CHAPTER–2
THEORY OF PRATIBHĀ

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF PRATIBHĀ

The importance of involving the use of skill and imagination to produce something new or a work of art or creative writing in Sanskrit poetics is called Pratibhā. In other words, the equivalent of creativity in Sanskrit poetics is called Pratibha. Philosophically, one can observe the difference between fancy and imagination. The fancy can be passive imagination in which the artist is unable to bring his creativity into action. On the other hand, the imagination is stage of the artist’s mind that shapes imagination into a concrete form.

The current chapter focuses on the concept of Pratibhā in poetics. It is well known that Pratibhā is the main cause behind the creation of the poetry. Here Pratibhā can be defined as the inborn ability of the poet, without it, poet would be unable to make or create poetry. The work of poet is to create a poem. The concept of Pratibhā is central to the discussion of classical Indian poetics. The basic meaning of Pratibhā is described by a flash across the mind, a revelation characterized by immediacy and freshness.

Glancing at the philosophical background of Pratibhā one can get the clue of Pratibhā from the Vedic period. The first grammarian who used the term Pratibhānam is known as Bhartrahari. According to him, Pratibhā is the ability to know something by using the feelings rather than considering the facts, that illuminates the meaning of whole sentence. Further, he maintains that the completeness of the sentence-meaning can be experienced only through a special kind of intuition called Pratibhā. He explains this in his Vākyapadiya.

\textit{Vicchedagrahanerthānām Pratibhābnyaiva Jāyate.} 
\textit{Vākyārthā Iti Tām Āhuḥ Padārthair Upapāditam.}  
(Vākyapadiya 2.143)

He wanted to say in this Śloka “When the word-meaning in a sentence are separated and understood, a different flash of insight is produced. Those flash of insight presented by the word-meaning described as the meanings of the sentence.”
By planting this statement at the beginning of philosophical and historical context about the linguistic theory in India Bhartrhari introduced the concept of Pratibhā into his linguistic theory.

The next well known work on literary theory is Kāvyalarāṅkara of a famous writer Bhamaha. The majority of scholars place him in the 7th c. A.D thou, it's an argumentative issue. Ample of reasons show that his work represents major landmark in Sanskrit poetic theory. This was a first attempt to deal with poetics separate from dramatic theory. Bhamaha is also well a known earliest exponent of the Alarikkara School of literary criticism in Sanskrit, and hence his treatise marks the beginning of an influential literary theory. The influence of Bhamaha's teachings on subsequent poetical works is by no means meager.²

In almost all his work, Bhamaha focused and explained poetry and drama. The period after Bhamaha was golden period for Sanskrit poetic theory. For many decades and centuries, almost all the important Sanskrit works on the subject were written, and all the literary theories explained in details. During this period both poetics and dramatic theory appear to have concerned attention of the scholars and literary theory reached its peak.

Word and sense was vital link for Bhamaha to start his general discussion. These two important factors can be said to constitute the Kāvyā-Sarira or the ‘body’ or external framework of poetry, are the Šabda (word) and the Artha (sense). The Alamkaras (poetic figures) are understood to form the essential signs of Kāvyā. In other words, poet has to form a senseful verbal composition along with charming turns of expressions to which the name of poetic figure is given. Bhamaha was known as master of this system his work has survived; truly he can be called, by no means its originator. The system, as we find it set forth in his work, is certainly not prehistoric, but indicates the clear existence of a develop teaching on the subject.

Bhamaha states at the outset of the Kāvyā-Prayojana (purposes of poetry) and Kāvyā-Hetu (the qualifications of poet), while mentioning the Kāvyā-Yonayah (sources of poetry). The views of Kāvyā-Prayojana need elaboration because they generally enumerate extraneous objects and high lights the general theory of poetry. Few writing from past shows more or less uncritical mention of Kirti (fame) for the poet and delight (Priti) for the reader as the chief objects of poetry; and herewith
Bhamaha (Kāvyalarṇkara), Dandin (Kāvyadarsa), Vamana (Kāvyalarṇkarasūtra-Vṛtti), Rudrata and Bhoja though belonging to different schools of opinion, seem to be content.

Certainly, with these fundamental objects of poetry it became customary to add, ‘wealth’, ‘social successes’ and ‘escape from ills’ from the poet’s standpoint. On the other hands, as from the reader’s point of view, poetry is said to bring ‘solace’; instruction in knowledge and ‘proficiency in the arts and ways of the world’; and these are sometimes instantly comprehended by the term Trivarga, viz., profit, pleasure and virtue, and which later on the Caturvarga, anticipated by Bhamaha adds Mokśa or liberation of the soul. This boosts and brings poetry on a level with other subjects such as arts or sciences which profess similar ends, and is in harnibt witch the deep-rooted idea of the functions of Śastraśa. But theorists like Mammata and his followers, introduced Abhinavagupta’s idea that the Kāvyas, as distinguished from the scriptures and the sciences, is Kanta-Sammita, that is like the teaching of a loving mistress, implying thereby that the pedagogic powers of poetry resolve themselves into a peculiar power of suggesting artistic enjoyment. One of the examples is Kāvyapraśa, It describes poetic speech as comprehending a creation ungoverned by nature’s laws consisting of pure joy. The Caturvatga and the other material objects of poetry are mentioned in almost unbroken tradition; but with the elaboration of a full-fledged scheme of poetics with the suggestion of Rasa, the purpose of poetry was brought into a level with the ultimate theory about its nature; and poetry was supposed to create peculiar mood of aesthetic pleasure, conveyed generally by the philosophic term ‘Anand’.

Although, these theorists believed in Pratibhā, they also maintained the importance of what Dandin calls Śrut and Abhiyoga, but what later writers call Vyutpatti (culture) and Abhyaśa (practice). Both Bhamaha and Dandin acknowledge Pratibhā which is said to be Naisargiki (natural) or Sahaja (inborn).

Dandin, an author of Kavyadarśa was the well known critic and poet after Bhamaha. His all work is primarily based on the theory of poetic and literary work. There are different opinions regarding the time period of Dandin. Mostly it is believed that he flourished in the 8th century A.D. His work shows more systematic presentation of material than Bhamaha’s and he was more appreciated in south India.
and Ceylon where it was translated into Tamil and Sinhalese respectively. Out of them, the Sinhalese adaptation entitled Siyabaslakara – the only work of its kind in old Sinhalese — dates as far back as the 9th century A.D., and appears to have been an influential critical manual. 

Although, Dandin presented Alamkara theory quite perfectly, yet his importance in the field of Sanskrit poetics lies in a different direction. He lamp lighted the Guna-Riti aspect of poetry. The greater portion of the first chapter in his work is devoted to a study of Riti and their constituent Gunas. However, he does not attempt to build poetic theory based on the concept of Riti. He made an attempt to introduce Riti and explain its nature in terms of Gunas. At the same time he also drew attention to the fact that Alarhakaras (poetic figures) were not the only worthwhile aesthetic entity in poetry. His aim was to present a critique of poetry incorporating Ritis, Gunas, Alarhakaras and Dośa.

Both Dandin and Bhamaha emphasised on sound and sense to form the ‘body’ of poetry. The classification of poetry into species of composition like the Sarga-Bandha (Mahakaya) etc. is almost identical, the only remarkable divergence occurring, as already noted in the case of Katha and Akhyayika which rigid distinction is not admitted by Dandin. Poetry is classified, according to its prose, verse and mixed (Miśra), while language furnishes another fundamental division yielding four distinct groups - Samskrta, Prakrta, Apabhramsha and Miśra, the last kind in both these divisions not being mentioned by Bhamaha.

Next aesthetician we have is Vamana. He builds up a theory of poetry based on the Guna–Riti concept. Vamana was the writer of the 9th century A. D., and his work was entitled Kavyalañkarakasutra. In Sanskrit poetics he is well known as the central character of the Riti theory and he was the first who talk about soul of poetry. According to him Riti is that soul of poetry, the factor that separates poetic speech from ordinary prosaic speech. Like Dandin, he too set about to explain Ritis in terms of Gunas. It is important to mention that Vamana had a partiality for drama and considered it as the literary form par excellence. But, in his treatise he devoted his attention mainly to poetic theory. 

According to Vamana “Poetry is that union of sound and sense which is devoid of poetic flaws and is embodied with Gunas (excellences) and the Alamkaras
The poetic excellence is an essential component of a piece of poetry, while a figure of speech is not. The soul of poetry is Riti, which is a structure of sounds comprising of poetic excellences.

Ānandavardhana also came in the 9th century A.D. He was also famous along with Vamana during this period. It was an outstanding period in Sanskrit poetics, for; it saw the birth of many important theoretical works. Out of them the place of importance easily goes to Dhvanyaloka of the famous aesthetician Ānandavardhana. All this laid a milestone in the entire history of Sanskrit poetic theory.

And after the Ānandavardhana’s Dhvanyaloka, Abhinavagupta wrote a commentary on Dhvanyaloka. Dhvanyalokalocana is a famous book that is written towards the end of the 10th century A. D. by Abhinavagupta revolutionized the entire trend of this Śāstra and placed it in an entirely new perspective. These two treatises reflect a sound understanding of the aesthetic element in poetry and their critical viewpoint is by far the best approach for the evaluation of poetry discovered by Sanskrit theorists. Emphasis therefore was shifted from the formal to the content aspect of poetry.

The importance of the function of suggestion in poetic language was first discussed by Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta. On the basis of this concept they formed the well known theory of Dhvani. Moreover, Anandavardhana and his followers deserve further credit for their success in satisfactorily incorporation of the concept of Rasa into their critical framework, thus affecting fine synthesis of the two concepts Rasa and Dhvani. Hence, it became a crowning achievement for them in Sanskrit aesthetic thought.

Anandavardhana in his Dhvanyaloka for the consideration of Pratibhā or imagination has eloquently praised the poet's creative power. He says - “In the vast domain of poetry, the poet alone is the sole creator. According to his whims and fancies the whole world of ours under goes transfiguration, If the poet be inspired by love, the whole world becomes transfused with emotion; but if he be devoid of all sentiment, everything becomes dry and in spite. The creative magic of the poet is unparalleled. He is free to fill inanimate objects with life and tame away life even from animate ones according to his sweet pleasure” “Nakāvyārthaviramoysti Yadi
He said “Non-creative (Pratibhāhina) person cannot do anything and a creative (Pratibhāsali) person has a more ideas to create new things”. He makes new from the old. In other words, Poet’s Pratibhā enacts as a line touch enabling even the old ideas appear as new and fresh. About the comparative importance of Śakti and Vyutpatti in poetry, Ānandavardhana laid down that “the poet’s imagination could work such magic that shortcomings in the taste and wants of learning might remain unnoticed in particular context while the poetry of his imagination would at once and invariably catch the attention of the readers”. Ānandavardhana substantiates his contention by citing an instance from Kalidasa’s Kumarasambhava, where the poet describes amours of Parvati and Isvara.

The period from Bhamaha up to 9th century was the period of poetry and drama, in the Indian history.

During the 11th century two main theories of poetry sprang up. This may be considered the period in which emphasis was more on poetry than on drama. One of the wonderful works belonging to this century was Vakroktijivita of Kuntaka. This treatise is of particular significance because it postulates the Vakrokti school of Sanskrit poetics. In Kuntaka’s work we come across not only in-sequence and argument, masterly comparison and sustained intellectual effort, but more than that a wealth of imagination and a breadth of outlook, a beautiful exuberance of fancy and language unparalleled in works on Sanskrit poetics. According to Kuntaka, Pratibhā or imagination is the keystone of the poetic arch.

Kavipratibhāoprodrava Pradhanviṣṭhata
(Vakroktijivita, p.13).

Whatever charm there be in poetry all that is attributable only to Pratibhā. The various elements of poetry such as Rasa, Bhāva and Alamkara have the poet’s imagination for their soul and particularly in the case of Alamkara, this is very well pronounced. Kuntaka’s idea of Vakrōkti Literary tilted ‘locution’ must not be mistaken to mean an encouragement of an artificial ‘poetic diction’ as different from that used by men in ordinary parlance. His theory corresponds more with that of Wordsworth who holds that “while describing things in language actually used by men the poets throw over the certain coloring of imagination whereby things shall be presented to the mind in an unusual aspect”.
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Kuntaka was aware of the fact that art could not be made the medium of philosophical, religious or scientific concepts, and thus insisted upon a clear distinction between Śastra and Kāvyā between intellectual and imaginative work, satin and ideas of the Śastra. He was the one that showed the difference between ordinary mode of common speech and artistic expression. Vakratva or Vakrabhava depends upon an imaginative turn of words and ideas, which he calls Bhangibhaiti, peculiar to poetic expression and abhorrent of logical or matter of fact expression. He further explains the Bhangibhaniti or Vakratva, for which another word is Vaictrya or Vicchitti (strikingness or charmingness), is the expression of the Vidagdha, the man versed in belle’s letters, who must be distinguished from the Vidvat, the mere scholar.

It is obvious that Kuntaka is one of the few Sanskrit theorists who puts a clear emphasis on the imaginative power of the poet and considers it to be the source of the characteristic of charm of poetic expression. He regards embellishment, even if it consists of figures of speech, as the poetic imagination. He therefore, draws a distinction between what may be called ‘speech figure’ on the one hand and ‘poetic-figure’ on the other. In a formal scheme of poetics they may correspond but in a poetic figure Kuntaka discovers a differentia which consists of a peculiar turn of expression (Vakratva) resulting in a characteristic strikingness and depends on the imaginative activity of the poet (Kavipratibhanivartiatatva). The so called figures of orthodox poetics are admissible only when they possess these characteristics of peculiar charm imparted by the imagination of the poet. The word ‘charm’ apparently means nothing but that which gives the expression to its poetic peculiarity. Kuntaka maintains, therefore, that embellishment depends on the poetic imagination. According to him;

“Prāktanādyatana - Sanskāra - Paripāka - Praudhā
Pratibhā Kācideva Kaviśaktib”

(Vakroktijivta, 1.29 Vṛtti.)

The verse suggests that poetry is always an embellished expression is differentiated from the plain and matter of fact expression of science and scriptures, embellishment in the general sense. Kuntaka knew very well that it is not easy for the poet to attain perfection in imagination at the very first flash. It needs to be polished before it can shine with full luster; this it undergoes in the process of expression. That
is to say, it is being expressed that an intuition defines itself. Theoreticians recognize
a stage called Avekksana in poetic composition, in which the poet removes one
expression and inserts another because his mind is still in hesitation, indicating that
the conception itself has not become quite definite. The faculty of creating a poetic
work is some sort of intellect which becomes mature out of the result of the
impressions (of the deeds) done in the previous as well as present birth. There are two
words given in the theory of Kuntaka, first is ‘Śabda-Paka’ that is ‘perfect expression’
and second is ‘Artha-Paka’ that is ‘perfect intuition’. Śabda-Paka (perfect expression)
is said to occur when the words in composition become irreplaceable. But in reality
this Śabda-Paka is nothing but Artha-Paka (perfect intuition).

Mahimabhatta another writer of 11th century is known for his work
Vyaktiviveka13 which did a great effort to establish that there was no separate
function called Dhvani in poetry; and what upholders of Dhvani principle – postulated
as the novel function of ‘suggestion’ was none other than the logical process of
inference. He strove to build a critique of poetry based on this concept of logical
inference, and took great pains to prove that what the believers of Dhvani –
considered as cases of suggestion were mere instances of inference. He showed that
this was a function not confined to poetry alone. This theory of Mahimabhatta is
sometimes known in Sanskrit as Anumitivada. However, as this was not
comprehensive critique of poetry but merely an attempt to nullify the Dhvani theory.
In his thesis Mahimabhatta gained no support from any following author and in itself
it was not capable of overriding the Dhvani theory.

The work of Mahimabhatta occupies a unique place in the history of Sanskrit
poetics. It is a polemical work directed to refute the doctrines of the Dhvanikara. His
own theory is that all various varieties of Dhvani and other vital elements of poetry
can be brought under the more comprehensive area of Anumana or inference. In a
thorough going fashion he sets about his business and points out no less than ten
defects in the very definition laid down by Anandavardhana, in the first chapter of his
book Vyaktiviveka. Mahimabhatta’s position is that Alamkaras or figures of speech
acquire worth in poetry only when they possess a special charm. This naturally raises
the problem whether ‘nature poetry’ or ‘Svabhavokti’ can be ranked as poetic
expression. He answers the question in the affirmative and supports his position by
advancing the following arguments “things in the world of nature have indeed a
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twofold aspect the universal and the special. The former admits of varieties in contradiction to the latter which is unique in its own way. It is this special aspect which is capable of being perceived by the poetry.

The brightest luminary in this phase of the Sastra was Mammata, who flourished towards the end of the 11th century A. D. Mammata was very loyal follower of the Dhvani School, and his critique of poetry is founded on the basis of this theory. Kāvyaprakāśa is a profound work and many were the commentaries that subsequent writers composed to elucidate the teachings contained therein. He wrote lot of Śalokas on Dhvani and his work takes the form of a handbook on the subject with the entire concepts and theories wicker into one organic and full dense. This treatise occupies an outstanding position in the history of Sanskrit poetics because of its intelligent interpretation and synthesis of the theories and the great literary acumen exhibited therein. According to Mammata intellect though serves as a seed for creating poetry:

"Śaktiḥ Kavitava - Bījrūpaḥ Sanskār - Visheshāḥ"
(Kāvyaprakāśa 1.3,)

"A particular sort of impression serving as a seed for creating poetry is called intellect." But he keeps other two factors also on the same footing along with intellect and accepts all the three factors combined in one.

In the history of Sanskrit poetry next name is Hemacandra. He wrote a famous Sastra that is Kavyanusasana. Who is believed to have flourished at the end of the 11th or the beginning of the 12th century A. D. and can be reckoned as another attempt at compiling a dense handbook of the Sastra based on existing knowledge. He is the only Acarya, who believes that the intellect is the only factor for creating poetry while the other two are meant for refining the intellect:

Pratibhāsyā Hetuḥ Vyutpatyabhyāsābhyaṁ Sanskāryā.
(Kavyanusasana, p.6)

It is noticeable that prior to Hemacandra, Rudrata had pointed out the types of Pratibhā: Sahaja (inborn) and Utpadya (produced out of erudition). His view seems to be clearly influenced by the above said second type of Pratibhā. He accepts Pratibhā as the only factor of poetry, better if refined with other two factors; while Jayadeva accepts Pratibhā as the seed for poetry, but it must be associated with the other two. In
our opinion the view—point of Hemacandra is quite agreeable.

Hemacandra and the older and the younger Vagbhata, may be conveniently mentioned here, but they do not call for any special remark. Hemacandra’s Kāvyanusasana, is written in the form of sutra with Vṛtti, and its commentary is called Viveka, which is composed by him. While the younger Vagbhata, whose work is written in the sutra and Vṛtti-form like Hemacandra’s definition and adopts literally latter’s modification of Mammata’s definition. The criterion of poetry, according to them is that it must contain through its word and sense, the Guna, Alamākara, Ritti and Rasa, but these elements are mentioned rather in an eclectic than critical spirit. The older Vagbhata accepts without question the ten Guna of older writers, but the younger Vagbhatta follows Mammata in limiting them to three, with the pointed remark that:

The topics dealt with in five Paricchedas of the Vagbhataṃkara are as follows:

1. The definition of Kāvyā, Pratibhā as the source of Kāvyā, aided by Vyutpatti and Abhyasa; the circumstances favorable to poetry and convention observed by poets.

2. The language of poetry; forms of poetry, its division into Padya (verse), Gadya (prose) and Miśra (mixed verse and prose), eight Dośas of Pada and of Vākya respectively and the Dośas of Artha.

3. The ten Guna (Mddhurya, Ojas, Prasdda, Slesa, Samddhi, Uddratd, Arthavyakti, Samata, Saukuumrya, Kānti ).

4. Four poetic figures of sound viz., Citra Vakrokti, Anuprasa and Yamaka and thirty five figures of sense, the two Ritis (Vaidarbhi and Gaudiya).

5. Nine Rasa, kinds of Nayaka and Nayika and kindred topics.

It is believed that after Jagannatha’s Rasa-Gangadhar is the last remarkable work on poetics and although it was difficult to found his work on subject but still, the whole of his Citra-Mimamsa-Khandana are taken up with the discussion and illustration of poetic figures, a topic which, as here set forth, forms indeed one of the most exhaustive and noteworthy presentation of later times, but is of little theoretical interest from the standpoint of general poetics. Jagannatha’s style is erudite and frightens the student by its involved language, its subtle reasoning and its unsparing criticism of earlier writers.
According to Jagannatha, the word 'Śabdārthau' ought not to have been used. It should be substituted by 'Śabda', as it is the 'word' which stands for poetry as in the sentences. Jagannatha defines poetry as a word or linguistic composition which brings charming idea into expression (Ramanīyarthapratipadakāḥ Śabdah): a definition which reminds us of Danḍin's well-known description of Kāvya-Sarira as 'Istartha-Vyavacchinna Padavali'.

**THE DEFINITION OF POETRY**

The historical background related to Pratibhā evolved, it is appropriate enough to attempt explaining the concept of Pratibhā, definition of poetry, and all the linked titled of this chapter. To the question as to, what is poetry? Poetry is known to be the highest form of art. The following account of the constituents of poetry, discovered through objective analysis, clearly shows that poetry is a set of well-connected meaningful words which constitute, as it were, its body. But such a set is also used for the ordinary communication of ideas in daily transactions as well as in scientific and philosophical works.

Poetry can be seen from another angle in Indian philosophy, that is, the meaning of the Sanskrit word for poetry is 'Kāvyā'. Kāvyā is equally applicable to Gadya (verse) as well as to and it is explained as 'Kavi-Karma' which amounts to saying that poetry is what the poet writes. So far as the nature of poetry is concerned, this explanation is not very illuminating. It is useful, however, in this respect that the question from poetry to the poet be shifted and it seems much less difficult to say what the Indians thought of the poet than of poetry. The common view of the poet is to regard him as a creator or as a maker. The poet's work involves the inventions of many new elements; and it is for this reason that in Sanskrit literature the poet is often found compared to the creator and the creator to the poet.

In Sanskrit poetics, from the very inception, an effort was made to give the definition of poetry, yet no clear-cut and ideal definition had been presented. To initiate, Bhamaha verses poetry as:

"Śabdārthau Sahitau Kāvyam"

(Kāvyā Alamānakara, 1.16)

In this Sutra Bhamaha said that 'A happy fusion of Śabda (sound) and Artha (sense) is called poetry'. If this definition pertains to all kinds of meaningful sentences
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. Therefore, it can be said that poetry is a union of sound and sense related by the mean of Alaihkaras. This definition again requires an explanation as to what an Alaihkaras is? This we intend to deal later.

In the view of Dandin the poetry is a group of sounds which indicates the happy aim designed by the author. He relates this happy aim in the following Sutra:

"Sharīram Tāvadishtārtha Vyavachinnā Padāvali"

(Kavyadarsha 1.10b)

What does he mean by 'Istartha'. According to him 'Istartha' is desired aim. He is of the view that the Alaihkaras are those types of characteristics that make poetry attractive and beautiful. The desired aim, thus, indicates the delectation born out of the use of Alaihkaras. The above-said statement by Dandin indicates the definition of the body of the poetry and not that Padavali poetry is not a group of sounds, but an inseparable union of both sound and sense. And secondly, the word 'Istartha' requires an explanation. This definition, however, has got an importance of its own. The word 'Padavali' in it is the first source of the 'Kavya-Purusa- Rupaka'.

Vamana is also talking about poetry in a different point of view. According to him, "Poetry is that union of sound and sense which is devoid of poetic flaws and is embodied with Gunas (excellences) and the Alaihkaras (figures of speech)". The poetic excellence is an essential component of a piece of poetry, while a figure of speech is not. The soul (essence) of poetry is Riti, which is a structure of sounds comprising of poetic excellences. According to him there are three kinds of Riti; (i) Vaidarbhi or the excellent (ii) Gaudi or the bombastic and (iii) Panchali or the middling.

The definition of poetry according to Ānandavardhana in Dhvanyaloka, can be completed in his two Šalokas:

"Śabdārtha Sharīram Tāvat Kāvyam"

"Ca Dhvanirātmā Kāvyasya"

According to him the body of poetry is the combination of denotative word and sound, while its soul is suggested sense. He said that Poetry is nothing but an internal beauty of a meaningful creation 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:

“Śabdārthau Sahitau Vakrakavivyāpārasālinī
Bandhe Vyavasthitau Kavyam Tadvidvadāhladakārini”

(Vakrokti Jivita 1.7)

According to Kuntaka “poetry is the union of sound and sense, arranged in a composition, which, consists of oblique sayings of a poet, is delightful for its sensible reader a listener”. The definition of poetry presented by Jagannatha is;

“Ramanīyārtha - Pratipādiakaḥ Śabdaḥ Kāvyam”

The definition of Jagannatha proposes new ideas for poetry. For him, the poetry is a word promoting happiness. Here, the word ‘Ramaniyata’ denotes not only poetic delight pertaining to Rasa, the main variety of Dhvanikavya, but also all the ingredients of Kāvya like Vastu-Dhvani-Kavya and Alarṅkara-Dhvani-Kāvyā, Gunibhuta-Vyangya-Kavya, Riti, Guna, Alarṅkaras, Vakrokti, etc,. This definition, thus, covering all the areas of poetics, has a wider field than Rasa which is limited to certain criteria, moreover, the word ‘Ramaniyata’ is not a technical term of poetics like Alamkara, Riti, Guna, Dhvanirasa, Vakrokti, etc,

The word and sense, blended like two friends, creating each other’s charm, make the poetry enjoyable. The real word is that which is chosen 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 causes pleasure in the mind of a Sahrdaya. The togetherness of the word and the sense is nothing but an attractive state which creates poetic pleasure in the mind of the spectator. This is exactly desired by the poet himself neither less nor more. In the case of music, we enjoy the musical notes or the tunes even without knowing the words and their meanings but justified as to poetry becomes a delight when sound conveys a sense.

In the whole discussion on the definition of poetry, we are making a general view of poetry that is, the poetry is a set of well connected meaningful words which constitute, as it were, its body. But such a set is also used for the ordinary communication of ideas in daily dealings as well as in scientific and philosophical works. Metrical form cannot be looked upon as the unique mark of poetry, for in India
even the works on technical subjects are written in that form. Now a question arises here; what are the differences between poetry and common speech? If it is said to be the beauty or attractiveness of words and meanings, then next question is that; what is it that makes them attractive? It cannot be said that attractiveness is due to the presentation of an attractive set of events or of a complete aesthetic configuration technically called Rasa, for a separate stanza presenting a single idea is also called poetry. The reply is that it is the presence of what is subsumed under six poetic categories and the absence of defects counted under the fourth that distinguishes poetry from common speech.

**POETIC CATEGORIES**

There are some poetic categories which makes poetry beautiful and attractiveness. These are seven in number. The first five are objective and the last two are subjective. These poetic categories are; (i) Lakṣana (the characteristic), (ii) Alamkaras (embellishment), (iii) Guna (quality), (iv) Doṣa (defect), (v) Riti (style), (vi) Dhvani (suggestive meaning), (vii) Rasa (aesthetic configuration). Each of these poetic categories is followed by an explanation as below.

i. **Lakṣana (The Characteristic)**

The first is Lakṣana. For Lakṣana or characteristic, it can be said that the idea of the Lakṣana or the characteristic marks of poetry first arose in the mind of Bharata. For him, they are separate from embellishments, figures of speech or Alamkaras. While the former are in the body itself, like slenderness of waist or plumpness of breasts, the latter are external additions, like necklace and bracelet. The beginning is based on the analogy of lines in the shape of a lotus, flag, or disc on palm or sole of foot, which are to palmist unmistakable marks of greatness of the man (Mahdpuruvalaksana) and because of which he can recognize the man as such even in the absence of all external things. Bharata definitely distinguishes thirty-six such marks, adding that there are many more which a close analytical study can reveal. Some of the important ones among them are: smallness, brilliance, parallelism, cause, expression, distinction, certainty, intelligence.

ii. **Alamkaras (Figures of Speech)**

The analytical approach to literary art was made from two points of view, that of the dramaturgies and that of the poet. The former distinguished between
characteristic and embellishment. And Bharata admitted only four embellishments or figures of speech, though he mentioned thirty-six characteristics as stated above. The poets, however, abolished this distinction, holding that a mark is a mark whether in the body, like lines in the palm, or added to it, like a badge. Thus Bhamaha, refers to the view about the externality of embellishments as that of others (Pare) and discusses forty-three embellishments, maintaining them to be characteristic marks of poetry and including in his list most of those mentioned by Bharata. He did so because he took the word Alamkaras, not in the sense signified by the English expression figure of speech as it is usually translated, but in its literal derivative sense, meaning “that which gives sufficiency” (Alarh Karoti). In the context of poetry, therefore, according to him, “it means that which gives sufficiency to a composition to be classed as poetry”. Taking the word in this sense, he identified Laksana (characteristics) with Alamkaras (embellishments) and asserted the general characteristic of all types of poetry to be a turn or twist (Vakratva) that a poetic genius gives to words and meanings. He held this turn to be the characteristic of all embellishments. Bacon seems to echo this very idea when he says that the poet distorts nature. As an empiricist he means by nature the material world, the sum total of all that is perceptible. He, therefore, finds that works of poetic art present the objects of nature, not in the form in which they are directly perceptible through the senses but in such a form as is different from what exists in nature though similar to it, so that it cannot be thought to be simply a copy of what is already there in nature. Accordingly, he does not agree with the naturalistic view that poetry is characterized by close adherence to nature, by faithful presentation of nature as it is. On the contrary, he holds that poetry is distorted nature. Poetic art has a definite place in his system. He recognizes many faculties of the sensitive or corporeal soul, including memory, imagination, and reason, which are responsible for the production of history, poetry, and philosophy respectively. Thus genius, according to him, is that aspect of mind which is responsible for production of poetic works and is nothing but imagination that distorts nature (puts her out of the shape in which she is directly perceptible) by twisting or drawing awry, by joining at pleasure things which can never come together in nature. This distortionistic view of poetry points out the general characteristic not only of the works of poetic art but also of all arts. An art, whether useful or fine, is a human activity which uses the products of nature as materials for artistic productions. And
every artistic activity gives a shape to a product of nature which is different from that in which nature produces it. A hairdresser curls hair. A young man with a “heroic” tendency twists and turns up the ends of his moustache. A sculptor chisels a stone out of the shape in which he finds it in nature. But this twisting or putting an object of nature out of shape may lead to the production of what is grotesque, wild, or eccentric. The standard by which to judge the poetic value of an imaginative construct, therefore, is recognized to be the aesthetic experience that it arouses in an aesthetic person.

iii. Guna (quality)

Quality belongs to a body, a substance. Words and meanings constitute the body of poetry. A constituent part of them, therefore, are poetic qualities, about whose number, function, and relation there is a difference of opinion. Bharata admitted ten and recognized them to be means of presenting Rasa: (i) Madhurya (sweetness), (ii) Ojas (forcefulness), (iii) Prasada (perspicuity), such a clarity in thought and expression as leads to the arousal of unexpressed ideas, (iv) Slesa (the pun), (v) Samddhi (smoothness), proper adjustment of ascent (high-flown language) and descent (simple language), (vi) Uddratd (magnificence or fanciful grouping of words), (vii) Arthavyakti (clearness of meaning), (viii) Samata (uniformity), Sameness of style, (ix) Saukuumrya (softness), absence of harshness, (x) Kānti (polish or brightness of style). Bhamaha accepted the first three only. The reason is obvious. Some of them can be classed as verbal figures of speech: for instance; the pun, others may be looked upon as mere absences of defects: for instance; softness and polish, which consist respectively in the mere absence of harshness and vulgarity, both well-recognized defects. As an exponent of the view that the embellishment, the distorted Vakrokti (utterance) is such a Lakṣawa (characteristic) as gives sufficiency to a composition to be recognized as poetic, he therefore, subsumed many of the above qualities under embellishment.

Vamana denied that the poetic embellishments are of primary importance, held that poetry is like a picture, and asserted that the comparative importance of embellishments and qualities in it is the same respectively as that of paints and lines in a picture. Just as the beauty of a picture depends on the lines of which the sketch is made while paints simply enhance it, so the beauty of a poetic production depends
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upon the poetic qualities and embellishments simply enhance it. Accordingly he accepted all the ten qualities mentioned by Bharata. Ananda Vardhana realized the force of the argument against the acceptance of the ten qualities; asserted that the distinction between qualities and figures of speech is that though both add to the charm of poetic composition, the former belong to the whole, like the beauty of a girl, whereas the latter pertain to a part only like a bracelet to an arm; and accepted only the three qualities which Bhamaha had recognized.

iv. **Dośa (defect)**

Dośa (defect) is that which diminishes the excellence, attractiveness, or value of a work of art. Bharata wrote in Nātyāśāstra first time an outline of Dośa along with other topics pertaining to Sanskrit poetics. According to Bharata, these Dośas are ten: Gūḍārtha, Arthantara, Arthahīna, Bhinnnārtha, Eka-rtha, Abhiplotārtha, Nyāyādepta, Viśam, Visandhi, Śabdahīna. According to him Guna, Dośa and Alamkāras comes in only incidentally.  

v. **Riti (Style)**

Style is the mode of arranging words according to their sound and meaning so as to present the poet's ideas effectively in harmony with the central theme—something like arranging different parts of the human organism in a picture. There are three recognized styles, based on the study of poetry of different regions, are called Vaidarbhi, Gauḍī, and Pāṅcāli. (i) Vaidarbhi is characterized by sweetness, abounds in sounds sweet to the ear, and has very few or no compounds. (ii) The characteristic of the Gauḍī is presentation of a heroic disposition in the forceful sounds in long compounds and alliterations. (iii) Pāṅcāli is marked by the use of neutral sounds and by fewer and smaller compounds than are found in Gauḍī. Vamana studied the styles exclusively from the point of view of the qualities. He found Vaidarbhi, to possess all the ten styles; Gauḍī possess only two styles, Ojas and Kānti (forcefulness and brilliance); and Pāṅcāli also possess only two styles, Mādhurya and Saukumārya (sweetness and tenderness). To the question, as to what is the soul of poetry? And he declared that Riti or style is the soul of poetry.

vi-vii **Rasa-Dhvani (Aesthetic Configuration and Suggestive Meaning)**

Suggestion, that is, the suggested meaning, is called Dhvani because it is connected with the symbolic or conventional meaning just as the echo is with the
original sound of a bell tolled in a temple. Just as the rise of the echo depends on acoustic conditions which are due to the construction of the temple, so the rise of the suggested meaning does on the subjective elements which constitute the personality of the aesthetic individual. Dhvani is also used for conventional symbol and conventional meaning from which the suggested meaning arises, for the power of word that is responsible for the arousal, and for the composition that contains such a meaning. Similarly the word Rasa, which signifies aesthetic configuration, is used for the aesthetic object as well as for the aesthetic experience got from it because the constituents of both are the same. Rasa is born out of the combination of Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicāribhāvas. As found in a drama, they may be classified as follows:

(i) The situation with a focal point which the central figure, the hero of the piece, faces,

(ii) the basic emotion that it arouses in the hero and that which the personality of the hero arouses in the human mind helps to focus on the situation,

(iii) Transient emotions which arise from the basic emotion, like waves from the sea, and merge back into it,

(iii) Physical changes, which are consequent on the rise of an emotion, both involuntary, such as horrification, the blush, and voluntary, like the movements of hands and feet. The aesthetic object is not a mere juxtaposition of these constituents; it is not a mere jumble. The precise nature of the relation of the constituents is conceived on the analogy of a juice that an expert cook prepares by putting together in due proportion various things of distinct tastes, sweet, bitter, astringent, sour, and selfish, in water, cooking them properly, and then filtering them. The analogy implies that the constituents of the aesthetic configuration have to be well refined; they have to be in right proportion and have to be so related that they present a unity which has an aesthetic value, distinct from that of each constituent separately. It means that the aesthetic experience at the emotive level is not the experience of a basic emotion in isolation from other constituents of the configuration, but in harmonious union with them; and that it is poetic genius alone which can conceive such a configuration and present it in such predominantly suggestive
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language that a connoisseur can get the same experience from it as that presented by the poet. From the standpoint of the exponents of the suggestive power of language, the basic emotion is the central fact, the soul, of the aesthetic configuration, and the latter without the en-livening principle. They maintain that while other constituents may be presented by the conventional, secondary, or intentional power of language, basic emotion and complete aesthetic configuration, Rasa, do not admit of presentation by means of the three aforesaid powers; and that they can be only suggested. Hence, the suggestive power of language; and, therefore, suggestive words and meanings are the means which help a genius in realizing his end, which is the presentation of complete aesthetic configuration. For, as a careful study of the works of great poets and dramatists reveals, the fact is, that from them we get the emotive aesthetic experience, though no word signifying the emotion is included.

THE CAUSE OF POETRY

The poetic categories leads us to define little deeper into the cause of poetry in this sub-section of the chapter, that is, what is the cause of poetry? In our daily life we can see or learn about any person, object or happening moving attraction, sorrow, fear or surprise, very few people in the world would not be affected by these. But most of the people for short time being become, excited, agitated or enthused by them. These all kind of scenes or happenings gets emblazoned in our mind, and from time to time, and sometimes even after many years, these get awakened, and if needed, we talk about them to other people. This kind of expression is called just a Varta that is a worldly talk. Now there are persons who relate these events, interwoven with their imagination so beautifully that their fascinating expression manifests and the narrator of it is called a poet and not an ordinary person. But, in some of these people can only enjoy and appreciate a piece of poetry, they cannot compose a poem, such people are called Sahradayas, once with a sensitive heart or a person with acceptability.

Rajasekhara also speaks about these two kind of people. According to Rajasekhara, the Kāvi or poet is possessed of ‘Karayitri Pratibhā’, that is, ‘creative faculty’, as the above said the Sahradaya or appreciator is possessed of ‘Bhavayitri Pratibhā’, that is, ‘appreciative faculty’.
It should be clear that the poet can be possessed of both the faculties and not only the creative one or the Kavi-Pratibhā, that is the creative faculty, it may be called poetic intuition and it is the main factor (tool) of poetry, without this main cause, there is no possibility to create of any poetic work.

The other aesthetician we have also shed light on the causes of poetry, Dandin, Vamana, Rudrata, Kuntaka and Mammata etc.

Dandin mentions three causes of poetry; (i) Naisargiki Pratibhā (inborn genius), (ii) Nirmala-Sastrajnana (clear academic understanding), and (iii) Amanda Abhiyoga (constant application of above- said genius poetic works).

“Naisargikī Ca Pratibhā Śrutam Ca Bahu Nirmalam, Amandasaca Bhiyogo Syah Kārnam Kāvyasampadaḥ”

[Kāvyalarikākara (Rudrata) 1.103]

Rudrata and Kuntaka too talking about same cause of poetry. They have enumerated from Śakti (inborn intuitive or intellectual power) and Vyutpatti (an accomplishment in the knowledge) in scriptures and literary works to be the cause of poetry. According to these aestheticians Śakti and Vyutpatti are two main causes of poetry but in the following Sūtra of Vamana another cause of poetry is to be found. He claims that in his Kāvyalarikārasūtra, that there are three causes of poetry and these three are (i) Loka (the knowledge of worldly norms and behaviour), (ii) Vidya (knowledge of various disciplines of learning), and (iii) Prakirna (miscellaneous). And this Prakirna have again the following six causes; these are (i) Laksajnata (study of scriptures), (ii) Abhiyoga (practice of composing poetic works), (iii) Vṛddha-Seva (having instructions from Guru / Guru: preceptor / preceptors), (iv) Aveksana (use of appropriate words and avoidance of improper words), (v) Pratibhā (inborn genius of poetic intuition) and (vi) Avadhana (concentration of mind while learning, study in of composing any literary work). Mammata, also is found to accept the above said causes of poetry in his Kavya Prakash in the following Śloka that read as;

“Śaktinirpunta Loka - Kāvyā-Śastradyavekṣnāt
Kāvyajñā - Śiksāyā Bhāyā iti Hetustaduddhave”

(Kāvy Praksā 1.3)
He wrote in his Kāvyā Prakāśa that there are three factors of the poetry. And these three are the main cause of poetry. The poet uses one or power from these. (i) Inborn intuitive intellectual power (ii) Proficiency in worldly conduct and also in the study of scriptures, as well as literary works, (iii) Practice of composing poetic works through the help of some one efficient in this art. Though the said factors lead one to create poetry but the element of Pratibhā is believed to be the main and fundamental in the process of creativity.

PRATIBHĀ AND ŚAKTI

Poetry or literature have inborn power; Pratibhā with the help of this power (Śakti) (poet's imagination power), create different meanings, this is of two types, first is Sehaja and second is Utapadhya. Sehaja is inborn genius and Utapadhya or Utpadhik Pratibhā is due to efforts, this is known as self - created power; one can get this with the help of Mantras and Devas (Deity). With the help of efforts, education or practice one can attain Alapa Pratibhā and then if a person creates poetry this type of Pratibhā is known as Utapadhya. It is further divided into two parts; (1) Kavyaśī, Which helps poet in the poetry to create, it is called Kavyaśī Pratibhā (2) Bhāvaśī, poet imagination unknown and invisible things with help of it, Bhāvaśī Pratibhā include helping hands of Bhavak or poetry's explanation. After learning all this, one can explain quality and imperfections of poetry.28

To explore the meaning of the term Pratibhā it is intended that the literal meaning be understood as just ‘Pratibhā’ has been derived from the root Bhā with a upasarga (prefix) ‘Pra’ meaning thereby ‘luminosity’, ‘sparkling’ or a flash of brightness and light. The parallel word expressing the similar meaning and connotation is ‘Camatkṛiti’. The term ‘Pratibhā’ has been considered as the motivating power that finally leads a poet to a poetic expression.29

Pratibhā is also known as talent, and skill; at a gross level it is understood as ability, aptitude, talent and skill. Pratibhā as Bhudi, extraordinary mental power, extraordinary intelligence power, a special affluence and also as called lightened. Pratibhā means something special in a person. Pratibhā is never ordinary but extra ordinary.30 The Sanskrit Hindi Kośa Pratibhā as, Mega, sharpened, intellect, imagination, power, Pragya, light “Prajñā Navnavomeshālinī Pratibhā Matā”.31
The Same definition of Pratibhā we can see in Hindi Šabda Sagar, that Pratibhā is that extraordinary mental power with the help of which human being can lead to perfection without any efforts and upgrade himself in comparison with others. Pratibhā is that extra ordinary intellectual power or qualification which expresses itself in literature, arts, and science. To this, similar meanings like as talent, and also known as Skill; Parveenta, Nipunta, High mental ability, etc. are to understood as some of the shades of the concept under consideration. Precisely, Pratibhā is also known as non-dual and extra-ordinary mental power and with the help of this power, a person can make impossible to possible. As held by the western aesthetic tradition too when we find S.T Coleridge, one of the greatest English critics, describing the same spirit in these words: “Good sense is the body of poetic genius, fancy its drapery, motion its life, and imagination the soul”.

This concept of Pratibhā plays a great role in Indian poetics. A great and true poet is that who uses this power of Pratibhā and create a new poetry with the reflection of his Pratibhā. Pratibhā is a special boon, custom, which causes practice and Adrushat. Pratibhā is similar to Buddhī, it is the universal quality, which creates new level of thinking and is just one shade of Buddhi that enables poet to create a new level of thinking. Pratibhā becomes a particular cause of poetic creation where as Abhyasa or practice can be held as general cause of it. By wording it to be particular means the inborn insight of a poet that makes this creative individual unique and thus separates from rest of others. While defining Pratibhā, Bhamaha, Rudrata, Bhattatauta, Jagannatha, Abhinavagupta. All agree to a minimum definition of Pratibhā as following.

Kāvyam Tu Jāyate Jayto Kasyachitpratibhāvatah

(Kāvyalarhkarā, 1.5)

According to Bhamaha, “ A Kāvyā worth its name can be composed only by a man who possesses Pratibhā”. For him Pratibhā (poetic imagination) is state of ‘as it is’ or of ‘is-ness’ meaning there by when no modification or alternator is being made while manifesting the ‘Poetic–ideas’ in to ‘Poetic–object’. He is right when he considers that even the untalented ones are able to study the Śastra with the aid of the instruction of the teacher, but not so with regard to poetry. A Kāvyā worth its name can be composed only by a man who possesses Pratibhā.
Here, Bhamaha does not give us any complex analysis of the concept of Pratibhā. But it is a natural in view of his antiquity. He recognizes Pratibhā on the part of the poet as the essential condition of good poetry and is enough to secure him a high place along with those who sought to discover the secret of good poetry. In this condition, we cannot forget that Bhamaha believed in Pratibhā.

But Dandin is more explicit than Bhamaha in admitting that even in the absence of natural genius one may turn out to be a poet by not sheer study and arduous practice. While Bhamaha seems to insist on Pratibhā as the primary requirement in a poet Dandin appears to differ from Bhamaha in this respect, ‘though there be a lack of that wondrous genius, the product of preceding births, yet the goddess of speech when worshipped by learning and application, is sure to grant the boon of poetry and consequently, Dandin exhorts all poetic aspirants to play their studies diligently and pursue their practice patiently’. He says that “So away with sloth, let Saradvati be ceaselessly worshipped by those who would win fame. Men, who have earned the capacity of composing poetry with sustained effort, though their poetic endowment is slender, are sure to shine in the assemblies of the learned. In other words genius may live and thrive without training, but training, does not less reward the watering - pot and pruning knife. Hard work and intense study conjoined with the strong propensity of nature would, no doubt, produce the best results”. According to Dandin: Pratibhā, of course, is an essential factor for the creation of poetry, yet in it’s absence, Saradvati (the goddess of learning) best owe her bliss upon a man who absorbs himself in the study of scriptures and poetics works and also does a lot of practice in composing literary pieces. 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 Dandin, Vamana too is assigning a secondary place to creative genius. But strange enough, the sutra which amplifies the nature of Pratibhā runs as;

“Pratibhānam Kavitvabijam”

(Kāvyalāṅkārā-Sutravṛtti)

“In genius lies the very seed of poetry. This of course, is more in consonance with the position of Bhamaba than that of Dandin. Vamana has gone a step further than Bhamaha in attempting to determine the nature of Pratibhā. 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. It is this that verily forms the germ out of which poetry sprouts forth and without which no literary composition is possible. If, never less, a man endeavor’s to produce poetry even in the absence of Pratibhā, the effect will be nothing but ridiculous.

Rudrata while defining Pratibhā in his treatise is found to be claiming it as, “Śakti or Pratibhā is that faculty in a poet through which he presents spontaneously any subject–matter manifested in his concentrated mind-using the appropriate words”.

“Manasa Śada Suasmadhini Visfuranmankadha Bhidhyasya
Akilastini Padini Ch Vibhatini Yasyamasu Sakatiah”

(Kāvyalamkara (Rudrata),1.15)

He is also found to be saying that:

“Tasya (Kāvyasya) Karane Tritayam Śaktirvyautpattirabhyasah”

(Kāvyalamkara (Rudrata))

Only Pratibā is a main Śakti. We can say that Śakti and Pratibhā are synonyms. Vyutpatti of learning assists him in adopting the necessary and avoiding the non essential of poetry. A person can write poetry with practice but it should not be great because practice is not a cause. Practice can provide excellence to genius. Rudrata defined Śakti as the springing forth in many ways of the ideas to be expressed and lucid diction in a well intense mind is indeed Śakti.37

This Śakti also called by the name of Pratibhā, according to Rudrata is of two types (i) innate and (ii) acquired.

i. The innate is the better one on account of its spontaneity. It needs but a little practice to give rise to poetry; whereas

ii. The second kind has got to be first produced by virtue of Vyutpatti and then adopted to practice before it can help poetry. Thus, since it entails much Endeavour, this latter kind of Pratibhā is inferior to that of the first.

Rudrata, we have seen has merely repeated in other words the ideas of his predecessors about the triple requisites of a post. But as regards the distinction of Pratibhā into two varieties, Sahaja and Utpadya, he is completely original. Dandin held that all Pratibhā is of one kind only and that it is Naisargiki; which is produced by virtue of learning. Whereas in the opinion of Dandin, all genius can be only innate
and can never be produced in the poet by strenuous endeavor on his part. However, Rudrata too admits that there is a difference in degree though not in kind between the two varieties of Pratibhā.

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 science if he possesses this vision of Truth. But in everyday speech the world accords that title to him alone that possesses both vision and imaginative description. Thus though Valmiki was highly gifted with enduring and clear vision, he was not hailed as a poet by people until the embodied it in a descriptive work.

Here Bhatta-Tauta has very ingeniously correlated the ancient sayings "Nanrsih Kurute Kāvyam" and "Rsayah Krantadarsinah" with his conception of the poet. A poet is first and foremost a seer. According to him there are two are the paths of Sarasvati; (i) science, the result of intellect and (ii) poetry, the product of Pratibhā.38 His alert genius penetrates all directions and he see through the nature of every object. But mere vision is not enough. It must be coordinated by the creative faculty which enables the poet to translate into words the numberless things that his imagination pictures before his mind. A poet is one who is skilled in the artistic expression of that which is vivified by Pratibhā; and his work is poetry. Highest poetry, which is the product of such genius, lifts the mask from the hidden beauty of the world and makes familiar objects, be as if they were not familiar.

According to Abhinavagupta, the gift of finding out newer and newer ideas and things is itself Pratibhā. But what makes for poetry is an aspect of Pratibhā that is conducive to the composition of poetry suffused with thrilling emotion and aesthetics beauty.

"Pratibhā Apūrvavastunirmāṅaksma Prajā, Tasyah Vishesh Rasavaishvaishdyā Sundarya Kavyanirmankasamtavam".
( Dhvanyalokalocana iv. 4)

According to Dhvanyalokalocana, Poetic genius is a consciousness capable of original invention. It is due to Pratibhā that even old themes come to take new beauty like trees which put on new glory with the advent of the spring. Pratibhā is the capacity to create under-dented objects.39 On the other hand it can be said that it is the creation of poetry covered with beauty and aesthetic joy. Here another importance of
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poets is determined with the appearance of unique creative power that is Pratibhā through the inner experience of the poet.

The art cannot be made the medium of philosophical, religious, or scientific concepts, and insisted upon a clear distinction between Śastra and Kāvyā between intellective and imaginative work, satīn and ideas of the Śastra. It also can be said that the poetic speech is an extraordinary deviation from the ordinary mode of common speech, so unique an artistic expression that can be rendered as natural.

In Sanskrit poetics Kuntaka is one of the few aestheticicians who puts a clear emphasis on the imaginative power of the poet and considers it to be the source of the characteristic charm of poetic expression. He regards embellishment, even if it consists of figures speech, as the poetic imagination. He therefore draws a distinction between what may be called speech figure, on the one hand, and poetic figure on the other. In a formal scheme of poetics they may correspond. But in a poetic figure Kuntaka discovers a differentia which consists of a peculiar turn of Vakratva (expression) resulting in a characteristic strikingness and depends on the imaginative activity of the poet (Kavipratibhanīvartatātva). The so called figures of orthodox poetics are admissible only when they possess these characteristics of peculiar charm imparted by the imagination of the poet, the word ‘charm’ apparently means nothing but that which gives poem the expression of its poetic peculiarity. Kuntaka maintains, therefore, that embellishment depending on the poetic imagination. According to him;

“Praktanadyarana Sanskara Paripaka Praudha Praubha Kacideva Kavisaktin”

(Vakraɔktijivita, 1.29 Vṛtti)

The creation of poetic work is some sort of intellect which becomes mature out of the result of the impressions of the deeds done in the previous as well as present birth. According to his view, poetry is always embellished expression, as distinguished from the plain and matter of fact expression of science and scriptures, embellishment in the general sense is always a characteristic of poetic expression.

If this is understood to mean that the intuition is perfect before it is expressed inwards, it needs modification. As Kunkta has rightly observed, a conception taking its rise in the Imagination of the poet will not have attained perfection at the very first flash. At best, it will be like a precious stone dug out of the mine, with its native appearance hardly to be distinguished from that of a bit of stone. It needs to be polished before it can shine with full luster and for this, it undergoes in the process of expression. Theorists recognize a stage called Avekksana in poetic work of art, in
which the poet removes one expression and inserts another because his mind is still in hesitation, indicating that the conception itself has not become quite definite.

Therefore, these works on poetics usually indulge in some discussion concerning the various requisites of the poet: Śakti or Pratibhā (Imagination), Vyutpatti (culture comprising both Bahujnata (varied knowledge) and Ucitanucitaviveka (Discrimination) and Abhyasa (practice). Among these Pratibhā is admitted to be the very seed of poetry. Without Pratibhā poetry can not arise, and even if composed somehow is sure to become the laughing stock of the world. The question that debated is “can Pratibhā alone produce poetry?”

Mammata who represents one school of opinion says that all the three together (samuditah), form the cause of poetry. According to Mammata intellect though serves as a seed for creating poetry.

“Śaktia Kavitav-Bizrupah Sanskar-Visheshah”

(Kāvyā Prakaśa. 1.3, Vyṛti.)

Pratibhā is the main cause of poetry; the equipment of a poet and the sources of poetry, Bhamaha appear to be cognizant of their importance. His remarks on these points are, however, brief as compared with those of Vamana, who deals with the subject elaborately for the first time. It may be pointed out in this connection that Sanskrit poetics, consistently with the original idea of its having been a more or less mechanical discipline, gives a long list of the essential qualifications which a poet should possess and lays down elaborate rules for his ‘education’. With the advance of the theoretical aspects or the science, this theme was; no doubt, made the object of a separate study by a group of writers who make it their business to instruct the poet in his profession; but all early writers on general poetics, more or less, touch upon the point. We shall have occasion to deal with this school of Kavi-Śikṣa; but it will be convenient to indicate here briefly the earlier speculations of the subject. One cannot deny the supreme necessity of genius or poetic gift (Satkavitva, Bhamaha) which consists in Pratibhā (poetic conception).

All writers, early or late, agree in emphasizing the requirement of study and experience. Bhamaha and Dandin admit Pratibhā which is said to be ordinary or inborn and Vamana puts it into a principle that in Pratibhā lays the seed of poetry and defines it as an antenatal capacity of the mind without which any poetry is not possible, Mammata uses the more common term Śakti for Pratibhā. Abhinavagupta defines it as Prajna intelligence (intelligence), which is capable of fresh creation.
(Apurva-Vastu-Nirmana-Ksama), its distinguishing characteristic being the capacity of creating poetry possessed of passion, clarity and beauty and he quotes the authority of Bharata who designates it as the ‘internal disposition’ or Antargata Bhāva of the poet. This agrees with the definition of Pratibhā as Prajana Nāa Navollekha Salini, given in a verse cited anonymously by Hemaeh德拉, but attributed by Ksemendra to Abhinava’s guru Bhatta-Tauta and it is recognized as canonical by later writers, to whom Abhinavagupta and Mammata were the final lawgivers, but who sometimes add that it is Lokottara and capable of producing an indefinable charm variously termed Vaicitrya, Vicchitti, Carutva, Saumdrya, Hṛdyatva or Ramaniyata.

Pratibhā is not a product of simple effort, it flashes like a piece of lightning in the clouds, and it does not arise simply due to prior training. It is a sudden surprise of genius that cannot be acquired through the practice of the craft. It is a beautiful gift which is given by god. But, it cannot be denied that certain prior conditions are necessary for its emergence, but they are only necessary preparatory conditions and not satisfactory ones. The concept of Pratibhā can be understood only if we relate it to another kind of concept Camatkara that refers to the untainted joy and wonder at one's encounter with something unprecedented. In a poetic creation it is a wonder that a poet's experience flows out in a form of poetic sentence. Before the readers savor this joy, the poet himself must experience it. In case of Valmiki while writing Ramayan Valmiki when created the first rhyme of Ramayan he himself is surprised because words flashed before his imagination when he saw the wounded Kraunca (curlew). When he repeated those lines, he was surprised at his own word. He realized that these lines were born of Tadatmya (the oneness) he had experienced with the male bird that lost his companion. But Abhinavagupta also recognizes that “Ma Nisad, etc.,” is not an explosion of Valrico’s own personal emotion as limited being; it is an emotion Sadharanikran (generalized) depersonalized and objectified. If it have been his own personalized emotion then others could not have related to it, and he could not have created poetry out of this sorrow but would have had only an outburst of emotion.

Then what is communicated and rendered through poetry is this distilled and condensed emotion which (following Bharata) Abhinava call rasa. Rasa is both the essence and identity of particular poetic work. To savor it the reader has to enter the world of the poet with a sympathetic consciousness. That is why the ideal reader is called a Sahrdaya; a person with a sympathetic heart. To understand Abhinava’s concept of creativity it will be useful to turn to his delineation of the obstacles that
come in the experience of rasa. For these impediments, if avoided, become parameters of creativity of Rasa (Rasanubhuti). Or one could say that a work of art can be creative only if it has been able to overcome these impediments. Abhinavagupta lists the following seven obstacles in Rasānubhuti.41

1. Lacking the requisite consciousness
2. The immersion in temporal and spatial determinations perceived as exclusively one’s own or exclusively those of another
3. The fact of being at the mercy of one’s own sensations of pleasure etc.
4. The defective state of the means of perception
5. The lack of evidence
6. The lack of predominant factor
7. The presence of doubt.

These obstacles in the aesthetic experience of the spectator make sense only if they apply equally to the poet’s experience. For creator/poet first seed of Rasa springs from his lived experience and then transmits it to the spectator through the combination of different aesthetic elements like the Sthayibhāvas and Vyabicaribhāvas. Lacking the requisite consciousness for the poetic experience would be being incapable of having an overview of the situation visualized.

In the end it can be claimed that the Indian poetic tradition is right in upholding Pratibhā as the capacity to create extraordinary objects. In the context of poetry it is the creation of poetry covered with beauty and aesthetic joy. As the saying goes that the greatness of poet is determined by the emergence of unique creative intuition through the inner experience of the poet.

Indian Philosophy explains the concept of Pratibhā in different ways. It has a grammatical perspective when it is equated with the doctrine of Sphoṭa by the grammarians. It has a whole lot of aesthetic connotations when aestheticians interpret it to be the source or genius of the poet that enables him to create a world having its’ foundations’ in the poet’s imagination. The concept has deeper philosophical implications when read and understood from a Śaiva Philosophical perspective. The concept of Pratibhā as Śakti in Kashmir Śaivism will be discussed in the upcoming chapter.
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