

CHAPTER-3

SUPREMACY OF ONE RASA : BACKGROUND IN SANSKRIT POETICS

CHAPTER-3

SUPREMACY OF ONE RASA : BACKGROUND IN SANSKRIT POETICS

Indian Poetics has recognised eight primary sentiments which are latent in man. They are *Rati* 'love', *Hāsa* 'laughter', *Śoka* 'sorrow', *Krodha* 'anger', *Utsāha* 'high-spiritedness', *Bhaya* 'fear', *Jugupsā* 'disgust', and *Vismaya* 'wonder'. As these are fundamental and relatively long-lasting, they are called as the *Sthāyibhāvas*. A *Sthāyibhāva* needs some stimulus for its arousal. The stimuli or the *Vibhāvas* that give rise to a *Sthāyin* are of two kinds : *Ālambana* which would be in the form of a person or a thing with reference to which a *Sthāyin* arises, and the *Uddīpana* or the attendant circumstance which would enhance the excited *Sthāyin*. Apart from these, there are some passing moods which are called *Sañcāribhāvas* or *Vyabhicāribhāvas*. They are thirty-three in number nirveda-'dis interestedness' etc. A *Sthāyin* is expressed through some physical gestures or emotional reactions which are technically called the *Anubhāvas*. When these are artistically represented either through a drama or through a poem they excite the *Sthāyin* in a *Sahrdaya*. He enjoys his own *Sthāyin* in a state of impersonalised subjectivity. Thus a *Sthāyibhāva*, transformed into a state of aesthetic enjoyment will be called *Rasa*. Thus, there will be eight *rasas* from eight *Sthāyibhāvas*. Bharata has given the following Sūtra.

विभावानुभाव्य भिचारिसयोगाद्रसनिष्पत्तिः ।^१

^१ (नाट्य शास्त्र. ६. ३२)

'Rasa issues out from the association of stimulus, emotional reaction and passing moods'. Of the eight *rasas*, *Śṛṅgāra* (developed out of *rati*) is considered as the best, the *rasarāja*. However, Bharata's *Rasa*-scheme is not adequate to cover all human emotions. It is necessary to hold the cases of non-sexual love like that between parents and children, elders and youngsters, as different from the traditional *Śṛṅgāra*. Daṇḍin is of the opinion that *Preyas* is very closely connected to *Śṛṅgāra* but different in the sense that *Prīti* is the *Sthāyin* of the former whereas *Rati* is the *Sthāyin* of the latter.² In his treatment, of *Prīti* appears to be identical with *Bhakti*, as his illustrations of *Prīti* refer to *Bhakti* only.³

Daṇḍin comments:

भक्तिमात्रसमाराध्यः सुप्रीतश्च ततो हरिः ।^४
प्रतिप्रकाशनं तच्च प्रेय इत्यवगम्यताम् ।^५

Daṇḍin does not consider *Bhakti* as a *Rasa* but keeps it outside the purview of his *Rasa*-scheme as he treats the cases of all eight *Rasas* under the head of *Rasavad Alankāra*.⁶

Ānandavardhana⁷ keeps silent on this issue. Abhinavagupāta refer to earlier Poeticians who claim that *Bhakti* and *Śraddhā* are different *Rasas*; he himself includes them under *Śānta* by making them accessories of *Śānta*:

² प्रेय प्रियतराख्यानम् । (Daṇḍin, Kāvyaḍarśa.11.275)

³ अद्य यामम गोविन्द etc.

⁴ Ibid., II, 277

⁵ Ibid., II, 279

⁶ इह त्वष्टरसायत्ता रसवता स्मृता गिराम् । Ibid, II.292 see for details, Ibid, 280–292

⁷ Before Ānandavardhana, Rudraṭa has treated *Preyān* as a *Rasa* but he relates it only with friendship : स्नेहप्रकृतिः प्रेयान् । (काव्यालङ्कार, १५)

ईश्वरप्रणिधानविषये भक्तिश्च द्वे स्मृतिमतिधृत्युत्साहानुप्रविष्टे अन्यथैव अङ्गं
(शान्तस्य) इति न तयोः पृथग्रसत्वेन गणनम् ।^८

Mammaṭa is the first *Ālaṅkārika* to refer directly to *Bhakti*. But he dismisses the status of *Rasa* to *Bhakti* and accepts it only as a *Vyabhicāribhāva* or passing mood:

रतिर्देवादिविषया व्यभिचारी तथाज्जितः ।

भावः प्रोक्तः----- ॥^९

The commentators of Mammaṭa like Govinda Ṭhakkura and Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa, naturally support his view by stating that the love towards god etc., can not rise to the level of a *Sthāyībhāva*

तेनाङ्गभूताया अनुभावादिभिरपुष्टायाश्च न रसत्वम् ।^{१०}

Hemacandra, the author of *Kāvyaṇusāsana*, is of the opinion that all the sentiments like *Sneha*, *Bhakti* etc., are the varieties of *rati* and are nourished as *Bhāvas* only :

स्नेहो भक्तिर्वात्सल्यमिति हि रतेरेव विशेषः ।

तुल्ययोः या परस्परं रतिः स स्नेहो ।

अनुत्तमस्य उत्तमे रतिः प्रसक्तिः, सैव भक्ति पदवाच्या ।

उत्तमस्य अनुत्तमे रतिः वात्सल्यम् ।

एवमादौ च विषये भावस्यैव, आस्वाद्यत्वात् ।^{११}

Appayya Dīkṣita, (17th century) upholds the view of Daṇḍin and observes that the thirty three transitory moods like *Nirveda* etc and the love expressed towards gods, elders, children etc., fall under the province of *Bhāva* only, and the instances where such a *Bhāva* is subordinated to something else come under

⁸ Abhinavabhāratī, as quoted in V Raghavan. Number of Rasas, P.110

⁹ काव्यप्रकाश, Iv, 12 cd.

¹⁰ Kāvyaaprakāśa P.126. But it should be noted that mammata reads the removal of inauspicious things (शिवेतरक्षति) as one of the purpose of poetry. Ibid 1.2

the figure Preyas : विभावानुभावाभ्यामभिव्यञ्जितो निर्वेदादिस्त्रयस्त्रिंशद्भेदो

देवतागुरुशिष्यद्विजपुत्रादावभिव्यज्यमाना रतिश्च भावः ।स यत्रापरस्याङ्गं तत्र प्रेयोऽलङ्कारः ।¹²

Jagannātha observes that *Bhakti* is nothing but *Rati* or love towards Godhead and it cannot rise to the level of a *rasa* :

भक्तेर्देवादिविषयरतित्वेन भावान्तर्गततया रसत्वानुपपत्तेः ।¹³

Thus the major theorists in Sanskrit Poetics, are of the opinion that *Bhakti* was not a *Rasa* on par with other traditionally accepted *Rasas*. However, these theorists did recognize the importance of *Bhakti*; for, some of them like Ānandavardhana, Appayya Dīkṣita etc., were devotees themselves and Abhinavagupta was a mystic too. The logic behind the dismissal of *Bhakti* is somewhat feeble and unconvincing. As Dr. Raghavan says :

' This is not commendable attitude. If it is said that friendship is only a variety of *Rati*, can we call the *Rasa* in the association of Rāma and Sugrīva, *Śṛṅgāra* ? If brotherly attachment again is brought under *Rati*, is the *Rasa* in the association of Rāma and Bharata or Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, *Śṛṅgāra* ? Literature is too full of these types of attachment.'¹⁴

Karuṇā—Synthesis: Bhavabhūti:

There are some writers who propose (or seem to propose) a theory in which not eight but only one of them is considered as the principal or original

¹¹ Quoted in V.Raghavan, number of Rasas, P.111, fn.2

¹² *Kuvalayānanda*, under *Rasavad Alankāra*, p. 183

¹³ *Rasasangādhara* Ibid , pp 123–124

¹⁴ Number of Rasas, P 112

rasa and all other *rasas* as arising out of (and also merging back in) that principal *rasa*. Prof. V. Rāgavan calls such a view as the theory of *Rasa*-synthesis. He says '*Rasa*-synthesis means a reducing of all *rasas* to the nature of one, formulation of one as *Prakṛti* and the rest as its *Vikṛti*'¹⁵:

There are at least four such cases before RG which deserve some consideration here.

First among these is Bhavabhūti. He is said to propound the theory of *Karuṇa*-synthesis. The tradition of considering *Karuṇa* as an important *rasa* is very old. The first *Kāvya* in Sanskrit, the *ādikāvya*, i.e. the *Rāmayaṇa*, arose out of a sense of pity¹⁶. *Raseṣu karuṇo rasah* is a well-known anonymous saying. Again, it is said: *Kāruṇyam Bhavabhutir eva tanute*¹⁷. 'Only Bhavabhuti is the past master in creating the pathetic (*Karuṇa*)' sentiment in which *api grāva rodity api dalati vajrasya hṛdayam* i.e. stones weep and the heart of thunderbolt becomes shattered¹⁸. Even the heroine Sīta in his *Uttara-rāma-caritam* is called the sentiment of *Karuṇa* incarnate i.e. *karuṇasya mūrtir athavā śarirīṇī*¹⁹. In the end of the third act of his play *Uttara-rāma-carita*, the characters of Vāsantī and Tamasā say:

एको रसः करुण एव निमित्तभेदा-द्विन्नः पृथक्पृथगिवाश्रयते विवर्तन् ।
आवर्तबुदबुदतरङ्गमयान्विकारा-नम्भो यथा, सलिलमेव हि तत्समस्तम् ॥²⁰

The verse has a *vedāntic* background as seen from the words like *nimitta*- 'cause/motive', *vivarta*- 'turning/revolving/changing', *vikāra*- 'agitation of mind',

¹⁵ Śrīngara Prakāśa-V.Rāghāva

¹⁶ Vālamiki rāmayaṇa 1.2 14

¹⁷ URC

¹⁸ URC I.28

¹⁹ URC, III, 4,

²⁰ URC, III, 47

etc. Bhavabhuti here appears to propose a theory that *Karuṇa* is the only all important *rasa* and all other *rasas* are only its transformations. Just as the single element of water takes various forms like whirlpool, bubbles, waves etc., Similarly it is *Karuṇa* that takes different forms due to various *nimittas*. *Karuṇa* is the *prakṛti*, other *rasas* are its *vikṛtis*. Though this statement is very appropriate in the context in which it appears, yet it is rather too much to say that Bhavabhuti appears to propound here a theory of *Karuṇa*-synthesis as some scholars claim. Vīrarāghava himself seems to be the first supporter (or the propounder? we do not know) of such an interpretation. He says:

इदमत्र कवेर्मतम्-यद्यपि शृङ्गार एक एव रस इति शृङ्गारप्रकाशकारादिमतम्,
तथापि प्राचुर्याद् रागिविरागि-साधारण्यात् करुण एक एव रसः ।
अन्ये तु तद्विकृतयः इति ।²¹ Vīrarāghava com. P-99

Śānta-Synthesis : Abhinavagupta:

Next we have Abhinava Gupta advocating a *Śānta*-synthesis. Actually, Bharata propounded only eight *rasas*:

शृगांरहास्य करुणा रौद्रवीरभयानकाः ।
बीभत्सश्चाद्भुतश्चैव अष्टो नाट्ये रसाः स्मृताः ॥²²

This is confirmed by Kālidāsa in his *Vikramorvaśīyam*. Act I in the verse:

मुनिना भरतेन यः प्रयोगो भवतीष्वष्टरसाश्रयो नियुक्तः ।²³ etc.

But it is likely that there was a tradition which included *Śānta* as the ninth *Rasa*.

Bhāvaprakāśana says:

उत्पत्तिस्तु रसानां या पुरा वासुकिनोदिता ।
नारदस्योच्यते सैषा प्रकारान्तरकल्पिता ॥²⁴ Bhā.Pra., p. 47

²¹ Vīrarāghava com P-99

²² N S V1.15

²³ Vikramor Vaśīyam-Act.I, verse

and in the same context:

रजस्तमोविहीनात्तु सत्वावस्थात् सचित्ततः ।
मनागस्पृष्टबाह्यार्थात् शान्तो रस इतीरितः ॥²⁴ Bhā.Pra., p. 48

Vāsuki was perhaps the first to accept *Śānta rasa*. Even Kohala is mentioned to discuss the *sthāyī* of *ānānta*. Dharmasuri, author of *Sāhityaratnākara*, says:

कोहलस्तु उत्साहो वा निर्वेदो वा शमो वा अस्य स्थायीत्युवाच ।²⁵ vide D.T. Tātacārya, J.O.R., vol. v, p, 29

Rāghavan shows the text of *Nāṭyaśāstra* containing the elements of *Śāntarasa*, in the verse:

क्वचिद्धर्मः क्वचित् क्रीडा क्वचिदर्थः क्वचित् शमः ।²⁶ I, 108 (I first line)
दुःखार्तानां श्रमार्तानां शोकार्तानां तपस्विनाम् ।²⁷ I, 114 (I first line)

Udbhata, probably the first commentator of Bharata, recognizes *Śānta* and speaks of nine *rasas*. Rāghavan feels that he could be the person to have made alterations in the text of *Nāṭya Śāstra* which in its revised form accommodates *Śānta rasa* and runs as follows:

शृङ्गारहास्यकरुणाः रौद्रवीरभयानकाः ।
बीभत्साद्भुतशान्ताश्च नव नाट्ये रसास्मृताः ॥ N.S. Vi, 16
रतिर्हासश्च शोकश्च क्रोधोत्साहौ भयं तथा ।
जुगुप्साविस्मयशमाः स्थायिभावाः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥²⁸ N.S. Vi, 18

There are authors like Aśvaghoṣa and king Harṣavardhana who wrote works depicting *Śānta* as their principal *rasa*. Theoretically also authors like Udbhata, Rudrata, Ānanda vardhana, and even perhaps Tauta and Nāyakā have

²⁴ Bhāva prakāśana–p.47

²⁵ Bhāva prakāśana–p.48

²⁶ Vide D. T. Tātacārya J.O.R., Vol.v,p,29

²⁷ N.S.I.108 (I st line)

²⁸ N.S.–I.114 (I st line)

²⁹ N.S.–I.

supported the case of *Śānta*. It is, however, Abhinava, who finally propounds. *Śānta* as the most important *rasa* is the *Prakṛti* of all.

The revised text of NS it self says :

भावा विकारा रत्याद्याः शान्तस्तु प्रकृतिर्मतः ।
विकारः प्रकृतेर्जातः पुनस्तत्रैव लीयते ॥
स्वं स्वं निमित्तमासाद्य शान्ताद्भावः प्रवर्तते ।
पुननिर्मित्तापाये च शान्त एवोपलीयते ॥³⁰ Vi. 86–87

Abhinava has strongly put forward the case of *Śānta-rasa* hence, the theory of *Śānta*-synthesis is ascribed to him. He dismissed the claims of *Nirveda* or *Śama* or *Utsāha* and proposes *Ātman* as the *sthāyī* of *Śānta*. He concludes:

तदिदमात्मस्वरूपमेव तत्त्वज्ञानं शमः ।³¹(P. 331)

He again says: all *rasas*, in the state of their relish, will be like *Śānta*. सर्वसानां सान्तप्राय एवास्वादः³²(P. 333, I.20)

Ahaṁkāra-Śṛṅgāra : Bhoja

Bhoja comes with in fifty years of Abhinawa and taking his idea from the latter, he propounds a theory which is generally called *Śṛṅgāra*-synthesis. The term *Śṛṅgāra* however is used in a very special philosophico-spiritual sense. In this theory Bhoja appears to adopt a monistic as well as pluralistic approach simultaneously.

The theory seems to develop from the following verse of Daṇḍin in which he has defined the *rasa*-based *Alaṁkāras*. The verse is :

प्रेयःप्रियतराख्यान रसवदरसपेशलम् ।
उर्जस्वि रुढाहंकारं युक्तक्तिर्ष च तत् त्रयम् ॥³³

³⁰ N.S Vi.86–87

³¹ N.S. P–331

Bhoja, in the first place, endorses the view that sentiment also are *Ālambikāras* and says *Preyaḥ*, *Rasavad* and *Urjasvi* become sentiments when they are *yuktotkarṣa*—'heightened', otherwise they remain merely qualities called *preyaḥ*, *Bhāvikatva* and *Aurjitya*. The sentiment called *Preyaḥ*, *Rasavad* and *Urjasvi* are a higher type of *Ālambikāras* because they are related to *Bhāvas*. Though them Bhoja propounds his own concept of the three-level *rasa*.

According to Bhoja, then the first state of *rasa* is *Rūḍhāhnikāra* this is the basic or fundamental stage of *rasa*. *Rasa* in this state is of the form of *Ahnikāra* or *Abhimāna*—Ego/Pride and is present in every soul as a result of its experiences of past lives. This *Abhimāna* which is self-consciousness can also be looked upon as *Śṛiṅgārā*—'self-love', in a highly philosophical sense. In Bhoja's own words :

रसोऽभिमानोऽहंकारः शृङ्गार इति गीयते ।
 योऽर्थः तस्यान्तयात काव्य कमनीयत्वभुने ॥
 विशिष्टादृष्टजन्मायं जन्मिनामन्तरात्मसु ।
 आत्मसम्यग्गुणोभूतेरेको हेतुः प्रकाशते ॥³²

This *Abhimāna*—*Ahnikāra*—*Śṛiṅgārā* develops into *Māna*—'dignity or self-respect or consciousness', it is the 'I', the ego which is at the root of, is the most primary cause of all experience as their 'experience', This stage is also called *Parākoṭi*.

The second stage, *Madhyamāvasthā*—'middle stage', occurs when this one basic *Ahnikāra* *rasa* manifests itself as *Abhimāna*—'self-assertion',

³² N.S.P-331

³³ काव्यादर्श २, २७५

³⁴ स.कण्ठा.५ १-२

'consciousness of the self', revealed in attaching itself to describes to several outward objects with which it comes in to contact. The one basic *rasa* thus manifests itself in multiplicity of forms. All the eight *rasas* described by Bharata's or the twelve given by Bhoja :

शृंगार-वीर-करुण-रौद्राद्भुत-भयानकाः ।
बीभत्स-हास्य-प्रेयासः शान्तोदात्तोद्धता रसाः ॥³⁵

or even all the forty-nine moods (including transitory moods and involuntary emotions) can develop to the state of *rasa* in this stage. In fact even when fully developed to the state at sentiment, in this stage, they will be called emotions only.

आलम्बनविभावेभ्यः स्वेभ्यः समुनिनाषम् ।
रसो रत्यादिरूपेण भाव इत्याभिधीयते ॥³⁶

Thus in this stage, the several emotions which have arisen out of the our *Ahaṁkāra*, are attended by their respective emotions etc. and develop to the state of climax, yet really speaking they are emotions only, they can be called sentiment only in secondary sense, because the real sentiment is only one the *Ahaṁkāra rasa* and it is a only when *Ahaṁkāra* is present as *Abhimāna*, as the experiences, that the different sentiments can be relished. (In the terminology of Abhinava, *Ātmā*-‘soul’, is neither *viśesata ullikhila* nor *atyantatiraskṛtā*.³⁷

The third and final stage also called *uttarā koṭi* occurs when all the several emotions having reached their individual climax, then become transformed into one unitary *rasa* which should now be called *Preman*. The

³⁵ स.कण्ठा.५.१६४

³⁶ स.कण्ठा.५.१६

³⁷ अभिनव भारती (NS. I P. 273)

climax of individuals emotions themselves is only *Preman*. The emotions which were several in the second stage now reach their highest intensity, and are synthesized into the one sentiment which is *Preman*. Dr. *Rāghavan* has described the entire process of this sentiment very well in these words: Thus *ahamkāra* or *abhimāna* of the first stage becomes *abhimāna* for various outward objects and become the manifold emotions of *rati* etc. and those emotions themselves develop into respective *rasas* and culminate in *preman*—‘love’ though which they again pass into the first fundamental sentiment of *ahamkāra*.³⁸

Thus in the first and final stages. In the *parā* and the *uttara koṭis*, the sentiment is only one. “We are there in a monistic *Pāramārthika* stage’ (ibid). Only in middle stage, the *Vyāvahārika* stage, pluralism of sentiment finds place. Again in the third stage the several manifestations of the emotions of the middle stage return to the original one sentiment. The several *Vikṛtis*, as it were, return to their *Prakṛti*. ‘This third stage is therefore only the involution of the evolved’. (ibid)

It is to be noted here that in identifying the sentiment with *Śṛṅgāra* on the one hand *Ahaṅkāra–Abhimān* on the other, *Bhoja* is actually admitting two sense of *Śṛṅgāra*, one at the ‘*Vyāvahārika*’ stage where it is the *Prakarṣa–yukta* state of *rati* and another in the spiritual–philosophical sense of *Abhimān*—souls attachment toward outward objects. Prof. K.C. Pandeya brings out this second connotation of *Śṛṅgāra* clearly the word *Śṛṅgāra* is used by Bhoja in the *Śṛṅgāra prakāśa* in the context of his theory that *Śṛṅgāra* is the only sentiment, not in the ordinary sense of the word as an aesthetic configuration, the central fact of

³⁸ शृंगार प्रकाश-P-410

which is love, but in the sense of self-feeling of a particular type, which is due to the pure religious dead of those in whom the quality of *Sattva* predominates and arises from or is strengthened by the residual traces of the experience of the part birth and takes a man to the highest cultural level (*yena śṅgam ucchrayo rīyate*).³⁹ (*Śrīpra*. P.420) (Indian Aesthetics I. P. 198) So far as this aspect of the theory is concerned the influence of the *Sāṃkhya* school of thought is to obvious. In the *Sāṃkhya* system, it is the *Ahaṃkāra* which makes all worldly experiences of pleasure and pain possible for the *Puruṣa*. Similarly, it is the *Ahaṃkāra* of the *sahṛdaya bhāvaka* which makes all the *rasa*-relish possible for him. A slight divergences may be noted here. In the *Darśana* the experiences can be either pleasurable or painful, where as in a *Kāvya*, all experiences—even those of pathetic will ultimately transform into *preman* only.

Adbhūta-Synthesis : Viśveśvara:

There are some other views of *rasa*-synthesis which however have not been given much importance. Viśvanātha Kavirāja, the author of *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, has noticed one such view of *Adbhūta*-synthesis which he ascribes to some *Nārāyaṇa* who obviously must have been his predecessor. In the context of *Adbhūta rasa*, Viśvantha says: *Tadāha Dharmadattaḥ svagranthe*

रसे सारश्चमत्कारः सर्वत्राप्यनुभूयते ।
तच्चमत्कार सारत्वात् सर्वत्राप्युद्भूतो रस ॥⁴⁰

It may be noted that this tradition of *Adbhūta*-synthesis seems to have gone some way. There is one work *camatkāra-candrika* (cc) of one

³⁹ शृंगार प्रकाश-P-420 Indian Aesthetics I.P. 198

⁴⁰ S.D.under III-3

Viśveśvarakavicaṇḍra (Pub. Andhra Uni, Press, Waltair, 1969, ed. Dr. P. Śrīrāmamūrti) Who was a *protege* of the famous king Śingabhūpāla (related 1386–1412 A.D.), author of *Rasāṇavasudhākara*. Viśveśvara defines *camatkāra* as *camatkārastu viduṣāmananda parivāhakṛta*.⁴¹ (CC.I.6) and *Kāvya* as *Śabdārthau sa camatkārau kāvyam*. He says : *camatkāra* can reside in all the seven elements of a poem:

गुणं रीतिं रसं वृत्तिं पाकं शय्यामलंकृतिम् ।
सप्तै तानि चमत्कारकारणं ब्रुवते बुधाः ।
गुणादीनां वाक्यशोभाकृतौ साधर्म्ययोगतः ॥ ^{४१}CC.I.6–7

The entire treatise elaborates in eight chapters (called *vilāsa*) this element of *camatkāra*—wander—ful achievement/astonishment :

Some sort of continuation of this view can be seen in *jagannathas Rasagangādhara*. He defines *Kāvya* as *ramaṇīyārthapratipādakaḥ śabdaḥ kāvyam* and *ramaṇīyatā* as *lokottarāḥ lādajanakajñāna gocaratā* and ultimately *svaviśiṣṭa janakavaccadekapratipāda–katāsansargeṇa camatkāraktvam kāvayatvam*.⁴³

One Hariprasāda, author of *Kāvyāloka* (written 1729 A.D.) also defines *Kāvya* thus:

विशिष्टशब्दरूपस्य काव्यस्यात्मा चमत्कृतिः ।
उत्पत्तिभूमिः प्रतिभा नागत्रोपपादितम् ॥ ^{४४}

It is in the light and context of these efforts that we now propose to examine RG's theory of *Bhakti* as the only and the highest of *Rasas* as propounded mainly in his BRAS.

⁴¹ Camatkāra Candrikā, I–6

⁴² Camatkāra Candrikā, I–6–7

⁴³ Rasagangādhara

⁴⁴ Kāvyāloka (quoted in intro, to cc, p.xxx vii)