EXPLORING RASA IN LATTER WRITERS

Dr. Sabyasachi Sarangi[1], Dr. Satya Narain Bharadwaj[2]
[1]Assistant Professor, Dept. of Prakrit and Sanskrit, Jain Vishva-Bharati Institute, Ladnun (Raj.), 341306
[2]Assistant Professor, Dept. of Prakrit and Sanskrit, Jain Vishva-Bharati Institute, Ladnun (Raj.), 341306

The doctrine of rasa, which is advocated, if not first enunciated, by अभिनवगुप्त, is finally adopted by almost all writers on general poetics who accept rasa-dhvani as an important element of poetry. With the exception of विश्वनाथ and केशवमिश्र, they do not indeed go so far as to declare expressly with अभिनवगुप्त that rasa alone is the essence of poetry, but they accept in reality the suggested sense in the form of rasa as essentially the main element. The Rasa is viewed as pleasant sentiment belonging to the reader whose dormant emotions, derived from experience or inherited instincts, are evoked by the reading of poems into an ideal and impersonalized form of joy; an appreciation or enjoyment, consisting of a pleasant mental condition in which the reader identifies himself with the feelings of the hero and experiences them in a generic form, the fullness of enjoyment depending upon the nature and experience of the particular reader. The sentiment thus evoked is essentially universal in character, and the aesthetic pleasure resulting from it is not individual (even though enjoyed as an intimately personal feeling). But generic and disinterested, being such as would be common to all trained readers (सामाजिकसंवेद्य). It is, therefore described as something supernormal (अलौकिक) and invariably pleasant, not to be compared to the normal pleasure of life which has always a reference to one's personal relations or interests, and which may be pleasant or painful. Things, which would be called causes of an emotion in the normal sense and which may produce disgust, horror or pity in real life, awaken these feelings indeed in poetry and drama, but convey them in such an ideal and generic from that these emotions, which are far from pleasant in ordinary life, are converted into an impersonal joy, which is ineffable and indivisible. One may be removed by disgust, horror or pity and shed real tears; but the underlying sentiment in always one of exquisite joy which must be distinguished from ordinary feelings.

This is the general position of all later theorists which regard to the nature and function of rasa in poetry. धनञ्जय, for instance, give us the same process of transformation of an ordinary emotion, dominant composition, into a poetic sentiment, as formally laid down by भरत and interpreted by अभिनवगुप्त and in this he is practically in agreement with मम्मट, विद्याधर, विश्वनाथ and others. The dominant emotion (स्थायीभाव), he says, becomes a sentiment (rasa) when it is brought into a relishable condition through the co-operation of the excitants, the ensuants and the accessories (including the सात्त्विकभावs). This sentiment is further amplified by the assertion that the enjoyer of rasa (रसिक) is the audience (सामाजिक) on whose capacity of enjoyment it depends, and that the dominant feeling becomes a sentiments when it is so enjoyed. the rasa, being a mental state, a subjective experience of the reader, in which enjoyment (आस्वाद्य, चर्वणा, रसना or भोग) is essential and in which the enjoyer and the object of enjoyment become identical, the reader receives the presented feeling into his own soul and thereby enjoys it . The locus of the rasa is not in the represented hero who belongs to the past; nor is it in the poem itself, the task of which is merely to exhibit the excitants etc. by which the dominant emotion is brought into expression and the rasa, on its part, becomes revealed to the reader, Nor does the rasa consist of the reader's mere

apprehension(प्रतीति) of the emotions exhibited in the poem or enacted by the actor; for the reader would then apprehend not the rasa but a feeling varying in different individuals, just as in real life the spectacle of a pair of lovers in union giving different spectators who witness it the varying emotions, according to their individual nature, of shame, envy, desire or aversion . The विभावs etc., therefore, being the स्थायीभाव to the enjoyment of रसिक, the aesthetically receptive reader or spectator, and thereby convert it into rasa; but they must be generalized and have no specific relation to a particular individual (परित्यक्त-विशेष). Thus, the विभाव is सीता, धनिक explains, must refer to woman in general, and not to the particular individual who was the daughter of जनक. Hence things, which are the exciting, ensuing or accessory circumstances in ordinary life, act as विभावs etc. in poetry, and generalize the dominant feeling into rasa. The spectator, say, of the deeds of अर्जुन on the stage may be compared, therefore, to the child who, in playing with clay elephants, experiences the sensations of its own energy as pleasant. The enjoyment in the spectator's mind is manifestation of that joy which is innate as the blissful nature of self, a circumstance which gives us the frequent comparison of रसास्वाद with ब्रह्मास्वाद.

The mental activity involved in this enjoyment has got four aspects taken in connection with the four primary sentiments of the erotic(श्रृङ्गार), the heroic(वीर), the horrible (वीभत्स), and the furious(रौद्र) admitted by Bharata , and consists respectively of the conditions of unfolding(विकास), expansion(विस्तार), agitation (क्षोभ), and distraction (विक्षेप). We have seen that भट्टनायक (along with अभिनवगुप्त) speaks of the bhoga (or आस्वाद्य) of rasa as involving only three mental conditions, named, विकास (pervasion), विस्तार (expansion), and धृति (melting), which later theorists have taken as the basis and justification of the three गुणs of प्रसाद, ओजs and माधुर्य respectively. With regard to ninth rasa, the quietist, which is not mentioned by भरत but which is acknowledge by some theorists, धनञ्जय forbids its delineation in the drama (iv.35); for the sentiment of absolute peace is in its own nature indefinable, and consists of four states mentioned by philosophers , viz. मैत्री, करुणा, मुदिता, and उपेक्षा, which are not realizable by the सहृदय. It is exit at all as rasa, it must comprehend the fourfold mental activity enunciated above, as corresponding to the fourfold states recognized by philosophers in शम .

विश्वनाथ is the only important writer, among later theorists, who boldly accepts अभिनवगुप्त: extreme view that the rasa-dhvani alone is the essence of poetry and builds up a system of Poetics on its basis .

Following up his own definition of poetry as "a sentence of which the soul is the rasa", विश्वनाथ: gives us an elaborate analysis of rasa in almost all its aspects. His sums up at the outset the characteristics of rasa in two verses thus. "The rasa, arising from an exaltation of the quality of सत्त्व, indivisible, self-manifested, made up of jay and thought in their identity, free from the contact of aught else perceived, akin to the realization of Brahma, and having for its essence supernormal wonder (चमत्कार), is enjoyed by those competent in its inseparableness (as an object of knowledge) from the knowledge of itself". He explains चमत्कार as consisting of an expansion of the mind and as synonymous with विस्मय. In the connection, विश्वनाथ: quotes with approval an opinion of his ancestor नारायण who put a premium on the sentiment of the marvelous (अद्भुतरस) and maintained that it was essential in all rasas. It is also explained clearly that the rasa is identical with the enjoyment of itself, or, in other words, there is no distinction between the object and the operation in the apprehension of rasa; so that when we say 'the rasa is enjoyed', we only use a figurative expression. It follows from this that the enjoyment of rasa is different in its nature from the ordinary processes of knowledge. विश्वनाथ: insists very strongly on the necessity of

वासना in the spectator, which consists of experience or instincts acquired from previous births (प्राक्तन). It one is not endowed with these germs of the capacity of appreciation, one may be develop them by study of poverty and experience of life. In the case of the grammarian, the philosopher or one well-versed in the sacred lore, these susceptibilities are deadened. If it is sometimes found that an eager student of poetry is still deficient in the capacity of relishing of rasa, we must assume that it is the result of his accumulated demerit of a previous birth. Thus, विश्वनाथ is anxious to show that experience and cultivation of the power of imagination are essential in one who seeks to enjoy rasa.

विश्वनाथ also insists that the विभाव etc. as well as the dominant feeling (स्थायीभाव) must be felt as generic or impersonalized. The reader must not take the feeling a his own individual emotion; for it would then remain as his feeling (and never become rasa) and would sometimes (e.g. in the case of the pathetic sentiments) cause pain, and not joy. Nor should the feeling be taken as pertaining solely to the hero; for then if cannot, as the feeling of another person, affect the reader become rasa. It is necessary, therefore, that the excitants etc. as well as the dominant feeling, should be generalized by a generic function (साधारणीकृति) inherent in themselves, which corresponds to the generic power (भावकत्व) postulated for poetry by भट्टनायक. This universalisation of the factors and the feelings enables the reader to identify himself with the personages depicted; and this conceit of community removes all difficulty about accepting extraordinary episodes of exalted personages who may be superior in virtue or prowess to the average reader. The excitants etc. are indeed normally called causes, but in reality the rasa is not an effect in the ordinary sense; for in the case of rasa there is the simultaneous presence of itself and its excitants, which is not true of an ordinary cause and effect. It is also pointed out that all the factors (विभाव etc.) need not be present at once, for the presence of one would revive the others by association of ideas. In the other words, what might seem wanting in the utterance of poetry is supplied, from the suggestive character of poetry itself, by force of association of ideas. It also follows from the character of rasa described above that it is not necessarily found in the actor, who is assuming the role of the hero performs his part only mechanically by rule and rote; he ranks as a spectator (and therefore as a recipient of rasa) in so far as he is himself a man of taste and actually experiences the feelings he enacts .

In spite of the unquestioned dominance of the Dhavni School, which no doubt recognized the importance of rasa but regarded it as one of the phases of the unexpressed only, one class of writes, who still adhered to rasa as the only element worth considering in poetry, continued to devote exclusive attention to it and built up a system, so to say, on the basic of the rasa alone. Of all the rasa, however, as शृङ्गार: (or love) forms the absorbing theme of Sanskrit poetry and drama in general, and as this particular poetic sentiment has an almost universal appeal, these writers naturally work out this important rasa in all its phases; and we have in consequences a series of erotico-rhetorical treatises of which the earliest known and the earliest known and the most remarkable is रुद्रभट्ट's शृङ्गारतिलक . रुद्रभट्ट states distinctly at the beginning of his work that although भरत and others have spoken of rasa in the drama, his object is to apply it to the case of poetry, and that a काव्य, in his opinion, must possess rasa as its constant theme. Following upon this we have भोज's शृङ्गारप्रकाश which deals with the subject in the usual elaborate encyclopedic manner of its author, with profuse illustrations of every phase of the erotic sentiment in no less than eighteen out of thirty-six chapters. After this come innumerable works of a similar nature , which take rasa, especially शृङ्गार, as their principal theme and which were composed apparently with the object of guiding the poet in the composition of erotic pieces so popular and profuse in Sanskrit poetry. Of these, the भावप्रकाश of शारदातनय, which reproduces the substance of most of the chapters of भोज's work,

and the exhaustive रसार्णवसुधाकर of सिङ्गभूपाल , as well as the two well known works of भानुदत्त , deserve mention. But none of these later treatises adds anything new or original to a subject already thrashed out it's almost.

A new turn was given to the theory by रूपगोस्वामिन्'s उज्ज्वलनीलमणि, which attempted to deal with rasa in terms of the वैष्णव idea of ujjvala or madhura rasa, by which was meant the श्रृङ्गाररस, the term ujjvala having been apparently suggested by Bharata's description of that rasa . The madhuara rasa, however, is represented not in its primarily a phase of bhakti-rasa (मधुराख्यो भक्तिरसः); for according to वैष्णव theology there are five rasas forming roughly the five degrees of the realization of bhakti or faith. Viz. शान्त (tranquility), दया (servitude or humility, also called प्रीति), sakhya (friendship or equality, also called preyas), वात्सल्य (parental affection) and माधुर्य (sweetness). The last, also called the ujjvala rasa, being the principal, is termed भक्तिरसराज् and constitutes the subject matter of the present treatise. The कृष्णरति or the love of कृष्ण forms the dominant feeling of स्थायीभाव of this sentiment, and the recipient here is not the literary सहृदय but the bhakta or the faithful . This स्थायीभाव, known as मधुररति, which is the source of the particular rasa, is defined in terms of the love of कृष्ण ; and the nature of नायक and नायिका is defined in the same manner and their feelings and emotions illustrated by adducing examples from poems dealing with the love-stories of कृष्ण and राधा. The work is, therefore, essentially a वैष्णव's religious treatise presented in a literary garb, taking कृष्ण as the ideal hero, with the caution, however, that what is true of कृष्ण as the hero does not apply to the ordinary secular hero (i. 18-21) .

With the exception of the उज्ज्वलनीलमणि, which attempts to bring erotica-religious ideas to bear upon the general theme of rasa, these specialized treatises have, however, very little importance from the speculative point of view; and as they belong property to the province of Erotics rather than poetics, treatment of them should be sought elsewhere. The simple idea, elaborated less in all these works is that awakening of rasa is all important in poetry, and that the fundamental rasa is श्रृङ्गार or the erotic, which is consequently treated in its various phases with copious illustrations. This is clearly expressed in the attitude of the author of अग्निपुराण and of Bhoja, who accept only one poetic rasa, viz. the erotic . In the same way, रुद्रभट्ट declares श्रृङ्गारनायको रसः (i.20), and भानुदत्त appears to take it for granted that श्रृङ्गार occupies an honored place among all the rasa (तत्र रसेषु श्रृङ्गारस्याभ्यर्थितत्त्वेन etc, ed. Benaras, p. 21).

It is unnecessary, as it is unprofitable, in the discussion of general principles, to enter here into the elaborate definitions, distinctions and classifications of the amorous sentiments with all its varying emotional moods and situations, which these treatise industriously discuss and which have always possessed such attraction to mediaeval scholastic minds. The theorists delight in arranging into division and sub-divisions, according to rank, character, circumstances and the like, all conceivable types of the hero, the heroine and their adjuncts, together with the different shades of their gestures and feelings, in conformity with the tradition which already obtained in the cognate sphere of dramaturgy . Thus रुद्रभट्ट, after a preliminary enumeration and definition of the rasas and the भाव, proceeds to speak of two aspects of श्रृङ्गार, viz. सम्भोग (love of union) and विप्रलम्भ (love of separation) , and classify the hero (नायक) into the faithful (अनुकूल), the gallant whose attention is equally divided among many (दक्षिण), the sly (शठ), and the saucy (धृष्ठ), according to his character as a lover. Later writer, however, subdivide each of these, again, into the best (उत्तम), the middling(मध्यम) and the lowest (अधम), and arrange the whole classification under the fourfold division of the genus hero into four types viz., (i) the brave and the high-spirited (धीरोदात्त) (ii) the brave and haughty (धीरोद्धत) (iii) the brave and sportive (धीरललित) and (iv)the brave serene(धीरप्रशान्त), thus

giving us altogether forty-eight subdivisions of hero . The follows a brief description of the assistants of the hero in matters of love (narma-saciva), viz. the Comrade (पिठमर्द), the Companion (विट) and the Buffon (विदूषक), some adding चेट (or the servant) in the enumeration.

In the same way, the heroine is taken broadly in threefold aspects in her relation to the hero as his wife (स्वीया), or belonging to another, (परकीया) and as common to all (सामान्या) The स्वीया is subdivided again into the adolescent and artless (मुग्धा), the youthful (मध्या), and the mature and audacious (प्रगल्भा), i.e. the inexperienced, the partly experienced and the fully experienced. Later authors introduce greater fineness by subdividing each of these according to her temper, into the partially self-possessed (धीरा), the not self-possessed (अधीरा), and the partially self-possessed (धीराधीरा), higher (ज्येष्ठा) or lower (कनिष्ठा), each holds in the affection of the hero. The परकीया or अन्यदीया who, according to वैष्णव ideas, is the highest type of the heroine, is twofold, according as she is a maiden (कन्या) or married (ऊढा) ; while the सामान्या heroine, who is sometimes extolled (रुद्रभट्ट), and sometimes deprecated (रुद्रभट्ट), is only of one kind, the वेश्या or courtesan . The sixteen types of heroine thus obtained are further arranged according to eightfold diversity in their condition or situation in relation to her lover, viz. heroine who has the lover under absolute control (स्वाधीनपतिका), the heroine disappointed in her assignation through misadventure or involuntary absence (उक्ता), the heroine in full dress expectant of her lover(वासकसज्जिका), the heroine deceived (विप्रलब्धा), the heroine separated by a quarrel (कलहान्तरिता as called अभिसन्धिता), the heroine outraged by the discovery of marks of unfaithfulness in the lover (खण्डिता), the heroine who meets her lover by assignation (अभिसारिका) and the heroine pining for the absence of her lover gone abroad(प्रोषितपतिका). We arrive in this way at an elaborate classification of the heroine into three hundred and eighty-four types; and one of the later writers states characteristically that there are other types also, but they cannot be specified for fear of prolixity (SD. iii.88, p. 120).

But here the theorists do not stop. The hero is endowed further by a set of eight special excellences, as springing from his character(सात्त्विक): e.g. brilliance (शोभा) including heroism, cleverness, truthfulness, emulation with superiors and compassion to inferiors; vivacity (विलास) indicated by his glance, step and laughing voice; grace (माधुर्य) displayed in placid demeanour even in trying circumstances; equanimity (गाम्भीर्य) consisting of superiority to emotions; steadfastness (स्थैर्य) in obtaining one's object; sense of honour (tejas) manifested in his impatience of insult; gallantry (lalita) in his word, dress or deportment; magnanimity (औदार्य) exhibited in generosity, agreeable words and equal treatment to friend and foe. The heroine is allowed a more generous set of qualities. First we have the three physical (अङ्गज) characteristics; भाव or first indication of emotion in a nature previously exempt, हाव or movement of eyes and brows indicating the awakening of emotion, हेला of the decided manifestation of feeling. Then we have seven inherent qualities. e.g. brilliance of youth, beauty and passion, the touch of loveliness given by love, sweetness, courage, meekness, radiance and self-control. Then are enumerated her ten graces, to which विश्वनाथ adds eight more. All her gestures, moods or different of delight, involuntary expression of affection, self-suppression through bashfulness, affected repulse of endearments, as well as the deepest and tenderest display of sentiments, are minutely analysed and classified. To this is added a detailed description of the modes in which the different types of heroines display their affection, the maidenly modest demeanour of the मुग्धा or the shameless boldness of the more experienced heroine. We should recognize the subtle power of analysis and insight which these attempts indicate; but speaking generally, the analysis is more of the form than of spirit, based on what we should

consider accidents rather than essentials. At the same time, marked as it is by much of scholastic formalism, there is an unmistakable attempt to do justice to facts, not only as they appeared to the experience of these theorists but to the observation of general poetic usage; and in the elaborate working out of the general thesis that the rasa is evolved on the basis of one or other of what they call the permanent mental moods, with the help of the various emotional adjuncts, the writers on poetics emotions, the psychology of which bears an intimate relation to their theory and in itself deserves a separate study.

The discussion of this extensive topic of the नायक and नायिका comes in topically under the theory of विभाव and अनुभाव, which act as factors of rasa. The mood, which is at the root of sentiment, is held to be the स्थायीभाव, the dominant feeling, the main theme of the composition in question. These feelings, according to Bharata, who is accepted on this point by all writers, can be classified into eight categories, viz. Love (rati), Mirth (हास), Sorrow (शोक), Anger (krodha), Energy (उत्साह), Fear (bhaya), Disgust (जुगुप्सा) and Astonishment (vismaya), though some later writes add, as we shall see. Tranquility (शम or nirveda) to the number. These dominant feelings are worked up into a corresponding number of sentiments of rasas through the means of the विभावs etc . The विभावs or Excitants are said to be of two kinds , viz., (1) the Substantial or Essential (आलम्बन), which consists of such material and dispensable ingredients as the hero, the heroine, the rival hero and their adjuncts, and (2) the Enhancing(उद्दीपन) viz. such condition of time, place and circumstance as serve to foster the rasa, e.g. the rising of the moon, comprise such outward manifestations of feeling as sidelong glances, a smile, a movement of the body, or such involuntary action of sympathetic realization of the persons depicted (सात्त्विक) as fainting (pralaya), change of color (वैवर्ण्य) trembling (vepathu) etc., which are, again dogmatically classified into eight varieties. There are other feelings of a more or less transitory nature, which accompany or interrupt the permanent mood without, however, supplanting it; and these are known, as we have noted, by the name of Accessories or व्यभिचारीभावs. These are linkened to servants following a king or to waves of the sea, whereby the dominant mood is understood as the king and the sea respectively, and classified elaborately into thirty-three categories, first mentioned by Bharata (pp.337f above) and implicitly accepted by his followers.

All these elements contribute towards developing the eight or nine स्थायीभावs into eight or nine different types of rasa. We have the earliest and most orthodox mention in Bharata.(p. 337 above) of eight स्थायीभावs and the resulting eight rasa corresponding to them, of which the Erotic (श्रृङ्गार), the Heroice (वीर), the Furious (raudra), and the Disgustful (बीभत्स) are the main, leading to four others, the Comic (हास्य), the Marvellous (adbhuta), the Pathetic (करुण) and the Terrible(भयानक). दण्डिन् accepts this classification (ii.280-87), but उद्भट (iv.4) adds the Quietist (शान्त) as the ninth rasa, although Bharata neither defines it nor mentions its corresponding विभावs. रुद्रट is singular in postulating a tenth rasa, called the Agreeable(preyas), which is accepted by Bhoja, with the tradition of two new rasa उदात्त and uddhata, as well as शान्त. रुद्रभट्ट admits nine rasas in Poetry; so do Hemachandra and the two वाग्भट्ट. The अग्निपुराण in the same way mentions nine rasas (and eight स्थायीभावs), but follows Bharata in regarding four as principal and says special stress on the श्रृङ्गार. आनन्दवर्धन admits शान्त (pp. 138, 238). Those later authors who accept the ninth rasa, The quietistic, necessarily postulate nirveda or self-disparagement, arising out of the knowledge of reality (तत्त्वज्ञान), as its स्थायीभाव, which is called by some authorities शम, or repose resulting from freedom from mental excitement . The वैष्णव writers (especially कविकर्णपुर add दास्य, sakhya, वात्सल्य,

preman and bhakti .

The author of the दशरूपक, however, contends that there can be no such स्थायीभाव as nirveda or शम, for the development of that state(if it is at all possible to destroy utterly love, hatred and other human feelings) would tend to the absence of all moods; and in the drama, the object of which is to delineate and inspire passion, it is inadmissible. Others, again hold that the Quietistic rasa does exit, as it is experienced by those who have attained that blissful state, but it has no स्थायीभाव in dramatic composition; for nirveda, being the composition; for nirveda, being the cessation of all wordly activity, or शम being freedom from all mental excitement, it is not fit to be represented. Hence मम्मट takes eight rasas in the drama(p.98) and nine in poetry (p.117). Bhoja, in accordance with the views of the school which lays special emphasis on the श्रृङ्गार, accepts only one rasa, the Erotic, in his श्रृङ्गारप्रकाश; and although he mentions as many as ten rasas in his सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरण, including the शान्त and the preyas, he appears to devote almost exclusive attention to the श्रृङ्गार in his treatment of the rasas in his work. The views about the admissibility of the शान्त are discussed by the author of the एकावली (pp.96.7) who maintains that Bharata has mentioned nirveda as व्यभिचारीभाव immediately in context after the enumeration of the स्थायीभावs and at the beginning of the list of the व्यभिचारीभावs; and this fact is interpreted as indicating that the sage meant it both as a स्थायीभाव and as a व्यभिचारीभाव; but Hemacahandra (p.81) anticipates and rejects this quibble of verbal interpretation, though agreeing in the general proposition as to the admissibility of शान्त as the ninth rasa.

विश्वनाथ primarily admits eight orthodox rasas (iii.p.160) but adds the ninth शान्त in deference to the views of these authorities, add a tenth rasa, called वात्सल्य or parental affection, subscribing apparently to वैष्णव ideas (pp. 185-86) . He quotes a verse to explain that the mood, called by the great sages the Quietistic, which has, among all sentiments, tranquility (शम) as its basis, is that state in which there is neither pain nor pleasure, nor hatred, nor affection, nor any desire . But the question arises how can Quietistic, being of the nature described, arising only in a state of emancipation wherein there is an absence of all feelings like the Accessories etc., be rasa, which implies a state of relishable enjoyment . To this objection विश्वनाथ replies that the Quietistic is a rasa because in that state the soul is only about to be emancipated (युक्त-वियुक्त-दशा) and is not completely absorbed in the Divine, so that the presence of feelings, like the Accessories etc. it is not incompatible. As for the statement that there is an absence of even pleasure in it, it is not contradictory, for it refers only to wordly pleasure . जगन्नाथ, the latest writer on the subject, advocates nine rasas and maintains (pp.29-30) that like all other rasa, the शान्त is Capable of being represented and appreciated by the audience. Since the clever performance of the actor, representing such a state of mind, free from disturbance and not affected by the passions or desire, is found in actual experience, to produce an impression on the mind of the audience it is their state of mind, exhibited by their silent and rapt attention, which ought to settle the question. The representation of absolute indifference or the actor's power of representing it is not the point in issue: it is the capacity of the spectator who actually feels the sentiment. जगन्नाथ also adds that even those, who do not admits this rasa in the drama, should accept it in poetry from the fact that poems like the महाभारत have for principal theme the delineation of शान्त rasa, which is thus established by universal experience (अखिललोकानुभवसिद्धत्वात्). नागेश remarks on this that the शान्त rasa should also be admitted in the drama on this ground, in as much as the Prabodha-candrodaya is universally acknowledged as a drama(p.30).

Coming to the essential bliss of rasa, viz. the भाव, we have seen that Bharata defines it in general

terms as that which manifests the sense of poetry through the three kinds of representation. वाचिक, आङ्गिक and सात्त्विक ; it is the emotion which ultimately becomes a sentiment, if it is dominant and therefore, serves as the basis of rasa. But later writers arrive at a greater precision and apply the term technically to those cases where there is no proper or complete development of rasa. Both धनञ्जय and भानुदत्त expand the definition of Bharata, the later defining it as a deviation from the natural mental state (विकार) which is favourable to the development of rasa (रसानुकूल) and which may be either physical (शारीर) or mental (आन्तर). But मम्मट fixes the conception of भाव as रतिर्देवादिविषयाव्यभिचारी तथाञ्जितः ('love having for its object a deity or the like, and also the suggested Accessory'), on which he adds the gloss : आदिशब्दात् मुनि-गुरु-नृप-पुत्रादि विषया, कान्ताविषयया तु व्यक्ता शृङ्गारः ('by the term the like are meant sages, preceptor, the king, the son etc., the one having a beloved woman for its object becomes the erotic') Govinda explains that the word rati here implies the स्थायीभाव which has not attained to the state of rasa . What is meant is that when the स्थायीभावs, like rati, have for their objects god, king, son and the like, or when the व्यभिचारीभावs are manifested as the principal sentiment in a composition, there is no rasa but भाव; and this definition is accepted by all writers after him.

Thus, विश्वनाथ explains the भाव as follows:

सञ्चारिणः प्राधानानि, देवादि-विषया रतिः।
उद्बुद्धमात्रः स्थायी च भावेत्याप्यभिधीयते॥

In other words, when the Accessories are principal, or when love etc. has a deity or the like for its object, or when a dominant feeling (स्थायीभाव) is merely awakened, we have भाव. His own gloss upon the above verse explains it in this way. Although they are always concomitants of rasa in which they finally rest, such Accessories as are for the time being followed by his king in his marriage procession; or love etc. having a deity, a sage, a spiritual guide, a king and the like for its object; or such स्थायीभाव as are merely awakened or have not attained the state of a rasa from their not being fully developed, are denoted by the term भाव. In all these cases apparently there is no complete or proper development of Rasa; and a भाव, therefore, in later terminology, may be generally described as an incomplete rasa. But this must be distinguished from the रसाभास or semblance of rasa and the analogous भावाभास, which occur when the poetic sentiments and emotions are falsely attributed(e.g. sentiments in animals such as described in कुमारसम्भव, iii. 36-37), or when they are brought out improperly, i.e. when there is a lack of entireness in them as regards their ingredients . The cases occur, according to Bhoja (v.20) when the mood or emotion is developed in an inferior character (हीनपात्र), in animals(तिर्यक्), in the rival hero (नायकप्रतियोगिन्) or in any other subordinate object (गौणपदार्थ) , but विश्वनाथ elaborately summaries various other cases (iii. 263-66), especially noting improprieties in connation with particular rasa. Thus, there is an impropriety if the Terrible (भयानक) is made to reside in a noble personage, or the Comic (हास्य) in a spiritual guide. It must be noted, as जगन्नाथ explains, that if a mood or feeling is developed by impropriety, the impropriety, unless it acts as a bar, does not constitute a fault .

In the same way (1) when there is an excitement only (and not full development) of sentiments, (2) when two opposing sentiments, striving for mastery, are represented as being relished in one and the same place and at the same time, or(3) when a number of sentiments, of which each succeeding one puts down the preceding, they constitute respectively भावोदय, भावसमाधि and भावशबलता. Now, all these phases of sentiment are taken as rasa topically, inasmuch as they are capable of being tasted (सर्वेऽपि रसनाद्रसः). These cases do not seem to have been formally recognized by Bharata, though hinted at by him in vi. 40, as

we learn from Abhinava's commentary on ch.vi, which is partially reproduced also in his Locana, p. 66. They are first met with in उद्भट, who includes them under ऊर्जस्विन् (vi. 6); but in रुद्रट (xii.4) and the ध्वनिकार ii.3) we find them definitely established.

This incomplete development of rasa and its subordination must be distinguished from the cases of the opposition (virodha) of simultaneously existing sentiments in the same theme. It is laid down formally that some rasas are intrinsically inconsistent with one another, e.g. the Erotic is opposed to the Disgustful, the Heroic to the Quietistic, and so forth . The incongruity or opposition result in three ways, viz. (1) from identity of the exciting cause (आलम्बनविभाव) (2) from identity of the subject of emotion and (3) from immediacy of succession. The incongruity in the first two cases may be removed by representing the sentiments as having different subjects (e.g. in the hero and the rival hero). The last case conflict may be removed by placing, between the two immediately succeeding sentiments, a sentiment which is not opposed to them. These are cases where two or more rasas stand in the relation of principal and subordinate; the term 'subordinate' being misleading, it is sometimes called a concomitant rasa (सञ्चारिन्), which implies that it cannot terminate absolutely in itself and at the same time is distinct from a fully developed rasa, as well as from a mere undeveloped भाव . There is also no incongruity where a conflicting rasa is recalled or described under comparison. All these questions properly come under the theory of Propriety or Aucitya in relation to rasa, elaborated by आनन्दवर्धन and his followers and is ultimately based on the dictum attributed to the ध्वनिकार (p.145), cf. Locana p.138), which lays down in general terms that the secret of Rasa lies in conforming to the established riles of propriety.

The doctrine of the ध्वन्यालोक that in a composition in which the sentiment is awakened, proprieties of various kinds (e.g. with reference to the speaker, the theme, the employment of the विभावs etc., the use of the अलङ्कारs and other elements, pp. 134f, 144f) should be observed, and that certain items of conflict(virodha) with the dominant sentiment should be avoided, gave rise to a theory of Propriety, which is generally comprehended by later writers under the discussion of the doÒas of rasa. Thus, in later treatises, the conventional doÒas of पद, पदार्थ, वाक्य, वाक्यार्थ recognized since वामन's time. It is क्षेमेन्द्र alone who emphasizes the importance of the subject by making it the theme of his औचित्यविचारचर्चा which will be noticed in its proper place. महिमभट्ट, in the twelfth chapter of his work, considers the question of anaucitya in some details. According to him, impropriety or incongruity has two aspects, according as it refers to शब्द or to अर्थ respectively. Then he speaks of propriety as external (बहिरङ्ग) or internal (अन्तरङ्ग), apparently as it is शब्दविषय or अर्थविषय. The cases of internal propriety, which consists in the proper employment of the विभावs etc. have already been explained by previous writers(e.g. ध्वन्यालोक pp. 144f). महिमभट्ट, therefore, takes up the question of external propriety, which he thinks falls under five faults of composition, viz. विदेहाविमर्श (non- discrimination of the predicate), prakrama-bheda (violation of uniformity in the expression), karma-bheda(syntactical irregularity), paunaruktya (tautology) and वाच्यवचन (omission of what must be expressed), to the explanation and exemplification of which he devotes, amidst several digression, the rest of the chapter(ch. ii). It is difficult to say why these faults of expression alone are singled out as defects resulting in a violation of rasa (rasabhaÉga). Later writers would include them under general defects, reserving the cases of virodha or opposition of rasa as specific instances of rasa-doÒas.

REFERENCES

[1]. But the Natya-darpana, as noted above (p. 446 fn), as well as Bhoja (सुखदुःखावस्थारूपः), believs that Rasa is सुखदुःखात्मक. The रसकलिका (p. 312) also holds this view. See the elaborate arguments set forth in Natya-darpana(ed. GOS, p. 159) in support of this view. Siddhicandra (Kavyaprakasha-khandana pp. 16-21) refers to this theory of the "Navyas" that all Rasas are not pleasurable, but some distinctly painful. They accordingly admit the four pleasurable Rasas, viz. श्रृङ्गार, वीर, हास्य, and अद्भुत only, and not those which involve pain, viz. करुण, रौद्र, बीभत्स and भयानक. See the question discussed by V. Raghavan, Number of Rasas, ch. viii.

[1]. Cf. Jacobi in GgA, 913, pp. 308f.

[1]. These circumstances, Dhanika thinks, disprove the व्यङ्ग्यत्व of Rasa. It seems that Dhanika does not accept the व्यङ्ग्य-व्यञ्जक relation of Rasa to poetry, but holds some views similar to the भाव्य-भावक theory of भट्टनायक (ed. Parab, 1917, p. 96).

[1]. See above p. 337. The fourfold division is probably adopted as an ostensible rationale for the doctrine of four primary and four secondary Rasas recognized by Bharata.

[1]. E.g. Yoga-sutra i. 33.

[1]. न च तथाभूतस्य शान्तरसस्य सहृदयास्वादयितारः शान्ति अथ तदुपायभूतो मुदिता-मैत्री-करुणो प्रेक्षादि लक्षणाः तस्य च विकास विस्तार-क्षोभ-विक्षेपरूपतैवेति।

[1]. भानुदत्तः, who substantially follows the doctrine of Rasa detailed their, is however singular in his classification of some aspects of Rasa. He speaks of Rasa as Laukika and alaukika, subdividing the latter into svapnaika (enjoyed in a dream), manorathika (fanciful like a castle in the air) and anupanayika (as depicted in poetry). He again gives us (रसतरङ्गिणी. Ch. viii, p. 65, ed. Regnaud) a three fold arrangement of Rasa with Reference to its manner of manifestation: (i) abhimukha, when it is manifested by means of the भाव, विभाव and अनुभाव. (ii) vimukha, when these elements are not directly expressed; so called because it is comprehensible with difficulty. (iii) paramukha, which has again two aspects according as it is (a) alamkara-mukha, i.e. where the alamkara is principal and the rasa is secondry. This includes probably the cases of figures like rasavat, which are included in गुणीभूतव्यङ्ग्यकाव्य by the Dhvani theorists, and (b) bhava-mukha where the bhava is in the same way principal.

[1]. This follows धनञ्जय's dictum that the enjoyment of Rasa is not precluded in the actor, if he realizes in himself the feelings depicted.

[1]. The topics dealt with in its three chapters are : I. The rasas, the स्थायिभावाः, the dramatic वृत्तिs, शृङ्गार and its division; the नायक, classified with illustrations; his assistants; classification of the नायिका, II.
Characteristics of love-in-separation, of पूर्वराग, the ten stages of love, the उपायs, etc, III. The other rasas, viz. हास्य, करुण, रौद्र, वीर, भयानक, बीभत्स, अद्भुत and शान्त; the four v[a]ttis appropriate to the rasas.

[1]. See above p. 517.

[1]. See pp. 233f, and chapter on Minor Writers.

[1]. See p. 235.

[1]. See p. 236. The three vilasas of this extensive work deal with the following topics : i. The hero, his qualities and classification; his adjuncts; the heroine, her classification and qualities, her sattvika excellences; the uddipana-vibhavas; the riti and the gunas; the dramatic vrttis; the satvika bhavas, ii. The vyabhicari-bhavas, the anubhavas, the eight rasas, iii. The drama and its varieties, characteristics etc.

[1]. The eight tarangas of Rasa-tarangiÆi are (i) Definition of Bhavas and subdivision there of; the sthayi-bhavas. (ii) The vibhavas. (iii) The anubhavas. (iv) The eight sattvika bhavas. (v) The vyabhicari-bhavas.(vi) The rasas and detailed treatment of sringara. (vii) The other rasas. (viii) The sthayi-bhavaja and rasaja drusti. The Rasamanjari, a much smaller work, devotes more than half of itself to the nayika and her companions and applies the rest to the sringaranayaka, his assistants, the eight sattvika gunas, the two aspects of srnigara and the ten stages of vipralambha-sringara.

[1]. यत्किञ्चिल्लोके शुचिमेध्यमुज्ज्वलदर्शनम् वा तत् शृङ्गारेणोपमीयते, Gaikwad ed., pp. 89-90.

[1].विश्वनाथ चक्रवर्तिन् explained as शान्तप्रीतिप्रेयोवात्सल्योज्ज्वलनामसु मुख्येषु.....सैवोज्ज्वलापरपर्यायो भक्तिरसानां राजा मधुराख्यो रसः।

[1]. स्वाद्यत्वं हृदि भक्तानामानीता श्रवणादिभिः एषा कृष्णरतिः स्थायी भावो भक्तिरसो भवेत्।, cited by विश्वनाथ चक्रवर्तिन्, p.4.

[1]. मधुराख्याय रतेर्लक्षणं चोक्तं मिथो हरेर्मृगाख्याश्च सम्भोगस्यादिकारणम्, मधुरापरपर्याया प्रियताख्योदिता रतिः, ibid., Ioc, cit.

[1]. The orthodox theorists (cf. जगन्नाथ pp. 47f) would regard bhakti(which being based on अनुराग or attachment cannot be comprehended by शान्त रस) as included in भाव, being देवादिविषय रतिः, and as inadmissible as a fully developed rasa. Cf. भानुदत्त, रसतरङ्गिणी ch. vi- On उज्ज्वलनीलमणि and वैष्णव theory of Rasa see S.K. De, वैष्णव Faith and movement, Calcutta, 1942.

[1]. See pp. 135-36. Cf. also मन्दारमरन्दचम्पू, ix, p. 107. (ed. काव्यमाला).

[1]. See Bharata नाट्यशास्त्र ch. Xxii-xxiv; दशरूपक iv.50f. and iii.

[1]. This statement follows Bharata and is accepted by most theorists including Bhoja; but धनञ्जज distinguishes three cases, privation (ayoga), sundering (विप्रलम्भ) and union(सम्भोग) : the first denoting the inability of lovers, through obstacles, to secure union, and the second arising from absence or resentment. The first case of love may pass through the well known ten stages(longing, anxiety, recollection, praise of the beloved, distress, raving, insanity, fever, stupor and death; cf. शिङ्गभूपाल ii. 178-201); while the second condition may be caused by a quarrel, due to discovery or inference of unfaithfulness (which may be counteracted bysix उपायs, viz. conciliating, winning over her friends, gifts humility, indifference or distracting her attention) or by absence arising from business, accident or a curse.

[1]. The good qualities of the hero are innumerable. For his characteristics, see धनञ्जज ii. 1 f; विश्वनाथ iii. 30f; शिङ्गभूपाल i. 61; etc. On the theme of नायक-नायिका, as treated in अलङ्कार works, see V. Raghavan, Intro. To his ed. Akbarshahi शृङ्गारमञ्जरी pp. 14-90.

[1]. The प्रतिनायक or the rival of the hero is धीरोदात्त, haughtiness being his essential characteristic; but he is described also as stubborn and vicious(दशरूपक ii. 9; साहित्यदर्पणiii. 130, p. 136). The पीठमर्द of the heropossesses, in a lesser degree, the qualities of the hero(e.g. Markanda in the मालतीमाधव). The term पीठमर्दिका in the feminine occurs in the मालतीमाधव in the sense of a trusty go-between, applied to the nun कौशिकी. The विट, usually neglected in the serious drama, except in चारुदत्त and मृच्छकटिक, appears in all his glory in the भाण, for which he is prescribed as the hero.

[1]. An amour with a married woman cannot, cannot, according to रुद्रट and रुद्रभट्ट form the subject of dominant Rasa in a play or poem; but this is the central theme of वैष्णव lyrics.

[1]. भरत xxii. 197-206 : धनञ्जय ii. 21f : विश्वनाथ iii. 67-70; शिङ्गभूपाल i. 121-51. Rarely a heroine, she must be represented as love when she is a heroine; but she cannot be so when be so when the hero is divine or royal.The exception occurs in a prahasana or farce(and incidentally in a भाण or the erotic monologue) where she can be represented in her low and avaricious character for cosmic effect.

[1]. The usual meeting places are given as a ruined temple, a garden, the house of a go-between, a cemetery, the bank of a stream, or any dark place generally.

[1]. Theoretically the Rasa is one, a single ineffable and impersonal joy, but it can be subdivided, not according to its own nature but according to the emotions which form its basis. भरत (ch. vi) and other theorists give a full description of the स्थायीभावs, विभावs etc. In the case of each Rasa, into which space forbids us to enter. A summary of it will be found in Lindenau Rasalehre Leipzig 1913, pp.8f. Thus, in the case of the heroic sentiment (वीर), the dominant feeling is energy(उत्साह); the excitants(विभावs) are coolness (असम्मोह), resolve(अध्यवसाय), circumspection(नय), strength(बल), etc.; the ensuants (अनुभावs) are firmness(स्थैर्य), heroism (शौर्य), sacrifice(त्याग) etc.; the व्यभिचारिणः or accessory feelings are those of assurance, arrogance. विश्वनाथ gives them somewhat differently. The essential excitant (आलम्बनविभाव) of the heroic sentiment, according to him, consists of those to be vanquished, and their acts and gestures from the enhancing excitants (उद्दीपनविभावs); the ensuants comprehend the desire or seeking for assistants and adherents; while the accessory feelings are patience, intelligence, remembrance, cogitation etc. The sentiment may take three from of corage (Bharata vi. 79=ed. Regnaud vi.80), viz. in battle (युद्धवीर), in virtuous deeds(धर्मवीर), and in liberality (दानवीर), to which later writers (e.g. विश्वनाथ) add दयावीर. It should also be noted that a special color and a presiding deity is attributed to each Rasa. Thus, red, black, white, dark, (श्याम) and grey are associated, not unreasonably with the furious, terrible, cosmic, erotic and pathetic and sentiments, although it is difficult to explain why horror is dark blue (नील), wonder is orange, and heroism us yellow. The respective deities are विष्णु (erotic), यम(pathetic), प्रमथ(comic), रुद्र(furious), इन्द्र(heroic), काल(terrible), महाकाल (disgustful), ब्रह्मा(marvelous),. विश्वनाथ adds that नारायण is the presiding deity of शान्त rasa and the colour associated is that of Jasmine(kunda).

[1]. These two divisions of विभाव are not mentioned by भरत but distinguished by धनञ्जय (iv. 2) and traditionally handed down by विश्वनाथ.

[1]. See above p. 339, fn 2. The सात्त्विकभावs in later works from a special class of अनुभावः.

[1]. If the verse is genuinely UdbhaÔa's. See above p. 431, fn. 2- On the शान्तरस in भरत and धनञ्जयsee S.K. De, Some Problems pp. 139-41. On the number and nomenclature of Rasa generally see V. Raghvan, Number of Rasas, Adyar 1940.

[1]. The शान्त text in Bharata, available in certain recensions, are interpolations. See Bhagavan, op.cit., pp. 15f , विश्वनाथ, कालिदास knew only eight Rasas, विक्रमोर्वशीय ii. 18, where मुनि-भरत is also mentioned.

[1]. This sentiment is also closely related to the sentiment of disgust; for it arises from an aversion to worldly things.

[1]. See S.K. De, वैष्णव Faith and Movement, p. 145.

[1]. भानुदत्त counts (रसतरङ्गिणी) माया under the Rasaa. रुद्रट mentioned preyas (friendship), which Rasa is accepted by भोज. Some writers add श्रद्धा along with भक्ति. See भानुदत्त, op. cit., p. 56, 11. 25f (ed. Regaaud) शिङ्गभुपाल admits only eight Rasas, but his treatment is from the standpoint of dramaturgy.

[1]. न यत्र दु:खं न सुखं न चिन्ता न द्वेष रागौ न च काचिद् इच्छा रसः स शान्तः कथितो मुनिन्द्रैः, सर्वेषु भावेषु शमप्रधानः, cited also in Dasa, iv. 49 (comm.).

[1]. इत्येवं रूपस्य शान्तस्य मोक्षावस्थायां एवात्मस्वरूपापत्तिलक्षणायां प्रादुर्भूतत्वात् तत्र सञ्चारादीनामभावात् कथं रसत्वम्।

[1]. यश्चास्मिन् सुखाभावोप्योक्तस्य वैषयिकसुखपरत्वान्न विरोधः।

[1]. A fourth kind of abhinaya is sometimes added, viz. आचार्य (extraneous), i.e. derived from dress, decoration etc.

[1]. रतिरीति स्थायिभावोपलक्षणं, देवादिविषयेत्यापि अप्राप्तरसावस्थोपलक्षणम्, p. 206.

[1]. अनौचित्यप्रवृत्तत्वे आभासो रसभावयोः(मम्मट) explained as : अनौचित्यं चात्र रसाणां भरतादिप्रणीतलक्षणानां सामग्रीरहितत्वे त्वेकदेशयोगित्वोपलक्षण परं बोध्यम्।

[1]. शिङ्गभूपाल(pp. 141-2) distinguishes two cases (i) where Rasa is ascribe to an inanimate object and (ii) where it is developed in an inferior character or in animals.

[1]. यावता त्वनौचित्येन रसस्य निष्पत्तिः तावत्तु न वार्यते, रसप्रतिकूलस्यैव तस्य निषेधत्वात्।

[1]. Some Rasas again are mutually consistent, e.g. करुण and बिभत्स go with हास्य (cf. भरत vi. 40) etc. this question see Lindenau Rasalehre (pp. 71f). According to विश्वनाथ, The Rasas hostile (i) to शृङ्गार are करुण, बिभत्स, रौद्र वीर and भयानक (ii) to हास्य-भयानक and करुण (iii) to करुण, हास्य शृङ्गार and शृङ्गार (iv) to रौद्र- हास्य, शृङ्गार and भयानक (v) to वीर-भयानक and शान्त (vi) to भयानक, शृङ्गार, वीत, रौद्र, हास्य and शान्त (vii) to शान्त,वीर, शृङ्गार, रौद्र,हास्य, and भयानक (viii) to बिभत्स- शृङ्गार. भानुदत्त gives the antagonistic Rasas as follow: शृङ्गार-बिभत्स; वीर-भयानक; रौद्र-अद्भुत; हास्य-करुण।

[1].अथैवात्र प्रधानेतरेषु रसेषु स्वातन्त्र्य विमर्शराहित्यात्, पूर्णरसभावमात्राश्च विलक्षणतया, सञ्जारि रसनाम्ना व्यपदेशः प्राच्यानाम्, Visvanatha, p.420.

Bibliography:

1. Bhavaprakashana of Saradatanaya, Edited by Madan mohan Agarwal, Chowkhamba Surabharati Prakashana, Varanasi, 1983.
2. Dasarupaka of Dhananjaya with Dipika Commentary, Amarnathvidya Prakashan, Delhi, 1979.
3. History of Sanskrit Poetics by S.K. De, Calcutta Oriental Press, Calcutta, 1925.
4. Introduction Indian Poetics and Aesthetics by Prof. B.K. Dalai and Prof. Ravindra Muley, Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, University of Pune, Pune, 2014.
5. Natyadarpana of Ramacandra & Gunacandra (1st Edn.1986 & 2nd Edn. 1994), Edited by T. C. Upreti, Parimal Publication, Delhi, 2005.
6. Natyashastra of Bharata, (Part - 1: Chapter 1-13 ; Part -2: Chapter 14-28 ; Part – 3: Chapter 29-36 ; Edited by Puspendar Kumar, New Bharatiya Book Corporation, Delhi, 2006.
7. Prataprudriya of Vidyanatha with Commentary of Kumaraswami (2nd Edition), Edited by Dr. Raghvan , Sanskrit Education Society, Madras, 1979.
8. Rasaviveka of Unknown Author, Edited by T.K.V.N. Sudarsanacharya, Sahitya Akademi, Delhi, 1957.
9. Rasapradipa of Prabhakara Bhatta,Saraswati Bhavan, Vanaras, 1982.
10. Rasamimamsa of Gangaram Jadi Edited by Srinivas Sharma, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Vanaras, 2003.

11. Rasamanjari of Bhanudatta Edited by Dr. Jamuna Pathak, Chowkhamba Vidya Bhavan, Varanasi, 2011.
12. Rasakaustubha of Benidatta, Indu Prakashan, Roop Nagar, Delhi, 1978.
13. Rasavilasa of Sukla Bhudev, Edited by Premlata Sharma, Poona Oriental Book House, Sadashiv Peth, Poona, 1952.
14. Rasagangadhara of Panditraja Jagannatha with commentary of Gurumarmaprakasha by Nagesbhatta, Edited by Sri Parasnsth Dwivedi, SampurnanadaSanskrit Visvavidyalaya, VaraÆasi, 2000.
15. Rasataranginі of Bhanudatta, Published by Sri Venkateswar Press, Mumbai, 1836.
16. Rasaviveka of Unknown author Edited by Sudarsanacsrya, Sri Venkateswar Oriental Research Institute, Tirupati, 1956.
17. RasakaumudÍ of Srikantha Edited by A.N. Jani, Oriental Research Institute, Baroda, 1959.
18. SahityadarpaÆa by Visvanatha, Bharatiya vidyaprakashan, Baranasi, 2001.
19. The Number of Rasas by V.Raghvan, The Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madrass, 1975.
20. The Post Jagannatha Literary Criticism in Sanskrit by Dr. M. SivakumaraSwamy, Dvaita Vedanta Studies and Research Foundation, Bangalore, 2009.
21. Ujjvalanilamani of Rupagoswamin, Edited by Narayana Goswami Maharaj, Gaudiya Vedanta Prakashana, New Delhi, 2006.