CHAPTER VI

KAVI AND SAHRDAYA
There are many discussions on kavi in Sanskrit literary criticism from Bhāmaha onward. The question is: Who is a poet or a literary artist? What are the elements by which he becomes a literary artist? One important element in his 'talent' or genius that makes him what he is. In this connection, we shall discuss here various views on the nesion of a literary artist.

**Bhāmaha**

Bhāmaha, the earliest Sanskrit rhetorician says that pratibhā (or poetic imagination) is the sine qua non for the poet. He says-

\[
gurūpadeśādhyetum śāstram jaḍadhiyo'pyalam
\]

\[
kāvyāṁ tu jāyate jātu kasyacit pratibhāvataḥ
\]

(kāvyālāṅkāra C-I. V.5. P.11)

It implies that even the untalented ones are able to study the śāstra with the help of the guidance of the teacher, but not so with regard to poetry. Because, a poetry worth its name can be composed only by a man who possesses pratibhā.

Bhāmaha again says-

\[
śabdaśchando' bhidhānārīhā itihāsāsrayāḥ kathāḥ
\]

\[
loko yuktiḥ kalāśceti mantavyāḥ kāvyagairhyamī
\]

(Kāvyālāṅkāra, C-I,V-9.P.11)

Here he gives a list of such elements which are essential to a poet. These are grammar, metre, lexicography, epic stories, worldly affairs, logic and fine arts.

Although, Bhāmaha hasn’t specifically used the words vyūtpatti (culture) and abhyāsa (practise or application) in this context, a persual of the following passage may help us guess his mind:

\[
śabdabhidheyā vijñāya kr̥tvā tadvidupāsanam
\]

\[
vilokyañyanibandhāṁśca kāryah kāvyakriyāharah
\]

(kāvyālāṅkāra, C-1,V.10.P.11)
"After acquainting oneself with (the principles of word and sense, after having devoted oneself to the teaching of the matters well versed in them, and finally, after having studied the composition of others poets, one should endeavour to compose a kāvyā."

Danḍin

According to Danḍin-

"naisargikī ca pratibhā srutaśca bahu nirmalam ;
amandasrābhiyogosyāh kāraṇam kāvyasampadaḥ ;"

(kāvyādārśa, C-I,V.103.P.177)

Danḍin follows, in general way, Bhāmaha. But he has much more to say them Bhāmaha. He adds another point, that is absence of natural genius. He explains that one may turn out to be a poet by dint of hard study and practice. While Bhāmaha mentions pratibhā as the primary requirement in a poet, Danḍin appears to differ from Bhāmaha in this respect. He says :

"na vidyate yadyapi purvavāsanā guṇānubandhi pratibhānamadbhutam.
srutena yatnena ca vāgupāsitā dhruvam karotyeva kamanyanugrahāṁ"

(kāvyādārśa, C-I,V-104.P.177)

Tr. : Though the wonderful faculty of natural disposition which presupposes an excellent inborn gift does not exist in a man, yet by serving the (Goddess of) speech with diligent study, one is sure to receive her blessings.

(kāvyādārśa, C-I,V-104.P.178)

He further says -

tadastatandrairaniśaṁ śarasvati
drāmadupasyā khalu kirttimipsubhiḥ :

\[ kr\text{ĕ} kavitve'pi jan\text{ā}h k\text{ṛ}ta\text{ś}ram\text{ā}h \]
\[ vidagdhagos\text{ṭ}h\text{ī}su viharttum\text{ī}\text{śate} \quad (k\text{ā}vy\text{ā}dar\text{ś}a \text{C-1, V-105.P.179}) \]

Tr.: Therefore, those who are desirous of fame, should always serve the Goddess of learning diligently and not lathargically. People thus toiled are competent to move in the assembly of poets despite their poor poetic gifts.

\[ (k\text{ā}vy\text{ā}dar\text{ś}a \text{C-1, V-105.P.180}) \]

**Vāmana**

Vāmana has treated a poet more exhaustively. He explains general reflections about the kavi. There are two types of poets 1) captious and 2) non-discrimination. In this connection, Vāmana says -

\[ arocakinaḥ satṛnābhyaḥvahārināśca kāvayaḥ \quad (k\text{ā}vy\text{ā}laṁkārasutravṛtti, C-1, V-1 P.3) \]

Further in the *vṛtti* these terms have been used in a metaphorical sense. Let us see the two types of poets described by Vāmana.

1) **Arocakins** : In composing a kāvyā, there poets proceed with the greatest diligence. They distinguish precisely between what is fit and what is not fit.

2) **Satṛnābhyaḥvahārinas** : This type of poets donot discriminate good from bad. Only poets of the former class are worth being instructed on account of their being endowed with the ability of discrimination. Here, there are two kinds of, poets one vivekin (discriminating) and the other avivekin (non-discriminating). So, Vāmana says-

\[ pūrve śīyāḥ | vivekīnṝt | (k\text{ā}vy\text{ā}laṁkārasutravṛtti, C-II,V-2.P.3) \]
\[ netare tadviparyāt | (k\text{ā}vy\text{ā}laṁkārasutravṛtti, C-II,V-3.P.3) \]

The science of poetics is not meant for people of latter class. That is -

\[ ne śastramadravyeśvarthavat | (k\text{ā}vy\text{ā}laṁkārasutravṛtti, C-II,V-4.P.3) \]
Indeed the kataka nut cannot clarify mire though it is used to clarify muddy water. Vāmana also mentions in the third chapter of his book arocakī-kavis. He says, they are designated as kāvyāṅgas or ancillaries to further the poetry.

“In this connection, Bharata remarks that the world of poetry is concurrent with the whole world of science and art, logic and rhetoric. The sphere of poetry is indeed all pervasive and all-embracing. Poet who is grist everything and ultimately it comes into his mill i.e the entire human experience, observation of nature, scraps of scientific lore, impressions from other, often hostile, phases of activity. And he absorbs all as the bee assimilates nectar. Sometime he denotes it back, somewhere, metamorphosed, according to the gift that is in him. The true honey of the mind on the other hands, Vāmana has divided kāvyāṅga into three sections- loka (the world), vidyā (the science) and prakīrṇaṁ (miscellaneous). He also brings pratibhā (which he calls pratibhāna) under the last head of prakīrṇa in the associations of such other requisites as laksyajñatva, abhiyoga and vṛddhasevā. “The mention of pratibhā in the same breath as that of perception of aim, application, attendance. Upon elders, etc. leads us at first sight to imagine that like Daṇḍin, Vāmana too is assigning a secondary place to creative genius. But strangely enough, the sūtra which amplifies the nature of pratibhā runs thus ‘kavītvabījam pratibhīnam’ (In genius lies the very seed of poetry)"

“The vṛtti on the above quoted sūtra makes it clear that pratibhā is an inborn talent, a mental impression, the cause of which is to be sought in previous births.”

1. Ibid. P. 172.
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So,

kavitvasya viṣam kavitvabījarājanmāntarāgataśaṃskāraviśaiṣaḥ kaścīt

yaṁ viṣam vinā kāvyam na nispadyate

nispannam vāvahāsāyatanaṁ syāt

(kāvyalaṅkārasutravṛtti, C-V.16.P.30)

"If, nevertheless, a man endeavours to produce poetry even in the absence of pratibhā the effect will be nothing but ridiculous. Here, Vāmana seems to have hit at the truth about poetry for the first time in history of Sanskrit poetics."

"His description of Pratibhā-

saktiḥ kavitvabījarūpaḥ saṃskāraviśoṣo kscit yāṁ

vinā kāvyam na prasaret prasṛtaṁ upahasanīyaṁ syāt

(vṛtti on kāvyāprakāśa.1.3.P.12)

Came to be accepted verbatim in later times at the hands of such standard writers as Manmaṭa and Hemacandra. A poem without poetic flash contains no life, it is a flower without fragrance."

Vāmana says ‘that the poet must bring to bear upon his composition a perfect concentration of mind. It is only then that he will be in a position to see through ‘the life of things’. To achieve such a state of mind, the poet must first gain access to an atmosphere congenial to his aim. The suitable atmosphere can be procured only at certain times of the day in specific places. The place must be secluded and time preferably the fourth watch of the light.’

" This gives us an insight into the practice of Sanskrit poets in ancient India. Sanskrit poets like Kālidāsa and Māgha too have corroborated this view. Kālidāsa says in Raghuvarnaśa (xviii)

1. Ibid P. 174.
2. Ibid P. 174.
paścimādyāminiyāmād prasādamiva cetanā.

Māgha is more explicit when he says-

gahanamapararātraprāptabuddhiprasādāḥ kāvaya
eva mahīpāścintayantyarthajātāṁ ॥ ॥

"Thus, the cool hours of the early morning seem to have been the time when
the poets composed their immortal poems. Vāmana is the first writer who gives us
these interesting details." ॥

Rudraṭa

"Rudraṭa, the next writer of note on Sanskrit poetics also accept in the main
the three fold requirement of the poet laid down by eariler writers He says -

tasyāsāranirāsātsāragrahaṇācca cāruṇāḥ karane

tritayamidāṁ vyāpriyate śaktirvyūtpattirabhyāsaḥ ॥ ॥

(kāvyālaṅkāra, C-1,V.14.P.9)

Śakti and pratibhā are synonyms. Words and meanings flash on the mind of
the poet as a result of genius. Vyūtpatti or learning assists him in adopting the essential
and avoiding the non-essential. Practice will lend excellence to genius." ॥

Śakti is defined by Rudraṭa as follows -

"The springing forth in many ways of the ideas to be expressed and lucid
diction in a well-concentrated mind is indeed śakti.." Pratibhā is another synonym.
And that is two-fold according to Rudraṭa- innate and acquired of these two; the
innate is the better one on account of its spontancy. It needs but a little practice to
give rise to poetry; whereas the second kind has got to be first produced by virtue of
vyūtpatti and then adopted to practice before it can be help poetry. Thus, since it
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entails much endeavour, this latter kind of pratibhā is inferior to that of the first. In other words, we may say that there are two classes of poets- the poets by education and practice, these we respect, and poets by nature, these we love. To borrow the words of E.R.B. Lytton -

Talk not of genius baffled, genius is matter of man.
Genius does what it must, and talent does what we can.”

“Again Rudraṭa has distinguished pratibhā into two varietics, sahajā and utpādyā. And he also holds that in addition to this innate genius, there is another kind of genius which is produced by virtue of learning. He also asserts that genius can be produced in the poet by strenuous endeavours on his part. However, Rudraṭa too admits that -

\[
\text{manasi sadā susamādhini visphuraṇamanekadhābhidheyasya} \\
\text{aklilaśṭāni padāni ca bhibhānti yasyāmasau saktiḥ} \\
\]

(kāvyālaṅkāra,C-1,V-15.P.11)

\[
\text{pratibhetyaparairuditā sahajotpādyā ca sā dvidhā bhavati} \\
\text{puṁsā saha jātatvādanayostu jyāyasi sahajā} \\
\]

(kāvyālaṅkāra, C-1,V.16.P.11)

\[
\text{svasyāsau saṁskāre paramaparam mṛgayate yato hetum} \\
\text{utpādyā tu kathāṃcidvyutpattyā janyate parayā} \\
\]

(kāvyālaṅkāra, C-1,V.17.P.12)

So much for the earlier writers. In their disquisitions sometimes pedantic, the truth is brought home to the reader that —

‘Tis long disputed, whether poets claim
From art or nature their best right to fame.
But art, if not enriched by nature’s vein,

1. Ibid. P.176
And a rude genius of uncultured strain,
Are useless both; but when in firendship joined,
A mutual succour in each other find.” (Horace) ¹

“A precise and comprehensive definition of pratibhā or poetic imagination
was laid down by Bhaṭṭa Tauta, the author of a work on poetics called kāvyakautuka
(which is not extant now). This definiton was reverentially accepted by Abhinavagupta
in his Dhvanyāloka[oca]na and his authority influenced all the succeeding writers such
as Mammatā.

The definition itself reads thus —

Poetic imagination is that gift of mind by whose aid one can visualise myriad
things a new.

It is by virtue of this gift alone that one deserves the title of ‘poet’. Hence it
goes without saying that poetry abounds for the most part in imaginative description.
There are some more verses of Bhaṭṭa Tauta which have come down to us as
quotations in the works of later writers such as Hemacandra. These indeed go to the
very heart of the question of poesy and bear quotation.

It has been remarked that no non-sage can be deservingly called poet; and a
sage will be worth his name only by virtue of his vision. By vision we mean that
insight into truth about all the manifold materials in the world and their various aspects.
One can win the distinction of ‘poet’ in the sciences if he possesses this vision of
Truth, But in everyday speech the world accords that title to him along who possesses
both vision and imaginative description. Thus though Vālmiki was highly gifted with
enduring and clear vision, he was not hailed as a poet by people until he embodied
it in a descriptive work.” ²

---

¹. Ibid. Pp. 176-177.
Kuntaka:

According to Kuntaka

*kavipratihāprautirava pradhānyenāvatiṣṭate |

It mean *pratibhā* or Imagination is the keystone of the poetic arch.

And

*yatkiñcanāpi saundaryta tatasvar pratibhodbhavvām |

It means, whenever charm there be in poetry, all that is attributable only to

*pratibhā*.

Further he says —

*yadyapi rasabhāvālaṅkārāṇāṁ svṛśāṁ kavī
ekauśalameva jīvitam, tathāpyalankārasya
viśoṣatastadamugraham viṇā... manānamā
tramāpi na vaicitryamutprekṣāmahe |

"In particular, the imagination processes treat fact, the data of experience, in a way totally different from the processes of which the reason avails itself. discarding experiences which the reason values, utilizing experiences which the reason discards, and meaning by Truth" some thing quite different from the truth of science”. The poet may, on the on hand, discard history for that “feigned history” as Bacon called it, depicting” a more ample greatness a more exact goodness, and a more absolute variety then can be found in the nature of things” or on the other, he may take familiar realities, and seek to forth different meaning which he has been within them by qualities of his own. Either process is included in what we call Imagination. We may quote a parallel passage from Wordsworth :-

“If thou partake the animating faith
That poets, even as prophets, each with each.
Connected in a mighty scheme of truth,
Have each his own peculiar faculty,
Heaven's gift, a sense that fits him to perceive
Objects unseen before, thou witt not blame.
The humblest of this band who dares to hope
That unto him hath also been vouchsafed,
An insight that in some sort he possesses
A principle, where by a work of his
Proceeding from a source of untaught things.
Creative and enduring may become
A power like one of nature's."

_Sahṛdaya_

_Sahṛdaya_ is a connoisseur. The Sanskrit poetics calls him _sahṛdaya_ “of like heart” with the poet. There are many discussions regarding a connoisseur.

“Ānandavardhana clearly states that appreciation of poetry is essentially the same as the creation of it. Pratiharendu Raja of the tenth century, commenting on the ‘endotelie listening’ (_Bhāvanā vṛ̥yāpāra_) which is a significant element in Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka’s formulation, proceeds to a generalised concept of imagination, which, according to him, is the basis not only of poetic creation but also of the reader’s and critic’s aesthetic recreation of poetry in the enjoyment of it. The aesthetic emotion is transferred only when there is an ideal reawakening of it in the reader. Ānandavardhana briefly describes the process by which this awakening takes place. The sensibility of the responsive reader first becomes attuned to the emotional situation portrayed (_Hṛdaya Samvada_). It then identifies itself with the portrayal (_Tanmayibhavana_). It then identification is there that experience of

---

1. Ibid Pp. 187-188
the aesthetic emotion (*Rasanubhava*) becomes a reality. Dhananjaya of the tenth century elaborates this. The creatively moulded aesthetic presentation which is an integration of stimuli (*Vibhavas* etc.) makes the sentiment relishable as an emotion. The enjoyer of the aesthetic emotion (*Rasika*) is the member of the audience (*Samajika*) who has the requisite sensitivity. Dhananjaya makes clear two things. First, the locus of the aesthetic emotion is the sensibility, not the stage representation or the libretto. The emotion is not a static entity but a processual reality which is perceived only when it is experienced. The locus of the *Rasa*, the points out, is not in the represented hero who belongs to the past; nor is it in the poem itself which is at best an integrated configuration of aesthetic excitants. Even more important is the second fact that the *Rasa* does not consist of the reader’s mere apprehension (*Pratiti*) of the emotion latent in the poem or enacted by the actor.”

Plato has a passage which reveals complete agreement with the view of Sanskrit poeties that the transfer of aesthetic experience takes place through sympathetic induction. “The stone Euripides calls magnet does not only attract iron rings, but it also gives them the power of attracting other rings as the stone itself does.... In the same way, the Muse herself inspires the artists, and through their inspiration others are enraptured, and the line of inspired is produced.... One poet is suspended from one Muse, another from another; he is said to be ‘possessed’.... From these primary rings, the poets, others are in turn suspended .... If as Bhaṭṭa Tauta said, vision precedes description in the case of the poet, the description transfers the vision to the reader. The glory of art, says Nahm, is that it “creates the creator,” that is, the percipient is enabled to share the thoughts and feelings of the artist, to share in other words the mysterious but exhilaratory experience of creation.

---

Dewey also concurs with the view that the sensitive reader is “of like heart” with the poet. The artist and audience should not be separated since “to perceive, a beholder must create his own experience.... We lay hold of the full import of a work of art only as we go through in our own vital processes, the processes the artist went through in producing the work. Spingarn similarly, wrote: ‘The identity of genius and taste is the final achievement of modern thought on the subject of art, and it means that, fundamentally, in their most significant moments, the creative and the critical instincts are one and the same... Criticism at last can free itself of its age-long self-contempt, now that it may realize that aesthetic judgment and artistic creation are instinct with the same vital life.’”

There are innumerable echoes of the same view in European thought: Empson for instance, wrote: “The process of getting to understand a poet is precisely that of constructing his poems in one’s own mind’. The reader has then created the poem a new for himself- by means of the poet’s words. The conviction that the true apprehension of poetry is a creative process is seen also in this delightfully lucid declaration of Sir Percy Nunn. ‘To lead pupils to ‘appreciate’ is not merely to lead them to admire or to take pleasure in a beautiful thing, but to make them become in a sense its re-creators.’ Robert Graves laid down that ‘the reader of the poem must fall into a complementary trance if he is to appreciate its full meaning. The reference to the trance would have been particularly liked by Sanskrit writers also.”

“The distinction between the poet’s creation and that of the sahrdaya can well be appreciated by an analogy from Vedānta. Advaita Vedanta postulates two different categories of empirical reality, the vyāvahārika and the prātiḥsaṣṭika. Of these the vyāvahārika world is the world we live in, which is created by Īśvara and the experience of which is shared by one and all Jīvas alike. As opposed to this, the prātiḥsaṣṭika is the dream world or the world of illusion which an individual Jīva

1. Ibid. P. 46.
2. Ibid. Pp. 46-47.
creates for himself and the expression of which is confined absolutely to himself. The position of the kavi and the sahrdaya is closely similar to this. Like Isvara, the poet creates a world, which like the vyāvahārika world is shared by all. The sahrdaya on the other hand, is like the Jīva and creates a little world, which, like the prātibhāsika creation, is limited to his experience. Even as the Jīva is the creator of his dream-world in spite of its limitations, there should be no difficult in conceding that the sahrdaya is the creator of his world, for which he draws his materials from the world created by the poet. The parallelism is in fact complete. In the universe of nāmarūpa the kavi and the sahrdaya bear identically the same relation towards nāmasṛṣṭi as Isvara an Jīva bear to rūpasṛṣṭi."1

"This near identity between the kavi and the sahrdaya becomes apparent from one more consideration. The make up of the kavi and the sahrdaya as described or hinted at by Sanskrit critics also points to their identical nature. The three factors, pratibhā, vyutpatti and abhyāsa which are enumerated in the case of the poet are implied in the case of the sahrdaya too. Pratibhā, in the case of poet is described as pūrvavāsanāgūnānubandhi. In the case of the sahrdaya too, this pūrva-vāsanā is mentioned as an essential preconition for sahrdayatva. With reference to the spectators of the play it is said-

savāsanānām sabhyānām rasasyāsvādanaṁ bhavet |
nirvāsanāstum rangāntah kāṣṭakunyāśamasannibhāḥ ||

Similar statements like vāsanā cadāṇīntani praktani ca rasāsvādaheetuḥ and pūṇyavantah yogivad rasasamantain also point to the fact that pūrvavāsanā is an essential factor for aesthetic relish. Likewise the reference to kāvyānuśīlanābhyāsa in his definition of sahrdaya touches upon the other two factors namely vyutpti and abhyāsa in the equipment of the poet. This shows that the equipment required of the

sahṛdaya is not for different from that of the poet. Like wise, the very concept of hrdayasamvāda, which is the final determinant of sahṛdayatva and which implies a kinship of hearts between the kavi and sahṛdaya (samatām hrdayam yasya saḥ) by Sanskrit literary critics.”

“Ānandavardhana appears to be thinking of this unity as the vision of the poet and the sahṛdaya in his verse:

yā vyāpāravatī rasāṅ rasayituṁ kācitkavināṁ navā
dṛśṭīryā pariniṣṭitārthaviśayonmeśā ca vaipaściti|
te dve apyavalambya viśvamanisāṁ nirvānayanto vayaṁ
śrāntā naiva ca labdhahabdhistyayana tvadbhaktitulyaṁ sukhaṁ ||

Though Abhinava has taken the second line as referring to śāstradrśti, the line can be interpreted with equal felicity as pointing to sahṛdayadrśti. The verse would then mean that the combined vision of the kavi and the sahṛdaya comprehends the entire universe.”

Kuntaka

On the point of sahṛdaya, Kuntaka starts that point with including the meaning of sāhitya.

He says --

śabdārthau sahitāveva prati tair sphurataḥ sadā |
sahitāviti tāveva kimpurvaṁ vidhiyate ||

(VJ.C-1.V.16.P.13)

Tr. : When it is so obvious that word and meaning are ever experienced jointly, what is the special import of mentioning it (in the definition).

He also explains _

sāhityamanayoḥ śobḥāśālitāṁ prati kāpyasau |
anyunānuritratvarmanohārinīyavasthīṁ ||

(VJ.C-1.V.17.P.14)

1. Ibid P. 42.
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Tr. : The sāhitya or mutual coherence between word and meaning in respect of beauty is nothing but a unique poetic usage, involving neither more or less than the exact form of word and meaning required to make the whole beautiful.

(VJT.C-1.V.17.P.311)

In this context, Kuntaka explains the term sāhitya must be restricted so as to apply only to such an extraordinary graceful usage of the poet in which the graces of world as well as meaning vie with each other to produce delight in the reader.

And he mentions :-

mārgānugunyasyabhago mādhuryādiguṇodayaḥ

Vṛttiyauucityamanohāri rasānām paripoṣaṇām

spardhayā vidyate yatra yathāsvamubhayorapi

sā kāpyavasthitoṣadvidāhldakanibandhanam

padādīvākparispandasāraḥ sāhityamucyate

Tr. : The rise of excellences like ‘sweetness’ in harmony with the ‘style’ the employment of figures endowed with abundant artistic beauty.

(VJC-1.V.17/Ex-34.P.312)

The full development of ‘sentiments’ in keeping with the prescribed ‘modes’ - when all these are competitively present in both word and meaning.

(VJT.C-1.V.17.P.312)

We have the quintessence of speech classified as word etc. and causing delight to the reader by its beauty. It is this which is designated here as Sāhitya.

(VJT.C-1.V.17.P.312)

Now Kuntaka explains that how poetics has a useful function superior to those of the other branches of knowledge and how it can confer benefits over and above the four values constituting the subject matter of other sciences.
apṛyālocite' pyartha bandhasaundaryasampadā

gītavaddhṛdayahlādam tadvīdāṁ vidadhāti yat || (V.J.C.1.V.17/Ex.37.P.26)
vācyāvabodhanispattau padavākyārthajīvitam |
yatkimapyarpayatyantaḥ pānakāsvādavatsatāṁ || (V.J.C.1.V.17/Ex-38.P.26)
śarīram jīviteneva sphuriteneva jīvitam |
vīnā nirjīvatāṁ yena vākyam yāti vipaścitām || (V.J.C.1.V.18-19/Ex-39.P.26)
yasmāktimapi saubhāgyam tadvādāmva gocaram |
sarasvatī samabhetyi taddānīṁ vicāryate || (V.J.C.1.V.17/Ex-40.P.26)

Tr.: That which produces delight in sensitive readers even by its beauty of style, though lacking in thoughtful content, just like melodious music.

(V.J.T.C.1.V.17/Ex-37.P.313)

that which is relished in its entirety without distinction of word and sentence import after the initial grasp of primary meanings, even like the unique savour of sweet drink by men of taste;

(V.J.T.C.1.V.17/Ex-38.P.313)

and without which a composition would appear life less to the critics, just like a body deprived of life and like a life devoid of vitality; (V.J.T.C.1.V.17/Ex/39.P.313)

and from the presence of which proceeds creative freshness of speech with a beauty discernible only to an accomplished critic this shall be discussed now.

(V.J.T.C.1.V.17/Ex.40.P.313)

The above mentioned facts point to the fact that a kavi and a sahṛdaya have to be of equal genius without which it is not possible to bring about saṁvāda or rapport between them.