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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 He draws his data, it will be seen, from unpublished manuscripts as readily as he does from published works.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 sānta:

श्रृङ्खराहस्यकरणा रौद्रवीरभयानकः ॥
बीमत्साल्टुतशान्ताश्च रसः पूर्वरुदाहरतः ॥
Although Dr. Raghavan considers all these views more or less in detail, the main part of his discussion is concerned with the admissibility of śāṅta 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 śāṅta attitude found expression in literature quite early; and this is corroborated by the works of Asvaghoṣa even if, on account of its chronological indefiniteness, we leave out of consideration the Mahābhārata, the usual example given of the śāṅta rasa. As regards writers on Poetics, the earliest to recognise it definitely, so far as our knowledge at present goes, was Udbhāṭa. 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 Nāṭyasāstra 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 Nāṭyasāstra 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 *Sākuntalam*, 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 *srīngāra*. When we ask whether *sānta* 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 *sānta* 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 *sānta* 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 Mārīca’s hermitage in a manner which affects us most profoundly. But, however splendidly depicted, the *sānta 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 *sānta* 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 śānta 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 śānta 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 śānta 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 śānta 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 śānta mood is by no means uncommon; and the śānta 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' (Ātman) 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. Kunhan 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, Alarīkāra sarvasva of Harso-pādhyāya (?), 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 Aubhālārya Kṛṣṇa of Devarakoṇḍa is given as the author.
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

I

For long, the Rasas were only eight in number. The text of the Nātya 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 योऽ प्रयोगो भवतीष्ठसरसाश्र्यो नियुक्तः।
लक्षिताभिनयं तमथ भर्ता मर्त्ता द्रुमना: सलेकपालः। || II, 18.

Vararuci’s Ubbhayābhisārikā 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.

यस्यास्तत्तेऽ प्रथमं हृदशीनयोवनद्वैतिकान्त्यानि गुणानि सप्तः
चतुर्विधाभिनयसिद्धः, द्वारिणिश्रविभो हस्तप्रचारः, अष्टादशविचं निरीक्षणम्
पर्य स्थानानि, गतिद्रव्यम् (-यम्), अष्टौ रसाः, त्रयो गीतवादित्रादिलङ्कः
इत्येवमादीनि न्यूतान्नानि लदाश्रयेऽ अलंक्ततानि।

p. 13, Caturbhāṇī, Madras.

On the side of the theorists, the writers on Poetics, Rasas were only eight up to the time of Daṇḍin 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:

\[ \text{श्रृङ्खार-हास्य-करुण-रौद्र-बोहर-भयानका: ।} \\
\text{वीमत्साहुत सांजो चेत्याश्चै नाट्ये रसा: स्वताः: ।} \\
\text{एते ह्याणा रसा: प्रोक्ता हेतुप्रेपेन महात्मना ॥} \\
\]

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

And their Sthāyins are thus given:

\[ \text{रत्निसाख्य शोकश्च कौचोसाही भयं तथा ।} \\
\text{जगुप्सा विस्मयव्यक्ति स्थायिमावा: प्रकीर्तिता: ॥ Ibid., VI, 17.} \]

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 Nāṭya sāstra has created for itself. The very first verse says to the effect that *almost* the first exponent of the Nāṭya sāstra is Brahman:

\[ \text{नाभ्यशास्त्रं प्रक्ष्यामि द्रष्यणा ययुदावहे ॥ I, 1.} \]

And this Brahman himself learnt from S'iva. This legend is settled in later times and is mentioned by all writers. How far is this based on evidences within the Nāṭya sāstra itself?

To begin with, sage Bharata says that Brahman himself contemplated and created out of the four Vedas, the fifth Veda called the Nāṭya Veda. I, 16-19. S'iva is mentioned in the first chapter, for the first time, with reference to the Kaisiki Vṛtti. 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 S'iva. I, 45.
We hear of S'iva 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 S'iva. This Samavakāra, and a Ḍima called Tripuradāha, one of S'iva's own exploits, were staged there. IV, 5-10. After the drama was finished, S'iva praised Brahman and the actors and told them that the beautiful and varied Karaṇas and Aṅgahāras of the Tāṇḍava dance which He himself did every evening might be introduced into the Pūrvarāṅga of their drama, so that their plain (S'uddha) Pūrvarāṅga might become a Citrapūrvarāṅga. IV, 11-15. He called upon one of his Gaṇas, Taṇḍu, to teach Bharata the Aṅgahāras and Karaṇas of Tāṇḍava. IV, 17-18. Thus S'iva is the God of dance proper, while Brahman himself created Drama and won S'iva'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:


dhāḥ patyāsāmāṇṭeśāt sarṣamabh vīlaṃv v c
yugabhādaṁbīrī vāsānathābhēnesāpī ||

1It is this Amṛtamathana that Kālidāsa makes into the Lakṣmīśvayamvara in his Vikramorvasīya.
The story given above points to the historical fact that Dance existed first and that Drama was then created. Taṇḍu signifies the link between the two. The gods of the two, Dance and Drama, are S'īva and Brahman. So it is that Bharata, who represents the operatic dance-drama, says at the beginning—

प्रणयं चिरसा देवों सितामहेश्वरोऽ

and Abhinava adds here, in his commentary—

"एको (महा) विजिगीर्नास्यम्पर्यथिवित्ततिः देवः। भगवास्तु आनन्दनिष्ठतवा क्रियाशीलः सच्यादी नृत्तवतीति नाथ्येऽऽदुपस्कारिणि
च नृत्ते तदुपद्वऽऽ प्रदत्तिताति तातेवात्र अधिदीवं गुरू चेति नमस्कारः।"


Thus S'īva's contribution is Dance which served to beautify Drama—तदुपस्कारिणि च नृत्ते. 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.

एते बाष्ट्र रसः प्रोक्तम दुहिष्णुन महागुणम्।

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

...... तस्माचायांत्य नोदृवः।
तस्मात्यायस्तसा अद्यातिति पश्चाथवोऽऽ मतम्॥


These bits of legend have to be connected with some facts available to us, viz., that there are really big works on Nāṭya
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

which are current as works of S'iva or Sadāsīva and Brahman. Says Mr. M. R. Kavi in his Introduction to his edition of the N. S'. with the Abhi. Bhā. in the Gaek. Series:—“We have fragments of both Brahmacchandra and Sadāsivabharata.” Abhinava himself refers to the three authorities, Sadāsīva, Brahman and Bharata.

“एतेन सदाशिवब्रह्मभरतमतत्रयविवेचनेन ब्रह्ममतसारतात्पति-पादनाथ etc.” p. 8.

The upshot of the discussion here gives the noteworthy fact that, of the three works Sadāsīva Bharata, Brahma Bharata and Bharata's Nāṭya śāstra, the Brahma Bharata is the best and most important according to some. The Daśarūpakārikās, IV, 38 and 39, proving Rasa to be Sāmājikāṣraya, are quoted and attributed to Sadāsīva by S'araḍātaṇaya. 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 Sadāsīva and Brahman exist. Though from the internal evidence of the Nāṭya śāstra of Bharata we know of S'iva as having contributed Dance only, there may be a Sadāsīva Bharata dealing with all departments of Nāṭya. It is also likely that this Sadāsīva Bharata is of special importance for its chapters on Dance, on Tāṇḍava, its Karaṇas and Aṅgahāras.

Similarly Tāṇḍu, who, in the Nāṭya śāstra, simply passes the Tāṇḍava from S'iva to Bharata, may have some old Nāṭya work to his credit. There is some difficulty in understanding the name Tāṇḍu. In Ch. I, we hear of a Tāṇḍu who is one of the hundred sons of Bharata. (I, 26.) From Ch. IV, we know him as belonging to S'iva's camp. In Ch. I, 26, the text has a variant (p. 18. Gaek. 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.

“सवैत्र पाठे तण्डवशब्द एव युक्तः; ताण्डवशब्दव्युत्पत्तिविवशाल ।”  

It looks as if ‘Tāṇḍu’ was created out of the word Tāṇḍava. Surely, this Tāṇḍava was being done by Sīva before Tāṇḍu who, on Sīva’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 Sīva. We find in Mr. M. R. Kavi’s Edn., Vol. I, p. 90: ‘तण्डुभिविनिशव्भो (नन्दिभर) तयोरपरनामनी ।’ But in the MS. of the Abhinavabharati in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, we find the passage running thus:

‘तण्डुभिविनिशव्भो तयोरेव (?) नामनि (सी) ’  
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 Tāṇḍu and Nandin. The S’abdakalpadruma says that, according to Halāyudha, Tāṇḍu is a door-keeper of Siva,—S’ivadvārāpālavisēṣa. The Vācaspatya says the same thing and adds that it is a name of Nandikesvara ‘शिवद्वारपालविशेषेय, नन्दिकेश्ये ’ | ‘नन्दी भृगुरितिस्तण्डु: ’ | ¹ In the

¹ The explanation of Tāṇḍava by Tāṇḍu is not the only explanation. Bhaṇuji and Kṣirasvāmin, in their commentaries on the Amarakosa (Nāṭya varga, S’1. 10) give Tāṇḍava as being so called
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S'abdakalpadurma, we find that according to the Trikāṇḍaśeṣa, the other names of Nandikesvara are Nandī, S'ālaṅkāyana and Tāṇḍavatālika, and that according to Hemacandra, the other names are Nandī and Tāṇḍu. Kesava’s Kalpadrūkosā (Gaek. edn., p. 392, Sl. 117-8) gives Nandin, S'ālaṅkāyana, Tāṇḍavatālika, Tāṇḍu, Kelikila and Kūśmāṇḍaka as the other names of Nandikesvara. If Tāṇḍu were a name of Nandikesvara, he would be both the time-keeper for S’īva’s Tāṇḍava (ताण्डवतालिक) and the promulgator of the Tāṇḍava (ताण्डुना प्रोत्तत ताण्डवम्). But, according to Sarvānanda 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 S’īva asked to teach the Tāṇḍava to Bharata may not be Nandikesvara but may be some other Gaṇa of S’īva. Ratnākara’s Haravijaya, which is a store-house of information for the Nātya-researcher, mentions Nandīsā and Tāṇḍu as two different persons and the commentator, Rājānaka Alaka, adds that Tāṇḍu is one of the Pramathagaṇas of S’īva.

after its exponent, Tāṇḍu. Bharata (com. on Amara) says that the sage Tāṇḍa (not Nandikesvara, a S'īvagaṇa) promulgated the S'āstra which came to be called after him ‘Tāṇḍi’ (Neuter); and from this Tāṇḍi is Tāṇḍava derived. ‘ताण्डेन कृतं ताण्डयं नूतनाश्च तद्वयास्तीति भर्ति: (अमर्तीक्षेयाम्)।’ See the S'abdakalpadruma and Vācaspatya on Tāṇḍava. Sarvānanda’s Tilāsarvasva, p. 41, T. S. S. edn., pt. 1. ताण्डेन भूनिना प्रोत्ततरः . . . . . . ताण्डिण नूतनाश्च।

tadaksāstīti tāṇḍavam. To these derivations, Subhūticandra adds ‘ताण्डे (ताण्डे) भूनेनेति ताण्डवम्।’ Tāṇḍava is so called because, being a forceful dance (Uddhata), earth is stamped heavily in it. Vidyāvinoda Nārāyaṇa gives all these explanations. Rāyamukuta gives Sarvānanda’s and Svāmin’s explanation and adds: “तबिवातो: ताण्डवमिति दू कौयदी।”
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नन्दीशानिन्द्यकराहतुष्करेयृ मन्द्यः स्वतन्त्र सुजेतसे विभूत तश्च ।
आशारितेऽपरिकल्पितसामवेदपर्यायाःशोभमथ ताण्डवसम्भ्राप्याययु।

N. S. Edn., II, 20.

Com. तण्डुनामाप्रमथः । तण्डवं नाम गीतकम् आलम्पोक्तम्
अभ्यागायतः¹ ॥ p. 21.

From this it would appear that Nandin is the drummer and Taṇḍu 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 Taṇḍu and Taṇḍava.

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.

"—प्रकृतिप्राणीयं भरतः, रसाधिकारिकं नन्दिकेश्वरः— ॥"


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 Taṇḍava thus originally meant the song, to the accompaniment of which Śiva danced; the dance then came to be called Taṇḍava after its song. Such instances of dances getting their names from the songs, the Tāla of the song, etc., are common. Cf. Carcarī is a Tāla, a musical composition, a dance and also a spring festival in which the Carcarī is danced. (The Ratnāvali, I.) Cf. Jatisvara, Varṇa, 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. S'āradātanaya relates a Rasa-legend in Ch. 3, of his Bhāvaprakāśa in which Nandin figures and which legend he ascribes to Vyāsa.

‘व्यासप्रोक्तं मार्गेण कथयामि यथार्थतः’ | We do not yet know of a work of Vyāsa on Nātya. The legend given in the Bhāvaprakāśa is this: Brahman created the worlds at S'īva’s bidding and then contemplated upon the past and saw with his mind’s eye the doings of S'īva. Nandikesvara appeared before Brahman at that time and taught him Nātya and asked him to teach the art to the Bharatas, i.e., actors. Brahman created the art of representation, drama, with a past story of S'īva called Tripuradāha, a धिमा. The Bharatas staged this Tripuradāha and while Brahman was witnessing it, there came forth from his four faces four Vṛttis with the four Rasas, S'rṅgāra, Vīra, Raudra and Bibhatsa. Concluding this story of Rasotpatti, S'āradātanaya says:

व्यक्ता मुखेन्यश्लोकत्तमा हत्यूँ: शंकराद्य: ।

The S'aṅkara mentioned here is another puzzle. S'āradātanaya 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 ‘S'īva-Nandin-Brahman-the Bharatas’ and ‘Nārada-Bharata, the sage’. In Ch. 10, S'āradātanaya 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 S'aṅkara may mean S'īva himself and this would mean then that the Sadās'īva Bharata is the source of this story. A S'aṅkara is cited in Pārśvadeva's Saṅgitasamayāsara, T. S. S. Edn, p. 42.
The Bharatas wrote two works, one in 12000 S'lokas and another in 6000 S'lokas. The basis of these two is the Nātyaveda which is perhaps double the extent of the first of these two. The second work in 6000 verses is the present Nātya sāstra of Bharata and the Daśarūpakāvaloka quotes it by the name, Śaṭśahasri. "वदनहस्तीकृताप्यततम्—‘एवम्यथ सामात्य-गुणयोगेन रसा निपपल्ये’ इति | IV. (Vide Bharata's N. S'. VII, p. 80, Kāśi Edn.) Bahurūpamisra has quoted the former work in 12000 verses, the Dvādasāsāhasri, in his gloss on the Daśarūpaka.1 Mr. M. R. Kavi quotes the Yāmalāṣṭakatantra in the preface to his edition of the Nātyasāstra (Vol. I, p. 6, fn. 1.), according to which the Nātyaveda, which S'āradātanaya mentions as the basis of the two Saṅgrahas, is a work in 36000 S'lokās. Which of these two, the Nātyaveda and the Dvādasāsāhasri, is the work of S'iva and which, of Brahman, cannot be said easily. The latter may be the Brahmbharata 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 Śaṭśahasri of Bharata, the Nātyasāstra, which says that according to Brahman, Rasas are eight. S'āradātanaya fashions this text into the form of a later controversial text, and makes Padmabhū (Brahman) refute the S'ānta and accept only eight Rasas. We can

conjecture safely that both the Sadāsivabharata and the Brahmabharata knew only eight Rasas.

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

उत्तरसिद्धः रसानां या पुरा वासुकिनोदिताः

नारदयोच्चते सैवा प्रकारान्तरकल्पिता || Bhā. Pra., p. 46.

The S'ānta Rasa is accepted in this account.

रजस्तमोविहीनातु सत्त्वावस्थात् सचितत: ||

मनागतस्यशब्दार्थ। शान्तो रस इत्तीरिति: || II, p. 48.

Who is this Vāsuki? We already know of two serpents among Saṅgītācāryas, Kambala and As'vatara and we must add to them this Nātyācārya Vāsuki. S'āradātanaya quotes Vāsuki earlier also (pp. 36-37) regarding the rise of Raṣa from Bhāvas.

नानाद्रव्योष्ठेः पाकैः व्यक्तम् मात्र्यते यथा ||

एवं मात्रा मात्रविनिमेयः सह ||

इति वासुकिनाश्युकौ मात्र्यो रससंवंब्: ||

This verse is, as pointed out by the editor of the Bhāvaparakāsa, found in the Nātya sāstra of Bharata, quoted along with four other verses, with the words—'ववतिरत चात्र छैका: ||' ¹

¹ Thus, there are Anuṣṭubh and Āryā verses quoted by Bharata. These are called Ānuvaṁśya 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 Sāhityaratnakara, 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 निवेदा वा शमो वा अस्य स्थायीत्यवाच”


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 Ānuvaṁsya Āryās, on p. 328: “ता प्रता श्रायो: एकप्रथशक्तया पूवाचिश्च: लक्षणात्मेन जपितता: ।
मुनिना तु सुख संप्राहय सत्यस्यां निरवेशिताः।”
Udbhāta recognises the Sānta as can be seen from his Kavyā-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 Nāṭyasāstra 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 Nāṭya and accept it in Kavya only? What are their arguments and how are they met?
(vi) Who are the writers who do not accept the S'ānta anywhere?

(vii) What is the Sthāyin of S'ānta?
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 Nāṭya 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 Dehalīdīpanyāya, 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 S’ama which is given as its Sthāyin in the

\(^1\) In the K. M. edn. of the N. S., ch. 23, S’l. 3 has the expression ‘Nava rasāśrayam’ but the correct reading here is Bhāvara-rasāśrayam’ as found in the Kāśī edn. (ch. 24, S’l. 3).
interpolated S'ánta text in Bharata; Ānanda holds as its Sthāyin 'that happiness which is the annihilation of all desires'—तृणाक्षयसुखः.

"तृणानां विषयाणां य: क्षयः सर्वतोनिवृत्तिः तिरोधः, तदेव सुखम्" Abhinava, Locana.

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

"अनेनेव चाश्चेन न शान्ते कक्षन मुनिना जात्यज्ञको विनियो-क्षयते । तेन जात्यज्ञकविनियोगाभावात् असत्चयिति पञुक्तप्रमुः।"

Abhinava first argues for S'ánta 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'ánta is not found in Bharata.

If this is accepted, we can trace the way by which S'ánta slowly came to be accepted as a Rasa. We can even explore the possibilities of finding some aspects of S'ánta 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 Śānta-rasa. The absence of Śānta 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 Śānta. The Rṣī, the fourth Puruṣārthha or Mokṣa, the third and the fourth Āśramas of the Vānaprastha and the Saṃnyāsin—these were already parts and sublime parts of Kāvyas such as the Raghuvaniśa and Nāṭakas such as the Sākuntala. Bharata, himself a sage, gave the Nāṭyasāstra 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 Śānta-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 Śṛṅgāra 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 S'ama, it certainly means that Bharata has landed, though unconsciously, on the Śānta rasa. Bharata says and these are surely genuine parts of the text:

कविद्वर्णः कवित्वः कविद्वर्णः कवित्वः । I, 106।
दुःखार्तनं अभार्तनं शोकार्तनं तपस्विनाम् ।

3
The first given passage is referred to by Abhinava also in connection with the discussion on the admissibility of S'anta 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:

"प्रतीयत एवेति मुनिनाप्यज्ञीकित्यत एव 'कचिच्छम:' हत्यादि

ब्द्धता |"

Abhinava, Locana, p. 177.

Another instance of Bharata’s awareness of the element of S'anta 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—Vitarāgas—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:

तुष्ण्टि तह्नः: कामे विद्रोहः: समयाश्रिते |
अर्थेत्यर्थशराश्रैव मोक्षेश्वय विरागिणः: ||

XXVII, 59, Kāśī Edn.

Says Abhinava in regard to this passage:

"हद्यसंवादोदपि तथाविभित्तत्वज्ञानब्धविष्कारमावितानां भवत्येव,


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, Āsva. parvan, Ch. XIII, 16, where Kāma says of himself:

यो मां प्रयत्ने हन्तुः मोक्षमात्माय पण्डितः |
तत्स्य मोक्षरतिस्थित्य नृत्याभि च हसामि च ||

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, कौचिद धर्मः, by speaking of Dharma S'rūgāra and by pointing out that the old, the learned and the experienced respond to such dramas as are based on Dharmā-khyānapurāṇa 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'ruti, 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 Trailokyānukaraṇa, that there is no Jñāna which in not

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

न तत् 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'ānta 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 Bhayānakā, Adbhuta, etc., as their Rasa. These can appear only as Aṅga or Saṅcāri rasas. But the reason for the acceptance of Bhayānakā, Adbhuta, Bībhsāta, 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'ānta say, Ignorance, Avidyā, producing Rāga and Dveṣa which result in a network of psychology covered by the eight Sthāyins, is inborn in man ever since he began his migration in Samsāra and practically speaking, this Avidyā cannot be rooted out. That is, S'ama which is their absence cannot be obtained. The Avaloka on the Daśarūpaka says:

“अन्ये है बस्तुतस्याभावं वर्णयन्ति | अनादिकालप्रवाहायात-रागद्वेषोहरून्त्यमशक्यत्वलाव |” 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'ānta 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: क्रीडनीयकमिर्चामो हस्तं ग्रंथं च यद्र भवेत् | Bharata often says that Nāṭya is Vinodajananā. Bhāmaha also says that
though the Mahākāvyya depicts all the four Puruṣārthas, it shall predominantly inculcate only Artha.

अत एव शान्तस्य स्थायित्वेक्षणायां। जीवनलोहे विस्मये पारोपकृतिमधामा। फलवताः। अनेनवाश्रयेन नाटक-रूपः वक्ष्यते। ऋद्भिलासादिमित्र्याणे। (N. S', XX, 11.) इति। अनेन हि ऋद्भिलासमितिमत्वात्मां रसी चरितः सकल्लोकहत्य-संवादयुन्दरप्रयोजनं नाटकेत मित्रात्मात्मात्मान। एतच तत्रैव वर्ष-विघ्यमां। य।” Gaek. Edn., I, p. 339.

Therefore it is that the Candrikākāra, the earlier commentator on the Dhva. A., says that the Sānta spoken of by Ānanda is certainly admissible as a Rasa, but that it can appear only as an Aṅga rasa in the Prāsaṅgika Itivyṛtta and never as the chief Rasa figuring in the Ādhikārika Itivyṛtta. 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 Vidyādharacakraśānti 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.
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"आधिकारिक्षेत्र तु शान्तो रसो (रसो न) निवद्वर्य इति \nचन्द्रिकाकारः । तत्त्वहास्माभिषेकः पर्यालोचितम्।" 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 Asvaghoṣa’s Buddhacarita and Saundarananda starting the religious Kāvya, and his Sārīputraprakaraṇa and the allegorical dramatic fragment discovered by Dr. Luders, the religious drama. The Buddhaistic 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 Asvaghoṣa says that he wrote a Mahākāvya for Upaśānti and Mokṣa, mixing a Tikta-medicine with Madhu.

इत्येका व्युपशान्तेय न रत्ने मोक्षयांगवर्धेऽहँतः
योत्तृत्ता महागर्भजन्मसति काव्योपवारात्तुतः।
यन्नमोक्षालोकसन्धिद्वहि मथा तत्त्वकाव्यसंहकुः
पाँच तिल्पयुक्तोधिं मधुयुतं हयं कर्म स्याविदितः॥

. . . . . . . .

काव्यव्यापेन तत्त्वं कायितमिह मथा मोक्षपरिवर्तितः।

(b) The Jain work, the Vastuvijñānaratnakosā, 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 Turuṣkas in the 36 Rājāvams’as given by it. Albeit its Jain authorship, it gives only Eight Rasas,—अष्टि रसः: (Peterson III, p. 268a).

(c) There is a Jain work named Adhyātmakalpadruma by Munisundarasūri (end of the 14th and early part of the 15th cent.
making Sānta the Aṅgi rasa of the Ādhikārika itivṛtta. We know that there were Buddhistic writers on Nāṭya like Rāhula, who, as citations of his views in the Abhinavabhāratī show, had his own differences from Bharata. Further, the Jain Anuyogadvāra sūtra, placed in the fifth century, mentions nine Rasas, adding the Prasāntarasa 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 Prasānta (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 'पव कष्य रसा', the nine Rasas of Kāvyā (see below).

The Nāgānanda, the first and only specimen to which the early advocates of Sānta clinging, is a Buddhistic story. Sṛiharṣa had leanings towards Buddhism and if this king Sṛiharṣa is the same as the Vārtikakāra of the Nāṭyasāstra quoted in the Abhinavabhāratī (which, however, is yet quite unproven), it is likely that his Nāṭya Vārttika, which must have made A. D.), which is otherwise called Sāntarasabhāvanā. (Ed. Nirmaya-sāgar, 1906, with extracts from Dharma-vijayagāni’s gloss). The work says in the Pratijñāloka that Sānta is proposed to be treated in the work and in the next verse which is titled, ‘Sāntarasamāhātmīya’, the author describes the Sānta as Rasendra. The commentary describes the Sānta as "Sūmān Sāntanāmā Rasādhīrāja" and "Sāvarasasāra." Compare also the names of some other Jain works Sāntasudhārasakāvyā of Vinayavijayagāni and the Prāśamarati of Umāsvāti (see esp. Sl. 106 in the latter).
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उक्त-अनुक्-दुरुस्कचिन्तन, 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 Nāṭya 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 Sāma itself. Sāma, its critics say, is the total absence of all feelings and activities. Such a state of non-action cannot be presented on the stage.

“कामाधभावोदये नानुभावः ... प्रयोगासमवादित्वाच | न हि चेष्टाविपरस: प्रयोगोपय्य: |” Abhi. Bhā., p. 334.

This argument proceeds on a wrong assumption. The state of absolute cessation of action is only the climax, the Paryanta-bhūmi, and this certainly cannot be shown. But the Paryanta-bhūmis of all other Rasas also sail in the same boat. Sṛṅgāra 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 Gītā says:

कुर्यादिद्रामांत्यासकः चिकित्स्युष्मकसब्रह्मम | III, 25.

The Gītā 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 Saundaryalaharī, 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 Kāvyā. 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 Lakṣmīdhara 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.

“विक्रियाजनका एव रसा इति अष्टी रसा भरतमंते | ‘शान्तत्व
निर्विकारत्वात् न शान्तं मेनिरे रसम्’ इति शान्तत्व रसालाभावात्

It is clear from Lakṣmīdhara’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 Lakṣmīdhara’s views on the Sānta could be had only when we recover his Sāhitya work, the Lakṣmīdhara, mentioned by him among his works in the colophon at the end of his commentary on the Saundaryalaharī.

That Bharata has not given the Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicārins 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, Āsayasuddhi, etc. Its Anubhāvas are Yama, Niyama, the practice of virtues, penance etc. Almost all Bhāvas can be its Vyabhicāris. Abhinava adds the Vibhāvas, साधुसमागम, सत्तंपक, 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 S'raddhā will stand out prominently as more intimate accessories, Ābhyantara Āṅgas. 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 Dveṣa. We know of the eight Sthāyins only, as instinctive in man. Dhṛti, Mati, etc. are given as Vyabhicāris in Sānta but we do not know of Dhṛti or Mati helping Sāma. All the Dhṛti and Mati known to us is mingled with Rāga and Dveṣa and other mundane associations.

\[\text{धृतिमुग्धस्तुरिपि प्राक्तविषयोपरागः कथं शान्ते स्वात्} ।
\]


1 In ch. 6 (pp. 135-6) S'āradātanaya 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 Prakṛṣṭa 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.

न च अकिछित्रकरत्वमात्रेन तत्त्वज्ञानोपाये व्युत्पादनं विनेयं।

Ibid., p. 334.

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 Cittasamvāda in it. The Avaloka on the Dāsārupaka says:

‘अन्ये तु कस्तुत्तस्त्य अभावं वर्णयति। अनादिकालवाहायात:-
रागद्वेषयोरूपचेष्टामुच्यतः।’ D. R. A., p. 117.

‘न च तथाभूतस्त्य शान्ततरस्त्य सहुद्या: स्वाद्भिषीतारः सन्ति।’

Ibid., p. 124.

All these objections are raised and answered by Ānanda-
vardhana:

‘यदि नाम सर्वजनानातुभक्तगोचरता तत्त्व नास्ति, नैतावतासी अलोक-
सामान्यमहानातुभविनोविचित्रितचित्रित् प्रतिक्षेपस्तु 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 Sānta play is bound to appeal. To them, the Śrīgāra and Vīra plays will have little appeal. Surely, on that ground, Śrīgāra 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 Trivargavyutpati must depict Rddhi, Vilāsa, etc. So have all dramas done. There are no plays which have developed S'ánta. The Nāgānanda, which some hold as a S'ánta play, is plainly not so. For the end here is not Mokṣa, 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 Vīra and S'rūgāra, the former as Dayāvīra, stand out prominently in the Nāgānanda.

"यतु कैशिकागानन्दादेह शास्त्र्य स्थायित्वमुपवर्णितम्। ततु मल्यविभागागो आपवन्धम्महेत्तेन विधाधरचक्रसतित्वंप्राप्तस्य विहृद्यम्। न ज्ञातकुरूतिबिभावःमञ्चो विश्वारागापरागामङ्गलम्। अतो द्या-बीरोत्साहोत्यात स्थायित्व। तत् ग्रुःस्वाम्य अन्तःस्व चक्रवर्तिवादेश्य फलेन अविरोधत् ईम्पितेव च सर्व तत्तत्वाद्यैव भवेदित्येव प्राप्त।"

D. R. Avaloka, p. 117.

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.

"अत्रोच्यते—यथा इह तावत् धर्मादित्यतम्, एवं मोक्षोपि पुरुषार्थः; शाश्वेत स्वरूपित्वाधासाधिवुचि च प्राधान्येन उपायतो व्युत्पन्नम् इति समसिद्धम्। यथा च कामादिर्दु समुचिताधिक्षेत्रो रसादिसांदवाच्यः; कविनद्यापारेण आस्वद्योम्यतापारणाभ्याय प्राप्ति धिभवन्दश्वादवतः सामाजिकान् प्रति रसस्व श्रुत्सरिताय नीवन्ते, तथा मोक्षाभिधानपरमपुरुषांचिता चित्रवृत्तिः किमिति रसस्व नानीयत इति बक्तयययम्।" 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 Nīca-prakṛti Bhāvas; Uttama Sāmājikas do not have Cittasaṅvāda on seeing them. If Viṭas delight in Sṛṅgāra, Vītarāgas delight in S'ānta.
"हृदयसंवादोऽधि तथाविषयतस्मावज्ञानवीजसंस्कारबाधितानां भक्तेव, यद्वस्यति 'मोक्षे चापि विरागिणः' इति। सर्वस्य नैकृत (or न सर्वस्य) हृदयसंवादः, भयानके वीरप्रकृतेरभावावत्।" Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 340, [Gaek. Edn.

And Bharata also says:

'न चैते गुणा: सर्वे एकसिम् प्रेक्षके स्वतः: ।
उत्तमममध्यानां संक्षिणां तु संसदि ।
न शक्यमध्यमैज्ञातिमुत्तमानां विचेष्ठितम्॥
तुष्पित तरणा: कामे विदभा: समयाश्रिते ।
अर्थेम्यराशैव मोक्षेष्वथ विरागिणः॥
नानाशीला: प्रकृतयः श्रीः नाटथं प्रतिभिषितम् ॥

drṣtra बीमतसिद्धे नित्यदेववाहेये च ।
एवं भावानुकरणयोः यस्मिन् प्रविशेषः ।
प्रेक्षकः स तु मन्तनयो गुणार्थैरलब्ध्क्तः॥ ॥ ।

N. S'. XXVII, 56-62.

There is a continuous chain of literature that depicts the supreme Rasa of S'ānta. In Kāvyā, Ānanda argues in Ud. IV, that the Mahābhārata leads as the great epic of S'ānta. 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.:

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

(a) In the first Adhyāya of the Anukramanikāparvan, 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 Dharmasāstra in Vācyavācaka, it is a Mokṣa Sāstra in Dhvani.

(b) In Sūtra 32 of the same ch. Sauti says that the Bhārata is the story of the Lord Himself: शस्त्र ग्रहाठक्रममि नारायणकथामाम, ।

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

(d) युग्मिष्ठो धर्मवेदो महादृष्टि: ।

(e) 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: ‘शस्त्रितसः शब्दतिः’.

(f) At the end of the Anukramanikāparvan, Dvārakārastra who is grieved at the loss of his sons is consoled by Saṅjaya who has a hymn on Kāla, the all-devouring Kāla, on hearing which the old king got Dvīti.

(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:

विचित्रार्थपद्यानमनेकसमयान्वितम् ।
प्रतिपर्श वैः प्राज्ञेष्वरावयमिव मोक्षिष्म: ॥
ञामेव वेदित्वेषु । . भेषजः स्वर्गमेल्याम् ॥ 35, 36.

(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.

अस्मिस्मर्यम कामे निविक्षेपतेन ।
इतिहासे महापुरुषे कुद्रिष्ठ परिलेखः ॥ 19.
धर्मशास्त्रां सुण्यमर्यमर्यास्त्रीयं परम् ।
मोक्षशास्त्रां प्रोक्तं व्यासेनासितुलिता ॥ 25.
वर्षे वार्षेच कामे च मोक्षे च भरतश्च ।
नवद्रिकं तदयोग्यं यमेहास्तिः न कृतितिः ॥ 26.

(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 Nirvāṇa 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 Ābhiras:

ददशापि कटायं गाण्डीवत्स्य परास्तम् ।
संबुश्च चैव विवश्चाबासासांस्थपत्तस्तम् ॥
नासं श्रुवणकिल्लेण भावनासामिल्लस्तम् ।
हत्र निर्खेद्यापबो व्यासवाद्यप्रवोदित: ॥
भर्मरौं सामसाय सन्न्यासं समरोच्चयत: ॥ 361-3.

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

'हष्ट: अज्जेश्वरी विद्यानितिलामः, स्माहौचित्यात्, यथा रामस्य वीराङ्गेन पिलुराजां पालयत्: '  Gaëk. I, p. 339.¹  

Next in importance to the Mahàbhàrata are the two S'ånta rasa poems of As'vaghoSa, the Buddhacarita and the Vyåsa is Mokṣa, and that Dharma, etc., are for its development.  

द्र०पायेन सुनिना वदिनं व्यधायि  
शाश्व सहकृतसंभितमत्र भोक्: ।  
प्राघान्यत: फळ्ड्रा प्रभुतत्तस्य- 
ध्रमविष्ठि तथा परिपोषषितु प्रणीतम् ॥  

Abhinava's pupil, Kåsemendra, holds S'ånta as the teaching of the M. Bhàrata. He says at the end of his Bhàratamañjarì:  

क्लोदारत्वसुमुक्तस्या भुक्ता भुवं कौशो  
भनोर्वः प्रतित्त्वविषयविनियमो जीवव्यक्तकृत्ति: ।  
गोपैयिक्षिण्यी जीत्तस्य विजय: कल्ले: किता क्ृजय:  
तत्तत्त्वस्वर्णिं विचारं दुर्ध्वं शान्त्वे भनो गीततात ॥  

¹ The author of the Bhàgavata, in his criticism of the Bhàrata, says that in the Great Epic, Vyåsa had described 'Pravròtti' (as Purvapakṣa) so much and so well, that man who is by nature attached to it, has mistaken to Purvapakṣa itself for the Siddhânta.  

जयुर्वितां धर्मस्मृतोज्ज्वालात्:  
स्माहौवर्कस्य महान् व्यतिक्रमः ।  
यद्राक्षरो धर्म इत्तत: स्तियो  
न मन्यते तत्त्व निषांतां जन: ॥  

I, 5, 15.
Sāundarananda. The following is a list of other S̄ānta rasa kāvyas:

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

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


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


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

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


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

13. Sīladūta by Cāritrasundaragani; not a regular Dūtakāvyā.


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. Jñānavilāsakāvyā by Jagannātha. “This is an allegorical Kāvyā explaining the greatness of Vedānta.”


18. Mysore I, p. 246. Gītavītarāga (2 MSS.) by Abhinava Cārūkīrtiṇāṭidācyā. This work is called Bāhubalisvāmi Aṣṭapadi in a MS. in the Jain Mutt at S’ravana Belagola. This appears to be a Jain S’ānta Rasa imitation of the Gītagovinda of Jayadeva.

Among dramas, Asvaghoṣa’s seem to be the earliest to have S’ānta as their dominant Rasa. His S’ārīputraprakaraṇa deals with the conversion of the hero to the Buddhist 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, Kṛṣṇamisra (c. 1098) wrote his Advaita allegory, the
Prabodhacandrodaya,¹ 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:

6. Dharmavijaya. Ś'uklabhūdeva. Ed. Bombay. MSS. in many catalogues. For com. on this, see Peterson, IV, p. 27.

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 Kṛṣṇamisrā,—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. Anumitiparināyayā marriage between Anumiti, daughter of Parāmarṣa with Nyāyarasika; by Nṛsiṃhakavi of Triplicane, Madras. This play is of little philosophical interest; it is a logic-play, तक्षानाटक.

MDSC.² 12463.

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


15. Bhaktivaibhavanāṭaka, on Kṛṣṇabhakti; by Rāgaguru Vāhinīpati Mm. Jīvadeva, 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.

² Tanjore New cat. Vol. XIX, p. 55. Kalitāṇḍavanāṭaka may be a philosophical or religious drama.

³ 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 wellknown South Indian author is Nallādikṣita.

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 Yasas'candra.

Bombay Branch R. A. S. 1292.

18. Pūṛnapuruśārthacandrodaya, on the union of Ānandapakavallī and King Daśāsva (lord of the ten senses, i.e., Ātman); by Jātavedas of Visvāmitra getra. The author later became an ascetic. MDSC. 12540-1. MDSC. 14602 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 S'uklesvaranātha. The several systems of philosophy dispute here in a debate in the court of King Bhagavantarāya.


21. S'ivanārāyaṇabhaṇja mahodayanāṭika; an allegorical play from Orissa; by Narasimha misra who lived under the patronage of S'iva Nārāyaṇa Bhaṇja, Rāja of Keonjhar. The work ends with Jīvanmukti.


THE NUMBER OF RASAS


23. Mitra, Notices, 1607: Tärābhaktitaraṅginī 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. Svānubhūtināṭaka. MS. dated Sam. 1705; by Anantapanaṇḍita, son of Tryambaka Paṇḍita.

26. Vivekacandrodayanāṭikā by Śiva.

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


29. Jñānacandrodaya 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 Triveni, a prolific south India Vaiśṇava Brahmin poetess, daughter of Udayendrapuram Veṅkaṭācārya, author of a Yādavarāghavapāṇḍavīya.

1 Akalaṅka’s Aṣṭaṣaṭi, commentary on Samantabhadra’s Āpta-mimāṁsā, is introduced as a female character in this drama.
She lived between 1817-83 and was the wife of Prativändabhayaṅkaram Veṅkaṭācārya of Sṛiperumbudur.


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


33. The Bhartṛharījatyāganāṭaka by Kṛṣṇabaladeva varmā. Published, Lucknow, 1898. Ibid. 315.

34. Citsūrīyāloka by Nṛṣimha daivajña; allegorical drama in 5 acts. Vizianagaram, 1894. Ibid. 437.

35. ᾱḥāmṛgī or Sarvavinoda in 4 acts; dealing with Sʿrṅgāra, Bībhatsa, Hāsya and Vairāgya. By Kṛṣṇa avadhūta, a Ghaṭikāsʿatamahākavi. Bellary, 1895. Ibid. 315.

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


¹ [MDSC. 12548 and 12754: Prapanna sapīṇḍikaraṇanirāsa 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 Śīva and Viṣṇu. Rāmānujācārya’s career is dramatised in the Yatirājāvijaya or Vedāntavilāsa by Varadācārya of Kāṇcī. (MDSC. 12696-12700; Tanjore Cat. 4486; Mysore I, p. 281; Adyar II, p. 30a). Sivabhaktānandanāṭaka, 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 Śrīngāra figures as a character with Madhu, Viraha, etc. as other characters. Thus dramas on the life of saints and devotees are Śāntarasa plays. The Bhārtṛharinirveda Nāṭaka of Harihara (Kāvyamālā) 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.

श्रीहरिहरणीतेन भर्तीरिनिवेन्दनांभा शान्तरसपदानेन नाटकेन तानुपासितमैहे ।
श्रृंगारदिरनेकजन्ममरणश्रेणीसमासादितेः
एणीतक्ष्युक्तः स्वदीपकस्तैराल्म्बन्नेतरार्जितेः ।
अस्त्येव क्षणिको रसः प्रतिपलं पर्यन्तवैरस्यभूः
ब्रह्मदैवतसुलाल्मकः परमविद्यान्तो हि शान्तो रसः ॥ २ ॥

Even in dramas on Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and Sīva, 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 ParamadHVani.

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 Nāṭya sāstra. Lollaṭa certainly recognised it, for as will be seen in a further section of this book, Lollaṭa recognises numerous Rasas. If he had admitted many minor Bhāvas as Rasas, he must certainly have admitted Sānta, which his predecessor had accepted.

“तेन आनन्तेय्यधि रसाना पर्व्यदप्रसिद्धच्या एताितषोभ्य-लारिति वथं भद्योड्टेन निन्दितम्, तदव्येपना फरामुस्य (?) इत्यर्थम्।”


But Lollaṭa seems to have made a compromise with the no-changers in the number of Rasas by creating ‘Pārṣadaprasiddhi’ as certifying only a few as Rasas. This vogue in circles of connoisseurs, Lollaṭa says, speaks only of these as Rasas, as capable of portrayal on the stage (Prayoja). The ‘these only’ (Etāvatām eva) in Lollaṭa 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 S’anuk’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 Samyagjñāna or Tattvajñāna as its Prakṛti or Sthāyin. Ch. VII, 3. He describes it in S’ils. 15-16, in Ch. XV:

सम्यक्ष्णांस्मक्रमेण: शान्तो विगतेच्छनाधयको भवति ।
सम्यक्ष्णां विषयों तमसो रागस्य चापगमात् ॥
जन्मजरामरादित्राः सैरामवासना विषये ।
क्रस्तुः क्षयोरिन्द्रचलेशावित्ति त्रय जायन्ते ॥

“सम्यक्ष्णां स्थायिमावः | विभावस्तु शव्दादिविषयस्वरूपम् ।
अनुभावो जन्मादित्रासादयः ||” Namisādu, p. 166. K.M. No. 2.

Namisādu adds that it is improper to deny the existence of S’ānta as a Rasa.

“कैंक्रमेच्छनांस्मक्रमेण: रसलं नेष्ट्रेम् | तदुपज्ञम् | भावादिकारणानामत्राम्पि विश्वमानल्वात् ॥” ibid.

Ānanda recognises the S’ānta, illustrates it with the Nāgānanda and gives तृणाक्षयसुख as its Sthāyin. Rājasēkhara’s Kāvyamīmāṁsa might have recognised the S’ānta in its lost chapter called Rasādhikārika, since Rājasēkhara 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.

‘भोक्तफलं प्रत्य वरसपरमस्तिरनिष्ठ्वावति स्वप्नस्वस्यः प्रधानतमः ।
स चायमस्तुपयायमित्रतासन काल्यकौँकुङ्, अस्मात्मिथ्वा तद्विवरणे बुध-तर्कशृणितिनिर्णयः पूर्वप्रक्ष्यसिद्धान्त हत्यां बुधना ।’ 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 Abhinavabhāratī. Abhinava's predecessor and ancestor, the author of the Candrikā on the Dhvanyāloka, accepts the Sānta 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 Sānta. It grants that Sānta 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—नाथ्यशाल्काप्रवक्ष्यामि भव्यणा यदुदाइतम्—Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka imaginatively interprets this as suggesting the Sānta Rasa.¹ 'Brahmaṇā yad uḍāḥṛtam' does not mean the Sāstra which was delivered by Brahmana, but Drama which is compared to the Brahman or the Absolute of Vedanta. The Nāṭa 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 Nāṭa 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 Abhinavabhāratī.
Edn. I. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka seems to have accepted as genuine the Sānta text found in Bharata.

"—शान्तरसाक्षेपोऽयं भविष्यति । स्वं स्वं निमित्तामाश्रय शान्ता-दुर्योगमार्गं रसः।" इति। तदनेन पारमार्थिकं प्रयोजनसुकृम्। इति व्याख्यानं हृदयदर्पणं पर्यंप्रभृति। यदाह—

' नमक्षेलोक्यनिर्माणकवेशम्ब्रम्ये यतः।
प्रतिक्षणं जगतान्त्यमयोगरसिको जनः॥' इति।

Kṣemendra accepts it as can be seen from his Aucityavicāracarā, pp. 130-1. Following Abhinava and Ānanda, he considers Sānta as the Rasa of the Bhārata. See Sl. 3 at the end of his Bhāratamañjarī. While Ānanda considers Karuṇa as the Rasa of the Rāmāyaṇa, Kṣemendra considers that the Karuṇa itself is the argument for Sānta being the ultimate Rasa. See Sl. 1 at the end of his Rāmāyaṇamañjarī. Sānta is the Rasa of Kṣemendra’s Baudhāvadānakalpalatā and some of his minor works, Darpadalana, etc. Bhoja accepts it both in his S. K. Ā. and Sl. Pra. Most of the later writers accept it.

The writers who do not accept Sānta 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 Dasarūpaka, the model and source for many a later work on Rūpaka. Dhanañjaya and Dhanika, both refute it and argue for its impossibility in drama.

शममपि केचित् प्राहुः पुष्टिनिष्ठेषु नैतत्स्य ।

1 D. T. Tāṭacārya, M.O.L., misunderstands this S'ama, the Bhāva which is given here as the Sthāyin of Sānta, as something having nothing to do with Sānta and as something new and distinct
From this it would appear that Dhanañjaya denies S'ánta only in drama but accepts it in Kāvya. But, as a matter of fact, Dhanañjaya, as interpreted by Dhanika, does not recognise it even in Kāvya. 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'ánta with Nirveda as its Sthāyin, K. Pra. IV. S'ls. 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'ánta as accepted by Vāsuki. S'īṅgabhūpāla recognises only eight Rasas in drama and refutes Bhoja for holding S'ánta 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'ánta only in drama, since, in drama which requires the action of a Rasa through its Anubhāvas, there is no possibility of acting S'ánta Rasa, which, according to them, is devoid of all activity. The S'ravyakāvya however can describe the S'ánta Rasa, for what cannot be acted can at least be described. The D. R. Avaloka proposes:

'ननु शान्तरसस्य अनभिमेयत्वात् गयचि नाभेदनुपवेशो नास्ति, 
तथापि सुभाषितातिद्वित्तृतः सर्वेणामपि शाब्दप्रतिपाद्यताया विद्मानत्वात्
काव्यविविधतम् न वायते।' 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'ánta. He says incorrectly: "Dhanañjaya seems to accept S'ama as distinct from S'ánta 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 तावत्—

‘‘न यत्र दुःखं न सुखं न चिन्ता न द्वेषरागों न च काचिदिच्छा।
रसस्तु शान्तः कथितो मुनीन्द्रे: सर्वेणु मावेशु शमप्रदानः।’’

इत्येवेक्षण:, तदा तत्स्मीयोऽक्षरायामेव आत्मस्वरूपपरतिविवर्ण्यायां
प्रादुर्भावात् तत्स्म पुरूषेण अनिवर्शनीययत। तथा हि श्रुतिरिपि स
एष नेति नेति अन्यापोहस्तुपेणाह।’’ D. R. A., p. 124.

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

"युक्तविख्यवधायकवस्थितो यः: शमः स एव यतः।
रसतामेति तदस्मिन् सयाायांदे: स्थितित्वान न विरुध्दः।’’

S.D., III, 250.

"यथास्मिन् दुक्तीत्वमोत्त्युक्तः, तस्य वैष्णवस्तुलयतात्
न विरोधः।’’ ibid. III (under Kārikā 249).

Vedāntadesika also has answered this and other objections to the Sāṅta in the prologue to his Saṅkalpasūryodaya. See D. T. Tattacharya, J. O. R., Vol. V, pp. 32-3, where the passage from Vedāntadesika is quoted in full.

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

¹ This is evidently a verse from an old writer who accepted the Sāṅta 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.¹ 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 Nāṭya 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 Saṅcārin, though an Ābhyantara 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

² See Sāhityadarpaṇa, III.

Again

निरहङ्करस्मत्वायताराधिरथ नो ।

सवर्णकारमहङ्कर्रहस्तितवं ब्रजनिति चेतु ।

अब्राह्मायब्रह्मस्तिति दयावीरादयस्तवः ॥

See Sāhityadarpaṇa, III.
These are at best very prominent and frequently appearing accessories. We can say:

कस्यचिन्हान्तमेदस्य स तु स्यादुपलक्षणम्।

Dayāvīra, etc. may be some cases of Sānta, not all cases of Sānta. Sānta comprehends all the forty-nine Bhāvas as its Vyabhicārins. It cannot be included in anything. शुद्धज्ञप्ता, द्यावीर, विचिन्त्रत्वादिस्याव्यष्टक—these are, each of them, a kind or a case of Sānta; they cannot define Sānta. If in spite of the fundamental difference between Sāma and Utsāha, some want to include Sānta in Vīra, because both have Utsāha of a 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 Sānta and Vīra, the two are made into one, well can Vīra and Raudra be made into one, because both carry out the destruction of the enemy. This Antarbhāavavāda is dealt with at greater length in the section on the Sthāyin of Sānta.

Sānta is the Rasa of Sāma, or Tattvajñāna or realisation of Ātmā. The whole world may be its Uddīpanavibhāva. Its Ālambanavibhāva is, in cases of Bhakti or devotion, a personal God, and in other cases, the Ātmā or the Brahman. Those who have accepted Sānta give it all the Rasa-details which Bharata gives to other Rasas, viz., its Varṇa (colour), Devatā (presiding deity), Vṛttī, Guṇa, etc. The original text of Bharata on the Rasa-devatās reads ‘अहुतो ब्रह्मदेवः’ VI, 50. Abhinava says that according to the Sānta-advocates, the text reads thus: ‘‘वीरो महेन्द्रेद्रवः स्यात् बुधः शान्तोज्ज्वलोद्द्युतः’’ इति शान्तवादिनः केचित पठन्ति। बुधो जिन: परोपकारैः, प्रबुद्धो 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—S'ri Nārāyaṇadaivaḥ. The Alaṅkāra-sarvasva 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—Kundendusundararacchāyaḥ. So also did Abhinava say: according to him, advocates of Sānta changed the text ‘पीतश्रेयसुधुतः स्मृतः’ into ‘स्वच्छपीतौ शामादसुलौ’ ‘स्वच्छपीतौ शामादसुलौ’ इति शान्त्वालिनां पाठः’. 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 Sattvaguṇa.2 ‘शान्ते तु सात्त्वत्येव वृत्तिरिति—.’ 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 Kaisikī.

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 S'ānta of others, postulates the Vṛtti of this basic Brāhma as the Brāhmī vṛtti. In the fight of Viṣṇu with the two demons, Madhu and Kaitabha, in which incident arose the four Vṛttis, Brahmā was a spectator and Haripāla makes this Taṭastha Brahmā the source of his Brāhmī vṛtti. This Vṛtti he ascribes not only to the Brāhma rasa, but to S'ānta and Adbhuta also. Brahmā is the Devatā of Adbhuta in the old text of Bharata also. Brahmā is thus the Devatā of S'ānta and Brāhma Rasas according to Haripāla:

अधिष्ठाय रसानेतान्त पञ्चाजायन्त वृत्तयः ||
केषिक्यारम्भी ब्राह्मी सात्वती भारती तथा ||

. . . . . .

ब्राह्मी नाम भवेद्रृतः ब्राह्मशान्ताद्वृत्ताश्चयः ||
ब्राह्मी ब्रह्मोद्वा तत्र रोषा नारायणोद्वा: || Mad. MS., p. 19.

Regarding the Guṇa of S'ānta: Ānanda says that Mādhurya is the Guṇa of S'ṛṅgāra (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 S'ānta. Perhaps Prasāda may fit S'ānta, for, above all, S'ama is the tranquillity and transparence of the Cittavṛtti or Antaḥkaraṇa which has become tarnished with the dust of this world. Prasāda which shows the total absence of Rāga and Dveṣa is the nearest

Śaṅgīta 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 Taṭasthatā of Sānta. But Hemacandra considers that in Sānta, Mādhurya exists in a high degree.

‘दुर्लभतमाधुर्यं श्रृङ्गरे। शान्तकरणविप्रलम्भेषु सातिशयनं।’
K. A. IV, p. 201.

‘सातिशयनमिति—अवयन्तदुर्लभतमाधुर्यात्।’ Com. ibid.

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

“तत्र श्रृङ्गरे संयोगाल्ये यन्माधुर्यं तत्तोद्विश्वितं कहरे, ताम्यं विप्रलम्भे, तेभ्योद्विये शान्ते।” R. G., p. 53.

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

आहादकलं माधुर्यं श्रृङ्गरे दुर्लभकरणम्।
कहरे विप्रलम्भे तत्च्छान्ते चातिश्यान्वितं॥ 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.
III

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, Ṭṛṣṇākṣayasukha, Vairāgya, Tattvajñāna, 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 Cātu on a king named Arjuna. This Rasakalikā is identical with the Rasakalikā which is quoted by Vāsudeva in his commentary on the Karpūramañjari (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 Rasaratnakara 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, Rasaratnakara, Madras University Kanarese Series, No. 9, Ed. by A. Venkat Rao and Pandit H. Sesha 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.

"शमो वैराग्यादिना निविष्कारचित्तव्यः ्यथा—
‘अश्रीमहि बयं भिक्षाम् आश्वासो बस्तीमहि।
शयीमहि महीपुष्पे कर्भःमहि किमिधृःः॥’" p. 9, R. 2241.

What other things does he mean besides Vairāgya when he says ‘Vairāgya-ādinā?’ 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, Dośanigraha, Santoṣa and Tattvasākṣātkāra.

"अथ शान्तः—
विषयेयो बिरक्तस्य तत्त्वज्ञस्य विवेकिन: ्
रागादिनिविष्कारतं शान्तिरित्यभिषीयते ॥

सा चतुर्विधा—वैराग्यम्, दोषनिष्ठ्रः, सन्तोषः, तत्त्वसाक्षा: त्मारिता चेति।"

"विषयेयो नित्यचित्तजायम् . . . . ् रागाधमायो दोष-
निष्ठ्रः . . . . ् तृणोमुन्मुन सन्तोषः . . . . ् तत्त्वसाक्षा: ्॥" 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 Saṅgītasudhākara 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.

श्रृण्डार हास्यनामा च बीमस्तः करणस्तथा ||
वीरे मयानकाद्वानो रैद्रायस्याद्वृत्तसंज्ञक: ||
शान्तो ब्रह्माभिवधः पश्याद् वायस्ल्याल्यस्तत: परम् ||
सम्मोगो विषलाम्भः स्वाद् रसास्वेते व्रोदेश ||

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

What his new Rasas, Sambhoga and Vipralambha, are and how they differ from the first, viz., Śṛṅgāra—their 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 Sānta. What are these two Rasas, Brāhma and Sānta 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:

आहादः प्रथम नर्मः जुगुप्सा शोक एव च ||
उत्साहदैत्यः कोशोधर्व विस्मयस्तदन्ततरम् ||
निर्वेदः तथा नन्दः प्रीति रत्नरति तथा ||
प्रत्येकं स्थायिनो भावः कमात् प्रत्येकमिरिता: || p. 17, ibid.

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

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

सम्भोगो विषममभ्र प्रांशातीति यथो रसा: ||
अतिरिक्ता उदारवं दुरिरालमहीणुजा || p. 17.

. . . . .

श्राशो नाम रस: सवीपद्योतीण्णूपक: ||
नित्य: स्थिरोक्त एवायं पार्थ्यवेन प्रकरितित: || p. 18.

From the latter verse we have to take that Haripāla distinguishes the Sānta 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 Tattvajñāna to be the Sthāyin of S’ānta, Abhinava quotes the verse श्रवा दुर्घो!नद्वान् 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 PRAPAṆCAHṚDAYA

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

"तदेतत्त्व (नाख्र्म्) अष्टभावानां नवरसानाम् आष्मन्तिः सः। ते
च प्रदर्शितः—"

रत्निःस्थः शोकः कौघोत्साहः सर्वं तथा.
जुगुप्सा विस्मयःवेवत्याः भावः प्रकीर्तितः।
शुद्धार्थस्थुतःचरणा वीररौद्रमानकः।
बीमतस्तर्दुःश्चनान्ताथः नव नाख्र्यरसः: सम्यतः।"

इति। तत्त्वात्यः भावः: पूर्वालः। तदुदचर्यरसः नवरसः।
तद्धभावानामभावो नवम इति केचिदाधुः। तदसमस्तसमः। नाख्र्याश्चे
नवरसानामभुपमात्। अत: सवैन्द्रियोपरमलक्षणः शान्तो नवमसः।"

pp. 55—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 Prasānta Rasa thus:

'प्रशाम्भर क्रोधादिजित्वा लक्ष्यरहितो भवत्यनेनेति प्रशान्तः। परम-गुरुवचः अवविधिदेवसमस्मुक्तित उपशममयार्त्तमा प्रशान्तो रस इत्यलं विष्टिरेण’

The text describes and illustrates the Prasānta thus:

निद्रोसमणसमाहाणसंभो जो परसंतभावेनम्।
अविकाररक्षणो सो रसो परसंतो तिरणयति।

प्रशान्तो रसो जहा—

सम्भावनिभिंगां उवसंतपरसंतसोमविधौ।
हि जह मुणिजो सोहहु मुखकलं पीवरसरीविभ।

छाया

निद्रोसमण: समाधानसंभवो यो: प्रशान्तभावेन।
अविकाररक्षण: स रस: प्रशान्त इति ज्ञातव्य:।

प्रशान्तो रसो यथा—

सद्माविनिविकारम् उपशान्तप्रशान्तसौम्यद्वीकम्।
पद्य यथा मुखे: शोभते मुखकलं पीवरश्रीकम्।

Besides this Prasānta Rasa, the commentator explains that the Vīraraśa 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 Prasānta are Rasas which are not brought into existence by any “Sūtradoṣas” like Anṛta, Parahiṃsā, etc. Yuddhavīra involves Paropaghāta, destruction of others; Adbhuta is roused by ‘hyperbole’, Atisayokti, which is a species of falsehood. More of this later.
IV

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 नास्त्येव शान्तो रसः। तस्य तु स्थायेव नोपदिष्टो मुनिनः’ इत्यादिः।”’ 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 Anuṣṭubhs enumerating the Rasas and the Sthāyins.

“श्रुक्कार + वीभत्साद्वृतसंज्ञी चेत्यशैव नाखं रसं: स्मृता:” became “श्रुक्कार + वीभत्साद्वृतशान्ताः नव नाखं रसं: स्मृता:” ।

And “जुगुप्सा विस्मयश्वेति स्थायिमावः प्रकृतिता:” was read as “जुगुप्साबिस्मयश्चम: स्थायिमावः प्रकृतिता: ||”
Abhinava has these remarks on these two texts:

"शान्तापलापिनिन्दः अष्टाविरि तत्र पठन्ति।"
"तत्र शान्तस्य स्थायी 'विस्मयश्रमा: ' हति कैद्धितं पठित:।"

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 Kāsī editions of the N. S'. do not have the section on S'ānta in Ch. VI. In this interpolated section, S'āma is given as the Sthāyin of S'ānta:

"अथ शान्तो नाम शमस्थायिभिमात्मको भोक्षप्रचर्च: ||""

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 चिरस्नपुस्तकेषु स्थायिभावानु रसवर्गापनेापाये इत्यन्नतरम् 'शान्तो नाम शमस्थायिभिमात्मक: ' इत्यदिशान्तत्त्वक्षण पठते ||"

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'ṛṅgāra. There is no doubt on this point that the section on S'ānta opened the section on Rasas and appeared even before S'ṛṅgāra, 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
Sānta, being Alaukika and free from worldly links, Sānta is the greatest Rasa and hence it is that it is dealt with at the very beginning.

"—हित्यस्य (शान्तस्य) सर्वमर्क्कुलिवाभिधानाय पूर्वमर्क्कुलिवाभिधानम्।"

Who may be the author responsible for introducing the Sānta texts in the N. S.'? It is not possible to say anything definite. All we know now is that Udbhata, the earliest of the now known regular commentators on Bharata, accepts the Sānta 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 Sānta.

For those who believe in the genuineness of these texts on Sānta as Bharata's own, there is no difficulty in answering the objection that Sānta 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 Sānta and described Sānta as the greatest Rasa.

One of the main objections against S'ama being accepted as the Sthāyin of Sānta 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 Sānta 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 Sānta are synonymous and the former cannot be the Sthāyin of the latter. S'ama and Sānta differ even as Bhaya and Bhayānaka, Vismaya
and Adbhuta and Häsa and Häsy. The former is Laukika, the latter Alaukika. Says Abhinava:

शमशान्तयो: पर्यायतं तु हासहस्याभ्यां व्याह्यात्म। सिद्धसाध्य-  
तया यदलौकिककल्येन (लौकिकालौकिककल्येन) साधारणसाधारणतया च  
वैलक्षण्यं शमशान्तयोरपि सुर्ममेव। Gaek. Edn., I, 336.

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

“एतदपि न सहन्ते, शमशान्तयो: पर्यायत्वात् (१), एकाख-  
पद्धारश्चाद्वा इति सङ्क्यायागात् (२)।” p. 333, ibid.

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

सम्यग्ज्ञानपत्ति: शान्तो विगतेच्छनायकों भवति।  
सम्यग्ज्ञानं विष्णुं तमसो रागस्य चापगमात्।॥ Ch. xvi, 15.  
सम्यग्ज्ञानं स्थायिभावः—Namisādhu.

Evidently Rudraṭa 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 Samyagjñāna as the Sthāyin of S'ānta. If Samyagjñāna means the realisation of the self, it becomes the causal antecedent of S'ama. Samyagjñāna 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 Samyagjñāna and S'ama. Under Rudraṭa's verse enumerating the Rasas, Namisādhu enumerates the Sthāyins, the Vyabhicārins, 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 Lollāṭa and S'ānkuka. Some of the views on the Sthāyin of S'ānta mentioned in the Abhinavabhāratī 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 Trśnākṣayasukha as its Sthāyin. He says:

'शान्तश्च तृणाक्षयसुखस्य य: परिपोषः तत्क्षणो रसः प्रतीयत एव। तथा चोकम्—

“यथ्य कामसुखं लोके यथ्य दिव्यं महत् सुखम।
तृणाक्षयसुखस्यैं नाहेत: षोडशीं कलाम्॥”

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

The Locana:

“तृणानां विषयाणां य: क्षय: सर्वतोनित्रूतचिरुपः निरोधः तदेव सुखं तत्स्य य: स्थायीभूतस्य परिपोषः रस्यमानताःक्षतः तदेव क्षणं वस्य स शान्तो रसः॥”

This non-acceptance of S'ama shows that Ānandavardhana 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—Trśnā-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 Trśnā as an Upalakṣaṇa for all Bhāvas, this Sthāyin will become identical with the S'ama or the Praśama,
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:

"अस्य च शान्तस्य अहंकारप्रमेयकरुपतया स्थितेः।" p. 177.

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


The Locana informs us that there were some who, not satisfied with Trṣṇākṣayasukha, gave the complete death of all the Cittavṛttis, the modifications of the mind, as the Sthāyin. Abhisava 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.

अन्येतु सर्वंचित्त्वित्रिप्रमाण एवास्य स्थायीतिः मन्यन्ते। तत्बालसः।
भास्य प्रसज्यप्रतिपत्तिमृगकर्त्ते चेतोद्रतात्वाभावेन भावत्वयोगाः। पर्यंतासे
तु अस्मत्वक्ष्म 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 Tṛṣṇākṣaya. While Anupajātaviseṣa-cittavṛtti is a state of Prāgabhāva of Tṛṣṇā etc., Tṛṣṇākṣaya refers to a state of the Pradhvamsābhāva of Tṛṣṇā etc. The extermination of Tṛṣṇā is the natural process; we see in experience the polluted Citta gradually clearing.

इति भरतवाक्य द्यष्वन्तः सर्वसामान्यस्वभावं शान्तमाच्छाणा अनुपजात-विशेषान्तरं विचिन्तित्क्रियं शान्तस्य स्थायिमावं मन्यन्ते। p. 177.

Bhoja gives Dhṛti as the Sthāyan of Sānta in his Sarasvatiḥkaṇṭhaḥbharana. pp. 514-515.

6. Dhṛti.

"—धृतिस्थायिभावः वस्तुत्वालोचनादिभिः व्यभिचारिभिः। वागारम्भादिविभिरनुष्ठानान्। निप्पञ्चः शान्त इत्यभिगीते। ¹

अन्ये पुनर्भव शमं प्रकृतिमामनन्ति, स तु धृतेरव विश्वेषो भवति।"

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

सबौः सम्भवतयस्तस्य सन्तुष्ट्य यस्य मानसम्।
उपायदूपदस्य ननु चर्मास्त्रूतैव भूः।

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

¹ See also the Sāhitya mimāṃsa, 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.¹ In the S'rṅgāraprakāśa Bhoja discards Dhṛti and holds S'ama as the Sthāyin.

“अन्तः च शर्मप्रकृतः: श्रान्तः: etc.”


Dhṛti is mentioned by Bharata as a Vyabhīcārin and in Ch. 7, Vijñāna, S'ruti, S'auca, Ācāra and Gurubhakti 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.

अष्टोपजीविनामथों धृतिरुद्धिमचेतसाम् । Gaek. Edn., I, 112.

This Dhṛti may refer generally to the balm-like effect Drama has. Abhinava takes it as ‘Dhairya’, 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 Abhinavabhāratī. 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

¹This 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:

“तत्त्वज्ञानजो निर्वेदोस्य स्थायी | एतदेशेव उभयमूलोपजीविभ-स्थायपनात अम्मज्ञमूलोक्तवसी पूर्व निर्दिष्टः |” Gaek. Edn., pp. 269-70.

“य च चासो तथाभूता (मोक्षाधिनाकन्तपरमपुरुषारंभेऽचिता) चिन्तितः: सैवा च (शान्ते) स्थायिभावाः | एतचु चिन्तयः, किवामासो? तत्त्वज्ञानो- थितो निर्वेद इति केवितः | तथा हि—दारिद्र्यादिरिमभवो यो निर्वेदः: ततोज्ञ एव, हेतोत्तत्त्वज्ञानस्य बैलक्षण्यात् | स्थायिसद्धारिमध्ये च एतदेश-मेवार्य पठितः: अन्यथा माजज्ञिको मुनि: तथा न पठेत्।” ibid. p. 334.

The problem that has to be faced first is the postulation of S'ānta as a Rasa. The first objection against it is that Bharata has not given its Sthāyin. To answer this criticism, certain advocates of S'ānta say that Bharata has given the Sthāyin of S'ānta in his text; it is Nirveda. But how did these advocates of S'ānta 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 Vyabhicārinis 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 (अम्मज्ञमूल निर्प्रयति). 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 किंवेददेह नाम दाैरित्रध्वन्यवचनानांक्षेपपुक्ष्ठतांसन-ष्ठजनवियोगतत्त्वज्ञानातिदिशि: विभावै: उपश्यते। Gaek. Edn., I, p. 357.

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 Sārṅgadeva

स्थायिः स्थान्त्रिकवेणेव तत्त्वान्तरोपमवद |
इष्ठानिष्ठित्वियोगाकसिद्दतत्त्व व्यभिचार्यसौ || Saṅgītaratnākara.

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:

तत्त्वज्ञानज्ञध निर्वेदः स्थाययत्वरोपमदाः | भाववेच्यसहित्यभयो
रस्त्यादिभयं व परमः स एव हि स्थाययत्वराणामुपमदाः ||

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

Mammaṭa accepts Nirveda as the Sthāyin.

“निवेद्याभ्यास्य अम्बङ्गताय व्याहित्वः वरदपि उपादानं व्यभिचारिनकोटेदपि स्थायित्वाभिधानार्थम्। तेन—

निवेद्याभ्यास्य: शान्तोदपि नवमो रसः।”

Mammaṭa does not say that this Nirveda is Amaṅgala, but says it is ‘Amaṅgalapṛāya’. As a matter of fact, Nirveda born of Tattvajñāna is the greatest Maṅgala. Says Bhaṭṭa Gopāla in his gloss here:

“तत्त्वचिन्तायो तु निवेद्यान्न किंविदमक्रमङ्गतायतम्, प्रत्युत मक्रमङ्गत्वमित्याह।” T. S. S. Edn. K. Pra., p. 138.

This shows how trivial this argument for Saṁta based on Maṅgalavāda is. Another difficulty in this argument of ‘Maṅgala-Amaṅgala’ is the question why there should be any Maṅgala when the enumeration of the Vyabhicārins begins. No doubt, there is the habit of Madhya-maṅgala among writers, but why should that Madhya-maṅgala 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 Dehalīḍipa, 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 S’oka 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, according to the circumstance, become any of the three. This is the pre-Abhinvagupta view of the nature of the forty-nine Bhāvas and the names Sthāyin, Vyabhicārin and Sāttvika. As a consequence of this view, there grew a tendency which expressed itself from the times of Rudraṭa and Lollaṭa 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 Vyabhicārins of Rati where he mentions Jugupsā, a Sthāyin, as one of the prohibited.

Vyabhicāriṇḍhāsya āstambhāyogajugupsāvajj: |


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

जगुप्सां & व्यभिचारित्वेन श्रुत्वर निगत्नुमिन: भावान्त सर्वेशतंवेव
स्थायित्वाविशारित्वचिन्तनाचावस्त्व (चिच्छलम्)¹ अनुभवतवानि योग्यतेप-
निर्षितानि शब्दार्थार्थवल्क्कृतानि अनुजानति | Abhi. Bhā., p. 334.

¹ Means Sāttvikatva.
Abhinava criticises this view. He does not accept the Nirveda born of Tattvajñāna as the Sthāyin of S'ānta. 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. Is'varakṛṣṇa 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.

‘वैराग्यात् प्रकृतिलय: ’। Sām. Kārikā, 45.

Says the Vṛttī of Gauḍapāda here:

यथा कस्यचिदैराग्यमस्ति, न तत्चज्ञानम्, तत्मादिज्ञानपूपिता-द्वैराग्यात् प्रकृतिलयः। मृत: अद्यासू प्रकृतिपू प्रधानवुद्वचद्वहस्तांत्माग्रेषु

वीयते, 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: तत्परं पवश्यातेर्कुणवैवृत्त्रूपम्। But Vyāsa, in his Bhāṣya
on this Sūtra, says that such Vairāgya is really Jñāna: 
(Ānandāśrama Edn., p. 20.) 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 Sānta.

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 Sānta 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. दुष्या दुम्मोदनह्यान् etc. Such Nirveda can be a Bhāva only.

The advocate of Nirveda quotes now Akṣapāda against Patañjali. Akṣapāda, he states, says in his Nyāya Sūtra 1, i, 2 that the removal of Mithyājñāna, 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 Sānta), 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 Sānta. 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'antā.

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

'उत्साह एवास्य स्थायीत्वन्ये |' p. 269.'

How did some writers come to hold Utsāha as the Sthāyin of S'antā? 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'antā. So much so that some antagonists of S'antā say that there is no need for a ninth Rasa named S'antā and that the situations in discussion come under Dayāvīra.

1 तत्र शान्तस्य स्थायी ‘विस्मयशामा’ इति कैथित, पठित:। उत्साह एवास्य स्थायीत्वन्ये। ज्युप्सेन्ति कैथित। सर्व हत्वेके। तत्त्वशान्हो निर्मितेदास्य स्थायी... ह्यपरे।''


ज्युप्सां शान्तिभिमावं तु शान्ते कैथिताभिधरे। उत्साहामहादृष्टिभेदे शामम, सर्वान्ते परे हिदु:। . . . . निर्मितेदास्य स्थायी शान्ते महेते।

S'ārūgadeva, Saṅgitaratnākara.
Nāgānanda is a Dayāvīra play. The Sthāyin of Dayāvīra, as of other Vīras, 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 Raghuvamsa (Sls. 19-23; from अनयत् प्रभुकतिस्तम्पदा to इति शत्रुषु चेन्द्रियेऽषु च.) Subrahmanya Sudhīḥ explains at length in his commentary, the Prauḍhaprakāśa, 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 Nirveda, who made the mistake of voting a Vyabhicārin to a Sthāyin’s place and hence felt their position beset with many difficulties.

1 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.

"नम्बेवं द्वावीरं ज्ञर्म्बीरो दानवीरो वा नासीं कवित्। शान्तस्त्रेष्वें नामान्तर-करणम्। तथा च मुनि:—
‘दानवीरं ज्ञर्म्बीरं युद्धवीरं तथैव च।
रसं वीरसमपि प्राह ब्रह्म त्रिविषिष्टमितम्।’

इखागममुरसरं श्रृविध्यमवात्मयात्।"” Locana, pp. 117-8.

Bhaṭṭa Gopāla, in his Kāvyā Prakāśa-vyākhyā: pp. 139-140, T. S. S:

"द्वावीरं इति शान्तस्त्रेष्वं नामान्तरकरणम्, चेन ’दानवीरं युद्धवीरं ज्ञर्म्बीरं तथैव च। रसं वीरसमपि प्राह ब्रह्म त्रिविषिष्टमितम्।’ इति श्रृविध्यमवात्म्यं मुनिना वीरस्वाम्य-वाधि।"
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

They had to resort to quibbling with auspiciousness-inauspiciousness, Dehatādīpanyāya, etc. The sponsors of Utsāha, like those of Rati and Jugupsā to whom we shall come presently, had the advantage of fixing one of the eight Sthāyins themselves mentioned by Bharata as the Sthāyin of Sānta also. But then arose the problem: how could one Bhāva beget two Rasas? The difficulty was overcome by accepting varieties of the same Sthāyin. It was even as Nirveda being made into a special species called Tattvajñāna-ja Nirveda, Nirveda born of the knowledge of Truth. Hāsa also has many varieties. Rati is divided into Sambhoga and Vipralambha.

The writers who held Utsāha as the Sthāyin of Sānta built on sand. They knew not what they were doing. The opponents at once undermined them by suggesting the inclusion of Sānta in Vīra. One of the main Pūrvapakṣas to Sānta is the possibility of its inclusion in one of the eight Rasas mentioned by Bharata. Ānanda mentions this objection and replies:

"न तस्य वीरिन्तंत्मावः कथूऽ युकः। तस्य अभिमानमयलेन व्यवस्थापनात्। अस्य च अहंकारमेतमैकत्रः स्थिते: इत्यते। इत्यते।" Dhva. Ā., pp. 177-8.

The Dasarūpakāvaloka says:

"अन्ये तु वीरबीमस्तादो अन्तर्भावो वर्णयति।" The real position of the Bhāva called Utsāha is this: Utsāha closely attends upon Ahaṅkāra without which there cannot be any activity. No Rasa is possible without these two elements. Bhoja pursues this line and discovers his
Ahaṅkāra theory of Rasa. But according to the rule of pre-
dominance, Prādhānyanyaya, it is Vīrārāsa to which this
Utsāha is connected most. This Vīra is held to have four
varieties, Yuddha, Dharma, Dāna and Dayā Vīras. 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 S'ānta.
Two such varieties are Dayāvīra and Dharmavīra which are
really names of two aspects of S'ānta. S'ānta 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
S'ānta. Dāna may stand for Tyāga also. त्यागने अमृतत्वमानम्:
Even Yuddhavīra can be a form of S'ānta: there are those
who fight religious crusades for the defence of their faith.
Similarly there can be a variety of S'ānta called Pāṇḍityavīra
which Jagannātha humorously introduces. Study of texts,
learning their true import and propagation of their teachings form part of S'ánta-activities. These produce Pāṇḍityavīra 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 Jīvanmukta and naturally, like God, he also stops not from untainting action for the sake of the world. The Lord says:

न मे पार्श्वस्ति कर्त्तव्यं त्रिषु लोकेषु किंचनः


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:

“स्वाजनि क भूतकृत्तस्त्य परार्थ्यांत्यामेव उच्चम इति उत्साहो-ज्ञान परोपकारविषयं च चांभायतत्त्वो दयापरयांवः अभ्यधिकोन्तरकः || अत एव तत् केवल दयार्थवें व्यपदिशान्ति, अन्ये धर्मवीरवें।”

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 Sānta and propose it for the place of the Sthāyin.\(^1\) ‘जूगुप्सति कैचित्’ Abhi. Bhā., Gaek. Edn., I, p. 262.

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

बीमत्: क्षोभणः: शुद्ध उद्रेगी स्यात् द्वितीयकः: ।
विद्याक्रमिकांसुगुप्ती क्षोभणो रुद्धरादिजः: ॥ 101.

Bibhatsa is of two kinds, Kṣobhaṇa and Udregī. But in the first line, there is an additional word S'uḍḍha. Commentators took it as qualifying Kṣobhaṇa and they distinguished the Udregī variety as Aśuddha. But Bhaṭṭa Tauta said that Bibhatsa is of three kinds: Kṣobhaṇa, S'uḍḍha and Udregī. The Gaek. Edn. gives a reading here which has 'स्यातूतीयकः:' for 'स्यात् द्वितीयकः'. Tauta explains S'uḍḍha 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'uḍḍha.
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But Tauta did not have the reading ‘स्यात् तुलीयकः’ for he interprets the text ‘स्याद् द्वितीयकः’. He says that though there are really three kinds, Bharata speaks of two, because of the rarity of persons having the Sūddha Jugupsā.

“द्वितीयक इत्यनेन तत्स्य दुर्लभ्भवेब अप्राप्तयुँ तुलितः”

ibid. P. 332.

So it is that some critics who do not want a separate Sānta say that, even as it is possible to include it in Vīra, it is possible to include it in Bībhatśa. The D. R. Avaloka says:

“अन्ये तु वीर्यभिमसस्तादौ अन्तर्भवं वर्णयति”

The reply to this is the same as to the argument which sought to include Sānta in Vīra. Just as Utsāha is a very prominent accessory of Sānta, Jugupsā also is. This Sūddha Jugupsā may be a prominent Vyabhicārin; but Sānta is not Jugupsātmaka. The Locana says:

“आदिमहें विषयजुगुप्सालेखानः वीर्यभिमसस्तत्तावं शक्यते। सा तस्य व्यभिचारिणी भवति, न तु स्थायितामेति।” P. 178.
The Abhinavabhaṭṭarati says:

"केवलं यथा चित्तवन्मे औष्ठवथम्, सम्बोगेदपि वा ‘वेमासमातो-
सवम्’ इति, यथा च रौद्रे औष्ठवथम्, यथा च करुणवीरमायणकादाभूतेषु
निवेद्ध्वितिसहस्रं: व्यविचारिणोदपि प्राधान्यनाभमासन्ते तथा शान्ते जुगु-
प्साद्याः: सर्वेषवै रागप्रतिपक्षीत।"

Another interesting view is that which holds the first Sthāyin, Rati, itself as the Sthāyin of Sānta

10. Rati. 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 Anātman 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, Ātmarati, 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.

सत्त्व सर्वां भूतानि आत्मनेवातुपश्यति |
सर्वभूतेषु चालमानं ततो न विजुगुप्सते ||

Like S'uddha Jugupsā, this is S'uddha Rati, a superior Love, distinct from the Rati of man for woman. Bhoja pursued this idea of Ātmarati and landed on the philosophical summit of the S'ṛigāra theory of one Rasa.

ङ्गो रसः स रसनीयतया आत्मरत्के: | S'ः Pra.
The Abhinavabhāratī records the Rati-view thus:

तत्र अनाहतानन्दमयस्वात्मविषया रतिरेव मोक्षसाधनमिति सैव शान्तेः स्थायिनीति ! यथोक्तमः—

'यथााँतररतिरेव स्यादात्मतस्वाभावाय मानवःः।' आत्मन्येव च सन्तुष्टः तत्स्य कार्यं न विषये ॥' इति (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.

'अत एव ईश्वरणिवाचविषये मक्तिशब्रह्म स्थायितिप्रायसांताहनु-
प्रविष्टे अन्यथवाक्षमिति न तयोः प्रयथमस्वलेन 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:

“अन्ये मन्यन्ते रत्यादय एवायौ चित्तस्वतिविवेषा उच्च: । त 
एव कथितिभावविविध्यतंत्या श्रुताचलोकिकविभावविवेषसंश्च: चित्रवित 
एव तावत्त । तत्वशः तनमध्याद् एव अन्यतथ मोहन्तर्गत्य स्थायः।”

11. Any one of the remaining Sthāyins.
It is in accordance with this view that some hold a variety of Vīra, Dayā or Dharma, Jugupsa for the world called S'uddha Jugupsā and Rati towards the Self called Ātma Rati as the Sthāyins of S'ānta. Abhinava elaborates in his Pūrvapakṣa that others among the eight Sthāyins have equal claim to be the Sthāyin.

"
"एवं समस्तविषयं बैठूं पस्यतः, विश्वं च शोच्यं १ विलोक्यतः,
सांसारिकं च द्रृष्टम् अपकारित्वेन २ पस्यतः, सातिशयम् असंमोहप्राणं
वैभवमाश्रितवत:; सर्वस्मात् विषयसार्थंद् विभ्यतः; ५ सर्वलोकस्पृहणीया-
दपि प्रमदादे: जुगुपस्मानस्य, ६ अपर्वेवत्वात्मविश्वासामात् विस्मयप्राणस्य,
मोक्षसिद्धिरिति हसादीनां विसमयान्तानां स्थायित्वं निरुपणीयम्।
न चैतन्यने: न संगतम्। याबदेव हि विशिष्टान् विभावान् परिगणयति
रत्यादिशब्देन च दवदेव च तत्कारानेन अन्यानु गृहीते, ताबदेव
तद्वचनरिक्ष-अलौकिकंहेतुपन्तानि रत्यादीनामुनि जानार्थवं अपवांस्विषयवम्।
एवं वादीन तु परस्परेऽव्यवहारायं एकत्र विश्विविरोधं
एव || तदुपायमेवदस्यं तस्य स्थायित्वमित्यत्वमानं प्रत्युक्तमेव।
स्थायित्रे-मेदन प्रतिपुष्यं रसस्मयायन्त्वथापते:। मोक्षकाल्वादेवो रस इति चेतः
क्षरोद्योग्यें बीररूपोद्योग्येन स्वातः।"

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 महत्वसम्मानवना,

1 Hāsa.
2 Sōka.
3 Krodha.
4 Utsāha.
5 Bhaya.
6 Jugupsā.
7 Vismaya.
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 Bhāṭṭa Bhallāṭa in a fine verse:

एतत्त्वं मुखात् कियत् कमलिनीपत्रे कणं पाथस:  
यन्तुकामणिरित्यमंत्र स जडः श्रणवेतदस्मादिप ।  
अहं गुल्यमानसक्रियाप्रविलियन्यादीयमाने शनैः  
कुत्रोढ़ीय गातो हेहेयुदिनं निद्राति नान्तःदूषा ||

So much on behalf of the importance of Hāsa in S'ānta.

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'oka seems to dominate in S'ānta. 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 S'ānta.

The very possibility of each or all of the eight Sthāyins being the Sthāyin of S'ānta prevents any one of them being the settled Sthāyin of S'ānta. 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, vis., 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 vicitrī 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 Sāṅgadeva says: Sāma is present in all the Rasas.

शम: सर्वसंपन्नति श्यैर्येतेऽद्व्यभिचारति। S. R., VII, S'1. 3535
and Kallinātha comments upon this:

‘अयमर्थः—लोके शुक्लारादिपु अद्यतु मध्ये यं कंचन रसमुभवत एव पुंसो जन्मान्तरसुक्खतिविशेषवशात् शम उत्तवत् हि तत्तदसम्भव्यात् शास्त्य 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
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considered as constituting together the Sthāyin, taking S'ānta as a peculiar case.


"अनये तु पानकरसत् अविभागं प्राशा: सर्वं प्रायद्योक्त्रवधय यादिन: ह्याह्। चित्तवृत्तिनामयुपमवात् अनयोन्यं च विरोधात् यत्रद्विनय मनोज्ञम।" ibid., p. 332.

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

"तत्त्वज्ञानक्षणस्य च स्थायिन: समस्तवस्य लौकिकालौकिकक्वत्रतिकलापो व्यभिचारितामभेति।" ibid., p. 338.

Rasa is developed from one and only one Sthāyin; if many Bhāvas appear, they can do so only as Vyabhicārins. The analogy of Pānakarasa 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 S'ānta? Abhinava holds that Tattvajñāna or Ātmasvarūpa itself is the Sthāyin of S'ānta. He briefly states it thus in his Abhinavabhāratī:

"कस्तत्त्वाते स्थायी? उच्चते—हेतु तत्त्वज्ञानमेव तावन्मोक्षसाधन-मिति तत्वेत्र मोक्षस्थायिता युक्ता। तत्त्वज्ञानं च नाम आत्मज्ञानमेव।"

"तेन आत्मेत्र ज्ञानजन्दादिविद्युद्धर्मयोगी परिकल्पितविषयोप-भोगरहितोश्च स्थायी।" Gaek. Edn., I, p. 337.
Earlier also he says:

"तत: बिवर्गतमकमद्वितिष्ठमबिपीरतनिवितिभिर्मात्मको मोक्षफ़लः
शान्तः। तत्र स्वात्माध्येन रसचव्याण्युक्तम्।" 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 Vyabhicārins. (Abhi. Bhā., p. 337.)

Therefore it is, says Abhinava, that Bharata mentions not this Sānta 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.

अतं एव प्रशृष्टमय गणना न युक्ताः। Abhi. Bhā., I, p. 337.

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

"विभावायगतिपदनं तत्स्य परमपुरुषार्थत्वया लोकयात्रात्मिकान्ततवात्।" 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 S'ānta by omission, by his eloquent silence.

"तेन आत्मेव ज्ञानान्दादिविशुद्धर्मयोगी परिक्रियतविषयोपयोग-रहितोत्र स्थायी। न चास्य स्थायित्वा स्थायिंत्वं वचनीयम। रत्यायो हि तत्त्वकारणातररोदवध्योत्थिर्माननिरूच्यमानान्वच: किष्किष्ठाकिञ्च अपि-क्षिकत्वा स्थायिरूपन्यथमितिसंश्चिया: स्थायिन उच्चायते। तत्त्वज्ञानं तु सक्कर्मान्तररोहितित्वानीयं सर्वेस्थायिभ्यं: स्थायित्वम् सर्वं रत्याविद्या: चित्तबुद्वी: व्यभिचारीभवन्तु निर्गत एव सिद्धस्थायिभावमिति तत्व बचनीयम। अत् एवं पृथगस्य गणना न युक्ता। न हि खण्डमुण्डयोऽयो गोलविभिः गण्यते। तेन एकात्मप्रज्ञाश्चास्त्रवा इत्यत्त्याहतमेव।"


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 S'ānta along with Rati, etc. is the difference between Ātmajñāna and other Sthāyins. Ātmajñāna 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 S'ānta itself which we gather from this discussion are:

1. Tattvajñāna or Ātmajñāna or Ātmasvarūpa or briefly the Ātman itself is the Sthāyin of S'ānta.

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 S'ānta Rasa.

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

"न चाल्य आत्मस्वभावस्य व्यंभिचारित्वम्, असंभवः, अवै-चित्यावहत्वात्, अनौचित्याच् | शम आत्मस्वभावः ||"

This Ātmasvabhāva is called S'āma.¹

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

"स्थायिनामापि व्यंभिचारित्वं भवति। यथा सर्वविद्विषयवा: | हास्यस्य श्रावाराहै, योक्त्य विप्रस्थमर्गाराहै . . . . . . | शास्त्रस्य कौपाभिस्हुद्तस्य प्रसादोद्वाराधै। |" T. S. S., Edn., pp. 11-12.

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

अथ शान्तो नाम श्रव्याधायन्नात्मकः etc.

Abhinava has said that S'ama is only another name for Ātmasvabhāva. When one speaks of S'ama or Nirveda both of which are Cittavṛttis, one has to qualify them as a special and superior kind to make them the Sthāyin of S'ānta. 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 S'ānta found in some recensions describes S'ānta 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 दु:खं न सुखं न भ्रेयो नापि मल्लसः ||
सम: सर्वेषु भूलेषु स शान्त: प्रश्नि: रसः ||
भावा विकारा रत्याचा: शान्तस्य प्रकृतिमतः ||
विकार: प्रकृतेजातः पुनस्त्रावृ ठीयते ||

that just as there are two different Nirvedas, two different Tattvajñānas, there are two S'amas. The Nirveda illustrated by the verse क्षयं दुर्योजनं ज्ञातवे 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-Sama.
Therefore it is that Bharata, says Abhinava, treated of Sānta at the head of all the Rasas. Further the relish of all Rasas is Alaukika, shorn of all mundane associations, and hence S'āntapraya. The bliss realised is akin to Brahmasvāda which is Ātmāsvāda. Jagannatha 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.

"वक्ष्यमाणश्रुतिस्वार्येन भक्तिरणा चिदेव रसः |"

Rasagangadhara, p. 23.
V

The Text of the Abhinavabhāratī
On the Śānta Rasa

In this section, I am presenting the text of the Abhinavabhāratī on the Śānta 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 Mm. 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'.¹ 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 Abhinavabhāratī from Māṅgāv Koil, which belong to H. H. the Jiyrar 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 foot-notes with the letters 'A', 'B', 'C'.

It is well known that Hemacandra, who reproducies 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.

अभिनवभारत्यां

शान्तरसस्पृकरणम्

ये पुनर्व रसा इति पठन्ति, तन्मते शान्तस्वरूपमभिदीयते।
तत्र केचिदरुप:—शान्त: शमस्थायिभावालभक: तत्स्ययोगिसंपक्खिदिभि:
विभावैतत्स्यते। तस्य कामकोधाभावरुपेनुभावावैरभिन्यः। व्यपिचारी
प्रक्तिमतिप्रशृङ्खलितिः।

एतदपरे न सहन्ते, शमशान्तयो: पर्यायति, एकादशप्प्रक्षाणां
इति संज्ञयायागात। किंतु विभावा तत्ततुलाल्यादय: तत्समन्तरभावविचि
श्रूभारदानुसन्धीयेन्त्र इति युक्तम। तपोस्वाध्ययनादयस्तु न शान्तस्य
समन्तरहेतव:। तत्त्वज्ञानस्य 2 अनन्तरहेतव इति चेत् 'पूवोंदिततत्त्वज्ञानेन
पदिकितत्त्वयोजयतेति। तपोस्वाध्ययनादयीनां विभावता ‘त्वक्का स्वात्।

1 M. and G. शमनस्य ये हेतव।
2 म. अनन्तरहेतव।
3 M. पूवरोोंतत्त्वज्ञानेनि।
4 G. युक्ता।
कामाध्यमावोऽपि नानुभावः; शान्ताधिपक्षाद्वादमृत्त्रे;ः अगमक्तव्; प्रयो-गासमवात्तिवाचः; न हि नेद्धक्षुपरमः प्रयोगकाव्यः। सुसमहाद्योऽपि
हि मि:श्रासोच्छासपतनभूशायनादिमि:। शेष्टाभिमेवानुभावः। ३। धृतिप्रसृतिरिपि प्राशक्षिप्योपरागः।
कथा शास्ते स्यातः? न चाकिष्ठिकर्त्त्वमात्रेण
तत्‌त्वालोपाये क्युःकाव्यः। ५। ६। ७।
विनेयः। ८।
सम्यदर्शनं समाक्ष्यि प्रासा;ः, अपि तु संसारे।
तत्र शास्तो
रस इति।

अतोऽवते—यथा।
हि तात्त्व धर्माधितित्यम्म्; एवं१० मोक्षोऽपि
पुरुषार्थः: शाक्षीदु श्रवरतिहासादिदु च भावाध्येनोपायतो न्युक्ताधिति
हि घुपसिद्धम्। यथा च कामादिदु समुचिताधिशिवृत्तवर्गः रस्यादिशिद्धवाच्या: कविनत्यापारेण
आस्वादयोप्यतापारण्ड्रारेण तथाकृतिहद्धसंवादवतः: सा-
मालिकांस्य मिति रसतः श्रुतार्धितिया नीयते, तथा मोक्षाभिषेकान्यसरमाँ
पुरुषार्थोऽविचित्र चित्तबहुति: किमिति रससे।११ नानीयत इति वक्तव्यम्। या
चासै तथाभूता चित्तबहुति: सैवात्र स्यायिभावः। पुनम् चित्तव्यम्—किचा—

१ M. कामाध्यमावः
२ M. भूषणादिमि:
३ M. अनुभाग्यः।
४ M. and G. प्राशक्षिप्योपरागः:
५ G. तत्वालोपाय: क्युःकाव्यः।
६ G. विनेयः।
७ G. चैते।
८ G. मानोऽवते।
९ यथा is omitted in M.
१० M. एव।
११ M. रसत्वान।
मासोः तत्त्वज्ञानोत्थितो निवेदद इति केवचः। तथा हि—दारिद्रयादि-प्रभवो यो निवेदः: ततोद्धव एव, हेतुस्तत्त्वज्ञानस्य वैलक्षण्यात। स्थायिः-सद्ग्रामिध्ये चैत्तदर्शवाय पठितः। अन्यथा माझस्थः सुनिः: तथा न पठेत। जुगुप्सां च व्यभिचारिलेन श्रुत्करे निषेधनः। मुनिर्वाचानां सर्वेशामेव स्थायिक्षवस्त्त्वार्थाविचारतात्तज्ञः अनुभाववानि। योग्यतोपनिपतितानि शब्दार्थवलङ्कद्वानि। अनुजानाति। तत्त्वज्ञानस्य निवेदः: स्थायित्वमनः। स्वाक्षरिच्चित्रसहितस्य रसादिः: यः: परमः। स्थायिशीलः। स एव त्यत श्लोकावलितानुमानरम्यः।

इदमपि पर्यतनुजःते—तत्त्वज्ञानो निवेददोत्स्यः। स्थायित्वा वदता तत्त्वज्ञानमेवात्र भिक्षुकले वर्तं स्यात्। वैराग्यसवज्जादिपुः कथं विभाव-वलम्भः। तदुपयायातिः चेतैः कारणकारणेऽयं विभावताव्यवहारः। स चालिः प्रस्थावः। किंच निवेदो नाम सर्वत्रानुपादितामस्य। वैराग्यवलङ्कः। स च तत्त्वज्ञानस्य प्रत्युतपयोगी। विरक्ते हि तथा प्रयत्ते, यथास्य तत्त्वः।

1. M. परितः।
2. M. निषेधम्।
3. M. reads चिन्ततातात्ववच and G. चिन्तनात तात्तज्ञः। Both mean little. We must have a word here to mean सास्त्वकत्व्। All writers from Bharata explain Sattva as Manas and therefore चिन्ततातज्ञः, however much uncouth the word may be, is suggested as standing here to mean सास्त्वकमावः। Unfortunately, Hemacandra’s epitome of this passage (p. 68, com.) does not have this word.
4. M. and G.—अनुभावस्यवत्तव, नियोग्योपनिपतिता निःशब्दवलङ्कः।
5. G. वा नानुभावः। M. न ज्ञानाति।
6. M. उपमार्गभावा etc.
7. M. and G. परस्पराविशेषः।
8. M. and G. व्यक्तिशीलः।
9. G. and Hemacandra. वैराग्यसवज्जादिपुः।
ज्ञानमुक्तते; तत्त्वज्ञानादिनि मोक्षः, न तु तत्त्व ज्ञाता निर्विद्यते, निर्वेदार्थ मोक्ष इति। 'वैराग्यात् प्रकृतिलयः' (ई. क्र. सार्वभौमकारिका—८५) इति हि तत्त्वमण्डतः। नन्तु तत्त्वज्ञानिनिन्; सर्वेऽंत द्वैराम्यं द्वैराम्यं द्वैराम्य। तत्त्वविविध्यत्वरूपुक्त्मम्—तस्यं परिपूर्ण्यात्सूपर्यात्सूपर्यात्सूपर्यात्सूपर्यात्। (योगसूत्रम्—१.१३) इति। भववेवः; 'तद्यथं तु वैराम्यं ज्ञानवेदेन परा कार्यः' इति भीतज्ञसिद्धनेवः भगवतामृताध्यायः। तत्तथं तत्त्वज्ञानेनं तत्त्वज्ञानमालया परिपूर्णमाणुमिति न निवेदः ज्ञायी; किन्तु तत्त्वज्ञानेव स्थायी भवेत्। यत्तु व्यभिचारिन्यार्थः वस्त्ते तत्त्वकारिन्याविक्रियाविश्लेष्योपस्योपायजज्ञातुबिन्वेत्रये यत्त्वस्मात्ज्ञानम्, यथा—

इति तत्त्विवेदस्य खेदरूपस्य ^विभावलेन; एतत्च तत्त्वब्रवत्यामः।

नन्तु मिथ्याज्ञानमूलो विविधगम्यः तत्त्वज्ञानात् प्रशास्तत्वतीति तुःक-जनसुश्रूणे अक्षापादादेः; भगवद्वि: मिथ्याज्ञानापचयकारणं तत्त्वज्ञानं

बैराम्यस्य दोषायात्लक्षणस्य कारणमुक्तम्। नन्तु तत्: किम्? नन्तु वैराम्यं निवेदः? क एवमहः? निवेदे हि शोकवायमसदस्यप्रकृतिविशेषः।

बैराम्यं तु रागादिनां प्रधानसः। अवबु वा वैराम्येव निवेदः। तथापि तत्स्य

* Not by Patañjali, but by Vyāsa in this Bhāṣya. (Ānand-āśrama Edn., p. 20.)

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

¹ M. and G. कारणतत्त्वान्.
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

स्वकारणवशात् मध्यभाषीनातीनि न मोक्षे साध्ये सुन्नततानीयता ।

अन्ये मन्यते स्वादय एवाधि चित्रवृत्तिविवेशार्थं उक्ता।

तदं एव यथात्विभावविविचारशुश्रुताभावकीयाविवेशसंश्चया: विचित्रा एव तावत्।

तत्तथ तत्त्वादेव अन्यतमोऽस्त्र स्थायी।

तत्र अनाहतानन्दमयस्वास्त-विषय रतिरेव वोक्षसाधनानिति, सैव ।

शान्ते स्थानिनिति।

यथोऽकम्—

यथात्मरतिरेव स्थाय आत्मत्वस्म मानवः।

आत्मन्येव च सन्तुष्टः: तस्य कार्यं न विचारते। (सीता. २.१७.)

इति। एवं समस्तविषयं वैचूतं पश्यत:, विशं च शोच्यं विलोकयत:, वांसारि कं च वृत्तान्तम अपकारित्वेन पश्यत:, सातिशयमससमाह्रप्रतानं श्रीमयुः। आश्रितवत:, सवैस्मात विषयसार्थार्थविभ्यमः। सर्वोऽक्ष्यकृतहिणीयादि प्रमददेव: जुगुप्सानस्य, अयूर्विर्वानात्मितियस्य विस्मयानास्य वोक्षसिद्धिरिति।

1 M. लयादाचारिव; G. लयादाचारिव।
2 M. and G. सिद्दं साध्यते।
3 M. and G. यद्यकोकिक्तचेव।
4 M. and G. आनन।
5 M. and G. शाक्षे।
6 M. and G. विनियमः।
7 M. and G. वाहः।
8 M. and G. पूर्वस्वात्म।
9 रति is omitted in M. and G.
नित्यप्रसीमम्। न चैतन्यन्वेन सम्यतम। याबद्वेद हि विशिष्टान्। ¹भावान्
परिगणनति। ²रत्यादिनाशदेवन शशदेवन च तत्प्रकारानेव अन्यान्। सद्गुहाते।
ताबद्वेद तद्वर्तिकालोधिकालेपतंतनां। रत्यादीनामुजानात्येव अपवर्गं
विषयं। एववादिनां उ परस्परमेव। ³विषार्यताम्। एकस्य स्थायिरं
विश्लेषित’ एव। तदुपायमेदात्। तत्त्व तत्त्व। स्थायित्वमित्यपुच्छ-
मां प्रत्युक्तमेव। ⁴स्थायित्वमेव प्रतिपुरुं। रसायनयान्त्यापि।
मोक्षेकेहनुवादू। एको रस इति चेतः। ⁵क्षयैकफल्वे वीररूढ्योरण्येकलं
स्यात्।।
अन्ये तु पानकसवदविभागं प्राताद। सर्वेऽएव रत्यादयोक्त्र स्थायिन
इत्यहुः। चित्रुवृत्तीनामपुष्पद्वारात्। अन्योन्यं च बिनोधासू एतदपि न
मनोज्ञम्।।
कस्तस्वर्ण स्थायी? उच्चते—इह तत्वज्ञानमेव ताक्ष्मोक्ष्मसाधन-
मिति तस्वैं भौतिकत्षेव। मोक्षेः स्थायिता युक्त। तत्वज्ञानं च नामात्मज्ञानमेव।
आत्मनः व्यतिरिक्तस्य विषयस्थैव। ⁶ज्ञानम्।। परो श्रीमातम अनात्मेव
स्यात्।। विपक्षितं चैतस्वद्वरुभिः।। अप्सराभिस्मायः चित्रत्यति इति इह
नातिनिर्भ्रवनं। कुः।। तेन आत्मेव ज्ञानान्त्यदिविकुद्रधर्मैयंगी परिकिल्य-
तविषयोपममोगिरहितात्र स्थायी।। न चास्य स्थायित्या स्थायिलं बचनीयम्।।

¹ M. and G. विभावान्।
² M. and G. परिगणणेदिस्वदेवन च तत्प्रकारानेव।
³ M. and G. विचारसत्ता।
⁴ M. and G. प्रथमेव।
⁵ M. and G. आप्तात्र।
⁶ M. क्षमको; G. क्षमकन्।
⁷ M. व्यतिरिक्तस्योदद्वस्येव ज्ञानम्; G. व्यतिरिण्य इन्द्रियस्येव ज्ञानं।
⁸ M. and G. आत्मालेव।
रावत्रयो हि तत्तकारणान्तरोद्ययोग्यतप्रमाननिर्देशयामानउत्तरः कवितानुक到来 
अपेक्षितताः स्थायित्वपत्रभिनितसंशयः । सन्तः स्थायिन इति 
उच्चयते । तत्तवज्ञानं तु सकलभावान्तरभिनितस्थानीयं सवेदभावम्यः 
स्थायित्मय सर्बः रथावदिकः चित्तावतः । ज्योथिरीभावयन् । निर्गत 
एव सिद्धस्थायित्वभिनितः । ततः अवनीमय। अत एव पृथगस्य गणना न 
युक्तः । न हि खण्डसुण्डयोग्यमेव तृतीयं गोलमिति गणयते । तेन एकाच- 
पशुशास्त्राविशेषस्त्रीलेखमेव । अस्यापि कथं न7 पृथगमणेनति चेतु पृथम् 
आल्पायोगाविदित तृतीयेकरमः । न हि रावत्रय इश्वरसृंख्यस्त्रीलेखः बुध 
तथाविभावमत्तृतृतृतितीतिगौरचः। । स्वगतपिरुपुरुप 
व्युत्तमात्वर्यस्तु नयुक्तस्मातः चित्तावन्तरकालधेयोवचारभाति ॥
भास्ताः वा लोके तथा । तथापि न सम्भवमात्रस्थायिनां गणनः, 
रसेशुक्लान्यानन्दोगावरुपः अधि तु व्यविचारितः । । लक्षणीयः विज्ञायते, 
नेतरथा । । तथा भीक्राचार्यशास्त्राविदित मण्डलस्त्रीलेखपदः । न चास्याल-
स्वभावस्च 1 व्यभिचारित्वम्; अस्म्भवात्, अवैचित्यावहृत्वम्, अनौ-चित्याच्। शम आलस्म्भावः; स शमशब्देन 2 मुनिना व्यपदिष्टः। यदि तु स एव शमशब्देन व्यपदिष्टते, निर्वर्दशब्देन वा, तत विक-द्वाधः। 3 केवलं शमाधिकित्वम् नरेन्द्रोषपि दारिद्र्यचादिविभावान्तरो-धितान्वदतुल्यात्मिकः: स 6 भवति। तुजातीय एव नेत्रमेंदे दिपि तद्यथ-देवस्य रतिभयाविदितिः 6। तद्यथाद्वमस्सर्वमेव तत्वज्ञानं 7 शमः; तथा च वक्तात्मकोपरागविशेषा एवतम्नो रत्यादिः। तदनुगमेशपि 8 एव शमस्मर्य रूपम् अव्यवधानसमाधिविवलदा 9 अधिगम्य, न्युथामेशपि 10 वशान्तता 11 भवति। यथोत्तम 11 'प्रशान्तवाहितासंस्कारात्' (थो० सू० ३० १००) इति। तत्वज्ञानलक्षणस्य च स्थायिनः समस्तस्य लौकिकालौकिकविक-बृत्तिकलापो व्यभिचारितमभयते। तदनुभावा एव च यमनियमाधुर्यक्ता 12 अनुभावा: 13 उपाश्रामिनयाययथायतेह च ये स्वभावाभिनया वस्यन्ते। अत

1 M. and G. व्यभिचारितवसंभवात्
2 M. and G. समात्मवायवस्थ दुर्मश्वबृद्धि
3 M. and G. भव:
4 M. and G. चित्रतुच्छन्तम्
5 M. and G. न
6 M. and G. नयाबिभिः
7 M. and G. शमता च
8 G. विद्विद्वम्
9 M. and G. अविश्वस्य
10 M. and G. वशान्तता
11 M. and G. भवन्ति
12 G. अनुभवतः
13 M. अनुभवात् उपाश्रामिनयस्य ... ध्यायते; G. उपाश्रामिनयस्य (आलिङ्ग) ध्यायते।
एते एतद्विषया एव। अयमेव हि स्वभावः। विभावा अपि1 परमेश्वरानु-
प्रहम्मतयः। 2शक्योन्मुलाक्ष रत्याद्र्योद्वरास्वाचा। केवलं यथा विवल्लभे
वैतुकयम्, सम्भागोपि वा ‘प्रेमासामार्होल्स्वम्’ इति, यथा च रैढ़े
वैभवम्, यथा च करण्वीरमयानकादृतेषु निर्वेंद्वभुति3तासहर्षः। व्यभि-
चारिणोपि प्राधान्येन अवभासस्ते, तथा 4शान्ते जिगुप्साचा: सर्वधेैैव
रागमतिपक्षकालः। तथा हि महाश्री ‘नुकपलादिव्यारणम्,’ 5असुभाया-
दिसुमुद्यादिव्यार्क्तपरिपक्षितमैकस्तितिहि धर्मेण। जिगुप्साहेषुस्वनैव निजा-
व्यक्तनं’ 6 च देवरातु पुनरम्भनं8 उपदिष्टम्। र्यावति च क्रृत्यक्षेत्र
परर्ष्ट्रथनायामेवोद्वचम इति उत्साहोत्स्य परोपकारविषयं चायचच्छाय
वर्तमान्तः। अत एव 9एतद्वितियारबितातु केचिद्
द्वाबीरवेन न्यपदिशनि, अन्ये थर्मवीरवेन।

ननूजसहोह्रह्यक्ष्यारण: शान्तस्वसहकारशैलव्यात्मकः10। व्यभिचारिनं हि विश्वस्यापि11 न नोचितम्, रताविव निर्वेंदादे। ‘शैवा
शाद्वलम्’ (नाग.३.२) इथादि हि परोपकारकरणे जिगुप्साह्यैव धर्मः

1 M. and G. कयम् additional.
2 M. कश्वोष रत्यादयः।
3 M. निर्वृत्ति।
4 M. and G. न जिगुसायां द्वैविव्यात्मकः।
5 M. and G. महामेतेन।
6 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.)
7 M. निजाम्यनम्। G. निजाम्यहांम्।
8 M. and G. पुज्जस्मासुपास्यम्।
9 G. तक्केढित्; M. Gap.
10 M. and G. शैलन्त्व।
11 G. and Hema. नानुसितम्।
वक्ष्यते। न दुं उत्साहस्या काचिदम्यवस्था; इच्छामयबन्धवतिकेन पाषाणताप्ये। यत् एव च च परिद्विरावर्षने स्वादोदेशेन कर्तव्यान्तरं नावशिष्यते। अत एव शान्तहृदयानं परोपकारयं शरीरस्तब्धराविदानं न शान्ताविरोधी। ‘आत्मानं गोपायेत’ ह्यादिना शक्तिकृत्यविषयं शरीर-रक्षणसुपदिश्यते, सन्न्यासिनं ॥ तद्रक्षादितात्यथाभावावत्। तथा हि—

'भूमिश्रृंखलामेकाणाणि प्राणा: संस्थितिहेतवः।
तात्विकता कि न हतं रक्षता कि न रक्षितम्॥' इति

सुप्रसिद्धचतुर्भूषाधकवत्मेव देहरक्षाया निदानं विशिष्टम्। शक्तिकृत्यश कहेऽभ्रो श्रवेत् वा पंढरनिकं सन्न्यासिलेव अवज्ञात। तद्वत्थाक्षरितः त्याजयं शरीरस्। यदि परार्थ त्यज्यते तत्र किमिव न संपादितं भवति? जीमौलवाहनादीनां न यतिवृत्तिः चेत्, कि तेन न?: तत्वचानितं ताबदव-श्रमस्ति। अन्यथा देहात्मामानिनाः देह एव सर्वस्वभूते धर्मायुद्धेशेन परार्थं त्यागस्य ॥ असम्भाव्यतवात्। युक्तैदिः हि न वीरस्य देहत्यागयो तथाः।

1 M. and Hema. न
2 M. अन्बियवथायी।
3 च is omitted in M. and G.
4 M. परार्थतत्त्वेऽ G. and Hema. परस्परतत्त्वेऽ.
5 M. भूततम; लक्षणाम्।
6 M. तद्भाषि।
7 M. G. and Hema. नयंतत्त्वम्।
8 M. and G. असम्भावः।
9 M. युक्ते विद्विनरस्य त्यागोद्योऽ; G. युक्तैदिः हि न शरीरस्य त्यागोद्योऽः।
10 M. परार्थः; G. परस्परार्थः।
'देवार्जनस्तत्तत्त्वज्ञानिनिष्ठतिष्ठितिष्ठिति।
श्रद्धा ॥ केवला दद्दृ द्रव्य श्रुत्वादि हि मुख्यते ॥' इति ।

केवलं ३ परार्थभीमभिधात् धर्मान् परोपकारात्मकफलक्षेत्रेनेव अभिसंहितात्
पुनरेण देहस्य तदुचितस्येव प्रादुर्भावो बोधिसत्वादिनां तत्त्वज्ञानिनामपि ॥

ह्रद्द: अल्पन्तिपि ४ विश्वासितिलाम्, स्वभावोपिष्ठियात्, यथा रामस्य
बीराज्ञि ५ पिछराज्ञि पाल्यत्। एवं श्रुताराजाः विश्विपि मन्तव्यम्। ६ अत
एव शान्तस्य स्थायित्वेदिपि अप्राधान्यम्। जीमुतवाहने त्रिवर्गसम्पत्तिरे रे
परोपकारिकाधानाया: फल्वात्। अनेनवाशयेन नाटकवक्ष्यो वक्यते—
'अद्वितीयासारादिर्मि’ ७ गुणि:।' (१९-११) इति। अनेन हि ८ ऋद्विलासम्
प्रधानमर्यादामोत्तरं सर्वं चरितं सकक्षोहकहदयस्वादस्युद्दरप्रयोजनं नाटके
निवेषायतिन्यायमिल्लक्ष्यम्। एतत्त तत्रैव वर्णिष्ठियाम:। अनेनवेत चाशयेन न
शान्ते कक्षन मुनिना जात्यज्ञ को विविधोक्ते (Vide Ch. 29 S'ls. 1-4)
तेन जात्यज्ञविनियोगाभावम् तदस्तवभिंगि प्रत्यक्षम् ॥

१ G. तत्त्वज्ञानिनाम्।
२ M. अद्वि चर्चनिवाचविच।
३ M. परायो हि सन्विचारात्।
४ श्रद्धा: अल्पन्तिपि is not found in M.
५ M. and G. बीराज्ञि।
६ M. एवं एव।
७ M. विश्वासितिल्यात्।
८ M. विश्वासः।
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

अन्ये तु, ‘‘¹जीमूतवाहनस्ते पुन्नन्तता भविष्यति’’ (नामा ४-६) इति शरणार्थिनिः ब्रजमेव त्रातवान्। शक्तिधार्यस्य न काचित्। परहिंसा च न काचिदिन्येवमाहुः। तत्त्वानुमतेऽवेद। न हि बोधिसत्वस्य पुनः ²अभ्युत्तनास्तक्षेत्रजीवितमभिन्नभावानुप्रवविं शक्तिधृतेऽदिति। न च काक-तालीयवृत्त्या शाख्र्यमुदेरर्याति। ततः सिद्धं दयालक्ष्यं शृङ्गाराहोुः प्रधानम्। अन्ये तु ज्ञानिकारिणो व्याख्यायं भवशीतल। यथोक्तम् ‘तत्त्ववद्रूपुहो धर्म-यात्रार्थिः संस्कृताः।’ (यो शो ३ ५ २७) इति। अत एव निद्रिष्ठमवा-दनूभवाभाव इति प्रत्युक्तम्। यदा तु पर्यन्तमिकालेमेवनन्मभावाभावः, तदायस्य अप्रयोगपर्यम्, रतिशोककारापिपर्यन्तयास्य अप्रयोगाय युक-त्वात्। हृदयसंवादोपिततथानिर्नियतम्मनीष्ठासः भावते; यद्रष्ट्यति ‘‘मोक्षे चापि बिरविग्नि।’’ (अध्यायः २७—श्रो रू) इति। सर्वत्र ‘‘न सवेन हृदयसंवादः।’’ भवानके वीरप्रकृतेऽभावात्। ननु तात्तत्त्व नयोगेव वीरस्य क आस्थाद।। उच्चतत्—यत्रायं ⁶ निच्छयते, तत्रावहः शुष्काहेप्यगुणगिनि श्रृङ्गारवीराधन्यतमस्तयेव। तत्त्वस्विष्ठेशमः भावाद्।। यत्रापि प्रहसनातः हास्यादे:। प्रधानता तत्राध्ययःनिपदिसर्वान्तरतिष्ठं एवाम्स्वादः।। ⁷भिन्नभिन्नानिकारास्वादोपेदेश एव रूपकमेदीनतेन निमित्त-मिति केचित्॥

¹ M. जीमूतवाहन कस्ते; G. जीमूतवाहन: कस्ते।
² M. and G. पुनर्भुत्त्यान्।
³ M. खा हेतुभवाभावः; G. लामे तु भावाभावः
⁴ M. इत्यं; G. इत्यः।
⁵ M. यथः; G. यथः(३०)
⁶ G. अहुनिष्ठावित्।
⁷ M. and G. हास्याद।
⁸ M. and G. भिन्नभिन्नानिकाराश्वादोपेदेश एव रूपकमेदीनतेन निमित्त-मिति केचित्॥
तस्मादर्थि शान्तो रसः। तथा च चिरन्तनपुस्तकेऽजु ‘स्थाविभावान्, रसलुमपनेश्याम्’। इत्यन्तरं शान्तो नाम शमस्थायिभाबास्तमक इत्यादिशान्तत्वलक्षण पत्तवते। तत्र सर्वसारां शान्तपाय प्रवास्वादः। विष-वेयम्यो विपशृष्ट्या। तन्मुख्यातालाम्। केवलं वासनान्तरोपहित इति। अत्र सर्वप्रकृतिवाभावानाय पूर्वमभिधानम्। लोके च प्रथम प्रथः सामान्ययो न गणनमिति स्थायित्व पुष्ठः ३नोक्तः। सामान्यमपि तु विवे-चक्षेन प्रथमवेग गणनीयमिति विवेचकाभिमसामाजिकान्तव्युस्तरक्षणपतीति-विषयत्या स प्रथमबुध्द एव। इतिहासपुराणाभिधानकोशादौ च नव रसा: श्रूण्ये, श्रीमलस्यान्तशाक्षेप्यपि। तथा ब्रोजः—

"अद्यानामहि देवानां श्रुतारादीि, प्रदर्शीवेत्।
मध्ये च देवदेवत्य शान्तं रूपं प्रदशीवेत्।"

तत्त्व च बैराम्यसंसारभीतिदययो विभावः। स हि तैस्यनिवृद्धविज्ञायते। नामकान्तनादयोजनाभावः। निवेद्यान्तत्त्वमिति नयादयो त्वमभिद्वारिशः। अव एव। इदंद्रियोशासनविषये भक्तिश्रद्धे स्त्रृतिमिति पथसाहानुपविषेधयथे-वाजिति न तथो: प्रथःस्वल्पन गणनम्। अत्र साध्वकारिका—

मोक्षशालोमनिमित्तत्त्वकायार्द्देहुसंयुक्तः।
निषेवकशध्वरुतः: शान्तस्यो नाम विजेः।

विभावस्थायित्वन्माययोगः: कमात् विशेषणान्त्रियं दर्शितः।

1. There is a न here in M. and G.
2. M. and G. लाभात्।
3. M. गुरु।
4. M. उत्साहान्तव्युपविषेधप्रणयः; G. उत्साहान्तव्युपविषेधप्रणयः.
स्वर्ण निमित्तमाय शान्तादुलपति रसः।
पुनर्निमितापायेसु शान्तं पञ्च प्रलीयते॥

इत्यादिना रसान्तरयोक्तित्वमुपसंहृतम॥

यत्रु डिमे हास्यश्रृंखारपरिहिरेण पद्मसत्वं च वक्ष्यते, तत्रायं भावः।
‘दीप्तिसकाव्योनिः’ (xxviii. 83). इति भाविना रक्षणेन रौद्रप्रथाने
तावद्विमे तद्विद्दत्स्य शान्तस्य सम्भवनेव न, किं निपेधेन। शान्ताः
सम्भवे तु दीप्तिसकाव्योनिनिरित्वेतेन किं व्यवच्छेदं श्रुत्सङ्गाहास्यवर्ज
पद्मसुकं इति झूके नातिरशकः।¹ ननु कहुऽबीमसम्भवनक्रमावाच्य-
मनेन पदेन व्यवच्छेदते। नैतत्, सात्वत्यामभट्टीछिसम्पल² इत्यनेनैव
तत्सिरासु। शान्ते तु सात्वत्येव द्विचिरिति न³ तद्वियवच्छेदमेवैतत्
तेन डिमश्ल्क्षण प्रत्युत शान्तरस्य सद्दने विक्रमः। श्रुत्सङ्गानु प्रसबंधन
मानः सम्भव्यं एव। तद्विं च हास्य इति तथोरेव प्रतिपेधः क्रतः
प्रात्यतः। सर्वसाम्याच्य विशेषतो वर्णध्वलाभिधानमनुचितमपर्यत सर्वशी
तत्तमिति ज्ञेयम्। ‘उत्पि ज्ञेयसु शान्तस्यापि दशोदोः।’⁴ सर्वभावो हि
हास्यसः।⁵ विभावलेन चास्य बीरविभूषः। अत एवायस्य रसस्य यम-
नियमध्वरणमिणाद्वृपदेशः।’⁶ अनुपयोगितया महाकुर्त्य सर्वप्राप्तायमिति-
चुर्चितव्यापकल्य चौपपचामिता भक्तिप्रसादः॥

¹ M. and G. तत्र प्रसादः।
² M. and G. सम्भेनैव।
³ M. and G. omit न।
⁴ M. and G. उपपति।
⁵ G. सत्तामाबः।
⁶ M. and G. सहविभावित्वेन।
⁷ G. उपदेशः।
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तत्त्वावलोकन कीशण? उच्चते—उपरागाधिके: उल्लासहरस्त-दिशितः, यदातमस्यः तदेव विलोमम्भतः त्यात्तःनात्तत्तः निगात्तसमानसिततर-सूत्रवद्। यदाहिततत्तत्रुपलक्षेौ सकलेऽप्रतिद्वः उपरागाधिके:। तथाभावेनापि स-कुछःत्तमालोम्यामेंति न्यायेन मासमां ध्यानस्यॉपवशाल्यकः। सकलतः। खजाल-हीिं प्रमाणनवमानसविदेकवैति काल्ययन्योगस्रवन्धायः साध्यारणत्या निर्माण-समां अन्तःस्त्वान्विलागेंिें लोकोत्तरान्तरान्तरिन्ति तथाविश्वहृद्यं विध्वच इति।।

एति नवेव रसा:। पुम्बोऽपिोगिवेिें हङ्क्नाधिके:। वा षयतामेव उपदेश्यन्त्र। तेन रसान्तरसभ्ये: अपि ६पार्श्वसिद्धश्च सद्व्यान्यिम इति यद्येवूतम तत्तत्तकम।। भावाभ्याये चैत्यहृद्ये। आदेिास्थायिक: चेहो रस इति लसत्।। चेहो धाबिष्ठः।। च च सवेऽत सावताहादावेव पर्थक्यति। तथािि बालश्च मातापित्रििो चेहः।। भयेिान्विान्तः।। यूनो:। मित्रजने रतो। व्यक्तशान्दः।। आतरि चेहः धर्मवीरः।। एव।। बुद्वस्त्र्वुिादारिेि इष्टव्यस्त।। एष्यिि ६गयस्थायिकः लैल्ययस्य प्रत्य-व्यायाने सर्विसमतः।। हासे वा रतो वा अन्यज्ञ पर्थवसानात्।। एवं महताविपि बालस्यमिति।।

1. M. तृत्र यदाहः तत्त्वस्यम्।। G. सूत्रवद्यात्तस्यम्।
2. M. तृत्रनुवत्ता।।
3. M. आत्म०।।
4. M. and G. एवं ते।।
5. M. पार्ष्टः।। G. पार्ष्टः।।
6. M. and G. चेहोद्वेपि विध्वचः।।
A. Both the Māṅgāv MSS. and Hema. read भयेः which is better than चेहोद्वेचे or चेहो द्वा (विध्वचः)
B. Both the Māṅgāv MSS. and Hema. read यूनो मित्र०।।
C. Both the Māṅgāv MSS. and Hema. read लक्ष्मणदि: which is better than the M. and G. reading लक्ष्मणदो।
7. M. धर्माधितः।। G. धर्माधितः।।
8. M. and G. गयस्थायिकः।।
VI

PREYAS, VĀTSALYA, PRĪTI, SNEHA, BHAKTI AND S'RADDHĀ RASAS

The incoming of the S'ānta rasa seems to have set the writers thinking on the sanctity or otherwise of the number eight or nine pertaining to the Rasas. Close on the footsteps of S'ānta, 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, S/l. 3). Preyas is found in Udbhāṭa as an Alamkāra by the side of Rasavat, both of which belong to a separate class of emotion-figures. Udbhāṭa considers Preyas as the poetry of Bhāva, Bhāva kāvyā, 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, प्रेयस: प्रियतराग्यानम्. In this sense, Preyas as Cāṭu lives in later literature also. But Udbhāṭa's view is peculiar. As Pratīhārendurāja observes, any Bhāva is Preyas for Udbhāṭa.

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

"षष्ठ रस इति रसाः भिषजः; तदनुसारिणः केविदन्धारमार्गपत्ति।"

The basis of this statement is not given; and I have not been able to find the Alamkārikas who held Rasas to be six.
"एवं भावकान्यस्य प्रेयस्वदिति लक्षणया व्यपदेशः।"

This view found no follower, since Udbhata’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 Pṛti is the Sthāyin of the former whereas Rati is the Sthāyin of Sṛṅgāra.

प्राक् प्रीतिदिखिता सेयं रति: श्रुत्तारां गताः।

Daṇḍin, II, 289.

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. Rudraṭa, who introduces Preyān at first, mentions Sneha as its Sthāyin—केहप्रकृतिः प्रेयान्। That Rudraṭa thought mainly of Friendship is shown not only by the Sthāyin but also by the following explication—

अन्योन्यं प्रति सुह्दोवर्ध्विररोध्यं मतस्तत्र। XVI, 18.

We now get three categories of non-sexual attachment or affection,—(i) the Preyas of Rudraṭa with Sneha as its Sthāyin which comes to friendship; (ii) Vātsalya or the affection of parents and elders for children and youngsters1 and (iii) Pṛti.

1 Vis'vanātha 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.

“अथ सुनीत्संमतो वस्तलः—

‘स्तुनं चमत्कारितत्या वस्तलं च रसं विदुः।

स्थायी वस्तलता श्रेष्ठ: प्रवाहालम्बनं मताम्॥

“सुनीत्सं मताम् वस्तलः—

‘स्तुनं चमत्कारितत्या वस्तलं च रसं विदुः।

स्थायी वस्तलता श्रेष्ठ: प्रवाहालम्बनं मताम्॥
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.

श्रीतिर्येवमेव स्याय लस्यं सांप्रयोगिकी | Bhoja, S. K. A., V.

Daṇḍin’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

अन्ये तु करुणास्थायी वालसत्यं दशमोदि च। K. M. edn., p. 100.

Kavikarṇaṇapūra Gosvāmin, who illustrates Vātsalya with Yasodā’s love for baby-Krishṇa, gives Mamakāra as its Sthāyin—

'अत्र समकार: स्यायी।' p. 148.

1 Kavikarṇaṇapūra classifies Love into sexual love—Sāmpraya-yogiki Priti, Maitri, Šauhārḍa and Bhāva. The last is the Sthāyin of Bhakti. "त्यत रतिर्यथा"

"रतिबेदङ्गश्चक्तु सुखभोगारुक्त्यक्तु।
सा श्रीतिस्मृती-सौहार्दभाववस्थान्तर्गता गच्छिति॥"

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

इत्याह युक्ते विदुरो नायनतत्स्तादी धृति: ||
भक्तिमात्रसमाराध्यः सुप्रीतिध्व ततो हरि: || K. A., II, 277.

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

इति साक्षात्कुरे देवे राजा यद्राजवर्ण: ||
प्रीतिपकाशनं तत्र प्रेय इत्यवगन्यताम् || 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 Sraddhā, Faith, also as a new Rasa. Abhinava however does not consider them as distinct Rasas but includes them in S'ānta of which the two are important accessories.

"अत एव इश्नरप्रणियानविषये भक्तिश्रद्धे स्मृतिमतिस्तुत्साहानु-
प्रविष्ये अन्यथेव अष्टम् (शान्तस्य) इति न तयोः प्रथमसत्वेन गणनम् ||"¹

Abhi. Bhā., I, Ch. VI, p. 340.

Of Bhakti, more will be said in the section on Madhura Rasa. The Dasarūpaka mentions Prīti 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. S'iva-
rāma's Rasaratnahāra seems to be another work which speaks of the Sraddhā 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, Preyān; but these proposed Sneha as the Rasa and Ārdrātā as the Sthāyin. Rudrāṭa himself mentioned this Ārdrātā while describing his Sneha Sthāyin:

आदर्णन्:करणतः स्नेहस्य भवति सब्जेत् | XVI, 19.

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

"आतत्राष्ट्याथिकः सन्महो रस इति लसत्। सन्महो ब्रह्मिष्ठः। सच्च रस्यसाहादावेव पर्यवस्थिति। तथा हि—बालस्य मातापित्त्राचै सन्महो भये विश्रान्तः। उक्तो भित्रजोने रत्तौ, वक्ष्मणादेः। आतारी धर्मवीर एव। एवं बृजस्य पुनर्दाविपि द्रष्ट्यस्य।" 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.

"संभवेन भक्तिरत्वायमिति हि रत्रेव विषेषा। तुल्ययो: या परस्परं रति: स संभवेन। अन्ततस्य उत्तमे रति: प्रसन्नः, सैव भक्तिरवाच्य:। उत्तमस्य अनुतमे रति: वालस्यम।।एवमादि च विषेये भास्वेय आस्वायत्तमम।।

Sāṅgītārātanākara, Sāṅgītaratnakara, p. 839.

भक्ति सन्महोऽथ चौल्यं केवलं वीणा मन्न्त्रे रसान।।

अद्वार्दयाधिघाणकः स्थायिनस्तेनु ते विदु:।।

तद्दतः। रतिमेवै ति भक्तिसन्महो तुगोचरौ।।

व्यभिचारित्वसन्योऽ। नूनयः स्थायिनौ तौ तौ।।
To have less distinctions is no great aim. If it is said that friendship is only a variety of Rati, can we call the Rasa in the association of Rāma and Sugrīva, Sṛṅgāra? If brotherly attachment again is brought under Rati, is the Rasa in the association of Rāma and Bharata or Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, Sṛṅgāra? If Dharmāvīra can be called forth to deny Rasatva to Lakṣmaṇa’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 Vātsalya¹ 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 Pāthyagunās, we find with reference to Varṇas and Rasas:

“तत्र शास्त्रायांश्रायोः स्वरितोदालिः, वीररौद्रादुस्मुनेतु उदात्तकम्पितः कर्णवात्सल्य-भयानकेऽतु अदुरालस्वरितकम्पितेर्वेगः: पाण्यामुपपाद्यति।”


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

अन्तः अस्यः सर्वः हि श्लेष्यं नवरसाध्यम।।

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

एव गर्भस्थायिकस्य लोक्यरसस्य प्रत्याख्याने सर्विष्णितत्वम्, हासे वा, रती वा, अन्यत् पर्यवसानात्। Abhi. Bhā., p. 342.

Laulya seems to have been proposed to label the Rasa of an anti-hero like Rāvana 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. Sāṅgadeva summarises Abhinava thus:

अयुक्तविषया तृणा लोक्यं तद्वास्तकारणम्।

Mṛgayā and Akṣa Rasas

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

प्रीतिभक्त्यादयो भावा मृगयाशास्त्रयो रसाः।
हरषोत्साहादिपु स्पष्टमंतर्भवात्र कीर्तिताः॥ 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 Lolita’s view that Rasas are innumerable, we may say that it was Lolita who proposed these additional Rasa. Though Lolita’s
commentary on the N. S.’ is not available, we have, about that time, the K. A. of Rudraṭa, which holds the same view on the number of Rasas as Lollaṭa 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”—Śvāmibhūtas, and were consequently attended upon by many minor ones, (Bahvāṣrayāḥ) 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 Cintā; S’rama by Nirveda and so on. Says Abhinava:

“—न्यभिचारिणामपि च न्यभिचारिणो भवन्ति, यथा निवेदित्य चिन्ता, श्रमस्य निवेद इत्यादि नीरूपयन्ति | तबाससत् | Ch. VII, p. 346.

Abhinava did not accept this view.¹ But Lollaṭa’s and Rudraṭa’s position would make its acceptance necessary for them. Bharata says while explaining what Rasa is:

अन्त रस इति कः पदार्थः? उच्यते; आस्तवाद्वात् |

¹If 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 Unmāda 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:

इति मन्तव्या रसा: सवें || XII, 3.
रसनादसत्वमेषां मधुरादीनामिभोक्तमाचार्यः।
निरेवदाविभाष्यति तत्त्वकामस्ततीति तेदा 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.

"अय्माशयो अन्यकार्य—यदुत नासिति सा कापि चित्रविरि: या परिपोष गता न रसिभवति। भरतेन सहद्यावर्जितकमातर्यावृत्त संजान् चास्चलित अष्टौ वा नव वा रसा उत्का इति।"

Rudraṭa was perhaps contemporaneous with Sāṅkuka C. 850 A.D. and thus followed Lollata, 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 Āryā in the N. S.’ says: चिन्ता-आयत्तक्य-समुद्र्भा. Ch. VII, 74, p. 362. Asūyā, a Vyabhicārin is given as an Anubhāva of another Vyabhicārin Garva (p. 369). In Autsukya, Cintā and Nidrā are given; and many other Vyabhicārins also occur here as well as in Viśāda (p. 370).

On p. 66 of his Locana, Abhinava cites काकाय etc. and calls it a case of Bhāvaśabalatā. He says that this verse portrays four pairs of Vyabhicārins appearing one after another: Vitarka-Autsukya; Mati-Smarana; Sāṅkā-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. ‘परस्परेत्र तु चित्ताया एव प्रभावतां दस्ती परमास्त्रादस्तुभान्।’
spoke only of eight or nine Bhāvas as Rasas, it is because of
their greater vogue among poets and critics. According to
Abhinava, Lollāta said the same thing:

"एताकर्ते एव च रसा इत्युक्तं पूर्वम्। तेन "आनन्दवेदपि पार्श्व-
पसिद्धया एतावतं प्रयोज्यतमः इति यद्व भद्दोऽभेदेत्तेन निर्देशितं तदद्वेष्यना-
परामृत्यः।"

"तेन रसान्तरसःवेदपि पार्श्वःपसिद्धया संश्वानियम इति यदन्ये:
(लोहटादिपरिवर्ते:) उक्तम्, तत्त्वत्त्वकम्। सावाधायः चैतदुःख्यते।"

ibid., p. 341.

It is perhaps Lollāta who, while commenting on the text
enumerating the Sthāyins, Vyabhicārins 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:

"स्थायिणिः स सहस्या नोत्सेत्यपरे।"
ibid., p. 270.

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

Pratīhārendurāja 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 Lollāta’s Pārśada-
prasiddhi. Pratīhārendurāja takes his stand on Caturvarga
as contrasted with those objects which are to be avoided by
the wise—the Parihārya. Pratīhārendu 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
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explanation; virtually this writer accepts the position of Rudraṭa. The ‘Tāṇtrika’ or ‘Pāribhāṣika’ nomenclature begs the question and one fails to see how any Bhāva, Nirveda or another, is irrelevant to a Puruṣārtha. Says Pratīhāreṇḍurāja:

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{‘एते च श्रुत्सारादयो नव यथायोगं चल्वर्गप्राप्युपायतत्वा तद्विर-
रिहारनिबन्धनत्वा तदन्यादीनां स्वाधिनां नवानां भावानां योः परिपोषः}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{तदात्मकः। अतः तथाविकेन रूपेण आस्वाधयतात्र आस्वादुमेदनिवन्धनेन}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{तात्त्रिक्रेण रसशब्दः अभिव्यथयते। निवेदन्तो तु तथाविकस्य आस्वादुस्य}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{थवस्य) अभावात् प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तमेदनिवन्धनस्य तात्त्रिक्रस्य रसशब्दस्य}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{अप्रयतिः। आस्वाधमात्राबिस्वस्या तु तत्रापि मधुराम्लाधितभवत् रसशब्द}-
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{प्रतिविवर्णव्यः। युद्धवं श्रुत्सारादिनं रसानुपक्रमः—}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{‘रसनादसत्वमेषां + असतीति तेषपि रसा: || (Rudraṭa; see above).} \text{ इति।}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{तदात्—}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{‘चल्वर्गोंत्रो प्राप्यपरिहार्यो क्रमावयतः।}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{चैतन्यमेदावास्वाधात् स रसस्ताद्दृशो मतः ||} \text{ इति।}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{स इति चैतन्यमेद इत्यथः। तादा इत्यथे आस्वादविशेषनिवन्धनलं}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{श्रुत्सारादिष्ठु तात्त्रिक्रस्य रसशब्दस्य उक्तम्।} \text{|| K.A. S.S. Vyā., p. 49.}
\end{array} \]

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 Pāṛṣada-prasiddhi or Pratīhāra’s Caturvargapraṇptypāya.

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{‘एते नैव रसा:, पुष्पयोपोगितेन,} \text{ रस्नायिक्यक्येन वा}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{इयतामेव उपदेश्यत्वात्। तेन रसान्तरसम्भवेद्यपि पार्ष्दपरिप्राप्तच्या} \text{etc. ||}
\end{array} \]
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VYASANA, DUHKHA AND SUKHA RASAS

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

सम्भवति तःपरेऽपि—यथा गर्भस्थायी लौल्यः, आर्तास्थायी स्नेहः, आसक्तस्थायी व्यसनम्, आरतिस्थायी दुःखम्, सन्तोषस्थायिः सुखमित्यादि।

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

According to the view that accepts the Vyabhicārin also as Rasas, the names Sthāyin and Vyabhicārin 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:

स्थायिनामपि व्यभिचारिणं स्वरति। यथा रतेदेवादिविषयायः।
हास्य शृङ्खारादौ, शोकस्य विप्रलम्बृशृङ्खारादौ, कोषस्य प्रणयकोपादौ,
श्वस्य वीरादौ, उत्साहस्य शृङ्खारादौ, भयस्य अभिसारिकादौ,
जुगुप्सायः संसारनिन्दादौ, शमस्य कोषाभिहतस्य प्रसादोद्भवादै॥

T. S. S. Edn., pp. 11-12.
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S'ārṅgadeva, Samgītaratnākara:

रत्यादयः स्थायिनाः स्थूलविद्वादिभावः ||
स्तोकैविद्वाहृतप्रत्यास्त एव व्यभिचारिणः ||
रसान्तरंवपि तदा यथायोगं भवन्ति ते ||
यथा हि हासः श्रुक्कारे रतिः शान्ते च ददयते ||
बीरे कोधो भयं शोके जूगप्सा च भयानके ||
उत्साहविस्मयः सर्वसेषु व्यभिचारिणो ||

Bhānudatta, Rasatarāṅgini, v:

स्थायिनोऽदिपि व्यभिचरन्ति || हासः श्रुक्कारे || रतिः शान्तकरण-
हास्येषु || भयशोकी कहणश्रुक्कारयोः || कोधो बीरे || जूगप्सा भयानके ||
उत्साहविस्मयः सर्वसेषु व्यभिचारिणो ||

Further, we find among the Vyabhicārins, Amarṣa which is only Krodha, the Stāyin of Raudra, but in a lesser degree; Trāsa which is Bhaya, the Stāyin of Bhayānaka; Viśāda which is only S'oka, the Stāyin 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 Prakāśa. 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 Abhimāna. Compared to this, even Rati-Sṛṅgāra, Hāsya, Vīra, and the other old Rasas are unfit to be called Rasas, but are only Bhāvas; much more so the Vyabhicārins. But this is a Pāramārthika state of affairs and there is a Vyāvahārīka state also in which, by
Upacāra, the name Rasa, by virtue of the immanence of Ahaṅkhāra 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:

रतिहृस्तं . . . . . |  
. . विस्मयश्वायो स्थायिभावः प्रकृतितः: || V. 14.

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

श्रृङ्खलवीरवृक्षमर्यादाद्वृत्तभयानकः: |  
बीमतसत्त्वः शान्तोदातोद्वृत्ता रसः: || 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. Ā. 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 Ěrjasvin.

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 Vatsalapraṇāti, *i.e.*, having Vātsalya as its Sthāyin, S. K. Ā., p. 514. Bhoja's illustration is however not friendship but only love for woman which will not prove Preyas as different from Sṛṅgāra. As a matter of fact, Preyas is considered by Bhoja as the Rasa lying at the root of Sṛṅgāra and all other types of love. Preyas is called Ahetupakṣa-pāta—

"रतिप्रीत्योरि चायमेव मूलप्रकृतिरिप्यते । यद्वित्यमाधुः—
‘अहेतुः पक्षापलो यस्तदय नासिन प्रतिति’
स हि स्रृंगालक्ष्यतादुरस्त्तमृत्तानि सौभ्यिति ॥। (U. R. Carita, V. 17.)

S.K.Ā., 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 Cakṣūrāga. 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. Hāsya is love for Hāsa; Vira is love for Utsāha and so on. In his Sṛṅgāra Prakāśa, Ch. XI, Bhoja says at the very outset:

रसांस्तिव्रह ब्रेमाणमेव आमन्तः ।

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

मोजस्तु वसलब्रेमाणम् एकादश रसानाच्छे । 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.)
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distinguished by a Rasa which dominates his character and constitutes his individuality. Thus S'ānta is the Rasa of the Dhīrasānta hero; Preyas of the Dhīralalita; Udātta or Urjasvin of the Dhīrodātta and Udhata of Dhīroddhata. He says expressly in his S'ṛṅgāra Prakāśa:

न ् च अष्टावेशिति नियमः, यत: शान्तं प्रेयांसमृ उद्धतं उर्जेश्विनं
च केचिद्रसमाचक्षे । तन्मूच्छ्यं किल नायकाणां धीरङ्गान्त-धीरललितं-

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 Udātta and Udhata Rasas and criticised them in his R. A. S., pp. 168-172, T. S. S. The amonymous Sāhitya mīmāṁsā (T. S. S, 114), a work largely indebted to Bhoja, also notes Bhoja’s Udātta, Udhata 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:

एतेन रुढाह्वास्तरा रसस्य पूर्वा कोटि: । र्यादिनामेकोनप्द्वा-
शतोषि विभा्वनामावलयभिचारितसंयोगात् परप्रक्रियाचितं रसव्यपदेशाहि

र्यादिनयो यदिः रसस्यारतिकोषयः
हर्षादिभि: किमपराद्धमत्तद्विभिचारः.
Bhoja restates Rudraṭa's position with some arguments. He asks: If Rāti 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, S'oka, Krodha etc. which are not ‘permanent’. Permanance or Evanesence 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, Glāni (Fatigue), or Harṣa (Delight), have their own Vyabhicārins, Anubhāvas and Vibhāvas.¹ 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.² (S. K. Ā., p. 636 and Sṛṅgāra Prakāśa, Vol. II, p. 394.) On pp. 394-5 of his Sṛṅgāra Prakāśa (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 Pāravasya. On p. 399 of the Sṛṅgāra Prakāśa (Vol. II) and 629 of his S. K. Ā., he speaks of Sādhvasa, Vīlāsa, Anurāga and Saṅgama Rasas. This beats Rudraṭa who mentioned Nirvedādi only, i.e. all the Cittavṛttis and primarily the Vyabhicārins, 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 Vyabhicārins of all the forty-nine Bhāvas. According to Abhinava, only the eight or nine Sthāyins can have Vyabhicārins. 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 Tīṣṭākṣaya and the N. D.’s Sukha is really Sānta Rasa.
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are physical manifestations. And in this respect, he is one
with Namisādhu who says while commenting on the bit in
Rudraṭa—‘इति मन्तव्या रसारसेवे’—

इतिशब्दः एवंप्रकारायः। एवंप्रकारा अन्येडपि भावा रतिनिर्देशस्तम्भाद्यः सर्वेदपि रसा बोध्यवः।

Though called Bhāvas, the Sāttvikas are physical mani-
festations. शारीरस्तु सात्तविकमभावादि: says Bhānudatta in his
Rasatarāṅgiṇī. But even these are Rasas, as much as any
Cittavṛtti, to Bhoja. Fortunately the inanimate Uddipana
Vibhāvas like the Malayamāruta and Moonlight and the
Ālambana Vibhāvas which are characters themselves are not
made Rasa. To these Bhoja would be content to give the
name ‘Rasānvyavibhūtis’. But there seem to have been
persons, before Bhoja also, who would take, as the Dasā-
rūpaka points out, such subjects as Mṛgayā 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 Vyabhicārins only; some
the interplay of all these; some the story enacted itself and
some all this put together.

अन्ये तु शुद्ध विभावम्, अपरे शुद्धमनुभावं, केचित्तु स्थायिमात्रम्,
इतरे व्यभिचारिणम्, अन्ये तस्याविनिर्मचारि, एके अनुकार्ये, केचन सकलमेव
समुदायं रसायुतित्वं बहुन:।” 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.

“विभेदाद्यः त्रयः समुदिता रसः।’ इति कतिपये। ‘त्रिषु येव
चमत्कारी स एव रसोद्योग्या तु त्र्योदपि 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, Cittavṛttis, and are thus not to be called Rasa. Similarly the Sattvikas. 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 Sattvikas which are also Raśas to him, Bhoja says in his S. K. Ā. (pp. 498-500) that though they become Raśas, they, being Sattvikas, are not attended by accessory Saṅcarins:

"अर्थ च स्तम्भः पुष्टापि सात्त्विकत्वात् सदैव अन्यानुयायीति नानुभावादिर्दिन/नुकर्ध्यते।"

"स्वर्ण रामाण्यान गातिहीत क पर्यात्न श्रीनांनुवन्धादयो न जायते।" S. K. Ā., p. 498.

What does Bhoja mean by such qualified Raśas? How can an unattended thing be considered Puṣṭa or developed? If it is still looking up to something to render itself understood (अन्यकुमारिति), how is it leading? A mere description of Stambha cannot make an instance of Stambha Raśa. The concept of Raśa means (1) an emotional state and (2) an emotional state which is 'Pradhāna'. This 'Pradhānatva' 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 Visrāṇti 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'anta. 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, Svatantra and Ananyakha-prekṣi, Ananyānuyāyi and Svavisrānta. This is the significance of the simple but effective simile of King and the followers. Abhinava clearly explains the position thus:

"अप्रधाने च वस्तुनि कस्य संविदा विद्वीरायम्यति, तस्यैव प्रत्ययस्य प्रधानान्तरं प्रत्यनुधावत: स्वातमिन अविद्व्यान्तत्वात्। अतो अप्रधानवं जहे विभावलुभावनोऽ, व्यभिचारिनिचे च संविदात्मके किष्टिनियमेन अन्यमल्प्रेक्षिणि संभवतीति तद्ततिर्थिक: स्मायेव चर्वाणापात्रम्।"


"ये लेने क्रतुमाल्यादयो विभावा: बाहार्य बाणपभृतयो अनु-भावा: ते न भावशब्देन व्यपदेश्या:।"

"भावशब्देन तावत् चित्रवृत्तिक्षेषा एव विवक्षिता:।"

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 Prādhānья among them. He accepts also that sometimes, the Sthāyins become Vyabhicārins but Vyabhicārins do not become Rasas. Vyabhicārins
are always Paratantra. 1 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 'Rañjanaṇādhikya' 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 paṇḍita 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 Vyabhicārins are always Paratantra; to Bhoja, they are Svatrantra and Paratantra according as they are Rasa or Bhāva. There is a writer, later than Vidyānātha, named Veṅkatanārāyaṇa dīkṣita, of the Āndhradesa, who seems to follow the view of writers like Bhoja. For he says that Vyabhicārins are of two kinds, Svatrantra and Paratantra; when they go to heighten another, they are the latter; they are the former when they do not have to heighten another.

परसन्त्र: स्वत्रन्त्रवाच द्विविधा व्यभिचारिण: ।
परस्परकां प्रात्रा: परसन्त्रा इतिरिता: ।
तद्भवे स्वतन्त्रा: स्युः भावा इति च ते स्मुत्ता: || 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 Vyabhicārin 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 चासु शान्तसेतुतर्मभिवन्धति | अनुरागस्य वैराग्यविरुद्धस्तवात्।
उच्चते—भक्ते: देवविद्विषयतिलेन भावान्त्तर्गत्तत्वा रसस्तानुपप्तेन।
. . . . भर्तादिमुनिवचनानामेव रसभावत्वविद्विषयस्थापकलेन,
स्वतन्त्रयोगात्। अन्यथा पुत्रादिविषयवा अपि रते: स्थायिभाववं कुतो
न स्यात्? न स्याद्र कुत: शुद्धभाववल्जुगुप्साशोककादीनाम, इत्यखिल-
दर्शनव्याकुली स्यात्। रसानां नवविकाट्तां च मुनिवण्णियन्त्रिता भज्जेत,
इति यथाशाश्रमेव ज्ञायः।” 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'ānta. S'ānta 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 wellknown. It may be that Bhakti is in some cases an Aṅga of the S'ānta 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, Yaśodā, Vasudeva and Nanda, Dāsyā 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 Ujjvalanilamaṇi deal with this Bhakti Rasa at very great length. Dr. Abhayakumar Guha has dealt with this subject in an article on the Rasa Cult in the Caitanyacaritrāmṛta in the Asutosh Mukerjee Siver Jubilee Volumes (III) and Dr. S. K. De’s complete account of ‘the Bhakti-Rasa Sāstra of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism’ in the IHQ (Vol. VIII) for 1932, removes the need for any further contribution on this subject.

These Vaiṣṇava Ālaṁkārikas accept the eight Rasas of Bharata; accept the Sānta; accept the Vātsalya; accept the ‘Sneha-prakṛtiḥ Preyān’ or the ‘Ārdra-taḥ-sthāyikaḥ Snehaḥ’ as Sakhyā and add only one absolutely new Rasa-concept, namely Dāsyā. 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 Sānta, Dāsyā, Sakhyā and Vātsalya. These five are called the five Mukhya Bhakti Rasas. The rest, the seven (Hāṣya, 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-rati.

शान्त दास्य (सत्य) मधुर रस नाम
कृष्ण भक्ति रस मध्ये ए पच्च प्रयान।
हास्याध्वातीरकरणबीमतसमय्रोद्ध
पच्च विध भक्ते गौण सति रस हृय।
पच्च रसस्थायी व्यापी रहें भक्तनते
सति गौण आगन्तुक पा ह्ये 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 Pṛīta (rendered as Faithfulness) and Sakhyā is called Preyas (rendered as Friendship).

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

"अथ प्रेमसः . . . अत्र चित्रद्वः स्थायी। प्रेमसे सर्वे
रसा अन्तर्भवनतीत्यत्र महीयानेव प्रपचः। अनन्यगौरवमयाहिद्मात्रमुक्तम्।"
This view of Preman will make it the basic Love, which Bhoja also says, lies at the root, as Mūlaprakṛti, of Rati and Prīti.

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 Vaiṣṇava Ālāmkārikas.

**Madhusūdana Sarasvatī 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,¹ a work, in which the subject is approached from the point of view of the Ālāmkārika. 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, तुःखास्मिन्नप्रियतम्, 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 भगवद्भक्तियोगस्यापि ्तुःखास्मिन्नप्रियतम परमपुरुषार्थार्थःप्रभ-त्याह—‘निरुषमुखस्मिन्नप्रियतम परमपुरुषार्थसम्बन्धोऽस्म’ इति । प. ५।

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.

तत्तथ अद्वितिचितस्य निर्विदपुर्वकं तत्त्वज्ञानम्। द्वितिचितस्य तु भगवत्थावृवणादिभाग्यवत्तमश्रद्धापूर्विका भक्तिरिति अवविलेन द्वयमप्प-पातम् । प. २।

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 Saṅcārin of Bhakti.

“अत्र ‘मनो यावत् प्रसीदति’ (भ. XI. 20.) इति भक्तियोग एव ज्ञानाविधिक्लेन उक्तः।” प. ३।

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 Adhikārins. 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 Antaḥkaraṇa takes the form of the object it comes into contract with; भगवद्याकारता is Bhakti.

"भजनम् अन्तःकरणस्य भगवद्याकारतारूपं भक्ति: ||
दृढत्वः भगवद्याकारतारूपं भक्ति: ||
सर्वेऽशो मनसो दृष्टिमित्रित्यमितियते \| I, 3.

... या सर्वेश्विषया दृष्टि: भगवद्याकारतेत्यथः; तदाकार-
तैहि सर्वेऽश्रविष्याविद्यारूपमां दश्यते; अतत्ससा भक्तिभिंतियते।" p. 13.

By Karaṇa Vyutpatti, Bhakti means the Sādhanas also.

"भज्यते सत्त्वेऽश्रविष्याभगवद्याकारस्य अन्तःकरणं क्रियते अथवा; इति
करणायुण्यस्या भक्तिश्रविष्या अवणकर्तिनादि साधनभिंतियते।" p. 8.

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

Sādhanas is eligible for Brahmavidyā. In form also, the two differ; Bhakti is a Savikalpaka-cittavṛtti and Brahmavidyā is a Nirvikalpaka-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 Ālambana Vibhāva is of course the Lord (p. 6); Tulasī, Candana etc. are the Uḍḍīpana 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, Bhagavadākārata, as the Sthāyin. This Cittavṛtti develops into the Rasa of ineffable bliss.

"—सकलविषयविमुखमनस्: महाभागस्य कस्यचित् भगवदुण-\nगरिमधन्नरप्रकृतिः बजनन्तितहुँसेनसाधनवभूतात्या \nश्रद्धीतब्धवदुकारायणं विभावासुभावयोजनसिद्धिन्विष्यसे: द्रव्यस्यर्पतया विभाव-\nनुभावयोजितिसेनगािसनिष्पति: इति।"

"विभावो द्विविधः—आलम्बनविभाव: उद्दीपनविभावः। तत्र \nआलम्बनविभावो भगवान्, उद्दीपनविभाव: तुलसीचन्दननादि:, अनुभावो \nनेत्रविचित्रियादि:। व्यभिचारिणो भावा: निर्वेंद्राव:; व्यक्तीभवव्यव-\nद्राकारसाम्बनसालः: स्थायिभाव: परमानन्दसाधकारार्थ: प्रादुर्भवति; \nस एव भक्त्यो इति:। तं परमं निरितिययं पुरुषार्थं बदन्ति नस्ता:।" p. 4.

It must be noted here that, though M.S. distinguishes Sānta and Bhakti as essentially different, he still gives Nirveda or सकलविषयविमुखमनस्ता (Vairāgya) as a condition precedent even to the Uḍḍīpana vibhāva. This would however make Sānta an Āṅga. Though M.S. gives his Sthāyin for Bhakti as Bhagavadākāracittavṛtti, 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. भगवद्धिषयप्रेमप्रकृतिः मतिफलम्। p. 11. On p. 16, he says that this molten state of the mind is called Praṇaya, 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 Pratibimba. The form of God is ineffable bliss.

M. S. then recognises that the following Bhāvas can become Sthāyins and Rasas. 1. Kāma becoming Sambhoga and Vipralambha; 2. Krodha becoming Dveṣa as in Sīṣupāla and Kaṁsa; 3. Bhaya; 4. Sneha (Dāsyā, Sakhya, Vātsalya, and Preyas); 5. Harṣa becoming love for Kṛṣṇa; 6. Hāsa; 7. Visānaya; 8. Utsāha (Dayā, Dāna and Dharma); 9. S’oka; 10. Jugupsā; 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 Īrsyā and Bhaya are not part of Bhakti (II, 29). So also Raudra and Bhayānaka are never Āngas 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.

रतिदेवादिविषया व्यभिचारी तथोजितः।
भाव: प्रोक्तो रसो नेति यदुर्कर्ष स्वाभिदेः॥
देवान्तरेण जीवल्यात् परानन्दार्काशनात्।
तथोजयस्; परमानन्दरूपे न परमात्मनि॥ 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 रसावास्त्र नेहशम्।
रसतं पुष्यते पूर्णसुलायनशीलकरणात्॥
परिपूर्वतया कुदरसेव्यो भगवद्रतिः।
खचोतेभ्य इवादित्यप्रभे बलवचत्रा॥ II, 77-78.
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'ama, Dama, Santuṣṭi etc., there is also the possibility of depicting the Māyā Rasa by showing the Jīvātman rolling in Saṁsāra 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 Rasataraṅginī of Bhānudatta puts it forward thus:

चित्रबृत्ति: द्विधा—प्रद्विद्धिनिद्विद्धि | निद्विद्धि यथा शान्तरसः; 
तथा प्रद्विद्धि मायारसः हृति प्रतिभाति | 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 विचुदु इव रतिहासशक्क्रोधोमायंकुप्साविस्मयास्तत्र 
उत्पदन्ते विद्वियन्ते च | तेन तत्र व्यभिचारिभावा हृति ।

The Sthāyin of this Rasa is Mithyājñāna.

लक्षणं च प्रबुद्धमिथ्याज्ञानवासना माया रसः | मिथ्याज्ञानस्म्य 
स्थायिभावः | विभावः: सांसारिकमोगार्जज्ञमच्छमा: | अनुभावः: पुत्र- 
कल्पविज्ञसाधारयादयः।
The Mandāramaranda-campū follows the Rasataraṅgiṇī and describes the Māyā-Rasa of Pravṛtti as well as the S'ānta Rasa of Nivṛtti. K. M. 35, p. 106.

Ciraṅjīvibhaṭṭācārya cites the Rasataraṅgiṇī on Māyā Rasa and criticises it:

अन्तोद्वद्विष्ठ—मायाया अनाधिकृत अजन्यत्वात् रसलासभवः।
रसायत सपेन जन्मा एव। कथं वा कथंते भवयाज्ञानादिः मायाया:
कारणमिति, शास्त्रविरूढ्यतात्। कस्ततत्त्व आवृत्तारिकाण्यं मते रसो नित्यः
माण्डलरूपः। अतोत्स्य कस्तस्यहृदयमेव मायाया रसलासभवः। माया
हि तुच्छा विनाशशालिनी क्षमित्येति दिक्ष। अत्य एव प्राचीनस्य-
प्रदायोपायृपि नवेल रसा: कथिता:।

Kāvyavilāsa, Sarvasvatī 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 S'ṛṅgāra etc. as Rasas? They all come under Māyā. If a portrayal of Bhīhatsa, 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 S'ānta Rasa, a Māyā-Rasa is no doubt present; but it is not a unitary Rasa. It is made up of S'ṛṅgāra and the seven other Rasas. Any given specimen presenting a mundane activity can be called by one of the eight names, S'ṛṅgāra 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 Cittasaṃvāda or Rasāsvāda; only the opposite Sānta will produce that in them. Therefore, practically speaking, there is no necessity for a Māyā-Rasa.

**The Kārpāṇya Rasa**

Along with the Laulya, which Abhinava had already mentioned, Bhānudatta examines if Kārpāṇya can be a Rasa. He mentions Spṛhā 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 Hāsya, development of Kārpāṇya also will become Hāsya.

**The Vṛḍanaka Rasa**

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

```plaintext
पव कल्य रसा पण्णता, तं जहा—
बीरो सिंगारो अन्नुयो अ रोदो अ होइ बोदन्वो
बेल्लणो वीभच्छो हासो कल्यो पसंतो अ ॥
```
The commentary of Maladhāri Hemacandra explains that Vṛidhanaka 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.

"श्रीदयति रुज्जामुल्पादयति रुज्जनीयवस्तुदर्शनादिष्ठाति भयानको नरस: पठचतेतत्त्यत्। स चेह रैद्दरसान्तर्भविवशस्त्रां प्रथमः नॉक्तः।"

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 Lakṣaṇa-sloka is—

भयानको भयानकश्रवस्तादिकारविन्यसमत्वः
संविष्णुसंग्रामविपादम्रवणविक्षिणो रसो रैद्द्रः॥

(छाया)

The illustration is however for Raudra proper:

श्रुकुटीविविधमितुल सन्दर्भो इत आकार्णिविषयः
हसि पशुं अस्यर्निम भीमरसित जलरैद्द्र रैद्दोडविष॥

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

1 The commentator's date is the end of the 11th cent. and early part of the 12th. He wrote his Jivasamāsa 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 Kāvyānusāsana.
"ननु भयजनकर्पादिभ्य: समुपव: संमोहाधिक्षिणं भयानक 
एव भवति, कथमस्य रौद्रत्वम्; किन्तु पिशाचादिरौद्रवस्तुभ्यो जातवात् 
रौद्रत्वमस्य विवशिततिमित्यदेषः।।। रौद्रो रस:। सोद्युपलक्षणल्वादशैव 
द्रष्टव्यः। अन्यथा च निरास्पद एव स्थात। अत एव रौद्रपरिणामव- 
पुनर्चेष्टाप्रतिपादकमेव उदाहरण दशीयित्वति। भीतचेष्टाप्रतिपादकं तु 
तद् स्वत एव अभ्युद्यमित्यर्थ सङ्क्षेपः।"

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 Kāraṇa-kārya-bhāva existing among the eight Rasas, श्रुताराज्ज्ञ भवेद्वास्य: 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 Vṛḍanaka Rasa, the definition and illustration are as follows:

विनयोपचारगुर्दवस्यांर्वाण्डव्यतिक्षमोक्षः।
श्रीदनको नाम रसो रुधारकरणलिङ्गः।

यथा——

किं लोकिककरणीयानु रुजनीयतरमिति रुजिलासिं।
विवाहे गुरुजनो परिवन्द्ये वद्धुनिवसनम्। (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 Sṛṅgāra has two phases, Sambhoga and Vipralambha, the two Adhīṣṭhānas, as Bharata says, of Sṛṅgāra. 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 Rasas called the Sānta and the Brāhma. Haripāla accepts thirteen Rasas: the eight of Bharata, Sānta and Vātsalya and three new Rasas, Sambhoga, Vipralambha and Brāhma. The peculiarity of the Brāhma-Rasa and its difference from the Sānta have already been explained.

श्रृङ्गारो हास्यनामा च बीमतः करणस्तथा ॥
बीरो महानकाहानो रूढाश्योद्वृतस्तंजंकः ॥
शान्तो भ्राष्टाभिधः पश्चादू वातस्याल्पयमतः परम् ॥
संभोगो विप्रलम्बः स्तात् रसास्तेते त्रयोदश ॥ p. 16.

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

संभोगो विप्रलम्बः ब्राह्मधिति त्रयो रसा: ॥
अतिरिक्ता उदीर्यंते हरिपालमहीनुजा ॥
S'rṅgāra has always been considered as Ujjvala and S'uci, a Rasa of men of cultivated taste and of sophisticated persons, the Uttamaparakṛtis. Therefore, in course of time, S'uci and Ujjvala became synonyms of S'rṅgāra. In an unsophisticated rustic, there is S'rṅgāra but only in a way. The ancients also consider that love in birds and beasts is not Rasa, but only its semblance, Rasābhāsa. Therefore, love as understood by the word S'rṅgāra 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 S'rṅgārā-bhāsa, it may be separated into a distinct Rasa and called Sambhoga.

More striking is Haripāla’s view regarding Vipralambha. Since both S'rṅgāra and Sambhoga are of a pleasurable nature, and Vipralambha is essentially of a painful nature, the latter is a separate Rasa. If S'rṅgāra is S'uci and Ujjvala,
Vipralambha is ‘Malina’. Vipralambha may be due to Sṛṅgāra or Sambhoga. This cause-effect relationship between Sṛṅgāra 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 Sṛṅgāra, Rati of Sambhoga and Arati of Vipralambha.

आहादः प्रथम् . . . .

. . . . . प्रात्यतिरी तथा ॥

प्रत्येकं स्थायिनो भावा: कमात् प्रत्येकमरिता: ॥ p. 17.

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.

आनन्दालक्ष्यातं रते: कैष्ठितुकम्, तत्तत्त्यम्। विप्रयोगादे:
आनन्दालक्ष्यं अयोगात्। Mad. MS., p. 7.
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: रतिसमयप्राप्तिना कुर्वेत् (S’ākuntala) and प्रेमासमातोत्सवम् (Tāpasavatsarāja). Therefore, Vipralambha is an aspect of Sṛṅgāra only, and of Vipralambha also, Rati is the Sthāyin.

“विप्रलम्बे रतिरेव स्थायी ... विपर्कर्धपि रते: स्वत-सिद्धवाल्।”

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. Vidyādhara, 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, Vidyādhara says, is irrelevant. Why should the subject know what it is enjoying
or how it enjoys, provided it enjoys? Kumārasvāmin cites this view of Vidyādhara in his commentary on the Pratāparudrīya:

‘अन्त्र तिरक्षोः: पारावतयोः कालकौशलाभावेन तददोषनुशुक्लारस्य विभावदिपरिपूर्ववाचात् आभासवत् द्यृष्ट्यम्।’ रस एवारयं नामास इति केचित्।

tadāraste vidyādhareṇa—‘विभावदिसंवभो हि रसं प्रति प्रयोजकः; न विभावादिज्ञानम्। तताः पिनामस्त्येव रसः।’ p. 21, Bālamānaromā Edn.

Earlier than Kumārasvāmin, Śrīngabhūpāla noticed this view of Vidyādhara, 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.) Vidyādhara’s view is thus stated:

‘अपरे तु रसाभासं तिरक्षो द्रवक्षे। ततः न परीक्षास्वम्।

तेष्वापि भावादिसंवभवत। विभावादिज्ञानशृष्ट्यास्तिक्षेपः। न भाजनं भविल
tumahinī rastsyau ti chan to amnuṣṭav api kechit tadabhaudē ou rasanviyā
taṃprajjñāt। अत्र विभावादिसंवभवोदपरसं प्रति प्रयोजकः। न विभावादिज्ञानम्। तताः पिनामस्त्येव रसः।’

The criticism of Śrīngabhūpāla is that Śrīṅgāra is essentially a Rasa of subjects, Ālambanas, who are S’uci 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 Cittasaṁvāda 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 Śṅgabhūpāla:

“अथ स्वजातियोग्यगमः करिणो करिणी प्रति विमावलं ह्यति चेत न। तस्यां कक्ष्यावर करिणो करिणी प्रति कारणत्वां, न पुनः विमावलम्।”

किंशु जातियोपेष्ट्में: वस्तुनो न विमावलम्, अपि तु भावक-चित्रोपासेहुमि रातिविशिष्टेरव।

“किंशु विमावज्जानम् नाम ऋषिज्ञविवेकः, तेन शूद्रः: तिरेम्भो न विमावकां याति। . . विवेकरहितजनोपलक्षणमेच्छगतस्य रसस्य आभासां प्रेषिष्ठावसः॥” R. A. S., pp. 206-7.

Consistent with this argument, Śṅgabhūpāla 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.’

आभासालं भवेत्रे यमनोधित्रात्मवर्तर्तनाम्।
असत्यस्योभयाभयात् अनिविध्यं द्रिष्टं भवेत्॥
असत्यस्य तत् स्याद् अनेतनगतं हु वधु॥
अयोग्यस्य तेर्सं नीर्तिष्ठ्यङ्गात्मश्च॥

Kumārasvāmin does not refute Vidyādhara, and Rājacūḍāmani dīkṣita fully agrees with Vidyādhara. After reproducing the Ekāvali, Rājacūḍāmani says that if the Kāvyaprakāśa is not wrong in illustrating Bhayānaka Rasa with the verse
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śrīvāmūkṣābhāramrīm etc. describing Fear in a deer, it is Rasa in birds and animals, and not Rasābhāsa.

अत एव काव्यप्रकाशिकायां ‘श्रीवामुक्षाभारम् सन्दर्भपति स्वन्दने बद्धत्थः—’ इति छोकें भयानकसंस्कृतस्यविश्वयगततया उदाहरत हृयाहूः।

Kāvyadarpaṇa, Ch. IV, pp. 211-2, Vānīvilās Edn.

Possibly, S'īṅgabhūpāla would reply to Rājacūḍāmaṇi that the Rasa in question is only S'īṅgāra, 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 S’oka in general, i.e., S’oka at the loss of relations and the like. The Uttamas
are chiefly sorry on issues of Dharma; the Madhyamas, on
cell of wealth and other possessions (Artha), and perhaps, only
Adhamas are supposed to sorrow too much over the loss of
those whom they love (Kāma). This however does not rule
out Karuṇa on the loss of the beloved in an Uttamaprakṛti.
It appears that only the third variety is S'oka and Karuṇa
proper, and that the first two varieties of S'oka in Dharma
and Artha, seem to be only Vyabhicārins. Three kinds of
Bhayānaka are given, Vyājāt (feigned), Aparādhāt (at having
done a mistake) and Vitrāsitaka, born of being timid by nature.
The varieties of Bīhatsa,—Kṣobhaṇa and Udvegin, or
Kṣobhaṇa, Udvegin and Suddha—have been spoken of while
considering the possibility of a kind of Jugupsā being the
Sthāyan of the S'ānta. (See above.) Adbhuta 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 S'ānta explained away S'ānta as provided for by one of
the varieties of the Vīra mentioned by Bharata. Bharata men-
tions three kinds of heroism: munificence, Dānavīra, as in
Karna; sticking to right at all costs, Dharmavīra, as in
Yudhishṭhira; and martial heroism, Yuddhavīra.

दानवीरं भर्मवीरं युद्धवीरं तथैव च ।
रसं वीरमणिप्राह ब्रह्म त्रिविषमेव हि || N. S., VI, 99.¹

¹ Cf. Bharata's description of Utsāha:

तत्त्व (उत्साहत्व) स्थायिं धैर्यं स्थायं वैशार्यदिविषितमुदार्जिनयः प्रयोक्तः ||

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. Jagannātha Paṇḍita 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-doṣas 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 Praśānta Rasa, free from such Sūtradoṣas.

"अत्र तु यागतपोगुणो वीरस्ये वर्तते | यागतपसी च ‘यागो गुणो गुणशतादिको मतो मे’, ‘परं लोकातिं धाम तपः शुरुविनिष्ठि
द्रवम्’ इत्यादिविचारनात् समस्तगुणध्रान् इत्यनया विवक्ष्या वीररसस्य
आदावपुन्यासः।"
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In VI, 97, Bharata says that Sṛṅgāra is of three forms, caused by speech (Vāk), dress (Nepathyā), and physical action (Kriyā), and Hāṣya and Raudra also have these three forms. But why should he restrict these three forms to Sṛṅgāra, Hāṣya and Raudra only? These three, speech, dress and action, form the three Abhinayas, Vācika, Āhārya and Āṅgika. The Sāttvika comes under the last. All Rasas are roused by these three Abhinayas. So Māṭrgupta says:

रसास्तु श्रवण्य वाचिक-नेपथ्य-स्वभावजः ||
रसानुस्त्रोपयालापं: श्रोक्तरविचारं: पदेस्तथा ||
नानांलकारसंयुक्ते: वाचिको रस इष्ट्यते ||
कर्मसूक्तव्योजातिदेशकालावन्ततिष्ठि: ||
माल्यभूषणवस्त्राधी: नेपथ्यसरस इष्ट्यते ||
रूपयोगवन्तवणमक्ष्मेवायुदितिभिः पराठि: ||
रस: स्वाभाविको जैय: स च नास्ते प्रशस्यते ||

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 Śṛṅgāra for each Puruṣārtha and relates the resulting four Śṛṅgāras with the four types of heroes, Dhīrodhatta, Dhīrodhāta, Dhīralalita and Dhīrsānta. Of this, I have spoken fully in the chapter on Rasa in my Ph.D. thesis on Bhoja’s Śṛṅgāraprakāśa.
VIII

Are all Rasas Pleasurale 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 Rasakalikā of Rudrabhaṭṭa also considered Vipralambha as standing in the way of accepting Rati as a purely pleasurale state and that as a matter of fact, Rasa was both, some Rasas being pleasurale and some painful.

करुणामयानामप्रयुक्तेऽशास्त्रकल्पविद्यार्थ्यां सामाजिकानाम्, रसस्य खुशुदःखालमभित्र तदुभयलक्षणवेच्यं उपपध्ये। अत एव तदुभयजनकल्लम्।

Rasakalikā, 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 Karuṇa? 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 खुशुदःखालस्थानारास:।

but he evidently means here the Laukika bhāvas to which the term Rasa is applied by extension. The Nāṭyadarpaṇa also says in S’ 109 (p. 158) सुखद्व:खातमको रस: 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 Sāṃkhyan scheme of three guṇas, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas: Only Sattva can make a Sthāyin and Rasa. In Krodha, which is Rājas 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:

“—दुर्विमाक्ष्य सत्त्वसम्भवत्, ते विना च स्थायिमायासंभवत्।
सत्त्वगुणस्य च सुखसम्भवत्, सचेष्टं भावानं सुखमयलेखिपि रजस्तमोऽस्मिनः
शमिल्यणात् तारत्म्यवस्तवतव्यस्म। अतो न सचेष्टं रसेष्टु तुल्यसुखानुमयः।” p. 22.

“कृष्णोक्षयादीनां साक्षात्सुखविवियोधिनाम्।
रसावस्ययुगलं तथानुभवात्तः ॥” II, 79

After saying this on the basis of the Sāṃkhya, Madhusūdana Sarasvatī discusses the question from the Vedāntic
standpoint also. All bliss is of the form of Brahmananda, 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 Upanisad: एतस्येव आनन्दस्य अन्य आनन्दा मात्रासमुपजीवितः.

Though literary enjoyment is superior to mundane enjoyment, it is still not on a par with Brahmasvāda. (I, 10-14.) Compared to Brahmasvāda, Kavyarasasvāda 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 Brahmasvāda, for there it is the Paramātman and Bhagavān themselves that are involved in them as Sthāyan and Ālambara. 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 Kavya and in the hearts of the spectator, are all of the form of bliss only.

बोध्यनिष्ठा यथास्यं ते सुखदः स्वादिशेतवः।
बोद्ध्यनिष्ठास्तु स्वेदस्य सुखमात्रेकहैतवः॥ 5.

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

सम्प्रदायम्बनामेका जाते वैस्तविकं मति:॥
सानन्दरक्षणेऽवशं व्यनक्तं सुखमुद्भतम्॥ III, 12-13.
IX

NEW VYABHICĀRINS AND SĀTTVIKAS

We have seen how freely later writers debated the question of adding newer Rasas 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'o ka becomes a Vyabhicārin, there is no need for Viṣāda; Bhaya in its Vyabhicārin-grade eliminates Trāsa; Sāgaranandin actually gives Trāsa as the Sthāyin\(^1\). 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 Nidrabhibhava and Nidrāsamuttha. 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 Sauca, as for instance, those whom Sāgaraṇandin, 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 Alaṅkāras of damsels, Bhāva, Hāva etc.,¹ the eight Sāttvikas, Ālāpa etc., given as modes of Vācikābhinaya, the ten Kāma Avasthās²—all these are comprehended in the term Vyabhicārin. Bhoja calls the Sāttvikas, Bāhya vyabhicārins:

वद्र आभ्यंत्तरा व्यभिचारिणं चिन्तोत्सुक्योवेगवितक्षौद्यः, बाह्यः
स्वेदौरोमाश्चायुव्यव्यायांद्यः | Sṝ. 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 Maugdhyā, Mada, Bhāvikatva and Paritapana according to Abhinava. See J. O. R. Vol. V1, 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 Padmaśri's Nāgarasarvasva following Rāhula's school, Ch. vii, S'ls. 3-4, where Viksepa, Mada, Maugdhyā and Tapanas are given in addition. (p. 29, Tanusukharam Sarma's edn., Bombay, 1921). While defining Viksepa, Padmasri quotes a writer named Kapila. Bhoja added Vihrta, Kridita and Keli which Śīṅga criticised. Visvaṉātha accepts Rāhula's and Bhoja's additions and has, in addition, three more, Kūṭūhala, Hasita and Cakita. (J. O. R. VI; pp. 209-210.)

² Bhānudatta shows in his R. T. how the ten Madanaavasthās 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 Śīṅgabhūpāla refutes) and S'ama which is needed for the S'ānta Rasa (Ch. xi). In his S.K.A., Bhoja counts among his thirty-three Vyabhicārins Sneha which Śīṅgabhūpāla refutes and, instead of adding S'ama as in his Sṛ. Pra., takes Dhṛti itself, one of the old Vyabhicārins given by Bharata, as the Sthāyin of S'ānta. Śīṅgabhūpāla raises the point that there can be more Vyabhicārins, mentions some—Udvega, Sneha, Dambha, Īrṣyā—but dismisses these as included in some of the thirty-three, with reasons which look strained. Bhānudatta proposes Chala:

"अत्र प्रतिभाति चछृढ़मयिको व्यभिचारिभाव इति।" (Ch. 5.)

and shows its occurrence in Sṛṅgāra, Raudra and Hāsyā. 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’.

Sāttvika अपि सर्वे एव, मनःप्रभवत्वात्। अनुपहतं हि मनः
सत्त्वमिल्युच्छते।


S'īngabhūpāla also says:

सर्वेदपि सत्त्वमूलत्वादू भावा यथपि सात्त्विका।
तथायमीयां सत्त्वकृमूलत्वात् सात्त्विकरथा॥

R. A. S., I. 310.

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

इन्भ च नवम्: सात्त्विको भाव इति प्रतिमाति। p. 66.

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

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

वेदात्मकं भवेतसत्वं सत्त्वाञ्गः: समुद्भितः। and सत्त्वजोभिनयः पूर्वं मया
प्रोक्तो ह्यद्रोहममः।

Abhinava also says “बाष्पाध्य बाष्पप्रस्ततयः”, 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 ‘Rasānukūla vikāra’, which is of two kinds, Ābhyantara (Sthāyin and Vyabhicārin) and Bāhya (Sāttvika etc.). But to exclude too-palpably physical acts, he gives them a different name Čeṣṭā 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 Čeṣṭā like Aṅgākrṣṭi and Akiṣimardana is done by man of his own will.

"न चाज्ञाकृष्टिनेत्रदर्दनादीनामपि भाववापति।| तेषां भाव-\nवक्षणाभावात्। रसानुकूलो विकारो भाव इति हि तत्तत्त्वम्।| अज्ञाकृष्टिचादयो हि न विकारः।| किंतु शरीरचेष्टा।| प्रत्यक्षसिद्धमेतत्।| अज्ञाकृष्टिरक्षिमद्वेद च पुरुषोरिच्छया विधीयते परित्यज्यते च।| जूह्मा च विकारादेव भवति, तत्रिहस्व निबर्तते चेति।"

Rasatarāṅgini, p. 69.
RASA-SYNTHESIS

KARUNA

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

माध्यमाद्र्शतां याति यत्सत्राधिकं मनः | 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 स्वयमादिकाविना सूत्रितः 'शोकः
क्षोक्तवमागतः' इत्येववादिना। नित्यृद्धश्र स एव सीतात्यन्तविद्योग-
यथान्तमेव स्वप्रवण्धमुपरतचक्षतः।

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

भगवान भूतार्थवादी प्राचेतस: 
पावने वचनामात्रं करणाद्वस्तरसं च किंविंदुपनिविद्यम् etc. Act. VII.

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

अहो संविधानकम्—
एको रसः करण एव निमित्तमेदाद्
भिनः प्रथक्कुशगिः श्रयते विचारान्यः 
आवर्तवहुदतरज्ञमयाने विकारान्
अभ्यो यथा सदृशमेव हि तत्समस्तम् || 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 सचिपि निमित्तमेदाद् साधिक्यसतिक्यसतिक्यविचित्रीत्वायुपार्थिकण्ये। 
भिन्न: विलक्षण एव प्रथक्कुशं विचारान्यैः च। वासनास्वतारामो। 
प्रभृतिषु परस्परविलक्षणावस्तुक्षोविहोस्मयनु| भजतिः।”

Vīrarāghava’s com., p. 99, N. S. Edn.

A general import bearing on our present subject of Rasa-synthesis 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'ṛṅgāra etc., even as the same water assumes the forms of whirl, bubble etc. Karuṇa is the Prakṛti; the other Rasas are its Vikṛtis. Vīrarāghava, a commentator, also saw such a meaning in this verse which shows that the interpretation is authenticated by tradition.
“एक इति। स्यते स्वाभाव इति रसः काव्यानुशीलनाभासवस्व-विशादीभूमित्वर्णीयतत्त्वतत्त्वस्यसामाजिकमकनोमुक्तमिर्मानतया निर्भ-रानन्दस्वतित्रः। कश्च इत्यजनियोगतन्त्रः लातिशयः। एक एव सत्वपि निमित्तमेदात् व्यञ्जनाविभावविभिन्नविशेषाद् भिनः विलक्षणः। प्रथक्क प्रथम् विचारविंति परस्यविलक्षणशृण्णाराधामत्वाः परिधानाः। “व्यस्त-परिणमः स्वाधिवर्तः” इति कपिलः। श्रयते भजते . . . इदम्य कर्मेन्तम्—मध्यपि श्रुण्णार एक एव रस इति शृण्णारस्यकाशकारविद-मयम्, तथापि प्राज्ञावृद्धि रागिविरागिसाधारण्यत् कर्ण एक एव रसः। अन्ये तु तद्विस्तारः।”

Virarāghava’s Com., p. 99.

To the Karuṇa-synthesis suggested by Bhāvabhūti, this commentator added two arguments, one that Karuṇa 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, Cittasaṃvāda; and here is a linguistic argument in :favour of a Karuṇa-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 Karuṇa.

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 Sānta as the one fundamental Rasa of which the other Rasas are modifications. He called Sānta 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 सर्वसानां शाल्लोका वास्तवादः विषयेन्यो विपरी- वृत्त्या— ।"


Further, the Sthāyin of Sānta, 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'rīgāra etc. Thus it is Sthāyitama; it is the Sthāyin of the Sthāyins, the Prakṛti of which Rati, Hāsa and the rest are Vikṛtis. Says Abhinava—

अन्त्र सर्वभ्रुक्तिलाभिभास्य पूर्वमभिभास्य ।


And according to some mss. known to Abhinava, the Sānta Rasa section is found at the very beginning, even before the S'rīgāra section.

"तथा च चिरन्तन्युस्तकेषु 'स्थायिभवान रसस्वमुपनेष्याम्' इत्यन्तरम् 'शान्तो नाम शमस्थायिभवात्मकः' इत्यादि लक्षणं पठवते ।"


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

भावा विकारा वत्याः: शान्तस्त्र प्रकृतिमेतः ।

विकार: प्रकृतेष्यात: पुनस्त्रैव लीतेते ॥
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स्वं स्वं निमित्तमासाय वान्ताङ्गावः प्रवत्तते |
पुनर्निमित्तापाये व वान्त एवोपलीयते ॥

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

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

AHAṆKĀRA-SAṆGĀRA

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 S'ṛṅgāra he formulated. He said that at the root of all Bhāvas lay the germ of Ahaṅkāra otherwise called S'ṛṅgāra and Abhimāna. It is a Guṇa 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, Häsa etc. Thus this basic S'ṛṅgāra is different from the first derivative of that name, the S'ṛṅgāra developed from Rati. So this S'ṛṅgāra-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 S'ṛ. Pra. I have set this forth at great length in my Ph. D. thesis on Bhoja's S'ṛ. Pra., and here I give only a brief account. The S. K. Ā. says:

रसोद्भिमानोद्हारः श्रृंगार इति गीयते ।
योक्ष्यस्तस्यान्वयात क्राव्यं कमनीयत्वमस्तुते ॥
While Abhinava in his Śānta-synthesis took his stand on that ultimate ripple-less state of the Ātman, Bhoja, adopting the Sāṃkhya 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. Śāma as much as Rati is the product of Ahaṅkāra.

"....

What is called Rasa is an experience of bliss unconditioned by any name. So long as there is the knowledge of the state being Rati or Hāsa or anything else, the spectator
is only in the state of Bhāvanā and Bhāva; beyond this is the state of Rasa. Says Bhoja:

आभावनोदयमन्यवधिया जनेन
यो मात्यते मनसि भावनया स भाव: ।
यो भावनाशपथमतिय विवर्तमानः
सारंकृतां हृदि परं स्वदते रसोज्ञाः ॥

Thus Sṛṅgāra, Hāsyā, Viśa—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 Madhyamā 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 Preman, from which stage again, experience passes into the primary stage of the one Rasa of Ahaṅkāra.
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. "प्रेम: भियतराष्यानमित्यनेन समस्तभावमूर्तिभिषिक्याय रते:
परम्कर्षाधिगमाद्र भावनाधि(ति?)गमे भावस्तुतामुहल्लक्य प्रेमस्नुपेन परिण-
ताया: उपादानातु भावान्तराणामपि परम्कर्षाधिगमे रसहुपेन परिण-
तिरिति ज्ञापयनहुप्रक्रिया उच्चरां कोटस्म्यपक्ष्यति। सर्वेशामपि हि रत्यादि-
प्रकर्षां रतिमिष्यो रणधियः परिहास्यिन्ति: अमर्किषय्य इति प्रेम्णेव
पर्यवसानं भवति।"

S. K. Ā., p. 613.

In the Sṛ. Pra. he adds: रसं तिवह प्रेमाणमेवावामनति | Ch. xi,

This Preman-synthesis finds an advocate in Kavikarṇa-
pūra, the author of the Alaṅkārakaustubha where he says:

. प्रेमसंसे सवे रसा अन्तर्भवतीत्वत महीनानेव प्रपद्यः।
अन्यगौरवमयादृ दिद्मात्रसुतम्। . . . तथा च—

' उन्माजन्ति निमजन्ति प्रेमाण्यवज्जस्त्वतः।
सवे रसाध्य भावाध्य तरं इव वारिवो॥'

pp. 147-8, Vārendra Edn.

RATI-S'RÑGĀRA

The Agnipurāṇa took Bhoja's Ahaṅkāra, but instead of
saying that Rati and all other Bhāvas emanated from it, said
that Rati was the first born of Abhimāna which was itself a
product of Ahaṅkāra and this Rati modified itself into Hāsa
etc. It further went behind Ahaṅkāra and said that Ahaṅkāra
is the first manifestation of Rasa or Camatkāra which is the
manifestation of the Ānanda, the innate nature of the Supreme
Being called Para Brahman.
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अक्षरं परमं श्रवण सनातनमञ्जं विनुः।
वेदान्तेशु वदन्त्येकं चैतन्यं ज्योतिरिधरस्य॥
आनन्दसहस्तस्तस्य न्युज्यते स कदाचन।
व्यक्तिस्य तस्य चैतन्यवचनकारसाहस्य॥
आयतस्तथा विकारो यः सोहद्वार इति स्मृतः॥
तत्तदभिमानः तत्रेदं समासं भवनत्रयम्॥
अभिमानान्ति तिथि च परिवोष्युपेयुषी।
व्यभिचारार्थिमान्यायव शुक्लार इति गीयते॥
तत्त्वेद्या कामभिरं हास्याध्या अथ्यनेककः॥
स्वस्वस्थायिविषेषोद्ध (शोध) परिंचो (पो)वस्वचक्षणः॥

A. P., Ch. 339, S’ls. 1-6.

ADBHUTA

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. Hāsyā 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—‘आक्षर्यवदभिमिश्यानम्’ N. S’, XXI, Kāśī edn., S’l. 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 Mṛchakatika 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.

कार्यं गोपुच्छादं कर्तव्यं काव्यबन्धमासादः ।
वेचोदाता भावः तेन सर्वं गृह्यं कार्यं ॥
सर्वं स्त्रिया नानासमावेश्वरिक्युक्तानाम् ।
निवेद्ये कर्तव्यो नििल्यै हि रसोद्वृत्तस्तिर्येः ॥

N. S’., XX, 46-47.

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

इत्येक्षमादिरूद्धिता गुणातिशययोगतः ।
सर्वेऽतिशयोक्तस्तु तर्केद्वात्तं यथागमम् ॥
सैव श्रवेष्व वकोक्षितरत्नावर्यो विभाव्यते ।
यथोस्यां कविना कार्यं: कोश्लारोज़नया विना ॥

Bhāmaha, K. A., II, 84-85.

असावतितिशयोक्ति: स्यादृ अल्कारोज़मु यथा ।

अल्कारार्नारायणामपेक्षकाहुः प्रायणमु ।
बागीश्महितामुक्तिमृ इमातिशयाह्यामु ॥

Daṇḍin, K. Ā., II, 214-220.
This point has been explained at some length by Ānanda and Abhinava in the Dhva. Ā. and the Locana, Ud. III, pp. 206-209. The very strikingness of poetic expression is Atiśaya and Adbhuta:

"... लोकोत्तरण रूपण अवस्थानम् ... लोकोत्तरण चैवातिशयः। तेन अतिशयोक्ति: सर्वाङ्गार्थसामान्यम्।"

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 Sṛṅgāra-theory in the Rasasudhānīdhi of Soṇthī 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, Bhanudatta says in his Rasataraṅgini—
‘अत्युक्ति अनोक्ति विमोक्ति विरोधभास्पत्येष्ठिता एव ।’

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

चमकार्द्भितविस्ताररूप: विस्मयापरर्परवर्य: । तत्त्वात्वते च अस्मे-पितामहसहस्रद्विगुरिगरिष्कचिपिंढितमुद्यश्रीमतारायणपदरूपम् । तदाह धर्मदत्त: स्वमन्ये—

‘रसे सारधमकार: सर्वत्रान्यनुभवते ।
तचमकारसारले सर्वत्रान्य्यद्वृतो रसः: ॥
तस्माददूमतमेवाह कृती 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. Bhānudatta accepts that in Sṛṅgāra and other cases there is an element of Adbhuta as Āṅga; where it is Āṅgin, the Rasa becomes Adbhuta proper.

श्रुत्साराद्रो चमकारदर्शनाचत्र मनोविभक्तः(स्तृ)लिङ्गतया माते तत्र
श्रुत्साराद्रय एव रसाः । प्राणान्येन यत्र माते तत्रा दृश्यम्य एव रसः ।

Rasatarangini, Ch. I.

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

“—इति नारायणेन अदृश्य एव रस इत्यमहितम् । धर्मदत्ता-दिविष्य तदेवानुस्तमुः । तत्र साधु । वैद्वक्षणस्य अनुभवसिद्ध्वात् ।
प्रकृतिमेवाच । नापि विभिन्नरित्रु स्वायत्त इव रसादिषु सिस्मायादुगम: ।
शोकादिषु तथान्युगमात्।” etc.
Prabhākara goes at length and says in the end that he has refuted this theory of ‘Adbhuta in all Rasas’ in his earlier Alamkāra work, the Alamkārarahasya, also, which is not available to us now.

On the practical side, S'aktibhadra’s Āscaryacūḍāmaṇi illustrates the dominating Rasa of Adbhuta, and this has been explained in detail by Professor Mr. 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 Adbhutadarpaṇa, where his Rāma is made to say:

वत्सत्यमभित: स्तव्यः इन्द्रियचरित्रजालवत् ।
अद्यतनेतारसाप्रक्ष्यति: अन्तर्मीलिताय माम् ॥

Kāvyamālā, 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 Cittasaṅvāda and is called Camatkāra, the Cittasaṅvāda is not, in all cases, of the form of an 'enlargement', Vistāra. There is Vikṣobha as in Bīhatsa, and there is Druti as in S'ṛṅgāra and Karuṇa. This Druti of S'ṛṅgāra and Karuṇa is totally absent in Raudra, Bīhatsa, Bhayānaka and Adbhuta, and in this way the Karuṇa-synthesis is defective. Abhinava’s S’ānta and Bhoja’s Ahaṅkara-S'ṛṅgāra, 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 Śṛṅgāra, 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 रसादृ कते कथिधिदर्शः प्रवर्तते ।

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

“—तत एव निविवस्वसंवेदनात्मकविद्यान्तिक्षणेन रसनापरपरन्याय श्रृद्धामाणलावू रसश्रवदेनाभिभीयते । तेन रसा एव नाथम, वस्य व्युत्पति: फलमित्युच्यते । तथा च ‘रसाहते’ (६-३३) इत्यत्र एकवचनोपपति: । तत्तथ शुद्धबहुतान्तरसारसार्य स्पोष्टदशीव असत्यानि वा, अन्विताभिधानदशीव उभयात्मकानि सत्यानि वा, अभिहितान्तरदशीव तत्समुदायिक्षणि वा, रसान्तरणि भागाभिनिवेशदशानि रूप्यन्ते (२)।”


Again, commenting on the Śūtra न हि रसाहते 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,

पूर्वेत्र वहुवचनमत्र चैकवचनं प्रशुद्धान्त्यायमात्यः । एक एव
tात्त्वपरमार्थयोरस: सूत्रस्थानलिङ्ग रूपके प्रतिभाति ।
tतत्सौच पुनर्मोगदशा
विभागः ।

Abhinava says that therefore Rasa and Nāṭya mean the same thing.¹ In experience also we find that our relish is one undefined state of the form of a repose of the mind, Visrānti. 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.

“अष्टावेव स्थायिन इति कुतः? तावतामेव स्वादाल्मकल्वाचिति चेत्, किमेते पञ्च्युस्तिसंत एकः स्वादाल्मा! तद्विन्द्रार्भिकसृतां—एतेषां कृष्ट्या एक एव स्वादाल्मा; एते च तद्विण्यार्दे इति—”

“अते (अत:) सर्वेऽ ज्ञात्याकृष्ट्या (स्थ:) एक एव स्वादाल्मा।”

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 (Guṇa) of the mind established in the Sattvaguna and completely devoid of any touch of either Rajas or Tamas, as the one eternal Sthāyun and the one eternal Rasa. This Sthāyun called Ānanda or ‘Āsvādānkura-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 Sthāyun also for this one Rasa which they do not in so many words, though their position implies this one Sthāyun also.

“आःस्वादाल्मकृष्ट्याकृन्दोक्तिः यथे: कथन चेतसः।
रजस्मोस्म्या हीनस्य शुद्धस्वत्वत्या सतः॥

¹ Cf. his Lōcana, p. 149. श्रीरत्नम् च रसः; तवेव नाथयम्, etc. Cf. also Abhinava’s borrower Sāṅgadeva: नाथयान्दे रसं मुखः। VII, 17. Saṁ. Ratnākara.
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

स स्थायी कथ्यते विजैः—विभावस्य पृथक्कथा।
पृथविधिपतं यात्‌येष सामाजिकतया सताम्॥" S'1. 63.

सामाजिकतया सतां सामाजिकानाम् एक एव कथिदायावदादृकर-
कन्दो मनस्: कोषपि धर्मविषेष: स्थायी। स तु विभावस्य उद्धतकारद्रिभिद्विषस्य मेदैवेच स्विति। Alarñ. Kau. V. Chap.

Commentary: "एक एवति—नन्तु स्थायिभावहृपथमेच्छय
एकते कथवेशक्त्य स्थायिन्: वीरसे उस्ताहवम्, कहणसे शोकतम्,
अद्भुतसे भवस्याल्य भवति, परस्परंकुशस्वामेतथा उस्ताहवदीपनाम
एकस्मान् स्थायिरूपमेण वृत्तिवाभावाविदित्याह—स लिति। स एकोपि
धर्मः: उद्धतकारद्रिभिद्विषस्य विभावसं मेदैवेच स्वित्रो भवति इस्यर्थः।
यथात् प्रते स्फटिकः: जपाकुहुमदिनापदर्थायं सज्जात् कदाचिद्रिक:,
कदाचित्त पीता: कदाचिच्छायः:। इत्यादिविनिर्धारकरो भवति, तथा एक
एव स्थायिरूपो धर्मः: वीरसादियोकायां नानाविभिधावानां सज्जात्,
कदाचिच्छायाः: कदाचिद्रिद्विषस्यः:। कदाचित्त शोकरूपः: इत्यादि-
विनिर्धारकरो भवतीति साभ:।"

In the same chapter, Kavikarṇapūra Gosvāmin again states this in clearer language:

गहरस्त: करण्योव्यापारान्तररोपकम्।
स्वाभाविनादिसंख्ये चमककारि सुखं रसः॥

अथ तु उद्धतकारद्रिणाय अनुकार्याणाय स्वतत्सिद्ध एव। काव्यादौ
तु सामाजिकानामेव। तेषां सर्वसामायिकविकिषाणि एक एव पूर्वोकः
कथ्यन्त आस्तादकन्त्र: चेतोधर्मविशेष: स्थायी। तत्र युक्ति: दर्शिष्यते—
रसस्य आनन्दधर्मेतत्वात् एकध्ययम्, भाव एवं हि।
उपाधिमेवदात्तानात्लम्, रस्याद्य उपाधयः॥

रस्याद्यः स्थायिनः यथा नानाविभशरावसलिल्लात्तम्येपि तरणि-
बिम्बप्रलिपिविन्य एक एवं, तथा उपाधिगत एवं भेदः, नानन्दगतो रसस्य।
Com "आनन्दधर्मेतत्वात् चर्मानन्दरूपत्वात् एकध्यमेकऽविविचलम्। यथा
सितोपङ्क्तियः पाकान्तरं नास्ति * * तथा रसस्यापि।"
<table>
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<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>39</td>
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<td>107, 109, 121, 131, 132, 147, 170, 177, 178, 179</td>
</tr>
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<td>72</td>
<td></td>
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<td>170, 171</td>
<td>Alanikaraarahasya</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
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<td>175</td>
<td>Alanikarasarvasva</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhyatma kalpadruma (Santarasadhaavan)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Avadhutarana</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anantadeva</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Asvaghosha</td>
<td>22, 33, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anantanarayanasuri</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>'Asvatara'</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>39</td>
<td>Astraati</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anumitipariyaya</td>
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<td>3</td>
</tr>
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<td>15, 16, 17, 27, 30, 35, 43, 45, 63, 64, 163, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>40</td>
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<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhinavagupta—frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ascaryacudama</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhinava Carukirtipanidita-carya</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Indiresa</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhinavaprabhata—frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td>Induduta</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarakosavyakhyas</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>Isamrgi (Sarvavinoda)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Amrathamathana' ('Asuravijaya', 'Laksmisvamvara')</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ujjvalanilama</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amrthamithra</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Uttararamacarita</td>
<td>121, 163, 164, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amrtojaya</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaka</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>---------------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttara ramacaritavayya- khyā</td>
<td>164, 165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udbhāta</td>
<td>13, 42, 61, 62, 107, 108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upaniṣad</td>
<td>47, 157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upaniṣadas</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udbhātubhisārikyā</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umāsvāti</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekāvalī</td>
<td>147, 148, 149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aucityavicāracarca</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karṇaśūryamāñjari</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalitāṇḍavatātaka</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalinātha</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td>34</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>1, 3, 147</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>34</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>43, 44</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyāprakāsa</td>
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</tr>
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<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gokulanātha</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīvadeva</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>Jñānasūryodaya nāṭaka</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṭikā Sarvasva</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAṆḌU (Bharataputra)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘TAṆḌU’ (Ṣivagaṇa)</td>
<td>3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattvamudrabhadrodaya</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘TAṆḌA’</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘TAṆḌIN’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘TAṆḌYA’</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūpāsavatsarāja</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tārābhaktitaraṅgaṇī</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tota, Taṭa</td>
<td>43, 78, 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trikāṇḍāsēṣa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Tripiradāha’</td>
<td>3, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivenī</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DĀṆḌIN</td>
<td>1, 107, 108, 110, 129, 168, 172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darpadalāṇa</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasarūpaka</td>
<td>5, 10, 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasarūpākāvaloka</td>
<td>10, 20, 27, 28, 46, 47, 75, 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāmodaraśrama</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvādasasāhasṛ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHANĀṆJAYA</td>
<td>45, 46, 113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhanika</td>
<td>45, 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmadatta</td>
<td>173, 174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmadeva gosvāmin</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmavijaya</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmavijayagani</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmāṣṭrī</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmodaya kāvya</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmodaya nāṭaka</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhvanyāloka</td>
<td>15, 163, 173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See also Anandavardhana).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhvanyāloka candrikā</td>
<td>21, 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See also Candrikākāra).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAGE**

| Dhvanyālokalocana—frequently | |
| NANDIKEŚVARA, NANDIN 6, | 7, 8, 9 |
| Namisādhū | 43, 62, 115, 125 |
| (Bhaṭṭa) Narasimha | 177 |
| Narasimhaṁśra | 38 |
| Nallādikṣita | 37 |
| Navagrahacarita | 37 |
| Nāgarasavasva | 159 |
| Nāgūnanda | 21, 23, 24, 28, 43, 48, 73, 100 |
| Nāṭakalakṣṇaratnakosā | 158, 159 |
| Nāṭyadarpaṇa | 118, 124, 154, 156 |
| Nāṭyavārttika | 23 |
| Nāṭyaveda | 10 |
| Nāṭyasāstra (of Bharata) | —frequently |
| Nāṭyasāstravyākhyā (of Abhinava) see Abhinavaśabdhārati. | |
| Nāṭyasāstravyākhyā (of Udbhata) | 42 |
| (Bhaṭṭa) Nāyaka | 44, 45 |
| ‘Nārada’ | 9, 11 |
| Nārāyaṇa | 173, 174 |
| Nārāyaṇa Vidyāvinoda | 7 |
| Nrṣimha kavi | 37 |
| Nrṣimha daivajñā | 40 |
| Nyāya sūtras | 72, 73 |
| PATAṆJALI | 71, 72, 95 |
| Padmasṛ | 159 |
| Padmasundara | 39 |
| Pāṛsvadeva | 9 |
| Pāṇḍadadharmakḥaṇḍana | 40 |
| ‘Purandaravijaya’ | 1 |
| Pūrṇapuruṣārthacandrodaya | 38 |
| Pracaṇḍarāhūdaya | 37 |
| Pratāparudraśya vyākhyā | 148 |
| Pratihārendraṣa | 61, 107, 116, 117 |
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(See also Śyāṅgāraprakāśa and Sarasvatīkāṇṭhābharaṇa.)

MADHUSŪDANA SARASVATĪ

Manodūta (Four different poems of the same name) 132-7, 156
Manodūtikā 34, 35
Mandāra maranda campu 139
Mamaṭa 46, 52, 69
Mahādeva 175
Mahābhārata 17, 19, 22, 30-33, 45, 63, 76, 77, 152
Mahārudasīmha 35
Mātṛgupta 153
Māyāvijaya 39
Māyurāja 147
Māra Bhāṭṭāraka, Saṅthi 173
Mālavikāgniṃitra 172
Mithyājñāna khaṇḍana 38
Muktipariṇāya 36
Mudritakumudacandra 38
Munisundarāśīri 22
Mṛcchakaṭiṣka 172
Meghadūtasamasyālekha 35
Meghavicaya 35
Mohanājaṭarājakya 36, 39

Yatirājavijaya (Vedānta vilāsa) 41
Yaśasćandra 38
Yaśālpāla 36
Yaśāvarga 39
Yāmalāṣṭaka tantra 10
Yoga Śūtrās 71, 79, 95, 99, 103
Yogasūtrabhāṣya 71, 72, 95

Brahmā Bharata 5, 10, 11
Bhakti Dūti 34
Bhaktirasāṃtatasindhu 130
Bhaktivaibhavanātaka 37
Bhagavadbhaktirasāyana 132-7, 156
Bharata—frequently
Bharatamallika 7
Bhartṛharinivelanātaka 41
Bhaṛṛaṛaṛh arirājvyāgānātaka 40
Bhallata 83
Bhavabhāvanā 141
Bhavabhūti 164, 165
Bhāgavata 33
Bhānuji 6
Bhāṇudatta 119, 125, 135, 152, 159, 160, 161, 162, 173, 174
Bhāmaha 2, 107, 108, 172
Bhāratamahājarti 33, 45
Bhāvaṃprakāśa 4, 9, 157
(See also Sāradātanaya.)
Bhāvanāpurusottama 36
INDEX

Raghuvamsa  
Ratnākara  17, 74  
Ratnāvali  119, 125, 138, 139, 152, 159, 160, 
161, 173, 174  
Rasakālika  53, 146, 155  
Rasagāṅgādhara  90, 125  
Rasataraṅgini  38  
Ratnāvali  8  
Ravidāsa  38  
Rasagāṅgādhara  90, 125  
Rasataraṅgini  119, 125, 138, 139, 152, 159, 160, 
161, 173, 174  
Lolla Lakṣmīdhara  25  
VARADĀCARYA  41  
Vararuci  1  
Vastuvijnānaratnakosa  22  
Vācaspatyā  6  
Vatsyāyana  8  
Vādicandra  38  
'Vāsuki'  11, 12, 46  
Vāsudeva  53  
Vikramorvasīya  1, 2  
Vijñānataraṅgini  35  
Vidyādhara  147, 148  
Vidyāparinaya  36  
Vidyāvinoda Nārāyaṇa  7  
Vinayavijayagaṇi  23, 34  
Vivekacandrodayanāṭikā  39  
Vivekavijaya  37  
Vis'vanātha  47, 50, 108, 159  
Vis'vanāthasimha  132  
Viṣṇudāsa  34  
Vīrārāghava  164, 165  
Venkaṭanātha (Vedānta desīka)  36, 47  
Venkaṭanārāyaṇadikṣita  128  
Venkaṭācārya (of Uda-yendrapuram)  39  
Vedāntavilāśa (Yatirāja-vijaya)  41  
Vedāntācārya (Manasālakāṭti)  41  
Vaijanātha  39  
Vaidyanātha  53  
Vyaktiviveka  88, 118  
Vyaktivivekavyākhya  88  
Vyāsa (M. Bhrata)  9, 63  
Vyāsa (Yogabhāṣya)  71, 95  
SāKTIBHADRA  175  
Sāṅkara (Śiva ?)  9  
Sāṅkarācārya  25  
Sāṅkuka  42, 43, 63, 115  
Sabdakalpadruma  6, 7

(Look also Bhānudatta.)

Rasaprādhata  174  
Rasarathnāhāra  110  
Rasaratnākara  53  
Rasasudhānāthī  173  
Rasārṇavasudhākara  122, 161  
(Round also S'īrgabhubāla.)

Rāghavabhaṭṭa  153  
Rājaciudāmāṇidīksita  149, 150  
Rājatarāṅgīnī  34  
Rājarāja-varan  41  
Rājashekhara  8, 43  
Rāmacandra  118  
Rāmarāma  34  
Rāmānuja Kavi  37  
Rāmānujacārya  41  
Rāmāyāna  33, 45, 163  
Rāmāyaṇamañjarī  45  
Rāyamukuta  7  
Rāhula  23, 50, 159  
Rudrabhaṭṭa  53, 146, 147, 155  
Rudraṭa  43, 62, 70, 107, 108, 110, 111, 114, 115, 
116, 117, 122, 123, 124, 125  
Rūpa Gosvāmin  130, 137, 160  

Lakṣmīdhara (Alaṅkāra work)  25  
'Lakhmisvayamvara',  
('Āmratahan'  
'Asuravijaya')  3  
Laghuvrābodha candrodaya  36  
Lollāta  42, 63, 70, 113, 114, 
115, 116, 117  
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3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17, 147</td>
<td>Sarasvatikanṭhābharana 19, 45, 65, 109, 113, 121, 124, 126, 160, 167, 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>(See also Bhoja.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23 | Sarasvatikanṭhābharana- 
| 23 | vyākhyā 177 |
| 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 26, 46, 157 | Sarvavinoda (Ihāmyṛṣṭi) 40 |
| 68, 73, 84, 88, 111, 113, 119, 177 | Sarvasiddhānta 132 |
| 46, 122, 148, 149, 159, 160, 161 | Sarvānanda 7 |
| 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 | Sāgaranandin 158, 159 |
| 39 | Sāṅkhyaśāstra 71, 95 |
| 41 | Sālva 53 |
| 35 | Sāhityadarpaṇa 47, 48, 108, 159, 173, 174 |
| 36 | Sahityamāṃsā 65 |
| 38 | Sahityaratnākara 12 |
| 110 | Siddhānta 35 |
| 35 | Siddhāntabherināṭaka 37 |
| 36 | Siddhāntasāstras 104 |
| 38 | Simhabhūpāla, (See Sāṅga-
| 45, 66, 121, 122, 123, 124, 159, 160, 161, 167, 168, 169, 170 | bhūpāla.) |
| (See also Bhoja.) | Sudarsanācārya 37 |
| 36 | Sundaradeva 36 |
| 40 | Sundarasāstrin 40 |
| 74 | Subrahmanyasa sudhī 74 |
| 22, 34 | Saundarananda 22, 34 |
| 25 | Saundaryalahari 25 |
| 36, 47 | S a u n d a r y a l a h a r i - 
| 23, 73 | vyākhyā 25 |
| 23 | Svātmāprakāsanāṭaka 40 |
| 39 | Svānbhūtināṭaka 39 |
| 10 | Hamsa Sandeśa (vedānta) 34 |
| 39 | Haravijaya 7 |
| 36 | Haravijayavyākhyā 7 |
| 50 | Haripāladeva 50, 54, 55, 144-150, 155 |
| 41 | Harihara 41 |
| 50 | Harṣopādhyāya (?) 50 |
| 44, 45 | Hṛdayadarpaṇa 44, 45 |
| 57, 141, 142 | Hemacandra 7, 52, 53, 64, 92-106, 110, 111, 112, 159 |
| 57, 141, 142 | (Maladhārī) Hemacandra |
INDEX
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Abhayakumar Guha, Dr. 112, 121, 130, 131
De, S.K., Dr. 23, 120, 121, 130, 131, 160
Kane, P. V. 173
Kavi, M. R. 5, 6, 10
Keith, A.B., Dr. 34, 37
Kuppuswami Sastri, Prof. Mm. 91, 175
Lüders, H., Dr. 22, 35
Raghavan, V. 10, 30, 44, 50, 119, 154, 159, 167
Sivaprasad Bhattacharya, Prof. 107
Tatacharya, D.T. 12, 45, 47
Weber 23
Winternitz 23, 141

SUBJECT INDEX—ENGLISH

A

Abhimāna-Ahaṁkāra-Sṛṅgāra (Bhoja’s theory of Rasa) 80, 119, 120, 122, 167-9, 173, 175
Action, continuance of selfless action 77
Action, in drama 4
Adbhuta Rasa, synthesis of all Rasas in 171-3
Advaita vedānta 34-9
" " and the Rasa-theory 156-7
Akṣa Rasa 113, 125
Ahaṁkāra 16
Ahaṁkāras of damsels 159
Allegorical drama 35-8
Ānanda Rasa 124
 Ānucitya 113, 149
 Āṅgahāras 3, 5
Anirvacanīya, nature of dramatic reality 44
Anurāga Rasa 124
Artha (second Puruṣārtha), dominant in Mahākāvya according to Bhāmaha 21
Artha Sṛṅgāra, see under Sṛṅgāra 84
Āśoka (king) 84
Āśramas -Saṁnyāsin 17
 -Vānaprastha 17
Ātman 49, 85, 86, 87, 88
(See also Brahman.)
Ātma-rati 80, 81
Aucitya 150
(See also Ānucitya.)
Avidyā 20, 26, 138-140
Āyurveda 36
(See also under Trivarga and Puruṣārthas).

B

Bhagavān, ālambana in Bhakti Rasa 157
Bhagavān, devata of Sānta Rasa 50
Bhāgavata dharmas 134
Bhakti, Bhakti Rasa 26, 34, 37, 39, 40, 42, 49, 50, 81, 109-111, 113, 129-138, 157
Bhāva, any Bhāva can become Rasa 70, 114, 115, 117, 118, 122-4
Bliss, difference in degree in the different Rasas 156
Brahman 49, 139
, ālambana of Śānta 49
, devatā of Śānta 50
, naṣa compared to 44
, ultimate basis of Rasa 157, 170, 176
Brahmānanda, rāsāsvāda akin to 157
Brāhma Rasa 51, 55, 56, 144
Brāhmi Vṛtti 51
Buddha, Buddhistic 35, 49, 50

C
Caitanya 130
, alaṃkāra sāstra by followers of 130-6
Caitanya Cult 36

D
Dance 3, 4, 5
Dance-Drama in temples 1
Dāsya 130, 136
Dayā Vira, see under Vira.
Dharma 17, 19, 150, 151
(See also under Puruṣārthas.)
Dharmākhyāṇa purāṇa 19
Dharma Vira, see under Vira.
Dharma Śrīgāra, see under Śrīgāra.
Dhīra lalita 122
, śānta 122
Dhirodāttā 122
Dhiroddhata 122
Dīma 3, 9
Drama
, appeals differently to different spectators 17, 18, 30
, as entertainment 20
, as vehicle of spiritual education 22
, compared to Māyā 44

Drama, kāvyā essentially not different from 48
, representation of the universe (trailokyā-nukaraṇa) 16, 17, 19
Dramatic contest 1
" reality 'anirvacaniya' 44
Duḥkha Rasa 118

E
Enlightened soul (Buddha), devatā of Śānta 50, 51
Ethics, criticism of some Rasas from the standpoint of 44, 152-3

G
God, see Bhagavān.
Guṇa (aesthetic), of the Rasa 16
" " " Sānta Rasa 51-52
Guṇas (Sattva, Rajas and Tamas) 156, 157, 177
, transcending the Guṇas 71

H
History
, Śānta as the message of 34

I
Indradhvaja festival 3
Itivṛtta 21, 23

J
Jain 23, 34-39, 57, 58, 140-3, 152, 153
Janaka (king of Mithilā) 24
INDEX

Jatisvara, a dance-composition  
Jātyaṅga (music)  
Jīvanmuktā  
Jñānamārga 129, 133, 138

K
Kais'ikī vr̥tti 2
Kāma 8, 18, 19, 29
(See also under Trivarga and Puruṣārthas.) avasthās, ten 159
, mokṣa kāma 18, 19
Karaṇaḥ 3, 5
Karma mārga 129
Kārpanyā Rasa 140
Karuṇa, synthesis of other Rasas in 163-5, 175
Kāvya, essentially not different from drama 48

L
Laulya Rasa 111-113, 118, 140
Laya 16
Literature, spiritual instruction through 22, 29
Literary vase (Pārśada prasiddhi) 42, 48, 116, 117
Loka saṅgraha (service) 24
Love, aspects of, Friendship, Affection, Loyalty, Attachment, Devotion 107-113

M
Madhura Rasa 110, 129-137, 160
Marriage custom, provincial 142-3
Māyas, drama compared to 44
Māya Rasa 138-140
Mokṣa, see under Puruṣārthas.
Mṛgayā Rasa 113, 125

Mukti 73
Music 3, 4, 8, 16
Musical composition 8

N
Nāṭya sāstra , sānta-texts in the Nāṭya sāstra interpolations 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 59-61, 63
Nautch (South Indian) 8
Nāyaka, four types of 122, 154
, four Rasas related to the four types of 122
Nivṛtti 140
Nṛtta-āngas 1
Nyāya (Darsana) 36, 39
" in the theory of Rasa 168

P
Pada, (a dance composition) 8
Pāravas'ya Rasa 124
Pārśada prasiddhi (vogue in literary circles) 42, 48, 116
Piṇḍi bandhas 8
Prakṛti (character-type) adhama or niça prakṛti 29, 150, 151
, madhyama prakṛti 29, 150, 151
, uttama prakṛti 29, 147, 150, 151
, several kinds of prakṛti 30
Praśama Rasa 124
Pravṛtti 33, 139, 140
Preman 121, 131, 132
, synthesis of Rasas in 169, 170
Preyas 107, 108, 109, 121, 122, 129, 130
### THE NUMBER OF RASAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priti</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>Rasas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trivarga 22-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>, Āṅga Rasas 20, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puruṣārtha</td>
<td>Artha 21, 150</td>
<td>, , &quot; , in Bhakti or Madhura Rasa 130, 131, 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dharma 17, 19, 31, 33, 150, 151</td>
<td>, difference in bliss in the different Rasas 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāma 29</td>
<td>, eight Rasas of old 1, 2, 4, 12, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See also S'rañgāra.)</td>
<td>Mokṣa 17, 18, 19, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 56, 71, 74, 129, 136, 166</td>
<td>, ethical criticism of some Rasas 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(See Mokṣa kāma also.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>, painfulness of some Rasas according to a few writers 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pūrvarānga (Citra and S'uddha) 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rasābhāsa 113, 145-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puṣṭimārga 35, 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rasadhvasi 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rasavat 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rasyā

| any Bhāva can become Rasya according to some 70, 114-118, 122-124 | Rasas 155 |
| definition of what Rasya is 17, 114, 126, 127, 128 | Sādhans 134 |
| first treatment of Rasya attributed to Nandikes'vara 8 | Sādhvasa Rasya 124 |
| only one 175 | Saints, lives of, as theme of dramas 41 |
| period of chaos in the history of 125, 126 | Śāivite Saints 41 |
| synthesis of all Rasas in one 163-179 | Śama, present in all Rasas 84 |

| Rasas | | Samavakāra 3, 153 |
| additional Rasas,—see separately under Akṣa Rasya, Ananda R., Anurāga R., Bhakti R., Brāhma R., Duhkha R., Kārpānyā R., Sāṅgama Rasya 55, 144, 150 | Sambhoga (separate Rasya) 124 |
| | | Saṁkhya, in the theory of Rasya 156, 168 |
INDEX

Samsāra 20
Samsārin 83
Sānta Rasa 11-106, 157, 160, 166
, anubhāvās of 26,
, 49, 62
, as Rasarāja and Rasendrā 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 (antarbhāva vāda) 48, 49, 75
, intrusion into Bharata's text 12, 13, 15, 16
, its relation to the eight old Sthāyins 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

Sānta Rasa minor Rasa by Haripāla 51,
, 55, 56
, Sthāyin of 15, 16,
, 42, 46, 58-90
, synthesis of other Rasas in 165-7, 175
, texts on it in the Nāṭya sāstra 12-16
, Varṇa of 50
, Vibhāvas of 26,
, 49, 62
, Vṛttti of 50, 51
, Vyāhīcārins of 26, 49, 52

Sāttvikas 158-161
Sauhārda 109
Sneha (Maitri, Sakhyā) 108,
, 109, 111, 118, 130, 136
Sphoṭa 176
Spiritual leaders 41
Spring festival 8
Sraddhā 26, 81, 110
Srīgāra
, a Srīgāra for each Puruṣārtha 154
, synthesis of Rasas in 170
, three kinds, Dharma—, Artha—, and Kāma 19, 153,
, 154
, three kinds, manifested by speech, dress and physical action 153
, Bhoja's new Abhimān-kāra-Sṛgāra 80,
, 119, 120, 122,
, 167-9, 173, 175
THE NUMBER OF RASAS

Sṛṅgāra

, synthesis of āhā
Rasas in 167-169, 175

Sthāyins

, view that Vyabhicārins also can become Sthāyins and vice versa 70, 118, 119

Sthita prajñā 24
S'uci (a name of Sṛṅgāra) 145, 148
Sukha Rasa 118
Svātantrya Rasa 124
Svara 16

T

Tāla 7, 8
Tāṇḍava 3-8
Tattvajñāna (Ātmajñāna) 71, 72, 85, 86

Temple-Drama 1
Temple of Indra 1
Tragedy 155
Trivarga-vyutpatti, end of drama according to some 28
Tyāga 58, 76

U

Udātta Rasa 66, 120-122
Uddhata Rasa 120-122
Ujjvala (a name of Sṛṅgāra) 130, 145, 148
Ūrjasvin 121

V

Vācikābhīnaya, modes of 159
Vairāgya 71, 72, 78
Varṣa (a dance-composition) 8
Vātsalya 110, 111, 120, 130, 131, 144

Vilāsa Rasa 124
Vipralambha (separate Rasa) 55, 144-147, 155
Vira 73-77, 130, 136, 151, 152
, Dāna Vira 48, 54, 73-77
130, 136, 151, 152
, Dayā Vira 21, 26, 28, 48, 49, 54, 58, 73-77,
82, 136
, Dharma Vira 48, 54, 73-77, 82, 112, 130,
136, 151
, Tapo Vira 58, 152
, Tyāga Vira 58, 76
, Yuddha Vira 54, 58, 73-77, 77, 151, 152
Vīra, of other kinds 76-77
Vis'istādvaita 36, 37, 39
Vriḍanaka Rasa 140-143
Vṛīti 16
Vṛttis 2, 9, 16, 50, 51
Vyabhicārins 158
; ābhyaṁ tantra
and bāhya 152, 162
, additions to
and removals
from the list of 158, 159
Vyasana Rasa 118
Vyutpatti (instruction from literature) 27

W

Western literary criticism 155

Y

Yatamāna 24, 83
Yogin 77, 83
Abduction

Rasas

Saussure + Rhetorics
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