
UNIT 2 THEORIES OF RASA

Contents

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Bhatta Lollata and his *Utpattivada*
- 2.3 Sri Sankuka and his *Anumitivada*
- 2.4 Bhatta Nayaka and his *Bhuktivada*
- 2.5 *Sadharnikarana*
- 2.6 Let us sum up
- 2.7 Key words
- 2.8 Further readings and references

2.0 OBJECTIVES

The main objective of writing this unit is to make you see how the school of *Rasa*, instituted by *Bharata*, took its first steps towards developing into an influential tradition. Transcending beyond the boundaries of *Natya* the influence of *Rasa* spread to other art forms like Painting, Architecture and Poetics. More noticeable was its entry into the hallowed circle of Philosophical reflections. Hailing from the nurturing ground of a rich tradition of poetics-Kashmir three scholars of repute, each following a different philosophy, pursued one common goal-study *Rasa*. Bhatta Lollata took the lead in this direction followed by Sri Sankuka and Bhatta Nayaka. This unit makes an effort to outline their interpretations of *Rasa*-theory and highlight their contributions towards its advancement. We are sure after reading this unit you should be able to:

- 1) have an overview of the theories of *Rasa* propounded by:
 - a) Bhatta Lollata
 - b) Sri Sankuka
 - c) Bhatta Nayaka
- 2) have a basic understanding of the principle of *Sadharnikarana*.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The rise of *Rasa* to achieve the status of a foundational concept of Indian poetics is a historical fact but how it happened is an area of interesting study. As an aesthetic principle *Rasa* gained an easy entry in to the world of Painting and Architecture but its tryst with sanskrit poetics had not been affable in its initial phase. Eminent Sanskrit poetic scholars and advocates of *Alamkara* school, *Bhamaha* and *Dandin* did take note of *Rasa* and also casually mentioned it in their expositions also but *Rasa* remained a stranger to the Sanskrit poetics for quite some time. May be it needed an equally potent concept of 'Dhvani' to do the honour of breaking the deadlock and also provide some missing links. Finally, it was Abhinavagupta who really paved the way for *Rasa* to gain a respectful entry into the world of poetics. However, much before all this happened Bhatta

Lollata, Sri Sankuka and Bhatta Nayaka were taking different kinds of initiatives to obtain *Rasa* an entry into the hallowed world of Philosophical reflections. The threesome endeavoured to raise some significant issues, which *Bharata* had just touched, redefine some crucial key-terms and offer their own versions of *Rasa* Theory.

These three commentators, known as *Rasa* theorists had so much in common among themselves. - All the three hailed from Kashmir, all the three wrote their commentaries on NS, none of their commentaries is extant today and all the three got adequate mention in *Abhinavabharati*. All of them sharply focussed on two key terms of *Rasa* theory – *Nispatti* and *Samyoga*. While they were giving their interpretations they also raised many other significant issues. One by one we shall be introducing you to their expositions and step by step you will be able to see the ascendance of the influence of *Rasa*.

2.2 BHATTA LOLLATA AND HIS UTPATTI-VADA

In the early 9th century A.D., Bhatta Lollata a philosopher from Kashmir, a fervent follower of *Mimamsa* and known to be a contemporary of Bhatta Kallata, produced a commentary of *Bharata's* *Rasa* theory and earned the distinction of being the first to initiate philosophical reflections on it. None of his work is extant and whatever we know of him and his views on *Rasa* come to us through the writings of Abhinavagupta. (*Dhvanyaloka Locana* and *Abhinavabharati*), Raj Shekhar (*Kavya Mimamsa*) and Mammatta (*Kavyaprakasa*) As you are aware India had a strong oral-tradition and mostly the texts were orally passed from one generation to the next generation. It is nothing strange that none of his writings are extant but what must be kept in mind is most of his views come to us through the writings of Abhinavagupta, who, in scholars like S K De's views, was one of his 'adverse critics.'

This first *Rasa*-theorists tried to give his interpretation to the *Rasa-sutra*, which apparently carried quite a few ambivalent issues. Being a *Mimamsaka* himself and in the absence of the idea of *Dhvani* (poetic suggestion) which took centre stage through the writings of Anandavardhana a little later tried he to extend the literalism to *Bharata's* *Rasa* theory and wanted to explain - what *Samyoga* stands for? What is meant by *nispatti*?, what is the significance of *Sthayibhava* in the realization of *Rasa* ?, how the two are related ? and what is the locus of *Rasa* ?

Lollata maintained that *Rasa* is an effect while *Vibhavas* are its direct cause. He held that *Rasa* is nothing more than an intensified and heightened *Sthayibhava* as a result of the combined effects of the play, the players and various theatrical devices. He further maintained that *Rasa* is located primarily in the characters. His *Rasa* is in fact real life *Sthayibhava* which is intensified, nurtured and heightened by *Vibhavas*, *Anubhavas* and *Vyabhicari Bhavas*. *Rasa-nispatti* (realization of *Rasa*) in Lollata's interpretation of *Rasa-sutra* becomes *Rasa-utpatti* (production of *Rasa*) or *upaciti* (intensification of *Sthayibhavas* culminating to *Rasa*). The imitation of the characters by actors who acquire this through their process of training and the other theatrical devices employed during the production of the play become a source of *Rasa* for the spectators. Lollata in his quest to learn more about the production of *Rasa* even spelled out the process and its stages, *Vibhavas* awaken, *Anubhavas* support and *Vyabhicaris Bhavas* strengthen the *Sthayibhavas* and enable it to attain the status of *Rasa* which then

becomes relishable. The locus of *Rasa* and focus of attention are characters, the imitating actors come secondarily. The spectators are charmed by the grandeur of theatre and the performing skills of the actors and what they are enjoying are not their own permanent emotions but the *upacit sthayibhava* (intensified permanent emotions) of the characters and indirectly of actors. This communication happens through the actors and their acting skills. Lollata was probably echoing the views held by Dandin in the *Kavyadarsa* and also by the author of *AgniPurana*.

Before we critically analyse his interpretation of *rasa* which is mainly based on the points of criticism raised by of his predecessors Sri Sankuka, Bhatta Nayaka, Bhatta Tauta and Abhinavagupta, we highlight below some of his significant assertions and achievements.

Initiated the Philosophical Reflection on *Rasa*

Bhatta Lollata, the first *Rasa* theorists is also credited with the commencement of philosophical reflections on *Rasa* theory. He not only spotted the ambivalent key terms of the *Rasa* theory but also raised the issues of their philosophical significance. It was his critical comments which attracted scholars like Sri Sankuka and Bhatta Nayaka to forge ahead the critical tradition.

Brought the Spotlight on *Sthayibhavas*

Bharata's Rasa-sutra is conspicuously silent on the role of *Sthayibhava* in the realization of *Rasa*. Even if we presume that *Bharata* simply could not have missed *Sthayibhava's* contribution towards *Rasa*, he did not explicitly state how it is related to *Vibhava* and *Anubhavas*. However, Lollata was more explicit in focussing the spotlight on *Sthayibhava* and giving it the distinction of being a potential *Rasa*.

***Rasas* are Innumerable**

Bharata talks of eight *Rasas*, in fact, initially he mentions only four basic *Rasas* out of which the remaining four emerge. Not even once the question regarding the number of *Rasas* is raised in NS. Lollata, however, clearly mentioned that the number of *Rasas* could be innumerable. He also might have been thinking the way Rudrata might have thought that *Rasas* are heightened *Bhavas* and there is no limit to the number of such *Bhavas*. Later on Abhinavagupta strongly criticised Lollata on this issue, and it is interesting to learn that himself did add the ninth *Rasa-Santa* to the existing tally.

Locus of *Rasa*

Lollata also raised the issue of locus of *Rasa* and stated that *Rasa* is primarily located in the historical characters e.g., Rama and *Dusyanta* and also manifested through various theatrical representations. However, Lollata is unable to explain how the actors are charmed by these representations.

Explained the Process and Meaning of *Rasa-Realization*

Lollata clearly mentions his three stage process of heightening of *sthayibhavas* and finally its intensification in to a full fledged *Rasa*. His *Rasa-nispatti* becomes *Rasa-utapatti* (production of *Rasa*).

Critical Observation

Sri Sankuka, Lollata’s predecessor did not appreciate much of his efforts and based most of his theory on the criticism of Lollata’s *Rasa*-theory. Abhinagupta articulates Sri Sankuka’s demolition of Lollata’s theory in the following eight steps:

- a) The cognition of *Sthayibhavas* is not possible without *Vibhavas* as *Vibhavas* are the *linga* through which the *Sthayibhavas* are cognized.
- b) While the *Rasa* is realised as a direct experience rather their knowledge is based on denotational meaning so how could *Sthayibhavas* be *Rasa* later, even when they are intensified.
- c) Sri Sankuka also questioned Lollata’s standpoint that if *sthayi* or in its intensified state *Rasa* already exists then what is the need of working out various combinations of *Vibhavas* etc.
- d) Sri Sankuka believed that *Rasa* is in an absolute unitary state not allowing any variations. If *Rasa* is considered to be the intensified *Sthayibhavas* it will have to entertain the gradual process of intensification which is not possible at all.
- e) Sri Sankuka extends the same logic to prove the redundancy of the six varieties of *hasya Rasa- smita, hasita, vihasita, upahasita, apahasita* and *atihatita*.
- f) Like *Hasya Rasa* Sri Sankuka pointed out that we will have to allow innumerable *Rasas*, due to ten states of *Kama*.
- g) On the same ground Sri Sankuka, questions the validity of *Soka* becoming and *Kaurna Rasa* because contrary to Lollata’s principle *Soka* in fact wanes as it progresses whereas it has to intensify if it has to achieve the status of *Kaurna Rasa*.
- h) Finally *Sthayibhavas* like *rati, utsah* and *krodha* also do not attain intensification instead it is known that as they evolve further they eventually subside.

Notwithstanding these points of criticism - raised by Sri Sankuka we must accede that Lollata rightly deserves the credit of bringing the spotlight on *sthayi*, emphasizing its vital role in the *Rasa*-realisation. Of course he could not realize that aesthetic communication is not yet another kind of intellectual discourse, *Rasa* is also not a real life permanent emotion in its intensified state. Lollata’s *Rasa*-theory has its own merits. He was the first thinker who drew the attention of later thinkers on the ambiguity of certain key terms in the *Rasa* theory. He did raise the issues of locus of *Rasa* and the experience of *Rasa* by the spectator. He might not have been successful in providing satisfactory answers to the key issues he himself raised but his predecessors seized the opportunities created by him.

2.3 SRI SANKUKA AND HIS ANUMITIVADA

A younger contemporary of Lollata, a 9th century AD Naiyayika from Kashmir was the second *Rasa*-theorist who guided the *Rasa*-debate to the next level. Almost exactly like Lollata none of his work is extant and all what we construe about his ideas is sourced from the writing of Abhinavagupta, Mammata and

Hemachandra. Sri Sankuka literally demolished Lollata's *Rasa*-theory to advance his own arguments. In doing so he did try to answer some questions raised by his able processor and took the debate to the next level. Outrightly rejecting Lollata's central idea that *Rasa* as an effect is only an intensified *sthayi* caused by the *Vibhavas* belonging to the characters and also the performers, Sri Sankuka offered an improved version of *Rasa* theory with a view to bring back the *Rasa* to where it belonged, redeemed *Rasa* to become a unique experience meant to be savoured by the spectators, reinstated the significance of the performing skills of the actors and finally raised the status of the aesthete to be more proactive so as to be able to infer the *Rasa* from the presented *sthayi-Bhavas* and enjoy it too. He brought back the primacy of *bhava* in relation to *Rasa*. He further tried to establish the *Rasa*-realization to be a unique process of inference unlike any other accepted forms of cognition. You have already seen how scathing was Sri Sankuka's criticism of Lollata's views now let us find out what new interpretation he offered to the *Rasa* theory and how tenable it itself was.

Sri Sankuka strongly criticised that *Rasa* is not a matter of production or intensification of *sthayibhavas*. Instead the *Rasa* is inferred. The *sthayibhavas* actually do not inhere in the actor but it is inferred to be the trained actor will his perfect rendering by means of blend *vibhavas*, *anubhavas* and *vyabhicaris bhavas* along unreal, creates an imitation of *sthayibhava*. The realisation of *Rasa* takes place when the audience infer the existence of *sthayi*. It is interesting to note that this type of cognition is unique, unlike any other accepted form of cognition. To expand his point further he offers an analogy of *citra-turaga nyaya* which stands for the analogy through which one can learn that the horse in the picture is actually called a horse.

His elaboration of *sthayibhava* and its relation of *vibhavas* etc. and *Rasa* are significant. He also raised another significant issue that direction cognitions of *sthayibhava* are not possible it can only be apprehended through its *vibhavas* etc. Unlike his processor he constantly talks of spectators and speaks of *Rasa* from the point of view and savouring of spectators. Besides he expects his spectators to be constantly ready to employ his ration faculty to infer.

Significant Assertions made by Sri Sankuka

- 1) Clarified the relationship of *sthayibhava* and *vibhavas* - Sri Sankuka clearly emphasised that only through *vibhavas* only the spectators infer a *sthayi* in the actor which is reality is not there.
- 2) The realisation of *Rasa* is a process of logical inference - For Sri Sankuka *nispatti* of *rasa* takes place in the form of an inference where the *vibhavas* are *anumapakas* and *Rasa* is *anumapya*.
- 3) Imitation of *sthayibhava* leads to *Rasa* - *Sthayibhava* are real life permanent emotions which are imitated by actors. Actors are trained in the art of impersonation and through their artificial renderings they imitate the *sthayibhavas*. Spectators finally enjoy *rasa* through the imitation made by actors.
- 4) The cognition of the inference is unique - Sri Sankuka uses an analogy of '*citra-turaga-nyaya*' to prove that cognition obtained from inference is unique and absolutely unlike is unique and absolutely unlike the commonly known forms of cognition.

- 5) Raises the status of the spectator - Bhatta Tanta and other later critics had serious reservation about his theory. Considering *Rasa* to be an imitated form of *sthayi* was totally unacceptable to them. The meaning Sri Sankuka wanted to assign to imitation was too restricted. Even his original idea of inference of *sthayibhavas* was also not tenable. Bhatta Nayaka pointed out that the inference was not possible because the character was not present before the audience. None the less the points he raised and the status of aesthete he elevated helped later thinkers to explore deeper and further on *Rasa*.

2.4 BHATTA NAYAKA AND HIS BHUKTIVADA: THE CULMINATION OF RASA DEBATE

Towards the end of 9th century A.D. the *Rasa* debate reached its culmination with the entry of Bhatta Nayaka – a Kashmiri scholar of repute. He was an accomplished Alamkarika and an ardent adherent of Samkhya philosophy. His work '*Hrdaya Darpana*', in which he is known to have demolished Ananda Vardhana's theory of Dhvani, is not available today but it has got some considerable mention and citation in *Abhinavabharti* and *Kavyaprakasa*.

In the on going *Rasa* debate earlier his processors Bhatta Lollata and Sri Sankuka had raised some significant issues in *Bharata*'s theory, pointing at inherent ambiguities and even asked some fundamental questions. Bhatta Nayaka changed the course of the discourse. On the strength of his arguments and doctrines *Rasa* scaled new sublime heights to claim its likeness to the mystic experience endowed with unalloyed bliss.

His greatest contribution came in the form of the principle of *Sadharnikarana*, (mostly translated as Universalisation/Generalisation/Transpersonalisation of emotions in Arts) which enabled poets, performers and aesthetes to create, manifest and enjoy the universalised emotional complex of artwork without any personal consideration. After *Rasa* and *Dhvani* *Sadharnikarana* was another foundational concept which later thinkers found hard to overlook. *Rasa* debate till then had seen two divergent interpretations which did generate some interest but engendered many questions too. Advocate of the first *Rasa* theory Lollata maintained that a theatrical situation *Vibhava* act as the efficient cause (*Karaka Hetu*) to produce *Rasa* which primarily emerged in the character and secondarily in the actors who were playing those historical characters. One could say Lollata's *Natya* was being played. The *rasa* was being realised too but it was not meant for the spectators.

Next *Rasa*-theorist started by strongly criticising his processor but offered a theory which did not convince many including Bhatta Nayaka. Sri Sankuka maintained that *Vibhava*, *anubhava* and *Vyabhicari Bhavas* conjoin to reproduce the *Sthayibhava*. Trained actors reproduce these unreal *Sthayibhavas* with their skills and theatrical devices for the audience to infer *Rasa* from the reproduced *sthayibhavas*.

Bhatta Nayaka clearly saw both the theories were unable do justice to *rasa* and he was not even convinced of the power of *Dhvani* too. So he advocated a three function theory through which language, specially in poetry, accomplished its desired task. These three functions or as he called them *Vyapars* were-

The *adhibha*, the literal meaning of *adhidha* would have only incorporated its denotative function only but Bhatta Nayaka went a step further that his *Abhidha Vyapars* was also endowed with the capacity to indicate also. In the words his *Abhidha* did contain *Laksana* (indication) also. This first function enables the poet and artist to convey the ordinary meaning at the level of intellect only. II- *Bhavakatva* or *Bhavna vyapar* refer to the emotive meaning which normally defies its expression through *Abhidha and Laksana*. It is this power of our emotional complex which help *Vibhavas* etc. to become universalised/generalised (*Sadharnikrta*) and attaining the unique status to belonging to ‘none’ but still be relishable by one and all. It is this function which allows the artist to imbue general characteristics in a situation, character or feeling. Through this principle the personal affiliations give way to universal elements so that the aesthete relishes his aesthetic experience without any personal involvements. We shall read more about an off shoot of this principle in the form of *Sadharnikarana* a little later. III-The third *vyapara* is called ‘*Bhogikarana*’ or ‘*Bhojkatva*’ through which the aesthete relished (*Bhoga*) the unalloyed bliss out of the artistic creation of the artist. This is the final stage where the spectators simply enjoys the art-work, poem, theatre an immerse themselves in its *Bhoga* which has a predominance of *sattva guna* in it. Elaborating further he clarifies that this state is neither like *anubhava* nor like *smarana* but it is a state where one feels totally immersed and totally expanded. Its blissful experience is so subtle that it is beyond description and beyond this world.

Significant Assertions by Bhatta Nayaka

Rasa is a State of Blissful Consciousness

Bhatta Nayaka becomes the first *Rasa* – theorist to highlight the sublimity, dominance of *sattva*, unalloyed nature and akinness to mystic experience of the highest order of *Rasa*-experience.

Analysed the Process of *rasa*-realization

Talking of the three function of poetic language viz. 1) *Abhidha* 2) *Bhavnavyapar* 3) *Bhojkatva*. He clearly laid bare how the process of realization of *rasa* take place. He clearly stated *rasa* is not just produced on inferred it in fact awakens as an aesthetic creation through the performance of these functions in the appropriate sequence.

The Doctrine of *Sadharnikarana*

The doctrine of *Sadharnikarana* which ensures that a poet has creatively de-individualised the emotions, shorn them of their pain-pleasure association and made them universal enough to be savourable by one and all. Abhinavagupta has quite a few problems in accepting Bhatta Nayaka’s views irrespective of the fact he did endorse some of his thought and even adopted them in his aesthetic principles. Being a hard-core *Dhvani* advocate Abhinavagupta was very critical of Bhatta Nayaka’s *Bhavnavyapara*. It was common knowledge that Bhatta Nayaka created his *Hrdaya Darpan* only to demolish *Dhvani*. Abhinavagupta wanted to accept *Bhavana* only on the ground of it means ‘*vyanjana*’ and he declared when a similar concept already existed what was the need of talking of a new concept.

Those who say that with Bhatta Nayaka the *rasa* debate rose to its culmination seem absolutely right. In fact it was Bhatta Nayaka and his three functions theory which answered any questions which were raised by his processor and also put the *Rasa* in the right perspective. Bharata has not talked much about the experiential aspect of *Rasa*. Bhatta Nayaka accomplished it to his best.

A Comprehensive Table Outlining and Contrasting Three Rasa Theories

<i>Rasa</i> -theorist	<i>Rasa</i> Theory	Philosophical affiliation	Idea of <i>Rasa</i>	Unique contribution
Bhatta Lollata (Early 9 th century A.D.)	<i>Utpatti-vada</i> or <i>upaciti-vada</i>	<i>Mimamsa</i>	Intensified, supported and strengthened by <i>Vibhavas</i> , <i>Anubhavas</i> and <i>Vyabhicari Sthayibhavas</i> become <i>Rasas</i> .	The first to offer Philosophical commentary to <i>Rasa</i> -theory. Highlights the significance of <i>Sthayibhava</i> in <i>Rasa</i> -realization. Did not believe in restricting number of <i>Rasas</i> to Eight only. Raised the issues of communication of <i>Rasa</i> to spectators and difference between <i>Rasa</i> and <i>Sthayibhava</i> .
Sri Sankuka (Mid 9 th century A.D.)	<i>Anumiti-vada</i> or <i>Pratitivada</i>	<i>Nyaya</i>	Imitated <i>Sthayibhavas</i> of characters become <i>Rasa</i> . While actors reproduce, the spectators infer <i>Sthayibhavas</i> .	Advanced Philosophical reflection of <i>Rasa</i> to next level. Highlighted the role of actor’s performance. Reiterated the primacy of <i>Sthayibhavas</i> in <i>Rasa</i> -realization. Maintained Actor to be active inferers than passive receivers.
Bhatta Nayaka (Late 10 th century A.D.)	<i>Bhuktivada</i>	<i>Samkhya</i>	<i>Sthayibhavas</i> experienced through <i>abhidha</i> and <i>bhavakatva</i> and relished as a transpersonalised and extrawordly bliss akin to Brahmananda is <i>Rasa</i>	Highlighted the real significance of Imagination (<i>bhavanavyapara</i>) as integral to aesthetic experience. Introduced the Principle of Universality of emotions (<i>Sadharnikarana</i>). Tilted later deliberation towards subjective aspect. Established <i>Rasa</i> to be essentially Blissful and akin to Brahmananda. Contributed significantly towards analysis of aesthetic experience.

2.5 SADHARNIKARANA

Bhatta Nayaka presented his doctrine of *Sadharnikarana* more than 600 years after *Bharata* had advanced his *Rasa*-theory. In between the first two *Rasa*-theorists seen to struggle hard in the absence of a ‘missing doctrine’. This was

one doctrine which even *Bharata* would have readily incorporated in his original *Rasa*-theory. This is one doctrine to which even an adverse critic like Abhinavagupta could not ignore. However, it is interesting to note that this doctrine is a kind of a corollary emerging from the second of the three *vyaparas* or functions or processes of poetry which one could accord to poetry. There are no denials Bhatta Nayaka will long be remembered for such a brilliant contribution to the advancement of *Rasa*-tradition.

In our day to day lives we live our emotions along with their associated personal considerations, may be with their pleasure, pain and other concerns. A tragic situation in our life does make us feel sad and yield us pain too. Similarly a happy situation does the opposite. Now, try to recollect an instance from your life when you watched a play or a film and encountered a tragic-scene. Did that tragic situation also yield you pain like your real life encounter? Your answer would definitely be no? But why? The doctrine of *Sadharnikarana* has the answer to this question. While going through the basic *rasa* theory presented by Bhatta Nayaka we learnt about three functions or *Vyaparas* ascribable to the language of poetry. The second function – *Bhavakatra* or '*Bhavn-vyapara*' provides the premise for the doctrine of *Sadharnikarana*. It is this power which enables the *vibhavas* in theatre to disassociate themselves from their worldly afflictions, personal egoistic considerations. Metaphors, figures of speech, absence of *dosa*, appropriate *gunas* in poetry and stylized movements, costumes, music, gestures, dance and other practioners to achieve *Sadharnikarana*. The process can be understood in this manner, a sympathetic spectator experiences the intensity of the emotions of the *vibhavas*, he ultimately forgets himself and identifies himself with the state of the *vibhava*. By doing so he is living the emotions but he is not being impeded by any associated affection. Such a feeling which is shorn of its association becomes a *type* which becomes an emotion having an eternal and universal appeal. But these *Sadharnikrit natyabhavas* (universalized theatrical emotions) do not loose their appeal, they do not become un-individualized, vague, devoid of their essential 'life and vibrancy'. These feelings continue to retain their concreteness but they have been emancipated from their personal and egoistic pleasure and pain giving associations.

It is interesting to note that *Sadharnikarana* emerges from the second function to poetry, which clearly indicates that after the aesthete has fully comprehended the denotation and indicative meaning to aesthete is now ready to insulate himself from the impact of feelings which might impede his aesthetic experience. At this second stage the doctrine helps the aesthete to break down the barriers of our psyche which do not allow the aesthetes to relive and relish the theatrical situation. On the strength of this principle the performer elevate the nature of *vibhava*, make it universally available and transform the *natyabhava* turning them into sharable common experience for one and all.

Students of comparative aesthetics will be familiar with some similar attempts made in the western world also. Thomas Aquinas' 'Reposeful contemplation', Kant's 'Disinterested satisfaction' and Edward Bullough's 'Psychical Distance' could be some close similarities. However developments happened much later in the western world. *Bharata* did not mention anything akin to this principle in his NS but his entire enterprise takes into account that *Natyabhavas* are an imitation of our day to day *Bhavas* but all his efforts to develop conventions, evolve symbolic tools, employ dramatic accessories, use stylized costumes, use

of music, dance, *purva ranga* rituals are indications that he wanted to theatrics situations to be objective situation with out loosing their immediacy and life.

Sadharnikarana as a principle aptly complimented *Rasa* theory and boldly answered questions like how and why a tragic situation is a relishable experience. Abhinagupta did raise some objection to this principle but finally he adopted into his own theory too. *Dhananjaya* the legendary another of ‘*Dasarupaka*’ also readily accepted this principle. We can conclude by saying that if *Rasa* is the destination *Sadharnikarana* is the pathway. Bhatta Nayaka must get the credit for this achievement.

Check your Progress I

Note: Use the space provided for your answers.

1) While offering a new interpretation to *Rasa-theory*, who emphasised the significance of acting? Name him and outline his *Rasa theory*.

2) Whose *Rasa* theory is better known as *Bhuktivada*? Name him and state his central idea.

3) Name the Kashmiri scholar who is credited with the distinction of being the first one to initiate the philosophical discussion of *Rasa-theory* and outline his viewpoint.

4) Define *Sadharnikarana*. State its central principle.

26

2.6 LET US SUM UP

This unit introduced you to three earliest *Rasa* theorists who laid the course of philosophical reflections of *Rasa* theory. First in the series, Bhatta Lollata, unlike *Bharta* himself, clearly stated that it is *Sthayibhava*, adequately intensified by *Vibhavas*, *Anubhavas* and *Vyabhicaribhavas*, which becomes *Rasa*. Subsequent commentator Sri Sankuka rejected Lollata's argument and declared that *Rasa* realization is not intensification but a process of logical inference. Finally Bhatta Nayaka stated that *Rasa* is *Sthayibhava* experienced through *abhida* and *bhavakatva* and relished as an extra worldly blissful experience by experiencing transpersonal feeling. In the end we introduced you to the principle of *Sadharnikarana* introduced by Bhatta Nayaka which stands for generalization of emotions and emancipating the artist and spectators from the personal and egoistic associations of feelings which might hamper the savouring of aesthetic delight.

2.7 KEY WORDS

<i>Abhidha</i>	:	The first of the three processes of language art to convey denotative and also indicative meanings.
<i>Anumiti</i>	:	Act of inference of <i>Sthayibhava</i> in the actor.
<i>Rasa-Nispatti</i>	:	(realization/manifestation/completion of <i>Rasa</i>) The process as to how the different elements of <i>Natya</i> conjoin and result in manifestation of <i>Rasa</i> .
<i>Sadharnikarana</i>	:	The process of de-individualising and universalising the emotional complex of an art work for a detached appreciation for one and all. (universalization/generalisation/impersonalisation/transpersonalisation of emotions)
<i>Samyoga</i>	:	(conjunction) Conjoining of different elements viz., <i>Vibhavas</i> , <i>Anubhavas</i> and <i>Vyabhicari Bhavas</i> according to the canonical prescriptions with an objective to manifest <i>Rasa</i> .
<i>Utapatti/Upaciti</i>	:	The production or intensification of <i>sthayibhava</i> to achieve realization of <i>rasa</i> .

2.8 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- De, S.K. *Some problems of Sanskrit poetics*. Calcutta: 1959.
- Jain Nirmala. *Rasa Siddhanta Aur Saundarya Shastra*. Delhi: National publishing house, 1967.
- Krishnamoorthy, K. Tr. *Studies in Indian Aesthetics and Criticism*. Mysore: 1979.
- Mohan, G.B. *The Response to Poetry: A study in comparative aesthetics*. New Delhi: 1968.
- Raghavan, V and Nagendra. Eds. *An introduction to Indian poetics*. Bombay: 1970.