CHAPTER II

ORDINARY WORLD

AND

THE WORLD OF ART
Ordinary World:

Ordinary world means our day-to-day world of experience. It explains reality, meaning and purpose of life. It exhorts the people to think clearly, act effectively and to live decently. Naturally, Philosophy in India began in reflections on the problem of human existence, the place of man in the universe, the meaning and purpose of life.

So, "this world is the world with which we all behave throughout our life. We know everything in this world i.e. it's form, it's colour etc. and every thing from the time I get up from my bed in the morning till I go to sleep at night. Whatever I do is to be taken as my behaviour. It is preceded by the knowledge of that thing. Thus, we know the world and then we behave with that world."

The cognition of the world is our experience, the content of the cognition is this world of our experience. That means, there is jñāna and in jñāna, there is viśāya. This viśāya is our ordinary world and this is our world which has existence. It is revealed by the knowledge. For example, after a potter has produced a pot, when we see the pot our seeing does not produce the pot, our seeing simply reveals the pot which is produced by the potter. This is how a realist will explain.

On the other hand, there is a great difference in the philosophy of an idealist. He will say that the world is a mental concept and it is projected by our mind outside. If we say that the world of our experience has no reality at all, how can we explain our own behaviour with this world? Therefore, it is necessary for us, at least to assume it's reality. The content (that is the world) continues to be real and continuance

---
to be ultimately real according to the realists. So, there is a potter, there is a pot. In the place of potter, we may have God to explain the reality of the world. Potter needs materials: earth, a wheel, a stick to rotate the wheel and produce the pot. The God as a potter also needs material. He cannot produce it by magic from nothing. A Potter in an ordinary experience requires mud. The God also requires materials for creation. Therefore, there has to be material available to the God out of which he will produce this pot of the universe. He is a potter. So, he is creator. And it is the same sense to a potter creating a pot. Once he creates it. At last, the world comes into existence. Actually what has come into existence? Materials were given to him and out of materials the effect has come into existence. The agency of the God is limited to the extent of bringing into existence an effect. The God creates something out of what is already available to him.

If he is also to create the material, he will need further material to create material and that material will also need further material and that material will also need further material to create it. So, where should it begin? We can never explain, in that case, this world. Therefore, it is logical to say that He is given materials and He creates this universe out of those materials. The realists, therefore, think that the God is there to create something out of the given materials. He does not create the primary materials? Because otherwise, such type of question will never end. The logic will never stop us from asking from what that material is created. It will never end. So, it will lead us to endless regression. Therefore, the system has realised that if we want to explain the creation of this universe, we must begin from somewhere. If we want to maintain that it is not created, then we are not required to begin from any entity. In that case many metaphysical problems will remain unsolved.

So, if the Mimāṃsaka's think that the world has never been like this, it has like this (Va kadačit anīdrāṃ jagat) all the time, then he is not required to explain the origin of the universe and naturally he does not require to posit any God.
It is only when we want to show that it is created. We need a creator and once we accept that He is a creator, we have to accept that there should be materials available to him. The Indian logicians do think in this line. Thus, according to them, this world is created, it comes into existence and is real, like a pot. It is *satya* as against *asatya*. The God can’t create a sky-flower. A sky-flower is *asatya* or fiction. It is created by our mind. We know that what the sky is, we also know that what a flower is, we make a combination and we say : a sky-flower. We also know what a horn is and now we say : a rabbit’s horn. Those things are created by our mind, these things are *asyata*, they have no existence, no reality. And therefore, the question about the creation of such things doesn’t arise. Our world is not like this. Our world is *satya* and as it is *satya*, it can be created. But for the creation we need knowledge. For example, if we want to create cloth, we need the knowledge of cloth. And also we need the knowledge about instrument by which we can create cloth. We should need the knowledge of threads. It is not possible that creation of these things is done by themselves. Therefore, we need someone to make them. Logic requires someone to explain the creation of the world and that knower, explainer, creator is the God. Because the God alone can know everything. We can’t have that qualification. We can’t be *sarvajña*. But we need someone who can be called a *sarvajña* (all-knower). Once He is posited, one will have to accept many qualities in that entity called God in order to explain the creation of this world. Once, it is created, the world is real. This is the explanation of the logical system. This system argues that knowledge does not create the world. On the other hand, knowledge reveals the world.

The world is a *padārtha* for this school of thought. What is a *padārtha*? *Padārtha* means ‘*padasya arthaḥ*’. What is the world after all? In our surrounding there are many things i.e. tree, flower, x, y, z etc. So, it is a collection of these entities. The world consists of a chair, a table, you, me, a tree, a flower, a road, a university etc.-etc. Then this is what the world is. So, it is a bundle of entities.
Thus, the world is a bundle, a collection, a set of entities. These entities can be referred to by pada. There are referents of the words and the world can be referred to by them. The world can be expressed in this way. This is the meaning of the word 'padārtha' (padasya arthaḥ). Arthaḥ is a referent, pada is a word. The world, in whatever form it appears is the content of our cognition. But when can we refer to it? When we know it. If we know this world we can refer to it? When we know it. If we know this world we can refer to it. This implies that when we say that the world is a referent it means that it is knowable. Unless it is knowable it can’t be namable. Unless we know a thing it can’t be given a name. Because we have called the world as padārtha. It means jñeya. The world is abhidheya and this implies that it is jñeya. Because without being jñeya it can’t be abhidheya.

jñeya means jñāna-viśaya.

abhidheya means abhidhā-viśaya.

It can be an object of a cognition and it can be an object of reference, an object of expression. So, our world is a padārtha, it implies that it is jñeya and it is abhidheya. And what can be the common characteristics of the world? The answer of the question is that the world possesses knowability and namability. What is knowable and what is namable has existence and hence this world has existence and it is real.

Padārtha is an entity. The world is an entity, a set of entities, a set of reals. This padārtha is of two kinds:

Entity (padārtha)

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Positive} & \quad \text{Negative} \\
(bhāva) & \quad (abhāva)
\end{align*} \]

(figure 1)*

This claim of logicians is very important from the philosophical point of view. We see that the world is knowable and namable. Such world can be either positive or negative. If we say that there is a pot, which is produced, it means it is an effect- \textit{kārya}. What is a \textit{kārya}? That which didn’t exist earlier and which comes to exist later is called \textit{kārya}. The process of creation is nothing else bringing into existence that which did not exist earlier. A Potter brings a pot into existence. As there are pots, so also there is absence of pot. Thus, any positive product has also an absence of it. Thus, the world consists of \textit{bhāva} and \textit{abhāva}.

Let us apply another parameter now. In this world \textit{padārtha} has been divided into two parts: 1. external and 2. internal.

\[ \text{Padārtha} \]
\[ \downarrow \]
\[ \text{External} \quad \text{Internal} \]

For any individual, there are certain things which are only in him. For example, his cognition, his knowledge, happiness, sorrow, etc. We don’t have any direct access to these. Even one does not have any direct access to one’s knowledge or desire. But it is not the fact that they don’t exist, they do exist. So, desire exists, knowledge exists. Knowledge is real, desire is real. And these are \textit{padārtha}, because there are knowable. I can have knowledge of knowledge. When I say that I can have knowledge of knowledge, I mean, that I am aware that I have knowledge. Awareness of knowledge is knowledge of knowledge. We call it by the term \textit{anuvyavasāya}. (\textit{anu} means afterward. \textit{vyavasāya} means awareness.) After the knowledge arises, we can be aware that there has arisen knowledge in the awareness, indicates that we can have knowledge of knowledge. Knowledge can be known. So, knowability is here and we can express it. What kind of knowledge we have?
The answer of this question is that we can tell that this is my or our knowledge. That means, that is expressible. So, knowledge is knowable and knowledge is expressible. Therefore, it is an entity. Where does it exist? It exists entirely in the world. According to western philosopher, such type of entities are called private entities (as against public). A garden is public like a tree, a flower, building etc. Whatever is knowable by all is called public. But desire is private. Actually, internal things are private. All these entities will be the entities of internal world of a particular person. But the whole world consists of internal and external entities. Whenever we say that the world is knowable, that means external entities and internal entities are knowable. But when we say that the world is expressible, that means the external and internal entities are expressible.

So, entire world is classified into seven sets of entities. They are called sapta-padartha. The whole world is nothing but seven sets of entities.

(Figure 2)*

We are concentrating on the categorization of the world of our experience. This world is called padārtha. Padārtha is an entity. An entity is what has an existence and which is real. It is of two kinds: 1. positive (bhāva) and 2. negative (abhāva). Positive entities are six. Negative entities are four. The six positive entities are dravya, guṇa, karman, sāmānya, višeṣa and samavāya. The four negative entities are pragabhāva, dhvaṁsa, atyantābhāva and anyonyābhāva. Anyonyabhāva is mutual absence. Atyantabhāva is called an absolute absence. Dravya is further divided into 9 subsets. Guṇa can be divided into 24, Karma-5, Samānya-2, Viṣaya innumerable, Samavāya only 1, Anyonyabhāva of 1 and Atyantabhāva-3.

One of the 9 in the set of dravya is prthivi and then we come down to the ordinary experience. Prthivi can be further divided into ghaṭa, paṭa, etc. Another set of dravya is jala, which can be divided into ice, ocean, river. Another set of dravya is air which can be divided as the external air and the air inside us. Another set of dravya is fire which can be further divided as the electricity, fire stimulating digestion. These lower items are existing in the world of our experience. And now we are categorising the world of our experience. We find the ghaṭa is there, paṭa is there, puṣpa is there. We are forming a category of all these things as prthivi. In our world of experience, similary we find water, ice. For them we are preparing a category called ap. In the same way, in our world of experience, we find electricity, thunder, the fire that helps our digestion when we are eating. These we are including in the category named tejas. This is the way how from the ordinary world of our experience, we are preparing categorical terms. We are trying to bring ordinary things into a class, into a set. There we have a set of earthly substances, here a set of waterly substances and so on. And as all these are being substances. We are giving them another name - dravya.
In the same manner, guna includes colours - white, yellow, blue etc. We call them all rūpa. Under rūpa, we have white, yellow, green.......  

(figure 3)*

In the lower part, we have included the objects of our ordinary experience of colours. But all these, we are calling by a cover term, colour (rūpa). Colour is a cover term for specific colours. Even in an ordinary world of experience, we can see that a human being keeps on categorizing. That is one of the reasons why a human being is called a rational being. We can't call a human being a rational being if he does not follow a pattern. That is what a human being is doing even in a common experience.

But an analyst or a philosopher is trying to categorize the entire universe. And he takes an example from whatever ordinary human beings are doing. And from that he further extends that activity and starts categorizing the whole world. In the lower part, this is the ordinary world of experience. From that he goes up creating a cover term to include a number of entities under one head, prthivi (earth), for example. And what can be included under the cover term prthivi also came from ordinary experience.

The world around us is absolutely real, it is namable and knowable. The world around us is a referent of padas. And the general definition of the world is that which can be referred to. If one claims that one can refer to a sky-flower, it is a false claim. What we are referring to is a flower which has been created by our mind. It does not form an entity in the world of reality according to the Indian logicians.

* Ibid. Introduction Part
The World of Art:

Our awareness as to our being indebted to ‘art’ is not that strong. It is because we do not have any clear conception of the meaning of the word ‘art’. We hesitate to find any essence in works of art. We sometimes feel that the works of art have no relevance to our life. Art is for Art and it has nothing to do with our lives. This is a common impression.

The fact is this - a literary artist creates his own world and also creates a language to describe that created world. Actually, an ordinary speaker takes the listener to the world with which the listener is already familiar and therefore, he understands the speaker’s sentence and the rapport is established between two, the ordinary speaker and the ordinary listener. But it is not the case with a literary language. The reader is not so easily taken to the world which the poet or a literary artist is presenting.

“The reader requires to be familiar with that created world and the created language to describe that world and after he is acquainted with these, he understands the language of the literary artist, and the rapport is established. The ordinary world is not created by any literary artist. It is given to him. He creates the new world by manipulating this given world. His creativity lies only in re-arranging the elements of the given world. His genius transforms the ordinary elements of the world and a world of a creative literary artist.”¹

It is clear that he gives a magic touch and the ordinary world starts appearing in a beautiful form. Actually, an artist transforms this very ordinary world of our experience into the world of art. There is another point to be noted here: Somerest Maugham attempts to distinguish the world from Art. “The author does not only

write when he is at his desk. He writes all day long, when he is thinking, when he is reading, when he is experiencing. Everything he sees and feels is significant to his purpose and consciously or unconsciously, he is for ever storing and making over his impressions.”¹

Marin Worte says, “It seems to me that the true artist must perforce, go from time to time to the elemental big forms - Sky, Sea, Mountain, Plains - and those things pertaining there to, to sort of re-true himself up, to recharge the battery. For, these big forms have everything. But to express these, you have to love these, to be a part of these in sympathy. Here we see that what is essential is not mere objective cognition of variety of the world, but sympathetic interpenetration with its various elements and its life.”²

“On the other hand, the experience is not a complete donation of the outside world to the human spirit. As Abrams has emphasised in his study of romantic poetry, the artist is not content merely to hold the mirror up to nature, but seeks to cast over the world, ‘the light that never was on sea or land, the conecration and the poet’s dream.’ Wordsworth revealed the true nature of the bipolar field of interaction which is aesthetic experience when he said that the imagination was ‘creator and receiver both’ and when he described himself as a lover of all the might world of eye and ear - both what they half-create and what perceive.”³

“When he (the artist) has succeeded in dissolving the world in his pure subjectivity.” Worte Gentile says, “that is to say, in feeling it, then only can he express it, drawing from himself what has flowed into him, and analysing in the light of consciousness the dim and formless matter within him, the mere feeling.”⁴

² Ibid P. 34.
³ Ibid P. 35.
⁴ Ibid P. 35.
"Ānandavardhana wants to make it clear beyond any ambiguity that the supreme position is reserved for creative imagination. He says that if the poet has the creative power (sakti or pratibhā) the defects that may arise from the lack of culture or learning will be cancelled, whereas, if the poet is deficient in it, and he has only learning, the defects in his composition will stand out as conspicuous features unassimilated into the poetic organism."¹

Kuntaka (950 A.D.), who formulated a significant theory of poetic expression which we shall discuss later agreed in deriving the unique quality of poetic expression from the activity of the poetic consciousness (kavi-karma).

"As indicated above, the poetic genius creates a new world with the help of the given world. His art is called kavi-vyāpāra or kavi-karma, 'the work of a literary artist'. The creation by an artist is an re-arrangement of things already given to him: A literary artist has complete freedom. He can transform an inanimate into an animate and an animate into inanimate. The flowers may start speaking and a living being may start behaving like an inanimate.... Acetanān cetanavat, cetanān, acetanavat...."²

It is the genius of an artist that arranges the ordinary world in a new order and thereby creates a new world. Therefore, it is rightly observed that a literary artist creates or transforms this world the way he likes it. In this respect he behaves like the creator of the universe.

\[
apāre kavisamsāre \\
kavir ekaḥ prajāpatiḥ \\
yathāsnai rocate viśvam \\
tathānām parivartate \|
\]

1. Ibid P. 37
The artist is the creator and his art is a representation of his universe. His universe is created by himself. He is the only creator of that world. He enjoys the freedom of converting this ordinary world into the world of art.

One thing is very clear that the artist does not create his world of art of nothing. Rather he transforms this very ordinary world of our experience into the world of art. He gives a magic touch and the ordinary world starts appearing in a beautiful form. What he actually does is he re-arranges the ordinary world into beautiful form that generates aesthetic rapture.

*****