

Śānta with the Combination of Other Rasas

Kumburuwela Seelananda

Department of Classical Languages, University of Peradeniya

seelanandakumburuwela@yahoo.com

Keywords: Abhinavagupta, Ānandavardhana, ŚāntarasaKśemendra,
Viśvanātha

1. Introduction

The concept of *Rasa* (sentiment) has a very wide scope in the field of Sanskrit literary criticism. Even though Bharatanuni has not referred to *Śāntarasa* in his elaboration of eight *Rasas* in his *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Udbhata mentioned about it (in the ninth century CE) as the ninth one in his *Kāvyaḷaṅkārasārasaṅgraha*. Hence, different views on the very existence of *Śānta* emerged in the ninth century CE. Many rhetoricians and commentators have expressed their views on *Śāntarasa* from their own perspectives. In fact, the debate of the number of *Rasas* is still going on among the rhetoricians without agreement. For instance, even though Ānandavardhana, and Abhinavagupta have accepted *Śānta* as a *Rasa*, Dhanañjaya, and Dhanika objected for it being difficult to be employed in dramas. Hence, Dhanañjaya and Dhanika agreed with the eight *sthāyibhāvas* and their respective *Rasas*. The main objective of this study is thus to examine the place of *Śānta* in combination with other *Rasas*. Specifically, this research focuses on the definitions of *Śāntarasa* enumerated by the dominant rhetoricians between the ninth Century CE and the seventeenth century CE. Accordingly, Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyaloka*, Abhinavagupta's *Locana* to the former, Kśemendra's *Auciyavicāracarca*, and Vishvanātha's *Sāhityadharpaṇa* were used as primary texts in this research. By going through these texts, it is expected to discover the positions of different rhetoricians on *Santa*.

2. Literature Review

Following are some of the important works on this subject. "I.A. Richards and Indian Theory of Rasa" by Gupteshwar Prasad is a worthy comparison of the subject from both East and West points of view. Among the topics, it discusses allied and non-allied sentiments in the pages 247-248. *Dhvanyāloka* by Ānandavardhana provides an extended description on *Śāntarasa* in combination with other *Rasas* in his third (*Dhvanyāloka* – pp. 388-394) and fourth (*Dhvanyāloka* – pp. 529-533) chapters. Abhinavagupta comments on the same sections of Anandavardhana in his *Dhvanyālokalocana*. *Auciyavicāracarcā* by Kśemendra mentions *Śāntarasa* as a subordinate of other sentiments such as, erotic (*Śṛṅgāra*), pathetic (*Karuṇa*), and

disgustful (*Bībhatsa*). The third chapter of *Sāhityadarpaṇa* by *Viśvanāta* mentions how to define the main sentiment and its opposite sentiments in relation to *Śāntarasa* (*Sāhityadarpaṇa* – p. 180).

3. Research Methodology

This is a literature research. The aforementioned original poetic classical texts in Sanskrit along with the secondary sources were subjected to thorough research to arrive at conclusions. In order to understand *Śānta* with the specific combination of other *Rasas*, the comparative and analytical methods were used.

4. Results and Discussion

According to the point of view of Indian authors, *Rasas* which typically goes hand in hand with other *Rasas* are called '*Mitra Rasa*' and other *Rasas* which do not mix with other *Rasas* are called '*Śatru Rasa*'. However, according to Indian *Rasa* theory, it is impossible to draw an exact division as *Mitra* or *Śatru Rasas* since *Rasas* depend on the situation since one particular *Rasa* may be *Śatru* in relation to another *Rasa*, the same may be *Mitra* in relation to some other in a given situation. For instance, *Śānta* is a *Mitra Rasa* in relation to *Karuṇa* while it is being *Śatru* in relation to *Śṛṅgāra*, *Raudra*, *Bhayānaka* and *Hāsya* at the same time. On the other hand, *Śṛṅgāra* is a *Mitra Rasa* in relation to *Hāsya* and *Adbhūta* while *Hāsya* and *Śṛṅgāra* are *Śatru* in relation to *Karuṇa*.

Ānandavardhana defines *Śānta-Raudra* and *Śānta-Śṛṅgāra* as *Śatru Rasas*. According to Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyāloka*, if it is represented in opposition to *Vibhāva*, *Anubhāva* and *Vyabhicāribhāva* of main *Rasa* in one situation, it can demolish *Rasa*. If a poet portrays a person with a spiritual mind as a substratum of the sentiment tranquility and then makes the same person with a lover as a substratum in the setting of erotic sentiment, it is indeed a sentiment hinder. When a single sentiment is used as the key in a work, no other sentiment should be treated fully at the same time, regardless of it being unopposed or opposed to the principle sentiment. If a subsidiary sentiment is being treated fully, it should be at all events kept only as a subsidiary with persistency. If quietistic is the principal sentiment, the erotic should be lesser in importance and vice versa. He mentions that the sentiments, which are in opposition to each other can be represented in the same situation by introducing a third sentiment between the two opposite sentiments. The example is using *Śānta* and *Śṛṅgāra* in *Nāgānanda* drama with *Adbutarasa*.

In *Locana*, Abhinavagupta mentions *Vibhāvas* of *Hāsya-Śṛṅgāra*, *Vīra-Adbhūta*, *Raudra-Karuṇa*, *Bhayānaka-Bībhatsa*, are not in opposition to each other and he accepts Ānandavardhana's categorization. *Śānta* is the state of extinction of desires, tranquil devotion, and quietism. Hence, *Śānta* does not coexist with *Raudra* and

Śṛṅgāra. To get the attention of audience or to present the work with unique charm, the opposite sentiments can be brought, and it is not a flaw. In Kśemendra's point of view, *Śānta* is a prominent sentiment, whereas erotic (*Śṛṅgāra*), Pathetic (*Karuṇa*), and Disgustful (*Bībhatsa*) are component sentiments. According to Viśvanātha, the heroic is unreliable with the fearful and the quietistic (*Śānta*). The quietistic is opposed with heroic, the erotic, the furious, the comic and the fearful. Fearful is unreliable with the erotic, the heroic, the furious, the comic and the quietistic.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The present study makes several noteworthy contributions to describe *Śānta* in combination with other *Rasas*. In fact, according to the Indian *Rasa* theory, it is impossible to divide between *Mitra* or *Śatru Rasas* because they depend on the situation, and the combination of *Rasa* is very complicated because many rhetoricians have defined it differently. Thus, the research reveals that *Śānta-Raudra* and *Śānta-Śṛṅgāra* are opposed (*Śatru*) to each other and the perspectives of all rhetoricians can be accepted without any controversies.

6. References

- Gupteshwar, P. (1994). *I.A. Richards and Indian Theory of Rasa*. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons.
- Rāmaṣāraka and Patabhirama sastri, (1940). *Dhvanyālōka of Ānandavardhanāchārya with the locana of Abhinavagupta*. Benaras: Haridas Sanskrit Series.
- Āryendraśharma, (1961). *Kṣemendralaghukāvyaśamgraha*. Hyderabad: University of Usmaniya.
- Karunakar, P. (1938). *Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha*. Lahore: Motilal Banarsidas.