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FOREWORD

I GLADLY respond to the desire of Dr. Raghavan that I should contribute a Foreword to this book. He has been carrying on researches in the field of Sanskrit literary criticism for several years past, and the material which he has brought together here shows how extensive is his acquaintance with the literature on the subject. He draws his data, it will be seen, from unpublished manuscripts as readily as he does from published works. The opinion formed on any aspect of the subject by one, who has devoted so much time to its study and whose knowledge of it is so wide, is of special value and deserves the careful attention of all scholars.

The particular problem considered here is that of the number of rasas, and its consideration necessarily involves the discussion of many important points relating to their nature and scope. As in the case of other problems investigated by the ancient Indians, we find here also an astounding variety of solutions. While some thinkers have held that there is but one rasa, others have maintained that the rasas are many, there being a wide divergence of opinion respecting their exact number. The usual view, however, is that there are eight rasas or nine, with the addition of what is termed śānta:

श्रुकारहास्यकरुणा रौद्रनीर्म्यानका: ।
बीमत्साङ्गुत्त्वशान्तत्तथ रसा: पूँवःस्नाहला: ॥
Although Dr. Raghavan considers all these views more or less in detail, the main part of his discussion is concerned with the admissibility of śānta as the ninth rasa. His treatment of the question is quite comprehensive, and he examines it both from the historical and the aesthetic sides. A brief reference to each of them may not be out of place.

Owing to the uncertainty of our knowledge of the early phases of Indian classical literature, it is not possible to say when poets began to portray this rasa. The ascetic and mystic elements, however, which form its distinctive basis, are very old features of Indian life; and they were highly valued by those who followed the teaching of the Veda as well as by those who did not. So we may assume that the śānta attitude found expression in literature quite early; and this is corroborated by the works of Asvaghosa even if, on account of its chronological indefiniteness, we leave out of consideration the Mahābhārata, the usual example given of the śānta rasa. As regards writers on Poetics, the earliest to recognise it definitely, so far as our knowledge at present goes, was Udbhāta. Possibly its recognition by them was even earlier. Bharata’s view in the matter is somewhat doubtful, by reason of the unsatisfactory character of the text of the Nātyasāstra as it has come down to us. Some manuscripts of it mention only eight rasas, but others nine. The weight of evidence bearing on the point seems, on the whole, to be on the former side; and Dr. Raghavan adduces several convincing arguments to show that the references to this rasa in Bharata are all spurious. But it should be added that the Nātyasāstra contains nearly all the essential points necessary for a theoretical formulation of it.

Before we pass on to the aesthetic aspect of the question, it is desirable to distinguish the emotive content or theme of
a literary work from the aesthetic sentiment which, according to the prevalent Indian view, its idealised representation evokes in the reader or the spectator. Thus in the case of the S'ākuntalam, Duṣyanta’s love for S'akuntalā forms the chief theme while the emotion, which it awakens in us as we witness the drama enacted, is *svānta*. When we ask whether *svānta* can be a *rasa*, we mean whether situations in life involving the quietistic sentiment lend themselves to be similarly dealt with in literature. If they do, then *svānta* is a *rasa*; otherwise, it is not. The practice of great poets like Kālidāsa, which is after all the true touchstone in such matters, shows that *svānta* situations can certainly be thus delineated in literary works. In the last act of his play, just alluded to, Kālidāsa describes the tranquillity and holiness of Mārica’s hermitage in a manner which affects us most profoundly. But, however splendidly depicted, the *svānta rasa* occupies only a subordinate place there; and a doubt may therefore arise whether it can be the leading sentiment in a work, i.e. whether it can be portrayed in such a manner that it will impress us at the end as the predominant element in the unity of *rasas* which, according to the Indian view, every work of art is expected to achieve. Some of the works of Asvaghōsa, to whom I have already referred, show that it can be so represented. The Mahābhārata also, at any rate in its present form, illustrates the same truth, as set forth by Ānandavardhana in his masterly way in the last section of his *Dhvanyāloka*.

Yet there were theorists who denied that the *svānta* could be an art emotion. It is hardly necessary to examine their arguments when we have the practice of great poets and the opinion of great art critics to the contrary. But a reference should be made to one of them which appears, at first sight, to possess some force. This argument is that the attitude of
mind for which sānta stands is altogether a rare one, and that its representation in art cannot therefore appeal to more than a very few. The objection, it is obvious, is based on the supposition that the test of true art is in the wideness of its appeal. The advocates of sānta brush this argument aside usually by saying that such questions are not to be decided by a plebiscite; but, by thus admitting the narrowness of its appeal, they seem to give up their position. Their conclusion that sānta is a rasa is irresistible. Indeed, it would have been a strange irony of circumstance if Indians, of all, had excluded it from the sphere of art. The way in which this particular objection is met, however, is not satisfactory. May it be that the contention that the appeal of sānta is only to a very few is wrong? No unwonted occasion in life—whether it be one of joy or one of sorrow—passes without bringing home to man the supreme desirability of spiritual peace. It means that the need for such peace is fundamental to the human heart; and this conclusion is confirmed by the pure satisfaction which the contemplation, for example, of the images of Buddha in meditative repose brings to so many. If so, the sānta mood is by no means uncommon; and the sānta rasa need not be an exception to the rule that the appeal of art is general. What is uncommon is the capacity in man to capture that mood and cultivate it, so that it may come to prevail over all other moods; but this deficiency does not matter so far as art is concerned for it has the power, of itself, to enable him to attain, albeit only for a while, the peace of spirit which, as an old Indian critic has observed, even a yogin has to strain himself long to win.

Dr. Raghavan makes a valuable contribution to the study not merely of Sanskrit literary criticism but of Indian Aesthetics as a whole, for the conception of rasa, though it is
here dealt with chiefly in its relation to poetry, is general and furnishes the criterion by which the worth of all forms of fine art may be judged. I have no doubt that the book will be read and appreciated very widely.

M. H.
PREFACE

Rasa, Aucitya and Dhvani form the three great contributions of Sanskrit Alamkāra Sāstra to the subject of Literary Criticism. Rasa is the very ‘soul’ (Atman) of poetry and drama. Of this concept of Rasa, one aspect namely the number of the Rasas—whether they are only the eight mentioned by Bharata or are more—is studied in the following pages. The study now and then does necessarily touch more fundamental aspects of the concept of Rasa also.

This study was originally published in the form of articles in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras. It was suggested to me that I might bring them out in book-form. That they have appeared now in book-form is due to the kindness of Dr. Srinivasa Murti, Director, Adyar Library, to whom my thanks are due for the inclusion of this publication in the Adyar Library Series. I must thank also Dr. C. Kunban Raja, D. Phil., Reader in Sanskrit, University of Madras and Curator, Adyar Library.

Thanks are also due to the authorities of the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras, and to the authorities of the University of Madras for permitting this publication.

Madras
29.7.40
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### ADDENDUM

P. 50, lines 6-7 and 26-7, Alarikāra sarvasva of Harṣopādhyāya (?), MS. in the Madras Govt. MSS. Library, R. No. 3325:—R. No. 5225 is another MS. of the same work in the same library in which Aubhalārya Kiṣṇa of Devarakoḍḍa is given as the author.
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

For long, the Rasas were only eight in number. The text of the Nāṭya sāstra of Bharata originally spoke only of eight Rasas. For a long time, the poets also were speaking only of eight Rasas. Kālidāsa says in his Vikramorvasīya:

मुनिना भरतेन य: प्रयोगों भक्तिभव्यसाध्यो नियुक्तः ||
कुविताभिनयं तत्वं भर्तृं मर्त्यं द्देमनः सहोकपायः || II, 18.

Vararuci's Udbhābhīṣṭikā has occasion to mention Rasas and their number. The context is a dramatic contest. The Viṣṇu praises one of the courtesans who is going to enact 'Purandaravijaya' in the temple of Indra at Kusumapura. Rasas are here mentioned as eight in number.

वस्त्रास्तावत् प्रथमं हृद्दीनव्योवेचनव्युत्तितिका धार्म्यादीनां शुभान्तरं सम्पत्,
वृत्तिविवेचनव्योवेचनव्युत्तितिका धार्म्यादीनां शुभान्तरं सम्पत्,
वः स्थानानि, नविनमानसां अनुरुच्छाते, अनुस्पृहानां निरीक्षणमः,
पद्धस्थानानि, नविनमानसां अनुरुच्छाते, अनुस्पृहानां निरीक्षणमः,
स्थानानि, नविनमानसां अनुरुच्छाते, अनुस्पृहानां निरीक्षणमः.

p. 13, Caturbhāṇī, Madras.

On the side of the theorists, the writers on Poetics, Rasas were only eight up to the time of Danḍin who briefly describes and illustrates only the eight Rasas. Naturally, we suppose
that Bhāmaha also knew only eight Rasas. These eight Rasas are thus given by Bharata:

श्रृण्णार-हस्त्स-करुण-रौद्र-वीर-भयानका: ||
वीभत्तानुत संजी चेत्यशो नाट्ये रसा: स्न्ताता: ||
पते शाश्वो रसा: मोक्ता हृद्धित्रो गहलना ||

N. S'. K. M. Edn., VI, 15-16.

And their Sthāyins are thus given:

रत्नां साह शोकस्थ कोषस्थाय सम्य तथा ||
ज्ञुपसा विस्मय्यद्वित स्मायिमा: परस्मित्तिता: || Ibid., VI, 17.

We are unable to fix the exact significance of the record here made by Bharata that these are the eight Rasas expounded by the great Brahman. The mention of Brahman may after all refer only to the legendary background which the Nātya śāstra has created for itself. The very first verse says to the effect that almost the first exponent of the Nātya śāstra is Brahman:

नामवशान्त प्रवश्यामि श्रवण घनदाहलम || I, 1.

And this Brahman himself learnt from Sīva. This legend is settled in later times and is mentioned by all writers. How far is this based on evidences within the Nātya śāstra itself?

To begin with, sage Bharata says that Brahman himself contemplated and created out of the four Vedas, the fifth Veda called the Nātya Veda. I, 16-19. Sīva is mentioned in the first chapter, for the first time, with reference to the Kaisikī Vyrtti. Brahman says that the beautiful, graceful and delicate Kaisikī cannot be properly presented by male actors, that it can be properly done only by actresses and that he has seen it depicted by only one among males, viz., God Sīva. I, 45.
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

We hear of Śiva again only in Ch. IV. The first drama ‘Asuravijaya’ or ‘Amṛtamathana’ was enacted before an audience of Devas and Asuras in Devaloka during the Indradhvaja festival. I, 54-57.

After this Samavakāra, the first drama to be staged, was finished, Brahman one day took Bharata and his troupe to Kailāsa to give a performance before God Śiva. This Samavakāra, and a Dīma called Tripuradāha, one of Śiva's own exploits, were staged there. IV, 5-10. After the drama was finished, Śiva praised Brahman and the actors and told them that the beautiful and varied Karanas and Aṅgāhāras of the Tāṇḍava dance which He himself did every evening might be introduced into the Pūrvaraṅga of their drama, so that their plain (S’uddha) Pūrvaraṅga might become a Citrapūrvaraṅga. IV, 11-15. He called upon one of his Gaṇas, Taṇḍu, to teach Bharata the Aṅgāhāras and Karanas of Tāṇḍava. IV, 17-18. Thus Śiva is the God of dance proper, while Brahman himself created Drama and won Śiva's appreciation for his creation of this art. Bharata is the first artiste whom Brahman chose for the exposition of the art that he created. Brahman's creation of the art of Drama referred to all parts of it, the text of the drama, the acting of it, the music that supported the performance and finally the Rasa which the above three evoked in the hearts of the audience. This is the meaning of the verse:

ऋषीह भाष्मसुभवेदात् सामस्यो गीतमेव च ।
ब्रह्मेदात्भिनयानि रसानांवर्णादिपि ॥

"It is this Amṛtamathana that Kālidāsa makes into the Lakṣmīmāyavayamvara in his Vikramorvasīya."
The story given above points to the historical fact that Dance existed first and that Drama was then created. Tanḍu signifies the link between the two. The gods of the two, Dance and Drama, are Śiva and Brahman. So it is that Bharata, who represents the operatic dance-drama, says at the beginning—

प्रणम्य शिरसा देवैं पितामहमेष्वराः

and Abhinava adds here, in his commentary—

“एको (वन्मा) विजिगीषुनामायपर्वतयितिति देवः | सगबांत्व आत्मनिर्भरतया कीडाकीलः सनव्यादौ नत्वतीति नाट्येऽरु पुरास्त्रार्गिति

\[ च \text{ ग्रुः} \text{ तदुपस्तारिणि} \] च \text{ ग्रुः} \text{ प्रद्धिचिति तात्वेयान् अधिप्रवृत्तं सुधू चेति नमस्त्वाऽः ||}


Thus Śiva’s contribution is Dance which served to beautify Drama—तदुपस्तारिणि च ग्रुः. Brahman’s contribution itself was self-sufficient for Drama. He spoke of Text, Action, Music and Rasa. It is to this part of the Drama of Brahman that Bharata refers in Ch. VI, when he says that these are the eight Rasas spoken of by Brahman.

पते बाणी रसः प्रेक्षा दुष्प्रेण महामना

It is on this text that S’aradātanaya relies when he says that, according to Brahman, Rasas are only eight, and the ninth, the S’ānta, is impossible.

...... तस्मायच्छात्तस्व नोद्वः |
तस्माचावनसा अश्चार्थिति प्रकटवो भवसः ||


These bits of legend have to be connected with some facts available to us, vis., that there are really big works on Nātya
which are current as works of Śива or Sadāśiva and Brahman. Says Mr. M. R. Kavi in his Introduction to his edition of the N. S.' with the Abhi. Bhā. in the Gae. Series:—“We have fragments of both Brahmabharata and Sadāśivabharata.” Abhinavabhūta himself refers to the three authorities, Sadāśiva, Brahman and Bharata.

““एतेन सदाशिवाद्वाममतत्वत्रविवेचनेन ब्रह्ममतसाराप्रतिपदनाय etc.” p. 8.

The upshot of the discussion here gives the noteworthy fact that, of the three works Sadāśiva Bharata, Brahma Bharata and Bharata’s Nāṭya śāstra, the Brahma Bharata is the best and most important according to some. The Daśarūpakakārikās, IV, 38 and 39, proving Rasa to be Śāmājīkaśraya, are quoted and attributed to Sadāśiva by Śāradātanaya. Bhā. Pra. VI, p. 152. This ascription does not seem to be reliable. The argumentative style of the Kārikās argue for a later writer. Whether this particular ascription be true or not, it can be accepted that old works in the name of Sadāśiva and Brahman exist. Though from the internal evidence of the Nāṭya śāstra of Bharata we know of Śiva as having contributed Dance only, there may be a Sadāśiva Bharata dealing with all departments of Nāṭya. It is also likely that this Sadāśiva Bharata is of special importance for its chapters on Dance, on Tāṇḍava, its Kāraṇas and Aṅgahāras.

Similarly Taṇḍu, who, in the Nāṭya śāstra, simply passes the Tāṇḍava from Śiva to Bharata, may have some old Nāṭya work to his credit. There is some difficulty in understanding the name Taṇḍu. In Ch. I, we hear of a Taṇḍu who is one of the hundred sons of Bharata. (I, 26.) From Ch. IV, we know him as belonging to Śiva’s camp. In Ch. I, 26, the text has a variant (p. 18. Gae. edn. fn.) Tāṇḍya, and in
Ch. IV, 17 and 18, we have the variant Tāṇḍin (p. 19, Gaek. edn. fn.). Abhinava says that the reading 'Tāṇḍu' is appropriate, in view of that word's suitability to the derivation of the word Tāṇḍava.

"सर्वत्र पाठे तण्डुशब्दे एव गुणः, तण्डवशब्दस्युपसिवशात्।" p. 90, Gaek. Edn., Vol. I.

It looks as if 'Tāṇḍu' was created out of the word Tāṇḍava. Surely, this Tāṇḍava was being done by S'īva before Tāṇḍu who, on S'īva's bidding, taught it to Bharata. Therefore, the name Tāṇḍava could not have been the name given to the dance subsequent to Tāṇḍu imparting it to Bharata. In this connection, the text of Abhinava's commentary seems to say that this Tāṇḍu is none else than Nandin, the chief attendant of S'īva. We find in Mr. M. R. Kavi's Edn., Vol. I, p. 90: 'तण्डुमुनिष्ठाद्वान् (नन्दिमत) तपोपरमाणवि।' But in the MS. of the Abhinavabharati in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, we find the passage running thus:

'तण्डुमुनिष्ठाद्वान् तस्योर (?) नामनि (नी)।' Vol. I, 68.

and it is rather difficult to reconstruct or understand this text. There does not seem to be unanimity among writers regarding the identity of Taṇḍu and Nandin. The S'abdakalpadruma says that, according to Halāyudha, Taṇḍu is a door-keeper of S'īva,—S'ivadvārapālavisēṣa. The Vācaspatya says the same thing and adds that it is a name of Nandikesvara 'शिवद्वारपालविशेषे, नन्दिकेर्षे।' Nandī मुनिष्ठित्सञ्जु:।' In the

\(^1\) The explanation of Tāṇḍava by Taṇḍu is not the only explanation. Bhānuji and Kṛtrasvāmin, in their commentaries on the Amarakosa (Nāṭya varga, S.I. 10) give Tāṇḍava as being so called...
S'abdakalpadurma, we find that according to the Trikāṇḍasācēṣa, the other names of Nandikesvara are Nandi, S'ālaṅkāyana and Tāṇḍavatālika, and that according to Hemacandra, the other names are Nandi and Tāṇḍu. Kesava's Kalpadrukosa (Gaek. edn., p. 392, St. 117-8) gives Nandin, S'ālaṅkāyana, Tāṇḍavatālika, Tāṇḍu, Kellika and Kūśmāṇḍaka as the other names of Nandikesvara. If Tāṇḍu were a name of Nandikesvara, he would be both the time-keeper for Siva's Tāṇḍava (tāṇḍavatālika) and the promulgator of the Tāṇḍava (tāṇḍana prāśa, tāṇḍavam). But, according to Sarvananda and Bharatamallika, the person who is responsible for the S'āstra through which Tāṇḍava got its name, is a sage (Muni) named Tāṇḍa or Tāṇḍya. And Tāṇḍu whom Siva asked to teach the Tāṇḍava to Bharata may not be Nandikesvara but may be some other Gaṇa of Siva. Ratnakara's Haravijaya, which is a store-house of information for the Nāṭya-researcher, mentions Nandisa and Tāṇḍu as two different persons and the commentator, Rājānaka Alaka, adds that Tāṇḍu is one of the Pramathāganas of Siva.

after its exponent, Tāṇḍu. Bharata (com. on Amara) says that the sage Tāṇḍa (not Nandikesvara, a S'ivagaṇa) promulgated the S'āstra which came to be called after him 'Tāṇḍī' (Neuter); and from this Tāṇḍi is Tāṇḍava derived. 'ताण्डेन कुर्ते (ताण्ड) कुस्तः, तद्स्कास्तीति भरतः (अभरठकायाम्)।' See the S'abdakalpadruruma and Vācaspatya on Tāṇḍava. Sarvananda's Tīkāsarvasva, p. 41, T. S. S. edn., pt. 1. ताण्डेन सुभिनिनार्या प्रेष्ण ।।। ताण्डिक ताण्डवास्म । तद्स्कास्तीति ताण्डवम । To these derivations, Subhuticandra adds 'तण्डे (तण्डे) सुभुनेनेति ताण्डवम ।' Tāṇḍava is so called because, being a forceful dance (Uddhata), earth is stamped heavily in it. Vidyāvinoda Nārāyaṇa gives all these explanations. Rayamukuta gives Sarvananda's and Svāmin's explanation and adds: "तण्डवतौ: ताण्डवमति हृ वृधिः।"
From this it would appear that Nandin is the drummer and Tāṇḍu the singer of the libretto for Śiva’s dance. Abhinava gives an extract from Kohala also on p. 182 (Gaek. edn. Vol. I) having some bearing on Tāṇḍu and Tāṇḍava.

The name Nandin is found twice in the Nāṭya sāstra, IV, 260 and 261, in connection with the Piṇḍībandhas. More than one work on Nāṭya has come down to us as the work of Nandikesvara. Rājaśekhara ascribes the first treatment of Rasa to Nandikesvara and the first treatment of Drama to Bharata.

"——स्पकनिरूपणीयं भरतं, रसाधिकारिं नन्दिकेश्वरं: — ।"


The chief ground on which Rājaśekhara foists the first treatment of Rasa on Nandikesvara is the record made by Vātsyāyana in his Kāma sūtra, I, 1-8, that Nandikesvara is the first author on Kāma. Love may be taken to be indicative of the other Rasas and further, it is the most important of the

1 Tāṇḍava thus originally meant the song, to the accompaniment of which Śiva danced; the dance then came to be called Tāṇḍava after its song. Such instances of dances getting their names from the songs, the Tāla of the song, etc., are common. Cf. Carcari is a Tāla, a musical composition, a dance and also a spring festival in which the Carcari is danced. (The Ratnāvali, I.) Cf. Jatisvara, Varna, Pada, etc., in the modern South Indian Nautch, which names of musical compositions serve as names of the dance items also.
emotions which form the material for literature. Sāradātanaya relates a Rasa-legend in Ch. 3, of his Bhāvaprakāśa in which Nandin figures and which legend he ascribes to Vyāsa. ‘स्यासदेत्तन मागण कपयामि ग्यायत्’ | We do not yet know of a work of Vyāsa on Nātya. The legend given in the Bhāvaprakāśa is this: Brahmān created the worlds at Siva’s bidding and then contemplated upon the past and saw with his mind’s eye the doings of Siva. Nandikesvara appeared before Brahmān at that time and taught him Nātya and asked him to teach the art to the Bharatas, i.e., actors. Brahmān created the art of representation, drama, with a past story of Siva called Tripurādāha, a Dīma. The Bharatas staged this Tripurādāha and while Brahmān was witnessing it, there came forth from his four faces four Vyuttis with the four Rasas, Sṛṅgāra, Vīra, Raudra and Bibhatsa. Concluding this story of Rasotpatti, Sāradātanaya says:

एक्कामुखेश्वर्यत्वतिना इल्ल्युः शाक्याद्यः।

The Sāṅkara mentioned here is another puzzle.1 Sāradātanaya brings Nārada also into the story and says that Nārada expounded this Rasotpatti to Bharata, the sage (p. 58, Ch. III). The two Guruparamparās found here are ‘Siva-Nandin-Brahman-the Bharatas’ and ‘Nārada-Bharata, the sage’. In Ch. 10, Sāradātanaya gives another story of how Nātya came to earth from heaven, where also the former Guru-paramparā is given. The actors, the Bharatas, are sent to this world and they write treatises on the art.

1 Sāṅkara may mean Siva himself and this would mean then that the Sāktasīva Bharata is the source of this story. A Sāṅkara is cited in Pārśvadeva’s Saṅgītasamayasāra, T. S. S. Edn, p. 42.
The Bharatas wrote two works, one in 12000 Ślokas and another in 6000 Ślokas. The basis of these two is the Nāṭyaveda which is perhaps double the extent of the first of these two. The second work in 6000 verses is the present Nāṭya sāstra of Bharata and the Dāsarūpakāvaloka quotes it by the name, Śaṭsahasrī, "पदसहस्रवत्तस्युमृक्तम्—‘एवेक्र सांस्कृतिपुर गुणयोगेन रसा निवशस्ते’ हि।" IV. (Vide Bharata’s N. S’. VII, p. 80, Kāsī Edn.) Bahurūpamisra has quoted the former work in 12000 verses, the Dvādasasāhasrī, in his gloss on the Dāsarūpaka. Mr. M. R. Kavi quotes the Yāmalāstakatantra in the preface to his edition of the Nāṭyasāstra (Vol. I, p. 6, fn. 1.), according to which the Nāṭyaveda, which Śāradātanaya mentions as the basis of the two Saṅgrahas, is a work in 36000 Ślokas. Which of these two, the Nāṭyaveda and the Dvādasasāhasrī, is the work of Śiva and which, of Brahman, cannot be said easily. The latter may be the Brahmayabharata referred to by Abhinava. What these works say on Rasa, we are not in a position to know.

The only work we have is the Śaṭsahasrī of Bharata, the Nāṭyasāstra, which says that according to Brahman, Raszas are eight. Śāradātanaya fashions this text into the form of a later controversial text, and makes Padmabhū (Brahman) refute the Sānta and accept only eight Raszas. We can

conjecture safely that both the Sādāśivabharata and the Brahmbharata knew only eight Rasas.

Was there any old work which expounded nine Rasas? When did the Śānta first make its appearance? Just after giving the above-noticed view of Padmabhū that Rasas are only eight, Śāradātanaya gives another account which he attributes to Vāsuki. There seems to be, from the following verse, an old work in which Vāsuki imparts the Nātyasāstra to Nārada.

उत्सित्तुरसाना या पुरा वासुकिनिमोदिता।
नारदस्योच्यते सैणा प्रकारान्तरकल्पिता। || Bhā. Pra., p. 46.

The Śānta Rasa is accepted in this account.

रक्षतमोबिहीतानातु सच्चाक्ष्यात सत्विचलः।
मनागगुरुवाग्नारौति शान्तो रस इत्तिरितः। || II, p. 48.

Who is this Vāsuki? We already know of two serpents among Sangitacāryas, Kambala and Aṣvatara and we must add to them this Nātyācārya Vāsuki. Śāradātanaya quotes Vāsuki earlier also (pp. 36-37) regarding the rise of Rasa from Bhāvas.

नामाद्वृयोपकृः पारेः: व्यवहरः मात्रते वथा।
पूर्वे मात्रा मात्रवन्ति रसान्भिन्यः: सह।
इति वासुकिनापुष्को माध्यमः रससंयमः। ||

This verse is, as pointed out by the editor of the Bhāvaprákāsa, found in the Nātya Sāstra of Bharata, quoted along with four other verses, with the words— "भवन्ति चात्र श्रोक्तः। "¹

¹ Thus, there are Anuṣṭubbh and Āryā verses quoted by Bharata. These are called Anuvāṃśya verses, handed down as basic and authoritative texts on Nātya written by other writers.
If we are to rely on Sāradātanaya, we have to suppose that the Rasa chapters in Bharata are based on the texts to Vāsuki and others and that this Vāsuki accepted a ninth Rasa, namely, the Sānta. Why then does Bharata’s text not mention the Sānta? If Bharata did not approve of Sānta being a Rasa, he must refute it, citing Vāsuki’s position. When no such controversy is seen in Bharata’s Nātyasāstra, we have to conclude that Sāradātanaya has only increased the confusion here, as on other topics also.

If we are to attach any weight to the statement of another late writer Dharmasūri, author of the Sāhityaratnākara, we have to suppose that Kohala is, like Vāsuki, another old writer who accepted the Sānta Rasa. He says regarding the Sthāyin of Sānta—

"कोहलस्तु उत्साहो वा निर्वेदा वा शमो वा अस्य स्थायीत्युवाच "


If Kohala had accepted Sānta, Abhinava and other champions of Sānta would have quoted him. Dharmasūri’s reference to Kohala is unreliable. But it is also likely that a late work falsely ascribed to Kohala speaks of the Sānta and Dharmasūri bases his statement on such a pseudo-Kohala work.

The Nātyasāstra of Bharata itself recognised only eight Rasas. Subsequently, when the Sānta was accepted by writers, the text of the N. S. was changed and read thus as indicated by Abhinava:

The definite authorship of these Anuṣṭubhs and Āryās is not known. Abhinava says while commenting on one set of such Anuvartī’s Āryās, on p. 328: “ता पुत्रा द्याया: एकप्रक्ष प्रत्या वूठानविचि; क्षणकलेन पतिता; । मुन्न पुजं संप्रतिः श्रापस्थानं निवेशिता:।”
Udbhāta recognises the Sānta as can be seen from his Kāvyā-laṅkārasārasaṅgraha. He is thus the first commentator on the N. S.' and the first Ālaṅkārika now known to have definitely begun to speak of Rasas as nine in number. So, he might have made the necessary alteration in the text of the Nātyasāstra as above shown and as pointed out by Abhinava.

Regarding this subject of Sānta Rasa, the following questions arise:

(i) Did Bharata recognise it? What are the arguments of those who hold that Bharata recognises it? What is the real position of Bharata in respect of Sānta?

(ii) Who is the first writer who introduced the Sānta Rasa? What was that condition in the world of letters that led to the postulation of Sānta?

(iii) Independent of Bharata accepting it or not, what is Sānta? Can it be a Rasa? What are the arguments of the opponents of Sānta?

(iv) What is the criticism of those who not only accept but praise the Sānta as the greatest Rasa? Who are these writers? What are the literary compositions that have proved the possibility of the Sānta Rasa?

(v) Who are those who, unable to find fault with Sānta, make a compromise, deny it in Nātya and accept it in Kāvya only? What are their arguments and how are they met?
(vi) Who are the writers who do not accept the Sānta anywhere?

(vii) What is the Sthāyin of Sānta?
These questions will be dealt with now.
Bharata certainly mentioned only eight Rasas.\(^1\) He did not give Sānta as the ninth Rasa. The texts on Sānta in certain recensions of Bharata's Nātya sāstra must have been interpolated by advocates of Sānta. Abhinava once argues the cause of Sānta on the basis of these Sānta texts available in certain recensions but he advocates its cause more vigorously earlier, quite independent of these Sānta texts in Bharata. Abhinava even gives various arguments to show why Bharata did not speak of it at all. Further, the advocates of Sānta who point out Nirveda or Dhṛti or any other Vyabhicārin already mentioned by Bharata as the Sthāyin of Sānta do so only because they feel that Sānta, its Sthāyin etc., are not given in Bharata; hence do they resort to the Dehalidipanyāya, Māṅgalya-amāṅgalya etc., to read the Sānta rasa into the text of Bharata. How they do this is discussed in the section on the Sthāyin of Sānta below. Again, if Ānanda who speaks of Sānta had known the Sānta texts of Bharata and had believed in them as genuine parts of Bharata, he would have quoted them in his advocacy of Sānta in Uddyota 3. Ānanda advocates Sānta on his own grounds and holds as its Sthāyin neither Nirveda with all its trifling supports, nor Sāma which is given as its Sthāyin in the

\(^1\) In the K. M. edn. of the N. S., ch. 23, Sli. 3 has the expression 'Navas rasāśrayam' but the correct reading here is Bhāva-rasāśrayam' as found in the Kāśi edn. (ch. 24, Sli. 3).
interpolated S'ānta text in Bharata; Ānanda holds as its Sthāyin 'that happiness which is the annihilation of all desires'—तृणाद्वित्यसङ्ग्रहः।

"तृणां विषयां य: क्षयः सर्वोत्तोमित्रिलङ्को विन्योगः, तदेव सूलसः" Abhinava, Locana.

All the writers who refute S'ānta are of opinion that Bharata's text does not know the S'ānta rasa. Further, Bharata gives Laya, Svara, Guṇa, Alāṅkāra, Vṛtti, Vṛttā etc., for the eight Rasas only in the several sections of his work; S'ānta is not mentioned here anywhere. This is part of the objection raised against S'ānta by its critics. They say, Bharata has related music and Rasas and has mentioned the Jātyāṅgas suggestive of the several Rasas but does not mention the S'ānta here. (Vide N. S'. XXIX, S'ls. 1-4.) We find in the Abhinavabhāratī:

"अनेन्नेव चाश्चेन न शाैतेन कृत्तन सुनिता जात्याङ्कः विनियो-क्षयेत | तेन जात्याङ्कविनियोगाभावात् असत्स्मितिः प्रत्युक्तम्।"


Abhinava first argues for S'ānta not on the basis of Bharata's mention of it, but on the basis of his silence on the subject which Abhinava makes out as more eloquent. This will be explained later. Suffice to point out here that express mention of S'ānta is not found in Bharata.

If this is accepted, we can trace the way by which S'ānta slowly came to be accepted as a Rasa. We can even explore the possibilities of finding some aspects of S'ānta in Bharata's accepted text. Bharata, it must be borne in mind, handles the whole world and analyses human psychology to a great extent and it will be a wonder if he were to be entirely
innocent of that part of human activity which is the sphere of the Sānta-rasa. The absence of Sānta in theory does not, however, mean the absence of poetry or drama with the quietistic motif. To suppose so would be as foolish as to think that before Rasadhvani was formulated as the soul of poetry, no great poetry existed. As Ānandavardhana points out, the Rasa of the great epic, the Mahābhārata, is Sānta. The Rṣi, the fourth Puruṣārtha or Mokṣa, the third and the fourth Āśramas of the Vānaprastha and the Samnyāsin—these were already parts and sublime parts of Kāvyas such as the Raghuvrāhsa and Nāṭakas such as the Sākuntala. Bharata, himself a sage, gave the Nātyasāstra to an assemblage of sages. Bharata, therefore, could hardly have lost sight of the Rṣis, the forests, Tapas, etc. As a matter of fact, Bharata does mention aspects of this Sānta-rasa and its attendant conditions.

An emotion is recognised as Rasa if it is a sufficiently permanent major instinct of man, if it is capable of being developed and delineated to its climax with its attendant and accessory feelings and if there are men of that temperament to feel imaginative emotional sympathy at the presentation of that Rasa. Thus are Sṛngāra and the other seven Rasas. So, if Bharata says that drama is of a varied nature in accordance with the varied nature of the world on the one hand and of the spectators on the other, if he says that one drama predominantly develops one Rasa whose appeal is only to those whose hearts are attuned to it and if he says that a certain drama may have its theme or purpose in Sāma, it certainly means that Bharata has landed, though unconsciously, on the Sānta-rasa. Bharata says and these are surely genuine parts of the text:

कविद्वर्म: कवित्व कौशल कर्मवर्ज्य: कवित्व श्रमः। I, 106.
दुःखात्मानं श्रमार्थानं शोकात्मानं तपस्विनामः।
The first given passage is referred to by Abhinava also in connection with the discussion on the admissibility of Sānta as a Rasa and by drawing attention to this bit—कचिच्छम:- Abhinava asks whether Bharata did not recognise the quietistic element also as part of dramatic presentation:

"शतीयत एवेति मुनिनाक्ष्यक्षीकित्वा एव "कचिच्छम:’’हत्यादि वदता।"

Abhinava, Locana, p. 177.

Another instance of Bharata’s awareness of the element of Sānta is pointed out by Abhinava. It is similar to the second passage extracted above. It refers to such spectators as are bereft of life’s passions—Vītarāgas—to whom only dramas of a nature in harmony with theirs and dramas depicting the Mokṣa puruṣārtha can have any appeal. While pointing out in Ch. XXVII that the very life of drama is its fusion with the audience and that certain hearts can respond only to certain themes, Bharata says:

तुष्यति तरणा: कामे विद्यमः समयाश्रिते |
अर्थोपन्धराश्रेष्ठ मोक्षस्य विरागिणः।

XXVII, 59, Kāśī Edn.

Says Abhinava in regard to this passage:

"हुदयसंवादोपि तथाविधतत्वस्वाम्यंकामेते,
बद्धति् मोक्षे चापि विरागिणः’’ इति।"


Further, Bharata speaks of a Kāma for each Puruṣārtha in Ch. XXIV and mentions here the variety called Mokṣa Kāma. What does this mean?
The S'ānta is only the Rasa of Mokṣa Kāma. Compare the Mahābhārata, Āṣva. parvan, Ch. XIII, 16, where Kāma says of himself:

यो मां प्रयत्ते हन्तु मोक्षमात्माय परिवित्तः।
तत्स्य मोक्षरितिस्वयम्मृत्यायीं च हसामिः॥

Again, what does Bharata mean by giving great scope for Dharma as an important theme handled in drama, by saying that drama is Dharmya, by mentioning Dharma as the purpose of some dramas, कविदृढः कर्मः, by speaking of Dharma S'ṛngāra and by pointing out that the old, the learned and the experienced respond to such dramas as are based on Dharmākhyānapurāṇa which comes under the Vibhāvānubhāva of the S'ānta?

While describing Nirveda¹, Bharata speaks of one kind of it that is born of Tattvajñāna; giving the causes of Glāni, he speaks of Taponiyama; defining Dhṛti², Bharata gives Vijñāna, S'ṛuti, S'aucācāra and Gurubhakti as some of its Vibhāvas and these pertain to S'ānta; Mati is given as born of Nānāsāstra-vicintana. If the quietistic element is not recognised even in some aspect by him, Bharata cannot say of Nātya that it is Trailokyānukarapa, that there is no Jñāna which in not

¹ Some hold this Nirveda as the Sthāyin of S'ānta.
² Bhoja holds this Dhṛti as the Sthāyin of S'ānta in his S. K. A. V. 23 and also pp. 514-5.
part of drama and no Vidyā which does not come within it:

न तत्त्व ज्ञानम् etc. I, 117.

The instances above shown point only to the recognition of S'ama as an element and they do not mean Bharata's acceptance of the S'anta as a Rasa. To be precise, S'ama is not mentioned as one of the forty-nine Bhāvas. Bharata did not have before him any specimen of drama written only for Mokṣa and Virāgins. It may be that there cannot also be dramas having only Bhayānaka, Adbhuta, etc., as their Rasa. These can appear only as Ānga or Sañcāri rasas. But the reason for the acceptance of Bhayānaka, Adbhuta, Bībhatas, etc., as Rasas is that humanity is more liable to these than to S'ama, hearts attuned to which must necessarily be very small in number. S'ama is almost impossible. For, the opponents of S'anta say, Ignorance, Avidyā, producing Rāga and Dveṣa which result in a network of psychology covered by the eight Sthāyins, is inborn in men ever since he began his migration in Sarṣāra and practically speaking, this Avidyā cannot be rooted out. That is, S'ama which is their absence cannot be obtained. The Avaloka on the Dasarūpaka says:

"अतः तु वस्तुतस्तत्त्वावन्तं वर्णयति | अनादिदिकालपथवाहवत-रागद्वैरोहच्छेदस्तुमाशक्यतात् |" p. 117.

This, however, is not wholly true for there is not any lack of persons who take to S'ama and strive to root out Rāga and Dveṣa. But this criticism against S'anta is pertinent to some extent in regard to drama generally which is for pleasure and which deals with worldly things. Drama arose as an entertainment: श्रीदन्नवकामिन्यमो दृश्य धुम्य च यदृ भवेत् | Bharata often says that Nātya is Vinodajanana. Bhāmaha also says that
Though the Mahakavya depicts all the four Puruṣārthas, it shall predominantly inculcate only Artha.

तत्।


Abhinava draws our attention in this connection to Bharata's definition of Nāṭaka which emphasises the fact that it shall depict chiefly worldly prosperity, gaiety, etc. From this point of view, Abhinava even says that Sānta is after all only Apradhāna, not the leading motif.

“अत एव शान्तस्य स्थायित्वेषप्रायाधारयम्। जीमलवाहि विनाऽसुमंतरेघ परोपकृतिः प्राधारयम्। अनैवाधारवेल नाटकलक्षणों चक्रवत्तेऽव। स्वस्यविलोक्तिसादिभिधिमित्रेण। नेन नयं कदिविलासप्राधारोन्नामभावं। स्वभविष्यनन्दविशेषवादविशेषविशेषादि। एतच तत्वेऽव बर्णविश्वाम्। ||” Gaek. Edn., I, p. 339.

Therefore it is that the Candrikākāra, the earlier commentator on the Dhva. Ā., says that the Sānta spoken of by Ānanda is certainly admissible as a Rasa, but that it can appear only as an Āṅga rasa in the Prāsaṅgika Itivṛtta and never as the chief Rasa figuring in the Adhikārika Itivṛtta. Evidently, the Candrikākāra also held the view that Vīra and Sṛṅgāra are the Rasas in the Nāgānanda in accordance with the ending in the attainment of Vidyādhara ca kravartitva and the sustained love-theme, and that the Sānta came in as a subsidiary idea to give a new variety of Vīra called Dayāvīra. Abhinava, however, rejects this view of the Candrikā in his Locana.
"अधिकारिकत्वेन तु शान्तो रसो (रसो न) निविद्वयः इति चन्द्रकारः | तच्चेदात्मांभिनं पवित्रोमतिम्।" Locana, p. 178.

But the above given extract from the Abhi. Bhā. seems to grant what Abhinava has criticised in his own Locana. He seems to grant that it is literature of Trivarga-interest that is of wide appeal in the world. Early dramas likewise dealt with Trivarga and the eight Rasas only.

But soon drama was to be made the noble vehicle of spiritual and religious instruction to the masses. Leaving the Brahminic Mahābhārata, we find Asvaghosa’s Buddhacarita and Saundarananda starting the religious Kāvyā, and his Sāriputraprakāraṇa and the allegorical dramatic fragment discovered by Dr. Luders, the religious drama. The Buddhistic and Jain poets and dramatists might have been responsible for the introduction of philosophical poems¹ and plays, for

¹ (a) The Saundarananda has two verses in the end in which Asvaghosa says that he wrote a Mahākāvyya for Upaśānti and Mokṣa, mixing a Tikta-medicine with Madhu.

(b) The Jain work, the Vastuvijñānaratnakosa, is a handbook of knowledge of miscellaneous things enumerated in sets of one, two, etc. (Peterson’s Report III, Oxford, 352a. IO, Keith 7583-4, Asiatic Soc. Beng. 4703 A). Of uncertain date, this work mentions Turuskas in the 36 Rājāvanshas given by it. Albeit its Jain authorship, it gives only Eight Rasas,—काय रसो: (Peterson III, p. 268a).

(c) There is a Jain work named Adhyanātmakalpadruma by Munisundarāsūri (end of the 14th and early part of the 15th cent.
making Śānta the Aṅgi rasa of the Ādhiṅkārika itivyṛtta. We know that there were Buddhistic writers on Nāṭya like Rāhula, who, as citations of his views in the Abhinavabhārati show, had his own differences from Bharata. Further, the Jain Anuyogadvāra sūtra, placed in the fifth century, mentions nine Rasas, adding the Pravāntarasā to the eight old Rasas (see below). Dr. S. K. De says in his Skr. Poetics (Vol. I, p. 36 f.n.) : “The Jaina Anuyogadāra Sutta (ed. N. S. P. 1915, fol. 134-5, also quoted in Weber ii, 2, pp. 701-2) which, Winternitz thinks, was probably put together by the middle of the fifth century, mentions nine Rasas, which, however, have hardly any reference (?) to poetic or dramatic Rasas; but the enumeration is interesting from the inclusion of Pravānta (not mentioned by Bharata) apparently from religious motives.” It is not known why Dr. De considers these nine Rasas mentioned in the Anuyogadvāra sūtra as having hardly any reference to poetic or dramatic Rasas. They are definitely mentioned in the work as ‘वाब कल्व रस’, the nine Rasas of Kāvyā (see below).

The Nāgānanda, the first and only specimen to which the early advocates of Śānta clung, is a Buddhistic story. Śrīharṣa had leanings towards Buddhism and if this king Śrīharṣa is the same as the Vārtikakāra of the Nāṭyasāstra quoted in the Abhinavabhārati (which, however, is yet quite unproven), it is likely that his Nāṭya Vārttika, which must have made

A. D.), which is otherwise called Sāntarasabhāvānā. (Ed. Nirmaya-
śāgar, 1906, with extracts from Dharmavijayagani’s gloss). The
work says in the Pratijñāsloka that Śānta is proposed to be treated
in the work and in the next verse which is titled, ‘Sāntara-
māhātmaya’, the author describes the Śānta as Rasendra. The
commentary describes the Śānta as “Srimān Śāntananda Rasādhi-
rājaḥ” and “Svararasātra”. Compare also the names of some
other Jain works Śāntasudhārasakāvyā of Vinayavijayaganī and the
Prasamaraṭi of Umāsvāti (see esp. Śl. 106 in the latter).
introduced the Sānta as a Rasa. It seems very likely that it is the appearance of the Nāgānanda in the world of drama that created a stir and set the discussion on Sānta on its feet in works on Nātya and Alamkāra.

What are the objections raised by the critics of Sānta against recognising it as a Rasa? The first objection is that Bharata did not speak of it. This is really no serious objection. The greater objection is that pertaining to the real nature of S'ama itself. S'ama, its critics say, is the total absence of all feelings and activities. Such a state of non-action cannot be presented on the stage.

"कामायमायोपिनी नानुमाल: \ldots प्रयोगासमबायित्वाय। न हि चेष्टायुपयम: प्रयोगायोगम:।" Abhi. Bhā., p. 334.

This argument proceeds on a wrong assumption. The state of absolute cessation of action is only the climax, the Paryantabhūmi, and this certainly cannot be shown. But the Paryantabhūmis of all other Rasas also sail in the same boat. S'yīgāra is not denied as a Rasa because Samprayoga is unfit to be shown on the stage. So also murder and Raudra. So, the acceptance of Sānta does not mean the attempt to present the impossible cessation of action but means only the portrayal of an ardent spirit in search of Truth and tranquillity. The manifold efforts of the Yatamāna, his trials, his victories over passions—these can be portrayed with great interest. Even one who has attained Truth can be shown and there will be no lack of action in him. A Siddha like Janaka will be doing Lokasaṅgraha. The Gitā says:

कुर्याद्विद्युतस्यकारः चिकित्सःनःसङ्क्षर्मस। III, 25.

The Gitā speaks of many a thing which a Sthitaprajña does.
Similar to the above noticed objection is the explanation which another writer offers for the omission of the Sānta. The Saundaryalalahari, ascribed to S'ankara, has three occasions to speak of the Rasas. In two verses 41 and 50, the hymn expressly mentions 'the nine Rasas', "nava rasa", in verse 41 with reference to Nātya and in verse 50 with reference to Kāvya. But in verse 51, the hymn refers only to eight Rasas which are described there as being expressed by the look of the Goddess. In the commentary on this verse, the 51st, Lolla Lakśmīdhara offers an explanation for the omission of the Sānta here. He says that according to Bharata's school, Rasas are only eight, for Rasa means a certain modification or state of the Citta and Sānta being really the absence of any state or modification, some do not consider it a Rasa.

"विकिवाजनका एव रसा हृति चपूरी रसा भरतमते। 'शान्तस्य निविकारस्यायं न शान्तं मेथिरे रसम्' हृति शान्तस्य रसाब्दाभावात् अष्टबौध रसा: सहिष्ठिता।"

Pp. 154-5, Mysore Edn.

It is clear from Lakśmīdhara's remarks here and on the two verses mentioning the nine Rasas that personally he would accept the Sānta. But any definite and detailed idea of Lakśmīdhara's views on the Sānta could be had only when we recover his Sāhitya work, the Lakśmīdhara, mentioned by him among his works in the colophon at the end of his commentary on the Saundaryalalahari.

That Bharata has not given the Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicāris of Sānta, as also its appropriate Vṛtti, musical Jāti, etc. is another trifling objection. These can be easily made out. Abhinava gives them. The interpolated Sānta text in Bharata gives the Vibhāvas, etc. of Sānta. The Sthāyin of Sānta is elaborately discussed in a special section
below. Its Vibhāvas are given in the text as Tattvajñāna, Vairāgya, Āśayasuddhi, etc. Its Anubhāvas are Yama, Niyama, the practice of virtues, penance etc. Almost all Bhāvas can be its Vyabhicārins. Abhinava adds the Vibhāvas, साधुसमागम, सत्तांपर्क, the good done in the past births, God’s grace, study of philosophy, etc. Abhinava further remarks that in Sānta one can see and enjoy the Anubhāvas, viz., the slow disappearance of Kāma, Krodha and other evils and that though the whole world of Bhāvas becomes Vyabhicārin for the Sānta, such Bhāvas like Nirveda and Jugupsā for worldly objects, Dhṛti, Mati, Utsāha of the type in Dayāvīra, Rati for God in the form of Bhakti and Sraddhā will stand out prominently as more intimate accessories, Āhhyantara Aṅgas. The text of the Abhinavabhāratī bearing on these is edited in a further section of this paper.

The next objection against Sānta is the impossibility of Sānta becoming a general feature of humanity in the same measure and to the same extent as Rati, etc., for the whole world is wrapped in Avidyā and is eternally slave to Rāga and Dveśa. We know of the eight Sthāyins only, as instinctive in man. Dhṛti, Mati, etc. are given as Vyabhicārins in Sānta but we do not know of Dhṛti or Mati helping S’ama. All the Dhṛti and Mati known to us is mingled with Rāga and Dveśa and other mundane associations.

दृश्यभृतिरिपिप्राप्तशिष्योपरागः कथने शान्ते स्वादः।


1 In ch. 6 (pp. 135-6) S’aradātanaya again treats of Sānta, in a clumsy manner. First he praises it as the Rasa which gives Mokṣa and gives its Vibhāvas, etc. Then he says that it has not got Vibhāvas, etc. to a full extent, is Vikalāṅga; but concludes that despite its imperfections, it is Frakṛṣṭa because of its relation with the fourth Puruṣārtha of Mokṣa.
Nor is the portrayal of non-action any good for Vyutpatti. The mere presentation of non-action does not educate anybody in the means to attain knowledge of Truth.

The quietistic element is not a dominant factor in man's life. If a poet develops it, it will become strange and unbelievable that there are really such impossible men who have spurned the pleasures of the world, women, position, wealth, etc. The general mass of the audience is mostly of ordinary men who will hardly respond to such a drama or have any Cittsasamāvāda in it. The Avaloka in the Dvamarupa says:

'अन्ये तु वस्तुतत्सत्य अभावं वर्णयति। अनादिकालमवाहायात-
रागद्वेषयोरुप्ये पत्थरामणीयवत्।' | D. R. A., p. 117.

'न च तथा भौतिक्य शान्तरस्त्य सहवतः स्वास्वितार् सन्ति।' | Ibid., p. 124.

All these objections are raised and answered by Ānandavardhana:

'यदि नाम सर्वज्ञाननुभवगोचरता तत्स्य नास्ति, नैतवतासी अलोक-
सामान्यनामहाभावनिद्धश्चिवत प्रतिकोण्डु शक्यः।' | Dhva. A., p. 177.

That the major part of humanity is wallowing in mundane pleasures does not disprove the existence of saints and sages. There are persons of spiritualistic bent and to them the S'ānta play is bound to appeal. To them, the Sṛṅgāra and Vīra plays will have little appeal. Surely, on that ground, Sṛṅgāra and Vīra are not dismissed from the fold of Rasas.
The argument of the impossibility of non-action being shown has already been refuted.

An extension of the argument that the S'ánta is not relishable is the argument that drama which is essentially for entertainment and Trivargavyutpatti must depict Rddhi, Vilása, etc. So have all dramas done. There are no plays which have developed S'ánta. The Nágānanda, which some hold as a S'ánta play, is plainly not so. For the end here is not Mokśa, but the attaining of lordship over the Vidyādharas; and all through, the love-theme runs and this is the first thing antagonistic to S'ánta. Therefore Vîra and S'īngāra, the former as Dayāvîra, stand out prominently in the Nágānanda.

All the arguments given above cannot disprove the possibility of S'ánta as a Rasa capable of relish by spectators. It is bound to be uncommon; all the same, it is as true as the inner experience and the higher life of the mystic which is
not in common with the life of ordinary worldly men. If S'ama is not only a part of the world but a glorious part of it also, it should also be so of the drama. Abhinava says that literature, poetry and drama, cannot restrict themselves to the Trivarga only but must get ennobled by embracing the fourth and the greatest Puruṣārtha also, Mokṣa. The attitude to Mokṣa is S'ama and S'ānta is the Rasa of the drama which depicts the endeavour to attain that.

"अन्तऽध्वं—यथा हि भावान चर्माधितित्वम्, परं मोक्षोपि पुरुषार्थः, श्रावण स्थलवित्तिहासादिषु च भावावेन उपायो व्यवाहत इति शुभसिद्धम्। यथा च कामायुधः समुचितवित्तिहासादिषु रचाविदिषा शान्तविवाचा: कविनित्त्वेन आश्वासनोपत्तिपापण्डितारण तथाविविष्ठद्य-संवादवत् शान्तिकाल्यां प्रति रसलं ध्वजःरावितिति नीयते, तथा मोक्षाभि-धानिकस्मस्तुपुरुषार्थोभिषित चित्रविन्दिति: किमिति रसलं नागीयत इति व्यक्तयम्।" Abhi. Bhā., I, Gaek. Edn., p. 334.

To say that it is impossible to exterminate Rāga and Dveṣa is to insult humanity, its heritage of philosophy and the long chain of its spiritual leaders. Surely there are men of that mind which can respond to a S'ānta drama. That hedonists are not able to sit through it cannot disprove S'ānta. It will be a pity if literature, and drama in particular, cannot rise beyond the level of mere entertainment and gaiety. It has been accepted that all cannot respond to all Rasas. Surely Bhayānaka will not raise sympathy in a heroic spirit. Bharata himself gives the respective characters—Prakṛtis—who respond to the different Rasas. Bhaya and Jugupsā are Nica-prakṛti Bhāvas; Uttama Sāmājikas do not have Cittasaṁvāda on seeing them. If Viṣṇu delight in Śrīṅgāra, Vītarāgas delight in S'ānta.
And Bharata also says:

"न चैते गुणा: सबे एकसिन् प्रेक्षके स्मरताः ।

उत्तमाचमध्वानां संकीर्णानां तु संसर्गः ।

न शक्यमध्वैश्वर्यावतमानां विचेदितम् ।

तुष्टति तत्वं: काम विद्वेषः समवास्थः ।

अर्थव्यवहारसैष: प्रेक्षके विरागः ।

नानाशीलः प्रकृत्यः शीते नाट्यं मतिष्ठितम् ।

हरा वीरमस्त्रोद्धु नियुद्धवाहेवतुः ।

पूवं व्यापकरणैवो यस्मिन् मदिरेशः ।

प्रेक्षकः स तु मन्तव्यो गुणेऽतैरबहुः।

N. S. XXVII, 56-62.

There is a continuous chain of literature that depicts the supreme Rasa of S'ánta. In Kāvyā, Ānanda argues in Ud. IV, that the Mahābhārata leads as the great epic of S'ánta. All the vicissitudes of the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas are only the Vācyavācaka, the Pūrvapakṣa, of which the purpose is the suggestion of the fact that S'ama is the greatest for which man should strive.¹ The utter uselessness of even the great victory

at Kurukṣetra, not to mention other worldly victories, is very well brought out by the epic. By the annihilation of even the race of Kṛṣṇa and by postulating Kṛṣṇa as the central personality, as the pivot of the plot, by calling the epic Nārāyaṇakathā, sage Vyāsa has made his message plain. The genius of Vyāsa would not have attempted at anything lower than this.¹

¹ The following ideas and passages in the epic may be considered in this connection:

(a) In the first Adhyāya of the Anukramāṇikāparvan, the epic salutes Dharma and Kṛṣṇa, its promulgator and sustainer, and says that it shall speak of the eternal Dharmas. If a work is a Dharmasastra in Vācyavācaka, it is a Mokṣa Sāstra in Dvani.

(b) In Sūtra 32 of the same ch. Sauti says that the Bhārata is the story of the Lord Himself: वर्णे प्रसादार्थार्थवर्णे नारायणकथ्यासमासमासम्।

(c) While giving the essential ideas of the great epic, it is said that the epic depicts the greatness of the Lord: वामुदेष्ययः माहातर्कम् . . . . उक्तवाग्नुभवावर्णिः।

(d) संभवं चर्मं संभवं महादूमः:

(e) अहं कृष्णो भयं च आश्रमः।

(f) In Sūtras 104-8 in which the epic is described as a tree, it is said in Sūtra 106 that the great fruit of this tree is the Sāntiparvan: ‘शाश्वते सांतिपुरवाहिः।’

(g) At the end of the Anukramāṇikāparvan, Dhritarāṣṭra who is grieved at the loss of his sons is consoled by Saṁjaya who has a hymn on Kāla, the all-devouring Kāla, on hearing which the old king got Dhṛti.

(2) प्रकातादिपम् तत्थवूता चतुर्मेष समासवः।

(2) विश्वेदहमाक्षमयिन्मयिन्मयिन्मयिन्मयिन्मयिन्मयिन्मयिन्मयिन्मयिन्मयिन्मयिन्मयिन्मयिन्मयिन्: 278.

Immediately after this, the Bhārata is described as Upaniṣad: अधोविषयं वृण्यं हृद्यथापत्योज्जवितः: 279.

(g) In Sūtra 291, the Bhārata is likened to the Āraṇyakas among the Vedas.

(h) In Sūtras 35-36, in the Parvasaṅgrahaparvan it is said that the wise seek the Bhārata, even as Vairāgya is sought by those
If one finds relish and importance in the subsidiary themes of marriage, dice, suffering, fight, it does not prevent another reader of nobler instincts and mystic disposition seeing through who desire liberation; and that it is like Ātman among things one must realise:

\begin{quote}
चित्तवर्षेणाधिष्ठितसमाधिः
प्रतिपा नै: प्राणंशुरंगन्धिष्व मोक्षिष्व: ||
सततेऽवेदितवेषु . . चैस: सर्वपमेवतः || 35, 36.
\end{quote}

(i) At the end of the Parvasaṅgrahaparvan and at the end of the Mahāprasthānīka, Dharma is sung of as the supreme good, not either Artha or Kāma. (I, ii, 392, and XVIII, v, 76-7.)

(j) Ch. 62, Ādi.

\begin{quote}
अहिम्मविध अद्वेद निशिक्षेपदेशोचनी ||
हतिहते महागृहे पुस्क्रिय परिनामिक || 19.
कर्मेषु श्रवणेऽप्रेम्यवशासिर्षेव वर्धम् ||
मोक्षाधिकारिः प्रोक्त ज्ञानविनिद्रिता || 25.
व्रं मङ्गो च वाचे च सोस्ये च भवतर्वम्
वृद्धान्तिः तदयुग ज्ञानान्ति न कुशितः || 26.
\end{quote}

(k) Both in the beginning and end, all-devouring Kāla is sung of. (I, i, 272-275 and XVI, ix, 36-40.) This is for Vairāgya.

(l) The triumph of Time, the vanity of earthly glories and the inevitable Nirveda are given in a masterly manner when the great archer, Arjuna, tried and tried, but could not use his bow when before his very eyes the Yādava women were lifted by the Dasyus and Abhiras:

\begin{quote}
क्ष्योपि दूरं गङ्गिकृत्य परम्भम् ||
सूरसां चैव विच्छायानमशानमप्रतथताम् ||
नाना वृजिकल्पाणि प्रभाववाहानिनिज्ञताम्
सूरः निर्वेंसुस्माध्यो व्यक्त्वव्रूपोऽहति ||
कर्मार्जनं समायं सम्प्यायं समरोऽवित || 351-3.
\end{quote}

In the second of his introductory verses in his commentary on the Gītā, Abhinavagupta says that the chief fruit of the epic of
these, and deducing the greatness of the Lord, of Dharma, Sāma and Mokṣa. To write in such a perfect manner as to give Vyākhyā for the readers in the Saṅcāri-rasas and Saṅcāri-themes also is not only not incompatible but is in perfect harmony with the chief Rasa and chief idea. Vide Dhva. A. Ud., IV, p. 238. Also Abhinava in his Abhi. Bhā.:

‘इद्द: अज्ञेयपि विढ्यान्तिष्ठान, स्मायाचिक्त्यात, वथा रामस्य वीराञ्जे पिरुराञ्जां पालयतः’


Next in importance to the Mahābhārata are the two Sānta rasa poems of Asvaghosa, the Buddhacarita and the Vyāsa is Mokṣa, and that Dharma, etc., are for its development.

Abhinava’s pupil, Kṣemendra, holds Sānta as the teaching of the M. Bhārata. He says at the end of his Bhāratamañjari:

' The author of the Bhāgavata, in his criticism of the Bhārata, says that in the Great Epic, Vyāsa had described 'Pravṛtti' (as Pūrvapakṣa) so much and so well, that man who is by nature attached to it, has mistaken to Pūrvapaksa itself for the Siddhānta.'
Sāundarananda. The following is a list of other Sānta rasākāvyas:

1. The Rājatarāṅgini of Kalhana mentions Sānta as its Rasa. I, 23. No great history can escape the ultimate suggestion of the noble Rasa of Sānta but Dr. Keith considers, in his Skt. Literature, that the Sānta in Kalhana is a moral bias detracting from his merit as a historian.

2. Kaivalyavallī pariṇaya vilāsa, a philosophical Kāvya written perhaps by a Travancore prince or poet attached to him. Bhakti, Kaṭākṣalakṣmī (the saving grace of the Lord), Brahmavidyā and Kaivalyavallī are some of the characters figuring in this poem.


   Oppert 5537. (Auf. I, 210a.)


6. Cetudūta. No. 25. Ātmānanda granthamālā Series, Bhavanagar. Theme identical with that of the previous works.

7. Bhaktidūtī by Kālīprāsaḍa (23 verses): a message to the beloved called Mukti, through the maid Bhakti. Rajendralal Mitra, Notices, III, p. 27.


12. Meghadūtasamsāyālekā by Meghavijaya. This is a message to the author’s Guru, like No. 5.

13. Śīlādūta by Cāritrasundarāgaṇī; not a regular Dūtakāvya.


15. Siddhadūta of Avadhūtarāma. (Samvat, 1423) (Bom. Br. R.A.S. 1235). Here, “a Tāpasa is the lover, a Siddha is the Dūta and Vidyā is the beloved.”

16. Tanjore New Cat. 3792. Jñānavilāsakāvya by Jagannātha. “This is an allegorical Kāvya explaining the greatness of Vedānta.”


18. Mysore I, p. 246. Gītavītarāga (2 MSS.) by Abhinava Cārūkīrtipaṇḍītācārya. This work is called Bāhubalīsvāmi Aṣṭapadī in a MS. in the Jain Mutt at Sravāṇa Belagola. This appears to be a Jain Sānta Rasa imitation of the Gītagovinda of Jayadeva.

Among dramas, Aśvaghoṣa’s seem to be the earliest to have Sānta as their dominant Rasa. His Sārīputraprakaraṇa deals with the conversion of the hero to the Buddhistic faith and another of his dramatic fragments discovered by Dr. Leuders shows an allegorical spiritual drama. Long after the time of Ānanda, and about the time of Abhinava, Kṛṣṇamīśra (c. 1098) wrote his Advaita allegory, the
Prabodhacandrodaya, which inaugurated a regular category of philosophical and allegorical plays. The following plays of this class were produced in different parts of the country, to propagate the several schools of philosophical and religious thought:

   Tanjore New Cat. Nos. 4427-4429.
   Tanjore New Cat. 4460. NW. Provinces Cat. Pt. VII, p. 46.

¹ There seems to be an abridged version of the Prabodhacandrodaya of Kṛṣṇamīśra,—Laghu Prabodhacandrodaya Nāṭaka, Vishrambhag collection No. 239, p. 428, S. R. Bhandarkar’s Deccan College Catalogue. There seems to be a Prabodhacandrodaya Kāvyā also in four Ullāsas. A MS. of this work is noticed in the Private Diary of Mr. R. A. Sastri, now deposited in the Catalogus Catalogorum Office, Madras University, on p. 34 of Part I, as existing in the Pyāra Candra Jain Big Mandir, Sailana State (Malwa, C.I.).

² This author wrote an Āyurveda allegory called Jīvānandana, (Kāvyamālā) in which Religion also figures.


13. Anumitipariṇaya: marriage between Anumiti, daughter of Parāmarśa with Nyāyarasika; by Nṛsiṁhakavi of Triplicane, Madras. This play is of little philosophical interest; it is a logic-play, तत्कनाटक.

MDSC. 12463.

14. Vivekavijaya, the triumph of Viveka over passions by Rāmānuja Kavi, son of Pārnaguru and grandson of Rāmānuja guru, of Śrīperumbudur near Madras.


15. Bhaktivaibhanāṭaka, on Kṛṣṇabhakti; by Rāja-guru Vāhinīpati Mm. Jivadeva, son of Trilocanācārya, of Puri, patronised by King Pratāparudrādeva.

MTSC. 3752.

1 A strange dramatic composition of his is the Navagrahacarita. Tanjore New Cat. 4689.

Tanjore New cat. Vol. XIX, p. 55. Kalitāṇḍavanāṭaka may be a philosophical or religious drama.

2 Dr. Keith's remark on p. 1225a of his IO catalogue and on p. 1695b, Index, that Mallādikṣita is the correct name and 'Nallā-' is incorrect, is wrong. The name of this well-known South Indian author is Nallādikṣita.

3 MDSC = Descriptive Cats. of the Madras Govt. Ori. MSS. Library.

MTSC = Triennial Cats. of the Madras Govt. Ori. MSS. Library.

17. Mudritakumudacandra, a dramatisation of a philosophical debate; by Yasasvāntara.

Bombay Branch R. A. S. 1292.

18. Pūrṇapurūṣārthacakrodhyāya, on the union of Ānandapakavalli and King Daśāyva (lord of the ten senses, i.e., Ātman); by Jātavedas of Visvāmitra gotra. The author latter became an ascetic. MDSC. 12540-1. MDSC. 14502 is a metrical resumé of the story of this play.

There are 2 copies of a commentary on this drama in the Travancore list of MSS. collected in 1103 Kollam.


Adyar II, p. 28a.

20. Prabodhodayanāṭaka by Sūklesvaraṇātha. The several systems of philosophy dispute here in a debate in the court of King Bhagavantaraṇya.


21. Śivanārāyaṇabhaṇḍa mahodayanāṭikā; an allegorical play from Orissa; by Narasimha misra who lived under the patronage of Śiva Nārāyaṇa Bhaṇḍa, Rāja of Keonjhar. The work ends with Jīvanmukti.


23. Mitra, Notices, 1607: Tārābhaktitaraṅgini contains two allegorical dramatic sequences in which Kali, Dharma, Viveka, etc. figure as characters. The work as a whole however is not a drama.


25. Svānuhūtināṭaka. MS. dated Sam. 1705; by Anantapanḍita, son of Tryambaka Panḍita.


26. Vivekacandrodayanāṭikā by Śiva.

27. Dharmodayanāṭaka composed in 1692 S’aka, A.D. 1770, by Dharmadeva Gosvāmi who composed a Dharmodaya Kavya also.
   Jour. of the Assam Res. Society, III, 4, p. 119.

28. Māyāvijaya by Anantanāraṇajasūri.

29. Jāñanacandrodaya by Padmasundara.
   The last two are mentioned on page v. fn. of the English introduction to the Gaekwad edition of the Moharāja-parājaya (No. IX).


31. Tattvamudrābhadrodaya, by Trivenī, a prolific south India Vaiṣṇava Brahmin poetess, daughter of Udayendra-puram Veṅkaṭācārya, author of a Yādavarāghavapāṇḍavīya.

1 Akalaṇḍa’s Aṣṭavatī, commentary on Samantabhadra’s Āpta- mīmāṁsā, is introduced as a female character in this drama.
She lived between 1817-83 and was the wife of Prativādi-
bhayānkarām Venkatacārya of Sīruperumbudur.

(Dr. M. Kṛṣṇamacharyya, M.A., M.L., Ph.D. Skr. 
Poetesses, pp. 62-63, Souvenir of the Silver Jubilee of the 
Trivandrum Skr. Series).

32. Antarvāyakaraṇāntyaparīśīṭa: a dramatic com-
position by Kṛṣṇānanda Sarasvatī, published in 4 parts from 
Calcutta 1894 (?)—1899. This achieves a Vyākaraṇa-Dharma 
S'leṣa, i.e. inculcates at once rules of grammar and moral and 
philosophical teachings.

British Museum, Printed Books Catalogue, 1892-
1906, Column 320.

33. The Bhartṛharītyatīyāganāṭaka by Kṛṣṇabala-deva 
varma. Published, Lucknow, 1898. Ibid. 315.

34. Citsāryāloka by Nrṣimha daivajña; allegorical drama 
in 5 acts. Vizianagaram, 1894. Ibid. 437.

35. Ihāmrī or Sarvavinoda in 4 acts; dealing with 
S'ṛṅgāra, Bibhatsa, Hāsya and Vairāgya. By Kṛṣṇa avadhūta, 
a Ghaṭikāsatamahākavi. Bellary, 1895. Ibid. 315.

36. Pāṣanḍādharma-khaṇḍana by Dāmodarāśrama, in 
3 acts showing up the heresy and immorality of the Puṣṭi-
mārgins. Composed in Sarvat 1683.


37. Svātmaprakāśanāṭaka by Sundarāsastrin of Polaham 
village (Tanjore D.t.) Advaita. Pub. Chidambaram, 1319. Ibid. 
1037-8.

38. Kṛṣṇabhakticandrikānāṭaka by Anantadeva, son of 
Āpadeva. Numerous MSS. Edn. Bombay Granthuratnamālā, 
1887-92.¹

¹ [MDSC. 12548 and 12754: Prapanna sapiṭākaraṇanirāsa is 
a drama strange in its theme which is a controversy regarding 
the proper obsequial rites to be performed for a dead Prapanna.
Besides there are many late dramas on the lives of the religious leaders, saints and devotees of Śiva and Viṣṇu. Rāmānujaścārya’s career is dramatised in the Yatirājajīvijaya or Vedāntavilāsa by Varadācārya of Kāñcī. (MDSC. 12696-12700; Tanjore Cat. 4486; Mysore I, p. 281; Adyar II, p. 30a). Sivabhāktānvandanaṭaka, MTSC. 5092 and 5520, is on the life of one of the Śaivite saints. Such dramas are more truly spiritual; for their portrayal of the religious and spiritual career of such personalities is more effective than the presentation of abstract spiritual ideas as characters on the stage. A love-story evokes love and for this purpose, one does not write a play in which Śrīṅgāra figures as a character with Madhu, Viraha, etc. as other characters. Thus dramas on the life of saints and devotees are Śāntarasa plays. The Bhartṛhariśirṣa Nāṭaka of Harihara (Kāvya-mālā) is a Śānta play of a conception far superior to other specimens though the author is somewhat unequal to the theme. The Prastāvanā says that it is a Śānta play and that the Śāntarasa is the only lasting Rasa.

श्रीहरिजरश्रीतिप्रभुदेववैद्यास्माते शान्तिरसश्राङ्गोन नाटकेन
तानुपासिस्थितिः।

श्रीमात्रायूरस्त्रूपस्नितिनवनमनवरश्रीरीतिप्रभुः
एवःकपकस्तेवरालम्बननारायणिति ।
अस्येव क्षणिको रसः प्रतिपर्ययंतवैरस्मृः
श्रीशांताद्वैतमालकः परस्पिरावान्तो हि शान्तो रसः || २ ||

THE NUMBER OF RASAS

Even in dramas on Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and Śiva, which are very large in number, there is Bhakti and through it Sānta as the ultimate Rasa, though the drama by itself has a different and definite Rasa in its theme. For, it is devotion to these forms of God that prompted the poets to write and it is devotion that is the result in the hearts of the Sāmājikas. The actual Rasa of the play in such cases will thus be a Rasavat, subordinated to Bhakti and Sānta which form the Paramadhwani.

The Sānta is accepted by a majority of writers. The earliest writer now known to mention it is Udbhaṭa. He simply mentions it in his K.A.S.S. but must have dealt with it at greater length, perhaps refuting the opposition to it also in his now lost commentary on the Nāṭyaśāstra. Lollāṭa certainly recognised it, for as will be seen in a further section of this book, Lollāṭa recognises numerous Rasas. If he had admitted many minor Bhāvas as Rasas, he must certainly have admitted Sānta, which his predecessor had accepted.

“तेन आनन्देऽपि रसाणां पार्वदसिद्धवा एताबतामेव प्रयोज्य- ब्रमिति यत् महूऽहतेन निद्धपितम्, तदवसेवना परामुख्य (?) इत्यि”


But Lollāṭa seems to have made a compromise with the no-changers in the number of Rasas by creating ‘Pārṣadapraśiddhi’ as certifying only a few as Rasas. This vogue in circles of connoisseurs, Lollāṭa says, speaks only of these as Rasas, as capable of portrayal on the stage (Prayojya). The ‘these only’ (Etāvatām eva) in Lollāṭa perhaps refer only to the old eight. That Sānta also is included and the ‘these’ refers to nine has to be confirmed by a more definite evidence. We have no clue to know Sāṅkuka’s attitude towards Sānta. From the number of views on the Sthāyin of Sānta which
Abhinava reviews and which must have been the views of the previous commentators of Bharata, we can guess that S’aṅkuka also accepted S’ānta. Rudraṭa recognises S’ānta and gives Samyajñāna or Tattvajñāna as its Prakṛti or Sthāyin. Ch. VII, 3. He describes it in S’ls. 15-16, in Ch. XV:

सम्यक्ष्यानमकृति: शान्तो विगतेच्छनायकों भवति 
सम्यक्ष्यानं विषये तमसो रागस्य चापगमात् 
जननजरामरणादित्रासो कैराम्बवासना विषये 
शुचिः स्मयोरिष्णाद्रेष्टाग्धिति तत् चायतसे 

"सम्यक्ष्यानं स्थायिमायाः: विभावस्तु शब्दार्थविषयस्वाहः 
अनुभवो जनमादिन्त्रासादय: 
"

Namisādhū, p. 166. K.M. No. 2. Namisādhū adds that it is improper to deny the existence of S’ānta as a Rasa.

"कैश्चिदन्त्य रसलं नेष्ठु | तद्युज्जम् | भावादिकारणानां 
मत्रापि विषमानात् 
"

Ibid.

Ānanda recognises the S’ānta, illustrates it with the Nāgāṇaṅda and gives तुष्णाक्यमुख as its Sthāyin. Rājaśekhara’s Kāvyamīmāṃsa might have recognised the S’ānta in its lost chapter called Rasādhikārika, since Rājaśekhara follows Rudraṭa to a large extent. Bhaṭṭa Tota accepts it and from a remark of Abhinava at the end of the S’ānta section in the Locana, we see that Tota’s Kāvyakautuka contains an elaborate examination of the objections to S’ānta and gives a brilliant exposition of it as the greatest Rasa.

"मोक्षवत्तेन चार्य परमपुर्याश्चर्यनिद्धारात् सर्वसंप्रस्थ: प्रभावम: | 
स चायमस्तुपुर्याभागस्थलोतेन काज्यकौलके, अस्माभिः तद्विवर्जने बहु- 
तर्कशत्वतिर्भम्: पूर्वप्रक्षासिद्धान्त इत्यलं बहुना | 
" p. 178.
Abhinava accepts it as the greatest Rasa in his three works, his lost commentary on his teacher’s Kāvyakautuka, his Locana and his Abhinavabhārati. Abhinava’s predecessor and ancestor, the author of the Candrikā on the Dhvanyāloka, accepts the S’ānta but gives the ruling that it can appear as an element in the subsidiary plot of the drama but never as the leading Rasa. (Locana, p. 178). This has been pointed out already. The view of the Candrikā represents one stage in the history of S’ānta. It grants that S’ānta is a Rasa but holds it still unworthy of the honour of being the leading Rasa. The next stage is the recognition of it as an Ādhikārika Rasa, but permissible as an Ādhikārika Rasa only in a Kāvyā; in Nāṭya, it should only be a Prāsaṅgika Rasa. The next stage is its complete acceptance, as Ādhikārika in Nāṭya also, and as the greatest of all Rasas, synthesising all the other Rasas in itself. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka accepts it and, like Abhinava, holds it as the greatest Rasa. Taking the very first verse of the Nāṭya sāstra—नाथ्यसाहित्यचिन्तनम् भ्रामण यदुदाहावम्—Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka imaginatively interprets this as suggesting the S’ānta Rasa.1 ‘Brahmaṇaḥ yad uḍāḥṭam’ does not mean the S’āstra which was delivered by Brahmā, but Drama which is compared to the Brahman or the Absolute of Vedānta. The Naṭa is like the Brahman; upon him is created the world of drama, as this world upon the substratum of the Brahman. Drama is Māyā and the nature of its reality is Anirvacanīya. Though fundamentally non-existent in the sense in which the Naṭa and the Brahman exist as realities, both this world and Drama do exist. Both help to the attainment of the Puruṣārthas. The essence of this view is given by him in his Maṅgalasloka to his now lost Hṛdayadarpana. See pp. 4-5. Abhi. Bhā. Gaek.

1 Vide J. O. R., Vol. VI, p. 211, my article, Writers quoted in the Abhinavabhārati.
Edn. I. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka seems to have accepted as genuine the Sāṇṭa text found in Bharata.

“—शान्तसांक्षेपोऽवं भविष्यति ‘सं सं निमित्तमासाध्व शान्ता-
दुःस्वते रसः’ इति। तदनेन पारसाधिकं प्रयोजनमुक्तम्” इति व्याख्यानं
हृदयदर्शिणे पर्यङ्गहीत्। यदाहै—

‘नमस्तीकायनिम्नकाल्ये शम्भवे यत्।’
प्रतिश्चणं जगान्यायप्रयोगसिको जनं: || ’ इति।”

Kṣemendra accepts it as can be seen from his Aucityavicārā-
carcā, pp. 130-1. Following Abhinava and Ānanda, he con-
siders Sāṇṭa as the Rasa of the Bhārata. See S1. 3 at the
end of his Bhāratamaṇḍari. While Ānanda considers Karuṇa
as the Rasa of the Rāmāyaṇa, Kṣemendra considers that the
Karupa itself is the argument for Sāṇṭa being the ultimate
Rasa. See S1. 1 at the end of his Rāmāyaṇamaṇḍari. Sāṇṭa
is the Rasa of Kṣemendra’s Bauddhāvatānakalpalatā and
some of his minor works, Darpadalana, etc. Bhoja accepts it
both in his S. K. Ā. and Sī. Pra. Most of the later writers
accept it.

The writers who do not accept Sāṇṭa are mainly writers
on Dramaturgy proper. They think they are loyal to Bharata
by denying it. The attitude begins (as far as we know now)
in the Dasaṛūpaka, the model and source for many a later
work on Rūpaka. Dhanaṇjaya and Dhanika, both refute it
and argue for its impossibility in drama.

शमसिप केचित्त प्राप्त: पुष्टिर्मशेषं नैतस्य।¹ D. R. IV, 35.

¹D. T. Tatācārya, M.O.L., misunderstands this Sāma, the
Bhāva which is given here as the Sthāyin of Sāṇṭa, as something
having nothing to do with Sāṇṭa and as something new and distinct
From this it would appear that Dhanañjaya denies S'ānta only in drama but accepts it in Kāvyā. But, as a matter of fact, Dhanañjaya, as interpreted by Dhanika, does not recognise it even in Kāvyā. See p. 124. Mammaṭa first says that the Nāṭya Rasas are only the eight given by Bharata, but adds afterwards that there is also a ninth Rasa called S'ānta with Nirveda as its Sthāyin, K. Pra. IV. S'īs. 6 and 12. S'āradātanaya denies it in Nāṭya, following one set of writers who opine that Brahmā gave only eight Rasas but subsequently mentions the S'ānta as accepted by Vāsuki. S'īngabhūpāla recognises only eight Rasas in drama while refutes Bhoja for holding S'ānta also as a Rasa, R.A.S. II, p. 171, T.S.S.

Some of the writers on Nāṭya seem to be anxious to object to S'ānta only in drama, since, in drama which requires the action of a Rasa through its Anubhāvas, there is no possibility of acting S'ānta Rasa, which, according to them, is devoid of all activity. The S'ravyakāvyā however can describe the S'ānta Rasa, for what cannot be acted can at least be described. The D. R. Avaloka proposes:

‘ननु शान्तरसस्य अनभिनेत्रवत्तात् वद्यपि नाधेषुनुबेवशो नास्ति, तथापि सुरक्षातीतातिविव्वतूहं सर्वेऽपापणि शान्तप्रतिवेधात्त्वा विच्छानालवल्ल काव्यविश्ववल्लं न बाप्यते।’ p. 124.

And even this Dhanika does not grant. For he says that such a state as S'ama is the very negation of the possibility of affirming anything of it. For, whatever way in which we can describe it is incorrect in so far as we are always describing in worldly terms something which is not like anything of this from S'ānta. He says incorrectly: “Dhanañjaya seems to accept S'ama as distinct from S'ānta rasa, which, he thinks, has no place in drama.” (J.O.R., Vol. V, p. 28.)
world. The Upaniṣads themselves describe the Brahman by saying that It is not this, not this. Such a state can never be made the subject of Kāvyā even.

"शान्तो हि तावत—

'न यत्र दुःखं न मुखं न चिन्ता न द्वेसस्वरूपी न च काचिदिद्धचा।
रसस्तु शान्त: कथितो मुनीन्त्रे: सवैः साबेछु शमप्रवन: ||'

इवेवेवल्क्षण:, तदा तत्व मोक्षाक्षायामेव आलस्यक्षुपापांतिक्षणां
प्रादुर्भवात् तत्व च स्वहृपेण अनिर्वचनीयता। तथा हि श्रुतिरिपि स
पुष्प नेति नेति अन्यापोहुऽपेणाह ||" D. R. A., p. 124.

This objection of the indescrivability of Sānta and the impossibility of entering it has already been answered. See above. The Sukha which is said to be absent in that state refers to worldly joy. Visvānātha thus replies to Dhanika:

"युक्तवियुक्तरसाभावविशिष्टो य: शम: स एव यतः।
रसतामेति तदर्सिन सवायाति: स्थितिः न विरुद्धा ||"

S.D., III, 250.

"वश्यासिन्दुः स्वल्पाचारोपक्षव:; तत्वं वैष्णवस्वलपरत्वात्
न विरोध: || ibid. III (under Kārikā 249).

Vedāntadesiika also has answered this and other objections to the Sānta in the prelogue to his Saṃkalpasūryodaya. See D. T. Tatacharya, J. O. R., Vol. V, pp. 32-3, where the passage from Vedāntadesiika is quoted in full.

To grant it in Kāvyā and to deny it in Nātya is as clumsy a compromise as the one which grants it inherent

\footnote{This is evidently a verse from an old writer who accepted the Sānta and described it in these terms.}
Rasatva and denies it conventional vogue as a Rasa. Kāvya is, in essence, only drama and this Abhinava has emphasised in his Abhinava-bhāratī. If it is possible to develop it as the theme of a Kāvya, equally is it possible to handle it as the motif of a drama.

There are other writers who are not so antagonistic towards Sānta as to deny it totally. They are not Abhāvavādins but are Antarbhāvavādins. The aspect called the quietistic is no doubt available in Kāvya and Nātya but one need not recognise it as a special and separate Rasa with the name Sānta which Bharata does not speak of. We can have it and relish it as a variety of one of the Rasas already given by Bharata. Thus, for instance, some writers include Sānta in Vīra and say that Sānta is nothing but Dayāvīra. This view cannot however explain all cases of Sānta but it owes its origin to the fact that it was Nāgānanda that was at first kept in view by the sponsors and adversaries of Sānta. Others try to include it in Jugupsā. Inclusion in many other Bhāvas is possible as will be shown in the section on the Sthāyin of Sānta. But in all these cases the Antarbhāvavādins mistake a Saṅcārīn, though an Ābhyantrara one, for the Sthāyin. Vīra, as emphasising Ego, as Ahaṅkārapradhāna, can go ill with Sānta which is the very negation of Ahaṅkāra. If there are certain varieties of selfless Vīra like Dayāvīra, Dharmavīra and Dānavīra, they must be brought under the Mahāviṣaya, viz., the Sānta and not vice versa. So also Jugupsā, etc.

2 See Sāhityadarpaṇa, III.

Again

तत्त्वांशिकास्थिरत्वमात्रं वस्मन्ति अक्षे ।
अवान्नमयेनस्तिः स्त्रावीरवस्थलः ॥
These are at best very prominent and frequently appearing accessories. We can say:

कस्यचिच्छान्तमेधस्य स तु स्यादुपलक्षणम्।

Dayāvīra, etc., may be some cases of S'ānta, not all cases of S'ānta. S'ānta comprehends all the forty-nine Bhāvas as its Vyabhicārins. It cannot be included in anything. शुद्धजुग्गस, द्यावीर, विचिन्त्रस्वादिष्ठाव्यणक—these are, each of them, a kind or a case of S'ānta; they cannot define S'ānta. If in spite of the fundamental difference between S'ama and Utsāha, some want to include S'ānta in Vīra, because both have Utsāha of; Sāttvika form in them, all the Rasas can be included in Vīra for there is hardly any activity without Utsāha. If because of the Sāttvika nature of the Utsāha in S'ānta and Vīra, the two are made into one, well can Vīra and Randa be made into one, because both carry out the destruction of the enemy. This Antarbhāvavāda is dealt with at greater length in the section on the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

S'ānta is the Rasa of S'ama, or Tattvajñāna or realisation of Ātman. The whole world may be its Uddīpanavibhāva. Its Ālambanavibhāva is, in cases of Bhakti or devotion, a personal God, and in other cases, the Ātman or the Brahman. Those who have accepted S'ānta give it all the Rasa-details which Bharata gives to other Rasas, viz., its Varna (colour), Devatā (presiding deity), Vṛttti, Guṇa, etc. The original text of Bharata on the Rasa-devatās reads 'अनुज्ञो भद्रदेवतः' VI, 50. Abhinava says that according to the S'ānta-advocates, the text reads thus: "वीरो बहृन्द्रदेव: स्यात् बुद्ध: शान्तोऽस्मज्ञोऽस्मज्ञ: दृष्टः। इति शान्तवादिनः कैशिः परन्तः। बुद्धो जिन: परोपकारिकपरः, प्रभुद्रो वा।" Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 300. Abhinava says that either the Buddha or the enlightened soul in general is
the Devatā of Sānta. The mention of Buddha in the amended text is tell-tale and shows the hand of some writer like Rāhula. It confirms our surmise in an earlier section of this book that the Buddhists might have ushered the Sānta in. It is natural that Visvanātha clearly stated Nārāyaṇa as the Devatā of Sānta—Sri Nārāyaṇadaivaḥ. The Alaukhārasavasva of Harṣopādhyāya (?), written for one Gopāladeva, makes the supreme spirit, Para Brahman, as the Devatā of Sānta.1 Regarding the colour of Sānta, one naturally expects it to be pure white, to be in consonance with the purity and knowledge that characterise it. Visvanātha says of it—Kundendusundaracakāyaḥ. So also did Abhinava say: according to him, advocates of Sānta changed the text ‘पीतविवाद्वृत: स्नृत: ’ into ‘स्वच्छ्यपीतो शामाद्रूतो’.’ ‘स्वच्छ्यपीतो शामाद्रूतो’ हति शान्तवादिनां पाठ:.’ Gaek. Edn., I, p. 299. The Vṛtti of Sānta is given by Abhinava as the Sāttvati, because the Sāttvati vṛtti is described by him as full of Sattvaguna. 2 ‘शान्ते न सात्त्वस्येव श्रुतिरिति—.’ Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 341. But, correctly speaking, the real Vṛtti of Sānta cannot be any of the four or can be any one of the four in the several situations according to the Vyabhicārins. Thus in the case of a drama involving Bhakti or devotion to a personal God, the Vṛtti is Kaisiki.

The Saṅgītasudhākara of king Haripāladeva (Madras MS.)3 which, as will be seen presently, accepts Sānta as a

---

1 Madras Govt. Ori. MSS. Library, Triennial Catalogues, 1910-1922, R. No. 3325.
2 Regarding this false etymology, of Sāttvati from Sattva, see my article on the Vṛttis, J. O. R., Vol. VII, pp. 38-44.
less basic Rasa and introduces a permanent quietistic Rasa called Brāhma, which latter corresponds to the Sānta of others, postulates the Vṛtti of this basic Brāhmārasa as the Brāhmī vṛtti. In the fight of Viṣṇu with the two demons, Madhu and Kaitabha, in which incident arose the four Vṛttis, Brahma was a spectator and Haripāla makes this Taṣastha Brahma the source of his Brāhmī vṛtti. This Vṛtti he ascribes not only to the Brāhma rasa, but to Sānta and Adbhuta also. Brahma is the Devatā of Adbhuta in the old text of Bharata also. Brahma is thus the Devatā of Sānta and Brāhma Rasas according to Haripāla:

अभिषिक्त रसानितानु मृदुज्ज्वलं वृचय: ।
कैशिकवारस्ती ब्राह्मी सात्त्वती भारती तथा ॥

ब्राह्मी नाम भवेषुद्विधि: ब्राह्मशान्तादृशुताधिथ्या ।
ब्राह्मी ब्रह्मोद्वा तत्र शेषा नारायणोऽद्वाः: ॥ Mad. MS., p. 19.

Regarding the Guṇa of Sānta: Ānanda says that Mādhurya is the Guṇa of Sṛṣigāra (Sambhoga), Vipralambha, and Karuṇa. This Guṇa is sweetness and the melting of the heart. Really speaking this Mādhurya applicable to worldly sweetness or Cittadruti of a worldly nature cannot apply to Sānta. Perhaps Prasāda may fit Sānta, for, above all, Sama is the tranquillity and transparence of the Cittavrīti or Antahkaraṇa which has become tarnished with the dust of this world. Prasāda which shows the total absence of Rāga and Dveṣa is the nearest

Sāngīta Literature. MSS. of Haripāla’s Saṅgītasudhākara are available in the Adyar (Cat. II, p. 46b), Tanjore (Nos. 10804-6) and Mysore (Cat. I, 378, entry 7, where there is some mistake) Libraries.
approach to the Taṇṭasthatā of Sānta. But Hemacandra considers that in Sānta, Mādhurya exists in a high degree.

'द्रुतिहेतुमाधुर्ये श्रुव्वरे । शान्तकरणप्रिपलमेवु सातिशयम् ।'
K. A. IV, p. 201.

'सातिशयमिति — अयन्तद्रुतिहेतुतत्वात् ' Com. ibid.

Jagannātha also views similarly. He gives the greatest amount of Mādhurya as present in Sānta.

"तत्र श्रुव्वरे संयोगाये कन्माधुर्ये ततोदतिशयितं कहणे, ताम्ब्रां विपलमे, तेम्ब्रां शान्ते।" R. G., p. 53.

In this respect, both Hemacandra and Jagannātha only follow Mammatā who says:

अहादकल्यां माधुर्ये श्रुव्वरे द्रुतिकारणम् ।
कहणे विपलमे तट्ट्वानं चातिशयान्वितम् || Kā. Pra., VIII, 3.

These writers seem to have in their mind the state of Brahmāsvāda or the realisation of Ānanda, that being the end of Sānta rasa. Surely bliss unalloyed is sweetest.
IN this section I propose to speak of some peculiar and original views expressed by some writers on the S'ánta Rasa.

THE RASAKALIKĀ OF RUDRABHAṬṬA

In the section on the Sthāyin of S'ánta it will be seen that Nirveda, Tṛṣṇākṣayāsukha, Vairāgya, Tatvajñāna, etc. make their claim to be the Sthāyin of S'ánta. Each of these helps the other and shades off into the other. All of them form aspects of the one Rasa of S'ánta. So it seems to Rudrabhaṭṭa, the author of the Rasakalikā, an unpublished work on Rasa preserved in two parts in two MSS. in the Govt. Oriental Library, Madras (Nos. R. 2241 and 3274)¹. He says first that

¹ The two MSS. make the work almost complete; but there still seems to be some portion missing. On p. 32 of R. 2241, there is a Cāṭu on a king named Arjuna. This Rasakalikā is identical with the Rasakalikā which is quoted by Vāsudeva in his commentary on the Karpūrāmañjari (K. M. Edn.). All the six verses cited by Vāsudeva are found in the Rasakalikā in these Madras MSS. There are two copies, an original and a transcript, of the Rasakalikā in the Mysore Oriental Library.

There is no indication of the author in the MSS. of this work. But we are able to know that one Rudrabhaṭṭa was its author from the external evidenc of a Kanarese treatise on Rasa, the Rasaratnākara of Sālva (16th cent.). Sālva says that he draws upon Amṛtānanda, Hemacandra, Rudrabhaṭṭa and Vaidyānātha. While dealing with the Uddipana-Vibhāvas, Sālva says that Rudrabhaṭṭa mentions them as four in his Rasakalikā (p. 11, Rasaratnākara, Madras University Kanarese Series, No. 9, Ed. by A. Venkat Rao and Pandit H. Seshu Ayyangar). On pp. 188-2 of this edn., is found an appendix containing all the passages of the Rasakalikā quoted by Sālva.
S'ama is the Sthāyin of S'ānta (R. 2241, p. 7) and then describes on p. 9 that S'ama is the untinted, rippleless state of the mind which is acquired through Vairāgya, etc.

"शो वैराम्यादिना निर्विकारचिल्लम्। यथा—
‘अशीमलि वर्यं भिक्षाम् भावायासो वसीमलि।
शरीमलि महोपश्रेष्ठ कर्ममलि किरीवस्थाः॥’" p. 9, R. 2241.

What other things does he mean besides Vairāgya when he says ‘Vairāgya-udinā’? He explains on p. 47. He says that even as Vīra is of the forms of Dāna-, Dayā-, Yuddha- and Dharma-Vīra, S'ānta also has four Prakāras or phases or forms: Vairāgya, Dosanigrāha, Śantoṣa and Tattvasākṣātākāra.

"अथ शान्ति—
विषयेऽपि विरचन्तर्न तत्वाक्षर विनेकिनः।
रागादिनिर्विकारल्य शान्तिरित्वभित्तीयते॥
सा चतुर्विश्व—वैराम्यम् दोषविभ्राहः सत्तोषः तत्त्वसाक्षात्कारिता चेति।"

"विषयेऽपि निन्दोक्षितर्वऽयम् . . . | रागाधिब्रह्मो दोष-
निमहः . . . | तुष्णोन्मृठन्म सत्तोषः . . . | तत्त्वसाक्षात्कारः॥" pp. 47-48.

Here Vairāgya and the other three are spoken of not as means to S'ama but as forms of S'ama or S'ānta itself.

THE SAŚGĪTASUDHĪKARA OF HARIPĀLADeva

Unlike most of the later writers, king Haripāla boldly wrote on independent lines, creating new concepts. He accepts thirteen Rasas: the old eight of Bharata, S'ānta,
Vātsalya (which comes down from Rudraṭa's time), and three absolutely new Rasas, Sambhoga, Vipralambha and Brāhma. He expressly says that the last three are new and distinct Rasas according to his view.

शुक्लारो हृदयनामा च बीमलस: करणस्तथा ||
बीरो महानकाहानो रौद्राल्योऽवृत्तसंज्ञक: ||
शान्तो ब्रह्मारिधः पथादृ बातल्यावश्यसत: यथा ||
सम्मोगो विमलस: स्थादृ रसात्लेते त्र्योदश ||

P. 16, Madras MS. R. 3082 (Ch. IV).

What his new Rasas, Sambhoga and Vipralambha, are and how they differ from the first, viz., S'rāgāra—these questions will be taken up in another section. Now we shall restrict ourselves to Haripāla's views on the new Rasa named Brāhma which he holds in addition to (and not in the place of) the S'ānta. What are these two Rasas, Brāhma and S'ānta and how do they differ? What are their respective and distinct Sthāyins? What is the necessity for recognising two such Rasas?

Haripāla gives the Sthāyins of his Rasas thus:

आहारः प्रथमं वर्णः¹ जूसुप्सा शोक एव च ||
उत्साहदेयः² कोहोद्व विस्मयस्तत्तलयतः ||
निर्वेदः तथानन्दः पीती रसस्तृती तथा ||
प्रथेकं स्थायिनो माथा: कमात् पश्चेकमरिला: | p. 17, ibid.

He accepts the view that Nirveda is the Sthāyin of S'ānta and in this acceptance, he seems to have a purpose which

¹ Narma means Hāsa.
² Bhaya is the old Sthāyin of Bhayamaka.
we shall see presently. Haripāla says further on these Rasas:

लग्नोऽग्रगंभर्य ब्रह्मस्तेति जयो रसा: ||
अतिरिक्त उद्विक्ष्टे हरिपालम्भीमुनि || p. 17.

... ... ...

ब्रह्मो नाम रस: सर्वश्रयोऽचरीरङ्रुपकः: ||
नित्य: स्थिरोऽवध पर्यव्य पार्श्वक्षेण प्रकृतितै: || p. 18.

From the latter verse we have to take that Haripāla distinguishes the S'ānta and the Brāhma Rasas as differing in the degree of permanence. He calls the Brāhma, of which Ānanda is given as the Sthāyin, eternal (Nitya) and permanent (Sthira), and from this we have to understand that the S'ānta of which Nirveda is the Sthāyin is impermanent (Anitya and Asthira). While discussing the claims of Nirveda born of Tattvajāna to be the Sthāyin of S'ānta, Abhinava quotes the verse ब्रह्मो दुःखोऽनह्वानु, etc. and points out that the resulting Bhāva is Kheda or Nirveda in ordinary things in the sphere of our mundane activities, which has no reference to the fourth Puruṣārtha, Mokṣa. This Nirveda can be developed into a Rasa which is a kind of quietude, S'ānta. Perhaps, it is to distinguish such a Rasa as this Nirveda-S'ānta involving a passive attitude towards mundane matters, that Haripāla postulated a Brāhma rasa to refer to a regular activity towards the attainment of Mokṣa. No such explanation is however offered by Haripāla. The above suggested explanation loses point when it is realised that a Nirveda in ordinary things must only be a Bhāva and if it is nourished into a Rasa, it cannot stop short without developing into a Rasa referring to Mokṣa. It is a pity that Haripāla has not explained himself more elaborately.
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

THE PRAPAñÇAHŘDAYA

The Prapañçahṛdaya, an anonymous compendium, published as No. XLV of the Trivandrum Skt. Series, treats of the subject of Rasa under Nātya, in the section on the Gāndharva Veda, in the chapter on the Upavedas. The work approaches S'ānta in a new manner. It says that there are only eight Sthāyins but opines that the Nātyasastra gives nine Rasas! It thus gives eight Sthāyins and nine Rasas. It refutes those who hold S'ānta as the negation of the other eight and holds it as the cessation of all the senses, Sarva-indriya-uparama. But what exactly is the S'ānta, it does not say.

"तदेतत्  (नाथम्) अष्टभावाना  नवरसानाम् आश्रयमृतम् । ते
च प्रदशिताः—

‘रत्नहास्यश्च शोकश्च कोषोलसाहि मयं तथा ।
जूगुष्वा विस्मयश्चेत्यद्दृशो मात्र: प्रकरितिति: ॥
श्रुतारहस्यकरणा वीररौद्रभयालकः ॥
बीमलान्तरशान्ताश्च नव नाथरसा: स्थूता: ॥’

इति । तत्रान्ति मात्र: । पूर्वरूपः । तदुच्चररूपः नवरसः । । ।
तदर्भावानामभावो नवम इति केवलाहु: । तदसमक्षसम । नाथशाखे
नवरसानामभयुपगमत् । अत: सच्चिद्योपपरमक्षण: शान्तो नवमरसः ।”

pp. 53—56.

How can one speak of a Rasa without a Sthāyin?

THE ANUYOGADVĀRA SŪTRA

The Anuyogadvārasūtra with the Skt. gloss of Maladhāri Hemacandra (Āgamodaya Samiti Series) deals with the nine
Rasas of Kāvya, p. 134 ff. The gloss first explains the Praśānta Rasa thus:

'*प्रशांतम् कौषाधिजनितौत्तमार्दितो भवत्यनेवेति प्रशान्तः। परम-\nगुरुवं: अवणादिहेतुसम्मुक्ततिः उपस्थितम् कार्याण्या प्रशान्तो रस ईत्यं कर्षणे।*

The text describes and illustrates the Praśānta thus:

निःसमायायामता यो परस्तावेण्यम्।\nअविकारलक्षणो सो रसो पृथो चिन्तावधः॥

प्रशान्तो रसो जहा—

सच्चानन्दिनिं उपस्थितपरस्तावेण्यम्।\nही जह युग्मणो सोहद गुहकमलं पीवरसरी्राणं॥

छाया

निदोपमनः समाधानस्माभो यः प्रशान्तमाचेन।\nअविकारलक्षणः स रसः प्रशान्त इति शास्त्रवः॥

प्रशान्तो रसो बथा—

सच्चानन्दिनिविकारः उपस्थितप्रशान्तस्यम्यहीकसम्।\nपद्य वथा सुने: शोभते मुखकमलं पीवरश्रीकसम॥

Besides this Praśānta Rasa, the commentator explains that the Vīrārasa in the text has two sublime varieties called Tyāgavīra and Tapovīra, both of which are superior to the third variety called Yuddhavīra. It further explains that Tyāgavīra, Tapovīra and the Praśānta are Rasas which are not brought into existence by any "Sūtradosas" like Anṛta, Parabhisā, etc. Yuddhavīra involves Paropaghāta, destruction of others; Adbhuta is roused by 'hyperbole', Atisayokti, which is a species of falsehood. More of this later.
THE STHĀYIN OF SĀNTA

When it is said that Bharata did not speak of the Sānta Rasa, it follows that he did not mention any Sthāyin which developed into that Rasa. One of the chief arguments of those who do not accept Sānta is that Bharata did not give its Sthāyin. Says the Locana:

“‘ननु नास्तेव शान्तो रसः। तस्युन स्थायिवेष्व नोपदिष्टो
हुनिना’ हस्याश्रेयं” p. 176.

The reply to this objection to Sānta must show that not only is a Sānta Rasa possible from a Sthāyin like Sāma, but also that the Sthāyin is available in Bharata’s text itself. So certain writers who held Sāma as the Sthāyin of Sānta interfered with Bharata’s text. The result of this interference is seen in three places. The first two are emendations of Bharata’s Anuṣṭubhss enumerating the Rasas and the Sthāyins.

“श्रुक्क + श्रीमत्ताद्वृत्तसंज्ञी चेत्यछो नाये रसः स्मता:” became “श्रुक्क + श्रीमत्ताद्वृत्तान्ताश नब नाये रसः स्मता:”
And “जुगुप्सा विस्मयश्चेति स्थायिभावः प्रकीर्तिता:” was read as “जुगुप्साविस्मयश्चेति: स्थायिभाव: प्रकीर्तिता:”
Abhinava has these remarks on these two texts:

"शान्तापदापिनस्तु अभ्यविति तत्र पठन्ति।"
"तत्र शान्तस्य स्थायी 'विस्मयविद्या' इति कैलित् पठिति।"


The third case of interference is a complete interpolation of a section on S'ānta in Ch. VI. (Gaek. Edn., I, p. 333.) The Kāvyamālā and the Kāśi editions of the N. S' do not have the section on S'ānta in Ch. VI. In this interpolated section, S'ama is given as the Sthāyin of S'ānta:

"अब शान्तो नाम शरस्थायिभिमानको मोक्षस्वर्तकः॥"

That this section was absent in certain MSS. and that certain recensions counted only eight Rasas is known from Abhinava's own remarks. Abhinava says:

"तथा च चिरस्तप्तस्तऻस्तु स्थायिभिमान कर्मसूपमेव इत्यनन्तरस् शान्तो नाम शरस्थायिभिमानकः ' इत्यादिशार्थत्तुक्षण पढन्ते॥"


This remark will make it clear that the section on S'ānta Rasa is not exactly the end of Chapter VI as now found in the Gaek. edn., but the beginning of the section treating of all the Rasas, i.e. before the subsection on S'yāgāra. There is no doubt on this point that the section on S'ānta opened the section on Rasas and appeared even before S'yāgāra, in some old MSS. which Abhinava consulted. For Abhinava makes an additional score out of this priority of S'ānta in the treatment of Rasas. He says that it is because the Sthāyin of S'ānta is Sthāyin par excellence, being the Ātman itself on which arise the comparatively less basic Sthāyins Rati, etc., and because all Rasāsvāda is of the form of
S'ánta, being Alaukika and free from worldly links, S'ánta is the greatest Rasa and hence it is that it is dealt with at the very beginning.

"—हलस्य (स्वात्स्य) सर्वभास्वदवाविद्यानां पूर्वमििन्दान्।"


Who may be the author responsible for introducing the S'ánta texts in the N. S.? It is not possible to say anything definite. All we know now is that Udbhāta, the earliest of the now known regular commentators on Bharata, accepts the S'ánta as is seen from his K. A. S. S. which however mentions not its Sthāyin. Pratīhārendurāja gives the Sthāyins and he speaks of S'ama as the Sthāyin of S'ánta.

For those who believe in the genuineness of these texts on S'ánta as Bharata's own, there is no difficulty in answering the objection that S'ánta cannot be accepted for the reason that Bharata did not mention at all its Sthāyin. For according to them, Bharata gave nine Rasas, mentioned S'ama as the Sthāyin of S'ánta and described S'ánta as the greatest Rasa.

One of the main objections against S'ama being accepted as the Sthāyin of S'ánta is that the texts which say so cannot be relied upon as genuine because of their absence in some recensions. Also because of the fact that the S'ama here spoken of would make the number of Bhāvas fifty and Bharata gives only forty-nine. Therefore some advocates of S'ánta put forward Nirveda as the Sthāyin, Nirveda being one of the forty-nine given by Bharata. These advocates of Nirveda did not however criticise S'ama. Another objection, an imaginary one, is that S'ama and S'ánta are synonymous and the former cannot be the Sthāyin of the latter. S'ama and S'ánta differ even as Bhaya and Bhayānaka, Vismaya
and Adbhuta and Hāsa and Hāsyā. The former is Laukika, the latter Alaukika. Says Abhinava:

शमशान्त्योऽऽर्तं हु बस्तांत्याम्यां व्याघ्रवात्। सिद्धसाध्य-
tया ब्लीकालिकतेन (लीकालिकतेन) साधारणसाधारणतया च
बैलक्रण्यं शमशान्त्योरं पुरमभेव। Gāek. Edn., I, 336.

Both the above-mentioned objections to S'ama are thus set forth by Abhinava, earlier, as Pūrvapakṣa:

“एतवं न सहने, शमशान्त्योऽऽर्तं पर्यायवात् (१), एकाल-
पश्चात्तथा इति सत्यवायमात् (२)।” p. 333, ibid.

Rudrāta comes next to Udbhata in the discussion on the Sthāyin of S'ānta. He mentions S'ānta as 2. Samyagjāna, a Rasa and gives its Sthāyin as Samyagjāna. Namisādhu clearly says that Rudrāta gives Samyagjāna as the Sthāyin.

सम्यगज्ञानक्षकिति: शान्तो विगतेष्ठनावको भयतिः।
सम्यगज्ञानं विषष्येव सत्यं रासस्य नापगमात्। Ch. xvi, 15.
सम्यगज्ञानं स्थायिमाबः—Namisādhu.

Evidently Rudrāta did not rely on the S'ānta texts in Bharata's N. S', but was bold enough to hold Rasas not mentioned by Bharata. So he left out S'ama and put forward Samyagjāna as the Sthāyin of S'ānta. If Samyagjāna means the realisation of the self, it becomes the causal antecedent of S'ama. Samyagjāna is Tattvajñāna and all writers following Bharata have given it as one of the Vibhāvas of S'ama. But Namisādhu does not make any difference between Samyagjāna and S'ama. Under Rudrāta's verse enumerating the Rasas, Namisādhu enumerates the Sthāyins, the Vyābhirāmins, etc. And here, he gives S'ama as the Sthāyin of S'ānta.
We are not able to know what Bhāva was held as Sthāyin by Lollaṭa and S’aṅkuka. Some of the views on the Sthāyin of S’ānta mentioned in the Abhinavabhārātī may be the views of these two commentators. To those views we shall turn presently. Before that we shall examine the views of authors whose works are available to us. Ānandhavardhana accepts the S’ānta Rasa, criticises the views of the opponents of S’ānta and determines the character of this Rasa. He does not hold S’ama or Nirveda as its Sthāyin but gives Tṛṣṇā-kṣaya-sukha as its Sthāyin. He says:

‘शान्त्वा तृष्णाक्षयसुखस्य य: परिपेयः तलक्षणो रसः प्रतीयत्
एव तथा नोकरर्—

“यथावकासुरं लोके यथा दिव्यं महतं सुखं.
तृष्णाक्षयसुखस्येति नाहि: षोडशी लक्षणं।”

III, Ud. p. 176, N. S. Edn.

The Locana:

“तृष्णानां विषयाणां य: क्षय: सवर्तोपितुहितम: निरोध: तदेव
लुक्ष्यं तस्य य: सवर्तीभूतम: परिपेय: रसमानानांतः तदेव लुक्षणं वस्य
स शान्तो रसः।”

This non-acceptance of S’ama shows that Ānanda-
vardhana did not accept or follow the S’ānta text in Bharata. His Sthāyin for S’ānta is that happiness which is the cessation of all desires—Tṛṣṇā-kṣaya-sukha—and is inspired by Vyāsa, whose Mahābhārata Ānanda is going to expound as a S’ānta-epic in the next Uddyota of his work. If however we take this Tṛṣṇā as an Upalakṣaṇa for all Bhāvas, this Sthāyin will become identical with the S’ama or the Prasama.
of all Cittavṛttis. That this Sthāyin also will, in some way, become a form of S'ama is accepted by Ānanda when he distinguishes the S'ānta from the Vīra in which certain opponents include the S'ānta. Ānanda says:

"अन्य च शान्तस्य अहंकारप्रभृतं कृपस्यस्य स्थिते: | " p. 177.

And the Locana here interprets Ahaṅkāraprāśama as Nirīhatva. Hemacandra, a follower of Ānanda and Abhinava, equates Ānanda's Tṛṣṇākṣaya with S'ama:

"—तृणाक्षयस्य: शम: स्थायिमाव: चर्मां प्रात: शान्तो रस: | "

K. A., p. 80.

The Locana informs us that there were some who, not satisfied with Tṛṣṇākṣayasukha, gave the complete death of all the Cittavṛttis, the modifications of the mind, as the Sthāyin. Abhinava replies that if this is meant as a negative state, it can hardly be a Bhāva; for a negative state cannot be a state or Bhāva; if however it is meant as a positive state marked by the absence of all the Cittavṛttis, it comes to the same thing as that state of bliss which is marked by the annihilation of all desires.

अन्ये तु सर्वंचित्रप्रभृतं एवात्य स्थायीति मन्यते | तत्ततः
भावस्य प्रसन्नप्रतिष्ठितं रसेऽन्न चेतोवतिलामावेन भावलयोगात् | पुनः दासे
तु अस्मितस्य एवायम् || Locana, p. 177 (Reconstructed).

There are others, the Locana continues, who quote a verse from Bharata on S'ānta as the one basic Rasa of which the other Bhāvas are transformations and hold that state of the mind when it is itself and is free from any transforming condition, as the Sthāyin of S'ānta. Abhinava
says that this also differs only slightly from Trṣṇākṣaya. While Anupajātaviseṣa-cittavrītī is a state of Prāgabhāva of Trṣṇā etc., Trṣṇākṣaya refers to a state of the Pradhvarinsābhāva of Trṣṇā etc. The extermination of Trṣṇā is the natural process; we see in experience the polluted Citta gradually clearing.

इति भरताये दृष्टवन्तः सवर्ससमानस्मृतवाक्ये शान्तमाति क्षणां अनुपजातविशेषान्तरं विचारलिक्ष्य मात्स्वस्य क्षमिवाभ भावनं || p. 177. 

Bhoja gives Dhrṣṭi as the Sthāyin of Sānta in his Sarasvatīkaraṇthābhāraṇa, pp. 514-515.

6. Dhrṣṭi.

“—ध्यात्मायमावः कस्तुतस्वाभोच्चविद्विन्द्वियापाभिः स्वभावितापवित्तथावित्तथापन: निर्णयः शान्ति इत्यमित्रियम्।”

अन्ये पुरस्व शामं प्रकटितमात्रमान्ति, स तु ध्वरेव विशेषेऽब्जति।”

What is this Dhrṣṭi? Dhrṣṭi means Firmness, Contentment and Joy. All the three are pertinent. But Bhoja means only contentment, Santuṣṭi, for, his illustration is:

सद्र्दृशस्य सम्प्लवत्सस्य सन्तुष्टं यथा मानसम्।
उपान्तूपादास्य नन्दु प्रमास्वते मृत्यु: ||

This contentment again is not far off from Trṣṇākṣaya or S'ama. Bhoja mentions S'ama here as being held by others and he opines that it comes under Dhrṣṭi. Perhaps the reason why Bhoja did not choose S'ama is that it is not found in Bharata's list of 49 Bhāvas. Dhrṣṭi is found there. Elsewhere Bhoja gives the same S'ama as a variety of the Vyabhicārin called Mati. (p. 523) मत्तिविशेषः: शामो यथा। Mati

1 See also the Sāhitya mīmāṃsā, TSS. 144, p. 59, where this view of Bhoja is noted. The S. M. itself does not accept the S'anta.
has a variety called Tattvajñāna which is again not different from S'ama. In the S'ṛṅgāraprakāśa Bhoja discards Dhṛti and holds S'ama as the Sthāyin.

"अन्न च श्रमप्रकृतिः शान्तः etc."


Dhṛti is mentioned by Bharata as a Vyabhicārin and in Ch. 7, Vijñāna, S'ruti, S'auca, Ācāra and Gurūbhakti are mentioned among its Vibhāvas. These would properly come within the scope of the S'ānta Rasa. Earlier, in the first chapter itself, Bharata speaks of Dhṛti. While describing how variously Drama pleases persons of differing temperaments and moods, Bharata says that Drama gives Dhṛti to those whose minds are in anguish or are disturbed very much.

अर्थोपजीविनामां धृतिर्विद्विधैवैतत्सालैः | Gaek. Edn., I, 112.

This Dhṛti may refer generally to the balm-like effect Drama has. Abhinava takes it as 'Dhāirya', firmness of heart. This Dhṛti may refer in particular also to such dramas in which the production of Dhṛti in the audience is the special purpose of the drama. Such cases would be S'ānta-plays.

Many other Bhāvas are held as the Sthāyin of S'ānta by other writers. We come to know of these from the Abhinavabhaṛati. We are not given in this work the names of the writers who held those views. The first of these Bhāvas to claim our attention is Nirveda. The almost only reason why certain writers hold Nirveda as the Sthāyin of S'ānta is their necessity to show the opponents of S'ānta Rasa that the Sthāyin of S'ānta is surely found in Bharata. They are not for holding

1 This Mati-variety is not that which Bhoja holds as the Sthāyin for his new Udātta Rasa on p. 515, S. K. Ā.
to S'ama, a Bhāva not to be found among Bharata’s forty-nine Bhāvas. While Bhoja tried for some time to get over the difficulty by picking out Dhṛti from the 49, there were earlier writers who took the very first Vyabhicārin Nirveda and proposed to treat it as a Bhāva which was both Vyabhicārin and Sthāyin. The Abhinavabhāratī says:

"तत्तज्ञानजो निर्बद्धकम् स्थवी | पुत्तरश्चेषु उभयमौपकृतिमिव-त्तज्ञानात् अज्ञकः भूतोपन्यस्ति पूवं निर्दिष्टः।" Gaek. Edn., pp. 269-70.

"या चासी तथाभिहाता (मोक्षाभिवायपरमवस्तकारीचित्त) चिन्तवति: सैवात्र (शान्ते) स्थविभावः। पुत्तर विनयम, किशामासि? तत्तज्ञानो- निर्वेक इति केवल। तथा हि—दारिद्र्यगवियानो यो निर्वेक: तत्तज्ञान एव, हेतोत्तत्तज्ञानस्य तेतर्कर्णात्मेऽस्मि। स्थविभावसमाधिवे च पुत्तर-भवाय परिगुल्लद, अन्यथा साधलिकौ भुनि: तथा न परिगुल्ल।" ibid. p. 334.

The problem that has to be faced first is the postulation of S'anta as a Rasa. The first objection against it is that Bharata has not given its Sthāyin. To answer this criticism, certain advocates of S'anta say that Bharata has given the Sthāyin of S'anta in his text; it is Nirveda. But how did these advocates of S'anta discover that it was Nirveda? Bharata does not say so; Bharata gives it as a Vyabhicāri-bhāva, the first among them. The reply is that Bharata's mention of Nirveda at the head of the Vyabhicārans and immediately after the Sthāyins, has a meaning. Nirveda is a dislike for objects and as such, is inauspicious, Amaṅgala. Sage Bharata is one who utters auspiciously and so his mention of Nirveda as the first asks us to explore a hidden meaning (अमांगला सत्य शायनिति). It is to show to us that, though it is inauspicious, it is given as the first, since, while being a
Vyabhicārin, it is also a Sthāyin; the Sthāyin of the Rasa called Sānta. If it is not for the suggestion of this Prayojana, Bharata would not have given the inauspicious Nirveda first. Then arises the question: Is Nirveda itself the Sthāyin? Nirveda is born of broken love, poverty or many more causes. What variety of it is exactly the Sthāyin of Sānta? Bharata describes Nirveda thus in Ch. 7:

तत्र निर्वेदै: नाम दारिद्रयायामानाधिमिरियाकुष्ककोषातांनेछनिष्यिनयागतः व्याहिनिविष्काराणानांदिवित: विभागः उपस्थते।

Bharata here gives many causes as producing Nirveda. One of these varieties of Nirveda is that born of Tattvajñāna. It is Nirveda for all mundane things. This Nirveda alone is relevant in a consideration of the Sānta Rasa. It is this Nirveda born of Tattvajñāna that is held as the Sthāyin of Sānta by those who are anxious to have the authority of Bharata. But how can a Vyabhicārin become a Sthāyin? It is said that only such Nirveda as is born of broken love, poverty, etc. is Vyabhicārin. The same Nirveda when it is born of Tattvajñāna and shuns all mundane things becomes the permanent Sthāyin. Says Sāṅgīgadāva

स्थायी स्थायिनिविष्काराणानां बैदिः।
इद्यानिष्यिनयागतेऽस्मिन्न्यानिविष्कारानि। सांगितारतनकाराः।

Such Nirveda becomes greater not only than other kinds of Nirveda but also than all the other Sthāyins and Vyabhicārins, all of which it subordinates. Says Abhinava while expounding the case of Nirveda:

तत्त्ववज्ञानज्ञ मिन्द्रः स्थायिनिग्रहंमयोऽसनिष्यिनयागतेऽस्मिन्न्यानिविष्काराः।

It is this 'Anyopamardaka' Sthāyin-type of Nirveda that is taken.

Mammaṭa accepts Nirveda as the Sthāyin.

"निवेद्यस्य अमक्कल्पायत्त्बम् प्रथममनुपदेशलेखपी उपादानं व्यभिचारि
लेखपी स्थायित्वाभिव्याख्यानार्थम् | तेन—

निवेद्यस्याभिव्याख्य: शान्तोधपि नवमो रस:।""

Mammaṭa does not say that this Nirveda is Amaṅgalā, but says it is 'Amaṅgalapraya'. As a matter of fact, Nirveda born of Tattvajñāna is the greatest Maṅgalā. Says Bhāṭṭa Gopāla in his gloss here:

"तत्चिन्तयां तु निवेद्यस्य न किभिद्मक्कल्पायत्त्बम्, प्रत्युत

This shows how trivial this argument for Śānta based on Maṅgalavāda is. Another difficulty in this argument of 'Maṅgalā-Amaṅgalā' is the question why there should be any Maṅgalā when the enumeration of the Vyabhicārins begins. No doubt, there is the habit of Madhya-maṅgalā among writers, but why should that Madhya-maṅgalā be at the beginning of the Vyabhicārins? Another argument advanced by the advocates of Nirveda is that it is in the position of a lamp on the door-step, a Dehalīḍha, shedding light on either side of the door. Being enumerated at the end of the eight Sthāyins and at the beginning of the Vyabhicārins, it has to be taken, according to the implied idea of Bhārata, that Nirveda among the Vyabhicārins must once be taken with preceding items, the Sthāyins, and then with the succeeding items, the Vyabhicārins. This is also an argument without weight. For there are other Vyabhicārins which also are Sthāyins, as for instance, Amarṣa which as Krodha is the Sthāyin of Raudra, and Viṣāda which
as Śoka is the Sthāyin of Karuṇa. These are not brought to
the front and enumerated at the beginning along with Nirveda.

Another possible objection to having Nirveda as Sthāyin
also besides a Vyabhicārin is that a Bhāva which Bharata has
definitely mentioned as a Vyabhicārin cannot be taken as a
Sthāyin also. But to this the reply comes out that Bharata
himself gives a hint, taking which it can be proved that the
status of Sthāyitva, Vyabhicāritva and Sāttvikatva of the
forty-nine Bhāvas are not names belonging only to those given
under those names but that any of the forty-nine may, accord-
ing to the circumstance, become any of the three. This is
the pre-Abhinavagupta view of the nature of the forty-nine
Bhāvas and the names Sthāyin, Vyabhicārin and Sāttvikā.
As a consequence of this view, there grew a tendency which
expressed itself from the times of Rudraṭa and Lollāṭa up to
the time of Bhoja, that Rasas are not eight or nine only,
but forty-nine. The hint mentioned above and referred to by
these theorists is contained in Bharata's text on the Vyabhicā-
rins of Rati where he mentions Jugupsā, a Sthāyin, as one
of the prohibited.

द्विभिचारिणश्चास्य आल्म्योऽध्वंज्युगप्साववजः ।


This means that Bharata himself suggests that Sthāyins may
become Vyabhicārins and Vyabhicārins, Sthāyins. This view
is stated as follows by Abhinavā, as Pārvapakṣa :

जुगप्तां च द्विभिचारितेन शूकरे निषेधनुमि: भावानां सर्वेषामेंष
स्थातिचारितचिन्तनावच्च (चित्रल)¹ अनुभवक्तानि योम्योप-
निपतितानि शब्दार्थवल्क्ताहि अनुज्ञाति । Abhi. Bhā., p. 334.

¹ Means Sāttvikatva.
Abhinava criticises this view. He does not accept the Nirveda born of Tattvajñāna as the Sthāyin of Sānta. If such Nirveda as is born of Tattvajñāna is the Sthāyin, it means that Tattvajñāna is the Vibhāva. The other Vibhāvas given, namely Vairāgya, Samādhi, etc., are not Vibhāvas strictly. If they are included as Vibhāvas because they are causes producing Tattvajñāna, they are really the causes of the cause. The cause of the cause is never called Vibhāva. Further, Nirveda itself is an aversion towards all objects and is not different from Vairāgya. Far from being the product of Tattvajñāna, Nirveda is one of the causes bringing about Tattvajñāna. For it is one having aversion to mundane things that strives after Mokṣa and attains Tattvajñāna. It is well-known that Mokṣa is directly attained through Tattvajñāna and it is not true to say that one attains Tattvajñāna first, then gets aversion and then attains Mokṣa. Īśvarakṛṣṇa also says that Vairāgya is not the final stage preceding Mokṣa, that Vairāgya at best results only in Prakṛti-laya in the absence of Tattvajñāna. Tattvajñāna alone results in Mokṣa.

‘वैराम्यात् प्रकृतिलय: | ’ Sāṁ. Kārikā, 45.

Says the Vṛtti of Gauḍapāda here:

यथा कस्यचिद् वैराम्यमस्ति, न तत्त्वज्ञानम्, तत्त्माद्वज्ञानपूर्वात्
वैराम्यात् प्रकृतिलयः | मृत्: अहातु प्रकृतिपुष्पानुद्वह्वह्वात्तमानगुरुं
खीयते, न मोक्षः ||

It may be said that Tattvajñāna strengthens Vairāgya and increases it. Patañjali also says that Vairāgya towards Guṇas results from Tattvajñāna (Puruṣakhyāti). Yoga Sūtra I, 16: तत्त्वज्ञानोऽविद्यवत्तत्वतद्विद्यायम्. But Vyāsa, in his Bhāṣya
on this Sūtra, says that such Vairāgya is really Jñāna: 

Therefore it comes to Tattvajñāna strengthening and increasing itself from stage to stage. The result is there is no Nirveda as Sthāyin but only Tattvajñāna. It is the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

Surely Bharata speaks in Ch. 7 (the Bhāvādhyāya), while describing Nirveda, of the Niveda that is born of Tattvajñāna. This Tattvajñāna or Samyagjñāna and the Nirveda born of it do not refer to S'ānta Rasa and its Sthāyin but refer only to the ordinary and common Nirveda born on one realising that he has wasted his energies in a worthless cause through mistake, as in serving a miser who would not pay. श्याय 

The advocate of Nirveda quotes now Akṣapāda against Patañjali. Akṣapāda, he states, says in his Nyāya Sūtra 1, i, 2 that the removal of Mithyajñāna, i.e. the appearance of Tattvajñāna, produces the destruction of Doṣa, i.e. produces Vairāgya. Thus Tattvajñāna-ja Nirveda or Tattvajñāna-ja Vairāgya is the Sthāyin. This Nirveda or Vairāgya is the final stage and not Tattvajñāna which is only one of the causes of Vairāgya. The reply to this is thus given in the Abhinavabhāratī: Surely Akṣapāda speaks of Vairāgya but who said Vairāgya is Nirveda? Nirveda is an attitude of aversion and a continued sadness and as such, is hardly identical with Vairāgya. Mokṣa, for which we are now postulating the Rasa (the S'ānta), is a state of Kaivalya in which there is neither the sorrow nor the joy of this earth. Vairāgya is the cessation of Rāga and Dveṣa and is not identical with Nirveda. Even if we accept that Nirveda is Vairāgya, it does not follow from Gautama's words that Vairāgya or Nirveda is the Sthāyin of S'ānta. According to the Sūtra of Gautama,
it is not the immediately preceding condition of Mukti. From Vairāgya, activity (Pravṛtti) must stop; from cessation of activity, birth must stop and when birth ends, misery flies away; when misery has fled, it is Mukti.

Lastly, there is no good reason why one should take so much trouble, qualify it as Nirveda born of Tattvajñāna and call it Vairāgya and stick to Nirveda. Such a cumbrous and elaborately described Nirveda is only another name for the simple S'ama which can be the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

Other views on the Sthāyin of S'ānta are also available in the Abhinavabhārati. Certain writers held Utsāha, the Sthāyin of Vīra, as the Sthāyin of S'ānta also. Abhinava says:

'उत्साह एवास्य स्थायीत्थि'। p. 269.

How did some writers come to hold Utsāha as the Sthāyin of S'ānta? Utsāha, as given by Bharata, is the Sthāyin of Vīra. It is said that there are three or four varieties of Vīra, Dānavīra and Dayāvīra being two of them. The variety named Dayāvīra as exhibited in the acts of sacrifice of Bodhisattvas and as dramatised by Harṣa in his Nāgānanda is very much akin to S'ānta. So much so that some antagonists of S'ānta say that there is no need for a ninth Rasa named S'ānta and that the situations in discussion come under Dayāvīra.

1 तव शास्त्रस्तु स्थायी 'विष्कर्षणम्' इति कैविलो पद्वित:। वस्ताह एवास्य स्थायीत्थि। शुगुप्सेति कैविल। तव इत्येके। तत्त्वान्वितो निजेतद्विमयेयो श्वायी...\\n इत्यरे। ।


शुगुप्सेति व्याकारणं तु लान्ते कैविलो मात्रै। वस्ताह एवास्यं स्थायीत्थि। सन्नामुप्ये बिनु:। . . . . . . निजेतद्विमयेयो:। लान्ते कैविलो मात्रै॥

S'ārūgadēva, Saṅgītaratnākara.
Nāgānanda is a Dayāvira play. The Sthāyin of Dayāvīra, as of other Viras, is Utsāha. Further, the path to attain Mokṣa is one of strenuous effort and the yogin's fights and victories in the realm of the spirit have always been described in the image of heroism. (Cf. the description of Aja and Raghu in Canto VIII of the Raghuvarama (Sls. 19-23; from अनयत् प्रमुखाकिसंपत्ता to हृति श्रेष्ठ चेन्त्रयेशु च.) Subrahmanya Sudhīrā explains at length in his commentary, the Praudha-prakāsa, on the Prabodha Candrodaya (Madras MS.), how Sāntarasa is portrayed in the play in the Samāsokti of Vīra. So it is perhaps that certain advocates of Sānta who were worried about finding a Sthāyin for Sānta from among the Bhāvas mentioned by Bharata, chose Utsāha. They intended to improve upon the position of those who held to Nirvēda, who made the mistake of voting a Vyabhicārin to a Sthāyin's place and hence felt their position beset with many difficulties.

3 In reply to these critics of Sānta who hold that there is no need for a new, Rasa like Sānta when there is Dayāvīra, Abhinava says that Bharata gave only three varieties of Vīra, Dānavīra, Dharmavīra and Yuddhavīra and that one cannot create a new Vīra. Dayāvīra is only a new name for Sānta.

"नन्येऽऽद्रवारौ धर्मावरौ द्वृष्टवरौ व नासी कवित्रः। शास्त्रवेदैव नामान्तर-करणम्। तथा सुनिः—"

"द्वारारौ धर्मावरौ द्वृष्टवरौ तथेऽऽ। रसं कवित्रविद्धा भाषा त्रिभिरस्मितम्॥"

ह्यवमपुरस्लरं तैरिवयेवाभावाि॥ "" Locana, pp. 117-8.

Bhaṭṭa Gopaḷa, in his Kāvyā Prakāśa-vyakhyā: pp. 139-140, T. S. S:

"द्वारारौ हृति शास्त्रवेदैव नामान्तरकरणम्। यदे 'द्वारारौ द्वृष्टवरौ धर्मावरौ तथेऽऽ। रसं कवित्रविद्धा भाषा त्रिभिरस्मितम्॥ हृति तैरिवयेवाभावाि सुनिः तैरिवयेवाभावाि-वाचि॥"
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They had to resort to quibbling with auspiciousness-inauspiciousness, Dehalidipanyaya, etc. The sponsors of Utsaha, like those of Rati and Jugupsa to whom we shall come presently, had the advantage of fixing one of the eight Sthayins themselves mentioned by Bharata as the Sthayin of S'anta also. But then arose the problem: how could one Bhava beget two Rasas? The difficulty was overcome by accepting varieties of the same Sthayin. It was even as Nirveda being made into a special species called Tattvajñana-ja Nirveda, Nirveda born of the knowledge of Truth. Häsa also has many varieties. Rati is divided into Sambhoga and Vipralambha.

The writers who held Utsaha as the Sthayin of S'anta built on sand. They knew not what they were doing. The opponents at once undermined them by suggesting the inclusion of S'anta in Vira. One of the main Pûrvapakṣas to S'anta is the possibility of its inclusion in one of the eight Rasas mentioned by Bharata. Ananda mentions this objection and replies:

“न तस्य वीरिन्तमािंवः कलुचुक्कः । तस्य अभिमानमयेन व्यवहारानां । अस्य च आहारमशेषसूक्ष्मत विद्वृत्तः ।”

“तयोद्ध एवंविन्धविशेषसद्वावेवपि बच्चिन्यं परिकल्प्यते, तद्विह-रौद्रयोगपि तथा मन्त्रः ॥” Dhva. Ā., pp. 177-8.

The Dasarūpakāvaloka says:

“अन्वेसु हु वीरीभिभाषाय अत्तमािवं वर्णयति ॥”

The real position of the Bhāva called Utsaha is this: Utsaha closely attends upon Ahañkāra without which there cannot be any activity. No Rasa is possible without these two elements. Bhoja pursues this line and discovers his
Ahaṁkāra theory of Rasa. But according to the rule of predominance, Prādhānyanyāya, it is Vīrasaṣa to which this Utsāha is connected most. This Vīra is held to have four varieties, Yuddha, Dharma, Dāna and Dayā Viras. Of this Yuddhavīra is Vīra proper. Utsāha is however Sthāyin of the other three varieties also. This Utsāha is the very basis of all action and as such can be seen in some varieties of Sānta. Two such varieties are Dayāvīra and Dharmavīra which are really names of two aspects of Sānta. Sānta is a wider field; it includes Dayā and Dharma but is not included in or exhausted by these two. Numerous are the religions and paths of action towards spiritual realisation. Why these two Vīras of Dayā and Dharma only? Dānavīra can be a form of Sānta. Dāna may stand for Tyāga also. त्यागनिर्क्रिये अमृतत्वमानशुः.
Even Yuddhavīra can be a form of Sānta: there are those who fight religious crusades for the defence of their faith. Similarly there can be a variety of Sānta called Pāṇḍityavīra which Jagannātha humorously introduces.¹ Study of texts,

¹ Rasagaṅgādhara, K. M. edn., pp. 37-42. भनिस्तलबो भशो शैलक्य भक्तिस्वेष भक्तानां निमित्तितु दश्यन्ते. (p. 51.) Jagannātha mentions besides the four old Vīras, Satyavīra, Pāṇḍityavīra, Kṛṣṇavīra and Balavīra. The Mahābhārata mentions numberless varieties of this Vīra, while describing Dāna. Bhīṣma says in the Dānadharma-parvan in the Anusāsana, S'la. 22-27.
learning their true import and propagation of their teachings form part of S'ánta-activities. These produce Pāndityavīra in the prophet who has to meet and win adversaries in debate. So also there is Kṣamāvīra which also Jagannātha points out. Kṣamā is a virtue of very great importance in S'ánta. So Utsāha is not S'ánta; S'ánta comprehends many kinds of Utsāha. That is, several kinds of sublimating Utsāhas are Vyabhicārins in S'ánta. Dayā-Utsāha, Dāna-Utsāha, etc. are very frequent and are intimately related Vyabhicārins in S'ánta. Even the yogin who has realised Truth and has become, like God, Kṛtakṛtya and Avāptasamastakāma, has yet embodied existence in this world as Jivanmukta and naturally, like God, he also stops not from untainting action for the sake of the world. The Lord says:

न मे पार्श्विनि कर्त्त्वेव निषु लोकेनु किक्षन ।

Thus Utsāha of such selfless activities as in Dānavīra, Dayāvīra, Dharmavīra, etc. is an intimate accessory (and only an accessory) in S'ánta. Says Abhinava:

"स्वालमणि च क्रूरिक्कत्वम परार्थघटनायामेव उच्चम हृति उत्ताहो-उस्य परोपकारकविषवेच्छाप्रयत्नो दयापर्यायं: अभ्यधिकोम्पतः । बत एव ततौ केविंद्र दयाधीरलेनन्यपदिशपिन्ति, अन्ये धर्मवीरलेन ।"

There is a saying that for those who would have this world, there is no hope for the other.

9. Jugupsā. Only he who discards all mundane things can walk to salvation. For this, he must cultivate the feeling of disgust or loathsomeness towards the things of this world. This is the Bhāva of Jugupsā. Some hold this to be most important in S'ānta and propose it for the place of the Sthāyin.¹ 'जुglassेति केषितः' Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 262.

Bhaṭṭa Tauta has made some contribution to this Jugupsā and its relation to S'ānta. In S'īs. 97-102, Ch. VI, Bharata speaks of the varieties in each of the eight Rasas and here he says of Bībhatsa:

बीभतस्: क्षोभण: शुद्ध उद्वेगी स्यात् द्वितीयकः: ।
विश्वामिकिसिद्धेन्गी क्षोभणोरुधिराविजः: || 101.

Bībhatsa is of two kinds, Kṣobhaṇa and Udvegī. But in the first line, there is an additional word S'uddha. Commentators took it as qualifying Kṣobhaṇa and they distinguished the Udvegī variety as Aśuddha. But Bhaṭṭa Tauta said that Bībhatsa is of three kinds: Kṣobhaṇa, S'uddha and Udvegī. The Gaek. Edn. gives a reading here which has 'स्यात् द्वितीयकः' for 'स्यात् द्वितीयकः'. Tauta explains S'uddha Jugupsā as the disgust at the so-called pleasures of the world. Such Jugupsā is illustrated by poems of Vairāgya in which women and the like are denounced. This is a very powerful aid to Mokṣa.² When passions assail and evils tempt, Patañjali asks us to contemplate the other side of the pleasures, the attendant misery, etc., and begin to loathe them.

¹ Nirveda is very closely allied to this Jugupsā.
² Just as Nirveda which is born of Tattvajñāna becomes Maṅgala, Jugupsā for worldly objects become S'uddha.
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But Tauta did not have the reading ‘स्यां दुःतीयकः’ for he interprets the text ‘स्यां द्वितीयकः’. He says that though there are really three kinds, Bharata speaks of two, because of the rarity of persons having the S’uddha Jugupsa.

“द्वितीयक इत्यनेन तत्स्य दूरभोज्य अप्राप्यवेच सूचयिति।”

Ibid. P. 332.

So it is that some critics who do not want a separate S’anta say that, even as it is possible to include it in Vıra, it is possible to include it in Bibhatasa. The D. R. Avaloka says:

“अन्ये तु वीरबीम्भसादी अन्त्यांवेच वर्णयिति।”

The reply to this is the same as to the argument which sought to include S’anta in Vıra. Just as Utsāha is a very prominent accessory of S’anta, Jugupsa also is. This S’uddha Jugupsa may be a prominent Vyabhicarina; but S’anta is not Jugupsatmaka. The Locana says:

“आदिमहेष्नेन विषयजुगुप्ताः रघुवाच सीमसेत्यांवेच: शक्यते। सा त्यस्म व्यभिचारिणी महति, न तु स्थापितामेति।” P. 178.
The Abhinavabhāratī says:

"केवलं यथा बिप्रदम्भे औप्सुक्षमम्, सम्भोगेडिपि वा 'प्रेमसमासो-
लवम्' इति, यथा च रोदे औग्यम्, यथा च करुणवीरस्यानकादृशते
विवेद्धुरुत्तिविषयाः: व्यभिचारिणोडिपि प्रायान्येवनाद्वासन्ते तथा शान्ते जुगु-
पाशा:, सर्वभौं रागमतिपक्षवात्।" p. 338.

Another interesting view is that which holds the first
Sthāyin, Rati, itself as the Sthāyin of Sānta
10. Rati. Rasa. This view also arose out of the
necessity to choose one of the Sthāyins
mentioned by Bharata himself as the Sthāyin of Sānta also.
This view also makes a fine approach to Sānta and is an
appreciation of an aspect of the fundamental nature of Sānta.
Truth whose realisation is salvation is of the nature of Self
which is Ātman. It has to be realised by piercing the veil of
things which are ‘Anātman’ and which shroud the Ātman.
Things Anātman must be loathed and this loathing of Anāt-
man led to the Jugupsā-view. The Rati-view is closely
related to the Jugupsā-view; for when ‘Anātman’ is loathed,
Ātman has to be loved. This love of Ātman, Ātmaratī, is the
Sthāyin of Sānta. When one realises Ātman everywhere, his
Love floods the universe; Jugupsā then flies away; for there
is none besides or beyond Ātman to be shunned then.

तस्मात सर्वोपि भूतानि आसमन्येवातुप्यति ।
सर्वभूतेऽचालानं ततो न किलजुप्सते ॥

Like Suddha Jugupsā, this is Suddha Rati, a superior
Love, distinct from the Rati of man for woman. Bhoja
pursued this idea of Ātmaratī and landed on the philosophical
summit of the Śṛūgāra theory of one Rasa.

शैवो रसः स रसानीयत्वाय आत्मारतेः । Śr. Prā.
The Abhinavabhañgā records the Rati-view thus:

तत्र अनाहलानदमवज्वालकिया रतिं अवो गोक्षारणिमि लैव शान्ते स्वाभिनीति ! यथोकम्—

‘यक्षात्मारतिरेष स्वादिसमुत्स्थं मानवः |
आत्मेष्व च सन्तुष्टः तत्य कार्ये न विचष्टे †’ हृदि (भ. गीता.)

Further, Rati has this additional qualification for being the Sthāyin of S'ānta, since the final state of Mokṣa is one of Ānanda and Self which is realised is itself of the form of Ānanda.

This Rati sails in the same boat as Utsāha and Jugupsā. Only it seems to be more intimate to S'ānta, a Vyabhicārin of greater importance. Not only Ātma-rati, but Rati for a personal God, which is called Bhakti and is proposed as a separate Rasa, comes under S'ānta. The S'ānta has had a love-treatment at the hands of some poets and theorists.

‘अतं एव ईश्वरप्राणिधानकिये भक्तिः श्रीमलिपिृष्ठसहानु-प्रविष्टे अन्यथेवाष्टरितिसिद्धम न तयोः पृथमस्ते गणनम् !’

On the same grounds on which Utsāha, Jugupsā and Rati were proposed, the other Sthāyins can also be proposed as Sthāyins of S'ānta. Only they have to be shorn of their ordinary Vibhāvas, etc. and made a superior and extra-ordinary variety (Vicitra) with Vibhāvas like S'ruta, etc. Any one of these eight Vicitra Sthāyins can be called the Sthāyin of S'ānta. Abhinava says:

“अन्यं मन्यते रस्यादेभवाहौ चिन्त्यविविधो उच्चः ! त एव कथितविभावविविधी (तथा) श्रुताभूलोकिविभावविरोधाय: विचित्र एव तत्ततः तत्त्वाद एव अन्यतःमौद्र स्थायी।”
It is in accordance with this view that some hold a variety of Vīra, Dayā or Dharma, Jugupsa for the world called Śuddha Jugupsā and Rati towards the Self called Ātma Rati as the Sthāyins of Sānta. Abhinava elaborates in his Pūrvapakṣa that others among the eight Sthāyins have equal claim to be the Sthāyin.

"एवं समस्तविषयं चैकृतः परस्यः, विष्णुं च श्रोच्यं विलोकयतः,
सांसारिकं च इमम् अपकारितेन" परस्यः, शास्त्रशास्त्रं असंमोहधर्मान
वीर्यमाधिष्ठितवं, सांस्कृतिक विययसार्थां विभक्तः, ८ सांस्कृतिकप्रहिणीया-
ञुप्रमदाये, ज्ञुप्पसमानस्म, ९ अपूर्वत्त्वातीतश्चात्मात् विसम्पथ्यानस्म,
मोहसिद्धिरिति हायादीनां विसम्पथानां स्थारिवर्ण निरीक्षणीयः। न
चैतन्यनेन: न संमतः। यावदेशं हि विष्णुविरागितां परिगणयति
सांस्कृतिकम् च तत्तकारानां अन्यानां ग्रहणेते, तावदेव
तद्वैतिरिक-तत्त्वज्ञानेन अन्यानां सत्याचारीमुनानां अपूर्वत्त्वातिशिक्षम्।

प्रूपर्वभानि तु परस्परेन विद्यार्थतां एकस्य स्थारिवर्ण विशेषित
पूर्व:। तत्त्वज्ञानेन तत्त्व स्थारिवर्णीयस्मप्यतथ्यमानः प्रत्युपर्वणेन। स्थारिव-
मेतेन प्रतिपृष्ठ रसम्पथाणवायव्यावहे:। वोज्यकुक्लवादेको रस इति चैतः,
क्षोभीक्लवो वीररोदशोर्ध्वेक्तः स्मातः।"

Gaek. Edn., I, pp. 336-7 (Corrected).

It is often said that for the thinking man, the world is a comedy. Man's pursuit after trifles, his अस्थाने महत्रसम्भावना,
produces laughter in those who know the real value of the things of the world. To the Yogin, man’s action and sentiment appear as Karma-ābhāsa and Bhāva-ābhāsa. Says Bhaṭṭā Bhaḷaṭṭa in a fine verse:

एतत्स्य मुशाद्विध्यदृष्टि कमलिनीपते करां पासस:
बन्मुक्तामणिरिलिमस्त स जया: श्रणवेतदस्मादीपि |
अद्युग्ल्यभानलक्षियामविलिस्तिन्यादीयमां शानि:
कृत्तोष्टीय गतो हृदेष्यनुढिनं निध्वा न नान्त:शुचा ||

So much on behalf of the importance of Hāsa in Sānta.

It is but a thin line that divides comedy from tragedy. To the feeling man, the same world is a tragedy. The Yogin pities the poor Samsārin, caught in the whirlpool of passion. Thus S’ōka seems to dominate in Sānta. The seeking Yogin, the Yatamāna, who strives towards his goal, considers the world and its temptations as his enemy; he gets angry at them and desires to do away with them. This attitude is Krodha and Raudra. The same attitude begets fear of the temptations from which the seeker desires to fly. This is Bhaya. He reads of or listens to an exposition of the greatness, the omniscience, omnipresence, blissfulness and other aspects of the nature of the Self and when he contemplates on this wonderful truth about his own Self, he is thrilled and struck with the wonders of the world of the Spirit. This is Vismaya. As explained already, he loathes even the so-called pleasures of the world and then Jugupsā forms the prominent attitude. In this manner, these seven Sthāyins can claim to be the Sthāyins of Sānta.

The very possibility of each or all of the eight Sthāyins being the Sthāyin of Sānta prevents any one of them being the settled Sthāyin of Sānta. It cannot also be held that,
according to circumstances, the Sthāyin varies in Sānta. A multi-sthāyinned Rasa is foreign to the theory of Rasa and is an impossibility. Many Sthāyins can only mean many Rasas. If by virtue of the unity of the object, viz., Mokṣa, a plurality of Sthāyins is accepted as resulting only in one Rasa, it can be pointed out that in view of both Vīra and Raudra resulting in the same end of the destruction of the enemy, Vīra and Raudra can be made into one Rasa. Therefore, neither any one nor all of the eight Sthāyins can be put forward as the Sthāyin of Sānta.

The real significance of this view however lies in another direction. It points to the fact that any or all of the other Sthāyins become, in their vicitra varieties, Vyabhicārins of Sānta and in their ordinary varieties the causes of Sānta. One may pass to Sāma from Rati or Sōka; as a result of broken love, or the death of a beloved person, one may seek solace in Sāma. Asōka fought the Kaliṅgas and passed from Vīra to Sānta. Therefore any of the eight Rasas or all of them can be the Uddipaka of Sānta. Therefore it is that Sāṅgīdeva says: Sāma is present in all the Rasas.

शम: सर्वसंपन्नति श्रेयंदेवत्वादिचार्येऽसि। S’ R., VII, S’l. 3535

and Kallinātha comments upon this:

‘अयमः—ऽके श्रुतिरादिपि अष्ट्वद्व मध्ये वं कैशन रसमनुभवत
एव पुंसो जन्मान्तरशुष्कविशेषवर्गस्त नम उत्पत्ति हि तत्चदवसम्बन्धात्
शमस्य सर्वसंपु अस्तित्वम् हि।’

The next view is a reply to the criticism of the above-
given view which proposed any one of the eight Sthāyins as the Sthāyin of Sānta. This view suggests that all the eight can be
considered as constituting together the Sthāyin, taking Sānta as a peculiar case.


"अन्ये तु पानकरस्वतः अविभागः प्रातः। सर्वे एव रसायोजन व्यावहिनः इत्यादः। चिक्कुते भवायमुग्धावातः, अन्योन्यं च विरोध्यातः यूनदिप्न न मनोहरम्।" ibid., p. 332.

It is true that as Pūrvapakṣa, the whole of this complex world is involved in Sānta; but all these form only Vyabhicārin. Says Abhinava:

"तत्त्वज्ञानवक्षणस्य च स्वाभिनः समस्तोऽयं लोकिकालोकिकः विचीत्वा सिद्धां प्रभिवारितामिति।" ibid., p. 338.

Rasa is developed from one and only one Sthāyin; if many Bhāvas appear, they can do so only as Vyabhicārin. The analogy of Pānakaśa must not be brought here. These Bhāvas contradict each other and cannot co-exist at the same time. How could they function together to produce a common Rasa?

So, what is the real Sthāyin of Sānta? Abhinava holds that Tattvajñāna or Ātmasvarūpa itself is the Sthāyin of Sānta. He briefly states it thus in his Abhinavabhāratī:

"कस्तक्षेप स्थायी। उच्चते-इह तत्त्वज्ञानेऽव तत्त्वमोक्षसाधनमिति तत्त्वीच मोक्षे स्माधिता युक्ता। तत्त्वज्ञानं च नाम आत्मज्ञानेऽव।"

"तेन आत्मेव ज्ञानान्नादिदिविशुद्धिः योग्यं परिक्लितविक्षेप-भोगराहितोऽव स्थायी।" Gaek. Edn., I, p. 337.
Earlier also he says:

"ततः त्रिवर्तिस्क्पन्धिततिथिमेविपरीततिथिकोटिमोक्षस्फलः
शान्तः | तत्र स्वात्मावेशोऽस्त्रश्रवणेनस्यक्।"  ibid. p. 269.

Tattvajñāna or knowledge of Ātman is the direct cause or is itself Mokṣa. Therefore Ātmajñāna or the very nature of the Soul or Self which is itself of the form of Knowledge and Bliss—Jñāna and Ānanda—is the Sthāyin. This Ātman is Sthāyin not in the same sense in which Rati, etc. are; it is Sthāyin par excellence. It is the basis and the root of all other Sthāyins. It is upon the substratum of this ultimate Sthāyin that, as a result of sense-contacts with external objects of the world, the other eight Sthāyins are created. Behind Rati, Hāsa, etc. is the eternal Ātman. Rati and other Sthāyins rise and fall but Ātman is Sthāyitama; Rati and the other Sthāyins become its Vyabhicārinās. (Abhi. Bhā., p. 337.)

Therefore it is, says Abhinava, that Bharata mentions not this Śānta rasa and its Sthāyin, Ātman. For, it belongs to a higher plane and it would have been improper if Bharata had given it among Rati and the rest. It is the very basis of Rati, etc. which are not possible without it. Hence there is no need to specially mention what is undeniably implied.

अत पु त्थगस्य गणना न युक्तम् | Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 337.

Bhaṭṭa Gopāla adds that Bharata abstained from indicating the Vibhāvas, etc. of Śānta, not because he did not accept this Rasa, but because of its super-mundane nature.

"विमावाषपतिपावनं तस्य परमपुर्वपार्वत्य विक्ष्रवात्तत्तवात्”
T. S. S., Edn. K. pra. vyā, p. 139.
This answers also the objection that one should not go beyond the total number of the Bhāvas which is given by Bharata as forty-nine. Abhinava says that the sanctity of the number ‘49’ is protected and that Bharata treats of Sānta by omission, by his eloquent silence.

"तेन आत्मनि ज्ञानानन्दादिविशुद्धप्रमेयं गौरि परिकल्पितविषयोपबोधनरहितोश्च स्थायिः। न वास्य स्थायित्वा स्थायित्वं वचनीयम्। रत्नाद्यमि हि तत्त्वावस्तः तत्त्वावस्तः वयोपविद्यामानसत्त्वः। कल्पनास्य अधिकण्डमितिः। स्वतत्त्वाः स्थायित्वं वचनीयम्। तत्त्वावस्तः तु सकलमानान्तरविविधश्चात्रीयं सर्वस्थायिम्। स्थायित्वं सर्वां स्थायित्वः। चित्तरुतो व्यभिचारार्पणाः। निर्मातिवृन्दविम्बाध्यमति ततः वचनीयम्। अत एव धर्मस्म मण्डलानां न चुकाः। न हि ललावुंडमेधयो गोल्पमिति गण्यते। तेन एकाकालप्रभाविष्याद इवं वया धातृमेव।"


As the permanent wall upon which Rati, etc. are formed, Ātman, the supreme Sthāyin, is necessarily implied. This mention by silence means not only its acceptance but its acceptance as the greatest Rasa.

Another reason why Bharata has not mentioned Sānta along with Rati, etc. is the difference between Ātma-jñāna and other Sthāyins. Ātma-jñāna is not relished by the same means or in the same manner as other Sthāyins. Since Ātmasvarūpa is usually seen as tinted by Rati, etc., the ordinary means of comprehension which comprehend Rati, etc. do not comprehend the Ātmasvarūpa. Further Bharata never attempted to give all the possible Sthāyins. He gave only those Sthāyins which are also Vyabhicārins; hence it is that he clubs them all together and speaks of them as the forty-nine Bhāvas.
That Sthāyin, Ātmajñāna, which is never a Vyabhicārin anywhere, is not mentioned at all by him. How could he, knowing as he did, its real nature?

All the above-given ingenuity and strain are the unavoidable corollary of the ancient method of commenting which never desired to go against the basic text and introduced new things only by securing for it the sanction of the basic text. The facts about the Rasa of Sānta itself which we gather from this discussion are:

1. Tattvajñāna or Ātmajñāna or Ātmasthāya or briefly the Ātman itself is the Sthāyin of Sānta.

2. It is like the wall; upon it are formed Rati, etc. which are ‘Upādhis’ of the pure self-illumined Spirit. Nourishment of the permanent, unconditioned and untarnished Spirit by the appropriate Vibhāvas, etc. will give the Sānta Rasa.

3. Though Rati etc. are Sthāyins compared to Nirveda etc., they are Vyabhicārin compared to the Ātmasthāya, which is Sthāyitama.

"न च चाल्य आलम्बनावस्य व्यभिचारिल्यं, अरसंभवत्, अव- 
चिद्यावहस्तत, अनौचित्याय। शाम आलम्बवामृ।"

This Ātmavabhāva is called S'ama.¹

¹ Though Abhinava holds S'ama which is identical with Ātmavabhāva as a Sthāyin for all time, the anonymous commentary on the Vyaktiviveka holds S'ama as appearing in the form of Vyabhicārin also in Śrīgāra.

"घा गुरिन्दाय घ्रीभिरिलं भवति। यथा रूपेत्वादिशिवशाय, हस्स्वस्य श्रुत्व, स्वहित्न भुत्तमाद्रार्दी। निप्पित्तं कच्चिदहस्तक्षण शामस्य कोपाभिग्रहस्य प्रशादोद्देशमादी।" T. S. S., Edn., pp. 11-12.

Sāṅgīgadeva also, who closely follows Abhinava, considers S'ama as a Vyabhicārin also. Perhaps Abhinava will reply to this
Abhinava advanced the above-given arguments for Śānta and its Sthāyin without resorting to the text of Bharata on Śānta found in some recensions. In this text, Śama is given as the Sthāyin of Śānta.

अथ शान्तो नाम श्रूमस्थाचिरिमालमक: etc.

Abhinava has said that Śama is only another name for Ātmasvabhāva. When one speaks of Śama or Nirveda both of which are Cittavṛttis, one has to qualify them as a special and superior kind to make them the Sthāyin of Śānta. This qualification is unnecessary when Ātman itself is accepted as the Sthāyin. Rati etc. which contaminate the Ātman represent the disturbed or Vyutthita state of the Citta. The pure nature of the Spirit is like the white thread on which are hung coloured stones at intervals. By constant meditation and effort, the pure light within is seen. It is a state of bliss in a double degree, as Rasāsvāda and as the Āsvāda of the real Ātmasvarūpa which is Ānanda.

The text on Śānta found in some recensions describes Śānta as the Prakṛti and Rati and other Bhāvas as its Vikāras. The latter rise and fall, appear and disappear on the Ātman. They merge in it.

न यत्र हुःखे न सुखे न हेमो नापि मत्सर:  
सम: सर्वेषु मूलेषु स शान्त: प्रधितो रस:  ||
भावा विकारा स्वाधा: शान्तस्य प्रकृतिसंयुक्त:  
विकार: प्रकृतत्त्वात: पुनस्त्वात् हीयते  ||

that just as there are two different Nirvedas, two different Tattvajñānas, there are two Śamas. The Nirveda illustrated by the verse इवा कुरोवम्बन् etc. is only a Bhāva; it cannot be Tattvajñāna-ja Nirveda which alone is held by some as Sthāyin. See Abhi. Bhā., pp. 335-6 and 335. Similar in nature is the Vyabhicāri-Śama.
संस्कृतमाशास्त्रीय भाषा: प्रवर्तते।
पुनःसंस्कृतापावे न शान्ते प्रवृत्तिवेते॥

Therefore it is that Bharata, says Abhinava, treated of S'ānta at the head of all the Rasas. Further the relish of all Rasas is Alaukika, shorn of all mundane associations, and hence S'āntapraṇya. The bliss realised is akin to Brahmāsvāda which is Ātmāsvāda. Jagannātha pursued this line and said that Rasa is the manifestation of the light of Ātman itself when the obscuring element falls away. Poetry and Drama remove the bars and Ātman manifests itself.

“वस्तुतः वैश्वानरस्त्रितियत्रेपन भमावरण चिदेव रसः।”
Rasagaṅgādhara, p. 23.
THE TEXT OF THE ABHINAVABHĀRATĪ ON THE SĀNTA RASA

In this section, I am presenting the text of the Abhinavabhārati on the Sānta Rasa. It would have been unnecessary to give this text here, if the text available in the Gaekwad Edition had not been so error-ridden. The text presented here by me is as corrected with the help of Professor Mr. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar. I give in the foot-notes the incorrect readings found in the MS. in the Madras Government Oriental MSS. Library with the letter ‘M’, and in the Gaekwad Edition with the letter ‘G’.

There are still a few passages of which completely satisfactory reconstruction has not been possible. Pandit H. Sesha Aiyangar of the Kanarese Department of the Madras University placed at my disposal the readings in two MSS. of the Abhinavabhārati from Māṅgāv Koil, which belong to H. H. the Jiyar of Melkote. Some of the readings in these two Māṅgāv MSS. supported our reconstructions while many agreed with those found in the Gaek. Edition. Two of the Māṅgāv readings were definitely helpful and these are given, besides a few others, in the footnotes with the letters ‘A’, ‘B’, ‘C’.

It is well known that Hemacandra, who reproduces whole sections from Abhinava, helps us a good deal in the task of reconstructing the text of the Abhinavabhāratī. The Sānta Rasa section in the Abhinavabhāratī is to be found, with the omission of some parts, on p. 68 (text and com.), pp. 80-87 (com.) and p. 96. (com.) of Hemacandra’s Kāvyānusāsana. As pointed out in the foot-notes, Hemacandra supports the two Māṅgāv readings selected by me, towards the close of the section.

शान्तरसप्रकरणम्

वे पुनर्व रसा इति पदन्ति, तन्मेते शान्तस्वरूपमभिभीते।
तत्र केविद्राहुः—शान्तः शमस्थायिमभास्तमः तपस्यायोगिसंपर्कादिनिः।
विभावैैैवायते। तस्य कामकोषायाभास्तपैैैरनमावैैैवमिनः।
व्यभिचारी प्रृतितमतिमुतिरितिः।

पुत्तरेऽन सहन्ते, शमशान्तयोः पर्यायवादः, एकाकारप्रकाशावाकः
इति संह्यायात्मात्। किंवद् विभावा अध्यात्मात्: तत्समन्तत्तस्वास्विनि
श्रुव्याराजावनसनीयत हि इति युक्तम्। तपोर्ध्वयात्माद्यस्व। न शान्तस्व
समन्तरेतेव।। तत्त्वात् अनन्तरेतेव हि इति चेत् पूंवार्धवप्रसादः
शानेडपि तत्र हि प्रयोज्यतेति तपोर्ध्वयात्मादीनाँ: विभावता ५ ‘स्यात्

1 M. and G. शान्तस्वः बे हेतुः।
2 M. अनन्तरेतेवः।
3 M. पूंवार्धवप्रसादः।
4 G. युक्ता।
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1. कामाध्यक्षपि नानुभवः शान्ताद्रिपाग्नि वाद्याथाचे : अगमक्वाल् प्रयो-गासमवालिकाचः न हि चेद्याव्यपराः प्रक्षोग्यश्यः। सुहोमोहाद्योरिपि हि नि:ध्वसोच्छासपतनभूर्भावनादिदिशः 2. चेद्याभिरेश्वानुभावः। पृथि-प्रभुतिरिपि प्रात्यविषयोपरां: कथं शान्ते स्थात ? न चाकिष्कित्वरमार्गश्च तत्त्वज्ञानोपये भुवापान्विते। विनेता:। 3. कैते पर्या:खु:एवित्तमसो दृष्यंते। संयमदर्शनं समास्वयं प्राप्तः। अपि ते संसारे। तत् शान्तो इति॥

अत्रोच्चते—यथा। 4. इह तबत चर्मवित्तिन्यमः एवः। मोक्षेति पुनःश्रुतं तत्तवशीतिहासादिकृ च प्राधान्यवेदान्तवादतो भुवापान्वितः इति दुर्बलसिद्धम। यथा च कामाध्यक्षपि संपुंचीताधिरिजूधृवो रत्नाकलिन्धकान्तः: कविन्दच्चापते आश्राव्यवस्थापङ्गम्यो तथाधिकरस्वंवर्धवल्ल: सामाजिकान् श्रद्धिर्में रसलं श्रुत्वार्दिश्यति नीयते, तथा मोक्षाभिवर्धनसम्-पुर्वाधोभिन्ता विचित्रमिति: किंमिति रसलं। 5. नानीयतं इति वाच्यम। या चासौ तथाभूतां च विचित्रमिति: सैवा तथा स्थायिभावः। एततु चिन्तयम्—किला—

1. M. कामाध्यक्षः।
2. M. भूसुधाविवः।
3. M. अघमावतः।
4. M. and G. प्रात्यविषयोपराः।
5. G. तत्त्वज्ञानोपये। भुवापान्तः।
6. G. विनेता।
10. G. वैधेष।
8. G. मानसो हार्छे।
9. A शास्वमस्या is the reading in both the Māṅgāv MSS.
11. वथा is omitted in M.

10. M. एव।
11. M. रसल्लान।
मात्र? तत्त्वज्ञानोत्सिथितो निर्वेंद्र शरि केनित्। तथा हि—दारिद्र्याधारि—
प्रवत्तो थो निवेद्व: ततोज्य एव, हेतुतत्त्वज्ञानस्य बैस्मण्यात। स्थापि-
समारिमावें वैटा ज्ञेवेवा ज्ञित्व: 1, अन्यथा मार्गशिर्को भविः: तथा न
पत्ते। जुरुप्स्वच व्यविशारिसेन श्रुतारे सिपेथन्न 2 मुनिमावान्तं सर्वेषा-
मेव स्थापिलसमारिसेविषतत्वादार्थ 3 अनुभवावानि 4 गोम्यतोपितिपति ताभि
शबदार्थवेल्कुल्यानि 5 अनुजानाति । तत्त्वज्ञानस्य निवेद: स्थायत्नसरो-
पमदक: 6। मार्गवाच्यसहिष्णुमयी रसायद्ध्वां य: परस: 7 स्थापिशिल:,
स एव किळास्थायत्नराजामुरमदक:।

इदमै पर्ययुक्तानि—तत्त्वज्ञानो निर्वेंद्रस्य 8 स्थायीति वदता
तत्त्वज्ञानमेवा बिभावकेतु इसक स्थात। वैभावसवीजाधिकु 9 कथे विमा-
वल्कम्? ! तदुपायाधिकु चेतु कारणकारणेव बिभावाववहारः, स चाति-
प्रस्तववहिः। किंच निवेदो नाम सर्वानुपादेयतामत्त्वो वैभाववस्थणः; स
च तत्त्वज्ञानस्य प्रत्युपत्योगी। किर्रहो हि तथा प्रयत्ते, यथायस्ततव-

1 M. परितिः।
2 M. विषेमकम्。
3 M. reads विभावावल्लेकस्य and G. विभावावल्लेकस्य। Both mean little. We must have a word here to mean साधिकृतः। All writers from Bharata explain Sattva as Manas and therefore चिन्तामण्डलम्, however much uncoherence the word may be, is suggested as standing here to mean साधिकृतः। Unfortunately, Hemacandra’s epitome of this passage (p. 68, com.) does not have this word.
4 M. and G.—अनुभावसवीजाधिकु, विभावावालकसिपति विव: जाम्बुवालङ्कः।
5 G. वा जाम्बुवालङ्क; M. वा जाम्बुवालङ्क।
6 M. उसस्यप्रबोध्ध्वान्तानि।
7 M. and G. परस्याविनीताः।
8 M. and G. स्थायत्थायिष्णु।
9 G. and Hemacandra. वैभवसवीजाधिकु।
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Not by Patañjali, but by Vyāsa in this Bhāṣya. (Ānanda-āśrama Edn., p. 20.)

*This is read as माधवेश्वर in one of the two Māṅgāv MSS. Both M. and G. have माधवेश्वर. Hemacandra also reads only माधवेश्वर. (p. 81, K. Anu. vyā.)

M. and G. कारणतत्त्वान.
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स्वकारणवशात् मध्यभाविनोधि न मोक्षे साध्ये सूत्रस्थानियता १प्रल्पादि आचार्यण्। किंचत् तत्त्ववाचनोतिवाच निवेदे इति शमस्तवेदं निवेदनानां कुर्ब स्वात्। शमषाणावोऽपि वर्यायां तु हासियायाम् व्याह्यातम्। २सिद्ध-साध्यतवाह, ३लोकालोककिलेन सापारणासाध्यतवाह च कैक्यान्य

अन्ये मन्यते राखदव पुर्वाहू विच्छिदीविशेषा उक्ता।। तत् एव कथितिविभाविविक्षूदात्यालोकिकविभावविवेशसंध्याय: विचित्रा पुर् तावत्।

तत्कथा तन्माहवच अन्यतमोऽजु व्यायाम। तत्र अनाहातान्त्रिकरस्थत्त्र-व्यायाम रतिवेव मोक्षसाधणमिति, सैव ६शाले व्यायिनीलि। यथोक्तम्—

व्यायामनिर्देश स्वात् आलमुक्तम् मानवः।
आलमुक्तम् च सांनुस्।। तत्व कार्यं न विचारे।।

(गीता ३-१३)

इति। एवं समस्तविश्वाय खैकुते पर्यतः। विश्व च श्रीचयं बिलाक्षयतः। सांसारिकं च वृत्तान्तम् अपकारिते पर्यतः। साक्ष्यविमोहवानं जीव्यम् ६ आक्षिततवः। सर्वभावं विन्दसाधनं विभ्यतः। ७ सर्वोक्तम् १०-१६-धादि प्रमदादेव: जुगुप्तमानस्। "अर्थोदत्तव्यास्तिश्वरसामात् विन्दसाधनस् मोक्षसिद्धिरिति।" रतिकारणार्या विन्दसाधनाम् अन्यतमस्व व्यायिनीं

१ M. खण्डाचारिव; G. खण्डाचारिव.
२ M. and G. विन्दाचारिव.
३ M. and G. पद्माकिलित्वाते.
४ M. and G. ब्रवर्षण.
५ M. and G. ब्रवर्षण.
६ M. and G. ब्रवर्षण.
७ M. and G. ब्रवर्षण.
८ M. and G. ब्रवर्षण.
९ रति is omitted in M. and G.
निरूपणीयम्। न चैतन्युपेर्वं सम्बन्धपूर्व। याबद्वेव हि विशिष्टां। ¹भावान् परिग्नयति। रसयादियोगोपेन चशाब्रेन च तथ्याकारानेव अन्यानु संबूढ़ति, ताबद्वेव तत्त्वत्तिरिक्तासैलकिहेतुरतत्त्वानां रसयादयानमुद्भावात् अपर्वण्य। विषयलमु। एवंवांद्रान तु परस्परेव। ²विशारयतां। एकत्र स्थायिलं विरीयत एव। तुपरामेदाद्। तस्य तस्य स्थायिलसत्तमपर्वण्य-मान प्रथुमेर्व।। स्थायिलमेत् प्रतितुर्व रसयादयानन्तस्याधिक। मोक्षेकहुष्टलुभ एको रस इति चेत एव। ³क्षेराकभङ्ग्ले वीररौद्योपरिकल्पवा स्थाय।।

अन्ये तु पानस्करसबब्धलिभां प्राताः सवे पुत्र रसयादयोड़ क्षयिन इत्यादि। ⁵चन्द्रग्नामुमुद्भावान। अवयोन्यं च विरोधाद पुत्रम न मनोग्रस्तम्।।

कर्त्तव्यं स्थायी। उच्चं—इह तत्त्वज्ञानेव तावनोक्षाति-मिति तस्येव मोक्षेव स्थायिता युक्ताः। तत्त्वज्ञानेव च नामात्मज्ञानेव।। आलमान्ध स्तवविशिष्टस्तवविशिष्टस्तवविशिष्ट। परो वेणांमा अनाले व रसयादव। विपरितं चैतामङ्ग्लुभि।। ब्यस्मातिरिक्तव्यं विन्यातं इति इह नातिनिर्वेदं।। कृति।। तेन आलमभे ज्ञाननन्दाविविधमयोगी परिपूर्णतित्विषयोपमोगरहितोऽजः स्थायी।। न चास्य स्थायितवः स्थायिलं व चरमीयम्।}

¹ M. and G. विशिष्टाः।
² M. and G. परिग्नयलक्षिणब्रेन च तत्त्वकारान्वेव।
³ M. and G. विशिष्टाः।
⁴ M. and G. प्रभृतिपेशः।
⁵ M. and G. शपसौ।
⁶ M. शमेकः।
⁷ M. व्यतिरिक्तमुदयुज्ज्योऽनमु; G. व्यतिरिक्त इत्तिरिक ज्ञानम्।
⁸ M. and G. आलमान्ध।
रत्नाद्यो हि तत्तंकारणान्तरोदयप्रयोगस्यथमाननिहतेऽथ्मानोत्तयः कवित्वः कालम् ॥ आपेक्षितया स्थायिरसामग्निचिंतिस्य: ॥ संत: स्थायिन इति उच्चयने । तत्त्वान्तर तु सकलभावान्तरभिस्विस्वान्यं सर्वस्थायिन्यं: स्थायितं सन्त: ॥ ठायाकित: चिंत्यतुतः ॥ व्यापिचारीरामणेऽनिर्मातः इति सिद्धस्थायिभाविभाषिता ॥ ततः बचनीयम् ॥ अत: एवं प्रश्नस्मां गणना न चुका ॥ न हि खण्डमुण्डयोगः तत्त्वानं गोत्रमिति गणयते ॥ तेन एकान्-पक्षशास्त्रार्थ इत्ययातनेव ॥ अस्तव्यपि कर्म न प्रश्नमाणेति चेतु प्रश्नम् ॥ वास्तवाय गया ॥ न हि स्थायाय इत्यति संतः ॥ प्रश्नम् ॥ वास्तवाय गया ॥ न हि स्थायाय इत्यति संतः ॥ प्रश्नम् ॥ वास्तवाय गया ॥ न हि स्थायाय इत्यति संतः ॥ प्रश्नम् ॥ वास्तवाय गया ॥ न हि स्थायाय इत्यति संतः ॥ प्रश्नम् ॥ वास्तवाय गया ॥

भासलो वा लोके तथा ॥ तथापि ने संभवनात्मान्यथायिनां गणनम् ॥ रसेवूस्ये अनुपयोगात: ॥ अपि तु व्यापिचारितेन ॥ लक्षणीयविविधाने विज्ञापिते ॥ नेतराः ॥ तथा वेकाशपधिशाखारीरि चतुर्मुखैत्कोपपति: ॥ न चास्माल॥

1. M. विश्वद्रामं.
2. M. शाश्वपक्त्या.
3. M. G. and Hemacandra omit संत:.
4. मंगाव शाखिका: स्थायिरसामग्निचिंतिस्य: So also Hemacandra.
5. M. इति.
6. M. भावान्ति सर्गतः.
10. M. कस्मस्येन.
11. G. गोष्ठम्.
12. M. व्यापिचारित्वः; G. व्यापिचारित्वः गोष्ठम्.
13. G. नेति.
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स्वभावस्यः व्यभिचारितम्; असमभवत्, अवैचित्र्यावहितस्य, अनौनित्याच्। शम आत्मस्वभावः; स शमशाल्लेनैहः मुनिना व्यपदितः।

यदि हु स पेष शमशाल्लेन व्यपदितश्च, निर्वेदशाल्लेन वा, तत्त कधिकाणां; ॥

केवलं शामक्षिप्तवर्त्ता ॥ निर्वेदोषि वारिद्रत्तादिविभावान्तरोक्तितांविनिमेयदुःख्यज्ञातीयः सं भवति। तज्जातीय एव हेतुभेदद्विप तत्तथ-देशो रतिभयादिरिव।

तत्त्वमात्रामूलपायेवत्त तत्त्वशा शमः, तथा च यतःक्षण्यप्राप्तमावशेषाय एवाश्च; तदनुगमेदापि शुद्धस्य रूपस्य, अव्यवहानसमाचित्तादृश्। अनितिन्य, श्युतानेदापि प्रशान्तता भवति।

यथोक्तम्, 'प्रशान्तबाहितासंस्कारात्' (भो ३० ३. १०) इति। तत्त्वानलक्षणस्य च व्याख्या: समस्तोऽवव शाक्तालशाक्तिकिकत-दृष्टिकोणोऽव्यभिचारितात्म्योति। तदनुमाहन एव च यमनियमाधुपृक्ता०

अनुभवः: ऀः उपायज्ञानिवाचध्यायेन्द्रै स ये स्वभावबिलव वित्यस्ते। अतः

1 M. and G. व्यभिचारितसंवभावः
2 M. and G. समानवयावहितस्य एमवानभेत।
3 M. and G. भावः
4 M. and G. शितास्तत्ताम्
5 M. and G. गः
6 M. and G. भवाचित्तरेष।
7 M. and G. शमता च
8 G. विनित्यः
9 M. and G. व्यभिचयः
10 M. and G. प्रशान्तिनः
11 M. and G. भवति
12 G. अवेशीत:
13 M. अवभाववत् भवाशिक्षययसः... च्यायसः; G. उपायज्ञानिलस्य (आश्रित) च्यायसः।

व्याख्यात्मः
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तत्तेति प्रूत्तिष्यया पि। अयमेव हि स्वभावः। विभवास्वभावम्। परमेश्वरानुप्रहमसम्मुतः। प्रक्षयोगुणवाकारायन्योज्जात्वाचः। केवलं यथा विप्रत्यमेव नैवसुक्षमः। सम्भोगेदपि वा गुणमायासारसम्। इति, यथा च रौढे ओऽक्रमः। यथा च गृहवीरमयानकारुपोऽदत्तेऽनिःवेदङ्गृहिनीऽत्रासहस्रः। व्यभिचारीणोऽदपि भाषाम्वेत्र अवभासान्तः, तथा 'शान्ते गुप्साधः सबैः रागवतिप्रकारः। तथा हि महामहोऽ'नृपपठाड़दिघारणम्। 'असुभायां<br>

निःसुभायांविभिन्नवदिक्षासाधसंस्करतिर्मृत्तिः समौ। जगुप्सादुहेनमैव भिषज्यम्प्रकरः। च देवरातु पुत्रवनन्ति। उपद्रवः। भास्मित्वं च कृतकृत्यां परार्थवनायामवोधमः इति उत्ताहोहुः परोपकारविशेषेच्छायाभ्रूः पद्यपरंपरायोगविष्णूऽड़पः। 'अतः एव 'पुत्रवचिच्छिन्निविलत् प्रेमविद्यान्तः, अन्यो वर्णविच्चले।

नानूनलाहोड़दोऽभासान्तः। शान्तस्वच्छद्वारशैलविष्णूः। 'व्यभिचारिलिं हि विरुद्धस्यापि। न नोचितम्, रत्नविव निःवेदः। 'शर्या शाहुलम्' (नागा १, २) इत्यादिः हि परोपकारकरेण आत्माहस्यव्र प्रकरः।

1 M. and G. कयम् additional.
2 M. श्रुत्योर रत्नविव:
3 M. विरूपति.
4 M. and G. न गुप्सायां विभिन्नविष्णूः.
5 M. and G. महानादः.

This bit both in M. and G. is very corrupt and suitable emendation was very difficult to be found. Unfortunately, Hemacandra's epitome of this portion does not contain this passage. (p. 81.)

1 M. विज्ञानवनम्; G. विज्ञानश्चम्हणम्.
4 M. and G. नुज्जनमायुपविष्णूः.
2 G. तुःक्रिमित; M. Gap.
5 M. and G. शैलविष्णूः.
11 G. and Hema. नाजुक्षितम्.
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हर्षये। न तु' उत्साहेण्या काव्यद्यवस्था; \textsuperscript{2} प्रस्तुतमण्डलन्त्रिकाते। वेत प्रभु च' परिइवर्तनेन श्वालोकोष्ठेशन कर्त्त्व्यान्तरं \nनावशिष्यते। अति प्रभु शान्तिद्वारणा परोपकार्य शरीरस्तवायिदानं \nशान्तिकरोपि। 'अतः मां गोपायेव' \textsuperscript{3} \nहस्याविना सकृतकत्यविषयं शरीरं रक्षणमुपर्यविहर, सम्यक्षिनि तद्विद्वन्द्वित्यभाववात। तथा हि—

'सध्यां धन्यकामसोक्षणां \nप्राणः संशिष्ठितेऽत्पुर।
\nताक्षिश्वता क्र न हूँत रक्षता क्र न रक्षितम। \textsuperscript{4} इति

\textsuperscript{5} वर्षसिद्धवपजसैवसमायकसेवमेव वेदनीयया निदानं दशितम। \nकृतकर्त्ययक्ष्ये \nजनेऽसैव सङ्के ते पतीतिदित सम्यकस्थिते सचति। तथवाकाशस्तम्यावः \nवायूयं \nशरीरम। यवद धराभ्यवते ततु किमिवं न संपादितच्चति। जीवमुक्त-
\nवानादीनां न \textsuperscript{6}वस्तिभवतिदितऽते, क्र न तेन। \nतत्वज्ञानीलय तत्वद्व-\n\nहरिमन्ति। अन्याथा देहात्मामाणिनां देह एव सर्वस्वमूते धर्माधनुष्ठेषो शर्यं \nसाध्नायवतात। \nयुक्तेदि हि न वीरस्य वेदन्यायायोषयमः, \n\textsuperscript{7}पञ्जाबज्योऽधेषोऽनव प्रत्ये:। \nमहमुतमानादिविधिमाणिनां \nकर्त्तव्यत्रवान्तरसंपंत्याविदिवं \nवाचिकं विजुस्मिते। \nततु स्त्रावानुष्ठेषो शर्यंस्मपचै वध्योगितं तेह्यागः-

\textsuperscript{1} M. and Hema. श
\textsuperscript{2} M. अय्यनस्वार्थी।
\textsuperscript{3} च is omitted in M. and G.
\textsuperscript{4} M. पापले; G. and Hema. पापले।
\textsuperscript{5} M. वृत्तामु; बक्षणम्।
\textsuperscript{6} M. तबाधि।
\textsuperscript{7} M. G. and Hema. सम्यकस्थ।
\textsuperscript{8} M. and G. वात्सिल्य।
\textsuperscript{9} M. युक्तेदि विनिष्ठानीस्तवम्। G. युक्तेदि हि न वीरस्य ध्यायोषयमः
\textsuperscript{10} M. पशुस्य; G. पशुस्य।
पर्यन्तसुपदेशदानादि, तदवःसामतत्त्वज्ञानानामसम्बन्धमेवेति। तेषपि
तत्त्वज्ञानिः। 'त्वाणि तत्त्वमेवः मुक्तिरिति स्खलितु शृद्धिः च।
वयोऽसम्——

'देवार्चनतस्तत्त्वज्ञानिनिर्दिष्टतिथिभी:।
श्रावः' क्र्त्वा दद्यं द्रव्यं गुहस्योऽधिपि हि मुख्ये॥६' इति।
केवलं 'परार्थभिन्नतिवज्ञात् धर्मात् परोपकालमकल्पनेऽवे अभिसंहितात्
पुनरपि देहस्य तदुचितत्वेऽव नादुरावो बोधिसत्वादिनानि
तत्त्वज्ञानिनाम।

हि: अकेष्वापि ७ विश्वानिदानः, स्वभावबिख्यातः, यथा रामाय
वीराः। ८ पितुराजः पालयतः। एवं श्रुताराध्येष्वापि मन्त्रयम्। ९अत
एव शान्तस्य स्थायिलेष्वापि अप्राप्यम्। जीूसवाहने त्विर्गस्मपत्तेऽव
परोपकृतिपनायाय: फल्वात्। अनेनवशकेन नाटककृत्यं वश्यते—
'ऋंद्रिविजालाबिद्विंशी' गुणे।' (१९-११) इति। अनेन हि ऋंद्रिविजाले
प्राणामर्थकानोरं सर्वं चरितं सकल्योक्तिद्वयसंवादसुन्दरप्रयोजनं नाटके
भवेश्यात्विनिक्षितम्। पुत्रं तैवव वर्णिष्याम्। अनेनेतव चाचायेन न
शान्ते कथन गुणिनां जात्यज्ञां वनिष्योत्स्ये (Vide Ch. 29 S'1s. 1-4)
तेन जात्यज्ञाविनियोगाभावात् तदस्थविभिर्विश्यकम्॥

१ G. तत्त्वज्ञानिनाम्।
२ M. अद्वी विदेशिकाविद्।
३ M. फाशौ हि चम्विकावः।
४ है: अकेष्वापि is not found in M.
५ M. and G. बीराजः।
६ M. एह एत।
७ M. विश्वास्वाधिन:।
८ M. विशालः।
अन्ये हु, ¹ "जीमूतवाहनस्ते पुनःरात्रा भक्षिष्यति" (नागायुक्त ४-९) हि दर्शनार्थी शुद्धार्थक तत्त्वात्। शक्तिस्वास्य न कृष्णम। शरीरसाधनम् न नातिकृष्णम्। शरीरसाधी न महावर्धनम् तदनुसारस्ते यह न हि वोवधिस्वात् सुनः ²अव्यस्ता तथा वर्धितमि सम्बन्धवानामुलाखित ॥ शक्तिस्वास्य ॥ न च कायम्। दुर्बलीयुक्त पायनाम् अव्यस्ता। अन्ये हु व्यमिचारिणी यथार्थवात्स्तव भवति ॥ यथोक्तम् 'तत्त्वमेव प्रत्य-निद्रस्ताति संस्करस्तः:' (योगसूत्र ४. २७) हि ॥ अत एव निवेद्यास्वदनुभवात् हि प्रत्यक्षम् ॥ यदा हु पर्यन्तभूमिकालेमेवनुभवायम्: तदावस्था यथाप्रवृत्तम्, रत्नशोकावरीपि पर्यन्तसिद्धाश्च अप्रवृत्तम् युक्तवात् || हृदयस्फोटनात्मकों तथ्विचिप्तस्वामानीजस्तकमात्रातिनां भवेत् ॥ यद्यति "मोक्षे चापि विस्मित: " (अध्याय: २७—श्रोत ५६२) हि ॥ सर्वस्य "न सर्वं हृदयस्फोटः, भयानके वीरस्यकटुभावात्। नन्दनाह ताहिः प्रयोगे वीरस्य क आस्वादः। २७ उच्चयते—यत्रायेक नियन्त्रते, तत्रावस्थं पुरुषार्थोपयोगिनि श्रीकपिलराजयततमस्थेव ॥ तत्किर्मस्वास्तमानः ॥ यत्रापि प्रहसनानां हर्षानां: प्रभावता तत्राप्युपनिशादिसान्तरनिष्ठ प्रव-स्वादः। ॥ "भित्रभित्रभिन्नकार्यव्याप्तः एव रूपकमेवमिचितते निमित-मिति केवलित।"
तस्मादसि शान्तो रसः। तथा च चिरन्तनपुलकेषु 'स्थायिभावानुरसस्तनस्यन्वै:। इत्यन्तर: शान्तो नाम शमस्तबिमयाबालक
हृदयादिशायत्वं क्षणम हिन्य। तत्र सर्वसंसारान्य शाल्माय प्रवासातः।.', विय-वियेम्यो विपारीत्रिथा।
तन्मुखियातामः। केवलं वासनानन्दारोपहितं हिति। अत्र सर्वप्रकृतिराधिपानाय पूर्वमभिक्षानम्।
लोके च प्रथमक प्रथमक सामान्यतः न गणनमिति स्थायिभाव प्रथमक। नोकः। सामान्यमपि तु विवे-चकेन प्रथमेव गणनीयमिति विवेचस्कृतिसमाजप्राचाध्यायणप्रतीतिविश्वस्य स प्रथमभूत पूणण।
इतिहासपुराणाभिमानकोशाऽ च नव रसा: 
शृण्यन्ते, श्रीमतिस्वदन्तशाखेष्वपि। तथा चोकमू—

"अध्यात्मिनिः देवानाश्रुकारानिवार्षेत्त।
मध्ये च देवदेवस्य शान्तेन रूपं प्रदर्शेयेत्।"

tतथः च वैराग्यसंसारभीतायः विभावः। स हि तैरपनिवनवैविवायते।
मोक्षक्ष्रिशुल्तादयोऽजुभावः। निवेदनस्तत्रत्रिकुत्स्यदयो व्यभिचारिणः।
अत एव ईश्वरप्रदेशाधिविषये भक्तिद्वादस्तत्रतिगृहीतोऽसाहानुप्रबोध्यचे वाज्ञामिति न तथो: प्रथमसलेघन गणनस। अत्र सव्याहकारिका—

मोक्षाध्यात्मिनिमित्तस्वाभावाष्टेवतंयुक्तः।
नि:देवस्वदम्युः शान्तसोः नाम विजेय:।

विभावस्वाभ्यतनमार्गसः क्रमावत् विशेषणविभेदं दर्शित:।

1 There is a न here in M. and G.
2 M. and G. अभावः।
3 M. युक्तः।
4 M. असाहानुप्रक्षेत्रसः; G. असाहानुप्रबोध्यसः।
स्वं स्वं निमित्तमादाय शान्तादस्त्वते रसः ।
पुनर्निमित्तचापे दु शान्ते पव भ्रीयते ॥

इस्यादिना रसान्तस्मक्तिक्वृच्छुसंहतम् ॥

यदू हिते हास्यशुक्करपरिहारण पड्सल्मं च बक्ष्यते, तथायं मावः ।
‘दीतरसकाव्यमोनि:’ (xxviii. 83) इति आविना लक्षणेन सौद्रप्रवाने
तावहुमें तदिरूढ्यस्थ स्वान्तस्य सम्बावनेव न, कि निषेधे। शान्ता-
सम्बे तु दीतरसकाव्यमोनिरित्येतेन कि व्यक्तचेव शुक्कराभास्यवर्जे
'पड्सल्मं इति सुके नातिप्रसू: । ननु करणवीमसम्भावशापायन्त्य-
मने नाद्रे व्यक्तचेवते। नैतु, ‘सावधारमेणीप्रविष्मग’ इत्यानेव
तपिलसात्। शान्ते तु साख्येपि खृतिरिति तु तद्वर्तचेतकमेवते।
तेन यिमल्पण स्वरुप शान्तसस्य सद्योऽग्ने लिङ्गश्। श्रुतवासु प्रस्मशे स्वत्य-
मानः सम्बाव्य पव तद्वर्जः च हास्य इति तथोरं प्रतिरेव: कृतः,
मातवात्। सबितास्माच विद्येष्टो बण्डवनामस्मिन्तऽप्यस्य तत्कलिन-तमिति ज्ञेयम्। ‘उत्कलस्तु शान्तस्मापि दशिते।” सत्यस्वा हि
हास्यस्त:। विभावेण चास्य चीलीक्षला। अत एवाय सस्य यम-
नियमस्तर्पणिणावन्दुदावेश:। अनुपयोगितवाद महाफलवलं सर्वप्राप्नीन्यमिति
कृत्वाचापकलं चौपञ्चर्मिति अंतमित्वप्रस्त:।

1 M. and G. तम प्रवाहः।
2 M. and G. सम्प्रोक्तेन।
3 M. and G. omit न।
4 M. and G. उपपल्लितः।
5 G. सर्पानामः।
6 M. and G. ताहितमाथिचेव।
7 G. ल्येवे।
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

तत्त्वात्मादोक्ष्य कीर्तित: उच्चते—उपरागाधिष्ठि: उत्साहस्त्रादिभिरहर्षरूपक: बद्धातुस्वरूपः तदेव विरोणतंत्रात्मात्मानसमानसिद्धारभूव: (४) यदाहिततत्वस्वरूपः सकलेऽर्त्स्त्यादिव: उपरजेक्षु: तथाभवेनापि सकलेऽर्त्स्त्यादिव: न्यायेऽभिषेके मृत्युभाग प्राप्तमानास जनसंसारसंभाषनिसमाप्ततः समाधिस्थापत्यात्मेऽति. म्यानेन भासमानाः "पराध्युततालमक" सकलेऽर्त्स्त्यादिव: जनानुमानान्तरद्विदेशकः जनत्वयोगमान्यात्माः साधारणतत्व निर्मातसमानाः अन्तर्निश्चिलारथाम्बेदी लोकोपरिवारान्नतानन्त्र तथाविभित्तिहरू विद्वेष हृति।

पूने नैषव रसाः। पुराणाधिक्षेत्रेन राैमाविनि व इयतानेके उपदेशीयात। तेन सन्तरसस्म: अपि "पर्वतप्रसिद्धिवा सड्कुणानिमत्ति यद्धेकोहरू लक्षणहरू। भावाल्याने चैतहवहस आदिताधिक्यक: यहेन रस हृति लक्षात। यहेन व्यक्तिक: | स च सबौ रत्नुस्तादावेऽव पर्यवस्थिति। तदाहे बालस्य मातापिन्नादी: यहेनवा विविधात्त:; यूनो: विस्तार नेताः; वस्त्रवादिक:; नाटोर यहेन वाचार्य; धमीवरूँ" एव। एव दृढ्य पुनावलीपि दृढ्यात। एवे "गर्भस्याधिकृत्य लोकोपरि रस्यास्य सर्विनिमित्तथा, हासी वा रसी वा अन्यत्र पर्यवसानात्। एवे संकारपि काँचामिति।"

1. M. श्रीमद्वा तत्त्वादि:; G. श्रीमद्वा तत्त्वादि:
2. M. परोऽदिता।
3. M. शाला।
4. M. और G. एंते,।
5. M. पाणि; G. पाणि।।
6. M. और G. श्रीसे विविधात्त:।

A. Both the Māṅgāv MSS. and Hema. read अथि which is better than श्रीसे or श्रीसे द्वा (विविधात्त:)
B. Both the Māṅgāv MSS. and Hema. read यूनो निश्चिता।
C. Both the Māṅgāv MSS. and Hema. read लक्ष्यादिक: which is better than the M. and G. reading लक्ष्यादिक:।
7. M. खरिश्वः; G. खरिश्वः।
8. M. और G. गन्त्वस्याधिकृत्य,
VI

PREYAS, VĀTSALYA, PRĪTI, SNEHA, BHAKTI AND SRADDHĀ RASAS

THE incoming of the Śānta rasa seems to have set the writers thinking on the sanctity or otherwise of the number eight or nine pertaining to the Rasas.1 Close on the footsteps of Śānta, an aspect of Love called Preyas or Vātsalya, covering cases of non-sexual love like that between parents and children, elders and youngsters, became a Rasa. The first work we now know mentioning it as the tenth Rasa is the K. A. of Rudraṭa (Ch. XII, Sl. 3). Preyas is found in Udbhata as an Alāṅkāra by the side of Rasavat, both of which belong to a separate class of emotion-figures. Udbhata considers Preyas as the poetry of Bhāva, Bhāva kavya, and distinguishes it from the poetry of Rasa called Rasavat. In Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, Preyas was a kind of sweet compliment born of devotion or love, प्रेयः प्रियतरास्यानम्. In this sense, Preyas as Cātu lives in later literature also. But Udbhata’s view is peculiar. As Pratihārenduṛāja observes, any Bhāva is Preyas for Udbhata,

1 Mr. Śivaprasāda Bhaṭṭācārya, in his Skr. gloss (in his Edn.) of the Alāṅkāra Kaustubha of Kavikarṇapūra Gosvāmin in the Varendra Research Society Series, says that some Ālāṅkārikas, following the Pāṇa śāstra and the Vaidya śāstra, hold Rasas to be six in number.

“प्रेय त्तो इति रक्षा मिथ्यः, तदौद्देशिरि: केवलहास्यार्मं कर्पि।”

The basis of this statement is not given; and I have not been able to find the Ālāṅkārikas who held Rasas to be six.
This view found no follower, since Udbhaṭa’s view of Bhāva kāvya and Rasa kāvya and his view of Bhāva or Rasa being indicated by their own names met with criticism. The older Preyas of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin as speech expressive of non-sexual love developed into a new Rasa. Daṇḍin says that this Preyas is very closely related to Sṛṅgāra but is distinct, since Pṛiti is the Sthāyin of the former whereas Rati is the Sthāyin of Sṛṅgāra.

Friendship or Affection of parents—Sneha and Vātsalya—feature in some of the noblest poetry and there was felt a necessity to recognise a Rasa for such situations. Rudrata who introduces Preyān at first, mentions Sneha as its Sthāyin— sleeppkṣpt: preyān. That Rudrata thought mainly of Friendship is shown not only by the Sthāyin but also by the following explication—

We now get three categories of non-sexual attachment or affection,— (i) the Preyas of Rudrata with Sneha as its Sthāyin which comes to friendship; (ii) Vātsalya or the affection of parents and elders for children and youngsters and (iii) Pṛiti,

1 Visvanātha calls this Vatsala, describes it as paternal affection and gives it in his S. D. after giving the 8 old Rasas and the Sānta, the 9th.
the other kinds of attachment like that between a leader and a follower, a king and his officer or court-poet. To these is to be added the fourth, Bhakti, reverence to elders and devotion to God.

All these aspects, to begin with, were called only Preyas, which then was understood as all types of non-sexual love.

प्रीतिरघ्न्येवेत् स्वाच्छ लस्यां सांप्रयोगिकीः | Bhoja, S. K. A., V.

Dandin's Preyas, as his two illustrations show, refer only to the fourth aspect called Bhakti. He actually calls it by the name Bhakti and uses as its synonym, Priti. Commenting

अन्येन तु करुणात्मकी वातस्यं दशमोत्पि च | K. M. edn., p. 100.

Kavikārṇapūrā Gosvāmin, who illustrates Vātsalya with Yasodā's love for baby-Kṛṣṇa, gives Mamakāra as its Sthāyin—

'अन्येन तु करुणात्मकी वातस्यं दशमोत्पि च' | p. 148.

1 Kavikārṇapūrā classifies Love into sexual love—Sāmpraya-yogikā Priti, Maitri, Sauhārda and Bhāva. The last is the Sthāyin of Bhakti. "तत्र रत्निक्षेत्रा "

"तत्र रत्निक्षेत्रा सम्मोगानुसूचयतु ||
वा प्रीतिमेधी-सौहार्द-भावं भवेद्भवेद गच्छति " ||

on Vidura's words spoken on Kṛṣṇa's arrival at his house, Daṇḍin says:

इत्याह युक्ते विदुरो नान्यतस्तदाहि धृति: ।
भक्तिनाथसमाराध्यः सुभीतत्व ततो हरि: ॥ K. A., II, 277.

Tho other instance is the manifestation of a king's devotion to Śiva, uttered in the form of a Stotra on seeing Him:

इति साक्षात् कहे राजो यद्राजवरम्यः ।
प्रीतिमकाश्च तथ श्रेयं हियवामयतां ॥ II, 279.

It is quite natural that in our literature, Bhakti should have come in as a dominant motif and that scholars should have accepted it as a distinct Rasa. Though Rudraṭa mentions only the Preyas of Sneha, we find the Abhinavabhāratī saying that others propose not only Bhakti but Śraddhā, Faith, also as a new Rasa. Abhinava however does not consider them as distinct Rasas but includes them in Śānta of which the two are important accessories.

"अत एव ईश्वरणिश्वविपेये भक्तिन्यूते स्त्रीतमतिपुरुसाहाश्व- 
प्रक्षेप्य अन्येऽव अहम् (शान्तस्य) इनि न तयो: प्रक्षेपसल्लव गणेः ॥ ॥"

Abhi. Bha., I, Ch. VI, p. 340.

Of Bhakti, more will be said in the section on Madhura Rasa. The Dasaṛūpaka mentions Pṛiti and Bhakti separately as Bhāvas and includes them in Harṣa, Utsāha or some other similar Bhāva. (IV, 84).

1 Hemacandra reproduces this discussion on the additional Rasas from the Abhi. Bha. See K. A., p. 68, Text and Com. Śivāraṇa's Rasaratnabhāra seems to be another work which speaks of the Śraddhā Rasa and includes it in one of the nine accepted Rasas.
Pṛiti here means types of love other than Rati and Bhakti. To be clear about accepting friendship as Rasa, some seem to have called Sneha itself as a Rasa. Rudrāṭa used the name Sneha for the Sthāyin and called the Rasa, Preyāṇ; but these proposed Sneha as the Rasa and Ārdratā as the Sthāyin. Rudrāṭa himself mentioned this Ārdratā while describing his Sneha Sthāyin:

अद्वाना:करणत्वा स्नेहपदे भवति स्वपेष | XVI, 19.

The Abhi. Bhā. thus introduces and criticises this Sneha rasa with Ārdratā as its Sthāyin:

"अद्वाना:स्नेह इति लस्तु | स्नेहो ब्रम्हिष्कः | स च रघुसातादाचे वर्णविभाजितः | तथा हि—वाष्ण्य मातापितादि स्नेहो भये विश्रान्तः | युनो मित्रजने रति, रक्तवादे: आतरि वर्धवीर एव | एवं द्रृढ्यम पुनःक्रादायपि द्रष्टव्यम् |" Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 342.¹

This dismisses Pṛiti, Sneha, Vātsalya and similar Rasas based on attachment. This is not a commendable attitude.

¹ Hemacandra, K. A. Vyā., p. 68.

"स्नेहो भिन्नवाचलान्त्यायिति हि रतिर्भिष्म विभेष्या: | तुष्यवो: वा पार्श्वं रति: स ब्रह्मः | अनुसरणं उक्तमें रति: प्रसन्ति: | तैव भिन्नवाचलान्त्या | उक्तमेव अनुसरणें रति: वाचलान्त्यम् | एवमादीच विषयं मातापितादिव आस्वादितम्।।

Sāṅgadēva, Saṅgitaratnakāra, p. 839.

अद्वाना: करणत्वा स्नेहपदे भवति स्वपेष | XVI, 19.

The Abhi. Bhā. thus introduces and criticises this Sneha rasa with Ārdratā as its Sthāyin:

"अद्वाना:स्नेह इति लस्तु | स्नेहो ब्रम्हिष्कः | स च रघुसातादाचे वर्णविभाजितः | तथा हि—वाष्ण्य मातापितादि स्नेहो भये विश्रान्तः | युनो मित्रजने रति, रक्तवादे: आतरि वर्धवीर एव | एवं द्रृढ्यम पुनःक्रादायपि द्रष्टव्यम् |" Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 342.¹

This dismisses Pṛiti, Sneha, Vātsalya and similar Rasas based on attachment. This is not a commendable attitude.

¹ Hemacandra, K. A. Vyā., p. 68.
To have less distinctions is no great aim. If it is said that friendship is only a variety of Rāti, can we call the Rasa in the association of Rāma and Sugrīva, Sṛṅgāra? If brotherly attachment again is brought under Rāti, is the Rasa in the association of Rāma and Bharata or Rāma and Laksmaṇa, Sṛṅgāra? If Dharmavīra can be called forth to deny Rasatva to Laksmaṇa’s attachment to Rāma, why should not opponents of Sānta call forth another kind of Vīra to deny Rasatva to Sānta? Do Abhinava and Hemacandra mean that Friendship, Brotherly attachment, Parental affection and the like are only Bhāvas that cannot be nourished into a state of Rasa with attendant accessories? Literature is only too full of these types of attachment. The instance of Daśaratha’s death due to separation from Rāma is ample proof for the existence of Vātsalya as a major mood, fit to be developed and fit to be relished.

**Laulya Rasa**

In the same section, the Abhi. Bhā. mentions and criticises another Rasa called Laulya, of which the Sthāyin is

1 Strangely, we find Vātsalya introduced (as a Rasa, of course) in the midst of other Rasas in the text of Bharata itself. In Ch. 17, second section, dealing with Pāthyaagunās, we find with reference to Varṇas and Rasas:

"तन हस्तान्त्यास्योः: चातितोवातः: शीतोश्चास्त्रतेषु उदात्तकम्पिते: कल्यावस्स्याः-
"भयाश्चेतुट्टत्त्वालत्तिकास्यैः: पाल्यमुपवादयति।"


A similar strange passage occurs in Ch. 22, in Sl. 3, same edn. where Rasas are mentioned as nine:

कल्यावस्स्याः सत्यं हि द्वेष्यं नवरसाध्वम्।

But the correct reading here is भावरसाध्वम् as the Kāśi edn. shows.
given as Gardha. Abhinava suggests that it can be included in Hāsa, Rati or elsewhere.

Laulya seems to have been proposed to label the Rasa of an anti-hero like Rāvaṇa whose vile passion for Sītā is enormous. This thirst of heart, Abhinava says, is inappropriate; it is not Rasa in him, but only Rasābhāsa; and this Anaucitya of his desire causes Hāsya Rasa. S'ārṅgadeva summarises Abhinava thus:

अनुकूलविषया दृष्णा लौय तद्वात् कारणम्।

Mṛgayā and Akṣa Rasas

Even as Abhinava does, Dhanaṇjaya also refers to other Rasas proposed by writers. Pṛiti and Bhakti, two additional Bhāvas, and their inclusion by Dhanaṇjaya in one or the other of the Bhāvas, were referred to previously. In the same verse, Dhanaṇjaya refers to two additional Rasas, Mṛgayā and Akṣa, Hunt and Gambling.

प्रीतिमक्याद्यो भावा मृगयाक्राद्यो रसः।
हर्षोत्साहादिन्द्र स्पष्टमन्तरभावान् कौंतितः॥ D. R., IV, 83.

Rasa refers no longer to a mental state only; these writers generalise it very much to mean any motif or any ‘idea.’

If we can infer anything from the mention of these additional Rasas by Abhinava after a reference to Lollaṭa’s view that Rasas are innumerable, we may say that it was Lollaṭa who proposed these additional Rasa. Though Lollaṭa’s
commentary on the N. S. is not available, we have, about that time, the K. A. of Rudrāṭa, which holds the same view on the number of Rasas as Lollāṭa is said by Abhinava to hold. These writers re-examined Bharata’s text to find out what exactly constituted Rasatva and Bhāvatva. Bharata considered as Rasas those emotions which were “masters”—Svāmibhūtās, and were consequently attended upon by many minor ones, (Bahvāsrayāḥ) which are called Bhāvas. The forty-nine Bhāvas described by him include the eight Sthāyins also and these eight are once again described as Bhāva among Bhāvas. This shows that the eight Sthāyins had a Sthāyin-stage and a Bhāva-stage. When reinforced by Vyabhicārins, Rati etc. became Sthāyins. Similarly, thought some writers, other Bhāvas also can be reinforced by other attendant Bhāvas and made Sthāyins. According to this view, the Vyabhicārins themselves would have other Vyabhicārins; Nirveda is attended by Cinta; Śrāma by Nirveda and so on. Says Abhinava:

“—व्यभिचारिणाथि व व्यभिचारिणो भवति, वद्धा निवेद्यैर्किन्ता, अभमत निवेद्य ह्यादि निग्रस्यानि | तथासंव | Ch. VII, p. 346.

Abhinava did not accept this view. But Lollāṭa’s and Rudrāṭa’s position would make its acceptance necessary for them. Bharata says while explaining what Rasa is:

अन्त रस इति कः पदार्थः ? उच्यते ; आस्वाद्यात् |

1 If he accepted this view, he might give a handle to those who considered all the thirty-three Vyabhicārins also as capable of becoming Rasas. So, he says, wherever there seem to occur in one Vyabhicārin many others, as for instance Vitarka etc. in Unmāḍa in Purūravas, it cannot be said that one Vyabhicārin is nourished by others, but it must be said that all these are separately Vyabhicārins nourishing the main Sthāyin, Vipralambha Rati.
Rudraṭa perhaps based himself on this text when he said that any Bhāva can be Rasa, because Āsvādyatva or relishability is present in it:

\[ \text{इति मन्तनया रसा: संवें || XII, 3.} \\
\text{रसनास्तत्तेघां मधुरादीनामिनिवृत्तमाधावां ||} \\
\text{निबंधादिव्यापि लिखिकामस्तीति तेषविर रसा: ||} \]

Only a poet must develop the Vyabhicārin also to a state of relishability. Namisādhu explains Rudraṭa clearly and observes that there is no mental state which cannot be called Rasa, if only it is developed.

"अयमाश्वो प्रत्यययस्य—अदुत नानित सा कापि चित्रवति: \\
या परिपोष गता न रसीमिति। भरतेन सहीमावर्जितव्यमायार्युव्यां \\
संज्ञा चारित्र अष्टी वा नव वा रसा उक्ता इति।"

Rudraṭa was perhaps contemporaneous with S’aṅkuka C. 850 A.D. and thus followed Lollaṭa, C. 825 A.D., on this question of Rasas being as many as Bhāvas. If Bharata

But Bharata does not seem to support this contention of Abhinava. He seems to allow Vyabhicārins in Vyabhicārins. Defining Dainya, the Ārya in the N. S’s. says: विष्णु-पौरुषवन-वामुर्या. Ch. VII, 74, p. 362. Astya, a Vyabhicārin is given as an Adbhāva of another Vyabhicārin Garva (p. 369). In Autsukya, Cintā and Nidrā are given; and many other Vyabhicārins also occur here as well as in Viṣāda (p. 370).

On p. 66 of his Locana, Abhinava cites kākārī etc. and calls it a case of Bhāvas’abalatā. He says that this verse portrays four pairs of Vyabhicārins appearing one after another: Vitarka-Autsukya; Mati-Smarana; S’aṅkū-Dainya; and lastly Dhṛti-Cintā. He concludes however that finally Cintā is the Vyabhicārin which we relish. This seems to mean that the one Vyabhicārin of Cintā has other Vyabhicārins, Vitarka etc. फलस्य दु ज्ञिताय एव प्रज्ञानस्ती ददती परमस्वादश्चलनम्।"
spoke only of eight or nine Bhāvas as Rasas, it is because of their greater vogue among poets and critics. According to Abhinava, Lollaṭa said the same thing:

“एतत्त्वं भयं स रसा हृदयं पुर्वें। तेन ‘आन्तोदेकी पार्श्व- प्रसिद्धया पृताविभा प्रयोजकः इति यत् मङ्गलोऽतुत्तेन निरुपितो तदवल्लेन- परामुदयः (?)ह्यकः।’” Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 299.

“तेन रसान्तरसंभोगेकी पार्श्वसिद्धया संभ्यानिनम् इति यद्यथे: (लोंटार्दितिष्ठयं:) उक्तम्, तत्वत्त्वकः। भावायाये चैत्तद्विष्ये।”

*ibid.*, p. 341.

It is perhaps Lollaṭa who, while commenting on the text enumerating the Sthāyins, Vyabhicarins etc. at the beginning of Ch. VI, says regarding Sthāyins that Bharata did not give any fixed number for the Sthāyins; for, Abhinava says in his commentary in this place:

“स्थायिषु च सद्यस्य नोक्तकत्वपरे।” *ibid.*, p. 270.

Unfortunately, the Bhāvādhyāya of the Abhinavabhāratī is, for the most part, lost and Abhinava’s detailed statement and refutation of Lollaṭa’s view are lost to us.

Pratihārendurāja who comes after Ānanda notices this view of Rudraṭa that Nirveda and the other Bhāvas are also Rasas. His explanation for many considering only eight or nine as Rasas is not very different from Lollaṭa’s Pārśada- prasiddhi. Pratihārendurāja takes his stand on Caturvarga as contrasted with those objects which are to be avoided by the wise—the Parihārya. Pratihārendu says that only nine are called Rasas because of their reference to the four Puruṣārthas and the name Rasa as restricted to these nine is ‘Tāntrika’, technical and traditional for this Sāstra. This is a clumsy
explanation; virtually this writer accepts the position of Rudraṭa. The ‘Tāntrika’ or ‘Pāribhāṣika’ nomenclature begs the question and one fails to see how any Bhāva, Nirveda or another, is irrelevant to a Puruṣārtha. Says Pratihārendurāja:

"एते च शुभकाराद्वो नयं यथार्थोंम चलत्वेऽपरिमाणपुष्पायत्वा तदित्तर-परिहारनिपुष्पनत्वा च रस्वादीनां स्थायिना नवानां भावानां यः परिपूर्वः
तदात्मकः! अतः तथाविषय रूपेन् आस्वाधलात् आस्वाददेनिकबन्धनेन
तान्त्रिकः रसस्वादेन अभिधीणयेत्। गीतासौदृशो तु तथाविषय आस्वाधलात्
(चक्रयाः) अभभावात् पुख्तिनिग्नितमेदुनिकबन्धनस्य
तान्त्रिकः रसस्वादस्य अभभावतः। आस्वादस्यविषय क्षयात् तत्र तथापि
मुद्युपमान्ति दिवश्च रसस्वाद-
पुख्तितिविवृद्धः। उदयं शुभकाराद्वी, रसस्वादस्य—

रसस्वादस्य+ अस्तित्वं तदापि रसाः॥ (Rudraṭa; see above). इति।
तदात्मकः—

'चलत्वेऽपरिमाणपुष्पायत्वा तस्मात् शुभकाराद्वी
चातन्यभेदवाचकाधात् स रसस्वादोऽ मतः॥' इति।

स इति चातन्यभेद इत्ययः। तदात्म स्वभावात् आस्वादविषयि
निकबन्धनमवर्तमानः
शुभकाराद्वी तान्त्रिकः रसस्वादस्य उक्तम्॥" K.A. S.S. Vyā., p. 49.

To some extent, the final observation of Abhinava himself at the end of the sixth chapter is weak and justifies the restriction of Rasatva to eight or nine on grounds neither stronger than nor different from Lollaṭa’s Pārśada-prasiddhi or Pratihāra's Caturvargaprāptiyupāya.

"एते नवेभ रसा: पुष्पोपायोगित्वेन रसस्वादविषयो वा
इत्येव उपदेश्येत्तवादः। तेन रसस्वादस्यविषयि पर्यायमितिविश्वासे। etc."

THE NUMBER OF RASAS

VYASA NA, DUHKA AND SUKHA RASAS

The Nātyadarpaṇa of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra follows Abhinava, reproducing these very words of the Abhinavabhāratī but adds that though, usefulness in Puruṣārtha and Rāṇjanā restrict Rasas to nine, more Rasas are possible: Laulya with Gardha as its Sthāyin; Sneha with Ādratā as its Sthāyin; Vyasana Rasa with Āsakti as its Sthāyin; Duḥkha Rasa with Arati as its Sthāyin and Sukha Rasa with Santōṣa as its Sthāyin.

सम्बन्धित तपरेदर्पि——यथा गर्वस्थायी लौल्यः, आद्रतास्तथा नेहः, आसफिस्थायी व्यसनम्, अरतिस्वायि दुःखम्, सन्तोषस्वायि सुखमित्यादि।

G. O. S. edn., p. 163.

According to the view that accepts the Vyabhicārins also as Rasas, the names Sthāyin and Vybhicārin are not fixed names of two sets, but rather names of stages. A Sthāyin may be a Vyabhicārin and a Vyabhicārin may become a Sthāyin. Abhinava himself draws our attention to Bharata prohibiting the Vyabhicārin Jugupsa in Sṛṅgāra. (p. 334, Abhi. Bhā.) This Jugupsa is a Sthāyin. The author of the gloss on the Vyaktiviveka says:

स्थायिनामेव व्यभिचारिण भवति। यथा रतेद्वादिविश्वायाः।
हासस्य श्रवणार्थिः, शोकस्य विप्रलम्बश्रवणार्थिः, कौशल्य प्रणयकौपिनाः,
विनमस्य बीरार्थिः, उत्साहस्य श्रवणार्थिः, भयस्य अभिसारिकार्थिः, जुगुप्ताया: संसारनिन्दार्थिः, शमस्य कोपाभिषेकस्य प्रत्यावृद्धिमादी॥

T. S. S. Edn., pp. 11-12.
Further, we find among the Vyabhicārinis, Amarśa which is only Krodha, the Sthāyin of Raudra, but in a lesser degree; Trāsa which is Bhaya, the Sthāyin of Bhayānaka; Viśāda which is only S'oka, the Sthāyin of Karuṇa Rasa.

Bhoja is a writer who held the same view as Lollāṭa and Rudrata on the number of Rasas. Bhoja’s theory of Rasa is a very complex problem and it has been expounded at length by the present writer in the Rasa section of his Ph. D. thesis on Bhoja’s Sṛṅgāra Prakāṣa. Bhoja is a monist and a pluralist combined regarding this question of the number of Rasas. Fundamentally, Rasa is only one to him, and that is, Ahaṅkāra or Sṛṅgāra or Abhīmāna. Compared to this, even Rati-Sṛṅgāra, Häṣya, Vīra, and the other old Rasas are unfit to be called Rasas, but are only Bhāvas; much more so the Vyabhicārinis. But this is a Pāramārthika state of affairs and there is a Vyāvahārika state also in which, by
Upacāra, the name Rasa, by virtue of the immanence of Ahaṅkāra in all of them, applies to all the forty-nine Bhāvas.

**UDĀTTA AND UDDHATA RASAS**

If we turn to Bhoja’s S. K. Ā., Ch. V, we find him first mentioning only the eight old Rasas:

रत्निर्स्ख |
----|----|
. . . . . |
      |
. . विस्मयभाष्ट्री स्थायिमाणः: प्रकृतितिः || V. 14.

Then, he adds, that these Rasas have ‘Viseṣas’, which, as a matter of fact, means, additional Rasas:

श्रुतार्वीरकुशणास्वतभूतमयानकः |
      |
बीमलस्बास्यमेवः: शान्तोदचोदिता रसा: || V. 164.

The additional Rasas mentioned here are the old S’ānta, the Preyas which we have already heard of and two absolutely new Rasas, Udātta and Uddhata. Dr. Abhayakumar Guha, writing on the Rasa Cult in the Caitanya Caritāmṛta, in the Asutosh Silver Jubilee Volumes, III, says on p. 375. “Another rhetorician, Bhojarāja, adds one more, e.g. Preman (love). Thus according to Bhojarāja, eleven Rasas in all.” That is, he says, to the wellknown nine, some add Vātsalya and Bhoja, Preman, making eleven. This information is wrong. Dr. S. K. De says in Vol. II of his Poetics: “and although he (Bhoja) mentions as many as ten Rasas in his encyclopaedic S. K. Ā., including the S’ānta and Preyas . . .” This also is incorrect. As shown above, Bhoja accepts twelve Rasas in all in his S. K. Ā. There is no peculiarity about S’ānta and
Preyas\(^1\) in Bhoja, both of which are Rasas from earlier times. The two new Rasas of Bhoja are Udātta and Uddhata Rasas. They are both explained and illustrated on p. 515 of the S. K. Ä. Mati is held as the Sthāyin of the Udātta Rasa and Garva as the Sthāyin of the Uddhata Rasa. Bhoja says that the Udātta is also called Īrjasvin.

It is clear that Bhoja proposed these two new Rasas as a result of his realisation that each type of Hero shall be

\(^1\) (a) Bhoja gives Preyas as Vatsalaprakṛti, i.e., having Vātsalya as its Sthāyin, S. K. Ä., p. 514. Bhoja's illustration is however not friendship but only love for woman which will not prove Preyas as different from Śṛūgāra. As a matter of fact, Preyas is considered by Bhoja as the Rasa lying at the root of Śṛūgāra and all other types of love. Preyas is called Ahetupakaśapāta—

"रत्निड्योमयि चायमेव मूलप्रकृतिरिप्यते। यद्विद्यमानः—
अहेतुः पन्याठो वस्तुपय नासिल प्रतिभिन्याः।
स हि श्रृंगारकृतस्तुमुन्त्तमूलविच सीम्यति॥ (U. R. Carita, V. 17.)
S. K. Ä., p. 515.

The verse from the U. R. Carita quoted by Bhoja occurs in the drama to explain the inexplicable love that two persons, of whatever descriptions they may be, evince mutually on seeing each other,—called Tārāmaitraka and Ćaṅgūrāga. This is a purer and more basic love and rides high in the synthetic tides of Bhoja's imaginative mind. Bhoja, as can be seen in the last section of this paper, synthesises all Rasas and Bhāvas in this Preyas or Preman. Hāșya is love for Hāśa; Vira is love for Utsāha and so on. In his Śṛūgāra Prakāśa, Ch. XI, Bhoja says at the very outset:

रत्निड्योमयि प्रेमालमेव आभासितः।

(b) Dr. De and Dr. Guha evidently owe their view of the number of Rasas accepted by Bhoja to Kavikārdapūra Gosvāmin's Alarhāra Kaustubha:

अस्यतु वस्तुप्रकृतिमयाम् एकदम् रसानावचे। p. 123.

Bhoja's synthesis of all Rasas in Preman is to be found in this writer also; of this more later. (See A. Kaus., pp. 147-8.)
distinguished by a Rasa which dominates his character and constitutes his individuality. Thus Sānta is the Rasa of the Dhīrāśanta hero; Preyaś of the Dhīralalita; Udāta or Urjasvin of the Dhīrodātta and Uddhata of Dhīroddhata. He says expressly in his Sṛṅgāra Prakāsa:

Among old Sanskrit writers also, as among modern research scholars, few had a correct knowledge of what the king of Dhārā said actually. Simhabhūpāla is the only writer who caught sight of Bhoja's Udāta and Uddhata Rasas and criticised them in his R. A. S., pp. 168-172, T. S. S. The anonymous Sāhitya mīmāṁsā (T. S. S, 114), a work largely indebted to Bhoja, also notes Bhoja's Udāta, Uddhata and Preyān and remarks that some would consider these three Rasas as included in the eight. I have dealt with this at length elsewhere.

In addition to these two new Rasas, Bhoja, like Rudraṭa, recognised all the Bhāvas as being capable of becoming Rasas. In the Vyavahāra-stage, Bhoja held all the forty-nine Bhāvas as Rasas:

एतन सुदाह्वांतरः सम्य पूर्वा कोटि: । रत्नादीनामेकोनप्रेणाः
क्तोद्विषते विभावानुभवविभचारसंयोगात् परम्परापंजिर्मे सम्यपदेशाहि

रत्नादयो यदि रसम्स्तुरतिक्रोऽ
हर्षादिभिः किं दशरादमत्तिद्विभिहैः
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Bhoja restates Rudraṭa's position with some arguments. He asks: If Rati and the other seven become Rasas, why not
Harṣa and the rest? If it is said that Rati etc. alone become Rasas by virtue of their being Sthāyins, why are not Harṣa and others Sthāyins? It cannot be said that all these eight and these eight only are 'permanent' and Harṣa etc. are 'fleeting'. Among these eight also, there are Bhaya, Hāsa, Sōka, Krōdha etc. which are not 'permanent'. Permanence or Evanescence is not inherent in any Bhāva invariably but is born as a result of character and circumstance. Universality and the quality of being a major mood do not pertain to these eight only. Cintā is as much a major mood, in a character and in a set of conditions, as Rati. Therefore, even as Rati, Gāni (Fatigue), or Harṣa (Delight), have their own Vyabhīcārins, Anubhāvas and Vibhāvas.2 Provided the poet develops these Harṣa etc. also with their attendant emotional conditions, they also attain to Sthāyitva and Rasatva. Thus, in a later section devoted to illustration, Bhoja speaks of Ānanda Rasa with Harṣa as its Sthāyin.3 (S. K. Ā., p. 636 and Sṛṅgāra Prakāsa, Vol. II, p. 394.) On pp. 394-5 of his Sṛṅgāra Prakāsa (Vol. II) and p. 627 of his S. K. Ā., he speaks, along with the Vīra and Uddhata Rasas, of the new Rasas Svātantrya, Ānanda, Prasama, and Pārvavasya. On p. 399 of the Sṛṅgāra Prakāsa (Vol. II) and 629 of his S. K. Ā., he speaks of Sādhvasa, Vīlāsa, Anurāga and Saṁgama Rasas. This beats Rudraṭa who mentioned Nirvedādi only, i.e. all the Cittavṛttis and primarily the Vyabhīcārins, as Rasas. But Bhoja extends Rasatva to Sāttvikas also, which

1 Accordingly, in Chs. XIII-XIV, (Vol. III, Mad. MS.), Bhoja gives the Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhīcārins of all the forty-nine Bhāvas. According to Abhinava, only the eight or nine Sthāyins can have Vyabhīcārins. Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas are granted to all.

2 The Nātya darpaṇa, as pointed out above, points out Sukha as a Rasa with Sāntoṣa as its Sthāyin. Contentment, Sāntoṣa, is Ānanda’s Tīṣṇākṣaya and the N. D.'s Sukha is really Sānta Rasa.
are physical manifestations. And in this respect, he is one with Namisādhu who says while commenting on the bit in Rudraṭa—‘इति मन्तव्य रसास्वेभः’—

इतिशबद्ध: एवंकारार्थः। एवंकारा अन्येऽपि भावा रतिनिवैद्यस्तम्भादयः सौंबेदपि रसा बोध्यः।

Though called Bhāvas, the Sāttvikas are physical manifestations. शारीरस्तु सत्त्विकमावादः says Bhānudatta in his Rasataraṅgini. But even these are Rasas, as much as any Cittavṛtti, to Bhoja. Fortunately the inanimate Uddīpana Vibhāvas like the Malayamāruta and Moonlight and the Ālambara Vibhāvas which are characters themselves are not made Rasa. To these Bhoja would be content to give the name ‘Rasāṇvyavibhūtis’. But there seem to have been persons, before Bhoja also, who would take, as the Dasarūpaka points out, such subjects as Mrgaya and Akṣa as Rasas.

From a passage in the Locana of Abhinava we understand that a period of chaos prevailed in the world of Rasas. Abhinava says that some hold the pure Vibhāva only as Rasa; some Sthāyin only; some the Vyabhicārin only; some the interplay of all these; some the story enacted itself and some all this put together.

अन्ये तु शुद्ध विभावः, अपरे शुद्धसुभावः, केचिद्रु स्थायिमात्रेम, इतरे व्यभिचारिणम्, अन्ये तत्संयोगिनम्, एके अनुकारिण्य, केचिद्रु सकलमेव समुदायः रसाहस्तियमिदं भवना।” Locana, p. 69.

It is perhaps on the authority of this passage in the Locana that Jagannātha Paṇḍita says in his R. G., p. 28.

“विभावादय: त्रयः समुदिता रसः” इति कतिपये। ‘त्रिशू व पूर्व चमककारी स एव रसोन्यथा तु अयोध्यपि न’ इति बहवः।
Such a view of the concept of Rasa has been criticised by Abhinavagupta. Surely the very substratum of the Bhāvas, namely the characters, the Ālambana Vibhāvas, cannot be called Rasa. Things like Moonlight and Southern Breeze, which are Jaḍa and are conditions of Nature kindling the sentiment, Uddīpanas, cannot possibly be mental states, Cittavṛtti, and are thus not to be called Rasa. Similarly the Sāttvikas. What Bhāva is tear which is a drop of water and Romāṇca which is hair standing on end? While defining, explaining and illustrating the eight Sāttvikas which are also Rasas to him, Bhoja says in his S. K. Ā. (pp. 498-500) that though they become Rasas, they, being Sāttvikas, are not attended by accessory Saṅcārins:

"अत्यं क स्तम्भ: पुष्टोपि सात्त्विकत्वात् सवैः अन्यानुवायीति
नानुभावादिभिरनुमिष्ठते।"

"अस्त्यापि (रोमाण्ड्य) सात्त्विकत्वात् अन्यानुवचन्यादयो न
जायन्ते।" S. K. Ā., p. 498.

What does Bhoja mean by such qualified Rasas? How can an unattended thing be considered Puṣṭa or developed? If it is still looking up to something to render itself understood (अन्यमुखप्रेषण), how is it leading? A mere description of Stambha cannot make an instance of Stambha Rasa. The concept of Rasa means (1) an emotional state and (2) an emotional state which is 'Pradhāna'. This 'Pradhānata' is not a mere question of a poet nourishing a Bhāva. It means that the Bhāva is, by nature, a major mood, within which occur a number of secondary emotional states. Only such a
major state of mind can be reinforced by attendant conditions. Bhoja says Glāni can be reinforced by S'rama etc. This is not possible. When it is said that one is Glāna, fatigued, the question is at once asked, and the mind does not rest without asking this question, why is he fatigued? That is, there cannot be Visrānti in a minor or fleeting feeling; such a minor mood is common to more than one state of mind. One may be fatigued because of Vipralambha, because of fight in Vīra, because of yogic practice in S'ānta. But when it is said that Rāma loves Sītā, there is no more question. A Sthāyin explains a world of feelings; it is like a master with many servants; it is independent, Svatantrya and Ananyamukhapreksī, Ananyānuyāyī and Svavisrānta. This is the significance of the simple but effective simile of King and the followers. Abhinava clearly explains the position thus:

"अप्रवचने व वस्तुनि कर्त्य संविद् विश्वाम्यति, तस्यैव प्रवचनस्य 
प्रधानान्तरं प्रत्यक्षान्तरं। स्वतम्नि अविश्वान्तरं। वतो अप्रवचने
जडे विभावालभक्ष्योऽविधिहरितस्य च संविदालुककेदिपि नियमेन
अन्ययुक्तप्रक्ष्योऽसंविदाति तद्विभक्तिः स्थाययथव चर्च्यावात्मसु।"


"वे लेते ऋतुमालियाद्यो विभावः। बायास बायासोऽभोज अनु-
भावः। तेन भावश्वेदन व्यपदेश्यः।"

"भावश्वेदनताब्दू किच्चु विभक्तिः प्रत्येकविभक्तिः।"

ibid., Ch. VII, p. 343.

As regards the criticism that some among the accepted Sthāyins of old are less permanent, Abhinava accepts that there does exist a graded Prādhānya among them. He accepts also that sometimes, the Sthāyins become Vyabhicārans but Vyabhicārans do not become Rasas. Vyabhicārans
are always Paratantra. It cannot be contended that all Bhāvas are equally relevant to the Puruṣārthas. The point in the argument of Caturvargopayoga is this: There are any number of things that man aspires for and works to get; but all these fall under the four heads of Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. Similarly, though any feeling of man, as such, cannot but be related to his activity towards Caturvargaprāpti, there is a classification and grouping possible among them, according to which we arrive at a few dominant heads, under which the rest can be brought. The argument of ‘Raṇja-nādhikya’ means this: Though there is Āsvādyatva in everything in poetry and drama, it is only some mental conditions that can be handled as leading themes; how can Glāni be worked at as the Rasa of a drama and who will relish it?

Jagannātha pandita adopts a peculiar attitude towards this question. He raises the problem by pointing out Bhakti as an additional Rasa. As love for God, an Anurāga, it cannot be brought under Sānta, since Sānta implies absence of any Rāga. He replies that all Rati except the Rati between man and woman is only a Bhāva and can never become a Rasa. If it is argued that Bhagavad Rati can be taken as the

1 To Abhinava, the Vyabhicārina are always Paratantra: to Bhoja, they are Svatantra and Paratantra according as they are Rasa or Bhāva. There is a writer, later than Vidyānātha, named Vedakatanārīyaṇa dikṣita, of the Andhradesa, who seems to follow the view of writers like Bhoja. For he says that Vyabhicārin are of two kinds, Svatantra and Paratantra; when they go to heighten another, they are the latter; they are the former when they do not have to heighten another.

पतन्त्रः स्वतन्त्राय विपर्याये व्यभिचारिणः ||
पतन्त्रकालं प्रातः। पतन्त्रं इतरितता: ।
तस्मिन्सि स्वतन्त्रः। ल्युः भाव इति च ते स्फलः ॥ Mad. MS., pp. 112-3.

He however does not explain his position further.
Sthāyi-Rati and the Strīpum-Rati be relegated to the Bhāva-class, another will propose Rati for children as a Sthāyin and a third will ask why Jugupsā and S'oka cannot be put down as Vyabhicārins instead of being called Sthāyins. The whole system of Bharata will then have to be overhauled and this is far from desirable! Bharata alone is the guide and authority to decide which Bhāva is Sthāyin and which Vyabhicārin.

"न चासौ शान्तसेवल्लभिन्नति | अनुरागस्य वैराग्यविरुद्धतः।
उच्चयते—भरे: देवादिविषयरतित्वेन साबान्तर्गत्या रससानुपचे।
. . . . भरतादिमुनिवचनानामेव समाध्याविद्ययस्यावलेन,
स्वात्स्याययोगात्। अन्यथा पुनर्दिविषयाया अपि रते: स्वायिनावलं कुलो
न स्यात्। न स्यात्ता कुलं: सुभमालयं युप्साशोकादीनाम, इत्यतिक-
दुर्गच्छन्याजुकी स्यात। रसां नमकल्गणना च मुनिवचननिबन्धार्या सभ्यतेन,
इति यथाशास्मेव ज्यायः।" R. G. pp. 45-6.

**Bhakti and Madhura Rasa**

It was pointed out previously how Daṇḍin illustrated Preyas by two instances of devotion to God, Bhakti. It is natural that, in this land, this sentiment of devotion should have been soon accepted as a Rasa. But Abhinava and others proposed to bring it under S'anta. S'anta is the Rasa relating to the final Puruṣārtha, Mokṣa; and many are the paths leading to Mokṣa. The three paths of Bakti, Karman and Jñāna are well-known. It may be that Bhakti is in some cases an Aṅga of the S'anta developed on lines of Jñāna but the advocates of Bhakti held it to be supreme by itself. They made Jñāna and Karman its aids; the release, Mokṣa, from everything which the Jñānin wanted, the Bhakta did not favour. He wanted that he should permanently be loving God.
Just as Vīra Rasa has the four varieties, Dāna etc., this Bhakti also has the varieties of Madhura or Sṛṅgāra or Ujjvala, i.e., love as in the case of the Gopīs towards Kṛṣṇa, Sakhya as in the case of Arjuna, Vātsalya as in the case of Devakī, Yasodā, Vasudeva and Nanda, Dāsyu or servitude as in the case of other devotees. The elaboration of Bhakti Rasa on these lines is the special contribution of the rhetoricians of Bengal who followed the school of Caitanya. Rūpa Gosvāmin’s two works, the Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu and the Ujjvalanīlaṁaṇi deal with this Bhakti Rasa at very great length. Dr. Abbayakumar Guha has dealt with this subject in an article on the Rasa Cult in the Caitanyakaritrāmṛta in the Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes (III) and Dr. S. K. De’s complete account of ‘the Bhakti-Rasa Sāstra of Bengal Vaiśnavism’ in the IHQ (Vol. VIII) for 1932, removes the need for any further contribution on this subject.

These Vaiśnava Ālambārikās accept the eight Rasas of Bharata; accept the Śānta; accept the Vātsalya; accept the ‘Sneha-prakṛtiḥ Preyāṇ’ or the ‘Ārdrātā-sthāyiḥkaḥ Snehaḥ’ as Sakhya and add only one absolutely new Rasa-concept, namely Dāsyu. Thus they speak of twelve Rasas but they give a new orientation to the whole scheme, wherein lies the speciality of their school. The old Sṛṅgāra becomes the chief Rasa; it is Rati for their God; it is also called Madhura and Ujjvala. Along with this Madhura, there are four others which are primary; they are Śānta, Dāsyu, Sakhya and Vātsalya. These five are called the five Mukhya Bhakti Rasās. The rest, the seven (Hāsya, Adbhuta, Vīra, Karuṇa, Bibhatsa, Bhayānaka and Raudra), are secondary, the Gaṇa Bhakti Rasas. The primary Bhakti Rasas numbering five are the five forms of Bhakti; the seven secondary Rasas are
more or less Vyabhicārins for the five primary Rasas, for they are Rasas only when they involve Kṛṣṇa-rāti.

शान्त दास्य (सहय) मधुर रस नाम
कृष्ण मति रस मधे ए पशु प्रधान।
हास्याभ्यासन्तथा ब्रह्मचारीमुद्रातृत
पशु विष भक्ते गौण शत रस हय।
पशु रसस्थायी व्यायी रहे भक्तनेते
सत्त गौण आगन्तुक पा इत्ये कारणे॥

(Quoted by Dr. A. K. Guha in the article ref. to above.)

According to the table given by Dr. De in his article (p. 666), Dāsya is called Pṛta (rendered as Faithfulness) and Sakhyā is called Preyas (rendered as Friendship).

Kavikarṇapūra's Aśānhkāra Kaustubha is a regular Alakhkāra treatise but it introduces some ideas of these Vaiśṇava Alakhkārikas also. Kavikarṇapūra does not give us the classification into Mukhya and Gaṇa Rasa, and we miss also Dāsya in his work. He accepts the eight Rasas of Bharata, the Sāṅta and the Vātsalya. To these ten he adds two more, Prema and Bhakti. Prema is the name he gives to the Madhura Rasa, the divine Śrīgāra between Kṛṣṇa and the Gopīs. He considers Cittadrava as its Sthāyin. According to him, this love is not Śrīgāra. He also records the view of some who hold Śrīgāra as the Rasa between Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa and says that, in that case, Prema will be the Aṅga of that Śrīgāra. But, according to himself, Prema is the Aṅgin; Śrīgāra its Aṅga. This Prema, Kavikarṇapūra considers as Love Supreme within which every other Rasa comes.

"अथ प्रेमस: . . . अत्र चित्रधव: स्थायी। प्रेमसे सर्वरसां अन्तरभवतीत्वत्र महीयानेव पपः। प्रत्यगौरवव्याहित्वात्मात्राःपुकृतः।"
This view of Preman will make it the basic Love, which Bhoja also says, lies at the root, as Mūlaprakṛti, of Rati and Priti.

The Vāghela King Visvanāthasimha, a great devotee of Rāma and the author of a number of works on Rāma, (A. D. 1853-4) treats of Bhagavad Bhakti as a Rasa at the end of his treatise Sarvasiddhānta. Vide Rajendralal Mitra, Notices of MSS., Vol VII, p. 100. No. 2329. It would be interesting to compare his elaboration of this subject with that of the Bengal Vaiśṇava Ālaṃkārikas.

**Madhusūdana Sarasvati on Bhakti Rasa**

It is a well-known fact that Madhusūdana-sarasvatī, the great Advaitic writer, was a great devotee of the personal God in the form of Kṛṣṇa. In this role, he has left to us a Stotra, and a treatise on devotion called Bhagavadbhaktirasāyana, a work, in which the subject is approached from the point of view of the Ālaṃkārika. It expounds the Bhakti Rasa. Though this Rasa is old and has been dealt with by others, as can be seen from the foregone survey, the treatment by Madhusūdana-sarasvatī has its own peculiarities.

Generally, the Puruṣārthas are said to be four, Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa. M. S. says that Puruṣārtha is

---

1 Benares Edn., 1927.
really one which is bliss untainted by misery, तुः:खास्तुपृथ्विभृक्तः, and that, if one speaks of four Puruṣārthas, one calls the means the end, adopting the common Upacāra (p. 5). Since devotion to God, Bhagavad-Bhakti, is one of the ways of attaining such unmixed bliss, Bhakti also is a Puruṣārtha.

अतो भगवद्क्रियोगस्वादे तुः:खास्तुपृथ्विभृक्तेन व परमपुरुषार्थविभृक्तेन —‘ निरूपमस्वलस्वविद्रुपमप्रयुत:खम् ’ इति | p. 5.

M. S. separates Jñāna and Bhakti and consequently does not include Bhakti in the fourth Puruṣārtha, Mokṣa. He bases himself on the difference in character in aspirants to spiritual salvation, which explains why some take to the path of knowledge, Jñāna, and some to the path of devotion, Bhakti. Firm minds seek the former through cultivated Nirveda, while softer minds tending to be emotional seek the latter.

तत्तथं अद्वितीयं नियंत्रित्वं तत्वं-शान्तम्। द्विविद्यम तु भगवद्वस्तववणादिभागबलवत्वमःचापिनि। मक्षिकिति अविष्कितेन द्वयमण्ड-पाल्यम्। p. 2.

On the basis of certain texts in the Bhāgavata, he even says that Jñāna also becomes a means and not an end, a means to the attainment of Cittaprasāda, which is necessary for Bhakti. This makes Jñāna a Saṅcārīn of Bhakti.

‘अन्तः ‘मनो यात्रं प्रसीवदितः’ (मा. XI. 20.) इति मक्षियोगं एव ज्ञानवित्तिक्लेण उक्तः।’ p. 3. 1

1 On p. 11 M.S. points out the difference between Bhakti and Brahmavidyā or Jñāna. The two are there for two different kinds of Adhikārin. The common man or anybody as such is a candidate for Bhakti; whereas, only he who has acquired the four
M.S. accepts two kinds of Bhakti; the means and the end, Sādhana and Phala. Even as Jñāna can be means to Bhakti, Bhakti itself can be. The Bhāgavata dharmas like S'ravaṇa and Kīrtana, which produce Cittaprasāda and Sattvasuddhi, form Sādhana bhakti (p. 8). Bhakti itself can serve to intensify Bhakti.

The word Bhakti itself is explained by M.S. in a very original manner. All writers explain Bhakti as Rati for God. M.S. does not say this at first. According to him, Bhakti is the Citta taking the form of the Lord. The Citta or Antahkaraṇa takes the form of the object it comes into contract with; भगवद्गृहत्ति is Bhakti.

"भजनम् अन्तःकरणस्व महाभक्तार्तारिकं भक्ति: ||
वृत्तं महाभक्तार्तारिकं वातावरणं गता ||
सर्वोष मनसो विविधस्मित्वातिभिः || 1, 3.

... या सर्वोषशिष्या हि भयां भक्तार्तारिकं विविधस्मित्वाति: अतस्तः महाभक्तिभिः || 13.

By Karaṇa Vyutptt, Bhakti means the Sādhanas also.

"भजनाद्वारं अन्तःकरणं किवते अन्यं। इति
करणलयस्या महामह्यन्ये अवधिकर्ति नाति साधनमित्वाति।" p. 8.

Thus the word Bhakti would apply to the Uddīpanas and the Anubhāvas also.

Sādhana is eligible for Brahmavidya. In form also, the two differ; Bhakti is a Savikālpa-cittavṛtti and Brahmavidya is a Nirvikālpa-cittavṛtti. In the former, the mind takes the form of God.

On p. 6, he points out to the critics who would not give Bhakti such a supreme and independent status of Puruṣārtha, that they should accept Bhakti as a Puruṣārtha, at least as forming part of the first or the fourth, Dharma or Mokṣa.
M.S. explains all details, Vibhāvas etc., according to his view. The Alambana Vibhāva is of course the Lord (p. 6); Tulasī, Candana etc. are the Uddīpana vibhāvas; Anubhāvas are tears of joy or closing of eyes and the like. Regarding the Sthāyin, the older writers give Rati but Madhusūdana holds the Citta being of the form of the Lord, Bhagavadākārati, as the Sthāyin. This Cittavṛtti develops into the Rasa of ineffable bliss.

"—सकलविषयविमुखवनसः महाभागादय कस्यचित्त भगवद्भ-
लिङ्गरिंकभमनन्यप्रतिबन्धवेत्रश्चितेन्द्रियायां मनोरथसः सर्वसाधनपरत्मयां
शूचीतमवद्वद्वकारायां विभावानुभावविभिषिंसंयोगेन रससहितत्वा विभावाः
नुभावविभिषिंसंयोगादासिषिणि: 'इति।

"विभावो द्विविषय:- आलम्बनविभाव: उद्दीपनविभाभः। तत्र
आलम्बनविभावो भगवानः, उद्दीपनविभावो तुल्सीवनन्दनादिः, अनुभाको
नेत्रविभिषियादिः। व्यभिचारिणो भवा: निर्वेदादयः। व्यक्तीवनस्त्रदव-
दासकरतात्त्वपरसाः: स्थाविभावः परमानन्दसाभायाकारातत्त्वकः भावृभृति
स एव भक्तियोग हि; ते परम निर्दिश्य गुरुषाथी वदन्ति रसरः। म " p. 4.

It must be noted here that, though M.S. distinguishes Sānta and Bhakti as essentially different, he still gives Nirveda or सकलविश्वविमुखवनस्तक्ता (Vairāgya) as a condition precedent even to the Uddīpana vibhāva. This would however make Sānta an Aṅga. Though M.S. gives his Sthāyin for Bhakti as Bhagavadākārakṣallavṛtti, there does not seem to be any great difference between this and Bhagavad-Rati. For he holds that the result of this Cittavṛtti, its Phala, is intense love for God. भगवद्विश्वविमुखवनस्तक्तां भक्तिलयम्। p. 11. On p. 16, he says that this molten state of the mind is called Prāṇaya, Anurāga, Sneha etc., all names of Rati.
According to M. S., the Ālambana of Bhakti is God; the Rasa realised, Paramānanda, is God; and the Sthāyin, the mind which has taken God's form, is also God. How is this explained? M.S. says that God the Ālambana is independent and is the Bimba of which the Sthāyin in us is the Prati-bimba. The form of God is ineffable bliss.

M.S. then recognises that the following Bhāvas can become Sthāyins and Rāsas. 1. Kāma becoming Sambhoga and Vipralambha; 2. Krodha becoming Dveṣa as in Śīsupāla and Kaṁsa; 3. Bhaya; 4. Snehā (Dāsyā, Sakhyā, Vātsalya, and Preyas); 5. Harṣa becoming love for Kṛṣṇa; 6. Hāsa; 7. Vīsmaṇa; 8. Utsāha (Dayā, Dāna and Dharma); 9. S'ōka; 10. Jñapsā; and 11. S'ama (II, 25-26). Of these, Dharmavīra, Dayāvīra, Bibhatsa and S'ama are not part of Bhakti Rasa (II, 27-28). Similarly Dveṣa born of Īṣyā and Bhaya are not part of Bhakti (II, 29). So also Raudra and Bhayānaka are never Aṅgas of Bhakti (II, 30). The rest form part of Bhakti (II, 31-33). As pointed out already, M. S. is of opinion that Sānta Rasa and Mokṣa Puruṣārtha are for 'Adrutacittas' and that both differ from Bhakti which is a
separate Puruṣārtha. Hence, he excludes Sānta from Bhakti. But as can be seen in the earlier section, the Bhakti Rasa scheme of Rūpa and others admit Sānta in Bhakti. This, the author of the gloss on M.S. also points out. M.S. rules out of the scope of Bhakti, Dharma-Vīra and Dayā-Vīra because their Ālambanas differ; Raudra and Bhaya are against love and Dveṣa cannot produce any Druti.

Those who did not accept Bhakti as a separate Rasa considered it as a Bhāva, a variety of Rati, the object of which was God. देवादिविषया रति: . To these writers, M.S. replies that this Bhāva-Rati described as ‘ Devādiviṣayā ’ refers to Rati for the gods like Indra and others. Rati for the one supreme God is a Rasa.

रतिवेदबिविषया व्यभिचारी तथोक्तिः ।
मारे: भोजो रसो नेति भदुर्क रसकोविदे: ॥
देवान्तरदृष्टे जीवलताः परारंपकाशानावः ।
त्वातोष्यम्; परमानन्दस्ये न परमामनि ॥ II, 75-76.

Bhakti Rasa is the real Rasa; since here it is that one has the ineffable bliss that is not tainted by even a grain of sorrow. Sṛṅgāra and other Rasas cannot mean this bliss and are inferior; they are like glow-worms; Bhakti is the very Sun.

कान्तादिविषया वा ये रसायास्तत्र नेद्धशम् ।
रसलं पुष्पते पूर्णाकाशस्पदविकारणात् ॥
परिपूर्णसा शुद्धरसस्वत्तो भगवद्वद्वति: ।
खचोतेभ्य इत्सादित्यप्रेमेव बलवचरा ॥ II, 77-78.
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

THE MĀYĀ RASA

The advent of S'ānta latterly gave rise to another controversial Rasa called Māyā. Just as there is the possibility of depicting the S'ānta Rasa with the psychological, religious and metaphysical concepts like Jñāna, Bhakti, S'āma, Dama, Santuṣṭi etc., there is also the possibility of depicting the Māyā Rasa by showing the Jīvātman rolling in Sāṃsāra as a result of Mithyājñāna or Avidyā, with characters Kāma, Krodha, Lobha and the like. Even as S'ānta is the Rasa of the state called Nivṛtti, Māyā is the Rasa of the state called Pravṛtti. In a philosophical drama, the Rasa from which the hero escapes into the S'ānta, will be Māyā. The Rasatarāṅgiṇī of Bhānudatta puts it forward thus:

विचरस्ति: हिंहा—पद्धतिनिर्दिष्टाच्छ। निःस्रो यथा शान्तसः, 
तथा प्रवृत्तियो भावार्थ हि तत्र वतित्वाति। Ch. VII.

He points out there how this Māyā cannot be identical with or included in Rati etc., all of which come within its fold. Rati and the seven other Sthāyins become the Vyabhicārins of this Rasa.

किन्तु विभुद्र इव रतिहासशोकोशोल्साहमयज्ञुप्सावलिस्मयास्त्र 
उत्थिन्ते विहीनते च। तेन तत्र व्यभिचारिभाव इति।

The Sthāyin of this Rasa is Mithyājñāna.

लक्षणं च प्रदुःमिथ्याज्ञानवासना माया रसः। मिथ्याज्ञानस्य 
स्थायिमान:। विभावः सांसारिकभोगज्ञानवस्त्र्यमिति। अनुमावः पुन: 
कल्लशविज्ञानात्मायादयः।
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

The Mandāramaranda-campū follows the Rasataraṅgini and describes the Māyā-Rasa of Pravṛtti as well as the Sānta Rasa of Nivṛtti. K. M. 35, p. 106.

Cirañjīvibhaṭṭācārya cites the Rasataraṅgini on Māyā Rasa and criticises it:

अन्तः चिन्तयच—मायाया आनादिलेन अजन्यत्वात् रसत्वासभवः।
रसास्तु सच्च जन्मा एव। कस्य वा कस्येत् मिथ्याज्ञानादि: मायाया:
कारणमिति, शाशवविहल्ल्वात्। वस्तुतस्तु ज्ञात्वदर्शिकाणां मते रसो नित्यः
आन्द्रूप:। अतोऽश्य यत्तस्तुभूतेन मायाया रसत्वासभवः। माया
हि तुष्टा विनाशशालिनी श्राब्धमिश्रिते विद्व:। अत एव शास्त्रीनस–
प्रदायिकैरपि नवेन रस:। कथितः।"

Kāvyavilāsa, Sarasvati Bhavan Studies, XVI, p. 10.

This scholastic criticism, going into some of the features of the concept of Māyā as accepted in Metaphysics, does not meet the question properly. If it is argued that Rasa is ‘Nitya’, ‘Ānandarūpa’ and hence of the form of the Brahman, and consequently Māyā which is different from Brahman cannot be a Rasa, how does the author propose to explain Sṛṅgāra etc. as Rasas? They all come under Māyā. If a portrayal of Bībhatsa, Bhayānaka and Raudra can be Rasa, why not Māyā? One objection that can be considered is however not mentioned by the critic of the Māyā-Rasa and it is this: As an opposite of the Sānta Rasa, a Māyā-Rasa is no doubt present; but it is not a unitary Rasa. It is made up of Sṛṅgāra and the seven other Rasas. Any given specimen presenting a mundane activity can be called by one of the eight names, Sṛṅgāra etc. It is not necessary to have a separate Rasa as Māyā which is only the common name of all the eight mundane Rasas of Pravṛtti. Suppose, in a
metaphysical play, Pravṛtti and Nivṛtti are portrayed; under the former Kāma, Krodha etc. will be portrayed as developing into Sṛṅgāra, Raudra and other Rasas. To us who see it with unenlightened minds, the several parts will appeal as Sṛṅgāra, Raudra and so on; we will never realise them as Māyā; if we realise, we shall be sitting along with the chosen few, the Jñānins who alone see Māyā in all those Rasas; and to them, this Māyā will not produce Cittasamvāda or Rasāsvāda; only the opposite Sānta will produce that in them. Therefore, practically speaking, there is no necessity for a Māyā-Rasa.

The Kārpanya Rasa

Along with the Laulya, which Abhinava had already mentioned, Bhānudatta examines if Kārpanya can be a Rasa. He mentions Sṛhrā as its Sthāyin. The argument for rejecting this is the same as that used by Abhinava for rejecting Laulya. Even as a development of Laulya can only become Hāsyā, development of Kārpanya also will become Hāsyā.

The Vṛīḍanaka Rasa

The Anuyogadvāra Sūtra of the Jains, which I mentioned previously in the section on the Sānta Rasa, gives nine Kāvyarasa, in which list, Bhayānaka is omitted and in its place is found a new Rasa called Vṛīḍanaka, which can be rendered as ‘Modesty’. (Āgomodaya Samiti Series Edn. with Maladharī Hemacandra’s Skt. gloss, p. 134.)

 pamph sannata, te jahā —
 vēri sīgāro jāmūryo v roddhyo v hōd bōḍhyo ।
 ujjeyo bīmchhō hāso kṛṣṇo pāntyo ṛ ॥
The commentary of Maladhāri Hemacandra explains that Vṛidhānaka is the Rasa of Bashfulness, that some give in its place Bhayānaka as a Rasa and that this Bhayānaka is included in Raudra and hence not mentioned separately.

"श्रीडयति लक्षणावतयति लक्षणीयस्तुदर्शनादिमयं मनो-\nध्वलीकतादिविक्रमं बीडनकः। अस्य स्थाने महवजनकसस्मादाबिद्वस्तु-\nदर्शनादिमयं मयाको रसः पठवतेवत्त्र। स चेष रौद्रसात्तर्व-\nविवक्षाणात् प्रथमः नोक्तः॥"

In defining, however, the text gives a verse in which we see Bhayānaka instead of Raudra, to explain which the commentator says that the text describes not Raudra as such, but describes it through its effect, Bhaya. The Lakṣānāsloka is—

मयवजननरुपशब्दान्वकारचिन्ताकथासमुखः।
समोहस्त्रंकविवादरणणिः रसो रौद्रः॥

(झाया)

The illustration is however for Raudra proper:

शुक्कटीविभिन्निर्मल सन्नद्धप्रेण इत आकीर्षितः।
हंसि पधुथ जयारति हेमरसित अतिरौद्र रौद्रोदसि॥

The commentator explains that though the Lakṣānāsloka means only the Bhayānaka Rasa, it has to be taken as referring to the cause of Bhayānaka, Raudra also.

3 The commentator's date is the end of the 11th cent. and early part of the 12th. He wrote his Ātivasamāsa in 1107 A.D. and Bhavabhāvanā in 1113 A.D. (Winternitz, Hist. Ind. Lit. Eng. Tran. II, p. 589.) He is different from the author of the Kavyānusāsana.
"ननु भयजनकृपापदिष्ट: समुद्र: समोहादिविभिं: भयानक
एव भवित, कथमस्य रौद्रलम्यः; किन्तु पिताचारिरौद्रवश्चिम्यः जातवात
रौद्रलम्य विविधविस्मितयोऽयोः । । ।
रौद्रो रसः, सोपप्तुरक्षणवायात्री
व्रत्तः, अन्यथा न निरास्वद् एव स्वातः। अत्य एव रौद्रपरिमाय-
लुक्कायस्यातिपादकमेव उदाहरण: दर्शिताय: । भीतवेद्यायपिपाय
तृतीयः स्वत: एव अन्यामित्वमेव अस्मायः।"

If the number of Rasas is to be reduced by omitting the Rasas which are produced by other Rasas or the Rasas which are the causes of other Rasas, we shall arrive at four Rasas, proceeding on the basis of Bharata's indication of the Kāranā-
kārya-bhāva existing among the eight Rasas, शुद्धराद्धि भवेदाध्य: etc. Such a process of reducing the number is illogical. There is no reason why the causal Rasa should be retained and the effected Rasa dismissed and why it should not be vice versa.

Coming to the Vṛiḍanaka Rasa, the definition and illustration are as follows:

विनयोपचारायुष्यगुरुदासमयात्मयित्वातः ।
शीतलको नाम रसो रूपात्वकारणविक्ष: ॥

यथा——

किं कौतिककरणीयत्वः लूजनीयतरतितमि रजस्तासिमि
विवाहे गुहजनो परिवर्ते वधुनिवसनम् ॥ ॥ (छाया)

According to the gloss, this is a verse addressed by a would-be bride to her maid. The reference in it is to a provincial marriage custom according to which, elderly women and
men, including the father-in-law and the mother-in-law, pay their respects to the Sārī and the person of the bride after the nuptial night. The bride is taken round and elders revere her for her chastity. The thought of the elders revering her produces shame in the bride’s heart.

This however is a mere Vyabhicārin and hardly a Rasa. Vṛīḍā of the same description is given by Bharata as one of the thirty-three Vyabhicārins.
VII

THE VARIETIES OF THE SAME RASA

The first Rasa Śṛṅgāra has two phases, Sambhoga and Vipralambha, the two Adhiṣṭhānas, as Bharata says, of Śṛṅgāra. There is a peculiar view in this connection propounded by king Haripāladeva, whom I have already mentioned in the section on the Sānta Rasa, as holding two Rāsas called the Sānta and the Brāhma. Haripālā accepts thirteen Rāsas: the eight of Bharata, Sānta and Vātsalya and three new Rāsas, Sambhoga, Vipralambha and Brāhma. The peculiarity of the Brāhma-Rasa and its difference from the Sānta have already been explained.

श्रुतारी हास्यनामा ज बीमलसः करणस्तथा ।
बीरो महानकाहानो ऋत्राः स्वतः वंदनसंज्ञकः ॥
शान्तो भाषाभिषेकः पव्वादिब वासलक्ष्यभवतः परमः ।
संभोगो विप्रलम्भः स्पाति समस्तीने तयोदश ॥ p. 16.

Haripālā has three different Rāsas, Śṛṅgāra, Sambhoga and Vipralambha. He considers them separate, since, according to him, their characters differ essentially. He thus argues his case against the ancients:

संभोगो विप्रलम्भः ब्राह्मधर्मिति त्रयो रसाः ।
अतिरिक्त उदीयते हरिपालमहीशुजः ॥
Sṛṅgāra has always been considered as Ujjvala and S'uci, a Rasa of men of cultivated taste and of sophisticated persons, the Uttamaprakṛtis. Therefore, in course of time, S'uci and Ujjvala became synonyms of Sṛṅgāra. In an unsophisticated rustic, there is Sṛṅgāra but only in a way. The ancients also consider that love in birds and beasts is not Rasa, but only its semblance, Rasaṁbhāsa. Therefore, love as understood by the word Sṛṅgāra is Anitya and Kvācitka, being present only in high class individuals. But love of a kind which is the joy a pair derives mutually is present in all living beings, rustics, birds and beasts. This love need not be called Sṛṅgāraṁbhāsa, it may be separated into a distinct Rasa and called Sambhoga.

More striking is Haripāla's view regarding Vipralambha. Since both Sṛṅgāra and Sambhoga are of a pleasurable nature, and Vipralambha is essentially of a painful nature, the latter is a separate Rasa. If Sṛṅgāra is S'uci and Ujjvala,
Vipralambha is 'Malina'. Vipralambha may be due to S'ṛṅgāra or Sambhoga. This cause-effect relationship between S'ṛṅgāra and Vipralambha is not proof of their essential identity. The two differ as much as Vīra and Bhayānaka, of which the former produces the latter.

If love among higher classes is different from rustic love and love among birds and animals, equally do the separations, Vipralambhas, in the two cases differ. Strictly speaking, Haripāla should have two Rasas for Love in separation.

Haripāla gives Āhlāda as the Sthāyin of S'ṛṅgāra, Rati of Sambhoga and Arati of Vipralambha.

The ancients were not unaware of the painfulness of Vipralambha, but they did not consider it, on this score, as a separate Rasa. Autsukya or longing is at the root of Vipralambha. This longing is only a kind of Rati. Arati can only be an intermediate state in the ten Avasthās of love and it is not the basic state of mind that persists throughout Vipralambha. The slender line of Rati runs through the state of Vipralambha; and if this Rati is not accepted in Vipralambha, as its Sthāyin, there can be no difference between Vipralambha and Karuṇa. The Rasakalikā of Rudrabhaṭṭa also opines that Rati is not of the form of happiness, since Vipralambha is far from being pleasurable.
The Rasakalikā however does not separate Vipralambha as a distinct Rasa, but takes it, as all do, as a phase of Sṛṅgāra only. It agrees with Haripāla in finding Vipralambha as standing in the way of accepting Rati to be of the nature of pleasure. Rati will thus be, according to the Rasakalikā, a state of pleasure as well as pain. Viprayoga, though apparently and immediately painful, is ultimately a state of pleasure. The very life of Rati is a certain longing; and this exists in Sambhoga as well as in Vipralambha. That it constitutes the life of Rati is seen from what Kālidāsa and Māyurāja say: रतिमुभयप्रार्थना कुरूङ्ते (S'ākuntala) and प्रेमासमालोकत्वम् (Tāpasavatsārāja). Therefore, Vipralambha is an aspect of Sṛṅgāra only, and of Vipralambha also, Rati is the Sthāyin.

“किपलमै रतिरब स्थायी . . . विप्रयोगं रेते: स्वत-सिद्धवात्।”

A. Kau., Kavikarṇapūra.

To match its opinion that Rati is not unmixed pleasure, the Rasakalikā says that Rasa itself is of the nature of both pleasure and pain; but of this more in a further section.

To return to Haripāla’s Sambhoga Rasa, he postulated this for the Love of those who are not Uttamaprakṛtis. The love of birds and beasts described so largely in the Kāvyas which was being known by the term Rasa-ābhāsa, comes under Haripāla’s Sambhoga Rasa. Vidyādghara, the author of the Ekāvalī, refuses to recognise that the love of birds and beasts is Rasābhāsa. He says that their love also is Rasa. If it is said that the birds and beasts do not consciously enjoy or enjoy in such a manner as cultivated men and women do, such knowledge and cultivated taste, Vidyādghara says, is irrelevant. Why should the subject know what it is enjoying.
or how it enjoys, provided it enjoys? Kumārasvāmin cites this view of Vidyādharā in his commentary on the Pratāparudrīya:

‘अत्र तिर्र्यो: पारा: कलाकौशीलासां तद्ध्यक्षरस्य विभावादिकरस्वर्णभावात् जामासां द्वादशं। रसम पवार्य्य नामास हृति केवल। तदुच्च बिचार्यशा—‘विभावादिसमवो हि रंगम प्रति प्रयोक्षः। न विभावादिवज्ञानम्। ततथा तिरर्खमस्तेव रसः।’ p. 21, Bālamanorāmā Edn.

Earlier than Kumārasvāmin, Sīṅgabhūpāla noticed this view of Vidyādharā, and as a staunch follower of the accepted tradition, criticised it. The discussion in his R. A. S., is too long to be quoted in full. (T. S. S. Edn., pp. 206-9.) Vidyādharā’s view is thus stated:

‘अपरे तु रसामांस तिर्र्यो रचक्षे। ततू न परीख्यामम्। तेषापि भावादिसमवात्। विभावादिवज्ञानस्य तिर्र्यश्: न माजनं मबितुमहान्ति रसपेति चेतु न। मनुष्येऽपि केवलौ तथाभूतेऽथ रसविषयाभासपरान। अत्र विभावादिसमवोपि रंगम प्रति प्रयोक्षः। न विभावादिवज्ञानम्। ततथा तिरर्खमस्तेव रसः।’

The criticism of Sīṅgabhūpāla is that Sīṅgāra is essentially a Rasa of subjects, Ālambanas, who are Śucī and Ujjvala; it is not enough if, according to their own conditions, birds and beasts do have a consciousness of their love and its art; it is a question of Aucitya. How can a human being who alone is Sāmājika for poetry and drama, have Cittasamvāda in such cases? The terms Vibhāva etc. do not apply in the case of the love among birds and beasts; the

1That love among birds and beasts has less of art and is less poetic, may not be accepted at all by the biologists.
emotional conditions there are called only Kāraṇa, Kārya etc. Says Śiṅgabhūpāla:

“�थ स्वजातिभव्यतिर्मं करिणां करिणां प्रति विभाव्यतं इति
चेत । तस्यं कक्षयां करिणां करिणां प्रति कारणत्वं न पुनं:
विभाव्यतम्।”

‘किंवद् जातिभव्यतिर्मं। कस्तुनो न विभाव्यतम्, अष्टि न भावक—
चित्व भास्त्वमहूर्महूर्महूर्मे रतिजिविकिर्षिते।

“किंवद् विभाव्यत्ति नाम जोिचित्वविविषेक तेन शृण्यः
तिष्ठिस्यो न विभाव्यत्ति यान्ति । । ।
विशेष्टमहव्यतिजानेपध्येक्षणम् सेष्यत्

Consistent with this argument, Śiṅgabhūpāla says that
Anaucitya is the only cause of a Rasa becoming its Ābhāsa;
that this Anaucitya is of two kinds, Asatyatva and Ayogyatva;
and that in trees and other aspects of nature which are
described in love-images, the Rasa is Ābhāsa by reason of
‘Asatyatva’ and in rustics, low people, and birds and beasts,
the Rasa is Ābhāsa by reason of ‘Ayogyatva.’

आभालितेः भवेदेशामनौदिचित्वविविषेकः
असत्यस्यबाद्योपस्यबाद्य अनोदिचित्वम् द्विशा भवेदेः।
असत्यस्यकृतेऽस्तः स्पौद्यः अचेतनगतं हु वत् ।
अयोग्यस्यकृतेऽपोक्तेऽमीतिविकिर्षितयं

Kumārasvāmin does not refute Vidyādharā, and Rājacūdā-
manī dikṣita fully agrees with Vidyādharā. After reproducing
the Ekāvalī, Rājacūdāmanī says that if the Kāvyaprakāsa
is not wrong in illustrating Bhāyanaka Rasa with the verse
Possibly, Śriṅgabhūpāla would reply to Rājacūḍāmaṇi that the Rasa in question is only Śrīṅgāra, and Aucityaviveka was spoken of only regarding this Rasa and its Ābhāsa. But would he accept that other Rasas in birds and beasts are not Ābhāsa and should a distinction be made among the Rasas?

Haripāla's contribution to this controversy is the creation of a Sambhoga Rasa for rustics, aborigines, birds, beasts etc.

Of Hāṣya Rasa, Bharata has given six varieties, ranging from smile to roar, according to the nature of men who are gentle, boisterous and so on. Kavikarṇapūra diminished this number to three. (A. Kau., p. 143.) Bharata himself speaks of a broad three-fold classification of laughter according as men are Uttama, Madhyama or Adhama, refined, moderately refined or unrefined. (N. S'. Ch., VI, pp. 315-7; Gaek. Edn. I.) Further, Bharata has recognised that Laughter has two varieties, Laughing with and Laughing at, Svagata and Paragata or Ātmastha and Parastha. (N. S', Ch. VI, p. 314.) Of these, I have spoken elsewhere.

Karuṇa varies according as its cause is curse, death and so on (pp. 310 and 332). On p. 332, Karuṇa is considered to be of three kinds, Karuṇa born of peril to Dharma, Karuṇa due to peril to Artha and Karuṇa born of Sōka in general, i.e., Sōka at the loss of relations and the like. The Uttamas
are chiefly sorry on issues of Dharma; the Madhyamás, on loss of wealth and other possessions (Artha), and perhaps, only Adhāmas are supposed to sorrow too much over the loss of those whom they love (Kāma). This however does not rule out Karuṇā on the loss of the beloved in an Uttamapārakṛtī. It appears that only the third variety is Soka and Karuṇā proper, and that the first two varieties of Soka in Dharma and Artha, seem to be only Vyabhicārins. Three kinds of Bhayānaka are given, Vyājāt (feigned), Aparādhāt (at having done a mistake) and Vitṛāśitaka, born of being timid by nature. The varieties of Bībhatsa,—Kṣobhaṇa and Udvegin, or Kṣobhaṇa, Udvegin and Suddha—have been spoken of while considering the possibility of a kind of Jugupsā being the Sthāyin of the Sānta. (See above.) Abhūtā is Divya and Ānandaja, wonder born of heavenly miracles and that produced by the joy one has when things are achieved. Such classifications of Rasas do not have any scientific basis or method in them.

Of the varieties of Rasas, the varieties of Vīra have attracted greatest notice, because an early school of opponents of the Sānta explained away Sānta as provided for by one of the varieties of the Vīra mentioned by Bharata. Bharata mentions three kinds of heroism: munificence, Dānavīra, as in Karna; sticking to right at all costs, Dharmavīra, as in Yudhīśṭhira; and martial heroism, Yuddhavīra.

दानबीरे धम्मबीरे युध्दबीरे तथैव च ।
रसं बीरमपि प्राह बन्ध्रा त्रिविषमेव हि || N. S., VI, 99.1

1 Cf. Bharata's description of Utsāha:
तत्त्वं (उत्साहम्) स्वेषं वैरेष वाण वेषति विणीदितिसुभावोपविविवः प्रयोगः
N. S., VII, p. 354.
Here again, the first two Vīras do not seem to be Rasas, they can only be Bhāvas. If they are developed as main themes, they will become Aṅgas of Sānta; or, they will form the Guṇas of the Nāyaka, as Audārya and Dhārmikatva.

A Dayāvīra was then proposed and this Dayāvīra sought to throw out Sānta for some time. Jāgannātha Pāṇḍita has pointed out other varieties of Vīra and the Mahābhārata gives a long list of Vīras. All this has been set forth already in the section on Sānta Rasa. (See above.)

Bhānudatta has taken trouble in his Rasataraṅginī (Ch. II) to prove that Dayāvīra cannot be included in Karuṇa Rasa; there is a confusion here between Karuṇā and Karuṇa.

The Anuyogadvārasūtra cited previously breaks the usual order in enumerating the Rasas and instead of opening with Sṛṅgāra, opens with Vīra. The gloss says here that Vīra is mentioned first, because it is the noblest and foremost of Rasas, and the Vīra meant here is that associated with Dāna and Tapas. Towards the end of this section, the text and the commentary divide the Rasas into two classes, those vitiated by what are called Sūtra-ḍoṣas such as Falsehood and Injury to others, and those which do not involve these sins. Here Yuddhavīra is considered vitiated by the sin or flaw of Injury to another, Paropaghāta. Similarly Adbhuta involves exaggeration which is a species of Falsehood. But such Vīra as Tapovīra and Dānavīra is, like the Prasānta Rasa, free from such Sūtra-ḍoṣas.

"अन्तः कु त्र्यागतपशुभुरसे बर्तते । त्यागतपसी त्र 'त्यागो
शुरुं गुणशतादिको मतो मे । 'परं लोकांतिं धाम तथं श्रुतमिति
हयस् 'हत्यादिविचारनात् समस्तगुणप्रधान इत्यनया विचक्षया बीरसस्य आदालुप्त्याः |"
In VI, 97, Bharata says that Sṛṅgāra is of three forms, caused by speech (Vāk), dress (Nepathyā), and physical action (Kriyā), and Hāsya and Raudra also have these three forms. But why should he restrict these three forms to Sṛṅgāra, Hāsya and Raudra only? These three, speech, dress and action, form the three Abhinayas, Vācika, Ahārya and Āṅgika. The Sāttvika comes under the last. All Rasas are roused by these three Abhinayas. So Mātṛgupta says:

रसास्तु विविधवाचिक-नेपथ्य-स्वमावजा: ।
रसानुरूपायापू शौकेय्याये: पदेतस्ता ।
नामांकारसशुकृ: वाचिको रस हयते ॥
कर्म्रूपवियोजनसंहारानुवर्तिमिः ।
माहयसृष्णवषाड़: नेपथ्यरस हयते ॥
रूपयोगवनवप्रवृत्तत्त्वाद्यविद्युत्तुष्णी: ।
रसः लाभार्थिको ढेयः स च नाट्ये महायते ॥

Quoted by Rāghavabhaṭṭa in his Sāk. Vyā.

In another connection, i.e., while describing the Sama-vakāra type of drama, Bharata speaks of three other kinds of Sṛṅgāra,—Dharma Sṛ., Artha Sṛ. and Kāma Sṛ.
Bhoja postulates a Sr̥ñgāra for each Puruṣārtha and relates the resulting four Sr̥ñgāras with the four types of heroes, Dhirodātta, Dhirodhdha, Dhūralālita and Dhūrsānta. Of this, I have spoken fully in the chapter on Rasa in my Ph.D. thesis on Bhoja's Sr̥ñgāraprakāṣa.
Are all Rasas Pleasurable or Are there some which Are Painful?

This is a very important question into which it is not possible to go completely in this book. It relates to the very theory of the concept of Rasa which is, strictly speaking, out of the scope of this book. While dealing with Haripāla’s new and separate Rasa of Vipralambha, it was pointed out that the Rasakalīka of Rudrabhaṭṭa also considered Vipralambha as standing in the way of accepting Rati as a purely pleasurable state and that as a matter of fact, Rasa was both, some Rasas being pleasurable and some painful.

करणामवानामपुष्पदेवलं सामाजिकानाम्, रसस्य सुखदःखामकत्या तदुमवलक्षणलेन उपपत्ते। अति पृय तदुभवनकलम्।

Rasakalīka, Mad. MS., pp. 51-52.

This question takes us straight into the greater one, why do we see and how do we enjoy a tragedy? What is the relish in Karuṇā? This problem, which is still to be solved even in Western literary criticism, cannot be undertaken for discussion here. True, Bhoja also says

रसा हि सुखदःखामस्थापहः।

but he evidently means here the Laukika bhāvas to which the term Rasa is applied by extension. The Nātyadarpana also says in S', 109 (p. 158) तुलनात्मको रसः and proceeds to elaborately prove in the Vṛtti that some Rasas are certainly painful and that our seeing them and enjoying them is really due to the excellence of the art of either the dramatist or of the art of the actors (p. 159).

The majority of the writers do not accept this view at all which misses the distinction between Laukika bhāva and the Rasa. All the Rasas are considered, uniformly and to an equal extent pleasurable. But it is noteworthy that a writer like Madhusūdana sarasvatī should hold the view that among Rasas, there is a difference of bliss. He first adopts the Sāmkhyana scheme of three guṇas, Sattva, Rajas and Tamás: Only Sattva can make a Sthāyin and Rasa. In Krodha, which is Rājasa and S'oka, which is Tāmasa, only a shred of Sattva exists, only so much as to make them Sthāyins and give them the blissfulness of Rasa, but this blissfulness or enjoyability is naturally meagre in Krodha and S'oka. Therefore all Rasas cannot be relished in the same measure. He says in his Bhaktirasāyana:

"—त्र्योत्तरत्र सत्त्वगुण mysteries, तं बिना च स्थायिमावासंभवत, सत्त्वगुण स भूलम्बितवात, सर्वोऽह वावाद्य भूलम्बित्वेति रजस्तत्त्वाय- शमित्वानां तारतम्यमभवत्वम्। अतो न सर्वेऽह स्तेषव तुल्य- 
भूलम्बितवः।" p. 22.

"कोष्ठे राजस्तत्वायां नास्तुल्यक्विरीढिनाम।।
रसलम्बन्युपगतं तथानुभवमात्रः।।" II, 79

After saying this on the basis of the Sāmkhya, Madhusūdana sarasvatī discusses the question from the Vedāntic
standpoint also. All bliss is of the form of Brahmānanda, for bliss is the form of the Brahman. This however does not militate against mundane things also being blissful, for it is said in the Upaniṣad: पुनर्वै आनन्दस्य अन्य आनन्दा मात्रामुपजीवनिः.

Though literary enjoyment is superior to mundane enjoyment, it is still not on a par with Brahmāsvāda. (I, 10-14.) Compared to Brahmāsvāda, Kāvyarasāsvāda is Laukika. A similar view is propounded by Sāradātanaya also. See Bhāvaprakāsa, Intro. pp. 39-40; pp. 52-3 G. O. S. Edn. But among literary Rasas also, the Sānta and Bhakti are on a par with Brahmāsvāda, for there it is the Paramātman and Bhagavān themselves that are involved in them as Sthāyin and Ālambana. The Advaitic approach is seen in full in Ch. III, where Madhusūdana sarasvatī discards his previous Sāmkhyan conclusion that Rasa is varying in degree in its bliss and says expressly that though, in the world, the Bhāvas are of the forms of Sukha, Duḥkha and Moha, their counterparts in the Kāvyā and in the hearts of the spectator, are all of the form of bliss only.

वैश्वनिििा ध्वास्मेक ते सुखः०खादिहेतवः ||
बोद्ध्वनिििास्तृ सर्वेत्थि गुल्मात्रेकेहेतवः || 5.

Sattva begins to spread and dominate as the sole Vṛtti of the Antaḥkaraṇa and Rasa is then manifested.

समृद्धावृक्षालश्चका जायते सात्विकी मति: ||
सानन्तरशेषास्वर्थं व्याप्ति शुक्लमुत्पम् || III, 12-13.
IX

NEW VYABHICÄRINS AND SÄTTVIKAS

We have seen how freely later writers debated the question of adding newer Rāsas to those that Bharata gave. But did not writers feel also that there was no finality about Bharata’s list of Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas and their number, thirty-three and eight?

Bharata gave the Bhāvas in three sets as Sthāyins, Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas. We have already examined and found that all the eight Sthāyins become Vyabhicārins also. Therefore these eight, the Sthāyins, must be added to the thirty-three Vyabhicārins. But when this addition is made, we have to reduce the thirty-three by removing a few which are redundant. Thus when S’oka becomes a Vyabhicārin, there is no need for Viṣāda; Bhaya in its Vyabhicārin-grade eliminates Trāsa; Sāgaranandin actually gives Trāsa as the Sthāyin. Krodha removes Amarṣa. This gives us eight and thirty Vyabhicārins. Further reduction is possible. Among the thirty, we have two Bhāvas, Glāni and S’rama, one of which will suffice. Not only do they look akin at first sight but prove to be identical also when their descriptions are examined. Another case of repetition is Nidrā and Supta; the second is very delicately distinguished from the first.

Bharata describes the latter as Nidrābhībhava and Nidrāsamutth. If two are thus removed, we have eight and twenty-eight. Some writers did see the redundancy at least in the case of Nidrā and Supta and, instead of Supta, gave a new Vyabhicārin called S'auca, as for instance, those whom Sāgaranandin, author of the Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakosa (pp. 83-87) follows.

Why did Bharata classify the Bhāvas into Vyabhicārins and Sāttvikas? Among Bhāvas, there are only two classes, Sthāyins and Vyabhicārins. The Anubhāvas, the twenty Alamkāras of damsels, Bhāva, Hāva etc., the eight Sāttvikas, Ālāpa etc., given as modes of Vācikābhīnaya, the ten Kāma Avasthās—all these are comprehended in the term Vyabhicārin. Bhoja calls the Sāttvikas, Bāhya vyabhicārins:

तत्र आध्यात्मिका व्यभिचारिणु चित्तोद्वक्कविगतिकांद्रयं, बाह्या:
स्वेदरोमाध्यावृत्तविद्यादयः।

S'r. Pra., Ch. xi.

But out of these numberless subsidiary mental states, there are a few which are more major, compared to others; not only are they major, but they are more definitely mental states than others which are physical manifestations. It may

1 Rāhula added to this set Maudgāhya, Mada, Bhāvikatva and Paritapana according to Abhinava. See J. O. R. Vol. VI, pp. 208-210, my article on 'Writers quoted in the Abhinavabhāratī'. See also Hemacandra, K.A., p. 316, where Abhinava's sentence referring to Rāhula's additions is reproduced. See also Padmaśrī's Nāgarasarvasva following Rāhula's school, Ch. vii, S'ls. 3-4, where Vikṣepa, Mada, Maudgāhya and Tapana are given in addition. (p. 29, Tanusukharam Sarma's edn., Bombay, 1921). While defining Vikṣepa, Padmaśrī quotes a writer named Kapila. Bhoja added Vihṛta, Kṛṣṭita and Keli which S'īna criticised. Viśvanātha accepts Rāhula's and Bhoja's additions and has, in addition, three more, Kutūhala, Hāsita and Cakita. (J. O. R. VI, pp. 209-210.)

2 Bhāṇudatta shows in his R. T. how the ten Madanāvasthās are included in the Vyabhicārins. (Ch. 5, p. 109, Edn. Venkatesvara Steam Press, with Hindi Com.)
be asked if the more major among these accessory mental states are only those given by Bharata and if there are not others. It has been pointed out that this list of Bharata can be reduced on one side; and as a matter of fact, it has been added to also on the other side. Bhoja, in his Sṛ. Pra., omits Apasmāra and Maraṇa and gives in their place, Īrṣyā (which Śiṅgabhūpāla refutes) and S'ama which is needed for the Sānta Rasa (Ch. xi). In his S.KĀ., Bhoja counts among his thirty-three Vyabhicārins Sneha which Śiṅgabhūpāla refutes and, instead of adding S'ama as in his Sṛ. Pra., takes Dhrṣṭi itself, one of the old Vyabhicārins given by Bharata, as the Sthāyin of Sānta. Śiṅgabhūpāla raises the point that there can be more Vyabhicārins, mentions some—Udviga, Sneha, Dambha, Īrṣyā—but dismisses these as included in some of the thirty-three, with reasons which look strained. Bhāṇudatta proposes Chāla:

“अत्र प्रतिमाति च कृष्णममिच्छिम्यं भविष्यारिमािम् हि” (Ch. 5.)

and shows its occurrence in Śrīgāra, Raudra and Hāsya. But it seems to be possible to include it in Bharata's Avahittha. (Vide its description, p. 373, GOS. edn. N.S.'I). Rūpa Gosvāmin, in his scheme of Madhura Rasa, accepts at first the traditional thirty-three Vyabhicārins and adds afterwards thirteen more Vyabhicārins generally, as also a few more specially under some individual Rasas (Vide Dr. S.K. De, IHQ, 1932, p. 663). Dr. De adds that the thirteen additional Vyabhicārins are brought by Rūpa under one or the other of the old thirty-three.

Bharata himself discusses the question of the separate naming and enumeration of the eight Sāttvikas. He says: as a matter of fact all Bhāvas enacted have to be 'entered into'; Sattva is 'entering into'; but still this 'entering into
the state’ is all the more necessary in the case of the eight Sāttvikas. For, a tear has actually to be shed. See pp. 379-381, GOS. edn. N. S.’ I. Bhoja says that in truth all Bhāvas are Sāttvikas, because Sattva means ‘Mind’.

Sāttvikas āpi sāv eva, man:prabhāvāt | abhūjante hi man: sattvamityuchyate |


Śṅgabhūpāla also says:

śvetāpi sattvamūlaveda bhava sady api sāttvikās: ||

tathāyamani śvetamūlaveda sāttvikāmasa ||

R. A. S., I. 310.

The only writer, now known, to propose a ninth Sāttvika, is Bhānudatta. He proposes Jñmabhā in his Rasatarāṅginī:

jñēbhā n nabam: sāttvikās bhav iti prabhāvat || p. 66.

Bhānudatta would not base himself on the meaning ‘तत्त्ववीभवन’ for the word Sattva and justify the separate enumeration of the Sāttvikas. For Sattva so understood would apply to the Vyabhićārins also. So, he interprets Sattva as the ‘body’—Jīvasarīra. Tear, Perspiration etc. are physical states and as such are distinct from the Vyabhićārins which are mental states. The former are Bāhya, the latter Āntara.¹ (Rasatarāṅginī, 

¹ Bharata uses Sattva as meaning also the opposite of mind prā., the physical body, and calls Bhāva, Hāva etc. by the name ‘Sāttvikābhinaya’. See Ch. XXIV, 5-7 and 40.

वेदांतव भवतोर्वस्त्व श्वभावः सप्रथित: || and sattvokāminval: puṣṇa saha śrīśo dviśiśe: ||

Abhinava also says “वज्राच्छ वायपश्रवत्”’, Abhi. Bhā., Ch. 7, p. 343, GOS. edn. I.
pp. 57-58 and 7-9). To accord with this, Bhānudatta defines a Bhāva not as a Cittavṛtti, but as a ‘Rasānuṅkula vikāra’, which is of two kinds, Ābhyaantara (Śthāyin and Vyabhicārin) and Bāhya (Sāttvika etc.). But to exclude too palpably physical acts, he gives them a different name Ceṣṭā which, he says, is different from Vikāra. The difference between the two is that while a Vikāra like a tear cannot be made to appear according to man’s desire, a Ceṣṭā like Āṅgākṛṣṭi and Akṣimardana is done by man of his own will.

"न चाशाक्षिरिष्किर्षिप्तमवर्यो अन्नवामी भाववापति; तेषां भाव-
वक्ष्णाभवात्। रसानुकुले विकारो भाव इति हि तत्कक्षणम्। अक्षा-
क्षणाभवो हि न विकारः। किन्तु शरीरचेत्। प्रत्यक्षविद्ययेत्।
अक्षाक्षिरिष्किर्षिमदनं च पुरुषरिष्किर्षया विषययेते परिवर्जयते च। जृम्भा च
विकारादेश भवति, तथोत्तुती निवर्तते चेति।"

Rastaraṅgini, p. 69.
RASA-SYNTHESIS

KARUṆA

The artistic mind has always shown a partiality for pathos. It is said that the sweetest songs are often songs of sorrow. The first Kāvya in Sanskrit rose out of the sense of pity. 'रसेशु करुणो रसः' is a well-known anonymous saying. Ānandavardhana says that the quality of sweetness which is the melting of the heart is found in the highest degree in Karuṇa.

माहुर्माध्यत्तं वाति वल्लुत्राधिकं मन: | Dhva. Ā., II.

But to point out the beauty and appeal of a Rasa is not to do any synthesis. By Rasa-synthesis is meant a reducing of all Rasas to the nature of one, a formulation of one as Prakṛti and the rest as its Vikṛtis.

No Ālāmkārika ever attempted a Karuṇa-synthesis, but Bhavabhūti, in his drama, Uttararāmacarita, suggested such a synthesis in Karuṇa. Ānandavardhana explains that the Rāmāyaṇa is an epic of Karuṇa:

रामायणे हि करुणो रसः स्वयमादिकविना सुनिति: 'शोकः-शोकवचागतः' इत्येववादिना। निन्यूङक्ष अं एव सीतात्यन्ततिथियोग-
पर्यंतनेव स्वप्रभवतमुपरचवता।

Dhva. Ā., IV, p. 237.
Bhavabhūti gave the same opinion when he said:

भगवान् भूतार्थवादी प्राचेतसः
पञ्चने चचनास्तं कृष्णाद्नुभरसं च किंचिन्दुपनिवधुस् etc. Act. VII.

Writing a masterpiece dominated by Karuṇa, Bhavabhūti, in a self-conscious mood, says through S'leṣa:

अहों संविधानकम्—
एको रस: करण एव निमित्तमेवदृ
भिष: पृथक्कृष्णगिरि अयते विवारं।
आवर्तहृदयंततरणाय विकारानु
अभो यथा सलिलेन्द्र हि तत्समस्ताम् || U. R. C., III, 47.

"O! what a great play I have written!" he seems to exclaim to himself. By context, the passage refers to Tamasā observing the pathos that was there in everybody, though in different forms.

"एक एव सज्जि निमित्तमेवदृ संस्कृतमनिश्चलाः कविरत्मार्यते
मिल: विलक्षण इव पृथक्कृष्णमू विबर्तानू। वासन्तीसिताराम:।
प्रमुखतिकु परस्परविक्षणः स्वयंविशेषाः भजति।"

Virarāghava's com., p. 99, N. S. Edn.

A general import bearing on our present subject of Rasasynthesis can also be seen in this verse. Bhavabhūti seems to say that there is only one Rasa, Karuṇa, and that it assumes the different forms called S'ṅgāra etc., even as the same water assumes the forms of whirl, bubble etc. Karuṇa is the Prakṛti; the other Rasas are its Vikṛtis. Virarāghava, a commentator, also saw such a meaning in this verse which shows that the interpretation is authenticated by tradition.
"एक इति | रस्यते स्वाध्यत्त इति रसः काव्यानुशीलनायास्वादः-विशालश्रीमृतत्वाकान्तमयीभवनयोग्यसामाजिकमनोमुकुर्माणित्वानन्तया निर्माणन्त्वसंविद्रूपः | करण इति जनकियोग्यजन्युद्दस्ततिशयः | एक एव साध्यके निमित्तमेतद्यो व्यक्तकविभावादित्विन्दित्तिविशेषत: स्मित: विलक्षणः | प्रत्यय प्रत्यय विवेकानु परस्परविलक्षणश्रुक्त्राकारात्मना परिणामम्। "व्यस्त-परिणामः स्थाप्तिवर्तः" इति कपिलः | श्रावते महते . . . . . . . . . . . . . 

इत्यर् कर्मनं—वचने श्रुक्त्रा एक एव रस इति श्रुक्त्राकाराप्रकर्मनि-भावः, तथापि मण्डुष्यां श्रुक्त्रारागिनिराधारण्यात् करण एक एव रसः। अन्ये तु तद्भजत्व: इति।"

Vīrāghava’s Com., p. 99.

To the Kāruṇā-synthesis suggested by Bhāvakīrti, this commentator added two arguments, one that Kāruṇā is present to the largest extent in life, and the other, that it is found not only in men with mundane desires but in the Yogins also. These however do not make for the Prakṛti-Vikṛti-bhāva in Bhavabhūti’s verse, and that alone forms the meaning of ‘Synthesis’. In English, the word ‘Sympathy’ meaning ‘response to another’s feeling of sorrow’, has come to be used in an enlarged sense to mean all forms of aesthetic response and attunement of heart, Cittasaṅgāda; and here is a linguistic argument in favour of a Kāruṇā-synthesis. For it seems, the model and the supreme example of a complete attunement of heart, which poetry and drama effects, is certainly the attunement of hearts in Kāruṇā.

Sānta

A regular attempt at synthesis in the field of Rasas by a theorist is however to be seen earliest only in the Abhinavabhāratī of Abhinavagupta. He sponsored the Sānta-synthesis.
by considering the S’ānta as the one fundamental Rasa of which the other Rasas are modifications. He called S’ānta the greatest Rasa, first because of its relation to the last and the greatest Puruṣārtha, Mokṣa. Next, poetic delight called Rasa is always of a non-worldly, Alaukika, character, shorn as it is of all mundane associations, a limitless, unbounded and ineffable bliss, and hence is of the form of S’ānta.

"तत्र सर्वसंगां शान्तभाय पवास्वादः, विषवेस्मो विपरि-\\


Further, the Sthāyin of S’ānta, the Ātman, is the very substratum of all mental activities; it is the one basic Citta illumined by this Ātman that takes the form of the Vṛttis of S’ṛṅgāra etc. Thus it is Sthāyitama; it is the Sthāyin of the Sthāyins, the Prakṛti of which Rati, Īsā and the rest are Vikṛtis. Says Abhinava—

अत्र सर्वप्रकृतिविभागाय पूर्वमिभागाय ।


And according to some mss. known to Abhinava, the S’ānta Rasa section is found at the very beginning, even before the S’ṛṅgāra section.

"तथा च चिरन्तनपुस्तकेदेहु ्स्थायिभावान् रसत्वमुपनेनैष्यामः: ्

इत्यन्तत् ्शान्तो नाम शमस्थायिभावात्मकः: ्हृत्यादि लक्ष्मण पद्यते।।"


The S’ānta text found in Bharata, according to some, definitely states this S’ānta-synthesis in two verses:

माया विकार रथाचा: शान्तस्तु प्रकृतिर्मेत: ।

विकार: प्रहेतुरात: पुनःस्त्रौङ्ग लीयते ॥
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

स्वं स्वम निर्मितामार्ग शान्ताश्रावः प्रवर्तते ।
पुनरन्मितापावेन च शान्तं एवोपलीयते ॥

N. S', VI, pp. 335-6, Gaek. Edn. I.

This has already been indicated in the Sānta Rasa section of this paper.

AHAṆKĀRA-ŚṛṅgāRA

When Abhinava was synthesising the Rasas in Sānta, a similar synthetic spirit was working in Bhoja who merged every Rasa and Bhāva in a new Śṛṅgāra he formulated. He said that at the root of all Bhāvas lay the germ of Ahaṅkāra otherwise called Śṛṅgāra and Abhimāna. It is a Gunā of the Ātman and is the result of past good acts. By Ahaṅkāra is meant a self-consciousness or the sense of 'I' which marks off the cultured from the uncultured. It is that by which not only for himself but for others and other objects also does man have any love. In this sense it is called Ātma-rati. It is this 'Ego' or 'Self-love' that is the one Rasa. Its manifestations are Rati, Hāsa etc. Thus this basic Śṛṅgāra is different from the first derivative of that name, the Śṛṅgāra developed from Rati. So this Śṛṅgāra-synthesis is not a synthesis in the first of the eight old Rasas of Bharata and others. This theory finds a brief statement in the fifth chapter of Bhoja's S. K. Ā. and an elaborate exposition in his Sṛ. Pra. I have set this forth at great length in my Ph. D. thesis on Bhoja's Sṛ. Pra., and here I give only a brief account. The S. K. Ā. says:

रशोभिषिमानोष्क्ष्यारः श्रुतारं इति गीते ।
योवर्षस्तुध्वानवात् काव्यं कमनीयत्वमाश्च।३३५-६

(This has already been indicated in the Sānta Rasa section of this paper.)
While Abhinava in his Śānta-synthesis took his stand on that ultimate ripple-less state of the Ātman, Bhoja, adopting the Sāmkhya and a Nyāya phraseology, took his stand on the Ātman with its first shoot of Ahaṅkāra. To Bhoja, even Śānta would appear only within the world of Ahaṅkāra; for to him, any Bhāva or Rasa can be experienced only through Ahaṅkāra. Sāma as much as Rati is the product of Ahaṅkāra.

"... tadbhavā rūpam eva bandha Prajñā parīkṣitah: | sa bhūtāh: 
ārtham ārthākṣari ca sa bhūtāh: |
śrancitaḥ prakṛtyābhadraḥ prakāśitām: |
śrancitaḥ prakṛtyābhadraḥ prakāśitām: |
śrancitaḥ prakṛtyābhadraḥ prakāśitām: |
śrancitaḥ prakṛtyābhadraḥ prakāśitām: |
śrancitaḥ prakṛtyābhadraḥ prakāśitām: |
śrancitaḥ prakṛtyābhadraḥ prakāśitām: |
śrancitaḥ prakṛtyābhadraḥ prakāśitām: |
śrancitaḥ prakṛtyābhadraḥ prakāśitām: |
śrancitaḥ prakṛtyābhadraḥ prakāśitām: |
śrancitaḥ prakṛtyābhadraḥ prakāśitām: |
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śrancitaḥ prakṛtyābhadraḥ prakāśitām: |
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śrancitaḥ prakṛtyābhadraḥ prakāśitām: |
śrancitaḥ prakṛtyāabh..."
is only in the state of Bhāvanā and Bhāva; beyond this is the
de state of Rasa. Says Bhoja:

अमावनोदयमनन्यथिया जनेन
यो भाव्य्नं मनसि भावनया स मावः 
यो भावप्रभाववतीत्य विवर्तमानः
साहिंकृती हृदि परं प्रवदते रसोजसी

Thus Sṛṅgāra, Hāsyā, Vīra—these are but Bhāva-states
in reality. The truth of Rasa is that it is only one and has
no more name than Rasa.

PREMAN

Side by side with or rather within this Ahaṅkāra-Sṛṅgāra
synthesis, Bhoja formulates a synthesis in Preman also.
Preman to him is a fundamental love lying at the root of
Rati, Sneha, Bhakti, why, at the root of all Bhāvas in much
the same manner as Ahaṅkāra itself. If one laughs, it is
because he loves to laugh; if he fights, he loves to do so.
Thus all activities go to fulfil a certain love which is
innate in man and which explains all his activities; it is this
love which makes all his activities a self-fulfilment. Bhoja
has three stages of his Rasa;—the Pūrva koṭi, the Madhyāma
avasthā and the Uttarā koṭi. In the first, it is the one
Ahaṅkāra; in the second, the one Ahaṅkāra has become the
forty-nine Bhāvas, each growing to its relative climax through
its Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas etc.; in the third all these several
Bhāvas become aspects of Preman, or rather ripen into Pre-
man, from which stage again, experience passes into the
primary stage of the one Rasa of Ahaṅkāra.


This Preman-synthesis finds an advocate in Kavikarnapa-ra, the author of the Alankarakaustubha where he says:

pemase sarve rasa antarbhavantityat maharayane praprab: |
aranyo'ramayand vibhak Painter | . . . . . . tathah ch—

'Unmjunini nimajjantit preshpenakrandshtub | sarve rasa brahman taran bhova variyai II'

pp. 147-8, Varendra Edn.

RATI-S'RANGARA

The Agnipuran took Bhoja's Ahaankara, but instead of saying that Rati and all other Bhavas emanated from it, said that Rati was the first born of Abhimana which was itself a product of Ahaankara and this Rati modified itself into Hasa etc. It further went behind Ahaankara and said that Ahaankara is the first manifestation of Rasa or Camatkara which is the manifestation of the Ananda, the innate nature of the Supreme Being called Para Brahman.
Wonder is an invariable element in all enjoyment, mundane or artistic. In art and literature, the element of surprise, extraordinariness, wonder, is present everywhere. The very theme has to be striking; for, when we see an extraordinary situation, do we not describe it as being dramatic? Wonder helps love. Häysa is only reversed wonder. The part Adbhuta has in Vīra is too plain; Bharata describes Adbhuta as born of Vīra. The hold of Adbhuta on the minds of the audience is fully realised by Bharata who says that the dramatist must so work out his story, so weave it, hide some and reveal some, that the audience may get at each step a surprise and a thrill. One of the ends which the means to developing the plot called the Sandhyāṅgas serve is the presentation of the story in a wondrous manner—'आकृतिविद्वा स्वाभाविकः'; N. S'., XXI, Kāsī edn., S'1. 54. There is again the need to
intricately complicate the problems of the story and give out a series of revelations in the end, thus carrying away the heart in the end with thrill after thrill. This can be realised, for instance, when the closing scene of the Mrćchkaṭaṭika or the Mālavikāgnimitra is read. The story has to be, says Bharata, in the form of a cow's tail, bushy at the end, with a crowd of surprises. There must be Adbhuta in the end.

N. S., XX, 46-47.

Similarly, on the side of verbal expression, the Vācyavācaka, or the Vācikābhinaya in drama, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin made a synthesis in Adbhuta when they praised Atisyokti as the one great figure of which the rest are but several forms.

Bhāmaha, K. A., II, 84-85.

This point has been explained at some length by Ānanda and Abhinava in the Dhva, Ā. and the Locana, Ud. III, pp. 205-209. The very strikingness of poetic expression is Atisaya and Adbhuta:

"... लोकोचरण १ष्पेपं अवश्यानम् ... लोकोचरण वैवातिशयः। तेन अतिशयोक्ति: सवल्लक्षारसामान्यम्।"

Locana, p. 208.¹

This Adbhuta or element of surprise characterises the climax-condition of all the Rasas. Adbhuta thus permeates a composition, its Alamkāra, Vastu and Rasa.

The regular theory of a synthesis of Rasas in Adbhuta was however made by an ancestor of the author of the Sāhityadarpana. He was known as Nārāyaṇa. In Ch. 3 of his S. D., Visvanātha gives this Adbhuta-synthesis in his Vṛtti on verse three, in the name of his ancestor, Nārāyaṇa, and herein quotes a verse and a half to that effect from the writing of one Dharmadatta. This Dharmadatta is cited as reviewing Bhoja’s Śrīṅgāra-theory in the Rasasudhānidhi of Saṅhi Māra Bhaṭṭāraka, available in a manuscript in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library (R. 3210). P. V. Kane says in his Introduction to the S. D. (p. cxxi) that this Dharmadatta was a contemporary of a subsequent Nārāyaṇa who was Visvanātha’s grandfather and was defeated by this Nārāyaṇa in a debate in the Kaliṅga court. This Dharmadatta wrote an Alamkāra treatise in which he stated the theory of

¹ Under Adbhuta Rasa, Bhānudatta says in his Rasatarangini—

‘अतुप्रति अमोकी किनोकी विरोधभावतप्रस्तल्लोकुला एव।’

Under Citrokti mentioned here, he brings all expressions turning on Lakṣanā. ‘लक्षणिमक्षिणं निन्त्रोक्तिव।’
Adbhuta-synthesis first propounded by the older Nārāyaṇa. The text of this synthesis in the S. D. runs as follows:

चमत्काराधिकचित्तारूपः विस्मयार्पयांः। तत्त्राणां च अस्मि-स्तितामहसहुद्वस्तेऽक्षर िगितमुद्वशीमचारायणपादेलकन्म्। तदाह धर्मदुःखः स्वाभृते—

'रसे सारंश्रमकारः सर्वगार्यनुभूषयते।
तचमत्कारसारले सर्वगार्यदृस्तो रसः॥
तस्माददृस्तोत्पतेव खली नारायणो रसम्।' इति। S. D., III.

It is accepted that Camatkāra is Rasāsvāda. This Camatkāra is a 'fillip' of the mind which is in essence a wonder. The 'Lokottaratva' of all Rasāsvāda, accepted on all hands, again points to Adbhuta. Bāhūndatta accepts that in Sṛṅgāra and other cases there is an element of Adbhuta as Aṅga; where it is Aṅgin, the Rasa becomes Adbhuta proper.

श्रृणाराजः चमत्काराद्विनाशेत्य सन्तोषिकः(सन्तु?) तिरक्तः भास्ते तत्र
श्रृणाराद्वः एव रसः।| प्राधान्येन यत्र भास्ते तत्रदृश्यः एव रसः।

Rasataraṇgini, Ch. I.

Prabhākara, author of the Rasapradīpa (p. 40, edn. Princess of Wales Sarasvatī Bhavan Texts), refutes this Adbhuta-synthesis:

"—इति नारायणेन अदृश्यः एव रसः इत्यभिहितम्। धर्मदुःखः-
दिशित्तः तदेवनुस्ततम्। तत्र साधुः। भैरवेष्यः अनुमावसिद्धत्वात्।
प्रकृतिमेदातः। नापि व्यभिचारिणि स्थायिनः हि रथ्यादिष्टं विस्म्यावुगमः।
शोकादिष्टं तत्तांनुगमात्।" etc.
Prabhākara goes at length and says in the end that he has refuted this theory of 'Adbhuta in all Rasas' in his earlier Alamkārā work, the Alamkārarahasya, also, which is not available to us now.

On the practical side, Saktibhadra's Āscaryacūḍāmanī illustrates the dominating Rasa of Adbhuta, and this has been explained in detail by Professor Mm. S. Kuppuswami Sastri in his Introduction (pp. 12-15) to the Bālamanoramā edn. of this play. The now lost Kṛtyārāvaṇa also seems to be a play which specialised in Adbhuta. Towards the end of the 17th century, young Mahādeva wrote his Adbhutadarpāṇa, where his Rāma is made to say:

यत्सल्यमिति: सत्यमेति: इन्द्रियवैरिन्द्रज्ञातवत ।
अद्वैतकरसादृश्चि: अन्तर्मृद्यतीव मानव ॥

Kāvyamāla, 55, IV, 8.

RASA ONLY ONE

It may be granted that an element of wonder enters many Rasas, but it is absent at least in Karuṇa as Prabhākara effectively points out. Though Rasāsvāda is Cittasaṁväda and is called Camatkāra, the Cittasaṁväda is not, in all cases, of the form of an 'enlargement', Vistāra. There is Vikṣo-bha as in Bibhatsa, and there is Druti as in Śṛṅgāra and Karuṇa. This Druti of Śṛṅgāra and Karuṇa is totally absent in Raudra, Bibhatsa, Bhayānaka and Adbhuta, and in this way the Karuṇa-synthesis is defective. Abhinava's Sānta and Bhoja's Ahaṅkara-Śṛṅgāra, going to the very substratum of the emotions may be conceded some validity; so also the synthesis in Preman, Vīra meaning Preman for Utsāha, and so on.
But though it might be difficult to prove and accept that all the Rasas are but forms of some one of them, it has been recognised by all writers that Rasa as such, the ineffable bliss, is one. Rasa is Rasa. It has no other name. It is one. It is like the Brahman or the Sphoṭa. The names Śvārga, Vīra etc. and the consequent plurality and difference are ultimately unreal; or they are at best like parts of a whole. Hence it is that Bharata also, says Abhinava, uses the singular—

न हि रसाद्र कर्ते कविकदर्थः। प्रवर्तषे।

N. S., V. pp. 273-4.

"—तत् एव निन्दितवसज्जनयानुष्ठानिनिल्लक्षणेन रसनापरम्यविश्वामतृत्वमथायुरण गृह्यमाणंत्वम् रसश्वेतानामिकीते। तेन रस एव नालोक, यथा अनुमित: फलमिलुच्छते। तथा च रसाद्रे (६-३३) इत्यत एकवचनोपरचि:। तस्य वैण्यगदत्तानाम्रसात्त्व स्कोटदशीव अस्मात्मान: बा, अन्नितानिधानदशीव दमायास्कानी सत्यानि बा, अन्नितानिधानदशीव ततस्वतायस्कानी बा, रसान्तराणि भागाभिनिनिवेशदशानि रूप्यन्ति (४)।"


Again, commenting on the Sūtra न हि रसाद्रे etc., Abhinava says that though names are given to it differently according to its evoking conditions, Rasa is fundamentally one. and hence it is that Bharata refers to it in the singular number,

पूर्वेण वहवचनः चैवचनः प्रसुतान्यास्यायमाशय:। एक एव तात्त्वपरमार्थाय रस: तुत्त्वात्यात्यात्ममेन रूपेण प्रतिमाति। तत्त्वाय पुनर्वर्तदशा विभाग:।

Abhinava says that therefore Rasa and Nāṭya mean the same thing. In experience also we find that our relish is one undefined state of the form of a repose of the mind, Vigrānti, Bhaṭṭa Narasimha, a later commentator on Bhoja’s S. K. Ā., in his exposition of Bhoja’s Rasa theory, points out that Rasa as relish, Svāda, is one.

"अघ्यादेव स्थायिन इति कृतः ? तावतामेव स्वादालमक्वादिति चेत्, किमेतेक्त्वस्तूत एकः स्वादालम्? तववार्यकारिनमस्वत:—एतेषां कृतस्य एक एव स्वादालम; एते च तववार्यकारिनमस्वत: इति—"

"अनेच्छे (धन:;) सर्वं कृतस्य (स्थ:;) एक एव स्वादालम्।"

Mad. MS., R. 2499, p. 150.

Kavikarṇapūra Gosvāmin states the point more elaborately and clearly. He considers a certain blissful state of the mind, which is a quality (Guna) of the mind established in the Sattvaguna and completely devoid of any touch of either Rajas or Tamas, as the one eternal Sthāyin and the one eternal Rasa. This Sthāyin called Ānanda or ‘Āsvādāṅkura-kanda’ is separately and diversely named according to the different causal conditions, the Vibhāvas. The difference between this writer and Abhinava and others is that he expressly postulates a Sthāyin also for this one Rasa which they do not in so many words, though their position implies this one Sthāyin also.

"आस्वादाकुरहन्दोरस्तिः धर्म: कथन चेतस:।
रजस्तमोम्यां हिनस्य शुद्धस्वक्षत्या सत:॥"

1 Cf. his Locana, p. 149. प्रीत्यातः च रसः; तदेव बाध्यम्, etc. Cf. also Abhinava’s borrower Sāṅgadeva: नाथस्यादि रसेषु मूल्ये:। VII, 17.
Sam. Ratnākara.
In the same chapter, Kavikarnapura Gosvamin again states this in clearer language:

बहिर्न्तः करण्योर्वर्यारंतरासरोपकम्।
स्वकारणादिसिद्धेषि चमकारि हुल्क सस्।।

अर्थै तु उच्चमर्यादनामृ अनुकार्यानाम स्वतसिद्ध हेतु। काल्यादी
तु सामाजिकानामेव। तेषा संसर्गामनित्यसाधारी एक एव पूर्वकः
क्रिः भावावलङ्कः चेतोमगमिशेषः स्वायत। तत्र दुःखः दर्शिविप्यते—
रसस्य आनन्दर्मेक्ष्यात् एकध्ययनः, माह एवं हि।
उपाखिमेदात्तानालथम्, रङ्गान उपाखयः॥

रङ्गान्यः स्थायिनः यथा नानाविक्षरावसिद्धस्तत्तन्त्येक्पि तत्रणी-
विम्बप्रतिविम्बं एकं एवं, तथा उपाखिण्यं एवं मेदः, नानान्दो रसस्य।
Com “आनन्दर्मेक्ष्यात्, चर्मान्नदः, रूपान्नदः, एकध्यमेकविश्ववेव। यथा
सितोपकायः, पाकान्तरं नासिति ॥ ॥ तथा रसस्यापि।”
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<td>Kalpadrūkṣa 7</td>
<td>Gitavākhyā 32, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallinātha 84</td>
<td>Gauḍa 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalhana 34</td>
<td>Gauvāṇi vijaya 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavikamāpūra Gosvāmin 36, 107, 109, 121, 131, 147, 150, 170, 177, 178, 179</td>
<td>Gokulanātha 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūma sūtras 8</td>
<td>(讣) Gopāla 74, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalidāsa 1, 3, 147</td>
<td>Gopāladeva 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālprasadā 34</td>
<td>Gautama (Aksapada) 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyakautuka 43, 44</td>
<td>Gauḍapāda 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyakautukavākhyā 43, 44</td>
<td>Ghanasyāma 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyadarśa 150</td>
<td>CandrikaKāra commentator on the Dhvanīyāloka 21, 22, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyāprakāsa 46, 52</td>
<td>Citsūryāloka 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyāprakāsavyākhyā 74, 86</td>
<td>Cīnaṇjivī bhaṭṭācārya 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyāmsamsa 8, 42</td>
<td>Cetoḍūta 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyāvasāna 139</td>
<td>Caitanyacandrodaya 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyādarvā 172</td>
<td>Jagannātha 35, 52, 90, 125, 128, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyānusāsana 92, 141, 159</td>
<td>Jayadeva 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyālakāra of (Bhāma) 172</td>
<td>Jayanta bhaṭṭa 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyālakāra (of Rudrāja) 107</td>
<td>Jātaveda 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyālakāra sāra samagraha 12, 42, 61</td>
<td>Jivadeva 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyālakāra sāra samagraha vyākhyā 117</td>
<td>Jvīsamāsa 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumārasvāmin 148</td>
<td>Jvānmuhti kālyāṇa 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛṣṇabaladevavarman 40</td>
<td>Jvānandana 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIAN</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jñāna Candrodaya</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jñāna mudrā nātaka</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jñāna muddra yāpārāyaya kavya</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jñānavilāsa kavya</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jñānasūryodaya nātaka</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tīkṣa Sarvasva</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANPU (Bharataputra)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Tanpu' (Sivagana)</td>
<td>3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattvamudrābhādrodaya</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Tanpu'</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Tāṇḍin'</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Tāṇḍya'</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāṭpasavastaraṇāja</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāṭpahāktitarāngini</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tota, Tauta</td>
<td>43, 78, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trikāṇḍavēṣa</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Trikāṇḍavēṣa'</td>
<td>3, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triveni</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DāṇḍIN</td>
<td>1, 107, 108, 110, 129, 168, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darpadalaya</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davarāpaka</td>
<td>5, 10, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davarāpakahāvaloka</td>
<td>10, 20, 27, 28, 46, 47, 75, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāmodarāśrama</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divādasvasāhasrī</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHANAṆJAYA</td>
<td>45, 46, 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhanika</td>
<td>45, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmadatta</td>
<td>173, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmadeva gosvāmin</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmavijaya</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmavijaya gaṇi</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmasūri</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmodaya kāvyā</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmodaya nātaka</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhvanīaloka</td>
<td>15, 163, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See also Anandavaradhana). Dhvanīalokacandrikā</td>
<td>21, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhvanīalokacandrikā</td>
<td>(See also Candrikākāra).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE NUMBER OF RASAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rasa</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prapanna sapindhakarananirasa</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabodhacandrododaya kavya</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabodhacandrododayanataka</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabodhacandrododayavyakhya</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabodhodayanataka</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabhakara</td>
<td>174, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pravaranatati</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BAHURUPAMISRA | 10 |
| Bhubalavami ashtapadi (Gitavatiraga) | 35 |
| Buddhacarita | 22, 23 |
| Baudhavavadasakalpa | 45 |
| 'Brahman' ('Druhiya', 'Padmabhuta') | 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 46 |
| Brahma Bharata | 5, 10, 11 |

| BHAKTI DUTT | 34 |
| Bhaktirasampratindhu | 130 |
| Bhaktiveabhavanataka | 37 |
| Bhagavadhaktrirasayana | 132-7, 156 |

| BHARATA—frequently | 7 |
| Bharatamallika | 7 |
| Bharitkarinivadanataka | 41 |
| Bharitkarinivadanataka | 40 |
| Bhalata | 83 |
| Bhavabhavan | 141 |
| Bhavabhuti | 164, 165 |
| Bhagavata | 33 |
| Bhagunji | 6 |
| Bhunuddatta | 119, 125, 135, 152, 159, 160, 161, 162, 173, 174 |
| Bhama | 2, 107, 108, 172 |
| Bhratamaligari | 33, 45 |
| Bhuvaprapaka | 4, 9, 157 |
| (See also Saradatanaya.) | |
| Bhuvanapurusottama | 36 |

| MADHUSUDANA SARASVATI | 132-7, 156 |
| Manodhita (Four different poems of the same name) | 34, 35 |
| Manodhistika | 35 |
| Mandara maranda campti | 139 |
| Mamma | 46, 52, 69 |
| Mahadeva | 175 |
| Mahabhara | 17, 19, 22, 30-33, 45, 63, 76, 77, 152 |
| Mahurudasimha | 35 |
| Matrij | 153 |
| Mayavijaya | 39 |
| Mayuraja | 147 |
| Maha Bhaatara, Sothi | 173 |
| Millavikagnimitra | 172 |
| Mithyajana khandana | 38 |
| Muktisajyana | 36 |
| Mudritakumaracandara | 38 |
| Munisundarmar | 22 |
| Mrchakati | 172 |
| Meghadutasamasyalekha | 35 |
| Meghavijaya | 35 |
| Moharajaparajaya | 36, 39 |

<p>| YATIRAJAVIJAYA (VEDANTA vilasa) | 41 |
| Yasas | 38 |
| Yasahpala | 36 |
| Yadvartmahavahavangada | 39 |
| Yamaalata tantra | 10 |
| Yoga Sutras | 71, 79, 95, 99, 103 |
| Yogasutrabhaya | 71, 72, 95 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raghuvamsa</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>Lolla Lakṣmīdhara</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratnākara</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratnāvalī</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravidāsa</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasakalikā</td>
<td>53, 146, 155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasagangādhara</td>
<td>90, 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasatarāngīt</td>
<td>119, 125, 138, 139, 152, 159, 160, 161, 173, 174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See also Bhānudatta.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasapradīśa</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasaratnākara</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasaratnākara</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasasudhānīdhi</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasārnavasudhākara</td>
<td>122, 161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See also Śāṅgabhūpāla.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāghavabhaṭṭa</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājakālijanidikṣa</td>
<td>149, 150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājatarāngīt</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājarājavarman</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājasēkhara</td>
<td>8, 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmacandra</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmarāma</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmānjuja Kavi</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmānuja Kavi</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmānujācārya</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmāyaṇa</td>
<td>33, 45, 163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmāyaṇamānjarī</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāyamukuta</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāhula</td>
<td>23, 50, 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrabhaṭṭa</td>
<td>53, 146, 147, 155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūpa Gośvāmin</td>
<td>130, 137, 160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakṣmīdhara</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alaṁkāra work)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Lakṣmisavayamvara',</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('Amṛtamatana', Asuravijaya')</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laṅghuprabodha caṇḍrodāya</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lollaṭa</td>
<td>42, 63, 70, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARADĀCĀRYA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vararuci</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vastuvijnānaratnakosa</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vācaspatya</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vātsyāyana</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vādicandra</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Vāsuki'</td>
<td>11, 12, 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāsudeva</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikramavastya</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijnānarataraṅgiṇī</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidyādharā</td>
<td>147, 148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidyāparīṇaya</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidyāvinoda Nārāyaṇa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinayavijayagaṇi</td>
<td>23, 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivekacandrodayanāṭikā</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivekavijaya</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visvanātha</td>
<td>47, 50, 108, 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visvanāthāsimha</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇudāsa</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitāraṅghava</td>
<td>164, 165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venkatanātha</td>
<td>36, 47</td>
<td>(Vedānta desika)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venkatanārtaradikṣita</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venkataścārya</td>
<td>(of Udayendrapuram)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedāntavīlasa</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(Yatirāja-vijaya)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedāntācārya</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(Manasaṅkaṭṭi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valjanātha</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaidyanātha</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyaktrivīka</td>
<td>88, 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyaktivivekvākhyā</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyāsa (M. Bhārata)</td>
<td>9, 63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyāsa (Yogabhūṣya)</td>
<td>71, 95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S'ĀKTIHADRA</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṅkara (Sīva?)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṅkarācārya</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṅkuka</td>
<td>42, 43, 63, 115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabdahalpadrama</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUBJECT INDEX—ENGLISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhimāna-Aharīnkāra-Sṛūgāra (Bhoja’s theory of Rasa) 80, 119, 120, 122, 167-9, 173, 175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action, continuance of selfless action</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action, in drama</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adbhuta Rasa, synthesis of all Rasas in</td>
<td>171-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advaita vedānta 34-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot; and the Rasa-theory 156-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akṣa Rasa 113, 125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alāṅkāra 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alāṅkāras of damsels 159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegorical drama 35-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ānanda Rasa 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaucitya 113, 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āṅgahāras 3, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anirvacanlyā, nature of dramatic reality 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anurūgā Rasa 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artha (second Puruṣārtha), dominant in Mahākāvyā according to Bhāmaha 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhagavān, ālambana in Bhakti Rasa 157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhagavān, devatā of Sānta Rasa 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūgavata dharmas 134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhakti, Bhakti Rasa 26, 34, 37, 39, 40, 42, 49, 50, 81, 109-111, 113, 129-138, 157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāva, any Bhāva can become Rasa 70, 114, 115, 117, 118, 122-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bliss, difference in degree in the different Rasas 156
Brahman 49, 139
äämbana of Sánta 49
devatā of Sánta 50
naṭa compared to 44
ultimate basis of Rasa 157, 170, 176
Brahmānanda, rasāsvāda akin to 157
Brāhma Rasa 51, 55, 56, 144
Brāhma Vṛtti 51
Buddha, Buddhistic 35, 49, 50
Caitanya 130
, alaṅkāra sāstra by followers of 130-6
Caitanya Cult 36

Dance 3, 4, 5
Dance-Drama in temples 1
Dāsya 130, 136
Dayā Vīra, see under Vīra.
Dharma 17, 19, 150, 151
(See also under Puruṣārthas.)
Dharmākhyāna purāṇa 19
Dhārma Vīra, see under Vīra.
Dhārma Śrīgāra, see under Śrīgāra.
Dhāra lalita 122
,, sānta 122
Dhīrodātta 122
Dhīrodāttā 122
Ḍima 3, 9
Drama
, appeals differently to different spectators 17, 18, 30
, as entertainment 20
, as vehicle of spiritual education 22
, compared to Māyā 44
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jatisvāra, a dance-composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jātynāga (music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīvanmukta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jñānāmārga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaisıkī vṛtti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See also under Trivarga and Puruṣārthas.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;avasthās, ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, mokṣa kāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāraṇas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārma mārga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārpaṇya Rasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karuṇa, synthesis of other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasas in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nātya sāstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, sāstra interpolations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14, 15, 16,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naught (South Indian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāyaka, four types of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, four Rasas related to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the four types of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīvṛtti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nītta-aṅgas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyāya (Darsana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, in the theory of Rasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laulya Rasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, spiritual instruction through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary vogue (Pāṛṣada prasiddhi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loka saṃgrahā (service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love, aspects of, Friendship, Affection, Loyalty, Attachment, Devotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhura Rasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage custom, provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māyā, drama compared to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māyā Rasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokṣa, see under Puruṣārthas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mṛgāyā Rasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nṛṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pada, (a dance composition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāravasāya Rasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṛṣada prasiddhi (vogue in literary circles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pindī bandhas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakṛti (character-type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, madhyama prakṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, uttama prakṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, several kinds of prakṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prasāma Rasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pravṛtti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107, 108, 109, 121,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122, 129, 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivarga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Puruṣārthas

| Pūrvaṅga (Citra and S'uddha) | 3 |
| Puṣṭimārga | 35, 40 |

Rasa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rasa</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>any Bhāva can become Rasa according to some 70, 114-118, 122-124</td>
<td>73-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definition of what Rasa is 17, 114, 126, 127, 128</td>
<td>73-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first treatment of Rasa attributed to Nandi-kes'vara</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only one</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period of chaos in the history of</td>
<td>125, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synthesis of all Rasas in one</td>
<td>163-179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rasas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rasas</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>additional Rasas,—see separately under Akaṇa Rasa, Ananda R., Anurāga R., Bhakti R., Brāhma R., Duḥkha R., Kārpaṇya R., Saṅgama Rasa</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sādhana</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śādhvasa Rasa</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saints, lives of, as theme of</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dramas</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S'āvite Saints</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S'ama, present in all Rasas</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samavakāra</td>
<td>3, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambhoga (separate Rasa)</td>
<td>55, 144, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saṅgama Rasa</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṅkhya, in the theory of</td>
<td>156, 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsāra</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsārin</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sānta Rasa</td>
<td>11-106, 157, 160, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- anubhāvas of 26, 49, 62
- as Rasarāja and Rasendra 23
- as the greatest Rasa 43, 44, 89
- Daivata of 49, 50
- elements of Sānta in Bharata's text 16, 17
- first treatment of the Sānta ascribed to Vāsuki 11, 12
- four phases of 53, 54
- Guṇa of 51, 52
- impossible in Nāṭya but acceptable in Kāvya 46
- inclusion of it in other Rasas (antar bhāva vāda) 48, 49, 75
- intrusion into Bharata's text 12, 13, 15, 16
- its relation to the eight old Sīhāyins 49, 81-84
- literature portraying 30-42
- love-treatment given to 81
- not the leading motif in literature 21, 44
- objections to Sānta as a Rasa 24-30
- postulated as a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sṛṅgāra</th>
<th>synthesis of all Rasas in 167-169, 175</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sthāyins</td>
<td>view that Vyabhicārins also can become Sthāyins and vice versa 70, 118, 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sthita prajñā</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suci (a name of Sṛṅgāra)</td>
<td>145, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukha Rasa</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svātantrya Rasa</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svara</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāla</td>
<td>3-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāttvajñāna (Ātmajñāna)</td>
<td>71, 72, 85, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple-Drama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple of Indra</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragedy</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivarga-vyūtpatti, end of drama according to some</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyāga</td>
<td>58, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>66, 120-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udātta Rasa</td>
<td>120-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uddhata Rasa</td>
<td>120-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujjvala (a name of Sṛṅgāra)</td>
<td>130, 145, 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urjvasvin</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vācikābhinsaya, modes of</td>
<td>71, 72, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vairāgya</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varṣa (a dance-composition)</td>
<td>110, 111, 120, 130, 131, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vātsalya</td>
<td>55, 144-147, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vipralambha (separate Rasa)</td>
<td>73-77, 130, 136, 151, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vira</td>
<td>48, 54, 73-77, 130, 136, 151, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāna Vira</td>
<td>21, 26, 28, 48, 49, 54, 58, 73-77, 82, 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharma Vira</td>
<td>48, 54, 73-77, 82, 112, 130, 136, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapo Vira</td>
<td>58, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyāga Vira</td>
<td>58, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuddha Vira</td>
<td>54, 58, 73-77, 151, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vira, of other kinds</td>
<td>76-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visṛṣṭādvaita</td>
<td>36, 37, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vṛṣṇakāla Rasa</td>
<td>140-143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vṛttis</td>
<td>2, 9, 16, 50, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyabhicārins</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śābhya and bāhya</td>
<td>152, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyāsana Rasa</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyūtpatti (instruction from literature)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western literary criticism</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yatamāna</td>
<td>24, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogin</td>
<td>77, 83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>