



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

## THE RASA AND LITERARY CRITICISM IN SANSKRIT POETICS

SUCHISMITA RAY

Ph.D. Research Scholar

Utkal University, Vani Vihar, Bhubaneswar

### Abstract:

*Rasa* -theory is the climax of Indian literature criticism where ‘art’ for ‘art-sake’ and ‘art means preaching’ both the principles are accomplished and the concepts of sub-wittedness and purposefulness relating to poetic expression are also meet with. *Rasa* is the only concept which is supposed to be present in almost all the poetic elements, like, *Guṇa*, *Alaṅkāra*, *Dhvani*, *Vakrokti*, *Anumiti*, and even poetic blemishes (*Kāvya-doṣa*). It is in this sense that *Rasa* is the fundamental (*Svarūpādhāyaka*) element of the *Kāvya*. The expression, like, *Aṅgin*, *Sanjñin*, *Jivita* and *Ātman* used for *Rasa* only indicate it’s all pervading nature (*Sarvatattvavyāpitā*). In this way, the history of *Rasa* became so wide that it could permit the whole of poetics.

There has developed a tradition to deal *Rasa* as an element as well as a theory, and as such it has evolved as an independent school of poetics. *Rasa* is only element which possesses a universal appeal and so is widely considered the essence of all the forms of literary expression, although a lot of works has been done on the *Rasa* and gradual study has been going on its different aspects by Indian and foreign scholars in different language also, but some of its aspects to which proper justice has not yet been done while some of its problems require further elucidation. The present work is an effort to explore such aspects and throw necessary light on them.

### Key Words:

*Rasa*, *Kāvya*, *Doṣa*, *Guṇa*, *Riti*, *Vṛtti*, *Vakrokti*, *Pravṛtti*, *padārthaḥ*, *Vāsanās*, *Kāvyaṇanda*, *Sahṛdaya*, *āsvādyā*, *Sthāyibhāva*, *Udreka*, *Rasika*, *mano-bhāva*, *Dharma*, *ātman*, *Adhikāri*, *Vākyārtha*, *Rasānubhūti*, *Cittavṛtti*, *Citiśakti*, *Pariṇāma*, *Citta*, *Buddhi*, *Sukha*, *Duḥkha*, *Moha*, *Kārikā*, *śāstra*, *Pratibhā*, *Kāvya-puruṣa*, *Vastu*.

### Introduction:

Literature is a subject which has a wider scope. Every language and country has their own traditions in the study and the teaching of literature. But there are a few aspects of literary study which are common to every literature. We shall first discuss those common aspects and then the traditions of Sanskrit literary criticism, and the *Rasa* in particular.

**Literature and the society:**

While explaining what is *Nātya* it is said in the *Natyasastra*:

योज्यं स्वभावो लोकस्य सुखदुःखसमन्वितः।  
सोऽङ्गाद्यभिनयोपेतो नाट्यमित्यभिधीयते ॥१

In this *Kārikā* the words *Nātya* and *Loka* are used in the sense of literature and the 'society' respectively. As can be seen from the above *Kārikā* it has been recognized, from the beginning of the literary criticism that the literature is the reflection of the society. The *Yaśastilakacampu* describes a *Kāvya* as a tree having three roots, two trunks, five branches, four leaves, nine shadows and ten levels (*Bhūmis*). It is also said that only he who knows about this tree can have a proper appreciation of the *Kāvya*:

त्रिमूलकं द्विधोत्थानं पञ्चशाखं चतुश्छदम्।  
योज्यं वेत्ति न वच्छायं दशभूमिंसकाव्यवित् ॥२

The tree of *Kāvya* has three roots — the society; the Vedas and the spiritual knowledge. The word and the meaning are its two trunks; the five *Ritis* - *Vaidarbhī*, *Gauḍī*, *Pāñcālī*, *Lāṭī* and *Dākṣiṇātyā* are its five branches; the four *Vṛttis* *Nāgarikā*, *Upanāgarikā*, *Paruṣā* and *Komalā* are the four leaves which cover this tree; the nine *Rasas* are the nine shadows which give happiness and pleasure to the men of aesthetic taste; the ten *guṇas* are the ten grounds on which fall these shadows.

As is said in *Vyaktiviveka* also the society the *Veda* and the spiritual knowledge are the sources which give raise to a *Kāvya*:

लोको वेदस्तथाध्यात्मं प्रमाणं त्रिविधं स्मृतम् ॥३

Here the words *Loka*, *Veda* and *Adhyātma* are used in the sense of the social life, the *śāstric* knowledge and the spiritual knowledge respectively.

Though Mammaṭa maintains the superiority of literature on account of its being different from the life in the world created by *Brahman* by saying:

नियतिशक्त्या नियतरूपा सुखदुःखमोहस्वभावापरमाण्वाद्युपादानकर्मादिसहकारिकारणपरतन्त्रा षड्रसा न च हृद्यैव  
तैः तादृशी ब्रह्मणो निर्मितिर्निर्माणम् । एतद् विलक्षणा तु कविवाङ्निर्मितिः । अतएव जयति ।४

Yet he also, in another place, accepts like the earlier writers of the like *Bhāmaha*, the importance of the knowledge society in creating a poem:

लोकस्य स्थावरजङ्गमात्मकलोकवृत्तस्य ।५

As society is the main spring of the literature, it is but natural that the social life, as depicted or indicated, should occupy the foremost place while considering the value of a literary work of any place, time, or the author.

Literature, in fact, helps us in proper understanding of the society and in leading a purposeful life. The incidents depicted in the literature being significant and purposeful make us look at the world with a rational healthy attitude towards it. A litterateur does not say anything in a casual manner. No incident occurs in a *Kāvya* just by accident. This is what is meant when it is said that the composition of a poet is beyond the control of the fate (*niyatikṛta-niyamarahita*).

Both the good and bad occur in the life of a person without expectation. When we are not able to establish any relation between the good and bad on one hand and on our known actions on the other we simply say that these things have occurred on account of fate. But in literature either the good or the bad entirely depends on the actions of the individual but not on the fate. All the incidents and their mutual relation should have proper justification. Then only the literature would be in a position to give proper direction in life, to the future generations. That is what is meant by the statement in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*:

भविष्यतश्च लोकस्य सर्वकर्मनुदर्शकम् ।६

“This would show to the future generation all the actions and their results.”

Therefore, while examining the literature one should not ignore the society. To examine the activities of the society as reflected in the literature is the first step in the literary criticism. A literary work should be examined and explained in such a way that a social condition brought-out from it with various actions and their consequences should be understood even by an ordinary student of literature.

### The Maintenance of Propriety:

Mahimabhaṭṭa refers to two methods of literary criticism the positive and negative, *Sampratipattimūlaka* and *Vipratipattimūlaka*. The critic following the positive method tries to bring out all the good aspects in a poem by which he is influenced not leaving even the subtlest points and this type of critic is named “*Tattvābhīniveśin*” (interested in finding the truth) by Vāmana. There is a critic of entirely different nature, called ‘*Arocakin*’, who does not agree with any aspect that is found in a poem and tries to point out only the defects contained in it. This method is called “negative” *Vipratipattimūlaka*.

The functions of a teacher are slightly different from those of a literary critic. Generally, a teacher is given to teach only such works which are popularly known as good works. Therefore, a teacher would have very great responsibility of establishing the propriety of all the incidents and the ideas, depicted in a work. Even in the works of great writers like Kālidāsa, the propriety has to be established. Even the great poets like Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti have tried to explain the propriety of Sitā’s banishment in the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki. The killing of *śambūka* has remained as an irremovable blemish on the disk of the moon (*candra bimba*), the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The efforts of the poets like Bhavabhūti to remove this blemish may appear all right in those days when to go to heaven is considered to be the highest goal of life. Once it is said that the goal has been achieved every type of impropriety is removed, but such justification cannot be accepted in the modern world though Bhavabhūti has tried his best to convince us. Kālidāsa has introduced the episode of the curse (of Dūrvāsā) to remove the impropriety in the rejection of *Śakuntalā* by *Duśyanta* as found in the original story of *Mahābhārata* and only this episode is responsible for the beauty of the dramatic plot of the *Abhijñānaśākuntalam*. The story as found in the *Mahābhārata*, is no doubt, repugnant but it is in accordance with what has happened.

Here we are now concerned with the propriety of the plot construction. The difference between the *Itihāsa* (Epic) and *Kāvya* is based on this only. This is the reason why Anandavardhana maintains that there is no use in describing the incidents as they have occurred:

नहिकवेरितिवृत्तमात्रनिर्वहणेनकिञ्चित्प्रयोजनम्, इतिहासादेवतत्सिद्धेः।७

Therefore, a successful critic relegates the historical incidents to the background, for the time being, and tries to explain them on the basis of the propriety. As far as the student of literature is concerned *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* also are, like *Meghadūta* and *Svapnavāsavadatta*, the works of the poets and so they also are to be examined on the basis of the propriety.

## The Importance and the purpose of the incidents :

Rājasekhara conceives the literature (*Sāhitya*) as a person (*Kāvya-Puruṣa*) and as the son of the goddess *Sarasvatī* (the goddess of learning), got through the boon. This conception is not just partial or one-sided. All the elements of a *Kāvya* like the *Alamkāra*, are given different places as the different limbs of the *Kāvya-puruṣa*; if one component part is called the body, another is said to be soul and the yet another one is called the quality of the soul:

उक्तं हि काव्यस्य शब्दार्थौ शरीरं, रसादिश्चात्मा, गुणाः शौर्यादिवत्,  
रीतयोऽवयवसंस्थानविशेषवत्, अलंकाराः कटककुण्डलादिवत् इति ।८

But the individuality of a *Kāvya* is based on some other factors also. In the life of a person there would be a number of situations in which he experiences many ups and downs based on different incidents which are responsible for his individuality. Similarly, the individuality of a *Kāvya* also is based on different types of emotions and situations found in it. The secret of calling this (*Kāvya*) as the imitation of life lies in this factor:

नानाभावोपसम्पन्नं नानावस्थान्तरात्मकम् ।  
लोकवृत्तानुकरणं नाट्यमेतन् मया कृतम् ॥९

The greatness of an individual depends on the purposefulness of the incidents connected with his life and the relative importance of the conditions. The meanness of an individual will be in the same ratio as that of the uselessness of the incidents in his life. The same case with a poem also. In the life of a man the main cause of the purposeless incidents is his nature. But in a poem, there is no place for such nature. Every incident in a *Kāvya* has some purpose and meaning. There is some relative importance of the incidents introduced in a poem. The function of a critic becomes very difficult because he has to explain the importance or otherwise of every incident, small or big in a *Kāvya*.

According to Anandavardhana, a great poet will have full control over his *Kāvya*. He covers up the purposelessness of small incidents by his *Pratibhā*, the intuitive power, so cleverly, that even a skillful critic finds it difficult to point out which of the incidents is more significant and which is less (significant):

अव्युत्पत्तिकृतोदोषःशक्त्यासंविद्यतेकवेः।१०

According to the *Dhvani* theory there is charm only when the main idea in a *Kāvya* is suggested without being conveyed directly. In the same way, the significance of an incident would be more charming only when it is suggested:

प्रसिद्धिश्चेयमस्त्येव विदग्धविद्वत्परिषत्सु यदभिमततरं वस्तु।  
व्यङ्ग्यत्वेन प्रकाशयते । न साक्षात् शब्दवाच्यत्वेनैव ॥ ११

## The Intention of the Poet:

Literature is an art. A poet wants to express his aesthetic experience through the art of literature. The beauty is not confined only to the form; it can be there in the ideas also. because the ideas can be both tender as well as harsh. A poet conceives the ideas, as in a womb, in a seminal form. They develop gradually when such a state comes that the poet becomes restless till he expresses them. These ideas which make the poet restless till he expresses them constitute the *Kavi-vivakṣā* the poet's intention.

According to Mahimabhata, the author of the *Vyaktiviveka*, the *Vivakṣā* in a *Kāvya* consists of the discretion between what should be done and what should not be and this is in general the subject matter of a *Kāvya*. This is the duty of a poet to express his experience of the truth in a beautiful style, the truth which is based on some doctrinal importance. Whatever may be conveyed, but the style should be charming, and the charm is called *Rasa*. According to him the *Rasa* in a *Kāvya* is the means to convey the truth, and the ideas. The skill of a critic lies in recognizing the *Vivakṣā* (intention) of the poet and in making it understood even by a general reader. He should understand the secret of every line. The *Vivakṣā* of a poet is concealed, in a peculiar way, in his method of expression. This is found in the whole work and in parts of it. Anandavardhana explained in the fourth chapter of *Dhvanyāloka*, the *Kavi-vivakṣā*, contained in the whole of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. Kuntaka, Mahimabhata and Kṣemendra have shown how the poet's intention can be traced in words and phrases also.

### The Style:

While examining a poem, we come across an important factor, i.e. the style adopted by a poet for the expression on his ideas. Style is a factor which distinguishes the poetry (*Kavya*) from the other types of literature. Vāmana identifies it correctly and says:

सति वक्तरि सत्यर्थे सति शब्दानुशासने ।  
अस्ति तन्न बिना येन परिस्रवति वाङ्मधु ॥१२

What is that factor by the association of which only a poem pours honey? This question naturally arises in the mind of every one. Vāmana quotes in reply to this question, the statement of an earlier writer who feels the peculiar arrangement of words used for conveying an idea is the factor which distinguishes a poet, though nothing new is said by it. This arrangement of words makes the reader overwhelmed with joy and the *Sahṛdaya* (a man of aesthetic sense) would feel that there is rain nectar pouring in his heart. किन्त्वस्ति काचिदपरैव पदानुपूर्वी, यस्यां न किञ्चिदपि किञ्चिदिवावभाति । आनन्दयत्यथ च कर्णपथप्रयाता, चेतः सताममृतवृष्टिरिव प्रविष्टा ॥१३

This arrangement of words is the style of *Kāvya* and the same is called *Riti* by Vāmana. It is given a technical name *Vacana-vinyāsa-Krama* by Rājasekhara. Perhaps following the earlier writers, Bhāmaha calls it '*Sauśabdya*'.

Bhavabhūti calls a *Kāvya* '*Suvacanam*'. What is said by Rāma, in *Uttararāmacarita* while praising the words of Sitā is in fact a beautiful definition of a *Kāvya* given by Bhavabhūti. A *Kāvya* consists of the careful use of the beautiful words which makes the flower of life which has faded away on account of worldly activities blossom again. Even a person who suffers from the lack of everything else can get full satisfaction from it. Though enjoyed through hearing a poem enchants all the senses. It is the nectar for the ear and for a reader of aesthetic sense it works like a *Rasāyana* (strength giving medicine).

म्लानस्य जीवकुसुमस्य विकासनानि संतर्पणानि सकलेन्द्रियमोहनानि ।

एतानि ते सुवचनानि सरोरुहाक्षि कर्णामृतानि मनसश्च रसायनानि ॥१४

It is a pleasant act for a critic to recognize and analyses the style of a *Kāvya*. The style of a *Kāvya* has connection with the taste of a person also. That is why each reader has a favorite poet of his own. Though each poet has his own peculiar style there is a tradition of classifying the poets under different groups on the basis of the style. A good critic of poetry can understand, immediately after reading a poem, whose poem it could be. We cannot dismiss as baseless the popular story that Kumārādāsa, the king Srilankā could recognize half of the verse as the composition of Kālidāsa the moment he heard it from a *Gaṇikā*.

## The Unity of the different poetic theories

In any language, once there is the development of literature, different methods also are evolved which, in course of time, take the form of different literary theories. Each language has its own literary theories and Sanskrit is not an exception to this general rule. The discussions based on the ingredients of a *Kāvya*, such as the *Doṣa*, *Guṇa*, *Alankāra*, *Rīti* and *Vṛtti* etc., and the theories based on the *Dhvani*, *Vakrokti*, *Rasa*, *Aucitya* etc., are the special features of the Sanskrit literature which cannot be found elsewhere. Even in the case of some of the literary trends, which are generally found to be similar in all the other languages, Sanskrit has its own speciality.

In every language of the world the literature began with the prose works. Metrical compositions were of much later times. On the contrary, the earliest literary works of Sanskrit, whether Vedic or classical, were in the form of metrical compositions. In course of time both the verse and prose were used for expression but the verse continued to hold the field, whether it was poetry (*Kāvya*), Epics or the *Purāṇas*.

When verse is considered, in the other languages of the world, as the medium of poetical expression and prose as that of any other type of expression, in Sanskrit, the Prose and the verse continue to be the media of expression both in the poetic and *Śāstric* (scientific) literature, even today. Even in one work, both the verse and prose are used. A large portion of *YajurvedaSamhitā* consists of prose. The two *Kāṇḍas* out of twenty in the Atharvaveda are composed in prose. The same method is found adopted in the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upaniṣads*.

The *Brāhmaṇas* are mainly in Prose whereas the large portions of the *Upaniṣads* are found in verse. The same is the case with *Mahābhārata* and *Bhāgavata*. We find the development of the same method in the inscriptions, dramas and the *Kāvyas* of the classical Sanskrit.

It is the special feature of Sanskrit that even in the works other than the *Kāvya* also dealing with subjects like Grammar, Philosophy, *Dharma*, *Artha* and *Kāma*, and in the Epics and the *Purāṇas*, the verse form is used in abundance. As a result of this there was an unbroken relation between the Poetic and *śāstric* works; with a constant exchange of the ideas and language-patterns thus making both complimentary to each other. That is why Mahimabhaṭṭa calls a *Kāvya* also a *śāstra*: *Kāvyanātya-śāstra-rūpo-ayam*. The difference is only in the mode of expression, and there is no difference in the ideas to be expressed: *Upāyamātra-bhedaḥ, na Phala-bhedaḥ*.

The main purpose of the both *Kāvya* and *śāstra* is to produce the sense of discretion (in the reader) between the good and bad:

सामान्येनोभयमपि च तत् विधिनिषेधव्युत्पत्तिफलम् ।१५

This close connection between the art and sciences is the unique feature of the Sanskrit language and literature which cannot be found anywhere else. Therefore, it is necessary to understand its importance. This close connection is not just accidental; this is the result of the deliberate efforts on the part of the great thinkers and the makers of the literature. The far-seeing intuitive power of those great men is at work to bring out this close contact between the creative art and the sciences. Now-a-days there is a gulf between the literature on one hand and the philosophy and the science on the other, in all the countries of the world. The gulf is becoming so wide that it is not possible to bring them closer to each other.

Viewed in this light, we can understand the greatness of the Indian thinkers who had established so much of closeness between these two branches of the literature, artistic and scientific and have been preserving it till today. Through this closeness it has been possible for the Sanskrit literature to maintain the cultural unity of India from times immemorial.

One has to bear this point in mind if one wants to make in-depth study of Sanskrit literature and evaluate it on right lines.

### Literature and Beauty:

Just as the study of the Sanskrit language has resulted in the development of a perfect grammar, so also the careful study of the literature has resulted in the appearance of a great tradition of literary criticism. This tradition has a very long history years beginning with of two thousand *Nāṭyaśāstra* of the 3rd century B.C. and extending up to the 17th century when *Rasagaṅgādhara* was produced by Panditarāja Jagannātha. The same tradition continues to influence the literary world in one way or the other, even today. The analysis of each and every part of the literature to the minutest details, as was done in Sanskrit, is hardly found in any literature of the world. The literary theories are described in such details, and so much of technical vocabulary connected with them is developed that a scholar of ordinary attainments would find it difficult to apply all these theories while teaching or appreciating any literary work. It is true that all the elements connected with a *Kāvya* like the *Doṣa*, *Guṇa*, *Riti*, *Vṛtti* and *Pravṛtti* etc., and the theories based on the *Rasa*, *Dhvani* and *Vakrokti* etc., are so systematized that mere reference to them while studying a literary work appears to be quite inadequate for appreciating it and so the application of some new principles appears to be necessary; but one would be committing a great blunder if one turns blind to all these elements, on that ground. Therefore, it is being attempted here to make a brief survey of these elements.

Literature is not merely an art; it is the most important one among all the fine arts. An art is called 'art because it is expressive or suggestive of beauty. What kind of beauty is suggested through a *Kāvya* and what is its nature? How it is, produced? These are the questions raised and answered in the works of literary criticism in Sanskrit. The beauty is called with various names - *Cārutā*, *śobhā*, *Saundarya*, *Camatkāra*, *Vicchitti* and *Ramaṇiyatā* etc., which are almost synonymous. In order to decide the greatness of a *Kāvya*, one has to understand the meaning of these words clearly.

None of these words is found in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of probably Bharata. Most these are the qualities of a composition and *Nāṭya*, being an art, is more the source of joy rather than beauty. The joy is not the quality of a composition but it is the quality (feeling) of the spectator. This is what is meant while saying that a drama is enjoyable. Therefore, every student of literature should know the difference between the beauty (*cārutā*) and being enjoyable.

Bhāmaha is the first writer who makes the search for *Cārutā* (beauty) in the work of a poet. It is clear from his discussion that some of the earlier writers were of the opinion that the *Vaidarbhamārga* is more suitable for the poetic expression. But Bhāmaha opines that the mere employment of *Vaidarbhamārga* (simple and elegant style) does not ensure the presence of beauty in a *Kāvya*:

न नितान्तादिमात्रेण जायते चारुता गिराम्<sup>१६</sup>

Here the word "ādi" refers to the *Vaidarbhamārga*, mentioned earlier. According to him the poetic beauty depends on the discreet use of the *Alaṅkāras* (figures of speech) which involve *Vakrokti* (a fine turn of speech):

वक्राभिधेयशब्दोक्तिरिष्टा वाचामलंकृतिः<sup>१७</sup>

Daṇḍin accepts that all the *Alaṅkāras* are responsible for the charm in a *Kāvya*:

काव्यशोभाकरान् धर्मानलंकारान् प्रचक्षते<sup>१८</sup>

Vāmana uses both the words “*Saundarya*’ and ‘*Sobhā*’. While accepting ‘*Alaṅkāra*’ as a synonym to ‘*Saundarya*’, he states that *guṇas* produce *śobhā* in a *Kāvya* and the *Alaṅkāras* enhance it.

काव्यशोभायाः कर्तारो धर्मा गुणाः, तदतिशयहेतवस्त्वलंकाराः१९

According to Anandavardhana the real ornament of the work of a poet is the suggested sense, *Dhvani*, which may be a *Vastu* (an idea), *Alaṅkāra* or *Rasa*:

मुख्या महाकविगिरामलंकृतिभृतामपि ।  
प्रतीयमानच्छायैषा भूषा लज्जेव योषिताम् ॥२०

As he feels the beauty (*cārutā*) of a *Kāvya* is suggested like the *Lāvanya* (loveliness) of a damsel, but it is conveyed directly:

प्रतीयमानं पुनरन्यदेव वस्त्वस्ति वाणीषु महाकवीनाम् ।  
यत्प्रसिद्धावयवातिरिक्तं विभाति लावण्यमिवाङ्गनासु ॥२१

According to Anandavardhana the factor that controls the beauty in a *Kāvya* is the suggestion of the ideas. Even a fine idea would not be so charming when it is expressed directly as when it is suggested.

साररूपो ह्यर्थः स्वशब्दानभिधेयत्वेन प्रकाशितः सुतरां शोभामावहति ।२२

Following Bhāmaha, Kuntaka accepts *Vakrokti* as the source of beauty (*camatkāra*) in a *Kāvya*, which is quite opposite to the *Svabhāvokti* (description of a thing as it is). According to Abhinavagupta, *Rasa* is the only source of the beauty in a *Kāvya*. Even the (suggested) *Vastu* and *Alaṅkāra* beautify the *Kāvya* only through the touch of *Rasa*. Viśvanātha also accepts the same views.

Panditarāja Jagannātha uses the word *Ramaṇiyatā* as a synonym to *Cārutā* (beauty) in a *Kāvya* which is, according to him, to be found only in the sense. This *Ramaṇiyatā* is responsible for the supernatural pleasure produced by a *Kāvya*.

One of the important aspects of the literary criticism is to find out, after a careful scrutiny, the beauty in a *Kāvya*. This can be done by taking up a word, a sentence, a verse, a context, a *sarga*, an *ucchvāsa* an act, or the whole work. A *Kāvya* is broadly, called an *Alaṅkāra* also. It's being an *Alaṅkāra* is mainly based only on the expression of the beauty. The *Rasa* alone can bring about perfect beauty in a *Kāvya* and this is what is meant by saying “*Saundaryamalāṅkārah*” - *Alaṅkāra* is the beauty.

### The Poetic experience:

The most important aspect in the literary criticism is to analyses and explains the nature of the poetic experience. It is very difficult to explain any experience, in words, because being an abstract thing is defying definitions. The same difficulty with the poetic experience also. The Indian literary critics have classified the experience under three headings. One type of the experience is to get the knowledge of something new. When we know something new, we feel got some additional knowledge which was not there earlier; and the experienced is called “*Vastu*’.

In the second type of the poetic experience, there is stringiness which is brought about by the *Alaṅkāras* which makes the reader, for a moment wonder-struck making him forgets the activities of the day-to-day life. In other words, it can be said as being produced by an extraordinary function (of the



words). There is no possibility of any increase in the knowledge of the reader by this type of experience. Only the natural instinct of a man for something wonderful is satisfied.

The third type of the poetic experience makes the reader completely absorbed in his own experience with no cognition of anything else at that moment. This self-forgetting state is called *Rasānubhūti*, experience of the sentiment. At this stage there is no new knowledge acquired and there is no feeling of wonder. The heart-overflows with a peculiar experience which is entirely different from the two types (of experience) described above. Every limb and every inch of the body is affected by this experience. It is very difficult to explain the experience of *Rasa* as compared with the experiences of *Vastu* and *Alaṅkāra*. Yet all the *Ālaṅkārikas* from Bharata to Panditarāja Jagannātha tried to analyse and explain this experience also along with the experience of the *Vastu* and *Alaṅkāra*. All the *Ālaṅkārikas* are unanimous in giving the highest importance to the experience of *Rasa*. As Anandavardhana feels the *Vastu* and *Alaṅkāra* are useful only as a means for developing the *Rasa*, they should be employed in a *Kāvya* in order to help the development of the *Rasa*, says Anandavardhana:

तथा शरीरमुत्पाद्य वस्तु कार्यं यथा तथा।  
यथारसमयं सर्वमेव तत्प्रतिभासते ॥२३

If the *Vastu* is developed in newer and newer forms or it is tried to produce charm through the employment of the *Alaṅkāras* neglecting the *Rasa* the *Kāvya* loses its value and the poet cannot be ranked to a higher place. Even the good poets of great *Pratibhā* (intuitive power) indulge in such wordy acrobatics and ultimately fail to produce a good *Kāvya*, says Anandavardhana: प्रबन्धविशेषस्य नाटकादे रसव्यक्तिनिमित्तमिदं चापरमवगन्तव्यम् यदलंकृतीनां शक्तावप्यानुरूप्येण योजनं शक्तो हि कदाचित् अलंकारनिबन्धने तदाक्षिततयैवानपेक्षितरसबन्धः प्रबन्धमारभते तदुपदेशार्थमिदम् उक्तम् ॥२४

### Conclusion:

The Indian literary criticism has given the highest place to *Rasa*. Everything else like *Alaṅkāra*, *Guṇa*, *Rīti*, *Vṛtti* and *Pravṛtti* etc. finds its place in a *Kāvya* so far as it is useful for the *Rasa*. The relevance of all these above-mentioned elements also is examined with reference to their usefulness to the *Rasa*. That is the reason why only those poets who attained perfection in depicting *Rasa* are given a very high place in India. Vālmiki, Vyāsa, Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti are the standing example for such perfection. It is said in praise of such poets –

जयन्ति ते सुकृतिनोरससिद्धाः कवीश्वराः।  
नास्तियेषां शः काये ज रामरणजं भयम् ॥

### References:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. <i>Nāṭyaśāstra</i> , 1.23                       | 9. <i>Nāṭyaśāstra</i> , 1.112                                |
| 2. <i>Yaśatilakacampū</i>                          | 10. <i>Dhvanyāloka</i> - <i>ṛtīya-udyota</i>                 |
| 3. <i>Vyaktiviveka</i> P.7                         | 11. <i>Dhvanyāloka</i> - <i>ṛtīya-udyota</i>                 |
| 4. <i>Kāvya prakāśa</i> , 1.1 ( <i>vṛtti</i> )     | 12. <i>Kāvya kaṅkāra-sūtravṛttī</i> 1.2.11                   |
| 5. <i>Kāvya prakāśa</i> , 1.3 ( <i>vṛtti</i> )     | 13. <i>Kāvya kaṅkāra-sūtravṛttī</i> 1.2.21                   |
| 6. <i>Nāṭyaśāstra</i> , 1.23                       | 14. <i>Uttara-rāma-carita</i> , 1.36                         |
| 7. <i>Dhvanyāloka</i> - <i>ṛtīya-udyota</i>        | 15. <i>Vyaktiviveka</i> P.7 (with <i>Madhusūdanī-vṛttī</i> ) |
| 8. <i>Sāhitya-darpaṇa</i> , <i>Pra. Pariccheda</i> | 16. <i>Kāvya kaṅkāra</i> 1.36                                |
|  | 17. <i>Kāvya kaṅkāra</i> 1.36                                |

18.Kāvyaḍarśa 2.1

22.Dhvanyāloka 2.30

19.Kāvyaḍaṅkāra-sūtra 3.1.1,2

23.Dhvanyāloka - ṛṭīya-udyota

20.Dhvanyāloka 3.38

24.Dhvanyāloka - ṛṭīya-udyota

21.Dhvanyāloka 1.4

**Bibliography:**

1. Chaturvedi, Prof. BM, *Some Unexplored Aspects of the Rasa Theory*, Translated by Prof. P. Sri Ramachandrudu, Vidyanidhi Prakashan, Delhi, 1996
2. शास्त्री डा. श्रीनिवास, काव्यप्रकाशः, साहित्य भण्डार , सुभाष बजार, मेरठ , १९९८
3. वसु डा. अनिल चन्द्र , काव्यालङ्कारसूत्रवृत्तिः, संस्कृत पुस्तक भण्डार , कलिकता , १९७७
4. शुक्ला रामदेव , काव्यालङ्कार, चौखम्बा, वारणासी , १९६६
5. चक्रवर्ती सत्यनारायण , ध्वन्यालोक , संस्कृत पुस्तक भण्डार , कलिकता , २००३
6. मुखोपाध्यायः डा. विमलकान्त , साहित्यदर्पणः , संस्कृत पुस्तक भण्डार , कलिकता , १९९६
7. मुखोपाध्यायः डा. रमारञ्जन , रससमीक्षा , संस्कृत पुस्तक भण्डार , कलिकता , १८८६

