

Chapter I

Introduction

Indian poetics, which is also known as Sanskrit poetics, is an enormous source of the theories and doctrines of poetry and drama. From the origin, the main objective of the Sanskrit poetics is to find out the essence or soul of the poetry. Indeed, poetry or *kavya* is an art which depends on the imaginative ability of poet and *rasanubhuti* or art experience is the primary goal of the poetry. In this way, the real purpose of a poet is to attain beauty with the help of words and sense and to stimulate chuffed experience in the heart of human being. But now the questions arise as how the beauty is conveyed in poetry? What is the nature of poetry? What is the nature of such experiences? How do different elements increase the beauty of poetry? These were some fundamental questions which were unsolved for the ancient poets. In order to solve these basic questions, the *Alankarasastraw*as created or developed. The term '*Alankarasastra*' is ordinarily used to signify literary criticism, but in literally wordsit stands only for figures of speech. It indicates towards a harmonious blend of poetics, aesthetics, and rhetoric in the context of Indian literature.

Though, it is true that the available sources and evidences are not enough for finding the origin of Sanskrit poetics. It is extremely difficult to find out the roots of Sanskrit poetics. Dr. S.K. De rightly observes, "The *Alankarasastra* is never mentioned among the orthodox disciplines which constitute the so-called *Vedangas*, nor do we meet with any passage in *Vedic Samhitas*, *Brahmanas* or the earlier *Upanisads* in which we may find a real basis for a system of poetics" (Hegde 1). In order to solve this riddle,

modern scholars made efforts to find the roots of the system of poetics in Vedic literature.

Vedic literature has a sacred antiquity. This literature includes mainly 'Vedas' which are four in number. Of the four, Rigveda is the earliest and the oldest. In Rigveda many specimens of poetry in the form of hymns is found. The word *upama* is found in abundance in the Rigveda. Then we come to *acarya* Panini. In Panini's work we come to across some interesting references concerning to the figure of speech *upama*. After Panini it was Kautilya who demonstrates the practice of epigraphically writing in his works. It is noticeable that he mentions several brilliances of writing modes and addresses them *lekhan-sampat*. After this, Bharatmuni may be called the first *acarya* who provide the first systematic treatise on the art of drama entitled *Natyasastra*. After Bharata, the period of about seven centuries is almost silence in the history of the development of *Alankarasastra* but there are some evidences and sources that fill this rift and these evidences and sources are the epigraphic records. The epigraphic sources of this period put some fascinating sidelight on the development of Sanskrit poetics. The Junagadh inscription of Rudradaman is a specimen of supreme and fabulous poetry. It is the mark of some poetical excellence and incidentally insinuates towards the division of poetry into *gadya* and *padya*. With the division of *gadya* and *padya* it also describes that both *gadya* and *padya* should be adorned. Another example of epigraphic writing is the inscription of Samudragupta which is pillared in Allahabad. The prose of this epigraph vies with the style of Bhamaha and it describes very fascinating epithet to Samudragupta. These epigraphic sources force one to attain an idea that Sanskrit poetics had covered a long distance before composition. Above description shows that even much earlier to Bhamaha,

Sanskrit poetics had made an enough deal of progress. Who is *kavi* (poet)? It was a question which was defined differently by various *acaryas* and scriptures.

In Amarkosa, for *vidvan*, *kavi* is a synonymous along with *pandita*, one who knows *sastras*, has discriminating intellect, and *mansi*, a thoughtful, meditative person. So *kavi* is a learned man who describes some subject/object. Under this definition, the ultimate reality, *paramatma*, is also designated as *kavi*. Brahma, the source of Vedas, is described as *adikavi* (Bhagavadgita). Next, Valmiki, the composer of Ramayana, in the language of the people (*laukikabhasa*) is also called *adikavi* (Kapoor 65).

The person skilled in *sastras* is called *pandita*. In this way *kavi* is considered as a learned man who refers to some subject or object. In the context of Bhagavad-Gita, the scripture of Hindu religion, Brahma is considered as *adikavi*. After this the learned composers of *Mahabharata* and Puranas are described as *kavi*. With the progress of time, the word *kavi* (poet) was defined in different way. Earlier it was associated merely with the description of incidents but now focus was set up towards the aesthetic pleasure of the audience also.

Many attempts have been made by different *acaryas* in order to define poetry also. There are many persons, objects or happenings around us in our daily life which arouse charm, attractions, pathos, fear, surprise etc. There would be hardly any person who would remain unaffected of these magical experiences. Most of us, even though for a short span of time, come under the spell of these beautiful experiences. These scenes or happenings get inscribed in our mind and later and sooner these come out from our mind when we discuss about them to other people. This type of simple description or expression is called just a *varta* i.e. a worldly talk but opposite of this simple expression or explanation of these events and scenes, there are some persons

who join these events with the power of their imagination then their fascinating expression comes under the category of poetry. Bhamaha and Vamana defined the poetry in the following words:

A composition, he writes, is like the face of a woman who may be herself beautiful but who does not become attractive without ornaments. “Figures of speech” are embellishments of literature. Though Vamana also gives explanation of “these embellishments of literature” in his work, he does not seem to agree with Bhamaha in describing poetry in these terms. According to him, poetry is not a whole, composed of words and meanings. It is a whole where *gunas* (qualities) and *alankara* (beauty) also enter as components (Barlingay 352).

In the words of Rajasekhra, the poet is owned of *karayitri pratibha*, i.e. creative faculty, while common appreciator is possessed of *bhavayitri pratibha*, i.e. appreciative ability. *Kavi-pratibha* is the pivotal factor of poetry. The composition of any poetic work cannot be imagined without the quality of *kavi-pratibha* i.e., the creative faculty. There were many Sanskrit rhetoricians who tried to reveal the causes of poetry and some of them, such as Dandin, Vamana, Rudrata, Kuntaka, and Mammata are more attainable than others in the defining of poetry. Dandin reveals the three causes of poetry. The first one is *nirmala-sastrajnana* (clear academic understanding), second is *isnaisargiki pratibha* (inborn genius) and the last is the *amanda abhiyoga* (constant application of above-said genius). Kuntaka and Rudrata also accepted three causes of poetry: *sakti*, *vyutpati* and *abhyasa*. Vamana also explained the different causes of poetry. He explained *vidya*, in the simple words, the knowledge of various disciplines of learning, *loka* i.e. the knowledge of worldly norms and behavior and *prakirna* (miscellaneous). Further he subdivided *prakirna* into six causes: *laksajnata* which is

the study of scriptures, *abhiyoga* i.e. practice of composing poetic works, *vrddha-seva* i.e. taking instructions and guidance from *Guru/Gurus*, *aveksana* i.e. use of proper words and evading of improper words, *pratibhana* (innate genius of poetic intuition) and *avadhana* (attentiveness of mind while studying, composing or learning, any literary work). Of these different causes what come out are the three causes for producing the poetry: *sakti* or *pratibha* (intellect or poetic intuition), *vautpatti* (erudition) and *abhyas* (practice) but these three causes were dealt different perspective by various Sanskrit rhetoricians. Therefore, there was no uniformity in the views of different *acharya*'s while handling of these three causes. Rudrata, Bhatta and Jagannatha defined *pratibha* according to the subject-matter of poetry; while Mamata and Kuntaka tried to explore as to how is it born? Defining *sakti* or *pratibha*, Rudrata says that *sakti* or *pratibha* is the ability of poet. With the help of this ability, he presents extemporaneously any subject matter which is manifested or occurred in his focused mind - using the proper words. While on the other hand, Rudrata and Jagannatha laid emphasized upon the external form of the poetry. They defined *sakti* or *pratibha* in the form of structure or syntax of poetry. According to Dandin, *pratibha* is an essential factor for the creation of poetry while Vamana took *pratibha* as the seed for creation of poetry. Hemcandra was perhaps the first *acarya* who supports to the intellect power in the composition of poetry. He advocates of the intellect as the fundamental factor for poetry. Hemcandra accepts *pratibha* as the only usual factor of poetry while Jayadeva accepts *pratibha* as the root for poetry. Though Jayadeva accepted the *pratibha* as the nucleus of poetry, yet he is also of the view that the knowledge and practice are nothing but inspiring roots for intellect. He holds that in some situation both erudition and practice do not serve to be such kind of cause for it. In this situation, he accepts *adrsta*

(unforeseen) phenomenon to the cause of it. He defines *adrsta* in the blessings and boons provided to any person by any god.

After the first cause of *sakti* or *pratibha* what cause of making poetry appear is *vayutpatti* (erudition). Here *vayutpatti* means minute study of the different scriptures and literary works and the knowledge of the worldly matters. *Vayutpatti* is helpful in making *pratibha* more sharp, poignant, potent, miraculous, and capable of understanding the essentials. Hemcandra rightly states that with the help of *vayutpatti* the *pratibha* is chiseled and polished. *Abhyas* (practice) is the last cause of three which is helpful in creating poetry. *Acarya* Mamgala is the one of ancient *acaryas* who takes side to the last one cause. He states that *abhyasa* is the only aspect for creating the poetry but he also adds that it is neither the alone and unavoidable cause nor is essential or predominant cause of poetry. There are many examples of poets all over the world whose very first work has become immortal. In concise, we may say that *pratibha* is the only and inevitable factor for creating poetry, and both *vayutpatti* and *abhyasa* are its polishing and magnifying causes.

After explaining the causes of poetry, various *acarya* tried to define the poetry. From the beginning of Sanskrit poetics many effort have been made by different *acaryas*. Yet no clear-cut and ideal definition had been presented. There are some names which draw our attention. First of all, *acarya* Bhamaha tried to define the poetry. Bhamaha defined by saying that “A happy fusion of *sabda* (sound) and *artha* (sense) is called poetry” (Choudhary 24) but Bhamaha advocates to the *alankaras* relating to both sound and sense. In the new definition of poetry given by Bhamaha was that poetry is a combination of sound and sense which prompts *alankaras* (figures of speech) but this definition could not be called a complete definition because it undoubtedly requires an explanation of an *alankara*. Dandin also defined the poetry in the following words: “the

body of the poetry is a group of sounds which indicates the happy aim intended by the author” (Choudhary 25). Vamana defined poetry as “Poetry is that union of sound and sense which is devoid of poetic flaws and is embodied with *gunas* (excellences) and the *alankaras*” (Choudhary 26). This definition lays emphasis on excellence as well as on the figures of speech. Such type of description comprising mechanical terms is not perfect one. Anandavardhana was the first *acarya* who included the *dhvani* in his definition of poetry. According to him- “The poetry is the combination of denotative word and sound, while its soul suggested sense” (Choudhary 26). Yet the word ‘*dhvani*’ in itself is a technical term of poetics. This definition, hence, is not an ideal one. Kuntaka also defined poetry on the basis of the principle of *vakrokti* which was propounded by him. He defined that “poetry is the union of sound and sense, arranged in a composition, which, consisting of oblique sayings of a poet is delightful to its sensible reader or listener” (Choudhary 27) but this definition also does not suit to poetry because it mostly deals with the external form of poetry, and, secondly, the term *vakrokti*, like the other terms such as *alankara*, *riti* and *dhvani* is a technical term of poetics. After Kuntaka the *acarya* who defined the poetry was Mammata. He defined the poetry by saying that poetry is organized by word and sense which are flawless, possessed of brilliances, and in which hardly a distinct figure of speech may be absent but this definition was also criticized by various scholars. Visvanatha pays attention towards the *rasa* while defining the poetry. He says that poetry is a sentence, the soul whereof is *rasa*. In his definition Visvanatha gave a prominent place to *rasa* but this definition also does not remain aloof itself from the cruel hands of various scholars and *acaryas*. They advocated that merely sentence is not body of poetry. It is half defined definition. They stated poetry as a happy fusion of word and sense.

After the definitions of the poetry what discussed was about the aim and purpose of the poetry. It was a tradition from the inception in Sanskrit poetics to mention the goal and purpose of their work in the opening of the book. Then, how could *acaryas* be untouched from this fundamental aspect of Sanskrit poetics. Bhamaha, Visvanatha, Hemcandra, Kuntaka, Vamana, Bhojaraja, and Rudrata, too preserved this ancient tradition. They also wrote down the purpose of the poetry in the beginning of their works. In the words of Bharata, drama (poetry) is an instrument of achieving *dharma* (virtue), fame and permanence. It provides benefactions, enriches intellect and imparts instruction. He is of the view that a good piece of poetry, besides giving reputation and rejoice, makes one leading of all arts and facilitates the realization of the four aims of human life that are: *dharma* (virtue), *artha* (wealth), *kama* (desire) and *moksa* (salvation). Bhamaha seems to influence with the views of Bharata while he enumerating the purpose the poetry. Bharata has already talked about *dahramya* and *yasasya*. Bhamaha used the *kirti* word at the place of *yasasya*. After Bhamaha's description of four aims of human life of the purpose of poetry, mostly *acaryas* followed these purpose. Kuntaka and Rudrata added more aims with these four purposes. Rudrata enumerated the elimination of suffering, averting trouble, deliverance form disease and achievement of the desired boon besides the four purposes which were propounded by Bhamaha. Kuntaka adds knowledge of code of conduct, mental exhilaration and spiritual illumination or expansion in the purpose of the poetry. Mammata also has a list of the purposes. He says poetry is for achieving fame, wealth and knowledge of code of conduct, for the removal of the evil, attaining instantaneous highest bliss and imparting instructions as sweetly as does anyone's beloved to him.

In this way, all Sanskrit *acaryas* somehow enumerated the purposes of the poetry and the purpose is the nucleus of the poetry because there is no piece of poetry

in the absence of purpose. Then it will be either a piece of narration or moralistic work. Though, such a work may bring fame, wealth or knowledge of ethics, but at the end it will fail in the test of poetry.

The most debated question from the initiation of Sanskrit poetics was about the soul or essence of the poetry. Originally the word *atman* (soul) derived from *Vaisesika, Vedanta* and *Nyaya sastras*. Various explanations or definitions have been given from the ancient time in the context of *atman* by the different *sastras* and *acaryas*. One of the various explanations advanced by the *sastras* is ‘*caitanyamatma*’, i.e. the Supreme Spirit, is considered as the core of all being and root of all sensations. Another one is ‘*jnanadhikaranamatama*’ that is defined as the soul of all knowledge. Here the word ‘knowledge’ has distinct meanings. It indicates towards will, grief, effort, jealousy and love besides knowledge. In concise we may define the word ‘soul’ in the context of *prana* (breath) and *cetanata* (consciousness).

In this way, the word *atman* (soul) has been used in poetics too in the context of *prana* or *cetanata* in the writings. Though, this word is used here in its expressed senses or large sense. In the Sanskrit poetics, it is considered the most fundamental and the essential element of poetry. It was *acarya* Vamana who for the first time used the word *atman* in poetics. He stated that the soul of the poetry is ‘*riti*’. After Vamana more *acarya* used this word in different senses. Anandvardhana used the word ‘*atman*’ in the context of *dhvani* who propounded that *dhvani* is the soul of poetry. Besides Anandvardhana, Visvanatha also used the word *atman* for defining the poetry. He accepted *rasa* as the soul of poetry.

With the introduction of this metaphor in the poetics the question which was raised was that which theory be accepted as the *atman* (soul/essence) of poetry. Though, the *atman* word for the first time was used by Vamana, while Dandin had

already mentioned *padavali* as the body of the poetry, yet till the age of Anandvardhana and even till the age of Kuntaka, this metaphor had not been presented, while on the basis of *dhavni* specially *rasa-dhavni* the appropriate development of *gunas*, *riti*, *dosas* and *alankaras* had been done and their definitions had been established. Therefore in the age of Kuntaka the essentiality of answering this question was being felt, i.e. which poetic element should be accepted as the soul of poetry? According to Bhamaha, Dandin and Udbhata, this indispensable element consisted in *alankara*, and according to Vamana it contained of *riti*. Later on *vakrokti*, *dhvni*, and *rasa* were considered to be the soul of poetry. In order to define a definite conclusion regarding the soul of poetry, it is obligatory to confer and have a comparative study of the mentioned theories or school of thoughts.

The classics of Sanskrit literature made an inquiry into the true nature of poetic beauty. Hence, rhetoricians started to investigate into the secret of poetic beauty and put forward their own theories. As a result of their incessant efforts, different *prasthanas* or schools came into the existence of the history of *Alankarasastra*. These schools are distinguished to one another on the basis of particular views advanced by their respective promoters and propagators regarding the essence of poetry. Samudrabandha records five schools viz. *alankara*, *riti*, *vakrokti*, *bhogikarana* and *dhavni*.

The Rasa School:

The rasa theory emerged with Bharata through his treatise *Natyasastra*. Literally, the word *rasa* stands for liquid or that which flows. The word ‘*rasa*’ was taken by Bharata from *Atharvaveda* for explaining the theory of stage-drama. He viewed that the attainment of *rasa* should be the paramount goal of a poet. Bharata categories eight types of *rasa* in his opus *Natyasastra*.

The Alankara School:

The earliest and continued school, it examines literary language and assumes that the axis of literariness lies in the figures of speech, in the way of figurative expression. Bhamha is the founder of this school. He is the first *alankarika* poetician in the history of Indian Sanskrit poetics. In his sustained and long lasting opus '*Kavyalankara*', he explains thirty five figures of speech. Bhamaha considers *alankaraa* fundamental aspect of poetry. According to him it is the most essential factor for the embellishment of poetry which cannot be avoided or ignored. Others who continued the tradition of *alankara* are Dandin, Udbhata, Rudrat, and Vamana. Rudrata divides all *alankaras* into two types-those based on phonetic form (*sabdalankara*) and those, based on meaning (*arthalankara*) and then further subdivides each into five and four subtypes respectively. Bhoja did not provide a new classification but added the third category-*ubhayalankara*- to the major types of Rudrata. All these *acarya* are somehow in favor of calling all the embellishing factors of poetry as an *alankara*.

The Riti School:

Riti School was founded by Vamana. It deals with the theory of language of literature. Indeed, it is described for the first time in Bharata's *Natyasastra* under the rubric of *vrtti* but it was Vamana who developed it into a school. The *riti* comprising *gunas* has been described the soul of poetry by Vamana. He describes there types of *ritis*-*vaidarbhi*, *gaudiya* and *pancali*. Of these *vaidarbhi* is bestowed with all the *gunas*, and the *gudiaya* is ascribed with two, namely *ojas* and *kanti*, and the *pancaliare* featured by *madhuraya* and *saukumarya*. Vamana does not open his mind on the question whether the *gunas*, which are presented in these *ritis* are *gunas* of word or that of sense, but from his analysis, especially from his silence, it can be assumed that he intended the presence of both the types of *gunas* in all the *ritis*. According to Vamana, *vaidarbhi* is the best

and most apt of these *ritis* as it was endowed with all the *gunas*. According to Vamana “*riti* is the soul of poetry, as all the beautifying elements of it can be included in the twenty *gunas* accepted by him” (Choudhary 49).

The Dhvani School:

The founder of the *Dhavni* School was Anandavardhana. He stated that *dhvni* is the soul of poetry. Here *dhvni* means indirect evoked meaning. It is the *dhvani* that separates poetry from other rational speeches. According to Anandavardhana, *dhvani* is an embracing principle that elucidates the structure and the function of the other chief elements of literature i.e. the aesthetic influence (*rasa*), the figural mode and devices (*alankara*), the formal values (*riti*), the superiority and defects (*guna-dosa*). In his treatise *Dhvanyaloka*, Anandavardhana discussed a structural analysis of indirect literary meaning. In Todorov’s view Anandavardhana “was perhaps the greatest of all the theorists of textual symbolism” (Kapoor 21). Before Anandavardhana, it was believed that *alankara* had a prime place in poetry, or *riti* was its soul. *Acaryas* who were in the favor of *alankara* stated that where will be *alankara*; there is no need of accepting *dhvni*. But Anandavardhana refuted the various *acarya*’s views. In the words of Anandavardhana, *dhvni* is dominating while the *alankara*, *guna* and *vrtti* are its various parts.

The Vakrokti School:

This school was established by renowned *acarya* named Kuntaka. Kuntaka defined *vakrokti* as oblique utterance. He states that the distinguishing property of literary language is its markedness. He made *vakrokti* a matured theory of literariness. According to him it is the soul of poetry. In order to explain this theory Kuntaka wrote a remarkable treatise entitled ‘*Vakrokti-jivitam*’. According to him, “poetic element which generates super-worldly charm in a statement is called *vakrokti*” (Choudhary 54).

It means oblique or marked statement which is different from the 'loka-varṭa' comes under the *vakrokti*. Before Kuntaka, the *alankara* was considered to be the ultimate aim of poetry and the *riti* and *dhvani* as the *atman* of the poetry. Kuntaka was well familiarized about all these theories and it is proved by his statement when he refutes the *riti* as the soul of poetry. Though, Kuntaka discarded *riti* but somewhere he shows his consent to *alankara, rasa, and dhvani*. It is verified when Kuntaka addresses *vakrokti* as an extraordinary *alankara*. In this context he called *vakrokti* as *vichitra abhidha*, i.e. *vyanjana sakti* or *dhvani*.

The period of the evolution of Indian Sanskrit poetics is of about 2000 years, i.e. from 200 BC to AD 1700. This period is of at least 1900 years. During this period, Sanskrit poetics achieved maturity with the moving time. There are the various stages of the development of poetics which took place during this period.

Kriyakapa:

Among the existing works on poetics, Bharata's *Natyasastra* is the antique text. The main goal of this opus was to describe how to make the dramatic performance popular and successful. That is why it talks regarding the different aspects of sorties covering from the auditorium to the actual stage-performance of the play. It deals with the eclectic aspects of drama whether it is dramatic poetry or poetic embellishments. The *Natyasastra* could be called the suggestive of the stage of *Kriyakalpa* in Indian Sanskrit poetics.

Kavyalaksana:

The period from Bhamaha and Dandin demarcates the second period in the evolution of Indian Sanskrit poetics. During this period, poetics became liberated of dramaturgy. The importance was shifted from the characteristics of poetry (*kavyalaksana*) to the poetic embellishments (*alankara*). This seems to be the general nature of debate

regarding poetry during this period. It seems possible that the conversation and discourses on literature were then addressed *kavyalaksana*. Roughly projected, the period up to AD 600 can be supposed to be the period of *kavyalaksana*.

Kavyalamkara:

The period from Dandin to Rudrat marks the third phase in the growth of poetics. During this period the nature of factors like poetic embellishments (*alanakaras*), properties (*gunas*) and *rasa* became more and more perfect and clear. The characteristic of attractiveness allied with poetry was then called *alankra*. The poetic constituents were treated as the means of creating the beautiful. The literary discussions and discourses were then called *Kavyalankara*. This period is calculated from AD 600 to AD 850.

Sahitya:

The age from Anandavardhana to Mammata marks the next phase of the development of Indian Sanskrit poetics. The general nature of discussion during this period concerning to literature was to look for answers to questions, such as: ‘What is meant by ‘*sahitya*, carrying of words and meanings?’ ‘What are the distinct types of meanings in poetry?’ ‘How is the meaning observed or perceived?’ This could be called the glorious and the most fruitful period in the evolution of Indian poetics. During this period poetics became an independent discipline, emerged out of the earlier discussions regarding ‘*alankaras*’. This period could be estimated till AD 1100.

Sahityapaddhati:

This was the last phase in the development era of Indian Sanskrit poetics. The later writers of the *sahitya*’s period followed the track as it was paved by Mammata. After Mammata no strong efforts were made in the development of Indian Sanskrit poetics by later *acaryas*, no attempt was made to cast the theoretical issues in a different mould

by evolving new methods. Jagannatha, the last writer in this phase, had set himself to the task of re-ordering the structure of poetics, but, he, too, moved to the track made by Mammata. In this way, it can be estimated that in the last phase of development there were no clues of new inventions. This period is from AD 1100 to AD 1650.

In this way, Indian Sanskrit poetics endeavored to touch the every corner of the poetry as well as the aesthetic beauty of poetry. Kuntaka was one of the many *acaryas* who also tried to elucidate the poetry according to his own theory of *vakrokti*.

As far as Western poetics is concerned, it takes its origin from the classical philosophy of Greece. In the Western tradition, attitude to literature has been profoundly contoured by the great writers and thinkers of classical antiquity. Plato and Aristotle were the two prominent figures among the rest who made a sustained and systematic inquiry into the nature of art and its modes of experience. It would not be exaggerate to say that a major and radical concept of the Western critical tradition came out from the mind of these two founding fathers but it can be find out that some essential queries and problems relating to art and its forms in the works of earlier Greek poets, rhetoricians and scholars. But it is misfortune because what is available is not sufficient. The sources show that whatever is found is not in a systematic way but is in unsystematic form. The earliest classical criticism praises the poet. Poet was assumed to be the leading or guiding star. It is believed according to the ancient notion of Greece that poet was inspired by divine muse.

Indeed, the origins of Western criticism took place in Greece and these were intensely bound up with the poetry. It was the response to the poetry that many of the basic principles of ancient literary criticism were formulated. As it is mentioned earlier that poet was inspired by the muse or divine power, it is also knows that poetry was a gift of god and goddess to the poet. It was Homer, the great Greek poet, who first of all

invoked Muse in the opening line of *Illiad*. The tradition of poetic inspiration which was set up by Homer was later followed by numerous poets. Hesiod, 7th century BC peasant poet, was one of such poets who expanded on the theme of poetic inspiration. He briefs in his *Theogony* how the Muses met him on the Mount Helicon and picked him out to be a poet. Pindar, 5th BC lyric poet, also accepts the supremacy of poetry. He considers poetry a treasure house which can never be destroyed.

The major purposes of the early Greek poetry were to provide pleasure and to preserve the memory of great achievements from oblivion but later it was also observed as the source of moral wisdom and practical guidance for living. In the oral culture of early Greece, poetry was the main source through which the ethics and values of society were mirrored and handed down. Poet was considered equal to teacher and is proved through a statement in *Frogs* given by Aeschylus when he says ‘Children have a master to teach them, grown-ups have the poets’ (Murray, Penelope and T. S. Dorsch 8).

Aristophanes, the Greek poet, was one of those poets who for the first time spoke for the duties and rights of the poet. He was a social reformer and satirist. He exposed the political fakeness and the sophists. He was of the view that it should be the duty of poet to teach people. He is generally thought to be one of the founding fathers of ancient literary criticism. His play *Frogs* is the earliest attempt of practical criticism. He takes into consideration factors such as the choice of language in poetry and drama.

It is generally acknowledged that the Greek philosopher Plato laid the foundation of Western philosophy. He tried to shape not only the different branches of knowledge but also tried to define the poet and poetry. Plato didn’t write any treatise devoted specifically to poetry, yet his contribution in the field of poetry is immense and long lasting. Many of the dialogues related to the poet and poetry are easily visible in his remarkable treatises. It is believed that Plato was greatly influenced by poetry in his

early days of life. He has written a great amount of poetry in his youth but abandoned this early passion of writing poetry when he met Socrates. Later Plato condemns poet and poetry as a whole. In Book 10 of the Republic, he expatriates all poets from his state. According to Plato all art, being fiction, is far removed from reality and twists and distorts truth, the accomplishment of which is the goal for man. Plato condemns all art by saying:

This was the conclusion at which I was seeking to arrive when I said that painting or drawing, and imitation in general are engaged upon productions which are removed from truth, and are also the companions and friends and associates of a principle within us which is equally removed from reason, and that they have no true or health aim (Nagarajan 7).

Plato also discusses on the storage of poets knowledge and their source of knowledge. It's example found in his immortal treatise *Ion*:

For all good poets compose their beautiful poems not by art but by inspiration and in a state of possession; and good composer of songs are not in their senses when they write their beautiful songs, but are just like Corybarites who are not in their senses when they dance...For a poet is a light and winged and holy creature, and cannot make poetry until he is inspired and is out of his senses and his reason is no longer in him; and until this comes to pass, no man can make poems or give forth oracles. For it is not by art that they make their many beautiful poems and speeches about things...but by a divine dispensation each man can make a beautiful poem only about the single matter to which the Mause inspires him;...about all else he is incapable... And this is the reason why the good choose their minds and uses as his servants the deliverers of oracles and the divine soothsayers, that we who hear them may know that it is not they who

...speak who are of much account, since they have no reason, but that it is the god himself who speaks and addresses us through them (Greene 16).

Plato tried to prove that it is the Almighty's blessing which make a poet able to write poetry. It is far from reason and logic because of its removal from the reality. Plato regarded the study of morals as basics and wanted all arts to be guided by moral principle. He favors strict censorship, and urges poets to inculcate in people the moral virtues of forbearance, tolerance and rectitude.

After Plato it was Aristotle who centralized his mind on the art of poetry. Aristotle is the backbone of Western poetic criticism. He was a man of letters, a naturalist and an academic as well as the student of Plato. He owed his philosophical career from his teacher Plato. He is remembered in the ocean of literature for his immortal work *Poetics*. Unfortunately, we have no original text of *Poetics*, but there are a few manuscripts belonging to different centuries. It is a collection Aristotle's lectures delivered to his pupils. Probably these lectures were compiled by one of his pupils. It is mainly a work of aesthetic theory, whose business is to understand how poetry operates and the way in which it achieves its influence.

Though Aristotle shows his consent related to Plato's concept of imitation of art but Aristotle takes a different path in order to define his concept of imitation of poetry. Whereas for Plato imitation denotes copying, and hence, petty and trivial, but it is dynamic and creative for Aristotle. Plato is of the view that poetry is inspired, and therefore is irrational activity but Aristotle defends poetry by saying that it is the product of skill or art, which is based on rational and intelligible principles. For Plato the poet owes no knowledge because what does he get straightly come from the blessings of god. Plato criticizes poetry on the ground of emotions. According to Plato poetry waters to emotions and makes a man weak. Aristotle also refutes this allegation.

After the demise of Aristotle a rift started broad in the field of Western literary criticism. There was nobody in the Greece who could fill the fissure which was left after the expiry of Plato and Aristotle. That is why the attention was paid from the 4th century BC Athens to Rome in the first century. Horace, Virgil and Ovid are the renowned name in the book of Western criticism and literature. Of the three, Horace is more attainable. He was more practical and less philosophical than Aristotle. His name is still active in the Western criticism because of his great opus *Ars Poetica*. It is a work which is completely dedicated to poetry. Here in this treatise, he focused his discussion on the three aspects of poetry; the content of poetry, style of poetry and a discussion on poets. He describes that theme of the poetry should be simple, intense and according to the ability of poet. He also favors the poetic ability of coined the new words. He demands the need for organic unity in the work of art. Poetic decorum is one of the many themes which is occurred in *Ars Poetica*. According to Horace poetry should confirm the principle of decorum and there should be a relationship between form and content, expression and thought, style and subject matter, diction and character. Another theme in the poem is that of the skill, craftsmanship and sheer hard work involved in the composition of poetry. He is of the view that poet needs natural talent but with the natural talent hard practice can't be ignored. He says that natural talent is cypher without training or hard work. Horace says that a poet must have knowledge of moral philosophy. He suggests that the ultimate aim of the poetry should be instruct and pleasure to the people.

Once again the sun of criticism rounded towards the Greek. Now the figure which was shined in the brightness of criticism on the Greek soil was different from Aristotle and Plato. That's figure name was Longinus. He was one of the third members of the 'Classical Triumvirate of Criticism' besides Aristotle and Horace. Longinus was

the first who talked about the sublimity in his opus *On the Sublime*. Sublimity is characterized by its ability to amaze and transport an audience, overwhelming them with its irresistible power. For Longinus, sublimity is an inspiring outburst of revelatory illumination. It consists in

The effect of elevated language upon an audience is not persuasion but transport. At every time and in every way imposing speech, with the spell it throws over us, prevails over that which aims at persuasion and gratification. Our persuasions we can usually control, but the influences of the sublime bring power and irresistible might to bear, and reign over every hearer. Similarly, we see skill in invention, and due order and arrangement of matter, emerging as the hard-won result not of one thing, not of two, but of the whole texture of the composition, whereas Sublimity flashing forth at the right moment scatters everything before it like a thunderbolt, and at once displays the power of the orator in all its plenitude (Nagarajan 24).

In the words of Longinus, literature is not didactic or sermon. It is vision and it effects as music effects on the soul. It helps us see with the eye of the spirit. Its spell is not for a moment but on the other hand its magic is long lasting. Immanuel Kant in his *Critique of Judgment* clarifies this Longinian Sublime in the following words:

Bold, overhanging, and as it were threatening, rocks; clouds piled up in the sky, moving with lightning flashes and thunder peals; volcanoes in all their violence of destruction; hurricanes with their track of devastation; the boundless ocean in a state of tumult; the lofty waterfall of a mighty river, and such like; these exhibit our faculty or resistance as insignificantly small in comparison with their might. But the sight of them is the more attractive, the more fearful it is, provided only that we are in security; and we readily call these objects sublime

because they raise the energies of the soul above their accustomed height, and discover in us a faculty of resistance of a quite different kind, which gives us courage to measure ourselves against the apparent almightiness of nature (Nagarajan 25).

Longinus describes the five sources of sublimity. The first is the capacity of firm thought and a strong understanding of ideas, in the simple words, the grandeur of conception. After this, comes the inspired emotion, strong passion, figure of speech and a proper construction of figures and second last comes noble diction and finally he talks about the power to integrate and fuse the elements so as to give them a tone of sublimity.

Philip Sidney's *Apologie* is a perfect example of the Renaissance criticism. Here in this treatise he considered the poet to be the father of learning. For Sidney, poet is the maker of all knowledge. He places the poet above from scientist, historians and philosophers. Though, he somehow seems influenced to Aristotle's concept of imitation while defining the poetry but for him poetry is not mere copying or representation of facts, it is much more. Sometimes it creates something new. He divides poetry into three categories: philosophical poetry, religious poetry and poetry as an imaginative treatment of the nature and life. He is of the views that the final aim of poetry should be moralistic.

William Wordsworth's *Preface to Lyrical Ballads* is a great work in the history of literary criticism. Here in his treatise, Wordsworth gives long lasting definition of poetry and poet. According to Wordsworth poetry is spontaneous overflow of the powerful feelings.

Poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings, takes its origin from emotion recollected in tranquility: the emotion is contemplated till, by a species of re-action, the tranquility gradually disappears, and an emotion, kindred to

that which was before the subject of contemplation, is gradually produced, and does itself actually exist in the mind. In this mood successful composition generally begins (Habib 438).

Wordsworth is of the view that poetry is the image of man and nature. He refutes the magical image of poet also. He is a simple man but there is a difference between the poet and a simple man. In the words of Wordsworth a true poet is a poet who addresses to a simple man. Poet is more sensible than a common man. William Wordsworth defined the poetry and poet in the context of a common man. Matthew Arnold was one of the most influential literary critics and a renowned poet of the Victorian period. He started his career as poet but later put his pursuit of writing poetry aside because of tepid and hostile reviews. He defined poetry in the words of criticism of life. In his definition of poetry, he adds the concept of high seriousness and truth.

In this way, from the very inception of Western poetic tradition everyone tried to define the poetry with different views and thoughts but one thing which looked common in all was that nobody paid attention the exclusion of poet's genius and autonomous and autotelic properties of poetry or literature but with the advent of the twentieth century complete scenario changed. All over the world a new debate started about the role of a writer's knowledge of his ancestors in the compiling of his writings. Russian formalism is one of the many ideas which developed in this context.

Works Cited

- Barlingay, S. S. *A Modern Introduction to Indian Aesthetic Theory*. New Delhi: D. K. Printworld, 2007. Print.
- Choudhary, Satya Dev. *Glimpse of Indian Poetics*. New Delhi: Star Print-o-Bind, 2010. Print
- Greene, William Chase. "Plato's View of Poetry." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philosophy*. 29. 1918: 1-75. *JSTOR*. 15 Sept 2015
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/310558>>
- Habib, M.A.R. *A History of Literary Criticism and Theory from Plato to the Present*. New Delhi: Wiley India, 2008. Print.
- Hegde, Suryanarayana. *The Concept of Vakrokti in Sanskrit Poetics*. New Delhi: Readworthy Publications, 2009. Print.
- Kapoor, Kapil. *Literary Theory Indian Conceptual Framework*. New Delhi: Rekha Printers, 1998. Print.
- Murray, Penelope and T.S. Dorsch. Trans. *Classical Literary Criticism*. Great Britain: Clays Ltd., 2004. Print.
- Nagarajan, M.S. *English Literary Criticism and Theory*. Chennai: Orient Blackswan, 2012. Print.