In chapter III of the ND our authors take up some of the topics which are vitally connected with poetry such as Vṛtti, Rasa, Bhāva, and Abhinaya. The chapter commences with the discussion of Vṛtti.

The authors, at the outset, explain the term Vṛtti: as "activity with a view to obtaining a cherished end".¹ Vṛttis are reckoned to be the "Mothers of Drama"². Action is the soul of drama. It is through action that plot develops. In the absence of action the drama would come to a standstill. Thus Vṛttis are rightly called the mothers - the birth-place - of drama. The Vṛttis are not independent but are inter-related and intimately associated with the sentiment (Rasa), Bhāva, and Abhinaya, as action is always in keeping with the sentiment or emotion to be conveyed.

2. Vide ND III, 103.
Activity can theoretically be divided into physical, verbal and mental. But all these three types of activities cannot be separated from one another since they are so much interrelated. Physical activity is inevitably blended with vocal and mental ones. Thinking too is mental speaking, in the sense that though we do not speak loudly, in mind we do utter the words which imply a particular thought. We have to think always when and before we act. Similarly mental and verbal activities are dependent on physical ones. When one speaks, one has to take assistance of the vocal organs of the body, viz., tongue, palate, etc. Mind too can work only when the body in the form of breath, etc., functions properly.

Thus the authors of the ND point out that these activities are inter-related. One of these activities is more prominent and the others are subservient to it. And that is how the division into the four types of Vṛttis takes place, based on the prominence of one over the other. In fact there is only

---

1. Abhi. (III, pp. 20-21) declares that Bhārati indicates verbal activity; Sātvati refers to the mental and Ārbbati to physical one. Whatever is graceful is Kaisikī.

The word Vṛtti is variously explained by different scholars. It can be derived from the root 'vṛt' = to be. Thus Vṛtti means "a state of being". It is also used in the popular language in the sense of mental state or disposition. Cf. SK II, 34.
one Vṛtti comprising of so many activities. So Vṛttis are rightly called "Mothers of Drama". They are equally important even in other forms of literature.

The Vṛttis are divided into four types: Bhāratī, Sātvatī, Kāśikī, and Arabhaṭi. The MD describes the nature of each of these in their order:

(1) BHĀRATĪ

In the Kārika No. 104, the authors of the MD describe the nature of Bhāratī from which the following points may be easily deduced:

(1) It is primarily connected with speech¹.

¹ The word Bhāratī literally means language or speech. The MD does not try to give any further etymology of the word. Clearly enough Bhāratī can be associated with Bharata and will mean "of or belonging to Bharata". It is so called because it is invented by sage Bharata or it is the Vṛtti of the actors (Bharatas). Bharata himself gives this etymology. Vide NS (Km) XX, 25.

Bharata gives another rather strange derivation of Bhāratī from Bhāra. While giving the mythological origin of Vṛttis at the time of a combat between Viṣṇu and the demons, the earth felt the burden (bhāra) and thus Bharatī was created (NS XX, II). Abhinava has rightly remarked that this etymology is based solely on the basis of similarity of sounds. Bharata might have been misled here by Yāṣka, the author of Mīrakta, who allows a word to be derived even on such verbal similarity.
(2) It can be introduced in all types of dramas.

(3) It specially occupies Āmukha and Prarocanā.

(4) Generally speaking it is in Sanskrit and can represent all types of Rasas. Sometimes it can be used in Prakrit.

(5) Other Vṛttis namely Sātvatī, Kaisīkī and Ārabhatī have gesticulation i.e. abhinaya as the most important element while B̄haratī is essentially verbal i.e. related to speech only. Verbal gesticulation will be Sātvatī.

The authors of the ND here rightly criticise Bharata. Bharata's definition (MS XXII, 25) is open to criticism. Bharata divides the eight Rasas among the four Vṛttis and points out that B̄haratī represents Bhībatsa and Karūna sentiments. The authors of the ND differ on this point and they propound that B̄haratī can represent or convey any sentiment. B̄haratī refers to speech and all the dramas and sentiments are primarily concerned with speech. So the restriction which Bharata has imposed upon B̄haratī cannot be literally accepted. The DR seems to have understood this difficulty earlier and hence declares that B̄haratī Vṛtti is present everywhere.

1. Vṛttiḥ sarvatra B̄haratīḥ... DR II, 62.
The ND finds out another contradiction in the NS. The NS restricts Bhārati to Bibhatsa and Karuna only but while discussing its nature Bharata points out that it can be introduced in Vīthi which has all the sentiments in it and Prahasana which is dominated by the sentiment of laughter (Hāsya). It can also come in Bhāna which has love or heroic as the principal sentiment. In fact, Vīthi and Prahasana are considered to be the two of the Angas of Bhārati.

Here the attack is not specified against any special work but it appears to be directed specially against the NS. The ND also disagrees with the NS and points out that Bharati can be introduced in any of the twelve types of drama.

**AMUKHA**

Bhārati is specially found in Amukha and Prarocana.

1. Association of Bhārati with Karuna can easily be understood. Karuna which chiefly consists of lamentations is replete with pathetic utterances and does not approve of much of physical action but it is difficult to understand Bhārati's special association with Bibhatsa. Moreover, other Rasas like Adbhuta, Santa, are also related with speech. Dr. Raghavan has correctly pointed out that Bhārati cannot be limited to prologue or a particular sentiment only. No drama can stand without it (J.O.R.Vol.VI, part IV, Pp.367-68).

2. It is also known as Prastāvana or Stāpana.
Amukha is the introductory dialogue between the Sūtradhāra and his wife Rati or Vidūṣaka or other actors. They introduce the subject matter, the drama and the dramatist to the audience and eulogise them. Here no special sentiment is to be conveyed. The actual drama starts after Amukha is over. Here no special Abhinaya (except Vācika) is essential. It is really the speech that dominates here. Amukha is expected to suggest the relevant matter by simple or striking speeches. The speeches can be rendered striking by introducing any of the thirteen Vīthyāngas.

Sūtradhāra is at times replaced by Sthāpaka.

The definition of Amukha given by the ND seems to echo the NS. The ND brings out the same thing in a compact form. It includes in one verse what Bharata states in two verses. The ND has taken care to see that no point is missed. The ND uses the word 'Māra' instead of 'Pāripārśvika' of Bharata and explains the word in the commentary as Pāripārśvika.

The ND explains the word 'Amukha' in two ways from the point of view of etymology -

(1) The word Āmukha can be split up into two parts A Mukha. A is a prefix in the sense of 'upto' or 'limit'. Āmukha therefore will mean "Upto Mukha". It is so called because it spreads upto the beginning of Mukha Sandhi. Āmukha ends when Mukha commences.

(2) 'A' can also be interpreted as 'slight'. Āmukha is 'slightly Mukha' i.e. it suggests Mukha. Āmukha should suggest the Mukha Sandhi or plot. It gives a background of the story which is very essential to understand and appreciate the story fully. It also introduces to the reader or spectator the nature of Mukha with which the play starts. It is called Prastāvana because it introduces Mukha.

Āmukha starts at the end of Fürvaranga. The authors of the MD point out that in the stage-direction "Nādyante tataḥ pravisati Śūtradhārāḥ", the word Nādi stands for the whole of Fürvaranga.

1. The same explanation is found in Abhi. In a similar language. Vide Abhi. III, p. 95 line 2.
2. Vide Amarakoṣa, p. 272; also compare words like, Ārakta in the sense of 'slightly reddish'.
3. In English this is known as a figure of speech called Metonymy i.e., a part for the whole.
Authors now treat the problem as to how the characters of the drama should enter the stage at the end of Āmakha. The rules of dramaturgy demand that a main character should not enter abruptly without any introduction. So Sūtradhāra or Sthāpaka should directly or indirectly announce the entry of a character. The following are the devices which may be resorted to in order to make the entry of a character natural and dramatic:

(1) The character enters, having caught the words (either a word, a phrase, or a sentence) uttered by the stage-manager or others, as it happens in the RTN where Yaugandharāyaṇa enters having caught the actual words of the stage-manager, viz., "Propitious fate brings at once the desired object even from a different isle...." etc.

(2) The last words of the stage-manager or other actors are heard by the character which enters. The character catches the sense which becomes the cause for his introduction on the stage, e.g., the entry of Bhīma in the Venśī with the words, "Can the sons of Dhrītarāṣṭra remain at peace when I am alive?" by catching the sense of the stage-manager's speech.

(3) By reference to time or season. The character is mentioned in comparison to some season by the stage-director.

The ND (also the DR and the SD) illustrates from the Chaitarāma where the stage-manager, as he describes the autumn season, impliedly herald the entrance of Rāma on the stage. The description of autumn brings in a reference to Rāma who destroys Rāvana as autumn destroys (i.e. supersedes) the rainy season.

(ii) By personal reference to the character. In order to connect drama and its Āmukha, the character is actually mentioned by name by the stage-manager with the words: "Here is Mr. so and so, etc.," The Āmukha of the Sāk. is of this type.

CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS:

Here the ND seems to have improved upon the divisions of Āmukha. To begin with, Bharata divides Āmukha into five types:

1) Udghātysa, ii) Kathodghāta, iii) Pravogatiśaya, iv) Pravṛttakā and v) Avalagita. It can easily be seen here that Udghātysa and Avalagita are in fact two of the Viṣthyaṅgas and it is not clear why they should be taken as the limbs of the Āmukha also. The NS points out in this context that the Viṣthyaṅgas may be used in Āmukha. So it is but natural that Viṣthyaṅgas may be introduced in the prologue so as to render it striking and fascinating. But it is no use considering them as special types.

1. Vide NS (GOS) XX, 33.
2. Vide NS (GOS) XX, 31.
or limbs of prologue. Moreover, it is rather queer as to why only two of the thirteen Vithyanges are selected and reckoned as the types of Āmukha. The DR seems to have thought about this problem and consequently omits these two and gives us only three of the five types of Āmukha given by the NS: Kathodgāta, Praṇyttaka and Prayogātīsaya. The DR however observes that any of the thirteen Vithyanges can occur in Āmukha.

But the ND goes a step further than the DR. Is it necessary to have this type of division of Āmukha or prologue at all? In fact, the types of Āmukha do not reveal the true inherent nature of Āmukha. These types are based merely on the problem as to how the main character may be introduced on the stage for the first time.

Āmukha, in fact, has many more purposes to serve, viz., introduction of the play, its subject matter, name (and brief history, if the author feels like giving) of the playwright, the praise of the learned audience, etc. The introduction of a character forms the end of the Āmukha which should be well connected with the drama proper otherwise Āmukha would appear to be quite out of joint. This is one of the purposes but not the nature of Āmukha.

The ND therefore thinks that this type of classification is of little use, and treats it as the method of introducing the character, which, of course, forms an essential part of
Amukha (Amukhaṅgabhūta).

In the above-mentioned devices for the entry of a character are the first two forms what Bharata calls Kathodghāta, a type of Amukha. The instance cited by the ND to illustrate the entry of the character having caught the sense (Artha) of the words uttered in Amukha is also the same as the one of the DR for Kathodghāta. No. 3 is the same as Pravratakā of the HS and the DR. The illustrations also are common in the ND and the DR. No. 4 is identical with Prayogātiśaya type of the HS and the DR. Both the DR and the ND give the same illustration from the Śāk.

Another reason for the change of the ND may be ascribed to the authors' keenness for simplicity. The authors aim at making the work as simple as possible and think it quite unnecessary to give such divisions and confusing names which at times go to make the simple point more difficult to comprehend. The ND introduces new words only when it is indispensable to do so.

What is more noteworthy here is that the ND does not follow the traditional divisions and sub-divisions. All the Sanskrit dramaturgists have followed Bharata in this case.

1. Bharata's NS (COS Vol. III) XX. 35.
with the exception of the ND which refuses to accept any authority blindly.

PRAROCANA:

Prarocana is defined as a means of attracting the audience by praising the merits (of the poet, the work and the audience).

The Purvaranga consists of preliminaries on the stage before the actual drama begins. This is divided into 19 parts: nine to be performed inside the curtain, the remaining ten to be performed outside the curtain. The performance of these has been ordained by the old preceptors. But the authors of the ND neglect it advancing the following reasons:

1. They are quite self-evident among the masses.
2. The order of their performance is futile.
3. Their purpose viz., gratification of the various gods is merely deceiving the credulous people.

The Prarocana, though a part of Purvaranga, is defined here as it has importance in Nātya.

Now the authors give the reason as to why it is called. Prarocana is so called because it makes the particular subject-matter highly agreeable, by arousing eagerness to see and

1. Prakṛtordhiḥ prakārsena rocyate...anayeti prarocana. ND, p. 155.
hear among the audience by praising the merits of the play. The
authors then illustrate it from the prologues of the Abhina-
varagbha, the RV, the NLV.

The eighteen Angas of Purvaranga are given in the NS.
Prarocana is the last of these 19 Angas. The ND refuses to
accept the remaining ones taking them to be useless and
redundant. It also severely criticizes the whole of Purvaranga
describing it to be meant for deceiving the innocent votaries.
The attitude of the ND appears to be typical of a Jaina. There
is nothing astounding if the heterodox Jainism frowns at this
confounding multiplicity of Hindu gods. This rather hostile
outlook seems to have crept in here (ND, p. 155). Being
Jainas our authors have failed to comprehend the role of
religion in the development of the Sanskrit drama.

Rmacandra and Gunacandra say that Prarocana is a part of
Purvaranga ceremony. But, in fact, the illustration that is
given is from Prastavana or Amukha. Here the authors seem to
confuse the two Prarocanas - one of Purvaranga and the other
of Amukha.

From this it may be inferred that in the times of the ND,
the distinction between Prarocana of Purvaranga and that of Amukha
(i. e. of the poet) was lost and in fact the long procedure of
Purvaranga was being curtailed.
**SATVATI**

Satvati is that Vṛtti which is born in Sattva i.e. Mind. It pertains to the mental activity which should be revealed by mental, verbal and physical gesticulations. Although there are all the three types of gesticulations, mental one alone is principal, other two being subordinate. It must have simplicity, joy, insult or humiliation, forbearance, etc. Its principal sentiment must be Vīra, Raudra, and Śanta. As it constitutes joy it has no Karuṇa. It should have forbearance and so no Autsukya or Arūgāra. It also includes Adbhūta.

The etymological explanation of Satvati is in accordance with the Abhi. Vol. III, p. 96. The explanation of the word Adharsa too is identical with that of the Abhi. III, p. 97.

It is really strange that the ND does not give a single instance of this Vṛtti, especially when it illustrates all the rest. The Abhi illustrates this from the Venṭī.

The ND (and the DR following the NS) divides the Satvati Vṛtti into four sub-divisions: Utthāpaka, Parivartaka, Sallāpaka and Saṅghatya. This division is not so essential and points only to the ancient Hindu mentality which is so fond of giving divisions and sub-divisions. The ND with its peculiar bent for simplicity avoids this without any loss of essential information.

---

But it is difficult to understand as to why only two Rasas—Vira and Adbhuta—should be included in this Vrtti. It may also be suggested that Satva may be taken here to mean 'spirit'. Satvati therefore is to be employed when spirited action has to be represented.

**Kaisiki**:

Etymologically the word means—that which is dominated by—chiefly concerned with—Kaisikes i.e. women, who are naturally possessed of long hair. The chief sentiments are love and humour. On account of the preponderance of these two sentiments the dress should be appropriate to this sentiment and amorous gestures. It must also have dramatic elements such as Dance, Music and Narma (which consists in laughter, refined mocking in order to attract the beloved by speech, refined action or dress).

---

1. This etymology seems to have been suggested by Abhinava who derives it from Kesā, hair which are meant chiefly for decoration. The word is similarly derived by many later scholars. It is possible that Bharata's explanation of Kaisiki being born out of graceful movement of Viṣṇu's hands while trying to tie the dishevelled locks of hair might have suggested the etymology mentioned above. Dr. Raghavan ridicules this etymology and suggests that it should be derived from Krathakaisika or Kaisika, the capital of Vidarbha.

2. Agrāmya īṣṭāvarjanarūpānparihēṣāh narma—DR, p. 57. Narma is a Sandhyānga also.
The HD illustrates each variety, viz., how laughter can be created by speech, garment and action. It gives illustrations to explain each of these three kinds of Narma, viz., by speech, dress and action. But all these illustrations are borrowed from the DR. Over and above these identical illustrations, the definition of Narma as given by the ND is almost the same as that of the DR.

The authors have put into a concise form what the NS describes in so many words. The NS, for instance, says 'Bāhinirṛttagītā', for which the ND puts one word only and that is Nātya and explains the word Nātya in the commentary as Nṛtta, Gīta and Vādītra. Thus the ND in only one line gives all necessary elements of the particular Vṛtti. Bharata's Kārikās are explanatory, hardly concise. The ND tries to make its Kārikās as brief, pointed and perfect as possible.

The NS divides the Kaisikī into four - Narma, Narmasūjiya, Narmasūta and Narmagarbha and devotes two verses on an average to explain each. The DR follows the NS but the ND ignores these divisions.

Here too all the three types of activities are present.

1. Cf. NS XX, 56 to 62.
Srnga which means love, signifies mental activity. Hasya and other forms of Narma suggest vocal activity, and Natya (i.e., dance, music etc.) signifies physical activity.

ARABHATI:

The Abhi. explains this as follows: Where the qualities of Arabhatas, viz., fury, violence, insolence, wildness, etc., dominate, the Vrtti is known as Arabhati. The MD clarifies it still further explaining the word Arabhati: "which abounds in Arabha i.e., arrogant people."

This Vrtti portrays untruth, fraud, magic. There are also battles with missiles, duels, etc.

There are all types of Abhinayas and all types of activities. Abhinava calls it a Kayavrtti probably because it is a Vrtti of force and violence which indicates physical activity.

It is possessed of Diptarasas i.e. Raudra, Bibhasa etc.

It is opposed to Kaisikhi which indicates grace and tenderness.

---

1. Ārṣera pratodekore tulyabhata udbhataḥ puruṣā Arabhaśa te santyaśemiti.... Arabhati. MD, p. 158.
CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS:

The authors of the ND choose their illustration as usual from Abhinava. The illustrations from the Venl and the RBh are mentioned by the Abhi (Vol. III, p. 104 lines 1-2). The illustration from the KTR has also been verbally borrowed from the Abhi, by our authors (Abhi. Vol. III, p. 104 lines 11 to 14).

The authors here ordain Diptarasas i.e., Raudra and Vira especially. Now Vira is the dominant sentiment of Satvati also. This is really confusing. The characteristics are overlapping and so the definitions are defective.

The NS also is not clear about this point. The NS makes the division of sentiments into four groups, each comprising of two Rasas. Thus, Kaisiki has Srngara and Hasya. Satvati has Vira and Adhhuta. Arabhati has Raudra and Bhayanaaka. Bharati has Bibhatsa and Karuna.

But here too there is a good deal of inconsistency. Bharata while discussing Rasas points out that out of the eight sentiments four are principal and other four are derived from these principal four. Accordingly Srngara, Vira, Raudra and Bibhatsa are the principal Rasas out of which are born

1. Cf. NS XX, 73-74.
2. Cf. NS VI, 40.
Hasya, Adbhuta, Karuna and Bhayānaka respectively. So naturally we expect that these subordinate sentiments should be connected with their respective principal ones. This is seen in the first two, viz., Kaśyikī and Sāttvati where Śṛṅgāra and Vīra are associated with Hasya and Adbhuta respectively. But when we come to Ārbhatī it is associated with Raudra and Bhayānaka which is a subordinate Rasa to Bībhatśa according to Bharata, himself. Similarly Bībhatśa and Karuṇa are mixed in Bārati when Karuṇa is connected with Raudra. Though it is true that this division of Bharata regarding Rasas being principal and subordinate is not scientific and universally acceptable, Bharata should have taken note of this point. The DR has correctly borne this point in mind and does not mention the subordinate Rasas at all. It points out that Kaśyikī depicts Śṛṅgāra, Sāttvati depicts Vīra, Ārabhatī denotes Raudra and Bībhatśa while Bārati permeates all Rasas. Here the so called subordinate Rasas are not mentioned at all. Only the principal ones are mentioned, they being the representatives of their subordinate ones.

1. The point has been discussed later in this chapter.
The DR's division seems to be more acceptable as it is more scientific. He has understood the nature of Bharati Vṛtti which literally means 'pertaining to speech' which underlies in fact the whole range of literature.

Bharata restricts it to Bibhatsa and Karuna only, both of which have less of physical activity and more of verbal one. But Bharati is ordained in Prabhasana which has humour as its principal sentiment. The ND therefore seems justified when it levies an attack on the NS pointing to this discrepancy.

But the ND itself is not quite clear in pointing out the distinction between Satvati and Arabhati both of which have Dīpta Rasas.

The DR seems to be quite logical and reasonable when it divides the different Rasas explicitly for the particular Vṛtti.

The concept of Vṛtti seems to have been quite clear even in the times of Bharata. Bharata gives a mythical account of the origin of Vṛttis. Of course, it is not possible to understand the account literally. The whole account makes it clear that Vṛtti is related primarily with activity. The three activities of mind, body and speech are interrelated. Vṛtti is primarily related with physical activity while Riti is related with speech.

---

1. NS (Gos) XX, 1-25.
The high place ascribed to Vṛtti in drama clearly points out that the Indian dramaturgists were not ignorant of the importance of the action in a play. According to the western critics, drama comprises of action and they think that Indian classical writers have not taken any note of this point. They charge Sanskrit dramas for not having speedy action. But here we see that they are mistaken. Indian theorists call action as 'the mother of drama'.

Abhinava explains the four Vṛtis in terms of action (Cestā) or Abhinaya. Thus Bharata refers to Vākcesṭā or Vācikābhīnaya. Sātvati refers to Manācesṭā or Sātvikābhīnaya and the remaining two refer to Kāyacestā or Āṅgikābhīnaya. The Kālīkī suggests graceful action while Ārabhatī implies wild action both being two aspects of Āṅgikābhīnaya.

Prof. Gupta defines it as "the mental disposition of particular personages in particular situations."¹

It should be noted here that Bharata gives four subdivisions (Vṛtyangas) of each of the four Vṛtis. In these divisions he is followed by the later works like the DR, the SD, etc. The ND seems to have purposefully omitted these subdivisions probably because they do not appear to be so scientific.²

¹ The Indian Theatre, p. 16.
² In writing this topic I have made use of Dr. V. Raghavan's article on 'Vṛttis'.

---

The high place ascribed to Vṛtti in drama clearly points out that the Indian dramaturgists were not ignorant of the importance of the action in a play. According to the western critics, drama comprises of action and they think that Indian classical writers have not taken any note of this point. They charge Sanskrit dramas for not having speedy action. But here we see that they are mistaken. Indian theorists call action as 'the mother of drama'.

Abhinava explains the four Vṛtis in terms of action (Cestā) or Abhinaya. Thus Bharata refers to Vākcesṭā or Vācikābhīnaya. Sātvati refers to Manācesṭā or Sātvikābhīnaya and the remaining two refer to Kāyacestā or Āṅgikābhīnaya; the Kālīkī suggests graceful action while Ārabhatī implies wild action both being two aspects of Āṅgikābhīnaya.

Prof. Gupta defines it as "the mental disposition of particular personages in particular situations."¹

It should be noted here that Bharata gives four subdivisions (Vṛtyangas) of each of the four Vṛtis. In these divisions he is followed by the later works like the DR, the SD, etc. The ND seems to have purposefully omitted these subdivisions probably because they do not appear to be so scientific.²

¹ The Indian Theatre, p. 16.
² In writing this topic I have made use of Dr. V. Raghavan's article on 'Vṛttis'.

---
RASA

After the discussion of Vyuttis the ND turns to what is reckoned by Indian rhetoricians as the very essence of poetry, viz., Rasa or Sentiment. Rasa\(^1\) is defined by the ND as "Permanent state brought to a high pitch by means of Vibhāvas and Vyabhicāri-Bhāvas and perceptible through Anubhāvas."

In the commentary the ND explains the terms Bhāva\(^2\) Vibhāva, Anubhāva etc.

---

1. The word Rasa is used in a variety of senses:—

   (1) In Vaiṣeṣika philosophy Rasa means a quality to be cognized by the organ of taste. Rasas are six, e. g., bitter, sour, sweet etc. This is the meaning ascribed to Rasa in common language.

   (2) In Ayurveda it stands for semen or constituent fluid of the body.

   (3) It also stands for so many other things such as water, drink, juice, desire or liking, love, pleasure, essence, mercury, mineral substance etc.

   (4) In Poetics it stands for the sentiment or aesthetic pleasure.

2. The NS explains it thus - (1) Bhāvas are so called because they reveal (Bhāvayanti) the rasas being united with the different types of Abhinaya, NS (KM) VII. p. 104.

   (ii) It is so called as it reveals the internal purport of the poet (NS XXII. 8.)
Sthāyī is that dominant state which remains permanent even when other states incessantly come and depart. It is called Bhāva since it becomes (Bhū to be or to become) Rasa when brought to a high pitch.

Vibhāvas which are the causes of Rasa are of two types—

(1) Ālaṃbāra (ii) Uddīpara.

Vyabhicāris go to nourish the dominant state.

The ND has followed here the celebrated dictum of the NS of Bharata, the oldest exponent of Rasa School, viz.,

"Rasa is produced by the unison of Vibhāvas, Anūbhāvas and Saṅcāri Bhāvas. The relation between sthāyī and Rasa is very clearly brought out. Rasa and sthāyī are not essentially different. Rasa is another name of sthāyī.

The sentiments are nine in number. The NS of Bharata refers to eight only. But later theorists (including Abhinavagupta) include Sānta as the ninth one. The ND also

1. All these have been treated in detail later on.
2. Kaver antargatam bhāvam bhāvayan bhāva ucyate—NS (KM) XXII, 8.
3. NS VI 43 (p. 295) also cf. Abhī. I, p. 273 Sthāyī exalted by Vibhāvas etc. is Rasa. He also quotes the authority of Daudin Cfr. Rati assumes the form of Śṛṅgāra, and Krodha of Raudra (Kāvyādārsa II, 281, 283).
4. Cf. NS (KM) VI, 16.
includes it and takes it as an independent Rasa.

The M divides the sentiments into two -

(i) those that bring joy i.e. pleasant. These are five: Srngāra, Bāsyā, Vīra, Adbhuta, and Śanta.
(ii) those that bring pain i.e. painful. These are four: Karuṇā, Raudra, Bībhatsa and Bhayāraka.

The M here differs from the majority of Indian rhetoricians who hold that Rasa is always pleasant. The joy that the experience of Rasa gives is compared with the joy that arises out of the realization of Brahma. (Brahmānandesahobbāra). Even though the emotions of sorrow, fear, fury etc. as we experience in our ordinary life do not produce joy, the experience of the same in literature goes to produce aesthetic delight. The experiences of life are quite different in that way from those of literature. In life our experiences are associated with the Hānopādānabuddhi i.e. we like to possess the agreeable things and abandon the dis-agreeable ones. This type of tendency of accepting and rejecting the things according as we like or dislike them is totally absent in poetry. In life whenever we see a beautiful thing, say a flower, our first desire is to have it, enjoy it and instantaneously we try to possess it and if we fail in our attempts we are unhappy. Thus the experiences of life are quite different.
The Nātyādṛṣṭaṇī is possibly the earliest to specifically divide the sentiments as pleasant and painful. The ND offers a very systematic series of arguments in support of its theory.

The ND's arguments run as under:

1. The Vibhāvas of the pleasant sentiments are agreeable and pleasant while those of unpleasant ones are unpleasant, e.g., the two types of Vibhāvas-Ālasābana and Uddīpana—of a pleasant sentiment like love will be a king and a princess or some beautiful damsel, a garden, the spring, flowers, fragrant breezes, sweet notes of the cuckoo, lotus-valka, etc., while those of unpleasant like Bībhatsa and Bhayānaka will be demons, ghosts, war, blood-shed, death etc.

2. To say that all the sentiments are pleasant is against the actual experience. In actual life the sentiments like Bhayānaka, Karuna, Bībhatsa or Kaudra are highly painful and that is why people turn their faces away from Bhayānaka etc. Not to talk of the actual Bhayānaka or Karuna but even that produced in poetry, (i.e. even the imitation of the sentiment) produces indescribable pain.

3. If we experience a sort of strikingness even from these sentiments it is due to the talents of the poet and/or the actor in representing a thing vividly in a realistic manner. The heroic persons exhibit amazement at an enemy who
cuts off the head at one stroke. Thus deceived by the strikingness caused by the art and skill of the poet and/or the actor the wise people experience high ecstatic delight even in the painful sentiments like Karupa and others. And with a view to tasting this the audience or spectators also turn towards them.

4. Moreover, the poet while delineating the life of Rāma depicts it as intermingled with joy and sorrow in accordance with the actual human life which is a mixture of both. Literature is defined as mirror of life and in order that it may rightly reflect life it should have joy and sorrow as well.

5. There is another reason for introducing the sorrowful sentiments in poetry. Pleasures become really more enjoyable when put in contrast with the experience of sorrow just as the sweetness of a drink becomes more enjoyable after some chilly taste.

6. Moreover, what sort of joy can the Sahrdayas experience as they witness such scenes as abduction of Sītā, the pulling of hair and garments of Draupadi, Hariścandra serving a Cāndala, death of Kohitaśva, Iksāmānā being struck by a missile, commencement of killing Śiśūr, etc., being enacted on the stage? The tragic states of the above-mentioned noble souls when imitated on the stage shall naturally produce
sorrow in the hearts of the sympathetic spectators.

If, on the other hand, these sorrows produce joy when imitated it cannot be called a faithful imitation. There should be definitely something wrong with the imitation itself as it appears quite differently (imitation should be of the same nature as original).

7. Some miserable souls deploring the death of their beloveds derive apparent joy when tragic is being staged. But in the true sense that is a feeling of sorrow only. An unhappy man alone will feel joy (or satisfaction) at the story of an unhappy man and will be unhappy on hearing some joyful story.

Thus it can be concluded that Karuna etc., produce sorrow only.

CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS:

The authors of the ND appear to be the foremost among the rhetoricians to present the view forcefully that all sentiments do not go to produce joy. This view of the dual nature of sentiments is not however totally new. While commenting upon the Rasa-sūtra of Bharata Abhinava points out that according to the Sāṅkhyaśas, Rasa is pleasant as well as painful. Abhinava

also refers to the view of 'some' who assert that "Adi" in "Haraṣadindēśāṅghagacchanti"¹, Bharata means "pain, etc."².

(Of course, Abhinavā does not agree with the view). The same view is expressed in Rasakalika of Ādhibhāta who holds that Rasa is capable of producing pleasure as well as pain³ and propounds that even Śṛṅgāra is not purely pleasant if we take into account Vipralībha.

Vāmana also gives a verse to the effect that in tragic plays there is a mixture of pleasure and pain⁴. The verse has been quoted by Hemacandra in his own commentary over the KS called Viveka.

Dr. V. Raghavan has also mentioned the view of Haripāla who takes Vipralībha as painful⁵. Bhoja in his SP also refers

1. yathā, hi nāṇāyaḥ janasamsākṣtam annam bhūjānā rasāṁ āsvādasyanti......tathā......sthāyibhijnān āsvādasyanti......
3. Rasasya sukbadubhkhatmakatayā tadubhayalakṣaṇanteru upapadyate Rasakalikā (MD:MS) Pp. 51-52 quoted by Dr. V. Raghavan in 'The Number of Rasas'.
4. Karunapreksanīyāsu saṃplavāḥ sukbadubhbhayoḥ; Yathānubhavataḥ siddhes tathāivojah prasādāyoh.
to the dual nature of Rasa. In *Sarasvatīkāntabhāmaṇa* while defining Karuṇa he clearly points out that Karuṇa causes pain in the heart. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī in his *Bhaktirasāyaṇa* points out that there is a difference of degree in the pleasure arising out of different Rasas. That is to say all Rasas do not yield the same type of pleasure

Thus it appears that there was a school of thought which believed that all Rasas were not pleasant. Yet Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra seem to be the first (and also the foremost) to discuss elaborately, extensively and systematically this view offering their arguments for their theory. They certainly

1. *Bhaktirasāyaṇa* p. 22.

2. Prof. Deshpande opines that there were two schools of thought regarding the nature of Rasa. According to one which he calls Paripuṣṭivāda, the Rasa is the same as *Sāhyībāva* (*Sāhyī eva rasaḥ*) its followers were Dandin, Vāmana, Lolita, Sāṅkuka, Sāṅkhyas, Bhōja and Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra. The other school was known as Abbivyaktivāda or Carvānāvāda or Kevalānandavāda which believed that Rasa was quite different from the dominant state (*Sāhyī-vilakṣaṇo rasaḥ*) and the followers of the school were Anandavardhana, Bhātattānta Abhinavagupta, Mammata, Hemacandra, Viśvanātha, Prabhākara, Madhusūdana Sarasvatī and Jagannātha.
deserve credit for holding out strongly against all the prominent theorists (including their own preceptor to whom great reverence is shown in the concluding verses of the ND) who unanimously believe that all Rasas produce nothing but joy. Rasa by virtue of its definition implies that it must be enjoyable, agreeable and pleasant irrespective of its kind and the joy that is derived is of the supreme quality fit to be compared with the joy that sages derive at the time of the realisation of Brahman². Hemacandra also following Mammata calls this joy as Parabrahmāsvādāsodara³.

The ND, therefore, is unique in making bold to chalk out a new path, setting aside the old and established one. Dr. Rakesha Gupta has well appreciated this boldness and showers praises for the same. He states, "In the whole range of Sanskrit Poetics there is, however, one work, viz., Nātyadārpana, the authors of which had the courage to maintain, even against the tradition, that the end of all poetry is not to please..."⁴. Dr. K. N. Matte also gives credit to our authors for their independent thinking and boldness⁵. Still it has got to be

1. Rasyate Āsvādyate iti Rasah.
4. Psychological studies in Rasas p. 68.
5. Rasavimarśa p. 177.
accepted that the theory of the ND could not win much of popularity on account of some of its obvious drawbacks. All the same, it did have an impact on some of the later writers. Siddhacandragadā refers to a view ascribing it to the 'moderners' who accept only four Rasas and are not prepared to grant Karūna, Raudra, Bhayānska and Bīhatsa (including Śanta) the status of "Rasa" at all. According to them to say that tragic (śoka) etc. produce joy like love (Rati) and others is a mad man's prattle. The reason why the lamentations of Aja and others are described is to unfold their great affection for their beloved. Similarly Śanta is represented to show the complete detachment of the persons striving for beatitude. In the same way, Bhaya is described to show the tenderness of the person. The real fact is that poet, by delineating different sentiments, wants to exhibit his skill in the delineation of the various Rasas.

But in spite of all the vigour and enthusiasm with which the authors of the ND have argued out their theory it could not be fully accepted on account of its several defects notwithstanding the fact that there were some who were influenced by the theory and voted for it.

2. Yat tu śoka-dayo 'pi ratya-diyat svaprakāsajñānasukhātmakā iti tad umattapralapitaṁ. ibid, p. 21.
3. Ibid, p. 22.
Let us then try to analyse the above arguments of Rāmacandra and Gūnapāda. The first argument clearly points out that the authors have failed to understand the distinction between the objects of actual life and those depicted in poetry. In life there is a personal affinity to things. For instance, if there is a beautiful flower, the moment one sees it one will try to pluck it, smell it, and possess it, similarly at the sight of a ferocious animal one runs away from it, avoids it, hates it. Thus our worldly experiences are always accompanied by this instinct of love or hate, possess or avoid (Gūnapāda).

The experiences of literature are totally of a different nature. In drama if we see a flower we do not try to possess it, nor do we run away from the theatre when a dreadful ghastly scene is represented. We know in the heart of our hearts that this is after all a play and not real. That is why in life if we see a damsel harassed by some person we might instantly run to her aid but in drama when we see Sītā being abducted by Rāvana and crying for help we remain fixed in our chairs knowing it in deep conscience that this is drama after all.

In advancing the second argument the MD also commits the same mistake. Even though we do not feel happy of tragic or fierce occurrences in life because of our being directly or personally involved in them, still we appreciate the same in
literature when they are depicted in purely a general and impersonal way. If the incidents of literature were to affect us in the same way as those in actual life do we would never go to witness tragic plays. On the contrary, it is the tragedies that have made a greater and deeper appeal to the humanity at large than the comedies. In the words of Shelley, "Our sweetest songs are those that tell of the saddest thought."

The third argument is in reply to the common question - "If Karuna and others produce pain why should we go to see such a drama at all?" The ND's reply is that the strikingness is due to the talents—art and skill (Pratibha)—of the poet and of the actor. It is true that we do appreciate the art of the poet in realistic delineation of the whole thing and the skill of the actor in representing it, but is it all? In fact, the appreciation of the poet or the actor comes afterwards and not at the time when we are being dragged into the torrents of emotion.

In the succeeding argument also the ND has committed the same mistake. Drama does reflect joys and sorrows of life. It is true that in life the incidents of misery to not bring joy. But the same when represented in literature have a different re-action. Even the depiction of sorrow is pleasant. There is a joy even in weeping. As Shelly has put it "the pleasure of sorrow is more pleasant than the pleasure of
pleasure itself."

The argument that follows cannot be reckoned to be an independent argument. It is in fact a corroboration of the view with concrete illustrations. But let us remember that it is the tragic scenes such as the lamentation of Aja or Rati or Purūravas or the repudiation of Sakuntalā in the Sāk. and tragedies like Hamlet, king Lear or Othello that have won appreciation of one and all and belong to all times and climes. When we witness a pathetic scene such as lamentation of a mother on the sad demise of her only son, the feeling that arises in our mind is not that of miserableness but that of pity or sympathy. The aim of the poet in delineating the noble characters, sufferings is to arouse that sympathy in us and we are not unaware of the joy of sympathising with others. Man by his very nature demands sympathy from others. A man with none to sympathise with him will find the life not worth living. For him the life will be a drudgery. But man not only requires sympathisers he also is anxious to give sympathy to others. There is a joy in giving sympathy as well. It is this sympathy the inner urge of human heart that compels him to enjoy even the pathetic scenes. In fact, that piece will have a greater over-whelming effect on the mind which will succeed
to the utmost degree in arousing our sympathies. Tragedies are capable of arousing this feeling much more than comedies and that is why they have a greater appeal.

In the last argument the ND has tried to touch a problem concerning human psychology. Life is more replete with misery so we, in fact, are eager to see as to whether the mountains of miseries that fall on us do fall on others too. Thus if we find that others too sail or sink in the same boat as we do, our unhappy, dissatisfied finds some relief. Prof. K. Sahai quotes from Dr. Johnson to the above effect. But this argument of the ND does not seem to be psychologically faultless.

Here the ND could have added one more argument. If Karuna too gave pleasure why do we weep and shed tears, when a pathetic scene is being staged? To say that these are the tears of joy and appreciation is being too far from the actual experience. But the fact is that just as there are tears in joy in the same way, there can be joy in tears as well.

---

1. KP, the creation of Brahman is Sukhaduhkhahosvabhava (I,1)

2. Dhamika while explaining the totally different natures of the pathos in literature and that of life compares this peculiar experience of pathetic scene which causes tears and also delight to the peculiar state which a lady experiences when she receives beating, tooth-bite, etc. from her lover in amorous sports. (DR: Avaloka, p. 98).
There have been various attempts to explain how joy is derived from tragedy or tragic scenes. In fact, tragedies, from times immemorial, are the causes of the universal delight. Great poets like Shakespeare have been immortal for their tragedies. The appreciation of the Act IV of the Abhijñānaśākuntalā, the master-piece of Kālidāsa, as the best Act¹, also clearly indicates that it is the pathetic scenes which have made universal appeal and won the admiration of all. To deny tragic or pathos will be tantamount to denying some of the best and the finest in literature.

It is a matter of general experience that there is pleasure in the tragic too². Some may call it "Katharsis" (Purification or purgation); phycologists may call it sympathetic feeling; the Indian theorists call it Karuṇa Rasa. Some critics try to account for this by reference to the human instinct of imitation which is so natural to man from the early childhood. He learns by imitation and naturally enjoys the works of imitation, and so even though the objects themselves may be painful to see, one delights to view the most realistic representation of them in art³.

1. Tatrūpi ca caturtho 'Ikāh.
2. In the words of Cowper - There is a pleasure in poetic pains which only poets know.
Prof. K. Sahal while discussing the view of the ND remarks that the authors of the ND have failed to comprehend the distinction between pain and pity. When we feel a personal loss, e.g., the sad demise of our own kinsmen, we experience pain. But when we hear of a similar loss of others we feel pity. But the analogy does not seem to be perfect as pity by itself can hardly produce joy.

Rasa, in fact, is a peculiar state of mind where one forgets for some time ego or self-consciousness and is submerged into a blissful state. This state is reached by an absolute concentration of mind. The life-like realistic acting (gesticulation) of the actor, his dress, make-up etc., stagecraft etc., go a long way in producing this mental concentration. It is this mental concentration which causes one to forget everything else in life that causes Rasa or aesthetic delight. The different types of states or sentiments are the different means of bringing about this higher mental state which is dominated by Sattva and may be rightly compared to the state at the time of beatitude.

1. Alocanāke patha para (in Hindi) Pp. 48-55 also compare, Psychological Studies in Rasas p. 34.
2. Cf. KP - Vigalita vedyāntara (p. 9).
The MD points out the difference between Vipralambha Śrṅgāra and Karuṇa. Vibhāvas and Anūbhāvas of both are common. The former also has fever, burning, anxiety, etc. as its Anūbhāvas like Karuṇa. But Karuṇa ends in disaster. The fate of Karuṇa is dark and gloomy while Vipralambha ends in re-union. Here there is a hope of meeting again though there is separation for the time being. Thus the hope of re-union decreases the intensity of pathos. In other words Soka is the dominant state (Sthāyī) in Karuṇa, while it is a momentary state (Vyabhicārī) in Vipralambha.

The next problem tackled by the MD is "To whom does the sentiment really belong?" The MD states that the Rasa primarily belongs to the actual human life and secondarily the spectators (or readers in case of poetry).

The MD now proceeds to comment further. It now explains the function of Anūbhāvas or consequents. Anūbhāvas are the external manifestations of a feeling. They are so called because they convey to us the feelings that really belong to others. They are expressed in numerous ways such as side-long glances, paralysis, perspiration, tears, horripilation, and the like.

1. Vide MD, p. 159.
According to the ND the process by which the spectators experience Rasa is, as follows:- The Rasa originally resides in the actual character, i.e. Rama, for instance. This sentiment is made known clearly to the spectators by means of Anubhavas. As a result the same type of sentiment arises in the hearts of the spectators also. This experience of Rasa is not directly perceived as it belongs to the province of mind which is beyond the reach of the organs of sense.

Here the view of Bhāmidatta deserves to be noted. He divides Rasas into two types:

1. Laukika or natural, which refers to the experiences of actual life.
2. Alaukika or supernatural, which is of three types
   (a) dream-experiences (b) the experiences resulting from building castles in the air and (c) from the reading of poetry or witnessing a drama.

The authors of the ND now launch upon another interesting problem as to whether or not an actor experiences Rasa. The

---

1. This view of Rāmacandra may very well be compared with that of Lollata who also believes that Rasa originally resides in Rama and others and being superimposed on the actor it gives delight to the spectators. Vide Atra lollatādayaḥ Rāmadāvamūtaryeṣṭhitō rasaḥ - Rāpacandrika, p. 44.

2. Rasatandīlī VI, Pp. 121-123.
MB's view is as follows. It is true that generally an actor does not experience the aesthetic delight. His business is to imitate, act or gesticulate inspite of the fact that he might not be actually experiencing that emotion. He might have to act weeping when acting the role of a lover in separation, even though he may be delighted at heart. So also perspiration, paralysis, etc., are possible even when the actor himself may not be experiencing the particular feeling. The external manifestations by the actors cause the rise of the dominant emotion in the heart of the spectators which may result in similar expressions such as weeping etc. in the case of the Sahrdayas.

The ND here points out that it is not that he never experiences the Rasa. At times he may. It is here that the ND differs from the majority of critics. The ND corroborates its view by citing a couple of instances from the actual life. A harlot though entering into amorous dalliance for the pleasure of others, may enjoy the pleasure herself at times. A songster, though singing for delighting others, sometimes experiences supreme pleasure himself. Similarly an actor while playing the role of the character may be totally one with it and experience the delight.

The problem, viz., whether or not an actor experiences the Rasa is a debatable one. Some scholars are of the opinion that the actor is required to present a life-like, real and actual
state of the character whose role he is playing. In order to achieve this object he should forget himself and be one with the character of the play. He should merge his individual personality into that of the character and should feel the feelings and emotions, states and sentiments of the character as his own. In this case he is likely to experience the sentiment. There are others, on the other hand, who opine that the business of the actor is simply to act. He is required to imitate verbal, physical and mental actions of the character whose role he is playing. He should be perfectly conscious of his duty. If, on the contrary, he forgets himself and establishes complete identity with the character it is quite likely that he would forget what he is required to speak or act and thus would totally fail in creating the desired effect on the minds of the spectators. As for instance, if an actor who is playing a tragic role on the stage starts actually weeping and shedding tears, it will not be possible for him to continue his speech with proper expressions on the face with the
result that the beauty of the whole situation will be marred.  

It appears therefore that even though the actor has to merge his personality into that of the character still however he should bear in mind that he has to imitate successfully and his concentration should be for realistic representation.

In fact, he has not to identify himself completely with the character but he has to make a show of complete identity with the character. In order to appear natural and realistic he has to make special efforts. It comes after constant practice and considerable training. There lies the

1. Coquelin, a great French actor, in his book on the art of acting quotes an instance from the life of another great actor Edwin Booth who was, one evening, so much absorbed in the part which he was playing that real tears flowed from his eyes, his voice broke with emotion, real sobs choked him. He thought that he was acting even better than usual but the fact was that he had acted very badly. Coquelin then points to the moral that in order to call forth feeling in others we ourselves must not experience it. He remarks that in all circumstances the actor must retain complete self-control. - M. Belging: Reading for Profit, quoted in Sahitya-mimansa, Pp. 32-33.
art of the actor, and art, it is rightly said, lies in concealing art. Still however if on certain occasion the actor completely forgets himself, and himself experiences the state and sentiment which he is required to represent he ceases, for the time being, to be an actor and belongs the category of the Preksaka or Bhāvaka.

After reiterating the statement that the Amūbhāvas (consequents) in case of an actor are the determinants or Vibhāvas in case of the spectators being the cause of producing Rasa in them (while those of the spectators are the after-effects of Rasa) [the ND turns to bring out the essential difference between the causes in actual life and those of literature.

In actual life the Vibhāvas etc., are real and so arouse a Sthāyibhāva to the state of Rasa¹ with reference to a particular object only, e.g., a young man who loves a particular lady enjoys the sentiment of love (ārūgāra) with reference to that lady only. But when the sentiment of love is aroused

1. ND, p. 160. It appears that the ND has wrongly used the word Rasa here. In actual life what we experience is no Rasa at all. It is at the most a feeling or an emotion which though akin to Rasa is much different from it, and is confined to literature. It should also be noted that the terms Vibhāva, Amūbhāva etc. are terms of literature only and should not be confused with cause and effects.
by seeing a lady loving another man (as happens in literature) that sentiment is not related to a particular individual but is of the general nature; similarly, the pathos arising out of seeing a woman lamenting the loss of some dear one is of a general nature; similarly, the case with other sentiments also. Thus the emotion (or state) which is aroused in the hearts of the audience or the spectators on reading, bearing or witnessing a literary piece by the determinants which are not real but which appear as real is always general, e.g., when one sees Rāma making love to Sītā, the sentiment of love arising in the spectators is not with reference to Sītā (the daughter of Janaka and the wife of Rāma) but with reference to a woman in general.

Not only the characters but even the emotions, etc. also are generalised and that is why all the spectators feel a sort of oneness with the emotion that is depicted which ultimately results into the experience of aesthetic joy.

1. Cf. Shakespeare—“And as imagination bodies forth
   The forms of things unknown, the poets pen
   Turns them to shapes and gives to airy nothings
   A local habitation and a name...”
This is how the ND explains the important principle of literary criticism called Sādhārāṇī-Karaṇa.

The ND now explains the place of Vyabhicāri Bhāvas. Their task is to stimulate and to intensify the dominant state. The Sthāyī bhāva, aroused by the fundamental (Ālaṁbana) and excitant (Uddīpana) determinants, made perceptible on account of the consequents, needs to be fed and raised to a high pitch in order that it may generate the sentiment. The suitable transitory states are essential for the creation of Rasa. For instance, Śṛṅgāra might require anxiety (Cintā) Karuṇa, dejection (Viṣāda); Raudra, wrath (Amarśa); Bhayānaka terror (Trāśa) and so on.

The ND opines that Rasa cannot exist without Vyabhicārīs even though it may happen that on account of certain causes, (e.g. subtlety or speed of action) the Rasa may be generated even without the Vyabhicārī. This implies that mostly there is some Vyabhicārī concealed even though it may not be easily detected for one reason or the other. One common illustration from the actual life would make the point quite clear: the sight of a lady by itself cannot produce love in the heart of a man who is attached to some other lady or who is totally
dispassionate. That is to say, the transitory states as anxiety, restlessness, etc. are requisites for love.

It is again pointed out that Vyabhicārīs and Anabhāvas seen in the case of an actor are, in fact, the Vibhāvas in the sense that they are the elements which go to produce Rasa, in the heart of the spectators.

The Nid finally treats of the relation between Kāvya and Rasa. Or in other words where does the Rasa reside? Rasa resides not in the poem or literary piece even though we call it Sarasa i.e. possessed of Rasa. It is obvious that an inanimate thing as Kāvya is, cannot be the substratum of Rasa which is "Cetana". Then why is it that we experience Rasa while reading or witnessing a literary piece? The answer is simple: we experience Rasa because that piece has a capacity to produce Rasa, even though it by itself does not contain it since if it were so, any ordinary man will experience the same type of Rasa on reading a poem. But it is a fact that an illiterate person will not enjoy the poetry at all however great it may be. Rasa is experienced only when the reader or the spectator understands the meaning. Moreover, the reader experiences the Rasa not as an external object as one does when one enjoys the sweet taste of the sweetmeats. The enjoyment of the sweetmeat is totally different from that of poetry.

Rasa is the dominant state of the mind of the reader himself lying dormant in the subconscious region of mind and brought to
consciousness when a similar situation is represented. When a piece is read conveying the determinates of horror or pathos, the corresponding dormant emotion is roused and it results into the experience of Rasa. And hence a person who does not possess the required dominant state in his heart cannot enjoy that Rasa. As for instance, a child will not be able to appreciate the story of love because he has never experienced what love is. And that is why in order that one may be capable of enjoying poetry one has got to be a Sahādaya.

Now the ND establishes the relation of Anubhāva, Vibhāva and Vyabhicāri Bhāvas to the dominant state (Sthāyī) or Rasa.

Anubhāvas (consequents): They are the effects (Kārya) of the dominant state or sentiment. They are so called because they indicate the sentiment. They are the external manifestation of a Bhāva. They are thousands in number such as stambha, Sveda, Vepathū and others.

Vibhāva (determinants): They are the causes (Hetu) of Bhāva or Rasa. They are so called because they cause the sthāyī

2. ND III, 110.
3. Vide ND III, 147 and the Vṛtti over it.
(which already resides in the minds of the spectators as impression (Vāsāmā) and which ultimately transforms it into Rasa) to be clearly perceived.

They are of two types:-

(i) Alambana vibhāva (fundamental determinant) comprises of characters such as the hero, the heroine, and others without whom sentiment cannot arise at all.

(ii) Uddīpana vibhāva (excitant determinant) are the conditions of place and time and circumstance, which go to develop (or foster) the Rasa, e.g., the garden, cool breezes, the moon, the cry of the cuckoo, etc., for the development of Śṛṅgāra.

It will be clear therefore, that what we call causes and effects in ordinary life are termed Vibhāvas and Ambhāvas respectively when they are treated in literature.

Vyabhicārī (or saṃcārī) Bhāvas (transitory states).
They are the states that accompany the Sthāyī Bhāva or Rasa.

The word Vyabhicārī is derived from the root 'car' to move with 'Vi' and Abhi (towards). It can be explained in two ways:-

1. Abhi in the sense of Abhimukha suggests 'nourishing' or causing to grow or increase. Vyabhicārībhāvas are so called because they specially (Vi) contribute to the growth or development of the dominant state which culminates into Rasa.
2. They are so called because they do not invariably follow (Vyabhicaranti) the dominant state. That is to say, they sometimes accompany a dominant state and at times do not. They do not invariably accompany their Vibhāvas also, e.g., debility, slothfulness, fatique, etc. will not accompany a person who uses the elixir of life.

Here all of the dominant states because they are of cognitive nature are animate while some of the Anubhāvas, Vibhāvas and Vyabhicāri Bhāvas such as courage, woman, and dejection respectively are animate and some such as perspiration, mountains, disease, respectively are inanimate. Moreover, Anubhāvas, Vibhāvas and Vyabhicāribhāvas are subordinate to the dominant state, (Sthāyi). According to the ND they are related to the Sthāyi as effect, cause and associate respectively. The dominant state is principal as it dominates all of them, being developed to a high pitch.1

Sthāyibhāvas denote the instincts or emotions deep seated in human mind. The Vyabhicāribhāvas are those that emerge from the Sthāyibhāvas and again submerge in them as the waves in an

1. That the dominant state is principal and the rest are subordinate is also evident from the fact that they (i.e. determinants, consequents etc) ultimately aim at the development of the dominant state. They are a means to the end which is Rasa.
ocean. Their effect is immediate and temporary while that of
the Sthāyīs is rooted in the character of man.

THE NUMBER OF RASAS.

According to the ND there are nine principal Rasas. They
are: 1) Śṛṅgāra 2) Hāṣya 3) Karuṇa 4) Raudra 5) Vīra 6) Bhayānaka
7) Bībhatsa 8) Adbhuta 9) Śanta.

The ND here tries to bring out an underlying relationship
among all these.

Out of all the Rasas Śṛṅgāra tops the list as love is
pleasant to one and all irrespective of caste and creed.
Hāṣya follows Śṛṅgāra. Then comes Karuṇa being opposite to
Hāṣya. Kāma i.e. love or desire is based on wealth. So
there comes Raudra having wealth as its principal aim. Both
love and wealth arise out of Dharma or law and thus follows Vīra
which has Dharma as its principal aim. Vīra is related to
Bhayānaka as the essence of Vīra is granting protection to
persons who are struck with or overpowered by fear. Spirited
persons despise such onwards and so arises Bībhatsa having
contempt as its dominant state. Despise is removed through

1. The ND literally follows the NS (GŚ) VI, 15.
surprise and thus Adbhuta (based on astonishment)¹. And lastly Dharmā is based on restraint and peace and therefore Śanta based on restraint (Śama).

Only these nine types of Rasa are proclaimed by Purvācāryas (ancient preceptors) as they are specially charming and more useful to human activities. But other Rasas also are possible such as Laulya (greediness) having greed as its dominant state, Sneha having compassion (Ārdrātā) as its dominant state, Vyasana with Attachment (Āsakti) as its dominant state, Duḥkha and Sukha having pain (Arati) and Satisfaction (Santosā) as their respective dominant states.

Some include these in the above nine only.

CRITICAL REMARKS

This is a worthy and appreciable attempt at bringing out a connecting link between these varied types of sentiments. The ND makes an effort to establish unity in the vast diversity.

¹. The ND here differs from the Abhi. and the KS.

The above explanation of the ND does not appear to be so convincing here as Adbhuta is primarily related to Vīra (as heroism breeds wonder) and not to Bībhatṣa. Abhinava (and Hemacandra follows) reckons Adbhuta as the result of Vīra. (Abhi. I, p. 267; vide also Bharata – Vīrāccalvādhipt-pattih – NS (GOS) VII:59.)
In fact, there is a thread of unity passing through all these various sentiments. All these sentiments whether Śṛṅgāra or Vīra, Māṣya or Kāruṇa, Adbhuta or Bibhatsa, Raudra or Bhayānaka are all Rasas i.e. they are capable of being enjoyed. They go to produce ecstatic delight the joy which is often compared with the one derived through the experience of the supreme Bliss. These different sentiments such as Śṛṅgāra, Vīra, etc. are the different phases, in fact, of one Rasa like the different shapes of gold. The underlying principle is the same such as gold in gold-ornaments or clay in earthen pots.

But the problem arises as to whether the explanation regarding this unity as given by the ND is justifiable or correct. The NS reduces the eight sentiments into four principal sentiments and the remaining four as derivative ones. Accordingly, Śṛṅgāra, Vīra, Raudra and Bibhatsa are principal sentiments which give rise to Māṣya, Adbhuta, Kāruṇa, and Bhayānaka respectively. The NS also explains the reason for calling the second group as derived one. Māṣya, the NS points out, is an imitation of Śṛṅgāra. Śṛṅgāra itself when improperly

1. Rasyate āsvādyate iti rasas, ND, p. 159.
2. Brahmāsvādasaḥodara - SD III, 2.
3. NS Ṛgaśi VI, 39.
and unworthily imitated produces humour and ridicule, like the Śṛṅgāra of rogues and hypocrites. Similarly the action of heroism (Vīra) produces wonder, a feeling of awe and amazement among the spectators (Adbhuta). An action of violence (Raudra) will give rise to Karuṇa or pathos as violent and furious action is bound to bring tragic results. A phenomenon of Bibhatsa in the same way goes to produce fear in the heart of the spectators (this is Bhayānaka). Thus the rest of the four sentiments are the results or modifications of the first four principal sentiments.

But this, it will be seen, is not so convincing. Is Hasya a modification of Śṛṅgāra only? Do we not find humour even in the absence of Śṛṅgāra or love? Again is Adbhuta generated from Vīra only? Does the sentiment of pathos originate from violence or fury only and fear from Raudra alone? The answers are not naturally in the affirmative. Humour has a field vaster than that of Śṛṅgāra and cannot be included only therein. Improper representation of any Rasa may tend to produce laughter or Hāsya. Similarly wonder can arise even in the absence of Vīra. Fear need not be the result of Bibhatsa only. Raudra also may as well cause fear. Thus the four derivative sentiments can develop independently of their respective principal sentiments. Moreover the NS lacks in consistency when it combines Raudra and Bhayānaka (a subordinate sentiment of Bibhatsa) with
Arabhati and Bibhatsa and Karuna under Bharati

The DR also follows the VS in this matter. Dhanika actually quotes lines from Bharata. The ND here goes a step forward. It does not rest satisfied with Bharata's division into principal and subordinate Rasas. It establishes a connecting link among all the Rasas. But here too the authors of the ND do not stand original. They have almost verbally borrowed from their learned preceptor Hemacandra who gives a just similar account of the inter-relation of Rasas and who in his turn appears to have borrowed it from Abhinava.

The general conception of Rasa as we have seen is that it is one and uniform like the Brahman of the spiritualists; consequently there have been efforts by various theorists to

1. VS (KS) XX, 52-63. Some may try to defend this classification of Bharata by pointing that by calling the four sentiments principal Bharata only means that they occur more frequently than the other ones. But the defence can hardly be convincing. Karuna and Hasya can be equally dominant. Bhawabhuta goes to the extent of considering Karuna as the only sentiment. Hasya is the dominating sentiment of Prabhasana. It is also difficult to understand the propriety calling Bibhatsa as a principal sentiment.

2. Cf. DR IV, 43-45.


5. Upanishads describe Brahman as Rasa. Cf. Taittiriyopanishad—Raso vai se (Brahmāndavali, p. 116.)
propagate that there is only one principal sentiment and the others are subordinate to it or are mere variants of it.

Bhavabhūti, the great Sanskrit poet, emphatically points out that Karuṇa is the only one sentiment and the other Rasas are its variants or different modifications under diverse states and situations just as the same water takes the form of waves, bubbles, etc.¹

In his Śṛṅgāraprakāśa Bhoja opines that Śṛṅgāra is the one and the only one Rasa and that all the forty nine states (Bhāva) arise out of Śṛṅgāra only².

Abhinavagupta, on the other hand, tries to prove that the fundamental sentiment is Śānta only³. Some theorists on the basis of the NS XX, 47 believe that Adbhuta is the dominant sentiment⁴. The SD refers to the view of Bhrāyana regarding the same and quotes from Dharmadatta in support of this view⁵.

---

1. Eko rasāḥ karuṇa eva nimittabhedād bhinnah prthak prthah āśrayate vivartan... etc, UTR III, 47.
2. Cf. Vaya tu śṛṅgāraneva rasanādrasamāsanamāmah (SP, p. 1), and also, ratiyādayah śṛṅgāraprabhavā eva ekopasaṃśad bhāvāh, vīraśayo mithyārasapravādah, śṛṅgāra evaiksaśaturvar-gakārāmaḥ rasa iti (SP, p. 2).
5. Rasa sāres ca samākhāraḥ sarvatāpyamabhyate; Tāc samātakārasatve sarvatāpyadbhuto rasaḥ – SD, p. 49. Also of Rasatarangini, Ch. 1, p. 28.
According to Bodhāyana, the author of the Bhāgavadajukīyaṁ, Hāsyā alone is the principal sentiment\(^1\), while Rūpasvāmi insists on giving prominence to Ujjvala rasa or Madhura rasa which has Kṛṣṇa-rati (or Madhura rati)—love for Kṛṣṇa—as its dominant state\(^2\).

In short all these theorists aim at establishing unity in diversity.

A slight suggestion to think on the above line seems to have been dropped by the early sage Bharata who recognizes four sentiments as the principal and the remaining four as being derived from them.

But all such efforts to reduce all the sentiment to one are not likely to meet with much success as the human mind is full of states and emotions which are complex at times and even contradictory so that to find out unity in the bewildering diversity is a very hard but to crack. And even though Rasa by itself, in principle, is one and homogeneous, the states (Bhāva) to which the different Rasas correspond are of varied nature.

The number of Rasas has differed with the different authorities. Just as there was a school which believed in one

---

1. Bhāgavadajukīyaṁ, Nāṭyaraśagū bāṣyām eva pradhānam p. 5.
2. Cf. Prthag eva bhaktirāsarāt... madhurāḥ—UjjvalaḷaNamaṇi, p.4.
Rasa only and tried to explain all other Rasas in terms of that Rasa in the same way there were theorists who did not find the number eight sufficient enough to include all the diverse sentiments and added to the number. It is very probable that Bharata mentioned only eight Rasas\(^1\). The ninth, viz., Santa was a later addition; but Santa has been accepted as ninth sentiment, by many of the later poetics. Āravardhāna and Abhinava consider it as the principal sentiment in the MBh\(^2\).

Some of the writers on dramaturgy on the other hand refuse to accept Santa in drama. Dhanañjaya, for instance, admits of Santa as a ninth Rasa in Poetry but does not recognize it in drama\(^3\). Dhanika refers to the view of some who do not believe in the existence of Santa for the following reasons.

(1) The Ācārya i.e. Bharata has not mentioned its Vibhāva, Ānubhāva, etc.

---

1. Even Abhinava who was a strong propounder of Santa Rasa while commenting upon that portion of the NS regarding Santa Rasa feels that it was an interpolation can be inferred from his remark - ye punar rava rasa. iti paṭhanti tanmate santaśvarūpaṁ abhidhiyate Abhi. I, p. 332. Kālidāsa also refers to eight Rasas mentioned by Bharata. Vide, Vikrama, II, 18.


3. Śamāśagī keen labh puṣṭir nātyotvamaitasya-DR IV,35.
(11) Sānta is not capable of human experience as it implies annihilation of love and hatred which have made a permanent abode in the human mind from times immemorial and are impossible to destroy.

(iii) It can be included in Viśa and Bibhatsa as Bibhatsa whose dominant state is Jugupsā gives rise to dejection, discontent (with the worldly pleasure) which ultimately result in Sama.

But these arguments can easily be refuted. It is not proper to advance the theory only on the basis of the authority of the text of the NS which has been so corrupt and mishandled from time to time. Moreover it would not be right to argue that Sānta does not exist because Bharata does not mention it. The second argument which is based on human psychology is likely to be severely opposed by the Mokṣavādins, who will address these theorists as materialists (Gārvākas). According to Indian philosophy Mokṣa is the highest ideal of human life and so it is heretical to deny it.

Similarly the argument of some who say that Sānta which implies annihilation of Rāga and Dveṣa cannot be represented by the actor who is not free from these dualities, is also invalid as the actor has simply to gesticulate. He does not experience Rasa at all1.

---

The third argument also does not appear quite sound as even though apathy for worldly pleasures may be a cause for Sama still however Sānta or Sāma is not similar in nature to Bībhatsa or Jugupsa; neither it is proper to include it in Vīra which has Utsāha i.e. vigour as its dominant state. In fact both Jugupsa and Utsāha can come as transitory states of Sānta but neither of them can be the dominant state of Sānta. Dhanika, following Dhanañjaya, holds that Sama cannot have place in drama as sama which implies cessation of all activity cannot be represented on stage in drama which is full of action.

The later theorists increase the number of Rasas. Rudrāṇa enumerates ten Rasas adding 'Preyśa' (with Snea as its dominant state) to the celebrated nine\(^1\). Bhoja refers to ten Rasas accepted by the learned, adding Vatsala to the old list of nine\(^2\). Some add Bhakti. Visvesvara refers to Māyā as a sentiment with Kithyājñāna as its dominant state\(^3\).

**TYPES OF RASAS**

1. **Srūgāra**

The Nd at the outset divides Sūngāra into two types -

---

1. Ka, p. 166.
2. SP, Āmnāsiṣur dasā rasa sudhiyo (p.1) But Bhāmidatta does not recognize Vatsala Rasa and includes it in Karuna. Vide Rasataraniṅgū V, p. 125.
3. Vide Rasacandrikā, p. 68.
(i) Sambhoga i.e. love in union

(ii) Vipralambha i.e. love in separation.

(i) Seeing touching etc. by loving young man and woman trying to please each other comes under this category. It is of innumerable varieties such as looking at each other, kissing, striking speeches, etc.

(ii) The second type implies separation - mental or physical - of the two - man and woman - even though they may be ardently loving each other, caused by various reasons. This is of five types:

(a) Separation due to pride.

(b) Separation due to long journey by the lover.

(c) Separation due to curse.

(d) Separation due to dependence on parents, etc.

(e) Separation due to some other cause even in the absence of dependence on parents etc.

The ND illustrates each of these five varieties from different works.

The ND then points out the Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas of Love.

The principal Vibhāvas are man and woman. Also other Vibhāvas are the work of poetry (be it Drṣṭya or Sravya) music, song, dance, seasons like spring, pastes of different types, garland, betel leaf, peculiar dress and ornaments accompanied by desirable persons and objects such as the Vidūṣaka, the moon-rise, Cakravāka, swans, etc.
It also includes sports such as plucking of flowers moving in a garden, water-sports, etc.

The dominant state is love (Rāti).

It is to be represented by the different types of gesticulations. It should also have vigour (Utsāha) etc.¹

Its Anūbhāvas are mental or physical torture, anger, dancing of eyes, knitting of eyebrows, etc. (in Saṃbhoga), and torture, tears, lamentations, etc. (in Vipralāmbha). In the former pleasant states such as Dhṛti etc. are introduced in the latter only painful ones such as Nivṛṣedā.

Bharata divides Srngāra into three types - caused by speech, by dress, and by physical action. Hāsyā and Raudra too are similarly divided. But this division is applicable to all other Rasas also as the above three refer to the three types of Abhinayās which are essential in arousing the sentiments

¹ Here the ND discusses an interesting point about the state of Utsāha (i.e. vigour). Vigour is the dominant state of Vīra and still forms a part of Srngāra. But the point is in Srngāra vigour does not dominate. It comes as a transitory state. And a dominant state of one sentiment can likewise become a transitory state of other sentiments.
2. **HASYA**

Hasya arises out of the distortion in behaviour, speech, body and dress and other awkward gestures like blowing one's nose, imitating others, etc.

This Hasya is represented by the peculiar movement of the nose, lips, eyes, holding of the belly or sides.

Dissimulation (Avabhitthā) vigour, wonder, etc. are its transitory states.

Hasya is divided into six types:

1. **Vihāsita** - laughing with sweet voice at the proper time and which makes the face reddish.

2. **Upahāsita** - laughing so that shoulders and the head shake.

3. **Smita** - smile where teeth are not seen.

4. **Hāsita** - smile wherein teeth are slightly visible.

5. **Apahāsita** - laughing at the improper time in such a way that tears come in eyes and the shoulders and the head shake violently.

6. **Atihāsita** - violent laughter with loud voice holding the sides by two hands.

First two are for middle characters, the next two for high-born persons and the last two for low persons.
This sentiment, as also Karuna, Shayana, Bhhatra, and Adbhuta, is freely and abundantly used in case of low characters or woman as they too are low as compared with men. A low man excessively laughs, weeps, fears, likes slander of others, and is astounded at an ordinary speech even.

The ND has followed here the NS. From the relevant discussion in the NS, the DR, the ND, etc., it is found that Hasya arises out of distortion or awkwardness in speech, action, dress, facial expressions, etc. This is obviously, a very low kind of humour. Consequently the sentiment itself was looked a little down upon. The statement of the ND that this sentiment is to be freely used in the case of low characters and women, goes to corroborate this view. This particular theory may be held responsible for the lack of intellectual humour in Sanskrit drama. The Indian theorists were rather unaware of the finer type of humour, wits, intelligent jokes which could win applause from the intelligentsia. That is why excepting a few works like the Sakuntala (witty remarks of Priyamvada), the Mrchakatika, etc., we find very little of humour in the whole range of Sanskrit drama. Whatever humour is there is stale and stereotyped mainly caused by the stupid speech and ugly gestures of the Vidusaka.

The definition is too narrow also because it does not take into consideration the humour arising out of the impropriety of
sentiments such as Śṛṅgāra and others.

Bharata divides Hāṣya into two - (i) Atmāstha when a person laughs all alone (ii) Parastha when he makes others laugh though he himself might be perfectly serious. The DR over and above this two-fold division divides each into three, viz., belonging to high, middle or low characters, giving thereby six divisions.

3. KARUNĀ

Karuna arises out of death, imprisonment, loss of wealth, curse or calamity such as revolution etc. These are the Vībhāvas. Soka is its dominant state. Its Anubhāvas are tears, paleness of face, loss of memory etc., scolding one's fate, weeping, lamenting, beating one's breasts etc. Hīrveda, Giñi, anxiety, eagerness, fatigue, paralysis, tremor paleness, tears, change of voice etc., are its Vyābhcārīs.

4. RAUDRA

The furious arises out of striking with weapons, falsehood, jealousy, treachery, bad policy, committing offence such as

1. Here the JD puts the Sāttvika bhāvas, which are in fact Anubhāvas, into Vyābhcārīs.
insulting one's wife and others, criticizing one's knowledge, action, country, caste, etc. depriving one of one's kingdom or wealth. It is represented by killing, blood-shed, cutting or breaking of limbs, pressing of lips or teeth, shivering of lips, cheeks, pressing the hands, etc. Distraction, ardour, avarice, inconstancy, fierceness, perspiration, horripilation, tremor, etc. are its transitory states. The MD here points out that even the Sāthāyi Bhāvas also may sometimes come in as transitory states.

5. **Vīra**

The heroic (Vīra) arises, out of valour, strength, (physical as well as of army, wealth, etc.) justice, reputation due to qualities like heroism which causes terror in the minds of the foes, and determination of the facts (Tattvaviniścaya). Its dominant state is Utsāha which may be regarding different matters such as war, religion, alms giving, merits, valour, etc.

It is represented by courage, steadfastness, inspiring the army, condemning the foe, giving alms, horripilation, etc. Patience, intellect, pride, anger, memory, horripilation etc. are its transitory states.

---

Here the ND marks out the distinction between Vīra and Kaudra. Both are martial sentiments and in both fight occurs. But the essential distinction is that the former is dominated by enthusiasm and justice while the latter is dominated by infatuation, pride and injustice.

6. BHAYĀNAKA

Bhayānaka or dreadful is caused by fearsome creatures like evil spirit, owls, etc., killing or fighting with weapons, lonely place or forest, a thief or a robber, the offence of an elderly person or a king. By seeing, hearing, or even thinking about the above-mentioned causes, Bhayānaka with Bhaya (or dread) as its dominant sentiment arises.

It is to be represented by paralysis, horripilation, tremor, change in facial expressions, drying up of the throat, paleness, swoon, etc.

Doubt infatuation, terror, epilepsy, death, perspiration, tremor, sinking of the voice, paleness, etc., are its Vyabhicāris.

7. BIBHATSĀ

It arises out of the perception, seeing or hearing of objects which are highly contemptible or disgusting as they may be dirty or rough or emitting foul smell. It also includes eulogy of the enemy. It has Jūgupsa (disgust) as its dominant state.
It is represented by splitting, shaking of one's limbs, despising, contracting the body, showing signs of hatred on the face, shutting the nose or ears, heart-ache, etc.

Disease, distraction, confusion, epilepsy, death, etc. are its transitory states.

8. **ADBHUTA**

It arises out of direct or indirect hearing or perception of divinities, magic, charming objects like architecture, beauty, fragrance, dance, song, and the like, acquiring of one's cherished object, etc. Vismaya or wonder is the dominant state here. It is represented by praising the object, horripilation, indication of joy, and wonder such as expansion of eyes, gazing with a steady eye, shaking of garments or fingers, inarticulate or faltering speech, tremor, perspiration, etc. Confusion, paralysis, tears, horripilation, etc. are its transitory states.

9. **SANTA**

It is caused by the fear of the Cycle of birth and death, disgust for the worldly objects, contemplation of the Absolute, perusal of scriptures, etc. It has Sama as its dominant state which implies a mental state of equipoise free from worldly desires, greed, anger, etc.

It is to be represented by forbearance, meditation, steady glances, kindness, impartiality, joy, etc. Nirveda (depression),
Mati (intellect), memory, Dhrti, (Forbearance) etc. are its Vyabhicāra.

The ND here refers to the view of some who do not believe in Santa on the ground that drama represents action while Santa aims at Moksa (which implies emancipation from all miseries and which constitutes non-activity).

CRITICAL REMARKS:

The above view apparently seems to refer to the DR. The DR asserts that Santa is also reckoned as one of the Rasas by some but it cannot have any place in drama.

Dhanika also refuses to accept the Santa on the ground that the love and hatred which have firm grip over our minds from the time immemorial cannot be annihilated. But this view does not seem to be quite acceptable for the reasons stated earlier.

After establishing the position of Santa as a Rasa we naturally face another problem, viz., what is the Stāya of Santa?

There are various views regarding the Stāya of Santa.

1. DR IV, 35.
2. The view of Dhanika and its criticism has been discussed in detail in this chapter under 'the number of Rasas.'
3. The controversy about the Stāya of Santa is suggested also by the DR when it refers to "Nirveda and others" as the so-called Stāya of Santa (DR. IV, 36).
The SR gives five views -

1. Nirveda or despondency

This Nirveda arises on account of the thought that I did not make efforts for attaining salvation - the highest end - in my earlier births. A sense of remorse and repentance for wasting invaluable human life (or lives) results in Nirveda.

Mamatta gives another reason for considering this as a Sthāyī of Śānta, viz., it is mentioned first among Vyabhicārīs by Bharata even though its import is not auspicious.

2. Jugupsā i.e. contempt for the sensual pleasures (visāya) without which man would not try for Śama.

3. Utsāha (energy or zest). This implies mental effort to practise the Śādhanacatuṣṭaya.

4. Śama i.e. abstinence from all sensual activities (Indriyavyāpāra).

5. All the above four combined together.

6. Anandavardhana considers 'Tranakṣayasukha' i.e. annihilation of sensual desires as the Sthāyī of Śama.

1. SR VII, 137k p. 816.
Over and above these, Samyag-jñāna, Dhṛti, Rati, Nirvīṣeṣa-cittavṛtti, Servacittavṛtti-prasāma, any of the eight Sthāyīs or all the eight Sthāyīs together are considered to be the Sthāyīs of Śānta.

According to the ND the Sthāyī of Śānta is Sama only.
It criticises Māmata for considering Nirveda as the Sthāyī of Śānta.

PLACE OF RASA IN POETRY

Word and sense constitute the body of poetry but Rasa or sentiment forms the very soul (of poetry). And having Rasa as its soul it enters the hearts of the appreciative reader or critic. Hence the poets are mainly interested in Rasa. And only that figure of speech enchants the heart, which is introduced in order to bring out Rasa. To make the point quite clear the ND gives as many as four illustrations (two form Ramacandra's own works and two from others) where figures of word and sense are introduced for Rasa only. The ND then explicitly points out that in poetry figures of speech are not so important as Rasa. A drama or a literary piece replete

1. ND, p. 177. This point has been discussed later.
2. Arthaśābdavapuḥ kāvyāṁ ND III, 123 a Here the ND seems to follow the definition of Bhāmaha who gives equal importance to word as well as sense in Kāvyā. His definition of Kāvyā is 'Sabdārthau Sahitaun Kāvyāṁ'.
with figures of speech but devoid of Rasa is compared to a ripe but dry (with no juice) mango which may be attractive in appearance but tastes insipid. Just as such a mango-fruit displeases us even so does such a poem. Hence some poets who do not go beyond strikingness of word and sense introduce alliteration, pun, etc. This may be appreciated in other forms of poetry but not in drama which is chiefly concerned with sentiment only. The ND condemns such poets as 'dry poets'.

Here the ND touches one of the most vital points about literature. From very ancient times there had been a problem of discussion as to what should be the most important element in poetry? What is in other word, the soul of poetry? What forms the guiding principle in poetry? And different rhetoricians propounded their own personal views as a result of which came into being five different schools of poetics.

The ND here points out the importance of Rasa in poetry. Rasa is the very soul of poetry. It is to poetry what fragrance is to a blossomed flower or what sweet juice is to a ripe mango fruit.

Here there is a red lamp shown to the poets who indulge themselves merely in ingenious play of word and sense. That is not true poetry. Scholarship of different sciences like Logic

1. Šusskavi - ND p. 171.
and grammar is different from poetic talents. A true poet does not care for the words but rather concentrates on Rasa. Words are merely the medium to convey the particular idea or sentiments. Words are thus means to an end and not an end in itself. It will be a serious unpardonable blunder on the part of the poet if he neglects the end, viz., Rasa and is too much attached to the display of his mastery of vocabulary and grammar.

The influence of Bharata and Abhinava is visible here too. The ND sides with the view of Bharata, viz., Rasa is the soul of poetry, the view which is merely slightly modified and widened by the propounders of Bhvati school, Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta. This view grew more and more popular by the advent of time and we find it accepted by almost all later writers on dramaturgy as well as poetics.

**CONTRADICTORY RASAS**

When rasa is accepted to be the summum bonum of dramatic
art, it becomes obligatory on the part of the playwright to care take utmost/with regard to Rasa the development of a Rasa in order that it may create a healthy emotional effect on the mind of the spectators. Rasa is so delicate that it demands serious attention of the writer while depicting it. One of the most important points that the dramatist should constantly bear in mind is that he should not fuse together those Rasas which are contradictory to each other such as Srngara and Bibhatas, Vīra and Bhayānaka, Hāsya and Karuṇa and so on.

Co-existence of such contradictory Rasas is very likely to mar the unified effect and so must be avoided.

The Nāda here states the conditions under which such contradictory Rasas can be fused together and the seeming contradiction removed. The contradictory sentiments sound contradictory only when (i) they are put at one place.

(ii) they are independent.

(iii) they are equally powerful.

So if this contradiction is to be removed the writer may use the following devices:

1. Certain Rasas are not contradictory, for instance, Srngāra and Hāsya, Srngāra and Vīra, Vīra and Adbhuta, Srngāra and Adbhuta.
The substratum or Asraya of the two Rasas should be changed. If Vira is depicted in the case of the hero, the Bhayānaka will not strike contradictory if depicted in the case of his rivals.

Moreover contradictory sentiments can stand together under different contexts. Thus Śṛṅgāra and Śanta which are mutually contradictory will not appear to be so when understood in different contexts, e.g., with reference to a lascivious man and a sage as is possible in the verse - 'Dantaksatāni Karajais ca vipātītāmi....' etc.¹

Moreover the sentiments appear contradictory specially when they are independent and equally powerful. But this contradiction is removed if one sentiment is made independent and the other one dependent upon it or they should be made subordinate to one principal Rasa. In the former case one sentiment will work as a helpmate to the other. Thus Śṛṅgāra may go a long way to heighten the effect of Karuṇa. Thus the recollection of the pleasures with the dead lover heightens the pathos.

Another way of removing the contradiction is to make the contradictory Rasas subordinate to some thing else. This is very easy. Even if they are made subordinate to another their contradiction disappears just as the cowives can stay

together happily under the supremacy of their lord even though they are rivals.

Again even when residing at one place the contradiction appears only when the sentiments are of equal strength and it would be instantly removed provided one is stronger than the other.

Lastly contradiction appears only when the contradictory sentiments are described simultaneously but not so if they are intercepted by a sentiment which is contrary to neither. Thus in the Nāgānada Sānta which is reflected in the words of the hero "......though contemptible, this youth will secure the fruit of my desire, if it passes away thus while I am serving my parents with devotion"¹ when followed by its contradictory sentiment, viz., Śṛṅgāra is mediated by Adbhuta which is contradictory to neither, being represented in the surprise expressed by the hero on hearing the charming song and music too².

In case of Vibhāvas and Vyabhicārīs too the contradiction can be removed in the manner as explained above with reference to Rasa.

¹. Nāg. I, 5*
². ibid I, 14.
The authors of the HD appear to be considerably indebted to the Dhvanyāloka where we find a systematic treatment of this topic for the first time.

**FLAWS (DOSA) OF RASAS**

The above discussion implies that the first flaw in the depiction of sentiment which is regarded as the very quintessence of drama by Indian theorists is to represent the contradictory sentiments simultaneously. Here there are other noteworthy flaws which a dramatist must scrupulously avoid. They are as under:

(1) **IMPROPRIETY**

It is of various kinds:

(a) **Introducing the Vibhāvas of a contradictory (or unfriendly) Rasa**, e.g., "Abandon pride. Enough of quarrels, the youth once passed will never return." being thus exhorted by the cuckoo birds, the young ladies indulge themselves in amorous sports. Here the fickleness of youth is the Vibhāva of Śanta which is unfriendly to Śṛṅgāra.

---

1. The verse quoted is from the Raghuvamśa (IX, 47) of Kālidāsa. Critics do not spare even the greatest poets. But here it is possible to defend Kālidāsa. What the lover wants to argue is this. As youth is so very evanescent every moment is highly precious. One cannot afford to waste it. So the purpose is not to create Vairāgya but to induce the beloved to enjoy to the full every second of life.
(b) Untimely representation.

e. g., in the Veni, in the time of war which caused the destruction of lacs of heroes along with Bhisma and others, the love-scene between Duryodhana and Bhānāmatī is represented.

In fact under this martial situation of the play a love-scene has no scope. But Bhattarāyana has committed a great artistic blunder while slavishly trying to follow the dramatic rules.

(c) Cutting off (the prevailing sentiment) all of a sudden. e. g., in the Mahāvīra-carita when the heroic sentiment has fully developed by the exchange of hot speeches between Rama and Parasurāma, the former suddenly bursts out, "I am going to untie the marriage-string."

(d) Misrepresenting the nature and temperament of high, middle and low characters. This can be through various ways:

(i) The comic, tragic, terrible and marvellous sentiments are quite unsuitable to high characters and so are decent love, furious and calm sentiments to the middle and low characters.

1. This scene is severely criticized by almost all writers on poetics; Cf. Dhv. p. 292. The ND seems to have drawn upon the Dhv. here.
(ii) Delineation of the love and union in the case of divine high characters as in the case of Pārvatī and Sāṅkara in the Kumārasambhava (Canto VIII), which is intolerable like the depiction of amorous sports of one's own parents.

(iii) Depiction of anger bearing immediate result, going to the heaven or nether region, crossing of ocean in case of non-divine high characters while delineating the heroic sentiment.

(iv) Depiction of sentiments quite contrary to the nature in case of the four types of heroes.

(v) Exuberance of heroism etc. in the case of middle and low characters.

(e) Inappropriate ness of language. The words should be appropriate to and in keeping with the emotion or sentiment to be conveyed. For instance in the case of vigorous (Dīpta) sentiments like Vīra and Raudra harsh consonants such as t, th, d, dh, v, or conjuncts should be abundantly used. Moreover, there ought to be long compounds. In case of delicate sentiments like Śringāra, Karuṇa, etc., the words should be soft. The dramatist should also avoid long compounds. In either case the words should be well-known, unambiguous, refined, and endowed with grace.
(f) Improper behaviour such as a fault or fraud committed by a high-born lady or the hero getting irritated on being kicked by the heroine.

(g) Action which is incompatible with the age or dress, time and clime, state or stage.

(h) When figures of word such as Yamaka, Slesa, etc. predominate or detailed descriptions of natural phenomena, seasons, ocean, sun-rise, moon-rise, are given they hinder the development of the sentiment proper.

(2) If a subordinate thing which is, in fact, meant to develop the main sentiment is described again and again it becomes a fault, e.g., in the KTR Rāma's weeping over and over again at the news of Jātāyu's death, Laksmana's injury caused by the missile and Sītā's distress carry pathos too far. A subordinate sentiment ought not to be raised so high lest it should over-shadow the principal one.

Here the ND criticizes the opinion of 'Some' who illustrate this by the description of Hayagrīva in the Hayagrīvavādha. But according to the ND this is a fault not of Rasa but of the plot itself as the hero of the plot is not delineated in detail. There the heroic sentiment is developed specially by the description of prowess and pomp of the culprit (Vadhya).”

1. Clearly enough the ND has criticized here under the 'Kecit' the author of the KP (This criticism is equally applicable to the KS which almost literally follows Mammaṭa, p. 71).
(3.) Not carrying the dominant sentiment to a high pitch. Here the sentiment which deserves development is not so developed.

(4.) The developing again and again even when the sentiment has already reached its acme is reckoned to be another fault, e.g., lamentation of Rati in the Kumārasambhava (Canto IV). If a sentiment which has been fully developed is again and again touched it fades and loses its charm like the withered garland of Malatī flowers.

(5.) Now in a play which includes a number of sentiments, the main sentiment should be connected or linked every time when it is interrupted by other sentiments. This linking is the essence of the development of Rasa. It should be remembered (brought to mind) again and again otherwise it will remain undeveloped and cause a serious flaw, e.g., in the RTN Sāgarika is totally forgotten on account of the entry of Bābhraya.

The ND at the close of the discussion points out that all of the above-mentioned flaws in fact can be included under impropriety but they are treated separately, with a view to elucidating by way of illustration as to how many types of improprieties are possible.
The ND next criticizes the view of some who hold that the Vyabhicārīs, Rasas, and Sthāyne should not be mentioned by name. Their verbal mention is a flaw in Rasa. But this is not correct, says the ND. Vyabhicārīs and others even though mentioned verbally may develop the dominant state (and ultimately Rasa), e.g. 'the eyes of that proud lady became eager when the lover was far, tremulous as he approached nearer, expanded as he talked, reddish as he embraced, with the brow slightly bent as he caught hold of her garments, full of tears when he bowed at her feet and sharp, as the lover committed an offence.'

1. The view referred to here seems again to have been directed against the KP of Mammaṭa. In the enumeration of Rasadosas in Ch. 7 (p. 434) of the KP this one tops the list. Mammaṭa takes this as a fault, of course he points out that it may not be so in all cases. When a particular gesture (Anubhāva) is incapable of suggesting only one specific state of mind then the Vyabhicārī may be mentioned in order that there should not be a shadow of doubt as to the emotion to be conveyed, e.g. haste (Tvarā) may be caused by eagerness and fear as well which are Vyabhicārīs. It will not be a fault even if the Vyabhicārī which is the cause of this haste is mentioned. It may be noted here that the KS too has followed the KP here and points out that verbal mention of Rasa, Bhāva, etc. is a fault but at times a similar mention of Vyabhicārīs may not be fault (Pp. 159-61) and illustrates it by this very verse.

2. ND, Pp. 175-6.
Here there is no Rasadosa but there is no strikingness or Vakrokti.

Similarly at times the Vibhāvas mentioned are common to two sentiments and consequently it is difficult to make sure as to which of the two is intended by the poet. This type of dubious apprehension or lack of perspicuity is a fault not of the Rasa but of the construction or expression. The illustration is -

"He (or she) does not relish any thing, his intellect has faded, commits faults (or stumbles at every step), rolls in the bed at night. Thus his body has forcibly fallen in a sad state. What can we do here?"

Here detachment to all objects etc. are possible in case of Karura also and thus there is a doubtful state about Śrīgārā being the chief sentiment. This according to the ND is a fault of expression.

This discussion of Rasadosas is mainly based on the Dhvanyāloka of Anandavardhana upon whom most of the later writers on poetics draw in the treatment of this and some other topics.

1. This again is mentioned by the KP as a Rasadosa (KS follows it) where Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas do not clearly suggest one sentiment. The same illustration is cited (p. 261). Thus the attack seems to be directed against Mammaṭa.
After the discussion of Rasa the authors of the ND turn to Bhāva. Bhāvas are of two types:

(i) Sthāyi bhāvas.
(ii) Vyabhicāribhāvas. The ND firstly treats of Sthāyibhāvas i.e., dominant states. They are nine in number corresponding to the nine Rasas; (i) Rati (Love), (ii) Hāsa (Humour), (iii) Soka (Sorrow), (iv) Krodha (anger), (v) Utsāha (vigour), (vi) Bhaya (terror), (vii) Jugupsa (hatred), (viii) Vismaya (wonder), and (ix) Sama (tranquility).

Rati consists in mutual attachment between a man and a woman. This attachment or affection is totally distinct from the one to be found in a wanton woman who is prompted merely by passion and her sole interest is the fulfilment of lust. It is also distinguished from the love or regard towards the good, elders, kinsmen, etc., or the attachment towards attractive things. Hāsa is the feeling of joy. The feeling of Soka consists of pain mingled with dejection. Utsāha is spiritedness or non-slothfulness in the religious activities, alms-giving, fighting etc. Bhaya implies confusion (Vaiklavya) Jugupsa is aversion or disgust. Vismaya is the emotion produced by seeing or hearing of anything surprising. Sama consists

1. The order very strictly corresponds to the NS of Bharata (cf. NS VI 18) with the difference that while the NS mentions eight, the ND adds Sama as the ninth.
in desirelessness. These dominant states are the causes (Pariṇāmikāraṇa) for the rise of their corresponding sentiments. In the cases of other sentiments these Sthāyis serve as transitory states or consequents (Anubbāva) for, as soon as they become they lose their Sthāyatva. If they come as accompanying states or helping ones they are transitory. If they come as effects they are consequents (Anubbāvas). Their transitory states and the consequents are the same as those of their respective sentiments.

It is rather strange to find that the ND should treat this important topic so summarily. While Bharata devotes considerable space to this topic the ND disposes off the treatment in a small paragraph in the commentary. The Kārikā 126 simply enumerates them but does not explain them at all. Even in the commentary they are explained in a short sentence at times in a word.

Here again a question may arise "Why then is this distinction of Sthāyi and Vyabhicāri? Can the Vyabhicārins also be Sthāyins?" The answer is in the negative. It is true that both Sthāyins as well as Vyabhicārins are Bhāvas, i.e., mental states. But all these states are not capable of being permanent ones in literature. Dream, sleep, jealousy, sickness etc. are bound to be momentary. They cannot be raised to a high level of

Sthāyī. So the ancient poets, taking into consideration the poetic and psychological factors, selected only a few out of the big number—just eight or nine—which could be developed into Rasa.

**Vyabhicāri Bhāvas**

The ND then turns to transitory states (*Vyabhicāri* or *Sancāri* Bhāvas). They are thirty three in number. They are as under:

27. Tarka or Vītarka, 28. Garva, 29. Autsukya, 30. Avahittha,

But this is not exhaustive. There can be even more transitory states such as—Kṣudh (hunger), Trṣṇā (thirst),
Maitrī (friendship), Maditā (mirth), Śraddhā (faith), Dayā (compassion), Upadeśā (indifference), Rati (love),

1. Rati has already been mentioned by the ND among the dominant states.
(contentment), Kṣamā (patience), Kārdava (tenderness),
Ārjava (straightforwardness), Dāsīnīya (courtesy), etc.
Moreover, even the Sthāyi Bhāvas and Ambhāvas may occur as
Vyabhicārīs.

They should be used with propriety. Some of them are
common to more sentiments than one, while others are not.

The authors of the ND appear to be quite correct when
they say that Vyabhicārī Bhāvas are not thirty-three only
but that there can be many more.

The ND then goes to define each of the above-mentioned
Bhāvas -

1. Nirveda (Discouragement) is disinterestedness or
dissatisfaction caused by afflictions such as poverty, disease,
insult, jealousy, beating, separation from the beloved, etc.
This causes mental agony and sighs. This is not invariably
and fixed for a particular sentiment/is to be occasionally
employed and so is called a transitory state and not a dominant
one. The same is the case with the remaining states too.

The ND here criticizes Mammata who considers this as
Sthāyi bhāva of Sānta on the ground that, though inauspicious,
it has been put first in the list of Vyabhicārīs by Bharata

and thereby asserts that it is a Sthāyī. The ND finds here a self-contradiction.

Of course the argument of Mammatā, though ingenious, cannot be called to be really intended by Bharata. It is clear that Bharata neither recognizes Sānta nor defines it. Had Bharata intended Nirveda to be a Sthāyī of a new sentiment he should have clearly stated it. It is difficult to understand why Bharata should put it in the list of Vyabhicārins if, he really thought it to be a Sthāyī.

Still however the way in which the ND has argued does not seem to be quite fair to Mammatā. Mammatā is aware of the transitory nature of Nirveda. What he means to say is simply this. When a list is given, the one which is the most important or auspicious among all the members should naturally top the list (Just as Rati, Śrīgāra, etc. top the list of Sthāyibhāvas, Rasas, etc.) Why then is Nirveda, which is really inauspicious in sense, should be placed first in the list of the Vyabhicārins. Mammatā believes that probably Bharata wants to attach more importance to it as it can be a Sthāyī of the ninth Rasa viz., Sānta.

The argument of the ND is open to another objection. It appears that permanent and transitory are relative terms. Even a Sthāyī can come as a transitory state to another in order to develop it. Very often Rati comes as a Vyabhicārī to Karūṇa (or Śoka)\(^1\). So it would not be correct to say that only because a state is mentioned in the list of Vyabhicārī- bhāvās it cannot be Sthāyī under any circumstance and vice versa.

2. **Gīti** (weakness) consists of agony, both mental as well as physical, caused by diseases, vomiting, hunger, thirst, etc. or by disability due to labour, journey, love-sport, or old age etc. This causes leanness of body or tremor\(^2\).

3. **Apasmāra** (Epilepsy) is the loss of discrimination as to what is fit to be done and what is not. It is caused by the influence of some evil spirit or some evil place. It is represented by falling on the ground, emitting foam from the mouth, heaving deep sighs, running, trembling, perspiring, etc.

4. **Śaṅkha** (apprehension) is the confused fickle state of mind on account of the misdeed done by one's own self or by others. It is represented by paleness, looking to and fro, veiling

---

1. Cf. the famous verse—Ayaṁ sa rasanoṭkarṣa… etc. where Śrīgāra comes in as a transitory state to Karūṇa.

oneself, drying up of the mouth, lips, throat, etc. licking by one's tongue, tremor, etc.

5. Asuya (Jealousy) is the feeling of intolerance of others' good qualities or virtues on account of avarice, hatred, pride, great fortune, power, charming grace, etc. It is represented by finding out flaws, whether true or false, knitting of the eye-brows, disregard, concealing of others' virtues, anger, wrath etc.

6. Mada (infatuation) is the joy as a result of intoxication. In the Uttama character this is represented by sleep and redness of face, sweat and smiling, horripilation, slightly stammering speech, graceful gait etc.

   In Nādhyāma characters it is represented by laughter and faltering, whaling, drooping down of arms, crookedness of gait etc.

   In Adhāma characters it is represented by tears and splitting, faltering of the speech, loss of memory, stumbling gait, vomiting, hiccoughing (Hīkka) coughing, etc.

   If a character enters intoxicated, the intoxication should be removed by terrifying it otherwise there would be chaos (Kāryavyāghata).
7. Srama (weariness or fatigue) is the exhaustion of the limbs on account of sexual enjoyments, a long journey, physical exercise, etc. It is to be represented by breathing deeply, side-glances, yawning, rubbing of limbs, slow and languid steps, etc.

8. Cintā (Anxiety) is mental affliction on account of not obtaining the desired object or obtaining the undesirable object. This is to be represented by absent-mindedness, heaving deep sighs, leanness etc.

9. Cāpala (Rashness) (or inconsistency-Yaas) is the feeling of venture on account of love, hatred, stupidity or dullness. It is to be represented by wilfulness or wantonness, harshness of speech, beating, killing, capturing, etc.

10. Āvara - (Agitation) is the feeling of agitation at the unexpected advent of the desired object, such as seeing (or hearing about) the gods, the preceptor, elderly persons (lit. worthy of respect), beloved ones, good fortune, etc; or an undesired object such as fire, earthquake, portentous wind, heavy rains, elephants, thieves, serpents, etc.

   This is to be represented by a change of physical state, such as standing up from the seat and coming forward to receive,
horrilpilation, embracing, giving of clothes, etc. at the advent of a beloved person or a desired object, and dropping down of all limbs, paleness of the face, running, agitated eyes, moving away swiftly, looking behind, grasping weapons, falling on the ground, quivering, lamentation, incoherent talk, etc. at the advent of an unpleasant object. Similarly there are mental changes like joy, surprise, etc. or doubt, dejection, dread, etc. as the case may be. Change in speech comprises of praise, flattery, appreciation or crying, lamenting, incongruous speech in different situations.

All these changes in the case of a high-born character are endowed with steadiness or dignity while in the case of a low character they are accompanied by rashness.

11. **Mati** (apprehension) is the talents (Pratibhā) as a result of the study of scientific treatises which destroys false cognition or doubts.

12. **Vyādhi** (sickness) is the feeling of physical and mental pain on account of the disorder of the three humours of the body.

   It is represented by cries of agony, withering up of the face, chattering of teeth, desire for cool air, throwing out of limbs, etc.

13. **Smrti** (recollection) is the memory of the thing previously
seen or apprehended, as a result of similarity of the thing recently observed.

14. **Dhrti** (contentment) is the feeling of satisfaction on account of knowledge, learning, attainment of the desired object, observance of purity, devotion to gods, special power, etc.

This is represented by bulkiness of the body, and not worrying about the things which have happened.

15. **Amarā (Indignation)** is the desire to wrong a person who has committed offence by insulting, showing contempt, etc.

It constitutes a desire to pay one back in one's own coin and thus differs from Krodha which is possible even when there is no wrong done by the opposite party. This is represented by shaking, thinking with the head bent low, perspiration, ardour, contemplation, devising the means, insulting, beating, etc.

16. **Marana (Demise)** consists of the determination of death as a result of diseases such as disorder of the three humours of the body, fever, itch (or scab), boils the wound caused

---

1. This Bhāva very much resembles the figure of speech called Smarana.


3. This itch and boil ought to be of a very serious nature. Otherwise they cannot cause death. But at least the person suffering from these diseases prefers death to unbearable suffering.
by weapons, drinking of poison, snake-bite, attack by wild
animals or an elephant or a horse, falling down from a carriage
or a lofty place, etc. The person loses all hopes for survival
as he considers the evil to be irresistible. This is represen-
ted by ineffectiveness of senses, agitated movements,
hiccoughing, heaving sighs, not seeing one’s attendants,
muttering indistinct syllables, pitiable condition of the face,
falling suddenly on the ground, trembling, getting emaciated,
emitting foam, dullness, bending of shoulders, etc.

Here actual death that is departure of soul from the body
should not be staged. Hence the determinants and consequents
of actual death are not proclaimed.

It is to be noted here that the word Marana does not
indicate death proper, for which the word actually stands, as
actual death was forbidden on the stage.

1. Hemacandra remarks that there are no Ambhāvas of actual
death (KS, p. 143).

2. Here we find an improvement upon Bharata who takes
Marana as actual death and gives two types of it:
(i) caused by disease (ii) caused by a blow or striking.
The DR (IV, 21) remarks that Marana is not discussed as
it is well-known and inauspicious. Hemacandra also takes
the word as a stage prior to death (Mrteh prāgavasthā
mṛtiḥ - KS, p. 143.)
17. *Moha* (Distraction) is the loss of sense as a result of a blow on a vital part of the body, unbearable pain, irresistible attack by a thief, a king, a snake, a tiger, etc., revolution in the country, danger of fire or water, seeing (or hearing about the foes. It is represented by whirling, falling down, inactivity of the senses, etc.

18. *Mudrā* (drowsiness) consists of inactivity of sense organs as a result of fatigue, Slothfulness, feebleness, waking at night, over-eating, intoxication, physical and mental exhaustion, worry, drowsiness, etc. It is represented by shaking of the head, yawning, inhaling, rolling of the eyes (eye-balls), bending of limbs, shutting of the eyes, confusion in all activities, etc.

19. *Supta* (sleep) it is a higher stage of *Mudrā*. In the latter only sense-organs become inactive and not the mind but here even the mind slightly ceases to function. It is represented by talk in dream and inactivity of organs. The Vibhāvas are the same as in *Mudrā*.

20. *Aṣṭryā* (cruelty) is becoming merciless towards a wicked man who is cruel, untruthful, deceitful, on account of the offence he has committed. It is represented by killing, imprisoning, beating, abusing, perspiring, shaking of the head etc.
21. Harṣa (Joy) is the mental delight caused by the obtainment of the agreeable thing (or beloved person). It implies abstinence from disagreeable thing, such as the favour of a god, one's preceptor, a king or one's master, obtaining food, clothing, wealth, progeny, etc. and festivities owing to occasions of joy such as the birth of a child, etc.

It is represented by perspiration, tears (of joy), stammering, inarticulate speech, horripilation, pleasant speech, happiness of eyes, and face, etc.

22. Viśāda (despair) consists of mental agony and dejection as a result of not obtaining the desired object or obtaining just the reverse (i.e. what is not desired). It is represented by sighing, contemplating the means of obtaining the desired object, seeking help-mates, distraction/ etc. in case of high-born and middle characters, and by drying up of the mouth, drowsiness, thinking, licking, etc. in the case of low-born ones.

23. Unmāda (Insanity) is the feeling of mental perplexity, and unsteadiness as a result of evil spirit, disorder of the etc. three humours of the human body. It is to be represented by doing improperly actions such as singing, dancing, reading aloud, standing, lying down (lit. sleeping), running, crying, talking incongruously, laughing without cause, etc.

1. ND, p. 185.
This comes as a transitory state of Vipralambha (love in Separation) in the case of a high-born character. In case the character is low, it figures as a Vyabhicāri of Karuna.

The ND tries to bring out the distinction between Unmēda and Apasmāra. The latter figures in Bhīmsena or Bhayānaka only while the former is for śṛṅgāra or Karuṇa as we have just observed. Moreover, while the former implies just the unsteadiness of mind, the latter signifies the non-existence or incompetence of the brain.

24. Dainya - (depression) is the feeling of mental feebleness (inferiority-complex) which is due to the hard times, poverty, contempt of others, etc. This is represented by paleness (lit. blackness) of the face, veiling the body, no decoration of the person, leaving aside all pomp and glory, dirtiness of attire, etc.

25. Vridā-(Shame) is lack of boldness before the elderly person on account of remorse for unworthy deed done, not keeping one's promise, disregard or violation of the orders of the elders, speaking ill of them etc. This is represented by concealing oneself, thinking with head low, pricking one's nails, scratching the ground, touching one's clothes or ring etc.

1- ND, p. 185.
26. **Trasa** (Fright) is a dreadful surprise at the terrific sight such as a hurricane or a fall of lightning, the roar of great Bhirava, or seeing of a very terrific ghost or a corpse, etc. It is to be represented by contracting one’s body, quivering, stupor, horripilation, faint, stammering speech, etc.

This is to be clearly differentiated from Bhaya where there is a loss of spirits owing to the anticipation of some evil.

27. **Turka** (deliberation or surmise) is the decision of one matter in the case of differences, doubts, etc. It is shown by the dancing movement, of the fingers, nodding of the head, knitting of eyebrows, etc.

28. **Garva** (Pride or insolence) is a feeling of over-estimating one’s own self accompanied by contempt towards others as a result of one’s high clan, family achievement, intellect, popularity, juvenility, power, etc. This is to be portrayed by showing disrespect, harshness, jealousy, conflict, not giving any answer, looking at one’s own body, ridiculing, disorder of ornaments, etc.

It will not be difficult to see that this feeling of pride is just contradictory to the one mentioned before, viz., Dainya. In terms of psychology we may call it superiority-complex.
29. **Autukva** (Impatience) is the eagerness or longing to see the beloved caused by recollection, desire to see or embrace, etc. It is represented by haste in mind, speech and body, uneasy glances, forgetting the duties, long sighs, incongruous utterances, perspiration, internal agony etc.

30. **Avahittha** (Dissimulation) is veiling or concealing one’s mental disturbances or outward manifestations like knitting of the eye-brows, reddening of the face, etc. This concealment may be due to boldness, fear, bashfulness (shame), dignity or crookedness. It is represented by indulging in some other activity different from the present one, such as looking at else where, speaking of something irrelevant, or showing artificial firmness, etc.

31. **Jadya** - (Stupor) is the inability to determine as to what one should do as a result of seeing or hearing of a desired object or an undesired one or some disease etc. Even after seeing with one’s naked eyes and hearing with one’s ears, a person is unable to decide his path of action. It is to be represented by silence, keeping mum, gazing with fixed eyes, dependence on others etc.

   This is different from Apasmāra and Moha which represent high excitement (loss of discrimination) and total loss of senses respectively.
32. **Ālasya** (slothfulness) is lack of enthusiasm in doing a thing as a result of fatigue, satiety (Sauhitya), nature (or temperament), disease, pregnancy, etc. This is to be shown chiefly in case of ladies and low characters. It is represented by yawning, not doing any activity except eating (as eating is done even by a slothful person).

Here Ārama or fatigue which itself is a Vyabhīcarī becomes a Vibhāva of Ālasya. But there is nothing wrong in this. Such a relation of cause and effect between Vyabhīcarīs is quite possible. Similarly a Vyabhīcarī can come in as an Amabhāva too of the other. Of course, one Vyabhīcarī cannot come as a Vyabhīcarī of the other because in that case that one will go up to the level of a Sthāyi.

33. **Vibodha** (waking) is interruption in slumber on account of sound (or noise), touch, dream etc. This is represented by stretching of limbs, yawning, rubbing the eyes, abandoning the bed, throwing off, of the arms, twisting of fingers, etc.

These Vyabhīcarī Bhāvas are temporary or short-lived as compared to the Sthāyi Bhāvas which are permanent or long-lived. They come and go like the pictures of the cinematograph. They are meant to help the development of the dominant state.

The enumeration and the explanation of the thirty three Vyabhīcarīs is in keeping with the NS of Bharata. All the theorists have usually followed the same.
The ND turns now to Anubhāvas. They are the effects (Kārya) of the (Rases), or Sthāyibhāvas or Vyabhicāri bhāvas or other Anubhāvas.

They are as under:

1. Vepathu (tremor) is the quivering of the limbs (or body) on account of fear, disease, joy, cold, anger, touch of the beloved, etc. It causes change in speech, gait, action, etc.

2. Stāṭha (Paralysis) is paralysing (becoming motionless) of the limbs such as hands, feet, etc., on account of excessive joy, surprise, dread, intoxication, disease, etc.

3. Romanes (hair-risplation). It is called Romanes when the hair stand erect on account of the sight of the beloved, disease, cold, anger, touch, etc.

4. Svarabheda (change of voice) is the change of voice owing to intoxication, fear, joy, anger, love, harshness, old age, etc. This change can be of two types: high-pitched voice or low-pitched one. It causes joy, humour, shame, dejection, etc.

5. Āṟu (tears) is shedding of tears from eyes on account of sorrow, looking intently at one object, great anger, smoke, applying of collyrium, yawning, terror, pain, laughter, etc.
6. Mūrčana (swoon) is losing control over one's senses (i.e. fainting), on account of heavy beating, anger, intoxication, etc. It causes falling on the ground, perspiration, heavy breathings, etc.

7. Svēda (Perspiration) is the excretion of liquid from the body on account of exertion, terror, joy, shame, disease, affliction, sorrow, heat, etc. It is represented by holding a fan in one's hand, desire for breeze, wiping off the perspiration, etc.

8. Vaivānya (Paleness) is the loss of one's lustre on account of condemnation, agony, terror, wrath, disease, cold, exertion, etc. It is represented by looking in the directions, pricking one's nails, blushing, etc.

There are thousands of Anubhāvas such as tranquillity, breathing a sigh of relief or pain, crying, lamenting, scratching the ground, turning on the other side, throwing, side-long glances, looking downward, admiration, laughter, giving alms, flattery, reddening of the face, etc.¹

Bharata (and the later theorists) calls these 'Sātvika Bhāvas.'² They are so called because these are caused by the

¹ ND, p. 186.
² NS (KM), Pp. 129-31.
concentration of mind. They cannot be imitated by an absent-minded person. They require great attention and care on the part of the actor. These, in fact, are not the actual mental states but are the external manifestations of the mental states. Hence it would be more correct to call them Amùbhàvas or consequents of mental states rather than Bhàvas or states.

Bharata also seems to be aware of this particular nature of the so-called Sàttvika Bhàvas and that is why he defines 'Sàttva' not as 'mind' but as arising out of the mind or mental concentration.

The DR also follows Bharata but understands this dual nature of these Bhàvas. Dhanika following Bharata tries to explain that they are Bhàvas because they are born of mind. But the explanation does not seem to be so convincing. Here there is an attempt to defend Bharata. The ND refuses to accept Bharata (or the authority of the DR and others) and boldly puts them in the category of the Amùbhàvas.

It appears that the authors of the ND are perfectly justified here as these eight are of the nature of consequents and not states. We can differentiate them from other consequents which are innumerable as the ND points out, by calling them Sàttvika Amùbhàvas since the representation of these require a very high type of mental concentration.

1. Vide - Iha hi sattvaṁ náma manabprabhavāṁ - NS(KM) p. 129.
2. Cf. prthag bhāvāḥ bhavanty anvēśābhavatve'pi sattvikāḥ - DR IV, 4.
ABHINAYA

Drama is primarily a mimetic art. It is defined as 'modes of imitation' and in order that the imitation may be realistic, histrionic art or gesticulation becomes absolutely essential. Thus drama is basically histrionic art and a treatise on dramaturgy would be called incomplete if it does not discuss this very important element of drama.

After discussing the sentiments and states the ND turns to Abhinaya. Abhinaya is derived from the root 'ni' to lead' with the prefix 'abhi' meaning 'towards' or 'near', so called because it leads the Artha-sense towards the spectators. The ND takes 'abhi' in the sense of vividly (graphically or picturously). So Abhinaya conveys the sense very graphically to the spectators.

Abhinaya is of four types:


1. Vācika-(verbal) is so called because its burden is to imitate speech. Drama is intimately associated with speech. The actor is supposed to imitate the speech of the character in keeping with the sentiment or state to be conveyed. While representing the heroic or furious sentiment the speech should be vigorous. It ought to be mild and soft if the sentiment is

2. ND p. 188.
Sṛṅgāra and so on. Thus speech should convey properly the different states such as anger, pride, etc., or shivering, horripilation, etc., and that is why the playwright often puts some stage-directions such as "angrily," "with agitation" etc. If the speech is imitated without any Bhāva, it is merely recitation and not Vācika Abhinaya.

The word Abhinaya suggests imitation of states or conditions of the persons whose lives are delineated.

Here the ND touches a subtle problem connected with the concept of Abhinaya. Is it really possible for the actor to imitate the mental or physical conditions of a person, say Rāma, who lived before centuries and whom he has not seen personally? Even the spectators have not seen Rāma in person and so cannot assert whether or not an actor is truly representing the states of Rāma. So the imitation in this respect cannot be real. The actor on account of the intense study of the life of Rāma depicted by the dramatist and continuous practice feels as if he has personally seen Rāma and imitates him. In fact, he imitates the ways of the world. The spectators superimpose the actual Rāma upon the actor being deceived, as it were, by the realistic and life-like four-fold

---

1. Here the authors of the ND may be convicted of self-contradiction as shivering and others have been recognized as Anubhāvas while discussing them (p. 1964) and here (p. 1978) they are referred to as Bhāvas.
Abhinaya of the actor and being spell-bound by highly attractive music and hearing the conventional usage of the names Rāma, Sīta, etc. with reference to the actor or the actress and they feel one with the pleasant or painful conditions of the characters.

The spectators superimpose Rāma and others upon the actor irrespective of the fact whether they have seen Rāma or not; otherwise they would feel that all this is artificial and would not be able to be one with the states of Rāma and others. Drama thus creates a world of illusion, nevertheless it is possible to enjoy Rasa even out of illusion, e.g., a man experiences Rasa even if he sees a damsel, an enemy or a thief even in dream (which is really untrue); otherwise how could the consequents of Rasas, such as stambha and others be seen in such cases?

The ND here points out that the poets describe the life of Rāma as visualised by the great seers (Rais) by their extraordinary power of knowledge and so what the poet describes is not false but perfectly true, more true than what is seen by one's own naked eye.

1. In fact a poet himself is a seer (cf. kavistu krāntadraṣṭā). One who does not have a vision of life cannot aspire to earn reputation as great poet.
In fact the poet's business is not to depict the historical truth. He is not a historian. From history he borrows merely the names of the characters and certain incidents or episodes connected with them. It is he who has to furnish the lifeless skeleton with flesh and blood and new spirit. His work is not a faithful reproduction but a new creation. As Aristotle puts it, "The poet's function is to describe, not the thing that has happened but a kind of thing that might happen."¹

2. **Andika** - (Bodily gestures)

It means gesticulation by limbs of the body such as head, hands, breast, waist, sides, feet, eyes, eye-brows, lips, cheeks, chin etc. This bodily action or gesticulation should be such as would convey the emotion such as anger, love, enmity, joy etc.² And thus there are several types of movements of limbs. Consequently, the movements of the head are of 13 types such as Ákampita, Kampita, etc. There are 36 types of glances and various types of looking³. There are many types of eyelid-movements⁴. There are seven types of eye-brow movements⁵. The ND then

---

2. For details refer to NS VIII, 17-38.
3. Ibid, 43-110.
4. Ibid, 111-118.
5. Ibid, 119-129.
Refers six types of nose-movements, six types of cheek-movements, six types of movements of lips (rather lower lip), many types of chin-movements, nine types of neck-movements.

3. Sātvika - (Temperamental) The gesticulation for which a concentration of mind (Sattva) is indispensable is called Sātvika. This is essential at the time of representing the Sātvika states such as Svarabheda, tremor, paralysis, horripilation, swoon, perspiration, paleness, tears, sighs, agony, cold, yawning, becoming lean and such actions as discharging foam from the mouth, etc.

This is different from verbal gesticulation as this does not form any speech. Nor this is physical as we do not find a clear and evident movement of limbs.

The ND adds that this is to be represented in keeping with the nature of the character which may be Uttama, Madhyama or Adhama.

4. Ahārya - Extraneous representation-(dresses and makeup)- This is an imitation of colour (such as white, black etc) taste, fragrance, dress, weapons, carriage, etc.

1. Ibid, 130-136.
2. Ibid, 137-140.
3. Ibid, 141-146.
4. Ibid, 147-152.
5. Ibid, 170-175.
6. ND, p. 191.
In short, this differs from the earlier three as they were primarily related to body, while Āhārya is different from physical gesticulations as it depends on external objects such as garments, make-up, etc. This is in keeping with the place (region or country), time, family, nature, conditions, sex, etc.

The ND does not admit of Citra Abhinaya as it can be included in Āṅgika, Sāmānyā Abhinaya too can be included in Vācika etc.

**CRITICAL REMARKS:**

After the discussion of Rasa and Bhāva, the ND turns to another important problem of dramatics viz., Abhinaya or Gestures. The ND does not treat this topic at length as does the MS. The latter devotes several chapters¹ to the discussion of gesticulation or histrionic art whose value in a drama can never be over-estimated. Drama is a spectacular form of Poetry (Drāya Kāvya) as against all other forms of poetry which are only to be read or heard (Sravya Kāvya). The success of a drama lies in its successful representation on the stage.

Even some of the best dramas fail on the stage. The dramatist has therefore, to be very vigilant about this aspect of drama.

---

¹ Ch. VIII treats of gestures of minor limbs, Ch. IX of hands, Ch. X of other limbs, Ch. XI, XII, XIII treat of other movements, Ch. XXI treats of Āhārya Abhinaya, Chs. XXII, XXIV, of Sāmānyābhīnaya, Ch. XXV of Citrābhīnaya.
and so long as its representation does not gratify the learned critics the dramatist can never feel happy about it. The success of this representation depends mostly upon the actors. Actors are not supposed to repeat the dialogues of a drama in a parrot-like cold way but have to reproduce with appropriate gestures of hands and feet, modulation of voice (in accordance with the emotion to be conveyed) and appropriate expressions on the face, without which the drama will fail to make the emotional appeal to the spectator or give him aesthetic delight (Rasa) which is the 'summu bonum' of drama or any form of literature. Abhinaya is therefore a means for creating Rasa. Thus the art of acting forms "the indispensable adjunct of dramaturgy".

This actually is the scope and importance of Abhinaya.

But it will easily be seen that it is primarily the concern of the actor and not the dramatist. Nevertheless, the dramatist cannot ignore this aspect. When he writes a play he has always to keep before his mental eye the demands of the stage and that is why he supplies the dialogue with various stage-directions (such as "angrily" "gesticulating shame, or love-torment or pity" etc.)

Among these four types of Abhinaya Vācika is more important, the others (i.e., Āṅgika, Sātvika and Āhārya) being meant for helping it.

Bharata has devoted two complete chapters on Sāmānyābhinaya which he divides into three types, viz., arising out of speech, physical action and mind and includes the qualities or natural characteristics (and types) of the various dramatic personages such as the hero, the heroine, their helpmates, the actor, the stage-manager, etc. The ND does not recognize it as that Abhinaya can very conveniently be included in any of the three Abhinayas viz., Vācika, Āṅgika, or Sātvika.

Bharata has also devoted one chapter to Citrābhinaya which he defines as the occasional peculiarities in the physical and other gestures.

But this again can be included in Āṅgika Abhinaya.

1. NS(KM) XXII, XXIV.
2. NS (KM) XXV.
3. NS (KM) XXV, I.