

HERMAN TIEKEN

ON THE USE OF *RASA* IN STUDIES OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

1. INTRODUCTION¹

In studies of Sanskrit plays the concept of *rasa* features prominently. The first topic dealt with in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, the oldest handbook on Sanskrit drama,² is *rasa*, and it denotes the flavour of a drama, which upon being tasted results in a pleasant experience in the spectator. According to the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, *rasa* constitutes the very essence of drama: there is no drama without *rasa*.³ Taking their cue from this, scholars generally consider it their first and foremost task to identify the *rasa*, or mood, of a play. The idea is that the *rasa* “explains” the play, that is, explains why it is as it is. All aspects, of form as well as contents, would have been determined by the *rasa* of the play.

This quest for the *rasa* takes various forms, the three main types of which can be specified as follows. The first approach may be illustrated with reference to Karin Steiner, the translator of Mūrāri’s *Anargharāghava*, “The Priceless Rāghava” (Steiner 1997). In the prologue to this play the director observes that the audience had been greatly disappointed by a recent performance. That play had contained four *rasas*, namely the gruesome or *raudra rasa*, the *rasa* of dislike or *bībhatsa*, the fearful or *bhayānaka rasa*, and the miraculous or *adbhuta rasa*. The director had this time selected a less ambitious or less varied play, namely one containing only two *rasas*, namely the heroic or *vīra rasa*, and the miraculous or *adbhuta rasa*.

Steiner interprets this prologue as indicating that the play is mainly about the heroic and miraculous *rasas*, the other *rasas* playing only a secondary role. In her synopsis of the play she duly notes down the *rasas* occurring in the play. In doing so she proceeds in the following way: when in the course of the action there is talk about a young woman, this is taken as an instance of the erotic or *śṛṅgāra rasa*; or when we are told about a statue of a woman who was brought back to life again we would have to do with a case of the miraculous or *adbhuta rasa*.

However, Steiner’s explanation seems rather gratuitous. For instance, no attempt is made to find support for the playwright’s claim concerning

the special role of the miraculous beside the heroic *rasa*. Apart from that, little else is done here than extracting small scenes out of their contexts and tacking labels to them. The exercise does not tell us anything about the play as a whole. This matter was taken up by Steiner mainly in connection with the seventh act of the play. In this act Rāma and Sītā travel in a chariot through the air from Laṅkā to Ayodhyā. Much like Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* the act consists mainly of verses describing the various places of India and has been criticized as lacking in dramatic element. In the case of this act the question as to how it fits in the drama as a whole simply could not be avoided. As I will show later Steiner's answer to this question is both correct and not correct, depending on whether one takes into account only the answer as such or the way in which she has arrived at it as well.

In Steiner's analysis of the *Anargharāghava* the miraculous *rasa* has somehow got lost. However, she does assign a special role to the heroic *rasa*. Her contention is that the play as a whole has been determined, or dominated, by the heroic *rasa*. Here we have to do with an idea which has come to be known as the so-called "dominant *rasa*". This constitutes the second type of use of *rasa* that may be distinguished. In order to illustrate what is meant by this dominant *rasa* I would like to turn to Edwin Gerow's study of the *Ūrubhaṅga* (Gerow 1985). This short anonymous play from South India⁴ presents us with the dying Duryodhana after he had been mortally wounded by Bhīma. The scene has been borrowed from the *Mahābhārata* but has been thoroughly reworked. For instance, where in the *Mahābhārata* Duryodhana remains till his very last moment filled with hatred towards the Pāṇḍavas, in the *Ūrubhaṅga* he is preaching forgiveness.

Gerow tries to explain this transformation of Duryodhana with reference to the *rasa* of the play. At this point I am not so much interested in the results of his investigation but in his approach, or rather, its premises. First, Gerow presents an analysis of the plot in terms borrowed from *Nāṭyaśāstra* (the so-called *arthaprakṛtis* and *avasthās*). In doing so he ends up with two possibilities, and concludes that while each "illuminates the play in a characteristic way, and reveals it as a powerful communication, . . . unless we are sure just what message the play intends, we can never decide between them" (pp. 409–410). He continues: "The question that remains, then, is to identify the dominant *rasa* [sthāyī] of the play, and derive therefrom a conception of the play's unity and purpose", to which he adds: "For it is the play's dominant *rasa* that decides the question of the play's achievement: it is *for that* that the play has been constructed" (p. 410). As to Gerow's focus on

the “dominant *rasa*”, I would like to quote a statement made by him in an earlier article on the plot structure of Kālidāsa’s *Śakuntalā* (Gerow 1979, 1980). There he wrote that “Indian theory is unanimous that in any serious art form one and only one *rasa* is ‘dominant’ (*pradhāna*), that this emotional dominance defines the play’s basic unity” (Gerow 1979: 567).

Gerow’s conclusion is that the *rasa* dominant in the *Ūrubhaṅga* is the “heroic” *rasa*; the forgiving mood of Duryodhana would characterize him as a so-called “compassionate hero”, for whom he coins the term *dayāvīra*. It should be noted that the term *dayāvīra* seems indeed to be of Gerow’s own invention. In any case, I have not been able to trace it in *Nāṭyaśāstra*.⁵

There are several problems inherent in an approach like this. At this stage I would like to single out the following two. The first problem is that the play is reduced to an exercise in *rasa*. The purpose of the drama would be purely aesthetic. Other functions, such as for instance those determined by the occasion of the performance, are completely left out of consideration. The question if or to what extent such external factors have been responsible for the characteristics of the plot has not been raised. To this question I will return later.

The second problem is that Gerow cannot really make clear why earlier interpretations, according to which the play presented in particular the so-called “pathetic” or *karuṇa rasa*, could not be correct. There are definitely “pathetic” elements in the play. And once we have started on this line, elements associated with the gruesome or *raudra rasa* are present as well. In fact, there is a whole range of possibilities, and as I see it Gerow does not provide even one single convincing argument why his choice in favour of the heroic *rasa* is inevitable.

The problem for Gerow appears to have been that he had to make a choice, suggested to him by the idea that in the end a play can have only one *rasa*. As we have seen, for this idea Gerow falls back upon indigenous Indian theories, which, again in Gerow’s own words are “unanimous that in any serious art form one and only one *rasa* is dominant”. Apart from the question as to which theory Gerow is referring here, it should be noted that according to this theory probably none of the available Sanskrit plays would pass the test.

Before going into this point, I would like to discuss a third use of *rasa* met with in studies of Indian drama, namely that of *rasa* as a magic word. By way of illustration I would like to refer to two recent studies here. The first one is the introduction by Lyne Bansat-Boudon to a collection of essays on Indian theatre traditions (Bansat-Boudon

1998). Bansat-Boudon's aim was to deal with indigenous concepts of theatricalness. The greatest part of her introduction is devoted to the role of illusion (*māyā*) in Sanskrit drama, which, the author argues, is an important condition to the creation of *rasa* ("la perfection de l'illusion est-elle une condition de l'avènement du *rasa*"; p. 11). However, as far as I know, illusion does not belong to the repertory of indigenous dramatic concepts at all. It is mentioned in *Nāṭyaśāstra*, but only as a counterproductive force: the first dramatic performance is disturbed by the demons, who immobilize the actors by their *māyā*, or their power of illusion. The reference to another important and well-known dramatic concept, namely *rasa*, does nothing to change this. In addition, it involves a broadening of the definition of *rasa* to such a point that it becomes an utterly meaningless concept with which one can indeed explain virtually everything.

The second example may be found in the contribution of Carole Jaspert-Pansu in the collection edited by Bansat-Boudon mentioned above (Jaspert-Pansu 1998). Jaspert-Pansu discusses the function of the play-within-a-play, which is found in the final act of Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita*. In this play-within-a-play the soul of the dead Sītā gives such a good performance of Sītā that Rāma is deluded into thinking his wife has come to life again. However, after a very promising start Jaspert-Pansu's conclusion does no more than state the obvious, namely that the play-within-a-play helps to underline the theatricalness of theatre. Jaspert-Pansu seems indeed to have expected more dramatic findings herself as well. Her concluding remarks sound strikingly apologetic. In fact, she admits that she has been unable to find out if Bhavabhūti knew what he was doing while inserting the play-within-a-play. Therefore she is doubtful if Bhavabhūti deserves to be compared to, for instance, Shakespeare or Calderon.⁶ But in a final line Jaspert-Pansu tells her readers not to despair, for what Bhavabhūti offers us is a poetical text giving us a taste of *rasa*.⁷

We are dealing with *rasa* as a kind of comforting *mantra* here. This third type of use of the term *rasa* properly belongs to the realm of fiction and need not be considered any further. The first two *rasa* approaches have the intention to judge Sanskrit drama according to its own aims and as such deserve to be looked into more closely. In what follows I intend to tackle the question if and to what extent their use of *rasa* agrees with what the indigenous tradition has to tell about *rasa*. On closer consideration, contrary to Gerow's claim no evidence will be found there to justify the assumption of something like a dominant *rasa*. In the case of Steiner's equation of *rasa* with scenes the situation

is less clear-cut. However, what will become clear is that too much is expected of the indigenous *rasa* theory. Apart from that, as already indicated, this approach results only in a highly atomized view of a play, reducing it to a cumulation of separate scenes. Next I will therefore attempt to present an alternative approach, which does account for the play as a whole. In the course of this exposition I will come back to the *Anargharāghava* and *Uttararāmacarita*. Among other things I will attempt to clear up some of the questions raised above, such as the function of the final act of Murāri's *Anargharāghava* and the role of the play-within-the-play in Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita*.

2. THE CONCEPT OF RASA IN THE NĀṬYAŚĀSTRA

At the outset we should be clear as to which *rasa* theory we start from. For the *rasa* theory has been formulated for the first time in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of the beginning of our era, but owes its prestige to the much later elaborations by Abhinavagupta and Ānandavardhana in the ninth and tenth centuries. However, these later reworkings are much too late to have any relevance for classical Sanskrit drama, which at that time was already well past its peak. Apart from that, Abhinavagupta and Ānandavardhana show theoretical concerns which are far removed from the practical problems facing a playwright at work. It will be clear that for our purposes we should restrict ourselves to the treatment of *rasa* found in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and should, in fact, do so as strictly as possible, that is, without allowing any interference of the more famous later elaborations.

In the *Nāṭyaśāstra* the treatment of *rasa* is divided over two chapters, the sixth and the seventh. The *rasa* of a dramatic performance, or literally its "taste" or "flavour", is said to be produced by the presentation on stage of emotions, or *bhāvas*. These emotions are compared to the ingredients and spices which make up the flavour of a dish.⁸ A *rasa* might thus be defined as, or rather, equated with, an aggregate of emotions. The main question we have to address here concerns the level of the aggregate: whether it indeed coincides with the play as a whole, as is maintained by Gerow, or only with incidents or scenes, as is assumed by Steiner.

To begin with Gerow's dominant *rasa*, or the question if each play is ultimately determined by one *rasa* only, *Nāṭyaśāstra* provides a very clear, if negative answer. At the end of chapter VII of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* it is said that there is no play which has only one *rasa* (v. 119).⁹

Other explicit references may be found in chapter XVIII which treats of the various types of plays. In v. 43 of that chapter it is said that while a play may include many different *rasas* and emotions, it should end with the so-called *adbhuta rasa*, or with an element of the miraculous.¹⁰ Thus, in any play there are at least two *rasas*. Gerow's approach of drama is accordingly not supported by the *Nāṭyaśāstra*: that treatise does not know of one dominant *rasa* accounting for the play as a whole. In fact, the situation seems to be exactly the opposite: the more *rasas* in a play the better it is. Following the definition of the *nāṭaka* given in XVIII 12, this is the most important type of play because it is filled to the brim with all kinds of different flavours and emotions.¹¹

This is not to say that there might not be a single theme or thread running through the play as a whole. The point I wish to make here is that whatever this unifying element may be, it is not *rasa*.

In postulating his dominant *rasa* Gerow not only ignores the *Nāṭyaśāstra* but also the classical playwrights themselves. I have already referred to the *Anargharāghava*, which according to Murāri's own words would include two *rasas*, the heroic and the miraculous. Murāri himself refers to a play by one of his predecessors, which included no less than four *rasas*. A highly interesting example of this situation is found in Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita*. In the seventh act of this play a performance of another play takes place in front of Rāma and his brother Lakṣmaṇa. The topic of the inserted play is the fate of Sītā after she had been abandoned by Rāma. According to the announcement preceding it, the play is filled with both the pathetic and the miraculous *rasas*. It takes up the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* after Sītā had thrown herself into the river in an attempt to end her life. In the first scene Sītā enters between two goddesses who had rescued her and who are carrying her two sons Kuśa and Lava on their hips. The two boys had been born while their mother Sītā was going down into the river. Upon seeing this scene Rāma, who was watching among the audience, exclaims: "But this is more than just pathetic" (*karuṇataram tu vartate* p. 134, ll. 10–11), referring to the pathetic or *karuṇa rasa*. In a similar way the *adbhuta rasa* is ticked off, for at a certain point we hear Rāma say "This is more than just a miracle" (*adbhutatarām kim api*: p. 136, l. 13).

If *rasa* does indeed not coincide with the drama as a whole, where do we have to look for *rasa* then: at the level of the act or, as is done by Steiner, on that of the scene or the incident? In the inserted play in Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita* *rasa* seems to coincide with scenes, but

we are dealing with a syncopated performance here, in which acts may have been shortened to scenes. Unfortunately, the *Nāṭyaśāstra* does not provide a clear answer to this question either.

As already noted, *rasa* is produced by emotions. The *Nāṭyaśāstra* distinguishes a total of 49 emotions, which are treated in detail in Chapter VII. Each of these emotions is presented as a scene in itself, and is described in terms of a reaction (*anubhāva*, *karma*) to a cause (*vibhāva*, *hetu*). To give a simple example, the emotion called “sweating” is said to be caused by anger, fear, joy, shame, grief, exhaustion, fever, the heat of the sun, by exertion and fatigue, and by being harrassed,¹² and is presented on stage by the actions such as taking hold of a fan, wiping away sweat, or longing for a cool breeze.¹³ The emotion of grief (*śoka*)

is caused by, among other *vibhāvas*, or causes, the separation from one’s beloved, the loss of wealth, killing, imprisonment, and painful experiences.

It is to be represented by *anubhāvas*, or effects, which include crying, trembling, weeping, paleness, stammering, becoming weak, falling on the ground, wailing, crying for help, sobbing, rigidness, madness, fainting, and dying.¹⁴

The 49 emotions are divided into three categories. These three categories show some kind of hierarchical order, in that each higher category encompasses the one below. Down at the bottom we find eight so-called involuntary emotional reactions (*sāttvikabhāvas*), which include, for instance, sweating, trembling, stammering, and shedding tears. Above the *sāttvikabhāvas* are found the 33 so-called fleeting or transitory emotions (*vyabhicāribhāvas*). I would like to quote the *Nāṭyaśāstra* on *śānkā*, or anxiety:

Anxiety is characterized by doubt and is found in women and other low characters.

It is produced by causes such as kidnapping, offences done by the king, and committing bad deeds.

It is represented by effects such as looking again and again, covering (the face), a dry mouth, licking the lips, a pallid face, stammering, trembling, dry lips, a dry throat, becoming black like a crow.¹⁵

Stammering and trembling, which are mentioned among the effects of anxiety here, are otherwise mentioned among the eight so-called involuntary emotional reactions.

Next, above the fleeting emotions we find the so-called permanent emotions (*sthāyibhāvas*), of which the text mentions exactly eight. One of these is *śoka*, or grief, which has already been discussed. Grief is caused by, among other things, the separation from one’s beloved, the loss of wealth, killing, imprisonment, and painful experiences. Its effects include items from the list of the 33 fleeting emotions, such as

fainting and dying, as well as items from the list of the eight involuntary emotions, such as trembling and paleness.

The permanent emotions are compared to kings surrounded by a large retinue of servants. It is said that it is because of this superiority among the emotions that the permanent emotions obtain the name (v.l. the position) of *rasa*.¹⁶ In the *Nāṭyaśāstra* altogether eight *rasas* have been specified each with its own counterpart among the eight permanent emotions. Thus, we have the *śṛṅgāra*, or erotic *rasa* corresponding to the emotion of *rati*, or love, the *rasa* of heroism corresponding to the emotion of aggression (*utsāha*), and so on.

The production of *rasa* out of the permanent emotions is the topic of the sixth chapter of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. There it is said that "even though they are accompanied by various other emotions (*nānābhāvopagatā api*), (only) (the) permanent emotions become *rasas*."¹⁷ In this chapter the 49 emotions are grouped in a slightly different way. Instead of the three categories of chapter VII we have only two here, namely that of permanent emotions, on the one hand, and that of fleeting emotions, on the other. The distinction is apparently based on a difference in the relationship of the emotions to the *rasas*. Each permanent emotion has, so to speak, a *rasa* of its own. By contrast, one and the same fleeting emotions can be found with different permanent emotions or with different *rasas*.¹⁸ This becomes clear from chapter VII, where, for instance, the involuntary emotional reaction of stammering (*svarabheda*) is found together with the heroic (VII 114) as well as with the fearful *rasa* (v. 115 *gadgada*); the fleeting emotion *glāni*, languor or depression, is found in connection with the comic (VII 110) as well as the pathetic *rasa* (v. 111). In VII 33 a distinction is made between anxiety in connection with the *rasa* of fear, which is caused by thieves, and anxiety in connection with the erotic *rasa*, which is caused by an unfaithful lover.¹⁹

In the sixth chapter it is shown how each of the eight *rasas* is produced from its own permanent emotion. By way of example I will give a translation of some passages dealing with the erotic *rasa*:

The first *rasa* is the *śṛṅgāra*, or the erotic *rasa*, which arises from the permanent emotion of love (*rati*). The persons involved wear splendidly white clothes.²⁰

Then follow two characterizations:

As its cause (*hetu*) this *rasa* has a man and a woman. It features excellent young persons.²¹

The case of the erotic *rasa* is a special one in that it has two varieties, depending on whether the lovers are united (*sambhoga*) or separated

(*vipralambha*). In what follows I restrict myself to the first variety, the one in which the lovers are enjoying each others' company. What we get first is the list of the causes and effects of the permanent emotion of love:

Love in union is caused by causes (*vibhāva*) which include, among other things, the proper season, a garland, ointments, ornaments, beloved persons, sensuous objects, an excellent building, enjoying (nice things), visiting a park, experiencing (agreeable things), hearing and seeing (pleasant things), playing games, and frivolity.

It is represented by symptoms (*anubhāva*) such as rapid eye movements, the knitting of the brow, glances, walking gracefully, graceful movements of the limbs and loving words.²²

After that the fleeting emotions involved are enumerated. In the case of the erotic *rasa* all 33 fleeting emotions are said to be possible, except sloth, cruelty, and strangely enough, disgust.²³

The inclusion of disgust (*jugupsā*) among the symptoms of the erotic *rasa* is curious. For otherwise disgust is the permanent emotion of the *bībhatsa rasa*, or the flavour of dislike. What is actually the matter here? In this connection I would like to return to the end of the seventh chapter, where the whole *rasa* fabric is somehow subverted. There, all emotions are lumped together. Any idea of a hierarchy among them is virtually denied,²⁴ which also applies to the supposedly exclusive relationship between a permanent emotion and a *rasa*. For instance, *krodha*, or anger, which is the regular permanent emotion of the *raudra* or terrific *rasa* (VII 112), is also mentioned in connection with the heroic or *vīra rasa* (VII 114). The permanent emotion of the heroic *rasa*, namely *utsāha*, is also found among the emotions of the terrific or *raudra rasa* (VI 112). Among the emotions leading to *bībhatsa rasa* or dislike, is mentioned *bhaya* or fear, which belongs to the *bhayānaka* or fearful *rasa* (VII 116). Finally, in the case of the *śṛṅgāra* or erotic *rasa*, all emotions, the eight permanent ones, the 33 fleeting ones and the eight symptoms, may occur with the exception of sloth, cruelty and disgust (VII 109).²⁵

The picture emerging from the *Nāṭyaśāstra* may be summed up as follows: while, for instance, the fearful or *bhayānaka rasa* can be evoked only by the emotion of fear, in another scene this same fear, or *bhaya*, may feature as a mere secondary or accidental emotion. Another point to be noted is the following. The individual *rasas* and emotions have been mentioned by name. The lists which are provided have generally been taken as exhaustive. That is to say, the *rasa* fabric would consist of no other than those eight *rasas* which have been mentioned, and no other permanent, fleeting and involuntary emotions than the 49 emotions mentioned. However, the *Nāṭyaśāstra* does not say that only the eight

permanent emotions become *rasas*, but it is said that only permanent emotions become *rasas*, or: “even though they are accompanied by various other emotions (*nānābhāvopagatā api*), (only) (the) permanent emotions become *rasas*”.

Apparently, depending on the context any emotion could function as a permanent emotion and produce its own *rasa*. In this situation the eight emotions mentioned in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* are reduced to being mere examples, presenting a more or less random selection from among the myriad of possible emotions. In this connection the number eight found in the case of the *rasas*, the permanent emotions as well as the involuntary emotional reactions, is telling. For the number eight is otherwise associated with so-called randomly selected examples. Instances of such lists of eight may be found in the *Kāmasūtra*. A case in point is the list of nail scratches made on the lover’s skin. After having enumerated eight types and having devised names for them, such as *ardhacandraka* and *maṇḍala* (II 4. 4 ff.),²⁶ the text adds that naturally there are other forms possible (II 4. 23).²⁷ A similar list of eight is found in *Kāmasūtra* II 5, 4–18 (tooth marks).

This interpretation of the treatment of *rasa* in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, namely as merely providing an illustration, is supported by many later traditional accounts of *rasa*. As shown by Raghavan (1963: 437ff.), it is this interpretation which is given by Bhoja in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, by Lollaṭa, one of Abhinavagupta’s predecessors, by Rudraṭa, and by Rudrabhaṭṭa. In the case of Bhoja this interpretation went hand in hand with an increase in the number of *rasas*.²⁸ Given this situation one may ask why this interpretation has been rejected by modern scholars, or else, has not been considered by them, in connection with the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. As I see it, it is simply the result of an uncritical reliance²⁹ on Abhinavagupta, who, for whatever reasons, saw in the *rasa* theory of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* a complete, self-contained whole.

At this point I would like to return to the initial question concerning the level on which *rasa* operates. Unfortunately, from chapters VI and VII of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* no clear answer can be derived. There, *rasa* is defined mainly in terms of symptoms or of combinations of symptoms. At the other end of the spectrum we have Murāri’s claim that his *Anargharāghava* contains two *rasas*. Even if he means to say that indeed only two of the eight *rasas* occur in the play, it remains unclear how these two *rasas* have been distributed over the play. The problem is that we do not know what to look for. By way of concrete information, all we have are lists of causes and effects, which on top of everything appear to be incomplete. Another problem is that, as I

have tried to show, the tastes or *rasas* arising from these causes and effects are unpredictable. The taste produced by the emotion anxiety is context-determined. It can be identified only at the end or from the context as a whole, when we have found out that the woman is anxiously waiting for her lover or, instead, fearing burglars breaking into the house.

All these considerations apart, this approach takes a completely atomized view of a play. The play is presented as a string of scenes and incidents. It is of course more than that. Gerow's aim to look for an overall principle determining the play as a whole is therefore understandable. The point, however, is that this principle is not to be looked for in *rasa*. Where else then do we have to look for a clue?

3. AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO SANSKRIT DRAMA

In what follows I would like to present an alternative approach to Sanskrit drama, which attempts to account precisely for a play as a whole. Some examples have been dealt with earlier (Tieken 1993, 1997). Finally, I will come back to Murāri's *Anargharāghava* and Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita* and discuss some of the points raised in the introduction.

In analysing the plot of a play we should start at the end. Sanskrit plays invariably end happily, and at the end the tension built up in the play is released. Therefore, if we want to find out where the play is really about we should indeed turn to its conclusion.

To illustrate this, I would like to refer to Kālidāsa's play *Śakuntalā*. The plot is well-known. The king had married Śakuntalā but due to a curse had completely forgotten about her. After the king had abandoned Śakuntalā he had remained childless, and the dynasty threatened to extinguish with him. What he did not know is that he had a son with Śakuntalā. His miraculous reunion with Śakuntalā at the end of the play at the same time solves his dynastic problems, as it provides the king with his long awaited heir. At that point Śakuntalā's role is virtually "reduced" to that of mother of a future *cakravartin* and the play ends with a prediction that the boy will be a universal emperor:

Crossing the oceans in a chariot smooth and silent,
He is destined to govern without rival the seven continents of earth.
Known here as Sarvadamana because he subdues the animals,
He will be newly named Bharata, supporter of the world.³⁰
(Translation by Coulson 1981: 159)

It may be noted that the continuation of a dynasty is a recurrent theme in the works of Kālidāsa. It is also found in his epic poem, the

Raghuvamśa, and in a slightly different form in his *Kumārasambhava* as well. The *Raghuvamśa*, in conformity with the word *vamśa* in its title, provides a list of the kings of the *Raghu* dynasty. At the end of the text the continuation of the dynasty is threatened as king Agnivarṇa neglects his duties and wastes away his time and energy in the harem. Fortunately, after his death the queen appears to be pregnant. In this way the continuation of the dynasty is secured just in time.³¹

On the basis of this curious ending scholars have mistakenly concluded that the *Raghuvamśa* as we now have it is incomplete. The same mistaken notion has been applied to Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava*, which, exactly like the *Raghuvamśa* ends on a note of promise. However, where the *Raghuvamśa* ends with the queen's pregnancy, the *Kumārasambhava* stops even earlier, namely at the conception of the future king during the wedding night of Śiva and Pārvatī.

This theme of the continuation of the dynasty, which is indeed found in plays as well as epic poems, I would like to call the dynastic paradigm. Another paradigm is that of "becoming *cakravartin* through self-sacrifice". It is met with in, for instance, Harṣa's *Nāgānanda* and Bhavabhūti's *Mālatīmādhava*. In the *Nāgānanda* the hero becomes *cakravartin*. The incidents leading to this end form a curious sequence. First the hero offered himself as a substitute for a boy with invalid parents who is about to be eaten by Garuḍa. Next, his life is saved by the goddess Gaurī, upon which he marries and becomes *cakravartin*. In Bhavabhūti's *Mālatīmādhava* a woman is sacrificed to the goddess and brought back to life again. Next, her husband becomes *cakravartin*. Both plays are set in the world of the *vidyādhara*s, beings between gods and humans. This betrays the indebtedness of the respective plots to the orbit of the *Brhatkathā*, a text by and about *vidyādhara*s. The *Brhatkathā*, though the text itself has been lost, seems to have abounded in stories of kings becoming *cakravartin* after they had first sacrificed their lives to the goddess. With his own hand the king cuts off his head, which is put back on again by the goddess.³²

A great majority of the Sanskrit plays, however, have themes taken from the epics, the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*. Most of them revolve around ritual sacrifices. A good example is the anonymous *Pañcarātra*. As I have shown elsewhere (Tieken 1997), its plot follows almost exactly the scenario of a *rājasūya*. Here I would like to mention only the title of the play, *Pañcarātra*, which refers to the five-day sacrifice, the so-called *kṣatrasya dhṛti*, which takes place between the completed *rājasūya* and the next one. For a new *rājasūya* is required if in that

five-day period someone comes forward and challenges the king's newly established authority.

A good example is the anonymous *Madhyamavyāyoga*, a play which I have dealt with elsewhere (Tieken 1997), so that I will restrict myself to the main points here. The plot of this short one-act play is simple. A brahmin family, consisting of father, mother, and their three sons, is on its way to the a relative's *upanayana* ceremony. Halfway they are stopped by a demon who demands a human being for food. After some deliberation the brahmin decides to offer his middle son. The boy is rescued, however, by the middle of the Pāṇḍava brothers, Bhīma. The play ends with the boy being restored to his family, and the entire family continuing their journey. This, however, is not all: The brahmin's three sons stand for the three brahmins who are to be invited to a ceremony. This obligation on the part of the patron of the ceremony to invite and feed minimally three brahmins is matched by the obligation of the brahmins to show up. Should they fail to show up, they will suffer for it in their next lives.³³ These ideas give quite a dramatic twist to the ending of the *Madhyama*. The brahmins almost failed to appear in full number at their relative's *upanayana*. Fortunately, the problem was solved just in time.

A somewhat more complicated case is the *Ūrubhaṅga*. This play has already been mentioned in connection with Gerow's dominant *rasa*. As said, one of the main problems of the play is posed by its deviation from the *Mahābhārata* version of the same incident. The spiteful Duryodhana of the *Mahābhārata* has been transformed into a saint preaching forgiveness towards his killer Bhīma. This twist is all the more striking as Bhīma had behaved treacherously by hitting Duryodhana below the belt. Gerow interpreted this deviation as the result of an attempt on the part of the playwright to create the conditions for *vīra* as the dominant *rasa* of the play. For Duryodhana he coined the term *dayāvīra*, or "compassionate hero".

However, as I have tried to show at another occasion (Tieken 1997), the deviation of the scene was caused by quite a different concern, namely by the fear of what might happen if a person dies taking his anger with him to heaven. The people who stay behind believe that such a person will not stop harrassing them from there, so they want to be reassured that the dead have died peacefully. In this way the play anticipates highly concrete, actual fears among Indians even today, which have been channeled through the so-called *piṇḍa* ritual and other ceremonies commemorating the dead. Down to the present day these ceremonies provide occasions for dramatic performances, the evidence

for which comes mainly from South India.³⁴ On closer consideration it is not unlikely that the *Ūrubhaṅga*, a South India play after all, was composed precisely for performances at such funerary ceremonies.

If the *Ūrubhaṅga*, which abounds in references to the *piṇḍa* ritual – there is even one made by Duryodhana himself – was indeed meant for performances at funerals, one may ask if the *Madhyama* could not have been a piece performed at the occasion of a son's completion of his study with a *guru*. However, I do not intend to pursue this question in terms of the concrete occasion of the performance, the point I wish to make being that plays are not mere aesthetic exercises. Due to the emphasis on *rasa* it has come to be overlooked that they reflect real tensions and anxieties existing in society. In the majority of the available Sanskrit plays we have to do with typically royal concerns, though the *Madhyama* with its family of brahmins is an exception to this. Thus, the *Śakuntalā* revolves around the problems involved in securing the continuation of the dynasty, while the *Pañcarātra* deals with the problems encountered during the performance of the *rājasūya*.

To these may be added the dramas based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which virtually all deal with royal sacrifices like *rājasūya* and *aśvamedha*. Beside the dynastic paradigm and the paradigm of “becoming *cakravartin* through self-sacrifice”, we may therefore distinguish the royal sacrifice paradigm. At another occasion I have already dealt with the *abhiṣeka*, or royal unction, in the anonymous South Indian *Abhiṣekanātaka*. In what follows I would like to examine the role of ritual and sacrifice in Murāri's *Anargharāghava* and Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita*. In doing so, I intend to clear up some points which have been raised earlier, such as if Bhavabhūti could be compared with any great western author. I must immediately add that while normally I find such comparisons beside the point (“Kālidāsa, the Indian Shakespeare”), in the case of Bhavabhūti I will show that there are reasons to make an exception.

4. MURĀRI'S ANARGHARĀGHAVA

Western criticism on the *Anargharāghava* has been very severe. Wilson wrote that it has no “dramatic merit” and is “deficient in character, action, situation, and interest”. “Murāri's language”, Wilson continues, “would be as far from good taste as his ideas.”³⁵ Part of the criticism may have been evoked by the seventh act, which counts no less than 152 verses. The greatest part (129 verses) is taken up by descriptions of the holy places of India. The scene presents Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā travelling through the air in a chariot. According to Steiner (1997)

this chariot drive is there as part of Rāma's unction, or *abhiṣeka*, which takes place at the end of the play. However, this conclusion, which is correct,³⁶ is virtually denied again by Steiner's own hesitations, because to her the identification of Rāma's chariot drive as a part of his *abhiṣeka* is only one of two alternatives. Steiner's other suggestion is that the tour is a *tīrthayātrā*, a pilgrimage along India's sacred places, undertaken for the purpose of purification and symbolising the gradual reintegration of Rāma after his banishment (Steiner 1997: 68). However, in the end Steiner seems to have a preference for the interpretation of the chariot tour as part of the royal unction. However, she does so only after she had first convinced herself that the royal unction which takes place at the very end of the play is indeed the real ending of the play. For also on this point Steiner sees several options. One of the endings would be the killing of Rāvaṇa in act six, at which point Rāma would have accomplished his divine function, signalled by a rain of flowers (p. 71). This ending, however, would have been only a prelude to the second one, formed by the rescue of Sītā. This concludes the Sītā story. Rāma's unction is only one of three endings, and the question as to which of the three endings is the real one is decided by Steiner on the basis of their contribution to the heroic or *vīra rasa*, by which the play would be dominated. Steiner argues that the rescue of Sītā could not be the end because the play is "eine Heldengeschichte, keine Liebesgeschichte" (p. 72). The killing of Rāvaṇa constituted at best only a provisional ending, leaving Rāma still a king without kingdom. From the point of the *vīra rasa* Rāma's *abhiṣeka* would indeed constitute the proper conclusion.

As indicated earlier one of the problems encountered in studies of the *rasas* in Sanskrit plays is the completely arbitrary way in which these examinations are carried out. In this respect Steiner's study is no exception. Murāri claims that his play contains the heroic as well as the miraculous *rasa*. Apart from the question if Steiner is justified in making the play as a whole dependent on only one *rasa*, it is not clear on what ground she selected the heroic *rasa* for this role, disregarding the miraculous *rasa*.

More importantly, however, Steiner somehow ignores the fact that virtually all *Rāma* plays end either with an *abhiṣeka* or else with an *aśvamedha*. The anonymous *Abhiṣekanāṭaka* opens with the unction ceremony of the monkey king Sugrīva and ends with the *abhiṣeka* of Rāma. Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita* begins with Rāma descending from his lion throne on which the unction had taken place after his return in Ayodhyā and ends twelve years later with the completion of an

aśvamedha. The most interesting parallel in this connection is, however, Bhavabhūti's *Mahāvīracarita*, which like Murāri's *Anargharāghava* ends with Rāma's uncton which, moreover, is preceded by an exactly similar chariot drive as seen in the latter play.³⁷

5. BHAVABHŪTI'S *UTTARARĀMACARITA*

As already mentioned, Jaspert-Pansu's examination of the role of the play-within-the-play in the *Uttararāmacarita* starts in a promising way. She connects this scene in the very last act with the visit to the picture gallery in the very first act. The gallery is decorated with paintings depicting the story of Rāma and Sītā up to Sītā's fire ordeal. The play is, so to speak, hemmed in between looking at paintings and looking at a dramatic performance. While this structural feature underlines the importance of the respective scenes, their function is an entirely different matter. On this point Jaspert-Pansu seems to have overlooked some vital clues.

For one thing she should have been more specific about the plot of the *Uttararāmacarita*. The plot has indeed been based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the action taking place twelve years after Rāma's *rājasūya*. But more specifically the play is about Rāma's performance of an *aśvamedha* sacrifice (e.g. p. 35, ll. 26–8: *atha sa rājā kimācāraḥ saṁprati. tena rājñā kratuḥ aśvamedhaḥ prakrāntaḥ*, "And what is the king doing at present? The king has started an *aśvamedha* sacrifice"). The problem is that for the sacrifice Rāma needs a son as well as a wife. For all Rāma knows his wife is no longer alive and he has no son. However, in what follows I would like to concentrate on the problem of the absent wife. How is this problem solved? For this we have to turn to the play performed in the final act. It is a composition by Vālmīki, and it takes up the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* at the point where it was left in the picture gallery, namely at Sītā's fire ordeal. The play features Sītā, played by her ghost, and the goddesses Earth and Gaṅgā, played by two Apsarases. From this play Rāma learns that Sītā was prevented from killing herself by the goddesses Earth and Gaṅgā and that she had given birth to two sons. It needs little effort on Rāma's part to realize that the two boys who had arrived at his court a moment before are actually his sons. The inserted play ends with the goddess Earth telling Sītā to postpone her death till her sons have grown up. All the actors retire. At this point Rāma faints. However, immediately after this "the miracle of Vālmīki" is announced, namely Sītā appearing in the flesh.

By Earth and Gaṅgā she is handed over to her husband Rāma, and the *aśvamedha* can be completed.

In the play-within-the-play explicit references are found to the picture gallery scene at the beginning of the play. The goddesses Earth and Gaṅgā hand over Sītā to her husband in order to comply with requests made by Rāma in front of some of the paintings.³⁸ However, it is not a matter of closing the circle, by going back to the beginning – quite the contrary. For in between the art of painting and that of drama we find the sculptural art, in the form of the golden statue of Sītā which during the *aśvamedha* sacrifice is meant to serve as a substitute for the real Sītā. Bhavabhūti thus presents three forms of art, which have in common that they imitate life, at which each is successful in its own way. When Rāma sees the painting of his life together with Sītā in Janasthāna it is as if he is reliving the scene again (p. 16, ll. 17–8: *hanta vartamāna iva janasthānavṛttāntaḥ pratibhāti*). The paintings bring back the old feelings (p. 19, v. 33: *... pratyāvṛttaḥ sa punar iva me jānakīviprayogaḥ*). But at one point Rāma is able to comfort Sītā by telling her that “it is only a picture” (p. 16, l. 14: *ayi, viyogatraste, citram etat*). As already indicated the golden statue of Sītā is serving as a substitute for Sītā. When the real Sītā hears that Rāma is performing an *aśvamedha* she feels hurt, concluding that he has remarried. But her fears are allayed when she hears Rāma only has a statue of herself (p. 71). In the case of the dramatic performance no such reservations as to its power of imitation are made. On the contrary, the drama is proved true by the appearance of Rāma’s sons whose birth is related in it. Moreover, at the end, the playwright Vālmīki makes Sītā appear in the flesh.

As already indicated, the dramatic performance at the end of the play is not a return to the beginning. Instead, it forms the culmination point. Of all the three arts mentioned in the play, that of drama itself is presented as superior in that it actually brings to life things and people here.

This analysis of the play would show that Jaspert-Pansu’s doubts as to whether Bhavabhūti was conscious of what he was doing are wholly unnecessary. The play is about the superiority of drama among the arts in imitating life. This follows not only from the structure of the plot, with paintings at the beginning, the sculptural art in the middle and drama at the end. Another indication of this is to be found in the term *śabdabrahman* or its synonyms. Vālmīki is said to possess *śabdabrahman*, and his *Rāmāyaṇa* is presented as a manifestation of this power.³⁹ If not the term, certainly the concept of *śabdabrahman*,

has been borrowed from Bharṭṛhari and refers to the power to create through speech.⁴⁰ As already said, the *Rāmāyaṇa* is presented as a manifestation, or creation (*vivarta*) of *śabdabrahman*. Lava, seeing his father, exclaims that the poet of the *Rāmāyaṇa* really knows how to bring to life the goddess of Speech (p. 122, v. 20: *sthāne rāmāyaṇakavir devīm vācam vyavīṛtat*). The same power is ascribed to, or rather, claimed by Bhavabhūti himself, who is said to be another *brahmā* married to the goddess of speech (p. 4, v. 2: *yaṁ brahmāṇam iyaṁ devī vāg vaśyevānuvartate*). As such the term *śabdabrahman* anticipates the end of the play, in which Sītā is brought back to life by the poet Vālmīki. In the *Uttararāmacarita* Vālmīki is called the first poet, that is, the first among the people to have unfolded *śabdabrahman* by having composed his *Rāmacarita*. By composing his own *Uttararāmacarita* Bhavabhūti, so to speak, steps into Vālmīki's footsteps and claims the same power for himself.

Finally, I would like to come back to Jaspert-Pansu's worries about Bhavabhūti's status in world literature: could he compete with, for instance, Shakespeare or Calderon? As already indicated I am personally not very fond of such comparisons. However, if we want to compare Bhavabhūti to a western author, Shakespeare and Calderon are not the first to come to mind. Instead, we might try Cervantes, the author of *Don Quichote*. In the second part of *Don Quichote* the hero is actually overtaken by the fame of the first part of the book. He meets imposters, men who have read Cervantes' novel and dressed up as Don Quichote, like Don Quichote, went in search of adventures. The irony in this is that Don Quichote himself was only imitating as well. He, for his part, set out to emulate the knights featuring in the many knights' stories which were popular at the time. As we have seen, a similar situation is found in Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita*, or for that matter already in Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*, with Rāma watching a dramatic performance dealing with his own life or listening to epic stories of his own adventures. Disregarding the completely different backgrounds to *Don Quichote* and *Uttararāmacarita*, the two texts represent interesting examples of works exploring the border area between fiction and reality.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

I would like to emphasize that my criticism of the concept of *rasa* is restricted to its use in investigations of plays or other literary texts. As far as I see it, this approach has not yielded even one really verifiable

and worthwhile conclusion so far. Much of what has been written along this line may be relegated to the area of creative writing.

The study of the history and development of *rasa* in the *śāstric* literature is of course an entirely different matter, if only because a close study of the *śāstras* would reveal the limitations of *rasa*. As I tried to show, some scholars ascribe a meaning or value to *rasa* which had never been intended. On closer consideration the treatment of *rasa* in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* presents a completely atomized vision of Sanskrit drama. The content of a play is cut up into the tiniest elements possible, an approach which is typical of *śāstras* in general. Another example from the *Nāṭyaśāstra* itself is the treatment of the plot, which ends in an enumeration of mini scenes, or *samdhyaṅgas*. A similar situation is met in the *alaṅkāraśāstras*, which break down poetry to the level of the individual figures of speech. Higher level issues are hardly treated; all we have are, again, lists and enumerations. The usefulness of the *śāstras* for an author at work, poet or playwright, is therefore *à priori* limited. As to the study of the categories of the *śāstras* in plays and poems, we should adjust our expectations accordingly.

By way of conclusion I would like to address another question, namely how we should interpret the important place accorded to *rasa* in the literature on drama. (I leave aside here later developments in which *rasa* came to be applied to literature in general.) For this I like to turn first to the *alaṅkāraśāstras*. If these texts treat primarily of figures of speech they do so because they consider this to be the most distinctive feature of *kāvya* (Gerow 1971: 13ff.). *kāvya* differs from ordinary speech by the way things are said, which is as far removed as possible from what we hear in ordinary speech. Returning to the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, it might be argued that to its authors it was *rasa* which distinguished drama from scenes in ordinary life. The aim of drama was to give pleasure to the audience. The problem is obvious: drama is expected to do so also in scenes which feature people suffering and which in real life and under normal circumstances would make people feel pity. Instead, the performance of such scenes in a dramatic form should give the audience a good feeling. The spectator should have the idea that he has witnessed, or is witnessing, a thing of beauty. So without *rasa* there is indeed no drama!

NOTES

¹ The present article has been based on a paper read at the yearly meeting of the Belgische Vereniging voor Indologie/Association belge d'Indologie held in Ghent on the 10th of December 1999.

² Chapters I–V of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* deal with the *pūrvaraṅga*, or the preliminary rituals, or rather, their dramatization. The treatment of *rasa* begins with VI 32. It is preceded in vv. 1–31 by, among other things, a table of contents of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

³ Text after VI 31 (p. 266):

*tatra rasān eva tāvad ādāvabhivyaḅhyāsyāmaḥ.
na hi rasād ṛte kaścīd arthaḥ pravartate,*

I will explain the *rasas* here first. For, no meaning is produced (in drama) without *rasa*.

As I will argue at the very end of this article it is *rasa* which makes the difference between witnessing scenes in drama and witnessing similar scenes in real life.

⁴ This play, together with twelve other plays, has somehow come to be attributed to the pre-Kālidāsa playwright Bhāsa. For a recent revision of this “Bhāsa theory”, see Tieken (1993 and 1997), where it has been argued that in reality we are dealing with a group of relatively late plays from South India.

⁵ In VI 79 the *Nāṭyaśāstra* distinguishes three types of *rasa* heroes, which, however, do not include Gerow’s *dayāvīra*:

*dānavīraṃ dharmavīraṃ yuddhavīraṃ tathaiva ca
rasavīraṃ api prāha brahmā trividham eva hi,*

Brahmā said that from the point of view of *rasa* there are three types of heroes, namely the hero of liberality, the hero of *dharmā* and the hero in battle.

⁶ “Il est cependant difficile de savoir si Bhavabhūti a considéré la question de l’illusion théâtrale et de ses jeux possibles avec la réalité de la même façon et dans le même dessein que les auteurs occidentaux de l’âge baroque, le Shakespeare de *Hamlet* ou le Calderon de *La Vie est un songe* et du *Grand Théâtre du monde*” (pp. 133–4).

⁷ “. . . la littérature apparaît restreinte à une interrogation sur elle-même et sur ses pouvoirs. Nous retrouvons sans aucun doute cet aspect dans la pièce de Bhavabhūti, brillant exercice de transposition qui n’en propose pas moins un texte d’une infinie poésie, toute destinée à susciter, chez qui prend la peine et le temps de la savourer, le *rasa*” (p. 134).

⁸ *Nāṭyaśāstra* VI, prose on pp. 282–3: *yathā hi nānāvyañjanasamskṛtam annam bhuñjānā rasān āsvādayanti sumanasah puruṣā harṣādīmścādhigacchanti tathā nānābhāvābhīnayaavyañjitān vāgaṅsattvopetān sthāyibhāvān āsvādayanti sumanasah prekṣakāḥ harṣādīmścādhigacchanti*, “In the same way as men, eating food prepared with various ingredients, enjoy the flavours and, fully satisfied, experience emotions like joy, in that way the spectators taste the permanent emotions which have been spiced with the representation of various (other) emotions and supported by the proper speech, by bodily acting and by acting emotions, and, fully satisfied, experience emotions like joy”.

⁹ *Nāṭyaśāstra* VII 119:

na hy ekarasajam kāvyam kiñcid asti prayogataḥ,

For there is no *kāvya* (the text of the play) with only one *rasa* when it is performed.

¹⁰ *Nāṭyaśāstra* XVIII 43:

*sarveṣāṃ kāvyānām nānārasabhāvayuktyuktānām
nirvahaṇe kartavyo nityam hi raso’dbhutas tajjñaiḥ,*

At the end of all plays, which have been provided with various flavours and emotions, the experts invariably introduce the miraculous *rasa*.

¹¹ *Nāṭyaśāstra* XVIII 12:

*nṛpatīnām yaccaritam nānārasabhāvaceṣitam bahudhā
sukhaduḥkhotpattikṛtam bhavati hi tan nāṭakam nāma,*

That type of drama which deals with the adventures of kings, the actions of which are in many ways filled with various flavours and emotions (or, with the v.l. *nānārasabhāvasambhṛtam*: which is filled in many ways with various flavours and emotions) and gives pleasure and grief, that is called *nāṭaka*.

¹² *Nāṭyaśāstra* VII 95:

*krodhabhayaharṣalajjāduḥkhaśramarogatāpaghātebhyaḥ
vyāyamaklamadharmaiḥ svedaḥ sampīdanāc caiva.*

¹³ *Nāṭyaśāstra* VII 102:

*vyajanagrahaṇāc cāpi svedāpanayanena ca
svedasyābhinayo yojyas tathā vātābhilāṣataḥ.*

¹⁴ *Nāṭyaśāstra* VII, prose on p. 345:

*śoko nāma iṣṭajanaviyogavibhavanāśavadhabandhaduḥkhānubhavanādibhir vibhāvaiḥ
samutpadyate.
tasyāśrapātaparidevitavilapitavairṇyasvarabhedasrastagātratābhūmi-
patanasasvanaruditākranditadīrghanīḥśvasitajaḍatonmādamohamaraṇādibhir
anubhāvair abhinayaḥ prayoktavyaḥ.*

¹⁵ *Nāṭyaśāstra* VII, prose on p. 352:

*śāṅkā nāma sandehātmikā strīnicaprabhavā.
cauryābhigrahaṇanrpāparādhapāpakarmakaranādibhir vibhāvaiḥ samutpadyate.
tasyā muhurmuhuravalokanāvakuṅṭhanamukhaśoṣaṇajihvāparilehana-
mukhavaivairṇyasvarabhedavepathuśuśkoṣṭhakaṇṭhavāyāśasādharmyādibhir anubhāvair
abhinayaḥ prayoktavyaḥ.*

¹⁶ *Nāṭyaśāstra* VII, prose on p. 343:

*yathā narendro bahujanaparivāro'pi sa eva nāma labhate nānyaḥ sumahān api
puruṣaḥ tathā vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicāriparivṛtaḥ sthāyī bhāvo rasanāma (rasatām)
labhate.*

¹⁷ *Nāṭyaśāstra* VII, prose on pp. 281–2:

*yathā hi guḍādibhir dravyair vyañjanair auśadhibhiśca śāḍavādayo rasā nirvartyante
tathā nānābhāvopagatā api sthāyīno bhāvā rasatvam āpnuvanti.*

¹⁸ In the present context I do not intend to go into the distinction between *rasa* and *bhāva*, which terms in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* are kept apart less strictly than has been generally assumed.

¹⁹ *Nāṭyaśāstra* VII 33:

*cauryādijanitā śāṅkā prāyaḥ kāryā bhayānake
priyavalyājanitā tathā śṛṅgāriṇī matā.*

²⁰ *Nāṭyaśāstra* VI, prose on p. 294:

tatra śṛṅgāro nāma ratisthāyibhāvaprabhavaḥ ujjvalaveṣātmakaḥ.

²¹ Id., p. 295:

sa ca strīpuruṣaḥetuka uttamayuvaprakṛtiḥ.

²² Id., pp. 297–9:

tatra sambhogas tāvat ṛtumālyānulepanālaṅkāreṣṭajanaviṣayavarabhavanopabhogopavanagamanānubhavanaśravaṇadarśanakṛdālilādibhir vibhāvair utpadyate. tasya nayanacāturyabhṛkṣepakaṭākṣasañcāralalitamadhurāṅgahāravākyādibhir anubhāvair abhinayaḥ prayoktavyaḥ.

²³ Id., p. 300:

vyabhicāriṇaś cāsyālasyaugryajugupsāvarjyāḥ.

²⁴ In some manuscripts of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* after VII 108 a set of five *śloka*s is found which contain a list, enumerating 46 of the 49 emotions. The order of the emotions seems to be completely random.

²⁵ *Nāṭyaśāstra* VII 109:

*ālasyaugryajugupsākhyair evaṁ bhāvais tu varjitāḥ
udbhāvayanti śṛṅgāraṁ sarve bhāvāḥ svasamjñayā.*

The first line may be compared with the prose text on p. 300, quoted in note 23. There it referred specifically to the *vyabhicāribhāvas*. In the present context reference is made to all *bhāvas*. Note that the verse follows immediately after the list (not found in all manuscripts), which enumerates 46 emotions, including those of all three categories.

The situation described in the final part of Chapter VII may be compared with VI 39–40. In these verses the eight *rasas* are divided into four pairs on the ground of similarities in the *anubhāvas*. It is stated that the work (that is, the effects or *anubhāvas*) which feature in, for instance, the *raudra rasa* could equally well produce the *karuṇa rasa*. The passage VI 39–40 has been dealt with, but from a different angle, by Kölver (1991).

²⁶ *Kāmasūtra* II 4, 4:

*tad āchchuritaḥ ardhacandro maṇḍalaṁ rekhā vyāghranakhaṁ
mayūrapadakaṁ śaśaplutakam utpalapatrakam iti rūpato'ṣṭavikalpam.*

Das (Nägelkratzen) ist der Form nach von achtfacher Art: Diskus, Halbmond, Kreis, Linie, Tigerkrallen, Pfauenfuß, Hasensprung, Lotusblatt (Mylius 1987: 49).

²⁷ *Kāmasūtra* II 4, 23:

ākṛtīvikārayuktāni cānyānyapi kurvīta,

Man kann auch noch andere Arten von (Kratzspur-)Formen ausführen (Mylius 1987: 51).

²⁸ Note also the “addition” of *sānta rasa* in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* itself.

²⁹ For another example of the confusion resulting from a too blind reliance on Abhinavagupta in the interpretation of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, see Tieken (1998).

³⁰ *Śakuntalā* VII 197:

*rathenānutkhātastimitagatinā tīrṇajaladhīḥ
purā saptadvīpāṁ jayati vasudhāṁ apratīrathaḥ
ihāyam sattvānām prasabhadamanāt sarvadamaṇaḥ
punar yāsyaty ākhyām bhārata iti lokasya bharaṇāt.*

³¹ See Tieken (1989).

³² For a study of these stories in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, see Baldissera (1996).

³³ See *Mānavadharmasāstra* III 190:

*ketitas tu yathānyāyam havyakavye dvijottamaḥ
kathamcid apy atikrāman pāpaḥ sūkaratām vrajet,*

But a Brāhmaṇa who, being duly invited to a rite in honour of the gods or of the manes, in any way breaks (the appointment), becomes guilty (of a crime), and (in his next birth) a hog.

(Translation Bühler 1886: 111)

³⁴ See, for instance, Frasca, who refers to *terukkūttu* performances in Tamilnadu at the *karumāti pūjai*, a funerary ceremony taking place eight or ten days after the demise of a family member (Frasca 1990: 135). See also de Bruin (1999: 281–2).

³⁵ The quotation has been taken from Steiner (1997: 9).

³⁶ For the function of the chariot drive in the *rājasūya* and its position in relation to the unction and enthronement ceremonies, see Heesterman (1957: 127–139, 140–157).

³⁷ The chariot drive is found in the seventh act of the *Mahāvīracarita*, which act in its present form is generally believed to the work of a different author, the majority of manuscripts breaking off at V 46. Whatever is the case here, Murāri, who tried to emulate and outdo Bhavabhūti (Tieken 1999), clearly had before him a text of the *Mahāvīracarita* which included the chariot drive.

³⁸ For Rāma's request to Gaṅgā, see p. 14, ll. 13–4, repeated at p. 139, ll. 16–9, for Rāma's request to Earth, see p. 26, ll. 26–7, repeated at p. 139, ll. 23–5.

³⁹ *Uttarāmacarita* p. 34, ll. 3–11:

*tena khalu punaḥ samayena taṁ bhagavantaṁ āvirbhūtaśabdabrahmaprakāśam ṛṣim
upasaṁgamyā bhagavān bhūtabhāvanaḥ padmayonir avocat: ṛṣe, prabuddho'si
vāgātmani brahmaṇi. tad brūhi rāmacaritam. avyāhatajyotir āṛṣam te prātibham
cakṣuḥ. ādyaḥ kavir asi. ity uktvāntarhitāḥ. atha sa bhagavān prācetasah prathamam
manuṣyeṣu śabdabrahmaṇas tādṛśam vivartam itihāsam rāmāyaṇam praṇināya.*

Or, en ce même temps, s'approchant du Sage vénéré auquel venait d'apparaître le Sacré sous sa forme de Verbe révélé, Brahma, le bienheureux auteur des êtres, lui parla ainsi: "O Sage, tu es initié à la vérité suprême dont l'âme est la Parole. Conte donc l'histoire de Rāma. Ton oeil prophétique de Voyant possède un éclat irrésistible. Tu es le premier Poète." Il dit, et disparut. Et alors le bienheureux fils de Pracetas, pour la première fois composa cette épopée, mutation du Verbe sacré parmi les hommes, – le Rāmāyaṇa.

⁴⁰ Note the very first verse of Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* (as quoted by Hacker 1953: 197/13):

*anādinidhanaṁ brahma śabdatattvaṁ yad akṣaram
vivartate'rthabhāvena prakriyā jagato yataḥ*

Das anfang- und endlose, unvergängliche Brahman, das das wahre Wesen des Wortes ist, das sich als die Dinge entfaltet, aus dem die Welt hervorgeht ...

REFERENCES

Baldissera, F.: 1996, 'Caṇḍikā/Caṇḍī, Vindhyaśāsini and Other Terrific Goddesses in the Kathāsaritsāgara'. In: A. Michaels et al. (eds.), *Wild Goddesses in India and*

- Nepal*. Proceedings of an International Symposium. Bern and Zurich, November 1994. Bern, 71–103.
- Bansat-Boudon, L.: 1998, *Théâtres indiens. Collection Puruṣārtha* 20. Paris.
- de Bruin, H.: 1999, *Kaṭṭaikkūttu. The Flexibility of a South Indian Theatre Tradition*. Groningen.
- Bühler, G.: 1886, *The Laws of Manu*, Reprint 1970. Delhi.
- Coulson, M.: 1981, *Three Sanskrit Plays*. Harmondsworth.
- Frasca, R.A.: 1990, *The Theater of the Mahābhārata. Terukkūttu Performances in South India*. Honolulu.
- Gerow, E.: 1971, *A Glossary of Indian Figures of Speech*. The Hague.
- Gerow, E.: 1979 and 1980, 'Plot Structure and the Development of *rasa* in the Śakuntalā, Pts I and II'. *JAOS* 99 (1979), 559–571 and *JAOS* 100 (1980), 267–282.
- Gerow, E.: 1985, 'Bhāsa's Ūrubhaṅga and Indian Poetics'. *JAOS* 105 (1985), 405–412.
- Hacker, P.: 1953, *Vivarta. Studien zur Geschichte der illusionistischen Kosmologie und der Erkenntnistheorie der Inder*. Wiesbaden.
- Heesterman, J.C.: 1957, *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration*. The Hague.
- Jaspart-Pansu, C.: 1998, 'La mise en abyme dans l'Uttararāmacarita de Bhavabhūti'. In: Bansat-Boudon, 123–136.
- Kāmasūtra*: 1964, Śrī Devdutta Śāstrī, *The Kāmasūtram of Śrī Vātsyāyana Muni. With the Jayamaṅgala Sanskrit Commentary of Śrī Yaśodhara*. Varanasi.
- Kölver, B.: 1991, 'Zur Frühgeschichte der Rasa-Lehre'. *BIS* 6, 21–48.
- Mahāvīracarita*: 1989, In: F. Grimal (ed.), *Le Mahāvīracarita de Bhavabhūti accompagné du commentaire de Vīrarāghava*. Pondichéry.
- Mānavadharmasāstra*: 1887, In: J. Jolly (ed.), *Mānava Dharmasāstra. The Code of Manu*. London.
- Mylius, K.: 1987, *Mallanāga Vātsyāyana. Das Kāmasūtra*. Wiesbaden.
- Nāṭyaśāstra*: 1992, 1934, 1954, 1964, In: M.R. Kavi and J.S. Pade (eds.), *Nāṭyaśāstra with the Commentary of Abhinavagupta*, Vols 1–4. Baroda.
- Raghavan, V.: 1963, *Bhoja's Śrīgāra Prakāśa*. Madras.
- Śakuntala*: 1876, In: M. Williams (ed.), *Śakuntalā. A Sanskrit Drama, in Seven Acts, by Kālidāsa. The Deva-Nāgarī Recension of the Text*. Oxford.
- Steiner, K.: 1997, *Anargharāghava. Das Schauspiel vom kostbaren Raghuproß. Einführung und Übersetzung*. Wiesbaden.
- Tieken, H.: 1989, 'The Structure of Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa*'. *StII* 15, 151–158.
- Tieken, H.: 1993, 'The So-called Trivandrum Plays Attributed to Bhāsa'. *WZKS* XXXIX, 5–44.
- Tieken, H.: 1997, 'Three Men in a Row (Studies in the Trivandrum Plays II)'. *WZKS* XLI, 17–52.
- Tieken, H.: 1998, review of L. Bansat-Boudon, *Poétique du théâtre Indien: Lectures du Nāṭyaśāstra*. Paris 1993. *Asian Folklore Studies* LVII (1998), 171–175.
- Tieken, H.: 1999, review of Steiner 1997. *WZKS* XLIII (1999), 257–260.
- Uttararāmacarita*: 1935, In: N. Stchoupak (ed.), *Uttararāmacarita (La dernière aventure de Rāma) Drame de Bhavabhūti*. Paris.