While discussing any principle of literary creation we may go over to Sanskrit Poetics, for Sanskrit Poetics is enormously rich in its conclusions. Besides, the fundamental similarity between European and Indian Poetics makes us all the more convinced that the main principles behind art-creation are co-eval with the spirit of man to whichever clime or country he might belong. They are age-old and eternal, so long as human nature remains as it is. The Romantic theory of imagination again has its special lines of contact with our ancient theory of imagination in Sanskrit Poetics.

The creative faculty in man is called "प्रतिभा" (Pratibha) in Sanskrit. प्रतिभा is defined as "नवनवीमेवशालिनी वुदिते प्रतिभेनुयोग्यवेत् न उर्ध्वो" , i.e., the faculty of creating ever new things. This creative in man is at its highest in poetry where the power of creation is called "अनूदक्त-निर्माणबलम् प्रतिभा" (Dhvanyāloka: I.6. Commentary), i.e., the power to create something entirely new, something which had no existence before. The poets actually can give to "anything nothing a local habitation and a name". This does not, however, mean that poetry or literature is entirely cut off from the basis of the factual world. As a matter of fact, Sanskrit dramas and epics in ancient India, like the Shakespearean dramas, were almost without exception, based on well-known characters in real life.
And yet the poets had their own standards of beauty and truth. They were never bound down by too much stress on the details from real life. This leads us to one of the fundamental principles in the world of that Poetic truth need not necessarily tally with the factual truth. This has been recognised in the following words of Anandavardhana, a 9th century aesthetician of Kashmir in his Dhvanyāloku, a treatise on Poetics:

"अनारे काव्यस्सारे काव्यरैका प्रज्ञालिङ्गिः।
प्रथासोऽऽै रीतिने विख्यातं तवेदं परविन्यते ॥"

(Chapter III).

The Agnipurana tells us the same thing:

"अनारे काव्यस्सारे काव्यरैका प्रज्ञालिङ्गिः।
प्रथासोऽऽै रीतिने विख्यातं तवेदं परविन्यते ॥"

(345. 10).

In the vast and limitless world of poetry the sole creator is the poet. He changes and transforms the universe according to his own choice.

The idea of the gift of poetic creation in Sanskrit Poetics accords very well with the Romantic theory of imagination. Imagination according to the Romantics is the complete faculty of literary creation, mystic in its origin in the sense that it is a gift from the most High God and cannot be acquired in the work-a-day world although constant application may brighten it, leading literature to an ideal plane as distinguished from the plane of mundane reality, and including
reason as well as emotion within itself. The basic assumption that runs like an undercurrent throughout Sanskrit Poetics is that the faculty of creation is a divine heritage of man. So long as God remained One, there was no creation. But, as the Upanisads tell us, God wanted to be many, because he wanted to realise and taste his own identity through the endless variety of his creations. In other words, He wanted to be many.

"प्रकृतिः कथा स्वयं प्रक्षिप्तिः " (Taittiriya Upanisad), i.e., "I am One, but I shall be many, I shall be born." This desire on the part of the creator gave rise to the creation of the Universe. It is this urge of realising one's own self in others, of sharing our own thoughts and feelings with other human beings, which is behind the creation of Art. Why did literature originate at all? It was because man was not satisfied with merely multiplying himself in his biological existence, but he also wanted to live eternally in the emotions and feelings of the rest of humanity. The idea is very finely expressed by Tagore in his essay "Sāityer Sāmagrī" ("Materials of Literature"):"

"Human feelings endeavour to impress myriads of minds through years and yeats. It was due to this earnest desire that from time immemorial we have so many gestures, so many languages and alphabets, innumerable carvings on stones, melting on metals and binding in leather, how many marks and signs on the barks and leaves of trees, on paper, with the brush, the pointed stick, the pen, how many attempts at writing from left to right, from right to left, from the top to the bottom, from one row to another: Why Only because, what I have thought, what I have felt, must not perish
it must flow on from mind to mind, from time to time, being though out and felt".

(Translated).

The famous theory of Rasa in Sanskrit Poetics shows us the importance of the faculty of poetic imagination. Literature has been defined by Viśvanātha, one of the most eminent writers in Sanskrit Poetics, as "वाक्यं रसोभिः काव्यम्" (Sahityadarpanam, Chapter I). It means that a composition having Rasa as its soul is called काव्य. Here of course we should note in passing that काव्य which literally means a poet's work, has always been used in Sanskrit Poetics, in the sense of literature as a whole. This, again, by the way, is a point of similarity with European Poetics where the term Poetry so often includes the entire range of literature. The term Rasa has been explained by Viśvanātha as "रसस्य आस्थिते दृविर रस"—Rasa is something which can be relished.

The word Rasa in Sanskrit may be used in so many different senses. It signifies any liquid in general. The quality of being relished through our physical sense of taste is also Rasa, and as such it may be of six different kinds: sweet, sour, saline, alkaline, bitter and pungent. In medical science in India it also refers to the digestive and other glandular secretions. In Poetics, however, the relishing is never purely physical. It has a highly technical sense which we shall discuss just now.

Viśvanātha, in Chapter III of his treatise Sahityadarpanam, explains Rasa in the following verse:
The permanent emotions like the Erotic feeling in the heart of a fit appreciator are transformed into the Rasa state through the agency of the Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Sañcārī Bhāvas.

Abhinavagupta, a most authoritative scholar of the 10th Century A.D., and the commentator of the Dhvanyāloka, defines Rasa in the following manner:

"शक्तिमाणाःप्रवर्तकः संयवादक विभावाः स्मृतिप्रकाशितविषेभ्यदिव्याहिनोऽविभावसंयुक्तस्वरूपस्वरूपविद्यानदितविद्याचारस्तिनियोगः रसं।"

(Commentary on the Dhvanyāloka)

Rasa is the relishing of the delightful consciousness of one's own. The causes and effects of our emotions in real life assume a completely new shape when they are revealed through the words of the poet. In this new shape they are called Vibhāva and Anubhāva respectively, and they develop a power to appeal to all hearts. These Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas in their turn arouse the emotions (e.g., the erotic) which are already there in the heart of the reader, and the consciousness becomes enjoyable as it is tinged by such emotions.

Anything in the objective world which arouses emotions is
called **Vibhāva** when it is placed in poetry and drama:

“सर्वाच्छादनोऽवस्था लोके विभावां काव्यनाथोऽयोः।”

(*Sāhityadarpanam*, Chapter III)

**Vibhāvas** are of two kinds: **Alambana** and **Uddīpana**. When a man is attracted by a woman amidst beautiful natural scenery, moonlight and fragrant breeze, the man and woman are **Alambana** — **Vibhāvas** to each other. The natural scenery and such other accessories are the exciting causes or **Uddīpana** — **Vibhāvas** in this particular context.

The external manifestations like gestures and postures through which any emotion is expressed in literature are called **Anubhāvas**. Thus, amorous glances of a lady to her lover expressed in literature are to be called **Anubhāvas**.

**Visvanātha** also recognises some minor emotions or **Sancārā Bhāvas** in literature. These, however, cannot exist all by themselves, but have to depend on the permanent emotions.

The permanent human emotions according to Sanskrit rhetoricians are: the Erotic Emotion, Laughter, Pathos, Anger, Endeavour, Fear, Repulsion, Wonder and Calm. Any of these nine permanent emotions, transmuted by the **Vibhāvas**, **Anubhāvas**, and **Sancārā Bhāvas**, attains to the state of **Rasa** or pure aesthetic enjoyment which is capable of being relished.

The **Rasa** theory is very ancient in India. We come across discussions on Rasa in the very ancient book of Dramaturgy written by the sage Bharata. We have no means of ascertaining the exact
date of Bharata's *Natyasāstra*. Without entering into the niceties of researches on this point (which is beside the point for our purpose), let us accept the date of Bharata as given by Mahāmāhopādhyāya Haraprasād Śastri as the 2nd century B.C.

According to Bharata, too, the main object in literature is the creation of Rasa which is produced by a combination of *Vibhṛva* Anubhāva and *Byabhicārya* (or *Sancarā*) Bhāva.

"न हि सातृते कविद्दर्शः प्रवर्तते | न तत्र विभवानुभवविधिभि संयोगाद रसलिखितं |
" (Natyasāstra, 6.34).

According to the nine permanent emotions of the human heart Rasa has been divided by Visvanātha into nine categories:

"शुचियः विभवानुभवसंयोगाः | वैभवस्ते दुर्मुख इत्यस्य एवः अशन्तस्त्रय मलः "
(Sahityadarpanam, Chapter III)

Bharata recognises eight Rasas and excludes *शान्तस्त्* or calm from his list. This, however, is no fundamental difference, for Bharata deals only with drama, and drama, which is mainly a clash and contrast of different personalities, does not generally have the note of calm as its most predominant Rasa throughout the drama, although it should be there at the end. Besides, *शान्तस्त्* may not be considered as a separate Rasa at all. It is a synthesis of all other Rasas, where all the other emotions have been absorbed and harmonised into one whole. This is the state of the Yogis whose minds are always in a state of equanimity. It is for this reason that Bhattacharya, a teacher of Abhinavagupta
in his *Kavya-Kautuka* regards the *Śānta Rasa* as superior to all other Rasas.

Rabindranath Tagore explains the theory of Rasa in the following manner:

"Our emotions are the gastric juices which transform this world of appearances into the more intimate world of sentiments. On the other hand, this outer world has its own juices, having their various qualities which excite our emotional activities. This is called in our Sanskrit Rhetoric Rasa which signifies outer juices having their response in the inner juices of our emotions. And a poem, according to it, is a sentence or sentences containing juices, which stimulate the juices of emotion. It brings to us ideas, vitalized by feelings, ready to be made into the life-stuff of our nature."

*(What is Art?)*

When an emotion is thus raised into the Rasa state through the power of creative imagination of the poet, it loses its individual character and becomes dissociated from such conditions as might have led us to any motivation. It becomes impersonal and universal. It is this impersonal character of the creation and enjoyment of Rasa which has been emphasized by Viśvanātha in the following lines:

"सच्चिदांत्यादानयज्ञप्रकाशिनयंचिनम्।
वैद्यनाथस्य उपन्यास शृंगासादस्योदरः॥"

*(Sāhityādarpanam, Chapter III)*
The enjoyment of literature is akin to that of the Absolute where the distinction between the knower and the knowable vanishes altogether. It is a state of rapture where we are lifted up for the time being from our "sole self", our trammelled everyday existence.

We have already referred to the concept of Ecstasy where we have noted that poetic Imagination, by producing Ecstasy, becomes a great instrument of moral good. The theory of Rasa also tells us about this Ecstasy produced by the poetic 'प्रति' or Imagination. We have already stated that a poetic creation becomes impersonal and universal, capable of being relished. But how is it possible for us, asks Visvanātha, to feel pleasure or pain with Rāma and Sītā while reading the Rāmāyana, when their delight or sorrow does not concern us in any way? How do the feelings of a particular man or woman become universal?

"नू कर्म रामदिवसबोधिकाः सीतादिर्मी सामाजिकान्य-ढुढ़ोध इति, उच्छताः
अभासाः सिंह विभागदिमासा साधारणैः कुलिः।
जनप्रभाबो यक्षासिन् भावभिधिन्तनादृश्।॥
प्रमाण लद्देहिन् स्थानामेत प्रलिन्दनाते ॥"

The objects arousing emotions have a function of producing a oneness between the creator or the reader and creation. It is due to this that a right-minded appreciator finds his own self engaged in crossing the ocean like Rāmacandra or Hanumāna. It is due to this again that even an ordinary man, for the time being shares in his mind the deeds of a hero. The sympathetic reader has no sense of his own separate self so long as he remains
absorbed in the literary creation. The experiences are his and yet not his at the same time:

"परस्य न परमेवति समेवति न समेतिच।
तदस्यादं स्मिरन्ते परिक्षेत्री न विद्याने॥"

(Ibid.)

Once, however, his experience at the time of enjoying a literary creation is over, he will come back to his "sole self", his own individual consciousness.

This power of Imagination of producing an identification between the writer or the reader and the object of creation is called 'साध्योक्षरण ' in Sanskrit Poetics. This 'तमयता ' (to become that) is essential for the creation as well as for the enjoyment of Art.

Tagore recognises this urge for making ourselves free in literature from our circumscribed day-to-day consciousness as the greatest impulse behind art creation. The Absolute has been characterised in the Upaniṣads as "सत्यं ह्यत्तत्त्वं त्रुणं " i.e., Brahman is the Truth Eternal, the Supreme consciousness and the Illimitable. Following this, Tagore tells us about three different manifestations of the human soul. The entire human soul consists of 'I am, I know, I express". Literature, which is an expression of the human soul, corresponds to the Illimitable aspect of the Absolute. (In the essay Sāhitya in the book Sāhityer Pathe, p. 21). So long as man remains circumscribed within himself, he is no creator. It is only when he steps out of his limited
existence, and tries to be united with others, that artistic creation takes place.

The theory of Rasa tells us that the Imagination gives literature an idealised character. In this, again, the Sanskrit rhetoricians are one with the English Romantics. Of course, the realists might object to such idealization of literature. But, after all, the real can only be the subject of literature. The ultimate product can never be real in the sense of an exact reproduction of the objective world. In that case there would be no necessity of any artistic creation whatsoever, for do we not find enough of real life around us? Art is not escapism, and from that point of view the realist's approach of faithfulness to real life is correct. Art grows out of life, and draws its sustenance from life. Cut off from life, it becomes like a hot-house plant without any vigorous growth. But, on the other hand, there can be no Art unless real life is transmuted by the genius of the poet into a thing of poetic beauty. The theory of Rasa grants full creative freedom to the artist whose Imagination creates something which is at once connected with and different from the world of objective reality. The point has already been touched in the verse quoted from the Dhvanyaloka:

"अपारे कोणसंसारे कविकं प्रज्ञानुविषी
प्रथमं रोचने विन्यायं नवपीठान।।
"

The very idea has been repeated in the following lines of the same book:

"भावनम अवैतनिकं विचारत विचारत विचारत
यथौपायति यथौरु पुनःकथे काशे स्वरं स्वरं
"

"अपारे कोणसंसारे कविकं प्रज्ञानुविषी
प्रथमं रोचने विन्यायं नवपीठान।।
"

The very idea has been repeated in the following lines of the same book:

"भावनम अवैतनिकं विचारत विचारत विचारत
यथौपायति यथौरु पुनःकथे काशे स्वरं स्वरं
"
It means that a great poet may, according to his own law, represent inanimate things as living, and conscious beings as lifeless. Visvanātha, too, in his Sāhityadarpanam, advises the poet to reject or alter anything that would be a hindrance to the creation of Rasa:

"पन्त्स्पादनुचितं कस्तु नायकमणस्य रसस्य वा।
सकुसिंधु तन् मर्मिकमन्यक्षा दा प्रकृत्येत्॥"

Bharata says the same in his Nātyasāstra:

"न हि रसायनं कष्टिं दशं सिंधुं प्रवर्तनेऽत्र वत्र विभवनमानवे भिविचारिष-संयीगाद रससिद्धतिः॥"

(Nātyasāstra : 6.34.)

And here is Anandavardhana who says in his Dhvanyāloka, Chapter III, that the poet must, in all respects, be guided by his aim of creating Rasa in his creation:

"कविनम काष्टिमानविनिध्यता सताभना रसप्रस्तुतेऽविद्यम्।"

And the same chapter also tells us that nothing but lack of propriety is a hindrance to the creation of Rasa:

"अपौविचारान्ते नाथद रसभूमिया कारणम्।
प्रभृतिचिंचिमनश्वतु रसस्यांशिपिन्त्रपर॥"

It is propriety or the inner requirement of Art which is all-important in Sanskrit Poetics for the creation of Rasa. To quote from chapter III of the Dhvanyāloka:

"तत्तथस्य रेतुप्रवचिः वनूबायथयोः॥"
A literary composition, as the line tells us, should be regulated by the propriety of the speaker and the object of his speech. Not merely this, Anandavardhana speaks of many other kinds of propriety:

"निर्याप्ताथासङ्गातिः सत्यमिन्त्रितं प्रवाचनं दीर्घाः संस्करणां नियंतरः"

(Ibid).

The sentence quoted above means that even when the propriety of the speaker and the speech is maintained, other kinds of propriety originating from the subject matter regulate the literary composition. In our judgment of any portion of a literary work, we should therefore see whether it is proper and organically connected with the whole. Otherwise the creation of Rasa would be hampered. That rule holds good not merely in verse, but also in prose, is specifically mentioned by Anandavardhana:

"उपद्योगशीलसशिलाश्य सुभाषितममप्रायं समाप्तंग्रामसन्धिः छार्दीनियमसविजि"

(Ibid., cit., Chapter III).

The paramount importance of the creation of Rasa in literature makes it obligatory on the part of the artist who handles history for his own purposes, that if anything in history becomes detrimental to the creation of Rasa, it may be changed according to his own needs. But the change must be congenial to the desired effect.

"दृष्टिकृतवशाख्यातं वचननुपुराणं स्थितिः।
उर्वरोद्वृत्तविषाधिकसृंचितकामिनः॥"

(Ibid).

Bhamaha, another authority on Sanskrit Poetics, says that
the responsibility of the poet is very great. There is no such word, no such object, law or art, which cannot be the subject of the poet's imagination:


“न स शब्देऽन्तर्वको न स भावो न स तस्तो कर्म।
ज्ञापने यज्ञ काब्योऽमृते भारी मद्दृश्यं कर्मेः॥”

(Bhāmahālāṅkāra : 5.3).

To quote Bharata again,


“न नोक्तले न तत्त शिफरे न सा विद्या न वेद तं कर्म।
नासी पेनो न तत्कर्मे नाद्यौपिन्न ग्रहं दृश्यने॥”

(Nātyāsāstra : 1.117).

There is no such knowledge, no arts, no branch of learning, no Yoga, no work, which cannot be the subject of drama.

The last two quotations prove beyond doubt that the boundary of the poet's creation is Infinite, it may include anything in the universe. There is thus, great similarity between Wordsworth's idea that there are no particular words or subjects earmarked for poetry. "The poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling", really glances "from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven".

Dhananjaya, another authority on Dramaturgy, glorifies the poet's imagination by saying that there is nothing which the poet's imagination is not capable of transmuting into Rasa - whether beautiful, desirable or noble, mean or ferocious or pleasant, mysterious or perverted:

“रंगेर जुगुसितमदुरमशादि तोर्म।
उग्रं प्रसादं गर्नं विकृतंद्र्वं कर्म।
यद् वाधवस्तु कार्यमिकायमानं
नवविज्ञि यज्ञ रसहास्मुप्रतिनिबोऽकरं॥” (Pāṇārījaka : h.85).
Such, then, is the power of the “अन्नवस्तुरीमाण्डलम प्रवर्ता” or the Imagination.

We should, however, note in passing that although anything unpleasant may be the subject matter of literature, it must be transmuted into Rasa; it must, in other words, be a thing of beauty and joy capable of being relished. The undue emphasis of the extreme realists on the unpleasant aspects of life cuts at the root of the concept of Imagination which includes a vision of the whole of life and throws the entire spirit of man into activity. Imagination as viewed by great artists and theorists of all ages, as also of the Romantics, is a reconciliation and harmonisation of all opposite where the beautiful as well as the ugly of the world of reality may all live side by side, being parts of a vast cosmos created by the poet.

The theory of Rasa was not something arbitrary to the Indian mind, for the Indians believed in the cosmic harmony of the universe, and the enjoyment of literature for them was just a fragment of the Absolute and the Bliss that descends upon one after one realises the Divine.

In the Taittiriya Upanishad Brahman alone is considered to be the absolute Rasa or the Bliss. A man, knowing the Brahman, becomes Blissful:

“पर्सै रे सांग | पर्सै देवर्णं सांग भवैति”

The Upanishads also tell us that Joy was at the creation of this entire Universe. God is Bliss and it was from Bliss that the
creation sprang up, it is Bliss that holds up the entire creation and it is in Bliss again that the creation will be dissolved:

"अनन्त जगतें सक्तिमानि भूमानि जायि, अनन्तै जायि जीवलि, अनन्तेऽपि प्रभलाभिमानि।"

And one who knows the Bliss that is Diviṣe is completely without fear from anything:

"अनन्तः ब्रह्माणि निद्रम् न विमेनि कुश्तिवन।"

Although it is impossible, the sages tell us, to give an exact characterisation of Brahman, for He can only be felt and cannot be expressed in words, an attempt at characterisation has been there, and the Upaniṣads call him "सच्चिदानन्देः", i.e., Eternal Existence, Supreme Consciousness and Bliss. The Bliss thus experienced in the realisation of the Diviṣe is without parallel and infinitely superior to all other enjoyments in human life. And yet, the enjoyment from literature has an essential similarity with the joy experienced at the Union with the Absolute. That is the reason why Viśvanātha calls the enjoyment of literature "कृष्णवद्यसङ्गदासाः" or a brother to the realization of the Absolute. Every major work in Sanskrit Poetics has an implicit faith that literary creation is a parallel to the creation of the Universe. The Upaniṣads tell us that Brahman is one and without a second ("एकमेवादिविद्यम्"), but He is also all-pervasive and everything in this Universe is He and none but He (परं सच्चिदिद् ब्रह्म). He is Unity Itself, above and independent of all relations. But just because there is nothing excepting Himself, He has to create the Universe out of Himself in order to relish
His own variety. The Upaniṣads tell us about the urge for creation in the Divine Himself.

"सोकांसन, वरु स्यो अजापिय दूलि!"

(The Tāttirīya Upaniṣad: 2.6).

He desired that though He was one, He would be many. He realizes Himself and His Love more fully as it were in His endless creations, because it is He who is present everywhere:

"एको देवः सर्वभूमि गृहः, सर्वबाणिः सर्वभूमिच्छर्दराणा!"

(The Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad: 6.11).

The urge for creation is thus something which we have inherited from "Our Father" who is not merely in heaven, but everywhere in this Universe, "in the light of the setting sun, and the round ocean and the living air, and the blue sky, and in the mind of man". Literary creation according to Sanskrit Poetics is something parallel to the creation of this Universe, although on a much smaller scale. Of course, God creates the Universe out of Himself; the material for His creation is nothing but Himself. The poet, on the other hand, takes over the materials for his creation ready-made from God's creation. He can only select and reject, arrange and re-arrange things, makes, in the words of Bacon in his A Advancement of Learning, "unlawful matches and divorces of things". And this, too, is a great creative freedom for the poetic imagination to have its free play.

The idea that God fulfils Himself in His own creations has found touching expression in many of the songs and poems of Tagore.
The Divine, in order to relish Himself, seeks union with the individual souls through eternity:

"Amôr milan lâgi tumî ñescho kabey thâckey,
Tomâr Chândra Sûrya kothây râkheboy tomyâ dhekey?"

Man has ever his "aspiration after the immense", "the devotion to something afar from the sphere of our sorrow", the mysterious urge to be united with the Universal Soul. The Divine, on the other hand, likes to come down to the human heart for tasting His own Love and Glory. That is why Tagore sings that without myself the Love of my God would not have been complete:

"Arnây nailey tribhunâneòvar
Tomâr prem hoto je mîche,
Tâi tomâr Ananda Amâr pur,
Tumi tâi escho ñîcey."

The Sanskrit equivalent for the word poet is 'Kabi' which literally means "a seer of truth". The word actually refers to the Divine in the Upaniṣads: "कविद्विमुक्ती परिमील दयापूर्वः" (Upaniṣad : 5.8). The Gītā also refers to Him in the same manner: "कविषु पुराणमनुशास्त्रिलैम्" (8.9). The Greek word 'poet', too, as we know, means a Creator. The poet, therefore, is a miniature of the Greatest Creator. And in his created world, the world of literature, he reigns supreme.

We have said that Rasa is that which can be relished. Now what actually do we relish in the world of imaginative creation? Sanskrit Poetics tells us that we relish our own liberated consciousness. The consciousness in our dreary intercourse of
daily life is limited and fettered by personal interests which serve as a veil upon it. The veil is completely lifted in the experience of the Divine. In the experience of literature too, this veil is lifted from our consciousness for the time being, and then it becomes impersonal and universal. In such a state of mind we experience a oneness with all objects in the Universe and are able, in the words of Wordsworth, to "see into the life of things". It is for this reason that Jagannātha, a great 17th century scholar of Sanskrit Poetics, has described Rasa as:

“स्नानदुवल्लिया भयोक्त्रया चित्रित र्सा”

The human consciousness, charged with the erotic or such other emotions, and having its veil broken, is called Rasa. Literature has been defined by Jagannātha as:

“रमणीयर्मयातलिनितमथ ब्रदुर्काल्पम्”
(Rasagangādhara : 1.1.).

Words conveying beautiful meaning will be Kāvyā. And ‘रमणीयताः’ or beauty has been defined as: “लोकोपपदुरुसस्म जनकम्रोणोक्तितः” or the ability to produce a transcendental joy fœr above the ordinary.

That the power of Imagination makes the poet create a joy that is distinguished from the petty pleasures of our day-to-day existence is repeatedly recognised by the English Romantic poets like Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats in their poems as well as critical discussions. The very same idea has been stated by Butcher in his commentary on Aristotle. “The object of Poetry,
as of all the fine arts, is to produce an emotional delight, a pure and elevated pleasure". (Aristotle's *Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, p. 221). The joy derived from an Imaginative creation is "complete in itself, and belongs to the ideal sphere of supreme happiness". (Ibid., p. 202).

The theory of Rasa in Indian Poetics, therefore, has made a great contribution in showing the distinctive character of the poetic Imagination. The Imagination may be fired up and inspired by the world of material reality, but it also transcends its limits and makes an ideal product which is complete in itself. And in this Sanskrit Poetics is one with the English Romantics.