

## CHAPTER-VI

### *Rasa after Dhanañjaya and Viśvanātha: a comparative analysis*

Idea of *Dhanañjaya* and *Viśvanātha* on different aspects of Sanskrit poetics in general and *Rasas* in particular has already been discussed in this chapter. Although, both of *Dhanañjaya* and *Viśvanātha* are found to be influenced by some of their predecessors (Like *Bharata*, *Ānandabhardhana*, *Abhinavagupta*, *Mammaṭa*, *Bhoja*, etc.) while conceptualizing their thoughts, each of them is being ennobled by own talent and excellences. They have incorporated almost all the topics those are related to literary criticism in their courses of discussion. Both of them belong to the *Rasa* school of history of Sanskrit poetics and they assign *Rasa* or the relish as the most essential element of *Kāvya* i.e., poetry and *Nāṭya* i.e. drama. A detailed discussion have been carried out on barriers aspects of Sanskrit poetics in the following and which have been examine to see how fra their contributions have some commonalities and differences.

In the history of Sanskrit literature, *Bharata* is the first founder of *Nāṭaka* or the drama. The concept of *Nāṭya* made by *Bharata* is-

“लोकवृत्तानुकरणं नाट्यम्”<sup>1</sup>

Another definition of *Nāṭya* is-

“त्रैलोक्यस्यास्य सर्वस्य नाट्यं भावानुकीर्तनम्”<sup>2</sup>

Following *Bharata*, *Nāṭaka* 's define by *Dhanañjaya* as-

“अवस्थानुकृतिर्नाट्यम्”<sup>-3</sup>

‘Drama is the imitating of situation.’

Again he said- A show (*Rūpa*) because of the fact that it is seen. i.e.,

“रूपं दृश्यतयोच्यते”<sup>4</sup>

The author defines-

“रूपकं तत्समारोपात्”<sup>5</sup>

That means, it representation (*Rūpaka*) because it is parts of actors.

“वस्तु नेता रसस्तेषां भेदकः”<sup>6</sup>

*Dhanañjaya* discusses about *Rūpaka* and its varieties in his own valuable work of the *Daśarūpaka*. He says-

“दशधैव रसाश्रयम्”<sup>7</sup>

Or, *Rūpakas* are ten types, and is based on the *Rasa*.

The ten chief varieties of *Rūpakas* are: The *Nāṭaka*, *Prakarāṇa*, *Bhāṇa*, *Prahasana*, *Ḍima*, *Vyāyoga*, *Samavakāra*, *Vīthī*, *Aṅka* and *Ihāmṛga*.<sup>8</sup>

....रस एवात्र जीवितम्<sup>9</sup>

So that “नाट्यं रसाश्रयम्”<sup>10</sup>

Another way poetry (*Kāvya*) is defined by various rhetoricians in different ways. But, *Bharatācārya* is found silent about it. The concept of poetry made by *Bhāmaha* is-

“शब्दार्थौ सहितौ काव्यम्”<sup>11</sup>

Or ‘the word and the sense well matched is poetry’.

*Dandīn* opines that the body of the poetry is formed by a collection of word possessing desirable sense-

“शरीरं तावदिष्टार्थो व्यावच्छिन्ना पदावली”<sup>12</sup>

*Vāmana* defines *Kāvya* as-

“काव्यशब्दोऽयं गुणालङ्कार संस्कृतयोः शब्दार्थयोर्वर्तते”<sup>13</sup>

*Ānandavardhana* is also of opinion that word and sense constitute the body of poetry-

“शब्दार्थो शरीरं तावत् काव्यम्”<sup>14</sup>

He assigns *Dhvani* as the soul of poetry-

“काव्यस्यात्मा ध्वनिः।”<sup>15</sup>

In the view of *Rājaśekhara*, poetry is that sentence possesses *Guṇa* (merit) and *Alaṅkāra* (figure of speech).

“गुणवदलंकृतञ्च वाक्यमेव काव्यम्”<sup>16</sup>

*Bhoja*, in his *SKB*, records that poetry should be free from blemishes and it should possess *Alaṅkāra*, *Guṇa* and *Rasa* in it;

“निर्दोषं गुणवत्काव्यम् अलङ्कारैरलङ्कृतम्  
रसान्वितं कविः कुर्वन् कीर्तिं प्रीतिञ्च विन्दति”<sup>17</sup>

Similarly, *Kṣemendra* defines poetry as-

“काव्यं विशिष्टा शब्दार्थो साहित्यं शब्दालङ्कृति”<sup>18</sup>

Poetry is the combination of particular word and sense that possesses poetic figure.

*Mammaṭabhaṭṭa* defines *Kāvya* as-

“तदोषैशब्दार्थौ सगुणावनलङ्कृतिपुनःतवापि”<sup>19</sup>

-Poetry consists in word and sense, devoid of fault and possessing excellences, and sometimes also ward of poetic figure.

*Viśvanātha* defines *Kāvya* as-

“वाक्यं रसात्मकं काव्यम्”<sup>20</sup>

It means-any sentence that possesses *Rasa* is poetry. Further, he says that in this definition, that term ‘*Rasātmakam*’ refers to that where of the soul is *Rasa*. In this way, *Viśvanātha* definition signifies that poetry is that sentence which possesses *Rasa* as its soul. Unlike *Mammaṭa* and some other rhetoricians, *Viśvanātha* does not strengthen equally upon word and sense while formulating poetry. Like *Danḍīn* and some other earlier theorist, *Viśvanātha*, in his definition, mentions only about *Vākya* (sentence) or the form, but not about *Artha* (sense) or the content. However, later he accepts both ‘*Śabda*’ and ‘*Artha*’ as the body of poetry.’<sup>21</sup>

With reference to his *Kāvya*-definition, *Viśvanātha* takes the opportunity to define *Vākya* or sentence which can be regarded one of the significant contributions of *Viśvanātha* to Sanskrit poetics. His definition of *Vākya* is-

“वाक्यं स्याद् योग्यताकाङ्क्षासतियुक्तः पदोच्चयः।”<sup>22</sup>

Sentence is a collection of words possessing *Yogyatā* (compatibility), *Ākaṃkṣā* (expectancy) and *Āsatti* (proximity). Here, *Viśvanātha* also explains *Yogyatā*, *Ākaṃkṣā* and *Āsatti* with illustrations. Even though *Vākya* is defined by various

earlier theorists of different branches of knowledge and their influence is seen in *Viśvanātha's Vākya* definition, this definition owns great popularity in Sanskrit poetics.

Although, *Dhanañjaya's* definition of *Nāṭya*, nothing has been stated about *Rasa*. So, both of *Dhanañjaya* and *Viśvanātha* are equally aware of the essentiality of *Rasa* in *Nāṭya* (drama) and *Kāvya* (poetry).

*Bharata* is the first known author to us to introduce and discuss it in relation to drama. Later on theory of *Rasa* was transferred to the region of poetry also. Although its mentions is found in the *Purāṇas* like *Agnipurāṇa* and *Dharmadotto Purāṇa*, yet the date of these *Purāṇas* is not sure and PV Kane and Manomohan Ghosh are of the view that they are later to the *NŚ* of *Bharata* and perhaps the discussion of *Rasa* in those *Purāṇas* is borrowed from the *NŚ*.<sup>23</sup>

*Bharata* accepted, *Rasa* as the soul of drama and maintained that nothing proceeds without *Rasa*. From then onwards in Sanskrit literature, *Rasa* has been the touch-stone of any work composed. Some old writers accepted it as an *Alamkāra*, while others as something separate, the spirit or soul of the literary work. Followers of the School of *Dhvani* established its superiority and prominence in poetry. The poetry where *Rasa* is dominant was called the best form of poetry and *Dhvani* and where it held a subordinate position, *Rasa* was regarded as an *Alamkāra* termed '*Rasavat*'.<sup>24</sup>

According to *Rājaśekhara*, *Nāndikeśvara* was the earliest writer on *Rasa* theory. But no work of *Nāndikeśvara* is available to us. Therefore for all

efficient purpose, we have to take only *Bharata* as the earliest writer on *Rasa*. His work, *NŚ* is mainly devoted to the exposition of the art of *Nāṭya*, and so it is more a work on dramaturgy than on poetics. Naturally, therefore, the *Rasa* is one of the many subjects that are discussed in the *NŚ*, that too as is applicable to the drama. The same has been introduced into the sphere of *Śrāsvyakāvya* also by later writers on aesthetics.<sup>25</sup>

*Bhāmaha* while writing about *Kāvya* says in uncertain terms, that a poem should contain all the *Rasas*.<sup>26</sup> Perhaps he is the first man to give place to *Rasa* in the *Śrāvya-kāvya* also. But he simply includes it among the *Alamkāras* and calls *Rasa* as the *Rasavadālamkāra*.<sup>27</sup> But what exactly was meant by ‘*Rasa*’ by *Bhāmaha* is not clearly known because he no where attempts to define *Rasa* and even the example given by him does not give any clear idea. When *Bhāmaha* does not give any definition of his own for *Rasa*, it can be assumed that he accepts the one given by *Bharata* and as understood by him.<sup>28</sup>

*Dandīn*’s views on *Rasa* are almost similar to those of *Bhāmaha*. He also includes it in *Alamkāras* naming it *Rasavādālamkāra*. While explaining the *Mādhuragaṇa* he defines it as containing *Rasa* which rests both with *Śabda* and *Artha*.<sup>29</sup> He explains that all *Alamkāras* aid in producing *Rasa* in general and the special responsibility of producing it rests with the *Agrāmyatā*.<sup>30</sup> Later on, he explains *Rasa* by defining the same as the *Sthāyibhāva* intensified by *Vibhāva* etc., but names it ‘*Rasavādālamkāra*’. Thus he explains all the eight *Rasas*, in the second chapter of *KD* in verses from 281 to 291. Thus *Dandīn*

deals with *Rasa* more elaborately than *Bhāmaha* which indicates the importance; *Rasa* is gaining gradually in the sphere of poetry also.<sup>31</sup>

*Udbhaṭa* in his *KLSV* follows the views of *Bhāmaha* and repeats the same sentence ‘रसवद् दर्शितस्पष्ट शृङ्गारादिरसोदयम्’<sup>32</sup> and adds his own sentence to it. “स्वशब्दस्थायिसञ्चारिविभावाभिनयास्पदम्”,<sup>33</sup> thereby meaning that *Rasodaya* requires- the mention of *Rasa* with its name (*Śṛṅgāra* etc., and the representation of *Sthāyi*, *Sañcārī*, *Vibhāvas* and *Anubhāvas*. One thing which is quite peculiar in *Udbhaṭa*, and which is not acceptable to later rhetorician is that *Rasotpatti* is possible even by *Svaśbdābhidhāna*, mentioning it by name. This is considered to be a serious defect of *Rasa*, by later rhetorician.<sup>34</sup>

*Rudraṭa* appears to be the first rhetorician to give the *Rasa* an independent place.<sup>35</sup> He does not give any special definition of *Rasa* of his own, but appears to be following the one given by *Bharata* because by writing “रसनाद्रसत्वमेषां मधुरादीनामिवोक्तमाचार्यैः”<sup>36</sup> he reminds us of the similar lines of *Bharata*.<sup>37</sup> Apart from the eight *Rasas* accepted by *Bharata*, *Rudraṭa* includes two more *Rasas*, namely *Śānta* and *Preyaṇa*. It is interesting to note that *Rudraṭa* does not find anything wrong in accepting *Vyabhicāribhāvas* like *Nirveda*, also as *Rasas*, provided clearly explained by *Namisādhu*.<sup>38</sup> He gives greater importance to *Rasa* in a poem and declares that without *Rasa* a *Kāvya* will be quite uninteresting. Thus by the time of *Rudraṭa*, *Rasa* could safe a place of considerable importance, in a *Śrāvya-Kāvya* also.<sup>39</sup>

Above explanation no author from *Bhāmaha* to *Rudraṭa* appears to be keen in examining the theory of *Rasa* by introducing his own view-point or

some philosophical principle. Everyone seems to be content with accepting what is said by *Bharata* about *Rasa*. It falls to the lot of the commentators on *Bharata* to interpret the theory of *Rasa* in their own way by introducing on philosophical principle. Thus we come across such four interpretators, *Bhaṭṭalollaṭa*, *Śaṅkuka*, *Bhaṭṭanāyaka* and *Abhinavagupta*. According to our present knowledge, *Lollaṭa* appears to be the first writer to have attempted a psychological analysis of *Rasa*. As quoted by *Abhinavagupta*.<sup>40</sup> He understands the *Rasasūtra* of *Bharata* like this.<sup>41</sup>

*Rasa* is produced when *Sthāyibhāva* is associated with *Vibhāvas*, *Anubhāvas* and *Vyabhicāribhāvas*. The mental condition named *Sthāyi* is produced by the *Vibhāvas* and the *Anubhāvas* of the *Vibhāvas* and by the *Vyabhicāribhāvas*. Though saying that the *Sthāyibhāva* is produced by the *Vibhāvas* etc., in the beginning *Lollaṭa* contends, at the end that the dormant feeling (*Sthāyibhāva*) intensified by the *Vibhāva* etc., turns into *Rasa*, and the same in its nonintensified state is called *Sthāyibhāva*.<sup>42</sup>

*Lollaṭa's* views are quoted by *Mammaṭa* also. But there slight difference between what is quoted by *Mammaṭa* and the one quoted by *Abhinavagupta*.

All the rhetoricians believe *Bharata* to be the earliest exponent of *Rasa* theory. So they try to find his support for all their views on *Rasa*.

*Bharata* does not claim any originality, in his *Rasa* theory. He simply explains in his own words what *Rasa* is and quotes two *Anuvāmsyaśloka*s in support of his explanation. The theory of *Rasa* as enunciated by *Bharata*



appears to be quite simple, free from later elaborate explanations based on various Philosophical speculations. His theory runs as follows:-

“तत्र विभावानुभावव्याभिचारिसंयोगाद् रसनिष्पत्तिः।”<sup>43</sup> कोऽष्टान्त? अत्राह यथाहि नानाव्यञ्जनोषधिद्रव्यसंयोगात् रसनिष्पत्तिः तथा नानाभावोपगमाद्रसनिष्पत्तिः। यथाहि गुडादिभर्द्रव्यैः व्यञ्जनैरोषधिभिश्च षाडवादयो रसा निर्वर्त्यन्ते तथा नाना भावोपगता अपि स्थायिनो भावा रसत्वमाप्नुवन्तीति। रसः इति कः पदार्थः? उच्यते, आस्वादत्वात्, कथमास्वादते रसः? यथाहि नानाव्यञ्जनसंस्कृतमन्नम भुञ्जाना रसानास्वादयन्ति हर्षादींश्चाधिगच्छन्तीति “सुमनसः पुरुषा” इत्यभिव्याख्याताः, तथा नानाभावाभिनयव्यञ्जितान् वागङ्गसत्वोपेतान् स्थायिभावानास्वादयन्ति हर्षादींश्चाधिगच्छन्तीति प्रेक्षकाः सुमनसः इत्यभिव्याख्याताः। तस्मान्नाट्यरसाः। अत्रानुवंशयौ श्लोकौ भवतः-

“यथा बहुद्रव्युतैर्व्यञ्जनैर्बहुभिर्युतम्।

आस्वादयन्ति भुञ्जाना भक्तं भक्तविदो जनाः॥

भावाभिनयसम्बद्धात् स्थायिभावांस्तथा बुधाः।

आस्वादयन्ति मनसा तस्मात् नाट्यरसाः स्मृताः ॥”<sup>44</sup>

According to *Bharata*, *Rasa* in only a *Laukikavastu*. He explains it on the analogy of *Pākarasa*. When we mix the food made of rice and wheat etc., with some *Vyañjanas*, a peculiar taste like *Śadaba* is produce. Similarly, the *Nātyarasa* are also produced by a peculiar admixute of *Vibhāvas*, *Anubhāvas* and *Vyabhicāribhāvas*, with the *Sthāyibhāva*. And to be more precise, according to *Bharata*, the *Sthāyibhāva* is changed into *Rasa* when it is associated with the *Vibhāvas* etc. This same *Sthāyibhāva*, when tasted by the *Sahṛdayas*, gives them pleasure, like the *Pākarasa* which gives pleasure to the eater. Thus judged by the similarity of *Pākarasa*, *Bharata* appears to think that

*Nāṭyarasa* is produced like the *Pākarasa* and that the pleasure (*Harṣa*) that is caused by the *Rasa* is quite different from the *Rasa* but not *Rasa* itself.<sup>45</sup>

He also appears to be thinking that the effect of *Rasa* need not certainly be pleasure alone, because he writes-“प्रेक्षका हर्षादींश्चाधिगच्छन्ति” implying pain also by the word ‘Adi.’ As can be seen from the phrase “नाट्यरसाः स्मृताः,” प्रेक्षका हर्षादींश्चाधिगच्छन्ति; तस्मान्नाट्यरसा इत्यभिव्याख्याताः”<sup>46</sup> *Bharata* has been concerned only with *Rasa* as associated with *Nāṭya* i.e. drama. He says-

“तत्र रसानेव तावदादावभिव्याख्यास्यामः। नहि रसादते कश्चिदर्थः प्रवर्तते”<sup>47</sup>

‘no meaning can proceed from speech without any kind of *Rasa*.’ We may say that all poetic meanings imbued with *Rasa*. With this passion *Bharata* tells us the process of realisation of *Rasa* in the *Sūtra*-“विभावानुभावव्याभिवारिसंयोगाद् रसनिष्पत्तिः”<sup>48</sup> This *Sūtra* clearly means ‘*Rasa* results from the combination of *Vibhāvas*, *Anubhāvas* and *Vyabhicāribhāvas*. That the word ‘*Samyoga*’ means a connection with the *Sthāyibhāvas* may be gathered from the prose exposition of the *Sūtra* by *Bharata* himself or a still later verse called *Anuvāmsya Śloka* running as-

भावभिनयासम्बद्धेन स्थायीभावस्थता बुद्धः।

आस्वादयन्ति मनसा तस्मान्ते रसः स्मर्तः॥<sup>49</sup>

Here *Bhāva* means *Vibhāvas* and *Vyabhicāribhāvas* and *Abhinaya* mean *Anubhāvas*. But it is all perplexing; the ambiguity of the tatement particularly of the terms *Samyoga* and *Niṣpatti* has been the subject of controversy and their peculiar interpretations give rise to different theories associated with the concept of *Rasa*. The original *Rasasūtra* of *Bharata* has been commented upon

by many commentators of *NS*. Their works are not conveniently available. The only commentary available is *Abhinavabharatī*. In that commentary, *Abhinavagupta* refers to his three predecessors and expound their views on *Rasa*. These commentators are *Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa*, *Śrī Saṅkuka* and *Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka*. How the *Rasa* arises culminates in others mind? The theory of *Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa* is called *Utpattivāda*. According to him *Niṣpatti* means *Utpatti* and *Samyoga* means combination in general. He says that *Rasa* primarily belongs to the hero. The spectator ascribes this *Rasa* to the actor for his peculiar dress, intelligent acting and stagecraft and thus his knowledge about hero's love for heroine gives him pleasure. The love is *Sthāyibhāva*; and the very *Sthāyin* being brought to its full form by *Vibhāvas*, etc., becomes *Rasa*-

तेन स्थायीन विभावानुभावादिभिरूपाचित रसः।<sup>50</sup>

In *Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa*'s theory, the relation between *Vibhāva* and *Rasa* is that of cause and effect, that between *Anubhāva* and *Rasa* is that of indicator and the thing indicated and that between *Vyabhicāribhāva* and *Rasa* is that of nourishes and the thing nourished. So according to this view, *Rasa* is produced as an effect. This view does not deal *Rasa* as a matter of the readers or the spectators's feelings or emotions.

The theory of *Śrī Saṅkuka* is called *Anumitivāda*. According to him *Niṣpatti* means *Anumiti* and *Samyoga* means universal concomitance. So the relation between *Vibhāvas* and *Rasa* is that of *Anumāpaka* and *Anumāpya* and the whole dictum means *Rasa* inferred from the *Vibhāvas*, *Anubhāvas* and *Sañcāribhāvas* with which it bears the relation of universal concomitance. *Śrī*

*Sāṅkuka* basically put forward the theory of inference. It holds that *Rasa* is not a developed from but an imitation of the permanent mood. The permanent mood exists in the original character like, *Rāma*, but the actor by means of his superior imitative faculty is identified with the original hero. This identification is of a peculiar nature resembling that of a horse with a horse in picture.

The theory of *Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka* is called *Bhuktivāda* which is based on the *Sāṅkhya* concept of *Guṇas* and Vedantic concept of *Ānanda* and *Bhoga*. According to *Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka* *Niṣpatti* means enjoyment and *Samyoga* means ideas of presentation in generalised form. He maintains that *Rasa* is neither produced nor cognised nor suggested. It is due to the relation of the enjoyed and enjoyer-

भुज्यभोजकभाव-सम्बन्धात् रसनिष्पत्तिः।<sup>51</sup>

In *Abhinaya* etc. the most remarkable contribution of this theory to the problem of aesthetic realization is that it has been considered for the first time as mental process, a subjective experience on the part of a refined appreciator.

*Abhinavagupta* did not claim that his theory of *Rasa* is an original one. He held that he was offering a polished and refined version of what was already there in *Bharata's* work. His theory is called *Abhivyaktivāda*. The terms *Samyoga* and *Niṣpatti*; signify the function of suggestions and manifestation respectively. According to him *Rasa* is suggested and it is relished in the manner of realisation-

तस्मात् स्थायीतामेतत् अभिभाज्यन्ते रसः प्रतिभ्याश्च रसन्ताति।<sup>52</sup>

He says that *Rasa* is relished by *Vyāñjanā* in the mind of the reader or the audience by *Vibhāvas*, etc. understood in a general form. It neither comes under the domain of *Abhidhā*, nor of *Tātparyakhyavṛtti*, nor of *Lakṣanā* nor of *Prataḥṣa*, nor of *Anumāna*, nor of *Smarāṇa*, is *Abhinavagupta*'s view accepted by *Viśvanātha* and almost all rhetoricians.

*Dhanañjaya*'s own theory of *Rasa* in which not the relation of *Vyāñgya-Vyañjaka*, but that of *Bhāvya-bhāvaka* is posited, like *Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka*'s treatment of it *Rasa-Kāvya* relationship.

*Dhanañjaya* states that *Rasa* as-

“विभावैरनुभावैश्च सातिकैर्व्यभिचारिभिः।

आनीयमानः स्वाद्यत्वं स्थायी भावो रसः स्मृतः॥”<sup>53</sup>

He also says that - the very permanent state becomes *Rasa* from the spectator's (*Rasika*) own capacity for being pleased and his attitude, not from the character of the hero to be imitated not from the works aiming at production of sentiment.

*Dhanañjaya* describes the particular stage of aesthetic experience; ‘Just as the verb’, whether to be spoken or whether present in the mind, when combined with nouns relating to it, is the essence of a sentence, so a permanent state, when combined with the other states, is the essence of a play. This very basic mental state is *Rasa*, because it is relish able. This relish consists in the experience of blissfulness of the subject that is free from limitations of individuality. It arises from the realization of the full meaning of the presented, whether it be expressed, indicated or implied. Although *Rasa* is only one,

because the universal subjective blissfulness has no variety. Yet because of variety of emotive affections of mind as also of accompanying conditions of heart, it is divided into four primary *Rasas*. Thus the blissful state of universalized subject is accompanied by blooming of heart in *Śṛṅgāra*, by boardening of it in *Vīra*, by tossing of it in *Bībhatsa* and by violent protest of it in *Raudra*.<sup>54</sup>

*Dhanika* maintains that there is *Bhāvya-bhāvaka-sambandha* between *Rasa* and *kāvya* and rejects the *Vyāngya-vyñjaka-bhāva* advanced by the exponents of *Dhvani*. According to him, *Rasa* is *Bhāvya* and *Kāvya* is *Bhāvaka*-

अतो न रसादिनां काव्येन सह व्याङ्ग-संयोकभावः किं तर्हि भाव्य-भावक-सम्बन्ध, काव्यं हि भावकं, भाव्य रसादेयः। ते हि स्वतः भावन्त औव भावकेषु विशिष्टभावादि मत काव्येन भाव्यन्ते।<sup>55</sup>

*Dhanika* says that the *Bhāvya-bhāvaka-sambandha* is not a new thing, because it has already been maintained by the *Mīmāṃsakas*. The *Bhāvya-bhāvaka-sambandha* exists also between *Kāvya* and *Samjīkamānas*. The poetry inspires the readers by the ideas it contains and the heart of the reader is filled with them. In this way the poetry is *Bhāvaka* and the heart of the reader is *Bhāvya*.

*Dhanañjaya* and *Dhanika* contend that the function of ‘*Vyāñjanā*’ is redundant. The so-called *Vyāñgyor̥tha* may be had as the *Tātparār̥tha* as it is also a meaning of the sentence-

तात्पर्यानातैरेकश्च व्यञ्जनियस्य न ध्वनिः।<sup>56</sup>

*Dhanañjaya* concedes to the fact that the suggested sense may not have a denotative word for it. But that should not be the reason for not calling it as *Vācya*, he contends. The *Sthāyibhāva*, which is said to be suggested by the express description of the *Vibhāvas*, etc., is not conveyed by any expressive words. But, yet it should be considered as the *Vācya* sense itself of the sentence. The *Sthāyibhāva* is indeed the ‘*Vākyārtha*’, the *Vācya* being intent on conveying the same. *Dhanañjaya* says:

वाच्या प्रकरणादिभ्यो बुद्धिस्था वा यथा क्रियाषा  
वाक्यार्थः कारकैर्युक्ता स्थायी भावस्तथेतरेः॥<sup>57</sup>

Again he admits ‘*Tātparyavṛtti*’ and rejects ‘*Vyāñjanā*’. He accepts *Bhāvya-bhāvaka-sambandha* between *Rasa* and *Kāvya*. Although he followed *Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka* he refutes ‘*Bhojakatva*’ and assumed *Bhāvya-bhāvaka-sambandha* on the basis of ‘*Bhāvakatva*’ after *Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka*. *Dhanañjaya* considered the word ‘*Bhāvanās*’ as the meaning of the word *Niṣpatti* of *Bharata’s Rasa-sūtra*. *Dhanika* says ‘*Bhāva*’ is called ‘*Bhāvya*’ because it creates the feelings of *Rasa*. So *Rasa* is *Bhāvya* and this is why *Bhāvya-bhāvaka-sambandha* is established between *Rasa* and *Kāvya*.

भावाविभनयसंबद्धान् भावयन्ति रसानिमान्  
यस्मात्तस्मादमी भावा विज्ञेया नाट्ययोक्तृभिः॥<sup>58</sup>

Aesthetic experience, according to *Dhanañjaya*, who follows *Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka*, consists in the realization of blissfulness of the universalized subject, affected by a universalized basic mental state and accompanied by a corresponding condition of heart.

*Dhanañjaya* accepted the ‘*Anubhāvatva*’ of *Sāttikabhāva* but *Viśvanātha* differentiated *Anubhāva* from *Sāttikabhāva*. So he says-

सतमात्रोद्भवत्वाते भिन्ना अप्यनुभावतः॥<sup>59</sup>

There are eight types of *Sāttikabhāva* and these are: *Stambha*, *Pralaya*, *Romāñca*, *Sveda*, *Vivarnatā*, *Vepathu*, *Aśru* and *Svabhanga*. Out of these, *Dhanañjaya* only defines *Sthambha* and *Pralaya*. In the rest of the *Sāttikabhāvas* the terms are so clear that *Dhanañjaya* does not feel any need to explain them. But *Viśvanātha* clearly mentions all types of *Sāttikabhāvas*. Among the thirty three types of *Vyabhicāribhāva*, *Marāṇa* is a one. *Marāṇa* is so much popular that *Dhanañjaya* does not give any definition to it. But other dramaturgiests create definition of *Marāṇa*. According to *Bharata-*

व्याधीनामेकभावो हि मरणाभिनयः स्मृतः।  
विषन्नगातैर्निशेषटैरिन्द्रियैश्च विवर्जितः॥<sup>60</sup>

One the other hand *Viśvanātha* gives a particular definition to *Marāṇa*. He says that-

शराद्यैर्मरणं जीवत्यागोत् पतनादिकृत्<sup>61</sup>

In *Sāhityadarpaṇa* among the abovely mentioned 33 types of *Vyabhicāribhāva* *Supta* is absent. Among these *Vyabhicāribhāvas*, *Dhanañjaya* mentions *Mati* but he does not mention *Anubhāva*. But *Viśvanātha* mentions *Anubhāva* and he says-

नीतिमार्गानुसृत्यादेर्धे निर्धारणं मतिः।<sup>62</sup>

Though *Śṛṅgāra Rasa* is classified into *Sambhoga* and *Vipralambha*, *Dhanañjaya* classifies *Śṛṅgāra* into three types and these are: *Ayoga*,



*Viprayoga* and *Samyoga*. On the other hand, *Viśvanātha* accepted the classification of *Śṛṅgāra* in types of *Sambhoga* and *Vipralambha*. *Dhanañjaya* classifies *Śṛṅgāra* into three types as he has accepted *Ayoga* and *Viprayoga* as special types of *Vipproyoga*.

Another way, *Viśvanātha*, a follower of *Abhinavagupta* and *Ānandanardhana*, shapes his *Sāhityadarpaṇa* after the structure of *Mammaṭa's KP*. He defines *Rasa* that *Sthāyibhāva* or the permanent sentiment such as love, etc., which after its proper association with *Vibhāva*, *Anubhāva* and *Sañcāribhāva*, is manifested as *Rasa* in the mind of *Sahṛdaya*.<sup>63</sup> Here he mentions *Sthāyibhava*, the permanent sentiment. *Mammaṭa's Rasa* definition also mentions *Sthāyibhāva*, which *Viśvanātha* imitates.<sup>64</sup>

*Viśvanātha* further clarifies his position by explaining what the word *Vyakta* or manifestation means that is experienced. *Rasa* is a kind something made manifest in different characters to which it is changed just as curd (*Dadhi*) or the like consists of milk (*Dugdha*). He further supports his use of the word *Vyakta*, that he does not mean to say that something previously completed and previously so extant like a pot which becomes visible in the light. The expression that *Rasa* is being experienced is to be understood like the odanam pacyate and quotes *Abhinavagupta*, the commentator on *Dhvanyāloka*.

In short, *Viśvanātha* following *Abhinavagupta* states that when *Rajas* and *Tamas*-the two qualities of *Citta*-are suppressed and *Sattva* quality comes into prominence, at the stage the real *Ātman* or awareness becomes the only element, and this is identified with *Ānandamaya* stage. At such a moment the

sense of self disappears, one may realize *Brahma*, and the *Rasa* realization is similar to this. It is to be noted that while *Abhinavagupta* following *Saiva Pratyābhijña* would call it omnipotent *Aham*, i.e., *Sadāśiva*, *Viśvanātha* would perhaps call it universal entity, the absolute. Like *Abhinavagupta* he also raised the concept of *Rasa* or precisely *Rasasvādāna* to the high possible level of human conception. The observer will not miss the point that *Viśvanātha* uses the expression *Sattvodreka*, i.e., exaltation of mind is main condition- precedent for association of permanent sentiment. The expression *Sattvodreka* is first used by *Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka* and though his theory of *Bhojakatva* has been rejected by *Abhinavagupta*, he has accepted *Nāyaka's* theory of '*Prakāś-anandamaya-nijasamvid visrantiḥ*.' The meaning conveyed by this expression is that *Rasa* is to be accepted as self-manifested one and it is by its inherent nature *Ānandamaya* which can be realised or experienced is not explained and *Viśvanātha* simply says it is conceived in the same manner as *Brahmopalabdhi* or realization of the absolute and he directs the questioners to those who advocate and establish *Brahmopalabdhi*. *Viśvanātha* says that the term permanent sentiment is mentioned not tautologically but in reliance of the maxim 'exception prabat regulam' with a view to declaring that these sentiments are not necessarily main in other sentiments. *Viśvanātha* simplifies the meaning of the term *Camatkāra* and he explains it as which could be used as the spirit of *Rasa*.

The objection raised by *Mahimbhaṭṭa* that if *Rasa* is accepted as manifested one by *Vyañjanā*, that *Rasa* cannot be a self-luminous one.

*Viśvanātha* treats this objection by saying that *Rasa* is neither something that is created nor an object which could be made into manifestation. *Rasa* is a process of realization or enjoyment.

*Viśvanātha* is very clear in his definition of *Rasa* and states that it neither belongs to self nor non-self. He has not stated how *Sattvodreka* relates to mental perception and how non-self concept of knowledge could be defined, as objective or subjective sense.

*Viśvanātha* directly relates *Rasa* to the definition of *Kāvya*. In his scheme *Rasa* is the only criterion and *summum bonum* in poetic art. In maintaining such an extreme view, he betrays an unmistakable influence of the *Rasa*-school on himself. Poetry is defined by him as a sentence, the soul whereof is *Rasa* ‘*Vākyam rasātmakam kāvyam*’, A sentence, again has been defined as a combination of words having compatibility, expectancy and proximity-

“वाक्यं स्याद् योग्यताकाङ्क्षासतियुक्तः पदोच्चयः।”<sup>65</sup>

*Viśvanātha* defines *Rasa* as

“विभावेनानुभावेन व्यक्तः सञ्चारिणा तन्मा  
रसतामेति रत्यादिः स्थायी भावः सचेतसाम्”<sup>66</sup>

Thus sentiment, made *Vyakta* by *Vibhāva*. *Anubhāva* and *Vyabhicāribhāva* or *Sañcāribhāva* is, transformed into a permanent state as *dadhi* is transformed from *dugdha* and is called *Rasa*. He describes the experience of *Rasa* in the following words:

“सत्वोद्रेकादखण्डखप्रकशानन्दचिन्मयः।  
वेदान्तरस्पर्शशून्यो ब्रह्मास्वादसहोदरः॥  
लोकोत्तरचमत्कार-प्राणः कैश्चित् प्रमातृभिः।  
स्वाकारवदभिन्नत्वेनायमास्वाद्यते रसः”॥<sup>67</sup>

With this exposition *Viśvanātha* points to another dimension of *Rasa* theory. This provides an explanation of how aesthetic experience is transmitted from one mind to another mind. The second person to whom it is transmitted must be a *Sahṛdaya*- a person of correct literary taste. Here anybody cannot have the experience of *Rasa*, individuals who can have such experience nurture the primary of the *Guṇa* called *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*. A correct literary taste is then developed, that is to say, a mind become *Sahṛdaya*, through this continuous nurturing and constant study of literature.

*Rasa* is a unitary and indivisible experience though brought about by diverse cause such as *Vibhāva* and so forth. It shines out by itself, and a further knowledge is not needed to relish it. It is of the nature of *Ānanda*-delicitation or pleasure, and is mind-made. At the time of its experience, *Rasa* is absolutely devoid of contamination with any other experience or knowledge. It is almost identical with the realization of *Brahman*. The experience of *Rasa* is transcendental in nature, and it has as its essence or soul, *Camatkāra* a peculiar state of wonder taking the form of a dilation of the mind. *Rasa* is enjoyed as itself, undivided, and identical with its own form. That is to say, while being experienced there is no separate cognition of *Rasa* and its enjoyment. It is realized as a unitary whole, identical with its knowledge, and hence the whole proof of its existence is its enjoyment by the *Sahṛdaya*.

Again, *Viśvanātha Rasa* is realized by the mind freed of *Rajas* and *Tamas* and it is different from worldly enjoyments and is like the unending self illuminating bliss of the meditation of the supreme being nothing else is cognised at the time it is being relished; it is something extraordinary and an internal surpassing other worldly things and is thus not different from oneself at the time of relishment. It draws in the mind from outward sensual objectives; so it gives rise to *sattva* or a serene mental condition due to studying of some extraordinary *Kāvya vastu*.

*Viśvanātha* rejects the view of *Jñāpyatā* of *Rasa*. He says *Rasa* is neither *Jñāpya* nor *jñānanyavisaya*, for its *pratiti* it constitutes its *satta*; it cannot go without thus *svaprakāśa* and not *jñānataragrādhyā*. His different idea on *Rasa* as-

“नायं ज्ञाप्यः स्वसत्तायां प्रतीत्यव्यभिचारतः”॥<sup>68</sup>

*Rasa* is not *Kārya* even i.e. it is not the effect of *Vibhāvas* etc.

*Rasa* is also not *Nitya*. *Pūrvasaṁvedana* is *vibhāvadijñānāt prakjñānam-* knowledge before the cognizance of *Vibhāvas* etc. *Tdrahitaḥ rasaḥ- Rasa* is berefit of it. So it is not *Nitya*:

यदि रसः नित्यः स्याद् तद विभावादिज्ञानात् प्रज्ञापि ज्ञायते॥<sup>69</sup>

*Rasa* again is neither *Bhavisyat* nor *Vartamāna* even.

“नापि भविष्यन् साक्षादानन्दमयस्वप्रकाशरूपत्वात्  
कार्याज्ञाप्यविलक्षणभावान्नो वर्तमानोऽपि”॥<sup>70</sup>

*Rasa* is not a future matter, for during its cognizance or relishment. It appears as *Ānandamaya* and it is so whenever it arises; *Rasa* being neither a

*Kārya* nor *Jñāpya* i.e. a matter of inference, it is not *Vartamāna* too; for a *Vartamāna* matter is either a *Kārya* or *Jñāpya*.

वर्तमानवस्तुनः कार्यज्ञाप्यन्तेस्त्वनियमत् नासः वर्तमानः इति भावः।<sup>71</sup>

*Viśvanātha* says that *Rasagrahaṇa* again is not a matter of *Nirvikalpajñāna*. *Nirvikalpakjñāna* is not its *Grāhaka*, for it arises to the sympathetic mind due to presence or contact of *Vibhāvas* etc. Though it is known to be *Paramānandamaya*, it is founded upon contact. *Rasagrahaṇa* cannot be a *Nirvikalpajana*, for *Nirvikalpana* is not due to any contact whatsoever ‘*Nirvikalpakam saṁsarganāvagahī*’. It is not even a *Savikalpakajñāna*, for it has no connection with *Abhiplāps* or *Vācanasaṁsarga* during its relish. रसग्रहनस्य वाचनासंसर्गात्त्व भावत् नासौ सवाकल्पकसम्भेद, and *Savikalpajñāna* is due to "वासनाप्राणयोग्यता न तु रसस्य तथा Being again *Svaprakāśa* and being *Jñānantaragrāhya*, *Rasa* strictly speaking cannot be *Savikalpaka*.

*Rasa* is directly perceptible during relish due to *Svādanā* and *Carvanāvvyāpāra*, it is not *Paroksa* or beyond the ranges of senses; neither it is *Aparoksa* or within the range of sense, for it arises only through knowledge of *Vibhāvas* etc. due to reading of *Kāvya* or seeing of a drama nor are these not comprehended within the range of senses.

“साक्षात्कारतया न वा

पर्योक्षस्तत्प्रकाशो नापर्योक्षः शब्दसम्भवात्”।<sup>72</sup>

*Rasa* being something *Āsrūyapurva* and *Adṛṣṭapūrva*. *Rasa* being something different from *Laukikānanda*, it is *Alaukika*, in other words its

*Śravana* or *Darśana* in others being impossible this being its speciality, it is *Alaukika*, it is known, cognized and relished by the *Sahṛdaya* only due to *Svādanā* and *Carvanāvvyāpāra*.

*Viśvanātha* adopts *Vyañjanā* for the relish of *Rasa*. He says *Rasa* is neither *Vācya* nor it is *Lakṣya*, but a matter to be got by *Vyañjanā* (or suggestion due to *Vāsanā* latent in a *Sahṛdaya* person).

After *ABH* the known exponents on the theory of *Rasa* are *Mammaṭa*, *Dhanañjaya*, *Viśvanātha*, and others. Even though *Mammaṭa* admits *Rasa*, he does not directly relate it to his definition of *Kāvya*. But the very definition of *Viśvanātha* clearly declares that *Rasa* is the soul of poetry and others are secondary elements to it. This shows his inclination to the theory of *Rasa* and its relish or *Āsvādana*. At first he says how *Ratyādi* becomes *Rasa* being manifested by *Vibhāva*, *Anubhāva* and *Sañcāribhāva*. The treatise of *Viśvanātha* is influenced by *Bharata*, the father of *Rasa* School. But the job of *Viśvanātha* is only to simplify the abstract nature of the definition of poetry and make it more clearly in a statement. His statement *Vyākṛta* shows how *Rasa* is manifested. *Rasatām eti* says how *Ratyādi* becomes *Rasa*. *Viśvanātha* avoids the ambiguity and makes it very clear like *ABH*'s explanation on the *NŚ*. *Viśvanātha* excludes the role of *Sāttvikabhāva* from the relish of *Rasa*. But *Bharata* thinks of the validity of *Rasa* and makes it an essential factor of drama. *Viśvanātha* includes the (*Sāttvika-bhāva*) in *Anubhāva*. But *Bharata* says every thing has its own importance. *MB* also accepts *Sāttvika bhāva*. But *Viśvanātha* is influenced by the view of *Dhanañjaya* included *Stambha*, *Sveda* etc. both in *Anubhāva* and *Sāttvika bhāva*. But *Viśvanātha* going one step forward says that they are one. Even if they are explained and classified by the logic of *go Vālivardanyāya*. But another Orissan *Alaṅkārika* named *JM* admits its separate identity from *Anubhāva*. *Viśvanātha* says *Rasa* is the transformation of the *Vibhāvānubhāva* etc. as milk becomes curd by transformation. It is not like a pot (*ghaṭa*) which has a prior existence and is

manifested by the lamp. *ABH* says *Rasa* is the consequence of *Vibhābānubhāva Vyābhicāribhāva*; as rice becomes *odanam* or boiled rice. Similarly, it is just a usage of *odanam* pacati boiling the boiled rice. If rice is boiled how he is again boiling? *Rasa* is transformation; a gradual process of change of *Vibhābānubhāva* etc. *Viśvanātha* says the proof of the *Rasa* is its relishing. The device of transformation is already depicted by *MB*. He says how *Rasa* is the *Avasthā parināma* or the consequence of the condition. But that *Abhivyakti* or the manifestation is neither by the logic *Ghatādinyāya* (as *ghata* is manifested by a lamp) nor by the logic of *Agñyādinyāya*. It is manifested by the logic *dahyādi* (as milk becomes curd). *Viśvanātha* statement of *Rasatām eti ratyādiḥ* and *Sthāyi bhāvāḥ sacetasām* shows how he is clearly influenced by the doctrine of *Rasa* in *VV*.<sup>73</sup>

*Bharatācārya* states that the eight *Rasas* (sentiments) recognised in drama are: *Śṛṅgāra* (Erotic), *Hāsya* (Comic), *Karuṇa* (Pathetic), *Raūdra* (Furious), *Vīra* (Heroic), *Bhayānaka* (Terrible), *Bībhatsa* (Odious) and *Adbhūta* (Marvellous). He says-

शृङ्गारहास्यकरुणारौद्रवीरभयानकाः।  
 बीभत्साद्भुतसंज्ञैवेत्यष्टौ नाट्ये रसा स्मृताः॥  
 एते ह्यष्टा रसाः प्रोक्ता द्रुहिणेन महात्मना।<sup>74</sup>

It becomes evident here, that *Bharata* talks of *Rasa* in relation to drama, and in the drama he accepts only eight *Rasas*.

These *Rasas*, eight in number, prevailed<sup>75</sup> upto the time of *Bhāmaha* and *Daṇḍin*. *Kālidāsa*<sup>76</sup> also accepted only eight *Rasas* as becomes clear from his verse in the *Vikramorvaśiyam*. Later, upto the time of *Abhinavagupta*, *Śānta Rasa* has gained ground and so he defends it in his *Abhinavabhāratī* which we will see later in our discussion. The number of *Rasas* was not restricted to eight only. The traditional view of eight *Rasas* was challenged and questioned and



dramaturgists differed in their views about the number of *Rasas*. The conception about the number of *Rasas* underwent a change, because *Bharata's* view about the number of *Rasas* was traditional and based on the prevalence of the strong psychological states which were accompanied by many transitory states. As psychological state (*Bhāva*) was generalized, the critics thought that any mental state could be nourished into a *Rasa* (sentiment) when accompanied with its proper accessories. Therefore, the innumerability of *Rasas* was accepted. But whatever view was held, eight *Rasas* enumerated by *Bharata* were accepted unquestioningly by all. Most of the later writers accepted *Śānta Rasa* in one respect or another.

*Abhinavagupta*<sup>77</sup> was a philosopher and a psychologist. He favoured oneness of *Rasa*. He also accepted *Rasa* as the consciousness of perfect bliss and in his view love, grief etc. act in beautifying it.<sup>78</sup>

*Dhanañjaya*<sup>79</sup> accepted eight *Rasas* in drama fixing their number to be eight because of the fourfold tendency of the heart of the spectator, namely- *Vikāśa* (unfolding), *Vistāra* (expansion), *Kṣobha* (agitation) and *Vikṣepa* (movement to and fro of the mind) in the enjoyment of sentiment.

Even though he follows *Bharata* for the concept of *Rasa*, he differs in some respects. He follows *Bharata's* eight *Rasa*. His ninth *Rasa Śānta* is not accepted in *Śrāvya kāvya*. But *Viśvanātha* accepts them all. He also minutely examines them and their differences. For example the difference between *Raūdra* and *Vīra* and *Dānavīra* and *Śāntarasa* are dealt. They are purely on the psychological background. *Viśvanātha* quotes also the tenth *Rasa* of *Bharata*

called *Vātsalya*. Through his contemporaries and his predecessors did not accept, *Viśvanātha* yet discussion show his acceptance. But as he says ‘*munīndra śāmmata rasa.*’<sup>80</sup>

वत्सलश्च रसः इति तेन स दशमोरसः।  
स्फूटं चमत्कारितया वत्सलश्च च रसः विदुः॥<sup>81</sup>

It seems he does not accept it fully and includes it in the *Kārikā*, unlike *Śānta Rasa*. He includes it in the *Bhāvadhvani*. So to sum up his number of *Rasas*, he clearly admits nine *Rasas*. As regards the *Vātsalya Rasa* he excludes this from his *Kārikā* and other discussions. His acceptance of *Śānta Rasa* is also not a new one. Because *Bharata* has accepted it in *Śrāvya kāvyas* *Viśvanātha* accepts it in the *Dṛśya kāvyas* also. But the difference is, *Bharata* accepts *Śānta* as the *Rasa Nirveda* as *Sthāyibhāva* which amounts to inactivity and so inauspicious for the drama to be staged. This enhances *Vairāgya*. But *Viśvanātha Śānta Rasa* has ‘*Śāma*’ as *Sthāyibhāva* which is auspicious and not bad to be shown in the *Dṛśya kāvyas*. *Śānta* according to *Bharata* is the meditation on *Brahman* and attainment of supreme knowledge. This has no *Sañcāribhāva*. This cannot be the *Rasa*. But *Viśvanātha* says, a man who is in the *Samādhi* has both *Yukta* and *Viyukta* stage by which neither he leaves the *Vāsanā* or desire nor does he fully mingle with *Brahman*. A man having achieved this stage of *Savikalpaka samādhi* or dynamic trance have *Śāma* as *Sthāyibhāva*. This *Rasa* has *Sañcāribhāva*. This can be a *Rasa* also. *Viśvanātha* thus justifies the existence of *Śānta Rasa* and differentiates it from the concept of *Bharata* not *Dhanañjaya*.

Thus, from all the previous discussion we may conclude that according to *Bharata*, *Abhinavagupta*, *Dhanañjaya*, *Dhanika* and *Viśvanātha* it becomes evident that sentiments or, rather *Rasa*, is enjoyed by the spectators who are cultured and aesthetes. Strong psychological Sthāyins are transformed into *Rasa* and they are called *Rasa* when they are brought to the level of enjoyment in combination with their *Vibhāvas*, *Anubhāvas* and *Vyābhicārins*. *Rasa* is not something created from concrete objects, but it is the pleasure of one's own awareness. In the enjoyment of *Rasa* both the subject and object are de-individualised and in their universalized form limitations of time and place disappear. In the process of *Rasa*-realisation, the spectator identifies himself with the character of the drama and passes through the same situations and trials in his reflection and imagination as the hero passes through. The aesthetic experience achieved from 'Kāvyaṃ' (drama and poetry) is unique from all other evidences and experiences whether the mystical. Aesthetic enjoyment of *Rasa* is a single, ineffable, transcendental joy of the self. It becomes *Rasa* when the combination of *Vibhāvas*, *Anubhāvas* and *Vyābhicārins* take place. To a simple statement of *Bharata* theoreticians gave different interpretations colouring it with their own philosophies. *Dhanañjaya* and *Viśvanātha* considered *Rasa* from the spectator's point of view and also from the dramatist's or the actor's point of view. Actor helps in visualizing the *Rasa* and *Vibhāvas* etc., *Vibhāva* and *Anubhāva* etc. are the means in the arousal of sentiment. *Vibhāva* has been translated as determinant, emotive situation,

stimulus; *Anubhāva* as mimetic changes, consequents; *Vyabhicārin*s as the transitory states or emotions and *Sthāyins*.

Against the idea that *Viśvanātha* is more a complier than an original thinker, it may be noted that his concept of *Rasa* has serious differences from his predecessors like *Vāmana*, *Kuṇṭaka*, *Mammaṭa*, and *Dhanañjaya* and his inclusion of the dramatic form in his poetics unlike many other critics who concern themselves exclusively with poetry confer upon him the status of a critic worthy of attention. True to Indian tradition he mentions the four *Puruṣārtha* of life as the final aim of poetry and strives to show how poetry can lead to the attainment of each of the four goals of life. In this context he draws support from an ancient authority, the *Agnipurāṇa* that also upholds the view that the science of dramaturgy or dramatic representation is a means of accomplishing the *Trivarga*: *Dharma*, *Artha* and *Kāma*. To this extent at least all writers on poetics are agreed that any poetry worth its name must have a *prayojana*.

Apart from these dissimilarities, *Viśvanātha* accepted *Dhanañjaya*'s ideas in all other cases while dealing with the topics of *Nāṭyarasa* and *Kāvya-rasa* also.

It appears that the whole discussion of the concept of *Rasa* leads to the philosophy of life, specially the aesthetics of life. Thus *Rasa* is the soul of literature and *Rasa* theory is a literary theory. A literary theory, which has a practical application in life, can be considered as valid. If attainment of *Puruṣārtha* or realization of *Ānandam* is the goal of life then the role of *Rasa*

theory cannot be denied. It has its relevance even in this material world at least for the sake of pleasure and enjoyment. Further, in most cases, a good literary theory has a double potential. It can lead to further theories, to newer philosophical speculations. At the same time it can also be applied to literary texts. The *Rasa* Theory can be applied for both purposes. *Rasa* theory covers a wide enough area. It has a general applicability as well as it is flexible enough to take the wear of time and to be malleable to interpretations and newer needs. The *Rasa* theory, one of the oldest theories in Indian tradition fulfils most of the conditions for its relevance to day. First expounded in *Bharata's NŚ*, it influences the entire discussion of dramaturgy there as the very essence of good writing. The strength of the *Rasa* theory lays in that it deals with what is common to all mankind, at all times.

It is important to note that the contribution made by the *Rasa* theorists (*Dhanañjaya* and *Viśvanātha*) can be considered for the entire literary process from its very conception in the mind of the poet or artist to its final perception in the heart of the reader. The *Rasa* theory has a tremendous linguistic potentiality for an emotion cannot ever be shown or communicated directly. It can only be suggested through words or their equivalent. From the standpoint of *Rasa* theory such words are not simply words for referring to the facts of the everyday world but for creating an alternative world of values as a serious addendum to human culture.