CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The present study aims to provide a critical understanding of the concept of ‘Pratibhā’ often translated as creativity in philosophical and aesthetic discourses. No doubt, creativity stands for a process in connection with imagination. This chapter mainly focuses on the questions raised below;

• What function does imagination play in the world of art?
• What are the constituting elements of art?
• What is the nature of art?
• Can art be divided into ‘imagination’ and ‘creativity’?
• Can art be talked in terms of certain specific rules in nature or does it represent well itself in extempore expression of feeling and emotions?
• What is the difference between imagination and fancy?
• The fundamental difference needs to be understood is as to how aesthetics as a branch of philosophy helps us to understand the issues related to art?
• What are the main problems of aesthetics?
• What is an aesthetic experience?
• Can it be said that aesthetics also concerns itself with appreciation and criticism of an art product?
• How art experience is viewed in the east and in the west?
• How an art process or the process of creativity is to be recognized?

With these introductory questions the intended purpose of the chapter is to present a historical explanation of the concept of Pratibhā from an Indian perspective. The aim is also to relate the historical chapter presentations of Pratibhā to our contemporary concepts of creativity.

MEANING OF ART

In simple words, art is the creative ability of man to make things that display form, beauty, and unusual perception. It does not discover the nature of reality; rather
it provides us the highest experience of life in the form of pleasure. It includes painting, sculpture, architecture, music, literature, and drama, dance, etc. Art value is mainly for its real aesthetic value. Aesthetics is considered as “a branch of philosophy dealing with the nature of the beautiful and with judgments concerning beauty”. In India cooking, eating, bathing, and sleeping can be regarded as religious. Cutting across the infinite varieties of religious sects and forms of worship, there is the fundamental unity of approach common to all which is generally missed by the westerner. In this widest sense, dance and drama, music and painting, are so many ways of divine worship. It does not mean, as is generally supposed, that art was a hand maid to religion, that the aesthetic come near was subordinated to dogmas of religion. What is meant is only this: artists in India small religious in their personal lives and took their vocation very seriously, so seriously that they deemed their art work to be on par with the hardest disciplines like Yoga.

A work of art forms the basis for an aesthetic life. Art is the conscious use of skill and creative imagination in the formation of aesthetic objects. Although the term ‘art’ refers to a wide variety of objects and activities, yet for the purpose of this study its usage is considered for the created object and the imaginative process.

Philosophers from the time of Plato have attempted to give a general definition of art; they suggest four different ways of looking at a work of art. These four words are (i) Eikon (likeness), (ii) Xoanon (something carved), (iii) Agalma (a source of joy to a god) and (iv) Kolossos (a substitute). These definitions have varied from considering art as an inferior and lifeless rendering of natural forms through a symbolic device to a highly abstract semantics depicting the hidden nuances of human psyche. In this way, the philosophers have tried to arrive at generalizations regarding the definition of art.

Plato and Aristotle considered art to be an imitation of Reality. For them art is just a copy of an object imitated, but it is not an imitation of the idea rather is an imitation of the particular object. The particular form of art that concerned them most was drama. Plato wrote in his book ‘Republic’ that the essence of drama was imitation - the simulation of appearances. Plato’s analysis of imitation as a concept results in a threefold distinction in reality. Plato thought that the sensory world imitated the world of forms. So, art (poems and drama) is removed from reality since
they mirror the objective world. So, art is an illusion of an illusion. Images and pictures are only imitations of imitations. Imitation is understood as representation of intuition of nature, a form of knowledge.5

The two significant theories of art laid down by Plato and Aristotle explain that art imitates nature and that it should serve a moral purpose. These theories still are current. Even abstract artists sometimes claim that their art follows (imitates) their own inner nature; they too celebrate a form of mimesis. For Plato, since art is an imitation of an imitation, art is imitation of nature; it is in effect three times removed from the truth. He set down the most important spectator area of early theory that art was fundamentally ‘imitation’ (mimesis).6 The word ‘mimesis’ is considered to mean for that which oscillates between the meaning of “imitation” and that of “representation”. We find the use of this word in Plato’s book titled ‘Republic’. For him, mimesis was an idea that administered the creation of work of art, in particular, with correspondence to the physical world understood as a model for beauty, truth and the good. It is the imitation or representation, as of human speech or behavior. Aristotle also places art in the genus of imitation and distinguishes each art in terms of its medium, objects and manner of imitation.

Kant, a great philosopher, gave his own concept of art. This theory of beauty and art is available in his book “Critique of Judgment”. According to this theory, art is not pure beauty completely separate from the concept, it is adherent beauty which presupposes and attaches itself to a concept. Art is the work of genius. Imagination and intellect are the two elements which constitute genius. To imagination, to intellect and to spirit here must add taste, the link between imagination and intellect. Art may, therefore, represent natural ugliness: artistic beauty, “is not a beautiful thing but a beautiful representation of a thing”: although the representation of ugliness has limits varying with the individual arts and an absolute limit at the disgusting and nauseating, which kill representation itself. 7

Kant’s discussion of art is his claim that beauty is the “exhibition”, “presentation” or “expression” of aesthetic ideas. Kant describes an aesthetic idea as a representation of the imagination that occasions much thinking, though without it being possible for any determinate thought that is concept, to be adequate to it. Such ideas, he says, are a “counterpart” to rational ideas, that is, representations which
cannot be exemplified in experience or by means of imagination. In natural things, too, there is adherent beauty which cannot be judged by the aesthetic judgment alone but demand a concept. Nature, thus, appears as a work of art, though superhuman art; “the teleological judgment is the basis and condition of the aesthetic.”

Beauty, according to Kant, in its subjective meaning is that which, in general and necessarily, without reasoning and without practical advantage, pleases. In its objective meaning it is the form suitable object in so far as that object is perceived out any conception of its utility. For example; when we say “this is a beautiful woman,” we merely mean that “nature beautifully represents in the form of this woman her purpose in the fabrication of the female body”: it is necessary therefore, besides nothing simple form, to aim at a concept, “so that the object may be detained through an aesthetic judgment logically conditioned.”

Kant describes that it is the “faculty of judgment” that provides us the experience of beauty and grasp. Kant was indifferent to music and painting, but his views on art contribute significantly towards aesthetics. He discussed three types of pleasure, viz. in the agreeable, in the good and in the beauty. Pleasure in the agreeable is a matter of gratification; pleasure in the food is important but not disinterested; while pleasure in beauty is ensured only if we respond to it as it presents itself, without any prejudice or reasoning.

Hegel, another well-known thinker, puts his views on art in a different way. He does not suppose to find any discussion of art in the analysis of sensibility and intuition, language and symbolism, and various grades of imagination and thought. He places art in the subject of absolute Spirit, together with religion and philosophy, and in this he regards Kant and other philosophers as his precursors, for like them he strongly denies that art has the function of representing the abstract concept, but not that it represents the concrete concept or idea. Hegel finds the manifestation of God himself in nature and in art in the form of beauty. Beauty is only the reflection of the natural beauty of the spirit. But the spiritual content must appear in sensuous form. The sensuous manifestation of spirit is only appearance, and it leads us to the only reality of the beautiful. Thus art is the production of this appearance of the Idea, and is a means, together with religion and philosophy, of bringing to consciousness and of expressing the threatening problems of humanity and sublime truths of the spirit.
To the realm of the concrete concept belongs art, as one of the three forms wherein the freedom of the spirit is achieved;

1. Immediate sensible objective knowledge,
2. Religion a representative consciousness plus worship, an element extraneous to mere art,
3. Philosophy free thought of the absolute spirit.  

Hegel believes that there is no difference between truth and beauty except that truth is the Idea itself as it exists in itself, and is thinkable. The Idea, manifested externally, becomes to the apprehension not only true but beautiful. The beautiful is the manifestation of the Idea.  

Croce believes that art is intuition. He says that “art can be intuition; but intuition cannot be always art. The artistic intuition is a distinct species differing from intuition in general. It has sometimes been thought that art is not a simple intuition, but an intuition of an intuition, in the same way as the concept of science has been defined not as the ordinary concept, but as the concept of concept. Thus, man would attain to art by objectifying, not his sensations, as happens with ordinary intuition but intuition itself. 

To intuit means to express. It implies that art is the expression of the emotion of its creator. The expression theory of art shows that art can also do something important for the people. But, according to Croce, “Art is the expression of impressions, not expression of expressions”.

The following three factors proposed by Henry Parker are considered essential for the definition of art. 

1. The provision of satisfaction through the imagination;
2. Social significance; and
3. Harmony.
The first factor essential for the definition of art is the provision of fulfilment in the imagination. Satisfaction through the imagination can be explained by an example of the day-dream. If a politician seeking office by election allows himself to day-dream the ceremony whereby he is declared the winner, it is clear that he is getting satisfaction, not by a real course of action that leads him; in fact to his goal, but through a purely fictitious occurrence which he makes up in his own mind, for himself. But, it should be noted that the motivating desire is the same in both cases. Another example of satisfaction through the imagination can be of the little girl playing with a doll, having animated conversation with it. She creates a world out of fancies to meet her desires. An artist also acts in a similar way. Therefore, while considering art as a dream it should not be mere dreaming but there needs to be the same creativeness and the same absorption in immediacy.

The second factor considered essential for art is its social element. By the social element we mean that the satisfaction of art does not depend upon factors peculiar to an individual, but rather, positively, upon types of objects that may be present in the experience of anyone. It is always impossible for anyone to share the satisfaction of others in their dreams. But in the case of art, the satisfaction depends upon patterns of sense and meanings that are potentially universal. We cannot dream the dream that others dream, but we can see the same pattern of colour or hear the same harmonies and melodies that others hear. But it cannot be denied that the evident differences may exist among the experiences of the same work of art in the case of different individuals.

It cannot be denied that art is a free creation of an imaginary world through which the artist expresses his desires and finds a solution for his problems. But art is not merely a self-expression. The artist builds something for his group from whom he demands sympathy and understanding. His aim is not to please the group; rather he insists that his group find pleasure in what pleases him. He stands for something in a group and expects that what he creates shall be valued as he values it.

The following two aspects emerge out of the discussion made above:

(i) the structural aspect, and
(ii) the feeling aspect.
The structural aspect of art work relates to the organic unity of space and time. As an aesthetic quality, organic unity implies the indivisibility of art work. This unity of elements gives birth to a new creation which is not equal to a mere togetherness of its parts. The feeling aspect of art states that no art can be regarded as a purely "spontaneous overflow of powerful emotions". It is not beauty or art alone that can create reactions in our mind, but everything which exists and comes in contact with our mind is sure to give rise to some states of consciousness and feeling in the form of experience. Different schools of philosophy have tried to explain the nature of these experiences in their own way.

The experiences arising due to the contact between the mind and these objects have a special significance for us. It will not be wrong to say that if there is anything in the world which carries utmost significance not for the practical utility and other benefits but just for the sake of the kind of experiences it produces, it is art and beauty. To trace a historical account of the nature and definition of art we find that art is the production or result of that conception of things by which the subject becomes its own object or the object its own subject. Beauty is the perception of the infinite in the finite. And the chief characteristic of works of art is unconscious infinity. Art is the uniting of the subjective with the objective, of nature with reason, of the unconscious with the conscious, and therefore art is the highest means of knowledge, beauty is the contemplation of things in them as they exist in the prototype. It is not the artist who by his knowledge or skill produces the beautiful, but the idea of beauty in him itself produces it.16

Art and beauty are always associated with experience. But this experience is considered "aesthetic" and it can be distinguished from other experiences.

While defining and distinguishing art, it can be said that all works of art, irrespective of their kind, exhibit harmony, form, pattern and design as their universal characteristic. However in the Indian perspective, the term ‘art’ stands for ‘Kalā’. The Sanskrit term means a pleasant human activity characterized by close observation, calculation, contemplation and clear expression. Such an activity is necessary for the production of a work of art. Kalā is a great source of aesthetic pleasure.
The history of the art of Indian origin shows that drama has also all the characteristics of any art. The stage drama has several dimensions;

(i) First is the script, presented in the form of an imitation of life.
(ii) It requires the medium of expression or Bhāva and acting.
(iii) This has to be done in a specific style.
(iv) And finally, it is to be evaluated in the form of the applause or otherwise from the audience.

It has, thus all the characteristics of any art, whether it is dance, music, painting, sculpture or architecture. Perhaps on this account, the theory of drama became a paradigm for all art-critics and the concepts in drama were employed and re-employed in different arts. They were, for example, employed in the criticism of poetry. Drama requires a continuum of time and deals with a medium. There is some media among a medium in different arts. For example, a medium in poetry and the medium of drama. The general characteristics of these media are also the characteristics of language whether they are of the nature of memory or concepts, or the material of which the art object is made. Bharata also discusses this in his Nātyaśāstra. But several refinements came from time to time in understanding and developed in the course of time. The theories of Alamkāra, Rīti, Dhwani, Rasa and Aucitya can be mentioned in the context.17

Role of Creativity and Imagination in Art

It is believed that the imagination is important for creative thought. The terms ‘creative’ and ‘imaginative’ are often used interchangeably. Kant, a great modern philosopher, recognized a connection between imagination and creativity.

There can be no work of art without creativity. It can be said without doubt that creativity is the soul of good art. We cannot consider a work of art complete and significant if it lacks creativity. But, creativity is a very difficult phenomenon to describe. We can describe what good art is, but it is very difficult to show how good art is created. A poet is gifted with a great gift of putting his ideas into words. His imagination power enables him to create poetry in any situation. Creativity turns new and imaginative ideas into reality. Thinking, and producing are the two process of creativity. Creativity leads to the formation or completion of an idea. If one has ideas, but does not act on them, one is imaginative, but not creative. Here, it can be said that
“creativity is the process of bringing something new into being... creativity requires excitement and dedication. Out of the creative act is born symbols and myths. It brings to our awareness what was previously hidden and points to new life. The experience is one of heightened consciousness—ecstasy.”

Here it can be said that if an artist or a poet wants to make something new it requires being creative and imaginative. Creativity processes in art. An artist works without an aim. Unlike an academic painter or writer, the creative artist does not know about his target before. Creative processes in art, then, are processes subject to critical control by the artist although not by virtue of the fact that he foresees the final result of the activity. That this way of construing creativity reflects part of what we have in mind when we speak of creative art can be shown if we contrast what results from creative processes so construed with what results from other activates that we do not call creative.

Creativity is a process of art, while on the other side the concept of imagination is considered as the capability to think of things in terms of possibilities. It is a conscious and intentional act of mind. By the interplay of the imagination and our rational minds, we can imagine and bring to form a culture for the new millennium where we can live together in peace.

The imagination enables us to reform existing ideas in new and effective ways. This occurs throughout the creative process, as the mind perceives the many varieties of possibilities and makes choices of what to leave in and what to leave out. Kant admits that there may also be artistic productions without an imagination, comparable with the free beauties of nature, flowers and some birds attractive drawing, musical fantasies without words. He finds no place for imagination amongst powers of the spirit but places it among the facts of sensation. He knows a reproductive imagination and an associative, but he knows nothing of a genuinely productive imagination, imagination in the proper sense.

A poet makes his words in different way in his imagination. His imagination works like a magic. It is for this reason that its study occupies a significant place in western schools of poetics. A philosophical critic like Coleridge of Croce builds a style of Aesthetics with Imagination as its key-stone. The Imagination is the ability to mentally visualize images and create things which are unique and have value in
society. Our imagination is the basis of learning everything about our reality with a child's innate sense of enchantment and wonder.

The whole discussion leads us to conclude that imagination and creativity are necessary for poetry. In Western Poetics there has been a debate over the question whether poetry is essentially 'imitation' or 'creation' (mimesis or poesis). However in India, both the modes have been admitted because both of them could achieve Rasa-Parkāśa, the most important aim of poetry. Neither 'imagination' nor 'creation' -- or to use in Indian philosophy, neither 'Śvabhāvokti' nor 'Vakrokti' -- is an end in itself; it is only a means to the realization of Rasa.22

MEANING AND NATURE OF AESTHETICS

Aesthetic, a branch of philosophy, deals with the nature of beauty, art, and taste with the creation and appreciation of beauty. It exists for the sake of knowledge, not as a guide to practice. An aesthetic theorist wishes to understand the artist not in order to interfere with the later, but in order to satisfy an intellectual interest of his own. In simple words, aesthetics can be called the philosophy of the beautiful.

The word 'Aesthetics' has its origin in the Greek language. It has been derived from Greek word 'Aisthetikas' which means esthetic, sensitive, sentient. It is a term generally used to designate different theories of beauty and elegance of more precise designation. Today, aestheticians are concerned with the theory of art and the theory of aesthetic that emerged in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries from the concept of beauty.

Of all the experiences we have in this world the aesthetic experience is different from other experiences. Aesthetic experience has its own value and place in our life. Anything beautiful or artistic becomes a source of aesthetic experience for us. This experience is the result of some stimuli varying in the degree of delight and excitement caused by the source of experience.

An aesthetic experience, primarily based on human emotions, is neither a personal experience nor a psycho-physical reaction to the emotional experiences of the dramatic characters. Although the aesthetic experience is based on human emotion, yet it is separate from a human emotion--this may sound like a paradox, but it is not. Now the question arises 'what are these emotions?' It can be said that when a man is said to express emotion, that at first, he is conscious only of having an
emotion, but not conscious of what this emotion is. All he is conscious of is an excitement, which he feels going on within him, but of what nature he is ignorant? He extricates himself from this helpless and oppressed condition by expressing himself through language. It has also something to do with consciousness become the emotion expressed is an emotion of whose nature the person who feels it is no longer unconscious. It has also something to do with the way in which he feels the emotion. In this way, he feels relieved of oppression and his mind is somehow lightened. The lightening of emotions has a certain similarity to the “Catharsis” by which emotions are earthed through being discharged into make-believe situation. However, these two things are not the same.

The expression of an emotion by speech may be addressed to someone; but if so, it is not done with the intention of arousing a like emotion in him. If there is any effect which we wish to produce in the hearer, it is only the effect, which we call, making him understand how we feel. But, as we have already seen, this is just the effect which expressing our emotions has on ourselves. It makes us, as well as the people to whom we talk, understand how we feel. A person expressing emotion is treating himself and spectators in the same kind of way he is making his emotions clear to spectators and that is what he is doing to himself.23

We can divide the human experience broadly into three categories: sensual, mental and intellectual. No category can be exclusive because of the extremely intricate and complex nature of our experience. But it is a workable classification based on the primary use of one faculty or the other. For example, the experience of a close friend embrace is a sensual pleasure, its reminiscence is a mental pleasure and the experience of a successful solution of an emotional problem is an intellectual pleasure. Certainly, it is not the pleasure of any of the kinds mentioned above. The aesthetic experience is different from the experience of reminiscence because fundamentally reminiscence is personal wherein our ego is invariably involved; it is not detached and is only partially liberated. Thus, it can be said that the aesthetic experience is the pleasant experience of an imaginative recreation of an emotion.

THE INDIAN AESTHETIC

After having a discussion on western aesthetics, now it would be appropriate to study aesthetics from the Indian point of view. Aesthetics is the science and
philosophy of the independent art threats that present the Absolute in a sensuous garb in such a way that their products serve as the effective mediums for the getting of experience of the Absolute for such connoisseurs as possess the necessary subjective condition. Indian aesthetic is based upon the conceptions of aesthetic value in terms of personal response or reproduction. This value is known as Rasa, the whole system is based upon and illustrated by literature, and cannot be applied to sculpture and painting.  

There are two main concepts of Indian poetry, drama, sculpture and painting. These two concepts are Rasa and Bhāva. Rasa and Bhāva, the key terms of Indian aesthetic speculation are found as freely used in works on sculpture and painting as in works on poetry and drama. We find the use of these two Sanskrit words even in the works on aesthetic theory. Rasa and Bhāva describe the aesthetic situation, the art object outside, more than the subjective state of the critic. 

These Bhāvas can be of two types that is simple and complex. We can understand simple Bhāva easily. It can be easily grasped; but the complex Bhāva cannot be easily understood. Complex Bhāva demands greater degree of aesthetic endeavour from the creator as well as the critic. These Bhāvas enhance the impressions of basic nature without taking away their importance. 

An artist stands above a simple Bhāva as he is not satisfied with such a simple representation of nature. He makes the Bhāvas or representation to be more and more complex if it is gifted with imagination. The most complex pattern imposed on nature and human nature by imagination of the artist wins the boundless admiration of the most cultivated man of taste. He calls it by the name Rasa since it provides him supreme delight.  

**RASA AS AN AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE**

In the field of Indian aesthetics, it is the rasa (aesthetic experience) that manifests itself when the Sthāyibhāva, that is the emotion of a reader or a spectator, is correlated with the three aspects expressed in a piece of creative literature, viz. (i) Vibhāva (excitant), (ii) Anubhāva (instant response) and (iii) Vyabhicāribhāva (transitory feelings). All these three aspects need to be accumulated as one. The word emotion cannot in its totality represent ‘Bhāva’, as emotion stands more for an outcome of feelings. Whereas Bhāvas lay calmly in the state of our heart which when
given appropriate environment manifest extrovertly. On the basis of this similarity the term emotion can be equalized with Bhāvas in the present context. The basic characteristics of the above mentioned Bhāvas or emotions are highlighted as under:

(a) Sthāyībhāva (permanent emotions)

Permanent emotions are inborn in every individual. These are neither acquired by any experience training nor as a result of any emotion or feeling.

These are eight in number: Rati (love), Hāsya (joy), Šoka (grief), Krodha (anger), Utsāha (enthusiasm), Bhaya (fear), Jugupsā (disgust) and Vismaya (surprise). According to some rhetoricians there are three more Bhāvas also: (i) Nirveda that is detachment from the worldly affairs; (ii) Vātsalya that is affection for children; and (iii) Sneha or Sāhacarya that is desire for the company of a particular friend of any sex.27

(b) Vyabhicāri Bhāva (transitory feelings)

Vyabhicāri Bhāva (transitory feelings) have been enumerated thirty-three in number, yet more can also be added in the list. Unlike the Sthāyībhāva, transitory feelings are neither inborn, nor permanent. Such feelings are aroused out of the Sthāyībhāva themselves. For example, the depression is born out of ‘sorrow’. Apart from it the transitory feelings are attached with more than one emotion. For example, the feelings like unsteadiness, longing, madness, dejection, sickness, agony, despair, depression, etc., are attached with the emotion ‘sorrow’ as well as with ‘love’ and also with ‘fear’.

(c) Vibhāva (an excitant)

The cause of any basic Sthāyībhāva in worldly affairs, when presented in any piece of creative literature is known as Vibhāva (an excitant). It is of two kinds: (i) Alambana-Vibhāva (substantial excitant), and (ii) Uddipana-Vibhāva (enhancer excitant).

(d) Anubhāva (issuant response)

The effect of physical expression of any Anubhāva is known as Anubhāva (issuant response). For example, in the case of fear, the physical movements of a terrified person from a lion in the jungle, like trembling, trying to look in all directions to seek help, perspiration, horrification, fainting, etc., is known as Anubhāva (issuant response). Similarly, in the case of sorrow, say, at the death of a
son in a drama on the stage, wailing, sobs, sighs, falling on the ground, raving, etc., of his parents are termed as issuant response.

The theory of Rasa in Indian philosophy is a theoretical endeavour to analyze the aesthetic experience in terms of its psychic content and the kind of relish it entails. It is clear that aesthetic experience is not only a significant subject for investigation but also the soul of the aesthetic theory in India. The Indian philosophers compare this experience with Rasānubhūti, which is the experience of Rasa with the highest spiritual bliss attained by realizing the Brāhmanahood. No doubt, some classics exist in other fine arts as well, but the fundamentals of Indian Aesthetics have been discussed constantly in the works of poetics. The broader concepts of aesthetics experience have been described mainly in the context of ‘Rasa’.

As already stated above that the aesthetic experience is not the experience of a personal emotion, it is the experience of a universalized emotion. It is an experience of a liberated state of mind which is free from egoistic interests. It stands close to the feeling of self-realization or self-fulfillment through sublimated human emotions embodied in the works of art. This feeling of self-fulfillment is possible through other media as well, for example, through fruitful action, through dedication or through meditation, but that is not an aesthetic experience. For aesthetic experience, the basis of human emotions and art-stimuli is essential. In short, it is the experience of an impersonal emotion realized in a liberated state of the psyche.28

For the earlier writers from Bharata to Bhamaha etc., Rasa was an objective concept which signified an aesthetic situation in a drama or an aesthetic expression in a poetic composition. But it assumed a purely subjective character under the impact of Advaita philosophy of the Saivita School headed by Abhinavagupta. According to Abhinavagupta, an aesthetic situation was a part of drama; an aesthetic expression was a piece of poetry and the experience, therefore, as Rasa. The views of these scholars from Abhinavagupta to Viśvanatha who defined Rasa as an aesthetic experience can be summed up as follows:

(1) The aesthetic experience is based primarily on human emotions.
(2) The state of bliss is pervaded by a feeling of spiritual illumination. It is mostly free from sensual elements. The physical emotions when converted in artistic
emotions are freed from the limitations of time and space and are thus universalized.

Nevertheless, the aesthetic experience is not a state of pure spiritual bliss, because it is not a permanent state of joy. Thus, according to Indian poetics, it is a state of transcendental joy, or a state of self-fulfillment. The question arises as to what is the relation between an emotional experience and aesthetic experience?

As already stated, that the aesthetic experience is primarily based on emotion. So, it is impossible to conceive of a form of beauty without some finer threads of emotional associations, direct or indirect, potent or latent. Majority of the Indian art-critics agree upon this inter-relationship of the aesthetic emotion and human emotion.

The Rasa without an emotional basis and an artistic emotion without Rasa can never exist. According to Indian poetics, the basic emotions underlying the aesthetic experience can be divided into two categories: (i) Emotions like love, wonder, courage and comedy which are pleasurable, (ii) Emotions like sadness, anger, terror, and horror which are painful in life. But when they form the material basis of art, they all lose their sting and the element of pain is extracted invariably. Thus, it can be easily proved that the artistic emotion is not identical with human emotion as such.

The normal human experience is acquired either by way of one’s own experience or by the experience of another person reacting on us through sympathy. The experience of our own self can be two-fold: (i) direct (ii) indirect or reflex. It has been just proved that the aesthetic experience is not direct. Can our aesthetic experience be a reflex experience? It is such experience which re-occurs in our consciousness without the direct stimulus. It can be broadly said that it is the reminiscence of a direct experience. Further, it may be said that the aesthetic experience is not the reminiscence even of a direct experience because even the reminiscences have positive personal association. They are pleasurable or painful according to the nature of the original experience. So, the aesthetic experience can be defined as a complex experience, pleasant in essence, in which the emotional and intellectual elements are blended in a subtle harmony. It has a separate identity because it is more refined than the emotional pleasure and more colorful than intellectual pleasure.
Plato, in his book titled ‘The Republic’ defines poetry as “the art of divine madness or inspiration. Because the poet is subject to this divine madness it is not poet’s function to convey the truth.” As Plato has it, truth is the concern of the philosopher only. As culture in those days did not consist in the private reading of books, but in the listening to performances, the recitals of orators (and poets), or the acting out by classical actors of tragedy, Plato maintained in his critique that theatre was not sufficient in conveying the truth.

There cannot be any poetry without words which means one can hardly dispense with semantics in the discussion of poetry. It does not mean that it is imperative to study linguistics, philology, morphology and such other subjects to appreciate poetry. However one must be fully conversant with the potency of words and word-structure in order to apprehend a poetic structure.

Poetry evokes emotions; no linguistic structure devoid of feelings or emotions deserves the appellation of poetry. Poetry is constituted of emotive language. According to Indian philosophers like Bhamaha, poetry is “Śabdārthau Sahitam Kāvyama” (Kavyadarsa.1.16). ‘A (happy) fusion of Śabda (word) and Artha (sense) is called poetry:’ If this definition pertains to all kinds of meaningful sentence that is worldly, scriptural, and poetic then how are we to understand the difference among them because all sentences that we utter do not become a form of poetry. Thus, it can be said that poetry is a union of word and meaning. Dandin says that the body of the poetry is a group of words which indicates the happy aim intended by the author.

“Śariram Tavadiśtartha Vyavachinna Padavali”

(Kāvyadarśa 1.10b)

The above-said statement by Dandin indicates that poetry is not merely a ‘Padavali’ or a group of words, but an inseparable union of both word and meaning. And secondly, the word ‘Iśtartha’ requires an explanation as it bears philosophical relevance to the present study. The word ‘Padavali’ in it is the first source of the ‘Kāvyā-Purusā- Rupaka’. Both these points have been discussed in detail in the present research work.

For Vamana, “Poetry is that union of word and meaning which is devoid of poetic flaws and is embodied with Gunas (excellences) and the Alarnkaras (figures of
speech). The poetic excellence is an essential component of a piece of poetry, while a figure of speech is not. According to him ‘Ritiratama Kāvyasa’ \(^{30}\) the soul (essence) of poetry is Riti, which is a structure of words comprising of poetic excellences.

Ānandavardhana, defines poetry in two sentences: “Śabdārtha Śarirm Tavat Kāvyam” and “Ca Dhvaniratma Kāvyasya”. The body of poetry is the combination of denotative word and sound, while its soul is the suggested sense. Poetry is nothing but an internal beauty of a meaningful construction of words, and such an idea was never presented by any Acārya before him, yet the word ‘Dhvani’ itself is a technical term of Poetics. Kuntaka has defined poetry on the basis of the doctrine of Vakrokti propounded by him;

“Śabdārthu Sahitau Vakrakavīvyaparastalini
Bandhe Vyavasthitau Kāvyam Tadvidyadahtadkarini”
(Vakrokti Jivita 1.7)

For him poetry is the union of word and meaning, arranged in a composition, which consisting of oblique sayings of a poet is delightful for its sensible reader or listener. The definition of poetry presented by Jagannatha is;

“Ramniyartha - Pratipadidha Śabdah Kāvyam”

The poetry is a word which promotes delight. Here, the word ‘Ramniyartha’ denotes not only poetic delight pertaining to rasa, the main variety of Dhvani-Kāvyā, but also all the ingredients of Kāvyā like Vastu-Dhvani-Kāvyā and Alanākara-Dhvani-Kāvyā, Guniibhuta-Vyangya-Kāvyā, Riti, Guna, Alanākaras, Vakrokti, etc. This definition, thus, covers all the areas of poetics and has a wider field than rasa. Moreover, the word ‘Ramniyartha’ is not a technical term of poetics like Alanākara, Riti, Guna, Dhvani-Rasa, Vakrokti, etc.

The word and meaning make the poetry delightful. The real word is that which selected out of a number of synonyms expresses the sense desired by the poet himself and the real sense is that which by its own alluring nature creates pleasure in the mind of a Sahradaya.

The togetherness of the ‘word’ and the ‘meaning’ is nothing but a captivating state which creates a poetic delight in the mind of the reader or viewer which is exactly desired by the poet himself neither less nor more. In the case of music, we enjoy the tune or musical notes even without knowing the words and subtle meanings, while poetry becomes a delight when sound conveys a sense.
THE CONCEPT OF PRATIBHĀ

Poetry is created only when a poet imagines things in a certain manner and presents them in a poetic composition that gives us pleasure. Thus, Pratibhā is the creative imagination of a poet.

In Indian philosophy the concept of Pratibhā has been described in different ways. From the grammatical perspective, it has been equated with the doctrine of ‘Sphoṭa’ by the grammarians. It has been considered genius of the poet that enables him to create a world having its foundations in the poet’s imagination. The concept of Pratibhā has deeper philosophical implications when studied from a Śaiva Philosophical perspective.

‘Pratibhā’ the motivating power of a poet, leads him to a poetic expression. Some of the definitions of poetics given by the poets of classical Indian literature are explained below.

‘Prajñā Navnavomeśalini Pratibhā Mata’

Pratibhā is that extraordinary mental power which enables us to lead a life of perfection without any efforts and upgrade ourselves in comparison with others. It is that extraordinary intellectual power or qualification which expresses itself in literature, arts, and science.

A poet should essentially possess the following three Kāvyahetu (qualifications of the poet):

- Pratibhā – it is the inborn genius.
- Vyutpatti – it is the acquired learning.
- Abhyasa – it is the proficiency acquired by practicing the art of composition.

THE CONCEPT OF PRATIBHĀ IN DIFFERENT SCHOOLS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

- Nyāya Vaiśeṣika

In this system that no knowledge can arise except through the contact of the Manas, the atomic intra-organic faculty of mind, with the self, this contact being an habitual causal antecedent to the phenomena of conscious life in general. The character of the resulting knowledge is determined by the state of the Manas, viz. whether it is at rest or in motion. If it is moving and all movement is eventually due to
the action of prior dispositions and Adrṣṭa, it comes of essential into relation with the 
senses which may Jagrat or may not, as in dream, be in touch with the objects, and the 
ensuing consciousness is either Jagrat or Svapna. But if the Manas be absolutely 
motionless, two states may follow according as this motionlessness is consequent 
merely upon nature’s demand for rest or on intense concentration. In the former case, 
consciousness will be in total abeyance until it emerges again, along with the renewal 
of motion in Manas, under a vital impulse acting from beyond. This is the state known 
as Suṣupti (dreams sleep). The second state is called yoga or Samādhi, in which 
consciousness, far from subsiding, is exalted into an extraordinary clarity of 
immediate intuition. Time, space and other limitations having vanished, the Manas 
stands face to face, as it were, not only with the pure self but with the realities of all 
things. This vision is Pratibhā or Ārsajñāna.33

- **Yoga**

  In the Yoga system, especially in that represented by Patañjali, Pratibhā is 
synonymous with an aspect of Prajñā. It is believed to be the supreme faculty of 
omniscience which is evolved through a continued practice of concentration on the 
self, not in its absolute and transcendent nature, but as appearing in the form of the 
phenomenal ego. The pure self is not a study of object. It is believed that as practice 
continues, and before the glory of the final explanation yet breaks forth, there dawns 
on the zone, in the fashion of the effulgence of the morning sun before the actual rise 
of the sphere above the horizon, an awful splendor in which the entire universe stands 
fully revealed. The vision of the many as reflected in the mirror of the one it is, so to 
speak. Although there is still predominance of multiplicity it is at this stage so 
thoroughly infused with the unity that it is in a sense identical with it. In view of this 
multiplicity in the object of this vision it is held to be an impediment to Kāivalya and 
to the highest wisdom which leads through the cessation of all mental life to supreme 
state.34

- **Vyākarna**

  The grammarians’ doctrine of Pratibhā is closely bound up with his view 
regarding the origin of knowledge and of the objective world, and as this subject has 
not yet been dealt with elsewhere it would be appropriate to furnish a short account of 
it here.
Sphoṭa being the image of the sound is the inner reality of speech. It is manifested by the sound and it is of an integrated nature. In modern linguistics, the whole expression is taken into account when the meaning is to be conveyed. Pratibhā as meaning of the sentence is such a concept. According to Bhartrihari, sentence is a meaningful linguistic unit. By Pratibhā only we can understand the sentence meaning as flash. Every expression consists of three elements that is the Dhvani or Nāda (physical sound), Sphoṭa (mental word) and the meaning. Bhartrihari has treated the first two elements he has entirely devoted the second Kānda.35

• Kaśmir Śaivism

Kaśmir Śaiva philosophy known as Trika philosophy, leading to densed in a simple language understandable by a layman of any faith or religion or even by any non-believer. In describing the nature of reality, the Kaśmir Śaiva believes that there is only One Being, called Lord Śiva. This Being is the nature and existence of all beings. This Being is defined as being filled with the infinite Prakāsa of God Consciousness. The Śaiva also holds that the objective world, although experienced as separate from one’s self, does not have a separate existence. It is the Śakti of Śiva. According to Kaśmir Śaivism, the manifestation of the universe of contradictory forms becomes possible due to the power of freedom of the absolute. His freedom represents the capacity for manifesting the world. It is this power of freedom which performs miracles in the state of finite existence. It is known under various names, such as perfect energy, Śakti, Spanda, etc. It implies unobstructed freedom in creation that which appears extremely difficult. When compared with powers of other Gods who are its creations, it is called independent and great power. Śiva does not require any instrument for bringing about the manifestation of the world. He manifests the objects by virtue of his will, without any break in connection. All the objects, both before and after manifestation, exit as one with Him, as he is absolutely powerful. His creativity is nothing more than this manifestation of his free will. 36

This creativity of free will can be observed even in pragmatic life. It is a well-known fact that the Yogis create various objects due to their will power alone. This creativity of the lord can also be seen on the analogy the reflectivity of such things as reflect, crystal, etc. The free will of the lord is always manifesting itself in the form
of the five-fold functions of universal creation, maintenance, destruction, self-concealment and self-revelation.\textsuperscript{37}

- **Vedānta**

  The word ‘Pratibhā’ seldom occurs in Vedāntic literature but the doctrine was certainly recognized. In the ninth Anuvāka of his Vārttika on the Taittiriya Upanisad (the only instance in which the term ‘Pratibhā’ is found in Vedānta), Suresvara mentions it by name Pratibhā-Jñāna and calls it Ārṣa, thereby implying that this knowledge, by nature transcendent, is the characteristic of Ṛsis or seers, and it is further stated there that it comes into manifestation only to that seeking soul, who, by means of constant repetition of mantra and of prolonged meditation, is able to throw off the veil of Māyā and enter into conscious communion with the Supreme Being. By way illustration it is pointed out that such an intuition dawned upon Trīśanku was revealed. And in consequence of this manifestation of Pratibhā, Trīśanku was converted into a Ṛsi.\textsuperscript{38}

  While concluding, it can be said that Pratibhā stands as a principle of creativity in the field of art and philosophy. This study provides a holistic understanding of the concept of Pratibhā and aesthetic experience from analytical perspective. Due care and concern has been given to the original texts related to Sanskrit Poetics, while concentrating on the critical explanations and philosophical interpretations of the concept. And in this thesis intends to broadly focus on the following questions and issues:-

  - What is the definition of Poetry?
  - What constitutes the Sarir (body) and Atman (soul) of poetry?
  - What is its purpose and what is the nature of the delight it imparts to its reader?
  - What does ‘Pratibhā’ stand for?
  - What are the interpretations of the concept of Pratibhā in the six school of Indian Poetics, Alāṅkara, Guna-Riti, Vakrokti, Aucharitya and Rasa-Dhvani?
  - What is Sphoṭa?
  - What is the contribution of Grammarians in understanding the concept ‘Pratibhā’?
- Pratibhā bears the same connotations in the field of art as the concept of Sphoṭa in Grammar. How?
- What could be the possible inter linkages involved among Šabdavaita, Brahmadvaita and Rasadvaita?
- How 'Pratibhā' has been interpreted by the Kaśmir-Śaivism?
- The interpretation of Prakaśa and Vimarsa in relation to Svatantrya in general and Kriya Svatantrya and Satta Svatantrya in particular.

It can be said as a conclusive statement that the concept Pratibhā has always remained a mystery because there are examples of poets who shaped, polished and improved their work with constant hard work and guidance from their early childhood days. There are others also who never showed any poetic creativity for a long period of time and did not have any literary background, yet all of a sudden poetry of high caliber, creating poetic delight in the minds of the readers started flowing out of their pen. The present research aims to address the above mentioned questions.
REFERENCES

1 Webster’s Seventh; New Collegiate Dictionary; Published by G.E.C. Merriam Company; Springfield, Massachusetts, U.S.A; 1969, p.15.

2 K. Krishnamoorthy (Article); Indian Aesthetics and Art Activity; Published Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla; 1968; p.45.

3 www.jstor.org.

4 Noel Carroll; Philosophy of Art; Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, London and New York; 1999; p.19.

5 Benedetto Crooce; Tr. Douglas Ainslie; Aesthetic, As Science of Expression and General Linguistic; Published D. Mehra, Rupa & Co., London; 1909; p.16.

6 www.jstor.org.

7 Benedetto Crooce; Tr. Douglas Ainslie; Aesthetic, As Science of Expression and General Linguistic; Published D. Mehra, Rupa & Co., London; 1909; p.275-276.

8 Kant’s Aesthetics and Teleology; www.plato.stanford.edu.

9 Benedetto Crooce; Tr. Douglas Ainslie; Aesthetic, As Science of Expression and General Linguistic; D. Mehra, Rupa & Co., London; 1909; p.25.

10 Ibid; p.298-299.

11 Ibid.

12 Ibid; p.36-37.


16 What is Art, Leo Tolstoy, Walter Scott, London; p.36-37

17 Barlingay, S.S.; A Modern Introduction to Indian Aesthetic Theory; D.K. Printworld, New Delhi; 2007; p.xii-xiv.


19 Ibid.
21 Prof. Nagandra and Prof. V. Raghavan; An Introduction to Indian Poetics; Macmillan and Co., Limited, Bombay; 1970; p.61.
22 Ibid; p.66.
24 Ibid; p.46.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid; p.50.
27 Choudhary Satya Dev; Glimpses of Indian Poetics; Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi; 2002; p.68.
28 Prof. Nagandra and Prof. V. Raghavan; An Introduction to Indian Poetics; Macmillan and Co., Limited, Bombay; 1970; p.76-77.
29 Dr. Rajesh Sahra (Hira); Bhartya Sahityershastra Kosa; Bihar Hindi Granth, Akademi Patna; p.783.
30 Prof. Nagandra and Prof. V. Raghavan; An Introduction to Indian Poetics; Macmillan and Co., Limited, Bombay; 1970; p.42.
31 Sanskriti Hindi Kośa; p.654.
32 Hindi Šabd Sagar; Sampadak-Visavanth Tirpathi, p.3155
33 Gopinath Kaviraj; Aspects of Indian Thought; Surajit C. Das, at General Printers and Publishers Private Limited, Calcutta; 1966; p.3-4.
34 Ibid.
35 Gayatri Rath; Linguistic Philosophy in Vākyapadiya; Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Varanasi; 2007; p.149.
36 Sharma, L. N.; Kašmir Šaivism; Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Varanasi; 1996; p.223.
37 Ibid; p.225.
38 Gopinath Kaviraj; Aspects of Indian Thought ; Surajit C. Das, at General Printers and Publishers Private Limited, Calcutta; 1966; p.25.