Rasa Theory

The word *rasa* within the Hindu context, specifically for certain devotional *bhakti* traditions, has come to refer to the ultimate experience of a transcendent and perfect love. This love engages pure emotions in any one of several eternal relationships with divinity, of greater or lesser levels of intensity of blissful intimacy that occur within the divine realm of *līlā* within which the acts or play of god take place. The complexity of the word can be accounted for by viewing its meanings that have traversed a wide spectrum of applications. The word’s meanings have been associated with a botanical substance, a sensory experience, an ontological significance, an aesthetic delight, a theological vision within *bhakti*. The religious meaning and significance of *rasa* and the development of a theory of an ultimate aesthetic principle called *rasa*, from the earliest usage in secular dramaturgy beginning around the 4th century CE up to its culmination in the *bhakti* tradition, especially of the → Caitanya school of → Gauḍiya Vaishnavism in the 16th century CE, is reviewed here.

The Sanskrit word *rasa* first appears in the hymns of the → Vedas. Its original meaning has to do with the botanical arena, its denotative meaning as simply the “sap” or “juice” from a plant, and by way of extension, the way in which sap or juice conduces to “taste,” a strong connotative sense of the word. These original meanings are usually associated with objects of this world. In the famed → Bhagavadgītā, we find the word occurring in five instances, carrying this meaning of human “taste” (2.59 [2x]; 7.8; 15.13; 17.10). However, there is one instance among these in which the divinity of → Kṛṣṇa identifies himself as *rasa*: “I am the taste (*rasa*) in water,” (*BhG. 7.8*). The divinity’s assertion “I am *rasa*” in the *Bhagavadgītā* imbues the term with greater theological significance and, again, anticipates later developments of the self (*→ ātman*) in relation to Kṛṣṇa who is eventually seen as the embodiment of all *rasa*.

From “sap” or “juice,” the meaning of the word *rasa* extended to the best or most essential part of anything. Thus one can observe how this broad definition takes the word further into its theological application as it is applied in the → Upaniṣads. Though the word appears many times in several of the earliest Upaniṣads, the specific instance within which the word appears in the *Taittiriyopaniṣad* had taken on significance for later *bhakti* schools. The passage reads:

Because truly that existence is auspiciously formed, *rasa* truly is that existence; for once one here reaches that *rasa*, this person becomes completely blissful. (*TaiU. 2.7.1*)

In this instance, the word *rasa* takes on a strong ontological dimension. The word’s meaning as “essence” as applied to botanicals in the Vedas is now applied to existence itself. Moreover, the state of blissfulness attained from having known or grasped this essence or *rasa* of existence has important soteriological implications.

This shift of meaning for the word from a more worldly referent in the Vedas to a more transcendent ontological referent in the Upaniṣads anticipated, perhaps even inspired, later *bhakti* theologians and theorists of *rasa* to engage the word theologically. Such a shift can be characterized as a move from the realm of the ordinary (*laukika*) arena of taste in this world and even beyond the extraordinary (*alaukika*) arena of the aesthetic that is yet still of this world, extending the extraordinary to the furthest reaches of the otherworldly realm of spiritual transcendence that also engages the extraordinary power of the aesthetic. Now let us turn to the Indian schools of dramaturgy and poetics in order to see how elements there have contributed to the religious understanding of *rasa* (see also → drama).

The earliest-known developed theory of *rasa* as an aesthetic concept is found in → Nātyaśāstra, attributed to Bharatamuni, a Sanskrit dramaturgical text which probably attained its final form between the 4th and 6th centuries CE (although likely a composite text with many contributors; on the date and authorship of → Nātyaśāstra, see Gerow, 1977, 227, 245; Haberman, 2003, xxxvi; see also → dance; → drama). The term is used there to describe the cumulative aesthetic effect of a dramatic performance. The text lists eight *rasas*:

• *śṛṅgāra*, “romance” or “passion”;
• *hāṣya*, “comedy”;
• *karuṇa*, “compassion”;
• *raudra*, “fury”;
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• *śṛṅgāra*, “romance” or “passion”;
• *hāṣya*, “comedy”;
• *karuṇa*, “compassion”;
• *raudra*, “fury”;
• viśra, “heroism”
• bhayānaka, “horror”;
• bibhatsā, “revulsion”;
• adbhuta, “amazement.”

Although these rasas are each connected with a particular emotion (bhāva), they were not in themselves emotions, exactly. Rather, Nāṭyaśāstra describes rasa as an aesthetic taste experienced by the audience after witnessing the portrayal of emotional components on the stage.

These components of emotion were categorized into four different types:

• sthāyibhāvas, “foundational emotions”;
• vyabhicāribhāvas, “transient emotions”;
• anubhāvas, “emotional reactions”;
• vibhāvas, “catalysts of emotion.”

The sthāyibhāvas are eight in number, each one giving rise to one of the eight rasas. They are, respectively:

• rati, “love”;
• hāsa, “jest”;
• śoka, “sorrow”;
• krodha, “anger”;
• utsāha, “willpower”;
• bhaya, “fear”;
• jugupsā, “disgust”;
• vismaya, “astonishment.”

That these emotional states are foundational means that they are capable of being sustained over the course of an entire play. As E. Gerow notes,

The dominant emotion [sthāyibhāva] is of course lost irretrievably if for a moment the sequence of events fails, is incoherent or confused, or if it does not reflect the sthāyibhāva itself at all times. (Dimock et al., 1974, 134)

By contrast, the 33 vyabhicāribhāvas listed in Nāṭyaśāstra manifest only temporarily, shifting with the course of the plot’s development. For example, in a love story, a heroine’s initial bashfulness may demonstrate her love for the hero, while later her jealousy may demonstrate the same love.

The anubhāvas essentially represent the emotion-driven behavior enacted on stage. It includes both volitional actions such as raising the eyebrows or gesturing with the hand as well as comparably involuntary bodily states such as perspiring or developing goosebumps. The actors were supposed to be able to display these latter as well on demand. A set list of eight such involuntary states is given in Nāṭyaśāstra under the name of sāttvikabhāvas: being stunned, perspiring, developing goosebumps, having one’s voice altered, shivering, changing color (e.g. become pale or red), crying, and fainting. These eight and the term used for them are not clearly distinguished from other anubhāvas in Nāṭyaśāstra, although later writers treated them as a separate category.

Finally, the vibhāvas include all of the various components of the drama whereby the appropriate emotions are evoked. This includes the setting as represented by stage props, the events of the play, as well as the characters portrayed.

In explaining how “the sthāyibhāvas attain the status of rasa,” Nāṭyaśāstra offers what has become perhaps the most foundational statement about rasa:

By arranging the vibhāvas, anubhāvas, and vyabhicāribhāvas in proper combination, rasa arises. (Nāṭś a. 6.32)

Later theorists utilized the ambiguity of this statement to develop theories of how rasa is experienced by a religious practitioner. However, in the dramaturgical context of Nāṭyaśāstra, this statement may best be read as explaining that in order for the audience to enjoy rasa while observing the play’s portrayal of the sthāyibhāva, all the various components of the play, from the props and costumes to the actor’s ability to cry or laugh in just the right manner, must work together harmoniously.

As the theory of rasa developed after Nāṭyaśāstra, many components of the theory became subject to varying interpretations. Some of these centered around apparent ambiguities in Nāṭyaśāstra itself, while others were based on some theorists’ willingness to depart from its presentation. Debates about two components of the theory played an especially important role in the development of its religious applications. The first is the distinction of rasa from ordinary emotion, along with the implications this has for the question of who can experience rasa. The second is the issue of how many rasas there are and the identity of those rasas.

While Nāṭyaśāstra does specify that it is the audience that experiences rasa, the text does not explicitly deny the ability of others – the playwright,
the actors, or the characters themselves – to experience *rasa*. Further, while *Nātyaśāstra* does clearly distinguish between *rasas* and *bhāvas* (ordinary emotions), some of the language it uses is ambiguous and could be read as implying that one’s experience of ordinary emotion could be heightened into *rasa*. However, Abhinavagupta, a 10th–11th century Kashmir Śaiva (see Kashmir Šaivism) and the author of one of the most influential commentaries on the *Nātyaśāstra*, the *Abhinavabhāratī*, does very clearly and explicitly deny that anyone other than the audience can experience *rasa*, a claim that has generally been viewed as the orthodox position, at least up to the late medieval period.

His doing so goes hand in hand with a repeated emphasis on the *alaukika* (extraordinary) nature of *rasa*. Most traditional texts on *rasa* do claim *rasa* to be *alaukika*, and the seeds of this claim can be found in *Nātyaśāstra*, but the term itself is quite ambiguous. It derives from the word *loka* which is often translated simply as “world.” Thus, *laukika* could be taken to mean “worldly” with its opposite, *alaukika*, meaning “otherworldly.” And in some of the most religiously focused discussions of *rasa*, it does have something like this sense. However, as *loka* can also mean “populace,” *alaukika* can be taken in the simpler sense of “not in the manner of common people,” or more simply, “extraordinary” or “special.” For example, in Sanskrit commentary literature, glosses that simply paraphrase a complex word are considered *laukika*, while those that cite technical grammatical rules to explain the words formation are *alaukika*.

For Abhinavagupta, *rasa* is *alaukika* in the sense that the experience of *rasa*, as distinct from ordinary emotional experiences, requires of the audience a process of abstracting and generalizing emotional experience (*sādhanānīkaranāna*). A sympathetic audience member (*sahṛdaya*) must be able to identify with the characters in the portrayal of emotion on the stage or in the poem. However, since the concrete details of his or her own emotional experiences are distinct from those of the characters represented, the identification can only take place on the level of the abstract essence of the emotion. This process of abstraction parallels the process of trying to understand the identity of one’s own self with the absolute, *brahman*, in Abhinavagupta’s Kashmir Śaivism as well as in other philosophical tradi-

tions in India espousing ultimate oneness. Abhinavagupta does make clear distinctions between the audience’s experience of *rasa* and the religious practitioner’s enlightened experience of *brahman*; the former is temporary while the latter is not. Nevertheless, both are of the nature of bliss and the former could be seen as helping to lead to the latter.

Abhinavagupta’s strict claim that only the audience can experience *rasa*, however, was not the only position taken. Abhinavagupta quotes earlier writers, Danḍi (7th cent.) and Bhaṭṭa Lollāṭa (9th cent.), who see *rasa* as a heightened form of emotion, rather than as something fundamentally distinct. The latter theorist explicitly states that the characters represented and even the actors can also experience *rasa*. This line of thinking was later taken up by Bhoja (11th cent.) and became the foundation for Vaiśnavas who spoke about *rasa* in the context of *bhakti* (devotion). In the 13th century, Hemādri wrote a commentary on Vopadeva’s *Mukṭāphala* entitled *Kaivalyadīpikā*, where all of the components of *Nātyaśāstra*’s theory of *rasa* are enumerated in relation to *Viśnu*. Here, Viśnu’s devotees are both listed in the category of *vibhāva* as characters in the story as well as identified as those who experience *rasa*.

This devotional turn of the *rasa* theory finds it most thorough and influential expression in the writings of Rūpa Gosvāmī (16th cent.), the preeminent theorist on *rasa* in the *bhakti* tradition. Rūpa was a theologian, poet, and playwright who, as a close associate and student of the Bengali saint *Caitanya*, played a founding role in his school of Vaiśnava devotion (Gauḍīya Vaiśnavism). In his work, we find a culmination of the development of *rasa* theory. Rūpa Gosvāmī’s achievement was conceiving the *rasas* specifically as *bhaktirasas*, the truest and highest forms of *rasa*. These are manifested eternally in the heaven beyond all heavens, *Kṛṣṇa’s* world of intimate divine acts, or *līlās*, and thus Rūpa Gosvāmī places *bhaktirasas* at the furthest reaches of what is understood as *alaukika*.

For Abhinavagupta, transcendence is impersonal and nondescript, and so the experience of an *alaukika rasa* requires abstraction from all personal details. However, in Rūpa Gosvāmī’s understanding, the person and the detailed personal characteristics of *Kṛṣṇa* and of his associates are all fully transcendent, beyond the temporal and finite nature of this world. Thus, the
emotions experienced by Kṛṣṇa and his associates, the “characters” of the divine līlās, are themselves alaukika, and are experienced directly as rasa. Kṛṣṇa’s līlās in which one finds the higher and more intimate rāgas are not just extraordinary, and not just otherworldly, but are located at the very pinnacle and center of the divine. Put simply, rasa finds its original source in the person and divinity of Kṛṣṇa, and its true forms manifest between Kṛṣṇa and his eternal associates within his transcendent acts or līlās, celebrating supreme love.

Still, Rūpa Gosvāmī recognized the power of the arts to evoke rasa in an audience. He wrote plays and poems and prescribed giving audience to artistic representations of Kṛṣṇa’s līlās as a central devotional practice, whereby a devotee could cultivate the experience of rasa. The composition of such literature was also recognized as a mode of devotional practice. Further, Rūpa Gosvāmī outlined a method of devotional practice known as rāgānuṣṭhāna wherein one becomes, through meditation, something like an actor imitating the role of one of Kṛṣṇa’s associates in the divine play of līlā. So ultimately for Rūpa Gosvāmī, the experience of rasa was available to all involved: to the poet or playwright, to the audience, to the actors and, most of all, to the characters themselves, Kṛṣṇa and his beloved companions.

For Rūpa Gosvāmī, rasa was not merely a “taste,” but a transcendent sensorial experience through the spiritual body of the advanced bhakta (devotee); rasa was not merely the essence of all existence as brahman, but finds its source at the very heart of brahman as the personal deity, Bhagavān; rasa was not merely aesthetic delight, but an experience of spiritual delight that supersedes all other experiences; rasa was not merely to be found in otherworldly realms, but specifically in the highest heaven of the divinity; and finally rasa was not merely referring to the most intimate and ultimate relationships with Kṛṣṇa as something to be observed as an audience in relation to a drama, but it was something in which the bhakta participated directly as an actor in the divine līlā. These various meanings of rasa now become engaged at the highest levels of and the furthest reaches of the alaukika. Indeed, the very first words of Rūpa Gosvāmī’s seminal work on bhaktirasa, titled Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu, he understands the ultimate and most intimate form of the godhead, identified as the divinity of Kṛṣṇa, as “the very embodiment of the essence of all rāgas” (BṛhaAm. 1.1.1).

Regarding the number and identity of the rāgas, there were theorists who denied the validity of some of Nātyaśāstra’s seight rāgas, such as bibhatsā (revulsion). Others, such as Bhoja, claimed that there is only one true rasa, a move with substantial theological significance. If the legitimacy of other rāgas was recognized, they were seen as merely varieties of the one true rasa. However, it was the addition of a ninth rasa, sānta, “peacefulness,” that played the most central role in solidifying the connection between rasa theory and theology in India. While the early outlines of a theoretical foundation for sāntarasa were likely established largely by Jaina and Buddhist writers, it is Abhinavagupta who provides us with one of the earliest extant thorough treatments of sāntarasa in his Abhinavabhārati. Sāntarasa became so religiously significant because of its close parallels, if not identity, with liberation (mokṣa) from the cycle of birth and death within worldly existence (samsāra), the ultimate goal of human life (puruṣārtha) according to many Hindu thinkers.

After Abhinavagupta, a number of additional rāgas become proposed. Most notable are three that are connected with modes of love, though, in contrast to śṛṅgārārasa, not romantic love: vātsalya (tenderness), preyas (camaraderie), and prīta (veneration). In addition, some, particularly Vaiṣṇava thinkers, began to argue for bhakti (devotion) as a rasa, substantially bridging the gap between rasa as an aesthetic element and as a religious one. Again, the reconsideration, in the context of bhakti, of the number and identity of the rāgas finds its most elaborate expression in the writings of Rūpa Gosvāmī.

Rūpa Gosvāmī makes four important innovations in this regard. First, he reconceptualizes the role of rati (love) from being the sthāyibhāva of only śṛṅgārārasa, to being, with various specifications, the sthāyibhāva of all forms of bhaktirasa. Second, he brings together Nātyaśāstra’s eight rāgas, the sāntarasa popularized by Abhinavagupta, and the three rāgas mentioned above, setting on a total of twelve rāgas. Third, he divides these twelve rāgas into two distinct groups with five primary and seven secondary rāgas. Finally, he shows how even within the primary rāgas, there is a hierarchical ranking of the rāgas based on intensity and intimacy.
As Rūpa Gosvāmī is concerned not just with rasa, but with bhaktirasa, the sthāyibhāva (foundational emotion) for each rasa must be a certain kind of intensely emotional love for the divinity as the supreme beloved, Kṛṣṇa. Thus, he reconceptualizes the role of rati (love) amongst the sthāyibhāvas. In the Nātyaśāstra, rati is the sthāyibhāva for śrīgārarasa (romance or passion). However, in Rūpa Gosvāmī’s theory, various modes of rati are the sthāyibhāvas for each rasa. For example, the Nātyaśāstra lists vismaya (astonishment) as the sthāyibhāva for adbhutarasa (amazement). Rūpa Gosvāmī, by contrast, lists visnayrati (love arising from astonishment) as the sthāyibhāva for adbhutabhaktirasa (the rasa of devotion in amazement). This same pattern is found for all of the pairs of sthāyibhāvas and rasas. However, for rati itself, Rūpa Gosvāmī substitutes madhurarati (love in its sweetest form) and for śrīgārarasa, substitutes madhurabhaktirasa (the rasa of the sweetest devotion), indicating that of all the relationships between the supreme divinity and his devotees, the intimate and passionate nature of romantic love makes it the sweetest of all forms of love.

As mentioned above, Rūpa Gosvāmī discusses a total of twelve rasas, but divides them into five primary rasas and seven secondary rasas. The secondary forms of rasa perform a supportive and adjunctive function in relation to the primary rasas. Any one of the secondary rasa can be temporarily experienced within any one of the sustained primary rasas. Although they are temporary, they nevertheless create a deeper impression on the devotee’s heart than the vyābhicāribhāvas (transient emotions). The secondary rasas represent different shades of love in the primary rasas, and they are as follows:

- hāsya, “comedy”;
- adbhuta, “amazement”;
- vīra, “heroism”;
- karuna, “compassion”;
- raudra, “fury”;
- bhayānaka, “horror”;
- bibhatsa, “revulsion.”

That Rūpa Gosvāmī does not reject these as varieties of bhaktirasa, but shows in detail how they arise within the experience of the primary rasas, evinces the nuanced sophistication of his theory.

The five primary rasas that Rūpa Gosvāmī illuminates are all essentially one, because they each consist of preman, or “purest love” for Kṛṣṇa. In order to satisfy the different types of bhaktas, and according to different levels of intensity and intimacy of feeling or bhāva within the love found in bhaktirasa, Rūpa Gosvāmī recognizes the following five, beginning with the least intense and moving to the highest and most intense fifth rasa, as expressed by their names:

- śānta, “peacefulness”;
- prīta, “veneration”;
- preyas, “camaraderie”;
- vātsalya, “tenderness”;
- madhura, “sweetness.”

In the following, the characteristics of the five rasas are described in relation to one another:

Reverential Love (Śāntarasa)
The soul loves the divine beloved from a distance, as a great and powerful emperor is loved by subjects who are not personally serving him. Here the soul is removed from the direct presence of the beloved, due to the soul’s awareness of his or her finite existence in relation to the overwhelming majesty and omnipresence of the Lord. This love is characterized as quiet veneration and admiration; reverential love is passive and contemplative, unlike the dynamic and more intimate forms of love that follow.

Subservient Love (Dāsyarasa)
The soul loves the beloved actively and more closely, as personal servants love and directly serve their king. Here the soul is in a submissive position to the beloved, who is in a superior position. This love is characterized as obedient service. The distance between the soul and god in reverential love is replaced by dynamic service in subservient love, although the relationship here remains formal.

Mutual Love (Sakhyarasa)
The soul loves the beloved more intimately in mutuality and equality, as a friend loves a companion. The endearing love of close friendships is now experienced with the supreme beloved, who places himself on an equal level with the soul.
This love is characterized by confidential, even playful and affectionate exchanges. Mutual love constitutes a greater level of intimacy with the divine, since the superior position of the beloved is no longer acknowledged.

**Nurturing Love (Vātsalyarasa)**

The soul loves the beloved even more deeply and tenderly, as a parent loves a child. The soul’s love for the beloved is from a higher or superior “parental” position as the soul cares for and protects the beloved, who in turn exhibits dependency upon the soul. This love is characterized by adoration and nurturing affection; here, the carefree and casual familiarity of mutual love is replaced by a constant mindfulness and sense of responsibility for the wellbeing of the beloved.

**Passionate Love (Śrīngārarasa)**

The soul loves the beloved in the most intimate way, as a lover loves a beloved in a conjugal, pre-marital, or extramarital relationship. It is the most confidential form of love, and the intensity of amorous feelings exchanged represents the greatest attainable intimacy in rasa. This love is characterized by total self-surrender of the lover in an exclusive passionate union with the divine, often heightened by periods of intense separation. Essential elements of all four previous rasa are present within this highest rasa (Schweig, 2005, 100–101).

It should be noted that these rasas are not categories in the strictest sense, because each higher rasa incorporates selective aspects from the lower rasas. Certain elements within each rasa are unique, and others are transferred or carried over into the higher rasas in more intensified forms (for an extended discussion, see Caitanyacaritāmṛta, Madhyalīlā 19; trans. Kavirāja & Prabhupada, 1975). The school views these five types of intimacy with the deity collectively, as hierarchically arranged stages of love. Each rasa, beginning with śāntarasa and proceeding to śrīngārarasa, represents a higher intensity of love and progressively greater level of intimacy. Yet each rasa, in and of itself, is also recognized as a perfection of love for the divine. Even so, the rasa of passionate love as śrīngāra or madhura is regarded as the ultimate perfection among all perfect rasas.

For Rūpa Gosvāmī, the aesthetic and the sacred merge, synergistically enhancing one another, allowing the divine to descend to this world in tangible ways. In point of fact, Rūpa Gosvāmī wrote poetry and dramas embelishing and expanding upon the divine otherworldly līlā of Kṛṣṇa, bringing, as it were, the alaukika into this world, the laukika. Now we have come full circle. It was bhaktirasa that is found only in and goes to the furthest reaches of the divine world, and yet it is also something that gets enacted here on the stage of this human life in which one is completely absorbed and devoted to Kṛṣṇa in all that one does, sādhanabhakti, or the practice of bhakti. Thus bhaktirasa is something ultimately manifested fully within the heart of the bhakta in this world, something that is also simultaneously occurring in the highest of all heavens.

The paradigmatic līlā that Rūpa Gosvāmī draws from for his explications and examples of bhaktirasa are those found within the sacred text of the much loved Bhāgavatapurāṇa (→ Purāṇas). It is regarded as the holiest of all scriptures by Rūpa Gosvāmī and the Caitanya school. Kṛṣṇa’s divine līlā as found especially within the famed book 10 of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, and especially those known as the vrajalīlās, that is, those adored childhood acts of Kṛṣṇa that take place in the pastoral village known as Vraja, are held most closely to the bhakta’s heart and are meditated upon ceaselessly. The theologians of the Caitanya school point out that these līlās related in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa are those that once took place in this world, within the celebrated sacred geography of Vraja, simultaneously mirroring the purest form of these līlās in the highest regions of the divine world. Again, we have the laukika and alaukika dialectic appearing here. The alaukika rasa pierce the limited everyday world and appear within the laukika.

Among all the various līlās of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, presenting the more intimate rasas, namely, those of sakhyā, vātsalya, and especially śrīngāra, the most famous and most celebrated and loved of all līlā sis the one known as the rāsalīlā, a līlā that occurs in five contiguous chapters (Bhāgp. 10.29–33; see also → drama and theatre). Here the word rāsa (to be distinguished from rasa without the first long “a”) refers to a special annual circle dance that celebrates the harvest season. Yet, theologians of the Caitanya school consider the word rāsa also to mean the culmination of rasas, and also emphasize how the rāsalīlā is the essence of all līlās. This ultimate and supreme expression of love in bhaktirasa is found in the Vraja gopikās, the cowherd maidens of
Vraja, who are Kṛṣṇa’s most intimate beloveds, and the rāsalīlā is the grand display of supreme love between them and Kṛṣṇa. The rasa of the eternal dance of divine love as the rāsa symbolizes how the divinity and the devotee are utterly subsumed by love, the former becomes forgetful of his infinitude and the latter forgetful of their finitude, as they become absorbed and swept up into rasa of the highest order. As one of the lines in the rāsalīlā verses expresses,

[T]hus he [Kṛṣṇa] allowed himself to be subdued by those nights made so brilliant by the rays of the moon… Inspiring the narrations and poetry of autumn, all those moonlit nights found their refuge in rasa. (BhāgP 10.33.26)
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