṇa’s unconsciousness. In this context Rāma’s heart has been filled with sātvikabhāva. He says “my valour is feeling sky as it were, my bow seems to slip from my hand, arrows are dropping down and my vision has been over powered by tears”. Seeing Lakṣmaṇa seriously wounded acute anxiety has been growing within Rāma’s heart. Without Lakṣmaṇa he wishes to die.

अवसीदैतिन गात्राणि स्वप्नादेवे नुमामिव ||

विन्ता मे वर्धते तीन्रा मुमुश्यि च जायते ||

103. Ibid, 7.48.1-2
104. Ibid, 7.48.3
105. वि.ने हैदार - कल्लीकिक कालिदास की कविताकला
106. V.R.-7.98.2-3
107. Ibid, 7.98.6
108. Ibid, 7.98.8-10
Thinking of returning to Ayodhyā without Lakṣmāṇa causes affliction to Rāma and this anxiety gives rise to grief. Rāma fell a prey to extreme madness conducted to his brotherly love by mere utterance of his beloved younger brother Lakṣmāṇa.

Here the sthāyībhava soka resides in the heart of Rāma is enriched through sañcāribhava उम्मद, लानि, etc. Besides, the above facts some contexts come in V.R. where karuṇarasa has not maintained the acme but the sthāyībhava soka has figured a very distinct place. For example in Y.K. seeing the death of Sītā by Meghanāda, created by magic, Rāma becomes unconscious and consequently follows his lamentation. Like wise Rāvana brings before Sītā Rāma’s cutoff head created by magic. Consequent lamentations of Sītā give rise to the sentiment of pathos. But here soka cannot be generalized due to the touch of unnaturally. Hence karuṇarasa has not reached its zenith but sthāyībhava soka is distinctly present. Scholars are of the opinion that karuṇarasa has depicted in the opposite prāttinayakpāk characters of Rā. Tārā vilāpa in the context of Vālīvadha and Mandodarī vilāpa in the context of Rāvaṇavadha are the examples of prāttinayakpāk.

In fine, karuṇarasa in the अंगसरस of V.R. It has permeated.
the entire epic.

**Chart of different occurrence of karuṇarasa**

Mentioned below are some of other episodes pertaining to karuṇarasa.

1. The sufferings and behaviour of Sītā extend over the largest part of the epic and constantly give rise to the sentiment of pathos.

2. शोक: श्लोकमागत : Brahmā, Nārada, and kraunca episode create pathos (B.K. 1.40)

3. The whole of Ay.K. is permeated with the sentiment of pathos as it is full of lamentations of king Daśaratha of Kauśalyā of Sītā of Laksmana of the ladies of the harem, of the citizen of Ayodhyā and of the ladies of Ayodhyā on different occasion as a result of the frustration of Rāma’s coronation.

4. Daśaratha’s narrating the incident of munikumārvadha and the lamentation of his parents to Kauśalyā makes the pathetic sentiment reach its zenith. The subsequent event of the lamentation of Daśaratha, his death, the lamentations of the queens of the harem, of Bharata o his arrival from Rājagrha, the swoon of Bharata and the miseries of Satrughana, Guha and the mothers on that account maintain the acme of the sentiment of pathos.

5. On hearing about the death of his father Daśaratha from the mouth of Bharata, Rāma, Sītā and Laksmana start their wailing and then after libations to Daśaratha after bathing. Again the atmosphere is filled with the sentiment of pathos. On his return to Ayodhyā Bharata finds himself overcome by grief at the bad condition of the city.
Sītā’s lamentations on her abduction by Rāvaṇa rouse the sentiment of pathos that is accelerated by the assassination of Jatāyu by Rāvaṇa (A.K. canto 49 and 51.)

7. The wonderings in the forest again on the part of Rāma and Lakṣmana in search of Sītā and Rāma’s lamentations for loss of Sītā give rise to the sentiment of pathos. The same sentiments intensified by the poet when Rāma and Lakṣmana come to the place where Jatāyu is lying wounded and after telling that it was Rāvaṇa who kidnapped Sītā and inflicted deadly wounds on him died in the lap of Rāma. (A.K. canto 60-68)

8. The lamentations of Tārā and Sugrīva give rise to the sentiment of pathos. (Kiṣ.K. canto 20-21)

9. Sampāti comes to know about the death of Jatāyu from the talk of the vānaras and is drowned in grief which creates the sentiment of pathos. (Kiṣ.K. canto 56)

10. Sītā’s lamentations at the time of rejecting the advice of the demonesses to accept Rāvaṇa as her husband give rise to the sentiment of intense pathos.

11. Rāvaṇa brings before Sītā Rāma’s cut off head created by magic. Consequent lamentations of Sītā give rise to the sentiment of pathos. (Y.K. canto 32)

12. The lamentations of Vibhīṣaṇa, Mandodarī and of other women of Rāvaṇa on his death generate the sentiment of pathos. (Y.K. canto 109, 110, 111)

13. The same sentiment reaches its acme when Rāma raises a doubt about the chastity of Sītā in the presence of all the vānaras as a result she enters into the funeral pyre. (Y.K. canto 115, 116)
14. The lamentations of Sita when she comes to know from Lakṣmana about her abandonment in the forest by Rāma give rise to the sentiment of pathos. (Y.K. canto 48)

15. The bath taking of Sītā entering in nether-world and the abandonment of Lakṣmana arouses the karuṇarasa. (U.K. canto 97 and 106)

III.2.5 Āṅgarasa of the Rā

The primary bhāvas enumerated by Bharata are eight. As they are in the subconscious of the psyche of human being and they are manifested as and when there is occasion for any of them. The bhāvas are known as sthāyibhāvas and amongst them which is predominant is known as āṅgibhāva which is responsible for the manifestation of rasa. In this connection Bharata has given a list of rasas corresponding their sthāyibhāvas. Because it is sthāyibhāva which becomes the rasa in a being becoming relation. Eight primary bhāvas are rati, hāsyā, śoka, krodha, utsāha, bhaya, jugupsā, vismayaḥ and śama.

The major and minor character of rasa are determined as per their pre-dominant position in the description. Even though karuṇa or vipralambha may be the principal sentiment of Rā, other rasas described in this wide canvas are treated as āṅgarasa. The minor sentiments generally are contributory to the relish of major sentiments. So the minor sentiments must be considered in connection with the major sentiments. There is a list given by Bharata and subsequently Viśvanātha. etc. regarding the inter relation of rasas. Some are opposite to some and some are contributory to some. Viśvanātha says in SD chapter II kārikā No.254-258.
Rasa

śṛngāra
bhayāṇaka, karuṇa
karuṇa
raudra

bhayāṇaka, sānta
śṛngāra, vīra, raudra
sānta
śṛngāra

Opposite rasa

karuṇa, bibhatsa, raudra, vīra, hāsya
hāsya, śṛngāra
hāsya, śṛngāra, bhayāṇaka
vīra
hāsya, sānta, bhayāṇaka
vīra, śṛngāra, raudra, hāsya, bhayāṇaka
bibhatsa

All the sentiments explained in Rā. are not supporting the principal sentiment of Rā. But Rā. has a wide scope of story element in which it looses the unity of time, action and place as a result of which in order to corelate the diversified events, different rasas are connected. In this view all other poetic sentiments can be known as aṅgarasa to fill in the gaps and lapses of the epic for which it is found, they have very significant roles in fulfiling the aim of the poet. There are occasions of aṅgarasa which need a thorough analysis to highlight certain important points of the poet. Though aṅgarasa are not supporting the aṅgīrasa yet they are contributory to the kāvyā. [see chapter IV for the detail enumeration of aṅgarasa of VR]